The *Building Assets-Reducing Risks* Program: Replication and Expansion of an Effective Strategy to Turn Around Low-Achieving Schools

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Competitive Preference Priorities 1

Responses to Selection Criteria

A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design 2

B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect 8

C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant 10

D. Quality of the Project Evaluation 15

E. Strategy and Capacity to further Develop and Bring to Scale 19

F. Sustainability 21

G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel 23

Supplemental Information Included in Appendix H of the Proposal

BARR Program Schema

BARR Logic Model

BARR Theory of Action

Organizational Chart

References

Competitive Preference Priorities

Building Assets—Reducing Risks (BARR) Program is a promising strategy that is the core of our i3 proposal. The goal of BARR is to increase student achievement for all first year high school students using asset building and improving school climate as the means for these changes. Innovation funds will allow BARR to be replicated in additional sites, including rural schools, expanded to impact all high school students, and add a college access and success component.

Competitive Priority 6 (College Access and Success) **-** *Admission Possible* will partner with us and develop a school-wide college access and success program in our BARR expansion. *Admission Possible's* mission is helping low-income high school students prepare for and earn admission to college. President Barack Obama praised the work of *Admission Possible* at a White House event June 30, 2009, highlighting innovative programs making a difference across the country. Historically, 98% of *Admission Possible* students have earned admission to college and nearly 80% of those college students either remain enrolled in college or have earned their degrees.

Competitive Priority 8 (Innovations that Serve Schools in rural LEAs) **-** Upon receipt of i3 funds, the BARR core will be implemented in four sites: two rural sites in Maine (Madison and Bucksport, MA); a first ring suburb of Minneapolis (St. Louis Park, MN) and one in the greater Los Angeles urban metroplex (Hemet, CA). The Maine schools are both classified as rural, per government criteria. Because BARR maximizes existing resources within the school and utilizes staff already engaged with students, the need for outside resources, typically scarce in rural communities, is lessened. The strength-based approach is desperately needed in rural communities. This approach builds on the community and school's strengths.

Section A: ***Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design***

Our application addresses **Absolute Priority 4**, Innovations that Turn around Persistently Low-performing Schools through integrating student supports into the school model to address non-academic barriers to learning; **Competitive Priority 6 (**College Access and Success); and **Competitive Priority 8 (**Innovations that Serve Schools in Rural LEAs).

Need: Transition into senior high is critical to ensure success for all students. Ninth grade is a "make-it-or-break-it year" for many students; academic success becomes more challenging and high-risk activities become more frequent. The *Building Assets—Reducing Risks* (BARR) program was developed in St. Louis Park, MN in response to these issues. The BARR program is a promising strategy that is the core of our i3 proposal. The focus of BARR is the first year of high school (typically 9th grade) with intentionality on high-need students, student achievement, and student growth. BARR will be replicated at three low-performing schools across the nation, including rural LEAs, and strengthened and expanded at the original St. Louis Park site to include 10th- through 12th-grade students with innovations that support college access and success. We will partner with the highly recognized program *Admission Possible* to develop our college access and success components (**BARR program schema in appendix**).

Students beginning high school commonly experience increased stress and behavior problems alongside declines in grades, attendance, interest in school, participation in extracurricular activities, and perceptions of academic competence and self-esteem (Alvidrez, Weinstein 1993; Reyes et al. 2000, et. al). Almost all students, even those who graduate from high school and enter college, experience drops in grades and attendance in 9th grade. However, research indicates that, relative to students who graduate high school, those who leave school prematurely experience steeper 9th-grade declines (Reyes et al. 2000; Roderick 1995).

BARR is a school-based program that uses the Developmental Assets model as its theoretical framework. BARR integrates student supports into the school model to address non-academic barriers to learning by using an asset-building approach to strengthen relationships, increase student engagement in school and learning, and identify and intervene with students who are high-need and not engaging in school. The purpose of the program is to increase assets for all students, increase student achievement, reduce academic failure, increase attendance rates, decrease disciplinary incidents, and decrease alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use among 9th graders. BARR has helped close the achievement gap in St. Louis Park, MN, in particular, by encouraging underrepresented students to access and achieve in honors classes.

Developmental Assets are the relationships, opportunities, values, skills, and self-perceptions that research has demonstrated are critical for young people's successful growth and development (Benson, 1997). The framework identifies 40 Developmental Assets, or building blocks, that children and adolescents need to grow up to be healthy, productive, and caring. It is compatible with the risk and protective factors framework in that BARR helps identify those factors that buffer individuals from the risk factors present in their environments and then find ways to increase the protection (Hawkins & Catalano, 2001). BARR also increases teacher effectiveness through training, use of student data, and utilization of educational best practices.

BARR has been implemented in St. Louis Park, MN for twelve years, and evaluated by external evaluators, including the MN Institute of Public Health. BARR has demonstrated results in reducing risk behaviors (i.e. failures, illegal substance use, truancy) and increasing thriving behaviors, including school success. Academic failure rates have noticeably declined and student growth has been demonstrated over the course of this project. As a result, it is listed in the National Registry of Evidence-Based Programs and Practices (NREPP). BARR has received

national and international attention; delegates from the Russian Republic, Australia, and Mauritius have visited our program. SLP school staff have presented the BARR program and its results to over 80 conference audiences, including the National Superintendents Conference.

BARR Replication—Maine and California: Upon receipt of i3 funds, the BARR core program will be implemented in three low-achieving schools, in addition to St. Louis Park, MN. Implementation will occur in two rural sites in Maine (**Competitive Preference Priority 8**) and one in the greater Los Angeles urban metroplex (Hemet, CA).

Table 1: School District Enrollment, Population, Free/Reduced Lunch, and AYP Status

	Madison Area Memorial H.S., Rural Maine	Bucksport H.S., Coastal and Rural Maine	Hemet H.S., Newly Urbanizing, CA	SLP H.S., first-ring suburb, MN
School Enrollment	304	387	2,000	1,350
District Population	6,102	1145	22,000	4,300
Free/Reduced Lunch	60 %	52 %	74%	50%
Annual Yearly Progress Status	School: Safe harbor ’08-’09 lowest perform schools in 2009	School has not passed AYP in last 4 years	School met AYP in ‘08-’09. District did not pass AYP 07-10	School met AYP in 08-09. District did not in ’08-’09.

The availability of low-cost housing in the city of Hemet has brought radical changes in family and socioeconomic diversity. Currently 27.5% of Hemet city residents speak a language other than English at home, and 58% of the students are classified as minority students.

BARR Expansion: In St. Louis Park, BARR will continue in 9th grade and expand into grades 10 through 12. We will enroll more high-need students in *Admission Possible* and develop

college access and success strategies for all students in the school (**Comp. Preference 6**). SLP High School receives many accolades due to its 9th-grade program (BARR) and has achieved recognition, such as *Newsweek* ranking SLP High School #1 in the state in 2009. It is important to note that these accomplishments occurred as the community is transitioning from being suburban to urban. For years, SLP teachers have requested that the program be expanded into higher grades. Innovation funds will allow these expansions to occur; *Admission Possible* will partner with us and develop a school-wide college access and success program. *Admission Possible*'s mission is helping low-income high school students prepare for and earn admission to college. President Barack Obama praised the work of *Admission Possible* at a White House event highlighting innovative programs making a difference across the country on June 30, 2009. Historically, 98% of *Admission Possible* students have earned admission to college and nearly 80% of those college students either remain enrolled in college or have earned their degrees. SLP High School has been implementing *Admission Possible* for a small number of students for the past three years with a high degree of success. We will impact all high school students in St. Louis Park and develop a national model with our BARR/*Admission Possible* partnership.

We will achieve our goal of turning around persistently low-performing schools through integrating student supports into the school model to address non-academic barriers to learning (**Absolute Priority 4**) utilizing BARR as the core program. The BARR program achieves its goals, objectives, and outcomes by utilizing a variety of strategies, all grounded in the Developmental Assets approach (Logic Model and Theory of Action in appendix).

<u>BARR Goal:</u> Increase student achievement using asset-building and improving school climate as means for these changes. Replication sites focus on first-year students and expansion sites impact all high-school students with added programming for college access and success.

Table 2: BARR Historical Objectives and i3 Replication/Expansion Program Objectives

HISTORICAL	i3	
BARR Core St. Louis Park, MN	**BARR Replication** Maine, California **(Competitive Priority 8)**	**BARR Expansion** St Louis Park, MN (**Competitive Priority 6)**
Objectives: *Impacts 9th graders* 1. Reduce academic failure. 2. Increase student attendance. 3. Decrease disciplinary incidents. 4. Decrease alcohol, tobacco & other drug use.	**Objectives:** *Impacts 9th graders* 1. Reduce academic failure. 2. Increase student attendance. 3. Decrease disciplinary incidents. 4. Decrease alcohol, tobacco & other drug use.	**Objectives:** *Impacts all students* Same as Objectives 1-4 for Replication Sites, plus: 5. Increase number of students seeking admission to college. 6. Improve ACT scores for high-need students.
Short-Term Outcomes: Assets were viewed as the framework in which the program was embedded. Funding was not available to measure assets or school climate changes. Short-term outcomes would mirror the replication site.	**Short-Term Outcomes:** ***All data as compared to first administration '10-'11.*** 1. Increase nine assets most strongly linked to academic success by 3% yearly. 2. Increase school climate scales by 3% yearly. *Impacts 9th graders.*	**Short-Term Outcomes:** ***All data as compared to first administration '10-'11.*** 1. Increase nine assets most strongly linked to academic success by 3% yearly. 2. Increase school climate scales by 3% yearly. *Impacts all students.*
Long-Term Outcomes:	**Long-Term Outcomes:**	**Long-Term Outcomes:**

All data as compared to baseline in '09-'10. 1. Reduce failure by 10%. 2. Increase attendance by 7%. 3. Decrease disciplinary incidents by 5%. 4. Decrease alcohol, tobacco and other drug use by 5%. *Impacts 9th graders.*	***All data as compared to baseline in '09-'10.*** 1. Reduce failure by 10%. 2. Increase attendance by 7%. 3. Decrease disciplinary incidents by 5%. 4. Decrease alcohol, tobacco and other drug use by 5%. *Impacts 9th graders.*	***All data as compared to baseline in '09-'10.*** Same as Objectives 1-4 for Core/Replication Site, plus: 5. Increase # of students seeking college admin by 5%. 6. Improve ACT score of high-need students by 18%. *Impacts all students*

BARR accomplishes its goals by employing a comprehensive set of interlocking **strategies:** **1)** Structure 9th-grade classes into **blocks** (team of three teachers for approximately 85 students); **2)** Reduce class sizes in block classes, allowing for **relationship-building**; **3)** Facilitate ***I Time***, a weekly class focused on social competency, substance abuse prevention, student-student and teacher-student relationships; **4)** Offer ongoing **staff development** regarding asset building, differentiated instruction, college readiness, and cultural competence; **5)** Increase **parent involvement** through an active 9th-grade parent advisory group; **6)** Increase **community involvement** by facilitating service-delivery partnerships; **7) Enforce school boundaries** through a school policy focused on asset building; **8)** Identify high-risk students and implement strength-based interventions through weekly **Risk Review** meetings; and **10**) Conduct **ongoing evaluation** of the program. The Expansion Program employs two additional strategies: **11**) Work in partnership with *Admission Possible* to develop and implement programs for students and train staff in **college access**; **12)** Increase number of high-need students in ***Admission Possible***.

In addition to the letters of partnership from the districts in Maine, Minnesota, and California and *Admission Possible*, letters of support from Senator Amy Klobuchar (MN), Senator Al Franken, Senator Susan Collins (ME), Representative Keith Ellison (MN), and Governor John E. Baldacci (ME) are included in the appendix.

Section B: ***Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect***

Developmental Assets Research Search Institute has identified 40 assets connected to positive youth development (Benson, 2006), with nine strongly linked to academic success: achievement motivation, school engagement, bonding to school, reading for pleasure, caring school climate, parent involvement in schooling, service to others, high expectation, and participation in high quality after-school programs. Levels of Developmental Assets in middle school contribute to **higher GPA** three years later in high school. Increases in assets are linked over time to increases in GPA (Scales et al., 2006). The key assets also are significantly related to **attendance**, sense of belonging, and students' **academic self-confidence** (Roberts & Scales, 2005). Students with higher levels of assets are far **less likely to engage in fighting**, threatening, or other aggressive behaviors that create unsafe school environments and interfere with their own and others' learning (Benson & Scales, 2009). The same assets-school success pattern occurs **among students of color, urban students, and students from low-income** families as among predominantly white, suburban, and more affluent students (see Scales, et al., 2005). High levels of the assets can significantly **reduce or even eliminate achievement gaps** related to socioeconomic status or race/ethnicity (Scales et al., 2008; Scales et al., 2006b).

Promising Research on BARR We present below only those findings of statistical significance. Other findings were in the expected direction but not statistically significant. The greatest gain seen through the BARR program has been in the area of **student achievement.** The

percentage of 9th-grade students who failed one or more classes in SLP High School decreased from 44% before BARR implementation to 28% in the first year of implementation ($p<.05$) and 21% following five years of implementation (21% vs. 28% or 44%, $p<.05$). A smaller percentage of 9th-grade students failed two or more classes after 5 years of BARR implementation than in the year before or year after implementation (18% and 21%, respectively; $p<.05$). These gains have held steady through school year 2008-2009.

From pre- to post-intervention, the percentage of students reporting **feeling positive about going to school (school connectedness)** increased for boys in the intervention school and decreased in the statewide comparison (37% to 42% vs. 33% to 32%, respectively; $p<.05$). From pre- to post-intervention, the percentage of students reporting that their **teachers showed respect** for students increased more for boys in the intervention school than for statewide comparison boys (66% to 77% vs. 63% to 68%, respectively; $p<.05$). From pre- to post-intervention, the percentage reporting **bullying** declined more for boys in the intervention school than for statewide comparison boys (14% to 9% vs. 18% to 17%, respectively; $p<.05$).

From pre- to post-intervention, the percentage reporting **recent cigarette smoking** declined more for boys in the intervention school than for statewide comparison boys (19% to 7% vs. 30% to 26%, respectively; $p<.05$). From pre- to post-intervention, the percentage reporting recent cigarette smoking declined more for girls in the intervention school than for statewide comparison girls (26% to 18% vs. 31% to 29%, respectively; $p<.05$).

School attendance rates and disciplinary incidents results were in the expected directions; however, these findings were not statistically significant. Considerable effort was spent operationalizing definitions of truancy and categories of disciplinary incidents. This same care will be taken with Maine and California sites, as definitions vary by district, county, and state.

The greatest limitation of these results is the lack of a control or comparison group. The BARR program involves all 9th-grade students, precluding a within-school control or comparison group. Since the St, Louis Park School District has only one high school, a comparison high school would require seeking a neighboring school district, creating scientific complications regarding equivalence. Considering budget and personnel, we employed a quasi-experimental design, examining pre-post intervention results compared to the statewide MN Student Survey.

Positive Impact on Student Achievement and Closing the Gap Research shows that when students of color or low-income students experience high levels of assets, their levels of attendance, school connectedness, effort, and grades become more like those of their white, more affluent peers (i.e. achievement gaps related to socioeconomic status or race/ethnicity can be reduced or even eliminated through building students' assets) (Scales et al., 2008).

The BARR program has been successful in closing the achievement gap of racial disparity evidenced in SLP's honors courses. Students of color are identified in 9th grade by block teachers and encouraged to take Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) classes. In the five years since the inception of this focus, BARR has moved the number of students of color in honors courses from 8 to 83 and the number of credits earned from 16 to over 172 ('05-'06 and '09-'10, respectively). Currently, 22% of the black student population is taking AP, IB, or honors courses, along with 14% of the Latino population, nearly mirroring the school's demographics. The 9th-grade failure rate has stayed the same, while in the past decade the minority population has grown tremendously. A number of articles have been authored about the BARR program, including those in the Minnesota Department of Education's *Blueprints*, the *Minnesota School Boards Association Journal*, and *Assets magazine*.

Section C. *Experience of the Applicant*

Search Institute has considerable experience relevant to the proposed project. For the last 20 years, institute staff have conducted both national and international research, and consulted with hundreds of community coalitions and thousands of schools, youth organizations, religious congregations, governmental agencies, and others implementing positive youth development programs based on the institute's framework of Developmental Assets. Over this period, more than 2,500 school districts in the United States have commissioned Search Institute to study Developmental Assets among their youth, typically followed by institute technical assistance with integrating asset-building principles into school and community programs and policies. These research and technical-assistance efforts have included a balance of urban, suburban, and rural districts. The institute has worked successfully with large and complex urban districts such as New York City, Seattle, Minneapolis, Albuquerque, Portland, San Jose, and Dallas. More than three million students in grades 4 through 12 have participated.

In the little more than 20 years since its introduction, the Developmental Assets approach has become acknowledged as one of the most widespread and influential frameworks for understanding and strengthening positive youth development (Eccles & Gootman, 2002, Small & Memmo, 2004). Google Scholar shows that the Developmental Assets approach and/or Search Institute have been referenced in more than 17,000 peer-reviewed journal articles. In 2009 alone, more than 10,000 schools and youth programs were using Search Institute resources, and in the last 15 years, more than 20 million of the Institute's books and other resources have been disseminated worldwide. In the last decade, more than 300,000 leaders in education, health, social services, religion, youth development, and other fields have been trained in the assets framework, and more than 5 million people from over 180 countries have visited the Institute's website. Search Institute has managed a vast number of large research and technical-assistance

projects growing out of this work, not only in thousands of schools, but also including national collaborations, to integrate asset-building and asset-focused data collection into the programs of the Boys and Girls Clubs of America and the YMCA of the USA and of Canada. More than 60 countries across the globe are using the asset approach.

One of our most ambitious projects is being undertaken by Search Institute and Vision Training Associates in collaboration with the RAND Corporation, the University of Southern Maine, and the Communities for Children and Youth initiative of the Governor's Children's Cabinet. Assets-Getting-to-Outcomes for Maine is a five-year project funded by the National Institute of Drug Abuse, using a quasi-experimental design to assess the success of a youth program improvement model (http://maineassets.org, see also National Institute on Drug Abuse, 2008). Twelve community coalitions comprising scores of schools and community organizations serving Maine youth are participating. Six were randomly assigned to be trained in the developmental assets framework (Fisher, Imm, Chinman, & Wandersman, 2006).

Search Institute's extensive experience managing research and technical assistance with schools has made a significant contribution both to scholarship and school improvement. For example, Scales and his colleagues (Scales & Roehlkepartain, 2003; Scales & Taccogna, 2000; Starkman, Scales, & Roberts, 2006; Scales & Benson, 2007) describe, based on many cross-sectional studies of sixth-through-twelfth-grade students, the robust and consistent relationship between levels of assets and self-reported school attendance and grades.

Scales et al. (2006) extended this line of research to a complex longitudinal investigation using school records to measure achievement. In this study, 370 students in grades 7 through 9 were followed for three years (through grades 10 to 12). The greater the number of Developmental Assets students reported in grades 7 to 9, the higher their actual GPA three years later. Increases

in Developmental Assets were significantly associated with increases in GPA. Furthermore, the effect size of assets on GPA was significantly larger than the effect size typically found for other well-documented documented school reform efforts. As Walser (2006) noted in a review of this Search Institute work in the *Harvard Education Letter* (2006), "achievement is as much about student development as it is about rigor and curriculum" (p. 2). In consistently demonstrating this link, through its research, and through numerous publications distributed widely in the education community, the institute has thus contributed to practical improvements that have positively affected student readiness to learn, and actual achievement, in thousands of schools across the country. We have also conducted several studies that show that experiencing the positive developmental relationships, opportunities, values, and skills that are the basis of our approach to promoting school success can significantly reduce or even eliminate SES- and racial/ethnic-related differences in educational outcomes (see, for example, Scales, Roehlkepartain, & Benson, 2010; Scales, Benson, Moore, Lippman, Brown, & Zaff, 2008; Scales, et al 2006).

We have provided numerous suggestions and real-life examples of how schools can build these assets in more than two dozen Search Institute education resources, such as *Great Places to Learn: Creating Asset-Building Schools that Help Students Succeed* (our foundational education resource—Starkman, Scales, & Roberts, 2006), *Engage Every Student: Motivation Tools for Teachers and Parents* (offers classroom and group strategies designed to empower youth with the desire and confidence to learn; learning profiles, activities, handouts, and other tools give both parents and teachers the resources they need to ensure that their children and students are excited, connected, and motivated to learn), and *Powerful Teaching* (18 educators share how they build assets, with dozens of specific instructional strategies given for asset building in subjects such as language arts, math and science, and health education).

Among our many other projects involving significant collaboration with schools and management of complex activities, we have evaluated service-learning in middle schools (Scales et al., 2000b), conducted a national study of U.S. elementary, middle, and high school principals' views on and use of service-learning (Scales & Roehlkepartain, 2004), and developed and extensively tested a new school climate survey now used in hundreds of schools nationally (Scales & Benson, 2007). Among other indications of the influence of this work, institute staff were invited to author the section on developmental characteristics of young adolescents in the National Middle School Association's seminal *This We Believe* (NMSA, 2009) document, that NMSA describes as the most widely circulated document in middle-level education. We also served as consultant to the Department's Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools (OSDFS) in 2010 as it developed its new school climate survey.. Most recently, we have collaborated with the Hopkins School District in suburban Minneapolis to submit a several-year proposal to the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences to pull these various strands of theory, practice, and research together to develop and test the feasibility of a new asset-building program, Assets for Academic Achievement. Finally, each year for the last 15 years, we have hosted a large international Healthy Communities • Healthy Youth conference, linking schools, families, youth, and communities from around the world. We anticipate more than 4,000 youth and adult participants at the 2010 HCHY conference, with collaborative planning having taken the last two years among Search Institute, the Houston ISD, and other Houston leaders.

Search Institute has the capacity to guide school systems through asset-building initiatives and the requisite process of organizational development. A primary example is our work with the Dallas Independent School District (DISD). DISD has been engaged with the asset framework for many years, via trainings and surveying of its students. Recently, their attention has turned to

creating system-wide tracking of student data and performance as part of a vigorous college readiness effort. The core of the effort is creating a profile for each student with a host of indicators about the individual's progress toward college acceptance. Beginning this spring, each student in grades 6 through 11 will now have Search Institute's *Developmental Assets Profile* (DAP) as a central part of their student profile. The DAP gives the district the means of assessing the psychological, social, and emotional health of each student, allowing for increased intervention strategies for the students most at risk as well as a means of using aggregate student data for organizational improvement efforts. Using funding from Gates Foundation, DISD has taken the DAP to the broadest district improvement level Search Institute to date.

Our growing body of school improvement work promises to lead schools toward creating and strengthening the organizational conditions needed for any intended reform or innovation to succeed. To this point, teachers in the BARR program have reported increased collegiality and decreased work stress, both of which are leading indicators of job satisfaction. Recruiting and retaining quality educators is paramount to all school improvement. The collaborative and collegial nature of the BARR program delivers practical structures for vastly improving the work conditions of educators. While not the key focus of the BARR program, this ancillary outcome significantly supports the core BARR goals and objectives.

Section D: *Quality of the Project Evaluation*

The local evaluation of this project will be overseen by Anu Sharma, Ph.D., L.P., with a final design to be developed collaboratively and approved by the management team. Since 1999, Dr. Sharma has been the external evaluator for numerous SLP School District programs, including federal and state initiatives. Dr. Sharma is trusted by school staff, teachers, and administrators.

Process Evaluation Questions 1) How are *resources allocated to implement activities* (staff

hours, skills, experience, training, and budget required, accuracy of original allocation)? 2) How is the *work plan implemented* (comparison of actual to planned activity, accuracy of original timeline, degree of adaptation, participation rates, attitudes regarding participation, perceived magnitude of change in outcomes, perceived quality of work plan)? 3) What is the perceived *impact of the project on students*? 4) What *obstacles or barriers* were encountered as each activity was implemented? 5) How did any broad *changes in the school district or community change the context* in which activities were implemented? 7) How are *preliminary evaluation findings used to improve* implementation of activities throughout the project?

Process Evaluation Measures Individual or group interviews will be conducted with the Project Director, Program Coordinator, Principals, Project Site Coordinators, Teachers, Staff, Students, and Parents. For persons most involved with the project, these interviews will occur quarterly. Otherwise, these interviews will occur twice during the school year. Student, teacher, and staff records will be maintained for all persons who participate in program activities assessing participation rates and perceived benefits of the project. Representative samples of participants will be selected for interviews to obtain more in-depth information.

Outcome Evaluation Questions Our questions will mirror the short- and long-term outcomes outlined in Section A (e.g., extent to which academic failure rates decreased for 9th grade students as compared to baseline in '09-'10, with objective of 10% listed in Section A). For brevity, we will not repeat each one here but rather explicate our methods.

Outcome Evaluation Methods Outcomes related to assets and school climate will be obtained from Search Institute instruments (the *Developmental Assets Profile* (DAP) and the School Climate Survey). The DAP will be augmented with increased measurement of the nine individual assets most linked to school success (each scale being 3-10 items in length). All of these

instruments are readily combined for single administration in a classroom setting; therefore, only one survey will be administered to students, to measure both assets and school climate.

The DAP is a 58-item survey focused on assets and requiring no more than a 6th-grade reading level and 10 minutes to complete. It is an individual measure that yields quantitative scores on assets in a profile format, is sensitive to changes in reported assets over time, and is suited to research and program evaluation (DAP User Manual, 2005). The scales have alpha reliabilities mostly in the .80s-.90s. Field testing showed good concurrent predictive validity. The augmented nine individual asset scales have reliabilities ranging from .74-.90.

Search Institute's School Climate Survey is a 61-item survey (of which we will use 40) requiring no more than a 6th-grade reading level and 20 minutes to complete. Eight subscales with acceptable alphas ranging from .64-.85 assess perceived safety, whether students feel treated as resources, and the overall emphasis students feel is given to academic expectations. The survey also measures factors closely linked to school success, including students' sense of belonging in the school, achievement motivation, and belief that they can succeed academically. These scales have good concurrent predictive validity (Scales & Leffert, 2004).

School records will provide data on student grades, test scores (e.g., ACT), attendance rates, disciplinary incidents, and number of students seeking college admissions. All partnering schools have agreed to allow access to these data. Alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use rates will be assessed using statewide instruments: ME Integrated Youth Health Survey (administered annually), CA Healthy Kids Survey (biannually), and MN Student Survey (every three years).

Implementation Data, Performance Feedback, and Periodic Assessment toward Outcomes We have intentionally written a process evaluation question that states, "How are preliminary evaluation findings used to improve implementation of activities throughout the

project?" to create a climate of continuous performance feedback. We have also created this expectation in Process Evaluation Questions 1 and 2, documenting "accuracy of original (planned) allocation" and "degree of adaptation required for each activity." We expect growth and change over the course of the project and will use this to improve and make course corrections and necessary adjustments in a timely fashion.

Sufficient Information to Facilitate Further Development/Replication/Testing The combined DAP/School Climate Survey will be administered to all students in all grades in all sites, replication and expansion. This will allow us to measure changes over time for asset levels and school climate scales. Individualized data will be linked to student outcomes, resulting in increased power for statistical analyses. We will use identification numbers to link baseline and subsequent surveys with student grades, test scores, attendance rates, and disciplinary information. The lead evaluator will also work with the local replication school districts in Maine and California to identify and build local evaluation capacity for this project. Dr. Sharma has considerable experience at building evaluation capacity through her nearly 10 years of work on SAMHSA's Service to Science, an evaluation capacity-building initiative. She will work with each replication site to not only implement the BARR evaluation activities, but also to identify and teach local evaluators to conduct these evaluation efforts and sustain them in the long-term.

Sufficient Resources The evaluation budget is approximately 6% of the total budget. While no hard and fast rules exist for evaluation budgets, typically fewer than 10% of project costs are dedicated to evaluation. Neither travel expenses for the lead evaluator nor cost of survey implementation or data analysis of survey results (DAP, School Climate, Asset Scales) are taken from this budget. Search Institute will be conducting the data analysis; however, BARR implementation is housed in an entirely different division than the research and data analysis

division within Search Institute, precluding a conflict of interest. Dr. Sharma will maintain close oversight of the data analysis of the Search Institute instruments. Therefore, 6% of the budget will allow Dr. Sharma sufficient personnel time to carry out our project evaluation effectively.

Section E. ***Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale***

Over four years, the project will reach 7,500 students. Search Institute has the requisite personnel, financial, and management resources to bring the BARR project to scale. Through our programs of scholarship, training and technical assistance, and product development and dissemination, the Developmental Assets approach has become one of the most prevalent, if not the most prevalent, frameworks in the positive youth development field, used by both scholars and practitioners worldwide. In addition to more than 3 million surveys administered to students in grades 4-12 in more than 2,500 U.S. communities, distribution of nearly 20 million units of our various publications, and training of more than 300,000 educators, counselors, youth workers, religious leaders, and others, senior staff serve as board members and consultants to major organizations such as the America's Promise Alliance, the National League of Cities, the Character Education Technical Advisory Committee of the U.S. Department of Education, the Department's Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools, and the National Middle School Association, among many others.

Interest in the BARR program has already been substantial—it has been the focus of more than 80 presentations at conferences, including the National Prevention Network in California and New Mexico, the National Superintendents' Conference, and the Safe Schools/Healthy Students Conference sponsored by USDOE. BARR staff were also invited by the U.S. Department of Education and the Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools to present at The Power of Change: Healthy Students, Safe Schools, Engaged Communities conference in August 2009. Every high

school in America is a potential adopter, since the program is classified as a universal preventive intervention. Thus, the program is relevant for all schools containing a 9th grade, as well as especially useful for schools with an identified 9th-grade risk population.

Scale-Up Costs Our estimates of scale-up costs are based in part on the operating structure of the prototype program tested in St. Louis Park, MN for the last 12 years, and in part on the proposed awarding of $200,000 to the Hemet School District for reaching 2,000 9th graders. Add-on costs for most schools will be reasonable, since all these resources already are involved with 9th-grade students at most schools, especially with at-risk students, as a normal part of their job descriptions. We would envision significant start-up savings by providing training in BARR implementation as part of our ongoing, nationwide training programs, and using new media, Facebook to Twitter, as well as Skype networking, to establish an online community of BARR users, trainees, and considerers that will serve to organically answer questions, stimulate interest, and link needs with resources. Based on an estimate of $200,000 per 2,000 9th graders, costs for reaching 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students are figured on hypotheticals of 50, 125, and 250 2,000-student high schools, or $10 million, $25 million, and $50 million, respectively.

Mechanisms for Dissemination Search Institute has numerous traditional and new media outlets for disseminating the results of the project:

- Web: three Web sites (the main Search Institute site, www.search-institute.org, annually receives more than 500,000 visitors).
- Training: more than 1,300 educators are trained per year in the Developmental Assets framework that underlies the BARR program.
- Publications catalogue: BARR materials will be added to our catalogue, which has sales of $2 million per year for asset-building products and resources, as well as to our online

newsletter, *Insights & Evidence*, the most-downloaded issue of which (fall 2003) showed how Developmental Assets boost student achievement.

- Peer-review: Search Institute staff publish in education, psychology, and youth development journals such as *Middle School Journal, Journal of Experiential Education, Urban Education, Professional School Counseling, Journal of Early Adolescence, Developmental Psychology, Applied Developmental Science, Journal of Community Psychology, Journal of Adolescence, NASSP Bulletin, Education Digest, Educational Horizons, Phi Delta Kappan, SOCIETY*, and the *American School Board Journal*, among hundreds of other publications.

Section F. *Sustainability*

Search Institute has the resources and support of stakeholders to conduct this project beyond the grant period, and to further incorporate the project into our ongoing work and the efforts of our many partners. Schools and educators have, for the last 20 years, represented the single largest percentage of Search Institute customers, clients, and partners, accounting for about 40% of our customer/client/partner base. Most of these are in elementary and secondary education, although our higher education partner base is rapidly expanding as Developmental Asset surveys and products begin to be developed for young adults ages 18-25. Each year, the education sector pays for roughly 150,000 of the institute's asset surveys to be administered in approximately 200 communities and 600 schools. In addition, the education sector purchases approximately 33,000 units of Search Institute products, and more than 1,300 educators participate per year in Search Institute trainings on how to create a more effective asset-building school environment. A major portion of our catalogue of products, reflecting more than two dozen separate resources, is explicitly developed for educators, school counselors, coaches, and administrators. Together, all of these customers and clients, many of whom are repeat customers, represent a vast network of

stakeholders that will be vitally interested in the latest evidence-based practices and products offered by the institute, and likely to adopt them. Moreover, Search Institute maintains collaborative relationships with key national, regional, and state education organizations and associations with stakeholder interest in this project, as well as with numerous key national youth organizations whose deep work in partnership with schools offers another indirect avenue of access to publicize the project and promote its adoption by others. For example, Search Institute's President serves on the Board of Directors for America's Promise Alliance, which has created the GradNation initiative to end the nation's dropout crisis. To date, more than 135 national organizations have become partners in that effort, all of which will be keenly interested in the BARR project and how their organizations might utilize it. Our other membership, authorship, and consultation links with key education-related organizations, such as the National Middle School Association, American School Counselors' Association, American School Health Association, and National Association of Secondary School Principals, will also ensure that widespread attention is given to the results of this project. These relationships between schools and Search Institute are often direct, but also frequently manifest themselves indirectly, thus expanding our capacity geometrically. In another example, the Hot Springs, Arkansas School District recently was awarded a $4 million Safe Schools Healthy Schools grant, using Search Institute's Developmental Assets approach, and many of BARR's elements, as the basis of its proposed initiatives. The school system became familiar with the assets approach through the involvement of the local YMCA with Search Institute's asset approach, rather than through a direct relationship with the institute. Our choice of evaluation measures also will assist us in attracting stakeholder interest. Among the measures we will use in the research and evaluation, if it is available, will be the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools' school climate survey, or

selected constructs from it. We have numerous other similar relationships and collaborations that will further multiply our chances of success in replicating and sustaining the project, including membership in the National Collaboration for Youth and the Ready by 21 initiative of the Forum for Youth Investment.

Section G: *Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel*

The i3 program will be overseen by the Management Team at Search Institute which consists of Angela Jerabek, Project Director; Gene Roehlkepartain, Vice President of Search Institute; Dr. Peter C. Scales, Senior Researcher; Project Coordinator (TBD); and Dr. Anu Sharma, Independent Evaluator, S & S Training and Consulting, Inc**.** The Management Team will assist all sites by monitoring implementation status, helping resolve problems, allocating financial and support resources, assisting in research and evaluation data collection and analysis activities, communicating with the USDOE, and overseeing preparation of site-specific and aggregate reports. Each of the four BARR sites will have a project coordinator who will be responsible for implementing the BARR program at each site and participating in the communities of practice. The BARR site coordinators, key staff roles, responsibilities, and timelines are listed in the BARR manual (pages 17-26). The proposed management plan (Table 3) is designed to achieve the objectives of BARR on time and within budget. The individual responsible for each milestone is identified (bold and underline).

Table 3: Management Plan, Activities, and Personnel

Activities/Milestones	**Timeline**	**Personnel**
Convene i3 Mgmt Team	Monthly beginning September 10, 2010	**Project Dir**, VP Search, Sr Scientist, Prjct Coord and Ind Evaluator
Implement Evaluation Plan	Sept 10 - ongoing	**Independent Evaluator**, Mgmt Team

Hire Search Institute Coord	Sept 10	**Management Team**
Hire project coord at 4 sites	Sept 10	**Building Admin**, Project Director
Plan BARR training at 4 sites	Sept 10 - ongoing	**Prjt Drctr**, Prjct Coord BARR Coord
Design site-specific task/timelines for each site	Sept 10 - ongoing	**BARR Coordinators**, Prjct Dir, Prjct Coord
Participate in Comm of Practice	Sept 10 - ongoing	**Project Director**, BARR Site Coords
Hire staff at BARR sites	Oct 10 - ongoing	BARR Coord, **Building Admin**
Collaborate with Admission Possible for college aspect	Oct 10 - ongoing	**Project Director**, BARR Coord at SLP, Admission Possible, SLP Staff
Collaborate with SLP Staff to develop BARR expansion	Oct 10 - ongoing	**Project Director**, BARR Coord at SLP, SLP Staff
Administer Asset and School Climate Survey at all sites	Oct 10 - yearly	**Project Director**, BARR Coords, Evaluator
BARR Expansion at SLP	Jan 11- ongoing	Project Director, **BARR Coord at SLP**, Admission Possible, SLP Admin
BARR Implementation at 3 replication sites	Sep 11- June 14	**Project Director**, BARR Coord, BARR staff
Final Project Eval Report	2014	**Prjct Dir**, Mgmt Team and Evaluator

The project director and other personnel are qualified to carry out their responsibilities and their time commitment is appropriate. The Project Director, Angela Jerabek, will provide broad oversight for activities at all sites, supervise the management plan, oversee *Admission Possible* integration, and provide support for the project. The .5 FTE BARR Coordinators will work with

staff in each of their buildings to implement BARR as well as with a cohort in communities of practice. See organizational chart in appendix for details.

Table 4: Roles, Responsibilities, and Qualifications of Management Team

Project Director: Angela Jerabek developed the BARR program, has trained schools in BARR, and has been the coordinator of BARR in SLP for the past 12 years. (Resume in appendix C.)
Liaison to Search Institute Executive Leadership (in-kind**):** Gene Roehlkepartain, Vice President of Search Institute, will serve as liaison to SI's executive leadership and will ensure that BARR project is embedded in ongoing strategic plans and management structure of SI.
Senior Internal Researcher: Dr. Peter Scales will ensure that all research activities are carried out consistent with Search Institute policies, will directly supervise the data analyst, and provide collegial support and consultation to Dr. Sharma as needed. (Resume in appendix C.)
Project Evaluator: Dr. Anu Sharma, external evaluator, was the original evaluator for the BARR project and has evaluated other SLP programs for the past 12 years. She will oversee all aspects of the process and outcome evaluation, conduct data analysis, and prepare evaluation reports. (Resume in appendix C.)
Data Analyst: Kathie Fraher will conduct data analysis in collaboration with the research scientist and independent evaluator.
Project Coordinator (position posted upon receipt of i3 funds): The project coordinator will coordinate and maintain administrative relationships with project team members, project site staff, and other partners, and will monitor work plans and budgets.
BARR Site Coordinator (position to be posted upon receipt of i3 funds): The Coordinator will have the following qualifications: 1) teacher license, 2) demonstrated knowledge and skill in leadership & coordination, and 3) understanding of interdisciplinary teaching.