

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.