


Paterson Public Schools Full Service Community Schools Evaluation Report 2019 - 2020



By Heléne Clark, Misra Iltus, Sangdong Tak

Table of Contents

- Executive Summary..... 2
- 1. Introduction 3
 - 1.1 Overview of Paterson Public Schools (PPS) - Full Service Community School (FSCS)..... 3
 - 1.2 Evaluation Methods 4
- 2. Full Service Community School Model and its Implementation in Paterson.....7
 - 2.1 Full Service Community Schools Model and Theory of Change.....7
 - 2.2 Theory of Change – The Process..... 9
 - 2.3 Full Service Community School Theory of Change – COVID edition.....10
- 3. Student Findings 19
 - 3.1 Student Outcomes Behavior and Attitude Results 19
 - 3.2 Academic and Attendance 55
- 4. Conclusion and Recommendations 69

Executive Summary

This is a final report of the external evaluation conducted by ActKnowledge of a Federal Full Service Community Schools Grant received by the Paterson Public School District for year school year 2019 - 2020. This year was exceptional as school building closed in March 2020 due to the pandemic and districts and schools had to develop methods of online learning, for teachers who were unfamiliar with the technology and worse, for families with no internet or computers. Others families had computers but had parents and siblings all needing to use it.

One lesson that was stark this year is the inequity across schools depending on resources. Poor neighborhoods families had fewer choices – less internet, no alternative learning sites, less child care. In this atmosphere, the role of community schools was placed in the forefront and we believe provides lessons for the community school movement, as well as educational equity for the future. The next draft of this report will delve more deeply into this development.

We also see that community school coordinators were proactive and had to adapt quickly to new methods of outreach. Techniques and family situations were learned in a new way that will provide lasting change and expansion to how schools operate.

1. Introduction

This is a final report of the external evaluation conducted by ActKnowledge of a Federal Full Service Community Schools Grant received by the Paterson Public School District for year school year 2019 - 2020. School 2, School 6, School 15 and JFK High School are the focus of the report.

The external evaluation uses a new draft of the Paterson Public Schools (PPS) – Full Service Community Schools (FSCS) Theory of Change (ToC). The initial ToC was developed in 2010. By 2019, with new staff, new schools funded, a new basis for goals and planning was begun through a participatory approach with key stakeholders and ActKnowledge. That draft is in this report. The new draft ToC workshops included all the Paterson community schools, not just the four analyzed in this evaluation.

The report presents results of a student survey of behavioral and perception measures, for two schools (6 and 15) there is a comparison between how students felt at the end of the 2019 school year and again at the beginning of the fall 2019 semester to see if self-reports remain constant or change. It includes academic progress from June 2018 – June 2019, and for some schools from 2017 – 2019.

The report also outlines a set of conclusions and recommendations for sustaining the Full Service Community Schools in Paterson.

1.1 Overview of Paterson Public Schools (PPS) – Full Service Community Schools (FSCS)

Paterson Public School District was successful in securing a Federal Full Service Community School grant in 2010, which led to the establishment of the Paterson Public Schools (PPS) – Full Service Community Schools (FSCS) initiative. The PPS FSCS initiative comprises five public schools, each of which is partnered with a lead community-based organization to plan, implement and sustain services to support the well-being and development of children, their families and the wider community. The first FSCS established under this initiative was School 5 in 2011, followed by Rev. Dr. Frank Napier School and New Roberto Clemente School in 2012, and Schools 6 and 15 in 2014.

Some schools received additional grants since the first grant in 2010. Napier in 2013, and NRC and School 6 in 2015, received School Improvement Grants (SIG). The SIG grant provides support for professional development and extended school day hours. Four schools experienced leadership change during this period with new principals appointed at Napier in 2014 and at Schools 5, 6 and NRC in 2015. Currently, School 6, School 2, School 15 and JFK have five year FSCS grants and are therefore funded for the current evaluation.

1.2 Evaluation Methods

This evaluation uses a participatory mixed-methods approach involving collection and analysis of qualitative and quantitative data. The implementation of the community school services at the schools is based on a model that hypothesizes what it takes to reach goals. The evaluation, in turn, tests whether the assumptions of that model were correct or not, and whether the outcomes identified are being achieved.

As a participatory evaluation, the evaluator and program practitioners ensured that key stakeholders were involved in setting goals, which they did as participants in Theory of Change workshops conducted by the evaluator during the summer season. Key stakeholders also helped identify and collect data, collaborated in the logistics of site visits and collection of materials, and participated in feedback meetings with the evaluators.

Theory of Change

The evaluation is guided by a comprehensive Theory of Change for the Initiative and for the constituent schools. The process of developing and refining the Theory of Change was carried out from 2010 to 2014 through a series Theory of Change sessions facilitated by ActKnowledge and the National Center for Community Schools, as detailed below:

Many FSCS model stakeholders participated in these sessions, including principals, teachers, parents, community school directors from each school; lead agencies (New Jersey Community Development Corporation (NJCDC), St. Paul's Community Development Center, and Boys and Girls Club of Paterson and Passaic); key personnel from Paterson Public School District and Paterson Education Foundation and providers of health services. The sessions were co-led and facilitated by ActKnowledge and the technical assistance provider from the National Center for Community Schools.

The process and details of the Theory of Change are described in section 2.

Site Visits

Comprehensive site visits were made by ActKnowledge at the start of the grant year, using a set of interview protocols designed to elicit the views of stakeholders on how the community school was developing, including changes, achievements, challenges, and factors facilitating or hindering progress. This involved:

- Interviewing all community school directors and program staff.
- Interviewing principals and/or assistant principals.
- Focus group interviews with parents and/or parent coordinators.
- Focus group interviews with students.

After March and school closure, interviews with multiple staff took the place of site visits. These interviews were conducted in summer 2020 and fall 2020.

Identification and Analysis of Quantitative Data

ActKnowledge has analyzed quantitative data relating to key preconditions to student performance and attainment such as attendance, behavior and youth development. This analysis was based on data provided by Paterson Public School District and ActKnowledge's own youth surveys.

Data on Academic Results

The analysis of academic results is based on data from the New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJ ASK) for 2011 through 2014 academic school years, and the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) for the 2015 academic school year.

- The data came in the form of raw scores from both assessments broken out by school and disaggregated by programs/services such as afterschool program, school based health service and any other targeted intervention.
- NJ ASK raw scores for students who participated in afterschool programs were analyzed for school years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014. A longitudinal analysis to examine the impact on

those who have consistently participated in afterschool programs across two years was not possible because the sample of those students matched was very small.

- NJ ASK raw scores for students who used school-based health clinic services at School 5, New Roberto Clemente and Napier were analyzed for the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 school years. A longitudinal analysis was possible at School 5, which allowed us to assess the impact of student use of school-based health clinic services over two consecutive years.
- NJ ASK raw scores for Intervention and Referral Service (I&RS) students at School 5 were analyzed for 2012-2013 and 2013-2014. We conducted a longitudinal analysis to examine the impact on students who received targeted interventions for two consecutive years.
- Our analysis of PARCC raw scores for the 2014-2015 school year serves as a baseline for measurement of progress moving forward.

Data on Attendance/Chronic Absenteeism

Chronic absenteeism rates were analyzed to show the overall results for the five community schools from 2012 to 2015. Total days present in a school year served as a measure for the impact of specific programs/services on attendance, such as afterschool and health services.

Student Surveys

ActKnowledge developed a survey questionnaire to elicit the views and perceptions of students (focusing on 3rd grade and up) in the full service community schools (identified through the initiative's Theory of Change and through the education research literature) relating to student achievement. The youth survey is a validated and replicated instrument used in other community school initiatives. It is designed to capture youth attitudes and behaviors, including perceptions of their school, their community and their future.

2. Full Service Community School Model and its Implementation in Paterson

2.1 Full Service Community Schools Model and Theory of Change

The U.S. Department of Education has defined a full service community school as:

...a public elementary or secondary school that works with its local educational agency and community-based organizations, nonprofit organizations, and other public or private entities to provide a coordinated and integrated set of comprehensive academic, social, and health services that respond to the needs of its students, students' family members, and community members.

The federally funded FSCS is an important recognition of the validity and success of the community school movement across the United States over the past 20 years. The community school model has been seen as an ongoing strategy for marshaling community resources around student success. Through extended hours, services and—crucially—the building of relationships and effective partnerships, the community school model conceives of education as a coordinated, child-centered effort in which schools, families and communities work

together to support student's educational success, build stronger families and improve communities.¹

This holistic approach has been shown to be particularly important to children living in poverty, who need a variety of family and community resources, including intellectual, social, physical, and emotional supports, to have the opportunity to attain academic success. As noted by the U.S. Department of Education:

Many children live in communities that lack not only high-performing schools, but also the supports needed to be ready and able to learn when they start school. School-community partnerships can be key strategies for providing resources to these individual students. A variety of organizations can help provide the missing resources for children living in poverty and, therefore, begin to transform struggling schools and communities.²

A key premise of the full service community school model is that a whole set of 'preconditions' or intermediate outcomes, will need to be met before student success outcomes (that embrace academic progress but also social, emotional and health development) can be achieved. These preconditions have been elaborated in the PPS FSCS Theory of Change developed through the participatory process described earlier.

PPS FSCS afterschool programs provide support for academically at-risk students. Paterson FSCS schools made progress in aligning afterschool programming with regular school day activities and curriculum. Each school had a lead teacher synchronizing afterschool with school day by communicating with teachers regarding homework, grades and student progress. In School 6, AmeriCorps members assist 2nd – 6th grade teachers in the classroom during the school day.

¹ The National Center for Community Schools provides a very comprehensive conceptual definition and outline of the community school model in its publication *Building Community School: A Guide for Action*, 2011.

² U.S. Department of Education. <https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2014/05/06/2014-10361/applications-for-new-awards-full-service-community-schools-program#h-4>

The installation of FSCS Community Health Centers in the schools began in 2012 at School 5, New Roberto Clemente in 2013, Napier in 2014, and School 6 and School 15 in 2015.

Services provided through the Health Centers include primary medicine (for example, immunization), vision (including optical examination and glasses), dentistry, behavioral health and nutrition education. Treatment coordinators in each center connect children and families across all service areas.

We found in the academic year of 2018 through 2019, that the three elementary schools (2,6, and 15) had increased services, particularly within the community school offices, with goods and services for families, and with increased social and behavioral health expertise.

“We had a parent that was going through tremendous stress with her apartment and was a single mom with three children. We enrolled the family into the health center and upon visits with the doctor it was determined that the daughter needed glasses and some nutrition counseling. As we became more involved in the family, we discovered that behavioral counseling was necessary. After a few months the teacher called down to the health center to inform us that whatever we were doing was helping the student tremendously...getting her glasses and counseling was making her less withdrawn and more focused in school”.

Denise Hajjar, FSCS Health Centers 2013

2.1 Full Service Community School Theory of Change – Planning for short-term COVID and re-opening

2.2 Theory of Change – The Process


This year, the Theory of Change Workshops were very different. Instead of participants (approximately 30) meeting together and designing one ToC for five years, this year each school plus a separate workshop of district FSCS leaders met virtually one school at a time. They drafted goals just for the next few months, and some went as far as goals for how to address learning loss or students who had missed school, after schools re-opening.

The way things are usually done:




The way workshops were conducted, via Zoom, this year.

Paterson Public Schools Full Service Community School Grant Evaluation



Below are the drafts each school, and district leaders developed to identify goals. They will continue to work on these to develop school plans.


2.3 Full Service Community School Theory of Change – COVID edition



Paterson Public Schools Full Service Community School Grant Evaluation




Welcome Helene Logged in Oct 21, 2020 7:21 PM
©2017 Acknowledge All Rights Reserved




Paterson Public Schools Full Service Community School Grant Evaluation



Welcome Helene Logged in Oct 21, 2020 7:21 PM
©2017 Actknowledge All Rights Reserved



Paterson Public Schools Full Service Community School Grant Evaluation



Paterson Public Schools Full Service Community School Grant Evaluation



Welcome Helene Logged in Oct 21, 2020 7:21 PM
© 2017 Actknowledge All Rights Reserved



Admin Management Console: Click Here

Dashboard School 2 2020

SCHOOL 2 THEORY OF CHANGE 2020

Canvas: Landscape Portrait Show Grid
Canvas: width height
Accountability Ceiling Select Tool
Add/Edit Outcomes Shapes:
Connectors:
Additional Items
Add Legend
Add Comment

Paterson Public Schools Full Service Community School Grant Evaluation

Zoom Meeting Participants: Helène Clark, Jenna Goodreau, Doris Salgado, Denise Hajjar, Inge

TOCO Logo: Welcome Helene Logged in Oct 23, 2020 11:53 AM @2017 Acknowledge All Rights Reserved

Admin Management Console: Click Here

Dashboard | PPS District w...

Canvas: Landscape Portrait Show Grid

Canvas: width + - height + -

Accountability Ceiling Select Tool

Add/Edit Outcomes Shapes:

Connectors:

Additional Items: Add Legend, Add Comment, Add External Graphics

Background

Diagram Content:

- Go back with a hybrid model
- High school teachers are teaching students prepared for each case
- Students attend all day
- Collages will look at opportunities differently - inventory work will mean a bit
- High school honor roll
- Many kids already behind. They're behind and they're in person?
- Tutoring
- Parents learn how to get online
- Internet access
- For kids who didn't do online learning, those who missed programs will target them
- Summer will be crucial
- Have a handle on online learning in Paterson
- Child care help so students have a place to do virtual learning
- Get more parents on online learning
- Cultural adjustments program during this time will help students learn
- Get it bring kids into school for eye check, vaccines, etc. Parents will be on long list
- Have enough safety to bring some families to the office
- Students get education - they are not here as they're in well-resourced communities
- Summer will be crucial
- Different people, health, connectivity, different social and cultural norms through them
- Child care help so students have a place to do virtual learning
- Get more parents on online learning
- Cultural adjustments program during this time will help students learn
- Get it bring kids into school for eye check, vaccines, etc. Parents will be on long list
- Have enough safety to bring some families to the office
- Capture lessons and good things learned from the school closures
- Integrate with relationships in PPS as they work to project to the future
- Coordinate and help with support for staff/teacher depression
- Address staff/teacher depression
- Students will be able to return to school when they open
- How the needs of individual principals as they work through this
- PIE is going to support principals need because they have lost staff due to budget cuts
- Work with principals to encourage more online
- Condition health services (still trying)
- District funding as a cushion
- PIE, New Dealers, etc. They get a lot of funding from other subject (like science)
- Short term out of control of that. Through learning in person in summer recess - get in many kids involved with health (like when they get sick. Work with some institutions)
- Get students to do activities for learning when they are used to playing
- Identify new ways to do research to learn best
- None coming to this depending on school to get them online
- Community Circle with staff, staff come around
- Each school has a designated staff time and faculty
- Practiced through classes
- District goal is 200% of what we had in 2019
- 20-25% increase of families and staff participating in Community Circle from last year

Paterson Public Schools Full Service Community School Grant Evaluation



Welcome Helene Logged in Oct 21, 2020 7:21 PM
©2017 Actknowledge All Rights Reserved



Admin Management Console: Click Here

Dashboard | NRC 2020

```
graph TD; A[Have all children checked for vision and mental health] --> B[more access provide services for students in need]; B --> C[build more trust and good communication with admin]; C --> D[be more accessible to families]; D --> E[Increase community outreach]; E --> F[Find projects and create something positive within the community together for now and for future]; F --> G[Strong parent confidence to support community]; G --> H[Set up virtual community events successfully (FSC included)]; I[Find a way to secure communication with children to check in their safety and mental health] --> J[Accumulating students around their therapy]; J --> K[Have more clear expectations for the community and others with consistent programs]; K --> L[How to get parents and families involved and get them support (chaperone services)]; L --> M[Improve communication with community]; N[make sure students are getting access to their day and attending and participating in class]; O[Disability video games]; P[ask to principal to see if it is available to meet with children outside their home (safety and privacy)];
```

Canvas: Landscape Portrait Show Grid
Canvas: width height
Accountability Ceiling Select Tool
Add/Edit Outcomes Shapes:
Connectors:
Additional Items
Add Legend
Add Comment

3. Findings

In this section, we present key findings from the evaluation based on a selection of outcomes articulated in the Theory of Change. These include:

- Differences between initial school closure and pandemic in Spring 2019, summer 2019 and the return to the fall 2019 semester. Lessons were learned which are useful when normality returns
- Student and family outcomes – surveys are being collected and will be compared with last year’s to see the change in attitude and behavior pre and post COVID.

3.1 Student Survey Results Spring 2019- Fall 2019

Fall 2020 To be added for comparison when collected and analyzed.

Overview

The survey results in this report are from two surveys administered to students in 3rd grade or above at the end of the 2018-2019 school year and during winter of the 2019-2020 school year. The surveys were conducted at School 2, School 6, and School 15. School 6 and School 15 participated in both surveys and School 2 only participated in the second. For the schools where both surveys were administered, it was possible to compare students’ opinion and perceptions across different times of the year. However, only one grade (8th grade for School 6 and 3rd grade for School 15) participated in one of the two surveys, and consequently a caution is required when interpreting the results

School	Total Number of Respondents
School 2	119
School 6	303
School 15	258

Summary of Results in Schools 6 and 15 between June 2019 and December 2019

1. Student perceptions of their school are highly positive in terms of learning skills, feeling they can succeed, and feeling accepted ([Figure 1 & 19](#)). This positive perception is more evident at School 15. This positive perception is slightly weakened in the second survey and it is more apparent at School 6 ([Figure 2 & 20](#)).

2. Almost three-quarters of students would ask for academic help at School 6 and about half of the students would do the same at School 15 at the end of the 2019 academic year ([Figure 3 & 21](#)). This number slightly decreased at School 6 and increased a lot at School 15 in the beginning of the 2020 academic year ([Figure 4 & 22](#)). Less than half the students would ask for help with problems at home or bullying, and this trend continued in the second survey.
3. Ninety-four to 100 percent at School 6 and 96 to 100 percent at School 15 reported gaining skills in reading, writing, and math in any time of the year ([Figure 5 & 23](#)). Having good attendance was the hardest part for students, but this pattern became better in the later survey ([Figure 6 & 24](#)).
4. In terms of school activities, more than 80 percent of students reported participation in sports and games at both schools, and the high percentage of participation maintained in the second academic year ([Figure 7 & 25](#)). Sixty to 70 percent of students at both schools participated in math and science activities for fun in any time of the year, but the number of students who read for fun decreased later in the year at both schools ([Figure 8 & 26](#)).
5. A majority of students at both schools reported that they got help with homework from family members and talked about their future with family ([Figure 9 & 27](#)). The percentage of getting homework help slightly decreased, but talking about their future increased at both schools ([Figure 10 & 28](#)). Less than half the students reported that their teachers knew their families well at both schools, and it reflected a similar percentage later in the year.
6. Less than half of students found a positive effect of participation in after-school programs at School 6, whereas about two-thirds of respondents reported a positive effect at School 15 ([Figure 11 & 29](#)). The trend was maintained in the beginning of the second academic year. ([Figure 12 & 30](#)).
7. The school health clinic gets high positive ratings at both locations in terms of staff members' friendly attitude and recommendation to a friend ([Figure 13, 14, 31, & 32](#)).
8. In the perception of a full-service community school, a majority of students at both schools reported that they were proud of their own culture and learn more about other cultures as well ([Figure 15 & 33](#)). Meanwhile, about half of the students stated that they felt safe in their neighborhood ([Figure 16 & 34](#)).
9. Approximately two-thirds of students at both schools in both surveys reported that they were aware of attending a full-service community school ([Figure 17, 18, 35, & 36](#)).

3.1 Student Outcomes

School 6

Figure 1. Student perceptions of their school, Spring 2019- School 6




Figure 2. Student perceptions of their school, Winter 2019- School 6




Figure 3. Student levels of comfort asking for different kinds of help at school, Spring 2019- School 6





Figure 4. Student levels of comfort asking for different kinds of help at school, Winter 2019- School 6



Paterson Public Schools Full Service Community School Grant Evaluation

Figure 5. Skills students are learning at school related to academic achievement, Spring 2019-School 6





Figure 6. Skills students are learning at school related to academic achievement, Winter 2019-School 6



Paterson Public Schools Full Service Community School Grant Evaluation

Figure 7. Participation of students in activities at school, Spring 2019- School 6




Figure 8. Participation of students in activities at school, Winter 2019- School 6




Figure 9. Student perceptions of parent / family involvement with school, Spring 2019- School 6




Figure 10. Student perceptions of parent / family involvement with school, Winter 2019- School 6




Figure 11. Participation of students in after-school programs, Spring 2019- School 6




Figure 12. Participation of students in after-school programs, Winter 2019- School 6




Figure 13. Student opinions on their school health clinics, Spring 2019- School 6





Figure 14. Student opinions on their school health clinics, Winter 2019- School 6



Paterson Public Schools Full Service Community School Grant Evaluation

Figure 15. Perceived impact of attending a full-service community school, Spring 2019- School 6




Figure 16. Perceived impact of attending a full-service community school, Winter 2019- School 6




Figure 17. Student awareness of attending a Full-Service Community School, Spring 2019- School 6





Figure 18. Student awareness of attending a Full-Service Community School, Winter 2019- School 6



School 15

Figure 19. Student perceptions of their school, Spring 2019- School 15




Figure 20. Student perceptions of their school, Winter 2019- School 15




Figure 21. Student levels of comfort asking for different kinds of help at school Spring 2019-School 15






Figure 22. Student levels of comfort asking for different kinds of help at school, Winter 2019-School 15



Paterson Public Schools Full Service Community School Grant Evaluation

Figure 23. Skills students are learning at school related to academic achievement, Spring 2019-School 15



Paterson Public Schools Full Service Community School Grant Evaluation

Figure 24. Skills students are learning at school related to academic achievement, Winter 2019-School 15




Figure 25. Participation of students in activities at school, Spring 2019- School 15




Figure 26. Participation of students in activities at school, Winter 2019- School 15




Figure 27. Student perceptions of parent / family involvement with school, Spring 2019- School 15




Figure 28. Student perceptions of parent / family involvement with school, Winter 2019- School 15




Figure 29. Participation of students in after-school programs, Spring 2019- School 15




Figure 30. Participation of students in after-school programs, Winter 2019- School 15




Figure 31. Student opinions on their school health clinics, Spring 2019- School 15




Figure 32. Student opinions on their school health clinics, Winter 2019- School 15




Figure 33. Perceived impact of attending a full-service community school, Spring 2019- School 15




Figure 34. Perceived impact of attending a full-service community school, Winter 2019- School 15




Figure 35. Student awareness of attending a Full-Service Community School, Spring 2019- School 15





Figure 36. Student awareness of attending a Full-Service Community School, Winter 2019- School 15



School 6 and 15 Combined

Figure 37. Student perceptions of their school, Spring 2019- School 6 & 15




Figure 38. Student perceptions of their school, Winter 2019- School 6 & 15




Figure 39. Student levels of comfort asking for different kinds of help at school, Spring 2019- School 6 & 15




Figure 40. Student levels of comfort asking for different kinds of help at school, Winter 2019- School 6 & 15




Figure 41. Skills students are learning at school related to academic achievement, Spring 2019- School 6 & 15




Figure 42. Skills students are learning at school related to academic achievement, Winter 2019-School 6 & 15




Figure 43. Participation of students in activities at school, Spring 2019- School 6 & 15




Figure 44. Participation of students in activities at school, Winter 2019- School 6 & 15




Figure 45. Student perceptions of parent / family involvement with school, Spring 2019- School 6 & 15




Figure 46. Student perceptions of parent / family involvement with school, Winter 2019- School 6 & 15




Figure 47. Participation of students in after-school programs, Spring 2019- School 6 & 15




Figure 48. Participation of students in after-school programs, Winter 2019- School 6 & 15




Figure 49. Student opinions on their school health clinics, Spring 2019- School 6 & 15




Figure 50. Student opinions on their school health clinics, Winter 2019- School 6 & 15




Figure 51. Perceived impact of attending a full-service community school, Spring 2019- School 6 & 15




Figure 52. Perceived impact of attending a full-service community school, Winter 2019- School 6 & 15




Figure 53. Student awareness of attending a Full-Service Community School, Spring 2019- School 6 & 15





Figure 54. Student awareness of attending a Full-Service Community School, Winter 2019- School 6 & 15



School 2

Figure 55. Student perceptions of their school, Winter 2019- School 2




Figure 56. Student levels of comfort asking for different kinds of help at school, Winter 2019- School 2




Figure 57. Skills students are learning at school related to academic achievement, Winter 2019 - School 2




Figure 58. Participation of students in activities at school, Winter 2019- School 2




Figure 59. Student perceptions of parent / family involvement with school, Winter 2019- School 2




Figure 60. Participation of students in after-school programs, Winter 2019- School 2




Figure 61. Student opinions on their school health clinics, Winter 2019- School 2




Figure 62. Perceived impact of attending a full-service community school, Winter 2019- School 2





Figure 63. Student awareness of attending a Full-Service Community School, Winter 2019- School 2



3.2 Academic, Attendance and Suspension Rates 2018 – 2019

* 2017 – 2019 are presented for School 6

Tests for end of 2019 were not given and we preserve here last year's scores to see how we can compare to June 2020.

This section presents the analysis of academic performance at the three elementary schools and JFK High School in Paterson New Jersey for the years 2017 – 2019 (School 6) and 2018 – 2019 in the others. It includes the record of student absences and out-of-school suspensions (OSS). The schools examined include School 2, School 6 and School 15 along with JFK High School. Academic performance was analyzed using English Language Art (ELA) and Math test scores from three academic years, 2016-2019³.

The students' ELA test scores were all constant each year at each school over 2017 - 2019, however School 15 reported *a moderate improvement* and School 6 showed *substantial improvement* from 2016 (see Figure 5). School 6 was the only school with 2016 data available, so we don't know if the other schools improved over that year. The results show that the percentage of students with reported ELA test scores increased at the elementary schools in general, while JFK experienced a substantial decrease.

The math test scores slightly decreased at School 2 and School 6, whereas School 15 showed *some increase in the second year*. The percentage of students who had reported math tests increased at each elementary school, while no JFK student math scores were reported in the second year (2018 – 2019).

Overall, the proportion of students who were absent more than five days slightly decreased in the second year, whereas the average days absent per student increased marginally at all schools. The proportion of students who were suspended at least once also slightly decreased at the elementary schools, while the average OSS per student somewhat increased. Reversely, a slightly higher percentage of students were suspended in the second year at JFK, though the average OSS per student slightly decreased.

METHODOLOGY

- Absence and OSS reports were based on the whole student body (1st to 8th grade) and the analysis of ELA and math test scores were obtained only from 3rd to 8th grade.
- The number of students considered to have high absence were those with more than five days and the average days absent per student included those who were absent at least once.

³ 2016 – 2017 was only available for School 6. The other schools are analyzed for 2018 – 2019.

- The number of students who were suspended and the average suspension per student all corresponded to those who were suspended at least once.
- The total numbers of students who took the ELA and math tests were not the same and hence the different numbers were used for the analysis of each subject.
- The analysis of elementary schools included a breakdown by grade as well as the whole student body, while JFK was examined aggregately as its grade information was missing in almost all cases.
- School 6 was analyzed over the three academic years while School 15 did not have consistent data for three years and for School 2, the data for the academic year of 2016-2017 were not available.

ACADEMIC RESULTS

CHANGE OVER TIME (2017 OR 2018 – 2019)

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

The number of students who took the ELA test increased in the second year at all elementary schools, while it decreased at JFK (Table 1). Percentage wise, the rate also increased at School 2 and School 15, while School 6 reported a decrease and JFK showed a substantial decrease.

Table 1. ELA test result by school and year

School	# of students taking ELA test		% out of the whole student body ²		Avg. ELA level	
	2017-2018	2018-2019	2017-2018	2018-2019	2017-2018	2018-2019
School 2	155	223	51.7	53.1	2.7	2.6
School 6	168	277	60.0	54.0	2.3	2.3
School 15	75	162	34.1	43.4	1.8	2.2
Elementary Total	398	662	49.8	50.7	2.3	2.4
JFK High	1393	1009	78.5	37.9	2.1	2.2

The average ELA test scores remained constant for two years at each school except for School 15, which showed an increase by 13 points (Figure 1). **Figure 5 shows that School 6 did show substantial improvement from 2016.**

Figure 1. Average ELA test score by school and year




Table 2. ELA test result by grade, School 2

Grade	# of students taking ELA test		Avg. ELA score		Avg. ELA level	
	2017-2018	2018-2019	2017-2018	2018-2019	2017-2018	2018-2019
3	35	49	731	715	2.7	2.1
4	41	40	717	733	2.2	2.9
5	33	43	719	727	2.3	2.5
6	35	43	747	730	3.3	2.6
7	11	35	752	747	3.5	3.3
8	---	13	---	728	---	2.5
Total	155	223	730	729	2.7	2.6

Figure 2. Average ELA test score by grade and year, School 2




Table 3. ELA test result by grade, School 6

Grade	# of students taking ELA test		Avg. ELA score		Avg. ELA level	
	2017-2018	2018-2019	2017-2018	2018-2019	2017-2018	2018-2019
3	43	41	704	702	1.8	2.0
4	44	78	718	718	2.2	2.3
5	43	55	725	723	2.5	2.4
6	32	58	729	720	2.7	2.3
7	6	38	714	733	2.0	2.9
8	---	7	---	724	---	2.4
Total	168	277	718	719	2.3	2.3

Figure 3. Average ELA test score by grade and year, School 6





Table 4. ELA test result by grade, School 15


Grade	# of students taking ELA test		Avg. ELA score		Avg. ELA level	
	2017-2018	2018-2019	2017-2018	2018-2019	2017-2018	2018-2019
3	67	81	700	716	1.8	2.2
4	8	78	707	713	1.9	2.1
5	---	3	---	701	---	1.7
Total	75	162	701	714	1.8	2.2

Figure 4. Average ELA test score by grade and year, School 15



It was possible to compare the three years of academic performance for School 6. Overall, each grade reported an increase in the ELA test scores over the three years (Figure 5).

Figure 5. Average ELA test score by grade and year, School 6



MATH

The number of students who took the math test increased in all elementary schools, while no JFK students took it in the second year. Percentage wise, the rate also increased in School 2 and School 15, while School 6 reported a slight decrease (Table 9)

Table 5. Math test result by school and year

School	# of students taking Math test		% out of the whole student body		Avg. Math level	
	2017-2018	2018-2019	2017-2018	2018-2019	2017-2018	2018-2019
School 2	160	229	53.3	54.5	2.5	2.4
School 6	168	292	60.0	56.9	2.1	2.1
School 15	78	171	35.5	45.8	2.0	2.2
Elementary Total	406	692	50.8	53.0	2.3	2.2
JFK High	424	---	23.9	---	1.9	---

The average math test scores slightly decreased at School 2 and School 6, while it increased somewhat at School 15 (Figure 6).

Figure 6. Average math test score by school and year




Table 6. Math test result by grade, School 2

Grade	# of students taking Math test		Avg. Math score		Avg. Math level	
	2017-2018	2018-2019	2017-2018	2018-2019	2017-2018	2018-2019
3	35	51	740	726	3.0	2.6
4	41	41	726	733	2.5	2.8
5	35	42	720	721	2.3	2.3
6	37	44	721	719	2.4	2.3
7	12	36	714	718	2.3	2.3
8	---	15	---	702	---	1.6
Total	160	229	726	722	2.5	2.4

Figure 7. Average Math test score by grade and year School 2




Table 7. Math test result by grade, School 6

Grade	# of students taking Math test		Avg. Math score		Avg. Math level	
	2017-2018	2018-2019	2017-2018	2018-2019	2017-2018	2018-2019
3	43	42	715	715	2.2	2.2
4	45	85	708	707	2.0	1.9
5	42	56	711	715	2.0	2.1
6	32	60	725	709	2.5	2.0
7	6	41	712	721	1.8	2.3
8	---	8	---	692	---	1.5
Total	168	292	714	712	2.1	2.1

Figure 8. Average Math test score by grade and year, School 6





Table 8. Math test result by grade, School 15


Grade	# of students taking Math test		Avg. Math score		Avg. Math level	
	2017-2018	2018-2019	2017-2018	2018-2019	2017-2018	2018-2019
3	70	87	711	719	2.0	2.3
4	8	81	700	712	1.6	2.1
5	---	3	---	709	---	1.7
Total	78	171	710	715	2.0	2.2

Figure 9. Average Math test score by grade and year, School 15



In terms of academic performance for math at School 6 over three years, 3rd and 5th grades (when they were first assessed in 2016-2017) showed a slight increase, while 4th and 6th grades maintained a status quo (Figure 10).

Figure 10. Average Math test score by grade and year, School 6



ABSENCE AND OUT-OF-SCHOOL SUSPENSIONS

The total number of students increased in the second year at all schools (Table 1). One reason for the increase in School 2 and School 6 is the addition of 8th grade records. (Table 10).

Table 9. Total number of students by school, 2017-2019

School	# of total students	
	2017-2018	2018-2019
School 2	407	522
School 6	374	655
School 15	380	599
Elementary Total	1161	1776
JFK High	1774	2663

Table 10. Total number of students by school and grade, 2017-2019

Grade	School 2		School 6		School 15		JFK	
	2017-2018	2018-2019	2017-2018	2018-2019	2017-2018	2018-2019	2017-2018	2018-2019
1	53	40	45	80	77	110	---	---
2	54	62	49	62	83	116	---	---
3	56	74	57	75	95	121	---	---
4	63	68	64	124	99	129	---	---
5	57	70	73	88	26	123	---	---
6	60	74	47	98	---	---	---	---
7	64	62	39	70	---	---	---	---
8	---	72	---	58	---	---	---	---
Total	407	522	374	655	380	599	---	---
9	---	---	---	---	---	---	601	709
10	---	---	---	---	---	---	602	676
11	---	---	---	---	---	---	562	664
12	---	---	---	---	---	---	9	614
Total							1774	2663

The number of students who were absent more than five days increased in the second year at all schools, but percentage wise, the rate slightly decreased, except for School 2 that reported an increase. Considering all those who were absent at least once, the average days absent per student slightly increased at all schools. The maximum days absent vary from school to school showing overall decrease, except for School 15 having an increase (Table 11).

Table 11. Absence report by school, 2017-2019

School	# of students absent more than five days		% out of the whole student body		Avg. days absent/student ²		Max. days absent	
	2017-2018	2018-2019	2017-2018	2018-2019	2017-2018	2018-2019	2017-2018	2018-2019
School 2	240	328	59.0	62.8	9.8	10.7	104	46
School 6	290	504	77.5	76.9	15.1	16.8	86	74
School 15	284	382	74.7	63.8	11.1	11.2	44	66
Elementary Total	814	1214	70.1	68.4	12.0	13.1	104	74
JFK High	1756	2593	99.0	97.4	23.4	23.7	165	145

Similarly, the number of students who were suspended out of school at least once increased in the second year, whereas the proportion of suspended students decreased at School 2 and School 6 and increased at School 15 and JFK. The average number of suspensions per student increased at all elementary schools, while it was the opposite at JFK (Table 4).

Table 12. Out-of-school suspension (OSS) report by school, 2017-2019

School	# of students suspended at least once		% out of the whole student body		Avg. suspension/student		Max. # of suspensions	
	2017-2018	2018-2019	2017-2018	2018-2019	2017-2018	2018-2019	2017-2018	2018-2019
School 2	28	33	6.9	6.3	1.8	2.4	6	18
School 6	59	85	15.8	13.0	3.0	6.0	9	29
School 15	7	26	1.8	4.3	2.1	3.0	5	8
Elementary Total	94	144	8.1	8.1	2.6	4.7	9	29
JFK High	201	319	11.3	12.0	5.9	5.7	29	34

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

4.1 Conclusions

The community schools fulfilled a more proactive role than even usual in getting and keeping families engaged and students learning. Maintaining social work and especially health services was very difficult but did occur on a limited basis.

4.2 Recommendations

Learning from the experience of school closure provided lessons to the coordinators that will be detailed in the next version of this report.