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F. Community Outreach for Involvement and Support

The emphasis here is on outreaching to the community to build linkages and collaborations, develop greater involvement in schooling, and enhance support for efforts to enable learning. Outreach is made to (a) public and private community agencies, universities, colleges, organizations, and facilities, (b) businesses and professional organizations and groups, and (c) volunteer service programs, organizations, and clubs. A Family and Community Service Center Facility would be an ideal context for some of this activity. Outcomes include specific measures of community participation and indices of student progress and community enhancement related to use of volunteers and use of additional community resources.

Work in this area requires (1) programs to recruit community involvement and support (e.g., linkages and integration with community health and social services; cadres of volunteers, mentors, and individuals with special expertise and resources; local businesses to adopt-a-school and provide resources, award, incentives, and jobs; formal partnership arrangements), (2) systems and programs specifically designed to train, screen, and maintain volunteers (e.g., parents, college students, senior citizens, peer and cross-age tutors and counselors, and professionals-in-training to provide direct help for staff and students—especially targeted students), (3) outreach programs to hard-to-involve students and families (those who don't come to school regularly—including truants and dropouts), (4) programs to enhance community-school connections and sense of community (e.g., orientations, open houses, performances and cultural and sports events, festivals and celebrations, workshops and fairs), and (5) relevant education for stakeholders.*

1. Mentor/volunteer programs
2. School-community partnerships
3. Economic development

*The range of activity related to community outreach is outlined extensively in a set of self-study surveys available from our Center. (See Part VI for information on how to access these instruments.)
Mentoring and volunteer programs have increasingly popular. Available data support their value for both students and those from the community who offer to provide such supports. Student outcomes include positive changes in attitudes, behavior, and academic performance (including improved school attendance, reduced substance abuse, less school failure, improved grades).

Also increasing in popularity are programs that outreach to the community to develop school-community collaborations. Indeed, After surveying a variety of school-community initiatives, Melaville and Blank (1998) conclude that the number of school-community initiatives is skyrocketing; the diversity across initiatives in terms of design, management, and funding arrangements is dizzying and daunting. Their analysis suggests (1) the initiatives are moving toward blended and integrated purposes and activity and (2) the activities are predominantly school-based and the education sector plays "a significant role in the creation and, particularly, management of these initiatives" and there is a clear trend "toward much greater community involvement in all aspects" of such initiatives -- especially in decision making at both the community and site levels. They also stress that "the ability of school-community initiatives to strengthen school functioning develops incrementally," with the first impact seen in improved school climate. With respect to sustainability, their findings support the need for stable leadership and long-term financing. Finally, they note

The still moving field of school-community initiatives is rich in its variations. But it is a variation born in state and local inventiveness, rather than reflective of irreconcilable differences or fundamental conflict. Even though communication among school-community initiatives is neither easy nor ongoing, the findings in this study suggest they are all moving toward an interlocking set of principles. An accent on development cuts across them all. These principles demonstrate the extent to which boundaries separating major approaches to school-community initiatives have blurred and been transformed. More importantly, they point to a strong sense of direction and shared purpose within the field.
Community Outreach (cont.)

Many of these collaborations involve efforts to create comprehensive approaches to support and strengthen students, families, and neighborhoods (see Part IV). The complexity of the work is making program evaluation difficult to carry out. Based on her analysis of such programs, Schorr (1997) concludes that a synthesis is emerging that "rejects addressing poverty, welfare, employment, education, child development, housing, and crime one at a time. It endorses the idea that the multiple and interrelated problems . . . require multiple and interrelated solutions."

A reasonable inference from available data is that school-community collaborations can be successful and cost-effective over the long-run. They not only improve access to services, they seem to encourage schools to open their doors in ways that enhance recreational, enrichment, and remedial opportunities and family involvement. A few have encompassed concerns for economic development and have demonstrated the ability to increase job opportunities for young people. At the same time, where the primary emphasis of school-community collaborations has been on restructuring community programs and co-locating some services on school sites, one negative side effect is the emergence of a new form of fragmentation as community and school professionals engage in a form of parallel play at school sites.

*Given the pressure to compile outcome findings relevant to addressing barriers to student learning, as a first step we simply have gathered and tabulated information from secondary sources (e.g., reviews, reports). Thus, unlike published literature reviews and meta analyses, we have not yet eliminated evaluations that were conducted in methodologically unsound ways. We will do so when we have time to track down original sources, and future drafts of this document will address the problem as well as including other facets of intervention related to this area. In this respect, we would appreciate any information readers can send us about well-designed evaluations of interventions that should be included and about any of the cited work that should be excluded.
# Table F. Community Outreach for Involvement and Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Mentor / Volunteer Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title of Program/Project</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. <em>Research review of volunteering effects on the young volunteer</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <em>Big Brothers / Big Sisters of America</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. <em>Juvenile Mentoring Program (JUMP)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For more information on each program, project, or article, see Appendix F.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Program/ Project*</th>
<th>Length of Evaluation</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Focus of Change</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Nature of Academic Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d. Volunteers in Maryland’s schools</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>Schools in Maryland</td>
<td>School system, Student</td>
<td>School programs have been positively impacted by volunteer services, including an increase in resources for instructional programs, improvement in students’ behaviors, and more use of school facilities after regular school hours. Volunteer services were seen as making a significant contribution to school programs.</td>
<td>None cited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Volunteer projects in San Francisco (1) Project Book Your Time, (2) Project Interconnections II, (3) Project Math in Action, (4) Project Think/Write</td>
<td>1.) 1985-1986, 1986-1987 annual evaluations, 2.) 1986-1987 annual evaluation, 3.) 3-year project evaluation, 4.) 1987-1988 annual evaluation</td>
<td>1.) Immigrant students K-5 in San Francisco, 2.) High school students in San Francisco, 3.) Math students, 4.) Middle and high school students</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1.) Questionnaires showed positive reactions to the program by teachers and volunteers. 2.) Volunteer college students were more likely to enter a career of foreign language teaching. 3.) Improvements in attitudes towards mathematics 4.) Data found positive impacts on volunteers and teachers.</td>
<td>1.)The school that implemented the literacy project school wide achieved greater gains in reading and language arts than the school with limited participation. Both schools scored higher than control schools 2.)By the end of the program, participating students were more confident and fluent in the foreign language being learned. 3.) Improvements were seen in student problem-solving performance 4.) Improved critical thinking and writing skills as preparation for future employment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Program/ Project*</th>
<th>Length of Evaluation</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Focus of Change</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Nature of Academic Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f. Senior citizen volunteers in the schools</td>
<td>None cited</td>
<td>Elementary school children</td>
<td>Senior Citizen</td>
<td>Provided elementary school children with caring and supportive senior citizens while also allowing older adults to engage in meaningful activities in a school setting that proved to be valuable.</td>
<td>None cited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Adopt-A-Grandparent Program</td>
<td>1 year evaluation</td>
<td>Dade County Public School students (Miami, FL)</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Improved all participating students’ self-concepts and at-risk students’ attitudes toward the elderly. Some positive impact was noted in senior citizens, particularly with respect to depression, but these changes were not as consistently positive as were those for students</td>
<td>None cited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Teen Line</td>
<td>Various; follow-ups up to 10+ years</td>
<td>Troubled adolescents 13-17 years old</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Between 1981 and 1992, the hot line serviced over 127,000 calls. In 1991 and 1992 alone, over 33,000 calls were answered. When compared to a matched, non-volunteer peer group, Teen Line volunteers’ level of social concern and empathy was significantly higher.</td>
<td>None Cited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Teen Outreach Program (TOP)</td>
<td>10 year evaluation</td>
<td>Young people ages 12-17</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>When compared with non-participants, 8% lower rate of course failure; 18% lower rate of suspension; 33% lower rate of pregnancy; and 60% lower school failure and dropout rate.</td>
<td>8% lower course failure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. DAYS La Familia Community Drug and Alcohol Prevention Programs (ATOD)</td>
<td>2 year evaluation, including 6, 12, &amp; 18 month follow-ups</td>
<td>Hispanic families with high-risk youth 6-11 years old</td>
<td>Student, Family</td>
<td>92% retention rate and over 80% attendance per session. Families more willing to discuss alcohol, tobacco, and other drug issues openly and made positive steps toward empowerment.</td>
<td>None cited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For more information on each program, project, or article, see Appendix F.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Program/Project*</th>
<th>Length of Evaluation</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Focus of Change</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Nature of Academic Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Alliance School Initiative</td>
<td>multiple years</td>
<td>Community, schools, and students (K-12)</td>
<td>Community, Student</td>
<td>School-community teams have developed neighborhood efforts to counter gang violence and ease racial tensions, introduced tutorial and scholarship opportunities, developed after-school and extended-day programs, and made substantive changes in the curriculum, scheduling and assessment methods.</td>
<td>None cited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Avance</td>
<td>Long-term follow-up</td>
<td>Young children from low-income families</td>
<td>Student, Families</td>
<td>Passes literacy from parent to child as well as reduces child abuse, mental health problems, and juvenile crime. Improves school performance.</td>
<td>Long-term follow-up studies show that 90% are graduating from high school and half go on to college.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Be A Star</td>
<td>1-year evaluation</td>
<td>Children (5-12 years old), families, schools</td>
<td>Student, Families, School</td>
<td>Compared to controls, those children who participated showed higher levels in the following areas: family bonding, prosocial behavior, self-concept, self-control, decision-making, emotional awareness, assertiveness, confidence, cooperation, negative attitudes about drugs and alcohol, self-efficacy, African-American culture, and school bonding.</td>
<td>None cited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For more information on each program, project, or article, see Appendix F.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Program/Project*</th>
<th>Length of Evaluation</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Focus of Change</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Nature of Academic Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>d. The Jackson School</strong></td>
<td>Qualitative, case-study evaluation based on a two-day site visit</td>
<td>6th - 8th grade students</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>As contrasted with other alternative schools, student and teacher perspectives of effectiveness are generally satisfactory. The school ensures small classes; maintains student’s individual attention and supports families in times of crisis.</td>
<td>None cited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e. Merritt Elementary Extended School</strong></td>
<td>multiple years</td>
<td>Elementary School students (K-5)</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Evolved into a community of caring and involved people, maximizing the potential of both its students and staff. Suggests outcome for student educational progress and success.</td>
<td>Suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>f. Beacon Schools (NY)</strong></td>
<td>multiple years</td>
<td>Students and adults</td>
<td>Students, Families, and Community</td>
<td>Fewer felony arrests among neighborhood youth; improved attendance and academics.</td>
<td>Improved academic performance. (One school rose from 580th out of 620 elementary schools in reading achievement to 319th three years after the intervention.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>g. Young &amp; Healthy</strong></td>
<td>Annual evaluation (5-year period)</td>
<td>Uninsured children needing health care services</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>During the program’s first year, 600 appointments were made. By the 2nd year, 1200 appointments were made. Expanded to the entire school district. By its 5th year, the program made 4800 appointments and has over 400 doctors on their referral list.</td>
<td>None cited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For more information on each program, project, or article, see Appendix F.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Program/Project</th>
<th>Length of Evaluation</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Focus of Change</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Nature of Academic Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a. Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS)</strong></td>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td>Families on welfare</td>
<td>Families, Parents</td>
<td>Employment rates of 66-91% and slightly higher rates for those attending four-year colleges.</td>
<td>None cited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b. Pacoima Urban Village</strong></td>
<td>Ongoing since 1995</td>
<td>Residence of the Pacoima Urban Village and cooperating employers</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Has registered over 800 villagers, and has become a focal point for villagers to find employment and develop ways to work together and help each other.</td>
<td>None cited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c. Job Corps</strong></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Disadvantaged students ages 16 and older</td>
<td>Students, Community</td>
<td>More than 75% become employed, obtain further training, or join the military. Completion of training is associated with better jobs and higher wages.</td>
<td>None cited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d. Annie E. Casey Foundation’s Rebuilding Communities Initiative</strong></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>All in the community</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>In it’s formative stages: 5 communities have developed neighborhood governance collaborative’s, a community-driven comprehensive community building plan, and are developing implementation capacity.</td>
<td>None cited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For more information on each program, project, or article, see Appendix F.  
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Appendix F: Community Outreach for Involvement and Support

The following are brief summaries and related information on the community outreach programs listed in Table F.
1. Mentor / Volunteer Programs

a. Research Review of volunteering effects on the young volunteer: Reviews some of the best researched volunteer service programs for adolescents and addresses three major questions: (1) What do existing data tell us about the effectiveness of community volunteer service programs in positively influencing the lives of the participants? (2) What do we know about why such programs work? (3) What are the most promising directions for future research and programming efforts to pursue? The review suggests that diverse, successful volunteer programs for adolescents, along with school-based support, are related to improvements in both the academic and social arenas. Specifically, volunteering relates to reduced rates of course failure, suspension from school, school dropout, improvement in reading grades, a reduction in teen pregnancy, and improved self-concept and attitudes toward society. The conditions under which the volunteering occurs, such as number of hours and the type of volunteer work, seem in some cases to be important to these outcomes, as does the age of the student volunteer.

For more information, see:

b. Big Brothers / Big Sisters of America: The Nation’s oldest mentoring program provides screening and training to volunteer mentors matching them with “little brothers” and “little sisters” in need of guidance. Public/Private Ventures (P/PV) performed an 18 month experimental evaluation of eight of the programs focusing on social activities, academic performance, attitudes and behaviors, relationships with family and friends, self-concept, and social and cultural enrichment. The study reports that mentored youth were less likely to engage in drug or alcohol use, resort to violence, or skip school. In addition, mentored youth were more likely to improve their grades and their relationships with family and friends. The 1995 P/PV evaluation suggests that, compared to controls, participants were 70% less likely to initiate drug use, one-third less likely to hit someone, skipped fewer classes and half as many days of school, felt more competent about doing schoolwork, showed modest gains in their grade point averages (with strongest gains among the Little Sisters), and improved their relationships with both parents and peers.

For more information, see:


c. Juvenile Mentoring Program (JUMP): This program administered by the federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention is designed to reduce juvenile delinquency and gang participation, improve academic performance, and reduce school dropout rates. It brings together caring, responsible adults and at-risk young people in need of positive role models. A 2 year evaluation suggests that strengthening the role of mentoring as a component of a youth program can pay dividends in improved school performance and reduced anti-social behavior, including alcohol and other drug abuse. According to parents and teachers familiar with the program, 30% of the youth who participated showed improvement in their school attendance, 30% showed academic improvement, 35% showed improvement in their general behavior, and 48% increased the frequency of appropriate interactions with peers.

For more information, see:

For program information, contact:
d. **Volunteers in Maryland’s Schools:** Community education programs sponsored by the Maryland State Department of Education were evaluated based on questionnaires completed by school principals and program coordinators on volunteer services to schools in Maryland. Results indicate that volunteer services were widely used throughout the school system in various ways, such as assisting teachers, providing support for administrative and clerical services, and tutoring students. School programs have been impacted positively by volunteer services, including an increase in resources for instructional programs, improvement in students’ behavior, and more use of school facilities after regular school hours. Volunteer services were perceived as making a significant contribution to school programs.

For more information, see:


e. **Volunteer Projects in San Francisco**

*e-1 Project Book Your Time:* This is a volunteer immigrant literacy project in which volunteers supplemented classroom activities by reading and listening to students. Some reading tutors were 5th grade students, others were adults. Test score data, as measure by the California Test of Basic Skills, showed that students in a school where the literacy project was implemented school wide (grades K-5) achieved greater gains in reading and language arts than students in a school in which only a few teachers participated. Both schools scored higher than control schools that did not have the program. Questionnaires showed positive reactions to the program by teachers and volunteers.

*e-2 Project Interconnections II:* This volunteer program is designed to increase high school students’ oral proficiency in a foreign language by using volunteer college students in conversation. An independent evaluation indicated that the high school students were more confident and fluent in the foreign language at the end of the program and the college students were more likely to enter a career of foreign-language teaching.

*e-3 Project Math in Action:* Math in Action is a 3 year volunteer demonstration project where college students helped teachers implement cooperative learning and the use of manipulatives in mathematics. Improvements were seen in student problem-solving performance and attitudes toward mathematics.

*e-4 Project Think/Write:* Teachers and volunteers from businesses attend workshops taught by the Bay Area Writing Project. Business volunteers go into classrooms to help improve critical thinking and writing skills of middle and high school students as preparation for future employment. Data indicate positive impacts on students, volunteers, and teachers.

For more information, see:


f. **Senior citizen volunteers in the schools:** A grandparents’ program of senior citizen volunteers designed to provide elementary school children access to caring, supportive senior citizens and provide opportunities for older adults to engage in meaningful activities in a school setting. Results reported support the value of for both children and adults.

For more information, see:

g. **Adopt-A-Grandparent Program:** This volunteer program in Miami, Florida involves local senior citizens and Dade County Public School students. Evaluation of the 1985-1986 program year reports that a favorable impact on all participating students’ self-concepts and at-risk students’ attitudes toward the elderly. Some positive impact was noted in senior citizen participants, particularly with respects to levels of depression, but these changes were not as consistently positive as were those noted for students.

*For more information, see:*


h. **Teen Line:** This teen-to-teen telephone counseling service focuses on troubled youth through peer counseling. Problems addressed include gang participation, use of weapons, youth arrests, AIDS, teen pregnancy, teen suicide, among others. Teen Line provides outreach, volunteer services, training programs, and statistics on service utilization. Between 1981 and 1992, the hot line serviced over 127,000 calls (in 1991 and 1992, over 33,000 calls were answered). When compared to a matched, non-volunteer peer group, Teen Line volunteers’ level of social concern and empathy was significantly higher.

*For more information, see:*

i. **Teen Outreach Program (TOP):** This school-based program is designed for young people between the ages of 12-17 and is aimed at fostering positive youth development. Strives to create a non-threatening environment with the guidance of a caring adult to help young people thrive and develop positive self-images, learn valuable life skills, and establish future goals. In a ten-year evaluation of the program conducted by Philliber Research Associates, participants (compared with a comparison sample) demonstrated 8% lower rate of course failure, 18% lower rate of suspension, 33% lower rate of pregnancy, and 60% lower school dropout rate.

*For more information, see:*

*For program information, contact:*
Cornerstone Consulting Group, P.O. Box 710082, Houston, Texas 77271-0082, (215) 572-9463.

j. **DAYS La Familia Community Drug and Alcohol Prevention Programs:** This is a community-based alcohol, tobacco, and other drug (ATOD) prevention program that targets Hispanic families with high-risk youth from 6 to 11 years old. It attempts to reduce identified risk factors while building on culturally relevant protective factors. During its first year, the program enrolled 219 youths and their families using existing community network and aggressive outreach. Reported results indicate a 92% retention rate and over 80% attendance per session; in addition, families became more willing to discuss ATOD issues openly and made positive steps toward empowerment.

*For more information, see:*
2. School-Community Partnerships

a. **Alliance School Initiative:** This is a community-based constituency in Texas aimed at working to strengthen schools by restructuring relationships among school and community stakeholders. Partners include the Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF), the Texas Interfaith Education Fund, the Texas Education Agency, school districts, school staff, parents, and community leaders. School-community teams have developed neighborhood efforts to counter gang violence and ease racial tensions; introduced tutorial and scholarship opportunities; developed after-school and extended-day programs; and made changes in the curriculum, scheduling, and assessment methods.

_for more information, see:_

b. **Avance:** This community-based early childhood program simultaneously focuses on two generations in an effort to motivate young children from low-income families to attend school. It began in San Antonio in 1973 and spread to over 50 sites. “Through weekly home visits, parenting workshops, and family support centers with on-site nurseries and top-notch early childhood programs, parents who have felt overwhelmed, depressed, and powerless gain control of their lives and radically change their own and their children’s prospects.” The program strives to help parents complete their informal education, improve their English, and sometimes control their anger. It also helps train and place parents in jobs. Reports indicate that it not only is useful for passing literacy from parent to child, but also helps reduce child abuse, mental health problems, and juvenile crime. In a population that had dropout rates of 70, 80, and 90%, long-term follow-up studies indicate that 90% of participating children graduate from high school and half go on to college.

_for more information, see:_

c. **Be A Star:** This community-based after school program began in 1992 in an area of St. Louis where gang activity, child abuse and neglect were high, large numbers of families received AFDC, and the high school dropout was 52%. Evaluations of the 1994-95 program year indicate that compared to controls, those children (5 to 12-years old) who participated showed higher levels of family bonding, prosocial behavior, self-concept, self-control, decision-making, emotional awareness, assertiveness, confidence, cooperation, negative attitudes about drugs and alcohol, self-efficacy, African-American culture, and school bonding. (All effects were measured by the Revised Individual Protective Factors Index - RPFI).

_for more information, see:_

d. **The Jackson School:** This is a community-based, temporary placement behavior-modification alternative school serving 6th through 8th grades (ages 10-15 years). The school is designed to serve students whose disruptive behavior problems prevent them from functioning successfully in a regular classroom. As part of a larger state-wide evaluation of alternative schools, a case study was done including site visits, school tours, classroom observations, and interviews. Information was gathered from teachers, students, administrators, counselors, parents, and community members. Student and teacher perspectives of effectiveness were generally satisfactory. The site was seen as ensuring small classes, maintaining students’ individual attention, supporting families in times of crisis, and helping students learn to negotiate their world by viewing them as part of a larger socio-economic system.

_for more information, see:_
e. **Merritt Elementary Extended School**: This school-based project was established to create a foundation for educational progress and student success. It is based on adult collaboration and on a nurturing and developmentally-oriented approach to student learning. The evolution of Merritt into a community of caring and involved people is believed to have enabled it to maximize the potential of both its students and staff. The school adopts the approach of developing the whole child as well as the stakeholders.

   *For more information, see:*
   

f. **Beacon Schools (N.Y.)**: These schools exemplify the move toward full-service schools and community-building. They target neighborhoods in which the first step in community building is to transform schools into community centers available to adults 365 days of the year. The program has expanded to 37 sites in New York, and initiatives are underway pursuing similar models in Chicago, Little Rock, Oakland, and San Francisco. Evaluative data are just beginning to emerge. Schorr (1997) notes that at one site, P.S. 194, “Academic performance at the school has improved dramatically, rising from 580th out of 620 city elementary schools in reading achievement in 1991 to 319th three years later. Attendance also improved, and police report fewer felony arrests among neighborhood youth.” These results are attributed to the combination of school reforms, the Beacon’s project efforts, and other city-wide efforts to address problems.

   *For more information, see:*
   

g. **Young & Healthy**: This is a school-based health service program that is tightly linked to the community. It was developed by the Pasadena Unified School District (CA) and is comprised of volunteer doctors who are willing to provide services free of charge to uninsured children. During the first year, only 600 appointments were made. By the second year, 1200 appointments were made, and it was expanded to the entire school district. By its fifth year, there were 4800 appointments and over 400 doctors were on the referral list.

   *For program information, contact:*
   
   Pasadena Unified School District; Pasadena, CA.
3. Economic Development

a. Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS): This is a program that encourages recipients to seek employment through improved education and training. A study of 158 students who had attended college in New York before the introduction of the program showed that almost 80% had been employed since graduation, and of these, almost 50% were earning over $20,000 per annum. In addition, while 62% were receiving welfare the year before entering college, only 17% were receiving it after graduation. Related studies conducted in five other states after introduction of the JOBS program revealed similar findings, with employment rates of 66-91% and slightly higher rates for those attending four-year colleges.

For more information, see:


b. Pacoima Urban Village: This program operates in a densely populated section of Pacoima, CA that includes over half of its population of over 60,000. The “village” is the focus of a socio-economic development strategy to help the community become financially independent and self-sufficient. It uses a number of strategies to fulfill its vision. These are designed to help villagers prepare to be competitive in the workforce, find jobs, and develop strong social and community interconnections. There also is a focus on improving the safety and appearance of each block within the village, helping businesses within the village to expand and become more financially lucrative, and helping new businesses develop. The village's Job Connection program, designed to match those looking for jobs with the job needs of employers, has been instrumental in helping over 130 villagers either find jobs or help them find the jobs themselves. The Job Connection program has registered over 800 villagers and has become a focal point for villagers looking for ways to work together and help each other.

For more information, contact:
Pacoima Urban Village, 13330 Vaughn St., Pacoima, CA 91340, (818) 834-1498, Fax: (818) 834-1492.

c. Job Corps: This is the nation's largest and most comprehensive residential education and job training program for at-risk youth, ages 16 through 24. Since 1964, it has provided more than 1.7 million young people with the integrated academic, vocational, and social skills training they need to gain independence and get quality, long-term jobs or further their education. It is a public-private partnership administered by the U.S. Department of Labor that has benefits for disadvantaged youth who attend the program, the communities where centers are located, and the employers and educators. Reports indicate that more than 75% of those who enroll in Job Corps become employed, obtain further training, or join the military. For young people who come from economically disadvantaged backgrounds, are high school dropouts, or read at an elementary school level, Job Corps offers an opportunities to become productive members of society. Those who complete training have the greatest chance of getting a better job and a higher wage.

For more information, contact:
Job Corps: 1-800-733-JOBS (1-800-733-5627), or visit their website at www.jobcorps.org.
d. Annie E. Casey Foundation's Rebuilding Communities Initiative (RCI): As described by the Foundation, "This, a seven-year initiative of the Annie E. Casey Foundation, is designed to provide the supports needed to help transform troubled economically disenfranchised neighborhoods into safe, supportive, and productive environments for children, youth, and their families. The Foundation works in partnership with community-based organizations on comprehensive strategies to reverse social isolation and disinvestment in low-income neighborhoods. The RCI objectives are: (1) Maximizing the capacity and impact of neighborhood resources and institutions; (2) Establishing effective neighborhood-based human service delivery systems for children, youth and families; (3) Developing capable and effective neighborhood collaboratives to which governance authority could gradually be devolved; (4) Improving availability of affordable housing and improving the social and physical infrastructure of the neighborhoods; and (5) Increasing public and private capital investments in the neighborhoods.

Five communities were funded in 1994 as RCI sites. The lead organization for the rebuilding effort in each of the communities is the Foundation's grantee. They are:

> The Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative (Boston, MA) for the Dudley Street Neighborhood in Roxbury, Boston.
> Germantown Settlement (Philadelphia, PA) for the Wister, Southwest Germantown, and Chew-Chelten neighborhoods in Germantown, Philadelphia.
> NEWSED Community Development Corporation (Denver, CO) for the La Alma/Lincoln Park neighborhood in West Denver.
> Warren/Conner Development Coalition (Detroit, MI) for neighborhoods in the Eastside of Detroit.

Participating RCI communities are eligible for grants for three phases of the initiative. The first phase of RCI was a planning phase. The result of the twenty-one month planning process was a neighborhood consensus on a community building plan, and a framework for implementing agreed upon reforms, programs, and development projects over the course of the initiative. The second, and current, phase of the initiative is the three-year capacity building phase. The capacity building phase is intended to enable neighborhood leaders, institutions, and residents to: develop the skills and experience; build the partnerships; develop and refine the program interventions; and attract the investments needed to actualize the community transformation that they envision. The final three-year phase of the initiative will be the demonstration phase. Those organizations that are funded for this phase will refine and demonstrate exemplary neighborhood capacity in one or more of the RCI critical elements contained in their community building plans.

In all five of the local communities, our grantee has succeeded in establishing an environment where collaboration and integrated approaches to family-centered community revitalization are understood and highly valued by residents, other community organizations, local government, and others involved in the initiative. Each of the sites has completed a community-driven comprehensive community building plan and is making varying degrees of progress to develop the capacity to implement the plans. We have completed the first year of the three-year capacity building phase. A number of observations may be useful to illustrate the current progress and impact of the initiative, as well as provide insights about the nature of the community change process. At each site, a local neighborhood governance collaborative has been fully established and has given greater cohesion and an increased sense of comprehensiveness to the work of local initiatives. Each grantee has been able to establish forward moving momentum around the initiative and, as a result, is totally committed to successfully implementing the community building plan. The five communities have used this phase of the initiative to begin building and demonstrating capacity to advance their community building plans through organizational development, community research, leadership development, partnership building, and planning for improved services and development projects. They have engaged a broad cross-section of community stakeholders in these activities, thereby establishing shared ownership and a reservoir of good will. All of the lead organizations are planning for neighborhood-based human services delivery systems with full involvement of neighborhood residents, and particularly those residents who depend on the services as vital supports to reconnect with jobs and other forms of productive community life. The efforts of grantees at each site are leading to increased physical and social infrastructure improvements. In some instances, construction of new housing units are expanding the overall inventory of affordable housing. In other instances, joint efforts are underway with local government to restore and retain affordable units for lower income families through...
extensive rehabilitation of the existing stock. Additional resources are also being brought into the neighborhood to help young families purchase their first home. In all of the communities, social networks are being strengthened through the intensive focus on new roles in community planning for neighborhood associations, religious, youth and civic groups. The communities have been able to attract capital investments to enhance the neighborhood revitalization. In some instances, new capital investments were made in the form of increased private lending for home buying and small business development, which will, in turn, create new job opportunities for residents. At one site, a new intermediary is being created to seek out new forms of investment and additional opportunities for strengthening the economics of the neighborhoods. Linkages with state and local governments to position the community for a role in system reforms must continue to be strengthened in all five communities. Building and strengthening relationships and capacities to take full advantage of opportunities to receive devolved functions continues to be a top priority.” (February 17, 1999) http://www.aecf.org/initiatives/rci/rci3.htm

For more information, contact:
The Annie E. Casey Foundation, 701 St. Paul St. Baltimore, MD 21202  ph: 410-547-6600  fax: 410-547-6624  e-mail: webmail@aecf.org