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APPENDIX A: DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

This appendix describes the data collection and analytic processes used to develop the findings in our report Promising Opportunities for Black and Latino Young Men. A central challenge was creating an analytic framework that could be uniformly applied to all schools, despite the individualized nature of their ESI plans. Thus, we selected methods that would illuminate educators’ perspectives on the initiative overall and highlight broad themes from the first year of implementation across ESI schools. Our data collection started in the summer before the 2012-2013 school year, but primarily entailed school visits to 38 ESI schools in the spring of 2013, during which we conducted interviews and focus groups with principals, ESI design team leaders, and 9th grade teachers. We also administered a structured questionnaire to principals to collect information about the specific ESI programs at each school. Finally, we sought to contextualize this school-based fieldwork by interviewing members of the DOE’s ESI team.

This multi-layered qualitative research design was inspired first and foremost by an understanding of ESI as a school-wide initiative. Each stakeholder type we focused on had a different role to play in ESI: Principals maintained budgetary oversight and provided the last word on high-level decisions related to ESI in their school; design team members developed the ESI plan and worked to ensure that all the pieces fit together; and teachers implemented specific programs. Our interviews and focus groups were designed to elicit a range of perspectives on ESI’s roll out and early implementation from individuals who were engaged in the work on a day-to-day basis. (We will begin student focus groups in the second year of implementation, when programming is expected to be more fully integrated in schools.) Below, we describe the steps we took to collect and code data, identify prominent themes, and connect these themes to the larger goals of the initiative.

Data Collection

Prior to beginning fieldwork, the research team developed protocols and data collection instruments for each of the four data collection activities that would take place at every ESI school:

- A one-on-one interview with the principal (see interview protocol in Appendix B);
- An interview with one or two members of the design team responsible for crafting the school’s ESI application and workplan (see interview protocol in Appendix B);
- A focus group with three to five 9th grade teachers (see focus group protocol in Appendix C);
- A structured questionnaire for principals about the details of ESI programming at his or her school (see questionnaire in Appendix D); and
- Documentation pertaining to each school’s ESI programming (e.g., descriptions of programs, curricula, attendance sheets, etc.).

We used the questionnaire and documentation—as well as schools’ Year 1 workplans (see Appendix I)—to assess the fidelity and intensity of implementation at each school; details about how we measured fidelity and intensity are presented below.

For the interviews with principals and members of the design team, we developed a single protocol covering three main topics: 1) process—steps staff members took to implement ESI programs in their school; 2) sustainability—plans to sustain ESI programming over time and beyond the funding period; and 3) challenges—challenges schools faced in implementing ESI programs and how they addressed those challenges. We designed a separate teacher protocol to obtain a more global look at the role of ESI in teachers’ schools, how it had influenced their work, and how it had influenced the 9th grade Black and Latino boys in their classrooms. After writing individual comments on both draft
protocols, the evaluation team met to collaboratively resolve issues relating to content, length, order of questions, and wording. The two lead researchers piloted the principal protocol with three non-ESI principals, made several small revisions, and finalized the document. They also revised the teacher protocol in response to researcher feedback following the first five school visits.

Before beginning data collection, all team members participated in an intensive training session that covered fieldwork logistics, confidentiality, interview best practices, and the specific protocols developed for the study. Each school visit was conducted by one researcher, usually within a single day but occasionally over the course of several days, to accommodate teachers and school leaders. The researcher would typically begin the school visit by meeting privately with the principal, during which time he or she clarified the day’s schedule, obtained signed approval for the field visit, and provided a brief introduction to the Research Alliance’s work. During this introduction, the interviewer emphasized that the Research Alliance was not evaluating any school individually, but rather seeking to gain a richer picture of ESI implementation, including successes and challenges, across the 38 ESI schools we visited. Researchers began each interview and focus group with a similar explanation, after which they would obtain signed individual consent forms and ask the interviewees if they had any questions. Interviews and focus groups were audiorecorded (and later transcribed), and researchers also took notes as subjects spoke. The conversations were semi-structured, in that researchers were expected to cover a defined set of questions but were also encouraged to depart from the protocol if they felt it would yield valuable data. The protocols included a list of specific probes and follow-up questions designed to obtain more specific information or elicit responses from more reticent subjects. The teacher focus groups were 45 minutes each, while the interviews with principals and design team members were 60 minutes each, allowing extra time to complete the structured questionnaire.

Data Analysis

The data analysis process was a highly iterative, six-step process designed to lead researchers from initial reflections about how ESI operated in individual schools to the identification and fine-grained analysis of major themes emerging from ESI’s implementation across the 38 schools. Descriptions of these six steps are provided below.

Reflection memos. Within two days of each school visit, researchers completed a reflection memo for each interview or focus group conducted in that school. As shown in Appendices E and F, the reflection memos followed a standard format based on the interview protocol. The basic purpose of these memos was to summarize educators’ responses to interview and focus group questions.

Analytic memos. After all of the interviews were complete, researchers began to focus on overarching themes characterizing ESI implementation across the 38 schools. First, the two lead researchers developed a list of six analytic themes for the principal and design team interviews and six analytic themes for the teacher focus groups. Each of these themes (e.g., “startup”) was based directly on one to two questions from the interview or focus group protocol. Then, each researcher was assigned a subset of themes about which to write an analytic memo. To do so, researchers reviewed all of the reflection memos for the appropriate interview type—38 in all for the teacher focus group, and 76 for the principal and design team interviews, and tallied subthemes (e.g., “startup challenges”) evident in the reflection memos. Researchers then wrote an analytic memo for each theme exploring response types individually and in relation to each other.

Transcript coding. Based on a careful review of these analytic memos, the researchers then developed a list of codes with which to analyze the transcript data. Our approach was to create codes that would allow us to capture data specific to 1) our protocol questions, 2) the ESI theory of action, and 3) the subthemes identified by the analytic memos (for example, interviewees in 12 schools identified “teacher buy-in” as a challenge, and we thus included “teacher buy-in” in our codebook). The initial code list was refined via a three-step process: first, the two lead
researchers worked together to apply the codes to interview transcripts from two schools, adding several new codes (e.g., “communication”) and renaming several others for clarity (e.g., “sustain-strat” became “sustainability”). Second, the provisional codebook was distributed to the research team, which undertook two rounds of trial coding. For each round, researchers were given the same transcript to code independently, followed by a team meeting to identify and work through areas of discord and clarify unclear codes. After the second round of trial coding and discussion, the codebook was deemed final, and interview transcripts from all 38 schools were assigned for coding (including transcripts that had been used in the code development process; see Appendix G). Each of the 38 schools was assigned to a researcher, who used Atlas.ti, a qualitative analysis software, to code that school’s transcripts. Throughout the coding process, researchers met intermittently to address questions that arose.

Coding memos. After all transcripts were coded, each researcher wrote a coding memo, noting and recommending codes to be further analyzed. A meeting was held to discuss the memos and select themes for further analysis. Most themes selected for further analysis had been identified by all researchers in their individual summary memos, either due to frequency (e.g., “student engagement”) or salience to the ESI theory of action (e.g. “academics,” “college supports,” “DOE support,” and “external partnerships”), or both (e.g., “race and gender” and “relationships”). ii A few other themes that did not appear in every summary memo were also selected for further analysis based on the team’s discussion and determination that they were significant (e.g., “DOE”).

Thematic outlines. After deciding on a list of codes to further analyze, each researcher conducted a closer reading of the transcript data related to a particular code and wrote a thematic outline about that code (e.g., “college supports”). This process focused on transcripts from schools where a subtheme related to the code (e.g., “expansion of college supports to the 9th grade”) was present.

Synthesis memos. The research team discussed each of these thematic outlines, after which each researcher wrote a one-page synthesis memo highlighting the most salient analytic insights from Year 1. As a final step, a lead researcher combined the synthesis memos into an annotated outline, upon which this report is based.

Strengths and Limitations of this Approach

As with all research methodologies, the approach outlined above has both strengths and weaknesses. Our intention was to obtain a rich understanding of how ESI implementation worked on the ground. The questionnaires we administered to principals and design team members were used to assess how closely district- and school-level ESI implementation was aligned with ESI’s theory of action. Interview and focus group data were collected to illuminate the struggles and successes educators faced when implementing ESI in schools. Dense, descriptive data collected systematically from educators at multiple levels of ESI implementation and across nearly all ESI schools are well suited to answering the complex questions at the heart of our implementation study. Carefully collecting and analyzing such data ensures that our findings are based on a balanced array of perspectives both within and across schools and allows us to identify patterns and unearth complexities in school-level ESI implementation.

Another strength of our method was that our analysis began concurrently with our data collection. This decision allowed us to hone in on themes and patterns from early on and pushed us to probe more deeply for specific aspects of implementation throughout our data collection. Our data collection methods and analysis provided ample room for reliability checks when there was a lack of clarity or agreement about what we were finding. The careful step-by-step process and collaborative effort ensured that no individual’s interpretation could dictate the direction of the analysis, while also highlighting alternative perspectives we might not have considered.

Of course, there are inherent limitations to collecting and analyzing this type of data—including the logistical complexities of data collection, the possibility of bias, and the limited extent to which causal inferences can be drawn
from qualitative data. These limitations, along with the steps we took to acknowledge and mitigate them, are described below.

The logistical complexities of collecting data from 38 schools presented several challenges. At two ESI schools, technical difficulties prevented interviews from being audio recorded. However, even in these instances, researchers wrote a detailed reflection memo immediately following the interview, and contacted the school to arrange a repeat interview. As a result, all interviews at all schools yielded reflection memos, and all but four interviews (with two principals and two teachers) were audio recorded and transcribed. Any additional data collection problems resulted from time constraints—in a few cases, principals, design team members, or teachers hit a scheduling snag and were unable to participate in the full interview, meaning researchers were not able to ask all the questions on the protocol. The protocols were designed to fit into a very tight time frame, so such cases were relatively rare. To ensure that even shortened interviews were as informative as possible, researchers developed a shared understanding of how to prioritize questions so that the most crucial data were collected every time. Overall, we compiled a robust set of 114 interviews covering a broad and in-depth protocol.

Another common challenge with qualitative research stems from the fact that interview subjects are not always neutral observers. When people are asked about an effort they are invested in, for instance, they may downplay challenges. Early on in this study, a few researchers reported the impression that research subjects were skewing answers to present their schools in a positive light. In response to this issue, the lead researchers coached their colleagues on reminding research subjects that this was not an evaluation of any particular school and, where appropriate, probing for challenges. In addition, our efforts to triangulate data by interviewing multiple actors across different schools, as well as individuals from the ESI central team, mitigated any individual cases in which respondents were less hesitant to offer critiques or speak about challenges.

Finally, it is worth noting that the qualitative data presented and analyzed in this report is intended to provide a rich picture of how ESI is being implemented on the ground, not a summary judgment of ESI’s success (or lack thereof). Teachers were sometimes unclear about which programs were and were not part of ESI—or whether the changes they were observing stemmed from ESI or from another major school event (e.g., changes in leadership). Our implementation findings are thus not themselves intended to answer questions about ESI’s effects, but rather to provide detailed information about how principals and teachers actually implemented this type of programming in their schools and what they viewed as the byproducts of that programming. Learning from the perspectives of educators on the ground is a valuable way to understand the processes and complexities of a school-level initiative.

Overall, data collection problems due to logistical and other constraints were rare and carefully mitigated. This yielded a nearly complete and very reliable set of data. Our analytic process was multi-layered, methodical, iterative, and focused on gleaning insights from the 38 schools as a whole rather than from any one school. As a result, we are confident that the analytic insights presented in this paper are robust and will contribute to a better understanding of ESI’s implementation.

**Fidelity and Intensity of Programs**

As noted above, in addition to interviews and focus group, we also used a structured questionnaire to assess the fidelity and intensity of implementation at each school. Each questionnaire was designed to gather the following information: a basic description of program activities; the number of students served (and the teacher-student ratio); the frequency and duration of the program; and any partners involved. We then compared this information to the school’s workplan and assigned the school a score on four dimensions of fidelity. For intensity, we compared the responses on each questionnaire to external quantitative measures and, similarly, assigned the school a score on four dimensions of intensity. More details about the fidelity and intensity measures we developed are provided below.
We measured fidelity with a 16-point rubric with four categories, each assessed on a scale of 1-4: (1) **Overall Programming** measured how many of the activities in a school’s workplan were actually being implemented. (2) **Frequency and Duration** measured how many of the programs were meeting as often and for as long as the workplan projected. (3) **Target Audience** identified whether the intended audience (e.g., teachers, Black and Latino male students, etc.) had participated in the programming. (4) **Partnerships** evaluated the school’s collaboration with outside vendors (see rubric in Appendix H). As noted in the report, some schools found that their proposed partners weren’t a good fit for their needs. For this reason, schools who terminated a partnership could still achieve a high score in the **partnerships** category, as long as they developed a replacement partnership or continued the program on their own.

We measured intensity with a similar 16-point rubric, also with four categories: (1) **Program Diversity** measured how well schools balanced their programming across the three ESI domains. (2) **Number of Students Served** measured what percentage of the school’s Black and Latino male student population participated in ESI programming. (3) **Frequency and Duration of Programming** measured how frequently and for how long programs were meeting. The frequency and duration category on the fidelity rubric measured the same information, but only as compared to the school’s workplan. By contrast, frequency and duration on the intensity rubric examined whether the length and consistency of programs were appropriate for meeting the goals and needs of the program itself. (4) **Overall Documentation** measured how thoroughly schools maintained records and materials for the programs they developed (see rubric in Appendix H).

Because this information was collected during the first year of ESI, the design teams, vendors, and other staff were in the challenging position of learning and planning while implementing ESI, which may have resulted in some unevenness in the data we collected. For example, some plans evolved throughout the year and may not have been fully fleshed out at the time of our data collection (January-February 2013). In addition, the individuals who filled out the questionnaire had varying levels of knowledge about their school’s ESI plans and about specific implementation activities. As a result, although we believe we obtained a generally accurate picture of implementation fidelity and intensity, some of our information may be incomplete given the timing of our visits and the particular respondents participating in our interviews. We also recognize that the concept of fidelity has limitations as it pertains to this project. Failing to implement a list of programs as conceived is not necessarily a sign of negligence or poor planning; some schools had good reasons for deciding to implement different programs than they had originally proposed.

**Notes**

1 Two schools were excluded from our data collection because severe damage from Hurricane Sandy substantially delayed their ESI implementation.

2 Two very frequent codes, “challenges” and “changes,” were not selected for further analysis because these codes were almost always used in conjunction with another frequently occurring code (e.g., if a teacher noted that peer relationships seemed to be improving as a result of ESI, the researcher would code this both as “changes” and “relationships”).
APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FOR ESI PRINCIPALS AND DESIGN TEAM MEMBERS

Statement to Subjects

The Research Alliance for New York City Schools at New York University is conducting an evaluation of the Expanded Success Initiative (ESI). The objective of this research is to learn which services and supports are planned and implemented under ESI, the challenges that schools confront as they implement ESI services, and the supports they need to implement ESI services more effectively.

As part of this study, we are interviewing principals and design team members in schools selected to receive ESI funding. Interviews will take approximately 60 minutes and will be audio recorded. The Research Alliance will use the information participants provide for research purposes only. We will keep confidential the identities of those who participate in the research and will not attribute any comments to any specific individuals or schools.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may request at any time that we stop the interview or turn off the audio recording. You may also request at any time that we not include the interview in the study.

Do you have any questions?

Background and Start-up

To get started, I’d like to ask you about your role in this school and your participation specifically with ESI.

1. First, how long have you been a principal [or staff member] in your school?
2. Please describe your role with ESI in your school. What are your main responsibilities?
3. [If not offered] Describe your involvement specifically with the start-up planning of ESI in your school.
   - Were there any challenges involved in the start-up process?
   - How were these challenges addressed?
4. Beyond what you just described, were there any key decisions made during the planning process that you think have had an important impact on the implementation of the ESI-funded programs in your school?

Overall Impressions

Later in the interview, I’m going to be asking you about different ESI programs, but before that, I have some broader questions about ESI.

5. To get started, briefly tell me about your overall impressions of ESI in your school so far.
6. How, if at all, has ESI changed the day-to-day work of your staff?
   - How have these changes impacted the culture of your school? Administration? Teachers?
   - Are there any other notable changes/impacts that ESI has had on your school’s staff in general?
7. What is the single most successful or promising ESI program in your school?
   - How do you know it’s successful? Is there evidence of it success? Probe for: data sources, measurable outcomes, other types of outcomes, etc.
   - What factors have contributed to this program’s success?
8. Which ESI program would you say is the least effective?
   • Why do you think this program is less effective than other ESI programs? *Probe for* challenges, obstacles, etc.
   • What advice would you give to another school trying to implement this program in their school?

**Challenges and Sustainability**

9. Have you encountered any challenges around implementing ESI in your school? If so, can you give me one or two examples?
   • How did you or your staff address these challenges?
10. Which programs will your school continue next year?
    • How are you and your staff making this decision?
    • What will you need in place in order to implement these programs next year? *Probe for* expertise, resources, partners.

**Partnerships and Support**

11. Are there any external partners that have played a key role in ESI at your school?
    • How have they helped your staff implement ESI in your school?
12. What role, if any, has the DOE team played in ESI at your school?
    • What types of support would help your schools implement ESI more effectively?

**Closing**

*Earlier in the interview, I asked you about your overall impressions of ESI….*

13. Has talking about specific aspects of this school prompted any other thoughts about ESI?
14. In closing, is there anything else that I should have asked you about ESI or that you’d like to share to help us understand the implementation of ESI in your school?

*[Turn off the tape recorder]* Is there anything else that you want to say with the tape recorder turned off?
APPENDIX C: FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOL FOR ESI TEACHERS

Statement to Subjects

The Research Alliance for New York City Schools at New York University is conducting an evaluation of the Expanded Success Initiative (ESI). The objective of this research is to learn which services and supports are planned and implemented under ESI, the challenges that schools confront as they implement ESI services, and the supports they need to implement ESI services more effectively.

As part of this study, we are conducting focus groups with 9th grade teachers in schools selected to receive ESI funding. Focus groups will take approximately 45 minutes and will be audio recorded. The Research Alliance will use the information participants provide for research purposes only. We will keep confidential the identities of those who participate in the research and will not attribute any comments to specific individuals or schools.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may request at any time that we stop the focus group or turn off the audio recording. You may also request at any time that we not include the focus group in the study.

Do you have any questions?

******************************************************************************

Background

To get started, I’d like to ask you about your role in this school and your general impressions of ESI.

1. How long have you been a teacher at this school and what do you teach?
2. Please tell me about your overall impressions of ESI in your school so far.

I’m now going to ask some specific questions about ESI implementation and roll out.

ESI Roll Out, Management & Communication

3. Please describe your role in the ESI application/program development process, if any.
   • Were there any challenges involved in the start-up process?
   • How were these challenges addressed?
4. When and how did you first hear about ESI?
5. Can you talk about the ongoing communication at your school regarding ESI?
   • How frequently do you hear about ESI? In what format (written memos, meetings, etc.) From whom?
   • Generally, what is the content of communications about ESI (e.g. about changes, open for discussion, announcing next steps, etc)?
6. Have there been any substantial changes in your school since ESI started?
   • If so, can you give me an example?
   • Probe for: student behavior, student attitudes towards learning, teacher expectations, etc.
As you know, ESI is focused on college readiness for Black and Latino boys…

7. How does the staff at your school discuss approaches to educating Black and Latino boys?
   • Has this changed at all since last school year?

**ESI Programming & Resources**

I’m going to shift gears now and ask you some questions about ESI programming and resources.

8. What do you think is the most successful or promising ESI program in your school?
   • How do you know it’s successful? Is there evidence of its success? Probe for: data sources, measurable outcomes, other types of outcomes, etc.
   • What factors have contributed to this program’s success?

9. Please describe any ESI-related professional development that you’ve participated in.
   • Probe as appropriate for PD-related challenges.
   • Probe: Have there been any PD opportunities that you were unable to attend?

**Wrap-up**

There are a few closing questions I’d like to ask before ending the interview.

10. In closing, is there anything else that I should have asked you about ESI or that you’d like to share to help us understand the implementation of ESI in your school?
    • Are there any additional challenges that you or other teachers have faced in the implementation of ESI programming that we have not already discussed?

[Turn off the tape recorder] Is there anything else that you want to say with the tape recorder turned off?
APPENDIX D: STRUCTURED QUESTIONNAIRE

[Use school workplan to ask about each ESI-funded program and repeat for each program.]

One of the things we want to learn is if there have been any changes to your ESI programs since the beginning of the school year. I’m going to ask you a series of brief questions about each of the ESI-funded programs in your school. If there is a question you don’t know the exact answer to, you can provide your best estimate.

1. Who is the target population for this program?
2. How many students/teachers are served?
3. [if students] How are they recruited?
4. [if students] What is the adult-student ratio?
5. How often is this program provided? For what duration of time?

SCHOOL: _______________________________________

ESI Program 1: _______________________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Recruitment</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Freq/Duration</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ESI Program 2: _______________________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Recruitment</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Freq/Duration</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ESI Program 3: _______________________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Recruitment</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Freq/Duration</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### ESI Program 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Recruitment Ratio</th>
<th>Freq/Duration</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### ESI Program 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Recruitment Ratio</th>
<th>Freq/Duration</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### ESI Program 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Recruitment Ratio</th>
<th>Freq/Duration</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

We will be conducting the student survey in the spring and are in need of a point person (a design team member, a teacher, etc.) that we can contact in addition to yourself for planning and logistics. In the space below, please provide that person’s name, e-mail address, and contact phone number:

Name:  
Email:  
Number:  

Thank you very much for your time.
APPENDIX E: PRINCIPAL AND DESIGN TEAM MEMBER
INTERVIEW REFLECTION MEMO FORM

General information

Interview date: 
Date this thematic summary was completed: 
School name: 
School BN: 
Interviewer’s initials: 

Pre-interview reflection

Who did you conduct the interview with? □ School Principal

□ Design team member, administrator

Role:

□ Design team member, non-administrator

Role:

Please provide a physical description of the school and any other informal observations. (Optional)

Please list any questions or clarifying comments asked or made before the interview began. (Optional)
Background and start-up

What is the interviewee’s role in the school and their specific involvement with ESI?

What details about the startup planning process for ESI did the interviewee discuss and to what detail?

What components of the planning process did the interviewee feel had an important impact on ESI implementation?

Overall impression

Provide a summary of the interviewee’s overall impression of ESI programming in their school.
How did the interviewee describe changes to the day-to-day work of the staff?

What were the interviewee’s overall thoughts about **promising** ESI programs in the school?

What were the interviewee’s overall thoughts about **less effective** ESI programs in the school?

**Challenges and sustainability**

What challenges in implementing ESI programs were mentioned by the interviewee? Include stated example(s).
What programs mentioned will continue in the next academic year? How is this decision being made? What needs were mentioned in order to implement these programs next year?

**Partnership and support**

What, if any, external partners were mentioned during the interview? What is their involvement with ESI?

How have these external partners (including the DOE) played a (key) role in ESI programs in the school?

**Closing statements**
What other comments or items were mentioned during the interview that you feel are important to include in this reflection? Examples of these can include a summary of your personal notes, additional comments or concerns noted during the interview, or questions from the interviewee regarding the evaluation or other Research Alliance work in schools.

If applicable, please provide any notes in the space below regarding data collection or interview issues encountered (e.g., issues with tape recorder, loud sound in the room, etc.).
APPENDIX F: TEACHER REFLECTION MEMO FORM

General information

Interview date:

Date this thematic summary was completed:

School name:

School BN:

Interviewer's initials:

Pre-interview reflection

Who did you conduct the interview with?
(e.g., role: department chair, administrator, etc.)

☐ Teacher 1

☐ Teacher 2

☐ Teacher 3

☐ Teacher 4 (if applicable), role:

☐ Teacher 5 (if applicable), role:

Please provide a physical description of the school and any other informal observations. (Optional)

Please list any questions or clarifying comments asked or made before the interview began. (Optional)
**Background**

What were the teachers’ overall impressions of ESI in their school?

**ESI roll out, management, and communication**

How did the interviewees describe their role in ESI planning (ESI application, program development process, etc.)?

What were the interviewee’s overall thoughts about challenges in the ESI start-up process and how, if at all, were they addressed?

When and how did teachers first hear about ESI in their school?
How did the interviewees discuss ongoing communication at their school regarding ESI?

How did the interviewees describe staff approaches to educating Black and Latino boys? What changes were noted?

What, if any, (substantial) changes since ESI programming began did the interviewees note? What examples were given?

**ESI programming and resources**

What did interviewees think was the most successful or promising ESI program in their school?
What, if any, professional development opportunities were mentioned during the interview? Challenges?

Wrap-up

What additional items or challenges did the interviewees share to help understand the implementation of ESI in their school?

What other comments or items were mentioned during the interview that you feel are important to include in this reflection? Examples of these can include a summary of your personal notes, additional comments or concerns noted during the interview, or questions from the interviewee regarding the evaluation or other Research Alliance work in schools.

If applicable, please provide any notes in the space below regarding data collection or interview issues encountered (e.g., issues with tape recorder, loud sound in the room, etc.).
APPENDIX G: ESI YEAR 1 INTERVIEW AND FOCUS GROUP CODEBOOK

I. Students, Parents, Teachers

[TEACHERBUY] Teacher buy-in: References to engaging teachers, eliciting teacher participation, or engaging teachers in the school.

[STUDENGAGE] Student engagement/motivation: References to the level of engagement or motivation of students (keep in mind that engagement/motivation could also be reflected in enrollment); references to attendance.

[STUDBEHAVIOR] Student behavior: References to student behavior (e.g., how students walk in the hallways, pay attention in class, treat one another, etc.).

[PARENTS] Parents: References to parents (e.g. engaging parents, challenges including parents, parent perspectives on ESI, etc.).

[RELATIONSHIPS] Relationships: References to within school and school-home relationships (teacher-to-teacher relationships, student-to-mentor relationships, teacher-to-parent relationships, teacher-to-student relationships, student-to-student relationships, etc.); references to students’ relationship to school overall (e.g., students seeming happier in school, students more excited about school culture, etc.).

II. Partners

[EXTPART] External partners: References to external vendors.

[DOE] DOE: References to DOE, including involvement, support, staff, etc.

III. Implementation of ESI

[STARTUP] Start up: References to the start-up process (writing the grant, composing the ESI team, deciding which programs to incorporate, etc.).

[INTEG] Integration of ESI: References to incorporating ESI into school programming, references to the incorporation of ESI into a holistic school approach.

[COMM] Communication: References to communication strategies or challenges (e.g., communication between DOE ESI team and principals, teachers and students, ESI school team and the school faculty, etc.).

[EXCLUSION] Exclusion of non-target population: References to the exclusion of the non-target population (girls, older students, White males) from ESI funding (e.g., female students feeling envious of new ESI programming, complaints from parents, etc.).

IV. School Practices

[RACE&GENDER] Confronting race and gender: References to identity politics; references to race, gender and socio-economic status; changes with respect to the level of school staff awareness of issues connected to race, poverty, and gender; references to culturally relevant pedagogy.

[PEDCURR] Pedagogical/curricular practices: References to teacher practices or school approaches to curriculum and pedagogy; references to reprogramming.

[COLLEGE] College awareness and college preparation focus: References to college/career awareness and college/career prep focus.

[DISCIPLINE] Practices and perspectives on discipline: References to disciplinary practices (suspension, expulsion, restorative justice, etc.) and the way school staff perceive school disciplinary practices.
V. Challenges and Changes

[CHALLENGES] Challenge: References to an ESI-related challenge.

[CHANGES] Change: References to changes due to ESI funding, programming, or involvement.

VI. Sustainability

[SUSTAINABILITY] Sustainability strategies: References to the sustainability of ESI programming (e.g., strategies around increasing sustainability, challenges confronted by the school with respect to implementing sustainable programming, etc.).

VIII. Programming

[MOSTSUCCESS] Most successful program: Use this code specifically when school staff refers to a program as the most successful ESI program/initiative.

[LEASTSUCCESS] Least successful program: Use this code specifically when school staff refers to a program as the least successful ESI program/initiative.

[EFFECTIVE] Effective/successful programs: Descriptions of ESI programs or initiatives that school staff acknowledge as effective/successful.

[INEFFECTIVE] Ineffective/unsuccessful programs: Descriptions of ESI programs or initiatives that school staff acknowledge as ineffective/unsuccessful ESI programs or initiatives.

[UNDERSTAND-EFF] Understandings of effective/successful programming: School staff understandings and explanations of why particular programs are effective/successful (e.g., the personnel, the curricular approach, incorporation of student feedback, etc.).

[UNDERSTAND-INEFF] Understandings of ineffective/unsuccessful programming: School staff understandings and explanations of why particular programs are ineffective/unsuccessful (e.g., the personnel, the curricular approach, incorporation of student feedback, etc.).
# Appendix H: Fidelity and Intensity Rubrics

### Table A1: Fidelity Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>4: High fidelity</th>
<th>3: Achieving fidelity</th>
<th>2: Developing fidelity</th>
<th>1: Low fidelity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall programming</strong></td>
<td>Quantity and design area of all programs match the workplan.</td>
<td>Quantity and design area of all programs mostly match the workplan. If a program was cancelled, there is a plan for replacing it.</td>
<td>One or more programs may have been removed from workplan without clear plan for replacement, or the programs are substantively different from those in workplan without a clear reason why.</td>
<td>Multiple programs from workplan are missing with no clear explanation or plan for replacement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency and duration</strong></td>
<td>All programs meet expectations for both frequency and duration as delineated in workplan.</td>
<td>Most programs meet expectations for both frequency and duration as delineated in workplan.</td>
<td>No more than half of the programs meet expectations for both frequency and duration as delineated in workplan.</td>
<td>Most programs do not meet expectations for both frequency and duration as delineated in workplan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target audience</strong></td>
<td>Programs serve the same number of students specified in work plan.</td>
<td>Programs serve most of the targeted population.</td>
<td>Some implemented programs serve no more than 50% of targeted audience.</td>
<td>No implemented program serves its target audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnerships</strong></td>
<td>School works with partners as indicated on workplan. If a partner was removed, it was replaced by another partner (or in-house staff) that meets the program needs.</td>
<td>School works with most partners as planned. One partnership was removed without replacement.</td>
<td>School has removed more than one partnership without replacement.</td>
<td>School does not work with any of the partners indicated on the workplan, and is not seeking replacement partners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A2: Intensity Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>4: High intensity</th>
<th>3: Achieving intensity</th>
<th>2: Developing intensity</th>
<th>1: Low intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program diversity</strong></td>
<td>The three design areas (academics, youth development, and school culture) are represented and well-balanced.</td>
<td>The three design areas are all represented.</td>
<td>One or more design areas are not addressed.</td>
<td>Two or more of the design areas are not addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency and duration</strong></td>
<td>All programs occur as frequently and for as long as appropriate to meet program needs.</td>
<td>Most programs occur as frequently and for as long as appropriate to meet program needs.</td>
<td>Some programs occur as frequently and for as long as appropriate to meet program needs.</td>
<td>No programs occur as frequently and for as long as appropriate to meet program needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of students served</strong></td>
<td>All or nearly all (roughly 90%) of the Black and Latino male population is involved in ESI-funded programming on at least a weekly basis.</td>
<td>Most of the Black and Latino male population (roughly 75%) is involved in ESI-funded programming on at least a weekly basis.</td>
<td>About half the Black and Latino male population (roughly 50%) is involved in ESI-funded programming on at least a weekly basis.</td>
<td>Less than 50% of the Black and Latino male population in the school participates in ESI-funded programming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documentation</strong></td>
<td>All programs have been documented so that they can be easily referenced for grant proposals and replicated in the case of staff turnover.</td>
<td>Most programs have been documented so that they can be easily referenced for grant proposals and replicated in the case of staff turnover.</td>
<td>Most programs have not been documented, or documentation is unclear or inconsistent.</td>
<td>Many programs appear to lack documentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I: ESI YEAR 1 WORKPLAN AND BUDGET TEMPLATES

Attachment A- Year 1 Planning Template

DBN and Name of School: ____________________

The Year 1 Planning Template is a tool to map out a work plan for Year 1 based on review of your school’s data and your Design Challenge proposal. Each step below is provided as a guide to build out a work plan. For additional guidance, please refer to the standards and promising practices of the Coalition of Schools Educating Boys of Color (COSEBOC.)

2012-2013 Work Plan Chart – ESI Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Learning Area</th>
<th>Activity Type &amp; Description (Include Partners from the list/Existing Partners/Consultants)</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Data Indicators</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target audience:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency of activity:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deliverables:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target audience:</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency of activity:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deliverables:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX 4  BUDGET PLANNING WORKSHEET

This document will also be sent separately.

Please submit this worksheet with the Application to: [http://www.dropit.to/esi](http://www.dropit.to/esi) PASSWORD: success

---

## Expanded Success Initiative Budget Planning Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Year Budget Plan</th>
<th>Yr 0</th>
<th>Yr 1</th>
<th>Yr 2</th>
<th>Yr 3</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of students on register SY 2011-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of 9th grade students SY 2011-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected # 9th grade students SY 2012-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # Admin/Ops Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # Instructional Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # Staff in Other student service roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # Other Staff shared w/other schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESI Grant for summer and SY12-13</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>← Provide details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Funds used for these programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spending Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Session: Admin/Ops Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Session: Instructional Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel/Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other stipends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting/Technical Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating: Other Vendor Expenses</td>
<td>← Provide details</td>
<td>← Provide details</td>
<td>← Provide details</td>
<td>← Provide details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating: Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>← Provide details</td>
<td>← Provide details</td>
<td>← Provide details</td>
<td>← Provide details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Note 1:** Budgets will be reviewed annually and may be subject to change on the part of the school and/or the ESI grant.

**Note 2:** ESI strategies are expected to be sustained within the school’s operating budget beginning in Yr 3 (school year 2014-15), and are expected to be entirely absorbed within the school’s operating budget by SY 2015-16. If schools plan on using other funds to supplement the strategies, those should be noted in the financial plan with a proposal for sustainability.

**Note 3:** For the purposes of evaluation and reporting, schools should budget for an even disbursement of funds across Yr 1 and Yr 2. However, if a school wishes to draw greater or lesser funds in Yr 1, reasonable alternatives to the disbursement schedule can be proposed as part of the application and budget proposal.
The Research Alliance for New York City Schools conducts rigorous studies on topics that matter to the city’s public schools. We strive to advance equity and excellence in education by providing non-partisan evidence about policies and practices that promote students’ development and academic success.