

1996

Evaluation of School-to-Work Programs: Where We're at and Where We Should be at as We Build Systems

Kevin Hollenbeck

W.E. Upjohn Institute, hollenbeck@upjohn.org

Citation

Hollenbeck, Kevin. 1996. "Evaluation of School-to-Work Programs" Where We're at and Where We Should be at as We Build Systems." Presented at the Governor's School-to-Work Conference, Lansing, MI, June.

<https://research.upjohn.org/confpapers/47>

This title is brought to you by the Upjohn Institute. For more information, please contact repository@upjohn.org.

EVALUATION OF SCHOOL-TO-WORK PROGRAMS:

**WHERE WE'RE AT AND WHERE WE SHOULD BE AT
AS WE BUILD SYSTEMS**

Kevin Hollenbeck, Senior Economist


**W.E. Upjohn Institute
300 S. Westnedge Ave.
Kalamazoo, MI 49007-4686**

(616) 343-5541


OBJECTIVES

1. Difference between performance measurement and evaluation
2. Federal STW Office has initiatives in both areas (clear up confusion)
3. States (including Michigan) and local partnership (in Michigan) are "scrambling" to establish performance measurement systems, but
 - appears to be little feedback to program management
 - almost no evaluation efforts
4. Surveys and data collection forms beginning to become available
 - no need to "reinvent the wheel"
 - but, local customization necessary
5. Some quantitative evidence on performance measurement and evaluation available

TYPES OF EVALUATION




EVALUATION TIMING



Source: Worthen and Sanders (1987)

GOVERNANCE/FUNDING



FEDERAL LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

- §402(a) of STWOA requires performance measurement system to ...
- §402(b) requires national evaluation of effectiveness based on ...

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT/EVALUATION ACTIVITIES OF FIRST 8 IMPLEMENTATION STATES

Kentucky: No information

Maine: Have developed plan that will be accomplished internally by local partnerships

Massachusetts: Recently contracted with Metis Associates

- 8 case studies
- designing unified performance measurement system for local partnerships
- developing self-assessment model for local partnerships

Michigan: Intends to competitively bid evaluation

New Jersey: Intends to work with Metis Associates for performance measurement system

New York: Has contracted with Magi a.k.a. Westchester Institute; forms on Internet

Oregon: No information

Wisconsin: Has contracted with Center on Education for Work, University of Wisconsin

- Begun in 10/95; first report due in 10/96
- Surveys of students, parent/guardians, instructors, and employers
- Case studies at 6 high schools

FLINT MTP NET IMPACT EVALUATION

SELECTED FINDINGS

Panel A: '92-'94 MTP Completers vs. Comparison Group

	<u>MTP</u>	<u>Comparison</u>
High School GPA (from transcript)	2.97*	2.66
Class Standing ^a	21st percentile*	42nd
High School: Math credits	3.62***	3.01
Science credits	2.75	2.57
No. of High School Activities: 12th gr.	2.41	3.37
No. of High School Absences: 11th gr.	2.40**	6.05
12th gr.	3.47***	8.59
Percent in Postsecondary in Fall '95 (self-reported)	46.7	48.0
Percent Employed in Fall '95	80.0	72.0
Average Hourly Wage	\$9.79***	\$5.55
Average Hours per Week	39.9	31.9
Percent Aspire to Technical or Crafts Occupations, Fall '95	50.0*	16.7

Source: Hollenbeck (1996)

^a Measured as average percentile from top.

FLINT MTP NET IMPACT EVALUATION

SELECTED FINDINGS (Continued)


Panel B: '93-'95 MTP Completers vs. Comparison Group

	<u>MTP</u>	<u>Comparison</u>
High School GPA (from transcript)	3.13	3.32*
Class Standing ^a	23rd percentile	29th
High School: Math credits	3.10	3.46**
Science credits	2.39	3.31***
No. of High School Activities: 11th gr.	2.34	3.91***
12th gr.	1.31	3.85***
No. of High School Absences: 11th gr.	2.56***	6.52
12th gr.	5.53*	8.08
Percent in Postsecondary in Fall '95 (self-reported)	89.3	91.4
Percent Employed in Fall '95	64.3	60.3
Average Hourly Wage	\$5.81	\$5.20
Average Hours per Week	31.2*	25.2
Percent Aspire to Technical or Crafts Occupations, Fall '95	44.4***	7.0

Source: Hollenbeck (1996)

^a Measured as average percentile from top.

STW PROGRAM MANAGEMENT MODEL WITH PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT FEEDBACK



Effective feedback requires:

- Commitment to continuous improvement
- Confidence in data
- Co-operation of all stakeholders