

“ I H A V E A D R E A M <sup>®</sup> ”  
F O U N D A T I O N  
N E W Y O R K M E T R O

P R O G R A M E V A L U A T I O N R E P O R T

JANUARY 2010

DR. JAMES MEIER, PROJECT DIRECTOR  
TAO ZHOU, RESEARCHER

MANAGEMENT CONSULTING

BUDGET AND COST REVIEWS

BUSINESS PLANS

**EVALUATIONS**

LICENSING/AFFILIATIONS

LOGISTICS

MANAGEMENT AUDITS

MARKET RESEARCH

POLICY AND DATA ANALYSIS

PROGRAM PLANNING

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

RESTRUCTURING

STRATEGIC ALLIANCES

ZONING



A R E T E C O N S U L T I N G

# Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Evaluation Approach and Methods.....	2
Data Limitations.....	3
Summary of Major Findings .....	4
Current Programs.....	5
Alumni.....	5
Profile of Current Dreamers .....	6
Academic Performance.....	8
Evaluation Methods.....	8
IHDF-NY Overall .....	9
Academic Performance: Four Sites .....	10
IHDF-NY Alumni Tracking Survey.....	12
Profile of the Respondents .....	12
High School Education of the Respondents .....	14
Postsecondary Education of the Respondents .....	15
Other Social/Life Status.....	18
Employment.....	18
Welfare.....	18
Encounters with Institutions .....	19
Community Services, Organized Support Group .....	19
Rating of IHDF-NY Programs and Activities.....	19
Conclusions.....	20
Attachments	

## INTRODUCTION

“I Have A Dream<sup>®</sup>” Foundation (IHDF) programs across the country work with low-income, high risk students who typically have been recruited into the program in the early elementary school grades. The “I Have A Dream” model provides to its students, who it calls “Dreamers,” a long-term commitment of mentoring, tutoring, and rich cultural and social experiences, works with them from elementary school through high school graduation, and guarantees tuition assistance for those who continue to higher education. IHDF aims to help them succeed in their schooling, lead productive lives, and break the cycle of poverty.

Consistent with other “I Have A Dream” programs, the mission of the “I Have A Dream” Foundation – New York Metro Area (IHDF-NY) is:

to empower children and families living in underserved areas of the tri-state region to reach their college and career goals by providing a dynamic, long-term program of mentoring, tutoring, and enrichment with an assured opportunity for higher education.

Whereas most “I Have A Dream<sup>®</sup>” programs start with the students of an entire early grade classroom (1<sup>st</sup> through 3<sup>rd</sup> grade) in a low performing school, the New York Metro Area program is unique among its national peers in that it draws its cohorts from public housing developments in New York City. In this model, with some exceptions, the students are usually on different grade levels and may attend any number of elementary schools. As with all IHDF programs, there are no minimum performance standards or selection criteria in this unique public-private partnership; all children within the specified school grade range are invited to join the program. This is notable as there is evidence that students who reside in public housing developments perform worse academically than other children from similar low income backgrounds who go to the same schools.<sup>1</sup> While there is some speculation about the reasons for this pattern – greater concentrations of poverty, peer pressures from other students who are not performing well, violence in the neighborhoods – in view of the fact that the 343 public housing developments in New York City contain some 130,000 children, finding ways to address the issue is of considerable public policy import.

Today, more than ever before, decision-makers seek evidence of program effectiveness. At the national level, “No Child Left Behind” legislation both reflects and has further contributed to the climate of accountability and results. IHDF-NY engaged Arete Consulting, a New York based firm specializing in education and evaluation, to analyze the effects of its current and completed programs on the academic performance and life experience of its Dreamers. This is a report of our findings.

---

<sup>1</sup> “Public Housing and Public Schools: How do Students Living in NYC Public Housing Fare in School?,” Furman Center for Real Estate and Urban Policy and The Institute for Education and Social Policy, New York University, November 2008.

## EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODS

The evaluation had three primary objectives:

- For Dreamers in *current* programs: To obtain and analyze academic performance data that reflects on their levels of progress since entering the IHDF-NY program.

As these programs are mid-stream with respect to the fundamental goals of IHDF-NY, these measures are useful for giving some indication of interim progress and for management purposes. The key factor is change in performance – e.g., in course grades or standardized test scores since the entry point into the IHDF-NY program – not absolute performance levels.

The vast majority of current Dreamers are in elementary grades and many do not yet have a continuous record of scores on standardized tests. In this evaluation, therefore, we report first on their grades in four subjects: math, English, science and social studies. For the smaller sample for whom we have data, we then report on changes in standardized test scores in math and English. As schools may use different conventions in report card grading (e.g. A, B, C letter grades, 1-100, 1-4 performance levels), we converted all grades to the 1-4 system commonly used for standardized tests and increasingly used on report cards:

- 1 = Not meeting standards for grade level
- 2 = Partially meeting standards for grade level
- 3 = Meeting standards for grade level
- 4 = Meeting standards for grade level with distinction

- For Dreamer *Alumni*: To systematically collect and analyze information on their current life status.

We developed a comprehensive questionnaire querying Dreamer Alumni who are now beyond school age and had participated in one of three IHDF-NY programs – cohorts operating from 1993-2008 – to find out what has happened in their lives with respect to academic involvements and attainments, employment, marital status, awards and achievements, leadership activities, and encounters with institutions (e.g., incarceration, welfare system). Dreamer Alumni filled out the survey online.

- IHDF-NY *capacity building*: To provide data collection instruments and frameworks – as used for this study – to IHDF-NY for ongoing data collection/information management.

The tables below provide additional information on the scope of the study.

<b>Elementary/Middle School Student Outcomes</b>			
<b>Objective</b>	<b>Cohorts (start year/ start grade)</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Measures of Impact</b>
Academic performance for elementary and middle school students	Current Programs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Melrose II (2002, 3rd)</li> <li>• Chelsea II (2004, 1st, 2005 1st)</li> <li>• DeHostos-Wise (2005, 3rd)</li> <li>• Ravenswood II (2006, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2007 3rd)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secure as many student transcripts as possible</li> <li>• IHDF-NY database</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change in grades</li> <li>• Change in test scores</li> </ul>

<b>Alumni Outcomes</b>			
<b>Objective</b>	<b>Cohorts (start year/ graduation year)</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Measures of Impact</b>
Academic performance in high school	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chelsea I (1993, 2003 &amp; 2004)</li> <li>• Ravenswood I (1994, 2004)</li> <li>• Melrose I (1998, 2008 &amp; 2009)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tracking survey and IHDF-NY records</li> <li>• IHDF-NY database</li> </ul>	• Graduation rates
Post-high school involvements: college selection and progress for graduates			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employment, marital status, incarceration, etc.</li> <li>• Recognitions, awards and involvements</li> <li>• College acceptance and attendance</li> </ul>
Leadership/initiative			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of leadership activities/roles</li> <li>• Number of extracurricular, community service activities, etc.</li> <li>• Awards and recognitions</li> </ul>

## **DATA LIMITATIONS**

As noted above, one of the objectives of this evaluation was to improve IHDF-NY’s capabilities for collecting and analyzing data. In designing new information collection instruments and databases it was inevitable that there would be gaps in the data that we obtained. Accordingly this assessment, the first rigorous analysis of IHDF-NY’s achievements, is viewed as the start of a continuing process to obtain and analyze a more comprehensive set of indicators and outcomes, and to obtain more complete returns for the respective cohorts of Dreamers. Limitations in this study included:

- Outdated contact information for some Alumni Dreamers whom we sought to reach for the tracking survey.

- Incomplete report card records, especially for the early years when Dreamers entered the program.

Despite these limitations, we believe we succeeded in obtaining substantial sample sizes, attributable in large part to the fact that IHDF-NY staff four years ago began to upgrade its data collection efforts. As the reader will see, we report findings for both current and Dreamer Alumni based on three different data sources, each of which provides a different window on IHDF-NY results: the IHDF-NY database – which has been more carefully monitored over recent years – is used whenever possible because it has complete information on selected aspects of Dreamer participation. Current Dreamers’ report cards, and the tracking survey for Dreamer Alumni, provided data and findings on other dimensions of IHDF-NY performance but were based on less than 100% of the cohorts.

Going forward, IHDF-NY intends to redouble its attention to data collection by:

- systematically, and on a pre-specified schedule, obtaining report cards and other periodically issued statistics;
- tracking down missing Dreamer Alumni using Internet research and reaching out to known friends within the same cohorts;
- gradually adding new items to the base of information it is collecting;
- implementing an online database management system to collect grades, test results and other important academic and social scores and behaviors;
- defining and instituting higher data collection standards for Program Directors and staff.

## SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

This assessment found considerable hard evidence that IHDF-NY programs are resulting in tangible and significant academic and life benefits for the participating Dreamers. Nearly 85% of the alumni Dreamers completed secondary school (68.4% high school graduates and 16.3% obtaining GEDs)<sup>2</sup>, far higher than the approximately 55% average for New York City Public School students which, of course, includes many privileged as well as at-risk students. These IHDF-NY alumni, moreover, have enrolled in post-secondary education programs in high percentages (85% of those completing high school) that well exceed New York City averages (64%), with the highest number of these (33%) attending four-year institutions. These success rates are particularly notable because all of the programs are based in public housing developments.

Our analysis of current Dreamers’ report cards shows measurable academic improvement within a few years of participation in the IHDF-NY programs, and it appears – subject to confirmation with further longitudinal study – that the improvements in academic performance continue to widen over time. If this trend is maintained, it will mark a distinct contrast to the typical trend for inner city schools, where achievement gaps commonly grow larger over time.

---

<sup>2</sup> Drawn from data source: IHDF Alumni Database. See Attachment 5 for additional details.

The key statistical findings are summarized below and then, following this summary, discussed in detail in the body of the report.

We note that the bulk of our findings are based on a large sample of the relevant Dreamer population – typically 78% or more<sup>2</sup>. The lack of a complete data set was due to problems with some contact information (for Dreamer Alumni), and difficulties in obtaining a full set of report cards for current Dreamers, coupled with time constraints in the conduct of this study. But having now, with Arete’s assistance, set up a data system and an explicit definition of data needs, IHDF-NY is in a position to make significant steps in improving its data and program management.

## **Current Programs**

IHDF-NY Dreamers in the four current New York City housing project cohorts have realized marked increases in grades and test scores. The students for whom we had data from these four programs showed gains after, on average, fewer than three years between their baseline report card and the latest one available to us.

Math grades, for example, increased by 0.67 points on the scale of 1 to 4 from, on average, 2.33 to 2.94. English grades increased by 0.62, social studies by 0.53, and science by 0.21. While these grade changes may seem small when expressed as decimals, if expressed as percentage point gains they are, respectively, 29% for math, 27% for English, 22% for social studies and 9% for science. Grades rose not only in aggregate, but also for the large majority of Dreamers. In math courses, the grades increased for 63% of the Dreamers, dropped for 12%, and were unchanged for 26%.<sup>3</sup> In English courses, grades increased for 68%, dropped for 14% and were unchanged for 17%. Standardized test scores in math and English – the two areas on which students are consistently tested – showed comparable increases, although the sample size of students for whom we had two sets of scores was much smaller.

Improvements in science and social studies were also substantial. The Dreamers’ average science and social studies grades grew by 0.21 and 0.53 respectively (on a scale of 1-4): 48% of the Dreamers in science and 52% in social studies had increases in their grades in the latest year in the programs.

All of these results strongly suggest the effectiveness of the IHDF-NY programs on Dreamers’ academic performance. Dreamers in these four programs attended 30 different schools. The fact that their grades show improvement over a fairly short time span, 2.64 years on average between baseline and most recent grades, suggests that the IHDF-NY program intervention is effective regardless of host school.

## **Alumni**

Nearly 78% of the 119 alumni Dreamers with contact information from three completed IHDF-NY cohorts – Chelsea I, Melrose I and Ravenswood I – filled out an Arete survey asking about their current involvements, academic history, and life experiences.

---

<sup>2</sup> 89% for current programs, 78% for Alumni ( 81% for Chelsea I, 73% for Melrose I and 78% for Ravenswood I)

<sup>3</sup> Percentages are rounded.

Various findings indicate that Dreamers who stayed in their IHDF-NY programs completed school and have gone on to postsecondary education at rates far above the averages for other at-risk groups with similar profiles.

About 90% of those who responded had obtained high school diplomas (87%) or a GED (4%). IHDF-NY's data derived from periodic contact with alumni indicates that 68.4% of *all* Dreamer Alumni (including those who did not complete the survey) graduated from high school and 16.3% more obtained GEDs. Regardless, the composite 85% high school completion rate for a group that was 100% "at-risk" kids compares exceptionally favorably to the New York City Public Schools graduation and GED rate: between 59% and 50% as variously reported by the New York City Department of Education and the New York State Education Department, respectively.

Moreover, most of those who completed high school – as measured by both the Arete survey (87%) and the IHDF-NY database (69%) – have already pursued some form of postsecondary education, with the largest numbers attending four-year colleges/universities, followed by two-year community colleges. These percentages are also higher than the New York City school system average – 64% of high school graduates go to college. Slightly over half the survey respondents (53%) are still enrolled in post-secondary programs.

The respondents overwhelmingly said that the IHDF-NY experience was a powerfully positive influence in their decision to go to college.

The employment profile of IHDF-NY alumni in some ways resembles the national picture. While a large percentage of Dreamer Alumni are working (58%), many others are unemployed (35%) and looking for work (66.7%).

A small number of respondents (5) had experienced incarceration or other institutional stays. Among the 93 respondents, four had been in jail for a term ranging from one day to six months; one had received a prison term of 6 months. (See Attachment 4 page 4 for details.)

Over three-quarters (76.3%) of the respondents reported that they are single. Three alumni are married, nine live with a partner, and 15 have children. Two of those fifteen have two children. The average age of all children was 2.6 years old.

## PROFILE OF CURRENT DREAMERS

According to IHDF-NY enrollment rosters, 54% of the 205 Dreamers in the four current programs are female and 46% male. They attended or are attending more than 20 public and private schools in the city. The Dreamers began participating in IHDF-NY programs in nearly all primary and middle school grades, ranging from grade 1 to grade 8. Most entered programs as primary school students.

Gender	#	%
Female	111	54%
Male	94	46%
Total	205	100%



IHDF-NY has been accepting Dreamers in its current programs every school year since 2002-03. Forty percent of the Dreamers entered the programs in 2005-06, followed by 20% in 2006-07. Overall, 60% of the Dreamers have been involved in their programs for three or four years, and 11% for less than three years.

1 <sup>st</sup> Year in Program	Number of Years in Program	#	%
02-03 School Year	7	27	13%
03-04 School Year	6	2	1%
04-05 School Year	5	31	15%
05-06 School Year	4	81	40%
06-07 School Year	3	42	20%
07-08 School Year	2	15	8%
08-09 School Year	1	7	3%
Total		205	100%

### Profile of the Four Sites

IHDF-NY, in collaboration with New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA), currently operates four programs in New York City housing developments: Melrose Houses in the Bronx, Chelsea-Elliott and DeHostos Wise Houses in Manhattan, and Ravenswood Houses in Queens.

Dreamers in each program attend between four and seven schools: four each in the Chelsea-Elliott (Chelsea II) and Ravenswood II programs,<sup>4</sup> five in Melrose II, and seven in DeHostos.

Chelsea II is the largest program with 69 Dreamers; Ravenswood II has 61 and DeHostos has 40, while Melrose II is the smallest, with 35 Dreamers on record. The gender composition in each program varies: Melrose II has far more female Dreamers than male, while the DeHostos ratio is the opposite. Chelsea II has 8% more female than male Dreamers, while Ravenswood II has almost equal numbers of male and female Dreamers.

Gender	Chelsea II		Ravenswood II		Melrose II		DeHostos		All	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Female	37	54%	31	51%	27	77%	16	40%	111	54%
Male	32	46%	30	49%	8	23%	24	60%	94	46%
Total	69	100%	61	100%	35	100%	40	100%	205	100%

The current programs began admitting Dreamers in different years: Melrose II first, in 2002-03; Chelsea II in 2004-05; and Ravenswood II and DeHostos programs in the 2005-06 school year.

Since theirs are the longest running current programs, the Melrose II and Chelsea II Dreamers have correspondingly greater longevity in their programs: 6.2 years for Melrose II and 4.4 for Chelsea II. The averages for Ravenswood II and DeHostos, the two newer programs, are about three years.

<sup>4</sup> The schools of nine Dreamers in Ravenswood II were indicated as “Other” in IHDF-NY Enrollment Rosters.

1 <sup>st</sup> Year in Program	Chelsea II		Ravenswood II		Melrose II		DeHostos		All	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
02-03 School Year	0	--	0	--	27	77%	0	--	27	13%
03-04 School Year	0	--	0	--	2	6%	0	--	2	1%
04-05 School Year	30	43%	0	--	1	3%	0	--	31	15%
05-06 School Year	39	57%	21	34%	5	14%	21	53%	81	40%
06-07 School Year	0	--	33	54%	0	--	9	23%	42	20%
07-08 School Year	0	--	7	11%	0	--	3	8%	15	8%
08-09 School Year	0	--	0	--	0	--	7	18%	7	3%
Total	69	100%	61	100.0%	35	100%	40	100%	205	100%
<b>Average Years</b>	<b>4.4</b>		<b>3.2</b>		<b>6.2</b>		<b>3.1</b>		<b>4.1</b>	

Most Dreamers enter their programs in elementary school. All students in the Chelsea II program entered at first grade. Both Ravenswood II and DeHostos accepted Dreamers from grade 2 through grade 6, and Melrose II admitted students beginning with the third grade. The largest percentage of entering Dreamers overall was from grade 3.

Grade at Entry	Chelsea II		Ravenswood II		Melrose II		DeHostos		All	
1	69	100%	0	--	0	--	0	--	69	34%
2	0	--	5	8%	0	--	2	5%	7	3%
3	0	--	42	69%	27	77%	15	38%	84	41%
4	0	--	13	21%	2	6%	11	28%	26	13%
5	0	--	0	--	1	3%	6	15%	7	3%
6	0	--	1	2%	0	--	6	15%	7	3%
7	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
8	0	--	0	--	5	14%	0	--	5	2%
Total	69	100%	61	100%	35	100%	40	100%	205	100%

## ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

### Evaluation Methods

IHDF-NY compiled information from report cards for 182 current Dreamers using a database prepared by Arete, capturing grades and New York State standardized test scores.<sup>5</sup> For this evaluation, we analyzed Dreamers' first available report card while in their IHDF-NY programs and their most recent report card. We examined each Dreamer's first report card as a baseline from which to measure changes at the end of their latest program year (which varied among Dreamers). We examined changes in grades for four subject areas – math, English, science, and social studies/history/global – as well as standardized test scores in math and English. The grades were then aggregated to report changes both by site and for all IHDF-NY current Dreamers. The reported findings are limited to these Dreamers for whom we have matched pairs of pre- and later grades.

<sup>5</sup> Some transcripts provided partial data, that is, with gaps in some fields.

## IHDF-NY Overall

IHDF-NY Dreamers as a whole made significant improvement in their academic performance in all subject areas during their time in IHDF-NY programs. Their average grades increased significantly in each of the four tracked subject areas over the time period examined.

The average math grade increased 0.67 points, and 63% of the Dreamers achieved higher math grades by the end of their most recent program year. Similar results also occurred in English.

Improvements in science and social studies were also significant. The Dreamers' average science and social studies grades grew by 0.2 and 0.5 respectively, while 48% of Dreamers in science and 52% in social studies had grade increases in their most recent program year.

Math						
	Baseline	Latest Year	Change ( $\Delta$ ) as of Latest Available Year	NYS Standardized Tests		
				First Year	Latest Year	Change ( $\Delta$ )
Number of grades available	164	112	102	55	93	36
Average (PL)	2.33	2.94	<b>0.67</b>	<b>2.78</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>0.40</b>
Number increasing			<b>64</b>			
Percent of total available			<b>63%</b>			
Number decreasing			12			
Percent of total available			12%			
No change			26			
Percent of total available			26%			

PL= Performance Level

English						
	Baseline	Latest Year	Change ( $\Delta$ ) as of Latest Available Year	NYS Standardized Tests		
				First Year	Latest Year	Change ( $\Delta$ )
Number of grades available	159	103	98	50	93	31
Average (PL)	2.31	2.91	<b>0.62</b>	<b>2.58</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>0.22</b>
Number increasing			<b>67</b>			
Percent of total available			<b>68%</b>			
Number decreasing			14			
Percent of total available			14%			
No change			17			
Percent of total available			17%			

Science			
	Baseline	Latest Year	Change ( $\Delta$ ) as of Latest Available Year
Number of grades available	163	111	100
Average (PL)	2.45	2.68	<b>0.21</b>
Number increasing			<b>48</b>
Percent of total available			<b>48%</b>
Number decreasing			30
Percent of total available			30%
No change			22
Percent of total available			22%

<b>Social Studies/History/Global</b>			
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Latest Year</b>	<b>Change (<math>\Delta</math>) as of Latest Available Year</b>
Number of grades available	163	110	100
Average (PL)	2.39	2.97	<b>0.53</b>
Number increasing			<b>52</b>
Percent of total available			<b>52%</b>
Number decreasing			16
Number of total available			16%
No change			32
Percent of total available			32%

The Dreamers' New York State standardized test scores follow a similar pattern. The average state math test score increased from 2.8 to 3.2 by the end of the latest year in the programs, a 14% increase. There was an 0.2 or 8% increase in average state English test scores during the same 2.64 years (from 2.6 to 2.8).

All of these results strongly suggest the effectiveness of the IHDF-NY programs in improving Dreamers' academic performance. Dreamers in these four programs attended 30 different schools. The fact that their scores show improvement over a fairly short time span, 2.64 years on average for this sample, also suggests that the IHDF-NY program intervention is effective regardless of host school.

### **Academic Performance: Four Sites**

The Chelsea II Dreamers, who along with the Melrose II cohort have been in their programs the longest, show the best results of the four programs. Average grades in math, English, science and social studies increased for Chelsea II Dreamers by 0.9, 0.8, 0.4 and 0.7 points respectively. Moreover, most individual grades improved: 85.5% of Chelsea II Dreamers received higher math and English grades at the end of their latest year than in their first year; more than 60% also improved their grades in both science and social studies.

<b>Chelsea II</b>				
	<b>Change (<math>\Delta</math>) at the End of Latest Year</b>			
	<b>Math</b>	<b>English</b>	<b>Science</b>	<b>Social Studies</b>
Number of grades available	<b>55</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>54</b>
Average change	<b>0.9</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.7</b>
Number increasing	<b>47</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>35</b>
Percent of total available	<b>86%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>65%</b>
Number decreasing	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>
Percent of total available	<b>4%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>13%</b>
No change	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>
Percent of total available	<b>11%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>22%</b>

Melrose II also had positive results, though markedly below those of Chelsea II. However, Melrose II is a substantially smaller program, and the number of Dreamers for whom we have data is correspondingly very small, potentially skewing the findings. Melrose II Dreamers' average

grades improved in each of the four tracked subject areas. The average math and English grades increased 0.6 and 0.7 points respectively by the end of the latest year, while 44% and 62.5% respectively improved their grades in math and English compared to their first year. Melrose II Dreamers made similar progress in social studies -- 66.7% had better grades with an average 0.6 point growth. Science is the only subject area that did not show similar progress. The average science grade grew by only 0.1 point, while 25% of Dreamers with available data improved their science grades over their first year with the program.

<b>Melrose II</b>				
	<b>Change (<math>\Delta</math>) at the End of Latest Year</b>			
	<b>Math</b>	<b>English</b>	<b>Science</b>	<b>Social Studies</b>
Number of grades available	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>
Average change	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.6</b>
Number increasing	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>
Percent of total available	<b>44%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>67%</b>
Number decreasing	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>
Percent of total available	<b>22%</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>22%</b>
No change	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>
Percent of total available	<b>33%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>11%</b>

Ravenswood II and DeHostos both began accepting Dreamers in 2005. On average, the lapsed time between baseline and recent report cards for their Dreamers is approximately two years, significantly shorter than in the Chelsea II and Melrose II programs. Consequently, the improvements of their Dreamers' academic performance have been more moderate.

The average grades in math, English, and science for Ravenswood II Dreamers increased 0.3, 0.2, and 0.1 respectively between their first and latest grading period in their program, while the average social studies grades did not change. The percentage with improved grades in these subjects are also smaller than the numbers at Chelsea II and Melrose II: approximately 18% in math, 40% for English, 29.4% for science, and 11.8% for social studies.

<b>Ravenswood II</b>				
	<b>Change (<math>\Delta</math>) at the End of Latest Year</b>			
	<b>Math</b>	<b>English</b>	<b>Science</b>	<b>Social Studies</b>
Number of grades available	<b>17</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>17</b>
Average change	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.0</b>
Number increasing	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
Percent of total available	<b>18%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>12%</b>
Number decreasing	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>
Percent of total available	<b>24%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>29%</b>
No change	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>
Percent of total available	<b>59%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>59%</b>

The DeHostos Dreamers achieved slightly more improvement than Ravenswood II Dreamers: average grades in math, English, science and social studies increased by 0.1, 0.3, 0.2 and 0.2

points respectively between their first and latest grading periods in the program. Over 47% of the Dreamers with available data have higher math grades than in their first year, 45% for English, 40% for science and 45% for social studies.

DeHostos				
	Change ( $\Delta$ ) at the End of Latest Year			
	Math	English	Science	Social Studies
Number of grades available	21	20	20	20
Average change	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.4
Number increasing	10	9	8	9
Percent of total available	48%	45%	40%	45%
Number decreasing	4	2	6	2
Percent of total available	19%	10%	30%	10%
No change	7	9	6	9
Percent of total available	33%	45%	30%	45%

## IHDF-NY ALUMNI TRACKING SURVEY

One hundred ninety-six Dreamer Alumni have graduated from three completed programs, Chelsea I, Melrose I, and Ravenswood I. Alumni Tracking Surveys were sent to 119 former Dreamers for whom there was still current contact information, and 93 responded, a response rate of 78%. Of those, about 42% were from Chelsea I, 38% from Ravenswood I, and 20% from Melrose I. This response distribution is comparable to the size of their respective cohorts: according to IHDF-NY records, 46% of the 196 alumni had attended the Chelsea I program, 35% Ravenswood I, and 18% Melrose I.

Program Attended	Total Number of Alumni	Number of Alumni Contacted	Number of Respondents	%	Response Rate
Chelsea I	92	50	39	41.9%	81%
Melrose I	35	26	19	20.4%	73%
Ravenswood I	69	43	35	37.6%	78%
<b>Total</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>78%</b>

### Profile of the Respondents

We received more responses from male alumni than female (54% vs. 38%). While the respondents ranged in age from 18 to 24 years, over half (66.7%) were 23 and 24 years old.

<b>Respondent's Age</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
18 years old	3	3.2%
19 years old	10	10.8%
20 years old	3	3.2%
21 years old	0	0.0%
22 years old	6	6.5%
23 year old	<b>48</b>	<b>51.6%</b>
24 years old	<b>14</b>	<b>15.1%</b>
No answer	9	9.7%
Total	93	100%

The respondents, as a group, had participated in IHDF-NY programs in every grade from elementary to high school. A majority indicated that they had begun participating in the 3rd grade. From grades 3 to 6 most Dreamers attended a limited number of elementary schools and thus found it logistically easier to attend IHDF-NY programming. These grades, correspondingly, had the highest participation rates.

<b>IHDF-NY Participation by Grade:</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
1st	9	9.7%
2nd	27	29.0%
3rd	75	80.6%
4th	69	74.2%
5th	74	79.6%
6th	69	74.2%
7th	65	69.9%
8th	61	65.6%
9th	54	58.1%
10th	53	57.0%
11th	52	55.9%
12th	51	54.8%

Over 93% of respondents identified themselves as either Black or Hispanic/Latino, and 5.4% reported as White. Over 31% speak both English and Spanish, although only 3.2 % said they speak only Spanish at home. The majority (60.2%) of respondents speak only English at home.

<b>Respondent's Ethnicity</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
American Indian	3	3.2%
Asian	2	2.2%
Black	40	43.0%
Hispanic/Latino	47	50.5%
White	5	5.4%
Other	4	4.3%
No answer	8	8.6%

Language Spoken at Home	#	%
English	56	60.2%
Spanish	3	3.2%
English & Spanish	29	31.2%
Other	0	0.0%
No answer	5	5.4%

Over three-quarters (76.3%) of the respondents reported that they are single. Three alumni are married, another nine live with a partner, and 15 have children. Two of those fifteen have two children. The average age of all children is 2.6 years.

Marital Status	#	%
Married*	3	3.2%
Single	71	76.3%
Unmarried live-in partner	9	9.7%
Divorced	0	0.0%
Separated (not yet divorced)	0	0.0%
Widowed	0	0.0%
Other**	2	2.2%
No answer	8	8.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>100%</b>

\* Nobody married more than once

\*\* Engaged

## High School Education

Most responding alumni (87%) have graduated from high school, and an additional 4% have received or are working on a GED. Among the 81 respondents who had graduated, 22 attended at least two schools and six reported that they attended three schools.

Graduated from High School	#	%
Yes	81	87.1%
No	7	7.5%
GED	4	4.3%
No answer	1	1.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>100%</b>

Number of High Schools Attended	#
2 High schools	22
3 High schools	6

Nearly two-thirds of those who had not graduated indicated their reasons as “No interest,” “Family responsibilities,” or “Received or still working on a GED.”



<b>Not Graduated, Current Status</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Still in high school	1	9.1%
Got or working on a GED	4	36.4%
Dropped out	1	9.1%
Have a job	2	18.2%
Other	2	18.2%
No answer	1	9.1%
<b>Total (Not Graduated)</b>	<b>11</b>	

Separately from the Alumni Tracking Survey, IHDF-NY has been tracking the academic history of its alumni. Their database indicates that approximately 85% of IHDF-NY alumni graduated from high school: 68.4% with a high school diploma and 16.3% with GEDs, a rate comparable to the one obtained through the survey.

<b>High School Diploma or GED</b>	<b>Chelsea I</b>		<b>Melrose I</b>		<b>Ravenswood I</b>		<b>All</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
High school diploma	65	70.1%	25	71.4%	44	63.8%	<b>134</b>	<b>68.4%</b>
GED	13	14.1%	3	8.6%	16	23.2%	<b>32</b>	<b>16.3%</b>
Still in high school	0	0.0%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	<b>1</b>	<b>0.5%</b>
Working on GED	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	7.2%	<b>5</b>	<b>2.6%</b>
Dropped out (no GED)	1	1.1%	6	17.1%	0	0%	<b>7</b>	<b>3.6%</b>
Unknown	13	14.1%	0	0%	4	5.8%	<b>17</b>	<b>8.7%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>196<sup>6</sup></b>	<b>100%</b>

The IHDF-NY database also allowed us to look at high school graduation rates across different programs. Over 87% of the Ravenswood I Dreamers had graduated from high school or received a GED, the highest percentage of all three programs. Chelsea I's rate is just slightly lower at 84.2%. Melrose I had the lowest overall percentage (80%), and also had the lowest percentage of Dreamers receiving GEDs rather than actually graduating from high school. Since Melrose I is the youngest of the three graduated programs, the number of Dreamer Alumni who receive GEDs is likely to increase in the near future.

## Postsecondary Education

Survey participants were asked whether they had pursued further education after high school. A large majority of respondents, 87%, indicated that they had done so: in essence, every respondent who graduated from high school continued their education.

<b>Any Further Education</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	81	87.1%
No	10	10.8%
No answer	2	2.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>100%</b>

<sup>6</sup> There were 214 Dreamers enrolled in the three alumni programs, but 18 never participated in the program and are not counted.

IHDF-NY's own tracking of post-secondary pursuits indicates that about 70% of all alumni went to some type of post-secondary institution, a pattern also comparable to high school completion.

Highest Postsecondary Program	All	
	#	%
2-year college	50	25.5%
4-year college	64	32.7%
Master program	6	3.1%
Vo/Tech program	16	8.2%
No postsecondary	60	30.6%
Total	196 <sup>7</sup>	100%

Looking at postsecondary pursuits through another lens, for the 81 Dreamer Alumni responding to the tracking survey who pursued further education, a majority (69.1%) attended college or university, almost 40% went to a community college (or attended a community college before going on to a four year college or university), and 6% attended vocational/trade schools. (The cumulative percentages exceed 100% because many alumni attended more than one type of institution.) Slightly more than a third (37%) of these 81 Dreamer Alumni attended more than one institution, while only two Dreamers reported that they had gone to more than three schools.

Type of Further Education School Ever Attended	#	%
Vocational/trade school	5	6.2%
Community college	32	39.5%
College/university	56	69.1%
Military academy	0	0.0%
Acting school	0	0.0%
Cooking school	0	0.0%
Religious training	0	0.0%
Other	3	3.7%

Although the participants left the IHDF-NY programs several years ago, over half (53%) of the respondents with postsecondary education are still attending school. On average, these alumni had (or have) 3.17 years of postsecondary education, ranging from one year to over six years.

---

<sup>7</sup> There were 214 Dreamers enrolled in the three alumni programs. However, 18 Dreamers are not counted since they never participated in the programs.

Number of Years Attended	Attending Dreamers	
	#	%
Less than 1	4	5%
1	17	21%
2	13	16%
3	5	6%
4	19	24%
5	14	17%
6	4	5%
More than 6	2	3%
No answer	3	4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>100%</b>
Average Years	<b>3.17</b>	

During their years at their post-secondary institutions, the alumni majored in 34 different areas. The top majors reported: Business Management, Psychology, Accounting, Criminal Justice, Liberal Arts and Social Work. Over three-quarters of the respondents with postsecondary education reported their GPA scores which, they report, averaged 2.8.

College GPA	#	%	Average GPA
Provided GPA	61	75.3%	<b>2.8</b>
No answer	20	24.7%	
Exact GPA	30	37.0%	
Estimated GPA	37	45.7%	
No answer	14	17.3%	

More than one-third (38%) reported that they had received scholarships from various sources other than the IHDF-NY assistance. These scholarships on average were \$8,800 and lasted for almost four years.

Received Any Scholarships	#	%	Average Years with Scholarship*	Average Amount of Scholarship**
Yes	31	38.3%	3.8	\$8,808
No	45	55.6%		
No answer	5	6.2%		
<b>Total</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		

\* 24 respondents provided information.

\*\* 12 respondents provided information.

We asked alumni whether they had graduated or expected to graduate from their post-secondary institutions. Most (81.5%) reported either graduation or the intention to graduate, in years ranging from 2006 to 2013.

Participating alumni were asked to rate IHDF-NY influence in their decision to obtain post-secondary education on a scale of 1=very negative to 7=very positive. The result was an overwhelmingly positive average rating of 6.5.

IHDF-NY Influence on Decision to Go to College	Response Detail	
	#	%
7 (Very positive)	58	65.9%
6	17	19.3%
5	9	10.2%
4 (No influence)	3	3.4%
3	0	0.0%
2	0	0.0%
1 (Very negative)	0	0.0%
Not Sure	1	1.1%
<b>Total</b>	88	
<b>Average Rating</b>		<b>6.5</b>

## Other Social/Life Status

### Employment

The employment profile of IHDF-NY Dreamer Alumni in some ways resembles the current general national picture. While a large percentage is working, many others are unemployed and looking for work. A majority (58%) of alumni indicated that they are currently working, but over 35% are not. Over half (54%) of working alumni reported that they have full-time jobs; others work either part-time or in an internship/work-study capacity. The average time with their current employers for those who are working now is 16.5 months.

Working Now	#	%	Full-time		Part-time		Other*		Average Months with Employer
			#	%	#	%	#	%	
Yes	54	58.1%	29	53.7%	22	40.7%	3	5.6%	<b>16.5</b>
No	33	35.5%							
No answer	6	6.5%							
<b>Total</b>	93	100%							

\* 1. work study; 2. Intern; 3. job at school

Further, 66.7% of alumni who are not currently working indicated that they are actively looking for a job. Only 18% (six respondents) expressed no intention to work at this time.

### Welfare

We asked alumni whether they receive any forms of public assistance. Over 60% reported that they are not currently on any form of welfare. Others receive various types of public support, including food stamps (17.2%), disability benefits (9.7%), Medicaid or unemployment benefits.

<b>Receiving Public Assistance</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
None	57	61.3%
Welfare	0	0.0%
Food Stamp	16	17.2%
Disability	9	9.7%
Other*	5	5.4%
No answer	6	6.5%
Total	93	100%

\* 1. Medicaid; 2. Child Support; 3. Unemployment

### **Encounters with Institutions**

A few of the 93 respondents had experienced incarceration. Four had been in jail for a term ranging from one day to six months, and one had received a prison term of six months. (See Attachment 4, page 4 for details.)

### **Community Services and Other Involvements**

To get a sense of civic involvement, we asked alumni about their participation in community service projects since high school and in organized support groups in college. About 40% indicated that they were involved in community service programs after graduating from high school, while 47% said they were not. Community service experience included helping the poor, the elderly and children at schools, hospitals and social programs; some participants were also active in charities and fundraising activities in their communities. (See Attachment 4, page 5.)

Alumni who pursued post-secondary education also reported some involvement in organized support groups on campus. Eleven (or 13.6%) of respondents participated in 10 different organizations. (See Attachment 4, page 3 for detail.)

The survey also included exploratory questions about awards, leadership positions, substance abuse and a few other topics.

### **Rating of IHDF-NY Programs and Activities**

The Alumni Tracking Survey also asked respondents to rate various activities and supportive services IHDF-NY had offered, on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being not at all valuable and 5 being extremely valuable).

Alumni rated all 16 activities offered by IHDF-NY, with an average rating above 4.0 on a scale of 1 = “not at all valuable” to 5 = “extremely valuable.” The highest rated activities were “Tutoring/Mentoring” and “College Tours,” each rated 4.5. Except for “Career Awareness,” all activities received a top rating of 5 from a majority of Dreamer Alumni. More than three-quarters (77.8%) of participating alumni rated “College Tours” 5 out of 5, while nearly 70% did so for “Skill/Interest Inventory.” A complete list of activities and their corresponding ratings are included in Attachment 4, page 6.

Alumni equally appreciated the help and support provided by IHDF-NY. Responding alumni rated every one of the 12 different types of support above 4 on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 = “not at all useful” and 5 = “extremely useful.” “Learning College Application Process” and “Having a Role Model” were rated highest, with average ratings of 4.56 and 4.54 respectively. A majority of participating alumni gave all 12 types of IHDF-NY support a top rating of “extremely useful”; “Learning College Application Process” and “Having a Role Model” were rated 5 (extremely useful) by 77% and 68% of the respondents respectively. See Attachment 4, page 6 for details.

## CONCLUSIONS

Our analysis of report cards of current Dreamers shows measurable academic improvement within a few years of participation in the IHDF-NY programs, and, it appears – subject to confirmation with further longitudinal study – the improvements in academic performance continue to widen over time. If this trend is maintained, it will mark a distinct contrast to the typical trend for inner city schools, where achievement gaps commonly grow larger over time.

We note that the bulk of our findings are based on a large sample of the relevant Dreamers population – typically 78% or more<sup>8</sup>. The lack of a complete data set was due to problems with some contact information (for Dreamer Alumni), and difficulties in obtaining a full set of report cards for current Dreamers, coupled with time constraints in the conduct of this study. But having now, with Arete’s assistance, set up a data system and an explicit definition of data needs, IHDF-NY is in a position to make significant steps in improving its data and program management.

---

<sup>8</sup> 89% for current programs, 78% for Alumni ( 81% for Chelsea I, 73% for Melrose I and 78% for Ravenswood I)

## **LIST OF ATTACHMENTS**

**Attachment 1:** Current Program Profiles

**Attachment 2:** Current Program Academic Performance

**Attachment 3:** Current Program Academic Performance by Site

**Attachment 4:** Alumni Tracking Survey 2009

**Attachment 5:** Alumni High School and Postsecondary Education Information

# Attachment 1: Current Program Profiles

(Source: IHDF-NY Rosters)

Total # of Dreamers

**205**

School At Entry	Site	#	%
PS 166	DeHostos	6	3%
PS 41	DeHostos	1	0%
PS 84	DeHostos	23	11%
PS 199M	DeHostos	1	0%
PS 70	DeHostos	3	1%
PS 811	DeHostos	2	1%
Holy Name Elementary	DeHostos	2	1%
PS 1X	Melrose II	24	12%
PS 156	Melrose II	4	2%
PS/MS 29	Melrose II	5	2%
IS 162	Melrose II	1	0%
MS 203	Melrose II	1	0%
PS 33	Chelsea II	66	32%
Guardian Angel School	Chelsea II	1	0%
Lorge School	Chelsea II	1	0%
St. Columbia	Chelsea II	1	0%
PS 112	Ravenswood II	21	10%
PS 76	Ravenswood II	21	10%
PS 111	Ravenswood II	10	5%
Other	Ravenswood II	9	4%
Unknown		2	1%
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>205</b>	<b>100%</b>

Gender	#	%
Female	94	46%
Male	111	54%

Grade at Entry		
1	69	34%
2	7	3%
3	84	41%
4	26	13%
5	7	3%
6	7	3%
7	0	0%
8	5	2%

1st Year in Program	#	%	Change Year to Year
02-03 School Year	27	13%	
03-04 School Year	2	1%	-25
04-05 School Year	31	15%	29
05-06 School Year	81	40%	50
06-07 School Year	42	20%	-39
07-08 School Year	15	7%	-27
08-09 School Year	7	3%	-8

Years in Program	#	%
1 Year	7	3%
2 Years	15	7%
3 Years	42	20%
4 Years	81	40%
5 Years	31	15%
6 Years	2	1%
7 Years	27	13%
<b>Total</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Average Years in the Program</b>	<b>4.1</b>	



Attachment 2: Current Program Academic Performance

(Source: IHDF-NY Report Card Database)

Math								
	Q1 of 1st Year	1st Year	Latest Year	Change at the End of First Year	Change at the End of Latest Year Available	NYS Standardized Tests		
						First Year	Latest Year	Change
Number of grades available	164	136	112	136	102	55	93	36
Average	2.3	2.32	2.94	<b>-0.04</b>	<b>0.67</b>	<b>2.78</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>0.40</b>
Number increasing				9	64			
Percent of total available				6.6%	<b>62.7%</b>			
Number decreasing				14	12			
Percent of total available				10.3%	<b>11.8%</b>			
No change				113	26			
Percent of total available				83.1%	25.5%			

English								
	Q1 of 1st Year	1st Year	Latest Year	Change at the End of First Year	Change at the End of Latest Year Available	NYS Standardized Tests		
						First Year	Latest Year	Change
Number of grades available	159	134	103	132	98	50	93	31
Average	2.31	2.24	2.91	<b>-0.09</b>	<b>0.62</b>	<b>2.58</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>0.22</b>
Number increasing				10	67			
Percent of total available				7.6%	<b>68.4%</b>			
Number decreasing				28	14			
Percent of total available				21.2%	<b>14.3%</b>			
No change				94	17			
Percent of total available				71.2%	17.3%			

Science					
	Q1 of 1st Year	1st Year	Latest Year	Change at the End of First Year	Change at the End of Latest Year Available
Number of grades available	163	135	111	134	100
Average	2.45	2.40	2.68	<b>-0.08</b>	<b>0.21</b>
Number increasing				1	48
Percent of total available				0.7%	<b>48.0%</b>
Number decreasing				11	30
Percent of total available				8.2%	<b>30.0%</b>
No change				122	22
Percent of total available				91.0%	22.0%

Social Studies/History/Global					
	Q1 of 1st Year	1st Year	Latest Year	Change at the End of First Year	Change at the End of Latest Year Available
Number of grades available	163	135	110	135	100
Average	2.39	2.37	2.97	<b>-0.10</b>	<b>0.53</b>
Number increasing				3	52
Percent of total available				2.2%	<b>52.0%</b>
Number decreasing				16	16
Percent of total available				11.9%	<b>16.0%</b>
No change				116	32
Percent of total available				85.9%	32.0%

### Attachment 3: Current Programs Academic Performance by Site

(Source: IHDF-NY Rosters)

Gender	Chelsea II		Ravenswood II		Melrose II		DeHostos	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Female	37	50%	31	51%	27	77%	16	40%
Male	32	43%	30	49%	8	23%	24	60%
Total	69	100%	61	100%	35	100%	40	100%

Grade at Entry	Chelsea II		Ravenswood II		Melrose II		DeHostos	
1	69	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
2	0	0%	5	8%	0	0%	2	5%
3	0	0%	42	69%	27	77%	15	38%
4	0	0%	13	21%	2	6%	11	28%
5	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	6	15%
6	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	6	15%
7	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
8	0	0%	0	0%	5	14%	0	0%
Total	69	100%	61	100%	35	100%	40	100%

1st Year in Program	Chelsea II		Ravenswood II		Melrose II		DeHostos	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
02-03 School Year	0	0%	0	0%	27	77%	0	0%
03-04 School Year	0	0%	0	0%	2	6%	0	0%
04-05 School Year	30	43%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%
05-06 School Year	39	57%	21	34%	5	14%	21	53%
06-07 School Year	0	0%	33	54%	0	0%	9	23%
07-08 School Year	0	0%	7	11%	0	0%	3	8%
08-09 School Year	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	18%
Total	69	100%	61	100%	35	100%	40	100%
<b>Average Years in the Program</b>	<b>4.4</b>		<b>3.2</b>		<b>6.2</b>		<b>3.1</b>	

Attachment 3: Current Programs Academic Performance by Site  
 (Source: IHDF-NY Report Card Database)

Math-- Chelsea II (Performance Level)									
	Number of Records	Q1 of 1st Year	1st Year	Latest Year Available	Change at the End of 1st Year	Change at the End of Latest Year Available	NYS Standardized Tests		
							First Year	Latest Year	Change
Number of grades available	74	74	74	55	74	55	8	54	3
Average		2.32	2.19	3.25	-0.13	0.93	3.63	3.48	-0.14
Number increasing					1	47			
Percent of total available					1.4%	85.5%			
Number decreasing					10	2			
Percent of total available					13.5%	3.6%			
No change					63	6			
Percent of total available					85.1%	10.9%			

Math--Melrose II (Performance Level)									
	Number of Records	Q1 of 1st Year	1st Year	Latest Year Available	Change at the End of 1st Year	Change at the End of Latest Year Available	NYS Standardized Tests		
							First Year	Latest Year	Change
Number of grades available	26	26	13	9	13	9	10	3	2
Average		1.88	1.96	2.44	0.08	0.56	2.30	2.00	-0.30
Number increasing					4	4			
Percent of total available					30.8%	44.4%			
Number decreasing					3	2			
Percent of total available					23.1%	22.2%			
No change					6	3			
Percent of total available					46.2%	33.3%			

Math-- DeHostos (Performance Level)									
	Number of Records	Q1 of 1st Year	1st Year	Latest Year Available	Change at the End of 1st Year	Change at the End of Latest Year Available	NYS Standardized Tests		
							First Year	Latest Year	Change
Number of grades available	41	26	12	31	12	21	34	32	29
Average		2.50	2.58	2.58	0.08	0.08	2.74	2.81	0.08
Number increasing					1	10			
Percent of total available					8.3%	47.6%			
Number decreasing					0	4			
Percent of total available					0.0%	19.0%			
No change					11	7			
Percent of total available					91.7%	33.3%			

Math-- Ravenswood II (Performance Level)									
	Number of Records	Q1 of 1st Year	1st Year	Latest Year Available	Change at the End of 1st Year	Change at the End of Latest Year Available	NYS Standardized Tests		
							First Year	Latest Year	Change
Number of grades available	41	38	37	17	37	17	3	4	2
Average		2.53	2.59	2.82	0.07	0.30	2.67	3.00	0.33
Number increasing					3	3			
Percent of total available					8.1%	17.6%			
Number decreasing					1	4			
Percent of total available					2.7%	23.5%			
No change					33	10			
Percent of total available					89.2%	58.8%			

Attachment 3: Current Programs Academic Performance by Site  
 (Source: IHDF-NY Report Card Database)

English--Chelsea II (Performance Level)									
	Number of Records	Q1 of 1st Year	1st Year	Latest Year	Change at the End of 1st Year	Change at the End of Latest Year Available	NYS Standardized Tests		
							First Year	Latest Year	Change
Number of grades available	74	74	74	55	74	55	8	55	3
Average		2.30	2.24	3.09	-0.06	0.80	3.00	2.96	-0.04
Number increasing					9	47			
Percent of total available					12.2%	85.5%			
Number decreasing					13	6			
Percent of total available					17.6%	10.9%			
No change					52	2			
Percent of total available					70.3%	3.6%			

English--Melrose II (Performance Level)									
	Number of Records	Q1 of 1st Year	1st Year	Latest Year	Change at the End of 1st Year	Change at the End of Latest Year Available	NYS Standardized Tests		
							First Year	Latest Year	Change
Number of grades available	26	26	13	8	13	8	10	3	2
Average		2.04	1.92	2.75	-0.12	0.71	2.20	2.00	-0.20
Number increasing					0	5			
Percent of total available					0.0%	62.5%			
Number decreasing					3	0			
Percent of total available					23.1%	0.0%			
No change					10	3			
Percent of total available					76.9%	37.5%			

English--DeHostos (Performance Level)									
	Number of Records	Q1 of 1st Year	1st Year	Latest Year	Change at the End of 1st Year	Change at the End of Latest Year Available	NYS Standardized Tests		
							First Year	Latest Year	Change
Number of grades available	41	22	10	24	9	20	29	31	24
Average		2.36	2.48	2.69	0.12	0.33	2.59	2.52	-0.07
Number increasing					0	9			
Percent of total available					0.0%	45.0%			
Number decreasing					1	2			
Percent of total available					11.1%	10.0%			
No change					8	9			
Percent of total available					88.9%	45.0%			

English--Ravenswood II (Performance Level)									
	Number of Records	Q1 of 1st Year	1st Year	Latest Year	Change at the End of 1st Year	Change at the End of Latest Year Available	NYS Standardized Tests		
							First Year	Latest Year	Change
Number of grades available	41	37	37	16	36	15	3	4	2
Average		2.49	2.30	2.68	-0.18	0.19	2.67	3.25	0.58
Number increasing					1	6			
Percent of total available					2.8%	40.0%			
Number decreasing					11	6			
Percent of total available					30.6%	40.0%			
No change					24	3			
Percent of total available					66.7%	20.0%			

Attachment 3: Current Programs Academic Performance by Site

(Source: IHDF-NY Report Card Database)

Science--Chelsea II (Performance Level)						
	Number of Records	Q1 of 1st Year	1st Year	Latest Year	Change at the End of 1st Year	Change at the End of Latest Year Available
Number of grades available	74	74	74	55	74	55
Average		2.5	2.4	2.9	-0.1	0.4
Number increasing					0	33
Percent of total available					0.0%	60.0%
Number decreasing					9	15
Percent of total available					12.2%	27.3%
No change					65	7
Percent of total available					87.8%	12.7%

Science--Melrose II (Performance Level)						
	Number of Records	Q1 of 1st Year	1st Year	Latest Year	Change at the End of 1st Year	Change at the End of Latest Year Available
Number of grades available	26	25	12	9	12	8
Average		2.16	2.25	2.22	0.09	0.06
Number increasing					0	2
Percent of total available					0.0%	25.0%
Number decreasing					0	3
Percent of total available					0.0%	37.5%
No change					12	3
Percent of total available					100.0%	37.5%

Science--DeHostos (Performance Level)						
	Number of Records	Q1 of 1st Year	1st Year	Latest Year	Change at the End of 1st Year	Change at the End of Latest Year Available
Number of grades available	41	26	12	30	12	20
Average		2.58	2.75	2.57	0.17	-0.01
Number increasing					0	8
Percent of total available					0.0%	40.0%
Number decreasing					0	6
Percent of total available					0.0%	30.0%
No change					12	6
Percent of total available					100.0%	30.0%

Science--Ravenswood II (Performance Level)						
	Number of Records	Q1 of 1st Year	1st Year	Latest Year	Change at the End of 1st Year	Change at the End of Latest Year Available
Number of grades available	41	38	37	17	36	17
Average		2.45	2.41	2.53	-0.04	0.08
Number increasing					1	5
Percent of total available					2.8%	29.4%
Number decreasing					2	6
Percent of total available					5.6%	35.3%
No change					33	6
Percent of total available					91.7%	35.3%

Attachment 3: Current Programs Academic Performance by Site  
 (Source: IHDF-NY Report Card Database)

Social Studies/History/Global--Chelsea II (Performance Level)						
	Number of Records	Q1 of 1st Year	1st Year	Latest Year	Change at the End of 1st Year	Change at the End of Latest Year Available
Number of grades available	74	72	72	55	72	54
Average		2.56	2.44	3.30	-0.12	0.75
Number increasing					1	35
Percent of total available					1.4%	64.8%
Number decreasing					10	7
Percent of total available					13.9%	13.0%
No change					61	12
Percent of total available					84.7%	22.2%

Social Studies/History/Global--Melrose II (Performance Level)						
	Number of Records	Q1 of 1st Year	1st Year	Latest Year	Change at the End of 1st Year	Change at the End of Latest Year Available
Number of grades available	26	26	13	9	13	9
Average		1.81	1.92	2.44	0.12	0.64
Number increasing					0	6
Percent of total available					0.0%	66.7%
Number decreasing					0	2
Percent of total available					0.0%	22.2%
No change					13	1
Percent of total available					100.0%	11.1%

Social Studies/History/Global--DeHostos (Performance Level)						
	Number of Records	Q1 of 1st Year	1st Year	Latest Year	Change at the End of 1st Year	Change at the End of Latest Year Available
Number of grades available	41	26	12	29	12	20
Average		2.42	2.58	2.83	0.16	0.40
Number increasing					1	9
Percent of total available					8.3%	45.0%
Number decreasing					0	2
Percent of total available					0.0%	10.0%
No change					11	10
Percent of total available					91.7%	50.0%

Social Studies/History/Global--Ravenswood II (Performance Level)						
	Number of Records	Q1 of 1st Year	1st Year	Latest Year	Change at the End of 1st Year	Change at the End of Latest Year Available
Number of grades available	41	39	38	17	38	17
Average		2.44	2.32	2.41	-0.12	-0.02
Number increasing					1	2
Percent of total available					2.6%	11.8%
Number decreasing					6	5
Percent of total available					15.8%	29.4%
No change					31	10
Percent of total available					81.6%	58.8%

## Attachment 4: Alumni Tracking Survey 2009

Total Respondents:

93

Program Attended	#	%
Chelsea I	39	41.9%
Melrose I	19	20.4%
Ravenswood I	35	37.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>100%</b>

Graduated from High School	#	%
Yes	81	87.1%
No	7	7.5%
GED	4	4.3%
No answer	1	1.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>100%</b>

Number of High Schools Attended	#	%
1 High school	79	97.5%
2 High schools	22	27.2%
3 High schools	6	7.4%

High School	Graduated		
	Yes	No	Total
HS 1	61	13	74
HS 2	15	6	21
HS 3	4	2	6

Not Graduated, Current Status	#	%
Still in high school	1	9.1%
Got or working on a GED	4	36.4%
Dropped out	1	9.1%
Have a job	2	18.2%
Other	2	18.2%
No answer	1	9.1%
<b>Total (Not Graduated)</b>	<b>11</b>	

IHDF-NY Participation by Grade	#	%
1st	9	9.7%
2nd	27	29.0%
3rd	75	80.6%
4th	69	74.2%
5th	74	79.6%
6th	69	74.2%
7th	65	69.9%
8th	61	65.6%
9th	54	58.1%
10th	53	57.0%
11th	52	55.9%
12th	51	54.8%

Reasons for Not Graduating from High School	#	%
I had to work	1	9.1%
Bad grades	1	9.1%
Health issues	0	0.0%
No interest in high school	3	27.3%
Didn't feel like studying	1	9.1%
Family responsibilities	3	27.3%
No one I knew graduated from high	0	0.0%
Other*	2	18.2%
<b>Total (Not graduated)</b>	<b>11</b>	

\* 1. personal issues; 2. going to finish, just had a baby

## Attachment 4: Alumni Tracking Survey 2009

Any Further Education	#	%
Yes	81	87.1%
No	10	10.8%
No answer	2	2.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>100%</b>

If Have Further Education, Number of Institutions Attended	#	%
1	77	95.1%
2	30	37.0%
3	2	2.5%
<b>All with further education</b>	<b>81</b>	

Type of Further Education School Ever Attended	#	%
Vocational/trade school	5	6.2%
Community college	32	39.5%
College/university	56	69.1%
Military academy	0	0.0%
Acting school	0	0.0%
Cooking school	0	0.0%
Religious training	0	0.0%
Other*	3	3.7%
<b>All with further education</b>	<b>81</b>	

\* 1. EMS training; 2. Bartending; 3. Early childhood

Institution	Entry Year (School Year)						
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
1st School	13	31	8	2	5	9	6
2nd School	0	1	4	8	6	8	1
3rd School	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Total	13	32	12	10	11	17	9
Percent	16.0%	39.5%	14.8%	12.3%	13.6%	21.0%	11.1%

Still Attending Now	#	%
Yes	43	53.1%
No	36	44.4%
No answer	2	2.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Number of Years Attended	#	% of further education
Less than 1	4	4.9%
1	17	21.0%
2	13	16.0%
3	5	6.2%
4	19	23.5%
5	14	17.3%
6	4	4.9%
More than 6	2	2.5%
No answer	3	3.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Average Years		3.17



## Attachment 4: Alumni Tracking Survey 2009

Graduated/Expect to Graduate	#	%	Graduation Year									
			2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	No answer	Total
Yes	66	81.5%	2	6	10	12	14	10	9	2	1	66
No*	12	14.8%										
No answer	3	3.7%										
<b>Total</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>100.0%</b>										

* If didn't graduate or expect to graduate, reasons:	
#	Reason
2	Working, not enough time.
1	Working, don't want to go to school
1	Not interested in school
1	Was not focused while being away from home
1	Intentions on transferring to other College
1	Dropped out to support family. Looking to return
3	Financial reasons.

College GPA	#	%	Average GPA
Provided GPA	61	75.3%	<b>2.8</b>
No answer	20	24.7%	
Exact GPA	30	37.0%	
Estimated GPA	37	45.7%	
No answer	14	17.3%	

Top Majors	#	%
Business Manag.	8	9.9%
Psychology	6	7.4%
Accounting	5	6.2%
Criminal Justice	5	6.2%
Liberal Arts	4	4.9%
Social Work	4	4.9%

Receive Any Scholarships	#	%	Average Years with Scholarship*	Average Amount of Scholarship**
Yes	31	38.3%	<b>3.8</b>	<b>\$8,808</b>
No	45	55.6%		
No answer	5	6.2%		
<b>Total</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		

\* 24 respondents provided information.

\*\* 12 respondents provided information.

Participated in Any Organized Support Group	#	%
Yes	11	13.6%
No	18	22.2%
No answer	52	64.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Support Group	#
HEOP	3
STEP	1
IHAD	2
SEEK	3
PELL	1
TAP	1
FCA*	1
EOP	1
SSSP	1
NSLAS**	1

\* Fellowship of Christian Athletes

\*\* National Society of Leadership and Success

## Attachment 4: Alumni Tracking Survey 2009

IHDF-NY Influence on College Decision	Response Detail	
	#	%
7 (Very Positive)	58	65.9%
6	17	19.3%
5	9	10.2%
4 (No Influence)	3	3.4%
3	0	0.0%
2	0	0.0%
1 (Very Negative)	0	0.0%
Not Sure	1	1.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>88</b>	
<b>Average Rating</b>	<b>6.5</b>	

Working Now	#	%	Full-time		Part-time		Other*		Average Months with Employer
			#	%	#	%	#	%	
Yes	54	58.1%	29	53.7%	22	40.7%	3	5.6%	<b>16.5</b>
No	33	35.5%							
No answer	6	6.5%							
<b>Total</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>100.0%</b>							

\* 1. work study; 2. Intern; 3. job at school

Receiving Public Assistance	#	%
No, none	57	61.3%
Welfare	0	0.0%
Food Stamp	16	17.2%
Disability	9	9.7%
Other*	5	5.4%
No answer	6	6.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>100%</b>

\* 1. Medicaid; 2. Child Support; 3. Unemployment;

4. Not in contact with family.

If Not Working, Would Like To Be Working?	#	%
Yes, looking for work	22	66.7%
Yes, will work after semester over	4	12.1%
Yes, job lined up, to start soon	2	6.1%
No, taking a break	4	12.1%
No, raising a family	2	6.1%
No, illness/health problems	0	0.0%
Other*	4	12.1%

\* 1. want to finish degree before working again

2. Received GI Bill

3. School and sports take up too much time

4. Pregnant

Institution	Number	Length	Year	Reason
Foster Home	1	1 year		
	2	2 months	2000	
Jail	1	4 days		
	2	1 day	2005	At wrong place, wrong time with wrong people
	3	1 week	2005	Drunk with schoolmate, he robbed one room, police think I am his lookout
	4	6 month	2007	
Prison	1	6 month	2007	
Hospital	1	2 days	2002	Ovarian cysts
	2	3 days	2007	Gave birth
	3	2 days	2007	Food sickness and miscarriage
	4	1 week	2007	Asthma
	5	1 month	2000	Asthma
	6	3 weeks	2005	Gall bladder removal
	7	1 day	2009	Gave birth
Other	1	3 years	2004	Reside in a shelter because housing issues

## Attachment 4: Alumni Tracking Survey 2009

Over a third (31.2%) of the respondents said that they had received awards for their achievements since leaving high school. Academic excellence at schools, job recognitions at work, and contributions for community services are among the most frequently cited reasons for the awards.

Received Any Awards	#	%
Yes	29	31.2%
No	50	53.8%
No answer	14	15.1%
Total	93	100%

Participating in Community Service Projects Since High School	#	%
Yes	37	39.8%
No	44	47.3%
No answer	12	12.9%
Total	93	100%

Alumni were also asked about any leadership roles they played in their school or community since high school. Over 20% of the respondents reported leadership activities across a wide range of areas.

Held Leadership Positions Since High School	#	%
Yes	19	20.4%
No	64	68.8%
No answer	10	10.8%
Total	93	100%

## Attachment 4: Alumni Tracking Survey 2009

How Valuable Were the Following IHDF-NY Activities	Rating by Participants														Rating Average		
	Participated		Not Participated		No answer		1 (Not at all valuable)		2		3		4			5 (Extremely valuable)	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		#	%
Tutoring/Mentoring	73	78.5%	9	9.7%	11	11.8%	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	9	12.3%	13	17.8%	50	68.5%	4.52
Homework Help	74	79.6%	6	6.5%	13	14.0%	1	1.4%	4	5.4%	9	12.2%	14	18.9%	46	62.2%	4.35
State Standard Exams Preparation	53	57.0%	25	26.9%	15	16.1%	1	1.9%	3	5.7%	7	13.2%	12	22.6%	30	56.6%	4.26
College Prep Workshops/Activities	51	54.8%	28	30.1%	14	15.1%	1	2.0%	4	7.8%	7	13.7%	8	15.7%	31	60.8%	4.25
College Tours	54	58.1%	26	28.0%	13	14.0%	1	1.9%	3	5.6%	5	9.3%	3	5.6%	42	77.8%	4.52
Career Awareness	44	47.3%	34	36.6%	15	16.1%	2	4.5%	3	6.8%	9	20.5%	9	20.5%	21	47.7%	4.00
Resume Writing/Interviewing Skills	44	47.3%	34	36.6%	15	16.1%	1	2.3%	5	11.4%	5	11.4%	5	11.4%	28	63.6%	4.23
Computer Training	44	47.3%	32	34.4%	17	18.3%	1	2.3%	3	6.8%	10	22.7%	4	9.1%	26	59.1%	4.16
Math and Literacy Enrichment	50	53.8%	26	28.0%	17	18.3%	1	2.0%	5	10.0%	6	12.0%	7	14.0%	31	62.0%	4.24
Social and Cultural Enrichment	47	50.5%	29	31.2%	17	18.3%	0	0.0%	4	8.5%	8	17.0%	6	12.8%	29	61.7%	4.28
Drop In Center	45	48.4%	27	29.0%	21	22.6%	0	0.0%	2	4.4%	7	15.6%	7	15.6%	29	64.4%	4.40
Recreation Trips	73	78.5%	7	7.5%	13	14.0%	2	2.7%	0	0.0%	9	12.3%	14	19.2%	48	65.8%	4.45
Skills/Interest Inventory	39	41.9%	31	33.3%	23	24.7%	1	2.6%	3	7.7%	4	10.3%	4	10.3%	27	69.2%	4.36
Violence Prevention	42	45.2%	33	35.5%	18	19.4%	1	2.4%	3	7.1%	10	23.8%	5	11.9%	23	54.8%	4.10
Counseling and Mental Health Services	42	45.2%	33	35.5%	18	19.4%	3	7.1%	4	9.5%	5	11.9%	3	7.1%	27	64.3%	4.12
Sports and Recreation	60	64.5%	17	18.3%	16	17.2%	0	0.0%	4	6.7%	5	8.3%	11	18.3%	40	66.7%	4.45

How Useful Were the Following IHDF-NY Support	Rating by Participants														Rating Average		
	Participated		Not Participated		No answer		1 (Not at all valuable)		2		3		4			5 (Extremely valuable)	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		#	%
Preparing for college	64	68.8%	16	17.2%	13	14.0%	1	1.6%	0	0.0%	9	14.1%	13	20.3%	41	64.1%	4.45
Learning the college application process	61	65.6%	21	22.6%	11	11.8%	1	1.6%	2	3.3%	6	9.8%	5	8.2%	47	77.0%	4.56
Getting a higher SAT score	46	49.5%	34	36.6%	13	14.0%	2	4.3%	4	8.7%	9	19.6%	6	13.0%	25	54.3%	4.04
Applying for an internship/job	53	57.0%	27	29.0%	13	14.0%	2	3.8%	1	1.9%	7	13.2%	10	18.9%	33	62.3%	4.34
Understanding your school work	67	72.0%	14	15.1%	12	12.9%	0	0.0%	4	6.0%	8	11.9%	12	17.9%	43	64.2%	4.40
Learning better ways to study	64	68.8%	17	18.3%	12	12.9%	0	0.0%	4	6.3%	12	18.8%	13	20.3%	35	54.7%	4.23
Learning internship/job skills/ responsibilities	57	61.3%	24	25.8%	12	12.9%	2	3.5%	2	3.5%	8	14.0%	9	15.8%	36	63.2%	4.32
Defining your goals	68	73.1%	13	14.0%	12	12.9%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%	9	13.2%	8	11.8%	49	72.1%	4.53
Developing skills gained from recreational activities	68	73.1%	11	11.8%	14	15.1%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%	12	17.6%	12	17.6%	42	61.8%	4.38
Developing leadership skills	62	66.7%	16	17.2%	15	16.1%	0	0.0%	2	3.2%	12	19.4%	11	17.7%	37	59.7%	4.34
Getting better organized	66	71.0%	16	17.2%	11	11.8%	1	1.5%	3	4.5%	11	16.7%	14	21.2%	37	56.1%	4.26
Having a role model	72	77.4%	10	10.8%	11	11.8%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%	8	11.1%	14	19.4%	49	68.1%	4.54

## Attachment 4: Alumni Tracking Survey 2009

Marital Status	#	%
Married*	3	3.2%
Single	71	76.3%
Unmarried live-in partner	9	9.7%
Divorced	0	0.0%
Separated (not yet divorced)	0	0.0%
Widowed	0	0.0%
Other**	2	2.2%
No answer	8	8.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>100%</b>

\* Nobody married more than once

\*\* Engaged

Respondent's Gender	#	%
Male	50	53.8%
Female	35	37.6%
No answer	8	8.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>100%</b>

Respondent's Age	#	%
18 years old	3	3.2%
19 years old	10	10.8%
20 years old	3	3.2%
21 years old	0	0.0%
22 years old	6	6.5%
23 year old	48	51.6%
24 years old	14	15.1%
No answer	9	9.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>100%</b>

Have Children	#	%	Number of Children		Children's Average Age
			1	2	
Yes	15	16.1%	15	2	2.6
No	70	75.3%			
No answer	8	8.6%			
<b>Total</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>100%</b>			

Age of Children	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	No answer	Total	Live in	Not live in	Don't know
Count (Child 1)	4	4	1	0	2	0	1	3	15	13	1	1
Count (Child 2)	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>		<b>15</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

Language Spoken at Home	#	%
English	56	60.2%
Spanish	3	3.2%
English & Spanish	29	31.2%
Other	0	0.0%
No answer	5	5.4%

Respondent's Ethnicity	#	%
American Indian	3	3.2%
Asian	2	2.2%
Black	40	43.0%
Hispanic/Latino	47	50.5%
White	5	5.4%
Other	4	4.3%
No answer	8	8.6%

## Attachment 4: Alumni Tracking Survey 2009

As optional questions, alumni were also asked about their historical and current use of drug, alcohol and tobacco. Most respondents chose to answer these questions. Most (82%) responding alumni said that they had used alcohol, but almost 80% said that they drink only moderately or rarely. Only two respondents reported heavy or binge drinking.

Ever Had Alcohol	#	%
Yes	76	81.7%
No, not at all	7	7.5%
No answer	10	10.8%
Total	93	100%

How Much Drinking Now	#	%
Rarely	53	57.0%
Moderate Drinking	21	22.6%
Heavy Drinking	1	1.1%
Binge Drinking	1	1.1%
No answer	17	18.3%
Total	93	100%

While over 60% of all responding alumni said that they had never used any illicit drugs, more than a quarter (25.8%) had experienced drug usage in the past. With regard to current drug use, the number of alumni who are using drugs is significantly smaller than the number who had used drugs previously.

Ever Used Drugs	#	%	Use Drugs Now	
			#	%
Yes	24	25.8%	6	6.5%
No, not at all	59	63.4%	61	65.6%
No answer	10	10.8%	26	28.0%
Total	93	100%	93	100%

Marijuana usage was reported by nearly a third (29%) of the respondents. A majority (52%) of those who had used marijuana said they used the substance only once or twice per week even at their heaviest usage. However, three respondents reported usage of five times per week, and two other responding alumni used marijuana more than 14 times per week at their heaviest usage. Two respondents also reported usage of hallucinogens or other illicit drugs.

Ever Use Marijuana	#	%
Yes	27	29.0%
No	52	55.9%
No answer	14	15.1%
Total	93	100%

Heaviest Marijuana Use, Times Per Week	#	%
1	4	14.8%
2	10	37.0%
3	1	3.7%
4	1	3.7%
5	3	11.1%
6	1	3.7%
7	1	3.7%
10	1	3.7%
More than 14	2	7.4%
No answer	3	11.1%
Total	27	100%

Usage of Other Substances	#	Times/week at heaviest use
Heroin	0	0
Cocaine	0	0
Hallucinogens	1	No answer
Other Illicit Drugs	1	1
Total	2	1

Although 36.6% of respondents indicated that they had smoked tobacco in the past, the number of alumni who smoke now is significantly lower at 14%. Therefore, an increasing number of alumni seem to stop smoking cigarettes.

Ever Smoked	#	%	Smoke Now	
			#	%
Yes	34	36.6%	13	14.0%
No, not at all	49	52.7%	59	63.4%
No answer	10	10.8%	21	22.6%
Total	93	100%	93	100%

## Attachment 5: Alumni High School and Postsecondary Education Information

(Source: IHDF Alumni Database)

High School Diploma or GED	Chelsea I		Melrose I		Ravenswood I		All	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
High School Diploma	65	70.7%	25	71.4%	44	63.8%	134	68.4%
GED	13	14.1%	3	8.6%	16	23.2%	32	16.3%
Still in HS	0	0.0%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	1	0.5%
Working on GED	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	7.2%	5	2.6%
Dropped out (no GED)	1	1.1%	6	17.1%	0	0.0%	7	3.6%
Unknown	13	14.1%	0	0.0%	4	5.8%	17	8.7%
Total	92	100%	35	100%	69	100%	196	100%

Highest Postsecondary Program	Chelsea I		Melrose I		Ravenswood I		All	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2-year college	21	22.8%	11	31.4%	18	26.1%	50	25.5%
4-year college	33	35.9%	8	22.9%	23	33.3%	64	32.7%
Master program	2	2.2%	0	0.0%	4	5.8%	6	3.1%
Vo/Tech program	9	9.8%	3	8.6%	4	5.8%	16	8.2%
No postsecondary	27	29.3%	13	37.1%	20	29.0%	60	30.6%
Total	92	100%	35	100%	69	100%	196	100%