

<p>Program:</p>	<p>Indicate which legislative appropriation this plan addresses.</p> <p><i>Students who are unhoused</i></p>
<p>Problem Statement:</p>	<p>Use this space to write a succinct problem statement the program is attempting to address.</p> <p><i>In 2023, an estimated 3.1% of enrolled students in New Mexico were identified as experiencing homelessness, according to the National Center for Homeless Education. English learner students and children with disabilities comprise 75% of students experiencing homelessness (National Center for Homeless Education (NCHE), n.d.). Children who are inadequately housed, including children living in a motel or in a home without utilities, may experience higher rates of abuse and neglect, mental health challenges, and an increase in substance abuse problems than their stably housed peers (FitzGerald et al., 2017). In addition, data show that children’s inadequate living environments can negatively impact academic performance (Cutuli et al, 2013) and increase chronic absenteeism (U.S. Department of Education, 2023). Furthermore, not completing high school is correlated with higher rates of homelessness later in life (Morton et al, 2018)².</i></p> <p><i>This grant program will provide payments directly to unhoused students. Tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grade students will be selected based on experiencing homelessness in schools that are in urban and rural areas as well as districts and state charter schools. A mixture of districts across the state will be selected to ensure variety across New Mexico. The schools will not receive money, however the contract will allow stipends for supporting staff needed. The supporting staff will be paid as contractors. In order to maintain eligibility to remain in the program, students will need to demonstrate at least a 92% school day attendance rate, attend meetings weekly with a counselor or social worker, attend weekly academic support sessions, and complete 90% of their school work calculated on a monthly basis.</i></p> <p><i>NMPED will work with local credit unions to provide financial literacy classes for the students and assist with opening savings or checking accounts. The payments will be paid by the REC directly into the students accounts using ACH for all students who meet the four requirements. The payment is \$500/monthly. We will also ask the credit unions or other private entities to donate money into the students accounts to ensure the monthly payments are not counted as income for the families.</i></p> <p><i>Students experiencing homelessness are a highly mobile group. To see the impact of this program on academic outcomes of our students we must allow them to stay in the program for as long as possible. In the instance that participating students move to a different school, the funding will follow the students as much as possible. NMPED will work with the unhoused students’ liaison in the new school to continue the student on the program. We lose unspent funds based on my understanding of PERF. If a student can not continue participating in the program, or is no longer enrolled at a school within the state, a new student from a participating school will be invited to take their place.</i></p>

<p>Overarching Goals:</p>	<p>Use this space to list three to five overarching goals for the program.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Increased attendance and decreased chronic absenteeism among participating students who are unhoused</i> 2. <i>Increased course completion and course grades among participating students who are unhoused</i> 3. <i>Increased engagement among participating students who are unhoused</i> 4. <i>Decreased dropout rates among participating students who are unhoused</i> 5. <i>Increased graduation rates among participating students who are unhoused</i>
<p>Underlying Assumptions and Research Base:</p> <p><i>Why do you think this program will work?</i></p>	<p>Use this space to include a brief summary regarding whether the program has been shown to work and whether the program is classified as evidence-based, research-based, promising, or does not yet have rigorous research. For definitions of these terms, see below and Section 6-3A-3 NMSA 1978.</p> <p><i>Direct cash transfer programs for students who are unhoused have been studied throughout the country. One study of a conditional cash transfer program in New York City was reviewed and included in the What Works Clearinghouse as a Tier 3 (promising) study (Miller and Riccio, 2011).</i></p> <p><i>Additionally, research and real-world outcomes from New Mexico Appleseed's Conditional Cash Transfer Pilot demonstrate that targeted financial and academic support can significantly improve attendance and engagement among students experiencing homelessness. In collaboration with the Los Alamos National Laboratory Foundation, Cuba Independent School District, and West Las Vegas School District, the pilot provided \$500 monthly stipends to 53 high school students facing housing instability. These stipends were contingent upon meeting specific academic goals, including maintaining 90% attendance and completing 90% of classwork, along with participating in weekly tutoring and check-ins.</i></p> <p><i>The results were compelling: over 80% of students remained in the program, and participants reported increased motivation, improved grades, and reduced stress due to financial relief. Families utilized the stipends for essential needs such as food, utilities, and transportation, directly addressing barriers to consistent school attendance. Importantly, 100% of participating families viewed the program requirements as fair and beneficial.</i></p> <p><i>These findings suggest that a program combining conditional financial incentives with academic and emotional support can effectively reduce chronic absenteeism and enhance graduation rates among homeless students. By addressing both the economic hardships and educational challenges faced by these students, such an approach offers a promising pathway to improved educational outcomes and long-term stability.</i></p>

References:

Cutuli J.J., Desjardins C.D., Herbers J.E., Long J.D., Heistad D., Chan C.K., Hinz E., Masten A.S. (2013). Academic achievement trajectories of homeless and highly mobile students: resilience in the context of chronic and acute risk. Child Development. Retrieved from:

<http://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3566371/>.

FitzGerald, C., Bannerman, T., Green, D., & Penaloza, L. (2017). New Mexico Youth Risk & Resiliency 2015 Survey Results Report: Housing Instability and Health. Retrieved from <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/prc-reports-documents/27/>

Miller, C., and Riccio, J. (2011). Toward reducing poverty across generations: Early findings from New York City's conditional cash transfer program. Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED517881>

Morton M.H., Dworsky A., Matjasko J.L., Curry S.R., Schlueter D., Chávez R., Farrell A.F. (2018). Prevalence and Correlates of Youth Homelessness in the United States. Journal of Adolescent Health. Retrieved from <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5826721/>.

National Center for Homeless Education (NCHE). (n.d.). <https://profiles.nche.seiservices.com/StateProfile.aspx?StateID=38>

National Center for Homeless Education (2023). Student Homelessness in America. Retrieved from: https://nche.ed.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/SY-21-22-EHCY-Data-Summary_FINAL.pdf.

New Mexico Youth Risk and Resiliency Survey, (September 16, 2019) 2015 NM-YRRS Results: Housing Instability Among Youth.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, EDFacts file 118: Homeless Students Enrolled, Data Group 655, LEA Level; and EDFacts file 195: chronic absenteeism, Data Group 814, school level, SY 2020-21 to 2022-23. Data may be accessed publicly on <https://eddataexpress.ed.gov/download>.

Logic Model

Building a logic model helps clearly articulate what a program aims to accomplish. It shows the relationships between program resources, activities, outputs, and expected outcomes, and serves as a framework for planning, implementation, and evaluation. In the logic model below, fill in the boxes to identify who is responsible for implementation, the activities each actor will carry out, how you will measure whether activities are implemented as intended, and the expected short- and long-term outcomes. See the [Institute for Education Sciences](#) for more information about logic models.

Actors	Activities	Outputs	Outcomes
<p>List the entities will be responsible for implementing the program (one row per actor).</p> <p><i>Examples: PED, school districts and charter schools, schools, educators, evaluators.</i></p>	<p>List the specific activities each actor will be responsible for carrying out during implementation.</p> <p><i>Examples: Awarding funding, providing technical support, collecting and cleaning data, training staff.</i></p>	<p>List the measures used to determine whether activities are being implemented as intended.</p> <p><i>Examples: Number of participants, attrition rate, number of times an activity was carried out, engagement metrics.</i></p>	<p>List the short-term and long-term measures that may be used to provide evidence that the program is making a difference.</p> <p>Short-Term: Benefits for participants. Long-Term: Benefits for entire program.</p> <p><i>Examples: Knowledge, skills, proficiency rates, graduation rates, chronic absence rates, additional outcomes for participants.</i></p>
<p>School Districts and Charters</p>	<p>Program Administration and Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Identify eligible students in partnership with NMPED ● Identify school coordinator to provide information to PED (preference for the point of contact person to be the homeless liaison but this is not set in stone). ● Engage in regular check-ins with PED ● Collect student eligibility and outcome data and share with PED; participants are required to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Attend school at least 92% of the time ○ Attend three weekly academic support sessions ○ Attend weekly check-ins with guidance counselors and social workers ○ Complete 90% of their schoolwork ● Collect and review data to ensure student eligibility and progress, including meeting programmatic requirements, and share with PED 	<p>Program Administration and Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● # of eligible students identified ● # student participants ● # of students maintaining eligibility in the program ● # of students who complete the program ● # of school coordinators identified ● # of check-ins and other engagement (text, email) with PED ● Student eligibility data shared with PED ● Student outcome data shared with PED 	<p>Short-Term Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Participating student attendance rate increases ● Participating student chronic absence rates decrease ● Participating student course completion increases ● Participating student course grades increase ● Increase student engagement
<p>Educators</p>	<p>Services and Supports for Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide tutoring ● Provide weekly check-ins ● Document student engagement with required program elements (e.g. completion of schoolwork) 	<p>Services and Supports for Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● # of tutoring sessions held ● # of weekly check-ins held ● # of students meeting program requirements 	

Actors	Activities	Outputs	Outcomes
PED	<p>Program Administration and Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop grant agreements, data sharing agreements, and other programmatic documents with LEAs to outline responsibilities and expectations • Coordinate with LEAs to identify students and school coordinators to participate in the program • Coordinate PERF funding with other programs for unhoused students, including housing stabilization and intensive case management • Engage in regular check-ins with LEAs on program administration and implementation • Provide technical assistance to LEAs to support program implementation • Coordinate with LEA and school coordinators to collect and receive student data, including eligibility and outcome data • Coordinate with local credit unions to provide financial literacy classes and account assistance for students • Review data to ensure student eligibility and progress, including meeting programmatic requirements • Create and submit analysis report to LECC 	<p>Program Administration and Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of school coordinators identified • # of students maintaining eligibility in the program across participating LEAs • # of students who complete the program across participating LEAs • # of check-ins and other engagement (text, email) with LEAs • Documentation of technical assistance provided • Student eligibility data received • Student outcome data received • Self-belief measures (fall and spring, pre-post) 	<p>Long-Term Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dropout rates for unhoused students decrease • Graduation rates for unhoused students increase (they examine this annually)
REC	<p>Services and Supports for Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administer funding to students/families (monthly payments of \$500 to 330 students experiencing homelessness) <p>Program Administration and Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Execute grant agreements, data sharing agreements, and other programmatic documents with PED 	<p>Services and Supports for Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of monthly payments provided <p>Program Administration and Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of grant agreements executed • \$ amount of grant funds provided to LEAs • \$ amount of grant funds spent by LEAs 	

Program Evaluation Plan and Description of Methods

A program evaluation plan provides a roadmap for determining whether a program is achieving its expected outcomes. It should include information about the target population, data collection methods, and planned data analysis. If needed, refer to the [World Bank pre-analysis plan checklist](#) for additional guidance.

Target Population and Sampling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● What is the target population of the program? (For example, is the program run at a classroom level, a school level, or a districtwide level? Is the program predominantly for a specific demographic or at-risk group?) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The target population is 330 10th-12th graders experiencing homelessness in the state of New Mexico. The program runs at the school level. The program has no other demographic requirements. ● What are the eligibility criteria for applying and participating in the program? How will you select participants? (For example, random selection, stratified sampling, propensity score matching)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Districts from across the state will be invited to participate to ensure a variety across New Mexico. NMPED will target a diverse mixture of urban and rural areas as well as districts and state charter schools to participate. NMPED will meet with the interested districts to ensure they have the necessary resources and capacity to successfully implement the program. If needed, funding is available to cover additional stipends for supporting staff. NMPED will also meet with school and district leadership as well as unhoused students' liaisons within the district to ensure staff capacity to support the program. Not all schools within a district will be required to participate, however, all students within a participating school who are eligible will have the option to participate. ○ Student-level participation selection utilizes purposive sampling and self-selection. Students experiencing homelessness (purposive sampling) will be asked to participate in the program (self-selection). ○ Students begin receiving payments for attendance and meeting other school requirements beginning in July 2025. Payments continue for 10 months (i.e., end of school year).
Evaluation Approach and Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Describe how your evaluation will be conducted. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A pre-post study design will be used with several components that vary by the outcomes of interest. ○ Ideally, this evaluation would use a matched comparison design to examine causal impacts for two outcomes of students participating in the program compared with similar students that did participate. Preferably (and if the sample size allows for a suitable match for all students), the comparison group would be generated as a 1:1 matched comparison sample using only students attending districts where the program was not offered. The method for matching would follow What Works Clearinghouse guidelines for appropriate matching characteristics and determinations of baseline

equivalence, which requires separate matches by the eventual outcomes of interest for the analysis. The evaluation would then measure differences in student outcomes of attendance rates and grade point average (GPA) for these two groups using a difference-in-differences research design. However, given the size of the student population of unhoused students in New Mexico, and the preference to exclude non-participating students from participating LEAs as eligible comparison students, the possibility for finding enough comparison students that are strong matches for participants is unlikely. The viability of a valid 1:1 matched comparison group will be explored, and used if possible, but for the rest of this plan it is assumed that a valid matched comparison sample will not be established.

- In the likely absence of a valid comparison group for all outcomes, and with some outcomes of interest that were not previously collected (students' school beliefs and academic engagement) or only occur at later time periods (graduation), the most likely suitable analyses for this evaluation will be descriptive and inferential comparisons of student outcomes. Potential analyses include either comparing non-participants to a non-matched sample of students within the unhoused student sample across the state or to themselves prior to receiving the program (intra-individual change over time).
- Due to the highly mobile student population served, students participating across multiple schools and student attrition from the program are both likely. Students who participate across multiple school sites and students who join the program after another student has exited will be tagged so that this differential participation can be used to either conduct subgroup analysis or as an additional control variable in regression analyses. Students who stop participating in the program will also be tagged and analyzed in subgroup analysis to document the characteristics of students who exit the program or lose contact with their school.
- Specify what methods and statistical tests PED plans to use. See UNM's research hierarchy for information on reliable research methods.
 - Descriptive (measures of central tendency) and inferential (t-tests) will be used to describe whether student-level outcomes for participants are changing over time. Specifically for attendance rates, grade point average (GPA), and graduation rates, student-level change after program participation will be compared between participating students and the entire population of unhoused students in non-participating districts across the state. This comparison will not be a 1:1 matched comparison sample, it will simply include all unhoused students from other school districts. Additionally, participant students' individual attendance rates and grade point average (GPA) will be compared using a paired sample t-test of student outcomes in the year before program participation compared with each subsequent year after the program is received. Finally, participating schools will administer the Student Well-

	<p>Being and Competency survey. The survey results for students in participating grade levels at funded schools will be analyzed descriptively, and if possible inferentially, to document changes in students' feelings of engagement and academic motivation during and after the program. This particular survey has been previously vetted and used by NMPED as a valid and reliable instrument for measuring multiple social emotional learning outcomes, including student engagement. The survey is based on the research by Skinner et al. (2008)¹, who are known and respected developmental psychologists in the field.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● If you are planning to assess the program's causal impact on student achievement, explain exactly how this will be done (for example, randomized control trials, matched comparisons). If you cannot assess causal impact: Provide a clear rationale for your proposed evaluation design. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Given the obstacles to creating an appropriate matched comparison sample or a suitable longitudinal dataset for the outcomes of interest, it will likely not be possible to assess the causal impact of this program. However, the inferential analyses detailed above will provide correlational evidence of any changes in outcomes related to program participation.
Data Collection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● What data collection methods will be used? Who will be responsible for collecting the data? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Data will be collected to ensure minimum program qualifications are being met by participating students. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ LEAs will use online reporting forms for students' daily attendance, completion of coursework, tutoring attendance, attending wraparound services, and grade point average. ■ PED will collect graduation rates via schools' annual mandated graduation reporting. ■ PED will send online surveys to participating students regarding their school self-beliefs (academic motivation and school engagement). ○ PED will collect attendance, GPA, and graduation data for both program participants and comparison students via schools' mandated reporting.
Implementation Timeline	Outline a proposed timeline for activities across the appropriation period:

¹ Skinner, E. A., Kindermann, T. A., & Furrer, C. J. (2008). A Motivational Perspective on Engagement and Disaffection: Conceptualization and Assessment of Children's Behavioral and Emotional Participation in Academic Activities in the Classroom. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 69(3), 493-525. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164408323233>

	<p>Year One (2025-2026):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Finalize evaluation plan (by 9/1/2025) ● Identify participating students (by 10/31/2025) ● Identify viability of matched comparison students (by 12/31/2025) ● Identify final comparison pool(s) for participants (by 1/31/2026) ● Gather data (ongoing- 6/30/2026) ● Analyze data (ongoing- 9/1/2026) ● Produce progress report with Year 1 outputs and outcomes (by 11/1/2026)
	<p>Year Two (2026-2027):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Review and revise evaluation plan (by 9/1/2026) ● Confirm participating students (by 10/31/2026) ● Confirm matched comparison students (by 1/31/2027) ● Gather data (ongoing- 6/30/2027) ● Analyze data (ongoing- 9/1/2027) ● Produce progress report with Year 2 outputs and outcomes (by 11/1/2027)
	<p>Year Three (2027-2028):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Review and revise evaluation plan (by 9/1/2027) ● Confirm participating students (by 10/31/2027) ● Confirm matched comparison students (by 1/31/2028) ● Gather data (ongoing- 6/30/2028) ● Analyze data (ongoing- 9/1/2028) ● Produce final report comparing key outcomes of funded schools with matched comparison schools over the three-year funding period (by 11/1/2028)
<p>Contacts for Annual Progress Updates</p>	<p>Please use this space to provide primary points of contact at PED for progress updates, expected by November 1 of each year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Simone Vann, At-Risk Intervention Response Director, Simone.Vann@ped.nm.gov ● Dr. Candice Castillo, Deputy Secretary, Candice.Castillo@ped.nm.gov

Topic	Housing Insecurity – Direct cash transfer program	Resolution
Reviewers	Tim Bedeaux and Jessica Hathaway, LESC Rachel Mabe and Sarah Dinces, LFC Lori Sciacca and Andrew Miner, DFA	
Requested Changes	<p><i>Within the “problem statement,” describe the program and funding mechanics in detail:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● It would be helpful if you could briefly describe what the program entails. Are students or families being paid? How much will they be paid? How will schools be selected for participation? What are the “conditions” students must meet guarantee payment? Who is responsible for paying students (REC)? Will schools receive any discretionary funding to support the program (e.g. tutoring/support sessions/training for staff on data collection requirements)? 	Paragraphs 2 & 3 were added to the Problem Statement section in the Program Description document to provide program information and address these questions.
	<p><i>Within the overarching Goals and the Evaluation plan and Methods, clearly describe how “engagement” will be measured:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Staff are unfamiliar with the survey that will be used to measure student engagement. It would be beneficial to clarify the individual survey items that will be used to measure “engagement.” ● Staff are concerned that the survey may lack validity or reliability as an instrument. Self-reported levels of engagement may not be a useful indicator of actual engagement. 	Text was added to the Evaluation and Approach Methods suggestion on page 2 of the Program Evaluation Plan to detail the validity of this instrument and NMPED’s prior vetting.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the use of a survey is acceptable, in-depth interviews or focus groups could help paint a more compelling picture of the conditions that caused a program to be effective (or ineffective). 	
	<p><i>Within the Logic Model and the evaluation plan remove academic achievement from continued eligibility requirements:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff are concerned that the inclusion of a “3.0 GPA” as an eligibility requirement may conflate causation of the program impacts and may also contribute to attrition. • The design of the previous promising Appleseed program was a “guaranteed payment for student attendance,” without requiring students to meet academic thresholds: <p>The Intervention</p> <p>Participants received a basic needs stipend of \$500 for each month, up to eight months during the 2020-2021 school year in exchange for the completion of the following requirements: ⁴³</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Weekly 1–2-hour tutoring sessions designed to assist students with completing work and instruction in reading and math. 2) Weekly check-ins to address social-emotional issues, academic challenges, and basic needs of students through-out the school year. These check-ins were a mix of online, over the phone and in-person, including home visits. 3) Attend school 90% of the time. 4) Complete 90% of their schoolwork on time. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The requirement could lead to confusion about whether the cash transfer itself was effective, or rather whether the high expectations for achievement were effective. 	<p>NMPED staff agreed that this should not be a necessary requirement for continued eligibility. Text was added to Paragraphs 2 of the Problem Statement section in the Program Description document to detail the intended eligibility requirement of 90% schoolwork completion.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Second, it is possible or even likely that students may struggle to meet this benchmark, particularly early in the program before the payments have meaningfully impacted students' lives. This could lead to early attrition and reduce the sample size. 	
	<p><i>Within the Evaluation Plan, consider the “public benefit” of the program:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide a rationale for selecting the schools for participation in the program. How are you ensuring funds will flow to schools with high levels of need, while still ensuring those schools have the necessary leadership and capacity to effectively run the program? 	<p>Text was added to the Target Population and Sampling Section of the Program Evaluation Plan detailing the district and school selection process.</p>
	<p><i>Within the Evaluation Plan, contribute to the evidence base with a strong design:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● This evaluation can build upon previous research by implementing a stronger design than existing research. Previous studies provide only <i>promising</i> research; staff urge PED to design a program that allows for a quasi-experimental design. ● It is understood that a 1:1 matched pair design would be PED's preference; staff would prefer this design as well. Random assignment of schools within participating school districts could help tighten the methodology to allow a successful 1:1 matched pair design. Staff believe the 1:1 matched pairs can be assembled early based on student demographic 	<p>NMPED program staff do not feel that the suggested program changes that allow for a quasi-experimental study will be acceptable when implementing the program.</p> <p>A large consideration of implementation is the staff resources and capacity at the school and district level to administer the program. Given this consideration, randomization of participating schools would not be ideal, as many school sites may be selected without the capacity to deliver the services as intended.</p> <p>Randomization of participating students, even with a phased approach, introduces ethical concerns</p>

	<p>characteristics readily available in Nova, even before payments begin.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Using random assignment also eliminates the need for a “preference to exclude non-participating students from participating LEAs.” Even with the potential limitations of an “opt-in” model, it is likely favorable to evaluate participants next to non-participating students <i>within</i> the participating school districts; comparing urban students experiencing homelessness to similar rural students introduces confounding variables, such as the fact that community supports for homeless students in urban areas are likely much more prevalent than in rural areas.● A phased design to the program can alleviate some ethical concerns associated with randomization. For instance, students in the control group in year one could be eligible for the payments beginning in year two.	<p>that cannot be ignored because of the ramifications of receiving monetary stipends. NMPED staff prefer a model where all eligible students within a participating school can opt into participation and no students that would like to participate are delayed in receiving stipends.</p> <p>Additionally, a phased approach would also interrupt the consistency of participation for different grade level students. Consistency in as many participants as possible is key to understanding how the program can help students over a three year cycle. Each of the three years will have students exiting (seniors) and students entering (sophomores) the program. For example, analyzing the seniors during the first year will allow NMPED staff to see the impact on twelfth grade students in the program for one year only, whereas the students who start as tenth graders during the first year will allow us to see the impact on students who are in the program for the full three years.</p> <p>The current program design does allow for potential matching of students within different schools at the same district, as not all schools within each participating district will be required to participate. The evaluation team can utilize this as much as possible when exploring the viability of the matching design. Additionally, school-level variables such as size, locale, and urbanicity can</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>be included in the matching process to ensure equitable considerations for school contexts of matched students.</p>
	<p><i>Within the Evaluation Plan, detail the plan for attrition:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● With this program in particular, PED should develop a plan for participant attrition. In particular, it will be important to monitor the characteristics of students who lose contact with their school and to understand patterns in why students may be losing eligibility for payments. ● If students lose eligibility or move schools, will additional students be added to the program? How often should that occur (e.g. every half-year)? What will happen to unspent funding? 	<p>Bullet 1, Subbullet 4 was added to the “Evaluation Approach and Methods” section of the Program Evaluation Plan to describe the analytic steps that will take place when students move schools or exit the program.</p> <p>Paragraph 4 was added to the Problem Statement section in the Program Description document to provide further program information about students moving between schools or dropping out of the program.</p>