The Student Experience in Engage New England Schools | Spring 2025 Student Survey Technical Report

Authors:
Jenna Rush
Sunny Cao
Thomas Kelley-Kemple

May 2026

SRI • 333 Ravenswood Avenue • Menlo Park, CA 94025-3493 • 650.859.2000 • www.sri.com

May 2026

Suggested citation:
Rush, J., Cao, S., & Kelley-Kemple, T. (2026). *The Student Experience in Engage New England Schools: Spring 2025 Student Survey Technical Report*. SRI.

Contents

List of Exhibits

This report accompanies SRI's February 2026 research brief on the student experience in Engage New England schools, providing greater detail on the results of the student survey highlighted in that brief. The research brief integrates findings from the study's qualitative data collection with the survey findings and provides more context on the Barr Foundation's Engage New England initiative.

Survey Purpose

The Barr Foundation's Engage New England (ENE) initiative is an effort to develop exemplary demonstration high schools that meet the academic and developmental needs of high school students who have fallen off track on their path to high school graduation and postsecondary success. The Barr Foundation expects ENE schools to provide students with an educational experience characterized by:

- strong relationships and community,
- personalized supports and progress monitoring,
- rigorous and purposeful instruction, and
- postsecondary planning.

Together, these core ENE strategies are intended to help students build the core skills and competencies they will need to be successful in high school and beyond.

To understand whether ENE schools were providing these experiences to students, in spring 2025 SRI surveyed students at the ENE schools and at traditional and alternative high schools (comparison schools). The traditional schools in our comparison group ranged in size from 1,500 to 2,000 students, and the alternative schools were similar in size to the ENE schools, serving fewer than 200 students. Most ENE students start high school at a traditional school, so comparison to traditional schools allows us to see if their experiences were different from what they would have been if they had stayed in that traditional setting. Comparison to alternative schools allows us to see if ENE schools are indeed offering a different type of alternative schooling experience.

Schools and Respondents

In spring 2025, SRI surveyed students at four ENE schools and eight comparison high schools—five traditional high schools and three alternative schools.[1] To identify comparison schools for each ENE school, we looked at student composition based on demographics such as gender, race

[1] A fifth ENE school, PROMISE College and Career Academy, received continued funding the following year and is not included in this analysis.

and ethnicity, English learner status, and special education status (Individualized Education Program [IEP] or Section 504 Plan). When possible, we included a comparison school in the same district as the ENE school, representing the traditional high school that students would attend if not enrolled at the ENE school.

The analysis includes respondents from 12 schools in total and up to 2,845 students: 332 students at the ENE schools, 2,434 students at the traditional schools, and 79 students at the alternative schools. The number of respondents varies by survey item and construct because of survey skip patterns in addition to some students opting not to respond to certain items

Analytic Approach

For each outcome, SRI estimated the mean response for students in each school type after statistically adjusting for differences in student composition and school context. We used multilevel modeling to account for student grouping within schools and included both student- and school-level control variables. We used linear models for outcomes based on Likert response scales and logistic regression for all binary outcomes. To confirm that the pattern of results was similar for Black and Latine students as it was for students overall, we conducted a parallel analysis separately for each of these two student groups. More information about the analytic models is available in the appendix of this report.

Survey Results

SRI combined survey items addressing similar concepts to create a composite measure that we refer to as a "construct." In the results below, items that do not fit into a construct are presented individually. We include asterisks for the estimated means in tables to indicate when differences between ENE and comparison school estimates are statistically significant.

Relationships and Community

The ENE initiative is grounded in the idea that students having caring, trusting, and supportive relationships with adults and their peers is critical for effective learning environments. The ENE initiative expects schools to build a strong culture of trust and belonging for students as a foundation for other learning to take place.

The **student–teacher relationships** construct represents the extent to which students report positive relationships with the teachers at their school, including their perceptions that their teachers listen to them, care about them, and can be relied on for support.

The **sense of belonging** construct represents the extent to which students feel accepted, respected, and valued by others in their school community.

In alignment with initiative expectations, students at the ENE schools reported stronger student–teacher relationships and sense of belonging than students at both traditional and alternative schools (Exhibit 1).

Exhibit 1. Mean ratings of student–teacher relationships and sense of belonging

Survey Construct	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
All students			
Student–teacher relationships	4.34	3.77***	3.40***
Sense of belonging	4.05	3.46**	3.42**
Latine students			
Student–teacher relationships	4.31	3.74***	
Sense of belonging	4.04	3.44**	
Black students			
Student–teacher relationships	4.17	3.70**	
Sense of belonging	3.81	3.41*	

Note. Responses fall on the following scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.

**$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Personalized Supports and Progress Monitoring

ENE schools build strong relationships with students and monitor their progress through a primary person model, in which each student has at least one adult who knows them well and helps them keep track of their progress toward graduation. Almost all (92%) students at ENE schools reported that they were assigned an adult who met with them regularly to discuss their academic progress (Exhibit 2). This was less common at comparison schools, particularly alternative schools, where only 37% of students reported being assigned to an adult in this way.

Exhibit 2. Percentage of students assigned an adult to meet with regularly

Survey Item	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
All students			
Assigned an adult to meet with regularly to discuss academic progress	92%	71%***	37%***
Latine students			

Survey Item	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
Assigned an adult to meet with regularly to discuss academic progress	94%	65%***	
Black students			
Assigned an adult to meet with regularly to discuss academic progress	94%	62%***	

***$p < .001$.

Although students at ENE schools, on average, reported meeting with their assigned adult more frequently than students at traditional and alternative schools, this finding is not statistically significant (Exhibit 3).

Exhibit 3. Mean frequency of student one-on-one meetings with assigned adult

Survey Item	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
All students			
Frequency of 1:1 meetings with assigned adult	3.38	2.21	2.76
Latine students			
Frequency of 1:1 meetings with assigned adult	3.32	2.20***	
Black students			
Frequency of 1:1 meetings with assigned adult	3.67	2.37***	

Note. This item was only asked of students who indicated that they had been assigned an adult to meet with regularly to discuss their academic progress. Responses fall on the following scale: 0 = never, 1 = once or twice this year, 2 = a few times this year, 3 = monthly or almost monthly, 4 = two or three times a month, and 5 = once a week or more.

Students at ENE schools were more likely than students at traditional schools to report that their assigned adult knew them well and believed they could succeed (Exhibit 4).

Exhibit 4. Mean ratings of students' relationship with advisor

Survey Item	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
All students			
My advisor knows me well	3.82	3.37**	3.47
My advisor believes I can succeed	4.39	4.00*	4.06
Latine students			
My advisor knows me well	3.67	3.34	
My advisor believes I can succeed	4.29	4.03	
Black students			
My advisor knows me well	3.88	3.33	
My advisor believes I can succeed	4.62	4.00***	

Note. These items were only asked of students who indicated that they had been assigned an adult to meet with regularly to discuss their academic progress. Responses fall on the following scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Rigorous and Purposeful Instruction

ENE schools strive to provide rigorous, engaging, and purposeful instruction that is connected to the development of transferable skills. They use project-based curricular units, called transformative learning experiences (TLEs), and define and teach core competencies that students need to succeed in and beyond high school.

The **competency-based instruction** construct represents students' perceptions of how often their teachers use competency-based practices in their classes, such as providing expectations for how work will be assessed, examples of student work, feedback to help students improve their work, and multiple chances for them to succeed. Compared with students in traditional and alternative schools, students in ENE schools reported that their teachers used these competency-based practices more frequently (Exhibit 5).

Exhibit 5. Mean ratings of competency-based instruction

Survey Construct	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
All students			
Competency-based instruction	4.25	3.71**	3.47***
Latine students			
Competency-based instruction	4.22	3.74**	
Black students			
Competency-based instruction	4.13	3.73**	

Note. Responses fall on the following scale: 1 = never, 2 = seldom, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, and 5 = always.
**$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

The **academic rigor** construct represents students' perceptions of how many of their classes include assignments that push them to deepen their thinking, demand critical thinking, require multiple drafts to strengthen their work, and challenge them to do their best.

The **purpose** construct represents how relevant and purposeful students report their coursework to be, including how many of their classes provide learning experiences that are tied to their interests and goals and are connected to issues that are important to their community.

The **classroom engagement comfort level** construct represents students' perceptions of their classroom environments, including the number of classes in which they feel comfortable sharing their ideas, making mistakes, and asking questions when they do not understand something.

On average, students at ENE schools reported that a higher proportion of their classes were rigorous and were purposeful compared with students at comparison schools (Exhibit 6). They also reported a supportive classroom environment in a higher proportion of their courses than did comparison students at traditional high schools. Although ENE students reported a higher proportion of courses dominated by student talk relative to comparison schools, these differences were not statistically significant.

Exhibit 6. Mean ratings of rigorous and purposeful instruction

Survey Construct or Item	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
All students			
Rigor	3.96	3.42***	3.30***
Purpose	4.09	3.45***	3.29***
Classroom engagement comfort level	3.93	3.43*	3.51

Survey Construct or Item	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
Students – not the teacher – do most of talking	3.22	2.96	2.96
Latine students			
Rigor	3.89	3.42***	
Purpose	4.05	3.42**	
Classroom engagement comfort level	3.91	3.40*	
Students – not the teacher – do most of talking	3.15	3.00	
Black students			
Rigor	3.88	3.41***	
Purpose	3.82	3.48*	
Classroom engagement comfort level	3.73	3.40	
Students – not the teacher – do most of talking	3.10	3.09	

Note. Students were asked for how many of their classes certain statements were true. Responses fall on the following scale: 1 = none, 2 = a few, 3 = about half, 4 = most, and 5 = all.

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.***$p < .001$.

ENE students reported engaging in class activities related to the real world more frequently than students at traditional high schools, with the exception of presenting to authentic audiences (Exhibit 7). In particular, ENE students reported having an outside expert or community member come to their class between two and three times during the school year, while students at traditional schools reported this activity occurred between once and twice during the year.

Exhibit 7. Mean ratings of authentic learning activities

Survey Item	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
All students			
Had outside experts or community members come to your class to discuss what you are learning	2.43	1.67*	1.93
Taken field trips connected to what you are learning in class	1.92	1.24***	1.44**
Received feedback on your work from outside experts or community members	1.95	1.22**	1.49
Presented your work to an audience that includes outside experts or community members	1.66	1.16	1.21
Latine students			
Had outside experts or community members come to your class to discuss what you are learning	2.36	1.74**	
Taken field trips connected to what you are learning in class	1.79	1.22***	

Survey Item	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
Received feedback on your work from outside experts or community members	1.89	1.15	
Presented your work to an audience that includes outside experts or community members	1.55	1.08	
Black students			
Had outside experts or community members come to your class to discuss what you are learning	2.31	1.81	
Taken field trips connected to what you are learning in class	1.95	1.34	
Received feedback on your work from outside experts or community members	1.64	1.45	
Presented your work to an audience that includes outside experts or community members	1.63	1.35	

Note. These items represent the number of times students reported engaging in the activities during the school year. Responses fall on the following scale: 0 = never, 1 = once, 2 = twice, 3 = three times, and 4 = four or more times.
$^{*}p < .05$. $^{**}p < .01$. $^{***}p < .001$.

Postsecondary Planning

Beyond ENE schools provide postsecondary supports that help students make an informed choice about their life after high school, complete a postsecondary planning portfolio, and take the necessary steps to reach their postsecondary or career goals.

Students at ENE schools were more likely than students at traditional and alternative schools to report that they had created a postsecondary plan (50%) and that someone at their school had helped them develop this plan (57%; Exhibit 8).

Exhibit 8. Percentage of students who created a postsecondary plan and received help to develop this plan

Survey Item	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
All students			
I have created a written postsecondary plan that describes what I will do after I graduate from high school	50%	38%**	25%**
Someone at my school has helped me begin to develop a written plan for what I will do after I graduate high school	57%	46%**	39%*
Latine students			
I have created a written postsecondary plan that describes what I will do after I graduate from high school	49%	35%**	
Someone at my school has helped me begin to develop a written plan for what I will do after I graduate high school	59%	42%***	

Survey Item	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
Black students			
I have created a written postsecondary plan that describes what I will do after I graduate from high school	44%	37%	
Someone at my school has helped me begin to develop a written plan for what I will do after I graduate high school	60%	44%	

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

The **postsecondary guidance** construct represents the extent to which students believe their school has helped them understand what they want to do after high school and the steps they need to take to achieve this college or career plan, including understanding the financial benefits of college and the financial aid options.

The **postsecondary plan self-efficacy** construct represents the extent to which students with a postsecondary plan express confidence in their plan, including believing they can achieve the plan, knowing how to do so, and feeling their plan is right for them.

Students at ENE schools more strongly agreed that their school had provided them with postsecondary guidance than students at traditional and alternative schools, but their higher sense of efficacy related to these plans was not statistically significant (Exhibit 9).

Exhibit 9. Mean ratings of postsecondary guidance and postsecondary plan self-efficacy

Survey Construct	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
All students			
Postsecondary guidance	3.97	3.34***	3.36**
Postsecondary plan self-efficacy	4.16	3.78	3.87
Latine students			
Postsecondary guidance	3.93	3.34**	
Postsecondary plan self-efficacy	4.09	3.87	
Black students			
Postsecondary guidance	3.79	3.31**	
Postsecondary plan self-efficacy	3.96	3.80	

Note. Postsecondary plan self-efficacy items were only asked of students who indicated that they had a written postsecondary plan. Responses fall on the following scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.

**$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Students at ENE schools reported getting help with writing a cover letter at a higher rate than students at traditional and alternative schools (Exhibit 10). They also reported receiving help with preparing a cover letter at higher rates than students at traditional schools. Across other postsecondary planning activities, participation rates were generally similar across groups, and differences were not statistically significant.

Exhibit 10. Percentage of students who engaged in postsecondary planning activities

Survey Item	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
All students			
During this school year, did you get help at school with resume writing?	67%	48%***	61%
During this school year, did you get help at school with cover letter writing?	56%	34%***	35%**
I have researched a career that interested me	80%	75%	73%
I have reviewed college admissions requirements	41%	46%	36%
I have compared the costs of different colleges	45%	46%	33%
I have found out how much it would cost to attend college	38%	31%	29%
I have toured a college	51%	51%	44%
Latine students			
During this school year, did you get help at school with resume writing?	65%	50%**	
During this school year, did you get help at school with cover letter writing?	54%	33%***	
I have researched a career that interested me	77%	74%	
I have reviewed college admissions requirements	41%	42%	
I have compared the costs of different colleges	39%	41%	
I have found out how much it would cost to attend college	39%	25%**	
I have toured a college	46%	50%	
Black students			
During this school year, did you get help at school with resume writing?	71%	54%	
During this school year, did you get help at school with cover letter writing?	58%	41%	
I have researched a career that interested me	82%	77%	
I have reviewed college admissions requirements	34%	47%	
I have compared the costs of different colleges	47%	43%	

Survey Item	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
I have found out how much it would cost to attend college	37%	35%	
I have toured a college	48%	46%	

$^{**}p < .01$. $^{***}p < .001$.

On average, students at ENE schools had lower educational aspirations than students at traditional high schools, both immediately after high school and in the long term (Exhibit 11). This finding makes sense given that ENE schools are meant to enroll student who have fallen off track to graduate high school.

Exhibit 11. Percentage of students planning to continue their education

Survey Item	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
All students			
Plan to continue education immediately after high school (including attending a trade or technical school, a two-year college, or a four-year college)	74%	88%***	63%
Aspire to obtain a bachelor's degree or higher	44%	54%**	43%
Latine students			
Plan to continue education immediately after high school (including attending a trade or technical school, a two-year college, or a four-year college)	73%	88%***	
Aspire to obtain a bachelor's degree or higher	39%	53%**	
Black students			
Plan to continue education immediately after high school (including attending a trade or technical school, a two-year college, or a four-year college)	78%	94%**	
Aspire to obtain a bachelor's degree or higher	56%	56%	

$^{**}p < .01$. $^{***}p < .001$.

Student Success Skills

ENE schools intend to help students build the skills and competencies they will need to be successful in high school and beyond. The **goal-setting** construct represents the extent to which students report setting goals around their performance in school, knowing what they need to do to achieve their goals, and knowing whether they are on track to meet their goals.

The **collaboration** construct represents students' assessments of their collaboration skills, including the extent to which they report considering everyone's ideas and sharing their own, paying attention when teammates talk, and helping their group solve problems. For these

questions, students were asked to think about the times this year that they worked in a group in class.

The **social awareness** construct represents the extent to which students report that they are respectful of others, they listen to other people's points of view, and they get along with people different from themselves.

The **self-efficacy** construct represents the extent to which students believe in their ability to achieve an outcome or reach a goal, including to overcome challenges and complete difficult tasks. Self-efficacy reflects confidence in the ability to exert control over one's motivation, behavior, and environment. Students with a high sense of self-efficacy may approach difficult tasks as challenges, quickly recover from and persist despite setbacks, and see failure as a need for more effort and strengthened skills.

The **growth mindset** construct represents the extent to which students believe that their abilities and skills can grow with effort. Students with a growth mindset see effort as necessary for success and embrace challenges.

Students at ENE schools reported higher levels of goal-setting, collaboration, self-efficacy, and growth mindset than students at traditional schools (Exhibit 12). Compared with students at alternative schools, students at ENE schools reported higher levels of collaboration and social awareness.

Exhibit 12. Mean ratings of student success skills

Survey Construct	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
All students			
Goal-setting	4.11	3.61*	3.67
Collaboration	4.22	3.87*	3.76*
Social awareness	4.28	3.92	3.75*
Self-efficacy	4.11	3.72*	3.78
Growth mindset	4.11	3.69*	3.80
Latine students			
Goal-setting	4.03	3.67	
Collaboration	4.14	3.93	
Social awareness	4.24	3.98	
Self-efficacy	4.08	3.73	
Growth mindset	4.07	3.69	

Survey Construct	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
Black students			
	3.87	3.62	
Goal-setting	3.97	3.87	
Collaboration	4.12	3.86	
Social awareness	3.90	3.69	
Self-efficacy	3.87	3.70	
Growth mindset	4.03	3.67	

Note. Responses fall on the following scale: 1 = not at all true, 2 = a little true, 3 = somewhat true, 4 = mostly true, and 5 = completely true.

*$p < .05$.

The **professional communication** construct represents students' perceptions of how well prepared they feel to communicate verbally and in writing in a school or work environment, including by making a presentation and speaking in public. Students at all three types of schools reported similar levels of how well prepared they felt to communicate professionally (Exhibit 13).

Exhibit 13. Mean ratings of professional communication

Survey Construct	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
All students			
Professional communication	3.59	3.32	3.24
Latine students			
Professional communication	3.57	3.33	
Black students			
Professional communication	3.35	3.44	

Note. Responses fall on the following scale: 1 = I do not feel prepared, 2 = I feel slightly prepared, 3 = I feel moderately prepared, 4 = I feel well prepared, and 5 = I feel very well prepared.

Appendix

Respondent Sample

Exhibits A-1 to A-10 describe student characteristics, including student demographics, school-related characteristics, housing details, employment details, and parental education.

Exhibit A-1. Respondent age

Characteristic	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
Age (mean in years)	17.65	16.12	16.25
Student n	314	2,197	61

Note. The number for age does not include missing respondents.

Exhibit A-2. Respondent grade level

Characteristic	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
9th grade	8%	28%	27%
10th grade	15%	25%	20%
11th grade	28%	21%	11%
12th grade	44%	17%	19%
Missing	5%	9%	23%
Student n	332	2,434	79

Exhibit A-3. Respondent prior course failure

Characteristic	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
Failed more than one class in high school	56%	27%	54%
Did not fail more than one class in high school	26%	52%	11%
Not sure about prior course failure	13%	11%	11%
Missing	5%	10%	23%
Student n	332	2,434	79

Exhibit A-4. Respondent race and ethnicity

Characteristic	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
Asian/Pacific Islander	2%	4%	9%
Black/African American	16%	15%	29%
Hispanic/Latino	62%	59%	34%
Middle Eastern/North African	2%	2%	1%
Native American	2%	2%	5%
White	23%	22%	16%
Missing	6%	8%	11%
Student n	332	2,434	79

Note. Students could self-identify as more than one race/ethnicity. Percentages may add to more than 100%.

Exhibit A-5. Respondent gender

Characteristic	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
Female/woman	52%	42%	34%
Male/man	39%	43%	38%
Genderqueer or gender non-conforming	2%	1%	3%
A gender identity not listed	0%	2%	3%
Prefer not to say	1%	3%	1%
Missing	5%	9%	22%
Student n	332	2,434	79

Exhibit A-6. Respondent English learner status

Characteristic	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
English learner	22%	16%	9%
Not English learner	52%	54%	42%
Not sure	15%	14%	20%
Prefer not to say	5%	5%	6%
Missing	6%	11%	23%
Student n	332	2,434	79

Exhibit A-7. Respondent special education status

Characteristic	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
IEP or 504 plan	25%	21%	41%
No IEP or 504 plan	54%	55%	28%
Not sure	11%	11%	5%
Prefer not to say	4%	4%	4%
Missing	5%	10%	23%
Student n	332	2,434	79

Exhibit A-8. Highest education level of respondent parent or guardian

Characteristic	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
Earned a graduate degree (such as master's degree, doctorate, law degree, medical degree)	6%	11%	8%
Graduated from a four-year college	8%	9%	4%
Graduated from a two-year college or technical/trade school	6%	6%	5%
Went to college but did not graduate	10%	8%	8%
Graduated from high school	24%	20%	20%
Did not graduate from high school	24%	17%	19%
I don't know	16%	18%	13%
Missing	5%	10%	24%
Student *n*	332	2,434	79

Exhibit A-9. Respondent housing

Characteristic	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
Consistent housing	70%	66%	53%
Temporary housing	3%	5%	8%
No current housing	5%	4%	4%
Prefer not to say	16%	15%	13%
Missing	6%	11%	23%
Student n	332	2,434	79

Exhibit A-10. Respondent parenting status

Characteristic	ENE	Traditional	Alternative
Have children	8%	2%	5%
No children	81%	83%	67%
Prefer not to say	2%	3%	4%
Missing	8%	12%	24%
Student n	332	2,434	79

Methodology

SRI summarized survey responses for students from each of the comparison school types (traditional and alternative high schools) relative to students at ENE schools. To account for the multilevel structure of the data (students nested within schools), we used hierarchical linear modeling. We included student-level covariates to account for observable differences between students and to reduce residual error and increase power. We estimated a series of models covering each of the survey metrics. Specifically, the models with dependent variables based on a single survey item have the following form:

$$Y_{ik} = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\boldsymbol{Trad})_i + \beta_2(\boldsymbol{Alt})_i + \beta_m(\boldsymbol{B})_i + \beta_n(\boldsymbol{X})_{ik} + \epsilon_{ik} + u_k$$

Outcome Y for student i in school k is modeled as a function of student-level enrollment at a traditional ($Trad$) or alternative (Alt) high school as well as a vector of n student-level covariates (X). These covariates include self-reported student characteristics: gender, English learner status, special education status, prior course failure, and age category. We grand-mean centered these student-level covariates using the overall respondent sample mean for each variable. The model includes a vector of m block indicators (B) that group each ENE school with its most similar traditional comparison high schools as well as school-level random effects (u_k) and a student-level error term (ϵ_{ik}). Coefficients $\hat{\beta}_1$ and $\hat{\beta}_2$ provide our estimate for the difference in the survey metric for students enrolled in ENE schools and each type of comparison school: traditional ($\hat{\beta}_2$) or alternative ($\hat{\beta}_2$). For dichotomous outcomes, we used logistic regression and presented results as differences in predicted probability; in these models, there is no student-level error term.

For models with dependent variables based on multiple items ("constructs"), the form is identical but individual items are clustered by construct:

$$Y_{ijk} = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\boldsymbol{Trad})_i + \beta_2(\boldsymbol{Alt})_i + \beta_m(\boldsymbol{B})_i + \beta_n(\boldsymbol{X})_{ik} + u_k + r_{ik} + e_{ijk}$$

This model is structurally identical to the model for single item dependent variables, but the outcome now represents the response for student i, in school k, on item j. To account for the extra variation introduces by having multiple items that measure the same characteristic we add

an error term e_{ijk}. By accounting for this variation properly, we can produce the correct standard errors on the differences between schools. To confirm that the overall pattern of results was similar for Black and Latine students, we ran the models separately for students in each of these groups only. This subgroup analysis did not include a comparison to alternative schools given the small sample from these schools.

Model Output: All Students

Each model includes students from the 12 schools: four ENE schools, five traditional high schools, and three alternative schools. The number of student records included in each model varies because of missing data for each item or construct used as the dependent variable in the model.

Relationships and Community

Exhibit A-11. Relationships and belonging point estimates

Survey Item or Construct	ENE (intercept)	Traditional	Alternative
Student–teacher relationships			
Coefficient (point estimate)	4.34	-0.57	-0.94
Standard error	0.06	0.08	0.14
Student *n*	321	2,346	76
Sense of belonging			
Coefficient (point estimate)	4.05	-0.60	-0.64
Standard error	0.06	0.08	0.15
Student *n*	316	2,236	64

Note. Responses fall on the following scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.

Personalized Supports and Progress Monitoring

Exhibit A-12. Primary person assignment point estimates

Survey Item	ENE (intercept)	Traditional	Alternative
Assigned an adult to meet with regularly to discuss academic progress			
Coefficient (point estimate in log odds)	2.38	-1.51	-2.93
Standard error	0.23	0.29	0.43
Student *n*	331	2,418	77

Exhibit A-13. Frequency of primary person meeting point estimates

Survey Item or Construct	ENE (intercept)	Traditional	Alternative
Frequency of 1:1 meetings with assigned adult			
Coefficient (point estimate)	3.38	-1.17	-0.63
Standard error	0.18	0.31	0.48
Student *n*	299	1,395	45

Exhibit A-14. Quality of primary person relationship point estimates

Survey Item or Construct	ENE (intercept)	Traditional	Alternative
My advisor knows me well			
Coefficient (point estimate)	3.82	-0.45	-0.34
Standard error	0.07	0.09	0.19
Student n	292	1,357	42
My advisor believes I can succeed			
Coefficient (point estimate)	4.39	-0.39	-0.33
Standard error	0.07	0.10	0.20
Student n	282	1,273	39

Rigorous and Purposeful Instruction

Exhibit A-15. Competency-based instruction point estimates

Survey Construct	ENE (intercept)	Traditional	Alternative
Competency-based instruction			
Coefficient (point estimate)	4.25	-0.54	-0.78
Standard error	0.06	0.09	0.14
Student n	329	2,414	77

Note. Responses fall on the following scale: 1 = never, 2 = seldom, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, and 5 = always.

Exhibit A-16. Qualities of instruction point estimates

Survey Construct or Item	ENE (intercept)	Traditional	Alternative
Rigor			
Coefficient (point estimate)	3.96	-0.54	-0.66
Standard error	0.05	0.06	0.11
Student *n*	329	2,403	76
Purpose			
Coefficient (point estimate)	4.09	-0.64	-0.80
Standard error	0.05	0.07	0.12
Student *n*	326	2,369	76
Classroom engagement comfort level			
Coefficient (point estimate)	3.93	-0.50	-0.42
Standard error	0.08	0.13	0.20
Student *n*	307	2,165	64
Students – not the teacher – do most of talking			
Coefficient (point estimate)	3.22	-0.27	-0.27
Standard error	0.09	0.13	0.21
Student *n*	290	2,180	70

Note. Students were asked for how many of their classes certain statements were true. Responses fall on the following scale: 1 = none, 2 = a few, 3 = about half, 4 = most, and 5 = all.

Exhibit A-17. Connections outside the classroom point estimates

Survey Item	ENE (intercept)	Traditional	Alternative
Had outside experts or community members come to your class to discuss what you are learning			
Coefficient (point estimate)	2.43	-0.76	-0.50
Standard error	0.13	0.22	0.33
Student *n*	327	2,393	77
Taken field trips connected to what you are learning in class			
Coefficient (point estimate)	1.92	-0.68	-0.48

Survey Item	ENE (intercept)	Traditional	Alternative
Standard error	0.08	0.09	0.18
Student *n*	327	2,384	77
Received feedback on your work from outside experts or community members			
Coefficient (point estimate)	1.95	-0.73	-0.46
Standard error	0.10	0.14	0.24
Student *n*	327	2,374	77
Presented your work to an audience that includes outside experts or community members			
Coefficient (point estimate)	1.66	-0.50	-0.45
Standard error	0.12	0.19	0.30
Student *n*	328	2,359	76

Note. These items represent the number of times students reported engaging in specific class activities during the school year. Responses fall on the following scale: 0 = never, 1 = once, 2 = twice, 3 = three times, and 4 = four or more times.

Postsecondary Planning

Exhibit A-18. Postsecondary plan point estimates

Survey Item	ENE (intercept)	Traditional	Alternative
I have created a written postsecondary plan that describes what I will do after I graduate from high school			
Coefficient (point estimate in log odds)	-0.01	-0.49	-1.07
Standard error	0.13	0.15	0.33
Student *n*	316	2,236	63
Someone at my school has helped me begin to develop a written plan for what I will do after I graduate high school			
Coefficient (point estimate in log odds)	0.26	-0.44	-0.71
Standard error	0.13	0.15	0.31
Student *n*	316	2,237	63

Exhibit A-19. Postsecondary guidance and plan self-efficacy point estimates

Survey Construct	ENE (intercept)	Traditional	Alternative
Postsecondary guidance			
Coefficient (point estimate)	3.97	-0.62	-0.61
Standard error	0.06	0.08	0.15
Student *n*	328	2,399	77
Postsecondary plan self-efficacy			
Coefficient (point estimate)	4.16	-0.38	-0.29
Standard error	0.08	0.11	0.20
Student *n*	200	1,043	32

Note. Postsecondary plan self-efficacy items were only asked of students who indicated that they had a written postsecondary plan. Responses fall on the following scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.

Exhibit A-20. Postsecondary planning support point estimates

Survey Item	ENE (intercept)	Traditional	Alternative
During this school year, did you get help at school with resume writing?			
Coefficient (point estimate in log odds)	0.73	-0.79	-0.30
Standard error	0.13	0.16	0.30
Student *n*	325	2,366	76
During this school year, did you get help at school with cover letter writing?			
Coefficient (point estimate in log odds)	0.24	-0.91	-0.85
Standard error	0.13	0.15	0.30
Student *n*	324	2,355	76
I have researched a career that interested me			
Coefficient (point estimate in log odds)	1.39	-0.32	-0.39
Standard error	0.16	0.19	0.35
Student *n*	326	2,370	76
I have reviewed college admissions requirements			
Coefficient (point estimate in log odds)	-0.36	0.21	-0.21

Survey Item	ENE (intercept)	Traditional	Alternative
Standard error	0.13	0.16	0.31
Student *n*	324	2,360	76
I have compared the costs of different colleges			
Coefficient (point estimate in log odds)	-0.20	0.03	-0.52
Standard error	0.12	0.15	0.30
Student *n*	323	2,354	76
I have found out how much it would cost to attend college			
Coefficient (point estimate in log odds)	-0.51	-0.27	-0.38
Standard error	0.12	0.15	0.31
Student *n*	325	2,349	76
I have toured a college			
Coefficient (point estimate in log odds)	0.06	-0.01	-0.30
Standard error	0.12	0.15	0.29
Student *n*	324	2,354	76

Exhibit A-21. Immediate postsecondary plan point estimates

Survey Item	ENE (intercept)	Traditional	Alternative
Plan to continue education immediately after high school (including attending a trade or technical school, a two-year college, or a four-year college)			
Coefficient (point estimate in log odds)	1.07	0.89	-0.52
Standard error	0.15	0.20	0.35
Student *n*	313	2,319	71
Aspire to obtain a bachelor's degree or higher			
Coefficient (point estimate in log odds)	-0.25	0.42	-0.02
Standard error	0.13	0.15	0.31
Student *n*	318	2,323	72

Student Success Skills

Exhibit A-22. Success skill point estimates

Survey Construct		ENE (intercept)	Traditional	Alternative
Goal-setting				
	Coefficient (point estimate)	4.11	-0.50	-0.43
	Standard error	0.08	0.12	0.20
	Student *n*	312	2,242	67
Collaboration				
	Coefficient (point estimate)	4.22	-0.35	-0.46
	Standard error	0.07	0.10	0.17
	Student *n*	315	2,307	70
Social awareness				
	Coefficient (point estimate)	4.28	-0.36	-0.53
	Standard error	0.07	0.11	0.18
	Student *n*	319	2,307	71
Self-efficacy				
	Coefficient (point estimate)	4.11	-0.39	-0.33
	Standard error	0.07	0.11	0.19
	Student *n*	316	2,249	67
Growth mindset				
	Coefficient (point estimate)	4.11	-0.42	-0.31
	Standard error	0.07	0.11	0.18
	Student *n*	320	2,313	70

Note. Responses fall on the following scale: 1 = not at all true, 2 = a little true, 3 = somewhat true, 4 = mostly true, and 5 = completely true.

Exhibit A-23. Communication point estimates

Survey Construct	ENE (intercept)	Traditional	Alternative
Professional communication			
Coefficient (point estimate)	3.59	-0.26	-0.34
Standard error	0.10	0.16	0.26
Student *n*	309	2,241	66

Note. Responses fall on the following scale: 1 = I do not feel prepared, 2 = I feel slightly prepared, 3 = I feel moderately prepared, 4 = I feel well prepared, and 5 = I feel very well prepared.

Model Output: Latine Students

Because of the small sample size from alternative schools, we do not provide subgroup estimates for that comparison school type.

Exhibit A-24. Point estimates for Latine students

Survey Construct or Item	ENE (intercept)	Traditional
Student-teacher relationships		
Coefficient (point estimate)	4.31	3.74
Standard error	0.07	0.09
Student *n*	1599	1599
Sense of belonging		
Coefficient (point estimate)	4.04	3.44
Standard error	0.07	0.10
Student *n*	1630	1630
Assigned an adult to meet with regularly to discuss academic progress		
Coefficient (point estimate)	94%	65%
Standard error	0.33	0.37
Student *n*	1634	1634
Frequency of 1:1 meetings with assigned adult		
Coefficient (point estimate)	3.32	2.20
Standard error	0.12	0.17

Survey Construct or Item	ENE (intercept)	Traditional
Student *n*	942	942
My advisor knows me well		
Coefficient (point estimate)	3.67	3.34
Standard error	0.10	0.16
Student *n*	923	923
My advisor believes I can succeed		
Coefficient (point estimate)	4.29	4.03
Standard error	0.10	0.15
Student *n*	879	879
Competency-based instruction		
Coefficient (point estimate)	4.22	3.74
Standard error	0.07	0.11
Student *n*	1636	1636
Rigor		
Coefficient (point estimate)	3.89	3.42
Standard error	0.06	0.08
Student *n*	1633	1633
Purpose		
Coefficient (point estimate)	4.05	3.42
Standard error	0.07	0.09
Student *n*	1615	1615
Classroom engagement comfort level		
Coefficient (point estimate)	3.91	3.40
Standard error	0.08	0.11
Student *n*	1574	1574
Students – not the teacher – do most of talking		
Coefficient (point estimate)	3.15	3.00

Survey Construct or Item	ENE (intercept)	Traditional
Standard error	0.10	0.15
Student *n*	1500	1500
Had outside experts or community members come to your class to discuss what you are learning		
Coefficient (point estimate)	2.36	1.74
Standard error	0.10	0.14
Student *n*	1631	1631
Taken field trips connected to what you are learning in class		
Coefficient (point estimate)	1.79	1.22
Standard error	0.10	0.12
Student *n*	1627	1627
Received feedback on your work from outside experts or community members		
Coefficient (point estimate)	1.89	1.15
Standard error	0.14	0.22
Student *n*	1622	1622
Presented your work to an audience that includes outside experts or community members		
Coefficient (point estimate)	1.55	1.08
Standard error	0.15	0.24
Student *n*	1612	1612
I have created a written postsecondary plan that describes what I will do after I graduate from high school		
Coefficient (point estimate)	49%	35%
Standard error	0.16	0.20
Student *n*	1633	1633
Someone at my school has helped me begin to develop a written plan for what I will do after I graduate high school		
Coefficient (point estimate)	59%	42%
Standard error	0.16	0.20
Student *n*	1631	1631

Survey Construct or Item	ENE (intercept)	Traditional
Postsecondary guidance		
Coefficient (point estimate)	3.93	3.34
Standard error	0.08	0.11
Student *n*	1635	1635
Postsecondary plan self-efficacy		
Coefficient (point estimate)	4.09	3.87
Standard error	0.09	0.14
Student *n*	796	796
During this school year, did you get help at school with resume writing?		
Coefficient (point estimate)	65%	50%
Standard error	0.17	0.21
Student *n*	1627	1627
During this school year, did you get help at school with cover letter writing?		
Coefficient (point estimate)	54%	33%
Standard error	0.16	0.20
Student *n*	1621	1621
I have researched a career that interested me		
Coefficient (point estimate)	77%	74%
Standard error	0.19	0.23
Student *n*	1635	1635
I have reviewed college admissions requirements		
Coefficient (point estimate)	41%	42%
Standard error	0.16	0.20
Student *n*	1628	1628
I have compared the costs of different colleges		
Coefficient (point estimate)	39%	41%
Standard error	9.79	0.20

Survey Construct or Item	ENE (intercept)	Traditional
Student *n*	1626	1626
I have found out how much it would cost to attend college		
Coefficient (point estimate)	39%	25%
Standard error	1.55	0.21
Student *n*	1628	1628
I have toured a college		
Coefficient (point estimate)	46%	50%
Standard error	0.16	0.20
Student *n*	1628	1628
Plan to continue education immediately after high school (including attending a trade or technical school, a two-year college, or a four-year college)		
Coefficient (point estimate)	73%	88%
Standard error	0.18	0.24
Student *n*	1607	1607
Aspire to obtain a bachelor's degree or higher		
Coefficient (point estimate)	39%	53%
Standard error	0.16	0.21
Student *n*	1616	1616
Goal-setting		
Coefficient (point estimate)	4.03	3.67
Standard error	0.11	0.18
Student *n*	1619	1619
Collaboration		
Coefficient (point estimate)	4.14	3.93
Standard error	0.08	0.12
Student *n*	1629	1629

Survey Construct or Item	ENE (intercept)	Traditional
Social awareness		
Coefficient (point estimate)	4.24	3.98
Standard error	0.08	0.12
Student *n*	1628	1628
Self-efficacy		
Coefficient (point estimate)	4.08	3.73
Standard error	0.10	0.16
Student *n*	1622	1622
Growth mindset		
Coefficient (point estimate)	4.07	3.69
Standard error	0.08	0.11
Student *n*	1632	1632
Professional communication		
Coefficient (point estimate)	3.57	3.33
Standard error	0.11	0.17
Student *n*	1613	1613

Model Output: Black Students

Because of the small sample size from alternative schools, we do not provide subgroup estimates for that comparison school type.

Exhibit A-25. Point estimates for Black students

Survey Construct or Item	ENE (intercept)	Traditional
Student-teacher relationships		
Coefficient (point estimate)	4.17	3.70
Standard error	0.13	0.15
Student *n*	413	413

Survey Construct or Item	ENE (intercept)	Traditional
Sense of belonging		
Coefficient (point estimate)	3.81	3.41
Standard error	0.13	0.16
Student *n*	425	425
Assigned an adult to meet with regularly to discuss academic progress		
Coefficient (point estimate)	94%	62%
Standard error	9.69	0.60
Student *n*	424	424
Frequency of 1:1 meetings with assigned adult		
Coefficient (point estimate)	3.67	2.37
Standard error	0.25	0.30
Student *n*	263	263
My advisor knows me well		
Coefficient (point estimate)	3.88	3.33
Standard error	0.19	0.24
Student *n*	254	254
My advisor believes I can succeed		
Coefficient (point estimate)	4.62	4.00
Standard error	0.13	0.16
Student *n*	234	234
Competency-based instruction		
Coefficient (point estimate)	4.13	3.73
Standard error	0.11	0.13
Student *n*	426	426
Rigor		
Coefficient (point estimate)	3.88	3.41
Standard error	0.10	0.11

Survey Construct or Item	ENE (intercept)	Traditional
Student *n*	421	421
Purpose		
Coefficient (point estimate)	3.82	3.48
Standard error	0.12	0.13
Student *n*	416	416
Classroom engagement comfort level		
Coefficient (point estimate)	3.73	3.40
Standard error	0.15	0.20
Student *n*	408	408
Students – not the teacher – do most of talking		
Coefficient (point estimate)	3.10	3.09
Standard error	0.18	0.23
Student *n*	386	386
Had outside experts or community members come to your class to discuss what you are learning		
Coefficient (point estimate)	2.31	1.81
Standard error	0.21	0.28
Student *n*	423	423
Taken field trips connected to what you are learning in class		
Coefficient (point estimate)	1.95	1.34
Standard error	0.21	0.26
Student *n*	423	423
Received feedback on your work from outside experts or community members		
Coefficient (point estimate)	1.64	1.45
Standard error	0.19	0.22
Student *n*	422	422
Presented your work to an audience that includes outside experts or community members		
Coefficient (point estimate)	1.63	1.35

Survey Construct or Item	ENE (intercept)	Traditional
Standard error	0.24	0.34
Student *n*	419	419
I have created a written postsecondary plan that describes what I will do after I graduate from high school		
Coefficient (point estimate)	44%	37%
Standard error	3.52	0.36
Student *n*	425	425
Someone at my school has helped me begin to develop a written plan for what I will do after I graduate high school		
Coefficient (point estimate)	60%	44%
Standard error	4.14	0.36
Student *n*	426	426
Postsecondary guidance		
Coefficient (point estimate)	3.79	3.31
Standard error	0.13	0.15
Student *n*	425	425
Postsecondary plan self-efficacy		
Coefficient (point estimate)	3.96	3.80
Standard error	0.17	0.20
Student *n*	217	217
During this school year, did you get help at school with resume writing?		
Coefficient (point estimate)	71%	54%
Standard error	8.04	0.38
Student *n*	424	424
During this school year, did you get help at school with cover letter writing?		
Coefficient (point estimate)	58%	41%
Standard error	4.32	0.36
Student *n*	423	423

Survey Construct or Item	ENE (intercept)	Traditional
I have researched a career that interested me		
Coefficient (point estimate)	82%	77%
Standard error	3.58	0.44
Student *n*	425	425
I have reviewed college admissions requirements		
Coefficient (point estimate)	34%	47%
Standard error	4.07	0.36
Student *n*	426	426
I have compared the costs of different colleges		
Coefficient (point estimate)	47%	43%
Standard error	3.71	0.36
Student *n*	426	426
I have found out how much it would cost to attend college		
Coefficient (point estimate)	37%	35%
Standard error	5.04	0.37
Student *n*	421	421
I have toured a college		
Coefficient (point estimate)	48%	46%
Standard error	3.64	0.36
Student *n*	421	421
Plan to continue education immediately after high school (including attending a trade or technical school, a two-year college, or a four-year college)		
Coefficient (point estimate)	78%	94%
Standard error	39.08	0.46
Student *n*	424	424
Aspire to obtain a bachelor's degree or higher		
Coefficient (point estimate)	56%	56%

Survey Construct or Item		ENE (intercept)	Traditional
	Standard error	4.81	0.36
	Student *n*	425	425
Goal-setting			
	Coefficient (point estimate)	3.87	3.62
	Standard error	0.13	0.16
	Student *n*	421	421
Collaboration			
	Coefficient (point estimate)	3.97	3.87
	Standard error	0.13	0.15
	Student *n*	422	422
Social awareness			
	Coefficient (point estimate)	4.12	3.86
	Standard error	0.13	0.14
	Student *n*	420	420
Self-efficacy			
	Coefficient (point estimate)	3.90	3.69
	Standard error	0.13	0.15
	Student *n*	424	424
Growth mindset			
	Coefficient (point estimate)	3.87	3.70
	Standard error	0.16	0.22
	Student *n*	425	425
Professional communication			
	Coefficient (point estimate)	3.35	3.44
	Standard error	0.13	0.15
	Student *n*	424	424

SRI Education, a division of SRI, is helping federal and state agencies, school districts, major foundations, nonprofit organizations, and international and commercial clients tackle some of the most complex issues in education to help students succeed. Our mission is **to reduce barriers and optimize outcomes for all children, youth, and families.** We do this by conducting high-quality research, supporting use of data and evidence, helping to strengthen state and local systems, and developing tools that improve teaching and accelerate and deepen learning. Our work covers a range of topics, including early learning and development, student behavior and well-being, teaching quality, digital learning, STEM and computer science, literacy and language arts, and college and career pathways.

Silicon Valley
(SRI headquarters)
333 Ravenswood Avenue
Menlo Park, CA 94025
1.650.859.2000

Washington, DC
1100 Wilson Boulevard
Suite 2700
Arlington, VA 22209
1.703.524.2053

education@sri.com

www.sri.com/education-learning/