

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### FINAL EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE 21<sup>st</sup> CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS GRANTS 2005-2006

Project Evaluators: Theresa Daniel  
Liling Hou

Approved:

---

Nancy Kihneman

---

Robert L. Mendro

---

Cecelia Oakeley

#### DESCRIPTION AND PURPOSES

The Dallas Independent School District was awarded \$9.2 million for three grant cycles to fund eleven Texas 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center (CLC) Grants. These grants were designed to provide extended-day, extended-year activities to complement the regular school year programs. Each grant, comprising five school centers, has a funding cycle with staggered beginning and ending dates for the fund year. Texas Education Agency (TEA) funds the 5-year grants using pass-through revenue from the United States Department of Education. Funds were used to establish, maintain, or expand community learning centers at schools that provide students with academic and enrichment opportunities. Re-application to TEA must be made each year.

The purpose of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers (CLC) grant program is to provide opportunities for communities to establish or expand learning centers. These learning centers offer: (a) opportunities for academic enrichment, including tutorial services to help children (particularly those attending low-performing schools) meet state and local academic achievement standards in core subjects, e.g., reading, mathematics, science, and social studies; (b) a broad array of additional program activities and services, e.g., youth development activities, art, music, physical education and fitness programs; and (c) literacy and related educational development for families of students served by community learning centers. Services are offered before and after school, as well as during weekends, summer, and holiday periods.

#### CONTEXT

The Texas 21<sup>st</sup> Century Grants offered students a broad array of activities designed to enhance learning by providing supplementary educational services. Services for students were provided before and after school, as well as during the summer and holiday periods. Each center also offered literacy or related instruction to students' family members. TEA mandated that schools focus on TAKS/TEKS objectives in reading, mathematics, science, and social studies. Tutorial services designed to address TEKS objectives were provided to students, particularly to those who attend academically unacceptable schools. The list of program activities varies by center but overall program activities included the following:

- Tutorials (Reading, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies);
- Enrichment activities that enhance application of Reading, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies theory and principles;
- Fine Arts instruction classes and performances (e.g., Music, Art, Theater, Dance);
- Physical Activity (e.g., team sports, track and field, aerobics, physical fitness);
- Limited English Proficient (LEP) instruction;
- Technology as a Tool/Technology Applications;
- Mentor/Parent (activities with students);
- Community Service Projects; and
- Service Learning Projects.

In addition, various activities were specifically offered to adult and sibling participants. Most were designed to improve family literacy. Adult sessions included: parenting, GED preparation, technology, job training, citizenship, and literacy. Sibling sessions included: childcare, pre-literacy and story time.

The eleven grants by grant cycle, along with corresponding schools, are listed below (Tables 1, 2 and 3). The grouping of the schools in the original grants was determined by which schools were interested in participating at the time of the writing of the proposal. After the interest in participating in 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC was established, the 25 schools comprising the Cycle 1 grants were grouped by school level with four grants composed of elementary schools and the fifth, Bridges to Success, made up of middle schools. The four Cycle 2 schools have two grants of elementary schools, After School LAB with four elementary schools and Jefferson High School, then Achievement Connection with all middle schools and the adjunct Lincoln High School. Cycle 3 has only two grants, one of five elementary schools and a second with a mixture, three high schools, one middle, and one elementary school. This report will use the grants and cycles as a means of organizing information, being aware that the grouping has been done in a somewhat arbitrary manner but with some ability to follow changes over the life of the grants.

Table 1  
21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC Cycle 1 Grants  
July 1, 2005—June 30, 2006

Grant Name	Center 1	Center 2	Center 3	Center 4	Center 5
Learning Zone	Henderson	Hogg	Houston	Medrano	U. Lee
Neighborhood Now	Blair	City Park	Kennedy	Reilly	V. Meadows
Bridges to Success	Zumwalt	Holmes	Hulcy	Seagoville	Quintanilla
Passing Zone	Milam	Peeler	Lagow	Jordan	Pershing
Success Express	Rowe	Truett	Moseley	Cochran	Stone

Table 2  
21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC Cycle 2 Grants  
June 1, 2005—May 31, 2006

Grant Name	Center 1	Center 2	Center 3	Center 4	Center 5
Achievement Connection	Marsh	Anderson*	Spence	Hood	Franklin
Achievement Avenue	Blanton	Arcadia Pk.	Allen	Pleasant Gr.	Stevens Pk.
After School LAB	Foster	Rosemont	Hernandez	Donald	Jefferson
Project Success	Central	Silberstein	Cuellar	Burleson	Hawthorne

\*Adjunct Site/Feeder School: Lincoln High School

Table 3  
21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC Cycle 3 Grants  
September 1, 2005—August 31, 2006

Grant Name	Center 1	Center 2	Center 3	Center 4	Center 5
After-School Ambassador	Maple Lawn	Roosevelt	N. Dallas	Spruce	Rusk
The Learning Place	Lisbon	Thornton	McNair	Tolbert	Cabell

TEA required the district to populate a web-based database, Texas Education Agency Secure Environment (TEA SE), completing data input and approval for data submission 30 days after the end of each school term. Electronic approvals of all input data must be completed by January 31, June 30, and August 31 of each grant year relative to activities tracking, staffing, certifications, students, and center information for 55 of 56 centers (1 center, Lincoln High School, is an adjunct site). Once each year TEA requires electronic approval for partners/subcontractors' information and program objectives' ratings by each grant center, completed by June 30. An end-of-year report was also required by TEA by grant cycle to assess the extent to which performance measures were met. This report was due 30 days after the end of each grant cycle. In addition to completing the required data input and TEA reports, evaluators have compiled data for the Executive Summary report that describes characteristics by cycle and school level for students in each of the eleven grants. A number of tables have been used to summarize student characteristics, adult participation, student attendance, a limited number of program activities, and demographic profiles for each grant and cycle.

## PROGRAM RESULTS

Results of program implementation were described through a series of data tables that summarize program utilization. These data represent the major areas considered to be indicators of utilization and to some extent indicators of effectiveness in reaching the eligible and targeted population. The major factors summarized by these data tables for each grant cycle were:

- Participant Demographic Summary
- Students Served Summary
- Program Activities and Participation Summary
- Grades by Activity Participation Level
- Adult/Family Member Participation by Student Participation Level
- Sample student survey response

## Participant Demographic Summary

Table 4 presents demographic information for the three grant cycles (11 grants) for all students enrolled in the 56 participating schools. Most frequently, participating students were Hispanic (65.2%), female (51.0%), non-LEP (70.5%), disadvantaged (81.2%), and non-special education students (92.9%). A total of 21,675 students enrolled for 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC programs in either the academic or enrichment tracks or both over the 2005 – 2006 school year.

Table 4  
Demographics of 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC 2005-2006  
Students (Across 11 Grants)

	Number of Students	Percent of Students
<b>Ethnicity</b>		
White	1,053	4.9
African American	6,147	28.4
Hispanic	14,125	65.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	290	1.3
Native American	60	0.3
Total	<u>21,675</u>	100.0
<b>Gender</b>		
Female	11,065	51.0
Male	<u>10,610</u>	49.0
Total	21,675	100.0
<b>LEP Status</b>		
LEP	6,401	29.5
Non-LEP	<u>15,274</u>	70.5
Total	21,675	100.0
<b>SES</b>		
Advantaged	4,085	18.8
Disadvantaged	<u>17,590</u>	81.2
Total	21,675	100.0
<b>Special Ed.</b>		
Non-Special Ed. Needs	20,137	92.9
Special Ed. Needs	<u>1,538</u>	7.1
Total	21,675	100.0

Compared to the executive summary of 2004-2005, 647 more students have been served with a slightly higher percentage of Hispanic students, but approximately the same percentage of African American students and fewer Anglo students. The percentage of LEP students has decreased by almost two percentage points with a 2.7 percent decrease in disadvantaged and slight increase (0.7%) in special education students. The male-female distribution is closer to parity.

When dividing the whole group into their cycles there are observations to be made. Table 5 presents demographic information for Cycle 1 (July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006). This cycle comprised five grants: Learning Zone, Neighborhood Now, Bridges to Success, Passing Zone, and Success Express. The Bridges to Success grant composed the largest percentage (22.4%) of participants in this cycle. A total of 8,936 Cycle 1 students participated in 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC activities during the year, down from last year's 9,584. Cycle 1 participants represent 41.2 percent of the total participating students in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC program down from 45.6 percent of last year's group. The profile of participating students for each of the Cycle 1 grants was overall almost two thirds Hispanic. There was little change within each of the subgroups from the last report although there was close to a 2-percentage point decrease in the number of disadvantaged students.

Table 5

Demographics of 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC Program Participants (CYCLE 1)  
July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006

	Learning Zone		Neighborhood Now		Bridges to Success		Passing Zone		Success Express		CYCLE 1	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Ethnicity</b>												
White	14	0.8	77	4.1	214	10.7	96	5.9	89	5.3	490	5.5
African Am.	386	22.0	350	18.8	997	49.8	253	15.4	608	36.1	2,594	29.0
Hispanic	1,296	74.0	1,404	75.4	783	39.1	1,266	77.3	964	57.3	5,713	63.9
Asian	53	3.0	27	1.4	2	0.1	14	0.9	17	1.0	113	1.3
Native Am.	2	0.1	5	0.3	5	0.2	9	0.5	5	0.3	26	0.3
Total	1,751	100.0	1,863	100.0	2,001	100.0	1,638	100.0	1,683	100.0	8,936	100.0
<b>Gender</b>												
Female	899	51.3	898	48.2	1,018	50.9	852	52.0	905	53.8	4,572	51.2
Male	852	48.7	965	51.8	983	49.1	786	48.0	778	46.2	4,364	48.8
Total	1,751	100.0	1,863	100.0	2,001	100.0	1,638	100.0	1,683	100.0	8,936	100.0
<b>LEP Status</b>												
LEP	718	41.0	830	44.6	219	10.9	595	36.3	477	28.3	2,839	31.8
Non-LEP	1,033	59.0	1,033	55.4	1,782	89.1	1,043	63.7	1,206	71.7	6,097	68.2
Total	1,751	100.0	1,863	100.0	2,001	100.0	1,638	100.0	1,683	100.0	8,936	100.0
<b>SES</b>												
Advantaged	192	11.0	230	12.3	549	27.4	252	15.4	385	22.9	1,608	18.0
Dis-advantaged	1,559	89.0	1,633	87.7	1,452	72.6	1,386	74.6	1,298	77.1	7,328	82.0
Total	1,751	100.0	1,863	100.0	2,001	100.0	1,638	100.0	1,683	100.0	8,936	100.0
<b>Special Ed.</b>												
Non-Sp. Ed.	1,644	93.9	1,736	93.2	1,779	88.9	1,553	94.8	1,577	93.7	8,289	92.8
Special Ed.	107	6.1	127	6.8	222	11.1	85	5.2	106	6.3	647	7.2
Total	1,751	100.0	1,863	100.0	2,001	100.0	1,638	100.0	1,683	100.0	8,936	100.0

Table 6 presents demographics for Cycle 2 grants (June 1, 2005 to May 31, 2006). This cycle comprised four grants: Achievement Connection, Achievement Avenue, After School LAB, and Project Success. A total of 9,184 Cycle 2 students participated in 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC activities during the year, an increase of 1,037 students over last year. The Achievement Connection Grant comprised the largest percentage (38.4%) of participants in this cycle. Cycle 2 participants represent 42.4 percent of the total students participating in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC program. The profile of participating students for each of the Cycle 2 grants showed little change from the last report date although the percentage of LEP students decreased by 3.6 percent and disadvantaged students decreased by 2.1 percent.

Table 6  
Demographics of 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC Program Participants (CYCLE 2)  
June 1, 2005 to May 31, 2006

	Achievement Connection		Achievement Avenue		After School LAB		Project Success		CYCLE 2	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Ethnicity</b>										
White	210	6.0	24	1.3	76	3.4	173	10.7	483	5.3
African American	1,204	34.1	272	15.0	168	7.5	337	20.8	1,981	21.6
Hispanic	2,053	58.2	1,503	83.0	1,931	86.7	1,105	68.3	6,592	71.8
Asian/Pacific Is.	53	1.5	5	0.3	43	1.9	0	0.0	101	1.1
Native American	<u>7</u>	0.2	<u>7</u>	0.4	<u>9</u>	0.4	<u>4</u>	0.2	<u>27</u>	0.3
Total	3,527	100.0	1,811	100.0	2,227	100.0	1,619	100.0	9,184	100.0
<b>Gender</b>										
Female	1,794	50.9	899	49.36	1,163	52.2	862	53.2	4,718	51.4
Male	<u>1,733</u>	49.1	<u>912</u>	50.4	<u>1,064</u>	47.8	<u>757</u>	46.8	<u>4,466</u>	48.6
Total	3,527	100.0	1,811	100.0	2,227	100.0	1,619	100.0	9,184	100.0
<b>LEP Status</b>										
LEP	758	21.5	741	40.9	885	39.7	467	28.8	2,851	31.0
Non-LEP	<u>2,769</u>	78.5	<u>1,070</u>	59.1	<u>1,342</u>	60.3	<u>1,152</u>	71.2	<u>6,333</u>	69.0
Total	3,527	100.0	1,811	100.0	2,227	100.0	1,619	100.0	9,184	100.0
<b>SES</b>										
Advantaged	942	26.7	214	11.8	341	15.3	212	13.1	1,709	18.6
Disadvantaged	<u>2,585</u>	73.3	<u>1,597</u>	88.2	<u>1,886</u>	84.7	<u>1,407</u>	86.9	<u>7,475</u>	81.4
Total	3,527	100.0	1,811	100.0	2,227	100.0	1,619	100.0	9,184	100.0
<b>Special Education</b>										
Non-Special Ed.	3,192	90.5	1,718	94.9	2,115	95.0	1,514	93.5	8,539	93.0
Special Ed.	<u>335</u>	9.5	<u>93</u>	5.1	<u>112</u>	5.0	<u>105</u>	6.5	<u>645</u>	7.0
Total	3,527	100.0	1,811	100.0	2,227	100.0	1,619	100.0	9,184	100.0

Table 7 presents the demographics for Cycle 3 (September 1, 2005 to August 31, 2006). This is the second year for the two Cycle 3 grants: The Learning Place and After-School Ambassador. A total of 3,555 Cycle 3 students participated in 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC activities during the year, an increase of 258 students over last year. The After School Ambassador grant comprised the larger percentage (60.0%) of the participants in this cycle. Cycle 3 participants represent 16.4% of the total students participating in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC program. The profile of participating students for each of the Cycle 3 grants showed some change from the report for the 2004-2005 school year. One difference was that almost 65 percent of the participating students in The Learning Place were African American while After-School Ambassador students were approximately 65 percent Hispanic. A second observation is a shift in gender composition. Last year females made up 52.7 percent of the participating students and this year males have taken a slight majority of 50.1 percent. Like the other two cycles, this set of sites showed a decrease in the percent of disadvantaged students. In school year 2004-2005 there were 81.6 percent disadvantaged compared with 78.4 percent this year, a decrease of 3.2 percent.

Table 7

Demographics of 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC Program Participants (CYCLE 3)  
September 1, 2005 to August 31, 2006

	After-School Ambassador		The Learning Place		CYCLE 3	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Ethnicity</b>						
White	32	1.5	48	3.4	80	2.3
African American	655	30.7	917	64.4	1,572	44.2
Hispanic	1,376	64.5	444	31.2	1,820	51.2
Asian/Pacific Is.	64	3.0	12	0.8	76	2.1
Native American	5	0.2	2	0.1	7	0.2
Total	2,132	100.0	1,423	100.0	3,555	100.0
<b>Gender</b>						
Female	1,048	49.2	727	51.1	1,775	49.9
Male	1,084	50.8	696	48.9	1,780	50.1
Total	2,132	100.0	1,423	100.0	3,555	100.1
<b>LEP Status</b>						
LEP	529	24.8	190	13.4	719	20.2
Non-LEP	1,603	75.2	1,233	86.6	2,836	79.8
Total	2,132	100.0	1,423	100.0	3,555	100.0
<b>SES</b>						
Advantaged	450	21.1	318	22.3	768	21.6
Disadvantaged	1,682	78.9	1,105	77.7	2,787	78.4
Total	2,132	100.0	1,423	100.0	3,555	100.0
<b>Special Education</b>						
Non-Special Ed.	1,971	92.4	1,338	94.0	3,309	93.1
Special Ed.	161	7.6	85	6.0	246	6.9
Total	2,132	100.0	1,423	100.0	3,555	100.0

### Students Served Summary

Any student enrolled from Pre-K through Grade 12, depending on the site, is eligible for 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC program services through designated school sites. Tables 8, 9, and 10 presented below summarize the number of program participants by grade level for each grant cycle.

Table 8 shows participating students by grade level at each of the grants for Cycle 1 as a percent of students eligible for 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC participation, i.e., school enrollment. For this cycle, just over 51 percent of eligible students were participants of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC program as opposed to 57 percent last year. Bridges to Success 8<sup>th</sup> grade students showed the largest decrease from school year 2004-2005 with a drop from 63.6 percent participation to 42.9 percent. All grants in Cycle 1 served greater than 50 percent of the program eligible students except for Bridges to Success and Success Express. The highest percentages of eligible students served were consistently in the middle grades, 3<sup>rd</sup> through 6<sup>th</sup> grades with over 90 percent of Neighborhood Now 3<sup>rd</sup> graders being served. Pre-K consistently showed

the lowest percentage of students participating. Bridges to Success comprised middle schools only and therefore served students in Grades 6-8.

Table 8

21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC Program Participants by Grant and Grade Level  
2005-2006 (CYCLE 1)

Level	Total Served		# Eligible		% of Eligible Served
	N	%	N	%	
<b>Learning Zone</b>					
Pre-K	5	0.3	272	9.4	1.8
Kindergarten	159	9.1	394	13.6	40.4
Grade 1	260	14.8	426	14.7	61.0
Grade 2	262	15.0	394	13.6	66.5
Grade 3	289	16.5	358	12.3	80.7
Grade 4	280	16.0	364	12.5	76.9
Grade 5	260	14.8	367	12.7	70.8
Grade 6	<u>236</u>	13.5	<u>326</u>	11.2	72.4
Total	1,751	100.0	2,901	100.0	60.5
<b>Neighborhood Now</b>					
Pre-K	5	0.3	241	8.5	2.1
Kindergarten	183	9.8	391	13.8	46.8
Grade 1	271	14.5	395	14.0	68.6
Grade 2	261	14.0	379	13.4	68.9
Grade 3	291	15.6	320	11.3	90.9
Grade 4	324	17.4	421	14.9	77.0
Grade 5	280	15.0	367	13.0	76.3
Grade 6	<u>248</u>	13.3	<u>317</u>	11.2	78.2
Total	1,863	100.0	2,831	100.0	65.8
<b>Bridges to Success</b>					
Grade 6	189	9.4	332	7.7	56.9
Grade 7	966	48.3	1,994	46.4	48.4
Grade 8	<u>846</u>	42.3	<u>1,970</u>	45.9	42.9
Total	2,001	100.0	4,296	100.0	46.6
<b>Passing Zone</b>					
Pre-K	22	1.3	294	9.0	7.5
Kindergarten	99	6.0	487	15.0	20.3
Grade 1	218	13.3	433	13.3	50.3
Grade 2	222	13.6	469	14.4	47.3
Grade 3	305	18.6	437	13.4	69.8
Grade 4	295	18.0	401	12.3	73.6
Grade 5	272	16.8	373	11.5	72.9
Grade 6	<u>205</u>	12.5	<u>380</u>	11.1	56.9
Total	1,638	100.0	3,254	100.0	50.3
<b>Success Express</b>					
Pre-K	3	0.2	347	8.5	0.9
Kindergarten	39	2.3	537	13.2	7.3
Grade 1	185	11.0	603	14.8	30.7
Grade 2	253	15.0	590	14.5	42.9
Grade 3	306	18.2	529	13.0	57.8
Grade 4	351	20.9	519	12.7	67.6
Grade 5	270	16.0	531	13.0	50.8
Grade 6	<u>276</u>	16.4	<u>422</u>	10.3	65.4
Total	1,683	100.0	4,078	100.0	41.3

*table continues*

Table 8 (Continued)

CYCLE 1 Total					
Pre-K	35	0.4	1,154	6.5	3.0
Kindergarten	480	5.4	1,809	10.4	26.5
Grade 1	934	10.5	1,857	10.7	50.3
Grade 2	998	11.2	1,832	10.6	54.5
Grade 3	1,191	13.3	1,644	9.5	72.4
Grade 4	1,250	14.0	1,705	9.8	73.3
Grade 5	1,082	12.1	1,638	9.4	66.1
Grade 6	1,103	12.3	1,751	10.1	62.8
Grade 7	1,002	11.2	1,994	11.5	50.3
Grade 8	<u>861</u>	9.6	<u>1,970</u>	11.3	43.7
Cycle 1 Total	<u>8,936</u>	100.0	<u>17,360</u>	100.0	51.5

Table 9 presents participating students by grade level at each of the grants for Cycle 2 as a percent of students eligible for 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC participation. For this cycle, 40.8 percent of eligible students were participants of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC program, a drop from last year's 45.0 percent. Three of the four grants in Cycle 2 served less than 50 percent of students eligible for the program although Achievement Connection rose from serving 39.0 percent in school year 2004-2005 to 53.8 percent of eligible students this past year. The highest participation rate in a grade level was in Achievement Avenue which served over 74.7 percent of students in Grade 4. Achievement Connection comprised secondary students only and therefore served students in Grades 7-12 but had a high point of reaching 68.6 percent of Grade 8 students. Upper grade students were the hardest group to reach for participation in after-school programs.

Table 9

21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC Program Participants by Grant and Grade Level  
2005-2006 (Cycle 2)

Level	Total Served		# Eligible		% of Eligible Served
	N	%	N	%	
<b>Achievement Connection</b>					
Grade 7	1,696	48.1	2,777	42.3	61.1
Grade 8	1,740	49.3	2,536	38.7	68.6
Grade 9	28	0.8	403	6.1	6.9
Grade 10	16	0.5	309	4.7	5.2
Grade 11	28	0.8	291	4.4	9.6
Grade 12	<u>19</u>	0.5	<u>245</u>	3.7	7.8
Total	<u>3,527</u>	100.0	<u>6,561</u>	100.0	53.8
<b>Achievement Avenue</b>					
Pre-K	31	1.7	387	10.1	8.0
Kindergarten	144	8.0	584	15.3	24.7
Grade 1	213	11.8	566	14.8	37.6
Grade 2	248	13.7	548	14.3	45.3
Grade 3	375	20.7	539	14.1	69.6
Grade 4	349	19.3	467	12.2	74.7
Grade 5	260	14.4	396	10.3	65.7
Grade 6	191	10.5	341	8.9	56.0
Total	<u>1,811</u>	100.0	<u>3,828</u>	100.0	47.3

*table continues*

Table 9 (Continued)

After School LAB					
Pre-K	12	0.5	364	6.5	3.3
Kindergarten	46	2.1	373	6.6	12.3
Grade 1	176	7.9	539	9.6	32.7
Grade 2	193	8.7	500	8.9	38.6
Grade 3	308	13.8	1,039	18.5	29.6
Grade 4	291	13.1	437	7.8	66.6
Grade 5	297	13.3	449	8.0	66.1
Grade 6	152	6.8	255	4.5	59.6
Grade 9	260	11.7	638	11.3	40.8
Grade 10	133	6.0	393	7.0	33.8
Grade 11	165	7.4	353	6.3	46.7
Grade 12	<u>194</u>	8.7	<u>286</u>	5.1	67.8
Total	2,227	100.0	5,626	100.0	39.6
Project Success					
Pre-K	1	0.1	206	5.6	0.5
Kindergarten	30	1.9	357	9.8	8.4
Grade 1	59	3.6	362	9.9	16.3
Grade 2	160	9.9	360	9.9	44.4
Grade 3	343	21.2	577	15.8	59.4
Grade 4	417	25.8	646	17.7	64.6
Grade 5	390	24.1	673	18.4	57.9
Grade 6	<u>219</u>	13.5	<u>470</u>	12.9	46.6
Total	1,619	100.0	3,651	100.0	44.3
Cycle 2 Total					
Pre-K	44	0.5	957	4.3	4.6
Kindergarten	220	2.4	1,314	5.8	16.7
Grade 1	448	4.9	2,271	10.1	19.7
Grade 2	601	6.5	1,408	6.3	42.7
Grade 3	1,026	11.2	2,155	9.6	47.6
Grade 4	1,057	11.5	3,563	15.8	29.7
Grade 5	947	10.3	1,518	6.8	62.4
Grade 6	562	6.1	1,066	4.7	52.7
Grade 7	1,696	18.5	2,777	12.4	61.1
Grade 8	1,740	18.9	2,536	11.3	68.6
Grade 9	288	3.1	1,041	4.6	27.7
Grade 10	149	1.6	702	3.1	21.2
Grade 11	193	2.1	644	2.9	30.0
Grade 12	<u>213</u>	2.3	<u>531</u>	2.4	40.1
Cycle 2 Total	9,184	100.0	22,483	100.0	40.8

Table 10 presents participating students by grade level at each of the grants for Cycle 3 as a percent of students eligible for 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC participation. For this cycle 41.3 percent of eligible students were participants of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC program up from last year's 40.0 percent. Neither of the grants in Cycle 3 served more than 50 percent of students eligible for the program although the fourth grade was the peak participating group in both grants.

Table 10

21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC Program Participants by Grant and Grade Level  
(Cycle 3) 2005-2006

Level	Total Served		# Eligible		% of Eligible Served
	N	%	N	%	
<b>After School Ambassador</b>					
Pre-K	0	0.0	80	1.4	0.0
Kindergarten	14	0.7	102	1.8	13.7
Grade 1	58	2.7	97	1.7	59.8
Grade 2	40	1.9	108	1.9	37.0
Grade 3	70	3.3	93	1.7	75.3
Grade 4	59	2.8	76	1.3	77.6
Grade 5	62	2.9	98	1.7	63.3
Grade 6	48	2.3	82	1.5	58.5
Grade 7	245	11.5	360	6.4	68.1
Grade 8	239	11.2	344	6.1	69.5
Grade 9	509	23.9	1,707	30.3	29.8
Grade 10	322	15.1	992	17.6	32.5
Grade 11	259	12.1	823	14.6	31.5
Grade 12	207	9.7	668	11.9	31.0
Total	2,132	100.0	5,630	100.0	37.9
<b>Learning Place</b>					
Pre-K	5	0.4	242	8.1	2.1
Kindergarten	96	6.7	406	13.5	23.8
Grade 1	152	10.7	401	13.4	37.9
Grade 2	216	15.2	381	12.8	56.7
Grade 3	264	18.6	430	14.4	61.4
Grade 4	258	18.1	377	12.6	68.4
Grade 5	272	19.1	425	14.2	64.0
Grade 6	160	11.2	324	10.9	49.4
Total	1,423	100.0	2,983	100.0	47.7
<b>CYCLE 3 Total</b>					
Pre-K	5	0.1	322	3.7	1.6
Kindergarten	110	3.1	505	5.9	21.8
Grade 1	210	5.9	498	5.8	42.2
Grade 2	256	7.2	489	5.7	52.4
Grade 3	334	9.4	523	6.1	63.9
Grade 4	317	8.9	453	5.3	70.0
Grade 5	334	9.4	523	6.1	63.9
Grade 6	208	5.9	406	4.7	51.2
Grade 7	245	6.9	360	4.2	68.1
Grade 8	239	6.7	344	4.0	69.5
Grade 9	509	14.3	1,707	19.8	29.8
Grade 10	322	9.1	992	11.5	32.5
Grade 11	259	7.3	823	9.6	31.5
Grade 12	207	5.8	668	7.8	31.0
Total	3,555	100.0	8,613	100.0	41.3

Comparing a class from school year 2004-2005 to the next grade up within the same cycle in the following year at times indicated that higher attendance was maintained over the two-year period, as in the After-School Ambassador grant, moving from 3<sup>rd</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup> grade. After-School Ambassador served 64.3 percent of students in Grade 3 in school year 2004-2005 with 77.6 percent of this year's 4<sup>th</sup> graders participating in the program, which was a high mark. Conversely, the Learning Place served 71.5 percent of students in Grade 4 in 2004-2005, which was one of the highest percentages of eligible students served by the program, but Grade 5 in 2005-2006 dropped to 64.0 percent and was the second highest in the same grant. Reviewing percentages of students served in Cycles 1 and 2, showed that there were similar inconsistencies suggesting that other factors may affect participation rates in addition to developed attendance habits.

#### Program Activities and Participation Summary

Tables 11, 12, and 13 display the percent of available program activities in which 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC students participated for each of the three cycles. Regular participation, as opposed to a drop-in attendance pattern, in the majority of available program activities is expected to be an indicator of program success. Additionally, many researchers have expressed interest in exploring the relationship of higher levels of participation in various after-school program activities on improved student performance.

Program managers believe that effective program implementation includes encouraging students to participate in as many available program activities as possible as well as attend on a frequent, regular basis. Activity participation levels were designated as: 25% or less, 26 to 50%, 51 to 75%, and 75% or more of available activities offered by schools comprising the grant. The activity participation levels serve as gradients for the purpose of observing trends that may be present in the data relative to increased participation levels.

Table 11 presents activity participation levels for Cycle 1. All five grants showed an upward shift in the highest participation bracket from Fall 2005 to Spring 2006. Overall, this translated into a jump in the Spring from the largest group of students being in the 25 percent or less range, to a high of 41.7 percent in the highest range, more than 75 percent. In school year 2004-2005, the high marks were all in the lower two brackets. School year 2005-2006 showed a move upward in attendance with two grants, Passing Zone and Success Express, ending with the largest group in the highest bracket. The unexpected 84.7 percent in the highest participation level for Passing Zone is being re-examined to identify what factors may have contributed to that attendance rate. Overall, there was a drop of total number of students from 6,683 to 6,164.

Table 11

Percent of Available Program Activities in Which 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC Students Participated (Cycle 1)

Activity Participation Level	Fall 2005 Students		Spring 2006 Students	
	N	%	N	%
<b>Learning Zone</b>				
25 Percent or Less	712	51.3	343	28.7
26 to 50 Percent	438	31.6	342	28.6
51 to 75 Percent	154	11.1	260	21.7
More than 75 Percent	<u>83</u>	6.0	<u>252</u>	21.1
Total	1,387	100.0	1,197	100.0
<b>Neighborhood Now</b>				
25 Percent or Less	582	39.4	253	16.4
26 to 50 Percent	610	41.2	384	24.9
51 to 75 Percent	274	18.5	453	29.4
More than 75 Percent	<u>13</u>	0.9	<u>452</u>	29.3
Total	1,479	100.0	1,542	100.0
<b>Bridges to Success</b>				
25 Percent or Less	1,028	72.0	223	23.7
26 to 50 Percent	229	16.0	413	43.9
51 to 75 Percent	134	9.4	245	26.0
More than 75 Percent	<u>36</u>	2.5	<u>60</u>	6.4
Total	1,427	100.0	941	100.0
<b>Passing Zone</b>				
25 Percent or Less	677	59.1	22	1.8
26 to 50 Percent	315	27.5	78	6.4
51 to 75 Percent	106	9.2	87	7.1
More than 75 Percent	<u>48</u>	4.2	<u>1,036</u>	84.7
Total	1,146	100.0	1,223	100.0
<b>Success Express</b>				
25 Percent or Less	468	37.6	25	2.0
26 to 50 Percent	428	34.4	91	7.2
51 to 75 Percent	250	20.1	377	29.9
More than 75 Percent	<u>98</u>	7.9	<u>768</u>	60.9
Total	1,244	100.0	1,261	100.0
<b>Cycle 1</b>				
25 Percent or Less	3,467	51.9	866	14.0
26 to 50 Percent	2,020	30.2	1,308	21.2
51 to 75 Percent	918	13.7	1,422	23.1
More than 75 Percent	<u>278</u>	4.2	<u>2,568</u>	41.7
Total	6,683	100.0	6,164	100.0

Table 12 presents activity participation levels for Cycle 2. For Cycle 2 grants combined, three of the four grants showed an upward shift in the highest participation bracket from Fall 2005 to Spring 2006. Taken as a whole, this translated into a jump from the highest percentage of students in the lowest participation level, 25 percent or less, to a high of 41.4 percent of students in the highest range, more than 75 percent. In school year 2004-2005, the high marks were all in the lower two brackets. Between Fall and Spring there was a large decrease in the number of students who participated, a drop from 7,378 to 4,850 possibly due to a few large single events in the Fall that were not repeated in the Spring.

Table 12  
Percent of Available Program Activities in Which 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC Students Participated (Cycle 2)

Activity Participation Level	Fall 2005 Students		Spring 2006 Students	
	N	%	N	%
<b>Achievement Connection</b>				
25 Percent or Less	2,899	91.5	500	57.3
26 to 50 Percent	229	7.2	220	25.2
51 to 75 Percent	29	0.9	101	11.6
More than 75 Percent	<u>11</u>	0.3	<u>51</u>	5.8
Total	3,168	100.0	872	100.0
<b>Achievement Avenue</b>				
25 Percent or Less	500	40.7	43	2.9
26 to 50 Percent	380	30.9	237	16.2
51 to 75 Percent	236	19.2	338	23.2
More than 75 Percent	<u>112</u>	9.1	<u>842</u>	57.7
Total	1,228	100.0	1,460	100.0
<b>After School LAB</b>				
25 Percent or Less	1,288	71.8	36	2.7
26 to 50 Percent	387	21.6	179	13.6
51 to 75 Percent	104	5.8	247	18.8
More than 75 Percent	<u>15</u>	0.8	<u>853</u>	64.9
Total	1,794	100.0	1,315	100.0
<b>Project Success</b>				
25 Percent or Less	617	51.9	259	21.5
26 to 50 Percent	95	8.0	365	30.3
51 to 75 Percent	79	6.6	317	26.4
More than 75 Percent	<u>397</u>	33.4	<u>262</u>	21.8
Total	1,188	100.0	1,203	100.0
<b>CYCLE 2 Total</b>				
25 Percent or Less	5,304	71.9	838	17.3
26 to 50 Percent	1,091	14.8	1,001	20.6
51 to 75 Percent	448	6.1	1,003	20.7
More than 75 Percent	<u>535</u>	7.3	<u>2,008</u>	41.4
Total	7,378	100.0	4,850	100.0

Table 13 presents activity participation levels for Cycle 3. The two grants that comprise Cycle 3 are made up of very different schools thus demonstrate different attendance patterns. Overall, the Spring semester showed an increase in regular attendance. For the After School Ambassador grant, three high schools, a middle school and an elementary school, that meant a drop in the 25 percent or less attendance category from almost 90 percent of the students to only 54.7 percent. The Learning Place, five elementary schools, went from 31.0 percent being on the lowest bracket, 25 percent or less, to 55.7 percent being in the highest bracket, more than 75 percent. From Fall to Spring, there was a small increase in the number of students who participated, a rise from 2,518 to 2,529.

Table 13

Percent of Available Program Activities in Which 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC Students Participated (Cycle 3)

Activity Participation Level	Fall 2005 Students		Spring 2006 Students	
	N	%	N	%
<b>After-School Ambassador</b>				
25 Percent or Less	1,281	89.4	743	54.7
26 to 50 Percent	129	9.0	397	29.2
51 to 75 Percent	5	0.3	160	11.8
More than 75 Percent	18	1.3	59	4.3
Total	1,433	100.0	1,359	100.0
<b>The Learning Place</b>				
25 Percent or Less	336	31.0	103	8.8
26 to 50 Percent	274	25.3	188	16.1
51 to 75 Percent	305	28.1	227	19.4
More than 75 Percent	170	15.7	652	55.7
Total	1,085	100.0	1,170	100.0
<b>Cycle 3 Total</b>				
25 Percent or Less	1,617	64.2	846	33.5
26 to 50 Percent	403	16.0	585	23.1
51 to 75 Percent	310	12.3	387	15.3
More than 75 Percent	188	7.5	711	28.1
Total	2,518	100.0	2,529	100.0

It would be expected that students who were present for more of the available days of the regular school days would participate at higher levels in CLC activities. Table 14 shows data for students participating in 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC who were present 90 percent or more of the regular school days by elementary, middle, and high school levels for all students. The fall and spring term regular school instructional days available were 83 and 94, respectively.

Table 14

21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC Students Who Were Present 90 Percent or More of Regular School Days by School Level

School Level	Fall 2005		Spring 2006	
	N	%	N	%
Elementary	9,318	96.7	9,565	95.0
Middle	4,268	92.4	1,908	90.3
High	1,402	87.7	949	82.2

The table illustrates that attendance at school during the day is highest for elementary school age students, decreases for middle school age students and is the lowest for high school students. This tendency is seen in the after-school participation levels also. It should be noted that overall Spring attendance is lower than Fall attendance for the three school levels although the grant totals show a mixed result. Similar patterns were recorded for school year 2004-2005. See Appendix A. Comparing

these data with student participation in 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC would reinforce that attendance peaks in elementary school.

### Regular Attendance

Attendance at after-school programs was originally viewed as offering programs in a safe environment to as many students as possible. In May of 2006, TEA sent a memo to 21st Century CLC program staff that reports from their tracking system guided them to add more definitions to program objectives related to student attendance. For the end-of-year reports for school year 2005-2006, data were to be supplied indicating the percentage of students attending 30 days or more throughout the semester, defined as "regular" students. This was a shift from the goal of large numbers of students to students who attended frequently on a regular basis.

Already presented above was an analysis of the increase in student attendance when viewed by quartiles. Particularly Spring 2006 figures would suggest that encouraging more frequent attendance has been partially successful. A review of 30-day or more attendance for the Spring 2006 would show sites ranged from an average attendance of all students of 5 days (4 sites), to 61 days (one site). Of the 55 sites, 17 had an overall average for all students of 30 days or more. The remaining 38 sites would be considered in need of attendance improvement. TEA required that grants, groupings of 5 sites, with less than 50% regular student attendance submit program improvement plans plus monthly progress reports beginning May 2006. Even though two grants were over the 50% threshold, all eleven were required to prepare these reports.

Coupling the 30-day plus criteria with reaching high numbers of students, the most current grant objectives strive for 80% of participating students attending 30 days plus. Four individual sites (Burlison, Lisbon, Thornton, and Truett) had attained this objective containing the 30 day plus language during the Spring 2006 semester but no grants had attained those student attendance levels. See Appendix B.

Needing to address the shift in definitions provided by TEA but still using the written objectives in effect for school year 2005-2006, a review of the performance Dallas ISD grants was done by the Evaluation and Accountability staff in August 2006. The review was to examine program compliance with grant objectives, to examine unresolved problems in data collection, and to examine ways to provide more evaluation services using current evaluation staff. Related to the attendance portion of the objectives, the review found that except for Cycle 1 participation, all grants were generally missing their primary objectives of the promised 80% attendance of available days for 22% to 24% of students. Cycle 1 has minimal requirements that were being met. (See Appendix C for Review) Note that this definition of student participation goals had different parameters than the TEA guide of May 2006.

The change in attendance definitions and the review of the program impacted direct program decision making in at least two ways. The first is that sessions offered in the following semester met more often. For example, rather than a class offered once a week for the entire after-school period, it would be offered four times a week for a shorter time period. A second impact was that if a particular class was poorly attended, either in total enrollment or consistent attendance, it would be dropped to concentrate on more popular classes.

### Grades by Activity Participation Level

TEA has been interested in examining the relationship between participation levels in available after-school activities and average semester grades expecting that greater participation would improve grades. Rather than present the information by cycle, it would seem that the school level of the students may be of interest in examining grades and program participation levels. This is based on the assumption that younger students have less mobility and less of a voice in how they spend their school day than high school age students. Table 15 shows the information divided by school level, elementary, middle and high school. The participation levels were those that had been used previously: 25 percent or less, 26 to 50 percent, 51 to 75 percent, and more than 75 percent. The grades were collected from Dallas ISD school records and were provided in a 100-point scale creating grade point averages (GPA). The students included in Table 15 are those who had attended after-school sessions in both the Fall 2005 and Spring

2006 semesters. The table shows the number of students (N) at each activity participation level, and the grade point mean (Mean) for Fall 2005 and Spring 2006. The last column is the mean difference of the Fall and Spring grades to show GPA gain.

Table 15

Overall Grade Point Average by School Level and Participation Level for Students Who Participated in Both Fall 2005 and Spring 2006 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Activities

School Level	Activity Participation Level	Fall 05 GPA		Spr 06 GPA		GPA Gain	
		N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
Elementary	25% or Less	465	84.06	474	84.03	465	0.01
	26 to 50%	2,027	84.57	2,052	84.64	2,026	0.12
	51 to 75%	2,874	85.68	2,912	85.81	2,870	0.16
	More than 75%	691	86.84	699	86.58	690	-0.25
Middle	25% or Less	782	80.45	800	81.30	782	1.00
	26 to 50%	472	80.24	479	80.73	472	0.55
	51 to 75%	151	81.52	158	81.58	151	0.08
	More than 75%	12	83.17	14	83.22	12	-0.02
High	25% or Less	532	79.82	542	80.54	530	0.80
	26 to 50%	118	84.13	119	85.53	118	1.39
	51 to 75%	21	83.18	20	84.34	20	0.95
	More than 75%	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

This table would indicate that the relationship between participation level of after-school programs and change in grade point average is mixed. One part of the question is whether increased attendance, consistent weekly attendance versus periodic, would positively affect the student's grade point average. For the elementary school students it would appear that this is true as the mean GPA increased as participation level increased but with a slight decrease at the highest participation level. The interpretation for the middle and high school students is complicated because for the middle school students there is a dip in the 26 to 50 percent range, and high school students drop off at the 51 to 75% participation level and were not represented in the highest attendance level. The Executive Summary for 2004 – 2005, the last report of similar data, showed trends resembling the above although the information was divided by cycle rather than school level. Appendix D contains the tables related to those data.

The second part of this question is whether students attending after-school programs for a longer period of time, two semesters, would increase grade point averages. Of interest is that there is an increase in grade point averages, a positive relationship, for the more sustained attendance groups except for the highest range, more than 75 percent participation level. The negative gain in the GPA for students who have attended after-school classes at the highest level for both elementary and middle school students is puzzling and merits additional study. Further analyses (ANOVA and Regression) were conducted for exploratory purposes; the results indicated that there were some degrees of relationship between the Participation Level and the Average GPA for Elementary and High School levels, but not for the Middle School level (see Appendix E).

The comparison presented here creates more questions than provides answers and it would seem there should be further research. Comparing frequency of participation or length of participation may reveal an important association between grade point average and increased participation levels but more data and more analysis would be in order. To gain additional understanding, it may be useful to compare tutoring versus enrichment class attendance, and compare students attending after-school programs with those who are attending just day school.

## Family Participation Summary

Program activities provide useful services to students as well as their family members, an innovative aspect of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC. Adult family member program activities support parental involvement and adult literacy. Adult family members most commonly attended English language classes or classes to complete high school credentials through the General Educational Development Test (GED). Other adults (non-family) in the program may have served in mentor capacities for students. Unfortunately, the data regarding young siblings of students were not recorded on a systematic basis.

Increased family member participation in program activities were expected to result in a higher percentage of activities in which students were likely to participate. Table 16 shows mean student activity attendance (percentage of activities attended) by adult participation level (None or 1+) and school level.

Table 16

21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC Funded Activities in Which Students Participated by Adult Family Member Participation  
Spring 2006, All Cycles

School Level	Adult Family Members Participating	Number of Students	Student Activity Attendance Mean %
Elementary	None	9,809	68.7
	1 +	454	72.5
Middle	None	1,984	33.6
	1 +	137	38.9
High	None	1,080	27.3
	1 +	79	36.2

It would appear that adult participation has had a positive impact on student participation in after-school programs in all three school levels in Spring 2006. It should be noted that only Spring 2006 data were used for exploratory purposes as the Fall 2005 adult data seemed to contain some unreasonably high counts and will require additional investigation and more data from subsequent semesters. Therefore, with the small amount of data collected from this experience in after-school classes, there are indications that the statement could be true but there is not conclusive evidence specifically what that relationship might be.

## What Do the Students Say?

An evaluation of an educational program can be done through a variety of means with students as major users of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program providing valuable insight. Therefore, a short survey was developed for that purpose and can be found in Appendix F. One school was randomly selected from each of the grants by the program manager for the grant producing 11 sites to receive surveys.

The sample of respondents was limited to 3<sup>rd</sup> graders and above as they would be able to answer the questions and more likely to have input into the decision as to whether they participate in the after-school program. There were 1,783 3<sup>rd</sup> grade and above students who attended the programs in the selected schools during February of 2006. Every 10<sup>th</sup> student starting at different points in their rosters was selected resulting in a representative sample of the whole group that is 10 percent of the total. See Table 17.

Table 17

## Student Survey Spring 2006

Randomly selected school	Feb 2006 attendance	Feb 2006 attendance 3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade & up	10% sample	Total students surveyed	Visit date
Martha T Reilly Elem	9	9	1	5	April 4
OW Holmes Middle	130	130	13	13	April 26
John B Hood Middle	242	242	24	24	April 13
Stephen Foster Elem	294	193	19	19	April 10
N Dallas High	460	460	46	46	April 11
Harry Stone Mont	154	98	9	9	April 26
AW Blanton Elem	76	76	7	7	April 27
Sam Houston Elem	177	95	10	10	April 12
Thomas Tolbert Elem	157	104	10	10	April 28
Richard Lagow Elem	273	192	19	19	April 28
Rufus Burleson Elem	164	164	16	16	April 24
Total	2,136	1,763	174	178	

One school had 9 students 3<sup>rd</sup> grade or above listed as having attended, which would add just one student to the pool. To get a better view of that school's program even though it is a diversion from the pure random sample, a minimum of 5 students per school were selected. Therefore Martha T Reilly Elementary would be over-sampled by 4 students to bring the total number of possible surveys to 178.

The surveys were self-administered or administered by a teacher of the selected students. The surveys were given to the site coordinator at the time of the site visit and collected 10 days later. There were 126 responses received with the one high school unable to have the surveys completed for a return rate of 71 percent. Of those who responded, 58.7 were females with 33.3 percent attending after school programs on a daily basis. A slightly larger percent, 43.7, attended a couple of times a week. Just over 60 percent attended tutoring classes with sporting programs the second most popular program at 28.6 percent. Homework was in third place with 12.7 percent, followed by art and theater tied at 4.8 percent. The varieties of other programs attended were marked by 29.4 percent of the students with dance being the highest "other" vote getter with 4 responses followed by choir and modeling with 3 apiece.

Regarding whether the after school program was a good place to get homework done, 90 students, or 71.4 percent, said that it was. Twenty seven students elaborated on that topic. "Sometimes," was the most common written response (10), with variation ranging from when they have the free time to while eating. Others shared that they can do their homework in other places, or that they have other things to do like cheerleading and tutoring or make friends, so after school was not the place for homework. Still others saw the after school program as a place to get things done because they could concentrate better, 3 students, or could get help, 3 students.

There was an open-ended question asking what the students liked about the after-school sessions. The most common answer was the fun activities in the opinion of 63 students, or 50 percent. Specific activities were mentioned such as chess, cheerleading, and soccer but working with teachers (7 students), making friends (5), and no uniforms (1) were also written. The second most prevalent response was that the after-school classes help them, 33 answers or 26.2 percent. More than half of them said they were helped by learning new things. Included also were answers such as help pull up grades (6), with homework (4), with TAKS (3), make better decisions (2), and be smarter (2). Three students wrote that they could do things they could not do in class and one said they could not go home.

One of the original reasons for the after school programs was to provide a safe environment. The vast majority, 119 or 94.4 percent, replied that they felt safe in the after-school program. Of the comments, six mentioned adults or teachers watching although two wrote that "sometimes" they felt safe.

When asked, 43 or 34.1 percent of the students responded that there were times that they did not want to participate in the after-school program. Only 28 provided additional comment about this. Those comments ranged from "being tired," 8 students, to "other things to do" from 5 to "it is boring," from another 3 students, to "just because" from one student.

Only 15 students answered "yes" to the question of whether there were problems that they would like to fix in the after-school program. The most common was "better snacks" mentioned by 3, and 2 students said they would like to be picked up on time.

The students had many suggestions for additional types of activities that they would include in after-school programs. Fine arts classes were the most popular with 24 items including art classes, band/music, dance, and singing classes. The second grouping with 19 suggestions was for activities such as cheerleading, gardening, cooking, yoga, drama and sewing. The third largest grouping with 16 was sports-related sessions including basketball, football, soccer, swimming, kickball, volleyball and archery. Not so popular but still mentioned as desirable activities by 7 students were computer classes, chess and math club.

Overall, the student's survey would indicate that students are enjoying attending the after-school programs and are learning while they are there. They overwhelmingly felt safe while they were attending the programs. There is always room for improvement and the students had many suggestions for program ideas with additional fine arts classes heading the list.

#### Summary:

The 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC programs were designed to target school children in the Dallas ISD in at-risk situations and offer before and after-school and other extended time academic learning and enrichment activities to help them progress through the grade levels and graduate from high school in a timely manner. Supplemental Education Services such as 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLCs are increasingly recognized as important to the overall successful education of students. This summary document has described a limited number of potential variables related to student demographics and program characteristics for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC program. The evaluation goal for the 2004-2005 school year was to develop data compilation techniques and refine data drill down opportunities that ensured accuracy and completeness of data and timeliness of reporting. Data were compiled at the grant and school level. Grant specific reports were distributed to aid the eleven program (grant) managers in decision-making and program improvement. In the 2005-2006 year of the grant, additional data were collected, refinements were made in the data collection process, and baseline steps taken in analysis and evaluation.

The relationship between extended day program participation and student performance is complex and at many times indirect with many interrelated causal variables. There are preliminary results indicating the possibility of associations between program participation levels or family involvement and improved student performance, so that finding ways to increase student and adult participation in 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC activities and tutorials is an important goal. Although family involvement in education has been known to be an important predictor of student success, there is little research evaluating the impact of family participation in extended day programs on student performance. These data collected in Dallas ISD after-school program offer a foundation to build upon.

There are some concerns with the attendance data collected especially for Fall 2005. The EZ Reports software was introduced late in the Fall 2005 semester and the program managers were unfamiliar with the mechanics of it. More changes in the form of improvements were made in the Spring allowing easier data entry and report generation but still producing questionable data. There was so little confidence in the tutorial data collected that analysis was not performed using those figures.

It should also be noted that there was a shift in approach directed by the TEA in Spring 2006. There was a change in emphasis which went from trying to enroll as many students as possible to enrolling students to be regular attendees. This was seen in a change from classes meeting once a week to meeting more frequently. These types of changes have highlighted the need for more training for not only the program

director and program managers, but also site coordinators. The response has been for regular national conferences to inform staff members in all 21<sup>st</sup> Century programs across the country of best practices used to better match needs and program services. A Texas statewide conference was developed and first offered in July 2006 to assist staff members across the state with TEA expectations. Locally, there are weekly meetings for the program managers to be better prepared for program development, data requirements and reports as well as monthly site coordinator meetings which include updates on pertinent topics. There is also a local advisory council which is addressing sustainability issues as the grants approach the end of 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC funding in 2008 and 2009.

#### Future Research and Recommendations

As more is learned about program activities, additional measurement and statistical analyses become more useful offering an increased opportunity to better understand desirable relationships. Areas to study in the future may include:

- The existence and magnitude of any potential relationship of grade point averages to student participation levels.
- The existence and magnitude of any potential relationship of academic achievement test scores to student participation levels, days, or other variables, e.g., adult participation.
- Comparisons of student achievement for students who participate at varying levels to students who do not participate.
- Assessing incremental progress for specific subject matter or academic outcomes in relationship to subject tutorial program attendance.
- Conducting parental or teacher surveys regarding perceptions of program value to student achievement or overall well-being.

In order to accomplish those further studies, it is recommended that data collection procedures put in place late in Spring 2006 be followed closely in order to improve the quality and reliability of the data. There must be some assurance in the raw data collected to prepare reports or perform any further statistical analysis. The monitoring of data collection and the resultant reports and analysis can then be used not only as tools of data analysis but also make programmatic corrections for both better service delivery of after-school programs and accountability to that goal.

## Appendix A: 2004-2005 School Attendance

### 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC Students Who Were Present 90 Percent or More of Regular School Days by School Level (CYCLE 1)

School Level	Fall 2004 90 Percent or More of Regular School Day		Spring 2005 90 Percent or More of Regular School Day		All 2004-2005 90 Percent or More of Regular School Day*	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>CYCLE 1</b>						
Elementary	4,143	95.9	4,832	94.6	3,291	96.5
Middle	2,622	94.6	2,464	89.9	1,831	93.7

Note: \* Comprises only those students with both fall and spring participation.

### 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC Students Who Were Present 90 Percent or More of Regular School Days by School Level (CYCLE 2)

School Level	Fall 2004 90 Percent or More of Regular School Day		Spring 2005 90 Percent or More of Regular School Day		All 2004-2005 90 Percent or More of Regular School Day*	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>CYCLE 2</b>						
Elementary	2,923	96.8	3,627	94.9	2,598	97.4
Middle	1,992	94.6	2,200	92.0	1,414	95.5
High	444	95.3	774	90.9	346	94.1

Note: \* Comprises only those students with both fall and spring participation.

### 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC Students Who Were Present 90 Percent or More of Regular School Days by School Level (CYCLE 3)

School Level	Fall 2004 90 Percent or More of Regular School Day		Spring 2005 90 Percent or More of Regular School Day		All 2004-2005 90 Percent or More of Regular School Day*	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>CYCLE 3</b>						
Elementary	713	97.7	1,338	95.6	593	97.7
Middle	121	96.0	538	93.4	89	94.7
High	38	90.5	923	79.8	30	93.8

Note: \* Comprises only those students with both fall and spring participation.

## Appendix B: Student Participation and Regular Attendees by Cycle, Spring 2006

### 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Participating Students and Regular Attendees (30+ Days) Cumulative Semester Report (January-May 2006)

School	Total Enrollment <sup>a</sup>	21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC Participating Students			21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC Regular Attendees (30+ Days)			
		N	% of Total Enrollment	Average # of Days	N	% of Total Enrollment	% of Participating Students	Average # of Days
<b>CYCLE 1</b>								
<b>Neighborhood Now, Arthur</b>								
W. A. Blair	838	404	48.2	22	106	12.6	26.2	45
City Park	256	160	62.5	33	97	37.9	60.6	45
Kennedy	773	605	78.3	27	243	31.4	40.2	43
Reilly	553	282	51.0	24	88	15.9	31.2	47
Jill Stone	358	156	43.6	32	77	21.5	49.4	51
Total	2778	1607	57.8		611	22.0	38.0	
<b>Bridges to Success, Clifton</b>								
D. A. Hulcy	636	221	34.7	18	21	3.3	9.5	35
Seagoville M.	982	564	57.4	5	13	1.3	2.3	38
O. W. Holmes	911	178	19.5	29	98	10.6	55.1	41
Quintanilla	1060	528	49.8	8	3	.3	1.5	32
Sarah Zumwalt	676	368	54.4	19	88	13.0	23.9	44
Total	4265	1859	43.6		223	5.2	12.0	
<b>Success Express, Kendrick</b>								
Edna Rowe	1014	430	42.4	34	191	18.8	44.4	47
Truett	1291	244	18.9	42	224	17.4	91.8	44
Nancy Moseley	820	309	37.7	52	236	28.8	76.4	62
Cochran	626	117	18.7	30	54	8.6	46.2	50
Harry Stone	465	184	39.6	14	20	4.3	10.9	38
Total	4216	1284	30.5		725	17.2	56.5	
<b>Learning Zone, Pohan</b>								
Henderson	822	363	44.2	11	10	1.2	2.8	34
Hogg	542	336	62.0	18	72	13.3	21.4	39
Houston	310	223	71.9	33	115	37.1	51.6	48
Medrano	723	305	42.2	12	11	1.5	3.6	34
U. Lee	484	161	33.3	13	17	3.5	10.6	36
Total	2881	1388	48.2		225	7.8	16.2	
<b>School Passing Zone, Smith</b>								
Ben Milam	287	193	67.2	46	151	52.6	78.2	54
Peeler	583	360	61.7	23	101	17.3	28.1	48
Lagow	714	359	50.3	21	81	11.3	22.6	43
Jordan	951	400	42.1	19	78	8.2	2.0	44
Pershing	714	156	21.8	30	81	11.3	52.0	42
Total	3249	1468	45.2		492	15.1	33.5	

<sup>a</sup> Total enrollment as of 1/22/2006

(Table continues on next page.)

Table continued

School	Total Enrollment <sup>a</sup>	21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC Participating Students			21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC Regular Attendees (30+ Days)			
		N	% of Total Enrollment	Average # of Days	N	% of Total Enrollment	% of Participating Students	Average # of Days
<b>CYCLE 2</b>								
<b>Achievement Connection, Hare</b>								
Marsh	1315	871	66.2	6	34	2.6	3.9	35
Anderson	686	486	70.8	8	30	4.4	6.2	36
Spence	788	267	33.9	5	1	.1	.4	32
Hood	1349	423	31.4	20	84	6.2	19.9	39
Franklin	1052	601	57.1	8	41	3.9	6.8	39
Total	5190	2648	51.0		190	3.7	7.2	
<b>After School Lab, Hoffmann</b>								
Foster	988	431	43.6	16	97	9.8	22.5	36
Rosemont	1158	357	30.8	25	117	10.1	32.8	46
Hernandez	591	309	52.3	30	154	26.1	49.8	44
Donald	768	251	32.7	28	109	14.2	43.4	42
Jefferson	1625	611	37.6	13	79	4.9	12.9	37
Total	4530	1959	43.2		556	12.3	28.4	
<b>Achievement Avenue, Moore</b>								
Pleasant Grove	1003	597	59.5	19	123	12.3	20.6	39
A. W. Blanton	756	129	17.1	27	39	5.2	30.2	36
Allen	561	330	58.8	41	204	36.4	61.8	58
Arcadia Park	731	156	21.3	34	97	13.3	62.2	45
Stevens Park	821	488	59.4	31	265	32.3	54.3	40
Total	3872	1700	43.9		728	18.8	42.8	
<b>Project Success, Thornton</b>								
Burleson	457	179	39.2	61	164	36.0	91.6	65
Central	551	279	50.6	16	23	4.2	8.2	32
Cuellar	949	294	31.0	11	7	.7	2.4	36
Hawthorne	726	369	50.8	12	22	3.0	6.0	35
Silberstein	983	258	26.2	20	46	.1	17.8	54
Total	3666	1379	37.6		262	7.1	19.0	
<b>CYCLE 3</b>								
<b>After School Ambassador, Kelley</b>								
Maple Lawn	722	258	35.7	13	16	2.2	6.2	35
Roosevelt	924	143	15.5	5	1	.7	.7	31
North Dallas	1630	814	49.9	5	6	.4	.7	37
Spruce	1501	258	17.2	22	59	3.9	22.9	39
Rusk	680	403	59.3	8	16	2.3	4.0	39
Total	5457	1876	34.4		98	1.8	5.2	
<b>The Learning Place, Salter</b>								
Lisbon	414	186	44.9	59	168	43.6	90.3	63
Thornton	599	199	33.2	59	176	29.5	88.4	63
McNair	587	294	50.1	17	47	8.0	16.0	37
Tolbert	686	179	26.1	32	92	13.4	51.4	50
Cabell	676	314	46.4	23	108	16.0	34.4	40
Total	2962	1172	39.6		591	19.9	50.4	

<sup>a</sup>Total enrollment as of 1/22/2006.

## Appendix C: Project Review, August 2006

### Project Review

#### 21<sup>st</sup> Century Project Grants

Research & Evaluation  
August 2006

#### ABSTRACT

Research and Evaluation reviewed the status of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Project Grants relative to grant objectives, data collection, and evaluation services.

#### Review Objectives:

- To examine program compliance with grant objectives.
- To examine unresolved problems in data collection.
- To examine ways to provide more evaluation services using current evaluation staff.

#### Findings:

The program review found the following

- Except for Cycle 1 participation all grants are generally missing their primary objectives
  - o Participation: The sites are not serving students for the promised 80% of available days for 22% to 24% of students. Cycle 1 has minimal requirements that are being met.
  - o All grants missed TAKS objectives.
  - o All grants missed adult participation objectives.
- Data collection problems exist and threaten the validity of data collected and reported to TEA. Data are not gathered in a timely or systematic fashion and some data definitions are inconsistent from site to site and grant to grant. The district does not own district data that are collated by the software vendor.
- Evaluation fails to address basic questions since most evaluation resources are going to the data collection and reporting problems. Evaluation does not answer key questions of compliance, nature of project activities, project impact, and fit of project activities to district goals.

#### Recommendations:

- All grants need to be examined for consistency with overall objectives for district after-school programs. All grants need to be brought into line with these requirements.
- The district needs to put its own requirements on the Cycle 1 grants over and above objectives reported to TEA. More intensive programs focused on fewer students need to be initiated.
- The data management and reporting problem needs immediate resolution.
  - o The part time data manager should be expanded to a full time position.
  - o Additionally, resources for two part time personnel for three months each (corresponding to the three major reports due to TEA) should be added to the budget.
- Data collection schedules, responsibilities, and personnel responsible need to be agreed upon and better procedures implemented.
  - o Data collection needs to be systematic at the site level with oversight by the individual grant managers and the data manager
  - o A plan needs to be developed outlining all participants' data collection responsibilities
- Evaluation needs to focus on compliance, attainment of project objectives, and monitoring of project activities to assure fidelity to overall district objectives.
- Midterm and annual reviews of project activities and results need to be initiated
- The contract with the software vendor needs to be renegotiated to give the district rights to its own data free of charge.

# Project Review

## 21<sup>st</sup> Century Project Grants

Research & Evaluation

August 2006

### Objectives of the Review

There are three objectives to this review of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Project Grants

1. To examine program compliance with grant objectives.
2. To examine unresolved problems in data collection.
3. To differentiate the time and effort needed to manage project reporting versus project evaluation.

### Executive Summary of Current Project Status

1. Program Compliance/Objective Attainment

The 21<sup>st</sup> Century grants are divided into three cycles, with Cycle 1 having some different objectives from Cycles 2 and 3.

- a. Cycle 1.

Cycle 1 has five objectives that are treated in this review. Cycle 1 grants were not framed to ensure intensive project participation in academic activities and this is reflected in the objectives.

- i. By the end of the current year each site (25 schools, 5 in each of 5 grants) will have one or more days of participation by at least 36% of the students enrolled at the campus.

This objective has been met. The recommendations note that this objective needs to be revised.

- ii. Increase the class completion/graduation rate to 85% by May 2006.

This objective has been met.

- iii. Increase the composite TAKS passing rate by 3% over the prior year.

This objective was not met in each of the 5 grants.

- iv. Reduce the number of student discipline referrals by 10% annually.

This objective was met in only 2 of the 5 grants.

- v. Each site will provide at least 3 adult programs serving 60 individuals per site.

This objective has been met at some sites, but the objective has not been met cumulatively by any of the 5 grants.

- b. Cycles 2 and 3

Cycles 2 and 3 each have 4 objectives that are treated in this review. The grant objectives for both cycles were reframed to ensure more intensive participation by a smaller number of students.

- i. Between 22% to 24% of the enrollment at each site (Cycle 2: 20 schools, 5 in each of 4 grants; Cycle 3: 10 schools 5 in each of 2 grants) will participate in 80% of the available days the program is in operation.

This objective was not met by any grant or site. No grant came close to meeting the objective.

- ii. Increase the composite TAKS passing rate by 1.5% over the prior year.

This objective was not met in each of the 6 grants.

- iii. Reduce the number of student discipline referrals by 10% annually.

This objective was not met in each of the 6 grants.

- iv. Each site will provide at least 3 adult programs serving 60 individuals per site.

This objective has been met at some sites, but the objective has not been met cumulatively by any of the 6 grants.

## 2. Data Collection Problems

There are several data collection problems

- a. Program activity codes are inconsistent across grants as related to TEA subjects and activities are not always related to grant objectives.
- b. Some sites are not collecting necessary information (e.g., student Ids).
- c. Many sites are not collecting basic information in a regular and timely manner.
- d. Adult sign-in sheets do not give necessary information for some reporting requirements.
- e. Reporting needs to distinguish between students and non-student siblings attending meetings.
- f. The district does not own data collated by the reporting software vendor. We should be getting our data back for free.

## 3. Separation of Evaluation and Reporting Activities

Currently, the grants fund 1.5 evaluation positions and a part-time data facilitator position. The bulk of time for all personnel is spent managing data reporting and collection. Both overall project management and Research & Evaluation wish to have more project evaluation, particularly in determining project effectiveness and compliance.

## Problems Identified

1. Except for Cycle 1 all grants are generally missing their primary objectives. Cycle 1 is not missing participation only because the requirements are minimal. Missing TAKS objectives is particularly a problem.

The evaluators know that TEA has contacted project management and required a plan to be submitted to correct both student and adult participation problems. It is reported that TEA informed the district that the grant funds were in jeopardy if corrective actions were not implemented. It is not known how accurate these reports are. The evaluators have not seen the plan and have no idea what corrective action has been promised to TEA.

2. Data collection problems exist and threaten the validity of data collected and reported to TEA. The largest problem is a lack of consistency in requiring accurate and timely record keeping and reporting from each grant. Also, the district must own all results computed through the contracted software vendor.
3. Evaluation fails to address basic questions since most evaluation resources are going to the data collection and reporting problems. Evaluation does not answer key questions of compliance, nature of project activities, project impact, and fit of project activities to district goals.

## Recommendations

### *Short-term*

1. The plan submitted to TEA for project correction needs to be examined and its consistency with overall district efforts and objectives for before-, extra-, and after-school programs needs to be examined. Any changes resulting from this examination should be made in the grant objectives and grants should be amended, if needed. This examination should have the participation of overall management, the evaluators, and the head of the grants management department.
2. The district needs to put its own requirements on the Cycle 1 grants. More intensive programs focused on fewer students need to be initiated. Attendance requirements for the original Cycle 1 objectives should still be easily accomplished.
3. The evaluation/data management and reporting problem needs immediate resolution. The part time data manager should be expanded to a full time position. Additionally, resources for two part time personnel for three months each (corresponding to the three major reports due to TEA) should be added to the budget. Coupled with the data collection and reporting recommendations

below, this should free up evaluators to conduct more evaluation and less data management, although evaluators will still assist in data reporting during the three major reporting periods.

4. Data collection schedules, responsibilities, and personnel responsible need to be agreed upon and a plan prepared and implemented. Data collection needs to be systematic at the site level with oversight by the individual grant managers and the data manager. The data manager will be responsible for monthly memos outlining data collection efforts and for reports of problems encountered after each of the three major TEA reporting periods. The plan will outline:

- Codes for activities tied to TEA subjects.
- Linkages between activities and objectives.
- What data will be collected.
- When data will be collected.
- Who is responsible for each part of data collection.
- When and how training of site personnel and grant managers on data collection requirements will occur and who will be responsible.
- How data entered will be verified, by whom, and on what schedule.
- What reporting activities will occur, on what timeline, and who is responsible for conducting them.
- How reports will be verified before submission.

5. The evaluators will create an evaluation plan before mid-September 2006 outlining expanded evaluation activities in compliance and in monitoring instructional activities and outcomes. This plan will follow standard department formats and include

- evaluation questions,
- data to be collected,
- activities to be conducted,
- reports to be generated,
- resources to be allocated to each activity,
- timelines for major events and
- due dates of reports.

#### *Long-term*

1. A midterm review of compliance reports and evaluations of instructional activities should be instituted. This review should include overall project management, the Deputy Superintendent for Instructional Services and Curriculum and Instruction, and the head of the Grants Management department. Mid-course corrections should be implemented if warranted by the review.

2. An annual review of TAKS objectives and results as well as final evaluation data and project reports should be conducted with the same staff as the midterm review. At this time, any overall changes to project scope and direction should be undertaken, if necessary.

3. The contract with the software vendor needs to be renegotiated to give the district rights to its own data for free. If the vendor refuses, the vendor should be replaced.

## Appendix D: 2004-2005 GPA by Activity Participation and by Cycle

### Overall Grade Point Average by Participation Level for 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC (CYCLE 1)

% of Available Activities	Fall 2004 Average Grade			Spring 2005 Average Grade			2004-2005 School Year*		
	N	Average	SD	N	Average	SD	N	Average	SD
<b>Passing Zone</b>									
25 percent or Less	321	81.0	8.3	357	82.1	8.5	125	82.7	7.6
26 to 50 percent	385	81.0	8.3	584	81.4	8.0	395	81.2	8.5
51 to 75 percent	139	80.0	8.3	162	79.8	9.1	163	81.0	7.5
More than 75 percent	134	80.7	6.5	14	78.0	10.9	14	77.8	6.9
<b>Learning Zone</b>									
25 percent or Less	261	81.2	7.1	400	81.4	7.9	132	80.9	7.1
26 to 50 percent	383	80.0	7.7	464	80.1	8.8	373	80.6	7.9
51 to 75 percent	219	81.2	7.2	157	81.0	8.7	205	81.4	7.6
More than 75 percent	73	81.0	8.0	90	80.7	7.8	50	80.1	8.1
<b>Bridges to Success</b>									
25 percent or Less	1,448	77.6	8.2	1,143	78.3	8.3	863	78.3	7.8
26 to 50 percent	338	78.0	7.3	414	76.7	7.5	266	77.4	7.1
51 to 75 percent	20	77.2	6.1	67	77.7	6.9	34	77.8	6.9
More than 75 percent	2	71.4	0.9	14	76.1	8.3	0	0.0	0.0
<b>Success Express</b>									
25 percent or Less	394	82.8	7.9	392	82.6	8.3	198	83.2	7.6
26 to 50 percent	507	81.6	7.6	580	81.9	7.6	439	82.1	7.2
51 to 75 percent	213	82.5	7.3	207	81.2	7.2	170	82.1	7.0
More than 75 percent	65	84.9	7.2	81	85.1	7.6	65	86.1	6.6
<b>Neighborhood Now</b>									
25 percent or Less	463	80.5	7.2	367	79.8	8.0	275	79.5	7.1
26 to 50 percent	410	79.8	7.3	400	80.0	7.8	355	80.0	7.2
51 to 75 percent	174	82.8	8.3	286	81.8	7.9	190	82.8	8.0
More than 75 percent	83	83.9	5.7	129	84.5	6.4	97	84.0	5.4
<b>CYCLE 1</b>									
25 percent or Less	2,887	79.5	8.1	2,659	80.1	8.4	1,593	79.7	7.8
26 to 50 percent	2,023	80.2	7.8	2,442	80.3	8.2	1,828	80.5	7.8
51 to 75 percent	765	81.6	7.7	879	80.8	8.1	762	81.6	7.6
More than 75 percent	357	82.2	7.0	328	83.0	7.8	226	83.4	6.9

Note: \* Comprises only those students with both fall and spring grades. SD = standard deviation. Average is overall grade point average.

**Overall Grade Point Average by Participation Level for 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC (CYCLE 2)**

% of Available Activities	Fall 2004 Average Grade			Spring 2005 Average Grade			2004-2005 School Year*		
	N	Average	SD	N	Average	SD	N	Average	SD
<b>Achievement Connection</b>									
25 percent or Less	933	77.8	8.5	1313	78.0	8.6	613	79.4	8.0
26 to 50 percent	375	79.4	8.0	269	78.5	8.4	248	78.9	8.2
51 to 75 percent	149	79.1	9.7	68	80.8	6.5	9	82.3	8.4
More than 75 percent	49	80.7	6.0	1	76.8	--	19	82.2	6.1
<b>After School LAB</b>									
25 percent or Less	492	79.7	7.5	705	80.4	7.9	282	80.5	7.4
26 to 50 percent	614	80.8	8.4	593	80.2	8.8	507	80.7	8.3
51 to 75 percent	194	82.1	7.7	241	82.0	8.7	212	82.9	8.0
More than 75 percent	26	84.4	7.4	63	84.2	7.5	20	84.6	7.0
<b>Achievement Avenue</b>									
25 percent or Less	403	80.5	8.4	373	82.0	8.7	171	82.3	8.8
26 to 50 percent	558	79.9	7.6	681	80.0	7.5	660	80.1	7.1
51 to 75 percent	182	81.2	7.5	170	79.8	6.6	168	80.4	6.5
More than 75 percent	113	82.1	6.8	132	82.2	7.5	75	84.4	7.0
<b>Project Success</b>									
25 percent or Less	378	80.0	7.4	297	82.5	8.0	174	81.9	7.4
26 to 50 percent	395	80.2	7.6	280	81.1	8.0	277	80.1	7.6
51 to 75 percent	97	80.2	7.3	281	77.9	7.5	177	78.4	6.8
More than 75 percent	78	82.4	7.3	136	81.6	7.6	80	82.7	7.3
<b>CYCLE 2</b>									
25 percent or Less	2,206	79.1	8.1	2,688	79.7	8.6	1,240	80.4	8.0
26 to 50 percent	1,942	80.2	7.9	1,823	80.0	8.2	1,692	80.1	7.7
51 to 75 percent	622	80.8	8.2	760	79.9	7.8	566	80.7	7.5
More than 75 percent	266	82.1	6.9	332	82.3	7.6	194	83.5	7.0

Note: \* Comprises only those students with both fall and spring grades. SD = standard deviation. Average is overall grade point average.

**Overall Grade Point Average by Participation Level for 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC (CYCLE 3)**

% of Available Activities	Fall 2004 Average Grade			Spring 2005 Average Grade			2004-2005 School Year*		
	N	Average	SD	N	Average	SD	N	Average	SD
<b>The Learning Place</b>									
25 percent or Less	155	82.8	7.8	278	81.2	8.4	50	82.8	8.1
26 to 50 percent	204	81.0	7.8	409	79.7	8.4	231	82.9	7.7
51 to 75 percent	186	81.5	8.3	198	81.6	8.3	161	81.0	8.0
More than 75 percent	81	83.2	8.2	89	84.6	8.9	51	85.5	8.2
<b>After-School Ambassador</b>									
25 percent or Less	13	78.6	5.9	880	77.5	8.6	3	79.7	4.0
26 to 50 percent	28	81.0	6.3	390	77.6	7.5	19	79.8	5.5
51 to 75 percent	4	78.4	5.4	78	78.5	6.4	13	79.4	5.8
More than 75 percent	7	80.2	5.8	4	85.5	8.7	0	0.0	0.0
<b>CYCLE 3</b>									
25 percent or Less	168	82.5	7.7	1158	78.4	8.7	53	82.6	7.9
26 to 50 percent	232	81.0	7.6	799	78.7	8.1	250	82.6	7.6
51 to 75 percent	190	81.4	8.3	276	80.7	7.9	174	80.9	7.8
More than 75 percent	88	82.9	8.1	93	84.6	8.9	51	85.5	8.2

Note: \* Comprises only those students with both fall and spring grades. SD = standard deviation. Average is overall grade point average.

## Appendix E: Results of ANOVA and Regression

**Average GPA and Activity Attendance for Students  
Who Participated in both Fall 2005 and Spring 2006 Semesters**

School Level	Participation Level	Avg_0506_GPA*		% Activity Attendance	
		N	Mean	N	Mean
Elementary	25% or Less	465	84.07	616	18.70
	26 to 50%	2026	84.63	2465	39.87
	51 to 75%	2870	85.77	3432	60.67
	More than 75%	690	86.73	835	82.02
Middle	25% or Less	782	80.95	816	14.53
	26 to 50%	472	80.51	492	34.93
	51 to 75%	151	81.56	158	62.05
	More than 75%	12	83.16	14	77.46
High	25% or Less	530	80.25	586	12.30
	26 to 50%	118	84.83	120	34.42
	51 to 75%	20	83.87	21	61.43
	More than 75%	0	NA	0	NA

### ANOVA a

School Level	Model	Unique Method		Mean Square	F	Sig.
		Sum of Squares	df			
Elementary	Model	3633.344	3	1211.115	34.564	0.000
	Residual	211884.314	6047	35.040		
	Total	215517.658	6050	35.623		
Middle	Model	200.894	3	66.965	1.419	0.235
	Residual	66682.005	1413	47.192		
	Total	66882.899	1416	47.234		
High	Model	2170.298	2	1085.149	26.968	0.000
	Residual	26758.692	665	40.239		
	Total	28928.991	667	43.372		

a Dependent Variable: Avg\_0506\_GPA

### Regression a

School Level	Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error			
Elementary	(Constant)	82.892	0.240		344.793	0.000
	ActivityAttendance	0.046	0.004	0.136	10.738	0.000
Middle	(Constant)	80.681	0.336		239.921	0.000
	ActivityAttendance	0.009	0.010	0.022	0.838	0.402
High	(Constant)	78.615	0.411		191.049	0.000
	ActivityAttendance	0.145	0.019	0.289	7.855	0.000

a Dependent Variable: Avg\_0506\_GPA

## Appendix F: Student Survey Spring 2006

1. How often do you attend the after- school programs with 21<sup>st</sup> Century?

- Daily
  - Couple of times a week
  - Just once in a while
  - For special programs
  - Other
- 

2. Which programs do you usually participate in? Mark all that apply.

- Tutoring classes
  - Homework sessions
  - Sports or physical fitness activities
  - Art classes
  - Theater classes
  - Other
- 

3. Is the after-school program a good place to get your homework done?

- Yes
  - No
  - Comment
- 

4. What do you like about the after-school programs? What makes you want to attend?

---

5. Do you feel safe in the after-school program?

- Yes
  - No
  - Comment
- 

6. Are there times you do not want to participate?

- Yes
  - No
  - Why?
- 

7. Are there problems that you would like to fix in the after-school program?

- Yes
- No

If yes, what would they be? \_\_\_\_\_

8. Are there other types of activities that you would like to have in an after-school program? \_\_\_\_\_

---