

An Evaluation Report about the Campbell Sub-grantee 21st Century Community Learning Centers in Project Year 3

Campbell Complex, Leeward Complex Area, Island of O‘ahu

**A report submitted to the
Hawai‘i Department of Education, Special Programs Management Section
for the period July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012**

**Elliott M. Oshiro, Lolito Sagaysay,
Aric D. H. Nakamura, Terry Ann F. Higa,
Curriculum Research & Development Group**

October 2013

Contents

Executive Summary.....	v
An Evaluation Report about the Campbell Sub-grantee.....	7
21st Century Community Learning Centers in Project Year 3.....	7
A Description of the Campbell 21st CCLC Project.....	7
Origin of the Project.....	8
Goals of the Project.....	5
Characteristics of the Program Materials and Resources.....	5
The Evaluation Design.....	9
The Evaluation of Implementation and Outcomes.....	10
The Plan to Evaluate Project Implementation.....	10
The Plan to Evaluate Project Outcomes.....	11
Evaluation Data-Collection Schedule.....	14
Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS) Reporting.....	14
Findings about Project Implementation in Project Year 3.....	16
Was the project implemented as planned in the grant proposal?.....	16
Characteristics of Clients for the Project.....	23
Which community-based partnerships.....	25
The Implementation of Core Academic Activities.....	25
The Implementation of Academic Enrichment Activities.....	33
Findings about Outcomes in Project Year 3.....	38
Findings about Academic Behavior.....	38
Findings About Academic Achievement.....	40
Dissemination of Results to the Public.....	41
Conclusions and Recommendations.....	44
References.....	51
Appendix A.....	53
Appendix B.....	65
Appendix C.....	89
Appendix D.....	95
Appendix E.....	99
Appendix F.....	107

Executive Summary

This evaluation report is about the Campbell sub-grantee's 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) project, also referred to as Growing through Engaging and Motivating Students (GEMS), which was in Year 3 of five years of funding during the period from summer of 2011 through spring of 2012. During this period, the Campbell sub-grantee included ten centers whose activities were implemented on the campuses of their respective host schools of 'Ewa Elementary, 'Ewa Beach Elementary, Holomua Elementary, Iroquois Point Elementary, Ka'imiloa Elementary, Keone'ula Elementary, Pōhākea Elementary, 'Ilima Intermediate, 'Ewa Makai Middle, and Campbell High. During the summer of 2011, five centers provided activities. The center at Keone'ula Elementary provided activities during the summer of 2011 only. During School Year 2011–12, nine centers provided activities. A total of 1,161 students in Kindergarten through Grade 10 participated in Campbell sub-grantee center activities during Year 3.

The purposes of this evaluation are to (a) fulfill the annual evaluation reporting requirement of 21st CCLC program, and (b) provide feedback to stakeholders for the purposes of project improvement about the extent and quality of implementation of its program components and program outcomes in academic achievement and academic behavior of students who participated in center activities for 30 or more days.

In Year 3, the Campbell sub-grantee project leaders and staff met the Hawai'i State Department of Education Special Programs Management Section (HIDOE-SPMS) implementation performance measures of (a) 100% of the centers implemented high quality services in at least one core academic area; (b) 100% of the centers offered enrichment and support activities; (c) 85% of centers established and maintained partnerships within the community to increase levels of community collaboration in planning, implementing, and sustaining programs; and (d) 100% of the centers were located in high-poverty communities. The sibling class, which was introduced in year 2, continued to be an implemented feature, providing safe and productive activities for siblings of center attendees.

In Year 3, the Campbell sub-grantee project leaders and staff did not meet the HIDOE-SPMS implementation performance measures of (a) 85% of the centers offered services to parents, seniors citizens, and other adult community members, (b) 75% of the centers offered services at least 15 hours per week on average during the school year and providing services when school is not in session.

As a sub-grantee, the project did not meet the outcome indicators of (a) 75% of regular program participants would improve turning in homework on time, classroom participation, regular attendance, and classroom behavior, and (b) 60% of regular program participants would improve in reading/language arts and mathematics.

We concluded that, in Year 3, the Campbell sub-grantee was a maturing project, however, the effects of the project are not yet seen in the outcome indicators. Project implementation was well aligned with its grant proposal, except for some well-selected upgrades to programming and changes to commu-

nity partners. In our experience as 21st CCLC sub-grantee evaluators, the changes in community partners are common over the five-year grant period. The Campbell sub-grantee project director consistently has been very resourceful in networking with many community organizations as potential partners for the center coordinators to select as appropriate for their center needs.

The center staff reported high levels of homework assistance in the centers; however, the day teachers reported that regular attendees' homework were not submitted on time. Therefore, we recommend development of a system to facilitate the students' prioritization of their assignments (for example, a log of homework dates assigned and dates due), that also can be used to communicate with day teachers. For the other academic behaviors (regular attendance, class participation, volunteering), we recommend that all center staff are made aware that these are objectives of the center and promote the behaviors in center students with intentionality that the behaviors transfer to the day classes. That is, these academic behaviors become part of center core academic activities and staff should discuss with center students the importance of the behaviors in day classes. The improved academic behaviors are fundamental to improved academic performance.

We further recommend that project leaders explore the possibility of providing professional development to center staff about working with the specific target groups in the centers. For instance, the centers enroll a large proportion of students who are eligible for free- and reduced-cost lunch and who may have challenges for academic achievement. The professional development may resemble what is provided for implementation of the Response to Intervention Tier-2, small-group interventions. This is a particular skill set of instructional strategies that include use of formative assessment data.

We also recommend that the sub-grantee center leaders and staff examine ways to (a) expand their hours of operation to meet the performance measures of 15 hours per week during the school year and (b) provide more activities for parents and other adult community members. In our experience working with several 21st CCLC sub-grantees, these two performance measures are difficult for Hawai'i centers to meet because of many competing activities for children, as well as, time commitments of parents and family situations.

We will meet with the center leaders to discuss the feasibility of implementing these recommendations at the Campbell 21st CCLC centers in Year 4 as a basis for improving center students' academic behaviors and performance. The project leadership has been very collaborative and we look forward to an update about any changes in the school community, project context, or programming. The project director has already informed us that she has secured three Resource Teachers to examine center data to inform center efforts in Year 4.

An Evaluation Report about the Campbell Sub-grantee 21st Century Community Learning Centers in Project Year 3

This is the Year 3 evaluation report for Campbell sub-grantee's 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) Growing through Engaging and Motivating Students (GEMS) project, which covers the summer of 2011 through the School Year (SY) 2011–12. The Campbell sub-grantee project leaders contracted an evaluation team from Curriculum Research & Development Group (CRDG) at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, College of Education to provide evaluation services. The CRDG evaluation team developed the design and completion of the evaluation of implementation and outcomes for the Campbell sub-grantee GEMS project with input from the 21st CCLC project director and center coordinators. This report is the result of the evaluation effort and includes a description of the GEMS project, evaluation design, data-collection methods, and findings about implementation and outcomes in Year 3. The evaluation questions, outcome indicators, and data-collection methods are based on the key performance indicators (KPIs) of the 21st CCLC program, the 21st CCLC evaluation report template, and the Campbell sub-grantee 21st CCLC grant proposal.

A Description of the Campbell 21st CCLC Project

In 2009, the Campbell sub-grantee received five years of funding for its 21st CCLC project under Title IV, Part B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), reauthorized and amended as the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. Since 2002, state education agencies have managed this federally funded competitive grant program under regulatory oversight from the U.S. Department of Education (USDE). According to the ESEA, the 21st CCLC program had the following purposes:

- (1) provide opportunities for academic enrichment, including providing tutorial services to help students, particularly students who attend low-performing schools, to meet State and local student academic achievement standards in core academic subjects, such as reading and mathematics;
- (2) offer students a broad array of additional services, programs, and activities, such as youth development activities, drug and violence prevention programs, counseling programs, art, music, and recreation programs, technology education programs, and character education programs, that are designed to reinforce and complement the regular academic program of participating students; and
- (3) offer families of students served by community learning centers opportunities for literacy and related educational development. (*Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, Title IV, Part B, 21st CCLC, 1965*)

This section is based on the Hawai'i State Department of Education, Special Programs Management Section (HIDOE-SPMS) 21st CCLC evaluation report template (2011b). We provide information about the 21st CCLC project as contextual information for the evaluation of implementation and outcomes. The grant proposal provided background information about the origins of the project and

current project goals, which includes a description of the local community, the location of 21st CCLC project sites, and other background information about the project. We also interviewed project staff to collect information about formative changes within the project.

Origin of the Project

The Campbell sub-grantee's 21st CCLC grant proposal included statements and data to support the school community needs statements for obtaining the 21st CCLC grant. The 'Ewa plains, where the Campbell complex schools are situated, had an influx of families with school-aged children. This new population changed the demographic profiles of the schools. The school population increased to be the largest in the Campbell-Kapolei complex area. Wilson (2008) stated in the Campbell complex 21st CCLC grant proposal that the special populations of English Language Learners (ELL), special education (SPED), and Title I (an indicator of high percentages of students with low socio-economic status at the school), fell

“just below 2% of the state averages for those population groups with the ELL group at Campbell Complex one of the highest in the Leeward District. The Title I population of the Campbell schools represents over a third of the total student population of the complex. At the present time, seven of the nine schools in the complex are receiving Title I funds: four schools have full funding, three schools will be target assist schools in [School Year] SY 09–10.” (p. 3)

Further, only about 10.7% of the community worked in the complex area, meaning that the children of these families needed afterschool care, outside of school time services, and other educative programs for school aged children. The Campbell sub-grantee wrote the 21st CCLC grant proposal with the hope of obtaining support for afterschool and other services outside of school times to address the needs of families who did not have funds to pay for these types of services. The goal of the 21st CCLC services was to emphasize students' academic achievement based on research-based programs, including enrichment activities and technology experiences. Additionally, despite attendance at pre-Kindergarten, the HI-DOE Trend Report for 2007–08 reported that only half of students were prepared to enter Kindergarten (Systems Accountability Office, System Evaluation & Reporting Section, 2008). A summer Kick Start program for the pre-Kindergarten children was incorporated in the planning of the proposed Campbell 21st CCLC grant (Wilson, 2008).

Where was the project implemented? In Year 3, the Campbell sub-grantee included 10 centers whose programs were implemented on the campuses of their host schools of 'Ewa Elementary, 'Ewa Beach Elementary, Holomua Elementary, Iroquois Point Elementary, Ka'imiloa Elementary, Keone'ula Elementary, Pōhākea Elementary, 'Ilima Intermediate, 'Ewa Makai Middle, and Campbell High. These 10 HIDOE public schools are part of the Campbell-Kapolei complex area on the Leeward coast of the island of O'ahu, State of Hawai'i. The host school names, street addresses, web sites, and other information are shown as Table 1. Note that the centers, although identified by their host school names, were separate

Table 1*Campbell Sub-grantee 21st CCLC: Location of Sites in Year 3*

School name	Address	City	State	Zip	Phone	Grade levels	url_home
‘Ewa El.	91-1280 Renton Road	‘Ewa Beach	HI	96706	681-8202	K–6	http://ewael.k12.hi.us
‘Ewa Beach El.	91-740 Papipi Road	‘Ewa Beach	HI	96706	689-1271	K–6	http://ewabeach.k12.hi.us
Iroquois Point El.	5553 Cormorant Avenue	‘Ewa Beach	HI	96706	499-6500	K–6	http://iroquois.k12.hi.us
Keone‘ula El.	91-970 Kaileolea Drive	‘Ewa Beach	HI	96706	689-1380	K–6	http://www.keoneulaes.org/
Ka‘imiloa El.	91-1028 Kaunolu Street	‘Ewa Beach	HI	96706	689-1280	K–6	http://www.kaimiloa.k12.hi.us
Holomua El.	91-1561 Keaunui Drive	‘Ewa Beach	HI	96706	685-9100	K–6	http://www.holomua.k12.hi.us
Pōhākea El.	91-750 Ft. Weaver Road	‘Ewa Beach	HI	96706	689-1290	K–6	http://www.pohakea.k12.hi.us/Pohakea_Elementary_School/HOME.html
‘Ewa Makai Middle	91-6291 Kapolei Parkway	‘Ewa Beach	HI	96706	687-9500	7–8	http://www.ewamakai.org
‘Ilima Intermediate	91-884 Ft. Weaver Road	‘Ewa Beach	HI	96706	687-9300	7–8	http://ilima1.k12.hi.us/HomePage.nsf
James Campbell High	91-980 North Rd	‘Ewa Beach	HI	96706-2746	689-1200	9–12	http://campbellhigh.org/

entities from their host schools and provided services to students outside of the regular day-school hours as required by the 21st CCLC program.

The 21st CCLC statutes require that student activities are to be held before or after regular day-school hours, evenings, weekends, holidays, and summer. However, activities for pre-Kindergarten and adult family members may be held during regular day-school hours “since these times may be the most suitable for serving these populations” (USDE, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Academic Improvement and Teacher Quality Programs, 2003, p. 28).

What were the characteristics of the school community? The Campbell sub-grantee school-community demographics is shown as Table 2. Data from the 2010 U.S. Census were not available at the time of the writing of this report so the Table 2 data is based on the 2000 U.S. Census. As shown in Table 2, the Campbell complex school community had 11.1% of families with children headed by a single mother, which approached the percentage for the state (18.3%). The school community’s percentage of households accepting public assistance income was 7.4% which is nearly equal to the state’s percentage at 7.6%. The school community’s percentage of families with children living in poverty was 5.7%, which is below the state’s percentage of 11.2%. Although Table 2 shows lower percentages of disadvantaged families and households in the Campbell complex school community compared to the state, these poverty indicators for the school community show that host schools were in areas where there are high percentages of households with variables considered at-risk for lower academic achievement.

Table 2
Poverty Indicators for the Campbell Sub-grantee School Community as Compared to the State of Hawai‘i^a

Community profile	School community	State of Hawai‘i
Percentage of families with children headed by a single mother	11.1%	18.3%
Percent of households with Public Assistance income	7.4%	7.6%
Percent of families with children living in poverty	5.7%	11.2%

^aBased on U.S. Census, 2000.

How many people did it affect? The 21st CCLC project provided services to a total of 1,161 students in Kindergarten through Grade 10 from the summer of 2011 through SY 2011–12. Additional information about student subgroups in this population and the number of students served at each center are discussed in other sections of this report. In addition to providing services to school-aged children, the Campbell 21st CCLC centers provided adult family members with activities to encourage family involvement in the centers. An accurate count of adult family members who participated in the program was not available. A combined total of 217 center administrators and staff were involved in the centers between the summer of 2011 through SY 2011–12. However, note that some staff were involved in the centers dur-

ing the summer of 2011 and SY 2011–12 and are included in both counts. Specific descriptions of the types of staff and counts per centers are provided in another section of this report.

Goals of the Project

The Campbell sub-grantee 21st CCLC centers implemented activities to supplement programs in their respective host schools. The sub-grantee’s objectives were to provide educational and other developmental services to students who have the greatest needs for learning opportunities. The project objectives, as stated in the project objective, aligned with the 21st CCLC program objectives:

- “Develop after school centers that offer high quality activities in core content areas such as English Language Arts, mathematics, or science to improve students’ academic achievement.”
- “Develop after school centers that offer high quality enrichment or support activities.”
- “Increase student engagement through enrichment activities that focus on critical thinking and inquiry.”
- “Increase the number of regular center students improving in mathematics.”
- “Increase the number of regular center students improving in Reading / Literacy.”
- “Provide opportunities for parents and other adults to center students’ learning experiences through a range of activities and workshops” (Campbell sub-grantee, 2011).

Clients involved in the program. The Sub-grantee 21st CCLC Handbook SY 2011–12 states that the “21st Century Community Learning Centers will serve children and community members with the greatest need for expanded learning opportunities” (HIDOE-SPMS, 2011a, p. Tab 3: Pro Imp & Plan—2) In Year 3, 1,161 students were enrolled over all the 10 Campbell sub-grantee centers. Of the total number of project participants, 634 (54.6%) qualified for free- or reduced-cost lunch, 176 (15.2%) qualified for ELL services, and 57 (4.9%) qualified for SPED services. These student demographics data were required to be reported by the USDE and HIDOE and reflect student populations who may have disadvantages or challenges for academic achievement.

Characteristics of the Program Materials and Resources

There were two sources of information about program materials and resources as summarized in this section. The information were collected by multiple methods: (a) center coordinators completed a section of the Learning Point Associates 21st CCLC 2012 Annual Performance Report (APR) from the federal on-line Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS) that elicited information about activities and materials; and (b) we conducted site visits, that included observing center activities and interviewing center coordinators and staff about the materials and resources used by students.

Program materials and resources provided by partners. In alignment with its 21st CCLC grant proposal (Wilson, 2008), the Campbell sub-grantee 21st CCLC project materials included Renaissance Learning, Accelerated Reading and Accelerated Math, supplemented with the programs of Literacy Navigator, Math Navigator, and Star assessments to provide student support in reading and mathematics. Levelled books (books considered appropriate for students' reading level) were used for reading instruction. Attendees were also encouraged to use the on-line My Access program to develop writing skills. The Campbell sub-grantee project leaders and staff implemented reading and mathematics activities using program materials they selected with the intention of meeting individual needs of attendees, providing pre- and post-assessments for summative purposes, and utilization of formative assessment. Additionally, day teachers provided input to inform the center staffs' work with individual center attendees.

In Year 3, the Campbell sub-grantee staff continued to implement tutorials in reading and mathematics with Renaissance Learning materials. Program maintenance included updating Renaissance Learning materials at several centers along with scheduled professional development sessions for center staff. These materials were selected to support individualized instruction, center-level pre-post assessments, specific instructional strategies based on individualized needs assessments, student self-assessment, and the use of school data to inform center activities. In some of the tutorials, center attendees completed on-line reading or mathematics assignments and then completed formative assessments. The programs generated progress reports for use by center staff.

The grant proposal included the goal that the project would provide enrichment activities such as robotics and multi-media/video production programs. The robotics program was implemented at the Holomua, Kai'miloa, Pōhākea, and 'Ewa Makai Middle centers. The multi-media/video production program was implemented at the Kai'miloa, Pōhākea, and 'Ewa Makai Middle centers. In addition to the activities noted in the grant proposal, center coordinators selected and implemented enrichment activities at their respective centers to address the needs and interests of their center attendees. Individual centers contracted community partners to implement some science or technology enrichment activities. The subcontractors who implemented these enrichment activities provided the instructional materials for their respective activities. The categories and types of activities varied at each center and the reader is referred to Appendix B for a description of activities at each center. Center staff distributed snacks to center attendees that were obtained under a federal school nutrition program.

What resources (e.g., grant funds, physical facilities, in-kind personnel, community partnerships) were available? The largest proportion of resources for the Campbell sub-grantee programming was provided by 21st CCLC grant funds. Host schools for the centers provided the physical facilities where the centers implemented activities. The Campbell sub-grantee projects leaders developed relation-

ships with community partners to implement and assist with enrichment activities. A listing of these partners by center is shown as Appendix E.

In what activities were project participants expected to take part? Center attendees participated in reading/literacy or mathematics tutorials and homework help as part of their day at a center. Additionally, attendees could participate in enrichment activities in the areas of science, sports, technology, culture/social studies, and art and music.

What specific procedures, if any, did project staff follow? Students were referred to the centers by teachers at their respective host schools or were recruited by the centers according to the criteria in the grant. Center staff followed a weekly schedule implementing activities focused on delivering services to center attendees meant to supplement the school day. They were expected to provide project activities in a secure and safe environment with participant behavior expectations similar to those found in the host schools. Across the Campbell 21st CCLC project, the focus was on reading/literacy and mathematics with tutoring and homework help using curriculum and instructional materials chosen to meet student needs.

How was the project administered? The Campbell 21st CCLC sub-grantee was administered through a tiered management structure with program authority delegated from the Complex Area Superintendent to a project director who provided overall management of the project. The project director was assisted by center coordinators who managed the operations of their respective centers. Center coordinators along with their staff implemented activities which focused on meeting the project objectives, providing services in reading/literacy, mathematics, and enrichment activities to meet the needs of center attendees and offered services to parents and adult family members of student attendees.

Who were the staff and others involved in the program? The information about the Campbell sub-grantee 2011–12 staff is shown as Table 3. In addition to the project director who provided managerial oversight of the project, center coordinators at every center provided operational management of the centers. Between the summer of 2011 and SY 2011–12, there was a total of 217 center administrators and staff members who delivered services at the 21st CCLC centers.

During the summer of 2011, there were six center coordinators and 41 staff members. Two center coordinators managed the ‘Ewa Beach center where one center coordinator trained and was replaced by the second center coordinator; there was one center coordinator for each of the following centers: ‘Ewa Elementary, Iroquois Point Elementary, Ka‘imiloa Elementary, and Keone‘ula Elementary. Of the 41 staff members, 28 staff members were school-day teachers, 5 were other nonteaching school-day staff, 5 were other school-day staff, and the 3 remaining staff members were in other categories including 1 college student, 1 youth development worker, and 1 paraprofessional teacher (listed in *Other*).

Table 3*Description of Staff at the Campbell Sub-grantee Centers in Year 3*

sy=school year, summ=summer

Center	Type of staff								
	School-day teachers (includes former and substitute teachers)	Center administrators and coordinators	Youth development workers and other nonschool day staff with a college degree or higher	Other nonteaching school-day staff (e.g., librarians, guidance counselors, aides)	Parents	College students	High school students	Other nonschool-day staff with some or no college	Other
‘Ewa El.	13 paid sy 7 paid summ	1 paid sy 1 paid summ	1 paid summ	1 paid summ				2 paid summ	
‘Ewa Beach El.	11 paid sy 1 paid summ	1 paid sy 2 paid summ	1 paid sy	2 paid sy				3 paid sy 1 paid summ	
Holomua El.	20 paid sy	2 paid sy							
∞ Iroquois Point El.	8 paid sy 7 paid summ	1 paid sy 1 paid summ						2 paid summ	1 paid summ (PPT)
Ka‘imiloa El.	20 paid sy 4 paid summ	1 paid sy 1 paid summ		4 paid summ			6 volunteer(s) sy	1 paid sy	
Keone‘ula El.	9 paid summ	1 paid summ				1 paid summ			
Pōhākea El.	26 paid sy	1 paid sy		1 paid sy			10 volunteer(s) sy		
‘Ewa Makai Mid.	12 paid sy	1 paid sy					1 volunteer(s) sy		
‘Ilima Int.	13 paid sy	1 paid sy		1 paid sy					
Campbell Hi.	5 paid sy	2 paid sy				1 paid sy		2 paid sy	2 paid sy (Educational Assistance)
Totals	128 paid sy 28 paid summ	11 paid sy 6 paid summ	1 paid sy 1 paid summ	4 paid sy 5 paid summ		1 paid sy 1 paid summ	17 volunteer(s) sy	6 paid sy 5 paid summ	2 paid sy 1 paid summ

Note. None of the centers had staff members in the category: “Other community members (e.g., business mentors, senior citizens, clergy).” Some staff were involved in the centers during the summer of 2011 and SY 2011–12 and are included in both counts. The total staff is 217 (47 during the summer of 2011 and 170 during SY 2011–12).

During SY 2011–12, there were 11 center coordinators. With the exceptions of Holomua Elementary and Campbell High centers which each had two center coordinators, the centers at the ‘Ewa Elementary, ‘Ewa Beach Elementary, Iroquois Point Elementary, Ka‘imiloa Elementary, Pōhākea Elementary, ‘Ilima Intermediate, and ‘Ewa Makai Middle each had one center coordinator. Of the 159 center staff members and volunteers, 128 were school-day teachers, 6 were other nonschool-day staff, 4 were other non-teaching school-day staff, 17 were volunteer high school students, and the 4 remaining staff members included 1 college student, 1 youth development worker, and 2 educational assistants (listed in *Other*). Of the 17 high school students who volunteered to implement activities in Project Year 3, 10 assisted at the Pōhākea center, 6 assisted at the Ka‘imiloa center, and 1 assisted at the ‘Ewa Makai Middle center.

As shown in Table 3, the majority of staff members during the summer of 2011 and SY 2011–12 were in paid positions. The majority of staff members were school-day teachers. Hiring school-day teachers and other school personnel provided the advantages of having staff who knew school rules and procedures for the security and safety of the project participants. School-day teachers also provided consistency with classroom management, student behavior management, differentiated learning, curricula, and formative assessment.

The Evaluation Design

The purposes of this evaluation were to fulfill the annual state and federal evaluation requirements and to provide information to the sub-grantee stakeholders about the project implementation and outcomes for project improvement as a basis for decision making to improve services to project participants. To address the purpose of the evaluation, the evaluators and center staff collected implementation and outcome data, including student data in the form of attendance, demographics, academic achievement, and academic behavior; descriptive data about center activities, center operations, and center staffing; and other data relevant to the implementation of project services to participants and their families. Statutory and regulatory requirements specify criteria for the evaluation of sub-grantee projects. The reader is referred to the statute, Title IV, Part B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) as reauthorized by the NCLB (*ESEA of 1965, Title IV, Part B, 21st Century Community Learning Centers*) and the non-regulatory guidance (USDE, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, *Academic Improvement and Teacher Quality Programs*, 2003) for the program requirements.

In consultation with project leadership, the evaluation was designed to align with three key 21st CCLC documents: (a) the Campbell sub-grantee 21st CCLC grant proposal (Wilson, 2008), (b) the HIDOE-SPMS (2010) key performance indicators (KPIs), and (c) HIDOE-SPMS (2011b) evaluation report template. The HIDOE-SPMS (2010) KPIs are performance measures and outcome indicators adapted from USDE 21st CCLC KPIs and are associated with the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA).

The Evaluation of Implementation and Outcomes

The evaluation design includes an evaluation of project implementation and an evaluation of project outcomes. The evaluation design is provided in the sections that follow this introduction and is presented with detail in Appendix A. As shown in Appendix A, Table A1, the evaluation design included the HIDEOE-SPMS objectives; indicators and performance measures; evaluation questions from the HIDEOE-SPMS evaluation report template, and identified sources and data-collection methods.

The Plan to Evaluate Project Implementation

The main implementation evaluation question is “Was the program implemented as planned in the grant proposal?” The nine sub-questions are (a) “If no, what changes were made and why?” (b) “What did the program finally look like?” (c) “What challenges have been faced in implementing the program and how are these challenges being addressed?” (d) “Which community-based partnerships, as planned in the grant application, have been established and maintained and which ones were not? Why?” (e) “Where was the program implemented?” (f) What were the characteristics of the school community? (g) “How many people did it affect?” (h) “Are the program activities interesting and valuable to students, teachers, administrators, and community partners?” and (i) “What are the plans to ensure effective program implementation next year?” (HIDEOE-SPMS, 2011b).

The study of project implementation was post-only. Data about implementation were collected with the following methods: (a) an evaluator-developed on-line questionnaire which was administered to paid or unpaid staff and contractors who implemented activities; (b) an evaluator-developed questionnaire about community partnerships was completed by center staff; (c) an evaluator-developed spreadsheet was designed to collect data about center student attendance, demographics, and academic achievement; (d) school-community data was downloaded from the HIDEOE website and summarized by the evaluators; (e) an evaluator-developed parent questionnaire about the family activities implemented by the centers was completed by parent or adult participants in center activities; and (f) interview data from evaluators’ interviews with project leaders and staff.

Descriptive data about center activities were collected with the 21st CCLC APR. We developed an on-line questionnaire to collect evaluative data about the activities. This on-line questionnaire was distributed to center staff, volunteers, contractors, and others who implemented activities. It was designed to elicit information about the extent and quality of implementation of the primary, secondary, core subject area, and academic enrichment activity categories defined on the APR. Respondents completed questionnaire items in two parts: (a) rating the extent of implementation on a four-point scale from 1 = none or very little, 2 = mediocre, 3 = moderate, and 4 = all or almost all and (b) rating the quality of implementation on a four-point scale from 1 = poor, 2 = mediocre, 3 = moderate, and 4 = very well. A caveat of this

method is that there may be personal or social pressure for respondents to report only positive information about their implementation of activities. Another limitation was that there may be a small number of individuals who implemented some types of activities, thereby limiting the respondent group.

The Plan to Evaluate Project Outcomes

The evaluation questions about project outcomes were (a) What changes were found in regular center attendees' academic behaviors as reported by their language arts or mathematics day classroom teachers? (b) What changes were found in regular center attendees' academic performance as reported by their language arts or mathematics day classroom teachers? (HIDOE-SPMS, 2010). The outcome indicators and the specific KPIs are shown in Appendix A, Table A1.

In our evaluation design, the HIDOE-SPMS KPI outcome indicators are shown as changes in regular attendees' academic behaviors and academic achievement in English Language Arts and mathematics. As defined by the 21st CCLC program, the center attendees who participated in 30 or more days of center activities were likely to have measurable effects. These center participants are referred to as "regular attendees," and outcome data were collected for regular attendees only.

The HIDOE-SPMS 21st CCLC program manager determined that the outcome performance objective for academic behavior would be 75% or more of a center's regular attendees, and for academic achievement would be 60% or more of a center's regular attendees. Center staff provided attendance data on all center attendees. We screened the attendance data for double listings of students by alternative spelling or presentation of name (for example, middle name used as first name), grade level, names, gender, ID number and so forth. Then, we summed each student's days of participation and generated each center's list of regular attendees. The lists of regular attendees were used to generate teacher surveys and identify those attendees for reporting of changes in Fall-Spring report card grades and changes in pre-post assessment scores.

The study of outcomes was post-only for academic behaviors. The teacher survey was developed under a contract between the USDE and Learning Point Associates for the purposes of collecting academic behavior data for the 21st CCLC program. According to instructions in APR documents, teacher survey administration requires one day-school teacher to complete the teacher survey for each regular attendee (Learning Point Associates, 2012). The teacher survey was administered to the regular attendee's elementary classroom day-school teacher or secondary (middle or high school) English Language Arts or mathematics day-school teacher. All sub-grantees are required to administer the teacher survey to day-school teachers of regular attendees and enter results of the teacher survey into PPICS. The teacher survey was designed to elicit teachers' retrospective views about changes to regular attendees' academic behaviors.

The teacher survey included 10 items, with each item about an academic behavior, and each survey item had eight possible responses. One of the possible responses was *Did not need improvement* (no value), and if the teacher marked this, then a rating would not be assigned to the item and the teacher was instructed to move to the next item. We assigned numeric values to the other possible responses. The other possible rating scale responses were 1 = significant decline, 2 = moderate decline, 3 = slight decline, 4 = no change, 5 = slight improvement, 6 = moderate improvement, and 7 = significant improvement.

Of the 10 items on the teacher survey, four items were designated as key performance indicators (KPIs) for the Hawai‘i 21st CCLC program by the state program manager. These four KPIs from the teacher survey were “turning in his or her homework on time,” “participating in class,” “attending class regularly,” and “behaving well in class.” The criterion was that 75% or more regular attendees’ English Language Arts, mathematics, or day teachers were to report improvement for each KPI across the sub-grantee.

The study of outcomes for academic achievement in English Language Arts and mathematics was a pre-post design: (a) the difference between Fall and Spring semester report card grades (as an HI-DOE-SPMS outcome indicator), and (b) the difference between pre-post assessment scores that were administered in the host schools. We added the regular attendees’ pre-post assessment scores in English Language Arts and mathematics to the evaluation of outcomes based on a decision with the previous HI-DOE-SPMS state program manager and project leaders. Center leaders and staff were provided with the criteria for pre-post assessments that would be appropriate and usable for the evaluation. The assessment must be (a) administered in the center’s host schools within the school year, (b) school- or grade-level assessments that were administered for school purposes (not for center purposes), (c) commercially developed and administered as instructed by the developers, (d) supported by literature that reported appropriate psychometric qualities of the assessment. There may be different assessments for each grade level within the school. Center coordinators were advised to follow instructions to the assessment when identifying the type of scores for comparison between the pre- and post-testing periods.

Multi-methods and collaboration for data-collection logistics. When possible, multiple methods were used to collect data from various stakeholders about the extent and quality of project implementation, variables that affect implementation, variables that may affect outcomes, and outcome measures. We used multiple methods to gain a fuller understanding about the project and confirm or enhance the validity of the evaluation. Some of these sources of data included meetings/discussions with the project director, group and individual meetings with center coordinators, and site visits where we had some opportunities to observe and speak with tutors and contractors.

The center coordinators collected and provided the majority of the evaluation data, namely, student attendance, student demographics, student outcome data, annual performance reports, and commu-

nity partnerships. The project director provided updates about the project and logistical coordination with the evaluators during in-person conversations or by telephone or e-mail. Substantial collaboration between the project and evaluation staff was needed to plan and carry out the collection of some types of data. Project-to-evaluator communication and collaboration were needed to support collecting data about parent activities. Center coordinators provided the dates of the parent activities and projected counts of parent attendees. Evaluators prepared the sign-in sheets and questionnaires. Center staff administered parent questionnaires at parent activities and returned completed questionnaires to us. For distribution of the on-line staff questionnaire about project implementation, center coordinators needed to provide us with e-mail addresses or contact information (if no e-mail address was available) of staff, volunteers, or contractors who implemented activities. This step needed to be completed in time for the on-line staff questionnaire to be administered either before a staff member left the project or before the end of the project year.

The project director provided data about project management across the centers—for example, modifications in previous years and the current year, the extensive options of enrichment activities available for center coordinators' selection, and information about community partners contracted through her office. During Project Year 3, we met with project staff during a center coordinator meeting and during site visits. During site visits, we met with each center coordinator and asked about center operations and activities (field trips, goals specific to the center, selection of students for the center, program materials and resources, staff characteristics, and parent/community activities). At site visits, center coordinators had the opportunity to ask questions about the evaluation, explain the selection process for activities, and show us documentation used for center management and project implementation.

On January 18, 2012, we met with the Campbell sub-grantee project director to discuss project implementation in Project Year 3. At this meeting, we presented data summarized according to the following topics: (a) enrollment of project participants, (b) procedures to identify and address student needs, (c) formative student assessment, (d) programmatic links to the host school and to the Common Core State Standards; and (e) professional development. The project director provided information about efforts to upgrade to the Renaissance Learning software, use Renaissance Learning assessments for formative feedback to center staff, provide snacks to students, extend the hours of operation, and provide additional professional development to support implementation of Renaissance Learning. The project director described the process to obtain a Renaissance Learning Accelerated Reading trainer and schedule training sessions. In addition, the project director instructed center staff to monitor student progress on a weekly basis. It was also reported that the 21st CCLC project had secured the commitment of three Resource Teachers to provide additional support to staff for setting student goals in reading and math, support the monitoring of student progress, assist with the planning of power lessons, and provided additional support through

demonstration lessons. The project director reported that the federal nutrition program provide snacks for distribution at six centers. This meeting with the project director was an opportunity for us to discuss, explore, collaborate, and gain insights for the purposes of project implementation and project evaluation.

Evaluation Data-Collection Schedule

On August 30, 2011, we met with the project director and center coordinators to discuss data-collection activities and agree on a schedule. We presented a draft evaluation data-collection schedule for discussion to meet the needs of the evaluation, centers, and host schools. The main issues that the project director, center coordinators, and evaluators considered in planning the schedule of deadlines were (a) avoiding intersession dates when scheduling administration of questionnaires, (b) determining feasible intermediate deadlines for submitting attendance data to prevent last minute scrambling for data and data entry and also to provide sufficient time to correct errors in the original data submitted, (c) determining the deadline to submit attendance/demographics data in the spring to provide sufficient time to review and/or correct the submitted data, analyze the reviewed/corrected data to identify the counts of 30-day attendees, compile a list of 30-day attendees for CRDG to prepare the teacher survey packets, and also to provide a list to the centers which contain the names and grade levels of 30-day attendees whose grades and pre/post scores were needed as outcome data, and (d) optimizing the time to allow center students to meet the 30-day attendance counts in the spring and take into account the close of the school year at the host schools when teachers are very busy and may not have much time to devote and focus on completing the teacher survey. The agreed-upon evaluation data-collection schedule is shown as Table 4. However, some informal changes were made to the deadlines during the year when requested by the center coordinators, and as we could accommodate the requests.

Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS) Reporting

The Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS) is a web-based data collection and report-generation system. Commissioned in 2003 to support the transition from Federal to state administration of the 21st CCLC program, Learning Point Associates is currently contracted to operate PPICS. The USDE uses PPICS to monitor state administration of the 21st CCLC program, to respond to Congressional and other inquiries, and to meet the Federal GPRA reporting requirements. Sub-grantees with active grants are required to collect, report, and certify data each year through PPICS.

The evaluation staff entered the PPICS data, and the Campbell sub-grantee project director certified the data before the November 5, 2012 deadline. During review of data for this report, CRDG evaluation staff uncovered errors in the PPICS data. Since the PPICS database was locked and correction of the data was not possible in PPICS at the time of this report, the evaluation staff identified inconsistencies between the PPICS and evaluation report data, made corrections on the corresponding tables in the evaluation report and appendices, and included notations of those corrections in this section.

Table 4*Campbell Sub-grantee in Project Year 3: Schedule of Deadlines for Evaluation Data*

School name	Deadline to submit Summer 2011 data to CRDG •attendance •student demographics • APR Forms A, B, C7, D •partners questionnaire •staff questionnaire	Deadline to submit Reading/LA and Math assessment names •Notify CRDG how many staff leaving during or after Fall semester (send notice to CRDG 2 weeks before staff leaves)	Deadline to submit to CRDG (for all participants) •Summer-Fall attendance •Summer-Fall student demographics •Notify CRDG how many staff leaving during or after Spring semester (send notice to CRDG 2 weeks before staff leaves)	Deadline to submit Summer – Spring attendance and demographics data to CRDG (all participants)	Deadline to submit Fall-Spring data to CRDG •partners questionnaire •staff questionnaires	Deadline to submit Fall-Spring data to CRDG •APR Forms A, B, C7, D •Teacher surveys •Pre- and post-test scores for reading and mathematics assessments	Deadline to submit to CRDG •1 st and 2 nd semester grades for English/reading/ Language Arts and mathematics (30-day+ attendee data) •Final attendance /demographics (Summer-Fall-Spring)
‘Ewa El.	09/30/2011	10/21/11	01/27/12	04/26/12	04/30/12	05/21/12	06/04/12
‘Ewa Beach El.	09/30/2011	10/21/11	01/27/12	04/26/12	04/30/12	05/21/12	06/04/12
Holomua El.	(Multi-tract)	10/21/11	01/27/12	05/21/12	06/01/12	06/18/12	06/29/12
Iroquois Pt. El.	09/30/2011	10/21/11	01/27/12	04/26/12	04/30/12	05/21/12	06/04/12
Ka‘imiloa El.	09/30/2011	10/21/11	01/27/12	04/26/12	04/30/12	05/21/12	06/04/12
Keone‘ula El.	09/30/2011	–	–	–	–	–	–
Pōhākea El.	Not open	10/21/11	01/27/12	04/26/12	04/30/12	05/21/12	06/04/12
‘Ewa Makai Mid.	Not open	10/21/11	01/27/12	04/26/12	04/30/12	05/21/12	06/04/12
‘Ilima Inter.	Not open	10/21/11	01/27/12	04/26/12	04/30/12	05/21/12	06/04/12
Campbell Hi.	Not open	10/21/11	01/27/12	04/26/12	04/30/12	05/21/12	06/04/12

Note. Keone‘ula Elementary center implemented activities during Summer 2011 only.

Errors found and corrections made during review. Evaluation staff found that we incorrectly entered the following data reported in PPICS:

- (a) ‘Ewa Beach center: Academic and enrichment activities shown in Appendix B, Table B2. The targeted students’ data for the Reading Instruction activity during SY 2011–12 was incorrectly reported as “Students who have been truant, suspended, or expelled” and was corrected as “Limited-English proficient students.”
- (b) Ka‘imiloa center: Academic and enrichment activities shown in Appendix B, Table B5. Four activities were each reported as two activities when the activity spanned from Fall through Spring sessions; the corrections were to report each of these four activities as a single activity spanning from Fall through Spring 2011–12. The four activities were: Accelerated Reading Sessions 1 and 2, Accelerated Mathematics Sessions 1 and 2, Enrichment Legos Sessions 1 and 2, and Media Production Sessions 1 and 2. Additionally, Hip Hop was incorrectly reported as “2 hours per day” and was corrected to “1 hour per day.”
- (c) Pōhākea center: Academic and enrichment activities shown in Appendix B, Table B7. The Cheerleading Enrichment activity was incorrectly reported as “1 day per week” and was corrected to “3 days per week.”
- (d) ‘Ewa center: The total number of weeks the center was open during 2011–12 shown in Table 8. The total number of weeks the center was open during SY 2011–12 was incorrectly reported as 22 weeks and was corrected to 20 weeks.

Findings about Project Implementation in Project Year 3

The main evaluation question about implementation is, “Was the project implemented as planned in the grant proposal?” (HIDOE-SPMS, 2012, p. 3). The nine sub-questions about implementation are (a) “If no, what changes were made and why?” (b) “What did the project finally look like?” (c) “What challenges have been faced in implementing the project and how are these challenges being addressed?” (d) “Which community-based partnerships, as planned in the grant application, have been established and maintained and which ones were not? Why?” (e) “Where was the project implemented?” (f) What were the characteristics of the school community? (g) “How many people did it affect?” (h) “Are the project activities interesting and valuable to students, teachers, administrators, and community partners?” and (i) “What are the plans to ensure effective project implementation next year?” (HIDOE-SPMS, 2012, p. 3).

Was the project implemented as planned in the grant proposal?

Over the first three years of the grant (Summer 2009 through SY 2009–10; Summer 2010 through SY 2010–11; and Summer 2011 through SY 2011–12), the Campbell sub-grantee implemented the project based on the grant proposal with modifications based on some changing requirements of the state program manager, on the needs of the project attendees, or on initiatives planned and implemented for

project improvement. As reported in the Project Year 1 and Project Year 2 evaluation reports (Higa, Sagaysay, Oshiro, & Nakamura, 2010, 2011), the Campbell sub-grantee's project implementation encompassed the majority of activities stated in the grant proposal. Modifications in Project Year 2 (Summer 2010 through SY 2010–11) were based on needs of center attendees, including a sub-grantee emphasis on parent and family events, expanding the availability of enrichment activities, and offering an activity for siblings who waited unsupervised at host schools. In Project Year 3 (Summer 2011 through SY 2011–12), Campbell sub-grantee project leaders continued planning and implementing project improvements based on the activities and foci of the grant proposal reported earlier with modifications based on needs of the center attendees and initiatives for project improvement. Centers faced additional challenges to implement the project that are discussed in the next section.

Project characteristics. The Campbell sub-grantee project administrator was the School Renewal Specialist (SRS). The Campbell sub-grantee hired a project director for the 21st CCLC grant, who reported directly to the SRS. The project director managed implementation and oversaw operations of the Campbell sub-grantee 21st CCLC grant and coordinated with the host school leaders and staff. Each center was managed by at least one center coordinator to oversee summer and school year operations and implementation of activities. More detail about center staffing is provided later in this report. As stated previously in this report, the Campbell sub-grantee centers were physically located on the campuses of their feeder schools (also called their host schools). Center students were referred to the centers by teachers in the host schools or recruited by the centers based on the criteria stated in the grant proposal.

High-need communities (indicator 3.1): 100% of centers are located in high-poverty communities. Based on the review of community and host school demographics, the Campbell sub-grantee centers were located in high-poverty communities and the majority of host schools had high levels of students eligible for free- and reduced-lunch.

As a measure of community poverty levels, we provide the counts and percentages of the free- and reduced-lunch subpopulations at the Campbell sub-grantee host schools for SYs 2006–07 through 2010–11 in Table 5. The range of free- or reduced-lunch percentages in the host schools are 25.9% to 62.6%. The average of this range is 45.6% and the median is 45.8%, which approach half the host schools' total populations. We concluded from these data that the Campbell sub-grantee project was located in a high-poverty community.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) of the host schools. One of the goals of the 21st CCLC program is to provide services designed to help students meet State and local academic achievement standards ("Title IV, Part B—21st Century Community Learning Centers," 2001). We display information about the enrollment levels of center student subgroups in Table 6. The status of the centers' host schools' achievement status of AYP in 2011–12 is shown as Table 7 (Systems Accountability Office, System Eval-

uation & Reporting Section, 2012). Although many other variables contribute to the achievement of AYP in the school, the centers provide services to students with the highest needs and, therefore, also contribute to the host schools' achievement of AYP.

In 2011–12, three host elementary schools (Holomua, Iroquois Point, and Pōhākea) and one middle school (‘Ilima Intermediate) met AYP.

We compared the AYP status of those student population subgroups that did not meet proficiency at the host school with similarly described attendees at the Campbell 21st CCLC project. For reading, the disadvantaged student subgroup did not meet proficiency at ‘Ewa, Ka‘imiloa, and Keone‘ula elementary schools, and ‘Ewa Makai Middle. For mathematics the disadvantaged student subgroup did not meet proficiency at ‘Ewa, ‘Ewa Beach, Ka‘imiloa, and Keone‘ula elementary schools, and ‘Ewa Makai Middle School. The disabled subgroup did not meet the mathematics proficiency objective at Campbell High School. The Asian/Pacific Islanders subgroup did not meet the mathematics proficiency objective at ‘Ewa, ‘Ewa Beach, and Ka‘imiloa elementary schools, and ‘Ewa Makai Middle School.

As shown in Table 7, for each student subgroup that did not meet the reading or mathematics proficiency objective in the host school, we show the percentage of the student subgroup to the center total enrollment. The percentage of each center's enrollment is accurate to the extent that the data we received (about center student demographics) were accurate. These percentages show that the centers provided support to some student subgroups that need supplemental assistance in academic performance and behavior beyond the day school activities. We understand that the centers may not enroll large percentages of these student subgroups for many reasons, including the reason that other projects and services are available to assist students in these subgroups to improve their academic performance.

Center staffing. As shown in Table 3, the majority of Campbell sub-grantee staff during the summer of 2011 and SY 2011–12 were school-day teachers (28 during the summer and 128 during the school year). The proportion of each type of staff to total staff cannot be calculated because some staff were employed during both the summer of 2011 and during the school year, and therefore, made the calculation difficult from the data in Table 3. The second largest group of center staff also worked in the host schools, but were in non-teaching positions, such as librarians, guidance counselors, or school aides. According to national research about the 21st CCLC program across the nation, it is advantageous to have center staff with these qualifications to build bridges between the host school and the extended day curriculum (Nafzger & Vinson, 2011). Host school staff would have familiarity with procedures for a safe environment for students, assessment procedures and use of data, instructional strategies, and project materials.

Table 5*Campbell Sub-grantee: Free- or Reduced-Cost Lunch Counts and Percentages Over SY 2006–07 through SY 2011–12*

Student profile	School-level counts and percentages ^a					2011–12 center-level counts and percentages of total center attendees	
	2006–07	2007–08	2008–09	2009–10	2010–11	Number of regular students on free or reduced lunch ^b	Total number of center students on free or reduced lunch ^b
‘Ewa Elementary	437 (47.2%)	417 (44.6%)	440 (46.2%)	493 (50.3%)	567 (56.7%)	20 (2.0%)	80 (7.9%)
‘Ewa Beach Elementary	214 (51.6%)	182 (49.9%)	191 (53.4%)	233 (55.0%)	246 (48.5%)	56 (9.0%)	105 (16.8%)
Holomua Elementary	330 (21.5%)	317 (22.0%)	332 (23.6%)	331 (23.2%)	358 (25.9%)	32 (2.3%)	39 (2.8%)
Iroquois Point Elementary	158 (24.2%)	194 (29.0%)	243 (36.2%)	312 (43.5%)	306 (42.6%)	15 (2.0%)	60 (8.2%)
Ka‘imiloa Elementary	370 (56.0%)	350 (53.9%)	358 (57.0%)	381 (59.7%)	382 (62.6%)	53 (8.0%)	102 (15.5%)
Keone‘ula Elementary ^c	96 (22.3%)	157 (21.0%)	175 (21.4%)	176 (22.0%)	224 (26.4%)	—	9 (1.1%)
Pōhākea Elementary	324 (61.6%)	285 (57.7%)	334 (62.4%)	334 (60.8%)	342 (60.5%)	107 (19.9%)	131 (24.3%)
‘Ewa Makai Middle	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	219 (37.3%)	4 (0.6%)	19 (2.7%)
‘Ilima Intermediate	541 (44.6%)	485 (37.3%)	560 (41.0%)	569 (42.6%)	409 (52.6%)	31 (4.2%)	51 (6.9%)
James Campbell High	913 (38.5%)	911 (36.6%)	1,047 (41.5%)	1,077 (40.8 %)	1,135 (43.0%)	16 (0.6%)	38 (1.4%)

^aThe school level counts and percentages are based on the HIDOE School Status and Improvement Reports. School Status & Improvement Report. Retrieved August 24, 2012 from: <http://arch.k12.hi.us/school/ssir/ssir.html>

^bThe total enrollment count used as a denominator is based on the Official Enrollment Count, 2011–12 School Year data from the October 12, 2011 HIDOE news release. The total school enrollment with SPED enrollment count (column V) was used as a denominator if the center had SPED students. The total school enrollment without SPED enrollment count (column Q) was used as a denominator if the center did not have SPED students. Retrieved August 24, 2012 and September 12, 2012 from: <http://doe.k12.hi.us/reports/enrollment/index.htm>

^cThis center only provided programming during Summer 2011.

Table 6*Campbell Sub-grantee in Project Year 3: Description of Students Who Received Services, by Demographic Variables*

Counts of students served in Project Year 3										
Center	Enrolled		Grade levels		Free- or reduced-cost lunch		SPED		ELL	
	Total center students	30+ days students	Total center students	30+ days students	Total center students	30+ days students	Total center students	30+ days students	Total center students	30+ days students
'Ewa El.	147	20 (13%)	Gr K: 62 Gr 3: 22 Gr 4: 22 Gr 5: 19 Gr 6: 22	Gr 3: 8 Gr 4: 1 Gr 5: 6 Gr 6: 5	80 (54%) no data: 67	20 (13%)	0 no data: 67	0	6 (4%) no data: 67	1 (0.6%)
'Ewa Beach El.	207	103 (49%)	Gr K: 34 Gr 1: 10 Gr 2: 30 Gr 3: 50 Gr 4: 30 Gr 5: 35 Gr 6: 16 no data: 2	Gr K: 14 Gr 1: 3 Gr 2: 22 Gr 3: 27 Gr 4: 11 Gr 5: 13 Gr 6: 12 no data: 1	105 (50%) no data: 2	56 (27%)	15 (7%) no data: 2	10 (4%)	16 (7%)	9 (4%)
Holomua El.	97	70 (72%)	Gr K: 1 Gr 1: 1 Gr 2: 3 Gr 3: 2 Gr 4: 35 Gr 5: 27 Gr 6: 28	Gr K: 1 Gr 2: 3 Gr 3: 1 Gr 4: 22 Gr 5: 22 Gr 6: 21	39 (40%)	32 (32%)	9 (9%)	7 (7%)	5 (5%)	3 (3%)
Iroquois Point El.	122	33 (27%)	Gr K: 21 Gr 3: 31 Gr 4: 31 Gr 5: 13 Gr 6: 26	Gr 3: 14 Gr 4: 14 Gr 5: 2 Gr 6: 3	60 (49%) no data: 9	15 (12%)	7 (5%) no data: 1	2 (1%)	5 (4%)	1 (0.8%)

(Table 6*Description of Students, by Demographic Variables, Who Received Services from Campbell Subgrantee Centers in SY 2011–12, continued)*

Center	Counts of students served in Project Year 3									
	Enrolled		Grade levels		Free- or reduced-cost lunch		SPED		ELL	
	Total center students	30+ days students	Total center students	30+ days students	Total center students	30+ days students	Total center students	30+ days students	Total center students	30+ days students
Ka‘imiloa El.	150	79 (52%)	Gr K: 43 Gr 2: 7 Gr 3: 36 Gr 4: 33 Gr 5: 26 Gr 6: 5	Gr 3: 27 Gr 4: 22 Gr 5: 26 Gr 6: 4	102 (68%) no data: 1	53 (35%)	5 (3%) 1: no data	1 (0.6%)	51 (34%)	32 (21%)
Keone‘ula EL. ^a	40	0	Gr K: 15 Gr 4: 25	—	9 (22%) no data: 17	—	0	—	5 (12%)	—
Pōhākea El.	186	150 (80%)	Gr 3: 49 Gr 4: 48 Gr 5: 39 Gr 6: 50	Gr 3: 37 Gr 4: 38 Gr 5: 34 Gr 6: 41	131 (70%)	107 (57%)	6 (3%)	6 (3%)	23 (12%)	21 (11%)
‘Ewa Makai Mid.	66	13 (19%)	Gr 7: 47 Gr 8: 19	Gr 7: 9 Gr 8: 4	19 (28%)	4 (6%)	2 (3%)	1 (1%)	3 (4%)	2 (3%)
‘Ilima Inter.	77	48 (62%)	Gr 7: 42 Gr 8: 35	Gr 7: 29 Gr 8: 19	51 (6%)	31 (4%)	9 (11%)	4 (5%)	26 (33%)	19 (24%)
Campbell Hi.	69	22 (31%)	Gr 9: 15 Gr 10: 54	Gr 9: 6 Gr 10: 16	38 (55%)	16 (23%)	4 (5%)	1 (1%)	36 (52%)	22 (31%)
TOTALS	1,161	538 (46%)			634 (54%)	334 (28%)	57 (5%)	32 (2%)	176 (15%)	110 (9%)

Note. The percentages are based on the total enrollment of center students.

^aThe Keone‘ula center only provided programming during Summer 2011.

Table 7*Campbell Sub-grantee in Project Year 3: Host School Achievement of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)¹*

Center name	Met AYP?	NCLB status	Reading: Group(s) that did not meet the proficiency objective of 72%	Mathematics: Group(s) that did not meet the proficiency objective of 64%
‘Ewa El.	Not met	Corrective action year 1	•Disadvantaged: (subgroup is 54% of center enrollment)	•All students •Disadvantaged: (subgroup is 54% of center enrollment) •Asian/Pacific Islander
‘Ewa Beach El.	Not met	School improvement year 1		•Disadvantaged: (subgroup is 50% of center enrollment) •Asian/Pacific Islander
Holomua El.	Met	In good standing, unconditional		
Iroquois Point El.	Met	In good standing, unconditional		
Ka‘imiloa El.	Not met	In good standing, pending	• All students • Disadvantaged: (subgroup is 68% of center enrollment)	• All students • Disadvantaged: (subgroup is 68% of center enrollment) • Asian/Pacific Islander
Keone‘ula El.	Not met	Corrective action year 1	• Disadvantaged: (subgroup is 22% of center enrollment)	• Disadvantaged: (subgroup is 22% of center enrollment)
Pōhākea El.	Met	In good standing, unconditional		
‘Ewa Makai Mid	Not met	In good standing, pending	• Disadvantaged: (subgroup is 28% of center enrollment)	• All students • Disadvantaged: (subgroup is 28% of center enrollment) • Asian/Pacific Islander
‘Ilima Int.	Met	Restructuring		
Campbell High	Not met	Restructuring		•Disabled (SPED): (subgroup is 5% of center enrollment)

¹Based on the 2011–2012 NCLB status final reports generated on September 25, 2012. Percentages of center enrollment are based on available student counts.

Hours of operation (indicator 2.5). *75% of centers will offer services at least 15 hours per week on average during the school year and provide services when school is not in session, such as during the summer and holidays* (HIDOE-SPMS, 2010). The Campbell sub-grantee did not meet this target in Project Year 3. The Campbell sub-grantee hours of operations for the summer of 2011 and SY 2011–12 are shown as Table 8.

During the summer of 2011, five Campbell sub-grantee centers implemented activities. These were the ‘Ewa, ‘Ewa Beach, Iroquois Point, Ka‘imiloa, and Keone‘ula centers. During the summer of 2011, the centers provided activities for two to seven weeks, four to five days per week, and 16.25 to 27 hours per week. The Keone‘ula center was open for the summer of 2011 only and did not offer 21st CCLC activities during SY 2011–12. The reader is referred to Table 8 for specific information about the number of hours and number of weeks of operation per center.

During SY 2011–12, nine Campbell centers offered activities for 20 to 37 weeks, four to five days a week, 6 to 12.5 hours per week. This did not meet the outcome indicator of 15 hours per week, but we note that the centers offered high-need students a safe environment after school with opportunities for homework assistance, tutorials, enrichment activities, and enhancement of academic behaviors.

Characteristics of Clients for the Project

In Project Year 3, 1,161 students participated in activities provided by the Campbell sub-grantee. The center-level counts of participating students are shown in Table 6 along with counts of students by grade level, free- and reduced-lunch status, SPED status, and ELL students. The counts of participants by activity for each center are shown as Appendix B.

Based on our review of the data, the Campbell GEMS project met the goal of enrolling students with high need, that is, students who qualify for free- or reduced-cost lunch, SPED, and ELL services. In deciding how to best select students for 21st CCLC services, stakeholders may consider the demographic characteristics of the center students as in demographic groupings in Table 6. Campbell sub-grantee decision makers along with host school and other school community stakeholders who seek to improve Campbell sub-grantee activities or supplement the efforts of the host schools may find the data useful. As mentioned in the discussion about AYP in this report, the project leaders may wish to look at the student groups that did not meet the NCLB proficiency objectives in reading and mathematics as potential groups to enroll in the centers or consider the alignment of student demographic grouping enrolled in the centers as compared to the student subgroups that did not meet the NCLB proficiency objectives in the same school year. Based on our review of the data, the Campbell sub-grantee project met the goal of enrolling students with high needs.

Table 8
Campbell Sub-grantee in Project Year 3: Hours of Operation

Center	Summer (actual)			School Year (actual)		
	Total number of weeks the center was open	Typical hours per week	Typical number of days per week the center was open	Total number of weeks the center was open	Typical hours per week	Typical number of days per week the center was open
‘Ewa El.	2	16.25	5	20 ^a	7.5	5
‘Ewa Beach El.	5	20	4	28	8	4
Holomua El.	N/A (Multi-track)			37	6	4
Iroquois Point El.	3	17.5	5	28	8	4
Ka‘imiloa El.	4	17.5	5	23	8	4
Keone‘ula El.	7	27	5	Not open		
Pōhākea El.	Not open			30	8	4
‘Ewa Makai Mid.	Not open			21	12	4
‘Ilima Int.	Not open			27	6	4
Campbell Hi.	Not open			30	12.5	5

^aTotal number of weeks the center was open during school year incorrectly reported in PPICS as 22 weeks was corrected to 20 weeks.

Which community-based partnerships, as planned in the grant application, have been established and maintained and which ones were not? Why?

In the grant proposal, the Campbell sub-grantee proposed to establish the following partnerships: Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID), CRDG at the University of Hawai‘i (external evaluators), Drug Free Hawai‘i, Hale Pono Boys and Girls Club of ‘Ewa Beach, Honolulu Academy of Arts: Art to Go Program, Honolulu Zoo: Zoo to You Outreach Program, Mad Science of Hawai‘i, Renaissance Learning, and sailors from USS Port Royal (Wilson, 2008). During Project Year 3, the Campbell sub-grantee secured several of the partners mentioned in the grant proposal: CRDG at the University of Hawai‘i (external evaluators), Honolulu Academy of Arts: Art to Go Program, Honolulu Zoo Society: Zoo to You Outreach Program, Renaissance Learning, and Mad Science of Hawai‘i.

The following partners named in the grant proposal did not work with the Campbell sub-grantee in Project Year 3, Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID), Drug Free Hawai‘i, Hale Pono Boys and Girls Club of ‘Ewa Beach, and sailors from USS Port Royal. However, the Campbell sub-grantee project director was able to secure other partners that were not named in the grant proposal: Michael Wall DBA (Doing Business As) Playful Percussion, Aloha Amazing Science, Bricks 4 Kidz, Honolulu Theater for Youth, Jeffrey Pagay DBA Airbrush Creations Hawai‘i, and Lorna Dias DBA Dancing Through Exercise. As stated in the Project Year 2 evaluation report (Higa, Sagaysay, Oshiro, & Nakamura, 2011), the project director was very resourceful with securing community partners. There were no reports from project leaders or staff that the differences in partnerships from the grant proposals made a difference in the recruitment of students, attendance, academic achievement, academic behavior, or other intended project implementation or outcomes.

The Implementation of Core Academic Activities

The HIDOE-SPMS (2010) criterion for the implementation of core academic activities was, “100% of centers will offer high-quality services in at least one core academic area, such as reading and literacy, mathematics, and science.” The Campbell sub-grantee met and surpassed this KPI in Project Year 3, implementing core academic activities in reading and literacy and mathematics at moderate to high levels of extent and quality.

Core academic activities (indicator 2.1): *100% of centers will offer high-quality services in at least one core academic area, such as reading and literacy, mathematics, and science.* To examine the core academic activities implemented at each center, the extent to which the activities were implemented, and the quality to which the activities were implemented, we gathered and reviewed data about center activities from the summer of 2011 through SY 2011–12. Campbell sub-grantee centers met the target with

each center delivering services to attendees in at least one core academic area from the summer of 2011 through SY 2011–12. A description of activities for the content area implemented at each center is shown as Appendix B. We present two different categorization displays of the activities. In Table 9, the activities were categorized by the APR activity subject areas as implemented across the centers. Additionally, in Table 10, the activities were categorized by the APR primary and secondary categories as implemented across the centers.

The activities implemented in Project Year 3 were categorized by core subject areas and are shown as Table 9. During the summer of 2011, the center staff at the ‘Ewa, ‘Ewa Beach, Ka‘imiloa, and Keone‘ula centers provided activities in the three core academic areas of reading and literacy, mathematics, and science. Iroquois Point center staff implemented mathematics and science activities. During SY 2011–12, staff at nine centers (‘Ewa, ‘Ewa Beach, Holomua, Iroquois Point, Ka‘imiloa, Pōhākea, Ewa Makai Middle, ‘Ilima Intermediate, and Campbell High) delivered services in two core academic areas of reading/literacy and mathematics. Staff at eight centers delivered services in the core academic area of science.

In addition to collecting descriptive data about categories of activities that were implemented, we collected and analyzed data from center staff regarding the extent of implementation and the quality of implementation of core subject area activities shown as Table 11. Respondents from seven centers reported that reading/literacy activities were implemented at *moderate* to *all or almost all* levels of extent and the quality of implementation was at *moderate* to *very well*. Respondents from eight centers reported that mathematics activities were implemented at *moderate* to *all or almost all* levels of extent and the quality of implementation was at *moderate* to *very well*.

Addressing the needs of individual students. As shown in Table 11, center staff reported addressing individual student needs at *moderate* to *all or almost all* levels of extent and *moderate* to *very well* levels of quality.

Findings about the implementation of academic activities, five or fewer respondents. This narrative summarizes the findings about centers or activities where data were provided by five or fewer respondents. We are reporting findings with those minimal levels of respondents to comply with research practices regarding non-publication of personally identifiable information. This narrative is an effort to include the full richness of the data about these activities provided by center staff, contractors, or volunteers. The reader should note that this narrative summarizes the points of view of five or fewer respondents and, therefore, may lack a broad perspective. Additionally, data with these very low levels of respondents and may include some social bias due to an individual’s pressure to positively represent their efforts.

Table 9

*Campbell Sub-grantee in Project Year 3: Categories of Activity Subject Areas and When They were Implemented
(Listed by Number of Subject Area Category)*

Center	Activity subject area categories (Summ = Subject category for the summer of 2011. SY = Subject category for SY 2011–12.)								
	Core academic areas				Academic enrichment areas				
	Reading or literacy	Mathematics	Science	Arts and music	Entrepreneurial education	Technology or telecommunications	Cultural activities or social studies	Health or nutrition	Other ^a
‘Ewa El.	Summ: 6 SY: 4	Summ: 6 SY: 5	Summ: 10 SY: 8	Summ: 10 SY: 4	0	0	Summ: 4 SY: 2	Summ: 7 SY: 1	0
‘Ewa Beach El.	Summ: 2 SY: 8	Summ: 4 SY: 10	Summ: 1 SY: 4	Summ: 4 SY: 8	SY: 2	0	Summ: 3 SY: 10	0	SY: 1
Holomua El.	SY: 4	SY: 4	SY: 1	SY: 2	0	SY: 1	0	0	0
Iroquois Point El.	SY: 2	Summ: 3 SY: 3	Summ: 2 SY: 1	Summ: 2 SY: 2	0	Summ: 1 SY: 2	SY: 1	Summ: 2	Summ: 2
Ka‘imiloa El.	Summ: 1 SY: 7	Summ: 1 SY: 5	Summ: 1 SY: 3	Summ: 3 SY: 5	0	SY: 2	0	Summ: 2 SY: 1	0
Keone‘ula El.	Summ: 2	Summ: 1	Summ: 1	Summ: 2	0	Summ: 1	0	0	0
Pōhākea El.	SY: 3	SY: 3	SY: 2	SY: 1	0	SY: 2	0	0	SY: 3
‘Ewa Makai Mid	SY: 2	SY: 3	SY: 1	SY: 3	0	SY: 2	SY: 3	0	0
‘Ilima Inter.	SY: 3	SY: 3	SY: 2	0	0	0	SY: 2	0	SY: 1
Campbell Hi.	SY: 2	SY: 2	0	SY: 1	0	SY: 1	SY: 1	0	0
TOTALS	Summ: 11 SY: 35	Summ: 15 SY: 38	Summ: 15 SY: 22	Summ: 21 SY: 26	SY: 2	Summ: 2 SY: 10	Summ: 7 SY: 19	Summ: 11 SY: 2	Summ: 2 SY: 5

(Table 9

*Categories of Activities and When They were Implemented at the Campbell subgrantee 21st CCLC Centers in SY 2011–12
(Listed by Number of Activities per Primary and Secondary Activity Category), continued)*

Note. The categories were defined on the 21st CCLC Annual Performance Report (Learning Point Associates, n.d.). Some activities were placed in more than one subject category.

^aThe following are additional information regarding the data in the “Other” category.

‘Ewa Beach Elem.

Other: SY: 1 = “Kinesthetic Learning” for the Sibling Homework Center activity.

Iroquois Point Elem.

Other: Summ: 2 = “Physical Education” for the Dance and P.E. activities.

Pōhākea Elem.

Other: SY: 3 = “Basketball skills and teamwork” for the Basketball Enrichment activity; “Cheerleading skills and teamwork” for the Cheerleading Enrichment activity; “Volleyball skills and teamwork” for the Volleyball Enrichment activity

‘Ilima Inter.

Other: SY: 1 = “None of the categories listed in the APR C7 form applied” for the Zumbatomic (Zumba for kids 4-12) activity. \

Table 10

*Campbell Sub-grantee in Project Year 3: Categories of Activities and When They were Implemented
(Listed by Number of Activities per Primary and Secondary Activity Category)*

Center	Primary activity categories and secondary activity categories (Summ1= Primary activity category for the summer of 2011. Summ2 = Secondary activity category for the summer of 2011. SY1 = Primary activity category for School Year 2011–12. SY2 = Secondary activity category for School Year 2011–12.)							
	Homework help	Tutorial	Academic enrichment	Recreational	Career or job training for youth	Community service or service learning	Other ^a	Activity had more than two program elements
‘Ewa El.	SY2: 4	Summ1: 4 SY1: 4	Summ1: 7 SY1: 4	Summ1: 1 SY1: 1	0	0	Summ2: 7 SY2: 2	Summ1: 1
‘Ewa Beach El.	Summ2: 4 SY2: 1	SY1: 2	Summ1: 4 SY1: 9 SY2: 1	0	SY2: 1	SY2: 1		SY2: 1
Holomua El.	SY2: 2	SY1: 2	SY1: 3	SY2: 3	0	0	0	0
Iroquois Point El.	SY2: 2	SY1: 2	Summ1: 1 SY1: 1	Summ1: 5 SY1: 1	0	0	Summ2: 1 SY2: 1	0
Ka‘imiloa El.	SY2: 11	SY2: 5	Summ1: 1 SY1: 9 SY2: 1	Summ1: 2 SY1: 1 SY2: 1	0	0	Summ2: 3 SY2: 5	SY1: 1
Keone‘ula El.	0	Summ1: 3	Summ1: 2 Summ2: 2	0	0	0	0	0
Pōhākea El.	SY2: 2	SY2: 2	SY1: 4	SY1: 4	0	0	SY2: 6	0
‘Ewa Makai Mid.	SY2: 1	SY2: 1	SY1: 3	SY1: 2	0	0	SY2: 2	0
‘Ilima Inter.	SY1: 1 SY2: 1	SY1: 1 SY2: 3	SY1: 2	SY1: 1	0	0	0	0
Campbell Hi.	SY2: 2	SY1: 2	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	Summ2: 4 SY1: 1 SY2: 26	Summ1: 7 SY1: 13 SY2: 10	Summ1: 15 Summ2: 3 SY1: 35 SY2: 2	Summ1: 8 SY1: 10 SY2: 4	SY2: 1	SY2: 1	Summ2: 11 SY2: 16	Summ1: 1 SY1: 1 SY2: 1

(Table 10

Findings About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities in the Campbell Subgrantee Centers in SY 2011–12, continued)

Note. The categories were defined on the 21st CCLC Annual Performance Report (Learning Point Associates, n.d.). Some activities were placed in more than one primary activity category or secondary activity category. Keone‘ula Elementary Center only provided activities during the summer of 2011.

^aThe following are additional information regarding the data in the “Other” category.

‘Ewa Elem.

Other: Summ2: 7 = “Introduce first experience of elementary school” for the following activities: Kickstart 2011, Bricks 4 Kidz, Mad Science Dinosaurs, Mad Science Electricity, Mad Science Seeking Our Senses, Art to Go Printmaking, Playful Percussion with Michael Wall

Other: SY2: 2 = “Parent Workshop Grades 3 & 4” for the Mad Science Mineral Mania activity; “Parent Workshop Grades 5 & 6” for the Mad Science Optical Illusions activity

Iroquois Point Elem.

Other: Summ2: 1 = “Health/P.E.” for the Dance activity

Other: SY2: 1 = “Art” for the Art activity

Ka‘imiloa Elem.

Other: Summ2: 3 = “Rituals and routines of the Kindergarten program” for the Kick Start activity; Dance and music for the Hip Hop and Playful Percussion activities

Other: SY2: 5 = “Art” for the Art Session I activity; “Science, Math, Language Arts” for the Enrichment Legos Session 1 and Enrichment Legos Session 2 activities; “Media Technology-putting together a short, simple media production” for the Media Production Session 1 and Media Production Session 2 activities.

Pōhākea Elem.

Other: SY2: 6 = “Basketball skills activities” for the Basketball Enrichment activity; “Cheerleading skills/activities” for the Cheerleading Enrichment activity; “Taiko dance/ drum skills” for the Dance- Taiko 2012 activity; “Media activities” for the Media Enrichment activity; “Robotic activities” for the Robotic Enrichment activity; “Volleyball skills activities” for the Volleyball Enrichment activity.

‘Ewa Makai Middle

Other: SY2: 2 = “Media activities” for the Media Enrichment activity; “Robotic activities” for the Robotic Enrichment activity.

Table 11*Campbell Sub-grantee in Project Year 3: Findings About the Implementation of Reading/Literacy, Mathematics, and Science Activities*

Activity	Average ratings of the <i>extent</i> of implementation (standard deviation)																													
	'Ewa El.			'Ewa Beach El.			Holomua El.			Iroquois Point El.			Ka'imiloa El.			Keone'ula El. ^a			Pōhākea El.			'Ewa Makai El.			'Ilima Inter.			Campbell Hi.		
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
<i>i1.</i> Address students' individual needs (e.g., low achievement, LEP, SPED, behavioral) for improving academic performance.	9	3.7	0.5	6	3.2	0.8	10	3.9	0.3	10	4.0	0	12	3.3	0.6	- ^b	-	-	8	3.3	0.5	- ^b	-	-	8	3.3	0.7	6	3.3	0.5
<i>i2.</i> participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in reading/literacy.	12	3.8	0.5	9	3.7	0.7	8	3.9	0.4	9	3.7	0.5	13	3.5	0.5	- ^b	-	-	10	3.6	0.5	- ^b	-	-	8	3.5	0.8	- ^b	-	-
<i>i3.</i> participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in mathematics	16	3.8	0.4	9	3.7	0.7	10	3.8	0.4	7	4.0	0	17	3.4	0.5	- ^b	-	-	8	3.8	0.5	- ^b	-	-	11	3.4	0.7	6	3.7	0.5
<i>i4.</i> participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in science.	12	3.0	0.9	- ^b	-	-	- ^b	-	-	- ^b	-	-	- ^b	-	-	- ^b	-	-	- ^b	-	-	- ^b	-	-	- ^b	-	-	- ^b	-	-

Note. The ratings 1.0 = none or very little; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = all or almost all for extent. The shaded cells indicate average item ratings of 3.0 and above which is interpreted as moderate to high levels of implementation.

^aOnly provided activities during the summer of 2011.

^b*n* is less than or equal to 5 and has been reported within the report narrative.

The *n* for each activity is different because the number of staff members who implemented each activity varied at each center.

(Table 11*Categories of Activities and When They were Implemented at the Campbell Sub-grantee Centers in SY 2011–12, continued)*

Activity	Average ratings of the <i>quality</i> of implementation (standard deviation)																													
	'Ewa El.			'Ewa Beach El.			Holomua El.			Iroquois Point El.			Ka'imiloa El.			Keone'ula El. ^a			Pōhākea El.			'Ewa Makai Mid.			'Ilima Inter.			Campbell Hi.		
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
<i>i1.</i> Address students' individual needs (e.g., low achievement, LEP, SpEd, behavioral) for improving academic performance.	9	3.4	0.5	6	3.0	0.6	10	3.9	0.3	10	3.8	0.4	12	3.3	0.5	^b	–	–	8	3.3	0.5	^b	–	–	8	3.5	0.9	6	3.2	0.8
<i>i2.</i> participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in reading/literacy.	12	3.8	0.5	9	3.6	0.5	8	4.0	0	9	3.7	0.5	13	3.3	0.5	^b	–	–	10	3.4	0.5	^b	–	–	8	3.3	1.0	^b	–	–
<i>i3.</i> participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in mathematics	16	3.8	0.4	9	3.7	0.5	10	4.0	0	6	3.8	0.4	17	3.4	0.5	^b	–	–	8	3.8	0.5	^b	–	–	11	3.5	0.8	6	3.3	0.8
<i>i4.</i> participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in science.	12	3.3	0.7	^b	–	–	^b	–	–	6	3.0	0.6	^b	–	–	^b	–	–	^b	–	–	^b	–	–	^b	–	–	^b	–	–

Note. 1.0 = poor; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = very well for quality. The shaded cells indicate average item ratings of 3.0 and above which is interpreted as moderate to high levels of implementation.

^aOnly provided activities during the summer of 2011.

^b*n* is less than or equal to 5 and has been reported within the report narrative.

Items 3 and 4 for Iroquois Point have smaller *n* sizes for quality of implementation than extent of implementation because not all respondents who rated the extent also rated the quality.

The data presented in this narrative was omitted from tables with similar data, but higher counts of respondents. In this case, the data here were omitted from Tables 11 and 11a. The evaluators omitted the findings overall in cases with five or fewer respondents so that the narrative may include a description of the findings across all centers (if there were low counts of respondents from centers to address implementation of one content area), or findings across all content areas (if there were low counts of respondents from one center to address implementation across multiple content areas). In this case, there were five or fewer counts of respondents from the Keone‘ula, ‘Ewa Makai Middle, and Campbell High centers across at least two of the three academic areas. Therefore, those findings are reported here instead of Tables 11 and 11a. There were also five or fewer counts of respondents from most of the centers for the science content area; therefore findings across all centers about implementation of science are reported here instead of Tables 11 and 11a.

Findings for the ‘Ewa Makai Middle and Campbell High centers, suggest that reading, mathematics, and science activities were implemented at *moderate* to *high* extent and quality in 2011–12. Additionally, center staff, contractors, and volunteers, reported addressing students’ individual needs for improving academic performance at moderate to high extent and quality.

The findings about the extent of implementation of science activities in Project Year 3 suggest that the levels were *moderate* to *high* at the ‘Ewa , ‘Ewa Beach, Holomua, Keone‘ula, ‘Ewa Makai Middle, and Campbell High centers. The extent of implementation of science activities were *mediocre* at the ‘Ewa Beach, Iroquois Point, Ka‘imiloa, and ‘Ilima Intermediate centers. There were no reported science activities for the Pōhakea center. The quality of implementation was *moderate* to *high* at all centers, except the Pōhakea center where no science activities were implemented.

The Implementation of Academic Enrichment Activities

Descriptive data about enrichment activities implemented in Project Year 3 are shown in Table 9. We reviewed the data about the categories of the enrichment activities to determine whether 100% of project centers met the implementation objective of providing enrichment activities to center attendees. Data about the extent to which the enrichment activities were implemented, and the quality to which the activities were implemented are provided in this report as formative feedback to project leaders.

Enrichment and support activities (indicator 2.2). 100% of centers will offer enrichment and support activities such as nutrition and health, art, music, technology, and recreation. The Campbell sub-grantee met this indicator in Project Year 3, with each center implementing enrichment activities.

Findings about the implementation of academic enrichment activities, reported by five or fewer respondents. This narrative summarizes the findings about centers where data were provided by

five or fewer respondents. We are reporting findings with those minimal levels of respondents in this narrative format instead of data tables to comply with research practices regarding non-publication of personally identifiable information. This narrative is an effort to include the full richness of the data about these activities provided by center staff, contractors, or volunteers. The reader should note that this narrative summarizes the points of view of five or fewer respondents and, therefore, may lack a broad perspective. Additionally, data with these very low levels of respondents and may include some social bias to individual's pressure to positively represent their efforts.

All 10 centers implemented telecommunications or technology activities. Respondents reported that the extent and quality of implementation were moderate to high at seven centers ('Ewa, 'Ewa Beach, Holomua, Ka'imiloa, Pōhākea, 'Ewa Makai Middle, and Campbell High). The extent of implementation was mediocre and the quality was moderate at the Iroquois Point and Keone'ula centers. At the 'Ilima Intermediate center, the extent of implementation was moderate and quality was mediocre. In Project Year 3, nine of the 10 centers implemented art and/or music activities. Respondents reported that the extent and quality of implementation were moderate to high at five centers ('Ewa, 'Ewa Beach, Ka'imiloa, Keone'ula, 'Ilima Intermediate). The extent of implementation was at a mediocre level and quality of implementation was mediocre at three centers ('Ewa Beach, Iroquois Point, Pōhākea). Respondents reported low extent and quality of implementation at the Campbell High center for art or music activities. There were no art or music activities reported for the 'Ewa Makai center in Project Year 3.

Health and nutrition activities were implemented at five centers ('Ewa 'Ewa Beach, Holomua, Iroquois Point, Ka'imiloa). Three centers ('Ewa, Holomua, Iroquois Point) implemented health and nutrition activities at moderate to high extent and quality. One center ('Ewa Beach) implemented health and nutrition activities at mediocre extent and quality. One center (Ka'imiloa) implemented the activities at mediocre extent and moderate quality. The Keone'ula center implemented health and nutrition activities at low extent and high quality.

Sports activities were implemented at nine of the 10 centers (the exception was Campbell High). Three centers (Holomua, Iroquois Point, and Pōhākea) implemented sports activities at moderate to high extent and quality. Four centers ('Ewa, Ka'imiloa, Keone'ula) implemented sports activities at mediocre extent, and moderate to high quality. The 'Ilima center implemented sports activities at mediocre extent and quality. Respondents reported that the 'Ewa Beach center implemented sports activities at low-mediocre extent and mediocre quality. Respondents for the 'Ewa Makai Middle center did not provide information about the extent to which sports activities were implemented, but reported that the activities were reported at mediocre to moderate levels.

Cultural or social studies activities were implemented at eight of the 10 centers in Project Year 3 (the exceptions are Keone‘ula and ‘Ewa Makai Middle). At six centers (‘Ewa, ‘Ewa Beach, Holomua, Ka‘imiloa, ‘Ilima Intermediate, and Campbell High), the cultural or social studies activities were implemented at moderate to high extent and quality. At the Pōhākea center, the cultural or social studies activities were implemented at mediocre to moderate extent and moderate quality. At the Iroquois Point center, the activities were implemented at mediocre extent and quality.

Entrepreneurial activities were reported for one center only, ‘Ilima Intermediate. This category of activities was reported as implemented at high extent and quality.

Service learning activities were reported as implemented at two centers, ‘Ewa Makai Middle and Campbell High. The ‘Ewa Makai center was reported as implementing service learning activities at mediocre extent and mediocre quality. The Campbell High center was reported as implementing service learning activities at moderate extent and high quality.

Support for academic behaviors. Data were collected from center staff members about the extent and quality of implementation of activities, discussions, and behavioral reinforcement for attendee behaviors. There were low numbers of respondents about activities to improve positive behaviors, therefore, we are providing narrative reports of findings only. The reader should note that this narrative summarizes the points of view of five or fewer respondents and, therefore, may lack a broad perspective. Additionally, data with these very low levels of respondents and may include some social bias to individual’s pressure to positively represent their efforts. Although there were more than five respondents for three centers (‘Ewa, Iroquois Point, and Ka‘imiloa), the findings for these three centers are included here so that the narrative may include a description of the findings across all centers.

The data presented in this narrative was in response to one item on the on-line questionnaire, “discuss appropriate positive behavior and reinforce the behaviors.” Center staff, contractors, or volunteers who directly implemented activities were asked to respond on four-point rating scales, the extent to which such activities were implemented, and the quality to which such activities were implemented.

The findings suggest that extent and quality of implementation of activities to improve student behaviors were moderate to high at nine of the 10 centers (the exception was ‘Ilima Intermediate). At the ‘Ilima Intermediate center, there was mediocre extent of implementation and moderate quality of implementation.

Community involvement (indicator 2.3): 85% of centers will establish and maintain partnerships within the community that continue to increase levels of community collaboration in planning, implementing, and sustaining programs. The Campbell sub-grantee met this indicator in Project Year 3. Based on the APR data collected, 100% of Campbell sub-grantee centers established or maintained partnerships with community organizations. Two partners, Renaissance Learning and CRDG pro-

vided services to the entire Campbell sub-grantee. Eight centers (‘Ewa, ‘Ewa Beach, Holomua, Iroquois Point, Ka‘imiloa, Keone‘ula, Pōhākea, ‘Ilima Intermediate) had contracted one to nine additional partners per center. Two centers (‘Ewa Makai Middle, Campbell High) did not have any additional partners.

Services to parents and other adult family members (indicator 2.4): Services to parents and other adult community members: 85% of centers will offer services to parents, senior citizens, and other adult community members. Based on SY 2011–12 APR data, seven (77.8%) of the nine centers implemented activities to involve parents and adult family members. There were low levels of responses about services to parents and other adult family members, therefore, the findings are reported in narrative format only. The reader should note that this narrative summarizes the points of view of five or fewer respondents and, therefore, may lack a broad perspective. Additionally, data provided by low levels of respondents and may include some bias based on social or individual pressure to positively represent their efforts.

The data presented in this narrative was in response to one item on the on-line questionnaire, “parents of students who participate in the centers also receive support/guidance from centers.” Center staff, contractors, or volunteers who directly implemented activities were asked to respond on four-point rating scales, the extent to which such activities were implemented, and the quality to which such activities were implemented. Five or fewer respondents at six centers (‘Ewa, ‘Ewa Beach, Holomua, Iroquois Point, Keone‘ula, and Campbell High) reported that parent activities were implemented at the centers. There were no responses about parent activities at four centers: Ka‘imiloa, Pōhākea, ‘Ewa Makai Middle, and ‘Ilima Intermediate.

The findings suggest that extent and quality of implementation of parent activities were moderate to high at six centers: ‘Ewa, ‘Ewa Beach, Holomua, Iroquois Point, Keone‘ula, and Campbell High.

Are the project activities interesting and valuable to students, teachers, administrators, and community partners? Descriptive data about project activities were provided by center coordinators on APR Form C-7. The descriptions included a primary and a secondary subject area for each activity. To gather evaluative data about the implemented activities, an evaluator-developed, on-line questionnaire was administered to center staff, contractors, or volunteers who implemented center activities to gather their evaluative perceptions about the extent and quality of implementation of project activities.

We referred to both sets of data to determine the intentionality of design for project activities. As shown in Table 10, the top three primary categories for the summer of 2011 activities were academic enrichment, recreation, and tutorial. The top three secondary categories were other, homework help, and academic enrichment. During SY 2011–12, the top three primary categories for activities were academic enrichment, tutorial, and recreation. The top three secondary categories were homework help, tutorial, and other. Among primary and secondary categories, the sub-grantee showed lower numbers of activities tar-

geted under career or job training for youth and community service or service learning. As shown in Table 9, the Campbell sub-grantee provided the majority of activities targeted at the core academic areas of reading or literacy, mathematics, and science during the summer of 2011 and SY 2011–12, with the enrichment activity area of arts and music also provided at a high level. The sub-grantee also targeted academic enrichment activities in categories of cultural activities or social studies, and technology or telecommunications during the summer of 2011 and SY 2011–12.

The sub-grantee provided 11 health or nutrition activities during the summer of 2011 and provided two health or nutrition activities during SY 2011–12. Among core and academic enrichment activity categories, the activity implemented at the lowest number was two entrepreneurial education activities provided at ‘Ewa Beach center. Based on the descriptive data summarized in Tables 9 and 10 about sub-grantee activities, the evaluators addressed the project objectives regarding implementation of core and enrichment activities required under the grant.

In addition, we reviewed center attendance data for the purpose of determining the percentage of attendees at each center whose attendance was for 30 or more days. Although the retention of attendees measured through their center attendance provides only a tenuous indicator of an attendee’s interest in the center’s project or activities, the percentage of those attendees whose attendance meets the federal criterion of a regular attendee is an indicator of a center’s ability to enroll and retain its target students. Based on our review of the data shown in Table 6, the following centers had percentages of regular attendees to total center attendees greater than 50%: Pōhākea (80%), Holomua (72%), ‘Ilima Intermediate (62%), and Ka‘imiloa (52%). The percentages of regular attendees at the remaining centers were less than 50%: ‘Ewa Beach (49%), Campbell High (31%), Iroquois Point (27%), ‘Ewa Makai Middle (19%), ‘Ewa (13%) and Keone‘ula (0%). Across Campbell sub-grantee centers, we found 46% of the 1,161 attendees were regular attendees. Although the measurement is tenuous, regular attendance of center attendees indicated the project’s ability to retain and affect the targeted student population.

What challenges were faced in implementation and how were they addressed? The Campbell sub-grantee centers faced a number of challenges to project implementation, including continued participation of attendees at some centers, increased staff oversight to meet the requirements of the federal school nutrition snack program, and developing and maintaining community-based partnerships. Several center coordinators reported challenges in continued participation of attendees. The center coordinators acknowledged that attendees were sometimes torn between attending the centers or other activities that were offered at the same time such as organized sports programs in the community. Several center coordinators reported plans to increase enrollment through outreach in the host schools by enlisting day school teachers for referrals, making inquiries about students who need additional academic assistance, and sending informational notices to parents and families describing the centers. Center coordinators also reported

increased staff time dedicated to meeting the reporting requirements of the federal snack program implemented at six centers. Several centers reorganized staff duties during snack distribution to meet national school lunch program requirements.

Findings about Outcomes in Project Year 3

The evaluation of outcomes addresses the HIDOE-SPMS KPIs and the program performance indicators established by the USDE for the 21st CCLC program. The evaluation questions for the study of outcomes are (a) “What changes were found in regular center students’ academic behaviors as reported by their language arts or mathematics day classroom teachers?” and (b) “What changes were found in regular center students’ academic performance as reported by their language arts or mathematics day classroom teachers?”

As a reminder, the Keone‘ula center was open during the summer of 2011 only, therefore, this center did not have regular attendees. Five of the 10 centers implemented activities during the summer of 2011.

Findings about Academic Behavior

After excluding data for regular attendees who did not need improvement and when data were not provided (missing data), data about regular attendees’ academic behavior collected with the 21st CCLC teacher survey were analyzed as counts, percentages, means, and standard deviations. The findings for all nine centers with regular attendees are shown as Table 12. Of the 10 items on the teacher survey, four items were designated by the HIDOE-SPMS state program manager as KPIs with the criterion of 75% or more of regular attendees reported as improving in (a) turning in his or her homework on time, (b) participating in class, (c) attending class regularly, and (d) behaving well in class. These four items designated as KPIs are shown in bold face in Table 12. We applied the 75% improvement criterion to all 10 academic behaviors on the teacher survey and indicated those centers where the outcome objectives were met by shaded cells in Table 12.

Findings by KPI (highest to lowest). As shown in Table 12, the Campbell sub-grantee did not meet the 75% criterion level for any of the KPIs. The highest count of centers meeting the 75% improvement for a KPI was for “participating in class” (seven centers): ‘Ewa (85%), ‘Ewa Beach (83%), Holomua (80%), Iroquois Point (96%), Ka‘imiloa (90%), Pōhākea (76%), and Campbell High (95%). The 75% improvement criterion was met for “turning in his or her homework on time” at four centers: Iroquois Point (83%), Ka‘imiloa (92%), ‘Ilima Intermediate (80%), and Campbell High (100%). The 75% improvement criterion was met for “behaving well in class” at three centers: ‘Ewa (75%), Iroquois Point

Table 12

Campbell Sub-grantee in Project Year 3: Overall Findings of the Teacher Survey About Student Academic Behavior

N and % of regular students showing improvement in behavior
(The statistics are based on the number of regular students from the center whose teachers reported as needing improvement in their academic behavior. The behaviors in bold print were designated as key performance behaviors by the HIDEO-SPMS section.)¹

Changed behavior in terms of...	‘Ewa El.	‘Ewa Beach El.	Holomua El.	Iroquois Point El.	Ka‘imiloa El.	Pōhākea El.	‘Ewa Makai Mid.	‘Ilima Inter.	Campbell Hi.
turning in his or her homework on time (KPI)	10 (71%) n=14	43 (69%) n=62	24 (67%) n=36	20 (83%) n=24	33 (92%) n=36	57 (73%) n=78	5 (71%) n=7	24 (80%) n=30	22 (100%) n=22
completing homework to your satisfaction	11 (79%) n=14	54 (76%) n=71	41 (84%) n=49	22 (88%) n=25	47 (92%) n=51	82 (78%) n=105	6 (86%) n=7	22 (73%) n=30	21 (100%) n=21
participating in class (KPI)	11 (85%) n=13	52 (83%) n=63	39 (80%) n=49	26 (96%) n=27	57 (90%) n=63	94 (76%) n=124	2 (50%) n=4	22 (71%) n=31	19 (95%) n=20
volunteering (e.g., for extra credit or more responsibilities)	3 (25%) n=12	18 (45%) n=40	27 (57%) n=47	13 (76%) n=17	15 (56%) n=27	57 (56%) n=101	2 (33%) n=6	18 (60%) n=30	16 (94%) n=17
attending class regularly (KPI)	3 (60%) n=5	16 (48%) n=33	12 (52%) n=23	5 (50%) n=10	7 (47%) n=15	26 (47%) n=55	0 n=2	6 (35%) n=17	14 (100%) n=14
being attentive in class	9 (75%) n=12	42 (67%) n=63	30 (73%) n=41	21 (88%) n=24	45 (79%) n=57	71 (72%) n=99	2 (50%) n=4	21 (70%) n=30	19 (100%) n=19
behaving well in class (KPI)	6 (75%) n=8	27 (53%) n=51	17 (68%) n=25	16 (80%) n=20	20 (71%) n=28	51 (62%) n=82	2 (50%) n=4	10 (59%) n=17	13 (93%) n=14
academic performance	16 (94%) n=17	73 (78%) n=93	50 (93%) n=54	28 (93%) n=30	66 (97%) n=68	123 (90%) n=136	6 (86%) n=7	27 (82%) n=33	21 (100%) n=21
coming to school motivated to learn	9 (69%) n=13	31 (56%) n=55	32 (82%) n=39	20 (87%) n=23	20 (77%) n=26	72 (73%) n=99	3 (50%) n=6	20 (71%) n=28	20 (100%) n=20
getting along well with other students	3 (60%) n=5	17 (46%) n=37	17 (77%) n=22	15 (75%) n=20	11 (65%) n=17	44 (66%) n=67	1 (50%) n=2	14 (78%) n=18	20 (95%) n=21

¹The shaded cells indicate centers with improvement of 75% or more of regular attendees, which was the outcome indicator criterion for the key performance indicator (KPI).

Note. KPI = key performance indicator. The key performance indicators were selected by the HIDEO State Program Manager as criteria to be met by each sub-grantee. The criteria for these KPIs are 75% of the regular attendees must show improvement as reported by the English/Language Arts or mathematics day teacher. We have applied the criteria of 75% to all teacher survey items.

(80%), and Campbell High (93%). One center, Campbell High, exceeded the 75% criterion for “attending class regularly,” with 100% of the regular attendees reported as showing improvement.

Findings for non-KPI behaviors. It is heartening to report that at least 75% of regular attendees at all nine Campbell sub-grantee centers were reported as improving on academic performance: ‘Ewa (94%), ‘Ewa Beach (78%), Holomua (93%), Iroquois Point (93%), Ka‘imiloa (97%), Pōhākea (90%), ‘Ewa Makai Middle (86%), ‘Ilima Intermediate (82%), and Campbell High (100%). At eight centers, at least 75% of regular attendees improved on completing homework to the satisfaction of either their English Language Arts or mathematics day teacher: ‘Ewa (79%), ‘Ewa Beach (76%), Holomua (84%), Iroquois Point (88%), Ka‘imiloa (92%), Pōhākea (78%), ‘Ewa Makai (86%), and Campbell High (100%). At least 75% of the regular attendees at four centers improved on being attentive in class: ‘Ewa (75%), Iroquois Point (88%), Ka‘imiloa (79%), and Campbell High (100%). At least 75% of the regular attendees at four centers improved on coming to school motivated to learn: Holomua (82%), Iroquois Point (87%), Ka‘imiloa (77%), and Campbell High (100%). At least 75% of the regular attendees at four centers improved on getting along well with other students: Holomua (77%), Iroquois Point (75%), ‘Ilima Intermediate (78%), and Campbell High (95%). At least 75% of the regular attendees improved in volunteering at the Iroquois Point (76%) and Campbell High (94%) centers.

Findings about meeting the outcome objective, by center. The Campbell High center met the outcome indicator of 75% regular attendees reported as improving on all 10 academic behaviors. The Iroquois Point center’s regular attendees met the 75% criteria for nine behavior items (the exception was attending class regularly). Ka‘imiloa center’s regular attendees met the 75% criterion for six academic behaviors. The ‘Ewa and Holomua centers’ regular attendees met the 75% criterion for five behaviors. Regular attendees at the ‘Ewa Beach, Pōhākea, and ‘Ilima Intermediate centers met the 75% criteria for three academic behaviors. The ‘Ewa Makai Middle regular attendees met the 75% criteria for two academic behaviors. The reader is referred to Table 12 for specific information referred to in this section.

Findings About Academic Achievement

The HIDEOE-SPMS outcome indicator for academic achievement was “60% of regular students will demonstrate improvement in reading/language arts and/or math.” Two types of data were collected to examine the levels of regular attendees’ academic achievement during Project Year 3: (a) Fall and Spring semester report card grades in reading/language arts and mathematics, and (b) pre-post reading and mathematics assessments administered in the centers’ host schools. Center staff reported changes in regular attendees’ report card semester grades when the grades increased one-half grade or more, decreased one-half grade or more, or no change. Changes in pre-post assessment scores were reported when the post-test scores were at least 5% higher or lower than the pre-test scores. The changes in semester report card

grades and changes in pre-post assessment scores were both reported as 1 = increase, 2 = decrease, 3 = no change, 4 = did not need to change, N/A, or no data.

60% or more regular attendees improved reading/language arts and mathematics grades:

Indicator 4.1a and 4.1b. The Campbell sub-grantee project did not meet the outcome indicator of 60% or more of regular attendee as shown by improvement in reading/language arts or mathematics semester report card grades (see Table 13). Three centers reached or exceeded the 60% criterion for regular attendees who improved in reading/language arts report card grades: ‘Ewa Beach (63%), Iroquois Point (70%), and Pōhākea (63%). Two centers, Iroquois Point (79%) and Pōhākea (73%), reached or exceeded the 60% criterion of regular attendees who improved their mathematics report card grades.

60% or more regular attendees improved reading/language arts and mathematics pre-post assessment scores. At times, host schools did not administer language arts or mathematics pre-post assessments that met the HIDOE-SPMS criteria of being (a) administered in the center’s host schools within the school year, (b) school- or grade-level assessments that were administered for school purposes (not for center purposes), (c) commercially developed and administered as instructed by the developers, (d) may be different for each grade level within the school, and (e) supported by literature that shows appropriate psychometric qualities of the assessment.

The Campbell sub-grantee did not meet this outcome indicator in Project Year 3. The data about changes in regular attendees’ pre-post assessment scores are shown as Table 13. The shaded cells indicate when the centers met the outcome indicator of *60% or more regular attendees improved reading/ language arts or mathematics pre-post assessment scores*. Five centers reported 60% or more regular attendees improving their scores between the pre- and post assessment in reading/language arts at ‘Ewa Beach (63%), Holomua (82%), Iroquois Point (88%), Ka’imiloa (100%), and Campbell High (95%). One center (Campbell High) reported 60% regular attendees increased pre-post assessment mathematics scores.

Dissemination of Results to the Public

At the time this report was written, the HIDOE’s website included a page for the 21st CCLC program at <http://doe.k12.hi.us/nclb/21cclc/>. Through the HIDOE web page, all sub-grantee external evaluation reports were made available to the public. Additionally, the Pōhākea center’s host school included 21st CCLC information on its website.

Table 13

Campbell Sub-grantee in Project Year 3: Changes in Course Grades and School-Based Assessments for Regular Attendees

Center (Number of regular attendees)	Changes in Language Arts grades ^{a, b}	Changes in pre-post test Language Arts scores ^{a, b}	Changes in Mathematics grades ^{a, b}	Changes in pre-post test Mathematics score ^{a, b}
‘Ewa El. (N = 20)	Improved: 4 (21%) No change: 13 (68%) Went down: 2 (11%) Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 1	Improved: N/A No change: N/A Went down: N/A Did not need to improve: N/A N/A: 20 No data: N/A	Improved: 5 (26%) No change: 11 (58%) Went down: 3 (16%) Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 1	Improved: N/A No change: N/A Went down: N/A Did not need to improve: N/A N/A: 20 No data: N/A
‘Ewa Beach El. (N = 103)	Improved: 61 (63%) No change: 34 (35%) Went down: 2 (2%) Did not need to improve: 5 N/A: 0 No data: 1	Improved: 61 (63%) No change: 34 (35%) Went down: 2 (2%) Did not need to improve: 5 N/A: 0 No data: 1	Improved: 54 (56%) No change: 36 (37%) Went down: 7 (7%) Did not need to improve: 4 N/A: 0 No data: 2	Improved: N/A No change: N/A Went down: N/A Did not need to improve: N/A N/A: 103 No data: N/A
Holomua El. (N = 70)	Improved: 33 (50%) No change: 28 (42%) Went down: 5 (8%) Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 4	Improved: 31 (82%) No change: 3 (8%) Went down: 4 (11%) Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 29 No data: 3	Improved: 20 (30%) No change: 34 (52%) Went down: 12 (18%) Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 4	Improved: N/A No change: N/A Went down: N/A Did not need to improve: N/A N/A: 70 No data: N/A
Iroquois Point El. (N = 33)	Improved: 23 (70%) No change: 9 (27%) Went down: 1 (3%) Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 0	Improved: 29 (88%) No change: 1 (3%) Went down: 3 (9%) Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 0	Improved: 26 (79%) No change: 6 (18%) Went down: 1 (3%) Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 0	Improved: N/A No change: N/A Went down: N/A Did not need to improve: N/A N/A: 33 No data: N/A
Ka‘imiloa El. (N = 79)	Improved: 23 (30%) No change: 47 (61%) Went down: 7 (9%) Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 2	Improved: 79 (100%) No change: 0 Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 0	Improved: 34 (44%) No change: 38 (49%) Went down: 5 (6%) Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 2	Improved: N/A No change: N/A Went down: N/A Did not need to improve: N/A N/A: 79 No data: N/A
Keone‘ula El. (N = 0)	No 30-day students. This center was open during the summer of 2011 only.			

(Table 13*Campbell Sub-grantee in Project Year 3: Changes in Course Grades and School-Based Assessments for Regular Attendees, continued)*

Center (Number of regular attendees)	Changes in Language Arts grades ^{a, b}	Changes in pre-post test Language Arts scores ^{a, b}	Changes in Mathematics grades ^{a, b}	Changes in pre-post test Mathematics score ^{a, b}
Pōhākea El. (<i>N</i> = 150)	Improved: 74 (63%) No change: 41 (35%) Went down: 2 (2%) Did not need to improve: 15 N/A: 0 No data: 3	Improved: 63 (56%) No change: 41 (36%) Went down: 9 (8%) Did not need to improve: 31 N/A: 0 No data: 6	Improved: 101 (73%) No change: 38 (27%) Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 8 N/A: 0 No data: 3	Improved: N/A No change: N/A Went down: N/A Did not need to improve: N/A N/A: 150 No data: N/A
‘Ewa Makai Mid. (<i>N</i> = 13)	Improved: 3 (25%) No change: 7 (58%) Went down: 2 (17%) Did not need to improve: 1 N/A: 0 No data: 0	Improved: N/A No change: N/A Went down: N/A Did not need to improve: N/A N/A: 13 No data: N/A	Improved: 3 (25%) No change: 4 (33%) Went down: 5 (42%) Did not need to improve: 1 N/A: 0 No data: 0	Improved: N/A No change: N/A Went down: N/A Did not need to improve: N/A N/A: 13 No data: N/A
‘Ilima Inter. (<i>N</i> = 47)	Improved: 19 (43%) No change: 17 (39%) Went down: 8 (18%) Did not need to improve: 3 N/A: 0 No data: 1	Improved: N/A No change: N/A Went down: N/A Did not need to improve: N/A N/A: 48 No data: N/A	Improved: 15 (24%) No change: 20 (45%) Went down: 9 (20%) Did not need to improve: 3 N/A: 0 No data: 1	Improved: N/A No change: N/A Went down: N/A Did not need to improve: N/A N/A: 48 No data: N/A
Campbell Hi. (<i>N</i> = 22)	Improved: 9 (47%) No change: 9 (47%) Went down: 1 (5%) Did not need to improve: 3 N/A: 0 No data: 0	Improved: 21 (95%) No change: 0 Went down: 1 (5%) Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 0	Improved: 5 (33%) No change: 8 (53%) Went down: 2 (13%) Did not need to improve: 7 N/A: 0 No data: 0	Improved: 12 (60%) No change: 1 (5%) Went down: 7 (35%) Did not need to improve: 2 N/A: 0 No data: 0

Note. The shaded cells indicate the centers where 60% or more of regular attendees improved course grades or pre- post-assessment scores.

^aCounts for *Did not need to improve* excluded from the denominator used to calculate percentages.

^bN/A indicates the number of center students whose grades were unavailable, who were not administered assessment tests by the day school, or whose assessment data were unusable for this evaluation.

Conclusions and Recommendations

In Project Year 3, the Campbell sub-grantee project was a well-implemented, maturing project. The project was well aligned with the grant proposal, except for changes in some community partners. We found that the project responded to match the needs of attendees with the capabilities and resources of partners and well-advised changes to the intended plan. An important step in Project Year 3 was that the project director engaged the support of HIDOE Resource Teachers to review formative assessment data about the center students in an effort to better understand their academic needs and improve how those needs are addressed in the centers. The expected effects from the intended implementation were not highly evident in the performance measures of semester report card grades and pre-post assessments administered in the host schools. There were about equal numbers of regular attendees in Project Year 2 and in Project Year 3 (537 regular attendees in Project Year 2, 538 regular attendees in Project Year 3), and there were about equal percentages of regular attendees who improved in their language arts report card grades (52% in Project Year 2, 50% in Project Year 3) and mathematics report card grades (59% in Project Year 2, 52% in Project Year 3) between Fall and Spring semesters.

Based on the data and findings of this report, we provide the following recommendations, which are also shown in Table 14.

- Although the data showed that the Campbell sub-grantee did not meet all four academic behavior KPIs, the centers were barely under the target for regular attendees' improvement in participation in class (8 of 10 centers). This is very encouraging because participation in class is an important academic behavior to build on for academic achievement; it is a behavioral indicator of student engagement with the learning process.
- For the academic behavior of submitting homework on time, the day teachers reported 71.1% of positive change in the regular center students' behavior. This was less than the previous year's improvement in the same behavior of 75.9% and just barely under the target of 75%. Theoretically, as students' academic behaviors improve, it is assumed that their academic achievement will improve. Homework assistance is reported as implemented at high extent and quality across all centers, and we are concerned that day teachers at only four centers reported 75% of the regular attendees turned in homework on time. Based on this finding, we recommend that the center leaders explore ways to address this issue. Perhaps center staff can work with center attendees to log a description of the homework that was addressed during center time, including the date presented and completed, and day teachers can review the log and check off or include a short comment to communicate to center staff that all homework assigned were or were not presented to the center staff. Center attendees may also present

Table 14*Campbell Sub-grantee in Project Year 3: A Summary of Findings, Comments, and Recommendations*

Performance measure	Objective met or not met in Project Year 3	Summary	Recommendations
Implementation objectives			
2.1. 100% of centers will offer high quality services in at least one core academic area, such as reading and literacy, mathematics, and science.	Met	All 10 Campbell centers implemented reading and mathematics at moderate to high extent and quality. Science activities were implemented at moderate to high extent at five centers ('Ewa, Holomua, Keone'ula, 'Ewa Makai Middle, Campbell High). Science activities were implemented at moderate to high quality at nine centers (exception is the 'Ilima center). Some of these findings are based on low levels of responses.	The criteria for the USDE and HODOE were met. Activities were implemented as intended, with the continuation (from Project Year 2) of the sibling class. This is a commendable initiative by the project director. In light of the achievement data, we support and recommend continuing this broader implementation plan for a consistent and sufficient amount of activity time for homework help and tutorials.
2.2. 100% of centers will offer enrichment and support activities such as nutrition and health, art, music, technology, and recreation.	Met	In Project Year 3, 7 of 10 centers implemented telecommunications/technology at moderate to high extent and quality. Cultural/social studies activities were implemented at moderate to high levels extent and quality at 6 to 8 centers. Art or music was implemented at 5 to 8 centers at moderate to high extent and quality. Some of these findings are based on low levels of responses.	The Campbell sub-grantee has continued the pattern of implementing a variety of enrichment activities. Enrichment activities are valuable for students' enjoyment of learning, application of the content areas in practical situations, and development of global and higher-order thinking. We recommend the continued emphasis on enrichment activities with intentional integration of academic components.

(Table 14

Campbell Sub-grantee in Project Year 3: A Summary of Findings, Comments, and Recommendations, continued)

Performance measure	Objective met or not met in Project Year 3	Summary	Recommendations
2.3. 85% of centers will establish and maintain partnerships within the community that continues to increase levels of community collaboration in planning, implementing, and sustaining programs.	Met	100% of the centers established or maintained partnerships with community organizations. Some partnerships that were mentioned in the grant proposal continued to partner with the Campbell sub-grantee in Project Year 3. Other partners mentioned in the grant proposal were replaced by new partners. The project director has been consistently resourceful at networking with community businesses and organizations for the purpose of providing possible partnerships to the centers.	The processes of securing partners are to be continued, as partners can become important to project sustainability. We commend the project director's highly effective efforts at networking to find potential partners and recommend continuing the process of allowing center coordinators to select the most appropriate partners for their centers.
2.4. 85% of centers will offer services to parents, senior citizens, and other adult community members.	Not met	In Project Year 3, seven (77.8%) of the nine centers implemented activities with parents and other adult family members.	The center leaders' efforts have been commendable. The centers should continue their efforts to involve parents and other adult family members in the centers and their children's activities.
2.5. 75% of centers will offer services at least 15 hours per week on average and provide services when school is not in session, such as during summer and holidays.	Not met	The performance measure was not met in Project Year 3. During the summer of 2011, five centers offered activities for two to seven weeks, 16.25 to 27 hours per week. During SY 2011–12, nine centers offered activities for 20 to 37 weeks, 6 to 12.5 hours per week.	We recommend that center leaders continue to look for ways to expand the center hours of operations to meet the performance objective of 15 hours per week. We also recognize that the centers offered high-need students a safe environment during hours when school was not in session, with opportunities for homework assistance, tutorials, enrichment activities, and enhancement of academic behaviors.

(Table 14*Campbell Sub-grantee in Project Year 3: A Summary of Findings, Comments, and Recommendations, continued)*

Performance measure	Objective met or not met in Project Year 3	Summary	Recommendations
3.1. 100% of students are in centers located in high-poverty communities.	Met	The 2000 U.S. Census show that the school community was approaching the state percentage on the two poverty variables of families headed by a single mother and households with public assistance income. Additionally, the host school demographics show approximately half of the population are qualified for free- or reduced-lunch status. The Campbell sub-grantee has enrolled the targeted student population for the 21 st CCLC. Of course, this means that there are challenges for improvement of academic performance and behaviors.	The project leaders are enrolling students from the appropriate target groups as defined by the 21 st CCLC program and students who were referred by teachers. As shown in Table 6, there are high percentages of students with free- and reduced-lunch status enrolled in the centers. These practices should be continued, as they enroll appropriate target groups.
Outcome objectives			
1.1b. 75% of regular program participants will have teacher-reported improvement in classroom participation as shown on the 21 st CCLC teacher survey.	Not met	Overall, the sub-grantee did not meet the KPI. The Campbell sub-grantee made much progress toward this performance measure. This KPI was met at 8 of the 10 centers: ‘Ewa, ‘Ewa Beach, Holomua, Iroquois Point, Ka‘imiloa, Pōhākea, and Campbell High centers.	We recommend that the tutors and staff continue their efforts toward improving students’ academic behavior toward this objective. New tutors should be made aware of this objective and provide opportunities for students to practice participation and discuss with students the importance of participation in day classes.
1.1a. 75% of regular program participants will have teacher-reported improvement in turning in homework on time as shown on the 21 st CCLC teacher survey.	Not met	This KPI was not met by the sub-grantee, overall. However, four individual centers met the KPI: Iroquois Point, Ka‘imiloa, ‘Ilima Intermediate, and Campbell High centers.	We recommend exploring the use of a homework log to help students prioritize their work by date assigned and date due. The log might also be used to communicate with the day teachers about homework assignments worked on with center staff.

(Table 14

Campbell Sub-grantee in Project Year 3: A Summary of Findings, Comments, and Recommendations, continued)

Performance measure	Objective met or not met in Project Year 3	Summary	Recommendations
1.1.c. 75% of regular program participants will have teacher-reported improvement in attending class regularly as shown on the 21 st CCLC teacher survey.	Not met	This KPI was not met at 9 of the 10 centers (met at the Campbell High center only).	We need to highlight the low levels of improvement on this KPI. If students do not attend class, they will not improve on any academic behaviors or academic areas. We strongly recommend that center tutors and staff be made aware of this objective and discuss with center students the importance of regular attendance in the center and day classes.
1.1.d. 75% of regular program participants will have teacher-reported improvement in student classroom behavior as shown on the 21 st CCLC teacher survey.	Not met	This KPI was not met at 7 of the 10 centers (the KPI was met at the ‘Ewa, Iroquois Point, Ka‘imiloa, and Campbell High centers).	We recommend that the tutors are made aware of this objective and work toward improving students’ classroom behavior (a) by aligning behavior expectations and discipline policies of host schools and centers and (b) discussing the behavioral expectations in the center and the day school with the center students.
4.1.a. 60% of regular program participants will have teacher-reported improvement in reading/language arts and mathematics.	Not met	Seven of the 10 centers did not meet this performance objective (met by ‘Ewa Beach, Iroquois Point, and Pōhākea).	We recommend that tutors with teacher-level qualifications lead the homework help and tutorial activities. Tutors with teacher-level qualifications are more likely to understand how to interpret and use formative assessment data to inform their work with individual students. If possible, professional development should be provided to tutors about working with the types of students in the center and with instructional strategies that complement the center environment (small group, ELL, SPED, disadvantaged).

their list of homework assignments to the center staff for assistance with prioritizing their efforts, which should facilitate timely completion of homework assignments.

- We note that the Campbell sub-grantee centers targeted the student populations that aligned with the goals of the 21st CCLC program, “the highest need students.” As shown by the demographic statistics, the Campbell sub-grantee students were from highly disadvantaged backgrounds, and therefore, may have had more challenges than students at other 21st CCLC centers. We recommend that the center staff continue and enhance their efforts to improve center students’ academic behaviors and the Project Year 4 evaluation will include an expanded study of activities implemented to improve students’ academic behaviors. Additionally, at site visits, we will interview project staff to provide improved descriptions of these activities in the next report.
- Homework that is complete and correct is essential to success in school, and we strongly recommend that the Campbell sub-grantee project leaders continue to devote sufficient center time to homework support and tutoring in reading and mathematics in all grade levels. The primary intent of the Campbell sub-grantee project leaders, as expressed within the grant proposal, focused on providing tutoring for reading and mathematics with a range of enrichment activities provided to expand students’ interests and experiences. The homework help and tutorial activities should be facilitated by staff with teaching credentials or the equivalent skills and knowledge to enhance students’ learning experience and provide linkage to the day classroom.

The project leaders may wish to explore the possibility of providing center tutors with professional development opportunities aligned with the needs of Campbell sub-grantee’s center attendees and with the delivery of center services. In Project Year 3, the largest group of center attendees had free- and reduced-lunch status (see Table 6). The centers’ organization and intake for student enrollment have similarities to the Response-to-Intervention Tier 2 level, that is, the centers provide services to many students who need more assistance than can be provided in a regular classroom environment (Johnson, n.d.). Center leaders may consider providing center staff with professional development in working with center attendees in the small group arrangement.

Our final recommendation is that the Campbell sub-grantee staff plan and develop the academic components of the enrichment activities. If enrichment activities are implemented by community partners, a consideration for selecting a partner might be that they implement activities with well-developed academic components. For instance, academic components may be planned and developed to align with the day school programs or those academic components that naturally fit within the enrichment activity. We

want to clarify that we are not discouraging the implementation of enrichment activities for recreational purposes. This is also valuable, particularly for the Campbell sub-grantee target groups. These children need to identify with schools as a place where they belong, enjoy, and are safe and comfortable. They need to regard school staff and other children as people that they like and with whom they can safely and comfortably interact. Students need to feel valued and that they can learn and correctly and ethically apply knowledge. We are, of course, reiterating the intent from the grant proposal, which stated that the environment of the Campbell sub-grantee centers should provide experiences for these children to develop, learn, and grow.

What are the plans to ensure effective program implementation next year? The Campbell sub-grantee project director is and has always been very conscientious about reviewing the project implementation, monitoring outcome status, and collaborating with centers to improve the project. Evaluators found positive indicators of implementation of academic and enrichment activities in Project Year 3, and we expect continued levels of implementation of activities into Project Year 4. Additionally, the project director secured partnerships with three former or current HIDOE Resource Teachers to review sub-grantee data for the purpose of project improvement and has kept communication lines open with us for evaluative findings and recommendations for project improvement.

We will keep communication lines open with the Campbell project leaders to review these Project Year 3 evaluation report findings and recommendations to address any questions and to discuss any foreseeable challenges to implementing the recommendations. Sub-grantee consideration of the recommendations including any foreseeable challenges should be well documented to inform future evaluation efforts. We look forward to these discussions because we are aware that some recommendations are a departure from the project description in the grant proposal. We look forward to this discussion about the new context and possibilities for the Campbell sub-grantee 21st CCLC project.

References

- Campbell sub-grantee. (2011). Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS). *Grantee profile: Campbell Complex objectives*. Retrieved from <http://ppics.learningpt.org/ppics/objectives.asp>
- Hawai'i State Department of Education, Special Programs Management Section (HIDOE-SPMS). (2010). Key performance indicators 21st Century Community Learning Centers: 2010–2011. Hawaii State Department of Education.
- Hawai'i State Department of Education, Special Programs Management Section (HIDOE-SPMS). (2011a, August). Sub-grantee 21st CCLC handbook: SY 2011–12. Hawaii State Department of Education.
- Hawai'i State Department of Education, Special Programs Management Section (HIDOE-SPMS). (2011b, September). 21st CCLC program: Evaluation report template. Hawaii State Department of Education.
- Higa, T. A. F., Sagaysay, L., & Oshiro, E. M. (2011). *The Campbell sub-grantee's 21st Century Community Learning Center project: Campbell Complex, Leeward Complex Area, island of Oahu*. Honolulu, Hawaii: Curriculum Research & Development Group, College of Education, University of Hawaii.
- Higa, T. A. F., Sagaysay, L., Oshiro, E. M., & Nakamura, A. D. H. (2010). *The Campbell Complex's 21st Century Community Learning Center Project—This report covers July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010*. Honolulu, Hawaii: Curriculum Research & Development Group, College of Education, University of Hawaii. Retrieved from <http://doe.k12.hi.us/nclb/21cclc/110412Campbell%20Complex%20Local%20Evaluation%200910.pdf>
- Learning Point Associates. (2012). Teacher Survey. *Profile and Performance Information Collection System*. Retrieved December 27, 2012, from <http://ppics.learningpt.org/ppics/survey.asp>

- Naftzger, N., & Vinson, M. (2011). *21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) Analytic Support for Evaluation and Program Monitoring: An overview of the 21st CCLC performance data: 2009–10* (Seventh Report). Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/21stcclc/performance.html>
- Systems Accountability Office, System Evaluation & Reporting Section. (2008). *Campbell Complex Trend Report: Educational and fiscal accountability*. Honolulu, Hawaii: Hawaii State Department of Education. Retrieved from http://arch.k12.hi.us/PDFs/trends/2007/Leeward/Act51_Complex830.pdf
- Systems Accountability Office, System Evaluation & Reporting Section. (2012). *AYP reports by school: 2012 reports*. Honolulu, Hawaii: Hawaii State Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://arch.k12.hi.us/PDFs/nclb/2012/FinalAYPallSch37Pub20120928.pdf>
- Systems Accountability Office, System Evaluation & Reporting Section. (n.d.). School Status & Improvement Report (SSIR). *Accountability Resource Center Hawaii*. State Education Agency. Retrieved August 9, 2012, from <http://arch.k12.hi.us/school/ssir/ssir.html>
- Title IV, Part B—21st Century Community Learning Centers. (2001). *ED.gov*. Retrieved March 22, 2010, from <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg55.html>
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Academic Improvement and Teacher Quality Programs. (2003, February). *21st Century Community Learning Centers non-regulatory guidance*. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/21stcclc/legislation.html>
- Wilson, J. (2008). *21st Century Community Learning Centers Grant Proposal* (grant proposal). Waipahu.

Appendix A
Evaluation Design

An Evaluation Design for the Campbell Sub-grantee 21st Century Community Learning Center Project: Growing through Engaging and Motivating Students

Beginning in SY 2009–2010, the Campbell sub-grantee implemented the 21st Century Community Learning Center (CCLC) project, also referred to as Growing through Engaging and Motivating Students (GEMS). The Campbell 21st CCLC project leaders contracted us as a team of evaluators from Curriculum Research & Evaluation Group (CRDG) to meet the local evaluation requirements of the grant.

Purposes of the Evaluation

Statutory and regulatory requirements specify criteria for the evaluation of 21st CCLC sub-grantees. The reader is referred to the statute, Title IV, Part B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 as reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) (Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965) and the non-regulatory guidance (U.S. Department of Education [USDE], Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Academic Improvement and Teacher Quality Programs, 2003). The purposes of this evaluation are to (a) fulfill the annual evaluation reporting requirements of the 21st CCLC program, (b) provide feedback to stakeholders for the purposes of project improvement about the extent and quality of implementation of its program components and program outcomes in academic achievement and academic behavior of students who participated in center activities for 30 or more days, and (c) provide information to project leaders as they plan for project sustainability and future grant writing.

Evaluation Design and Methodology

In consultation with project leaders, we designed the evaluation to align with three key 21st CCLC documents: (a) the Campbell sub-grantee 21st CCLC grant proposal, (b) the Hawai‘i Department of Education Special Programs Management Section (HIDOE-SPMS) key performance indicators (KPIs), and (c) the HIDOE-SPMS evaluation report template. The HIDOE-SPMS KPIs are the criteria for the Hawai‘i state 21st CCLC program evaluation (HIDOE-SPMS, 2010). They are adapted by the HIDOE-SPMS state program manager from the Federal Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) 21st CCLC indicators established by the USDE. The evaluation design includes a study of project implementation and a study of project outcomes as shown in tabular form in Table A1. The design includes the HIDOE KPI objectives, indicators and performance measures; evaluation questions from the HIDOE-SPMS evaluation report template; and identified sources and methods of data collection.

Table A1*Evaluation Design for the Campbell 21st CCLC sub-grantee*

Evaluation sub questions	Performance measure	Evaluation method
Study of Implementation Implementation Objectives: (a) 21st Century Community Learning Centers will offer a range of high-quality educational, developmental, and recreational services, (b) 21st Century Community Learning Centers will serve children and community members with the greatest need for expanded learning opportunities. ^b		
Evaluation Question 1: Has the program been implemented as planned in the grant application? ^a		
(a) If no, what changes were made and why? (b) What did the program finally look like? ^a (c) What challenges have been faced in implementing the program and how are these challenges being addressed? ^a	2.1 Core educational services: 100% of centers will offer high-quality services in at least one core academic area, such as reading and literacy, mathematics, and science. ^b 2.2 Enrichment and support activities: 100% of centers will offer enrichment and support activities such as nutrition and health, art, music, technology, and recreation. ^b 2.4 Services to parents and other adult community members: More than 85% of centers will offer services to parents, senior citizens, and other adult community members. ^b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluator-developed staff questionnaire regarding extent and quality of implementation (evaluative data) • HIDOE-SPMS/Evaluator-developed 21st CCLC site program summary form • 21st CCLC APR Form C7 questionnaire (descriptive data)
Sub-questions (a) through (c)	2.5 Extended hours: More than 75% of centers will offer services at least 15 hours per week on average during the school year and provide services when school is not in session, such as during the summer and holidays. ^b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HIDOE-SPMS/Evaluator-developed 21st CCLC site program summary form • 21st CCLC APR Form A questionnaire
Sub-questions (a) through (c) and (d) Which community-based partnerships, as planned in the grant application, have been established and maintained and which ones were not? Why? ^a	2.3 Community involvement: More than 85% of centers will establish and maintain partnerships within the community that continue to increase levels of community collaboration in planning, implementing, and sustaining programs. ^b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluator-developed questionnaire based on 21st CCLC annual performance report categories
Sub-questions (a) through (c) and (e) Where was the program implemented? ^a (f) What were the characteristics of the school community? ^a (g) How many people did it affect? ^a	3.1 High-need communities: 100% of centers are located in high-poverty communities. ^b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HDOE website data on school communities

(Table A1*Evaluation Design for the Campbell 21st CCLC sub-grantee, continued)*

Evaluation sub questions	Performance measure	Evaluation method
(h) Are program activities interesting and valuable to students, teachers, administrators, and community partners? ^a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in student attendance in the subsequent school year. • Increase in the number of regular attendees in the subsequent school year. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with project staff, attendance data, staff questionnaire data
(i) What are the plans to ensure effective program implementation next year? ^a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate to high levels of extent and quality of implementation in the subsequent school year. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formative feedback discussions between project leaders and CRDG evaluators • Staff questionnaire data
<p>Study of Outcomes</p> <p>Outcome objectives: (a) participants in 21st Century Community Learning Centers will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes, ^b (b) participants in 21st Century Community Learning Centers will demonstrate academic improvement based on formative and summative assessment given throughout the school year. ^c</p> <p>Evaluation Question 2: (a) What changes were found in regular center students' academic behaviors as reported by their language arts or mathematics day classroom teachers? (b) What changes were found in regular center students' academic performance as reported by their language arts or mathematics day classroom teachers?</p>		
(a) What changes were found in regular center students' school attendance, classroom performance, and decreased disciplinary actions as reported by their host elementary school homeroom day teachers or host middle/high school day teachers in reading or mathematics?	<p>1.1a 75% of regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in turning in homework on time. ^b</p> <p>1.1b 75% of regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in classroom participation. ^b</p> <p>1.1c 75% of regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in attending class regularly. ^b</p> <p>1.1d 75% of regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in student classroom behavior. ^b</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21st CCLC teacher survey about academic behaviors
(b) What changes were found in regular center students' academic achievement in reading/language arts and/or mathematics?	<p>4.1a 60% of regular center students will demonstrate improvement in reading/language arts. ^b</p> <p>4.1b 60% of regular center students will demonstrate improvement in mathematics. ^b</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes between Fall and Spring semester report card grades in reading and mathematics • Changes between first and second administration of pre-test in reading and mathematics

^a(HIDOE-SPMS, 2011b).^b(HIDOE-SPMS, 2010). Enumerators are referenced from HIDOE-SPMS.^c(HIDOE-SPMS, 2011, p. Tab 3: Prog Imp & Plan-2)

Additional information on the design of the implementation evaluation and outcome evaluation is provided in the sections that follow this introduction.

The implementation evaluation plan. The evaluation staff designed the evaluation of implementation to address the main implementation evaluation question and the nine sub-questions (a–i):

- “Was the program implemented as planned in the grant proposal?”
- (a) “If no, what changes were made and why?”
 - (b) “What did the program finally look like?”
 - (c) “What challenges have been faced in implementing the program and how are these challenges being addressed?”
 - (d) “Which community-based partnerships, as planned in the grant application, have been established and maintained and which ones were not? Why?”
 - (e) “Where was the program implemented?”
 - (f) What were the characteristics of the school community?
 - (g) “How many people did it affect?”
 - (h) “Are the program activities interesting and valuable to students, teachers, administrators, and community partners?”
 - (i) “What are the plans to ensure effective program implementation next year?”
- (HIDOE-SPMS, 2011b, p. 3).

The outcome evaluation plan. The design of the evaluation of outcomes addresses the outcome indicators and KPIs shown in Table A1. As previously noted, these KPIs, which measure the changes in academic achievement and academic behavior of 21st CCLC participants who attended center activities for 30 or more days, referred to as “regular attendees,” are adapted from the federal 21st CCLC GPRA performance indicators. The evaluation questions for the study of outcomes are:

- (a) What changes were found in regular center attendees’ academic behaviors as reported by their language arts or mathematics day classroom teachers?
- (b) What changes were found in regular center attendees’ academic performance as reported by their language arts or mathematics day classroom teachers? (HIDOE-SPMS, 2010).

Evaluation Data-Collection Schedule

At the beginning of Year 3, the project director, center coordinators, and evaluation team agreed on a data-collection schedule to coordinate evaluation activities. On August 30, 2011, we presented a draft evaluation data-collection schedule to the project director and center coordinators for discussion. Key issues in planning the schedule of deadlines were (a) avoiding intersession dates when scheduling administration of questionnaires, (b) including feasible intermediate deadlines for submitting attendance

data to prevent last minute scrambling for data and data entry, and also to provide sufficient time to correct errors in the original data submitted, (c) requiring the deadline to submit attendance/demographics data in the Spring to provide sufficient time to review and/or correct the submitted data, analyze the reviewed/corrected data to identify the counts of 30-day attendees, compile a list of 30-day attendees for CRDG to prepare the teacher survey packets, and also to provide a list to the centers which contain the names and grade levels of 30-day attendees whose grades and pre/post scores were needed as outcome data, and (d) optimizing the time to allow center students to meet the 30-day attendance counts in the Spring and take into account the close of the school year at the host schools when teachers are very busy and may not have much time to focus on completing the teacher survey.

Data-Collection Methods

Multiple sources of data were required to complete implementation and outcome evaluations of the Campbell 21st CCLC project. Implementation evaluation required descriptive and evaluative data; outcome evaluation required evaluative data. Sources of data included publicly available data from the U.S. Census and the HIDEOE, and project data available from the project director, center coordinators, center staff, center participants, host school day teachers, adult family members, and volunteers.

The student attendance spreadsheets. We formatted a spreadsheet for use by center staff to document student attendance, student demographics, changes in student Language Arts/Reading and Mathematics report card grades, and changes in student Language Arts/Reading and Mathematics pre/post test scores. Center staff submitted these data to us electronically after the summer session, fall session, spring break, and end of the current school year. After each submission of the center student attendance spreadsheet, we reviewed the spreadsheets for common errors to ensure that the data were properly entered into the spreadsheet. An evaluator visited with center staff during the school year to discuss data-entry procedures and made recommendations for improving efficiency. The evaluation principal investigator and/or an evaluation staff member met with the Campbell sub-grantee center coordinators (who oversaw the centers) to discuss any issues with data collection and data entry.

The 21st CCLC Annual Performance Report (APR). We collected APR data as a program requirement to report on the 21st CCLC Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS), an on-line reporting system developed by Learning Point Associates, a contractor of the USDE. Center staff completed paper forms of the APR or distributed the APR forms to the appropriate respondent group (e.g. the 21st CCLC Teacher Survey, Community Partner Questionnaire, etc.). The 21st CCLC APR forms were separated into four different forms. Form A asked the Center Coordinators to report the hours of operation for their respective centers, such as when the GEMS program was in operation (e.g. before

school, during school, after school, and weekend), the weekly total hours of operation for summer and school year sessions, and the total number of weeks the center was open during summer and school year. Center coordinators used Form B to report the number of paid and volunteer staff members and the number of staff members categorized by type (e.g. school-day teacher, center administrator/ coordinator, youth development worker, non-teaching school staff, parent, college student, high school student, community member, or non-school-day staff). Using APR Form C7, center coordinators reported descriptive data about activities provided by the center including activity category, the activity subject area, when the activity was held, the number of participants, the student population targeted by the activity, total number of weeks provided, the typical number of days per week the activity was provided, and the typical number of hours per day the activity was provided. Center coordinators are also asked to provide a description of the activity on Form C7. Center coordinators also completed APR Form D to provide data about the regular day school affiliation of center attendees and whether the host school was active during the time when the center was operating. Once the APR forms were collected the data were reviewed by the evaluators for any discrepancies and corrected if any discrepancies were found, then they were entered into the PPICS database.

The on-line questionnaire about project implementation. The evaluator-developed, on-line questionnaire was designed to be distributed to staff, contractors, or volunteers who were directly involved in implementing activities. This target group was chosen because the staff members who implemented the activities were in the best position to know the extent and quality of the activities that were implemented in comparison to what was planned for implementation. Through this questionnaire, respondents provided evaluative information about project implementation, including comments about challenges to implementation and how challenges were addressed. Respondents described project activities and the extent and quality to which academic and enrichment content areas were implemented.

The strength of the on-line questionnaire was that data were collected directly from the stakeholders who have first-hand knowledge about the implementation of activities. One weakness in this method was the possible increase in subjectivity due to self-reported data. That is, the respondent who implemented the activities may have a high stake in the activity and would report data with personal biases. Another weakness was that the respondent needed to understand that the data reporting task is comprehensive over all activities that he or she implemented. Evaluation staff held meetings with the center coordinators to explain the purpose of the on-line questionnaire and had similar discussions, to the extent possible, with the respondents during site visits. Evaluation staff administered the on-line questionnaire through an individual e-mail to each respondent. Some center staff members did not have e-mail addresses. Therefore, evaluation staff provided respondents who did not have an e-mail address, with a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) address, password, and instructions on how to use the URL to access

the questionnaire. The on-line questionnaire was anonymous, and we were unable to identify data with individual respondents. However, we were able to keep counts of the number of respondents by center who completed the questionnaire.

The questionnaire about community partners. The questionnaire was based on 21st CCLC APR categories about community partners and was developed to collect standardized information about community partnerships aligned to the 21st CCLC required evaluation report. If the partner worked with one center, the center coordinator completed the form. If the partner worked with more than one center, the project director or a center staff member completed the form. We provided respondents with the questionnaire and the 21st CCLC definitions of each type of partner. The caveat in this method was that the categories attached to the checklist are rather broad, and the descriptions were not as specific as some respondents would prefer.

The 21st CCLC teacher survey. Federal requirements include determination of center attendee academic behavior as an outcome measure. In addition to the federal outcome measure about regular attendee academic behavior, the HODOE-SPMS section selected four of the academic behaviors listed as items on the teacher survey as Hawai'i KPIs: (a) turning in homework on time, (b) classroom participation, (c) attending class regularly, and (d) student classroom behavior. To collect data about attendee academic behavior, evaluators and center staff administered the teacher survey that included 10 items rated on a 7-point scale about academic behaviors. Teacher survey administration varied between elementary and secondary school. At the elementary level, the elementary school homeroom teacher of the regular attendee was the respondent and at the secondary level, the middle/high school English/ Language Arts or mathematics teacher of the regular attendee was the respondent.

This teacher survey was developed by Learning Point Associates, a USDE-contracted organization. All 21st CCLC sub-grantees were required to collect data about academic behavior using the teacher survey. The advantage of using the teacher survey to collect academic behavior data was that standardized data were collected across all 21st CCLC projects. The standardized academic behavior data provided basis for comparisons from year-to-year, between individual centers, between sub-grantees, and nationally between states. The teacher survey items were based on research of academic behaviors that predict student academic achievement in day classes. To maximize the effects of a student's participation in center activities, the survey should be distributed at the end of the school year when the day teacher would observe any center effects on the student's performance in class. However, it is problematic to distribute the teacher survey at the end of the school year because this coincides with day teacher's busiest period of the school year. At this time, a teacher is faced with end-of-year testing, grading, and closing down the classroom. To optimize returns, we negotiated with the center coordinators to find the

best time to distribute the survey several weeks before the end of the school year and allow enough time for center students to participate in activities and reach 30 days of attendance.

Semester grades and pre-post test scores. The overall goal of the 21st CCLC program is to help students improve their performance and behaviors in the host school. Therefore, the measures of academic achievement were report card semester grades for reading and mathematics and pre-post reading and mathematics test scores from assessments administered in the host schools. The types of report card grades were defined by the 21st CCLC program. For Project Year 3, the Campbell sub-grantee leaders agreed to report the changes in the reading and mathematics grades for the elementary school sites and English/Language Arts and Mathematics grades for the middle and high school sites. The center coordinators also agreed to report changes in pre-post test scores if, (a) the pre-post tests were administered as a regular part of the center host school's operations, that is, not by special request of the center, (b) the pre-post test was commercially published as opposed to developed by teachers, (c) the test was administered as a true pre-post test with the pre-test administered early in the school year (i.e., Summer or Fall 2011) and the post-test in Spring 2012, and (d) the test must have been supported by literature that displays the appropriate psychometric qualities of the test. Therefore, data on the changes in pre-post test scores were not always available because the host school did not administer pre-post tests in reading or mathematics or some of the students with 30 or more days of attendance did not have pre-post test scores because the administration of pre-post tests was limited to certain grade levels.

Adequate Yearly Progress. The Campbell 21st CCLC project director requested that Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) be included as an outcome indicator in this evaluation design. AYP was based on Hawai'i State Assessment (HSA) scores. The proficiency rate requirements for SY 2011–2012 were at least 72% of students proficient in reading; and at least 64% of students proficient in mathematics (Retrieved from <http://arch.k12.hi.us/PDFs/nclb/2012/FinalAYPallSch37Pub20120928.pdf> 11/18/12). If an acceptable percentage of students in the school (and subgroups) passed the HSA in the school year, then it was said that the school met AYP. The USDE set proficiency objectives, which were percentages of the student population, and subgroups of the student population that must pass the HSA for that school to meet AYP. If the school did not meet AYP, then specific rating and consequences were enacted to improve that school's outcomes. In the event that the school does not improve student outcomes, the school becomes subject to restructuring.

Students enrolled in the 21st CCL center are a percentage of their entire host school. Additionally, the number of center students who stay in the centers for 30 or more days (regular attendees) is a percentage of the total number of center students. The 21st CCLC program requirement for a study of

outcomes only pertains to regular attendees. Therefore, looking at AYP as an outcome measure of the centers has to be tempered by looking at this outcome measure of host school performance (AYP) being attributed to the population of regular attendees (a percentage of the total center students, who are themselves a percentage of the host school population).

Site visits. The evaluation staff collected data for internal use about the implementation of activities by directly observing activities at each site. At times, the evaluation staff were accompanied by a center staff member. At other times, the evaluation staff were provided with a list of times and locations on campus when activities were held, and the site visit was unaccompanied. As much as possible, we chose to view activities on a typical center day, that is, not a showcase day, a special activity day in the host school, or close to a holiday so that we could observe the usual implementation of activities. Hand-written notes were taken during the site visits and were used to compare the description of activities submitted by center staff on the C7 APR form or other data collected about implementation. We considered site visits as snap shots of the activities because the day of the site visit may have been unusual or our presence may have affected the behavior of tutors or students. Therefore, we did not report the site visit data as stand-alone implementation data.

References

- Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, Title IV, Part B, 21st Century Community Learning Centers., 20 USC § 7171–7176. Retrieved from <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/granule/USCODE-2011-title20/USCODE-2011-title20-chap70-subchapIV-partB-sec7171/content-detail.html>
- Hawai‘i State Department of Education. (2012). *2012 reports*. Retrieved November 18, 2012, from <http://arch.k12.hi.us/PDFs/nclb/2012/FinalAYPallSch37Pub20120928.pdf>
- Hawai‘i State Department of Education, Special Programs Management Section (HIDOE-SPMS). (2010). *Hawai‘i 21st CCLC key performance indicators*. Honolulu, HI: author.
- Hawai‘i State Department of Education, Special Programs Management Section (HIDOE-SPMS). (2011a). *21st CCLC: Evaluation report template*. Honolulu, HI: author.
- Hawai‘i State Department of Education, Special Programs Management Section (HIDOE-SPMS). (2011b). *Sub-grantee 21st CCLC Handbook SY 2011-12*. Honolulu, HI: author.
- Learning Point Associates. (2012). 21st CCLC 2012 Annual Performance Report: Paper Forms for Centers. *Profile and Performance Information Collection System*. Retrieved June 8, 2012, from <http://ppics.learningpt.org/ppics/survey.asp>
- Performance—21st Century Community Learning Centers. (2012, February 15). Programs; Reports; Reference Materials. Retrieved November 2, 2012, from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/21stcclc/performance.html>
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Academic Improvement and Teacher Quality Programs. (2003, February). *21st Century Community Learning Centers non-regulatory guidance*. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/21stcclc/legislation.html>

Appendix B
Description of Academic and Enrichment Activities
Implemented at the Campbell Sub-grantee Centers in Project Year 3
(The Summer of 2011 through School Year 2011–12)

Table B1*'Ewa Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 3*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
The Summer of 2011 activities							
Summer Reading grade 3	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. 	5 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reading or literacy Science Arts and music Health or nutrition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tutoring 		2 weeks 5 days per week 3.5 hours per day
Summer Reading grade 4	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. 	4 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reading or literacy Science Arts and music Health or nutrition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tutoring 		2 weeks 5 days per week 3.5 hours per day
Summer Math grade 3	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. 	5 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mathematics Science Arts and music Health or nutrition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tutoring 		2 weeks 5 days per week 3.5 hours per day
Summer Math grade 4	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. 	4 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mathematics Science Arts and music Health or nutrition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tutoring 		2 weeks 5 days per week 3.5 hours per day

(Table B1*Ewa Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 3, continued)*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Kickstart 2011	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-Kindergarten students 	66 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science • Arts and music • Cultural activities or social studies • Health or nutrition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The activity had more than two program elements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce first experience of elementary school 	2 weeks 5 days per week 3.5 hours per day
Aloha Amazing Science Squid Dissection	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students 	9 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic enrichment learning program 		1 week 1 day per week 1 hour per day
Bricks 4 Kidz	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students • Pre-Kindergarten students 	69 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic enrichment learning program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce first experience of elementary school 	1 week 2 days per week 3 hours per day
Mad Science Dinosaurs	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-Kindergarten students 	66 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science • Arts and music • Cultural activities or social studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic enrichment learning program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce first experience of elementary school 	1 week 1 day per week 1 hour per day

(Table B1

Ewa Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 3, continued)

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Mad Science Electricity	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. Limited-English-proficient students 	9 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reading or literacy Mathematics Science Arts and music 	Academic enrichment learning program	Introduce first experience of elementary school	1 week 1 day per week 1 hour per day
Mad Science Seeking Our Senses	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pre-Kindergarten students 	66 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Science Health or nutrition 	Academic enrichment learning program	Introduce first experience of elementary school	1 week 1 day per week 1 hour per day
Art to Go Printmaking	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. Limited-English-proficient students Pre-Kindergarten students 	69 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Art and music Cultural activities or social studies 	Academic enrichment learning program	Introduce first experience of elementary school	1 week 1 day per week 4.5 hours per day
Hip Hop with Tracy Jones for Summer GEMS grades 3 & 4	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. Limited-English-proficient students 	9 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arts and music Health or nutrition 	Recreational activity		1 week 1 day per week 1 hour per day
Playful Percussion with Michael Wall	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pre-Kindergarten students 	66 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Art and music Cultural activities or social studies 	Academic enrichment learning program	Introduce first experience of elementary school	1 week 1 day per week 2 hours per day
School year 2011–12 activities							
Fall GEMS Reading Program 2011–12	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. Limited-English-proficient students 	41 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reading or literacy Science Arts and music 	Tutoring	Homework help	10 weeks 5 days per week 1.5 hours per day

(Table B1*Ewa Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 3, continued)*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Spring GEMS Reading Program 2011–12	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students 	37 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading or literacy • Science • Arts and music 	• Tutoring	• Homework help	10 weeks 5 days per week 1.5 hours per day
Fall GEMS Math Program 2011-12	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students 	41 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mathematics • Science • Arts and music 	• Tutoring	• Homework help	10 weeks 5 days per week 1.5 hours per day
Spring GEMS Math Program 2011–12	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students 	37 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mathematics • Science • Arts and music 	• Tutoring	• Homework help	10 weeks 5 days per week 1.5 hours per day
Honolulu Zoo Society Outreach Program - Zoo to You	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students 	40 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science • Cultural activities or social studies 	• Academic enrichment learning program		1 week 1 day per week 1 hour per day
Mad Science Dry Ice	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students 	20 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mathematics • Science 	• Academic enrichment learning program		1 week 1 day per week 1 hour per day
Mad Science Mineral Mania	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students 	12 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading or literacy • Science • Cultural activities or social studies 	• Academic enrichment learning program	• Parent Workshop Grades 3 & 4	1 week 1 day per week 1 hour per day

(Table B1

Ewa Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 3, continued)

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Mad Science Optical Illusions	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average.• Limited-English-proficient students	9 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reading or literacy• Mathematics• Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Academic enrichment learning program	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Parent Workshop Grades 5 & 6	1 week 1 day per week 1 hour per day
Spring GEMS Physical Education Grades 3 & 4	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average.• Limited-English-proficient students	14 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mathematics• Health or nutrition	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Recreational activity		1 week 1 day per week 1 hour per day

Table B2*'Ewa Beach Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 3*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
The Summer of 2011 activities							
Aloha Amazing Science	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. Limited-English-proficient students 	15 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reading or literacy Mathematics Science Arts and music Cultural activities or social studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic enrichment learning program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Homework help 	1 week 1 day per week 1 hour per day
Bricks 4 Kidz	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. Limited-English-proficient students 	15 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reading or literacy Mathematics Art and music 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic enrichment learning program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Homework help 	1 week 1 day per week 1 hour per day
Dancing Through Exercise	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. Limited-English-proficient students 	15 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mathematics Arts and music Cultural activities or social studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic enrichment learning program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Homework help 	1 week 1 day per week 1 hour per day
Playful Percussion	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. Limited-English-proficient students 	15 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mathematics Arts and music Cultural activities or social studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic enrichment learning program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Homework help 	1 week 1 day per week 1 hour per day

(Table B2*'Ewa Beach Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 3, continued)*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
School year 2011–12 activities							
Reading Instruction	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students^a • Students with special needs or disabilities 	30 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading or literacy • Cultural activities or social studies 	• Tutoring	• Academic enrichment learning program	27 weeks 4 days per week 2 hours per day
Math Instruction	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities 	30 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mathematics • Science 	• Tutoring	• The activity had more than two program elements	27 weeks 4 days per week 2 hours per day
Sibling Homework Center	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities • Any student whose siblings are enrolled in afterschool tutoring/activities 	55 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science • Arts and music • Technology or telecommunications • Cultural activities or social studies • Kinesthetic Learning 	• Academic enrichment learning program	• Homework help	27 weeks 4 days per week 2 hours per day
Aloha Science	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities 	20 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science • Arts and music • Cultural activities or social studies 	• Academic enrichment learning program		4 weeks 1 day per week 2 hours per day

(Table B2*'Ewa Beach Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 3, continued)*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Mad Science	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities 	24 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science • Cultural activities or social studies 	• Academic enrichment learning program		4 weeks 1 day per week 2 hours per day
Art	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities 	30 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Arts and music • Cultural activities or social studies 	• Academic enrichment learning program		3 weeks 1 day per week 2 hours per day
Art to Go	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities 	24 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Arts and music • Cultural activities or social studies 	• Academic enrichment learning program		6 weeks 2 days per week 2 hours per day
Dancing Through Exercise	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities 	15 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mathematics • Arts and music • Cultural activities or social studies 	• Academic enrichment learning program		6 weeks 1 day per week 2 hours per day

(Table B2*'Ewa Beach Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 3, continued)*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Hawai'i Theatre for Youth	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities 	30 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Arts and music • Entrepreneurial education • Cultural activities or social studies 	• Academic enrichment learning program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Career or job training for youth • Community Service or service learning 	7 weeks 2 days per week 2 hours per day
Hip Hop Dance Instruction	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities 	30 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mathematics • Arts and music • Cultural activities or social studies 	• Academic enrichment learning program		10 weeks 1 day per week 2 hours per day
Zoo to You	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities 	40 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Arts and music • Entrepreneurial education • Cultural activities or social studies 	• Academic enrichment learning program		2 weeks 1 day per week 2 hours per day

^aAPR reported "Limited-English-proficient students." This was incorrectly reported to PPICS as "Students who have been truant, suspended, or expelled."

Table B3*Holomua Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 3*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
School year 2011–12 activities							
Renaissance Learning— Accelerated Reading (AR)	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. Disadvantaged 	27 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reading or literacy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tutoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Homework help 	35 weeks 3 days per week 1.5 hours per day
Renaissance Learning— Accelerated Math	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. Disadvantaged 	35 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mathematics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tutoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Homework help 	35 weeks 3 days per week 1.5 hours per day
Arts and Crafts	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. 	18 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reading or literacy Mathematics Arts and music 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic enrichment learning program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recreational activity 	37 weeks 1 day per week 1.5 hours per day
Ceramics	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. 	18 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reading or literacy Mathematics Arts and music 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic enrichment learning program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recreational activity 	37 weeks 1 day per week 1.5 hours per day
Robotics	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. 	18 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reading or literacy Mathematics Science Technology or telecommunications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic enrichment learning program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recreational activity 	35 weeks 1 day per week 1.5 hours per day

Table B4*Iroquois Point Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 3*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
The Summer of 2011 activities							
Bricks4Kidz	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities • Regular Ed. Students who have had no preschool experience and are entering kindergarten this SY. 	20 students per day	• Mathematics	• Recreational activity		1 week 1 day per week 1 hour per day
Aloha Amazing Science	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students • Regular Education Students 	23 students per day	• Science	• Academic enrichment learning program		2 weeks 1 day per week 1.25 hours per day
Mad Science	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students • Regular Education Students 	30 students per day	• Science	• Academic enrichment learning program		2 weeks 1 day per week 1.25 hours per day
Underwater Robotics	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students • Regular Education Students 	9 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mathematics • Science • Technology or telecommunications 	• Academic enrichment learning program		3 weeks 1 day per week 1.5 hours per day

(Table B4*Iroquois Point Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 3, continued)*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Dance	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities • Regular Ed. Students who have had no preschool experience and are entering kindergarten this SY. 	20 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arts and music • Health or nutrition • Physical Education 	• Recreational activity	• Health/P.E.	2 weeks 1 day per week 1 hour per day
P.E.	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students • Regular Education Students 	30 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health or nutrition • Physical Education 	• Recreational activity		3 weeks 1 day per week 1 hour per day
Playful Percussion	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students • Regular Education Students 	20 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mathematics • Arts and music 	• Recreational activity		2 weeks 1 day per week 1.25 hours per day
School year 2011–12 activities							
Reading Tutoring	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students 	20 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Technology or telecommunications 	• Tutoring	• Homework help	24 weeks 4 days per week 1.5 hours per day
Math Tutoring	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students 	3 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mathematics • Technology or telecommunications 	• Tutoring	• Homework help	24 weeks 4 days per week 1.5 hours per day

(Table B4

Iroquois Point Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 3, continued)

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Aloha Amazing Science (SY)	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average.• Limited-English-proficient students	20 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reading or literacy• Mathematics• Science• Arts and music• Cultural activities or social studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Academic enrichment learning program		3 weeks 2 days per week 1.5 hours per day
Art to Go	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average.• Limited-English-proficient students• Regular Education Students	40 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Arts and music	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Recreational activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Art	3 weeks 2 days per week 1.5 hours per day

Table B5*Ka'imiloa Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 3*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
The Summer of 2011							
Kick Start	Summer	• Registered kindergarten students	37 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science • Arts and music • Health or nutrition	• Academic enrichment learning program	• Rituals and routines of the Kindergarten program	4 weeks 5 days per week 3.5 hours per day
Hip Hop	Summer	• Registered kindergarten students	40 students per day	• Arts and music • Health or nutrition	• Recreational activity	• Dance and music	1 week 1 day per week 2 hours per day
Playful Percussion	Summer	• Registered kindergarten students	40 students per day	• Arts and music	• Recreational activity	• Dance and music	2 weeks 1 day per week 2 hours per day
School year 2011–12 activities							
Accelerated Reading Session 1 & 2 ^a	School year	• Limited-English-proficiency students	12 students per day	• Reading or literacy	Academic enrichment learning program	• Tutoring • Homework help	21 weeks 4 days per week 1.75 hours per day
Accelerated Math Session 1 & 2 ^b	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average.	56 students per day	• Mathematics	Academic enrichment learning program	• Tutoring • Homework help	21 weeks 4 days per week 1.75 hours per day

(Table B5*Ka'imiloa Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 3, continued)*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Art Session 1	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average.	10 students per day	• Arts and music	Academic enrichment learning program	• Tutoring • Homework help • Art	9 weeks 1 day per week 1 hour per day
Enrichment Legos Session 1 & 2 ^c	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average.	11 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science	Academic enrichment learning program	• Homework help • Science, Math, Language Arts	20 weeks 1 day per week 1.75 hours per day
Enrichment Wednesdays	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average.	40 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science • Art and music • Health or nutrition	The activity had more than two program elements	• Academic enrichment learning program • Homework help • Recreational activity	11 weeks 1 day per week 2 hours per day
Hip Hop	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average.	13 students per day	• Arts and music	Recreational activity	• Homework help	11 weeks 1 day per week 1 hour per day ^d
Media Production Session 1 & 2 ^e	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average.	12 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Arts and music • Technology or telecommunications	Academic enrichment learning program	• Homework help • Media Technology—putting together a short, simple media production	20 weeks 1 day per week 1.75 hours per day

^a Combined Accelerated Reading Session 1 & 2 into one listing; this was incorrectly reported to PPICS as separate listings for Accelerated Reading Session 1 and Accelerated Reading Session 2.

^b Combined Accelerated Math Session 1 & 2 into one listing; this was incorrectly reported to PPICS as separate listings for Accelerated Math Session 1 and Accelerated Math Session 2.

^c Combined Enrichment Lego Session 1 & 2 into one listing; this was incorrectly reported to PPICS as separate listings for Enrichment Lego Session 1 and Enrichment Lego Session 2.

^d ARP reported 1 hour per day. This was incorrectly reported to PPICS as 2 hours per day.

^e Combined Media Production Session 1 & 2 into one listing; this was incorrectly reported to PPICS as separate listings for Media Production Session 1 and Media Production Session 2.

Table B6*Keone‘ula Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 3*

Activity name	When implemented: School Year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
The Summer of 2011 activities							
Pre-K Kick Start	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incoming K Students with very little or no preschool experience 	15 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reading or literacy Art and music 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tutoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic enrichment learning program 	3 weeks 5 days per week 3 hours per day
Math	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. 	27 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mathematics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tutoring 		4 weeks 5 days per week 1.5 hours per day
Science Enrichment	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. 	27 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Science 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tutoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic enrichment learning program 	4 weeks 3 days per week 1.5 hours per day
Media	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. 	27 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technology or telecommunications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic enrichment learning program 		4 weeks 4 days per week 1 hour per day
Music, Playful Percussion	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incoming Kindergarten Students with very little or no preschool experience 	15 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reading or literacy Art and music 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic enrichment learning program 		2 weeks 2 days per week 1.75 hours per day

Table B7*Pōhākea Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 3*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
School year 2011–12 activities							
Reading SY '11–'12	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities • Students who have not yet met HSA benchmarks 	30 students per day	• Reading or literacy	• Academic enrichment learning program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tutoring • Homework help • Individual/Group reading assignments/tutoring for HSA benchmarks "Meets, Exceeds" 	25 weeks 4 days per week 1.5 hours per day
Math SY '11–'12	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities • Students who have not yet met HSA benchmarks 	40 students per day	• Mathematics	• Academic enrichment learning program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tutoring • Homework help • Individual/Group math assignments/tutoring for HSA benchmarks "Meets, Exceeds" 	28 weeks 4 days per week 1.5 hours per day
Basketball Enrichment	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students interested in basketball 	15 students per day	• Basketball skills and teamwork	• Recreational activity	• Basketball skills activities	13 weeks 3 days per week 1 hour per day

(Table B7*Pōhākea Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 3, continued)*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of partici- pants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Cheerleading Enrichment	School year	• Students interested in cheerleading	15 students per day	• Cheerleading skills and teamwork	• Recrea- tional activity	• Cheerleading skills/activities	13 weeks 3 days per week ^a 1 hour per day
Dance-Taiko 2012	School year	• Students at Pohakea Gr. 4–Gr. 6	11 students per day	• Arts and music	• Recrea- tional activity	• Taiko dance/ drum skills	7 weeks 1 day per week 1.5 hours per day
Media Enrichment	School year	• Students interested in media activities	12 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science • Technology or telecommuni- cations	• Academic enrich- ment learning program	• Media activities	29 weeks 3 days per week 1.5 hours per day
Robotics Enrichment	School year	• Students interested in robotics	10 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science • Technology/ telecommuni- cations	• Academic enrich- ment learning program	• Robotic activities	29 weeks 4 days per week 1.5 hours per day
Volleyball Enrichment	School year	• Students interested in volleyball	30 students per day	• Volleyball skills and teamwork	• Recrea- tional activity	• Volleyball skills activities	12 weeks 3 days per week 1 hour per day

^a APR data reported 3 days per week. This was incorrectly reported to PPICS as 1 day per week.

Table B8*‘Ewa Makai Middle Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 3*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
School year 2011–12 activities							
Math SY '11–'12	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. Limited-English-proficient students Students with special needs or disabilities Students who have not yet met HSA benchmarks 	35 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mathematics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic enrichment learning program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tutoring Homework help Individual/group math assignments/tutoring for HSA benchmarks "Meets, Exceeds" 	21 weeks 4 days per week 1 hour per day
Drama SY '11–'12	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students interested in drama 	16 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arts and music Cultural activities or social studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recreational activity 		21 weeks 2 days per week 2 hours per day
Hula Dance SY '11–'12	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students interested in Hula Dance 	8 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arts and music Cultural activities or social studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recreational activity 		21 weeks 2 days per week 1 hour per day

(Table B8*'Ewa Makai Middle Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 3, continued)*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Media Enrichment	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students interested in media activities 	16 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Arts and music • Technology or telecommunications • Cultural activities or social studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic enrichment learning program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Media activities 	21 weeks 4 days per week 2 hours per day
Robotics Enrichment SY '11-'12	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students interested in robotics 	13 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science • Technology or telecommunications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic enrichment learning program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robotics activities 	21 weeks 4 days per week 2 hours per day

Table B9*Ilima Intermediate Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 3*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
School year 2011–12 activities							
Accelerated Reading	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities 	15 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading or literacy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic enrichment learning program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tutoring 	26 weeks 4 days per week 1 hour per day
Accelerated Math	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities 	30 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mathematics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic enrichment learning program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tutoring 	26 weeks 4 days per week 1 hour per day
ESL Tutoring	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities 	20 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science • Cultural activities or social studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homework help 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tutoring 	24 weeks 4 days per week 1.5 hours per day
Tutoring	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities 	45 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science • Cultural activities or social studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tutoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homework help 	26 weeks 4 days per week 1 hour per day
Zumbatomic (Zumba for kids 4–12)	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None of the categories listed in the APR C7 form applied 	45 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None of the categories listed in the C7 form applied 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreationa l activity 		1 week 1 day per week 1.5 hours per day

Table B10*Campbell High Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 3*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
School year 2011–12 activities							
English	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities 	20 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Arts and music • Technology or tele-communications • Cultural activities or social studies 	• Tutoring	• Homework help	29 weeks 5 days per week 2 hours per day
Math	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average. • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities 	15 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading or literacy • Mathematics 	• Tutoring	• Homework help	29 weeks 3 days per week 2 hours per day

Appendix C
Respondents' Comments Consolidated by Item Across
the Campbell Sub-grantee Centers about the Implementation
of Core Academic Activities in Project Year 3
(The Summer of 2011 through School Year 2011–12)

Table C1

Comments Consolidated by Item Across the Campbell Sub-grantee Centers About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Reading/Literacy, Mathematics, and Science Activities in Project Year 3

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
<i>i1. receive assistance to address their individual needs (e.g., low achievement, LEP, SpEd, behavioral) for improving academic performance.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Students worked on assignments based on their individual levels.• Behaviorally, this was a challenge.• The students were out of control, and didnt like to be there no matter how hard I tried.• Tutors communicated with Gen ed teachers to gain insightful information to provide the most appropriate supports.• Both math and reading programs assess students on their individual skills so the tutors can teach and give lessons that address their specific needs.• Students were taught using manipulatives and visuals to assist them with math and homework• Working with classroom teachers really helped with the planning.• students were chosen to help them reach HSA standards.• Homework assistance & VMath were very helpful for students.• Individual needs for all were addressed from the low achievement (tutorial, Sys 44) to high achievement (Robotics, Media, Tutoring)• SPED students get help in improving their grades• Some students put into Accelerated Math would benefit more from just tutoring with their current math assignments in school. Since they are here until 5:15pm, going home and working on homework is not always an option in their households. Giving them tutoring/homework help here before they leave would be more beneficial to them maintaining good grades and academic progress.• lack of motivation from students• Students that came to tutoring had behavioral and attitude problems• implemented very well• These students were the main focus of my group. Each student received help with choosing a book on reading level keeping notes for each chapter and testing on the AR program.• Students were able to improve content knowledge

(Table C1

Comments Consolidated by Item Across the Campbell Sub-grantee Centers About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Reading/Literacy, Mathematics, and Science Activities in Project Year 3, continued)

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
<i>i2.</i> participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in reading/history.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Students worked on strategies and skills that they needed at their own level.• inconsistant attendance played a factor with achievement• older students were able to do on their own or needed more time to complete at home• group size could be smaller to• Difficult to pair the low level readers with higher level readers. The gap was very large, 5-7 level difference.• No additional comments• Need to practice more aspects of literacy than only comprehension• Students motivated to pass HSA• Reading program assess students on their individual skills so the tutors can teach and give lessons that address their specific needs.• larger book selection would help• Students had fun listening to stories.• Renaissance Reading was the specific program used for tutoring. In addition, students read books they brought from their classes.• Students read books every day.• Students used Ren Learn & SFA inactive materials to teach to reading benchmarks• I read to or monitor students to read AR books• None• Slow computers, lack of computers, no Internet connection for weeks• students participated very well• See above

(Table C1

Comments Consolidated by Item Across the Campbell Sub-grantee Centers About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Reading/Literacy, Mathematics, and Science Activities in Project Year 3, continued)

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
i3. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in mathematics.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The small group size allowed me to give students much personal attention and help as needed.• Students worked on strategies and skills and problem-solving based on their individual levels.• older students were able to do on their own or finished at home• tutoring class sizes were very large, which at times made it difficult to reach every student on a consistent basis.• Reduced class sizes would be easier to manage, especially with a computer generated system• Math program assess students on their individual skills so the tutors can teach and give lessons that address their specific needs.• Working with classroom teachers helped with the planning.• Renaissance Math was the program used In addition, teachers planned their lessons around what was being taught in the classroom.• Students used individualized Ren Learn assignments to teach math benchmarks needed.• No problems encountered.• Work sheet to practice in addition to homework• Was secondary, back-up or on-call tutor.• None• We should be able to choose the objectives that correspond with what the students are working on in their math class• Homework help mostly.• The accelerated math program was boring for students. I think a more flexible program would be better.• Students received one to one help in this area

(Table C1

Comments Consolidated by Item Across the Campbell Sub-grantee Centers About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Reading/Literacy, Mathematics, and Science Activities in Project Year 3, continued)

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
<i>i4.</i> participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in science.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• many wonderful enrichment - mad science was wonderful• Students were offered outside science program like Mad Scientist.• Enrichment classes provided via Aloha Amazing Science.• Through the integration of articles and texts that support literacy.• Enrichment classes provided by Aloha Amazing Science and the Honolulu Zoological Society brought programs dealing with science.• assist students in their Science projects• students were given help in the area that was required in their daily assignments

Appendix D

Respondents' Comments Consolidated by Item Across the Campbell Sub-grantee Centers about the Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities in Project Year 3 (The Summer of 2011 through School Year 2011–12)

Table D1

Comments Consolidated by Item Across the Campbell Sub-grantee Centers about the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities in Project Year 3

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
<i>i5.</i> participate in art and/or music activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Students got to participate in outside services that provided art activities.• Would have been nice to relate fun activities with the subject they were receiving tutoring for.• The students were forced to do drama for parent night. If they didnt want to the would get scolded. It was to the point the students would cry. Students at this age are very shy and insecure. It upset me very much they were forced to participate.• Enrichment activities provided where students learned and played african drums and danced to a variety of music.• Staff came by to teach our students physical education skills and incorporated games/drills to enhance learning and use of large motor muscles.• Students also enjoyed doing art and music.• Enrichment providers doing art, hip hop dancing, and African Music broadened our students experiences with art and music,• Thanks to director [name deleted] for obtaining enrichment activities such as hip hop, zumba, art-to-go, Zoo-to-You, Mad Science activites on Enrichment Wednesdays for GEMs students• Most of the students enjoyed this supplemental activity• Students need to be exposed to creative media, such as video productions or music in order to express themselves on how things work and so that they open to teachers.
<i>i6.</i> participate in entrepreneurial education activities (business ventures).	No comments provided.
<i>i7.</i> participate in telecommunications and technology education activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• great oppotunities in robotics• Students had an opportunity to work on the IXL program online as well as Renaissance.• Students were not very engaged when it came to the robotics, they were "over" it within the first few weeks. When they are older, they are not interested in leggos anymore.• GT Tutor began teaching students iPages, Keynote, PowerPoint lessons.• VMath is an excellent way for students to practice their math skills.• Our media created projects for the day school sharing e.g. Student of Month, Perfect Attendance, Student Council

(Table D1

Comments Consolidated by Item Across the Campbell Sub-grantee Centers about the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities in Project Year 3, continued)

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
<i>i</i> 8. participate in sports activities (e.g., basketball, baseball, football, swimming).	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Robotics provided a foundation for our students to compete in tournaments.• WSell done with the number of computers to accommodate the students' needs• I really like how the P.E. teacher incorporated academic learning during activities. i.e. Students had to create a story using once sentence at a time with their partner while walking back and forth to pass a ball.• This only happened 1 or 2 times• Enrichment activities provided students with organized games/sports to help with motor skills and learning that healthy lifestyles include exercise.• Some of the students received tutorial academic, enrichment instruction along with basketball, volleyball, track, cheerleading skills
<i>i</i> 9. participate in cultural activities/social studies activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Enrichment activities provided where students learned and played african drums and danced to a variety of music.• Staff came by to teach our students physical education skills and incorporated games/drills to enhance learning and use of large motor muscles.
<i>i</i> 10. participate in health/nutrition-related activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Enrichment activities provided students with organized games/sports to help with motor skills and learning that healthy lifestyles include exercise.
<i>i</i> 11. participate in service learning activities (service activities in the school or local community).	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• our students were encouraged to give help in the Elem schools in the area
<i>i</i> 12. CLC staff discuss appropriate, positive behavior with students and reinforce positive behaviors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Would have like to have seen more follow through in a timely manner with monthly incentives. i.e. Movie day and raffle prizes sometimes were delayed or not done at all.• Teachers practiced and reinforced appropriate behaviors.• Very enthusiastic staff. Worked well with our students. Got the students excited about learning new things in life.• Teacher reinforced positive attitude in students• Teachers talked about and implemented positive behavior in the tutoring session.

Appendix E

**Campbell Sub-grantee Centers: Community Partners in Project Year 3
(The Summer of 2011 through School Year 2011–12)**

Table E1*Campbell Sub-grantee Community Partners in Project Year 3*

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of Contribution	Subcontractor?
UH/COE-Curriculum Research and Development Group, (CRDG)	College or university	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Evaluation services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing 	yes
Renaissance Learning	For-profit entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials 	yes

Table E2*'Ewa Elementary Center: Community Partners in Project Year 3*

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Subcontractor?
Aloha Amazing Science	For-profit entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing 	yes
Bricks 4 Kidz	For-profit entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid Staffing 	yes
Honolulu Zoo Society: Zoo to You Outreach Program	Other unit of city or county government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Paid staffing 	yes
Jeffrey Pagay DBA Airbrush Creations Hawaii	For-profit entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing 	yes
Lorna Dias DBA Dancing through Exercise Classes	For-profit entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Paid staffing 	yes
Mad Science of Hawaii	For-profit entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing 	yes
Michael Wall (Playful Percussion)	For-profit entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Paid staffing 	yes

Table E3*'Ewa Beach Elementary Center: Community Partners in Project Year 3*

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Subcontractor?
Aloha Amazing Science	For-profit entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing 	yes
Bricks 4 Kidz	For-profit entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid Staffing 	yes
Honolulu Academy of Arts: Art to Go Program	Community-based organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing 	yes
Honolulu Theatre for Youth	Community-based organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing 	yes
Honolulu Zoological Society: Zoo to You Outreach Program	Other unit of city or county government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Paid staffing 	yes
Jeffrey Pagay DBA Airbrush Creations Hawaii	For-profit entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing 	yes
Lorna Dias DBA Dancing through Exercise Classes	For-profit entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Paid staffing 	yes
Mad Science of Hawaii	For-profit entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing 	yes
Michael Wall (Playful Percussion)	For-profit entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Paid staffing 	yes

Table E4*Holomua Elementary Center: Community Partners in Project Year 3*

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Subcontractor?
Mad Science of Hawaii	For-profit entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing 	yes

Table E5*Iroquois Point Elementary Center: Community Partners in Project Year 3*

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Subcontractor?
Aloha Amazing Science	For-profit entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing 	yes
Honolulu Zoo Society: Zoo to You Outreach Program	Other unit of city or county government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Paid staffing 	yes
Jeffrey Pagay DBA Airbrush Creations Hawaii	For-profit entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing 	yes
Mad Science of Hawaii	For-profit entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing 	yes
Michael Wall (Playful Percussion)	For-profit entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Paid staffing 	yes

Table E6*Ka'imiloa Elementary Center: Community Partners in Project Year 3*

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Subcontractor?
Aloha Amazing Science	For-profit entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing 	yes
Honolulu Zoo Society: Zoo to You Outreach Program	Other unit of city or county government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Paid staffing 	yes
Jeffrey Pagay DBA Airbrush Creations Hawaii	For-profit entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing 	yes
Lorna Dias DBA Dancing through Exercise Classes	For-profit entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Paid staffing 	yes
Mad Science of Hawaii	For-profit entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing 	yes
Michael Wall (Playful Percussion)	For-profit entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Paid staffing 	yes

Table E7*Keone 'ula Elementary Center: Community Partners in Project Year 3*

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Subcontractor?
Aloha Amazing Science	For-profit entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing 	yes
Michael Wall (Playful Percussion)	For-profit entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Paid staffing 	yes

Table E8*Pōhākea Elementary Center: Community Partners in Project Year 3*

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Subcontractor?
Honolulu Academy of Arts: Art to Go Program	Community-based organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing 	yes
Honolulu Zoo Society: Zoo to You Outreach Program	Other unit of city or county government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Paid staffing 	yes
Mad Science of Hawaii	For-profit entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing 	yes

Table E9*'Ewa Makai Middle Center: Community Partners in Project Year 3*

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Subcontractor?
Except for those partners listed in Table F1 for the Campbell sub-grantee, this center had no other community partners during Project Year 3			

Table E10*Ilima Intermediate Center: Community Partners in Project Year 3*

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Subcontractor?
Honolulu Zoo Society: Zoo to You Outreach Program	Other unit of city or county government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Paid staffing 	yes
Jeffrey Pagay DBA Airbrush Creations Hawaii	For-profit entity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing 	yes

Table E11*Campbell High Center: Community Partners in Project Year 3*

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Subcontractor?
Except for those partners listed in Table F1 for the Campbell sub-grantee, this center had no other community partners during Project Year 3			

Appendix F
Campbell Sub-Grantee Centers' Parent and
Other Adult Activities in Project Year 3
(The Summer of 2011 through School Year 2011–12)

Table F1*'Ewa Elementary: Parent Activities Implemented in Project Year 3*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Kickstart 2011	Summer	• Adult family members	15 adult family members		• Promotion of family involvement		1 week 2 days per week 1 hour per day
Hip Hop with Tracy Jones	Summer	• Adult family members	15 adult family members		• Promotion of family involvement		1 week 1 day per week 1 hour per day
Mad Science Mineral Mania	School year	• Adult family members	11 adult family members		• Promotion of family involvement		1 week 1 day per week 1 hour per day
Mad Science Optical Illusions	School year	• Adult family members	7 adult family members		• Promotion of family involvement		1 week 1 day per week 1 hour per day

Table F2*'Ewa Elementary: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Parent Activities in Project Year 3*

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
i13. parents of students who participate in the centers also receive support/guidance from the centers.	• parent days

Table F3*'Ewa Beach Elementary: Parent Activities Implemented in Project Year 3*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
No parent activities were reported.							

Table F4*'Ewa Beach Elementary: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Parent Activities in Project Year 3*

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
i13. parents of students who participate in the centers also receive support/guidance from the centers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parent expectations are not always correct. i.e. Snack time and extra activities for students are not expected.

Table F5*Holomua Elementary: Parent Activities Implemented in Project Year 3*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
No parent activities were reported.							

Table F6*Holomua Elementary: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Parent Activities in Project Year 3*

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
i13. parents of students who participate in the centers also receive support/guidance from the centers.	No comments were provided.

Table F7*Iroquois Point Elementary: Parent Activities Implemented in Project Year 3*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
No parent activities were reported.							

Table F8*Iroquois Point Elementary: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Parent Activities in Project Year 3*

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
i13. parents of students who participate in the centers also receive support/guidance from the centers.	No comments were provided.

Table F9*Ka'imiloa Elementary: Parent Activities Implemented in Project Year 3*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
No parent activities were reported.							

Table F10*Ka'imiloa Elementary: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Parent Activities in Project Year 3*

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
i13. parents of students who participate in the centers also receive support/guidance from the centers.	No comments were provided.

Table F11*Keone'ula Elementary: Parent Activities Implemented in Project Year 3*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
No parent activities were reported.							

Table F12

Keone‘ula Elementary: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Parent Activities in Project Year 3

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
i13. parents of students who participate in the centers also receive support/guidance from the centers.	No comments were provided.

Table F13

Pōhākea Elementary: Parent Activities Implemented in Project Year 3

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Dance-Taiko	School year	• Adult family members	45 adult family members		• Promotion of parental involvement		1 week 1 day per week 3 hours per day

Table F14

Pōhākea Elementary: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Parent Activities in Project Year 3

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
i13. parents of students who participate in the centers also receive support/guidance from the centers.	No comments were provided.

Table F15*Ewa Makai Middle: Parent Activities Implemented in Project Year 3*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
No parent activities were reported.							

Table F16*Ewa Makai Middle: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Parent Activities in Project Year 3*

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
i13. parents of students who participate in the centers also receive support/guidance from the centers.	No comments were provided.

Table F17*Ilima Intermediate: Parent Activities Implemented in Project Year 3*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
No parent activities were reported.							

Table F18*Ilima Intermediate: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Parent Activities in Project Year 3*

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
i13. parents of students who participate in the centers also receive support/guidance from the centers.	No comments were provided.

Table F19*Campbell High: Parent Activities Implemented in Project Year 3*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student/adult category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
No parent activities were reported.							

Table F20*Campbell High: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Parent Activities in Project Year 3*

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
i13. parents of students who participate in the centers also receive support/guidance from the centers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some parents came to participate

Table F21*'Ewa Elementary Center Parent Questionnaire: Findings About the April 13, 2012 Parent Night Activity*

Questions	Total responses	Missing data	1 = <i>Very little</i>	2	3	4 = <i>A lot</i>	Average extent (std. dev.)
1. How much did you learn from tonight's session? (About science, reading, math, technology, etc.?)	17	0	0	0	2	15	3.9 (0.3)
2. How much did you learn about how your child learns/how your child is taught from tonight's sessions?	17	0	0	1	0	16	3.9 (0.5)
3. How much NEW information did you learn tonight (if any) about how to work with your child on a project?	17	0	0	0	5	12	3.7 (0.5)
4. To what extent might the information from tonight's session be connected to a career for you?	17	0	2	4	2	9	3.1 (1.1)
5. To what extent was tonight's session enjoyable for you and your child?	16	1	0	0	1	15	3.9 (0.2)

Note. The shaded cells indicate average ratings of 3.0 and above, and are interpreted as moderate to high levels of implementation.

Table F21a

'Ewa Elementary Center Parent Comments about the April 13, 2012 Parent Night Activity

Questions	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
1. How much did you learn from tonight's session? (About science, reading, math, technology, etc.?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• My grandchild learn a lot about rocks.• These information was taught @ a later age when I was in school.
2. How much did you learn about how your child learns/how your child is taught from tonight's lesson?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• very engaging• She learn a lot of things today. really good.• Mineral mania taught a lot about minerals and rocks for my child
3. How much NEW information did you learn tonight (if any) about how to work with your child on a project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• the new information. how I worked with my child is really easy.• Presentation for a project & creativity
4. To what extent might the information from tonight's session be connected to a career for you?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Very little for me. But a lot for my child!• My career is okay• I think a little of science has to do with any career.• Becoming a future teacher• I'm in sales.
5. To what extent was tonight's session enjoyable for you and your child?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Very• yes• The session is always kept interesting.• I appreciate the program Thank you
6. What do you hope to see in future family activity events?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• same stuff great job! loved the video!• The students really were engaged in the hands-on activities. Maybe we could invite parents to a robotic event where the kids get to demonstrate their robots.• The Mad Science is more than what I expected for the better. It's very interesting and more fun with learning. Thank you for the invite.• Excursion to museums which is a related to these events. Space camps on Ford Island• The program was great. It was full of information & the staff is very helpful.• more demonstrations. The presentation was great!• I hope Parent night for the GEMS program continues for a long time. It was very informative & assuring to learn the many exciting things my child is learning. Great job Faculty & Staff!• I love hearing everything my kids learn when they get home. You guy are all doing a great job!• more out door activitys learning from the nature environment• more events like this, it promotes parent involvement more• more hands on team challenges parent participation• Hands on activities are always fun!

Table F22*'Ewa Beach Parent Questionnaire: Findings About the May 6, 2012 Parent Night Activity*

Questions	Total responses	Missing data	1 = <i>Very little</i>	2	3	4 = <i>A lot</i>	Average extent (std. dev.)
1. How much did you learn from tonight's session? (About science, reading, math, technology, etc.?)	46	1	2	1	11	32	3.6 (0.7)
2. How much did you learn about how your child learns/how your child is taught from tonight's sessions?	46	1	2	1	11	32	3.6 (0.7)
3. How much NEW information did you learn tonight (if any) about how to work with your child on a project?	46	1	2	3	13	28	3.5 (0.8)
4. To what extent might the information from tonight's session be connected to a career for you?	45	2	12	5	10	18	2.8 (1.2)
5. To what extent was tonight's session enjoyable for you and your child?	46	1	0	0	6	40	3.9 (0.3)

Note. The shaded cells indicate average ratings of 3.0 and above, and are interpreted as moderate to high levels of implementation.

Table F22a

'Ewa Beach Center Parent Comments about the May 6, 2012 Parent Night Activity

Questions	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
1. How much did you learn from tonight's session? (About science, reading, math, technology, etc.?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Already had previous knowledge. Good for students to learn. Plus its fun!• Liked the display Boards.• not too much• I learned from tonight session is how we get to build a robot• Reading. Liked the 3x having to read and comprehend• I really didn't know much about what the gems program was until tonight.
2. How much did you learn about how your child learns/how your child is taught from tonight's lesson?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• a lot• I enjoyed learning about how you are leveraging technology to teach.• I learned how my child was taught
3. How much NEW information did you learn tonight (if any) about how to work with your child on a project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• a lot• Would like a hand out with his level or improvement on it.• I like having to read to themselves outloud & with teacher
4. To what extent might the information from tonight's session be connected to a career for you?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• I am an instructor for the submarine force. Aids in structure to teach.• not a lot• I am in medical prof. Fluency and Accuracy is a major too!• Math Tutor Teacher
5. To what extent was tonight's session enjoyable for you and your child?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The fact that it was a "Hands on" Learning technique. Thank you.• The performances were awesome!• Very Well Done! Enjoyed!!• Good Fun Da Dancing• very enjoyable• The Performances!!!• We all had a wonderful time• We enjoyed it• The kids were Fantabulous!
6. What do you hope to see in future family activity events?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cultural influences in community [illegible] learn Ethnic cultures• A similar activity. Teachers are great at what they do. Very nice!! Thank you for taking the time w\ our children.• Make kid prizes• sports, band• Perfect!

(Table F22a

'Ewa Beach Center Parent Comments about the May 6, 2012 Parent Night Activity, continued)

Questions

Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)

- Nothing! Perfect!
 - Hope to have this program this year Thank you very much for helping my children
 - More exciting activity as same as tonight
 - Awesome job!!! I look forward to next year
 - exactley what went on in the program tonight Thank you.
 - Everything was great!!
 - More child interaction
 - Fun and family bonding because its great to have fun and learn new things like working Together
 - Same things We really enjoyed ourself
 - I hope to see in future family activity events are more performance because I want students to have more fun in this G.E.M.S program
 - I really enjoyed the teachers, school & all the things you do for our kids.
 - Everything was just fine.
 - more 1 on 1 with teacher. Teachers did a great job explaining the program!
 - Enjoyed the GEMS program. Thank you for all the time & effort put into the program. I know my son enjoyed the reading program and never appeared to be tired.
 - More music
 - Mr. America Mr. Hawai'i Mr. Ewa Beach Thank you for the snacks & water! Taito Drumming
-

Table F23*Ka'imiloa Elementary Center Parent Questionnaire: Findings About the March 28, 2012 Parent Night Activity*

Questions	Total responses	Missing data	1 = <i>Very little</i>	2	3	4 = <i>A lot</i>	Average extent (std. dev.)
1. How much did you learn from tonight's session? (About science, reading, math, technology, etc.?)	7	1	0	0	3	4	3.6 (0.5)
2. How much did you learn about how your child learns/how your child is taught from tonight's sessions?	8	0	0	0	4	4	3.5 (0.5)
3. How much NEW information did you learn tonight (if any) about how to work with your child on a project?	8	0	0	0	4	4	3.5 (0.5)
4. To what extent might the information from tonight's session be connected to a career for you?	8	0	1	0	5	2	3.0 (0.9)
5. To what extent was tonight's session enjoyable for you and your child?	8	0	0	0	2	6	3.8 (0.4)

Note. The shaded cells indicate average ratings of 3.0 and above, and are interpreted as moderate to high levels of implementation.

Table F23a

Ka'imiloa Elementary Center Parent Comments about the March 28, 2012 Parent Night Activity

Questions	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
1. How much did you learn from tonight's session? (About science, reading, math, technology, etc.?)	No comments were provided.
2. How much did you learn about how your child learns/how your child is taught from tonight's lesson?	No comments were provided.
3. How much NEW information did you learn tonight (if any) about how to work with your child on a project?	No comments were provided.
4. To what extent might the information from tonight's session be connected to a career for you?	No comments were provided.
5. To what extent was tonight's session enjoyable for you and your child?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• My kids were very excited to show us what they've learned on the computer and there projects.
6. What do you hope to see in future family activity events?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• My child's performance in her subjects.• The rest of my children coming along to enjoy.

Table F24*Campbell High Center Parent Questionnaire: Findings About the March 28, 2012 Parent Night Activity*

Questions	Total responses	Missing data	1 = <i>Very little</i>	2	3	4 = <i>A lot</i>	Average extent (std. dev.)
1. How much did you learn from tonight's session? (About science, reading, math, technology, etc.?)	18	0	0	0	11	7	3.4 (0.5)
2. How much did you learn about how your child learns/how your child is taught from tonight's sessions?	18	0	0	1	6	11	3.6 (0.6)
3. How much NEW information did you learn tonight (if any) about how to work with your child on a project?	18	0	0	0	10	8	3.4 (0.5)
4. To what extent might the information from tonight's session be connected to a career for you?	18	0	0	3	10	5	3.1 (0.7)
5. To what extent was tonight's session enjoyable for you and your child?	18	0	0	2	4	12	3.6 (0.7)

Note. The shaded cells indicate average ratings of 3.0 and above, and are interpreted as moderate to high levels of implementation.

Table F24a

Campbell High Center Parent Comments about the March 28, 2012 Parent Night Activity

Questions	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
1. How much did you learn from tonight's session? (About science, reading, math, technology, etc.?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• It would help the student in their activities
2. How much did you learn about how your child learns/how your child is taught from tonight's lesson?	No comments were provided.
3. How much NEW information did you learn tonight (if any) about how to work with your child on a project?	No comments were provided.
4. To what extent might the information from tonight's session be connected to a career for you?	No comments were provided.
5. To what extent was tonight's session enjoyable for you and your child?	No comments were provided.
6. What do you hope to see in future family activity events?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• I would like to see the Principal to talk about the activity.• More educated tour for the students• Just hope to have more activities that would also serve as bonding moment with my kid.• More educated tour for the students• More seats• We hope to see more improvement about their studies, learning about some academic subjects. Having a wide knowledge about their lesson.• more educational tour for the students, teachers, & parents.• I hope to see my child in the class one day.
