

An Evaluation Report about the
Central Kaua‘i Sub-grantee 21st Century
Community Learning Centers
in Project Year 5

Aric D. H. Nakamura, Elliott M. Oshiro
Terry Ann F. Higa, Lolito Sagaysay

December 2013

**An Evaluation Report about the
Central Kaua‘i Sub-grantee 21st Century
Community Learning Centers
in Project Year 5**

Central Kaua‘i Complex, Kaua‘i District, Island of Kaua‘i

**A report submitted to the
Hawai‘i Department of Education, Special Programs Management Section
for the period July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013**

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

December 2013

Contents

Executive Summary.....	v
A Description of the Central Kaua‘i Sub-Grantee Project.....	1
Origin of the Project.....	2
Goals of the Project.....	5
Characteristics of the Project Materials and Resources.....	5
The Evaluation Design.....	7
The Evaluation of Project Implementation.....	11
The Evaluation of Project Outcomes.....	12
Findings about Project Implementation in Project Year 5.....	12
Was the Project Implemented as Planned in the Grant Proposal?.....	12
Characteristics of Clients for the Project.....	13
Which community-based partnerships, as planned in the grant application, have been established and maintained and which ones were not? Why?.....	15
The Implementation of Core Academic Activities.....	16
The Implementation of Academic Enrichment Activities.....	22
Findings about Project Outcomes in Project Year 5.....	26
Dissemination of Results to the Public.....	26
Conclusions and Recommendations.....	26
References.....	32
Appendix A.....	33
Appendix B.....	57
Appendix C.....	65
Appendix D.....	69
Appendix E.....	73

Executive Summary

This report covers Project Year 5 of the Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee’s 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) project, which operated from the summer of 2012 through spring of 2013. This includes June 2013 as a short summer session. Usually, data for summer sessions are included in the findings for the following school year. However, the June 2013 short summer session was an exception for the 21st CCLC program and the June 2013 summer session is included in the reporting for Project Year 5. For simplicity in reporting, we will continue to report the project year as summer of 2012 through spring 2013.

This report fulfills the evaluation requirements set by the Hawai‘i Department of Education Special Program Management Section (HIDOE-SPMS), which oversees the 21st CCLC program in Hawai‘i. The Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee included five centers at the host schools of King Kaumuali‘i Elementary, Kōloa Elementary, Elsie H. Wilcox Elementary, Chiefess Kamakahahei Middle, and Kaua‘i High. Data were collected about the implementation of activities and outcomes to fulfill the 21st CCLC program evaluation requirements. The evaluation questions and outcome indicators are based on the evaluation reporting requirements and report template of the 21st CCLC program. Statutory and regulatory requirements specify criteria for the evaluation of sub-grantee projects.

As in previous evaluations of this project, the evaluators originally planned the study of project implementation and outcomes to fully address the evaluation questions in the HIDOE-SPMS evaluation report template. Our plan for the study of implementation included the collection of descriptive information, evaluative information, data about the extent and quality of implementation of project activities, and descriptions about implementation of the project provided by project leaders and staff for comparison with descriptions in the grant proposal. The study of project implementation and outcomes included the collection of student-level data to address federal and state performance measures.

The evaluators faced a major challenge to the collection of evaluation data in Project Year 5. The HIDOE Data Governance Office (DGO) informed the evaluators that a data sharing agreement was necessary to collect Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) or personally identifiable information (PII). The DGO and Curriculum Research & Development Group (CRDG) reached agreement on most of the issues toward a finalized data sharing agreement. However, the unresolved issue was free- and reduced-lunch data. The free- and reduced-lunch status data are required for reporting by the USDE for the 21st CCLC program as evidence that the centers are providing services to a key target group. We reported this remaining issue to the HIDOE Educational Specialist who is, to this date continuing discussions with the DGO. The free- and reduced-lunch data are included with other center participants’ demographics and outcome data in the data-collection instruments. Therefore, we have not received clearance to collect the centers’ spreadsheets for this report. Data on the spreadsheets that were not available to us for this report are the center participants’ grade levels, attendance, gender, ethnicity, free- and reduced-lunch status, special education status, English Language Learner (ELL) status, and data based on attendance (teacher survey/academic behavior data, report card grades, and pre-/post-test assessment scores). Information gathered for this report were from completed Annual Performance Report forms, on-line questionnaires about implementation of activities, questionnaires about community partners, and

communications with center staff members.

During the preparation of this report, efforts are ongoing between CRDG and HIDOE to negotiate the remaining issue; however, because of the impending reporting deadline, the evaluators completed this report without the FERPA and PII data. If the FERPA and PII data are available to us prior to the deadline for reporting into the 21st CCLC Learning Points Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS), we will assist the center leaders and staff with preparing the data for entry into PPICS.

The data from the past five project years show growing percentages of students qualifying for free- or reduced-lunch status at the centers' host schools, and are considered as evidence that the five host schools are situated in a community with high-poverty demographics. Each of the five Central Kaua'i sub-grantee centers implemented activities in at least one core academic area of reading/literacy, mathematics, or science, and also provided academic enrichment activities to center students. We were not able to determine if the sub-grantee implemented the core academic activities at high extent and quality at all five centers because there was a short timeline for collecting data in Project Year 5. The sub-grantee maintained two partnerships that were written into the grant proposal: (a) CRDG Kaua'i Island Utility Cooperative (KIUC)/Kaua'i Economic Development Board (KEDB) (provided materials for the robotics activities, as well as coordinated the island wide robotics competition) and (b) the HIDOE Central Kaua'i District office (provided facilities for the centers at the host schools and the SRS to manage the 21st CCLC project). The Central Kaua'i sub-grantee also partnered with a team of evaluators from CRDG from the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa College of Education (UHM CoE), a partner who provided services as an external evaluator. Furthermore, the Kaumuali'i and Kōloa centers secured volunteer partners, who were host school employees or parents of students at the host schools. The Kamakahelei Middle center secured two partners: the Boys and Girls Club and Waimea Teen Care (Project Alert Drug Awareness Program).

There were conflicting data about the implementation of activities with parents and other adult family members. The conflict was that no descriptive information was provided to the evaluators about activities with parent and other adult family members. However, evaluative information was provided (submitted via the on-line questionnaires) about activities with parents and other adult family members. We recommend that center leaders collaborate with other sub-grantees and review literature for best practices involving parents and other adult family members. Based on our over 10 years of working with several sub-grantees, we understand that implementing activities with families is challenging because there are many demands for parents' time, despite their high value for their children's education and high interest in becoming involved in center activities. The centers did not meet the performance measure for providing services at least 15 hours per week on average when school is not in session. Again, from our experience, we understand that this is difficult for centers in Hawai'i to accomplish, but we encourage the centers to continue to strive toward this objective.

Our review of the Central Kaua'i 21st CCLC data for Project Year 5 and the past four years show that there is high value in the host schools and school community for this project. The evidence is the high level of teacher, staff, and student participation at centers like Kamakahelei Middle and provision of services to high need student groups. In our over 10 years of experience as 21st CCLC evaluators, we consider it is rare to see so many unpaid partners in a sub-grantee. We interpret these events as evidence of interest and value in sustaining the centers.

An Evaluation Report about the Central Kaua‘i 21st Century Community Learning Center Project in Project Year 5

This is the Year 5 evaluation report for Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee’s 21st Century Community Learning Center (CCLC) project, covering the summer of 2012 through spring of 2013. This report also covers a short summer session in June 2013. Usually, data for summer sessions are included in the findings for the following school year. However, the June 2013 short summer session was an exception for the 21st CCLC program and is included in the reporting for Project Year 5. For simplicity in reporting, we will continue to report the project year as summer of 2012 through spring 2013. The Central Kaua‘i 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 (UHM-CoE) to provide evaluation services. The CRDG evaluation team developed and implemented an evaluation design for the Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee with input from the Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee project director and center coordinators. This report is the result of the evaluation efforts and includes a description of the project, evaluation design, data-collection methods, and findings about implementation and outcomes in Project Year 5. 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 Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee 21st CCLC grant proposal.

A Description of the Central Kaua‘i Sub-Grantee Project

The Central Kaua‘i 21st CCLC sub-grantee was in its fifth and final year of funding, which began in the summer of 2012 and continued through the spring of 2013. Since 2002, state education agencies have managed this federally funded competitive grant program under regulatory oversight from the U.S. Department of Education (USDE). The 21st CCLC program had the following purposes:

- (1) provide opportunities for academic enrichment, including 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;
- (3) and offer families of students served by community learning centers opportunities for literacy and related educational development (*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 (2012). In this report, we include information about the project as contextual information for the evaluation of implementation and outcomes. Some background information was gleaned from the grant proposal, including information about the origins of the project and project goals, a description of the local community, the location of

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

As written in the Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee’s 21st CCLC grant proposal, “each [host] school examined their individual Strategic and Academic Plans for the 2008–09 school year to ensure alignment with goals and activities already established through involvement of all stakeholders. A framework was developed by a team of school representatives, who explored the needs of each school and developed an overall common complex plan that would serve all students K–12. Although each school is situated in a unique community with unique needs common needs areas were identified through analysis of each school’s achievement data in math, reading and science. It became clear that there is a need for student enrichment opportunities to strengthen and extend the learning in the classroom” (Baker, 2009, pp. 4–5).

Where was the project implemented? In Project Year 5, the Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee included five centers that were situated on the campuses of their respective host schools of Kaumuali‘i Elementary, Kōloa Elementary, Wilcox Elementary, Kamakahaiei Middle, and Kaua‘i High. All of the five centers provided 21st CCLC project services during Project Year 5. These five HIDOE public schools are part of the Central Kaua‘i complex area, on the island of Kaua‘i, State of Hawai‘i. The host school names, street addresses, web sites, and other information are shown as Table 1.

The 21st CCLC program 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” (Learning Point Associates, 2012, p. 2). Note that the centers, although identified by their host school names were separate entities from their host schools and provided services to students outside of the regular day-school hours as required by the 21st CCLC.

What are the characteristics of the school community? The free- or reduced-lunch percentages of the five Central Kaua‘i host schools participating in the project are shown in Table 2. The free- or reduced-lunch percentages show that over the last five years, the free- or reduced-lunch percentages have increased between 9% and 23.5% at the host schools. The increase in percentages are 9% at Kaumuali‘i, 12.1% at Kōloa, 23.5% at Wilcox, 13.5% at Kamakahaiei, and 12.4% at Kaua‘i High. Furthermore, the free- or reduced-lunch percentage for the Central Kaua‘i Complex has grown by 15.7% over the last five years.

When comparing this percentage to the five-year growth rate of the State of Hawai‘i (11.3%), it surpasses the increase in growth of the State of Hawai‘i free- or reduced-lunch percentage by 4.4%.

How many people did it affect? A description of each center student subgroup and the number of students served at each center are discussed in the section of this report about addressing findings about implementation. An approximate combined total of 165 center administrators and staff were involved in the centers during Project Year 5. However, note that some staff members were involved in the centers during both the summer and school year terms, and are included in both counts. Specific descriptions of

Table 1*Central Kaua‘i Sub-grantee: Location of Sites in Project Year 5*

School name	Address	Phone	Grade levels	url_home
Kaumuali‘i Elem.	4380 Hanamāulu Road Līhue, HI 96766	(808) 241-3150	K–5	http://www.Kaumuali‘i.k12.hi.us/king.html
Kōloa Elem.	3223 Po‘ipū Road Kōloa, HI 96766	(808) 742-8460	PreK–5	http://Kōloa.k12.hi.us
Wilcox Elem.	4319 Hardy Street Līhue, HI 96766	(808) 274-3150	K–5	http://wilcox.k12.hi.us
Kamakahahei Middle	4431 Nūhou Street Līhue, HI 96766	(808) 241-3200	6–8	http://www.ckms.k12.hi.us
Kaua‘i High	3577 Lala Road Līhue, HI 96766	(808) 274-3160	9–12	http://teacherweb.com/HI/Kaua‘ihigh

Table 2*Central Kaua‘i Sub-grantee: Free- or reduced-lunch Counts and Percentages over School Years 2007–08 through 2011–12*

Student profile	School-level counts and percentages ¹				
	2007–08	2008–09	2009–10	2010–11	2011–12
Kaumuali‘i El.	251 (48.0%)	269 (48.9%)	268 (49.2%)	318 (55.3%)	348 (57.0%)
Kōloa El.	80 (44.4%)	104 (47.9%)	136 (56.0%)	116 (48.9%)	156 (56.5%)
Wilcox El.	231 (25.5%)	288 (30.9%)	358 (39.2%)	402 (43.8%)	457 (49.0%)
Kamakahahei Mid.	297 (31.3%)	316 (34.5%)	321 (35.2%)	366 (41.2%)	398 (44.8%)
Kaua‘i Hi.	272 (21.4%)	330 (26.2%)	339 (28.3%)	396 (32.8%)	401 (33.8%)
Central Kaua‘i Complex ³	1,131 (29.5%)	1,307 (33.7%)	1,422 (37.3%)	1,598 (41.8%)	1,760 (45.2%)
State of Hawai‘i ³	66,339 (38.6%)	71,568 (42.0%)	74,924 (43.9%)	80,374 (47.3%)	85,813 (49.9%)

¹The school level counts and percentages are based on the HIDOE School Status and Improvement Reports. Retrieved August 24, 2012 from: <http://arch.k12.hi.us/school/ssir/ssir.html>

²The 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 special education (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>

³The Central Kaua‘i Complex and State of Hawai‘i counts and percentages are based on the HIDOE Trend Report 2011–12. Retrieved September 9, 2013 from: <http://arch.k12.hi.us/school/trends/trends.html>

the types of staff and counts per centers are provided in the findings about implementation section of this report specific to center staff.

Goals of the Project

The purpose of the 21st CCLC program is to provide services to students who have the greatest need for supplemental learning opportunities. As stated in the grant proposal, the five HIDOE Central Kaua‘i host schools have high populations of students in need of supplemental learning opportunities (Baker, 2009). As a 21st CCLC funded project, the objectives for the Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee align with the 21st CCLC program key performance indicators. The sub-grantee’s objectives are listed below.

- Improve regular center students’ academic behavior.
- Develop each school’s capacity as a learning center by providing services in at least one core academic area such as reading, mathematics, and science.
- Develop each school’s capacity as a learning center by providing enrichment and support activities.
- Develop each school’s capacity as a learning center by fostering community collaboration.
- Facilitate the social development of participating students. (Central Kaua‘i 21st CCLC, 2011)

Clients involved in the project. The sub-grantee 21st CCLC Handbook for 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, 2011, Tab 3: Plan and Program Implementation, p. 2). Center coordinators reported the types of student participants per activities on Annual Performance Report (APR) Form C7. These data are summarized and shown in more detail as Appendix A. The center coordinators reported that they enrolled the following student populations in their respective centers during Project Year 5: (a) Kaumuali‘i: economically disadvantaged, students who were not performing at grade level/failing, students considered ELL, Kindergarten students, and Asian/Pacific Islander (a student subgroup that did not reach the reading and mathematics proficiency objectives in SY 2011–12) (Nakamura, Oshiro, Higa, & Sagaysay, 2013); (b) Kōloa: students who were not performing at grade level/failing, ELL students, students with special needs or disabilities, and students with behavior issues; (c) Wilcox: students entering Kindergarten, students not performing at grade level/failing, ELL students, students with special needs or disabilities, and students with special needs or disabilities; (d) Kamakahahei Middle: students who were performing below grade level/failing, ELL students, students with special needs/disabilities, ELL students, and students with special needs/disabilities; (e) Kaua‘i High: students who needed to complete credits to graduate.

Characteristics of the Project Materials and Resources

There were two sources of information about project materials and resources which are summarized in this section. To the extent possible, the information was collected by multiple methods. Further elaboration on data-collection methods is provided in the section on the evaluation design. Center coordinators completed a section of the Learning Point Associates 21st CCLC 2012 APR from the federal online Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS) that elicited information about activities and materials. Other sources of information were e-mail messaging, telephone calls, or in-person communications with center coordinators about the materials and resources used by students.

Project materials and resources provided by partners: What resources (e.g., grant funds, physical facilities, in-kind personnel, community partnerships) were available? The sub-grantee's grant proposal states that school stakeholders will determine research-based practices to address those areas of need. Program materials and resources provided by partners are shown in tabular form in Appendix B.

The largest proportion of resources for the Central Kaua'i sub-grantee programming was provided by 21st CCLC grant funds. There were three partners across the sub-grantee's centers in 2012–13. One partner was CRDG from UHM-CoE, the external evaluator for the Central Kaua'i sub-grantee, Kaua'i Island Utilities Cooperative (KIUC)/Kaua'i Economic Development Board (KEDB) who provided materials for the robotics activities, as well as coordinated the island wide robotics competition, and the other partner was the HIDOE Central Kaua'i District office, that agreed to the School Renewal Specialist (SRS) having responsibilities as sub-grantee Project Director and allowing the centers to use the host school facilities. The host schools also referred students to the centers. A second Project Director was contracted (the former SRS who was now retired from the HIDOE) to facilitate data collection and support center operations.

In Project Year 5, four of the five centers secured partnerships for their centers. The Kaumuali'i center leaders secured seven individual partners and the Kōloa center leaders secured five individual partners who provided volunteer staffing at the respective centers in Project Year 5. These individuals preferred to be anonymous for the purposes of this report. The Wilcox center leaders secured a partnership with the Kaua'i High School Key Club who provided volunteer staffing for the center. The Kamakahaie center leaders secured two partnerships for their center, the Boys and Girls Club of Hawai'i who provided programming or activity related services to the center, and the Waimea Teen Care–Project Alert–Drug Awareness Program who also provided programming or activity related services to the center.

In what activities were project participants expected to take part? Based on information provided by center staff on APR Form C7, center attendees in the elementary centers participated in activities focusing on core areas such as reading/language arts, mathematics and science. The elementary centers also provided academic enrichment activities in the content areas of art, career education, character education, critical thinking skills, cultural/social studies, dance, drama, health/nutrition, foreign language, literature, music, physical education, routines of kindergarten, sports, and technology. The middle school center offered enrichment activities in arts, cultural/social studies, health/nutrition, music, and technology. The high school center offered credit recovery activities as the personal transition plan (PTP) one-half credit requirement for graduation. The high school center activities were integrated activities that included the enrichment areas of art, cultural/social studies, health/nutrition, music, and technology.

What specific procedures, if any, did project staff follow? Center attendees were referred to the centers by teachers at their respective host schools or were recruited by center leaders and staff according to the criteria in the grant. Center staff followed a weekly schedule implementing activities focused on delivering services to attendees meant to supplement the school day. Center leaders and staff were expected to provide project activities in a secure and safe environment with participant behavior expectations similar to those found in the host schools.

How was the project administered? The Central Kaua‘i 21st CCLC sub-grantee was administered through a tiered management structure with project authority delegated from the project directors who provided direct management of the project. The project directors were assisted by center coordinators who managed the operations of their respective centers. Center coordinators along with their staff implemented center activities to meet the project objectives by providing services in reading/literacy, mathematics, science, and enrichment activities to meet the academic performance and behavior needs of center attendees.

Staff and others involved in the project. The evaluators collected information about the Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee Project Year 5 staff on APR Form B, which is shown as Table 3. Besides the project directors, who provided managerial oversight of the project, center coordinators at every center provided operational management of the centers. During the summer of 2012, there were six center coordinators and 57 staff members. Two center coordinators managed the Kaua‘i High center; there was one center coordinator for each of the following centers: Kaumuali‘i Elementary, Kōloa Elementary, Wilcox Elementary, and Kamakahelei Middle. Of the 57 staff members two were unpaid volunteer high school students and 55 were paid staff members in the following categories: 35 school-day teachers; six high school students; five other nonteaching school-day staff; four other nonschool-day staff with some or no college; two other nonschool-day staff with a college degree or higher; two college students; and one parent.

During SY 2012–13, there were nine center coordinators: one center coordinator was at Kamakahelei Middle, and two center coordinators were at each of the following centers: Kaumuali‘i Elementary, Kōloa Elementary, Wilcox Elementary and Kaua‘i High. Of the 101 other center staff members, 82 were paid staff members and 19 were unpaid volunteers. The 82 paid staff members were reported in the following categories: 55 school-day teachers; 10 parents; nine other nonschool-day staff with some or no college; five other nonteaching school-day staff; one other nonschool-day staff with college degree or higher; one other community member; and one college student. There were 19 volunteer staff members in the following categories: six high school students; 11 parents; one elementary student; and one other nonteaching school-day staff.

As shown in Table 3, the majority of staff members during the summer of 2012 and SY 2012–13 were in paid positions. In addition, the majority of staff members were school-day teachers. Hiring school-day teachers and other school personnel provided the advantages of 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 as a basis for decision making to improve services to project participants. The project leaders also may consider the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of this evaluation to inform sustainability of the project or proposal writing for future funding of project activities.

Table 3*Central Kaua'i Sub-grantee: Description of Staff at the 21st CCLC Center in Project Year 5*

Center	Type of staff									
	School-day teachers (includes former and substitute teachers)	Center administrators and coordinators	Youth development workers or 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 community members (e.g., business mentors, senior citizens, clergy, etc.)	Other nonschool-day staff with some or no college	Other: elementary school volunteer
Kaumuali'i El.	21 paid sy 20 paid summ	2 paid sy 1 paid summ	—	—	7 vol. sy	—	—	—	—	1 vol. sy
Kōloa El.	9 paid sy 3 paid summ	2 paid sy 1 paid summ	1 paid sy	5 paid sy 1 vol. sy 5 paid summ	3 paid sy 4 vol. sy 1 paid summ	—	—	1 paid sy	—	—
Wilcox El.	17 paid sy 5 paid summ	2 paid sy 1 paid summ	—	—	—	1 paid sy	6 vol.sy	—	3 paid sy 2 paid summ	—
Kamakahele i Mid.	2 paid sy 2 paid summ	1 paid sy 1 paid summ	2 paid summ	—	—	2 paid summ	6 paid summ 2 vol. summ	—	6 paid sy 2 paid summ	—
Kaua'i Hi.	6 paid sy 5 paid summ	2 paid sy 2 paid summ	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
TOTALS	55 paid sy 35 paid summ	9 paid sy 6 paid summ	1 paid sy 2 paid summ	5 paid sy 1 vol. sy 5 paid summ	10 paid sy 11 vol. sy 1 paid summ	1 paid sy 2 paid summ	6 vol.sy 6 paid sum 2 vol. summ	1 paid sy	9 paid sy 4 paid summ	1 vol. sy

Note. sy=school year, summ=summer, vol.=volunteer

Some staff members were involved in the centers during the summer of 2012 and SY 2012–13 and were included in both counts. The total staff was 150 (57 during summer of 2012 and 93 during SY 2012–13).

There were major challenges to data collection in Project Year 5 that need to be described here. The 2012–13 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between CRDG and the Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee was executed in February of 2013. The Evaluation Principal Investigator (PI) sought permission from the HIDOE Data Governance Office (DGO) to obtain HIDOE data necessary to fulfill the MOA and Federal 21st CCLC PPICS and HIDOE reporting requirements. Therefore, the PI contacted the DGO about procedures for approval to collect data as stated in the MOA with the Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee. As requested by the DGO staff, CRDG staff provided DGO staff with copies of the MOA, evaluation design, data-collection plans, USDE and HIDOE documents about the 21st CCLC program and requirements for evaluation reports. In the initial stages of this process, DGO staff required that CRDG evaluators cease all evaluation activities with the sub-grantee. The CRDG evaluators asked the sub-grantee center staff to continue collecting all 2012–13 data and document their center activities, but they should hold on to the files until CRDG receives clearance from the DGO to collect the data. The CRDG PI was told that a data-sharing agreement would be drafted. Some issues with the data-sharing agreement came into the discussions, such as assignment of the data-collection tasks and the timeline for destruction/retention of data.

In May 2013, the DGO granted partial approval for CRDG to distribute data-collection instruments and collect data that were not Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) or personally identifiable information (PII). The partial approval allowed us to collect data based on the annual performance report (center operations, staffing, description of activities, and identity of feeder schools) and description of community partners. The Central Kaua‘i project director facilitated the data collection with center coordinators and submitted the non-PII and non-FERPA data to CRDG.

In June 2013, a data-sharing agreement drafted by the DGO was reviewed by the CRDG staff and a UHM attorney; however, some issues were still outstanding. Throughout the negotiation process of the data-sharing agreement, the CRDG evaluators continued to look toward methods of collecting data that do not contain PII. The CRDG evaluators modified the procedures to distribute the on-line questionnaire about the implementation of activities to distribute the questionnaire by URL instead of e-mail addresses (which are PII). However, there were concerns that the distribution of the questionnaires by URL addresses expanded the possible threats to validity because the URL address may be used by an unintended respondent. The DGO approved the use of this method and, by June 2013, the CRDG evaluators communicated with the sub-grantee leaders to collect data about the activities that were implemented for the extended summer session. Although the number of respondents did not include all the June 2013 centers or reach all of the staff, contractors, and volunteers in time, some information on implementation were collected through a collaborative effort of the center leaders, center staff, and the CRDG evaluators.

The data that we have not been given clearance to collect for this report are the center participants’ first and last names, grade level, student HIDOE ID numbers, attendance, gender, ethnicity, free- and reduced-lunch status, SPED status, ELL status, and data based on attendance (teacher survey/academic behavior data, report card grades, and pre-post assessment).

We believe that the DGO has an extremely important role to protect HIDOE staff and students whose PII and FERPA data would be included in the information needed to fulfill the requirements of the

evaluation report and PPICS. We believe that we had a very professional and collaborative working relationship with the DGO staff. The UHM attorneys and the HIDOE Educational Specialist as well as other stakeholders were very supportive in facilitating the progress of the data-sharing agreement. We were able to come to agreement on most of the issues, for instance, parties responsible for tasks and data destruction/retention legal issues. The outstanding issue was types of data that CRDG could collect, specifically, free- and reduced-lunch data. The free- and reduced-lunch status data are required for reporting to the USDE for the 21st CCLC program and is evidence that the centers are providing services to a key target group. The HIDOE DGO explained that free- and reduced-lunch status is a highly confidential piece of information and therefore would not include this data in the data sharing agreement. We reported this to the HIDOE Educational Specialist who has been in discussions with the DGO. Our understanding is that another Educational Specialist was involved in the discussions.

Unfortunately, while the negotiations are ongoing, we approached the deadline to submit the Central Kaua‘i 21st CCLC sub-grantee evaluation report so that the Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee which was in the final year of funding in 2012–13 (Project Year 5) can meet their invoicing and funds liquidation deadlines. Regretfully, we have to submit this report without PII or FERPA data. We will continue to work with the DGO towards executing the data-sharing agreement to obtain the FERPA and PII data in time to meet the 21st CCLC PPICS deadline, and we will work with the sub-grantees on entering the data into the PPICS system.

We feel strongly that this situation is very unfortunate, although some extremely important issues are at stake for future sharing of HIDOE data between 21st CCLC sub-grantees and their evaluators.

To address the purposes of the evaluation, the evaluators and center staff collected implementation and outcome data, including descriptive data about center activities, center operations, and center staffing; and other data relevant to the implementation of project services to participants. 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 (ESEA) of 1965 as reauthorized by the NCLB (*ESEA of 1965, Title IV, Part B, 21st CCLC*, 1965) and the non-regulatory guidance (USDE, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Academic Improvement and Teacher Quality Programs, 2003) for the program requirements. The free- or reduced-lunch data are on spreadsheets together with center students’ grade level, attendance, gender, ethnicity, SPED status, and ELL status. Therefore, these other data could not be collected without the executed data sharing agreement. Data that would result from collecting attendance data (and subsequent calculation of 30 days of attendance) also could not be collected. These are 21st CCLC teacher surveys about academic behavior, report card grades, and pre-post assessments about academic achievement.

In consultation with project leadership, the evaluation was designed to align with three key 21st CCLC documents: (a) the Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee 21st CCLC grant proposal (Baker, 2009); (b) the HIDOE-SPMS (2010) key performance indicators (KPIs); and (c) HIDOE-SPMS (2011) evaluation report template. The HIDOE-SPMS (2010) KPIs are performance measures and outcome indicators adapted from USDE 21st CCLC KPIs and associated with the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA).

The evaluation design includes plans for the evaluation of project implementation and project outcomes. At the beginning of the summer of 2012 and SY 2012–13, the CRDG evaluators, sub-grantee

leaders, and center coordinators agreed on an evaluation timeline and deliverables. CRDG evaluators provided the center staff with templates and copies of data-collection instruments. The evaluators also provided written instructions on completing the templates and instruments and were available by e-mail and telephone for questions from the Central Kaua‘i leaders and center coordinators.

The Evaluation of Project Implementation

The main evaluation question is “Was the program implemented as planned in the grant proposal?” (HIDOE-SPMS, 2011, p. 3). The associated nine sub-questions about implementation 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 are 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?” (HIDOE-SPMS, 2011, p. 3).

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, contractors, and volunteers who implemented activities; (b) an evaluator-developed questionnaire about community partnerships; and (c) summaries of school community data from the HIDOE website.

Descriptive data about center activities were collected by distribution of the APR Form C7 to center coordinators. Evaluative data about center activities were collected by distribution of an evaluator-developed on-line questionnaire to center staff, volunteers, contractors, and others who implemented activities. The on-line questionnaire was designed to elicit data 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 the questionnaire items in two parts: (a) rating the extent of implementation on a 4-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 4-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 efforts to implement activities. Another limitation was that there may be a small number of individuals who implemented some types of activities, thereby limiting the respondent group. However, we believed that it was valuable to collect evaluative data about implementation of activities from those who were directly involved with implementation.

The evaluation methods were targeted to the best source of information as respondent groups. Data about project implementation were provided by the project director, center coordinators, center staff, contractors, and parents who directly participated in center activities. The project directors provided information about overall center operations, updates about changes in personnel or instructional materials, and contractors who provided enrichment activities, dates and times of center and staff events, and so forth. Center coordinators reported information about center operations, staffing, programmatic intention, student and adult activities, and student demographics, attendance, behavior, and academic performance. Center staff reported information about implementing activities, extent of implementation, and quality of implementation.

The Evaluation of Project Outcomes

The evaluation questions about outcomes are (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?” (HIDOE-SPMS, 2012, p. 4).

The student-level outcome data focused on regular center students. As defined by the 21st CCLC program, the regular center students likely have participated in sufficient levels of center activities to have measurable effects. The evaluation design for the study of outcomes was intended to be pre/post. Intended outcome data were to include (a) the 21st CCLC teacher survey about academic behaviors which should have been administered to the elementary school regular classroom teachers and middle school English Language Arts or mathematics day teachers of regular center students and (b) Fall and Spring semester report card grades in English Language Arts and mathematics.

Findings about Project Implementation in Project Year 5

The main evaluation question about implementation is “Was the project implemented as planned in the grant proposal?” (HIDOE-SPMS, 2011, 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?” and (e) “Are the project activities interesting and valuable to students, teachers, administrators, and community partners?” (HIDOE-SPMS, 2011, p. 3).

The reader should note that four questions about implementation were moved to the introductory section of this report and are addressed in that section.. Those four questions are: “Where was the program implemented?” “What are characteristics of the school community?” “How many people did it affect?” and “What are the plans to ensure effective program implementation next year?”

Was the Project Implemented as Planned in the Grant Proposal?

In the grant proposal, project leaders proposed that the Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee will consist of five host schools, including three elementary schools, one middle school, and one high school. The five host schools were Kaumuali‘i Elementary, Kōloa Elementary, Wilcox Elementary, Kamakahaiei Middle, and Kaua‘i High. The project was implemented at these schools as planned.

Project characteristics. The Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee grant writer, original program administrator, and project director was the Central Kaua‘i SRS. That SRS retired after Project Year 2 and her successor SRS became the sub-grantee program administrator with duties as the project director. The former SRS/project director was contracted to facilitate project administration and data collection for the evaluation, while the current SRS was responsible for the project’s fiscal matters. Both the former and current SRS managed and oversaw operations, implementation of the Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee 21st CCLC grant, and coordination of the project with 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. As stated previously in this report, the Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee centers were physically

located on the campuses of their host schools (also called their feeder 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 (see discussion earlier in this report specific to characteristics of center students).

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 shown as Table 2, the Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee centers were located in high-poverty communities in SY 2007–08 through 2011–12.

Center staffing. As shown in Table 3, the majority of Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee staff during Project Year 5 were school day teachers (35 during the summer and 55 during the school year). The proportion of each type of staff to total staff could not be calculated because some staff members were employed for both the summer of 2012 and during the school year. The staffing also included other non-teaching school school-day staff (five during the summer of 2012 and six during the school year). 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). There are advantages for centers to employ host school staff; for example, depending on the position of staff member in the host school, the staff member would have familiarity with procedures for a safe environment for students, assessment procedures and use of data, instructional strategies, and project materials.

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 Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee did not meet this target in Project Year 5. The Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee hours of operations for Project Year 5 are shown as Table 4. During the summer of 2012, all five Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee centers implemented activities. During the summer of 2012, the centers offered activities from three to five weeks, three to five days per week, and 15 to 32 hours per week. During SY 2012–13, all five Central Kaua‘i centers offered activities from 28 to 39 weeks, two to five days per week, and four to 16 hours per week. This does not meet the outcome indicator of 15 hours per week, but we note that the centers offered high-need students a safe environment outside of regular school hours, almost daily, with opportunities for homework assistance, tutorials, enrichment activities, and enhancement of academic behaviors.

Characteristics of Clients for the Project

The center coordinators provided information on the APR Form C7 about number of students and types of students that participated in each activity in Project Year 5. The information is presented in tabular form as Appendix A. We provide the information about number and descriptions of center students here as information about characteristics of clients. The reader should note that center students typically attended more than one activity in each center, therefore, students are included in counts for more than one activity and counts should not be summed across activities. Additionally, readers should consider that the instructions for completing APR Form C7 were to provide counts for a typical day.

Table 4
Central Kaua‘i Sub-grantee: Hours of Operation in Project Year 5

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
Kaumuali‘i El.	4	20	3	28	6	3
Kōloa El.	4	24	4	39	11.9	5
Wilcox El.	3	25	5	39	4	2
Kamakahahei Mid.	4	32	4	31	16	4
Kaua‘i Hi.	5	15	5	30	6	4

In the summer of 2012, between 16 and 122 students participated in each activity each day at the Kaumuali‘i center. The center coordinators reported that the categories of participating students were economically disadvantaged or of Asian/Pacific Islander ethnicity (a sub-population group that did not meet the reading and mathematics proficiency objectives in 2011–12) (Adequate Yearly Performance Report, HIDOE, 2012).

In SY 2012–13 at the Kaumuali‘i center, there were between eight and 84 students who participated in each activity each day. The categories of participating students were students not performing at grade level/failing/performing below average, students of ELL status, economically disadvantaged, Asian-Pacific Islander, and other types of participants. The reader is referred to Appendix A for specific information.

In the summer of 2012 at the Kōloa center, there was an average of 42 students participating in each activity each day. The center coordinators reported that the categories of participating students were students who were not performing at grade level/failing/performing below average, or performing below average, students who were of ELL status, students with disabilities, and students with behavior issues. The reader is referred to Appendix A for specific information. At the Kōloa center during SY 2012–13, there were between 10 and 45 students who participated in each activity each day. The participating students were students who were performing below grade level/failing/performing below average, students who were of ELL status, and students with special needs or disabilities.

In the summer of 2012 at the Wilcox center, there were between 16 and 48 students who participated in each activity each day. The center coordinators reported that participating students were pre-Kindergarten, students who were not performing at grade level/failing/performing below average, and students who were of ELL status. At the Wilcox center during SY 2012–13, there were between eight and 34 students who participated in each activity each day. The participating students were students not performing at grade level/failing/performing below average, students who were of ELL status, and students with special needs or disabilities.

At the Kamakahahei center, 29 to 57 students participated in activities per day during the summer of 2012 and five to 100 students participated in activities per day during SY 2012–13. The center coordinators reported that the participating students during the summer of 2012 and SY 2012–13 were students not performing at grade level/failing/performing below average, students who were of ELL status, or students with special needs or disabilities.

In the summer of 2012, between 15 and 20 students participated in the activity per day at the Kaua‘i High center. The participating students were students in the Class of 2013 who needed to complete their PTP one-half credit graduation requirement. Also in SY 2012–13, it was reported that between 15 and 20 students participated in the activity per day and the participating students were students in the Class of 2013 who needed to complete their PTP one-half credit graduation requirement. The activity was also open to students in the Class of 2014.

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 Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee proposed to establish the following partnerships: KIUC/KEDB, YMCA of Kaua‘i and HIDOE Central Kaua‘i Complex. During Project Year

5, the Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee secured two of the three partners listed in the grant: (a) KIUC/KEDB (provided materials for the robotics activities, as well as coordinated the island wide robotics competition); and (b) HIDOE Central Kaua‘i complex (the SRS was project leader and the host schools provided facilities for center activities). Also, the Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee partnered with CRDG at the UHM-CoE, who provided services as an external evaluator. Furthermore, four of the five centers secured partnerships for their centers. The Kaumuali‘i center leaders secured seven individual partners and the Kōloa center leaders secured five individual partners who provided volunteer staffing at the respective centers in Project Year 5. These individuals preferred to be anonymous for the purposes of this report. The Wilcox center secured a partnership with the Kaua‘i High School Key Club, who provided volunteer staffing for the center. The Kamakahahei center leaders secured two partnerships for their center, the Boys and Girls Club of Hawai‘i and the Waimea Teen Care–Project Alert–Drug Awareness Program, who both provided programming or activity related services.

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.” There was a low response rate to the on-line questionnaire about the extent and quality of implementation so we could not determine the quality of the centers’ activities in the core academic areas.

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. Each of the five centers implemented core academic activities in Project Year 5, but there were mixed levels of implementation. At the Kaumuali‘i, Wilcox, Kōloa, and Kamakahahei centers, the level of implementing at least one area of academic activities was at moderate to high levels of extent and quality. The exception was at Kaua‘i High, where implementation levels were reported at mediocre extent and quality. We provide more detail about the methods of collecting data and the responses here, but we believe that the response rate was too low to determine whether or not this target was met during Project Year 5. 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 implemented in the summer of 2012 and SY 2012–13. As discussed earlier in this report, there was a very short timeframe to collect data about implementation, and this resulted in the low response rate.

Descriptive data about project activities were provided by center coordinators on the APR Form C-7. The descriptions included a primary and a secondary subject area for each activity. To gather evaluative data about activities implemented in Project Year 5, the evaluation team administered an on-line staff questionnaire that elicited the perceptions of staff, contractors, or volunteers about the extent and quality of implementation of project activities.

A description of activities, including content areas, implemented at each center is shown as Appendix A. We summarized the data as shown in two different categorization displays of the activities (Tables 5 and 6). As shown in Table 5, the activities were categorized by the APR activity subject areas as implemented across the centers in Year 5. Additionally, as shown in Table 6, the activities were

Table 5

*Central Kaua‘i Sub-grantee: Categories of Activity Subject Areas and When They were Implemented in Project Year 5
(Listed by Number of Subject Area Category)*

Center	Activity subject area categories (Summ = Subject category for Summer 2012. SY = Subject category for SY 2012–13.)									
	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	None of the above
Kaumuali‘i El.	Summ: 2 SY: 4	Summ: 2 SY: 4	SY: 2	Summ: 3 SY: 4	0	0	Summ: 1 SY: 1	Summ: 1 SY: 2	Summ: 3 SY: 2	0
Kōloa El.	Summ: 3 SY: 11	Summ: 3 SY: 8	Summ: 2 SY: 3	Summ: 2 SY: 4	0	Summ: 2 SY: 3	Summ: 1 SY: 3	Summ: 1 SY: 5	Summ: 1 SY: 4	SY: 1
Wilcox El	Summ: 2 SY: 6	Summ: 1 SY: 7	SY: 4	Summ: 1 SY: 3	0	SY: 4	0	SY: 1	Summ: 1	0
Kamakāhelei Mid.	Summ: 1	Summ: 1	0	Summ: 3 SY: 1	0	Summ: 1 SY: 1	0	Summ: 1 SY: 2	SY: 1	0
Kaua‘i Hi.	Summ: 1 SY: 1	Summ: 1 SY: 1	Summ: 1 SY: 1	Summ: 1 SY: 1	Summ: 1 SY: 1	Summ: 1 SY: 1	Summ: 1 SY: 1	Summ: 1 SY: 1	Summ: 1 SY: 1	0
TOTALS	Summ: 9 SY: 22	Summ: 8 SY: 20	Summ: 3 SY: 10	Summ: 10 SY: 13	Summ: 1 SY: 1	Summ: 4 SY: 9	Summ: 3 SY: 5	Summ: 4 SY: 11	Summ: 6 SY: 8	Summ: 0 SY: 1

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.

(Table 5

Central Kaua‘i Sub-grantee: Categories of Activity Subject Areas and When They were Implemented in Project Year 5, continued)

Kaumuali‘i Elementary

Other: Summ: 3 = “Critical thinking and problem solving skills” for the LitArt activity; “Critical thinking and problem solving skills” for the Games of Strategy activity; and “Foreign language” for the Spanish activity.

Other: SY: 2 = “Critical thinking skills” for the Board Games activity and “Critical thinking skills” for the Strategic Games activity.

Kōloa Elementary

Other: Summ: 1 = “Exercise” for the Physical Education activity.

Other: SY: 4 = “Physical Education” for the PE and Track activities; “Career” for the Junior Police Officers activity; and “Environmental Education” for the Earth Friends activity.

Wilcox Elementary

Other: Summ: 1 = “Exposure to Kindergarten routines” for the Jump Start activity.

Kamakahahelei Inter.

Other: SY: 1 = “Character Development – 5 C’s (Competence, Confidence, Character, Connections, and Contributions)” for the Character Development activity.

Kaua‘i High

Other: Summ: 1 = “Guidance/career planning” for the Kaua‘i High School PTP Tutorial.

Other: SY: 1 = “Guidance/career planning” for the Kaua‘i High School PTP Tutorial.

Table 6

*Central Kaua‘i Sub-grantee: Categories of Activities and When They were Implemented in Project Year 5
(Listed by Number of Activities per Primary and Secondary Activity Category)*

Center	Primary activity categories and secondary activity categories (Summ1= Primary activity category for Summer 2011. Summ2 = Secondary activity category for Summer 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	Activity to promote youth leadership	Community service or service learning	Drug and violence prevention, counseling, or character education	Mentoring	Supplemental Education Services	Other ^a	Activity had more than two program elements
Kaumuali‘i El.	SY1: 1	SY1: 1	Summ1: 8 SY1: 5 SY2: 1	Summ2: 1 SY1: 3 SY2: 2	0	SY1: 1	SY2: 1	0	0	0	Summ2: 1	0
Kōloa El.	0	Summ2: 1 SY2: 5	Summ1: 5 SY1: 10	Summ1: 1 SY1: 11 SY2: 1	0	SY1: 1	0	SY1: 1 SY2: 1	0	Summ2: 5	SY2: 10	0
Wilcox El.	SY2: 6	Summ2: 1 SY1: 1 SY2: 2	Summ1: 2 SY1: 8	Summ1: 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Summ2: 1	0
Kamakahahelei Mid.	0	0	Summ1: 5 SY1: 2	Summ1: 1 SY1: 2	0	0	0	SY1: 1	0	0	0	0
Kaua‘i Hi.	0	SY2: 1	SY2: 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	SY1: 1
TOTALS	SY1: 1 SY2: 6	Summ2: 2 SY1: 2 SY2: 8	Summ1: 20 SY1: 25 SY2: 2	Summ1: 3 Summ2: 1 SY1: 16 SY2: 3	0	SY1: 2	SY2: 1	SY1: 2 SY2: 1	0	Summ2: 5	Summ2: 2 SY2: 10	SY1: 1

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.

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

Kaumuali‘i Elementary

Other: Summ2: 1 = “Physical Fitness” for the Movement activity.

(Table 6

Central Kaua'i Sub-grantee: Categories of Activities and When They were Implemented in Project Year 5, continued)

Kōloa Elementary

Other: SY2: 10 = “Social Skills Training” for the Morning Club activity; “Technology” for the Beginning Robotics activity; “Technology” for the Competition Robotics activity; “Gardening/Environmental Education” for the Earth Friends activity; “Dance” for the Hula Dance activity; “How to Make Jewelry/Jewelry Design” for the Jewelry Making activity; “Cooking Instruction/Nutrition” for the Organic Chefs activity; “Physical Education” for the PE activity.

Wilcox Elementary

Other: Summ2: 1 = “Program to help transition incoming Kindergarten students who haven’t attended preschool to a classroom setting” for the Jump Start activity.

Other: SY2: 1 = “Music, dance, drama, singing” for the Creative arts/Ukulele activity.

categorized by the APR primary and secondary types of activities as implemented across the center. During the summer of 2012, the center staff at all five centers provided activities in the core academic areas of reading and literacy and mathematics. The Kōloa Elementary and Kaua‘i High center staff provided activities in the core academic area of science. During SY 2012–13, four of the five centers (Kaumuali‘i, Kōloa, Wilcox, and Kaua‘i High) delivered services in the three core academic areas of reading/literacy, mathematics, and science. The exception was the Kamakahahei Middle center.

The evaluation staff referred to both sets of data to determine the intentionality of design for project activities. As shown in Table 6, the top two primary categories for the summer of 2012 activities were academic enrichment and recreation. The top two secondary categories were tutorial and other (specific information were added by coordinators). During SY 2012–13, the top two primary categories for activities were, again, academic enrichment and recreation. The top three secondary categories were recreation, other (specific information added by coordinators), and tutorial. Among primary and secondary categories, the sub-grantee showed lower numbers of activities targeted under career or job training for youth, drug and violence prevention, mentoring, and community service or service learning. In addition to collection of descriptive information about activities, we collected and analyzed data from center staff regarding the extent of implementation and the quality of implementation of core subject area activities. However, because there were only a few respondents who provided information about the extent and quality of implementation of core subject areas, we are presenting the data in summarized form rather than numerical, tabular format.

Evaluative findings about the implementation of academic activities, reported by five or fewer respondents.

This narrative summarizes the findings about centers where data were provided by five or fewer respondents. We report findings with those minimal levels of respondents in narrative format instead of numerical, tabular format 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 collected by self-report methods may include some social bias to an individual’s pressure to positively represent their efforts.

Findings about the implementation of reading and literacy activities suggest that they were implemented at moderate to high extent and quality in tutorials, classes, integrated content, or enrichment activities at Kaumuali‘i, Kōloa, Wilcox, and Kamakahahei Middle centers in Project Year 5. The reading and literacy activities were implemented at mediocre extent and quality in tutorials and classes at the Kaua‘i High center in Project Year 5.

Findings about the implementation of mathematics activities suggest that they were implemented at moderate to high extent and quality in tutorials, classes, integrated content, or enrichment activities at Kaumuali‘i, Wilcox, and Kamakahahei Middle centers in Project Year 5. The mathematics activities were implemented at mediocre extent and quality in tutorials and classes at the Kaua‘i High center in Project Year 5.

Findings about the implementation of science activities suggest that they were implemented at moderate to high extent and quality in homework help, tutorials, classes, integrated content, and enrichment activities at the Kaumuali‘i and Kōloa centers in Project Year 5. The science activities were implemented at mediocre extent and quality in tutorials and classes at the Kaua‘i High center in Project Year 5.

Findings about the implementation of assistance to address students’ individual needs for improving academic performance suggest that assistance was provided at moderate to high extent and quality in tutorials, classes, integrated content, and enrichment activities at Kaumuali‘i, Wilcox, Kamakahahei Middle, and Kaua‘i High centers in Project Year 5.

Center staff provided comments about the extent and quality of responding to individual student needs; extent of implementation of reading/literacy, mathematics, and science activities; quality of implementation of reading/literary, mathematics, and science activities; extent of implementation of academic enrichment activities; and quality of implementation of academic enrichment activities. These comments were consolidated across centers by item, and are shown as Appendix C.

The Implementation of Academic Enrichment Activities

Evaluators collected data about the enrichment activities implemented by Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee project staff. We reviewed the data about the categories of the enrichment activities, the extent to which the activities were implemented, and the quality to which the activities were implemented to determine whether 100% of project centers met the implementation objective of providing enrichment activities to center attendees.

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 Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee met this indicator in Project Year 5, with each center implementing enrichment activities. Art and music, health or nutrition, and discussions of appropriate and positive behavior activities were offered at five centers: Kaumuali‘i, Kōloa, Wilcox, Kamakahahei Middle, and Kaua‘i High. Technology or telecommunications activities were offered at four centers: Kōloa, Wilcox, Kamakahahei Middle, and Kaua‘i High. Sports activities were offered at three centers: Kaumuali‘i, Kōloa, and Kamakahahei Middle. Cultural or social studies activities were offered at three centers: Kaumuali‘i, Kōloa, and Kaua‘i High. Entrepreneurial education activities and service learning activities were offered at one center: Kaua‘i High.

There were mixed findings about the extent of implementation of enrichment activities, as reported by center staff members, volunteers, or contractors who implemented the activities. However, because there were very few respondents who provided extent and quality of implementation data of academic enrichment areas, we are presenting the data only in summarized form.

Evaluative findings about the implementation of enrichment and support 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 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 collected by self-report methods may include some social bias due to an individual's pressure to positively represent their efforts. Findings about the implementation of art or music activities suggest that they were implemented at moderate to high extent and quality in homework help, tutorials, classes, integrated content, or enrichment activities at Kaumuali'i, Wilcox, and Kamakahahei Middle centers in Project Year 5. The art or music activities were implemented at mediocre extent and quality in tutorials and classes at the Kaua'i High center in Project Year 5.

There were no reports about the extent and quality of implementation of entrepreneurial education activities at the Central Kaua'i sub-grantee centers in Project Year 5.

Findings about the implementation of telecommunication or technology activities suggest that they were implemented at moderate to high extent and quality in tutorials and activities at Kaumuali'i, Kōloa, Kamakahahei Middle, and Kaua'i High centers in Project Year 5.

Findings about the implementation of sports activities suggest that they were implemented at moderate to high extent and quality in homework help, tutorials, classes, integrated content, or enrichment activities at Kaumuali'i and Kamakahahei Middle centers in Project Year 5.

Findings about the implementation of cultural or social studies activities suggest that they were implemented at mediocre extent and moderate to high quality in tutorials, classes, integrated content, or enrichment activities at the Kaumuali'i center in Project Year 5. The cultural or social studies activities were implemented at mediocre extent and quality in tutorials and classes at the Kaua'i High center in Project Year 5.

Findings about the implementation of health or nutrition-related activities suggest that they were implemented at high extent and quality in integrated content activities at Kaumuali'i center in Project Year 5. The health or nutrition-related activities were implemented at mediocre extent and quality in tutorials and classes at the Kaua'i High center in Project Year 5.

Findings about the implementation of service learning activities suggest that they were implemented at mediocre extent and quality in tutorials and classes at the Kaua'i High center in Project Year 5.

Findings about the implementation of discussions of appropriate and positive behaviors with students to reinforce positive behaviors suggest that they were implemented at moderate to high extent and quality in tutorials, classes, integrated content, and enrichment activities at Kaumuali'i, Kōloa, and Kamakahahei Middle centers in Project Year 5. The activities to reinforce positive behavior were implemented at mediocre extent and quality in tutorials, classes, and integrated content at the Kaua'i High center in Project Year 5.

Center staff provided comments about the extent and quality of responding to individual student needs; extent of implementation of reading/literary, mathematics, and science activities; quality of implementation of reading/literary, mathematics, and science activities; extent of implementation of academic enrichment activities; and quality of implementation of academic enrichment activities. These comments were consolidated across centers by item, and are shown as Appendix D.

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. We believe that the Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee met this indicator in Project Year 5. Although this was not in the grant proposal, the sub-grantee leaders were very successful in securing volunteer individuals as staff. We believe that this shows school community value for the project and, perhaps, support for sustainability. Additionally, the Wilcox center secured an organization as a partner and the Kamakahahei Middle center secured two organizations as partners. Two sub-grantee partners were sustained in Project Year 5.

The two sub-grantee partners mentioned in the grant proposal that were secured and maintained throughout the five project years were (a) KIUC/KEDB who provided materials for the robotics activities, as well as coordinated the island wide robotics competition and (b) the HIDEOE Central Kaua‘i Complex who provided the host school facilities to implement the project activities, referred the attendees that attended the respective center, and the SRS devoted part of her time and energy to managing the 21st CCLC sub-grantee project. Also, the Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee partnered with CRDG at the UHM CoE, who provided services as an external evaluator. Four of the five centers secured new partnerships. The Kaumuali‘i center secured seven individuals as partners, who preferred to be anonymous for the purposes of this report. Those partners provided volunteer staffing for the Kaumuali‘i center. The Kōloa center secured five individuals as partners, who also preferred to be anonymous for the purposes of this report. The individuals provided volunteer staffing for the Kōloa center. The Wilcox center secured a partnership with the Kaua‘i High School Key Club who provided volunteer staffing for the center. The fourth center was the Kamakahahei Middle center, who secured two partnerships for their center. The two partners were the Boys and Girls Club of Hawai‘i and the Waimea Teen Care–Project Alert–Drug Awareness Program who both provided programming or activity related services to the center.

Services to parents and other adult family members (indicator 2.4): 85% of centers will offer services to parents, senior citizens, and other adult community members. We were not able to determine whether or not this performance measure was met in Project Year 5. Based on the SY 2012–13 APR data, none of the centers implemented activities to involve parents and adult family members. However, data from center staff about the extent and quality of implementation of center activities designed to provide services to adult family members indicates that one center did provide ratings on extent and quality of implementation regarding activities that involved parents and adult family members. Findings about the implementation of activities with parents of center attendees suggest that they were implemented at mediocre extent and quality in enrichment activities at the Kaumuali‘i center in Project Year 5. Based on the short timeline to collect non-PII data, we were not able to clarify the APR data with center staff, resulting in confusing findings. We also believe that the low response rate to the on-line questionnaire was due to the short time line for responding to the questionnaire.

Are the project activities interesting and valuable to students, teachers, administrators, and community partners? The majority of activities implemented during Project Year 5 were in the core academic areas of reading or literacy, mathematics, and science. The sub-grantee also provided academic enrichment activities in the categories of arts and music, cultural activities or social studies, technology or telecommunications, sports, culture and social studies, health or nutrition, and discussions regarding

appropriate, positive behavior during Project Year 5. The Central Kaua‘i center staff implemented 10 art or music activities during the summer of 2012, and 13 art or music activities during SY 2012–13. Among core academic and academic enrichment activity categories, the type of activity implemented the least across all the centers was entrepreneurial education with one center (Kaua‘i High) implementing this type of activity. Based on the descriptive data summarized in Tables 5 and 6 about sub-grantee activities, the evaluators addressed the project objectives regarding implementation of core and enrichment activities required under the grant.

We summarized these data to address the evaluation sub-question about activities that are interesting and valuable to stakeholders. We believe that the centers’ scheduling of activities reflect the 21st CCLC program priorities, which are to provide academic enrichment activities designed to improve the academic achievement and behavior of students with the highest needs. We believe that the administrators and teachers who support the sub-grantee have a vested interest and shared value system with the program. Center students participated in center activities voluntarily to some extent. However, many center students are quite young and probably do not feel that they have other options if their parents or teachers tell them they should attend the center activities.

A project director reported that an important challenge to center effectiveness was the participation level of attendees. The project director acknowledged that if students in the target group have poor attendance in the day school, these students are likely to have poor attendance in the centers. The project director also reported that center coordinators attempted to increase enrollment through outreach in the host schools, enlisting day school teachers for referrals, and inquiring about students who need additional academic assistance.

The project director also reported that the Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee centers faced several challenges to project implementation, including sustainability, continued participation of attendees at some centers, and developing and maintaining community-based partnerships. The project director reported that one of the biggest challenges was sustainability, with the challenge of securing partners as a primary challenge for the project after grant funding ends. We consider it an exceptionally strong show of interest and value in center sustainability by several school community individuals that they volunteered their time and energy as staff members at the centers in Project Year 5.

We reflect on Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee’s Project Year 4, when a school community member donated personal funds and volunteered time and energy to facilitate center activities. In the first four project years, the Kamakahahei center enrolled almost all the students from the host school and employed many of the day teachers and staff. This is extremely strong evidence of interest and value from the school community, students, teachers, and administrators to work towards improving student academics performances and behaviors. Further, there is a history of the middle school center students engaging in various service learning projects, which are valuable activities to the community. Throughout the five years of the 21st CCLC grant, the Kaua‘i High center provided credit recovery, career exploration, and graduation requirement activities. These are other highly valuable areas provided by the Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee for those students in need that cannot be provided in the day school. Administrators, teachers, students, and the school community would, of course, highly value any services that boost the graduate rates and college- or career-readiness of their students.

Findings about Project Outcomes in Project Year 5

The design of the evaluation of outcomes was intended to address the HIDEOE-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?” The data-sharing agreement was under negotiation at the time that this report was prepared and outcome data (teacher surveys and semester grades) could not be collected for Project Year 5. Therefore, we are not able to report effects of the efforts of the center staff, specifically, in terms of the Central Kaua‘i program activities to student academic behavior or academic performance.

Dissemination of Results to the Public

At the time this report was written, the HIDEOE’s website included a page for the 21st CCLC program at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForStudents/21stCCLC/Pages/default.aspx>. Our understanding is that all sub-grantee external evaluation reports will be made available to the public as links on this web page, as this was the practice in previous years.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The reader should note that in Project Year 5 the Central Kaua‘i centers targeted students who have the greatest needs for improved learning opportunities, which are the student populations that aligned with the goals of the 21st CCLC program.

The reader is urged to read this entire section on conclusions and recommendations which expands to project management. We hope that they can be considered when preparing a proposal for another 21st CCLC grant beyond the current one which ended after Project Year 5.

For its next 21st CCLC grant, we recommend that the Central Kaua‘i center leaders network with each other and other 21st CCLC center leaders to learn about best practices. We strongly recommend that the Central Kaua‘i project leaders devote sufficient center time to homework help and tutorial activities in all grade levels. Homework that is complete and correct is essential to success in school. 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.

We recommend that each Central Kaua‘i center use formative assessments to support their reading and mathematics tutorial activities. The formative assessments provide the tutors with information about students’ individual progress and identify areas of students’ individual needs for additional assistance. The centers should select formative assessments that align with the assessments used in the host schools. If it is not possible for the centers to obtain formative assessments, project leaders might obtain copies of the center students’ formative assessment information from the day school. Center staff may find other linkages to the day school, such as communicating with day teachers about students’ individual needs for improvement. This recommendation supports the former recommendation that qualified teachers should lead the homework help and tutorial activities. This level of staff may be

more knowledgeable about how to use formative assessment data to inform center students' learning activities.

Our final recommendation is to develop the academic components of the enrichment activities. The academic components may be developed to align with the day school programs or those academic components that naturally fit within the enrichment activity. The concept of having enrichment activities for recreational purposes is also valuable, particularly for the Central Kaua'i target groups. These children need to identify with schools as a place where they belong and are safe and comfortable. They need to regard school staff and other children as people that they like and can safely and comfortably interact with them. Students need to feel valued and that they can learn and correctly and ethically apply knowledge. We support and encourage the Central Kaua'i centers to continue to develop their program to address the needs of their selected target groups.

Table 7*The Central Kaua‘i Evaluation in Project Year 5: Findings, Summary, and Recommendations by Performance Measure*

Performance measure	Objective met or not met in 2012–13	Summary	Recommendations
Implementation objectives			
The reader is reminded that there were low numbers of respondents, possibly due to the short time frame for collection of data about implementation. Actual implementation may be broader than what is reported here.			
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.	Cannot determine the status	All five Central Kaua‘i centers offered both reading/literacy and mathematics activities in Project Year 5. However, the quality of implementation was moderate to high at four of the five centers: Kaumuali‘i, Kōloa, Wilcox, and Kamakahelei Middle in at least one core academic area. Implementation levels were mediocre at the Kaua‘i high school center.	Of course, the core academic areas are important to emphasize. We recommend that the project leaders continue to emphasize and work to upgrade activities in implementation of the core academic areas, in sustainability efforts, or in a new grant.
2.2. 100% of centers will offer enrichment and support activities such as nutrition and health, art, music, technology, and recreation.	Met	All five centers offered activities that included between four to six enrichment subject area categories. Five centers offered activities that included art or music or health or nutrition contents. Four centers (Kōloa, Wilcox, Kamakahelei Middle, and Kaua‘i High school) each offered activities with technology or telecommunication. Three centers (Kaumuali‘i, Kōloa, Kaua‘i High) each offered activities with cultural activities or social studies. One center (Kaua‘i High) offered activities with entrepreneurial education content. All five centers offered activities with other types of content areas.	The 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 encourage continuing the emphasis on enrichment activities in Central Kaua‘i’s next 21 st CCLC grant.

(Table 7

The Central Kaua‘i Evaluation in Project Year 5: Findings, Summary, and Recommendations by Performance Measure, continued)

Performance measure	Objective met or not met in 2012–13	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	Staff communication indicates that partners in Project year 5 were CRDG at UHM-CoE and the HIDOE Central Kaua‘i complex. Four of the centers secured partnerships for their individual centers. The Kaumuali‘i center had seven individual partners who volunteered as staff. The Kōloa center secured five individual partners who volunteered as staff. The Wilcox center secured a partnership with the high school Key Club. The Kamakahahei Middle center secured programming in two partnerships: the Boys and Girls Club and the Waimea Teen Care (Project Alert Drug Awareness program).	In the next 21 st CCLC grant we urge all Central Kaua‘i centers to establish and maintain partnerships with community organizations to increase program sustainability. The volunteer staff partnerships were extremely important evidence of the interest and value that school community partners place on the centers. Center leaders may wish to encourage this type of involvement from community members. It is also heartening that two community organizations were secured as center partners and these types of partnerships should be encouraged.
2.4. 85% of centers will offer services to parents, senior citizens, and other adult community members.	Cannot determine the status	Conflicting data were collected about services to parents and other adult community members. Evaluators were not able to resolve the conflicting data because of the short timeframe for collecting data in Project Year 5.	Center leaders may wish to network with other sub-grantee leaders or staff and review 21 st CCLC literature for best practices regarding involvement of parents. Center leaders or grant writers may wish to consider activities and information for parents in three areas (a) activities that their children are engaged in, (b) how parents can facilitate their children’s learning, and (c) how parents can further their own education (e.g., on-line courses, community education).

(Table 7*The Central Kaua'i Evaluation in Project Year 5: Findings, Summary, and Recommendations by Performance Measure, continued)*

Performance measure	Objective met or not met in 2012–13	Summary	Recommendations
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	During the summer of 2012, the five centers were open 15 to 32 hours per week, three to five days a week, and three to five weeks. During SY 2012–13, the Kamakahelei center was open 16 hours per week, and 4 days per week, and 31 weeks. The four remaining centers were open 4 to 11.9 hours per week, 2 to 5 days per week, and 28 to 39 weeks.	Center leaders should continue to look for ways to expand the center hours of operations to meet the performance objective of 15 hours per week. However, we note that center leaders and staff provided students with many hours of a safe environment with educational activities during hours outside of the school day.
3.1. 100% of students are in centers located in high-poverty communities.	Cannot determine the status	In Project Year 5, we were not able to collect data about (a) the numbers of center students who were qualified for free- or reduced-lunch or (b) the level of poverty. However, data collected for the five-year period 2007–08 through 2011–12 shown on Table 2 about free- and reduced-cost lunch show that the host schools continued to have high and increasing percentages in their populations of free- and reduced-cost lunch status, suggesting that the host schools were in high-poverty communities.	Center leaders should continue to provide services to the high-need populations.

(Table 7

The Central Kaua'i Evaluation in Project Year 5: Findings, Summary, and Recommendations by Performance Measure, continued)

Performance measure	Objective met or not met in 2012–13	Summary	Recommendations
Outcome objectives			
1.1.a. 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.	N/A	Data could not be collected at the time that this report was prepared.	
1.1.b. 75% of regular program participants will have teacher-reported improvement in classroom participation as shown on the 21 st CCLC teacher survey.	N/A	Data could not be collected at the time that this report was prepared.	
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.	N/A	Data could not be collected at the time that this report was prepared.	
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.	N/A	Data could not be collected at the time that this report was prepared.	
4.1.a. 60% of regular program participants will have teacher-reported improvement in reading/language arts and mathematics.	N/A	Data could not be collected at the time that this report was prepared.	

Note. This table summarizes findings and recommendations by performance measures only. Readers are urged to read the entire section for other conclusions and recommendations.

References

- Baker, B. (2009). *21st Century Community Learning Center Grant Proposal*. Lihue: Central Kaua'i Complex.
- Hawai'i Department of Education. (2012). *No child left behind: Annual yearly performance report*. Retrieved October 22, 2013 from: <http://arch.k12.hi.us/PDFs/nclb/2012/FinalAYPallSch37Pub20120928.pdf>
- Hawai'i Department of Education. (2012). *School accountability: School status & improvement report*. Retrieved August 20, 2013 from: <http://arch.k12.hi.us/school/ssir/ssir.html>
- Hawai'i Department of Education. (2012). *Trend report: Educational and fiscal accountability*. Retrieved September 9, 2013 from: <http://arch.k12.hi.us/school/trends/trends.html>
- Hawai'i Department of Education-Special Programs Management Section. (2012). *21st CCLC program: Evaluation report template*. Honolulu, HI: author.
- Hawai'i Department of Education-Special Programs Management Section. (2010). *Key performance indicators: 21st Century Community Learning Centers, 2010–2011*. Honolulu, HI: author.
- Learning Point Associates (n.d.). *Profile and performance information collection system*. Washington DC: American Institutes for Research.
- Naftzger, N., & Vinson, M. (2011, September). 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) analytic support for evaluation and program monitoring: An overview of the 21st CCLC performance data: 2009–10. Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates.
- Nakamura, A. D. H., Oshiro, E. M., Higa, T. F., Sagaysay, L. (2013). *An evaluation report about the Central Kauai Sub-Grantee's 21st Century Community Learning Centers in project year 4*. Honolulu: Curriculum Research & Development Group, College of Education, University of Hawai'i.

Appendix A

Description of Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented at the Central Kaua‘i Centers in Project Year 5 (the Summer of 2012 through SY 2012–13)

Table A1*Kaumuali'i Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 5*

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Summer 2012 activities							
Math	Summer	Other: Economically disadvantaged, Asian/Pacific Islander	122 students per day	Mathematics	Academic enrichment learning program		4 weeks, 5 days per week, 4 hours per day
Arts and Crafts	Summer	Other: Economically disadvantaged, Asian/Pacific Islander	102 students per day	Arts and music	Academic enrichment learning program		4 weeks, 5 days per week, 4 hours per day
Cooking	Summer	Other: Economically disadvantaged, Asian/Pacific Islander	36 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics	Academic enrichment learning program		4 weeks, 5 days per week, 4 hours per day
Games of Strategy	Summer	Other: Economically disadvantaged, Asian/Pacific Islander	20 students per day	Other: Critical thinking and problem solving skills	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	4 weeks, 5 days per week, 4 hours per day
LitArt	Summer	Other: Economically disadvantaged, Asian/Pacific Islander	50 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Arts and music	Academic enrichment learning program		4 weeks, 5 days per week, 4 hours per day
Movement	Summer	Other: Economically disadvantaged, Asian/Pacific Islander	122 students per day	Health or nutrition	Academic enrichment learning program	Other: Physical Fitness	4 weeks, 5 days per week, 4 hours per day
Music Appreciation	Summer	Other: Economically disadvantaged, Asian/Pacific Islander	16 students per day	Arts and music	Academic enrichment learning program		4 weeks, 5 days per week, 4 hours per day
Spanish	Summer	Other: Economically disadvantaged, Asian/Pacific Islander	20 students per day	•Cultural activities or social studies •Other: Foreign language	Academic enrichment learning program		4 weeks, 5 days per week, 4 hours per day

(Table A1*Kaumuali'i Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 5, continued)*

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
SY 2012–13 activities							
Literature and 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 •Other: Economically disadvantaged & Asian/Pacific Islander Kindergarten students 	10 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Mathematics 	Tutoring	Academic enrichment learning program	25 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day
Art Enrichment	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 •Other: Economically disadvantaged & Asian/Pacific Islander 	10 students per day	Arts and music	Academic enrichment learning program		25 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day
Arts & Crafts/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 •Other: Economically disadvantaged & Asian/Pacific Islander 	10 students per day	Arts and music	Academic enrichment learning program		25 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day

(Table A1*Kaumuali'i Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 5, continued)*

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Board Games	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 •Other: Economically disadvantaged & Asian/Pacific Islander Grade 2 students 	10 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Other: Critical thinking skills 	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	25 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day
Civic Leadership	School Year	Other: Students interested in leadership	27–30 students per day	Cultural activities or social studies	Activity to promote youth leadership	Community service or service learning	25 weeks, 1 days per week, 2 hour per day
Dance	School Year	Other: Economically disadvantaged & Asian/Pacific Islander 4 th & 5 th grade students interested in dance	15 students per day	Arts and music	Recreational activity		25 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day
Fitness	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 •Other: Economically Disadvantaged & Asian Pacific Islander Kindergarten and First Grade Students 	10 students per day	Health or nutrition	Recreational activity		25 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day
Homework Help	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 •Other: Economically Disadvantaged & Asian Pacific Islander 	84 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Science 	Homework Help		25 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day

(Table A1*Kaumuali'i Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 5, continued)*

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Movement	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 •Other: Economically Disadvantaged & Asian Pacific Islander Kindergarten and First Grade students 	10 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Arts and music •Health or nutrition 	Recreational activity		25 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day
Robotics	School Year	Other: Proficient/gifted students	10 students per day	Science	Academic enrichment learning program		11 weeks, 4 days per week, 1 hour per day (4 wks) 2 hours per day (7 wks)
Strategic Games	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 •Other: Economically disadvantaged & Asian/Pacific Islander Third Grade students 	8–10 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Other: Critical thinking skills 	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	25 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day

Table A2*Kōloa Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities in Project Year 5*

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Summer 2012 activities							
Accelerated Math	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 •Other: Students with behavior issues 	42 students per day	Mathematics	Academic enrichment learning program	Tutoring	4 weeks, 4 days per week, 6 hours per day
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 •Students with special needs or disabilities •Other: Students with behavior issues 	42 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Science •Technology or telecommunications 	Academic enrichment learning program	Tutoring	4 weeks, 4 days per week, 6 hours per day
Computers	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 •Other: Students with behavior issues 	42 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Science •Technology or telecommunications 	Academic enrichment learning program	Tutoring	4 weeks, 4 days per week, 6 hours per day

(Table A2*Kōloa Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities in Project Year 5, continued)*

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Hawaiian	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 •Other: Students with behavior issues 	42 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Arts and music •Cultural activities or social studies 	Academic enrichment learning program	Other: Cultural awareness, Hawaiian history	4 weeks, 4 days per week, 6 hours per day
Novels	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 •Other: Students with behavior issues 	42 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Arts and music 	Academic enrichment learning program	Tutoring	4 weeks, 4 days per week, 6 hours per day
Physical Education	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities •Other: students with behavior issues 	42 students per day	Health or nutrition	Recreational activity		4 weeks, 4 days per week, 6 hours per day
SY 2012–13 activities							
Morning Club	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise 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 	Recreational activity	Other: Social Skills Training	39 weeks, 5 days per week, 1 hour per day

(Table A2*Kōloa Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities in Project Year 5, continued)*

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Art	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	15 students per day	Arts and music	Recreational activity		19 weeks, 3 days per week, 1–2 hours per day
Beginning Robotics	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	10 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Science •Technology or telecommunications 	Academic enrichment learning program	Other: Technology	19 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day
Competition Robotics	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	10 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Science •Technology or telecommunications 	Academic enrichment learning program	Other: Technology	19 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day
Earth Friends	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	15 students per day	Other: Environmental Education	Recreational activity	Other: Gardening/Environmental education	7 weeks, 1 day per week, 1.25 hours per day
Hula/Dance	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	25 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Arts and music •Cultural activities or social studies 	Recreational activity	Other: Dance	19 weeks, 1 day per week, 1.5 hours per day

(Table A2*Kōloa Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities in Project Year 5, continued)*

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Homework Boost	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise 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 	Homework Help	Tutoring	19 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day
Jewelry Making	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Students with special needs or disabilities 	15 students per day	Arts and music	Recreational activity	Other: How to make jewelry/jewelry design	7 weeks, 1 day per week, 1 hour per day
JPO (Junior Police Officers)	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	5 students per day	Other: Career	Activity to promote youth leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Drug and violence prevention, counseling, or character education •Activity to promote youth leadership 	39 weeks, 5 days per week, 1 hour per day
Kajukenbo	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	15 students per day	None of the categories listed in the PPICS APR form C7	Drug and violence prevention, counseling, or character education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Recreational activity •Activity to promote youth leadership 	15 weeks, 4 days per week, 1 hour per day
Kid Biz3000	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	15 students per day	Reading or literacy	Academic enrichment learning program	Tutoring	19 weeks, 1 day per week, 1 hour per day

(Table A2*Kōloa Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities in Project Year 5, continued)*

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Little Einsteins	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Students with special needs or disabilities 	15 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Science •Technology or telecommunications 	Academic enrichment learning program		12 weeks, 2–4 days per week, 1 hour per day
Math Games	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	12 students per day	Mathematics	Academic enrichment learning program	Tutoring	8 weeks, 4 days per week, 1 hour per day
Organic Chefs	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	10 students per day	Health or nutrition	Recreational activity	Other: Cooking instruction/nutrition	19 weeks, 1–2 days per week, 1.25 hours per day
PE	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	15 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Health or nutrition •Other: Physical Education 	Recreational activity	Other: Physical Education	7 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day

(Table A2*Kōloa Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities in Project Year 5, continued)*

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Reader/Write Workshop	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	15 students per day	Reading or literacy	Academic enrichment learning program	Tutoring	8 weeks, 4 days per week, 1 hour per day
Speak Japanese	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	10 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Cultural activities or social studies 	Academic enrichment learning program		19 weeks, 1 day per week, 1 hour per day
Speak Spanish	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	10 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Cultural activities or social studies 	Academic enrichment learning program		19 weeks, 1 day per week, 1 hour per day
Spring Boost	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	36 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Mathematics 	Academic enrichment learning program	Tutoring	1 week, 4 days per week, 4.25 hours per day

(Table A2*Kōloa Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities in Project Year 5, continued)*

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Track	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	35 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Health or nutrition •Other: Physical Education 	Recreational activity	Other: Physical Education	12 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day
Ukulele	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	20 students per day	Arts and music	Recreational activity	Other: Music	21 weeks, 2 days per week, 2 hours per day
Winter Boost	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	28 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Mathematics 	Academic enrichment learning program	Tutoring	1 week, 4 days per week, 4.25 hour per day
Yoga	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	10 students per day	Health or nutrition	Recreational activity		19 weeks, 1 day per week, 1 hour per day

(Table A2

Kōloa Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities in Project Year 5, continued)

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Zumba	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average•Limited English-proficient students•Students with special needs or disabilities	20 students per day	Health or nutrition	Recreational activity		7 weeks, 1 day per week, 0.75 hour per day

Table A3*Wilcox Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities in Project Year 5*

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Summer 2012 activities							
Art	Summer	None of the categories listed in the PPICS APR form C7	47 students per day	Arts and music	Recreational activity		3 weeks, 5 days per week, 5 hours per day
Jump Start	Summer	Other: Students entering kindergarten without preschool experience	16 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Other: Exposure to Kindergarten routines 	Academic enrichment learning program	Other: Program to help transition incoming kindergarten students who haven't attended preschool to a classroom setting.	3 weeks, 5 days per week, 5 hours per day
Wilcox Elementary 2012 Summer Program	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students 	47 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Mathematics 	Academic enrichment learning program	Tutoring	3 weeks, 5 days per week, 5 hours per day
SY 2012–13 activities							
Creative Arts/Ukulele	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	34 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Arts and music •Health or nutrition 	Academic enrichment learning program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Homework help •Drug and violence prevention, counseling, or character education •Activity to promote youth leadership 	39 weeks, 2 days per week, 2 hours per day

(Table A3*Wilcox Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities in Project Year 5, continued)*

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Imagine Learning	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students 	18 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Mathematics 	Academic enrichment learning program	Homework help	29 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day
Imagine Learning/Homework Help	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students 	8 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Mathematics 	Academic enrichment learning program	Homework help	29 weeks, 2 days per week, 2 hours per day
Junior LEGO	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students 	15 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Mathematics •Science •Technology or telecommunications 	Academic enrichment learning program	Homework help	21 weeks, 2 days per week, 2 hours per day

(Table A3*Wilcox Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities in Project Year 5, continued)*

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
LitArt	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise 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 •Science •Arts and music 	Academic enrichment learning program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Tutoring •Homework help 	29 weeks, 2 days per week, 2 hours per day
Powerpoint/Homework Help	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students 	18 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Science •Technology or telecommunications 	Academic enrichment learning program	Homework help	29 weeks, 2 days per week, 2 hours per day
Robotics	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	15 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Mathematics •Science •Technology or telecommunications 	Academic enrichment learning program		24 weeks, 1 day per week, 2 hours per day

(Table A3*Wilcox Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities in Project Year 5, continued)*

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Spring Boost	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	28 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Arts and music •Technology or telecommunications 	Academic enrichment learning program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Tutoring •Homework help 	1 week, 4 days per week, 6.5 hours per day
Tutoring	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	23 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Mathematics 	Tutoring	Homework help	14 weeks, 2 days per week, 2 hours per day

Table A4*Kamakahahelei Middle: Academic and Enrichment Activities in Project Year 5*

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Summer 2012 activities							
Art Class	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	57 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Mathematics 	Academic enrichment learning program		4 weeks, 4 days per week, 3 hours per day
Drama/Acting Class	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	29 students per day	Arts and music	Academic enrichment learning program		4 weeks, 4 days per week, 3 hours per day
Music Class	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	29 students per day	Arts and music	Academic enrichment learning program		4 weeks, 4 days per week, 3 hours per day

(Table A4*Kamakahelei Middle: Academic and Enrichment Activities in Project Year 5, continued)*

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Music Video Class	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	29 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Arts and music •Technology or telecommunications 	Academic enrichment learning program		4 weeks, 4 days per week, 3 hours per day
Physical Education Class	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	57 students per day	Health or nutrition	Academic enrichment learning program		4 weeks, 4 days per week, 1 hour per day
Team Building Activities	Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	57 students per day	Other: Physical Education	Recreational activity		4 weeks, 4 days per week, 3 hours per day

(Table A4*Kamakahahei Middle: Academic and Enrichment Activities in Project Year 5, continued)*

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
SY 2012–13 activities							
Art	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	15–30 students per day	Arts and music	Academic enrichment learning program		31 weeks, 4 days per week, 1 hour per day
Character Development	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	80–100 students per day	Other: Character Development- 5 C's (Competence, Confidence, Character, Connections, Contributions	Drug- and violence-prevention, counseling, or character education		31 weeks, 4 days per week, 0.5 hour per day
Computers/Video Games	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	5–10 students per day	Technology or telecommunications	Recreational activity		31 weeks, 4 days per week, 1 hour per day

(Table A4*Kamakahelei Middle: Academic and Enrichment Activities in Project Year 5, continued)*

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Gardening	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	15–30 students per day	Health or nutrition	Academic enrichment learning program		31 weeks, 4 days per week, 1 hour per day
Physical Fitness	School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities 	60–70 students per day	Health or nutrition	Recreational activity		31 weeks, 4 days per week, 1 hour per day

Table A5*Kaua‘i High: Academic and Enrichment Activities in Project Year 5*

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Summer 2012 activities							
Kaua‘i High School (PTP) Tutorial	Summer	Other: (Summer 2012: students from the Class of 2013 needing to complete their PTP .5 credit graduation requirement)	15–20 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Science •Arts and music •Entrepreneurial education •Technology or tele-communications •Cultural activities or social studies •Health or nutrition •Other: guidance/career planning 	The activity had more than two program elements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Academic enrichment learning program •Tutoring 	5 weeks, 5 days per week, 3 hours per day
SY 2012–13 activities							
Kaua‘i High School PTP Tutorial	School Year	Other: (SY 2012–13: students from the Class of 2013 needing to complete their PTP .5 credit graduation requirement. Sessions were also open for students in the Class of 2014)	15–20 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Science •Arts and music •Entrepreneurial education •Technology or tele-communication •Cultural activities or social studies •Health or nutrition •Other: guidance/career planning 	The activity had more than two program elements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Academic enrichment learning program •Tutoring 	30 weeks, 4 days per week, 1.5 hours per day

Appendix B

Central Kaua‘i Centers’ Community Partners in Project Year 5 (the Summer of 2012 through SY 2012–13)

Table B1*Kaumuali'i Elementary: Community Partners in Project Year 5*

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Monetary value of contribution	Subcontractor?
Volunteer Individual Partner	Public School — employee	Volunteer Staffing	0	No
Volunteer Individual Partner	Public School — employee	Volunteer Staffing	0	No
Volunteer Individual Partner	Public School — employee	Volunteer Staffing	0	No
Volunteer Individual Partner	Public School — employee	Volunteer Staffing	0	No
Volunteer Individual Partner	Public School — employee	Volunteer Staffing	0	No
Volunteer Individual Partner	Public School — employee	Volunteer Staffing	0	No
Volunteer Individual Partner	Public School — employee	Volunteer Staffing	0	No

Table B2*Kōloa Elementary: Community Partners in Project Year 5*

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Monetary value of contribution	Subcontractor?
Volunteer Individual Partner	Public School — parent	Volunteer Staffing	\$93.38	No
Volunteer Individual Partner	Public School — Social Worker	Volunteer Staffing	\$144.69	No
Volunteer Individual Partner	Public School — parent	Volunteer Staffing	\$400.20	No
Volunteer Individual Partner	Public School — parent	Volunteer Staffing	\$785.46	No

Table B3

Wilcox Elementary: Community Partners in Project Year 5

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Monetary value of contribution	Subcontractor?
Kaua'i High School Key Club	Public School — student club	Volunteer Staffing	\$368	No

Table B4*Kamakahelei Middle: Community Partners in Project Year 5*

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Monetary value of contribution	Subcontractor?
Boys and Girls Club of Hawai'i	Nationally Affiliated Non-Profit Agency-Boys/Girls Club	Programming or activity-related services	\$224	No
Waimea Teen Care – Project Alert – Drug Awareness Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Public School• Other	Programming or activity-related services	\$270	No

Table B5

Kaua‘i High: Community Partners in Project Year 5

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Monetary value of contribution	Subcontractor?
Kaua‘i High did not report any community partners during Project Year 5				

Table B6*Central Kaua'i Sub-grantee Community Partners in Project Year 5*

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Monetary value of contribution	Subcontractor?
UH/COE— Curriculum Research & Development Group (CRDG)	College or university	Evaluation services	\$35,000	yes

Appendix C

Summary of Respondents' Comments about the Implementation of Core Academic Activities at the Central Kaua'i Centers in Project Year 5 (the Summer of 2012 through SY 2012–13)

Table C1

Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Reading/Literacy, Mathematics, and Science Activities in the Central Kaua'i Centers in Project Year 5

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">• Review of basic facts for add, sub, multi. and division. Review of all math strands.• Use of computer programs that align lessons with individual student needs, providing additional support in the classroom through aides and small group pull out• Could have used more time with small groups
<i>i2. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in reading/history.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• students' ability to fully participate• Could have used more time with small groups
<i>i3. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in mathematics.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• I had no problems. I really enjoyed doing this.• Review of basic facts for add, sub, multi. and division. Review of all math strands.
<i>i4. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in science.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Physical science and engineering focusing on bridge building

Appendix D

Summary of Respondents' Comments about the Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities at the Central Kaua'i Centers in Project Year 5 (the Summer of 2012 through SY 2012–13)

Table D1

Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities in the Central Kaua'i Centers in Project Year 5

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
<i>i5.</i> participate in art and/or music activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • students' ability to fully participate • the music class invited, us to listen to music that they learn in class • Out of the 3 week session, the students actually had 7 classes. We split the classes in half to provide smaller group instruction but it ended up being a very short time for projects. Still, I liked the small groups and they were able to get some exposure to art concepts and skills.
<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"> • Power Points on Bridge Building and Engineering and a Bridge Building Interactive
<i>i8.</i> participate in sports activities (e.g., basketball, baseball, football, swimming).	No comments provided.
<i>i9.</i> participate in cultural activities/social studies activities.	No comments provided.
<i>i10.</i> participate in health/nutrition-related activities.	No comments provided.
<i>i11.</i> participate in service learning activities (service activities in the school or local community).	No comments provided.
<i>i12.</i> CLC staff discuss appropriate, positive behavior with students and reinforce positive behaviors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This Summer had a cohesive staff and students who were motivated to learn every day

Appendix E

Summary of Respondents' Comments about the Implementation of Parent and Other Adult Activities at the Central Kaua'i Centers in Project Year 5 (the Summer of 2012 through SY 2012–13)

Table E1

Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities in the Central Kaua'i Centers in Project Year 5

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.