

**An Evaluation Report about the
Farrington Subgrantee Kalihi Consortium's
21st Century Community Learning Center Project**

Farrington Complex, Honolulu District, O'ahu

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

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

March 2013

Contents

Executive Summary.....	v
A Description of the Kalihi Learning Center Project.....	1
The KLC’s School-Community Demographic.....	3
The Evaluation Design and Data-Collection Methods.....	10
The Evaluation Schedule.....	12
The Evaluation of Project Implementation.....	12
Program Characteristics.....	18
Center Staffing.....	18
Hours of Operation.....	21
The Implementation of Core Academic Activities.....	26
The Implementation of Activities to Improve Positive Behaviors.....	29
The Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities.....	31
The Implementation of Community-Based Partnerships.....	34
Services to Parents and Other Adult Family Members.....	35
A Comparison of the Number of Students who Remained in the KLC Centers in 2010–11 and 2011–12.....	37
Challenges Faced in Implementing the Program and how the Challenges were Addressed ...	38
Program Activities Identified as Interesting and Valuable to Students, Teachers, Administrators, and Community Partners.....	40
The Evaluation of Project Outcomes.....	40
Teacher-Reported Changes in Regular Center Students’ Academic Behaviors.....	41
Findings about the Academic Achievement of Regular Center Students in 2011–12.....	43
Dissemination of Results to the Public.....	48
Conclusions and Recommendations.....	48
References.....	57
Appendix A.....	57
Appendix B.....	67
Appendix C.....	79
Appendix D.....	87
Appendix E.....	103
Appendix F.....	123
Appendix G.....	129
Appendix H.....	137
Appendix I.....	147

Executive Summary

This evaluation report is about the Farrington Subgrantee 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) project, also called the Kalihi Learning Consortium (KLC), in School Year 2011–12. The US Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education provides 21st CCLC funds to states to support subgrantees. The Hawai‘i Department of Education (HIDOE), Special Programs Management Section (SPMS) manages the 21st CCLC program for the State of Hawai‘i. The consortium was in Year 4 of five years of funding by the 21st CCLC program in 2011–12. All seven KLC centers were implemented on the campuses of their host schools of Fern Elementary, Ka‘ewai Elementary, Kalihi Waena Elementary, Linapuni Elementary, Pu‘uhale Elementary, Dole Middle, and Kalākaua Middle schools. The project leaders and center staff were true to the grant proposal and mainly enrolled students from target groups with disadvantages for academic achievement— that is, students with low socio-economic status (as indicated by qualification for free- or reduced-cost lunch) or students with low English language proficiency. Our review of the project’s historical data shows that project leaders wisely decided to provide all center students with tutorial activities, rather than only those students who struggled with the academic enrichment activities provided in the centers. A little over half of the paid center staff were school day teachers, and the next largest group of center staff were non-teaching school day staff such as librarians, guidance counselors, and aides. Research about the 21st CCLC program across the nation has shown that these staff qualifications help to build bridges between the host school and extended day program (Nafzger & Vinson, 2011).

In 2011–12, the KLC project leaders and staff met the HIDOE-SPMS performance measures of (a) implementing high quality services in at least one core academic area in 100% of centers; (b) offering enrichment and support activities in 100% of centers; (c) offering services to parents, seniors citizens, and other adult community members in 85% of centers; and (d) establishing 100% of the centers in high-poverty communities. Additionally, the KLC project leaders and staff met the KLC Year 4 goal of increasing the number of center students who remained in the centers over the school year, as measured by students who participate in activities for 30 days or more from summer through the school year. However, in 2011–12, the KLC project did not meet the HIDOE-SPMS implementation performance measures for (a) 100% of centers provided services at least 15 hours per week on average when school was not in

session and (b) 85% of centers established and maintained partnerships within the community to increase levels of community collaboration in planning, implementing, and sustaining programs.

As a subgrantee, the KLC did not meet the outcome performance measures for (a) 75% of regular program participants would improve turning in homework on time, classroom participation, regular attendance, and classroom behavior, and (b) 60% of regular program participants improve in reading/language arts and mathematics.

We posit that the KLC project has matured in implementing activities, but the effects are not yet seen in center students' academic behavior and performance. We believe that the efforts were well placed. The target groups have many disadvantages, and improving their academic behavior and performance to meet the HIDEOE-SPMS performance criteria is challenging. This is our first year as lead evaluators, which is rather late in the project, and the project leaders may not be able to implement many of our recommendations. We recommend that project leaders continue providing services to the high-need groups targeted from the inception of the project; this has been commendable. In addition, project leaders should network to learn best practices for the target group. They may consider hiring an ELL consultant to advise center staff or hiring ELL teachers as center staff to work directly with students. In 2011–12, despite their busy schedules, the host school principals also had the role of center coordinators. They should periodically review project management needs giving consideration toward the roles of a Project Director and/or Center Coordinators dedicated to overseeing center operations, including monitoring the implementation of activities and center student development. As evaluators, we were concerned about some very low response rates, and a dedicated center leader may help to facilitate data collection. A dedicated center leader also would provide periodic monitoring of center students' academic improvement through reading/language arts and mathematics formative assessments in the center. Additionally, we recommend a homework check and homework help component, particularly because the target group students may not have support at home for homework completion. Children in the center target groups may be provided with opportunities to become more comfortable with classroom participation and other behaviors that support academic performance through varied center activities.

Again, we believe that the KLC was well-implemented, with one change from the grant proposal that we believe is highly appropriate. The effects of center staff's efforts are not yet seen as increases in student performance or behaviors. We have additional recommendations that

are based on our review of the KLC data, research about the 21st CCLC program nation-wide, as experienced evaluators of 21st CCLC evaluators in Hawai‘i, and our professional experience in education and program evaluation. However, it may not be possible to implement these recommendations within this funding cycle. We recommend that the project consider our recommendations for future grants.

An Evaluation Report about the Farrington Subgrantee Kalihi Consortium's 21st Century Community Learning Center Project

This evaluation report is about Year 4 (School Year [SY] 2011–12) of the Farrington Subgrantee 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC), a consortium of schools in the Kalihi community. In Year 4, we were contracted as a team from Curriculum Research & Development Group (CRDG) at the University of Hawai'i at Manōa to provide evaluation services. To aid the presentation of the evaluation findings, we have included a description of the project as contextual information for this report. The project description includes project inception, revisions, operations, staffing, target group, and partnerships. This report also includes a description of the evaluation design, the data-collection methods, and findings about project implementation and outcomes in Year 4. The evaluation questions, outcome indicators, and data-collection methods were based on the key performance indicators (KPIs) of the 21st CCLC program, the 21st CCLC evaluation report template, and the Farrington Subgrantee 21st CCLC grant proposal.

A Description of the Kalihi Learning Center Project

The Farrington Subgrantee 21st CCLC project was also called the Kalihi Learning Consortium or the Kalihi Learning Centers. In this report, we refer to this project as the Kalihi Learning Centers (KLC). The KLC project was funded by the 21st CCLC program beginning in SY 2008–09. As defined by the 21st CCLC program, the KLC project's Year 4 began in Summer 2011 and ran through Spring 2012. All seven KLC centers implemented homework help, tutoring, and academic enrichment activities outside of school-day hours. The seven KLC centers were located on the campuses of the HIDOE Farrington complex schools named in the 21st CCLC grant proposal. These public schools, referred to as center host schools are Fern Elementary, Ka'ewai Elementary, Kalihi Waena Elementary, Linapuni Elementary, Pu'uhale Elementary, Dole Middle, and Kalākaua Middle schools. These host schools are in the city of Honolulu, on the island of O'ahu, State of Hawai'i. The host school names, street addresses, web sites, and other information are shown as Table 1.

Each center was identified using the name of the host school, but they were distinguished from their host schools because the 21st CCLC program funded each center to operate outside of

Table 1*Location of the Kalihi Learning Centers' Host Schools in SY 2011–12*

Name of host school	Address	City	State	Zip	Phone	Grade levels	url_home
Fern Elem.	1121 Middle Street	Honolulu	HI	96819	832-3040	K–5	http://fern.k12.hi.us/
Ka'ewai Elem.	1929 Kamehameha IV Road	Honolulu	HI	96819	832-3500	K–5	http://165.248.6.166/data/school.asp?schoolcode=113
Kalihi Waena Elem.	1240 Gulick Avenue	Honolulu	HI	96819	832-3210	K–5	http://kalihiwaena.com/
Linapuni Elem.	1434 Linapuni Street	Honolulu	HI	96819	832-3303	PreK–1	http://www.linapuniel.k12.hi.us/Welcome.html
Pu'uhale Elem.	345 Pu'uhale Road	Honolulu	HI	96819	832-3190	K–5	http://165.248.6.166/data/school.asp?schoolcode=145
Dole Middle	1803 Kamehameha IV Road	Honolulu	HI	96819	832-3340	6–8	http://www.dolemiddle.k12.hi.us/Dole_Middle_School/Home.html
Kalākaua Middle	821 Kalihi Street	Honolulu	HI	96819	832-3130	6–8	http://www.Kalākauamiddle.org/

school hours, to service students identified as high need, and to supplement the services of the host school.

The KLC's School-Community Demographic

We reviewed school community data to determine the student, host school, and community demographic features of the KLC centers. We found that 100% of the KLC centers were based in high-poverty school communities, meeting the related HIDOE Special Programs Management Section (HIDOE-SPMS) outcome indicator. We also reviewed the year 2000 US Census statistics for the Farrington school community shown as Table 2. The KLC centers were in school communities with high percentages of households headed by single mothers (26.4%), households receiving public assistance (17.1%), and families with children living in poverty (22.8%). The KLC school community had higher proportions of households with indicators of poverty than the proportions for the State of Hawai'i, suggesting that there were a large percentage of children with disadvantages for academic achievement in the KLC host schools.

We also collected school-level data to examine whether KLC addressed measures in the grant proposal to enroll students who qualified for free- or reduced-cost lunch or were identified as low in English proficiency or English Language Learners (ELL).

The school-level demographic data shown in Table 3 include counts and percentages of students on free- or reduced-cost lunch over SYs 2006–07 through 2010–11. Students qualify for free- or reduced-cost lunch based on low family income. School-level statistics for SY 2011–12 were not available at the time data were collected for this report. As reported in Table 3, the percentage of students qualified for free- or reduced-cost lunch varied from 62.5% to 99.2% between 2006–07 to 2010–11 at the KLC schools.

We used the proportion of center students on free- and reduced-cost lunch to the host school's student population to calculate the percentage of the free- and reduced-cost lunch subgroup at each school that received 21st CCLC services. We also included regular center students—those students who received 21st CCLC services for 30 or more days. The two columns presented on the far right of Table 3 show (a) the number of students enrolled in the centers who received free- or reduced-cost lunch, (b) the percentages of the number of center students on free- or reduced-cost lunch, (c) the number of regular center students on free- or reduced-cost lunch and (d) the number of regular center students as a percentage to total school

enrollment. These percentages address the KLC's intended plan to address the HODOE-SPMS outcome indicators and the needs of the school community, that one of the primary target groups for the KLC centers would be students on free- and reduced-cost lunch (Hargrove & Nomiya, 2008). The KLC grant proposal did not include a criterion for the percentage of students in the subgroup to be represented in the centers. As shown in Table 3, the highest proportion (77.8%) of the total school enrollment in a center was at the Linapuni Center. The centers enrolled the following percentages of their corresponding host school's total school enrollment in 2011–12: Ka'ewai Center, 23.0%; Dole Middle Center, 24.1%; Kalākaua Middle Center, 32.1%; Kalihi Waena Center, 33.4%; and Pu'uhale Center, 40.6%.

The second disadvantaged target group for the KLC centers were students considered low in English proficiency or English language learners (ELL) (Hargrove & Nomiya, 2008). We collected and calculated the number and percentages of ELL students enrolled at the KLC host schools from 2006–07 through 2010–11 and enrolled at the centers in 2011–12. The findings are shown as Table 4. Linapuni Elementary had the greatest percentage of ELL students over the five years (45.8% to 59.6%). Kalākaua Middle had the lowest percentage of ELL students (17.3% to 27.5%), approximately one-fifth to one-quarter of the total student body. The counts of ELL students at the host schools in 2011–12 were not yet published at the time that this report was written. Therefore, the two columns on the far right of Table 4 show only the counts of ELL students in the centers to the total host school enrollment for SY 2011–2012. We used available data to calculate the percentage of ELL students at each center to the total host school enrollment. A more sensitive method would be to review the proportion of ELL students in the center to the number of ELL students in the host school. It was all the more impressive that Linapuni's center enrolled 41.5% of the host school's ELL students in 2011–12. Pu'uhale Center enrolled 13.0%; Kalihi Waena Center enrolled 9.9%; Ka'ewai Center enrolled 7.6%; Fern center enrolled 5.4%; Dole Middle Center enrolled 2.3%; and Kalākaua Middle Center did not enroll any of the host school's ELL students. These were mixed findings about providing services to this target group because the percentages of ELL students at some centers were low, regardless of the lack of data about ELL students in the host school in 2011–12.

The percentage of ELL regular center students (column farthest on the right in Table 4) was an indicator of the amount of services that the centers provided to the ELL students in

relation to all center students. The centers that provided the highest percentage of services to ELL regular center students (to the least amount) were Linapuni (22.4%), Ka‘ewai (20.9%), Pu‘uhale (14.2%), Kalihi Waena (5.5%), Dole Middle (5.1%), and Kalākaua Middle (0%).

Origin of the program. The previous KLC evaluators described the origin of the KLC project in the 2009–10 evaluation report (Hargrove & Matsuo, 2010). A consortium working group composed of an educator with extensive experience working with the HIDOE, the Honolulu District Complex Area Superintendent, a former principal, and the principals of the seven host schools wrote the 21st CCLC grant proposal to provide learning opportunities outside of regular school time to KLC students. Their grant proposal was funded in the Fall of 2008.

The purpose of the KLC was to provide academic support and enrichment learning opportunities to students identified with high need for these services. The purpose of the evaluation was to examine the extent to which those services were implemented, the quality of the implementation of those services, and the changes in academic behavior and performance of students who participated in the 21st CCLC activities at least 30 days from Summer 2011 through Spring 2012.

Program goals. The KLC grant writers envisioned a consortium of schools that focused on improving the literacy and numeracy skills of students with the highest needs through academic enrichment activities (Hargrove & Nomiyama, 2008). Center students would also exhibit positive behavioral changes to support improved classroom performance. The KLC project would include center students’ parents or adult family members (particularly those with low English proficiency) by enrolling them in adult education classes or involving them in center activities. Middle school project leaders would collaborate with elementary school project leaders to develop joint activities where upper-grade students would mentor, tutor, or facilitate activities with lower-grade students. Three school-community showcases were planned for the purposes of “building community academic knowledge” and “demonstrations of learning among the schools” (Hargrove & Nomiyama, 2008, p. 6). Qualified staff members, most likely with teacher qualifications, would facilitate the learning opportunities, to form a link between the regular host school program and the extended day program, and form healthy relationships with students and their families.

Year 1 of the project. In the first year of the project (SY 2008–09), KLC project leaders were challenged with looking for qualified staff to facilitate learning opportunities to the targeted student group and to develop supportive relationships with the students. The project leaders worked to coordinate the extended-day KLC program with the total school program and other after-school programs that were being implemented.

The project leaders also evaluated the project for the first three project years. By Fall 2009, all seven centers were fully staffed, and the project leaders turned their attention to collecting data that would reflect the uniqueness of the KLC project and address 21st CCLC program requirements. The project leaders developed an Excel databook to standardize the collection of quantitative data across the seven centers. However, the project leaders reported challenges with data collection including inconsistencies based on the assigned staff and their differing understandings of how data were to be entered into the databook. Some of those challenges were addressed by simplifying the format of the databook; however, the challenges resulting from multiple staff assigned to enter data continued over the project years.

Year 2 of the project. In Year 2 (SY 2009–10), the KLC’s goal was to implement the program as planned with academic enrichment learning opportunities for students enrolled in an extended-day program before and after the regular-day program. Qualified instructors, likely, HIDOE teachers, were to provide the intended learning opportunities in a safe environment. Parents were to be invited to become involved in the program.

Despite changes in school administration, the KLC sites were fully staffed and programs were fully implemented in Year 2. Although an Excel databook was developed to standardize data collection providing evidence about the services delivered to center students, the KLC continued to be challenged with collecting consistent and necessary data for HIDOE evaluation reporting and for the Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS), the 21st CCLC program on-line reporting system. (Hargrove & Matsuo, 2010). A total of 967 students registered for center activities, and 698 (72.2%) of the total center students participated for 30 or more days. In Year 2, the KLC collected regular center students’ Hawai‘i State Assessment (HSA) scores and General Learner Outcome (GLO) #2 data as outcome indicators for academic achievement and behavior, respectively. A review of the KLC regular center students’ HSA scores in Year 2 showed that 50% of the regular program participants with HSA reading data met

or exceeded the HSA reading proficiency and 38% of the regular program participants with HSA math data met or exceeded the HSA math proficiency. This result indicate that, as a subgrantee in Year 2, the KLC did not meet the 60% outcome indicator target for academic achievement set by the HIDOE-SPMS for the percentage of regular program participants with improvement in reading/language arts and math. The Year 2 GLO data show that 19% of the KLC regular center students improved in their GLO #2 behavior indicating that as a subgrantee the KLC also did not meet the 75% outcome indicator target for academic behavior set by the HIDOE-SPMS for the percentage of regular program participants with improvement in academic behavior.

Year 3 of the project. The KLC Year 3 (SY 2010–11) goals were to refine implementation of the program as planned and stated in the grant proposal. These plans were to “provide opportunities for students with the greatest need to practice their literacy and numeracy skills and to broaden their learning experiences with enrichment activities” (Hargrove & Matsuo, 2011, p. 11). The center coordinators were to continue their efforts to recruit and hire instructors who had expertise in facilitating learning and worked well with students. The centers continued to build community partnerships.

In Year 3, as in Years 1 and 2, all center students were required to attend tutoring or homework help and enrichment activities. Enrichment activities included art, music, robotics, sports, other technology-enhanced activities, and nutrition and health. Both middle school centers continued to partner with After School All Stars (ASAS) to provide staffing and coordinate their activities. Staffing consisted of school-day teachers (56%), non-teaching school staff (10%), and non-school staff with or without a college degree (34%). KLC enrolled 1,068 students at the beginning of Year 3, an increase from the 967 students enrolled in Year 2. In addition, 634 (59.4%) of the 1,068 students in Year 3 participated for 30 or more days. This was a decrease from the 698 students who participated for 30 or more days in Year 2. With our assistance (CRDG) as data analysts, the centers improved the data-collection process in Year 3 (Hargrove & Matsuo, 2011).

The findings for Year 3 about academic achievement indicate that, as a subgrantee, the KLC did not meet the HIDOE-SPMS outcome indicator target that 60% of regular center students would improve their academic performance in reading/language arts and math. In Year 3, 49% of the regular program participants with HSA reading data met or exceeded the HSA

reading proficiency objective and 40% of the regular program participants with HSA math data met or exceeded the HSA math proficiency objective. These Year 3 findings were similar to findings from Year 2. The report card data show that 34% of the regular program participants with reading grades data improved in their grades from first to second semester and 28% of the regular program participants with math grades data improved in their grades from first to second semester.

In Year 3, the KLC subgrantee did not meet the HIDEOE-SPMS 75% outcome indicator target for improvement of academic behavior by regular program participants. In Year 3, 38% of the KLC regular center students improved in their GLO #2 behavior, which was an improvement from the 19% in Year 2. The percentages of regular program participants with improvement in four KPI behaviors from the teacher survey data were (a) turning in homework on time (68%), (b) classroom participation (73%), (c) attending class regularly (63%), and (d) classroom behavior (66%). As a subgrantee, the KLC was close, but fell short of meeting the 75% outcome indicator target.

Year 4 additional objectives. In Year 4 of the project (SY 2011–12), the focus of this report, the project goals were to improve on the Year 3 project performance by (a) increasing the number of students who remain in the program throughout the school year and (b) meeting or exceeding the Year 3 levels of the number of students with improved academic behaviors as measured by the 21st CCLC teacher survey.

The Evaluation Design and Data-Collection Methods

The purpose of the evaluation was to fulfill the annual evaluation reporting requirements of the 21st CCLC program and to provide information about project implementation and outcomes to KLC stakeholders as the basis to make decisions to improve services for its beneficiaries. The evaluation design was developed to align with three key 21st CCLC documents: (a) the HIDEOE-SPMS KPIs, (b) HIDEOE-SPMS evaluation report template, and (c) the KLC grant proposal. The outcome indicators referenced in the tabular display of the evaluation design shown in Appendix B are from the Hawai‘i 21st CCLC KPIs (HIDEOE-SPMS, 2010). The HIDEOE-SPMS KPIs were adapted from the Government Performance and Results

Act (GPRA) performance indicators associated with the 21st CCLC program and revised over the program years as deemed necessary by the state program manager. The full evaluation design shown as Appendix B include a description of data-collection methods.

The main evaluation question about implementation is, “Was the program implemented as planned in the grant application?” The evaluation 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 sort of community?” (g) “How many people did it affect?” (h) “Are program activities interesting and valuable to students, teachers, administrators, and community partners?” (i) “What are the plans to ensure effective program implementation next year?” (HIDOE-SPMS, 2012, p. 3).

The evaluation design for the study of project implementation was post-only. Data about implementation were collected with the following methods: (a) an evaluator-developed on-line questionnaire which was administered to paid or unpaid staff and contractors who implemented activities; (b) the evaluator-developed questionnaire about community partnership, completed by center staff; (c) the evaluator-developed (former evaluator) databook with tabs about student attendance and demographics, parent and family activities, descriptions of staff, and descriptions of activities, completed by center staff; (d) summaries of school community data; and (e) interviews with project staff.

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 post

only. Outcome data are (a) the 21st CCLC teacher survey about academic behaviors which was administered to the elementary school regular classroom teachers and middle school English Language Arts or mathematics day teachers of regular center students, (b) Fall and Spring semester report card grades in English Language Arts and mathematics; (c) HSA scores in English Language Arts and mathematics; (d) GLO #2 ratings; and (e) AYP for the host schools.

The Evaluation Schedule

In project year 3 (2010–11) and the first half of project year 4 (fall 2011), we were the KLC data analysts working in collaboration with the lead evaluators. In fall 2011, we entered into discussions with the Complex Area Superintendent and former evaluators to become the KLC subgrantee lead evaluators. At the November 8, 2011 meeting of the consortium principals, we presented a draft schedule of deadlines for collection of data and submission of data to CRDG. The principals agreed to the schedule of deadlines shown as Table 5.

Key issues in planning the schedule of deadlines were (a) avoiding intersession dates when scheduling administration of questionnaires; (b) including feasible intermediate deadlines for submitting attendance data to prevent last minute scrambling, and also provide time to correct errors in the originally submitted data; (c) deadlines for attendance counts submitted in the Spring to provide time for reviews, for analysis to identify the counts of 30-day participants, for compiling the list for CRDG to prepare the teacher survey packets, and for return of the 30-day participants lists of students whose grades were needed as outcome data to the centers; and (d) to optimize the time to allow center students to meet the 30-day attendance counts in the Spring and take into account the end of the school year at the host schools when teachers are very busy and may not have much time to devote to focus on completing the teacher survey.

The Evaluation of Project Implementation

The main evaluation question about implementation is, “Has the program been implemented as planned in the grant application?” The sub-questions are (a) “If no, what changes were made and why?” (b) “Describe what the program finally looked 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) “Are program activities

Table 5*Kalihi Learning Centers Schedule of Evaluation Data-Collection Deadlines in SY 2011–12*

Center name	Deadline to submit Summer 2011 data to CRDG	Deadline to submit to CRDG (for all participants)	Deadline to submit Summer - Spring attendance and demographics data to CRDG (all participants)	Deadline to submit Fall-Spring data to CRDG	Deadline to submit Fall-Spring data to CRDG	Deadline to submit to CRDG
	Databook •Summer 2011 attendance •Summer 2011 student demographics • Summer 2011 Staffing • Summer 2011 Family-Community Involvement	Databook •Summer-Fall attendance •Summer-Fall student demographics •Staffing •F-C Involvement •Program site info (due 1/31/2012)	Databook •Summer-Spring attendance • Summer-Spring student names, grade levels	•partners questionnaire •staff questionnaires	•Teacher surveys	Databook •1 st and 2 nd semester grades for English/reading/ Language Arts and mathematics (30+ days attendees) •1 st and 4 th Qtr GLO (30+ days attendees) •HSA 2011, 2012 for English/reading/ Language Arts and mathematics (30+ days attendees) •Final attendance /demographics (Summer-Fall-Spring- ALL students) •Final Staffing •Final F-C Involvement •Attendance by Activities
Fern El.	02/03/12	02/03/12	04/23/12	04/30/12	05/21/12	06/04/12
Ka‘ewai El.	Not open	02/03/12	04/23/12	04/30/12	05/21/12	06/04/12
Kalihi Waena El.	02/03/12	02/03/12	04/23/12	04/30/12	05/21/12	06/04/12
Linapuni El.	02/03/12	02/03/12	04/23/12	04/30/12	05/21/12	06/04/12
Pu‘uhale El.	02/03/12	02/03/12	04/23/12	04/30/12	05/21/12	06/04/12
Dole Middle	Not open	02/03/12	04/23/12	04/30/12	05/21/12	06/04/12
Kalākaua Middle	Not open	02/03/12	04/23/12	04/30/12	05/21/12	06/04/12

interesting and valuable to students, teachers, administrators, and community partners?” (f) “What are the plans to ensure effective program implementation next year?” (HIDOE-SPMS, 2011, p. 3).

Characteristics of clients in the program. In 2011–12, a total of 1,282 students participated in activities provided by the KLC. The center-level counts of participating students are provided in Table 6 along with counts of students by grade level, free- and reduced-lunch status, special education status (SpEd), and ELL students. Narrative accounts of the free- and reduced-lunch and ELL demographics data are provided in previous sections of this report. The counts for each center are shown in Appendix A (school community demographics) and also in Appendix C (types of participants by activity). Based on our review of the data, the KLC project met the goal of enrolling students with the greatest need, that is, students who qualify for free- or reduced-cost lunch or ELL services.

In deciding how to best select students for 21st CCLC services, stakeholders may consider the demographic characteristics of the center students shown in Tables 6 and 7. KLC decision makers along with host school and other school community stakeholders who seek to improve KLC program activities or supplement day school’s efforts may find the data useful. For example, the project leaders may wish to look at the student groups who did not meet the proficiency objectives in reading and mathematics as potential groups to enroll in the centers.

The data in Tables A1 through A7 in Appendix A are specific to individual centers and their host schools. These tables include counts of students who enrolled at the school, counts of students who qualified for SpEd programs, and counts of students who qualified for ELL services. These tables also include the center-level counts and percentages of all center students to the total host school enrollment, and the number of regular center students to the total number of center students.

Adequate yearly progress of the host schools. Table 8 includes the status of host schools in terms of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and the student subgroups that did not meet the proficiency objectives in 2011–12. As shown in Table 8, all students at Ka‘ewai, Linapuni, and Dole Middle did not meet the proficiency objective of 72% in reading. At Fern Elementary, the ELL subgroup did not meet the proficiency objective. At Kalākaua Middle, the SpEd and ELL subgroups did not meet the proficiency objectives.

Table 6*Description of Students, by Demographic Variables, Who Received Services from the KLC Centers in SY 2011–12*

Center	Counts of students served in 2011–12									
	Enrolled		Grade levels		Free- or reduced-cost lunch		SPED		ELL	
	Total center students	30+ days students	Total center students	30+ days students	Total center students	30+ days students	Total center students	30+ days students	Total center students	30+ days students
Fern Elem.	101	8	Gr 2: 22 Gr 3: 5 Gr 4: 18 Gr 5: 56	Gr 2: 1 Gr 4: 1 Gr 5: 6	86 (85%) no data: 2	5 (5%)	9 (9%)	0	29 (29%) no data: 10	2 (2%) no data: 2
Ka'ewai Elem.	91	77	Gr PK: 1 Gr K: 20 Gr 1: 12 Gr 2: 9 Gr 3: 26 Gr 4: 20 Gr 5: 3	Gr PK: 1 Gr K: 17 Gr 1: 11 Gr 2: 7 Gr 3: 22 Gr 4: 17 Gr 5: 2	82 (90%)	70 (77%)	5 (6%)	1 (1%)	27 (30%)	19 (21%)
Kalihi Waena Elem.	219	63	Gr 1: 11 Gr 2: 31 Gr 3: 68 Gr 4: 52 Gr 5: 57	Gr 2: 10 Gr 3: 20 Gr 4: 21 Gr 5: 12	198 (90%)	57 (26%)	8 (4%)	3 (1%)	59 (27%)	12 (6%)
Linapuni Elem.	134	46	Gr K: 40 Gr 1: 93 no data: 1	Gr K: 1 Gr 1: 45	133 (99%) no data: 1	46 (34%)	6 (5%) no data: 1	1 (1%)	71 (53%) no data: 1	30 (22%)
Pu'uhale Elem.	127	77	Gr K: 27 Gr 1: 21 Gr 2: 18 Gr 3: 20 Gr 4: 13 Gr 5: 28	Gr K: 18 Gr 1: 20 Gr 2: 6 Gr 3: 14 Gr 4: 7 Gr 5: 12	97 (76%) no data: 3	58 (46%)	5 (4%) no data: 2	0	31 (24%) no data: 2	18 (14%)
Dole Middle	316	257	Gr 6: 128 Gr 7: 105 Gr 8: 83	Gr 6: 111 Gr 7: 79 Gr 8: 67	190 (60%)	157 (50%)	17 (5%)	13 (4%)	18 (6%)	16 (5%)
Kalākaua Middle	294	129	Gr 6: 124 Gr 7: 126 Gr 8: 44	Gr 6: 85 Gr 7: 33 Gr 8: 11	294 (100%)	129 (44%)	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	1,282	652 (51.2%)			1,080 (84.2%)	522 (79.5%)	50 (3.9%)	18 (2.7%)	235 (18.3%)	97 (14.8%)

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

Table 8*Kalihi Learning Centers Achievement of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in SY 2011–12¹*

Center name	Met AYP?	NCLB status	Reading: Group(s) that did not meet the proficiency objective of 72%	Mathematics: Group(s) that did not meet the proficiency objective of 64%
Fern Elem.	Not met	Restructuring	•Limited English (ELL)	•Limited English (ELL)
Ka'ewai Elem.	Not met	In good standing, pending	•All students •Disadvantaged •Asian/Pacific Islander	
Kalihi Waena Elem.	Met			
Linapuni Elem.	Not met	School improvement year 1	•All students •Disadvantaged •Asian/Pacific Islander	•All students •Disadvantaged •Asian/Pacific Islander
Pu'uhale Elem.	Met	Planning for restructuring		
Dole Mid.	Not met	Restructuring	•All students •Disadvantaged •Limited English (ELL) •Asian/Pacific Islander	•Disadvantaged •Limited English (ELL)
Kalākaua Mid.	Not met	Restructuring	•Disabled (SPED) •Limited English (ELL)	•Disabled (SPED)

¹Based on the 2011–2012 NCLB status final reports generated on August 24, 2012.

For mathematics, the ELL subgroup at Fern did not meet the proficiency objective of 64%. At Linapuni, all students, disadvantaged students, and Asian/Pacific Islander students did not meet the mathematics proficiency objective. At Dole Middle, students in the disadvantaged and ELL subgroups did not meet the proficiency objective. At Kalākaua Middle, students in the SpEd subgroup did not meet the proficiency objective.

Program Characteristics

Principals of the KLC host schools also had responsibilities as center coordinators. All the center activities were held on the grounds of the host schools. All center students were required to participate in tutorial time each day before or after participating in any enrichment activity. Requiring all the center students to participate in tutorial time is a deviation from the grant proposal, which described plans for tutorials to be provided to the students who struggled with the academic enrichment activities. Our review of the target groups' characteristics lead us to believe that project leaders wisely made this change from the grant proposal because the center students currently enrolled have extreme disadvantages for academic achievement.

The KLC centers met their goal of focusing on the implementation of academic enrichment activities in 2011–12. As shown in Table 9, six of the seven centers offered tutoring or academic enrichment activities four or five days a weeks. Ka'ewai center was the exception, implementing activities two days a week. Centers reported the description of each center's activities shown as Appendix C. Homework help, tutoring, recreational activities, and integrated activities were offered to center students in 2011–12. The academic enrichment activities integrated various content areas, including reading or literacy, mathematics, science, technology or telecommunications, health or nutrition, culture or social studies, arts and music.

Center Staffing

The KLC project leaders met their goal of staffing the centers with qualified teachers. The centers reported data shown in Table 10 that a little over half of the center staff were also school day teachers. The second largest group of center staff also worked in the host schools, but were in non-teaching positions, such as librarians, guidance counselors, or school aides. As mentioned in the grant proposal, it was advantageous to contract host school personnel to build bridges between the host school and the extended day curriculum (Hargrove & Nomiya, 2008). Host school staff would be familiar with procedures for a safe environment for students. Additionally, research about the 21st CCLC program across the nation has shown that these staff qualifications help to build bridges between the host school and extended day program (Nafzger & Vinson, 2011).

Table 9

*Categories of Activities and When They were Implemented at the Kalihi Learning Center 21st CCLC Centers in SY 2011–12
(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	Community service or service learning	Other	Activity had more than two program elements
Fern Elem.	SY2: 3	Summ1: 3 SY1: 3	SY1: 5	SY2: 5	0	0	0	0
Ka‘ewai Elem.	0	SY1: 2	SY1: 1	0	0	0	0	0
Kalihi Waena Elem.	0	Summ1: 5 SY1: 9	Summ1: 6 SY1: 8	Summ2: 6 SY2: 8	0	0	0	0
Linapuni Elem.	0	Summ1: 1 SY1: 3	Summ1: 5 SY1: 3	Summ2: 5 SY2: 3	0	0	0	0
Pu‘uhale Elem.	SY2: 8	SY1: 8	SY1: 11	SY2: 11	0	0	0	0
Dole Middle	SY1: 2	SY2: 2	SY1: 36	SY2: 36	0	0	0	0
Kalākaua Middle	SY1: 1	SY2: 1	SY1: 25	SY2: 25	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	Summ1: 0 Summ2: 0 SY1: 3 SY2: 11	Summ1: 9 Summ2: 0 SY1: 25 SY2: 3	Summ1: 11 Summ2: 0 SY1: 89 SY2: 0	Summ1: 0 Summ2: 11 SY1: 0 SY2: 88	0	0	0	0

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.

Table 10*Description of Staff at the Kalihi Learning Centers in SY 2011–12*

sy=school year, summ=summer

Center	Type of staff								
	School-day teachers (includes former and substitute teachers)	Center administrators and coordinators	Youth development workers and other nonschool day staff with a college degree or higher	Other nonteaching school-day staff (e.g., librarians, guidance counselors, aides)	Parents	Other community members (e.g., business mentors, senior citizens, clergy)	High school students	Other nonschool-day staff with some or no college	Other
Fern Elem.	1 paid sy 2 paid summ		1 paid sy	1 paid summ				2 paid sy	
Ka'ewai Elem.	7 paid sy								
Kalihi Waena Elem.	17 paid sy 2 paid summ		10 paid sy	2 paid sy			4 paid summ		2 paid summ
Linapuni Elem.	6 paid sy 1 volunteer sy 16 paid summ	1 volunteer sy		6 paid sy 5 volunteer sy 8 paid summ	1 volunteer sy	1 paid sy	1 paid sy	1 paid summ	1 paid sy 1 volunteer sy 4 paid summ
Pu'uhale Elem.	9 paid sy	1 paid sy	1 paid sy	6 paid sy					5 paid sy (college students)
Dole Middle	10 paid sy								
Kalākaua Middle			4 paid sy					3 paid sy 1 volunteer sy	
TOTALS	50 paid sy 1 volunteer sy 20 paid summ	1 paid sy 1 volunteer sy	16 paid sy	14 paid sy 5 volunteer sy 8 paid summ	1 volunteer sy	1 paid sy	1 paid sy 4 paid summ	5 paid sy 1 volunteer sy 1 paid summ	6 paid sy 1 volunteer sy 6 paid summ

Note. Some staff were involved in the centers during Summer 2011 and School Year 2011–12 and are included in both counts.

Hours of Operation

According to the HIDEOE-SPMS outcome indicators, the 21st CCLC program target is that 75% of the centers should provide services at least 15 hours a week on average during the school year, and provide services when school is not in session, such as during the summer and holidays (HIDEOE-SPMS, 2010). The KLC subgrantee did not meet this target in 2011–12. The KLC hours of operation for Summer 2011 and SY 2011–12 are shown as Table 11.

Three centers (Fern, Kalihi Waena, and Linapuni) were open during Summer 2011. Of these three centers, Fern was open 20 hours per week. Linapuni was open 14 hours per week, which is just slightly under the preferred 15 hours per week. Kalihi Waena was open 8 hours per week.

All seven KLC centers were open during the school year. The typical number of hours per week during the school year was highest at the Pu‘uhale Center (16 hours), followed by Dole Center (15 hours), Kalihi Waena Center (12 hours), Kalākaua Center (11 hours), Linapuni Center (9 hours), Fern Center (8 hours), and Ka‘ewai Center (6 hours). The centers implemented activities between 37 weeks at five days per week (Linapuni) to 32 weeks at two days per week (Ka‘ewai).

The KLC centers did not meet the 75% mark of offering services at least 15 hours a week as targeted by the 21st CCLC program. However, the KLC centers were open for a notable amount of time. The 2011–12 school year was 39 weeks long and the centers provided services between 32 and 37 weeks. The HIDEOE schools were typically open five days a week. Four centers (Linapuni, Pu‘uhale, Dole, and Kalākaua) were open every day; Fern and Kalihi Waena were open four days; and Ka‘ewai was open two days.

After reviewing the KLC data for 2011–12, we posit that the program was generally implemented as described in the grant proposal, that is, with emphasis on academic enrichment activities toward the goal of academic achievement. The project leaders made decisions to change some intended plans from the grant proposal to better serve the target groups, such as providing homework help and tutoring for all students. We provide more specifics about the implementation of the program beginning with descriptive data about the activities that were

Table 11
Kalihi Learning Centers Hours of Operation in SY 2011–12

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
Fern Elem.	4	20	5	32	8	4
Ka‘ewai Elem.	Not open	Not open	Not open	32	6	2
Kalihi Waena Elem.	6	8	4	33	12	4
Linapuni Elem.	5	14	4	37	9	5
Pu‘uhale Elem.	Not open	Not open	Not open	32	16	5
Dole Middle	Not open	Not open	Not open	32	15	5
Kalākaua Middle	Not open	Not open	Not open	32	11	5

implemented at the KLC centers. Then we provide evaluative findings about the implementation of those activities.

All seven KLC centers implemented activities in SY 2011–12. Data collected to describe the activities implemented at the seven KLC centers were organized in tables shown in Appendix C, Tables C1 through C7. The descriptive data provide contextual information for the evaluative findings about the extent and quality of what was implemented. An overall description of the activities for the subgrantee (summarizing Appendix C) is shown as Table 12. In Table 12, the types of activities are shown as categories of core academic activities (primary and secondary categorizations), categories of academic enrichment activities (primary and secondary categorizations), and time of year the activity was implemented (Summer 2011 or SY 2011–12).

At the elementary school centers, the types of activities implemented were homework help, tutoring, academic enrichment activities, and recreational activities. These activities were mainly facilitated by part-time teachers, who were also school day teachers. At the middle school centers, the community partner, ASAS, was contracted to lead activities. ASAS provided homework help, tutoring, recreational activities, and academic enrichment activities to the students. ASAS provided the recreational and academic enrichment activities listed in the footnotes of Tables C6 and C7 in Appendix C. We requested data from stakeholder groups who were directly involved with implementing activities in 2011–12. We also collected data about the implementation of activities by attending quarterly meetings with the school principals who managed the centers and the ASAS partners who implemented activities at the two middle schools.

We collected evaluative data about the implementation of core educational activities. Project staff, contractors, or volunteers who implemented activities during Summer 2011 or SY 2011–12 were sent a letter or email message inviting them to complete an online staff questionnaire. The respondents were asked to rate the extent and quality to which they implemented each content area.

Table 12

*Categories of Activity Subject Areas and When They were Implemented at the Kalihi Learning Center 21st CCLC Centers in SY 2011–12
(Listed by Number of Subject Area Category)*

Center	Activity subject area categories								
	(Summ = Subject category for Summer 2011. SY = Subject category for SY 2011–12.)								
	Core academic areas			Academic enrichment areas					
	Reading or literacy	Mathematics	Science	Arts and music	Entrepreneurial education	Technology or telecommunications	Cultural activities or social studies	Health or nutrition	Other
Fern Elem.	Summ: 3 SY: 2	Summ: 3 SY: 2	SY: 1	SY: 3	0	SY: 1	SY: 1	SY: 1	0
Ka'ewai Elem.	SY: 2	SY: 1	SY: 2	0	0	SY: 2	0	0	0
Kalihi Waena Elem.	Summ: 2 SY: 7	Summ: 2 SY: 7	SY: 2	0	0	0	0	Summ: 2 SY: 5	0
Linapuni Elem.	Summ: 5 SY: 2	Summ: 2 SY: 1	Summ: 1 SY: 1	Summ: 1 SY: 1	0	SY: 3	Summ: 1 SY: 1	Summ: 1	0
Pu'uhale Elem.	SY: 9	SY: 7	SY: 1	SY: 5	0	SY: 5	SY: 3	SY: 1	0
Dole Middle	SY: 11	SY: 3	SY: 3	SY: 11	0	SY: 4	SY: 3	SY: 11	0
Kalākaua Middle	SY: 8	SY: 5	SY: 2	SY: 8	0	SY: 2	SY: 1	SY: 10	0
TOTALS	Summ: 10 SY: 41	Summ: 7 SY: 26	Summ: 1 SY: 12	Summ: 1 SY: 28	0	SY: 17	Summ: 1 SY: 9	Summ: 3 SY: 28	0

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.

As discussed in the methods section of the evaluation design in Appendix B, a weakness of this method was that the respondents may have biased their reporting to more positive levels of implementation because of possible political consequences of their responses, or respondents may have positively biased their ratings because they believed the activity was implemented to the greatest extent possible. We tried to clarify the expectations for the ratings in the instructions on the instrument to address this weakness; however, our efforts would only minimize, not eliminate, the possibility of self-report bias.

We also compared the findings about implementation to what was proposed in the grant proposal and held discussions with project administration and staff to discover any influences that changed the original plans for the project and challenges to implementation. In comparison to the grant proposal, we found that

- tutoring was provided for all center students. As discussed previously in this report, this change from the grant proposal was a considered decision by project leaders to address the challenges faced by current students enrolled in the centers.
- the academic improvement/remediation program of providing individual tutorials or small groups practices was implemented, mainly in small groups.
- the mentoring by secondary students was implemented in one elementary school.
- some active sharing of best practices occurred between principals at quarterly meetings.
- no evidence was observed or data submitted about professional development for center instructors.
- no evidence was observed or data submitted about workshops and classes for parents and families. However, there were a few parent and family-community activities as described in this report in a separate section and Appendix G.

The Implementation of Core Academic Activities

The HDOE-SPMS section's 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" (HDOE-SPMS, 2010). The KLC subgrantee met and surpassed this KPI in 2011–12. Each of the seven KLC centers implemented high-quality activities in both reading and mathematics in SY 2011–12. The centers at Fern Elementary, Ka'ewai Elementary, Pu'uhale Elementary, and Dole Middle also implemented high-quality science activities in 2011–12.

The elementary center part-time teachers (who were also school day teachers) implemented the core activities, shown in Appendix C, Tables C1 through C7, in the form of homework help, tutoring, and academic enrichment activities. The community partner, ASAS, required students at the two middle school centers to participate in tutoring as well as the sports activities in a day, shown as Tables C6 and C7.

Evaluative findings over all seven KLC centers about implementation of the core academic activities are shown as Table 13 (findings about extent of implementation) and Table 14 (findings about quality of implementation). The shaded cells indicate item averages at 3.0 or higher (moderate levels to higher extent or quality of implementation). Findings for an additional item are shown in Tables 13 and 14, "[Rate the extent/quality to which you] address students' individual needs (e.g., low academic achievement, LEP, SpEd, behavioral) for improving academic performance." Although this item did not address a core academic area, we included findings for this item with the items about implementing core academic areas, because we believe that a program that served students with high needs for academic support will also accommodate individual students' needs for academic achievement. Findings from all staff who responded (albeit a minimal number) showed that individual student needs were being addressed.

As shown in Tables 13 and 14, findings about the extent and quality of implementation for reading, mathematics, and science content were at moderate to high levels at Fern, Ka'ewai, Linapuni, Pu'uhale, and Dole Middle school centers. The extent and quality of implementation for reading and mathematics were also reported at moderate to high levels at Kalihi Waena and Kalākaua Middle schools centers. The Kalihi Waena center did not implement science activities.

Table 13
Summary of Findings About the Extent of Implementation of Reading/Literacy, Mathematics, and Science Activities in SY 2011–12

Activity	Average ratings of the extent of implementation (standard deviation)																				
	Fern Elem.			Ka‘ewai Elem.			Kalihi Waena Elem.			Linapuni Elem.			Pu‘uhale Elem.			Dole Middle			Kalākaua Middle		
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
i1. Address students' individual needs (e.g., low achievement, LEP, SpEd, behavioral) for improving academic performance.	1	4.0	0	1	3.0	0	0	0	0	6	3.8	0.4	3	4.0	0	1	4.0	0	0	0	0
i2. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in reading/literacy.	1	4.0	0	3	3.0	0	2	3.5	0.7	9	3.8	0.4	4	3.8	0.5	1	4.0	0	1	3.0	0
i3. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in mathematics	2	3.5	0.7	3	3.0	0	1	4.0	0.20	5	3.4	0.5	4	3.5	0.6	1	4.0	0	1	4.0	0
i4. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in science.	2	3.5	0.7	2	3.0	0	0	0	0	4	3.3	1.0	1	4.0	0	1	4.0	0	1	2.0	0

Note. 1.0 = none or very little; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = all or almost all. The shaded cells indicate ratings of 3.0 and above which is interpreted as moderate to high levels of implementation. The *n* for each activity is different because the number of staff members who implemented each activity varied at each center.

Table 14
Summary of Findings About the Quality of Implementation of Reading/Literacy, Mathematics, and Science Activities in SY 2011–12

Activity	Average ratings of the quality of implementation (standard deviation)																				
	Fern Elem.			Ka‘ewai Elem.			Kalihi Waena Elem.			Linapuni Elem.			Pu‘uhale Elem.			Dole Middle			Kalākaua Middle		
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
i1. Address students' individual needs (e.g., low achievement, LEP, SpEd, behavioral) for improving academic performance.	1	4.0	0	1	3.0	0	0	0	0	6	3.5	0.5	3	4.0	0	1	4.0	0	0	0	0
i2. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in reading/literacy.	1	4.0	0	3	3.0	0	2	3.0	0	9	3.7	0.5	4	3.5	0.6	1	4.0	0	1	3.0	0
i3. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in mathematics	2	3.5	0.7	3	3.0	0	1	3.0	0	5	3.4	0.5	4	3.3	0.5	1	4.0	0	1	4.0	0
i4. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in science.	2	3.5	0.7	2	3.0	0	0	0	0	4	3.8	0.5	1	4.0	0	1	4.0	0	1	2.0	0

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

The Kalākaua Middle Center implemented science activities at mediocre levels for extent and quality.

Respondents at five of the seven centers (Fern, Ka‘ewai, Linapuni, Pu‘uhale, and Dole) provided ratings indicating they addressed students’ individual needs at moderate to high levels. There were no responses from the center staff at Kalihi Waena and Kalākaua Middle.

The low number of responses from some centers to individual items was a concern for the evaluation because this means that there were less than full reporting about implementation. We will discuss the collection of implementation data with the principals and project staff in Year 5 to explore how the methodology can be improved.

The Implementation of Activities to Improve Positive Behaviors

One item on the on-line questionnaire was included to elicit information from staff, volunteers, or contractors who implemented activities to improve center students’ positive behaviors. Center staff may have (or probably did) implement strategies to improve positive behaviors as a part of core academic activities or academic enrichment activities. The responses were summarized and are shown as Tables 15 and 16. The low response rates were a concern. Where there were low response rates that indicate only one or two people per center discussed appropriate positive behaviors and reinforced those behaviors with center students, either the questionnaire respondents did not follow or understand the instructions to respond to the item, or the respondents did not wish to provide the information. Perhaps there were other reasons why the respondents did not provide the information. In any case, we will make an effort to improve the response rate in Year 5 of the project, first by discussing the situation with project leaders to understand why the response rate was so low, then taking steps to revise the evaluation design to collect data about implementation of efforts to improve academic behavior, using methods that may have increased response rates.

The Year 4 responses, albeit low response rates, indicate moderate to high extent and quality of implementation of discussing and reinforcing positive behaviors at six KLC centers, the exception being Kalākaua Middle, in 2011–12. The greatest number of respondents (four) was at the Linapuni Center, suggesting that this is the number of staff who worked to enhance positive behaviors with center students. There were two respondents from Pu‘uhale and one respondent from each of the centers at Fern, Ka‘ewai, Kalihi Waena, and Dole Middle.

Table 15*Summary of Findings About the Extent of Implementation of Activities to Improve Positive Behaviors in SY 2011–12*

Activity	Average ratings of the extent of implementation (standard deviation)																				
	Fern Elem.			Ka'ewai Elem.			Kalihi Waena Elem.			Linapuni Elem.			Pu'uhale Elem.			Dole Middle			Kalākaua Middle		
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
i12. discuss appropriate positive behavior and reinforce the behaviors	1	4.0	0	1	3.0	0	1	4.0	0	4	4.0	0	2	3.0	1.4	1	4.0	0	0	0	0

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

Table 16*Summary of Findings About the Quality of Implementation of Activities to Improve Positive Behaviors in SY 2011–12*

Activity	Average ratings of the quality of implementation (standard deviation)																				
	Fern Elem.			Ka'ewai Elem.			Kalihi Waena Elem.			Linapuni Elem.			Pu'uhale Elem.			Dole Middle			Kalākaua Middle		
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
i12. discuss appropriate positive behavior and reinforce the behaviors	1	4.0	0	1	3.0	0	1	4.0	0	4	3.8	0.5	2	3.0	0	1	4.0	0	0	0	0

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

The Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities

During 2011–12, KLC centers offered a variety of enrichment and support activities as shown in Table 12 (a variation on Table 9, also includes data from Appendix C). The enrichment activities were valuable for students’ enjoyment of learning, application of the content areas in practical situations, and development of global and higher-order thinking. Six of the seven centers offered activities in telecommunications and technology (Fern, Ka‘ewai, Linapuni, Pu‘uhale, Dole, and Kalākaua); and health and nutrition, including sports activities (Fern, Kalihi Waena, Linapuni, Pu‘uhale, Dole, and Kalākaua). Five of the seven centers offered activities in art and music (Fern, Linapuni, Pu‘uhale, Dole, and Kalākaua); and cultural or social studies (Fern, Linapuni, Pu‘uhale, Dole, and Kalākaua).

The HDOE-SPMS section set a criterion level for the implementation of enrichment and support activities, “100% of centers will offer enrichment and support activities such as nutrition and health, art, music, technology, and recreation” (HDOE-SPMS, 2010). The KLC subgrantee met and surpassed this KPI.

In 2011–12, each of the seven KLC centers offered more than one enrichment and support activity. Through an online questionnaire, project staff, contractors, or volunteers who were directly involved with implementing activities during Summer 2011 or SY 2011–12 provided evaluative data about the implementation of enrichment and support activities. Respondents rated the extent to which they implemented each content area on a 4-point scale.

The findings over all seven KLC centers are shown as Table 17 (extent of implementation) and Table 18 (quality of implementation). The shaded cells indicate item averages at 3.0 or higher (moderate levels to higher extent or quality of implementation). Center-level findings about the implementation of enrichment and support activities are shown as Appendix E, Tables E1 through E7. The findings should be regarded with reservation because the response rate was extremely low for some items.

Table 17*Summary of Findings About the Extent of Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities in SY 2011–12*

Activity	Average ratings of the extent of implementation (standard deviation)																				
	Fern Elem.			Ka‘ewai Elem.			Kalihi Waena Elem.			Linapuni Elem.			Pu‘uhale Elem.			Dole Middle			Kalākaua Middle		
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
i5. art and/or music	0	0	0	1	3.0	0	0	0	0	5	3.4	1.3	4	3.8	0.5	1	4.0	0	1	4.0	0
i6. entrepreneurial education (business ventures)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.0	0	0	0	0
i7. telecommunications and technology education	2	3.5	0.7	1	3.0	0	1	4.0	0	3	3.7	0.6	3	3.7	0.6	1	4.0	0	0	0	0
i8. Sports (e.g., basketball, baseball, football, swimming)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4.0	0	1	4.0	0	1	4.0	0	1	4.0	0	1	4.0	0
i9. cultural activities/social studies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4.0	0	2	4.0	0	1	4.0	0	0	0	0
i10. health/nutrition	1	4.0	0	1	3.0	0	0	0	0	2	4.0	0	0	0	0	1	4.0	0	0	0	0
i11. Service learning activities (service activities in the school or local community)	1	4.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.0	0	1	4.0	0	0	0	0

Note. 1.0 = none or very little; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = all or almost all. The shaded cells indicate ratings of 3.0 and above which is interpreted as moderate to high levels of implementation. The *n* for each activity is different because the number of staff members who implemented each activity varied at each center.

Table 18*Summary of Findings About the Quality of Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities in SY 2011–12*

Activity	Average ratings of the quality of implementation (standard deviation)																				
	Fern Elem.			Ka‘ewai Elem.			Kalihi Waena Elem.			Linapuni Elem.			Pu‘uhale Elem.			Dole Middle			Kalākaua Middle		
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
i5. art and/or music	0	0	0	1	3.0	0	0	0	0	5	3.2	1.3	4	3.5	0.6	1	4.0	0	1	4.0	0
i6. entrepreneurial education (business ventures)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.0	0	0	0	0
i7. telecommunications and technology education	2	3.5	0.7	1	3.0	0	1	4.0	0	3	3.3	0.6	3	3.3	0.6	1	4.0	0	0	0	0
i8. Sports (e.g., basketball, baseball, football, swimming)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4.0	0	1	3.0	0	1	4.0	0	1	4.0	0	1	4.0	0
i9. cultural activities/social studies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4.0	0	2	4.0	0	1	4.0	0	0	0	0
i10. health/nutrition	1	4.0	0	1	3.0	0	0	0	0	2	3.0	0	0	0	0	1	4.0	0	0	0	0
i11. Service learning activities (service activities in the school or local community)	1	4.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.0	0	1	4.0	0	0	0	0

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

The Implementation of Community-Based Partnerships

The HIDEOE-SPMS section set a criterion level for community involvement, “More than 85% of centers will establish and maintain partnerships within the community that continue to increase levels of community collaboration in planning, implementation, and sustaining programs” (HIDEOE-SPMS, 2010). The evaluation sub-questions are, “Which community-based partnerships, as planned in the grant application, have been established and maintained and which ones were not? Why?” (HIDEOE-SPMS, 2011).

The KLC subgrantee did not meet this KPI in 2011–12; however, we have some unanswered questions after our review of the data. The reported listing of community partners for each center and activities implemented by partners are shown in Appendix F. The centers at Dole and Kalākaua Middle schools (roughly, 29% of the centers) both reported partnering with ASAS. The Dole Middle Center worked with other partners: Weed and Seed Honolulu, Kalihi YMCA, and Young Life O‘ahu. The partners provided programming or activity-related services, goods or materials, volunteer or paid staffing, funding or helped to raise funds, implementation of project initiatives, or evaluation services. The monetary value of a partner’s services ranged from \$400.00 to \$136,000.00. Although not formally reported with specific data to support the value and type of contribution provided, meetings and discussions with center staff reported that the Police Athletic League (PAL) was a partner to Kalihi Waena and PAL personnel served as coaches for the various Kalihi Waena sports activities. Similarly, the Ka‘ewai staff also reported at one of the meetings with the KLC principals that they partnered with Second Steps, but did not provide the evaluators with specific data about the value and type of contribution provided by Second Steps.

Center staff submitted data to the evaluators through the KLC databook, including information about family-community events. The community events included names of participating organizations; these organizations are listed in Appendix G. Although we requested information about these organizations as community partners, the center staff did not respond. Additionally, we were provided information about a center activity involving the Police Activities League (PAL), but did not receive information about PAL as a community partner as we requested. Therefore, although it seemed that there were other partners involved in the KLC in 2011–12, we were not able to collect any concrete information.

Which community-based partnerships, as planned in the grant application, have been established and maintained and which ones were not? Why?" Both middle school centers continued contracts with ASAS to provide staff and to coordinate their center activities. Although not formally reported with specific data to support the value and type of contribution provided, PAL continued to provide coaches for one of the elementary center's athletic program, and Second Steps was reported as a partner for another elementary center. Farrington High School students also continued their involvement with one of the middle school centers.

Services to Parents and Other Adult Family Members

The HIDOE-SPMS objective for providing services to parents and other adult family members in 2011–12 is “More than 85% of centers will offer services to parents and other adult family members.” The KLC grant proposal include two objectives that were more specific than the HIDOE-SPMS objective: (a) parents or other adult family members will enroll in Adult Education classes, and (b) parents or other adult family members, particularly with low English proficiency, will observe or involve themselves in center activities (Hargrove & Nomiya, 2008).

There were mixed findings about services to parents and other adult family members in 2011–12. The KLC met the HIDOE-SPMS objective in 2011–12, but not the objectives from the grant proposal. Data were collected with two different methods: (a) the CRDG evaluator-developed on-line questionnaire that was distributed to staff, contractors, or volunteers who implemented activities and (b) the KLC databook section about numbers and types of family members who participated in center-sponsored community events.

Activities for support/guidance of parents and other adult family members. The findings from the on-line questionnaire are shown as Tables 19 and 20. Respondents to the on-line questionnaire reported that six of the seven KLC centers (85.7%) implemented activities in which parents of students who participate in the centers also receive support/guidance from the centers (the exception was the Kalākaua Middle Center). The implementation levels were moderate to high extent and quality. These findings should be viewed with some reservation because of the low number of respondents.

Table 19

Summary of Findings About the Extent of Implementation of Parent Activities in SY 2011–12

Activity	Average ratings of the extent of implementation (standard deviation)																				
	Fern Elem.			Ka'ewai Elem.			Kalihi Waena Elem.			Linapuni Elem.			Pu'uhale Elem.			Dole Middle			Kalākaua Middle		
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
i13. parents of students who participate in the centers also receive support/guidance from the centers	1	4.0	0	1	3.0	0	1	4.0	0	4	3.8	0.5	2	3.0	0	1	4.0	0	0	0	0

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

Table 20

Summary of Findings About the Quality of Implementation of Parent Activities in SY 2011–12

Activity	Average ratings of the quality of implementation (standard deviation)																				
	Fern Elem.			Ka'ewai Elem.			Kalihi Waena Elem.			Linapuni Elem.			Pu'uhale Elem.			Dole Middle			Kalākaua Middle		
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
i13. parents of students who participate in the centers also receive support/guidance from the centers	1	---	---	1	---	---	1	---	---	2	3.5	0.7	1	2.0	0	1	4.0	0	0	0	0

Note. 1.0 = poor; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = very well. The shaded cells indicate ratings of 3.0 and above which is interpreted as moderate to high levels of quality of implementation. Linapuni and Pu'uhale have smaller *n* sizes for quality of implementation than extent of implementation because not all respondents who rated the extent also rated the quality.

However, if findings about activities with family and community members are combined with these findings about parent and adult family member activities, it can be stated that all (100%) of the KLC centers provided services to parents and adult family members.

Activities with family and community members. The centers submitted information in their databook about family and community members' participation rates in center activities. The activities were open to all community members and were distinct from activities that they reported about on the on-line questionnaire.

With the Ka'ewai Center as the exception, six of the seven centers (85.7%) reported family members of their center students participated in center-sponsored community events. Some activities were to increase community awareness and interest in school activities, such as the sports activities at Kalihi Waena, Lego and 'Ohana Fair at Linapuni, and a sampling of activities at Pu'uhale. Other centers involved community members with service learning, such as the Dole Middle Center's community clean up and help with the Special Olympics. The center at Kalākaua Middle had three showcase (culminating) events, one held during each of the first three quarters of the school year. At these events, students showcased what they worked on during their enrichment activities. Details about activities for each center are shown as Tables G1 through G7 in Appendix G. These findings addressed the goal stated in the grant proposal. We noted that the levels of participation were quite varied and no criterion was set as a target.

A Comparison of the Number of Students who Remained in the KLC Centers in 2010–11 and 2011–12

We collected and reviewed data about the number of students who attended the centers to determine effects of center activities on student enrollment and retention in the KLC program. According to the Year 3 evaluation report, it was a goal in Year 4 to increase the number of students who remain in the 21st CCLC program over the 2011–12 school year (Hargrove & Matsuo, 2011). We addressed this question by comparing the number of regular center students in 2010–11 and the number of regular center students in 2011–12. This statistic was used for four reasons: (a) students enroll in the centers at different times during the school year, (b) attendance was uneven, (c) students left the program at different times, and (d) the 30-day participation level in the 21st CCLC program was meaningful and deemed sufficient to examine the impact on students' academic achievement and behaviors. Therefore, it was a positive goal for the centers

to provide services to students for 30 or more days because this was the amount of services considered to make a difference in the students' achievement and behaviors.

Although the number of students who registered for the extended-day program has steadily increased (967 in Year 2, 1,068 in Year 3, and 1,282 in Year 4), the number of students who remained with the program for at least 30 days fluctuated (698 in Year 2, 634 in Year 3, and 657 in Year 4). The steady increase in the number of student who registered for the program may either indicate increased interest by the students in the activities or the effectiveness of the staff's efforts to get students involved. The challenge was to keep the students, with the support of their parents, interested in continuing to attend the activities for at least 30 days. The 21st CCLC program was supplemental to the day school; therefore, attrition may be partly due to the targeted student population (those with greatest need). Another reason may be the lack of understanding on the part of the parents, and sometimes students, of the commitment to remain in the program (Hargrove & Matsuo, 2011).

Based on our comparison of school years 2010–11 and 2011–12, the KLC centers reached their goal of increasing the number of students who remained in the centers. As shown in Table 21, the count of regular center students increased from 634 to 657 or by 23 students. In 2011–12, the total enrollment was 1,282 students compared with 2010–11 when the total enrollment was 1,068 students. However in 2011–12, regular students accounted for 51.2% of the total center enrollment compared with 2010–11, when regular center students accounted for 59.4% of the total center enrollment. Although the count of regular students was larger than the previous year, comparison of the percentages showed that the proportion of center students who remained in the centers throughout the school year was less in 2011–12.

Challenges Faced in Implementing the Program and how the Challenges were Addressed

The KLC subgrantee enrolled the targeted student population for the 21st CCLC. Of course, there were challenges implementing activities focused on improvement of center students' academic performance and behavior. The centers were tasked with providing activities to improve the students' reading/literacy and math skills and activities to provide a more well-rounded experience for the students. One project leader described the challenges and how they were addressed:

Table 21*Description of Students Who Received Services in SY 2010–11 and SY 2011–12 from the KLC Centers*

Center	Counts of students served in 2010–11				Counts of students served in 2011–12			
	Enrolled		Grade levels		Enrolled		Grade levels	
	Total center students	30+ days students	Total center students	30+ days students	Total center students	30+ days students	Total center students	30+ days students
Fern Elem.	35	6	Gr 2: 2 Gr 3: 10 Gr 4: 8 Gr 5: 15	Gr 3: 1 Gr 5: 5	101	8	Gr 2: 22 Gr 3: 5 Gr 4: 18 Gr 5: 56	Gr 2: 1 Gr 4: 1 Gr 5: 6
Ka'ewai Elem.	75	64	Gr K: 3 Gr 1: 10 Gr 2: 13 Gr 3: 18 Gr 4: 12 Gr 5: 19	Gr K: 2 Gr 1: 10 Gr 2: 10 Gr 3: 16 Gr 4: 9 Gr 5: 17	91	77	Gr PK: 1 Gr K: 20 Gr 1: 12 Gr 2: 9 Gr 3: 26 Gr 4: 20 Gr 5: 3	Gr PK: 1 Gr K: 17 Gr 1: 11 Gr 2: 7 Gr 3: 22 Gr 4: 17 Gr 5: 2
Kalihi Waena Elem.	189	103	Gr 1: 7 Gr 2: 10 Gr 3: 84 Gr 4: 37 Gr 5: 51	Gr 1: 4 Gr 2: 6 Gr 3: 30 Gr 4: 30 Gr 5: 33	219	63	Gr 1: 11 Gr 2: 31 Gr 3: 68 Gr 4: 52 Gr 5: 57	Gr 2: 10 Gr 3: 20 Gr 4: 21 Gr 5: 12
Linapuni Elem.	89	53	Gr 1: 20 Gr 2: 69	Gr 1: 7 Gr 2: 46	134	46	Gr K: 40 Gr 1: 93 no data: 1	Gr K: 1 Gr 1: 45
Pu'uhale Elem.	144	87	Gr PK: 14 Gr 1: 15 Gr 2: 23 Gr 3: 23 Gr 4: 28 Gr 5: 41	Gr PK: 7 Gr 1: 9 Gr 2: 17 Gr 3: 11 Gr 4: 21 Gr 5: 22	127	77	Gr K: 27 Gr 1: 21 Gr 2: 18 Gr 3: 20 Gr 4: 13 Gr 5: 28	Gr K: 18 Gr 1: 20 Gr 2: 6 Gr 3: 14 Gr 4: 7 Gr 5: 12
Dole Middle	352	183	Gr 6: 148 Gr 7: 117 Gr 8: 87	Gr 6: 83 Gr 7: 62 Gr 8: 38	316	257	Gr 6: 128 Gr 7: 105 Gr 8: 83	Gr 6: 111 Gr 7: 79 Gr 8: 67
Kalākaua Middle	184	138	Gr 6: 96 Gr 7: 46 Gr 8: 42	Gr 6: 74 Gr 7: 33 Gr 8: 31	294	129	Gr 6: 124 Gr 7: 126 Gr 8: 44	Gr 6: 85 Gr 7: 33 Gr 8: 11
Total	1,068	634 (59.4%)	1,068	634	1,282	657 (51.2%)	1,282	657

Over the years, the greatest challenge has been to offer a variety of learning opportunities that are recreational (i.e., that are not just for fun and games) that provide an alternative to classroom learning. In addition, some school sites have been faced with a personnel challenge (e.g., finding enough instructors; finding instructors that provide the rigor and relevance to bridge the gap between formal learning and play). Furthermore, the administrators have had to step up, as they changed their positions and their school sites. Luckily, KLC has provided the commonality and consistency over the years. (E. Hargrove, personal communication, October 11, 2012).

Program Activities Identified as Interesting and Valuable to Students, Teachers, Administrators, and Community Partners

The principals and their center staff planned for each student to attend at least one reading/math homework or tutoring activity and an enrichment activity during each day. Day teachers were included during planning to suggest activities that would be beneficial, and a few of these teachers used their professional experience to tutor students in the program. The ASAS partner staffed and coordinated the middle school sites' activities. The students were offered a variety of enrichment activities. Generally, the middle school sites offered more choices of enrichment activities compared to the elementary school sites. Enrichment activities included Acting Out, Baseball, Basketball, Cheerleading, Chess, Clay and murals, Cooking, Creative Art, Cross Country, Cyber Cycle, Drawing, Film, Football, Gardening, Glee, Hawaiiana, Hip Hop, Hooks, Hula, Leadership, Learning Mandarin and Chinese Culture, Martial Arts, Multi-Sports, Nutrition, Photo Fantasy, Polynesian Dance, Robotics, Service Learning, Science, Soccer, Softball, Study Hall, Tennis, Ukulele, Ultimate Frisbee, Volleyball, Website, Woodshop, Yoga, Young Life, and Zumba Dance.

The Evaluation of Project Outcomes

The evaluation of outcomes addressed the HDOE-SPMS KPIs and the program performance indicators established by the US Department of Education (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?"

Teacher-Reported Changes in Regular Center Students' Academic Behaviors

The center students' academic behaviors that were set as the HODOE-SPMS KPI criteria were four items on the teachers survey about (a) turning in homework on time, (b) classroom participation, (c) attending class regularly, and (d) classroom behavior. The outcome indicator is 75% of regular center students would show improvement in these behaviors. The teacher survey include items about 10 academic behaviors, that is, one item per behavior. We report changes on all 10 academic behaviors as effects of the centers, distinguishing the four KPIs from findings on the other academic behaviors.

We report behavioral findings across all KLC centers in Table 22 and report the findings for individual centers as tables in Appendix H. The shaded cells in Table H1–H7 indicate that teachers reported that 75% or more of the regular center students improved in the behavior. These percentages were calculated after excluding data for regular center students who did not need to improve or for whom data were not available. This streamlined dataset aligned with the calculations on the PPICS on-line reporting system for the 21st CCLC program.

Improvement by KPIs. The shaded cells in Table 22 indicate when 75% of the regular students improved in the behavior, as reported by day teachers. Over all the centers, there were insufficient levels of improvement on the KPIs to state that the KLC met the outcome indicators. Although the KLC subgrantee did not meet the outcome indicators, the individual centers met the 75% level of regular students' improvement for individual behaviors. From the data collected, day teachers reported at least 75% of the regular center students improved academic behaviors and met the KPIs at the following centers: (a) "turning in his or her homework on time" at Fern Elementary (83%), Ka'ewai Elementary (91%), and Pu'uhale Elementary (77%); (b) "participating in class" at Fern Elementary (83%), Ka'ewai Elementary (100%), and Linapuni Elementary (94%); (c) "attending class regularly" at Ka'ewai Elementary (80%); and (d) "behaving well in class" at Fern Elementary (100%), Ka'ewai Elementary (87%), and Linapuni Elementary (85%).

Table 22*Overall Findings about Regular Students' Academic Behavior Based on Teacher Survey Responses in SY 2011–12*

Changed behavior in terms of...	N and % of regular students showing improvement in behavior (The statistics are based on the number of regular students from the center whose teachers reported as needing improvement in their academic behavior. The behaviors in bold print were designated as key performance behaviors by the HDOE-SPMS section.)						
	Fern Elem.	Ka'ewai Elem.	Kalihi Waena Elem.	Linapuni Elem.	Pu'uhale Elem.	Dole Middle	Kalākaua Middle
turning in his or her homework on time (KPI)	5 (83%) n=6	31 (91%) n=34	22 (59%) n=37	17 (68%) n=25	23 (77%) n=30	56 (45%) n=124	37 (58%) n=64
completing homework to your satisfaction	5 (71%) n=7	37 (90%) n=41	30 (68%) n=44	19 (66%) n=29	28 (76%) n=37	59 (46%) n=127	38 (58%) n=66
participating in class (KPI)	5 (83%) n=6	46 (100%) n=46	28 (72%) n=39	30 (94%) n=32	28 (72%) n=39	60 (50%) n=121	44 (64%) n=69
volunteering (e.g., for extra credit or more responsibilities)	5 (71%) n=7	42 (89%) n=47	19 (50%) n=38	20 (95%) n=21	20 (56%) n=36	41 (30%) n=136	25 (38%) n=66
attending class regularly (KPI)	1 (50%) n=2	20 (80%) n=25	10 (38%) n=26	14 (67%) n=21	13 (68%) n=19	21 (29%) n=72	4 (14%) n=29
being attentive in class	4 (80%) n=5	42 (93%) n=45	20 (51%) n=39	30 (94%) n=32	18 (56%) n=32	47 (47%) n=100	34 (65%) n=52
behaving well in class (KPI)	3 (100%) n=3	33 (87%) n=38	18 (55%) n=33	23 (85%) n=27	15 (50%) n=30	45 (48%) n=93	28 (60%) n=47
academic performance	7 (100%) n=7	48 (96%) n=50	31 (69%) n=45	36 (97%) n=37	31 (74%) n=42	60 (50%) n=120	43 (61%) n=71
coming to school motivated to learn	5 (100%) n=5	40 (91%) n=44	20 (59%) n=34	34 (94%) n=36	24 (69%) n=35	43 (37%) n=115	34 (57%) n=60
getting along well with other students	3 (100%) n=3	38 (95%) n=40	14 (56%) n=25	21 (88%) n=24	19 (58%) n=33	44 (44%) n=99	14 (37%) n=38

¹The shaded cells indicate improvement of 75% or more.

Improvement on academic behaviors by center. We were extremely impressed that 75% or more of the regular center students at the Ka‘ewai Center improved on all 10 (100%) academic behaviors. At the Fern and Linapuni centers, 75% or more of the regular center students improved on seven of the 10 (70%) academic behaviors. At the Pu‘uhale Center, 75% or more regular center students improved on two of the 10 (20%) of the academic behaviors.

Improvement on academic behaviors not designated as KPIs. For the academic behaviors that were not designated as KPIs, the teachers reported that 75% or more of the regular center students improved in “completing homework to your satisfaction” at Ka‘ewai and Pu‘uhale Elementary; “volunteering” at Ka‘ewai and Linapuni Elementary; “being attentive in class” at Fern, Ka‘ewai, and Linapuni Elementary; “academic performance” at Fern, Ka‘ewai, and Linapuni Elementary; “coming to school motivated to learn” at Fern, Ka‘ewai, and Linapuni Elementary; and “getting along well with other students” at Fern, Ka‘ewai, and Linapuni Elementary. The teachers reported that all or almost all of the regular center students at Fern Elementary (100%), Ka‘ewai Elementary (96%), and Linapuni Elementary (97%) improved their “academic performance.”

Findings about academic behaviors based on General Learner Outcome #2. The KLC project leaders added GLO #2 as a measure of academic behavior. GLO #2 is about students as community contributors or “the understanding that it is essential for human beings to work together” (retrieved November 7, 2012 from http://doe.k12.hi.us/curriculum/GLO_rubric_grade1-6.htm). We applied the same criteria of 75% to the findings for GLO #2 that was applied to the findings for the teacher survey items. The findings show that 75% or more of regular center students at the Ka‘ewai Center reached the targeted mark of improving on the behavior during the school year.

Findings about the Academic Achievement of Regular Center Students in 2011–12

The HIDEOE-SPMS evaluation question is, “What changes were found in regular center students’ academic achievement in reading/language arts and/or mathematics?” The HIDEOE-SPMS (2010) outcome indicator is that 60% of the regular center students increased academic achievement in reading/language arts and/or mathematics in 2011–12. The primary measure to address this evaluation question was the change in regular center students’ semester report card grades in language arts and mathematics, findings shown as Table 23. The shaded cells indicate

Table 23*Changes in Course Grades for Regular Students at the Kalihi Learning Centers in SY 2011–12¹*

Assessment	Fern Elem.	Ka‘ewai Elem.	Kalihi Waena Elem.	Linapuni Elem.	Pu‘uhale Elem.	Dole Middle	Kalākaua Middle
Changes in <i>Language Arts</i> grades	Improved: 0 No change: 3 Went down: 2 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 3	Improved: 59 No change: 18 Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 0	Improved: 15 No change: 43 Went down: 2 Did not need to improve: 1 N/A: 1 No data: 1	Improved: 9 No change: 34 Went down: 2 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 1 No data: 0	Improved: 36 No change: 29 Went down: 2 Did not need to improve: 8 N/A: 2 No data: 0	Improved: 49 No change: 97 Went down: 54 Did not need to improve: 36 N/A: 0 No data: 21	Improved: 26 No change: 37 Went down: 35 Did not need to improve: 26 N/A: 5 No data: 0
Changes in <i>Mathematics</i> grades	Improved: 0 No change: 5 Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 3	Improved: 62 No change: 15 Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 0	Improved: 11 No change: 42 Went down: 8 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 1 No data: 1	Improved: 6 No change: 35 Went down: 3 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 2 No data: 0	Improved: 21 No change: 43 Went down: 2 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 11 No data: 0	Improved: 53 No change: 108 Went down: 47 Did not need to improve: 28 N/A: 0 No data: 21	Improved: 41 No change: 25 Went down: 31 Did not need to improve: 27 N/A: 5 No data: 0

¹The shaded cells indicate improvement in course grades for 60% or more of the center’s regular students. Count for “did not need to improve” is excluded from the numerator and denominator in the improvement percentage calculation.

²N/A indicates the number of center students whose grades were not available.

centers and content areas where 60% or more of the regular center students improved at least half a grade comparing their report card grades from Fall and Spring. These percentages were calculated after excluding data for regular center students who were already achieving the highest grade in the first semester and continued to achieve the highest grade in the second semester so they could not make any improvement on their semester grades. This streamlined dataset aligned with the calculations on the PPICS on-line reporting system for the 21st CCLC program.

The KLC subgrantee did not meet the 60% outcome indicator in 2011–12. In English language arts, two of the seven centers (Ka‘ewai and Pu‘uhale) reached the target. In mathematics, two centers (Fern and Ka‘ewai) reached the target. The findings by center showed that Ka‘ewai reached the 60% target in both language arts and mathematics. Pu‘uhale reached the 60% target in language arts only. Although none of the other centers reached the target in language arts or mathematics, this was an overall improvement for the KLC from the previous year. In 2011–12, 34.8% of regular center students improved their mathematics report card grades from Fall to Spring semester, which was an increase over the 28.6% of the regular center students who improved on their mathematics report card grades in 2010–11. In language arts, 35.1% of the regular center students improved their report card grades in 2011–12, which was an improvement over the 33.3% of regular center students who improved their language arts report card grades in 2010–11.

Findings about academic achievement as shown by Hawai‘i State Assessment scores.

In 2011–12, the HSA was the standards-based assessment of the Hawai‘i Content and Performance Standards III (HCPS III). The HSA in reading and mathematics was administered to students in Grades 3–8 and 10 (Retrieved October 5, 2012 from <http://doe.k12.hi.us/nclb/index.htm>). We collected HSA data from the centers and reviewed information from the HDOE website. The summarized data are shown as Table 24. The data reports various grade levels in each center which had 60% of their regular center students exceeding or meeting the proficiency objectives for reading or math. Table 25 showed which centers in school years 2009–10, 2010–11, or 2011–12 had 60% of their regular center students exceeding or meeting the proficiency objectives for reading or math. In Appendix I, we include a report of the HSA reading and mathematics scores as indicators of the centers’ effects on the academic achievement of the regular center students in relation to the state benchmarks.

Table 24*Summary of Findings about Academic Achievement by Center/Grade Levels as Shown by HSA Scores*

Center	Grade Level	60% of regular center students met or exceeded HSA proficiency objectives in reading (+)		60% of regular center students met or exceeded HSA proficiency objectives in mathematics (+)	
		2010–11	2011–12	2010–11	2011–12
		Fern Elem.	3		
	4				
	5		+		+
Ka'ewai Elem	3				
	4				
	5				
Kalihi Waena Elem.	3				
	4				
	5	+	+		
Linapuni Elem.	PreK	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Pu'uhale Elem.	3		+		+
	4	+	+	+	+
	5	+			
Dole Middle	6				
	7				
	8				
Kalākaua Middle	6		+		+
	7				
	8				

Note. In 2010–11, the proficiency objective was 72% for reading and 64% for math.

In 2011–12, the proficiency objective was 72% for reading and 64% for math.

Linapuni Elementary is a PreK–1 school and HSA tests are not administered to the students.

A blank cell denotes that the proficiency objective was not met or exceeded for the corresponding center/grade level/year.

Table 25*Summary of Findings about Academic Achievement by Center as Shown by HSA Scores*

Center	60% of regular center students met or exceeded HSA proficiency objectives in reading (+)			60% of regular center students met or exceeded HSA proficiency objectives in mathematics (+)		
	2009–10	2010–11	2011–12	2009–10	2010–11	2011–12
	Fern Elem.					
Ka'ewai Elem	+					
Kalihi Waena Elem.						
Linapuni Elem.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Pu'uhale Elem.			+			+
Dole Middle						
Kalākaua Middle						

Note. In 2009–10, the proficiency objective was 58% for reading and 46% for math.

In 2010–11, the proficiency objective was 72% for reading and 64% for math.

In 2011–12, the proficiency objective was 72% for reading and 64% for math.

Linapuni Elementary is a PreK–1 school and HSA tests are not administered to the students.

A blank cell denotes that the proficiency objective was not met or exceeded for the corresponding center/year.

The HSA scores shown in Tables 24 and 25 spanned multiple school years. These scores should not be considered longitudinal data because the HSA, along with the cut scores, were changed substantially during those years. Additionally, we did not collect the data by tracking students. That is, the regular center students in each of the three years cannot be assumed to be the same students who continued to attend center activities for 30 or more days. There were possibilities, however, that the centers improved in implementing their services, or that many of the same students enrolled in the centers in each of the three years, but this is speculation.

The HDOE criteria for improvement in academic achievement is 60% of the regular center students who needed improvement. We used the same performance indicator of 60% improvement as the targeted criteria for the HSA reading and mathematics scores. As a subgrantee, the KLC centers did not meet the 60% improvement in 2011–12 based on HSA scores. The findings for individual centers' improvement with regard to the 60% of regular center students were

- In 2011–12, 64% of Pu‘uhale’s Grade 3 regular center students exceeded or met the HSA reading and mathematics proficiency objective.
- In 2010–11 and 2011–12, 100% of Pu‘uhale Grade 4 regular center students exceeded or met the HSA reading and mathematics proficiency objective.
- In 2010–11, 67% of Kalihi Waena’s Grade 5 regular center students exceeded or met the reading proficiency objective.
In 2011–12, 75% of Kalihi Waena’s Grade 5 regular center students exceeded or met the reading proficiency objective.
- In 2011–12, 67% of Fern Elementary’s Grade 5 regular center students exceeded or met the reading and mathematics proficiency objective.
- In 2010–11 67% of Pu‘uhale Grade 5 regular center students exceeded or met the HSA reading proficiency objective.
- In 2011–12, 64% of Kalākaua’s Grade 6 regular center students exceeded or met the reading and mathematics proficiency objective.
- In 2010–11 and 2011–12, the Grade 7 or Grade 8 regular center students did not meet the reading and mathematics proficiency objectives.

Dissemination of Results to the Public

At the time this report was written, the Hawai'i Department of Education's website included a page for the 21st CCLC program at <http://doe.k12.hi.us/nclb/21cclc/>. Through this web page, all sub-grantee external evaluation reports were made available to the public.

Additionally, the Linapuni host school included 21st CCLC information on their school web page.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The KLC project in 2011–12 was a maturing project that was well implemented and implemented as proposed in the grant proposal, except instead of providing tutorials for those students struggling with the enrichment activities, the tutorials were provided to all students. Based on the academic achievement data, we agreed that this was a well advised change to the intended plan. The effects of the change in the intended implementation were not yet seen in students' academic achievement or behaviors. However, some growth was seen in the number of students who improved in their language arts and mathematics reports card grades between Fall and Spring semesters in comparison with the previous year's cohort. Although the pattern of growth was encouraging, we provide some recommendations for the consideration of project leaders. The conclusions and recommendations by performance measure are shown as Table 26. However, the reader is urged to read the entire section on conclusions and recommendations which expands to project management. We understand that it may not be feasible to implement many of the recommendations within this funding cycle, but we hope that they can be considered for continuation of the activities and, perhaps, another grant beyond the current one.

What are the plans to ensure effective program implementation next year? Although the data show that the KLC did not meet the KPIs in all four academic behaviors, the centers were barely under the target. For the academic behavior of submitting homework on time, the day teachers reported 71.1% of positive change in the regular center students' behavior. Although this was less than the previous year's improvement in the same behavior of 75.9%, it was still just barely under the target of 75%. Theoretically, as students' academic behaviors improved, it was assumed their academic achievement should show improvement. The reader should note that the KLC centers targeted the student populations that aligned with the goals of the 21st CCLC program, "the highest need students." As shown by the demographic statistics, the KLC students

Table 26*The KLC Evaluation in SY 2011–12: Findings, Summary, and Recommendations by Performance Measure*

Performance measure	Objective met or not met in 2011–12	Summary	Recommendations
Implementation objectives			
Enrollment of target groups: students qualified for free- or reduced lunch or students who are English Language Learners	Met	The proportion of center students receiving free- or reduced-cost lunch to host school student enrollment varied from 16.1% (Fern) to 77.8% (Linapuni). The proportion of center students receiving ELL services to host school enrollment varied from 0 (Kalākaua) to 41.5% (Linapuni).	If there are high levels of ELL students, the center leaders may consider including ELL specialists as center staff for these students.
Staffing will mainly consist of day teachers or others with equivalent qualifications.	Met	A little over half of the paid staff were school-day teachers. The second largest group of staff were nonteaching school-day staff such as librarians, guidance counselors, and aides.	The staff with qualifications as a regular teacher should lead the homework help and reading/literacy and math tutorial activities.
2.1. 100% of centers will offer high quality services in at least one core academic area, such as reading and literacy, mathematics, and science.	Met	For core academic activities, Fern, Ka‘ewai, Linapuni, Pu‘uhale, and Dole implemented reading, math, and science at high levels. Kalihi Waena, and Kalākaua implemented reading and math at high levels. The low response rate to the online staff questionnaire is a concern and we will work with project leaders and staff to improve the response rate in Year 5.	The criteria for the USDE and HDOE were met. Activities were implemented as intended, except that tutoring was offered to all center students instead of only students who were struggling in the academic enrichment activities. In light of the achievement data, we support and recommend continuing this broader implementation plan for a consistent and sufficient amount of activity time for homework help and tutorials.

(Table 26

The KLC Evaluation in SY 2011–12: Findings, Summary, and Recommendations by Performance Measure, continued)

Performance measure	Objective met or not met in 2011–12	Summary	Recommendations
2.2. 100% of centers will offer enrichment and support activities such as nutrition and health, art, music, technology, and recreation.	Met	Data were collected about the implementation of 7 content areas that may have been integrated into enrichment areas. Dole Middle’s staff reported high levels of implementing all content areas. Linapuni and Pu’uhale staff each reported implementing 5 content areas at high levels. Fern and Ka’ewai’s staff each reported implementing 3 content areas at high levels. Kalihi Waena’s staff reported implementing 2 content areas at high levels. The low response rate to the online staff questionnaire is a concern and we will work with project leaders and staff to improve the response rate in Year 5.	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.
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.	Not met	Based on the reports of family and community activities, we surmise that other partnerships existed but were not reported.	We urge principals/center staff to report all partners. We will provide the 21 st CCLC definition of partnerships.
2.4. 85% of centers will offer services to parents, senior citizens, and other adult community members.	Met	The data were a combination of activities that were (a) services for support/guidance of parents and other adult family members implemented at six centers (exception was Kalākaua) and (b) events for family members and the community implemented at six centers (exception was Ka’ewai) to increase community awareness and interest in school activities, community involvement with the school in service learning, community involvement in school showcase events.	In prior years, descriptive data were reported. In 2012–13, we will work with principals/center staff to collect evaluative data about the parent /family activities.

(Table 26

The KLC Evaluation in SY 2011–12: Findings, Summary, and Recommendations by Performance Measure, continued)

Performance measure	Objective met or not met in 2011–12	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	The performance measure was not met, but the centers offered services for a considerable amount of time during the school year. Centers were open between 32 and 37 weeks. Six of the seven centers were open 4 or 5 days a week and 8 to 16 hours per week. The exception was Ka‘ewai, which was open 2 days a week for 6 hours per week.	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.
3.1. 100% of students are in centers located in high-poverty communities.	Met	The 2000 US Census show that the school community was higher than the overall State on the three poverty variables of families headed by a single mother, households with public assistance income, and families with children living in poverty. The KLC subgrantee has enrolled the targeted student population for the 21 st CCLC. Of course, this means that there are challenges for improvement of academic performance and behaviors.	The project leaders are enrolling students from the appropriate target groups as defined by the 21 st CCLC program. This practice should be continued.
Increase in number of students who remained in the centers over the school year.	Met	This is a KLC objective stated in the Year 3 report.	We recommend carrying this goal into Year 5. Research of 21 st CCLC programs across the US are showing that students who spent greater amounts of time participating in center activities showed higher levels of achievement (Naftzger & Vinson, 2011). The principals/center staff should discuss this goal and strategies for improving on center student attendance.

(Table 26

The KLC Evaluation in SY 2011–12: Findings, Summary, and Recommendations by Performance Measure, continued)

Performance measure	Objective met or not met in 2011–12	Summary	Recommendations
Outcome objectives			
1.1a. 75% of regular program participants will have teacher-reported improvement in turning in homework on time as shown on the 21 st CCLC teacher survey.	Not met	This KPI was met by Fern, Ka‘ewai, and Pu‘uhale.	We recommend that the tutorial time include a focus on homework help. The two target groups (low SES and ELL) may not have the support at home for completing homework and the extended day activities may be critical for supporting these students in this way. A component of homework help should be helping the students organize themselves so that they know what needs to be completed for homework in each content area and when the assignment is due.
1.1b. 75% of regular program participants will have teacher-reported improvement in classroom participation as shown on the 21 st CCLC teacher survey.	Not met	This KPI was met by Fern, Ka‘ewai, and Linapuni.	We recommend that the tutors are made aware of this objective and provide opportunities for students to improve their classroom participation.
1.1c. 75% of regular program participants will have teacher-reported improvement in attending class regularly as shown on the 21 st CCLC teacher survey.	Not met	This KPI was met by Ka‘ewai.	The principals/center staff should discuss this objective and strategies for improving on student attendance in day classes.
1.1d. 75% of regular program participants will have teacher-reported improvement in student classroom behavior as shown on the 21 st CCLC teacher survey.	Not met	This KPI was met by Fern, Ka‘ewai, and Linapuni.	We recommend that the tutors are made aware of this objective and work toward improving students’ classroom behavior.

(Table 26

The KLC Evaluation in SY 2011–12: Findings, Summary, and Recommendations by Performance Measure, continued)

Performance measure	Objective met or not met in 2011–12	Summary	Recommendations
4.1.a. 60% of regular program participants will have teacher-reported improvement in reading/language arts and mathematics.	Not met	The recommendation that tutors with teacher-level qualification lead the homework help and tutorial activities align with this recommendation. Tutors with teacher-level qualifications are more likely to understand how to interpret and use formative assessment data to inform their work with individual students.	We recommend that formative assessments be given in the centers. If formative assessments are not available in the centers, then, perhaps, if scores from the day school are accessible the center staff can use these scores as guides for individual student’s rate of improvement (or lack thereof) and individual student’s areas of need for assistance. Professional development can be provided to staff about administration, interpretation, and use of formative assessments as needed.

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

were from highly disadvantaged backgrounds, and therefore, may have had more challenges than students at other 21st CCLC centers. In Year 5, we will revise the on-line questionnaire to collect data about what was implemented to improve students' academic behaviors. We recommend that the center staff continue and enhance their efforts to improve center students' academic behaviors. Additionally, at site visits, we will interview project staff to provide descriptions of these activities.

We recommend that the KLC leaders network with each other and other 21st CCLC to find information about best practices. Project leaders may consider visiting another subgrantee to study organizational features of the subgrantee and to share best practices for implementing academic and enrichment activities. Within the KLC subgrantee, the Ka'ewai center had very favorable findings about academic behaviors. The Fern, Linapuni, and Pu'u hale centers had favorable findings for some of the academic behaviors. If the coordinators agree that the student characteristics and needs for academic achievement are not very different between the centers, these best practices may be generalizable over all the KLC centers in the after-school activities.

The KLC leaders may consider creating a grantee-level position, for instance, KLC Project Director that is dedicated to overseeing project operations, activities, staffing, and liaison with the host schools. Perhaps Site Coordinator positions at each center may be established to support the Project Director. The Project Director and Site Coordinators would provide daily, on site, monitoring for centers' needs for adjustments. The principals bring strong leadership skills and linkage to the host schools to the centers. The Project Director and Site Coordinators would work with the principals to implement centers that have a true center-host school partnership.

We strongly recommend that the KLC 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 original intent of the KLC implementation was that homework help and tutorials would be required for students to attend enrichment activities. 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 KLC 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 define 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 at this point in the project, project leaders might obtain copies of the center students' formative assessment scores from the day school. Formative assessments may already be used because they were part of the project plan (Hargrove & Nomiyama, 2008). 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 interpret formative assessment data to facilitate center students' learning activities.

We will meet with project leaders about adding to the evaluation pre-post test scores in reading or Language Arts and mathematics that are given in the centers' host schools. This will be an additional outcome measure about academic achievement and an additional means to study regular center students' progress over the school year. The pre-post test will need to be professionally developed, administered as recommended by the test developers, administered as a regular part of the day school (not just for the purpose of the center evaluation), and may be different for each grade level. If the host schools do not administer such pre-post tests, we do *not* recommend that the host schools administer such assessment for the sake of the center evaluation.

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 KLC 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 KLC centers to continue to develop their program to address the needs of their selected target groups.

References

- Hargrove, E., & Matsuo, J. (2010). *Kalihi Learning Center: A 21st Century Community Learning Center; A consortium of school in the Farrington complex local evaluation report, SY 2009–10*. Honolulu, HI: Hawai‘i Department of Education, Honolulu District Office.
- Hargrove, E., & Matsuo, J. (2011). *Kalihi Learning Center: A 21st Century Community Learning Center; A consortium of school in the Farrington complex local evaluation report, SY 2010–11*. Honolulu, HI: Hawai‘i Department of Education, Honolulu District Office.
- Hargrove, E., & Nomiya, C. (2008). *Farrington complex community learning centers (A Kalihi learning community project)*. Honolulu, HI: Hawai‘i Department of Education, Honolulu District Office.
- Hawai‘i Department of Education. (n.d.). *General learner outcomes for grades 1–6*. Retrieved November 7, 2012, from http://doe.k12.hi.us/curriculum/GLO_rubric_grade1-6.htm
- Hawai‘i Department of Education. (2012). *Reports, Enrollment*. Retrieved August 24, 2012 and September 12, 2012 from <http://doe.k12.hi.us/reports/enrollment/index.htm>
- Hawai‘i Department of Education. (2012). *School Accountability: School Status & Improvement Report*. Retrieved August 24, 2012 from <http://arch.k12.hi.us/school/ssir/ssir.html>
- Hawai‘i Department of Education-Special Programs Management Section. (2011). *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.

Appendix A
School Community Characteristics

Appendix B
Evaluation Design

A Design for the Evaluation of the Farrington Sub-Grantee: Kalihi Learning Center’s 21st Century Community Learning Center Project

The purposes of the evaluation are to (a) fulfill the annual evaluation reporting requirements of the 21st CCLC program, and (b) provide information about project implementation and outcomes to Kalihi Learning Center’s (KLC) stakeholders as the basis for decision-making to improve project services for its beneficiaries.

This evaluation design for the Farrington Sub-grantee Kalihi Consortium’s 21st Century Community Learning Center (CCLC) project, also referred to as the Kalihi Learning Center (KLC) project, was developed under a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the Hawai‘i Department of Education (HIDOE) and Curriculum Research & Development Group (CRDG) of the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, College of Education (UHM-CoE). The Hawai‘i 21st CCLC program is under the management of the HIDOE Special Program Management Section (SPMS).

We developed this evaluation design by incorporating selected features from three key documents: (a) the 2011 HIDOE-SPMS evaluation report template, (b) the 2010 Hawai‘i 21st CCLC key performance indicators (KPIs), and (c) the KLC grant proposal statements about plans for project implementation and outcomes written by Hargrove and Nomiyama (2008). A brief summary of each document is provided as background for the evaluation design.

The KLC evaluation design is presented in tabular form in Table B1. As shown in Table B1, evaluation questions and sub-questions are cited from the 21st CCLC evaluation report template (HIDOE-SPMS, 2011). The report template did not include evaluation questions related to outcomes. Therefore, to complete the evaluation design, we composed the evaluation questions about outcomes. The outcome indicators are cited from the HIDOE-SPMS KPIs (2010).

The Hawai‘i 21st CCLC implementation objectives are to “serve children and community members with the greatest need for expanded learning opportunities” by offering “a range of high-quality educational, developmental, and recreational services” (HIDOE-SPMS, 2010).

The KLC grant proposal included statements of needs for the unique characteristics of the KLC school community and students (Hargrove & Nomiyama, 2008). The grant proposal stated that the 21st CCLC project will primarily provide services to students who are of greatest need, specifically, students who received free- and reduced lunch, and students who are English Language Learners (ELL). We addressed the description of the intended student target in the KLC grant proposal by summarizing the current center students’ demographic characteristics in detail beyond what is required by the 21st CCLC program. The analyses will show whether or not the centers are providing services to a high proportion of the host schools’ students who received free- and reduced-lunch or ELL services.

The 21st CCLC program outcome objectives are specific to students who participate in program activities for 30 or more days. These students are referred to as regular center students.

Table B1

Evaluation Design for the Kalihi Learning Centers

Evaluation sub questions	Outcome indicators ²	Evaluation method ³
<p style="text-align: center;">Study of Implementation</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Implementation Objectives: (a) 21st Century Community Learning Centers will offer a range of high-quality educational, developmental, and recreational services, (b) 21st Century Community Learning Centers will serve children and community members with the greatest need for expanded learning opportunities.²</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Evaluation Question 1: Has the program been implemented as planned in the grant application?¹</p>		
<p>(a) If no, what changes were made and why? (b) What did the program finally look like?¹ (c) What challenges have been faced in implementing the program and how are these challenges being addressed?¹</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •100% of centers will offer high-quality services in at least one core academic area, such as reading and literacy, mathematics, and science.² •100% of centers will offer enrichment and support activities such as nutrition and health, art, music, technology, and recreation.² •More than 85% of centers will offer services to parents, senior citizens, and other adult community members.² 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Evaluator-developed staff questionnaire regarding extent and quality of implementation (evaluative data) •HIDOE-SPMS/Evaluator-developed 21st CCLC site program summary form •Evaluator-developed databook
<p>Sub-questions (a) through (c)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •More than 75% of centers will offer services at least 15 hours per week on average during the school year and provide services when school is not in session, such as during the summer and holidays.² 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •HIDOE-SPMS/Evaluator-developed 21st CCLC site program summary form •Evaluator-developed databook
<p>Sub-questions (a) through (c) and (d) Which community-based partnerships, as planned in the grant application, have been established and maintained and which ones were not? Why?¹</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •More than 85% of centers will establish and maintain partnerships within the community that continue to increase levels of community collaboration in planning, implementing, and sustaining programs.² 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Evaluator-developed questionnaire based on 21st CCLC annual performance report categories

(Table B1

Evaluation Design for the Kalihi Learning Centers, continued)

Evaluation sub questions	Outcome indicators²	Evaluation method³
Sub-questions (a) through (c) and (e)Where was the program implemented? ¹ (f)What sort of community? ¹ (g)How many people did it affect? ¹	• High-need communities: 100% of centers are located in high-poverty communities. ²	•HDOE website data on school communities
(h)Are program activities interesting and valuable to students, teachers, administrators, and community partners? ¹ (i) Did the number of students who remained in the program throughout the school year increase in comparison to the previous year? (indicator that the activities offered by the centers were more interesting to students) ³	• Increase in student attendance in the subsequent school year. • Increase in the number of regular attendees over the previous year.	•Interviews with project staff, attendance data, staff questionnaire data
(j) What are the plans to ensure effective program implementation next year? ¹	• Moderate to high levels of extent and quality of implementation in the subsequent school year.	•Formative feedback discussions between project leaders and CRDG evaluators •Staff questionnaire data

(Table B1

Evaluation Design for the Kalihi Learning Centers, continued)

Evaluation sub questions	Outcome indicators ²	Evaluation method ³
<p>Study of Outcomes</p> <p>Outcome objectives: (a) participants in 21st Century Community Learning Centers will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes, (b) participants in 21st Century Community Learning Centers will demonstrate academic improvement based on formative and summative assessment given throughout the school year. ²</p> <p>Evaluation Question 2: (a) What changes were found in regular center students' academic behaviors as reported by their language arts or mathematics day classroom teachers? (b) What changes were found in regular center students' academic performance as reported by their language arts or mathematics day classroom teachers?</p>		
(a)What changes were found in regular center students' school attendance, classroom performance, and decreased disciplinary actions as reported by their host elementary school regular classroom teachers or host middle/high school day teachers in reading or mathematics?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•75% of regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in turning in homework on time²•75% of regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in classroom participation²•75% of regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in attending class regularly²•75% of regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in student classroom behavior²	•21 st CCLC teacher survey about academic behaviors
(b)What changes were found in regular center students' academic achievement in reading/language arts and/or mathematics?	•60% of regular center students will demonstrate improvement in reading/language arts and/or math.	•Changes between Fall and Spring semester report card grades in reading and mathematics

¹(HDOE-SPMS, 2011).

²(HIDOE-SPMS, 2010).

³(Hargrove & Matsuo, 2011).

The outcome objectives state that regular center students (a) will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes and (b) will demonstrate academic improvement based on formative and summative assessment given throughout the school year.

The outcome indicators shown in Table B1 of the evaluation design are taken from the Hawai‘i 21st CCLC KPIs (HIDOE-SPMS, 2010), which was an adaptation of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) performance indicators associated with the 21st CCLC program. As deemed necessary, HIDOE-SPMS state program manager made revisions to the Hawai‘i 21st CCLC KPIs over the program years. The KPIs are the four outcome indicators related to improvement in academic behaviors. The other eight performance measures are considered outcome indicators related to the KPIs. The HIDOE-SPMS section selected the criteria included in the statements of outcome indicators.

The KLC Project as Described in the Grant Proposal

The KLC grant writers planned to focus on academic enrichment activities, to provide students with a learning venue that is different from the day school, and to facilitate enhancement of the students’ language arts and mathematics skills (Hargrove & Nomiya, 2008). The grant writers also planned for adult education classes for parents or adult family members of the center students. Parents, particularly parents with limited English proficiency, would be encouraged to become involved with the centers as learners and observers. Middle and high school project leaders would collaborate with elementary school project leaders to develop activities where the upper-grade students would mentor, tutor, or facilitate activities with lower-grade students. Three school-community showcases were planned to “build community academic knowledge” and “demonstrations of learning among the schools” (Hargrove & Nomiya, 2008, p. 5).

The grant writers envisioned extended day centers with quality instructors, including HIDOE teachers, to facilitate the learning opportunities and communication between the extended day program and the host schools. Community partners such as Coalition for a Drug-Free Hawai‘i, Second Steps, Strengthening Hawai‘i’s Families, Police Athletic League (PAL), University of Hawai‘i—Center for Disabilities Studies, and US Army National Guard (support for the DARE program) would provide services and support. Farrington High School Robotics team, and Farrington High School students would provide mentorship, tutoring, or activities to elementary students.

One change was made in partnerships after the start of the grant. Upon recommendation from the HIDOE, After School All Stars (ASAS) became the main community partner and provided both tutoring and sports activities at the two middle schools. The remaining partners were Second Steps and Police Athletic League (PAL). After evaluation data are collected and summarized, the findings would be compared to the program described in the grant proposal to address the main evaluation question about implementation and sub-questions.

Data-Collection Methods

The study of implementation required descriptive and evaluative data. The study of outcomes required evaluative data. For the study of implementation, the evaluators collected descriptive data from KLC databooks, questionnaires adapted from the 21st CCLC annual performance report (APR), evaluator-developed questionnaires, and interviews with project leaders. To obtain implementation evaluative data, the evaluators collected data from the KLC databook, four questionnaires, and HIDEOE website searches. For the study of outcomes, the evaluators collected data from the KLC databooks.

The databook. The former project leaders/evaluators developed the databook in Project Year 2 (SY 2009–10). The project leaders/evaluators based the databook on an Excel spreadsheet and formatted the databook for the purpose of data collection. Center staff entered data about student attendance, student demographics, student report card grades, student participation in activities, center staff information, and family-community involvement in activities. We (evaluators from CRDG) were contracted in Year 3 to assist with data analysis. In Year 4, we were contracted as the lead evaluators. In Year 4, we asked center staff to electronically submit their databook after winter session and after spring break. After each submission of the center databook, we reviewed the data to ensure that the data were properly entered into the databook. An evaluator visited with center staff during the school year to discuss data-entry procedures and made recommendations for improving efficiency. The evaluation principal investigator and an evaluation staff member met with the KLC school principals (who oversaw the centers) to discuss any issues with data collection and data entry.

The 21st CCLC APR. Evaluation staff gathered APR data from center staff data submissions in the form of the databook, data-collection instruments (e.g. the 21st CCLC Teacher Survey, Community Partner Questionnaire, etc.). Evaluation staff also collected information during meetings and site visits with the center staff.

The on-line questionnaire about project implementation. The evaluator-developed, on-line questionnaire was designed to be distributed to staff, contractors, or volunteers who were directly involved in implementing activities. This target group was chosen because the staff members who implemented the activities were in the best position to know the extent and quality of the activities that were implemented in comparison to what was planned for implementation. Through this questionnaire, respondents provided evaluative information about the implementation of activities, including comments about any challenges to implementation and how those challenges were addressed. Respondents provided the mode of implementation and the extent and quality to which the activity implemented the academic and enrichment content areas of interest to 21st CCLC.

The strength of the on-line questionnaire was that data were collected directly from the stakeholders who have first-hand knowledge about the implementation of activities. One weakness in this method was the possible increase in subjectivity due to self-reported data. That

is, the respondent who implemented the activities may have a high stake in the activity and would report data with personal biases. Another weakness was that the respondent needed to understand that the data reporting task is comprehensive over all activities that he or she implemented. Evaluation staff held meetings with the school principals (who had responsibilities as Center Coordinators) to explain the purpose of the on-line questionnaire and had similar discussions, to the extent possible, with the center staff (the respondents) during site visits. Evaluation staff administered the online questionnaire through an individual e-mail to each respondent. Several center staff members did not have e-mail addresses. Evaluation staff provided respondents who did not have an e-mail address, with a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) address and instructions on how to use the URL to access the questionnaire. The on-line questionnaire was anonymous, and we were unable to identify data with individual respondents. However, we were able to keep counts of the number of respondents by center who completed the questionnaire.

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

The 21st CCLC teacher survey. The teacher survey included 10 items about academic behaviors such as timely completion of homework, satisfactory completion of homework, attentiveness in class, etc. The HIDOE-SPMS section selected four of the academic behaviors as Hawai'i KPIs: (a) turning in homework on time, (b) classroom participation, (c) attending class regularly, and (d) student classroom behavior. These KPIs were aligned with the 21st CCLC GPRA. To measure academic behavior, either the elementary school regular classroom teacher, the middle/high school English/Language Arts or mathematics teacher of each regular center student was asked to complete a survey with ratings (on a 7-point rating scale) about changes in the student's academic behavior.

This teacher survey was developed by Learning Point Associates, a USDE-contracted organization. Local evaluators for the 21st CCLC subgrantees were required to collect data about academic behavior using the teacher survey. The advantage of using the teacher survey to collect academic behavior data was that standardized data were collected across all 21st CCLC projects. The standardized academic behavior data provided basis for comparisons from year-to-year, between individual centers, between subgrantees, and nationally between states. The teacher survey items were based on research of academic behaviors that predict student academic achievement in day classes. The distribution of the survey at the end of the school year became a

major weakness of data collection. To maximize the effects of a student's participation in center activities, the survey should be distributed at the end of the school year when the day teacher would observe any center effects on the student's performance in class. However, it is problematic to distribute the teacher survey at the end of the school year because this coincides with day teachers' busiest period of the school year. At this time, teachers are faced with end-of-year testing, grading, and closing down the classroom. To optimize returns, we negotiated with the principals/Center Coordinators to find the best time to distribute the survey several weeks before the end of the school year, and allow enough time for center students to participate in activities and reach 30 days of attendance.

Semester grades. The overall goal of the 21st CCLC program was to help students improve their performance and behaviors in the host school. Therefore, the measures of academic achievement were report card semester grades for reading and mathematics in the host schools. The types of report card grades were defined by the 21st CCLC program. For 2011–12 the KLC leaders agreed to report Reading Comprehension and Math Operations for the elementary school sites and English and Math grades for the middle and high school sites.

Adequate yearly progress. Host school principals requested that adequate yearly progress (AYP) be included in this evaluation design. AYP was based on Hawai'i State Assessment scores. The proficiency rate requirements for SY 2011–12 were at least 72% of students proficient in reading; and at least 64% of students proficient in mathematics (Retrieved from <http://arch.k12.hi.us/PDFs/nclb/2012/FinalAYPallSch37Pub20120928.pdf> 11/18/12).

If an acceptable percentage of students in the school (and subgroups) passed the HSA in the school year, then it was said that the school met AYP. The USDE set proficiency objectives, which were percentages of the student population, and subgroups of the student population that must pass the HSA for that school to meet AYP. If the school did not meet AYP, then specific rating and consequences were enacted to improve that school's outcomes. In the event that the school does not improve student outcomes, the school becomes subject to restructuring.

The reader needs to keep in mind that the students in the center are a percentage of their entire host school. At times, the center participants are a minority of students from the host school. Additionally, in most cases, the number of center students who stay in the centers for 30 or more days (regular center students) is a minority of the total number of center students. The 21st CCLC program requirement for a study of outcomes only pertains to the regular center students. Therefore, looking at AYP as an outcome measure of the centers has to be tempered by comparing the host school student population and the center population.

Site visits. Evaluation staff collected data for internal use about the implementation of activities by directly observing activities at each site. At times, we were accompanied by a center staff member and other times we were provided with a list of campus locations directing us to places and times when activities were held, and the site visit was unaccompanied. As much as possible, we chose to view activities on a typical center day, that is, not a showcase day, a special activity day in the host school, or close to a holiday so that we could observe the usual

implementation of activities. Hand-written notes were taken during the site visits and were used to compare the description of activities submitted by center staff on the databooks or other data collected about implementation. We considered site visits as snap shots of the activities because the day of the site visit may have been unusual or our presence may have affected the students. Therefore, we did not report the site visit data as stand-alone implementation data.

References

- Hargrove, E., & Nomiya, C. (2008). *Farrington Complex Community Learning Centers: A Kalihi learning community project*. Honolulu, HI: Honolulu District Office.
- Hawai'i Department of Education. (2012). *2012 reports*. Retrieved November 18, 2012, from <http://arch.k12.hi.us/PDFs/nclb/2012/FinalAYPallSch37Pub20120928.pdf>
- Hawai'i State Department of Education—Special Programs Management Section. (2010). *Hawai'i 21st CCLC key performance indicators*. Honolulu: author.
- Hawai'i State Department of Education—Special Programs Management Section. (2011). *21st CCLC: Evaluation report template*. Honolulu, HI: author.
- Performance—21st Century Community Learning Centers. (2012, February 15). Programs; Reports; Reference Materials. Retrieved November 2, 2012, from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/21stcclc/performance.html>

Appendix C
Description of Academic and Enrichment Activities
Implemented at the Kalihi Learning Centers in SY 2011–12

Table C1*Fern Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in SY 2011–12*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Summer 2011 activities							
Math and Reading Tutoring	Summer	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	46 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics	Tutoring		4 weeks, 5 days per week, 4 hours per day
School Year 2011–12 activities							
Reading and Math Tutoring/ Homework Help	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	9 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics	Tutoring	Homework help	32 weeks, 4 days per week, 2 hours per day
Enrichment Activities ¹	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	9 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Science •Arts and music •Technology or telecommunications •Cultural activities or social studies	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	32 weeks, 2 days per week, 2 hours per day

¹Enrichment activities include: Hip Hop Dance, Polynesian Dance, Robotics, Yoga, Zumba Dance**Table C2***Ka'ewai Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in SY 2011–12*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
School Year 2011–12 activities							
Math and Reading Tutoring	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	65 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics	Tutoring		32 weeks, 2 days per week, 3 hours per day
Science Enrichment	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	65 students per day	•Science	Academic enrichment learning program		32 weeks, 2 days per week, 2 hours per day

Table C3*Kalihi Waena Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in SY 2011–12*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Summer 2011 activities							
Tutoring	Summer	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	17 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics	Tutoring		6 weeks, 4 days per week, 2 hours per day
Summer 2011 Enrichment Activities ¹	Summer	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	17 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Science •Technology or telecommunications •Health or nutrition	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	6 weeks, 4 days per week, 2 hours per day
School Year 2011–12 activities							
Tutoring	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	32 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Science	Tutoring	Homework help	39 weeks, 4 days per week, 2 hours per day
Enrichment Activities ²	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	30 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Science •Technology or telecommunications •Health or nutrition	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	39 weeks, 4 days per week, 2 hours per day

¹Summer 2011 enrichment activities include: Baseball, Basketball, Cheerleading, Robotics, Soccer, and Volleyball.²School Year 2011–12 enrichment activities include: Baseball; Basketball; Cheerleading; Football; Robotics; Science Club; Soccer; and Volleyball.

Table C4*Linapuni Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in SY 2011–12*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Summer 2011 activities							
Reading and Math Transitional/ Instructional Classes	Summer	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	47 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics	Tutoring		5 weeks, 4 days per week, 3.5 hours per day
Enrichment Activities ¹	Summer	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	47 students per day	•Science •Arts and music •Cultural activities or social studies •Health or nutrition	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	5 weeks, 4 days per week, 3.5 hours per day
School Year 2011–12 activities							
Math and Reading Tutoring ²	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	18 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics	Tutoring		37 weeks, 5 days per week, 2 hours per day
Enrichment Activities ³	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	7 students per day	•Science •Arts and music •Technology or telecommunications •Cultural activities or social studies	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	37 weeks, 5 days per week, 1 hour per day

¹Summer 2011 Enrichment activities include: Hawaiiiana, Library Classes, Mad Science (Fire and Ice), P.E., and T-Shirt Theater.

²School Year 2011–12 Tutoring activities include: Actual Community Empowerment (ACE) Reading Program, Tumble Books (Computer Program), and Math Facts Games on iPad.

³School Year 2011–12 Enrichment activities include: Hula with ACE students and LEGO

Table C5*Pu'uhale Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in SY 2011–12*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
School Year 2011–12 activities							
Math and Reading Tutoring/ Homework Help ¹	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	32 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics	Tutoring	Homework help	32 weeks, 5 days per week, 3 hours per day
Enrichment Activities ²	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	32 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Science •Arts and music •Technology or telecommunications •Cultural activities or social studies •Health or nutrition	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	32 weeks, 5 days per week, 3 hours per day

¹School Year 2011–12 Tutoring/Homework Help activities include: ELL Parent/Child computer center, Homework Center, Kindergarten Tutorial, Kid Biz, IXL (Math), Math Navigator, Math Tutorial, Reading Tutorial

²School Year 2011–12 Enrichment activities include: Arts & Crafts, Book Club, Choir, Hip Hop, Hula/Tahitian, Learning Mandarin and Chinese Culture, Panther Productions, Robotics, Sports, Student Council, Ukulele

Table C6*Dole Middle: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in SY 2011–12*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
School Year 2011–12 activities							
Homework / Study Hall	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	143 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Science	Homework help	Tutoring	32 weeks, 5 days per week, 1.5 hours per day
Enrichment Activities ¹	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	164 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Science •Arts and music •Technology or telecommunications •Cultural activities or social studies •Health or nutrition	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	32 weeks, 5 days per week, 2 hours per day

¹School Year 2011–12 Enrichment activities include: Acting Out; Basketball; Bball Girls; Breakaway; Chess; Clay and murals; Cooking; Creative Art; Cross Country; Cyber Cycle; Docu 1 & 2; Drawing; Events; Film; Football; Frisbees; Gardening; Glee; Hip Hop; Hooks; Hula; Leadership; Martial Arts; Multi-Sports; Photo; Service Learning; SMC; Soccer; Softball; Study Hall; Tennis; Ukulele; Volleyball; Website; Woodshop; Young life

Table C7*Kalākaua Middle: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in SY 2011–12*

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
School Year 2011–12 activities							
Homework	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	56 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Science 	Homework help	Tutoring	32 weeks, 5 days per week, 2 hours per day
Enrichment Activities ¹	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	94 students per day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Science •Arts and music •Technology or telecommunications •Cultural activities or social studies •Health or nutrition 	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	32 weeks, 5 days per week, 2 hours per day

¹School Year 2011–12 Enrichment activities include: All-Star Runway, Arts & Crafts, Basketball, Chess Club, Cooking, Football, Free Style Friday, Game On, Glee, Healthy Food Challenge, Heroes, Hip-Hop Dance, Junior Engineers, Man Power, Mo Drama, Monday Cooking Class, Multi-Sports, Nutrition, Photo Fantasy, Soccer, SYTYCD, Tennis Time, Ukulele, Ultimate Frisbee, Volleyball

Appendix D
Findings about the Implementation of
Core Academic Activities at the Kalihi Learning Centers in SY 2011–12

Table D1

Fern Elementary: Findings About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Reading, Mathematics, and Science Activities in SY 2011–12

Activity	Did not implement or did not observe implementation	Context of implementation	Total responses	N responses about the extent to which the activity was implemented					Average extent (std. dev.)	N responses about how well the activity was implemented					Average quality (std. dev.)
				Missing data	1=none or very little	2	3	4=all or almost all		Missing data	1=poor	2	3	4=very well	
i1. Students receive assistance to address their individual needs (e.g., low achievement, LEP, SpEd, behavioral) for improving academic performance.	4	1: homework help 1: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 1: other: (Social Skills, Cooperation skills)	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)
i2. Students participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in reading/literacy .	4	1: homework help 1: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 1: other: (Programming, reading manuals, website information/research [sic])	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)
i3. Students participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in mathematics .	3	1: homework help 1: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 1: other: (through Robotics [sic] programming)	2	0	0	0	1	1	3.5 (0.7)	0	0	0	1	1	3.5 (0.7)
i4. Students participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in science .	3	1: homework help 1: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 1: other: (Web research for "Food Factor" missins [sic])	2	0	0	0	1	1	3.5 (0.7)	0	0	0	1	1	3.5 (0.7)

Note. 1.0 = none or very little; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = all or almost all for extent and 1.0 = *poor*; 2.0 = *mediocre*; 3.0 = *moderate*; 4.0 = *very well* for quality. The shaded cells indicate ratings of 3.0 and above which is interpreted as moderate to high levels of implementation. The *n* for each activity is different because the number of staff members who implemented each activity varied at each center.

Table D1a

Fern Elementary: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Activities in SY 2011–12

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
i1. receive assistance to address their individual needs (e.g., low achievement, LEP, SpEd, behavioral) for improving academic performance.	•Criteria [sic] to participate was open to any student regardless of needs.
i2. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in reading/literacy.	•10 minute silent reading precluded after school classes; tutoring was available for homework help as well.
i3. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in mathematics.	•Programming their robots required knowledge of math skills (i.e., angles, patterning)
i4. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in science.	•Web research on the Food Factor challenge involved cleanliness, correct amount of refrigeration time, etc.) Web reseach [sic] was done with reports prepared.

Table D2

Ka 'ewai Elementary: Findings About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Reading, Mathematics, and Science Activities in SY 2011–12

Activity	Did not implement or did not observe implementation	Context of implementation	Total responses	N responses about the extent to which the activity was implemented					N responses about how well the activity was implemented						
				Missing data	1=none or very little	2	3	4=all or almost all	Average extent (std. dev.)	Missing data	1=poor	2	3	4=very well	Average quality (std. dev.)
i1. Students receive assistance to address their individual needs (e.g., low achievement, LEP, SpEd, behavioral) for improving academic performance.	3	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 0: other:	1	0	0	0	1	0	3.0 (0)	0	0	0	1	0	3.0 (0)
i2. Students participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in reading/literacy .	1	1: homework help 2: tutorials/classes 2: integrated content 0: other:	3	0	0	0	3	0	3.0 (0)	0	0	0	3	0	3.0 (0)
i3. Students participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in mathematics .	1	1: homework help 2: tutorials/classes 2: integrated content 0: other:	3	0	0	0	3	0	3.0 (0)	0	0	0	3	0	3.0 (0)
i4. Students participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in science .	2	1: homework help 1: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 0: other:	2	0	0	0	2	0	3.0 (0)	0	0	0	2	0	3.0 (0)

Note. 1.0 = none or very little; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = all or almost all for extent and 1.0 = poor; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = very well for quality. The shaded cells indicate ratings of 3.0 and above which is interpreted as moderate to high levels of implementation. The *n* for each activity is different because the number of staff members who implemented each activity varied at each center.

Table D2a

Ka‘ewai Elementary: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Activities in SY 2011–12

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
i1. receive assistance to address their individual needs (e.g., low achievement, LEP, SpEd, behavioral) for improving academic performance.	No comments provided.
i2. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in reading/literacy.	•We try to make learning fun. We use computers, too.
i3. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in mathematics.	•Same as above.
i4. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in science.	No comments provided.

Table D3

Kalihi Waena Elementary: Findings About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Reading, Mathematics, and Science Activities in SY 2011–12

Activity	Did not implement or did not observe implementation	Context of implementation	Total responses	N responses about the extent to which the activity was implemented						N responses about how well the activity was implemented					
				Missing data	1=none or very little	2	3	4=all or almost all	Average extent (std. dev.)	Missing data	1=poor	2	3	4=very well	Average quality (std. dev.)
i1. Students receive assistance to address their individual needs (e.g., low achievement, LEP, SpEd, behavioral) for improving academic performance.	5	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 0: other:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
i2. Students participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in reading/literacy .	3	1: homework help 1: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 0: other:	2	0	0	0	1	1	3.5 (0.7)	0	0	0	2	0	3.0 (0)
i3. Students participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in mathematics .	4	1: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 0: other:	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	1	0	3.0 (0)
i4. Students participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in science .	5	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 0: other:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Note. 1.0 = none or very little; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = all or almost all for extent and 1.0 = *poor*; 2.0 = *mediocre*; 3.0 = *moderate*; 4.0 = *very well* for quality. The shaded cells indicate ratings of 3.0 and above which is interpreted as moderate to high levels of implementation. The *n* for each activity is different because the number of staff members who implemented each activity varied at each center.

Table D3a

Kalihi Waena Elementary: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Activities in SY 2011–12

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
i1. receive assistance to address their individual needs (e.g., low achievement, LEP, SpEd, behavioral) for improving academic performance.	No comments provided.
i2. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in reading/literacy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •None •Student attendance and family understanding was sometimes an issue. Also behavioral challenges were issues
i3. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in mathematics.	•none
i4. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in science.	No comments provided.

Table D4

Linapuni Elementary: Findings About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Reading, Mathematics, and Science Activities in SY 2011–12

Activity	Did not implement or did not observe implementation	Context of implementation	Total responses	N responses about the extent to which the activity was implemented					N responses about how well the activity was implemented						
				Missing data	1=none or very little	2	3	4=all or almost all	Average extent (std. dev.)	Missing data	1=poor	2	3	4=very well	Average quality (std. dev.)
i1. Students receive assistance to address their individual needs (e.g., low achievement, LEP, SpEd, behavioral) for improving academic performance.	9	3: homework help 2: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 2: other: (inclusion classes, classroom instruction in language arts, math, social studies, science, health, affective education (working with others))	6	0	0	0	1	5	3.8 (0.4)	0	0	0	3	3	3.5 (0.5)
i2. Students participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in reading/literacy .	6	3: homework help 4: tutorials/classes 2: integrated content 4: other: (Jr. Robotics/Science Fair, ACE Tutoring, inclusion classes, classroom instruction in language arts)	9	0	0	0	2	7	3.8 (0.4)	0	0	0	3	6	3.7 (0.5)
i3. Students participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in mathematics .	10	0: homework help 2: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 2: other: (Jr. Robotics/Science Fair, inclusion classes)	5	0	0	0	3	2	3.4 (0.5)	0	0	0	3	2	3.4 (0.5)
i4. Students participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in science .	11	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 4: other: (Jr. Robotics/Science Fair, Jr. First Lego League/ District Science Fair, inclusion classes, hands on activities)	4	0	0	1	1	2	3.3 (1.0)	0	0	0	1	3	3.8 (0.5)

Note. 1.0 = none or very little; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = all or almost all for extent and 1.0 = *poor*; 2.0 = *mediocre*; 3.0 = *moderate*; 4.0 = *very well* for quality. The shaded cells indicate ratings of 3.0 and above which is interpreted as moderate to high levels of implementation. The *n* for each activity is different because the number of staff members who implemented each activity varied at each center.

Table D4a

Linapuni Elementary: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Activities in SY 2011–12

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
i1. receive assistance to address their individual needs (e.g., low achievement, LEP, SpEd, behavioral) for improving academic performance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •None •Curriculum was differentiated to meet individual needs; assessments were ongoing to check on progress; tests were given at the end of the year to rate achievement *We depend on our EA, PPT, SSC, and counselor to hlep [sic] those with special needs.
i2. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in reading/literacy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Conducted research, written explanations of what they did for both Jr.Robotics and Science Fair •Reading/literacy is integrated into science, technology, social studies, math...
i3. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in mathematics.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Needed to identify patterns, use geometry, problem-solving when constructing models •Mth [sic] is integrated into science, social studies, circle time...
i4. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in science.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Conducted research, written explanations of what they did for both Jr.Robotics and Science Fair •We do this well using Creative Curriculum and LiteraSci as guidelines.

Table D5

Pu'uhale Elementary: Findings About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Reading, Mathematics, and Science Activities in SY 2011–12

Activity	Did not implement or did not observe implementation	Context of implementation	Total responses	N responses about the extent to which the activity was implemented					N responses about how well the activity was implemented						
				Missing data	1=none or very little	2	3	4=all or almost all	Average extent (std. dev.)	Missing data	1=poor	2	3	4=very well	Average quality (std. dev.)
i1. Students receive assistance to address their individual needs (e.g., low achievement, LEP, SpEd, behavioral) for improving academic performance.	9	1: homework help 1: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 0: other:	3	0	0	0	0	3	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	0	3	4.0 (0)
i2. Students participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in reading/literacy .	8	1: homework help 3: tutorials/classes 2: integrated content 1: other: (Kid Biz)	4	0	0	0	1	3	3.8 (0.5)	0	0	0	2	2	3.5 (0.6)
i3. Students participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in mathematics .	8	2: homework help 3: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 1: other: (IXL Math)	4	0	0	0	2	2	3.5 (0.6)	0	0	0	3	1	3.3 (0.5)
i4. Students participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in science .	11	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 1: other: (First Lego Logo)	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)

Note. 1.0 = none or very little; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = all or almost all for extent and 1.0 = *poor*; 2.0 = *mediocre*; 3.0 = *moderate*; 4.0 = *very well* for quality. The shaded cells indicate ratings of 3.0 and above which is interpreted as moderate to high levels of implementation. The *n* for each activity is different because the number of staff members who implemented each activity varied at each center.

Table D5a

Pu 'uhale Elementary: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Activities in SY 2011–12

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
i1. receive assistance to address their individual needs (e.g., low achievement, LEP, SpEd, behavioral) for improving academic performance.	•Each child provided opportunity learn at his or her pace. [sic]
i2. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in reading/literacy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Finding quality personnel is key. •Students worked individually or together to read, write and speak about diferent [sic] cultures. •Attendance- There were times students left school earlier than anticipted. [sic]
i3. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in mathematics.	No comments provided.
i4. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in science.	No comments provided.

Table D6

Dole Middle: Findings About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Reading, Mathematics, and Science Activities in SY 2011–12

Activity	Did not implement or did not observe implementation	Context of implementation	Total responses	N responses about the extent to which the activity was implemented					N responses about how well the activity was implemented						
				Missing data	1=none or very little	2	3	4=all or almost all	Average extent (std. dev.)	Missing data	1=poor	2	3	4=very well	Average quality (std. dev.)
i1. Students receive assistance to address their individual needs (e.g., low achievement, LEP, SpEd, behavioral) for improving academic performance.	1	1: homework help 1: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 0: other:	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)
i2. Students participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in reading/literacy .	1	1: homework help 1: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 0: other:	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)
i3. Students participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in mathematics .	1	1: homework help 1: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 0: other:	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)
i4. Students participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in science .	1	1: homework help 1: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 0: other:	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)

Note. 1.0 = none or very little; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = all or almost all for extent and 1.0 = poor; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = very well for quality. The shaded cells indicate ratings of 3.0 and above which is interpreted as moderate to high levels of implementation. The *n* for each activity is different because the number of staff members who implemented each activity varied at each center.

Table D6a*Dole Middle: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Activities in SY 2011–12*

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
i1. receive assistance to address their individual needs (e.g., low achievement, LEP, SpEd, behavioral) for improving academic performance.	No comments provided.
i2. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in reading/literacy.	No comments provided.
i3. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in mathematics.	No comments provided.
i4. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in science.	No comments provided.

Table D7

Kalākaua Middle: Findings About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Reading, Mathematics, and Science Activities in SY 2011–12

Activity	Did not implement or did not observe implementation	Context of implementation	Total responses	N responses about the extent to which the activity was implemented						N responses about how well the activity was implemented					
				Missing data	1=none or very little	2	3	4=all or almost all	Average extent (std. dev.)	Missing data	1=poor	2	3	4=very well	Average quality (std. dev.)
i1. Students receive assistance to address their individual needs (e.g., low achievement, LEP, SpEd, behavioral) for improving academic performance.	3	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 0: other:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
i2. Students participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in reading/literacy .	2	1: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 0: other:	1	0	0	0	1	0	3.0 (0)	0	0	0	1	0	3.0 (0)
i3. Students participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in mathematics .	2	1: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 0: other:	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)
i4. Students participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in science .	2	1: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 0: other:	1	0	0	1	0	0	2.0 (0)	0	0	1	0	0	2.0 (0)

Note. 1.0 = none or very little; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = all or almost all for extent and 1.0 = poor; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = very well for quality. The shaded cells indicate ratings of 3.0 and above which is interpreted as moderate to high levels of implementation. The *n* for each activity is different because the number of staff members who implemented each activity varied at each center.

Table D7a*Kalākaua Middle: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Activities in SY 2011–12*

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
i1. receive assistance to address their individual needs (e.g., low achievement, LEP, SpEd, behavioral) for improving academic performance.	No comments provided.
i2. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in reading/literacy.	No comments provided.
i3. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in mathematics.	No comments provided.
i4. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in science.	No comments provided.

Appendix E

Findings about the Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities at the Kalihi Learning Centers in SY 2011–12

Table E1*Fern Elementary: Findings About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities in SY 2011–12*

Activity	Did not implement or did not observe implementation	Context of implementation	Total responses	N responses about the extent to which the activity was implemented						N responses about how well the activity was implemented					
				Missing data	1=none or very little	2	3	4=all or almost all	Average extent (std. dev.)	Missing data	1=poor	2	3	4=very well	Average quality (std. dev.)
i5. Students participate in art and/or music activities.	5	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 0: other:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
i6. Students participate in entrepreneurial education activities (business ventures).	5	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 0: other:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
i7. Students participate in telecommunications and technology education activities.	3	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 1: other: (Programming, web research, typing reports)	2	0	0	0	1	1	3.5 (0.7)	0	0	0	1	1	3.5 (0.7)
i8. Students participate in sports activities (e.g., basketball, baseball, football, swimming).	5	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 0: other:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
i9. Students participate in cultural activities/social studies activities.	5	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 0: other:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
i10. Students participate in health/nutrition-related activities.	4	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 1: other: ("Food Factor" themed robotics missions/research)	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)

(Table E1*Fern Elementary: Findings About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities in SY 2011–12, continued)*

Activity	Did not implement or did not observe implementation	Context of implementation	Total responses	N responses about the extent to which the activity was implemented						N responses about how well the activity was implemented					
				Missing data	1=none or very little	2	3	4=all or almost all	Average extent (std. dev.)	Missing data	1=poor	2	3	4=very well	Average quality (std. dev.)
i11. Students participate in service learning activities (service activities in the school or local community).	4	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 1: other: (Sharing at STEM night with community and parents in school)	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)
i12. CLC staff discuss appropriate, positive behavior with students and reinforce positive behaviors.	4	0: homework help 1: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 1: other: (Daily on acceptable behaviors, attitudes, teaming)	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)

Note. 1.0 = none or very little; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = all or almost all for extent and 1.0 = poor; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = very well for quality. The shaded cells indicate ratings of 3.0 and above which is interpreted as moderate to high levels of implementation. The *n* for each activity is different because the number of staff members who implemented each activity varied at each center.

Table E1a

Fern Elementary: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Activities in SY 2011–12

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
i5. participate in art and/or music activities	No comments provided.
i6. participate in entrepreneurial education activities (business ventures).	No comments provided.
i7. participate in telecommunications and technology education activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •High use of th [sic] computer to program their robots; Microsoft Word program was heavily used; web research was ongoing.
i8. participate in sports activities (e.g., basketball, baseball, football, swimming).	No comments provided.
i9. participate in cultural activities/social studies activities.	No comments provided.
i10. participate in health/nutrition-related activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •“Food Factor” research on the food pyramid; healthy eating styles; skit was created/perfored [sic] related to nutrition.
i11. participate in service learning activities (service activities in the school or local community).	No comments provided.
i12. CLC staff discuss appropriate, positive behavior with students and reinforce positive behaviors.	No comments provided.

Table E2

Ka'ewai Elementary: Findings About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities in SY 2011–12

Activity	Did not implement or did not observe implementation	Context of implementation	Total responses	N responses about the extent to which the activity was implemented						N responses about how well the activity was implemented					
				Missing data	1=none or very little	2	3	4=all or almost all	Average extent (std. dev.)	Missing data	1=poor	2	3	4=very well	Average quality (std. dev.)
i5. Students participate in art and/or music activities.	3	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 0: other:	1	0	0	0	1	0	3.0 (0)	0	0	0	1	0	3.0 (0)
i6. Students participate in entrepreneurial education activities (business ventures).	4	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 0: other:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
i7. Students participate in telecommunications and technology education activities.	3	1: homework help 1: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 0: other:	1	0	0	0	1	0	3.0 (0)	0	0	0	1	0	3.0 (0)
i8. Students participate in sports activities (e.g., basketball, baseball, football, swimming).	4	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 0: other:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
i9. Students participate in cultural activities/social studies activities.	4	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 0: other:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
i10. Students participate in health/nutrition-related activities.	3	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 0: other:	1	0	0	0	1	0	3.0 (0)	0	0	0	1	0	3.0 (0)
i11. Students participate in service learning activities (service activities in the school or local community).	4	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 0: other:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
i12. CLC staff discuss appropriate, positive behavior with students and reinforce positive behaviors.	3	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 0: other:	1	0	0	0	1	0	3.0 (0)	0	0	0	1	0	3.0 (0)

Note. 1.0 = none or very little; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = all or almost all for extent and 1.0 = poor; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = very well for quality. The shaded cells indicate ratings of 3.0 and above which is interpreted as moderate to high levels of implementation. The *n* for each activity is different because the number of staff members who implemented each activity varied at each center.

Table E2a*Ka‘ewai Elementary: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Activities in SY 2011–12*

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
i5. participate in art and/or music activities	No comments provided.
i6. participate in entrepreneurial education activities (business ventures).	No comments provided.
i7. participate in telecommunications and technology education activities.	No comments provided.
i8. participate in sports activities (e.g., basketball, baseball, football, swimming).	No comments provided.
i9. participate in cultural activities/social studies activities.	No comments provided.
i10. participate in health/nutrition-related activities.	No comments provided.
i11. participate in service learning activities (service activities in the school or local community).	No comments provided.
i12. CLC staff discuss appropriate, positive behavior with students and reinforce positive behaviors.	No comments provided.

(Table E3

Kalihi Waena Elementary: Findings About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities in SY 2011–12, continued)

Activity	Did not implement or did not observe implementation	Context of implementation	Total responses	N responses about the extent to which the activity was implemented						N responses about how well the activity was implemented					
				Missing data	1=none or very little	2	3	4=all or almost all	Average extent (std. dev.)	Missing data	1=poor	2	3	4=very well	Average quality (std. dev.)
i11. Students participate in service learning activities (service activities in the school or local community).	5	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 0: other:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
i12. CLC staff discuss appropriate, positive behavior with students and reinforce positive behaviors.	4	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 1: other: (Teamwork, good sportsmanship like conduct)	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)

Note. 1.0 = none or very little; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = all or almost all for extent and 1.0 = poor; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = very well for quality. The shaded cells indicate ratings of 3.0 and above which is interpreted as moderate to high levels of implementation. The *n* for each activity is different because the number of staff members who implemented each activity varied at each center.

Table E3a*Kalihi Waena Elementary: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Activities in SY 2011–12*

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
i5. participate in art and/or music activities	No comments provided.
i6. participate in entrepreneurial education activities (business ventures).	No comments provided.
i7. participate in telecommunications and technology education activities.	No comments provided.
i8. participate in sports activities (e.g., basketball, baseball, football, swimming).	No comments provided.
i9. participate in cultural activities/social studies activities.	No comments provided.
i10. participate in health/nutrition-related activities.	No comments provided.
i11. participate in service learning activities (service activities in the school or local community).	No comments provided.
i12. CLC staff discuss appropriate, positive behavior with students and reinforce positive behaviors.	No comments provided.

Table E4

Linapuni Elementary: Findings About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities in SY 2011–12

Activity	Did not implement or did not observe implementation	Context of implementation	Total responses	N responses about the extent to which the activity was implemented					N responses about how well the activity was implemented						
				Missing data	1=none or very little	2	3	4=all or almost all	Average extent (std. dev.)	Missing data	1=poor	2	3	4=very well	Average quality (std. dev.)
i5. Students participate in art and/or music activities.	10	0: homework help 2: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 3: other: (skip, uncheck this box, inclusion classroom, music teacher)	5	0	1	0	0	4	3.4 (1.3)	0	1	0	1	3	3.2 (1.3)
i6. Students participate in entrepreneurial education activities (business ventures).	15	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 0: other:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
i7. Students participate in telecommunications and technology education activities.	12	0: homework help 1: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 2: other: (Jr. Robotics/Science Fair, students worked on computers)	3	0	0	0	1	2	3.7 (0.6)	0	0	0	2	1	3.3 (0.6)
i8. Students participate in sports activities (e.g., basketball, baseball, football, swimming).	14	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 1: other: (pe teacher)	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	1	0	3.0 (0)
i9. Students participate in cultural activities/social studies activities.	12	0: homework help 2: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 1: other: (Hawaiian studies)	3	0	0	0	0	3	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	0	3	4.0 (0)
i10. Students participate in health/nutrition-related activities.	13	0: homework help 1: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 1: other: (Home Center)	2	0	0	0	0	2	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	2	0	3.0 (0)
i11. Students participate in service learning activities (service activities in the school or local community).	15	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 0: other:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
i12. CLC staff discuss appropriate, positive behavior with students and reinforce positive behaviors.	11	2: homework help 2: tutorials/classes 2: integrated content 2: other: (Jr. Robotics/Science Fair, School wide bucket filler program)	4	0	0	0	0	4	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	1	3	3.8 (0.5)

Note. 1.0 = none or very little; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = all or almost all for extent and 1.0 = poor; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = very well for quality. The shaded cells indicate ratings of 3.0 and above which is interpreted as moderate to high levels of implementation. The *n* for each activity is different because the number of staff members who implemented each activity varied at each center.

Table E4a*Linapuni Elementary: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Activities in SY 2011–12*

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
i5. participate in art and/or music activities	•We have daily movement time and a music teacher.
i6. participate in entrepreneurial education activities (business ventures).	No comments provided.
i7. participate in telecommunications and technology education activities.	•Conducted research, written explanations of what they did for both Jr.Robotics and Science Fair •We have 3 computers that the children have access to.
i8. participate in sports activities (e.g., basketball, baseball, football, swimming).	•We have a pe [sic] teacher weekly.
i9. participate in cultural activities/social studies activities.	•We have Hawaiian Studies weekly.
i10. participate in health/nutrition-related activities.	•Nutrition through SNAP program •Students learn through playing in home center.
i11. participate in service learning activities (service activities in the school or local community).	No comments provided.
i12. CLC staff discuss appropriate, positive behavior with students and reinforce positive behaviors.	•Appropriate behaviors during enrichment classes and field trips •We have a bucket filler program.

Table E5

Pu'uhale Elementary: Findings About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities in SY 2011–12

Activity	Did not implement or did not observe implementation	Context of implementation	Total responses	N responses about the extent to which the activity was implemented					N responses about how well the activity was implemented						
				Missing data	1=none or very little	2	3	4=all or almost all	Average extent (std. dev.)	Missing data	1=poor	2	3	4=very well	Average quality (std. dev.)
i5. Students participate in art and/or music activities.	8	0: homework help 1: tutorials/classes 2: integrated content 3: other: (hip hop class, choir, Reading/safety/social skills/creativity)	4	0	0	0	1	3	3.8 (0.5)	0	0	0	2	2	3.5 (0.6)
i6. Students participate in entrepreneurial education activities (business ventures).	12	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 0: other:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
i7. Students participate in telecommunications and technology education activities.	9	0: homework help 1: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 2: other: (Robotics, Robotics)	3	0	0	0	1	2	3.7 (0.6)	0	0	0	2	1	3.3 (0.6)
i8. Students participate in sports activities (e.g., basketball, baseball, football, swimming).	11	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 1: other: (Most of our activities involved activities that would be beneficial to establishing a solid foundation for their future with Physical Activity. We introduced basic motor skill movements as well as other sport specific exercises that not only helped with their coordination but to show them that playing with friends on a field can be fun!)	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0.0)	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)
i9. Students participate in cultural activities/social studies activities.	10	0: homework help 1: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 1: other: (Physical Education; After-School Fun Fair)	2	0	0	0	0	2	4.0 (0.0)	0	0	0	0	2	4.0 (0)
i10. Students participate in health/nutrition-related activities.	12	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 0: other:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

(Table E5*Pu'uhale Elementary: Findings About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities in SY 2011–12, continued)*

Activity	Did not implement or did not observe implementation	Context of implementation	Total responses	N responses about the extent to which the activity was implemented					N responses about how well the activity was implemented						
				Missing data	1=none or very little	2	3	4=all or almost all	Average extent (std. dev.)	Missing data	1=poor	2	3	4=very well	Average quality (std. dev.)
i11. Students participate in service learning activities (service activities in the school or local community).	11	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 1: other: (implement activities that would affect the entire student body/communication skills/leadership/encourage student participation)	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)
i12. CLC staff discuss appropriate, positive behavior with students and reinforce positive behaviors.	10	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 2: other: (Safety / Anti bullying, Leadership skills/responsibility/reliability/self independence/socialization/public speaking)	2	0	0	1	0	1	3.0 (1.4)	0	0	0	2	0	3.0 (0)

Note. 1.0 = none or very little; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = all or almost all for extent and 1.0 = poor; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = very well for quality. The shaded cells indicate ratings of 3.0 and above which is interpreted as moderate to high levels of implementation. The *n* for each activity is different because the number of staff members who implemented each activity varied at each center.

Table E5a*Pu'uhale Elementary: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Activities in SY 2011–12*

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
i5. participate in art and/or music activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students had regular opportunities to sing and learn simple songs on the piano and do art activities. • choir could have started earlier in the year to improve quality of performance
i6. participate in entrepreneurial education activities (business ventures).	No comments provided.
i7. participate in telecommunications and technology education activities.	No comments provided.
i8. participate in sports activities (e.g., basketball, baseball, football, swimming).	• Soccer, Ball catching drills, Frisbee, Track events (Running/Relays), Football.
i9. participate in cultural activities/social studies activities.	• Students learned about another country, did cultural crafts and activities, learned geography and languag. [sic]
i10. participate in health/nutrition-related activities.	No comments provided.
i11. participate in service learning activities (service activities in the school or local community).	No comments provided.
i12. CLC staff discuss appropriate, positive behavior with students and reinforce positive behaviors.	No comments provided.

Table E6

Dole Middle: Findings About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities in SY 2011–12

Activity	Did not implement or did not observe implementation	Context of implementation	Total responses	N responses about the extent to which the activity was implemented						N responses about how well the activity was implemented					
				Missing data	1=none or very little	2	3	4=all or almost all	Average extent (std. dev.)	Missing data	1=poor	2	3	4=very well	Average quality (std. dev.)
i5. Students participate in art and/or music activities.	1	1: homework help 1: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 0: other:	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)
i6. Students participate in entrepreneurial education activities (business ventures).	1	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 0: other:	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)
i7. Students participate in telecommunications and technology education activities.	1	0: homework help 1: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 0: other:	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)
i8. Students participate in sports activities (e.g., basketball, baseball, football, swimming).	1	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 0: other:	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)
i9. Students participate in cultural activities/social studies activities.	1	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 0: other:	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)
i10. Students participate in health/nutrition-related activities.	1	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 0: other:	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)
i11. Students participate in service learning activities (service activities in the school or local community).	1	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 0: other:	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)
i12. CLC staff discuss appropriate, positive behavior with students and reinforce positive behaviors.	1	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 0: other:	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)

Note. 1.0 = none or very little; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = all or almost all for extent and 1.0 = poor; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = very well for quality. The shaded cells indicate ratings of 3.0 and above which is interpreted as moderate to high levels of implementation. The *n* for each activity is different because the number of staff members who implemented each activity varied at each center.

Table E6a*Dole Middle: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Activities in SY 2011–12*

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
i5. participate in art and/or music activities	No comments provided.
i6. participate in entrepreneurial education activities (business ventures).	No comments provided.
i7. participate in telecommunications and technology education activities.	No comments provided.
i8. participate in sports activities (e.g., basketball, baseball, football, swimming).	No comments provided.
i9. participate in cultural activities/social studies activities.	No comments provided.
i10. participate in health/nutrition-related activities.	No comments provided.
i11. participate in service learning activities (service activities in the school or local community).	No comments provided.
i12. CLC staff discuss appropriate, positive behavior with students and reinforce positive behaviors.	No comments provided.

Table E7

Kalākaua Middle: Findings About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities in SY 2011–12

Activity	Did not implement or did not observe implementation	Context of implementation	Total responses	N responses about the extent to which the activity was implemented						N responses about how well the activity was implemented					
				Missing data	1=none or very little	2	3	4=all or almost all	Average extent (std. dev.)	Missing data	1=poor	2	3	4=very well	Average quality (std. dev.)
i5. Students participate in art and/or music activities.	2	0: homework help 1: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 0: other:	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)
i6. Students participate in entrepreneurial education activities (business ventures).	3	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 0: other:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
i7. Students participate in telecommunications and technology education activities.	3	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 0: other:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
i8. Students participate in sports activities (e.g., basketball, baseball, football, swimming).	2	0: homework help 1: tutorials/classes 1: integrated content 0: other:	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)	0	0	0	0	1	4.0 (0)
i9. Students participate in cultural activities/social studies activities.	3	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 0: other:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
i10. Students participate in health/nutrition-related activities.	3	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 0: other:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
i11. Students participate in service learning activities (service activities in the school or local community).	3	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 0: other:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
i12. CLC staff discuss appropriate, positive behavior with students and reinforce positive behaviors.	3	0: homework help 0: tutorials/classes 0: integrated content 0: other:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Note. 1.0 = none or very little; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = all or almost all for extent and 1.0 = poor; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = very well for quality. The shaded cells indicate ratings of 3.0 and above which is interpreted as moderate to high levels of implementation. The *n* for each activity is different because the number of staff members who implemented each activity varied at each center.

Table E7a*Kalākaua Middle: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Activities in SY 2011–12*

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
i5. participate in art and/or music activities	No comments provided.
i6. participate in entrepreneurial education activities (business ventures).	No comments provided.
i7. participate in telecommunications and technology education activities.	No comments provided.
i8. participate in sports activities (e.g., basketball, baseball, football, swimming).	No comments provided.
i9. participate in cultural activities/social studies activities.	No comments provided.
i10. participate in health/nutrition-related activities.	No comments provided.
i11. participate in service learning activities (service activities in the school or local community).	No comments provided.
i12. CLC staff discuss appropriate, positive behavior with students and reinforce positive behaviors.	No comments provided.

Appendix F
Kalihi Learning Centers' Community Partners in SY 2011–12

Table F1*Fern Elementary: Community Partners in SY 2011–12*

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Monetary value of contribution	Subcontractor?
Fern Elementary did not report any community partners during 2011–12				

Table F2*Ka‘ewai Elementary: Community Partners in SY 2011–12*

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Monetary value of contribution	Subcontractor?
Ka‘ewai Elementary did not report any community partners during 2011–12				

Table F3*Kalihi Waena Elementary: Community Partners in SY 2011–12*

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Monetary value of contribution	Subcontractor?
Kalihi Waena Elementary did not report any community partners during 2011–12				

Table F4*Linapuni Elementary: Community Partners in SY 2011–12*

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Monetary value of contribution	Subcontractor?
Linapuni Elementary did not report any community partners during 2011–12				

Table F5*Pu‘uhale Elementary: Community Partners in SY 2011–12*

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Monetary value of contribution	Subcontractor?
Pu‘uhale Elementary did not report any community partners during 2011–12				

Table F6*Dole Middle: Community Partners in SY 2011–12*

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Monetary value of contribution	Subcontractor?
After-School All-Stars Hawai'i	•Nationally Affiliated Non-Profit Agency-Other	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Volunteer staffing •Paid staffing •Evaluation services •Funding or raised funds •Implementation of initiatives such as sports based youth development, high school transition, service learning, career exploration, CampUs	For Dole Middle and Kalākaua Middle: •\$1,810 donated contributions •\$136,000 subcontract	yes
Weed and Seed Honolulu, Life 360	•Community-Based Organization •Faith-Based Organization	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Volunteer staffing	\$400.00	no
Kalihi YMCA	•Community-Based Organization •Nationally Affiliated Non-Profit Agency-YMCA/YWCA	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	\$700.00	no
Young Life O'ahu	•Community-Based Organization •Nationally Affiliated Non-Profit Agency-Other •Faith-Based Organization	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Volunteer staffing	\$500.00	no

Table F7*Kalākaua Middle: Community Partners in SY 2011–12*

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Monetary value of contribution	Subcontractor?
After-School All-Stars Hawai'i	Nationally Affiliated Non-Profit Agency-Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Volunteer staffing •Paid staffing •Evaluation services •Funding or raised funds •Implementation of initiatives such as sports based youth development, high school transition, service learning, career exploration, CampUs 	For Dole Middle and Kalākaua Middle: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •\$1,810 donated contributions •\$136,000 subcontract 	yes

Table F8*Kalihi Learning Center Sub-grantee Community Partners in SY 2011–12*

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Monetary value of contribution	Subcontractor?
UH/COE— Curriculum Research & Development Group (CRDG)	College or university	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Evaluation services 	\$35,000	yes

Appendix G
Findings about the Implementation of
Family and Community Involvement Activities in SY 2011–12

Table G1*Fern Elementary: Family and Community Involvement Events in SY 2011–12*

Event name	When occurred: School year or summer	Event focus	Number of student participants in this event	Number of parent or adult family member participants in this event
School Year 2011–12 Family and Community Involvement Events				
Brown Bags	School year	N/A	3 students	6 parent/adult family members
Kalākaua Ohana Fair	School year	•Support for 21st CCLC students in KLC enrichment events	3 students	6 parent/adult family members

Table G2*Ka‘ewai Elementary: Family and Community Involvement Events in SY 2011–12*

Event name	When occurred: School year or summer	Event focus	Number of student participants in this event	Number of parent or adult family member participants in this event
Ka‘ewai Elementary did not report any family and community involvement events participants during 2011–12				

Table G3*Kalihi Waena Elementary: Family and Community Involvement Events in SY 2011–12*

Event name	When occurred: School year or summer	Event focus	Number of student participants in this event	Number of parent or adult family member participants in this event
Summer 2011 Family and Community Involvement Events				
Baseball Game Days	Summer 2011	•Support for 21st CCLC students in sports events	2 students	2 parent/adult family members
School Year 2011–12 Family and Community Involvement Events				
Basketball Game Days	School year	•Support for 21st CCLC students in sports events	15 students	14 parent/adult family members
Cheerleading Game Days	School year	•Support for 21st CCLC students in sports events	1 student	1 parent/adult family member
Football Game Days	School year	•Support for 21st CCLC students in sports events	7 students	7 parent/adult family members
Robotics	School year	•Support for 21st CCLC students in KLC enrichment events	13 students	13 parent/adult family members

Table G4*Linapuni Elementary: Family and Community Involvement Events in SY 2011–12*

Event name	When occurred: School year or summer	Event focus	Number of student participants in this event	Number of parent or adult family member participants in this event
School Year 2011–12 Family and Community Involvement Events				
Junior First LEGO League	School year	•Support for 21st CCLC students in KLC enrichment events	6 students	8 parent/adult family members
‘Ohana Fair	School year	•Support for 21st CCLC students in KLC enrichment events	23 students	22 parent/adult family members
Science Fair	School year	•Support for 21st CCLC students in KLC enrichment events	5 students	6 parent/adult family members

Table G5*Pu‘uhale Elementary: Family and Community Involvement Events in SY 2011–12*

Event name	When occurred: School year or summer	Event focus	Number of student participants in this event	Number of parent or adult family member participants in this event
School Year 2011–12 Family and Community Involvement Events				
Cyberbullying	School year	•Take adult education classes	14 students	11 parent/adult family members
Family Night	School year	•Support for 21st CCLC students in KLC enrichment events	37 students	26 parent/adult family members
Kalākaua ‘Ohana Fair	School year	•Support for 21st CCLC students in KLC enrichment events	38 students	24 parent/adult family members
Reading Strategies	School year	•Help with reading •Help with homework	16 students	18 parent/adult family members
Robotic Competition	School year	•Help with reading •Help with math	37 students	26 parent/adult family members

Table G6*Dole Middle: Family and Community Involvement Events in SY 2011–12*

Event name	When occurred: School year or summer	Event focus	Number of student participants in this event	Number of parent or adult family member participants in this event
School Year 2011–12 Family and Community Involvement Events				
Community clean-up	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Keeping community clean •Building relationships with community members and families •Volunteering in school related activities and helping with tutoring hour 	117 students	76 parent/adult family members
KPT forum	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Help with homework 	48 students	17 parent/adult family members
Lights on after-school	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bring community members, families and others to see the areas' after-school programs •Families participated in activities and network with each other to build stronger community bonds 	17 students	17 parent/adult family members
Open house	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Help with reading •Help with math •Help with homework •Take adult education classes 	229 students	183 parent/adult family members
Parent night	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Help with reading •Help with math •Help with homework •Take adult education classes 	214 students	183 parent/adult family members
Special Olympics	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Support students participating in the unified softball tournament at the Special Olympics State Games 	1 student	1 parent/adult family member
Sports showdown	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Support students in a sports competition with the other After-School All-Stars sites 	38 students	28 parent/adult family members

Table G7*Kalākaua Middle: Family and Community Involvement Events in SY 2011–12*

Event name	When occurred: School year or summer	Event focus	Number of student participants in this event	Number of parent or adult family member participants in this event
School Year 2011–12 Family and Community Involvement Events				
1st qtr Culminating Event	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students showcase what they have been working on in their enrichment/sports classes throughout the quarter •Support for 21st CCLC students in KLC enrichment events 	37 students	35 parent/adult family members
2nd qtr Culminating Event	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students showcase what they have been working on in their enrichment/sports classes throughout the quarter •Support for 21st CCLC students in KLC enrichment events 	37 students	35 parent/adult family members
3rd qtr Culminating Event	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students showcase what they have been working on in their enrichment/sports classes throughout the quarter •Support for 21st CCLC students in KLC enrichment events 	24 students	23 parent/adult family members

Appendix H

**Findings about Changes in Regular Center Students' Behaviors
as Shown by Teacher-Reported Behaviors on the
21st CCLC Teacher Survey and General Learner Outcome #2 in SY 2011–12**

Table H1

Fern Elementary: Results of the Teacher Survey About Academic Behavior in SY 2011–12

Changed behavior in terms of...	Missing data ¹	Did not need improvement	Number of regular attendees							Average rating (std. dev.) ²	N (%) of regular students needing and showing improvement in behavior ³
			Significant improvement=7	Moderate improvement=6	Slight improvement=5	No change=4	Slight decline=3	Moderate decline=2	Significant decline=1		
turning in his or her homework on time (KPI)	0	1	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	5.7 (1.0)	5 (83%) n=6
completing homework to your satisfaction	0	0	3	2	0	1	1	0	0	5.7 (1.6)	5 (71%) n=7
participating in class (KPI)	0	1	2	0	3	1	0	0	0	5.5 (1.2)	5 (83%) n=6
volunteering (e.g., for extra credit or more responsibilities)	0	0	3	0	2	2	0	0	0	5.6 (1.4)	5 (71%) n=7
attending class regularly (KPI)	0	5	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	4.5 (0.7)	1 (50%) n=2
being attentive in class	0	2	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	5.2 (1.1)	4 (80%) n=5
behaving well in class (KPI)	0	4	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	5.7 (1.2)	3 (100%) n=3
academic performance	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	6.4 (0.5)	7 (100%) n=7
coming to school motivated to learn	0	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	6.4 (0.9)	5 (100%) n=5
getting along well with other students	0	4	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	5.3 (0.6)	3 (100%) n=3

¹Missing data is based on the number of surveys received from respondents.

²The shaded cells indicate improvement of 5.0+ (slight improvement and higher).

³The percentage is based on the total number of regular students needing improvement in their behavior (sum of ratings from 1 through 7). *n* = the number of students who needed improvement in the corresponding behavior. Shaded cells indicate improvement of 75% or more of regular students who needed improvement.

Table H2*Ka'ewai Elementary: Results of the Teacher Survey About Academic Behavior in SY 2011–12*

Changed behavior in terms of...	Missing data ¹	Did not need improvement	Number of regular attendees							Average rating (std. dev.) ²	N (%) of regular students needing and showing improvement in behavior ³
			Significant improvement=7	Moderate improvement=6	Slight improvement=5	No change=4	Slight decline=3	Moderate decline=2	Significant decline=1		
turning in his or her homework on time (KPI)	4	18	17	11	3	1	2	0	0	6.2 (1.1)	31 (91%) n=34
completing homework to your satisfaction	4	11	12	21	4	2	2	0	0	6.0 (1.0)	37 (90%) n=41
participating in class (KPI)	0	10	20	16	10	0	0	0	0	6.2 (0.8)	46 (100%) n=46
volunteering (e.g., for extra credit or more responsibilities)	5	4	16	19	7	5	0	0	0	6.0 (1.0)	42 (89%) n=47
attending class regularly (KPI)	2	29	10	6	4	3	2	0	0	5.8 (1.3)	20 (80%) n=25
being attentive in class	0	11	15	19	8	1	2	0	0	6.0 (1.0)	42 (93%) n=45
behaving well in class (KPI)	0	18	11	16	6	1	3	1	0	5.7 (1.3)	33 (87%) n=38
academic performance	0	6	24	18	6	2	0	0	0	6.3 (0.8)	48 (96%) n=50
coming to school motivated to learn	0	12	17	18	5	2	2	0	0	6.0 (1.1)	40 (91%) n=44
getting along well with other students	0	16	11	22	5	2	0	0	0	6.1 (0.8)	38 (95%) n=40

¹Missing data is based on the number of surveys received from respondents.²The shaded cells indicate improvement of 5.0+ (slight improvement and higher).³The percentage is based on the total number of regular students needing improvement in their behavior (sum of ratings from 1 through 7). *n* = the number of students who needed improvement in the corresponding behavior. Shaded cells indicate improvement of 75% or more of regular students who needed improvement.

Table H3*Kalihi Waena Elementary: Results of the Teacher Survey About Academic Behavior in SY 2011–12*

Changed behavior in terms of...	Missing data ¹	Did not need improvement	Number of regular attendees							Average rating (std. dev.) ²	N (%) of regular students needing and showing improvement in behavior ³
			Significant improvement=7	Moderate improvement=6	Slight improvement=5	No change=4	Slight decline=3	Moderate decline=2	Significant decline=1		
turning in his or her homework on time (KPI)	2	14	2	8	12	11	4	0	0	4.8 (1.1)	22 (59%) n=37
completing homework to your satisfaction	0	9	2	13	15	10	3	1	0	5.0 (1.1)	30 (68%) n=44
participating in class (KPI)	0	14	7	4	17	11	0	0	0	5.2 (1.0)	28 (72%) n=39
volunteering (e.g., for extra credit or more responsibilities)	0	15	2	9	8	19	0	0	0	4.8 (1.0)	19 (50%) n=38
attending class regularly (KPI)	0	27	1	5	4	15	0	1	0	4.6 (1.1)	10 (38%) n=26
being attentive in class	0	14	2	9	9	16	3	0	0	4.8 (1.1)	20 (51%) n=39
behaving well in class (KPI)	0	20	2	7	9	12	2	1	0	4.8 (1.1)	18 (55%) n=33
academic performance	0	8	6	9	16	11	2	1	0	5.1 (1.2)	31 (69%) n=45
coming to school motivated to learn	0	19	4	5	11	11	3	0	0	4.9 (1.1)	20 (59%) n=34
getting along well with other students	0	28	3	6	5	9	2	0	0	5.0 (1.2)	14 (56%) n=25

¹Missing data is based on the number of surveys received from respondents.²The shaded cells indicate improvement of 5.0+ (slight improvement and higher).³The percentage is based on the total number of regular students needing improvement in their behavior (sum of ratings from 1 through 7). *n* = the number of students who needed improvement in the corresponding behavior. Shaded cells indicate improvement of 75% or more of regular students who needed improvement.

Table H4*Linapuni Elementary: Results of the Teacher Survey About Academic Behavior in SY 2011–12*

Changed behavior in terms of...	Missing data ¹	Did not need improvement	Number of regular attendees							Average rating (std. dev.) ²	N (%) of regular students needing and showing improvement in behavior ³
			Significant improvement=7	Moderate improvement=6	Slight improvement=5	No change=4	Slight decline=3	Moderate decline=2	Significant decline=1		
turning in his or her homework on time (KPI)	0	16	8	1	8	8	0	0	0	5.4 (1.3)	17 (68%) n=25
completing homework to your satisfaction	0	12	6	4	9	10	0	0	0	5.2 (1.1)	19 (66%) n=29
participating in class (KPI)	1	8	8	8	14	2	0	0	0	5.7 (0.9)	30 (94%) n=32
volunteering (e.g., for extra credit or more responsibilities)	0	20	3	7	10	1	0	0	0	5.6 (0.8)	20 (95%) n=21
attending class regularly (KPI)	0	20	5	6	3	3	4	0	0	5.2 (1.5)	14 (67%) n=21
being attentive in class	0	9	9	6	15	2	0	0	0	5.7 (1.0)	30 (94%) n=32
behaving well in class (KPI)	0	14	3	9	11	4	0	0	0	5.4 (0.9)	23 (85%) n=27
academic performance	0	4	10	9	17	1	0	0	0	5.8 (0.9)	36 (97%) n=37
coming to school motivated to learn	0	5	10	8	16	2	0	0	0	5.7 (0.9)	34 (94%) n=36
getting along well with other students	0	17	4	8	9	3	0	0	0	5.5 (0.9)	21 (88%) n=24

¹Missing data is based on the number of surveys received from respondents.²The shaded cells indicate improvement of 5.0+ (slight improvement and higher).³The percentage is based on the total number of regular students needing improvement in their behavior (sum of ratings from 1 through 7). *n* = the number of students who needed improvement in the corresponding behavior. Shaded cells indicate improvement of 75% or more of regular students who needed improvement.

Table H5*Pu'uhale Elementary: Results of the Teacher Survey About Academic Behavior in SY 2011–12*

Changed behavior in terms of...	Missing data ¹	Did not need improvement	Number of regular attendees							Average rating (std. dev.) ²	N (%) of regular students needing and showing improvement in behavior ³
			Significant improvement=7	Moderate improvement=6	Slight improvement=5	No change=4	Slight decline=3	Moderate decline=2	Significant decline=1		
turning in his or her homework on time (KPI)	0	36	6	9	8	6	1	0	0	5.4 (1.1)	23 (77%) n=30
completing homework to your satisfaction	1	28	4	10	14	6	3	0	0	5.2 (1.1)	28 (76%) n=37
participating in class (KPI)	0	27	6	13	9	11	0	0	0	5.4 (1.1)	28 (72%) n=39
volunteering (e.g., for extra credit or more responsibilities)	1	29	3	10	7	15	1	0	0	5.0 (1.1)	20 (56%) n=36
attending class regularly (KPI)	0	47	5	7	1	4	1	1	0	5.4 (1.5)	13 (68%) n=19
being attentive in class	0	34	3	8	7	14	0	0	0	5.0 (1.0)	18 (56%) n=32
behaving well in class (KPI)	0	36	3	6	6	8	6	1	0	4.6 (1.4)	15 (50%) n=30
academic performance	0	24	7	11	13	9	2	0	0	5.3 (1.1)	31 (74%) n=42
coming to school motivated to learn	0	31	6	10	8	10	1	0	0	5.3 (1.2)	24 (69%) n=35
getting along well with other students	0	33	4	6	9	9	5	0	0	4.8 (1.3)	19 (58%) n=33

¹Missing data is based on the number of surveys received from respondents.²The shaded cells indicate improvement of 5.0+ (slight improvement and higher).³The percentage is based on the total number of regular students needing improvement in their behavior (sum of ratings from 1 through 7). *n* = the number of students who needed improvement in the corresponding behavior. Shaded cells indicate improvement of 75% or more of regular students who needed improvement.

Table H6*Dole Middle: Results of the Teacher Survey About Academic Behavior in SY 2011–12*

Changed behavior in terms of...	Missing data ¹	Did not need improvement	Number of regular attendees							Average rating (std. dev.) ²	N (%) of regular students needing and showing improvement in behavior ³
			Significant improvement=7	Moderate improvement=6	Slight improvement=5	No change=4	Slight decline=3	Moderate decline=2	Significant decline=1		
turning in his or her homework on time (KPI)	2	60	7	16	33	35	17	7	9	4.2 (1.5)	56 (45%) n=124
completing homework to your satisfaction	2	57	9	16	34	34	20	7	7	4.3 (1.5)	59 (46%) n=127
participating in class (KPI)	2	63	8	22	30	44	13	1	3	4.6 (1.3)	60 (50%) n=121
volunteering (e.g., for extra credit or more responsibilities)	2	48	12	14	15	89	3	0	3	4.5 (1.1)	41 (30%) n=136
attending class regularly (KPI)	2	112	2	7	12	38	8	2	3	4.2 (1.2)	21 (29%) n=72
being attentive in class	3	83	7	13	27	24	20	7	2	4.3 (1.4)	47 (47%) n=100
behaving well in class (KPI)	2	91	8	12	25	24	16	5	3	4.4 (1.4)	45 (48%) n=93
academic performance	2	64	9	19	32	30	16	8	6	4.4 (1.5)	60 (50%) n=120
coming to school motivated to learn	3	68	8	13	22	44	14	9	5	4.2 (1.4)	43 (37%) n=115
getting along well with other students	3	84	8	12	24	42	8	3	2	4.5 (1.3)	44 (44%) n=99

¹Missing data is based on the number of surveys received from respondents.²The shaded cells indicate improvement of 5.0+ (slight improvement and higher).³The percentage is based on the total number of regular students needing improvement in their behavior (sum of ratings from 1 through 7). *n* = the number of students who needed improvement in the corresponding behavior. Shaded cells indicate improvement of 75% or more of regular students who needed improvement.

Table H7*Kalākaua Middle: Results of the Teacher Survey About Academic Behavior in SY 2011–12*

Changed behavior in terms of...	Missing data ¹	Did not need improvement	Number of regular attendees							Average rating (std. dev.) ²	N (%) of regular students needing and showing improvement in behavior ³
			Significant improvement=7	Moderate improvement=6	Slight improvement=5	No change=4	Slight decline=3	Moderate decline=2	Significant decline=1		
turning in his or her homework on time (KPI)	0	54	11	14	12	11	6	6	4	4.7 (1.8)	37 (58%) n=64
completing homework to your satisfaction	0	52	15	14	9	14	6	3	5	4.8 (1.8)	38 (58%) n=66
participating in class (KPI)	0	49	9	22	13	20	0	4	1	5.1 (1.4)	44 (64%) n=69
volunteering (e.g., for extra credit or more responsibilities)	2	50	1	13	11	39	0	1	1	4.5 (1.0)	25 (38%) n=66
attending class regularly (KPI)	0	89	0	3	1	19	3	2	1	3.9 (1.1)	4 (14%) n=29
being attentive in class	1	65	6	18	10	7	6	4	1	4.9 (1.6)	34 (65%) n=52
behaving well in class (KPI)	0	71	7	12	9	9	9	0	1	4.9 (1.5)	28 (60%) n=47
academic performance	0	47	16	16	11	15	5	6	2	5.0 (1.7)	43 (61%) n=71
coming to school motivated to learn	0	58	7	15	12	18	2	2	4	4.8 (1.6)	34 (57%) n=60
getting along well with other students	0	80	2	6	6	23	1	0	0	4.6 (1.0)	14 (37%) n=38

¹Missing data is based on the number of surveys received from respondents.²The shaded cells indicate improvement of 5.0+ (slight improvement and higher).³The percentage is based on the total number of regular students needing improvement in their behavior (sum of ratings from 1 through 7). *n* = the number of students who needed improvement in the corresponding behavior. Shaded cells indicate improvement of 75% or more of regular students who needed improvement.

Table H8

Changes in General Learner Outcomes (GLOs) for GLO #2 (Community Contributor)¹ for Regular Students at the Kalihi Learning Centers in SY 2011–12

Assessment	Fern Elem.	Ka'ewai Elem.	Kalihi Waena Elem.	Linapuni Elem.	Pu'uhale Elem.	Dole Middle	Kalākaua Middle
Changes in General Learner Outcomes (GLOs) for GLO #2 (Community Contributor)	Improved: 1 No change: 3 Went down: 1 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 3	Improved: 67 No change: 3 Went down: 1 Did not need to improve: 6 N/A: 0 No data: 0	Improved: 19 No change: 38 Went down: 1 Did not need to improve: 3 N/A: 1 No data: 1	Improved: 22 No change: 24 Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 0	Improved: 13 No change: 47 Went down: 4 Did not need to improve: 11 N/A: 2 No data: 0	Improved: 5 No change: 157 Went down: 11 Did not need to improve: 83 N/A: 0 No data: 1	Improved: 34 No change: 52 Went down: 11 Did not need to improve: 31 N/A: 1 No data: 0

¹GLO #2 Community Contributor: *The understanding that it is essential for human beings to work together.*
Shaded cells indicate improvement of 75% or more of regular students who needed improvement.

Appendix I
Findings about Regular Center Students' Academic Achievement
as shown by Changes in Hawai'i State Assessment Scores

Table 11

Hawai'i State Assessments (HSA) 2010–11 and 2011–12 Results for Regular Students at the Kalihi Learning Centers

Grade	Content area	Fern Elem.	Ka'ewai Elem.	Kalihi Waena Elem.	Linapuni Elem.	Pu'uhale Elem.	Dole Middle	Kalākāua Middle	Total
3	Reading 2010–11	N/A	Exceeds: 0 Meets: 0 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 0 N/A: 22 No data: 0 E/M: N/A	Exceeds: 0 Meets: 0 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 0 N/A: 20 No data: 0 E/M: N/A	N/A	Exceeds: 0 Meets: 0 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 0 N/A: 14 No data: 0 E/M: N/A			Exceeds: 0 Meets: 0 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 0 N/A: 56 No data: 0 E/M: N/A
	Reading 2011–12	N/A	Exceeds: 6 Meets: 5 Approaches: 8 Well Below: 2 N/A: 0 No data: 1 E/M: 50%	Exceeds: 1 Meets: 2 Approaches: 12 Well Below: 5 N/A: 0 No data: 0 E/M: 15%	N/A	Exceeds: 4 Meets: 5 Approaches: 4 Well Below: 0 N/A: 1 No data: 0 E/M: 64%			Exceeds: 11 Meets: 12 Approaches: 24 Well Below: 7 N/A: 1 No data: 1 E/M: 41%
	Math 2010–11	N/A	Exceeds: 0 Meets: 0 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 0 N/A: 22 No data: 0 E/M: N/A	Exceeds: 0 Meets: 0 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 0 N/A: 20 No data: 0 E/M: N/A	N/A	Exceeds: 0 Meets: 0 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 0 N/A: 14 No data: 0 E/M: N/A			Exceeds: 0 Meets: 0 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 0 N/A: 56 No data: 0 E/M: N/A
	Math 2011–12	N/A	Exceeds: 4 Meets: 8 Approaches: 3 Well Below: 6 N/A: 0 No data: 1 E/M: 55%	Exceeds: 0 Meets: 7 Approaches: 6 Well Below: 7 N/A: 0 No data: 0 E/M: 35%	N/A	Exceeds: 0 Meets: 9 Approaches: 4 Well Below: 0 N/A: 1 No data: 0 E/M: 64%			Exceeds: 4 Meets: 24 Approaches: 13 Well Below: 13 N/A: 1 No data: 1 E/M: 50%

Note. The shaded data cells indicate 60% or more of the regular students in that cell met or exceed the HSA proficiency rate for the corresponding school year.

(Table 11*Hawai'i State Assessments (HSA) 2010–11 and 2011–12 Results for Regular Students at the Kalihi Learning Centers, continued)*

Grade	Content area	Fern Elem.	Ka'ewai Elem.	Kalihi Waena Elem.	Linapuni Elem.	Pu'uhale Elem.	Dole Middle	Kalākaua Middle	Total
4	Reading 2010–11	Exceeds: 0 Meets: 0 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 1 E/M: 0%	Exceeds: 4 Meets: 4 Approaches: 6 Well Below: 0 N/A: 3 No data: 0 E/M: 47%	Exceeds: 1 Meets: 7 Approaches: 7 Well Below: 6 N/A: 0 No data: 0 E/M: 38%	N/A	Exceeds: 3 Meets: 4 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 0 E/M: 100%			Exceeds: 8 Meets: 15 Approaches: 13 Well Below: 6 N/A: 3 No data: 1 E/M: 50%
	Reading 2011–12	Exceeds: 0 Meets: 0 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 1 E/M: 0%	Exceeds: 4 Meets: 3 Approaches: 8 Well Below: 2 N/A: 0 No data: 0 E/M: 41%	Exceeds: 3 Meets: 6 Approaches: 11 Well Below: 1 N/A: 0 No data: 0 E/M: 43%	N/A	Exceeds: 3 Meets: 4 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 0 E/M: 100%			Exceeds: 10 Meets: 13 Approaches: 19 Well Below: 3 N/A: 0 No data: 1 E/M: 50%
	Math 2010–11	Exceeds: 0 Meets: 0 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 1 E/M: 0%	Exceeds: 3 Meets: 7 Approaches: 3 Well Below: 1 N/A: 3 No data: 0 E/M: 59%	Exceeds: 0 Meets: 4 Approaches: 12 Well Below: 5 N/A: 0 No data: 0 E/M: 19%	N/A	Exceeds: 1 Meets: 6 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 0 E/M: 100%			Exceeds: 4 Meets: 17 Approaches: 15 Well Below: 6 N/A: 3 No data: 1 E/M: 46%
	Math 2011–12	Exceeds: 0 Meets: 0 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 1 E/M: 0%	Exceeds: 2 Meets: 7 Approaches: 6 Well Below: 2 N/A: 0 No data: 0 E/M: 53%	Exceeds: 1 Meets: 7 Approaches: 12 Well Below: 1 N/A: 0 No data: 0 E/M: 38%	N/A	Exceeds: 0 Meets: 7 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 0 E/M: 100%			Exceeds: 3 Meets: 21 Approaches: 18 Well Below: 3 N/A: 0 No data: 1 E/M: 52%

Note. The shaded data cells indicate 60% or more of the regular students in that cell met or exceed the HSA proficiency rate for the corresponding school year.

(Table 11*Hawai'i State Assessments (HSA) 2010–11 and 2011–12 Results for Regular Students at the Kalihi Learning Centers, continued)*

Grade	Subject	Fern Elem.	Ka'ewai Elem.	Kalihi Waena Elem.	Linapuni Elem.	Pu'uhale Elem.	Dole Middle	Kalākaua Middle	Total
5	Reading 2010–11	Exceeds: 1 Meets: 2 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 3 E/M: 50%	Exceeds: 0 Meets: 0 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 1 N/A: 1 No data: 0 E/M: 0%	Exceeds: 1 Meets: 7 Approaches: 1 Well Below: 2 N/A: 1 No data: 0 E/M: 67%	N/A	Exceeds: 1 Meets: 7 Approaches: 3 Well Below: 0 N/A: 1 No data: 0 E/M: 67%			Exceeds: 3 Meets: 16 Approaches: 4 Well Below: 3 N/A: 3 No data: 3 E/M: 59%
	Reading 2011–12	Exceeds: 1 Meets: 3 Approaches: 1 Well Below: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 1 E/M: 67%	Exceeds: 0 Meets: 0 Approaches: 2 Well Below: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 0 E/M: 0%	Exceeds: 5 Meets: 4 Approaches: 2 Well Below: 0 N/A: 1 No data: 0 E/M: 75%	N/A	Exceeds: 2 Meets: 4 Approaches: 6 Well Below: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 0 E/M: 50%			Exceeds: 8 Meets: 11 Approaches: 11 Well Below: 0 N/A: 1 No data: 1 E/M: 59%
	Math 2010–11	Exceeds: 0 Meets: 0 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 6 E/M: 0%	Exceeds: 0 Meets: 0 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 1 N/A: 1 No data: 0 E/M: 0%	Exceeds: 0 Meets: 5 Approaches: 4 Well Below: 2 N/A: 1 No data: 0 E/M: 42%	N/A	Exceeds: 1 Meets: 4 Approaches: 5 Well Below: 1 N/A: 1 No data: 0 E/M: 42%			Exceeds: 1 Meets: 9 Approaches: 9 Well Below: 4 N/A: 3 No data: 6 E/M: 31%
	Math 2011–12	Exceeds: 0 Meets: 4 Approaches: 1 Well Below: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 1 E/M: 67%	Exceeds: 0 Meets: 0 Approaches: 2 Well Below: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 0 E/M: 0%	Exceeds: 1 Meets: 6 Approaches: 3 Well Below: 1 N/A: 1 No data: 0 E/M: 58%	N/A	Exceeds: 3 Meets: 2 Approaches: 7 Well Below: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 0 E/M: 42%			Exceeds: 4 Meets: 12 Approaches: 13 Well Below: 1 N/A: 1 No data: 1 E/M: 50%

Note. The shaded data cells indicate 60% or more of the regular students in that cell met or exceed the HSA proficiency rate for the corresponding school year.

(Table 11*Hawai‘i State Assessments (HSA) 2010–11 and 2011–12 Results for Regular Students at the Kalihi Learning Centers, continued)*

Grade	Content area	Fern Elem.	Ka‘ewai Elem.	Kalihi Waena Elem.	Linapuni Elem.	Pu‘uhale Elem.	Dole Middle	Kalākaua Middle	Total
6	Reading 2010–11						Exceeds: 0 Meets: 0 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 0 N/A: 111 No data: 0 E/M: N/A	Exceeds: 22 Meets: 27 Approaches: 24 Well Below: 11 N/A: 1 No data: 0 E/M: 58%	Exceeds: 22 Meets: 27 Approaches: 24 Well Below: 11 N/A: 112 No data: 0 E/M: 25%
	Reading 2011–12						Exceeds: 15 Meets: 42 Approaches: 33 Well Below: 13 N/A: 0 No data: 8 E/M: 51%	Exceeds: 22 Meets: 32 Approaches: 22 Well Below: 7 N/A: 2 No data: 0 E/M: 64%	Exceeds: 37 Meets: 74 Approaches: 55 Well Below: 20 N/A: 2 No data: 8 E/M: 57%
	Math 2010–11						Exceeds: 0 Meets: 0 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 0 N/A: 111 No data: 0 E/M: N/A	Exceeds: 15 Meets: 31 Approaches: 24 Well Below: 14 N/A: 1 No data: 0 E/M: 54%	Exceeds: 15 Meets: 31 Approaches: 24 Well Below: 14 N/A: 112 No data: 0 E/M: 23%
	Math 2011–12						Exceeds: 10 Meets: 30 Approaches: 38 Well Below: 25 N/A: 0 No data: 8 E/M: 36%	Exceeds: 18 Meets: 36 Approaches: 19 Well Below: 10 N/A: 2 No data: 0 E/M: 64%	Exceeds: 28 Meets: 66 Approaches: 57 Well Below: 35 N/A: 2 No data: 8 E/M: 48%

Note. The shaded data cells indicate 60% or more of the regular students in that cell met or exceed the HSA proficiency rate for the corresponding school year.

(Table 11)*Hawai'i State Assessments (HSA) 2010–11 and 2011–12 Results for Regular Students at the Kalihi Learning Centers, continued)*

Grade	Content area	Fern Elem.	Ka'ewai Elem.	Kalihi Waena Elem.	Linapuni Elem.	Pu'uhale Elem.	Dole Middle	Kalākaua Middle	Total
7	Reading 2010–11						Exceeds: 0 Meets: 0 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 0 N/A: 79 No data: 0 E/M: N/A	Exceeds: 1 Meets: 8 Approaches: 12 Well Below: 9 N/A: 3 No data: 0 E/M: 27%	Exceeds: 1 Meets: 8 Approaches: 12 Well Below: 9 N/A: 82 No data: 0 E/M: 8%
	Reading 2011–12						Exceeds: 8 Meets: 18 Approaches: 29 Well Below: 15 N/A: 0 No data: 9 E/M: 33%	Exceeds: 1 Meets: 14 Approaches: 13 Well Below: 4 N/A: 1 No data: 0 E/M: 45%	Exceeds: 9 Meets: 32 Approaches: 42 Well Below: 19 N/A: 1 No data: 9 E/M: 37%
	Math 2010–11						Exceeds: 0 Meets: 0 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 0 N/A: 79 No data: 0 E/M: N/A	Exceeds: 1 Meets: 8 Approaches: 12 Well Below: 9 N/A: 3 No data: 0 E/M: 27%	Exceeds: 1 Meets: 8 Approaches: 12 Well Below: 9 N/A: 82 No data: 0 E/M: 8%
	Math 2011–12						Exceeds: 4 Meets: 17 Approaches: 20 Well Below: 29 N/A: 0 No data: 9 E/M: 27%	Exceeds: 3 Meets: 7 Approaches: 14 Well Below: 8 N/A: 1 No data: 0 E/M: 30%	Exceeds: 7 Meets: 24 Approaches: 34 Well Below: 37 N/A: 1 No data: 9 E/M: 28%

Note. The shaded data cells indicate 60% or more of the regular students in that cell met or exceed the HSA proficiency rate for the corresponding school year.

(Table 11*Hawai'i State Assessments (HSA) 2010–11 and 2011–12 Results for Regular Students at the Kalihi Learning Centers, continued)*

Grade	Content area	Fern Elem.	Ka'ewai Elem.	Kalihi Waena Elem.	Linapuni Elem.	Pu'uhale Elem.	Dole Middle	Kalākaua Middle	Total
8	Reading 2010–11						Exceeds: 0 Meets: 0 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 0 N/A: 67 No data: 0 E/M: N/A	Exceeds: 4 Meets: 0 Approaches: 2 Well Below: 5 N/A: 0 No data: 0 E/M: 36%	Exceeds: 4 Meets: 0 Approaches: 2 Well Below: 5 N/A: 67 No data: 0 E/M: 5%
	Reading 2011–12						Exceeds: 15 Meets: 18 Approaches: 16 Well Below: 12 N/A: 0 No data: 6 E/M: 49%	Exceeds: 3 Meets: 2 Approaches: 4 Well Below: 2 N/A: 0 No data: 0 E/M: 45%	Exceeds: 18 Meets: 20 Approaches: 20 Well Below: 14 N/A: 0 No data: 6 E/M: 49%
	Math 2010–11						Exceeds: 0 Meets: 0 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 0 N/A: 67 No data: 0 E/M: N/A	Exceeds: 1 Meets: 3 Approaches: 2 Well Below: 5 N/A: 0 No data: 0 E/M: 36%	Exceeds: 1 Meets: 3 Approaches: 2 Well Below: 5 N/A: 67 No data: 0 E/M: 5%
	Math 2011–12						Exceeds: 6 Meets: 26 Approaches: 14 Well Below: 15 N/A: 0 No data: 6 E/M: 48%	Exceeds: 3 Meets: 2 Approaches: 3 Well Below: 3 N/A: 0 No data: 0 E/M: 45%	Exceeds: 9 Meets: 28 Approaches: 17 Well Below: 18 N/A: 0 No data: 6 E/M: 48%

Note. The shaded data cells indicate 60% or more of the regular students in that cell met or exceed the HSA proficiency rate for the corresponding school year.

(Table II

Hawai'i State Assessments (HSA) 2010–11 and 2011–12 Results for Regular Students at the Kalihi Learning Centers, continued)

Grade	Content area	Fern Elem.	Ka'ewai Elem.	Kalihi Waena Elem.	Linapuni Elem.	Pu'uhale Elem.	Dole Middle	Kalākaua Middle	Total
Total	Reading 2010–11	Exceeds: 1 Meets: 2 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 4 E/M: 43%	Exceeds: 4 Meets: 4 Approaches: 6 Well Below: 1 N/A: 26 No data: 0 E/M: 20%	Exceeds: 2 Meets: 14 Approaches: 8 Well Below: 8 N/A: 21 No data: 0 E/M: 30%	N/A	Exceeds: 4 Meets: 11 Approaches: 3 Well Below: 0 N/A: 15 No data: 0 E/M: 45%	Exceeds: 0 Meets: 0 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 0 N/A: 257 No data: 0 E/M: N/A	Exceeds: 27 Meets: 35 Approaches: 38 Well Below: 25 N/A: 4 No data: 0 E/M: 48%	Exceeds: 38 Meets: 66 Approaches: 55 Well Below: 34 N/A: 323 No data: 4 E/M: 20%
	Reading 2011–12	Exceeds: 1 Meets: 3 Approaches: 1 Well Below: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 2 E/M: 57%	Exceeds: 10 Meets: 8 Approaches: 18 Well Below: 4 N/A: 0 No data: 1 E/M: 44%	Exceeds: 9 Meets: 12 Approaches: 25 Well Below: 6 N/A: 1 No data: 0 E/M: 40%	N/A	Exceeds: 9 Meets: 13 Approaches: 10 Well Below: 0 N/A: 1 No data: 0 E/M: 67%	Exceeds: 38 Meets: 78 Approaches: 78 Well Below: 40 N/A: 0 No data: 23 E/M: 45%	Exceeds: 26 Meets: 48 Approaches: 39 Well Below: 13 N/A: 3 No data: 0 E/M: 57%	Exceeds: 93 Meets: 162 Approaches: 171 Well Below: 63 N/A: 5 No data: 26 E/M: 49%
	Math 2010–11	Exceeds: 0 Meets: 0 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 7 E/M: 0%	Exceeds: 3 Meets: 7 Approaches: 3 Well Below: 2 N/A: 26 No data: 0 E/M: 24%	Exceeds: 0 Meets: 9 Approaches: 16 Well Below: 7 N/A: 21 No data: 0 E/M: 17%	N/A	Exceeds: 2 Meets: 10 Approaches: 5 Well Below: 1 N/A: 15 No data: 0 E/M: 36%	Exceeds: 0 Meets: 0 Approaches: 0 Well Below: 0 N/A: 257 No data: 0 E/M: N/A	Exceeds: 17 Meets: 42 Approaches: 38 Well Below: 28 N/A: 4 No data: 0 E/M: 46%	Exceeds: 22 Meets: 68 Approaches: 62 Well Below: 38 N/A: 323 No data: 7 E/M: 17%
	Math 2011–12	Exceeds: 0 Meets: 4 Approaches: 1 Well Below: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 2 E/M: 57%	Exceeds: 6 Meets: 15 Approaches: 11 Well Below: 8 N/A: 0 No data: 1 E/M: 51%	Exceeds: 2 Meets: 20 Approaches: 21 Well Below: 9 N/A: 1 No data: 0 E/M: 41%	N/A	Exceeds: 3 Meets: 18 Approaches: 11 Well Below: 0 N/A: 1 No data: 0 E/M: 64%	Exceeds: 20 Meets: 73 Approaches: 72 Well Below: 69 N/A: 0 No data: 23 E/M: 36%	Exceeds: 24 Meets: 45 Approaches: 36 Well Below: 21 N/A: 3 No data: 0 E/M: 53%	Exceeds: 55 Meets: 175 Approaches: 152 Well Below: 107 N/A: 5 No data: 26 E/M: 42%

Note. The shaded data cells indicate 60% or more of the regular students in that cell met or exceed the HSA proficiency rate for the corresponding school year.

Table 12*Hawai'i State Assessments (HSA) Results for Regular Students in 2009–2010, 2010–2011, and 2011–12 at the Kalihi Learning Centers, All Grades*

Subject	Fern Elem.	Ka'eawai Elem.	Kalihi Waena Elem.	Linapuni Elem.	Pu'uhale Elem.	Dole Middle	Kalākaua Middle	Total
Reading 2009–10	Ex: 0 M: 12 (40.0%) Ap: 5 (16.7%) WB: 13 (43.3%) N/A: 0 ND: 0	Ex: 1 (6.7%) M: 9 (60.0%) Ap: 5 (33.3%) WB: 0 N/A: 0 ND: 0	Ex: 8 (6.0%) M: 66 (49.6%) Ap: 31 (23.3%) WB: 28 (21.1%) N/A: 0 NB: 0	N/A	Ex: 1 (2.1%) M: 17 (36.2%) Ap: 18 (38.3%) WB: 11 (23.4%) N/A: 0 ND: 0	Ex: 0 M: 24 (51.1%) Ap: 11 (23.4%) WB: 12 (25.5%) N/A: 0 ND: 0	Ex: 2 (4.8%) M: 15 (35.7%) Ap: 11 (26.2%) WB: 14 (33.3%) N/A: 0 ND: 0	Ex: 12 (3.8%) M: 143 (45.6%) Ap: 81 (25.8%) WB: 78 (24.8%) N/A: 0 ND: 0
Reading 2010–11	Ex: 2 (33.3%) M: 0 Ap: 1 (16.7%) WB: 2 (33.3%) N/A: 0 ND: 1 (16.7%)	Ex: 8 (19.1%) M: 12 (28.6%) Ap: 13 (30.9%) WB: 8 (19.0%) N/A: 0 ND: 1 (2.4%)	Ex: 13 (14.0%) M: 24 (25.8%) Ap: 42 (45.1%) WB: 13 (14.0%) N/A: 0 ND: 1 (1.1%)	N/A	Ex: 13 (24.1%) M: 9 (16.7%) Ap: 10 (18.5%) WB: 4 (7.4%) N/A: 0 ND: 18 (33.3%)	Ex: 36 (19.7%) M: 56 (30.6%) Ap: 39 (21.3%) WB: 32 (17.5%) N/A: 0 ND: 20 (10.9%)	Ex: 19 (13.8%) M: 38 (27.5%) Ap: 45 (32.6%) WB: 30 (21.7%) N/A: 0 ND: 6 (4.4%)	Ex: 91 (17.6%) M: 139 (26.9%) Ap: 150 (29.1%) WB: 89 (17.3%) N/A: 0 ND: 47 (9.1%)
Reading 2011–12	Ex: 1 (14.3%) M: 3 (42.9) Ap: 1 (14.3%) WB: 0 N/A: 0 ND: 2 (28.5%)	Ex: 10 (24.4%) M: 8 (19.5%) Ap: 18 (43.9%) WB: 4 (9.8%) N/A: 0 ND: 1 (2.4%)	Ex: 9 (17.0%) M: 12 (22.6%) Ap: 25 (47.2%) WB: 6 (11.3%) N/A: 1 (1.9%) ND: 0	N/A	Ex: 9 (27.3%) M: 13 (39.4%) Ap: 10 (30.3%) WB: 0 N/A: 1 (3.0%) ND: 0	Ex: 38 (14.8%) M: 78 (30.4%) Ap: 78 (30.4%) WB: 40 (15.5%) N/A: 0 ND: 23 (8.9%)	Ex: 26 (20.2%) M: 48 (37.2%) Ap: 39 (30.2%) WB: 13 (10.1%) N/A: 3 (2.3%) ND: 0	Ex: 93 (17.9%) M: 162 (31.1%) Ap: 171 (32.9%) WB: 63 (12.1%) N/A: 5 (1.0%) ND: 26 (5.0%)
Math 2009–10	Ex: 4 (13.3%) M: 5 (16.7%) Ap: 14 (46.7%) WB: 7 (23.3%) N/A: 0 ND: 0	Ex: 0 M: 0 Ap: 0 WB: 0 N/A: 15 (100%) ND: 0	Ex: 26 (19.6%) M: 33 (24.8%) Ap: 53 (39.8%) WB: 18 (13.5%) N/A: 3 (2.3%) ND: 0	N/A	Ex: 3 (6.4%) M: 12 (25.5%) Ap: 26 (55.3%) WB: 5 (10.7%) N/A: 1 (2.1%) ND: 0	Ex: 3 (6.4%) M: 11 (23.4%) Ap: 24 (51.1%) WB: 9 (19.1%) N/A: 0 ND: 0	Ex: 5 (11.9%) M: 9 (21.4%) Ap: 20 (47.6%) WB: 8 (19.1%) N/A: 0 ND: 0	Ex: 41 (13.1%) M: 70 (22.3%) Ap: 137 (43.6%) WB: 47 (15.0%) N/A: 19 (6.0%) ND: 0
Math 2010–11	Ex: 1 (16.7%) M: 2 (33.3%) Ap: 1 (16.7%) WB: 1 (16.7%) N/A: 0 ND: 1 (16.6%)	Ex: 0 M: 10 (23.8%) Ap: 15 (35.7%) WB: 16 (38.1%) N/A: 0 ND: 1 (2.4%)	Ex: 3 (3.2%) M: 32 (34.4%) Ap: 36 (38.7%) WB: 20 (21.5%) N/A: 0 ND: 2 (2.2%)	N/A	Ex: 3 (5.6%) M: 13 (24.1%) Ap: 13 (24.1%) WB: 7 (12.9%) N/A: 0 ND: 18 (33.3%)	Ex: 28 (15.3%) M: 51 (27.9%) Ap: 35 (19.1%) WB: 49 (26.8%) N/A: 0 ND: 20 (10.9%)	Ex: 11 (8.0%) M: 33 (23.9%) Ap: 48 (34.8%) WB: 40 (29.0%) N/A: 0 ND: 6 (4.3%)	Ex: 46 (8.9%) M: 141 (27.3%) Ap: 148 (28.7%) WB: 133 (25.8%) N/A: 0 ND: 48 (9.3%)
Math 2011–12	Ex: 0 M: 4 (57.1%) Ap: 1 (14.3%) WB: 0 N/A: 0 ND: 2 (28.6%)	Ex: 6 (14.6%) M: 15 (36.6%) Ap: 11 (26.8%) WB: 8 (19.5%) N/A: 0 ND: 1 (2.5%)	Ex: 2 (3.8%) M: 20 (37.7%) Ap: 21 (39.6%) WB: 9 (17.0%) N/A: 1 (1.9%) ND: 0	N/A	Ex: 3 (9.1%) M: 18 (54.6%) Ap: 11 (33.3%) WB: 0 N/A: 1 (3.0%) ND: 0	Ex: 20 (7.8%) M: 73 (28.4%) Ap: 72 (28.0%) WB: 69 (26.9%) N/A: 0 ND: 23 (8.9%)	Ex: 24 (18.6%) M: 45 (34.9%) Ap: 36 (27.9%) WB: 21 (16.3%) N/A: 3 (2.3%) ND: 0	Ex: 55 (10.6%) M: 175 (33.6%) Ap: 152 (29.2%) WB: 107 (20.6%) N/A: 5 (1.0%) ND: 26 (5.0%)

Note. The shaded data cells indicate 60% or more of the regular students in that cell met or exceed the HSA proficiency rate for the corresponding school year.