

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

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

November 2013

**An Evaluation Report about the
Farrington Sub-grantee Kalihi Learning 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, 2012 through June 30, 2013**

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

November 2013

Contents

Executive Summary.....	v
A Description of the Kalihi Learning Center Project.....	1
The KLC’s School-Community Demographic.....	3
Summary of Project Years 1 through 4.....	7
The Evaluation Design and Data-Collection Methods.....	10
The Evaluation Schedule.....	11
Findings about Project Implementation.....	14
Program Characteristics.....	15
Center Staffing.....	18
Hours of Operation.....	18
The Implementation of Core Academic Activities.....	23
The Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities.....	24
The Implementation of Activities to Improve Positive Behaviors.....	26
The Implementation of Community-Based Partnerships.....	26
Services to Parents and Other Adult Family Members.....	27
Challenges Faced in Implementing the Program and how the Challenges were Addressed.....	28
Program Activities Identified as Interesting and Valuable to Students, Teachers, Administrators, and Community Partners.....	28
Findings about Project Outcomes.....	30
Dissemination of Results to the Public.....	30
Conclusions and Recommendations.....	30
References.....	38
Appendix A.....	41
Appendix B.....	51
Appendix C.....	55
Appendix D.....	59
Appendix E.....	67

Executive Summary

This evaluation report is about the Farrington Sub-grantee 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) project, also called the Kalihi Learning Consortium (KLC), in Project Year 5. The U.S. Department of Education (USDE), Office of Elementary and Secondary Education provides 21st CCLC funds to states to support sub-grantees. 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 5 of five years of funding by the 21st CCLC program during the period from the summer of 2012 through spring of 2013.

There were major challenges to the collection of evaluation data in Project Year 5. We were informed by the HIDOE Data Governance Office (DGO) that we needed clearance, in the form of a data-sharing agreement, in order for us to receive data files that included Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) information or personally identifiable information (PII). After negotiating several issues, at the time that this report was prepared, the outstanding issue was free- and reduced-lunch status data. The free- and reduced-lunch status data are required for reporting by the USDE for the 21st CCLC program as evidence that the centers are providing services to a key target group. We reported this remaining issue to the HIDOE Educational Specialist who continued discussions with the DGO at the time that this report was prepared. Unfortunately, while the negotiation efforts were ongoing between CRDG and HIDOE, the data-sharing agreement was not fully executed, and the report deadline for this report was approaching.

The free- and reduced-lunch data are included with other center participants’ demographics and outcome data in the KLC databooks. Therefore, we have not received clearance to collect the centers’ databooks for this report. Data that were not available to us for this report are the center participants’ first and last names, grade level, student HIDOE identification (ID) numbers, attendance, gender, ethnicity, free- and reduced-lunch status, special education status, English Language Learner (ELL) status, and data based on attendance (teacher survey/academic behavior data, General Learner Outcomes (GLO) scores, Hawai‘i State

Assessment (HSA) scores, and report card grades). Information gathered for this report were from site visits and communication with center staff members.

All seven KLC centers operated on the campuses of their respected 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 reported that they continued to enroll 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. This aligns with the objective noted in the grant proposal. 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.

The majority of the center staff at four of the five elementary centers were day teachers at the respective host schools, and these center staff led the majority of homework help, tutorial, and academic enrichment activities. Their remaining staff were other non-teaching school-day staff (e.g., librarians, guidance counselors, 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). Dole Middle and Kalākaua Middle center leaders continued their partnership with After School All Stars (ASAS), who provided staffing to implement their center activities.

In Project Year 5, the KLC project leaders and staff met the HIDEOE-SPMS performance measures of (a) offering enrichment and support activities in 100% of centers; (b) offering services to parents, seniors citizens, and other adult community members in 85% of centers; and (c) establishing 100% of the centers in high-poverty communities. However, the KLC project did not meet the HIDEOE-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.

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 could not be determined due to the lack of teacher survey, GLO, and grades data. The centers all implemented at least one core academic area, but we could not determine the quality of implementation because there was very limited distribution of the questionnaire about implementation in Year 5.

It was commendable that project leaders continued providing services to the high-need groups targeted from the inception to Year 5 of the project. We recommend that they continue this trend in the next 21st CCLC grant. In addition, project leaders should network to learn best practices for the target group. Considering the high levels of ELL students that were enrolled at the centers, center leaders may consider hiring an ELL consultant to advise center staff or hiring ELL teachers as center staff to work directly with students. Despite their busy schedules, the host school principals continued their role of center coordinators in Project Year 5. 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. 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. We did not have data to see the effects of center staff members' efforts in student performance or behaviors. Based on interviews with project leaders and direct observation of center activities, we believe that the KLC program was well-implemented in Project Year 5.

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

This evaluation report is about Year 5 of the Farrington sub-grantee 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC), a consortium of seven schools in the Kalihi community. In Year 5, we were contracted as a team from Curriculum Research & Development Group (CRDG) at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa College of Education (UHM-CoE) to provide evaluation services to the Farrington sub-grantee for the second year. 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 5. The evaluation questions, outcome indicators, and data-collection methods are based on the key performance indicators (KPIs) of the 21st CCLC program, the 21st CCLC evaluation report template, and the Farrington sub-grantee 21st CCLC grant proposal.

A Description of the Kalihi Learning Center Project

The Farrington sub-grantee 21st CCLC project was also called the Kalihi Learning Consortium or the Kalihi Learning Centers (KLC). In this report, we refer to this project as the KLC. The KLC project was funded by the Hawai‘i Department of Education Special Programs Management Section’s (HIDOE-SPMS) 21st CCLC program beginning in SY 2008–09. As defined by the 21st CCLC program, the KLC project’s Year 5 began in the summer of 2012 and continued through spring 2013. 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. The 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.

Table 1*Location of the Kalihi Learning Centers' Host Schools in Project Year 5*

Name of host school	Address	City	State	Zip	Phone	Grade levels	url_home
Fern El.	1121 Middle Street	Honolulu	HI	96819	832-3040	K-5	http://fern.k12.hi.us/
Ka'ewai El.	1929 Kamehameha IV Road	Honolulu	HI	96819	832-3500	K-5	No school website available.
Kalihi Waena El.	1240 Gulick Avenue	Honolulu	HI	96819	832-3210	K-5	http://kalihiwaena.com/
Linapuni El.	1434 Linapuni Street	Honolulu	HI	96819	832-3303	PreK-1	http://www.linapuniel.k12.hi.us/Site/Welcome.html
Pu'uhale El.	345 Pu'uhale Road	Honolulu	HI	96819	832-3190	K-5	No school website available.
Dole Middle	1803 Kamehameha IV Road	Honolulu	HI	96819	832-3340	6-8	http://dolediplomats.org/
Kalākaua Middle	821 Kalihi Street	Honolulu	HI	96819	832-3130	6-8	http://www.kalakauamiddle.org/

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

The KLC's School-Community Demographic

We reviewed reports about the KLC school community for student, host school, and community demographic data. We found that 100% of the KLC centers were based in high-poverty school communities, meeting the related HIDEOE-SPMS outcome indicator. As reported in Table 2, the percentage of students qualifying for free- or reduced-cost lunch, which is based on low family income, varied from 62.5% to 99.2% between SYs 2007–08 through 2011–12 at the KLC host schools. These percentages are also significantly higher than the state percentages of 38.6% to 49.9% during the same period (HIDOE, 2012a; 2012b).

We reviewed school-level data to examine whether KLC leaders and staff 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 Learner (ELL). School-level statistics for SY 2012–13 were not available at the time data were collected for this report, therefore the school-level demographic data shown in Table 2 and Table 3 include counts and percentages of students qualified for free- or reduced-cost lunch and students of ELL status over SYs 2007–08 through 2011–12 (HIDOE, 2012a; 2012b).

As stated above, Table 2 shows that the percentage of students qualifying for free- or reduced-cost lunch varied from 62.5% to 99.2% between 2007–08 through 2011–12 at the KLC host schools, which are significantly higher than the state percentages of 38.6% to 49.9% during the same period. In addition, between 2007–08 through 2011–12 the Farrington complex, which includes the host schools, have much higher percentages of students qualifying for free- or reduced-cost lunch at 63.9% to 72.9% than the state percentages. These percentages show the KLC's intended plan to address the HIDEOE-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 second disadvantaged target group for the KLC centers are students of ELL status (Hargrove & Nomiya, 2008). We collected the numbers and percentages of ELL students enrolled at the KLC host schools from 2007–08 through 2011–12 and the findings are shown as

Table 3. The table indicates that the percentage of ELL students varied from 18.2% to 77.8% between 2007–08 through 2011–12 at the KLC host schools which are significantly higher than the state percentages of 8.7% through 11.2% during the same period. Also, between 2007–08 through 2011–12 the Farrington complex had more than double the percentages of ELL students at 24.7% to 29.2% in relation to the state percentages (HIDOE, 2012a; 2012b).

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 and the principals of the seven host schools (including one principal who is the current Farrington-Kaiser-Kalani Complex Area Superintendent) 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 the summer of 2012 through the spring of 2013.

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 & Nomiya, 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 & Nomiya, 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.

Summary of Project Years 1 through 4

We provide a brief description of the early project years here. The reader is referred to the 2011–12 evaluation report or a fuller description (Higa, Sagaysay, Oshiro, & Nakamura, 2013).

Programming. In Project Year 1 (the summer of 2008 until the spring of 2009), 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 Year 2 KLC goal was to implement the program as planned with academic enrichment learning opportunities outside of regular-day hours. Despite changes in school administration, the KLC sites were fully implemented in Year 2 (Hargrove & Matsuo, 2010).

In Year 3, the KLC goals were to refine implementation of the program as planned and stated in the grant proposal by “provid[ing] 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 forming working relationships with students, as well as building 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 ASAS to provide staffing and coordinate their activities.

In Project Year 4, 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 findings were that the project increased the enrollment of center students over the amount from Year 3. Due to variations in reporting of the Year 3 and Year 4, 21st CCLC teacher survey data results, improvement on academic behavior in Year 4 over Year 3 could not be determined.

Center enrollment. The KLC centers were in operation by late fall of its initial year of the project, but they were challenged with gathering and recording the Year 1 data to provide supporting documentation of its activities. Therefore, no Year 1 data are available to confirm enrollment. Year 2 (the summer of 2009 until the spring of 2010) was the first year of full

implementation (Hargrove & Matsuo, 2010). In Project Year 2, 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 3, 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. In Year 4, KLC enrolled 1,282 students at the beginning of Year 4, an increase from the 1,068 students enrolled in Year 3. In addition, 657 (51.2%) of the 1,282 students in Year 4 participated for 30 or more days. Although this was a decrease in the percentage (51.2% versus 59.4%), the Year 4 project goal to increase the number of students who remain in the program throughout the school year was met by an increase in the count from the 634 (59.4%) students of 1,068 who participated for 30 or more days in Year 3.

Center staffing. The annual project evaluation reports include findings that project leaders were deliberate in their hiring practices of well-qualified center staff in each project year. In Project Year 1, it was initially a challenge for project leaders to find qualified staff to work in the centers. However, by Fall 2009, all seven centers were fully staffed to implement its activities (Hargrove & Matsuo, 2011). A Year 3 goal was for center coordinators to continue efforts to recruit and hire instructors with expertise in facilitating learning and forming positive working relationships with students. Dole Middle and Kalākaua Middle centers continued to partner with 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%). In Project Year 4, the KLC project leaders met their goal of staffing the centers with qualified teachers. The centers reported that a little over half of the center staff were 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 & Nomiyama, 2008).

Major findings. A review of the KLC regular center students' Hawai'i State Assessment (HSA) scores in Year 2 showed that 50% of the regular program participants with HSA reading data met or exceeded the HSA reading proficiency objective and 38% of the regular program participants with HSA mathematics data met or exceeded the HSA mathematics proficiency

objective. However, this result indicates that 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 mathematics. The Year 2 General Learner Outcomes (GLO) data show that 19% of the KLC regular center students improved in their GLO #2 behavior indicating that as a sub-grantee 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.

The findings for Year 3 about academic achievement indicate that 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 mathematics. 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 mathematics data met or exceeded the HSA mathematics proficiency objective. 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 mathematics grades data improved in their grades from first to second semester.

In Year 3, the KLC sub-grantee did not meet the HIDOE-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 sub-grantee, the KLC was close, but fell short of meeting the 75% outcome indicator target.

In Year 4 of the project (the summer of 2011 through SY 2011–12), 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 reported by their day classroom teachers on the 21st CCLC teacher survey. In Year 4, 657 (51.2%) of the 1,282 students in Year 4

participated for 30 or more days. Although this was a decrease in the percentage (51.2% versus 59.4%), the Year 4 project goal to increase the number of students who remain in the program throughout the school year was met by an increase in the count from the 634 (59.4%) students of 1,068 who participated for 30 or more days in Year 3. In Year 4, 52% of the regular program participants with HSA reading data met or exceeded the HSA reading proficiency objective versus 49% in Year 3; and in Year 4, 47% of the regular program participants with HSA mathematics data met or exceeded the HSA mathematics proficiency objective in comparison to 40% in Year 3. The Year 4 report card data also showed that 35.1% of the regular program participants with reading grades data improved in their grades from first to second semester versus 33.3% in Year 3. Also in Year 4, 34.8% of the regular program participants with mathematics grades data improved in their grades from first to second semester versus 33.3% in Year 3.

The Evaluation Design and Data-Collection Methods

The purpose of the evaluation was to fulfill the annual state and federal evaluation reporting requirements of the 21st CCLC program and to provide information about project implementation and outcomes to KLC stakeholders to inform sustainability of the project or proposal writing for future funding of activities.

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 HIDEOE-SPMS KPIs were adapted from the Government Performance and Results Act performance indicators associated with the 21st CCLC program and revised over the program years as deemed necessary by the state program manager.

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 or intended to be 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 (30 or more days) 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

On January 4, 2013 we forwarded an email to the KLC principals that included an attached draft schedule of deadlines for collection and submission of project Year 5 data. We also provided hard copies of the same schedule to the principals and their data staff during our February 2013 site visits to their respective centers. The Year 5 deadlines were similar to the Year 4 deadlines and no changes to the original draft of the Year 5 schedule of deadlines were proposed by the principals or their data staff.

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.

However, there were major challenges to data collection in Project Year 5 that need to be described here. The 2012–13 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between CRDG and the KLC sub-grantee was executed in November of 2012. In December 2012, the Evaluation Principal Investigator (PI) contacted the HIDEOE Data Governance Office (DGO) staff to inquire whether or not we needed permission to obtain HIDEOE data necessary to fulfill the MOA and Federal 21st CCLC Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS) and HIDEOE reporting requirements. As requested by the DGO staff, CRDG staff provided DGO staff with copies of the MOA, evaluation design, data-collection plans, U.S. Department of Education (USDE) and HIDEOE documents about the 21st CCLC program and requirements for evaluation reports. In the initial stages of this process, DGO staff required that CRDG evaluators cease all evaluation activities with the sub-grantee. The CRDG evaluators asked the sub-grantee center staff to continue collecting all 2012–13 data and document their center activities, but they should hold on to the files until CRDG receives clearance from the DGO to collect the data.

The DGO decided that a data-sharing agreement was necessary for each 21st CCLC sub-grantee, including the CRDG evaluators who had an MOA with the KLC sub-grantee. During the discussions about drafting the data-sharing agreement, the DGO asked other stakeholders for input and additional issues needed to be addressed, such as assignment of the data-collection tasks and the timeline for destruction/retention of data.

In May 2013, the DGO granted partial approval for CRDG to distribute data-collection instruments and collect data that were not Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) or personally identifiable information (PII). The partial approval allowed us to collect non-PII and non-FERPA project data.

In June 2013, a data-sharing agreement drafted by the DGO was reviewed by the CRDG staff and UHM attorney. Throughout the time for negotiating the data-sharing agreement, the CRDG evaluators continued to look toward methods of collecting data that did not contain PII. The CRDG evaluators modified the procedures to distribute the on-line questionnaire about the implementation of activities to distribute the questionnaire by URL instead of e-mail addresses (which are PII). This was not our preferred procedure because the distribution of the questionnaires by URL addresses posed threats to validity, specifically, the possibility that the URL address may be used an unintended respondent. The DGO approved the distribution of the on-line questionnaires by URL and, by June 2013, the CRDG evaluators communicated with the sub-grantee leaders to collect data about the activities that were implemented for the extended summer session. Although the number of respondents did not include all the June 2013 centers or reach all the staff, contractors, and volunteers in time, some implementation data were collected through a collaborative effort of the center leaders, center staff, and the CRDG evaluators.

The data that we have not been given clearance to collect for this report are the center participants' first and last names, grade level, student HIDEOE ID numbers, attendance, gender, ethnicity, free- and reduced-lunch status, special education status, ELL status, and data based on attendance (teacher survey/academic behavior data, GLO ratings, HSA scores, and report card grades).

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

Unfortunately, while the negotiations are ongoing, we approached the deadline to submit the KLC 21st CCLC sub-grantee evaluation report so that the KLC sub-grantee, which was in the final year of funding in 2012–13 (Project Year 5), can meet their invoicing and funds liquidation deadlines. Regretfully, we have had to submit this report without PII or FERPA data. We will continue to work with the DGO towards executing the data-sharing agreement to obtain the FERPA and PII data in time to meet the 21st CCLC PPICS deadline, and we will work with the sub-grantees on entering the data into the PPICS system. We feel strongly that this situation is very unfortunate, although some extremely important issues are at stake for future sharing of HIDEOE data between 21st CCLC sub-grantees and their evaluators.

Findings about 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 interesting and valuable to students, teachers, administrators, and community partners?” (f) “What are the plans to ensure effective program implementation next year?” (HIDEOE-SPMS, 2012, p. 3).

Characteristics of clients in the program. As noted in an earlier section of this report, there have been major challenges to data collection in Project Year 5. At the time of this writing, the data-sharing agreement document which was needed to allow CRDG to collect and receive HIDEOE data for this project, was still being negotiated and was not yet fully executed. We currently do not have clearance from the DGO to receive data with FERPA information or PII including participants’ first and last names, grade level, student HIDEOE ID numbers, attendance, gender, ethnicity, free- and reduced-lunch status, special education status, ELL status, and data based on attendance (teacher survey/academic behavior data, GLO ratings, HSA scores, and report card grades). The KLC databook was designed to include these PII data, and we were not able to collect the databooks to review, analyze, and report participants’ demographics information for this Project Year 5 evaluation report. However, we based participant information on data gathered in the February and March 2013 site visits and communication with center staff. Although we believe these data are accurate, they are not as specific as in previous years. That is,

the data do not include 2012–13 demographics data for the centers, host schools, Farrington complex, and state. However, demographics data for the host schools, Farrington complex, and state for 2007–08 through 2011–12 as shown on Table 2 about free- and reduced-cost lunch and Table 3 about ELL support the school principals’ and center staff members’ statements in our February and March 2013 site visits that their students continued to have disadvantages for academic achievement in Project Year 5.

Program Characteristics

Principals of the KLC host schools continued their responsibilities as center coordinators in Project Year 5. Some centers participated in activities where competition (baseball, basketball, football, volleyball, and robotics) and showcase/culminating/field trip/special events were held on locations outside of their respective host school campuses, but a majority of the center activities were held on the grounds of the host schools.

As in previous years, 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 in Project Years 3 and 4 lead us to believe that project leaders wisely made this change from the grant proposal because the center students enrolled during these years have disadvantages for academic achievement, such as, low socio-economic status (as indicated by free- or reduced-lunch status), low proficiency in the English language (ELL status), and special education status.

Based on information gathered in our February and March 2013 site visits of the centers and their activities, all seven of the KLC centers met their goal of focusing on the implementation of academic enrichment activities in Project Year 5. The centers offered tutoring or academic enrichment activities two to six days a week. Refer to Table 4 and Table 5 for the Project Year 5 information on each center’s academic enrichment activities and primary and secondary categories of the activities.

Also in our February and March 2013 site visits and communications with center staff, centers reported the description of their activities shown as Appendix A. Homework help, tutoring, recreational activities, and integrated activities were offered to center participants in Year 5. The academic enrichment activities integrated various content areas, including reading or

Table 4

Categories of Activities and When They were Implemented at the Kalihi Learning Center 21st CCLC Centers in Project Year 5 (Listed as Primary and Secondary Activity Category. "X" denotes that the center implemented the activity category during the corresponding period.)

Center	Primary activity categories and secondary activity categories (Summ1= Primary activity category for Summer 2012. Summ2 = Secondary activity category for Summer 2012. SY1 = Primary activity category for School Year 2012–13. SY2 = Secondary activity category for School Year 2012–13.)							Activity had more than two program elements
	Homework help	Tutorial	Academic enrichment	Recreational	Career or job training for youth	Community service or service learning	Other	
Fern El.	SY2: X	Summ1: X SY1: X	SY1: X	SY2: X				
Ka‘ewai El.	SY2: X	SY1: X SY2: X	SY1: X					
Kalihi Waena El.	Summ2: X SY2: X	Summ1: X SY1: X	Summ1: X SY1: X	Summ2: X SY2: X				
Linapuni El.	SY2: X	Summ1: X SY1: X	Summ1: X SY1: X	Summ2: X SY2: X				
Pu‘uhale El.	SY1: X	Summ1: X SY2: X	Summ1: X SY1: X	SY2: X				
Dole Mid.	SY1: X	SY2: X	SY1: X	SY2: X				
Kalākaua Mid.	SY1: X	SY2: X	SY1: X	SY2: X				
Number of Centers Implementing the Category	Summ2: 1 SY1: 3 SY2: 4	Summ1: 4 SY1: 4 SY2: 4	Summ1: 3 SY1: 7	Summ2: 2 SY2: 6				

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 5

Categories of Activity Subject Areas and When They were Implemented at the Kalihi Learning Center 21st CCLC Centers in Project Year 5 (Listed by Subject Area Category. “X” denotes that the center implemented the subject area category during the corresponding period.)

Center	Activity subject area categories								
	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 El.	Summ: X SY: X	Summ: X SY: X		SY: X				SY: X	
Ka‘ewai El.	SY: X	SY: X	SY: X			SY: X	SY: X		
Kalihi Waena El.	Summ: X SY: X	Summ: X SY: X	Summ: X SY: X	SY: X		Summ: X SY: X		Summ: X SY: X	
Linapuni El.	Summ: X SY: X	Summ: X SY: X	Summ: X SY: X	Summ: X SY: X		Summ: X SY: X		Summ: X SY: X	
Pu‘uhale El.	Summ: X SY: X	Summ: X SY: X	SY: X	SY: X		Summ: X SY: X	SY: X	SY: X	
Dole Mid.	SY: X	SY: X		SY: X			SY: X	SY: X	
Kalākaua Mid.	SY: X	SY: X		SY: X			SY: X	SY: X	
Number of Centers Implementing the Subject Area Category	Summ: 4 SY: 7	Summ: 4 SY: 7	Summ: 2 SY: 4	Summ: 1 SY: 6		Summ: 3 SY: 4	SY: 4	Summ: 2 SY: 6	

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.

literacy, mathematics, science, technology or telecommunications, health or nutrition, culture or social studies, arts and music.

Center Staffing

The staffing data was limited to information that we had clearance to receive so it is based on information gathered in our February and March 2013 site visits and communications with the center staffs. As shown in Table 6, the seven centers had their host school principals serve as center coordinators; 60% to 100% of the center staff at four of the five elementary centers were also host school day teachers at their respective host schools; four centers contracted center staff who were also host school staff in non-teaching positions, such as librarians, guidance counselors, or school aides; two centers contracted center staff who were also college and high school students; and one center contracted center staff who were nonschool-day staff with some or no college. 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 & Nomiyama, 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).

Hours of Operation

According to the HIDOE-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 (HIDOE-SPMS, 2010). Table 7 shows the KLC hours of operation for Year 5.

Four centers (Fern, Kalihi Waena, Linapuni, and Pu‘uhale) were open for 21st CCLC activities during the summer of 2012. Of these four centers, Pu‘uhale was open 25 hours per week. Fern and Kalihi Waena were each open 20 hours per week. Linapuni was open 14 hours per week, which is just slightly under the 15 hours per week target.

All seven KLC centers were open during the school year. Three of the centers met the 15 hours per week target and one center was slightly below the target at 14 hours per week. The typical number of hours per week during the school year was highest at Kalākaua (17 hours), followed by Dole (15.5 hours), Pu‘uhale (15 hours) Kalihi Waena (14 hours), Fern (10 hours),

Table 6*Description of Staff at the Kalihi Learning Centers in Project Year 5^a*

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	College students
Fern El.	Staffing count was not determined through any communication received, but it was noted at the February 2013 that 2012–13 tutors were all Fern Elementary day school teachers. The host school principal was the center coordinator.								
Ka‘ewai El.	7 ^b	1 ^c		4 ^b					
Kalihi Waena El.	20 ^a	1 ^c		5 ^b					
Linapuni El.	Staffing count was not determined, but it was noted at the February 2013 that 2012–13 tutors were all Linapuni Elementary day school teachers. Other staff included educational assistants. The host school principal was the center coordinator.								
Pu‘uhale El.	5 ^b	1 ^c		24 ^b					
Dole Mid.	Staffing count was not determined through any communication received, but it was noted at the February 2013 that 2012–13 staff members did not include any day teachers or regular school staff because the school is in restructuring so emphasis is on improving the quality of their programming during the day. However, day teachers could volunteer to tutor any of their students who requested help. The center’s partner, After School All Stars, provided most of the staff. Staff members included college students and also volunteer 9 th graders who returned to Dole Middle as mentors. The host school principal was the center coordinator.								
Kalākaua Mid.	Staffing count was not determined through any communication received, but it was noted at the March 2013 that 2012–13 staff members did not include any day teachers. However one of the staff members has a Masters in Education. The host school principal was the center coordinator.								
Total number of centers with staff category	5	7 ^c		4			2	2	1

^aThe data provided on this table is based on information gathered from the February/March 2013 site visit to the center. A data-sharing agreement was not fully executed at the time of writing this report so the evaluator was not cleared to receive data with FERPA information and PII. Staffing information is included in the KLC databooks, but since they contain PII data, the evaluator could not request the databooks.

^bIt was noted that at the February 2013 site visits that staff members at: (a) Ka‘ewai Elementary center consisted of seven regular day school teachers and four educational assistants; (b) Kalihi Waena Elementary center consisted of 25 regular day school teachers and five non-teaching staff; (c) Pu‘uhale Elementary center consisted of five regular day school teachers and 24 Paraprofessional Tutors (non-teaching staff).

^cThe host school principals served as center coordinators.

Table 7
Kalihi Learning Centers Hours of Operation in Project Year 5

Center	Summer (actual)			School Year (actual)		
	Total number of weeks the center was open	Typical hours per week	Typical number of days per week the center was open	Total number of weeks the center was open	Typical hours per week	Typical number of days per week the center was open
Fern Elem.	5	20	5	25	10	3
Ka‘ewai Elem.	Not open	Not open	Not open	24	4	2
Kalihi Waena Elem.	4	20	5	41	14	6
Linapuni Elem.	4	14	4	32	7	5
Pu‘uhale Elem.	2	25	5	27	15	5
Dole Mid.	Not open	Not open	Not open	35	15.5	5
Kalākaua Mid.	Not open	Not open	Not open	36	17	5

Linapuni (7 hours), and Ka‘ewai Center (4 hours). The centers implemented activities between 36 weeks at five days per week (Kalākaua) to 24 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, five of the KLC centers were open for a notable amount of time. The 2012–13 school year was 39 weeks long and the centers provided services between 24 and 41 weeks with some centers providing services during school breaks when school is not in session. The HODOE schools were typically open five days a week. Kalihi Waena was open six days, which included Saturday game days; four centers (Linapuni, Pu‘uhale, Dole, and Kalākaua) were open five days a week; Fern was open three days a week; and Ka‘ewai was open two days a week.

The findings suggest 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 continued to serve the target groups by requiring all students to participate in homework help and/or tutoring. We provide more specifics about the implementation of the program beginning with descriptive data about the activities that were implemented at the KLC centers. Then we provide evaluative findings about the implementation of those activities.

All seven KLC centers implemented activities in Project Year 5. Information collected about the activities implemented at the seven KLC centers are organized in tables shown in Appendix A, Tables A1 through A7. 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 sub-grantee (summarizing Appendix A) is shown as Table 4 and Table 5. In Table 5, the types of activities are shown as categories of core academic activities, categories of academic enrichment activities, and the time of year the activity was implemented (the summer of 2012 or SY 2012–13).

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 center staff who were also school day teachers at the host schools. The community partner, ASAS, was contracted to lead activities at the middle school centers. ASAS provided homework help, tutoring, academic enrichment activities, and recreational activities to the participants. We gathered information about the implementation of activities during our

February and March 2013 site visits and interviews with the school principals who managed the centers and the ASAS partner who implemented activities at the two middle schools.

We collected evaluative data about the implementation of core educational activities by sending a letter or email message to project staff, contractors, or volunteers who implemented activities during the summer of 2012 or SY 2012–13 and inviting them to complete an on-line questionnaire. The respondents were asked to rate the extent and quality to which they implemented each content area.

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. Additionally, the method was revised and approved by the DGO in June 2013, as explained previously in this report. By that time, we were not able to collect data from all the center staff members who may have already closed down for the summer.

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.
- mentoring by secondary students was implemented in the two middle schools.
- 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 family-community activities such as game and robotics competition and school and KLC showcase and culminating events, where parents could participate in or observe what their children did at the centers.

The Implementation of Core Academic Activities

The HDOE-SPMS 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 sub-grantee offered at least one core academic area in all seven centers in Project Year 5. However, due to insufficient amount of data gathered, the quality of implementation of the core activities for the overall sub-grantee could not be determined.

The elementary center tutors implemented the core activities, in the form of homework help, tutoring, and academic enrichment activities as shown in Appendix A, Tables A1 through A7 and Table 4. The community partner, ASAS, also implemented the core activities by requiring all students at the two middle school centers to participate in homework hour and tutoring as well as academic enrichment activities, shown as Tables A6 and A7.

Findings about the implementation of academic activities, data reported by five or fewer respondents. This narrative summarizes the findings about the implementation of activities with reading or literacy, mathematics, or science content where the data were provided by five or fewer respondents. We are reporting findings with those minimal levels of respondents to comply with research practices regarding non-publication of PII. This narrative is an effort to include the full richness of the data about these activities provided by center staff, contractors, or volunteers. The reader should note that this narrative summarizes the points of view of five or fewer respondents and, therefore, may lack a broad perspective. Additionally, data with these very low levels of respondents may include some social bias to individual’s pressure to positively represent their efforts. The reader should note that we had data-collection challenges resulting in very limited time to collect data in Project Year 5 and responses were provided by the staff, contractors, or volunteers who implemented activities at the Fern and Linapuni centers only. Activities were implemented at the other KLC centers over Project Year 5, but we were only able to collect a limited portion of the data.

Findings about the implementation of reading and literacy activities suggest that they were implemented at moderate to high extent and quality in tutorials, classes, or integrated content at the Fern and Linapuni centers in Project Year 5. At the Linapuni center, reading and literacy content was also implemented during homework help sessions.

Findings about the implementation of mathematics activities suggest that they were implemented at moderate to high extent and quality in tutorials, classes, or integrated content at

the Fern and Linapuni centers in Project Year 5. At the Linapuni center, mathematics content was also implemented during homework help sessions.

Findings about the implementation of science activities suggest that they were implemented at moderate to high extent and quality in integrated content at the Fern and Linapuni centers in Project Year 5. Additionally, science content was implemented in tutorials and classes at the Fern center.

Findings about the implementation of assistance to address students' individual needs for improving academic performance suggest that assistance was provided at moderate to high extent and quality in tutorials, classes, or integrated content at the Fern and Linapuni centers in Project Year 5.

The Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities

During Project Year 5, data on enrichment and support activities were based on information gathered at the February and March 2013 site visits to the centers and communication with center staff. The KLC centers offered a variety of enrichment and support activities as shown in Table 5 (a variation on Table 4, also includes data from Appendix A). 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. The information gathered show that four of the seven centers offered activities in telecommunications and technology (Ka'ewai, Kalihi Waena, Linapuni, and Pu'uhale). Six centers offered health and nutrition, including sports activities (Fern, Kalihi Waena, Linapuni, Pu'uhale, Dole, and Kalākaua). Six centers offered activities in art and music (Fern, Kalihi Waena, Linapuni, Pu'uhale, Dole, and Kalākaua); and four centers offered cultural or social studies activities (Ka'ewai, 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 sub-grantee met and surpassed this KPI. In Project Year 5, each of the seven KLC centers offered more than one enrichment and support activity.

Findings about the implementation of enrichment and support activities, data provided by five or fewer respondents. Here, we summarize the findings about centers where data were provided by five or fewer respondents. We are reporting findings with those minimal levels of respondents to comply with research practices regarding non-publication of PII. This narrative is an effort to include the full richness of the data about these activities provided by

center staff, contractors, or volunteers. The reader should note that this narrative summarizes the points of view of five or fewer respondents and, therefore, may lack a broad perspective. Additionally, data with these very low levels of respondents may include some social bias to individual's pressure to positively represent their efforts. The reader should note that we had data-collection challenges resulting in very limited time to collect data in Project Year 5 and responses were provided by the staff, contractors, or volunteers who implemented activities at the Fern and Linapuni centers only.

Findings about the implementation of art or music activities suggest that they were implemented at mediocre extent and moderate quality at the Fern center, and high extent and quality at the Linapuni center in Project Year 5. At the Fern center, art or music content was implemented as tutorials, classes, or integrated content. At the Linapuni center, art or music content was implemented as tutorials or integrated content.

Findings about the implementation of telecommunications or technology activities suggest that they were implemented at moderate extent and mediocre quality at the Fern center and moderate extent and quality at the Linapuni center in Project Year 5. At the Fern center, telecommunications or technology activities were implemented in tutorials, classes, or integrated content. At the Linapuni center, telecommunications or technology content was implemented in small group or individual activities.

Findings about the implementation of sports activities suggest that they were implemented at low extent and mediocre quality at the Fern center as tutorials, classes, or integrated activities in Project Year 5.

Findings about the implementation of cultural or social studies activities suggest that they were implemented at mediocre extent and quality in tutorials, classes, or integrated content at the Fern center in Project Year 5.

Findings about the implementation of discussions of appropriate and positive behaviors with students to reinforce positive behaviors suggest that they were implemented at mediocre extent and quality in tutorials, classes, and integrated content at the Fern center in Project Year 5. Discussions and reinforcement of appropriate and positive behaviors were implemented at high extent and quality at the Linapuni center in tutorials, classes, integrated content, and other school-wide efforts at the Linapuni center in Project Year 5.

Findings about the implementation of activities with parents of center attendees suggest that they were implemented at mediocre extent and quality in tutorials and classes at the Fern center in Project Year 5.

There were no reports about implementation of entrepreneurial activities, health or nutrition-related activities, or service learning activities at the KLC centers in Project Year 5.

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 reader should note that we had data-collection challenges resulting in very limited time to collect data in Project Year 5 and responses were provided by the staff, contractors, or volunteers who implemented activities at the Fern and Linapuni centers only. It is likely that efforts were made at the other centers during Project Year 5 to improve positive behaviors.

The Fern and Linapuni centers reported staff discussing appropriate, positive behaviors with students and reinforcing positive behaviors at a mediocre level of extent and quality of implementation at Fern and high extent and quality of implementation at Linapuni.

The Implementation of Community-Based Partnerships

The HIDOE-SPMS 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" (HIDOE-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?" (HIDOE-SPMS, 2011).

The KLC sub-grantee did not meet this KPI in Project Year 5. Three of the centers (Kalihi Waena, Dole Middle, and Kalākaua Middle) reported having community partners. Fern also reported that their center students participated in a school-wide Read Aloud program that was held by a volunteer group for eight weeks, one night per week; and school-wide movie nights that were held by another organization. The listing of community partners for each center are shown in Appendix D. Dole Middle and Kalākaua Middle both continued their partnerships with ASAS and Farrington High School students. In addition, both middle school centers worked with other partners as listed in Appendix D. Dole Middle and Kalākaua Middle partners provided programming or activity-related services, goods or materials, and volunteer or paid staffing. The Kalihi Waena center staff also reported that Common Grace staff mentored center participants and the Police Athletic League (PAL) personnel served as coaches for the various Kalihi Waena

sports activities as well as sponsoring field trips for center participants to attend UHM baseball and football games. The monetary value reported for partners' services ranged from \$1,050 to \$90,672.

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 staffing and to coordinate their center activities. They also welcomed Farrington High School students' continued involvement with their centers. Kalihi Waena also continued its partnership with PAL who provided coaches for their athletic program.

Services to Parents and Other Adult Family Members

The HIDOE-SPMS objective for providing services to parents and other adult family members in 2012–13 is "More than 85% of centers will offer services to parents and other adult family members." The KLC grant proposal includes 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 Project Year 5. The KLC met the HIDOE-SPMS objective in Project Year 5, but not the objectives from the grant proposal. Intentions were to collect data 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 reader should note that we had data-collection challenges resulting in very limited time to collect data in Project Year 5 and responses were provided by the staff, contractors, or volunteers who implemented activities at the Fern and Linapuni centers only. Although we received less than five responses, the only center to provide data (Fern) reported that parents of students who participated in the center also received support/guidance from the center at a mediocre level of extent and quality of implementation. These findings should be viewed with some reservation because of the low number of respondents. However, if findings about activities with family and community members are combined with 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. We gathered information about family and community members' participation in center activities. The activities were open to all community members and were distinct from usual, daily activities in the centers.

All seven centers (100 %) provided opportunities for family members of center students to participate in center-sponsored community events. Some were continuation of activities that were meant to increase community awareness and interest in school activities, such as the sports activities at Kalihi Waena, Dole, and Kalākaua; Robotics at Kalihi Waena and Linapuni; and a sampling of the seven centers' activities at the Kalākaua 'Ohana Fair. Some centers held showcase events at their respective host school locations. At the showcase events, parents and community members were invited to observe what the center students worked on in their enrichment activities. Dole also continued to involve community members with service learning through community clean up and also help with the Special Olympics. Findings to address the goal stated in the grant proposal about activities for each center are shown as Tables E1 through E7 in Appendix E.

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

Kalihi Waena, Linapuni, and Pu'uhale reported implementing their activities as planned. No issues were reported for Fern and Ka'ewai.

Dole Middle and Kalākaua Middle reported issues with recruiting sufficient numbers of staff members to fill positions to implement their planned activities. In the beginning of Project Year 5, staffing at Kalākaua Middle was not stable and it resulted in losing some participants. However, the hiring of a third Activities Coordinator helped to resolve this issue. Both Dole Middle and Kalākaua Middle were also faced with students' preference to engage in non-project activities that are outside of the school campus, but the center staff continued their efforts to recruit students to participate in center activities, especially those students who remained on the school grounds after school hours.

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

Ka'ewai staff reported that, in Project Year 5, focus on science and activities would be valuable to center participants to help improve their test scores. They also reported that activities to promote and establish students' positive relationships with each other and with their teachers

may be valuable in resolving some of the behavior issues. These student-student and student-teacher relationships may promote better understanding among the students and with their teachers. The project leadership understands that the program is too academic-driven. Therefore, they strive to find the staffing as the basis for offering more performing arts activities (that is, art, music, and drama). It was also suggested that participants in one center could possibly participate in another center's activity (e.g. sports) if the activity was not offered at their center.

Kalihi Waena center staff reported that, in the center and the host school, there is a similar emphasis on academics and the GLOs. They also reported that, besides exposing the center participants to competition, their sports activities are whole-child centered which focused on child development (i.e., social, emotional, health/nutrition, community, and etc.).

Pu'uhale center leaders reported that their goal was to improve on reading and mathematics as indicated by the academic enrichment activities offered at their center (Homework Help for grades 2, 3, 4, 5; I-Ready; Imagine Learning; IXL; Kid Biz; Math Tutoring for grades 3, 4; Reading Tutoring for grades 3, 4). They also reported that they wish they could have offered "brain-gym" and cross-over activities that encouraged physical activity.

Dole Middle center leaders reported that the school was in restructuring so the emphasis was on improving the quality of programming during the day. The center focused on improving academics with study hall/homework help continuing to be a standard part of their 21st CCLC program. The project leadership was pleased that the enrichment programs were continued. They regarded service learning projects and career exploration activities as valuable to the center participants.

At Kalākaua Middle, the focus in Project Year 5 was academic performance. The leadership made it mandatory for ELL students to attend tutoring activities before they could participate in fun activities. It was reported that the Drama, Girl Power, and Hip-hop/Dance activities were the most popular activities and that the popularity of an activity may be due to the staff who implemented the activity. That is, if the staff member laid down structure for the activity and students established a positive relationship with a staff member, these features of an activity may have an influence on the popularity of the activity. We also observed that the Girl Power activity appears highly effective for empowering and building confidence in the participating young adolescent girls.

Findings about Project Outcomes

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

The data-sharing agreement was under negotiation at the time that this report was prepared and outcome data (teacher surveys, GLO ratings, semester grades, and HSA scores) could not be collected for Project Year 5. Therefore, we are not able to report any effects, if any, of the KLC program activities to student academic behavior or academic performance.

Dissemination of Results to the Public

At the time this report was written, the HIDOE’s website included a page for the 21st CCLC program at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForStudents/21stCCLC/Pages/default.aspx>. The HIDOE website was in the process of being revamped, and our understanding is that the 21st CCLC program link on this web page will have links to all sub-grantee external evaluation reports.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The reader should note that in Project Year 5 the KLC centers targeted the student populations that aligned with the goals of the 21st CCLC program, “the highest need students.” They also enrolled students recommended by their host day school teachers and counselors to their target population. The KLC centers implemented their programs as planned and as proposed in the grant proposal, except instead of providing tutorials only for those students struggling with the enrichment activities, the tutorials were provided to all students.

We provide a summary of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations in Table 8. However, the reader is urged to read the entire section on conclusions and recommendations which expands to project management. We hope that the recommendations can be considered when preparing a proposal for another 21st CCLC grant beyond the current one which ended after Project Year 5.

For its next 21st CCLC grant, we recommend that the KLC leaders network with each other and other 21st CCLC to find information about best practices. Project leaders may consider visiting another sub-grantee to study organizational features of the sub-grantee and to share best

Table 8*The KLC Evaluation in Project Year 5: Findings, Summary, and Recommendations by Performance Measure*

Performance measure	Objective met or not met in 2012–13	Summary	Recommendations
Implementation objectives			
Enrollment of target groups: students qualified for free- or reduced lunch or students who are English Language Learners	Met	<p>We were not able to collect the databooks to review, analyze, and report participants’ demographics information in this Project Year 5 evaluation report. Therefore, we based participant information on data gathered in the February and March 2013 site visits and communication with center staff. Although we believe these data are accurate, they are not as specific as in previous years. That is, the data that was available at the time of this writing do not include 2012–13 demographics data for the centers, host schools, Farrington complex, and state. However, data for the five-year period 2007–08 through 2011–12 shown on Table 2 about free- and reduced-cost lunch and Table 3 about ELL support the school principals’ and center staff members’ statements in our February and March 2013 site visits that their respective host schools continued to have high percentages of free- and reduced-cost lunch and ELL status populations and in Project Year 5 these students comprised the majority of their center participants.</p>	As recommended in Year 4, if their host schools and centers have high levels of ELL students, the center leaders may want to consider including ELL specialists as center staff for these students in their next 21 st CCLC program.

(Table 8

The KLC Evaluation in Project Year 5: Findings, Summary, and Recommendations by Performance Measure, continued)

Performance measure	Objective met or not met in 2012–13	Summary	Recommendations
Staffing will mainly consist of day teachers or others with equivalent qualifications.	Not met	The majority of center staff/tutors at four of the five elementary centers were day teachers at their respective host schools. Dole Middle and Kalākaua Middle contracted ASAS to implement their activities and none of their staff were day school teachers. However, one of Kalākaua Middle’s staff has a Masters in Education.	The staff with qualifications as a regular teacher should lead the homework help and reading/literacy and mathematics 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.	Could not be determined	All of the KLC centers offered both reading and literacy and mathematics activities. However, the quality of implementing the core activities could not be determined due to the lack of sufficient data gathered.	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. We support and recommend continuing this broader implementation plan for a consistent and sufficient amount of activity time for homework help and tutorials.
2.2. 100% of centers will offer enrichment and support activities such as nutrition and health, art, music, technology, and recreation.	Met	All seven centers offered activities that included between two to four enrichment subject area categories. See Tables 4 and 5 for reference. Six of the centers offered activities that included art or music and health or nutrition contents. The exception was Ka’ewai. Four centers (Ka’ewai, Kalihi Waena, Linapuni, and Pu’uhale) each offered activities with technology or telecommunication. Four centers (Ka’ewai, Pu’uhale, Dole Middle, and Kalākaua Middle) each offered activities with cultural activities or social studies.	The enrichment activities are valuable for students’ enjoyment of learning, application of the content areas in practical situations, and development of global and higher-order thinking. We encourage continuing the emphasis on enrichment activities in KLC’s next 21 st CCLC grant.

(Table 8

The KLC Evaluation in Project Year 5: Findings, Summary, and Recommendations by Performance Measure, continued)

Performance measure	Objective met or not met in 2012–13	Summary	Recommendations
2.3. 85% of centers will establish and maintain partnerships within the community that continues to increase levels of community collaboration in planning, implementing, and sustaining programs.	Not met	The information gathered at the site visits and staff communication indicate that partners were established by four (Fern, Kalihi Waena, Dole Middle, and Kalākaua Middle) of the seven centers.	In the next 21 st CCLC grant we urge all KLC centers to establish and maintain partnerships with community organizations to increase program sustainability. We also urge center staff to report all partners they have established.
2.4. 85% of centers will offer services to parents, senior citizens, and other adult community members.	Met	The data gathered relate to events that provided opportunities for family members and the community to increase their awareness and interest in school activities, involvement with the school in service learning, and involvement in school showcase events. All seven centers (100%) provided opportunities for family members of center students and other community members to participate in center-sponsored events. Some were continuation of activities that were meant to increase community awareness and interest in school activities, such as the sports activities at Kalihi Waena, Dole, and Kalākaua; robotics at Kalihi Waena and Linapuni; and a sampling of the seven centers' activities at the Kalākaua 'Ohana Fair. Some centers held showcase events at their respective host school locations where parents and community members were invited to observe what the center students worked on in their enrichment activities.	If budget and staffing resources allow and parents are able to work into their schedule to attend, having parents attend tutoring/ homework help activities together with their children could be beneficial. Parents could be introduced and become familiar with the tools (e.g. reading and math computer programs that are accessible on home computers) that their children use in the activities so that they can assist them at home.

(Table 8

The KLC Evaluation in Project Year 5: Findings, Summary, and Recommendations by Performance Measure, continued)

Performance measure	Objective met or not met in 2012–13	Summary	Recommendations
2.5. 75% of centers will offer services at least 15 hours per week on average and provide services when school is not in session, such as during summer and holidays.	Not met	Three of the four centers (Fern, Kalihi Waena, and Pu‘uhale) who were open during the summer of 2012, provided at least 15 hours of services per week. Linapuni was slightly below the target, providing 14 hours of service per week. During SY 2012–13, three of the seven centers (Pu‘uhale, Dole Middle, and Kalākaua Middle) provided at least 15 hours of services to participants per week. Kalihi Waena provided 14 hours of services per week, just slightly below the 15 hours target.	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	Data reviewed for the five-year period 2007–08 through 2011–12 shown on Table 2 about free- and reduced-cost lunch support the school principals’ and center staff members’ statements in our February and March 2013 site visits that their respective host schools continued to have high percentages of free- and reduced-cost lunch status populations and in Project Year 5 these students comprised the majority of their center participants.	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.	N/A	This is a KLC objective stated in the Year 3 report. However, at the time of this report was prepared no data could be collected to determine whether or not the goal was met.	We recommend carrying this goal into the next grant. Research of 21 st CCLC programs across the U.S. 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 in their next grant.

(Table 8

The KLC Evaluation in Project Year 5: Findings, Summary, and Recommendations by Performance Measure, continued)

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

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

practices for implementing academic and enrichment activities as well as how to improve on their data collection process and instruments.

As in the Project Year 4 evaluation report, we recommend that, in the next grant, the KLC leaders consider creating a grantee-level position (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 host school 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 diagnostic/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 assessments that align with the assessments used in the host schools. 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 also urge project leaders in the next grant to add pre-post test scores in reading or Language Arts and mathematics that are given in the centers' host schools to the evaluation. 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 echo a recommendation from the previous year. We remind sub-grantee leaders to continue efforts to develop the academic components of the enrichment activities. Our experience with this sub-grantee is that they have invested considerable efforts into providing activities for high-need students. Services to these target groups should be continued during sustainability efforts or considered for future grant writing. 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 the program in their next grant to address the needs of their high-need 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. (2012a). *School Accountability: School Status & Improvement Report*. Retrieved August 20, 2013 from:
<http://arch.k12.hi.us/school/ssir/ssir.html>
- Hawai‘i Department of Education. (2012b). *Trend Report: Educational and Fiscal Accountability*. Retrieved September 9, 2013 from:
<http://arch.k12.hi.us/school/trends/trends.html>
- Hawai‘i Department of Education-Special Programs Management Section. (2012). *21st CCLC program: Evaluation report template*. Honolulu, HI: author.
- Hawai‘i Department of Education-Special Programs Management Section. (2010). *Key performance indicators: 21st Century Community Learning Centers, 2010–2011*. Honolulu, HI: author.
- Higa, T. F., Sagaysay, L., Oshiro, E., & Nakamura, A. (2013). *An Evaluation Report about the Farrington Subgrantee Kalihi Consortium’s 21st Century Community Learning Center Project: Farrington Complex, Honolulu District, O‘ahu*. Honolulu, Hawaii: Curriculum Research & Development Group, College of Education, University of Hawaii.
- 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

Description of Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented at the Kalihi Learning Centers in Project Year 5 (the Summer of 2012 through SY 2012–13)

Table A1
Fern Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 5^a

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 2012 activities							
Math and Reading Tutoring / Kindercamp	Summer	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	Number of students per day = N/A ^a	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics	Tutoring		5 weeks, 5 days per week, 4 hours per day
School Year 2012–13 activities							
Reading and Math Tutoring/ Homework Help	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	Number of students per day = N/A ^a	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics	Tutoring	Homework help	25 weeks, 3 days per week, 1 hour per day
Enrichment Activities ^b	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	Number of students per day = N/A ^a	•Reading or literacy •Arts and music •Health or nutrition	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	25 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day

^aThe data provided on this table is based on information gathered from the February 2013 site visit to the center. A data-sharing agreement was not fully executed at the time of writing this report so the evaluator was not cleared to receive data with FERPA information and PII.

^bEnrichment activities include: Hip Hop Dance; Writing/Drama.

Table A2*Ka‘ewai Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 5^a*

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 2012–13 activities ¹							
Math and Reading Tutoring	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	20 students per day ^a	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Technology or telecommunications	Tutoring	Homework help	24 weeks, 2 days per week, 2 hours per day
Computer Lab/Social/Hard Science Enrichment	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	24 students per day ^a	•Reading or literacy •Science •Technology or telecommunications	Academic enrichment learning program	Tutoring	24 weeks, 2 days per week, 2 hours per day

^aThe data provided on this table is based on information gathered from the February 2013 site visit to the center. During our site visit the student attendance for the corresponding activities were: Math and Reading Tutoring = 9 students; KidBiz-Geometry = 11; Science/Math Tutoring = 8 students; Social/Hard Science Enrichment = 16. A data-sharing agreement was not fully executed at the time of writing this report so the evaluator was not cleared to receive data with FERPA information and PII.

Table A3*Kalihi Waena Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 5^a*

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 2012 activities							
Tutoring	Summer	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	Number of students per day = N/A ^a	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics	Tutoring	Homework help	4 weeks, 5 days per week, 4 hours per day
Summer 2012 Enrichment Activities ^b	Summer	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	Number of students per day = N/A ^a	•Health or nutrition	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	4 weeks, 5 days per week, 4 hours per day
School Year 2012–13 activities							
Tutoring / Study Hall	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	26 students per day ^c	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Science	Tutoring	Homework help	41 weeks, 5 days per week, 1 hour per day
Enrichment Activities ^d	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	Number of students per day = N/A ^a	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Science •Arts or music •Technology or telecommunications •Health or nutrition	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	41 weeks, 6 days per week, 1.5 hours per day

^aThe data provided on this table is based on information gathered from the February 2013 site visit to the center. A data-sharing agreement was not fully executed at the time of writing this report so the evaluator was not cleared to receive data with FERPA information and PII.

^bSummer 2012 enrichment activities include: Baseball, Basketball, Cheerleading, Robotics, and Volleyball.

^cSchool Year 2012–13: During our site visit the student attendance for the corresponding activities were: Study Hall = 10; Tutoring = 16

^dSchool Year 2012–13 enrichment activities include: Baseball; Basketball; Cheerleading; Dance Club; Football; Robotics; Science Club; Soccer; and Volleyball. During our site visit the student attendance for the Dance Club activity was 12 students.

Table A4*Linapuni Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 5^a*

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 2012 activities							
Reading and Math Transitional/ Instructional Classes	Summer	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	Number of students per day = N/A ^a	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics	Tutoring		4 weeks, 4 days per week, 3.13 hours per day
Enrichment Activities ^b	Summer	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	Number of students per day = N/A ^a	•Science •Arts and music •Technology or telecommunications •Cultural activities or social studies •Health or nutrition	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	4 weeks, 2 days per week, 0.75 hour per day
School Year 2012–13 activities							
Math and Reading Tutoring ^c	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	Number of students per day = N/A ^a	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Technology or telecommunications	Tutoring	Homework help	32 weeks, 5 days per week, 1 hour per day
Enrichment Activities ^d	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	Number of students per day = N/A ^a	•Science •Arts and music •Technology or telecommunications •Health or nutrition	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	32 weeks, 4 days per week, 1 hour per day

^aThe data provided on this table is based on information gathered from the February 2013 site visit to the center. A data-sharing agreement was not fully executed at the time of writing this report so the evaluator was not cleared to receive data with FERPA information and PII.

^bSummer 2012 Enrichment activities include: Literacy integrated with music/drama/cooking; Science/Lego Program.

^cSchool Year 2012–13 Tutoring activities include: Facts Games on iPad; Literacy integrated w/Music/Art/Drama; Tutorial Math & Rdg. Games on iPad

^dSchool Year 2012–13 Enrichment activities include: Organized Games; Robotics (Lego club).

Table A5*Pu'uhale Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 5^a*

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 2012 activities							
Tutoring / Transition to K / Jumpstart to 5 / Jumpstart for ELL	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	Number of students per day = N/A ^a	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Technology or telecommunications	Tutoring		2 weeks, 5 days per week, 5 hours per day
Jumpstart to Panther Productions	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	Number of students per day = N/A ^a	•Reading or literacy •Technology or telecommunications	Academic enrichment learning program		2 weeks, 3 days per week, 5 hours per day
School Year 2012–13 activities							
Homework Club / Tutoring ^b	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	Number of students per day = N/A ^a	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Technology or telecommunications	Homework help	Tutoring	27 weeks, 5 days per week, 1 hour per day
Enrichment Activities ^c	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	Number of students per day = N/A ^a	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Arts and music •Technology or telecommunications •Cultural activities or social studies •Health or nutrition	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	27 weeks, 5 days per week, 2 hours per day

^aThe data provided on this table is based on information gathered from the March 2013 site visit to the center. A data-sharing agreement was not fully executed at the time of writing this report so the evaluator was not cleared to receive data with FERPA information and PII.

^bSchool Year 2012–13 Homework Club/Tutoring activities include: Homework Help–Grades 2, 3, 4, 5; I-Ready; Imagine Learning; IXL; Kid Biz; Math Tutoring–Grades 3, 4; Reading Tutoring – Grades 3, 4

^cSchool Year 2012–13 Enrichment activities include: Art; Book Club; Choir; Hip-hop; Hula–Tahitian; Panther production news cast; Sports; Student Council; Ukulele

Table A6
Dole Middle: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 5^a

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 2012–13 activities							
Homework / Study Hall	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	130 students per day ^c	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Mathematics 	Homework help	Tutoring	35 weeks, 5 days per week, 1 hour per day
Enrichment Activities ^b	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	130 students per day ^c	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Arts and music •Cultural activities or social studies •Health or nutrition 	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	35 weeks, 5 days per week, 2 hours per day

^aThe data provided on this table is based on information gathered from the February 2013 site visit to the center. A data-sharing agreement was not fully executed at the time of writing this report so the evaluator was not cleared to receive data with FERPA information and PII

^bSchool Year 2012–13 Enrichment activities include: Basketball (Junior/Advanced); Cooking; Football; Girl Sports (Junior League) with Girl Power; Kickball-Field Ball; Martial Arts; Music-Ukulele; Taiko/Lion Dance; Yoga

^cSchool Year 2012–13 student per day count is based on information gathered at the February 2013 site visit meeting.

Table A7*Kalākaua Middle: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 5^a*

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 2012–13 activities							
Homework / Study Hall	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	Number of students per day = N/A ^a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Science •Arts and music 	Homework help	Tutoring	36 weeks, 5 days per week, 1 hours per day
Enrichment Activities ^b	School year	Greatest need, F/R Lunch, ELL students	Number of students per day = N/A ^a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Science •Arts and music •Cultural activities or social studies •Health or nutrition 	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	36 weeks, 5 days per week, 2 hours per day

^aThe data provided on this table is based on information gathered from the March 2013 site visit to the center. A data-sharing agreement was not fully executed at the time of writing this report so the evaluator was not cleared to receive data with FERPA information and PII

^bSchool Year 2012–13 Enrichment activities include: Arts & Crafts; Basketball (Boys/Girls); Chorus/Drama; Dance/Hip-hop; Field Sports; Football; Girls Club; Girl Power; Healthy Living; Soccer; Sports Pack; Volleyball

Appendix B

**Summary of Respondents' Comments about the
Implementation of Core Academic Activities in Project Year 5
(the Summer of 2012 through SY 2012–13)**

Table B1*The Farrington Sub-grantee in Project Year 5: Consolidated Comments About the Implementation of Core Academic Activities*

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
<i>i1.</i> receive assistance to address their individual needs (e.g., low achievement, LEP, SpEd, behavioral) for improving academic performance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Did not have enough time to give the lower achievement students individual attention. •Limited number of students serviced due to limited hours of school
<i>i2.</i> participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in reading/literacy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Some students dropped out, frequents absences and tardies hampered their improvement. •Due to the different grade levels serviced (K-1), lessons had to be adapted to the different grade levels and classes.
<i>i3.</i> participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in mathematics.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •same as above [Some students dropped out, frequents absences and tardies hampered their improvement.] •Integration of math activities was limited due to time constraints and the varying levels of the students.
<i>i4.</i> participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in science.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •All students received instruction in science and participated in the activities.

Appendix C

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

Table C1

The Farrington sub-grantee in Project Year 5: Consolidated Comments About the Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
<i>i5.</i> participate in art and/or music activities	No comments provided.
<i>i6.</i> participate in entrepreneurial education activities (business ventures).	No comments provided.
<i>i7.</i> participate in telecommunications and technology education activities.	No comments provided.
<i>i8.</i> participate in sports activities (e.g., basketball, baseball, football, swimming).	No comments provided.
<i>i9.</i> participate in cultural activities/social studies activities.	No comments provided.
<i>i10.</i> participate in health/nutrition-related activities.	No comments provided.
<i>i11.</i> participate in service learning activities (service activities in the school or local community).	No comments provided.
<i>i12.</i> CLC staff discuss appropriate, positive behavior with students and reinforce positive behaviors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Appropriate behaviors were more challenging for students who had never attended our school previously or had not attended school at all.

Appendix D

Kalihi Learning Centers' Community Partners in Project Year 5 (the Summer of 2012 through SY 2012–13)

Table D1*Fern Elementary: Community Partners in Project Year 5*

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Monetary value of contribution	Subcontractor?
-----------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------

- A school-wide Read Aloud program that was held by a volunteer group for eight weeks, one night per week. The group also provided pizza to participants.
- School-wide movie nights that were held by another volunteer group.

Note: It was reported at the February 2013 site visit that, during Year 5, 21st CCLC students participated in the above events held by volunteer groups.

Table D2*Ka'ewai Elementary: Community Partners in Project Year 5*

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Monetary value of contribution	Subcontractor
-----------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------

None

Note: It was reported at the February 2013 site visit that this center did not have any community partners during Year 5.

Table D3*Kalihi Waena Elementary: Community Partners in Project Year 5*

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Monetary value of contribution	Subcontractor?
-----------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------

- Police Athletic League (PAL) provided volunteer staffing/coaches and sponsored field trips for center participants to attend University of Hawaii baseball and football games.
- Common Grace mentored center participants.

Note: The above information were reported at the February 2013 site visit.

Table D4*Linapuni Elementary: Community Partners in Project Year 5*

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Monetary value of contribution	Subcontractor?
-----------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------

None

Note: It was reported at the February 2013 site visit that this center did not have any community partners during Year 5.

Table D5

Pu'uhale Elementary: Community Partners in Project Year 5

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Monetary value of contribution	Subcontractor?
None				

Note: It was reported at the March 2013 site visit that this center did not have any community partners during Year 5.

Table D6*Dole Middle: Community Partners in Project Year 5*

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"> •\$18,800 donated contribution •\$90,672 subcontract 	yes
Farrington High School Junior ROTC	Public School	No additional information about this partner was gathered during the February 2013 site visit		
Hawai'i Sargeants Majors Association (U.S. Army)	Nationally Affiliated Non-Profit Agency-Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Funding or raised funds 	\$1,800	no
Junior League of Honolulu	Nationally Affiliated Non-Profit Agency-Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Volunteer staffing 	\$1,050	no
Special Olympics Hawai'i	Nationally Affiliated Non-Profit Agency-Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Volunteer staffing •Funding or raised funds •Transportation, housing, and meals 	\$4,300	no
Wyld Life – Young Life	Faith-based organization	No additional information about this partner was gathered during the February 2013 site visit		

Note: The above list of Dole Middle partners were noted in the February 2013 site visit to the center.

Table D7*Kalākaua Middle: Community Partners in Project Year 5*

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Monetary value of contribution	Subcontractor?
2 nd Steps ^a	Community-based organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Volunteer staffing 	\$2,000	no
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"> •\$18,800 donated contribution •\$90,672 subcontract 	yes
Farrington HS students		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Volunteer staffing^b 		
Uplink ^c				
YMCA Outreach Counselor	Nationally Affiliated Non-Profit Agency-YMCA/YWCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Volunteer staffing 	\$8,000	no

Note: The above list of Kalākaua Middle partners were noted in the March 2013 site visit to the center.

^aThe additional information for 2nd Steps and YMCA Outreach Counselor was submitted by the center on completed Community Partnership forms.

^bTwo to six Farrington HS students volunteer to help out with various activities every day (e.g. the dance-hip-hop activity). No additional information about this partner was gathered during the March 2013 site visit.

^cNo additional information about this partner was gathered during the March 2013 site visit.

Table D8*Kalihi Learning Center Sub-grantee Community Partners in Project Year 5*

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

Appendix E

Findings about the Implementation of Family and Community Involvement Activities in Project Year 5 (the Summer of 2012 through SY 2012–13)

Table E1*Fern Elementary: Family and Community Involvement Events in Project Year 5*

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 2012–13 Family and Community Involvement Events				
Kalākaua ‘Ohana Fair	School year	•Support for 21st CCLC students in KLC enrichment events	No additional information were collected for this activity.	

Table E2*Ka‘ewai Elementary: Family and Community Involvement Events in Project Year 5*

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 2012–13 Family and Community Involvement Events				
Kalākaua ‘Ohana Fair	School year	•Support for 21st CCLC students in KLC enrichment events	No additional information were collected for this activity.	
Science Fair	School year	No additional information was gathered for this event.	No additional information were collected for this activity.	

Table E3*Kalihi Waena Elementary: Family and Community Involvement Events in Project Year 5*

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 2012 Family and Community Involvement Events				
Baseball Game Days	Summer 2012	•Support for 21st CCLC students in sports events	No additional information were collected for this activity.	
School Year 2012–13 Family and Community Involvement Events				
Basketball Game Days	School year	•Support for 21st CCLC students in sports events	No additional information were collected for this activity.	
Football Game Days	School year	•Support for 21st CCLC students in sports events	No additional information were collected for this activity.	
Kalākaua ‘Ohana Fair	School year	•Support for 21st CCLC students in KLC enrichment events	No additional information were collected for this activity.	
Robotics Competition	School year	•Support for 21st CCLC students in KLC enrichment events	No additional information were collected for this activity.	

Table E4*Linapuni Elementary: Family and Community Involvement Events in Project Year 5*

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 2012–13 Family and Community Involvement Events				
LEGO Robotics	School year	•Support for 21st CCLC students in KLC enrichment events	6 students	6 parent/adult family members
Kalākaua ‘Ohana Fair	School year	•Support for 21st CCLC students in KLC enrichment events	No additional information were collected for this activity.	

Table E5*Pu‘uhale Elementary: Family and Community Involvement Events in Project Year 5*

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 2012–13 Family and Community Involvement Events				
Family Night (End of the Year)	School year	•Support for 21st CCLC students in KLC enrichment events	No additional information were collected for this activity.	
Kalākaua ‘Ohana Fair	School year	•Support for 21st CCLC students in KLC enrichment events	No additional information were collected for this activity.	
Pu‘uhale Elementary A+ Fair	School year	•Support for 21st CCLC students in KLC enrichment events	No additional information were collected for this activity.	

Table E6*Dole Middle: Family and Community Involvement Events in Project Year 5*

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 2012–13 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 	No additional information were collected for this activity.	
Culminating Events (December, May)	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 	No additional information were collected for this activity.	
Kalākaua ‘Ohana Fair	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Support for 21st CCLC students in KLC enrichment events 	No additional information were collected for this activity.	
Parent Orientation (July/August)	School year		No additional information were collected for this activity.	
Special Olympics	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Support students participating in Special Olympics 	No additional information were collected for this activity.	
Sports showdown	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Support students in a sports competition with the other After-School All-Stars sites 	No additional information were collected for this activity.	

Table E7*Kalākaua Middle: Family and Community Involvement Events in Project Year 5*

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 2012–13 Family and Community Involvement Events				
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 	No additional information were collected for this activity.	
Kalākaua ‘Ohana Fair	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Support for 21st CCLC students in KLC enrichment events 	No additional information were collected for this activity.	
Sports showdown	School year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Support students in a sports competition with the other After-School All-Stars sites 	No additional information were collected for this activity.	