

**An Evaluation Report about the KALO Sub-
grantee 21st Century Community Learning
Centers in Project Year 2**

**Kanu O Ka Aina Learning Ohana (KALO)
Kamuela, Hawai'i**

**A report submitted to the
Hawai'i Department of Education Community Engagement
Office
for the period May 31, 2016 to May 26, 2017**

Andrea (Nani) Ippel Barretto, Nancy Levenson, Te Benioni

February 2018

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This evaluation report is about the KALO sub-grantee's 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) project, which was in Year 2 of five years of funding during the period from summer of 2016 through spring of 2017. During this period, the KALO sub-grantee included 5 centers across 3 islands whose activities were implemented on the campuses of their respective host schools of Hakipu'u Learning Center Public Charter School (PCS), Halau Ku Mana PCS; Kanu o ka Aina PCS; Kawaikini PCS; and, Ke Kula 'o Samuel M. Kamakau PCS. During the summer of 2016, Kanu o ka Aina PCS was the only center that provided activities. By the end of the 2016-17 school year, all five centers were delivering afterschool programming. A total of 374 students in Kindergarten through Grade 12 participated in KALO sub-grantee center activities during Year 2.

The purpose of this evaluation was to fulfill the annual state and federal evaluation requirements and to provide information to the sub-grantee stakeholders about the project implementation for project improvement as a basis for decision-making to improve services to project participants.

In Year 2, the KALO sub-grantee project leaders and staff met the modified program objectives of:

1. To hire and train program staff on the overall program goal and objectives
2. To develop support materials and resources
3. To recruit participants and implement at least one afterschool activity
4. To collect and maintain accurate enrollment and participant data
5. To create and use an APR data collection instrument

In Year 2, the KALO sub-grantee project leaders and staff did not assess the extent to which they may have met the implementation performance measures set by the Hawai'i State Department of Education Special Programs Management Section (HIDOE-SPMS). Among others, this is a primary recommendation for Year 3.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Origin of the Program

The 21st CCLC sub-grantee, Kanu o ka 'Aina Learning 'Ohana (KALO), is a 501(c)3 organization that works with its partners to establish an autonomous, holistic, education environment for the children of Hawai'i: grounding every child and adult in the values that have shaped and empowered Hawaiians for generations; involving every member of the Hawaiian community in determining his/her educational path and preparing every child of Hawai'i to thrive in the modern world, free from oppression and with pride for our heritage. As a voice for evidence-based reform, KALO administers funding to Hawaiian-focused charter schools (HFCS) across Hawaii and promotes policies and practices that strengthen organizations to create innovative models of education for perpetuating Hawaiian culture.

Using 21st CCLC funds, KALO began administering after-school programming to five schools across three islands during the 2016/2017 school year: Hakipu'u Learning Center (4-12) on O'ahu; Halau Ku Mana (6-12) on O'ahu; Kanu o ka Aina (K-12) on Hawai'i Island; Kawaikini (K-12) on Kaua'i; and, Ke Kula 'o Samuel M. Kamakau (K-12) on O'ahu. Schools were invited to participate based on their higher than average rates of Free & Reduced Lunch-eligibility, being one of Hawai'i's lowest performing schools according to STRIVE HI results, and due to their struggle with poor graduation rates.

Goals of the Program

The overall goal of this project is for KALO to provide high quality afterschool programming for students and their families, imbued in culture-based education and designed to impact academic performance in math, college and career readiness, and socio-emotional well-being. To achieve that goal, KALO spent Project Year 2 creating and putting into place systems and mechanisms whereby program staff at each of the five sites, and the program director, could plan for, implement, and assess afterschool programming effectively and efficiently. According to KALO, a bottom-up, organic ("learn-as-we-go") approach to program planning and implementation gave them and their site coordinators (SC) the autonomy and flexibility needed to design and carry out activities that were relevant to their individual school communities.

Program objectives for this reporting period included:

1. To hire and train program staff on the overall program goal and objectives

2. To develop support materials and resources
3. To recruit participants and implement at least one afterschool activity
4. To collect and maintain accurate enrollment and participant data
5. To create and use an APR data collection instrument

Participants

Afterschool programming was made available to all students who attended school during the 2016-2017 school year, regardless of age, socioeconomic status, experience, special needs, and ability level. The school year ran from August 1, 2016 to May 26, 2017. Overall, 374 students across five sites participated at some level in at least one afterschool activity during the 2016/17 school year. Of those, 47.3% were male (48.7% were female; and, 4.0% were not reported); 45.7% were eligible for free &/or reduced lunch; 0.3% had limited English Language Proficiency; and, 6.1 percent had special needs.

Hakipu'u Learning Center PCS on O'ahu delivered afterschool programming to 28 4th to 12 grade students (n=3 4/5th graders and n=25 6-12th graders). Of those, 32.1% were male (25.0% female, 42.9% not reported); 46.6% were of Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander descent (3.6% White, 3.6% Hispanic/Latino, 3.6% American Indian, 42.9% did not indicate); 28.6% were eligible for free and/or reduced lunch; no one had limited English Language Proficiency; and, 17.9 percent had special needs.

Halau Ku Mana PCS on O'ahu delivered afterschool programming to 43 students in grades 6-12. Of those, 53.5% were male; 83.7% were of Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander descent (9.3% White, 4.7% Asian); 30.2% were eligible for free and/or reduced lunch; nobody had limited English Language Proficiency; and, 18.6 percent had special needs.

Kanu o ka Aina PCS on Hawai'i Island delivered afterschool programming to 127 PS-12 students (n=77 PS-5 and n=50 6-12). Of those, 56.7% were male (40.9% female); 56.7% were of Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander descent (22.8% White, 11% 2 or more races); 47.2% were eligible for free and/or reduced lunch; no one had limited English Language Proficiency; and, 6.3 percent had special needs.

Kawaikini PCS on Kaua'i delivered afterschool programming to 85 students in grades K to 5. Of those, 47.7% were male; 93.0% were of Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander descent (5.8% White, 1.2% Asian); 57.0% were eligible for free and/or reduced lunch; nobody had limited English Language Proficiency; and, 2.3 percent had special needs.

Ke Kula 'o Samuel M. Kamakau PCS on Oahu delivered afterschool programming to 91 students in grades K to 12 (n=65 K-5 and n=26 6-12). Of those, 35.9% were male; 92.3% were of Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander descent (7.7% Asian); 44.6% were eligible for free and/or reduced lunch; and, nobody had limited English Language Proficiency or had special needs.

Kanu o ka Aina PCS was the only site to administer a summer 2016 program. However, no participant data was collected.

Characteristics of Program Materials and Resources

Program staff at KALO, including the Program Director (PD), developed numerous materials that would help guide site coordinators during their first year of planning and programming, including a Staff Handbook, a Parent Handbook, recruitment materials (flyers, letters), enrollment forms, new activity forms, descriptions of sample programs, student exit surveys, and monitoring forms. The Staff Handbook outlines in detail the program's goals and objectives, quality standards and expectations, descriptions of sample academic and enrichment activities to consider, and other administrative policies. Once SC's and school principals became familiar with these materials, the program director visited each of the sites and held an orientation session so that program objectives, timelines, and data collection procedures could be discussed, along with any questions and/or concerns.

Prior to the start of the school year, school administrators and/or SC's were asked to talk to school-day teachers, students and parents about what they were looking for in an afterschool program, what was already available, and what students needed most. The result was a list of need areas that ranged from homework support (for students and parents), *malama 'aina* (environmental stewardship) to school gardening and hip-hop classes. Based on this list and prior to implementation, SC's were asked to submit

a New Activity Form (see Appendix X) to the program director, describing the proposed activity and participants, timeline, and budget. The New Activity Form also served as a planning tool for the SC's. Upon approval from the PD, SC's recruited and enrolled participants and administered the activity as planned.

Staff and Other Personnel Involvement

Three KALO employees were active in the program: Ms. Nancy Levenson, Director of Compliance; Mr. Te Benioni, Project Director (1.00 FTE), Stasia Nauka, Admin Support (.25 FTE). KALO also employed a site coordinator for each of the sites: Stasia Nauka (Kanu o ka Aina PCS) (0.75 FTE); Ramsey Soto (Halau Ku Mana PCS) (0.75 FTE); Noe Haumea (Kawaikini PCS) (0.75 FTE); Hau'oli Waiiau (Kamakau PCS) (0.75 FTE); and, Zoe Reusser (Hakipu'u PCS) (0.75 FTE). Andrea (Nani) Barretto served as the external evaluator on the project for Year 2.

Each SC was responsible for hiring the staff needed to carry out the proposed activities. Total number of personnel hired across all sites included: college students (3 paid) (1 volunteer), community members (2 paid) (4 volunteers), high school students (1 paid) (6 volunteers), parents (2 volunteers), school day teachers (9 paid) (7 volunteers), other non-teaching school staff (1 paid) (1 volunteer), subcontracted staff (6 paid) (3 volunteers), and other individuals (1 paid) (9 volunteers).

Program monitoring was conducted monthly via a monthly monitoring survey that was administered to SC's at the beginning of every month to reflect programming and attendance from the previous month. Information gathered included: current programming (activity description, day and time), number of participants, new activities administered the previous month, family engagement activities conducted the previous month, description of any new community partnerships that were forged the previous month, challenges encountered the previous month, successes encountered the previous month, any concerns and/or questions that respondents have for KALO, and uploaded documentation (updated programs calendar, new lesson plans, flyer for a family night, etc) that supported what programs were conducted the previous month.

EVALUATION DESIGN AND RESULTS

Purpose of the Evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation was to fulfill the annual state and federal evaluation requirements and to provide information to the sub-grantee stakeholders about the project implementation for project improvement as a basis for decision-making to improve services to project participants. To address the purpose of the evaluation, KALO staff, along with the external evaluator, collected student data in the form of attendance and demographics; descriptive data about center activities, center operations, and center staffing; and, other data relevant to the implementation of afterschool activities to participants and their families.

It's important to note that an outcomes evaluation was not conducted for this reporting period. According to KALO staff, this was because the focus of year 2 was to meet the modified objectives that were needed to get afterschool programming planned and delivered. These modified objectives are listed below.

Implementation Evaluation Plan

The main implementation evaluation was designed to assess the extent to which the following Year 2 program objectives were met:

- To hire and train program staff on the overall program goal and objectives
- To develop support materials and resources
- To recruit participants and implement at least one afterschool activity
- To collect and maintain accurate enrollment and participant data, and
- To create and use an APR data collection instrument

Data about implementation were collected with the following methods: (a) an evaluator-developed online questionnaire which was administered monthly to SC's; and, (b) an evaluator-developed spreadsheet that was designed to collect data about student attendance and demographics.

Evaluation Schedule

Monthly monitoring forms were developed in January 2017 and were then programmed into Survey Monkey after PD approval. Starting in early February 2017, SC's were sent emails during the first week of every month with a reminder to complete the web-based survey at their earliest convenience. An attendance

spreadsheet was also created during this period. All SC's were asked to collect and maintain attendance on these spreadsheets throughout the remainder of the school year.

Results of the Implementation Evaluation

KALO personnel, including the PD, Director of Compliance, and the evaluator, spent the first semester of the 2016/17 school year developing the following support materials and resources (deliverables):

Deliverable	Description
Staff Handbook	Project goal & objectives, program personnel, quality standards and expectations, administrative expectations, personnel policies (commitment, staffing requirements, application process, criminal history hiring policy, conflict of interest, confidentiality requirements, confidential student data, grievances, attendance policy for staff and students, dismissal procedures, behavior policy, staff dress code, timesheets, transportation of students), family involvement, program calendar, student recruitment, connecting to schools, core academic focus, college & career readiness, enrichment activities, snacks and allowable food items, budget, health and safety
Parent & Student Handbook	Introduction to program, locations and site coordinators, hours of operation, inclement weather, intercessions, family involvement, educational philosophy, enrollment, attendance policy, absences, dismissal procedures, behavior policy, health & safety, emergency procedures, security, media release
New Activity Form	Site information, name of activity, brief description of activity, describe process for ensuring that the activity is aligned with and supports school day learning, describe

	any structured opportunities for acknowledging student achievements, frequency of activity, length of activity, proposed number of students, proposed number of staff, activity type (aligned with APR categories), itemized budget, signature of SC and principal
Activity Close Out Form	Site information, name of activity, describe any changes that were made to the proposed activity, describe what you learned from planning and carrying out the activity, actual start and end dates, actual number of students impacted, actual number of staff used to carry out activity, actual grade levels of impacted students, financial report (project vs actual costs), signatures of SC and principal
Recruitment flyers and/or posters	See Appendix for a sample flyer
Registration/Enrollment Forms	See Appendix for the standardized enrollment form

By the end of the reporting period, every site had a SC that had been hired and trained by KALO personnel. SC's planned for and began delivering afterschool activities at different time points throughout the school year.

Site	Date that SC was hired	Date where afterschool programming began
Hakipu'u Learning Center	January 2017	February 2017
Halau Ku Mana	December 2016	February 2017
Kanu o ka Aina	June 2016	June 2016
Kawaikini	January 2017	
Kamakau	September 2016	October 2016

The following table outlines the afterschool programs and activities that were delivered to participants and their families during the school year 2016-17 at each of the centers. In addition to the name of the activity, the frequency, length, and average number of participants is also listed.

Hakipuu PCS				
Name of Activity	Topic Area	Frequency	Length	Average Number of Participants
Tech Sciences	Technology	Twice per week	1-2 hours per session	3
Pr.I.D.E.	Project-based learning	Twice per week	1-2 hours per session	1
Music Club	Enrichment	Weekly	1-2 hours	5
Art Club	Enrichment	Twice per week	1-2 hours	13
Homework Help	Academic help	Twice per week	1-2 hours	7
Book Club	Academic literacy	Twice per week	1-2 hours	3

Halau Ku Mana PCS				
Name of Activity	Topic Area	Frequency	Length	Average Number of Participants
Aftercare	Academic and enrichment	Daily	2 – 3.5 hours	5-10

Kanu o ka Aina PCS				
Name of	Topic Area	Frequency	Length	Average

Activity				Number of Participants
Keiki Care	Academic & enrichment, including homework help	Daily	2-4 hours	21-30
Cirque Ohana	Enrichment activities centered around circus fun	Weekly	2-4 hours	11-20
Gardening	Community & service learning	Twice per week	1-2 hours	5-10
Book/Movie Club	Literacy	Weekly	1-2 hours	5-10
Study Hall	Academic homework help	Four times per week	1-2 hours	5-10
Basketball	Physical education	Twice per week	2-4 hours	5-10

Kawaikini PCS				
Name of Activity	Topic Area	Frequency	Length	Average Number of Participants
Aftercare	Academic, including homework	Daily	2-4 hours	>30

	help			
--	------	--	--	--

Kamakau PCS				
Name of Activity	Topic Area	Frequency	Length	Average Number of Participants
Strategy	STEM	Weekly	1-2 hours per session	11-20
Math & Science 7-12	STEM	Three times per week	< 1 hour	< 5
Hawaiian Language 7-12	Literacy	Two times per week	1-2 hours	< 5
English 7-12	English Learners Support	Twice per week	< 1 hour	< 5
Art Club K-12	Arts & Music	Weekly	1-2 hours	11-20
Study Hall 5-12	Homework help	Twice per week	1-2 hours	5-10
Study Hall 1-4	Homework help	Twice per week	1-2 hours	5-10
Zumba K-12	Physical activity	Weekly	1-2 hours	>30
Reading 5-6	Literacy	Weekly	<1 hour	>30
Math 5-6	STEM	Weekly	<1 hour	5-10
Hawaiian language 7-12	Literacy	Three times per week	<1 hour	<5
Hawaiian language 3-4	Literacy	Weekly	1-2 hours	<5

Math & Science 3-4	STEM	Weekly	1-2 hours	<5
Kaula K-12	Community & service learning	Weekly	1-2 hours	11-20
Mo'olelo K-12	Literacy	Weekly	1-2 hours	11-20
Photography K-12	Arts & Music	Weekly	1-2 hours	21-30
Kui Ka Lono	Community & service learning	Once per term	>4 hours	11-20
Spring Break Art 1-4	Arts & Music	Once per term	>4 hours	5-10
Spring Break Math 1-2	STEM	Once per term	>4 hours	5-10
Spring Break 5-6	STEM	Once per term	<4 hours	5-10

SC's were encouraged to plan for and conduct myriad family engagement activities throughout the school year. Kanu o ka Aina PCS remained the center with the most family engagement activities planned and executed. It carried out on a regular basis (every 3 months) a very popular Math Night and another popular Literacy Night for families and community members. It was organized the annual Book Fair event where both educational and enrichment activities were conducted and held a Charity Walk, too. The other centers were less active when it came to family engagement. Halau Ku Mana PCS carried out two Stream Clean Up days and Kamakau PCS coordinated a stage production at a local shopping center with about 70 individuals.

Although New Activity Forms and Close-Out Forms have been developed, SC's have not been consistently completing and submitting them for review. No data is currently available that would allow us to report on the extent and quality of submissions. Furthermore, although attendance data had been collected and maintained on

evaluator-developed spreadsheets for the duration of this reporting period by SC's, there was mechanism in place that would have allowed us to report on attendance data on a more regular basis. The PD stated that they were planning on purchasing and putting into place the EZReport System of enrollment and attendance data.

Results of the 3x Per Year Project Narrative Report

Although not part of the original evaluation plan for Year 2, we found of significance the data collected and submitted by the KALO sub-grantee on the 3x Per Year Project Narrative Report. To understand the major strengths and major challenges that were being experienced by SC's at each of the centers, the monthly monitoring survey included open-ended questions so that SC's could describe in detail what was working and what wasn't working the previous month. The results are summarized in the tables below, per reporting period.

Summer 2016		
Total enrollment this quarter by site/center:	Site	Enrollment
	Kanu o ka 'Aina	80
	Halau Ku Mana	0
	Kawaikini	0
	Kamakau	0
	Hakipu'u	0
<p>Major strengths for this term: Our summer program had a Hula theme this year, and the students learned Hawaiian songs, chants, did recycled art projects, and crafted their own hula implements such as: ipu (made from gourd), pu'ili (split bamboo), and kala'au (wooden sticks). We were able to integrate math, biology, science, reading, as well as Hawaiian culture into our curriculum, while giving our students a fun, cultural experience. The group that made pu'ili (split bamboo implements) is an example of STEAM integration. The students collaborated in small groups to devise methods to measure and split the bamboo, they created pie diagram to split the bamboo</p>		

evenly.

Our most talked about field trip this summer, was to the 'imiloa Astronomy Center in Hilo, and there the students learned about space, astronomy, ancient Hawaiian star navigation, and they also were able to touch and manipulate many of the "hands-on" display's and science activities. It was a fun day and the students also were able to learn a lot about science, technology, and astronomy.

This year we were also able to include an additional instructor two days per week who coordinated field sports and games, adding a health and fitness element to our program. Overall it was not only a fun cultural experience, but also a good summer enrichment which helped carry them into the next school year.

The parent comments below reflect participant enthusiasm program satisfaction:

"We're from Oahu, and we've been sending our two kids here for the last 3 years and it gets better every year."

"Thank you for a great summer program...the Ho'ike was wonderful, and my daughter is so happy she was able to make her own ipu for hula!"

Major challenges for this term:

The biggest challenge for our program overall was not being able to start afterschool programming for four sites in our 21st Century program. Finding the right site coordinator has proven challenging. We have worked closely with school administration to hire each Site Coordinator; we determined that the programs are better off to extend the search to ensure that we hire quality coordinators that are well suited to the purpose of 21st Century Learning Centers.

All sites will have a site coordinator and will be in operation Fall-2016. We are also working to replicate our summer program to additional sites during Summer 2017.

The biggest challenge for our one operating site was not having enough classroom space, and transportation for the students for the various field trips that were part of the program. We limited our attendance to 80 students, however we could have served more. We are already making plans for next summer to allow the program to expand. We are exploring a schedule that would divide participants into groups for field trips, reducing the transportation requirements for each trip. We will also have the use of an additional building next summer allowing us to accommodate

additional students.

Fall 2016		
Total enrollment this quarter by site/center:	Site	Enrollment
	Kanu o ka 'Aina	181
	Hālau Kū Māna	0
	Kawaikini	84
	Ke Kula 'o Samuel M. Kamakau	54
	Hakipu'u Learning Center	25

Major strengths for this term:

It has been exciting to see the progress made and the programs being offered to students. In evaluating program strengths several themes emerged across our five sites. First, the availability of eager and enthusiastic members of the school communities both volunteer and paid, that want to contribute in some way to the planning and implementation of program activities. Families are becoming invested in the success of the programs and are thus more willing to provide generous feedback to program staff regarding what's working and what's not, additional activities and/or services desired, and barriers to and enablers of participation in the program. The programs are also strengthening the school/family/community bonds. For example, the program staff from one site described the strong feeling of ohana (family) that is felt among participating families and program staff. They said that because the staff has developed an intimate connection to the participating families, it is that much easier for them to care for the students and provide them with high quality instruction.

Second, afterschool programs are addressing high priority needs that have been identified by the target populations. For example, school personnel have reported struggling to increase student math scores (competency and literacy); afterschool program activities are being designed around providing support to students through math tutoring and other math activities that are correlated with school day curriculum.

Third, all sites reported an increase in student access to opportunities that they wouldn't have had otherwise as another major strength.

And fourth, program flexibility allows site coordinators to adapt programs based on participant feedback and observed needs. One site has had success including students who remained at school late, waiting for rides. For these students, the program offers a positive environment that provides additional educational activities. Involving participants in the planning and execution of the program is becoming a strength at one site. Of course, the main objective of the program continues to be centered around math, literacy, culture, and art; however, as activities are developed for and by the students themselves we are witnessing an eager cohort of students who are beginning to love to learn. They are excited to be participating; they are asking to repeat activities; they are wondering at lunchtime what's on the afternoon agenda; they are reminding program staff that a particular activity, like painting, still has to be finished. They are becoming enthusiastic participants!

Major challenges for this term:

As is expected, every site experienced some challenges to planning and implementing program activities. Initially hiring site coordinators took longer than expected, this has been a major contributor to delays in program implementation. Fortunately, all sites now have functioning site coordinators. Another related challenge is hiring tutors and other program staff. The nature of this type of employment attracts people who are looking to supplement their employment with an additional job, making scheduling difficult. We are working with site coordinators to streamline the hiring process and provide recruitment help through community colleges etc. to ensure quality staff is available for each site.

Lack of adequate facilities which is a common issue for Hawaiian Focused Charter Schools, presents challenges for our sites. With limited indoor space, some sites utilize outdoor tent space for program activities. During inclement weather this can limit activities and require program adaptations.

Another challenge is retention of students. Today's students have many demands on their time. There seems to be a natural ebb and flow to participant attendance. We are implementing innovative ideas such as student driven activities mentioned in the strength section to increase student excitement. Site coordinators are working to keep students engaged and encourage parents and students to make an attendance

commitment to the program.

Lastly there is some challenge being geographical separated from our sites. We are dealing with this through site visits, emails, and refinement of procedures. We are also looking into setting up a central dashboard that will provide secure communication between KALO and site coordinators and provide a collaborative space for site coordinators to share ideas.

Spring 2017

Total enrollment this quarter by site/center:	Site	Enrollment
	Kanu o ka 'Aina	192
	Hālau Kū Māna	18
	Kawaikini	80
	Ke Kula 'o Samuel M. Kamakau	54
	Hakipu'u Learning Center	18

Major strengths for this term:

The biggest strengths this term has been getting all five of our site coordinators and programs up and running. It has been exciting to see the inspired progress made by our site coordinators, and the different types of programs being offered to students. Another great success has been four of our five program sites planning and executing summer programs in June. All programs are strengthening the school/family/community bonds. For example, the program staff from one site described the strong feeling of ohana (family) that is felt among participating families and program staff. They said that because the staff has developed an intimate connection to the participating families, it is that much easier for them to care for the students and provide them with high quality instruction.

Each of our five afterschool programs are addressing high priority needs that have been identified by the target populations. For example, the site coordinator at Halau Ku Mana has reported that they are struggling to increase student math scores (competency and literacy); afterschool program activities are being designed around providing support to students through math tutoring and other math activities that are correlated with school day curriculum.

All sites reported an increase in student access to opportunities that they wouldn't have otherwise been able to experience. Students from our summer program at Halau Ku Mana were able to go aboard the Hokule'a upon her return to Hawaii, and to have one-on-one time with navigators, crew members, and support crew. This experience would not have been possible without the relationships and support from our 21st Century Program.

Program flexibility allows site coordinators to adapt programs based on participant feedback and observed needs. It allows for customized afterschool programming based on student input as well as input from the school administration. While the main objective of our program continues to be centered around math, literacy, culture, and art; as activities are developed for and by the students themselves we are witnessing an eager cohort of students who are beginning to love to learn. They are excited to be participating; they are asking to repeat activities; they are wondering at lunch time what's on the afternoon agenda; they are reminding program staff that a particular activity, like painting, still has to be finished. They are becoming enthusiastic participants!

Major challenges for this term:

As is expected, every site experienced some challenges to planning and implementing program activities. This is the first term we are fully staffed site coordinators at all five sites. Initially hiring site coordinators took longer than expected, resulting program implementation delays. Fortunately, now that all sites now have functioning site coordinators, afterschool and summer programming is strong at all five locations. Another related challenge is hiring tutors and other program staff. The nature of this type of employment attracts people who are looking to supplement their employment with an additional job, making scheduling difficult. We are working with site coordinators to streamline the hiring process and provide recruitment help through community colleges etc. to ensure quality staff is available for each site.

Lack of adequate facilities which is a common issue for Hawaiian Focused Charter Schools, continues to present challenges for our sites. With limited indoor and storage space, some sites utilize outdoor tents for program activities. During inclement weather this can limit activities and require program adaptations.

Lastly there is some challenge being geographical separated from our sites. We are dealing with this through site visits, emails, and refinement of procedures. We are

also looking into setting up a central dashboard that will provide secure communication between KALO and site coordinators and provide a collaborative space for site coordinators to share ideas.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In Project Year 2, the KALO sub-grantee project was a well-planned, maturing project. Because the planning phase of the project was not explicitly discussed in the grant proposal, the determination could not be made as to whether the planning phase thus far was well aligned with what was proposed in the grant proposal. However, significant effort and time have been put into the planning phase with hopes that high quality programming will be delivered in the next reporting period. An important step in Project Year 2 was that the PD engaged the support of the participating schools and site coordinators to plan for and develop well thought-out activities.

Based on the data and findings of this report, we provide the following recommendations.

- SC's should be more consistent and thorough with their completion and submission of the New Activity Forms prior to implementation of any afterschool activity
- SC's should be more consistent and thorough with their completion and submission of the Activity Close Out Form, to be completed immediately following the end of any afterschool activity
- SC's should collect and maintain attendance on a more regular basis
- An outcomes evaluation should be planned and implemented for Project Year 3
- Additional implementation data should be collected in Project Year 3, such as survey to be administered to paid or unpaid staff and contractors who implemented activities; a survey about community partnerships to be completed by project staff; academic achievement data; and, a parent questionnaire about family activities implemented by the sites; and, interview data from evaluators' interviews with project leaders and staff
- Project leaders should explore the possibility of providing professional development to SC's and other project staff
- Project leaders should examine ways to provide more activities for parents and other adult community members
- The evaluation for Project Year 3 must assess the extent to which the KALO sub-grantee may have met the implementation performance measures set by the Hawai'i State Department of Education Special Programs Management Section (HIDOE-SPMS)

