CR DG Curriculum Research
& Development Group

An Evaluation Report about the Central Kauaʻi Sub-grantee 21st Century Community Learning Centers in Project Year 4

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

March 2013

University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa

Contents

Executive Summary

This report covers Project Year 4 of the Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee's 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) project, from the summer of 2011 through spring of 2012. This report fulfills the requirements for the evaluation set by the Hawaiʻi State Department of Education Special Program Management Section (HIDOE-SPMS), which oversees the 21st CCLC program in Hawaiʻi. The Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee includes five centers at the host schools of King Kaumualiʻi Elementary, Kōloa Elementary, Elsie H. Wilcox Elementary, Chiefess Kamakahelei Middle, and Kauaʻi High. Data were collected about the implementation of activities and outcomes to fulfill the 21st CCLC program evaluation requirements. The evaluation questions and outcome indicators are based on the evaluation reporting requirements and report template of the 21st CCLC program. Statutory and regulatory requirements specify criteria for the evaluation of sub-grantee projects.

The study of project implementation includes descriptive information and evaluative information to report the extent and quality of implementation of the project in Project Year 4. We compared descriptions provided by project leaders and staff about what was actually implemented to descriptions in the grant proposal, and we addressed the evaluation questions in the HIDOE-SPMS evaluation report template. The evaluative findings about what was implemented provide feedback to project leaders and other stakeholders about where improvements can be made in project implementation. The study of outcomes focused on the extent to which the criteria of 75% or more of regular center students (regular students are students who participated in center activities for 30 or more days in the project year) improved in the four key performance indicators (academic behaviors), or 60% or more of regular center attendees improved in English Language Arts or mathematics semester grades or pre-post assessment scores that were given in the school.

The 2000 U.S. census data about the school community and demographic data about the centers' host schools show that the Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee is situated in a community with high-poverty demographics. The findings about implementation suggest that the activities about academic and enrichment content areas were implemented at levels that met or exceeded the performance measures.

Each of the five Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee centers implemented high-quality services in at least one core academic area of reading/literacy, mathematics, and science, and also provided academic enrichment activities to center students. The sub-grantee maintained two partnerships that were written into the grant proposal: (a) the HIDOE Central Kauaʻi District office (provided facilities for the centers at the host schools and the School Renewal Specialist to manage the 21st CCLC project); and (b) Kauaʻi Economic Development Board that worked with Kauaʻi Island Utilities Cooperative (a partner that facilitated the robotics activities). The host schools also referred students to the centers. An additional partner, Curriculum Research & Development Group from the University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa College of Education, was secured to provide program evaluation services for the sub-grantee. The Kōloa center secured a partner, an individual, who prefers to be unnamed for the purposes of this report. There were challenges with securing or maintaining other partners for various reasons, including, a potential partner that did not have staff or a program of activities to devote to the 21st CCLC project and other partners were not able to obtain security clearance for their employees to work with center students and staff.

The performance measure for offering services to parents and other adults was not met, although two centers reported implementing activities in this category.

The centers did not meet the performance measure for providing services at least 15 hours per week on average when school is not in session. From our experience, this is difficult for centers in Hawaiʻi to accomplish, but we encourage the centers to continue to strive toward this objective.

The five centers in the sub-grantee did not meet the four key performance indicators related to academic behaviors. The centers also did not meet the performance measures related to academic achievement. However, the reader should note that for many of the performance measures, the percentages of regular center students that improved in the academic behavior were barely under the 75% target for four of five centers. In our analyses of the data and discussions with one project director, we concluded that the basis of challenges with academic performance and behaviors may be regular attendees' chronic absenteeism from day classes. As reported by day teachers, there were many regular students who needed to improve their attendance (an item on the teacher survey), but many regular students did not improve on this behavior in Project Year 4. We recommend that the center and host school leaders collaborate on strategies to study the reasons for absenteeism and how to improve attendance of these students in day school as well as in the centers.

The Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee met the performance measures for implementing academic and enrichment activities, which were implemented by center staff, many of which had the qualifications of classroom teachers, or had other positions in the host schools, providing connections to the host schools. It appeared to be more challenging to meet the implementation performance measures of components dependent on the willingness of groups of people outside the project devoting their time and energy, that is, for parent activities, community partnerships, and center operations of 15 hours a week on average (families would need to commit their children's time to participating in center activities). We hope that our recommendations of sharing between center staff and stakeholders to discuss best practices and holding community-type events (see the report for a fuller description) to involve families will facilitate movement toward meeting the performance measures.

An Evaluation Report about the Central Kauaʻi Sub-grantee 21st Century Community Learning Center Project in Project Year 4

This is the Project Year 4 evaluation report for Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee's 21st Century Community Learning Center (CCLC) project, covering the summer of 2011 through School Year (SY) 2011–12. The Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee project leaders contracted an evaluation team from Curriculum Research & Development Group (CRDG) at the University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa, College of Education (UHM-CoE) to provide evaluation services. The CRDG evaluation team developed and implemented an evaluation design for the Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee with input from the Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee project director and center coordinators. This report is the result of the evaluation efforts and includes a description of the project, evaluation design, data-collection methods, and findings about implementation and outcomes in Project Year 4. The evaluation questions, outcome indicators, and data-collection methods are based on the key performance indicators (KPIs) of the 21st CCLC program, the 21st CCLC evaluation report template, and the Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee 21st CCLC grant proposal.

A Description of the Central Kauaʻi Sub-Grantee Project

The Central Kauaʻi 21st CCLC sub-grantee was in its fourth year of five years of funding. Project year 4 began in summer of 2011 and continued through SY 2011–12. Since 2002, state education agencies have managed this federally funded competitive grant program under regulatory oversight from the U.S. Department of Education (USDE). According to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the 21st CCLC program had the following purposes:

(1)   provide opportunities for academic enrichment, including tutorial services to help students, particularly students who attend low-performing schools, to meet State and local student academic achievement standards in core academic subjects, such as reading and mathematics;

(2)   offer students a broad array of additional services, programs, and activities, such as youth development activities, drug and violence prevention programs, counseling programs, art, music, and recreation programs, technology education programs, and character education programs, that are designed to reinforce and complement the regular academic program of participating students; and

(3)   offer families of students served by community learning centers opportunities for literacy and related educational development (USDE, 2001).

In 2010, the Hawaiʻi State Department of Education, Special Programs Management Section (HIDOE-SPMS) distributed the 21st CCLC evaluation report template that was used as the template for this report. In this report, we include information about the project as contextual information for the evaluation of implementation and outcomes. Some background information was gleaned from the grant proposal, including information about the origin of the project and project goals, a description of the local community, the location of project sites, and other background information about the project. We interviewed project staff to collect information about formative changes within the project.

Origin of the Project

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

Where was the project implemented? The Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee included five centers that were situated on the campuses of their respective host schools of Kaumualiʻi Elementary, Kōloa Elementary, Wilcox Elementary, Kamakahelei Middle, and Kauaʻi High. All five centers provided 21st CCLC project services during Project Year 4. These five HIDOE public schools are part of the Central Kauaʻi complex area, on the island of Kauaʻi, State of Hawaiʻi. The host school names, street addresses, web sites, and other information are shown as Table 1.

The 21st CCLC program statutes require that student activities are to be held before or after regular day-school hours, evenings, weekends, holidays, and summer. However, activities for pre-Kindergarten (pre-K) and adult family members may be held during regular day-school hours "since these times may be the most suitable for serving these populations" (Learning Point Associates, 2012, p. 2). Note that the centers, although identified by their host school names were separate entities from their host schools and provided services to students outside of the regular day-school hours as required by the 21st CCLC.

What are the characteristics of the school community? The school community demographics of the five Central Kauaʻi centers participating in the project are shown in Table 2. The socio-economic status (SES) demographics show a large percentage of households (21.0%) headed by a single mother, which is above the State's indicator of 18.3%. The second indicator of poverty, community households with public assistance income, is 6.4%, which is slightly below the State's percentage of 7.6%. The third indicator of poverty, school community's families with children living in poverty, is at 7.5% which is below the State's percentage of 11.2%. The first poverty indicator for the school community show that host schools were in areas of high percentages of households headed by a single mother, which may mean that the children may have disadvantages that place them at-risk for academic achievement.

How many people did it affect? The evaluators found that the five Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee centers provided services to a total of 1,643 students in pre-K through Grade 12 during Project Year 4. Additional information about student subgroups in this population and the number of students served at each center are discussed in the findings about implementation section of this report with a specific description of center students. A combined total of 145 center administrators and staff were involved in the centers during Project Year 4. However, note that some staff were involved in the centers

Table 1

Central Kauaʻi Sub-grantee: Location of Sites in Project Year 4

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

Table 2

Central Kauaʻi Sub-grantee: Poverty Indicators for the School Community as Compared to the State of Hawaiʻi[1]

Community profile	School community	State of Hawaiʻi
Percentage of families with children headed by a single mother	21.0%	18.3%
Percent of households with public assistance income	6.4%	7.6%
Percent of families with children living in poverty	7.5%	11.2%

[1]Based on the 2000 U.S. Census.

during both the summer and school year terms, and are included in both counts. Specific descriptions of the types of staff and counts of staff for each center are provided in the findings about implementation section of this report specific to center staff.

Goals of the Project

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

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

Clients involved in the project. The sub-grantee 21st CCLC Handbook for SY 2011–12 states that the "21st Century Community Learning Centers will serve children and community members with the greatest need for expanded learning opportunities" (HIDOE-SPMS, 2011b, Tab 3: Plan and Program Implementation, p. 2). The collected data show that 1,643 students were enrolled overall the five Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee 21st CCLC centers. Of the total number of project participants, 719 (43.8%) qualified for free- or reduced-cost lunch, 126 (7.7%) qualified for English Language Learners (ELL) services, and 94 (5.7%) qualified for special education (SPED) services. These student demographic data were required for reporting by the USDE and HIDOE and reflect student populations who may have disadvantages or challenges for academic achievement. Additional details about the student populations are provided in this report in the section specific to findings about implementation as student demographic subgroups by center and student participation in activities.

Characteristics of the Project Materials and Resources

There were two sources of information about project materials and resources which are summarized in this section. To the extent possible, the information was collected by multiple methods. Further elaboration on data-collection methods is provided in the section on the evaluation design. Center coordinators completed a downloaded copy of the Learning Point Associates 21st CCLC 2012 Annual Performance Report (APR) from the federal online Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS) that elicited information about activities and materials. Another source of information was site visits, where we observed center activities and interviewed center coordinators and staff about the materials and resources used by students.

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

The largest proportion of resources for the Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee programming was provided by 21st CCLC grant funds. There were three partners across the sub-grantee's centers in 2011–12. One partner was CRDG from UHM-CoE, the external evaluator for the Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee. The other partner was the HIDOE Central Kauaʻi District office, that agreed to the School Renewal Specialist (SRS) having responsibilities as sub-grantee Project Director and allowing the centers to use the host school facilities. The host schools also referred students to the centers. A second Project Director was contracted (the former SRS who was now retired from the HIDOE) to facilitate data collection and support center operations. A third partner for the sub-grantee, Kauaʻi Economic Development Board (KEDB) that worked with Kauaʻi Island Utilities Cooperative (KIUC), facilitated the robotics activities. The Kōloa center secured a partner, an individual, who prefers to be anonymous for the purposes of this report. This individual provided programming or activity-related services, goods or materials, staffing, and funding or raised funds. There were challenges with securing or maintaining other partners for various reasons, including, difficulties with securing staffing and developing a program of activities for the 21st CCLC project and obtaining security clearance for employees to work with center students and staff. Some partners from 2010–11 did not continue with the project. Other centers did not have partners in Project Year 4.

In what activities were project participants expected to take part? The activities by center are shown in Appendix A. Based on information provided by center staff, center attendees in the elementary centers participated in academic activities focusing on core areas such as reading/language arts, mathematics, and science. In addition to the previously mentioned academic activities, the elementary centers provided academic enrichment activities in the areas of art, career education, character education, critical thinking skills, cultural/social studies, dance, drama, health/nutrition, foreign language, literature, music, physical education, routines of kindergarten, sports, and technology.

At the middle and high school centers, they offered credit recovery activities in the core areas of reading/language arts, mathematics, and science. They also offered credit recovery activities for social

studies. The middle school center offered enrichment activities in arts, cultural/social studies, entrepreneurial education, health/nutrition, music, and technology. The high school center activities were integrated activities that included the enrichment areas of art, cultural/social studies, entrepreneurial education, health/nutrition, music, and technology.

What specific procedures, if any, did project staff follow? Students were referred to the centers by teachers at their respective host schools or were recruited by the centers according to the criteria in the grant. Furthermore, at the Kamakahelei Middle center, the site coordinator was able to secure the participation of the majority of students in the host school. Center staff followed a weekly schedule of implementing activities focused on delivering services to attendees meant to supplement the school day. They were expected to provide project activities in a secure and safe environment with participant behavior expectations similar to those found in the host schools. Across the project, the focus was on reading/literacy and mathematics with tutoring and homework help. Additional details are provided in this report with the findings about implementation.

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

Staff and others involved in the project. The evaluators collected information about the Central Kaua‘i sub-grantee Project Year 4 staff, which is shown as Table 3. Besides the project directors, who provided managerial oversight of the project, there was at least one center coordinator at each center who provided operational management of the center.

During the summer of 2011, there were six center coordinators and 42 staff members. Two center coordinators managed the Kaua‘i High center; there was one center coordinator for each of the following centers: Kaumuali‘i Elementary, Kōloa Elementary, Wilcox Elementary, and Kamakahelei Middle. Of the 42 staff members, 28 staff members were school-day teachers, 4 were other nonteaching school-day staff, 4 were other nonschool-day staff with a college degree or higher, and the 6 remaining staff members were in the other nonschool-day staff with some or no college.

During SY 2011–12, there were seven center coordinators. With the exceptions of Kaumuali‘i Elementary and Kaua‘i High centers which each had two center coordinators, the centers at the Kōloa Elementary, Wilcox Elementary, Kamakahelei Middle each had one center coordinator. Of the 90 center staff members, 61 were school-day teachers, 6 paid and 1 volunteer were other nonschool-day staff with a college degree or higher education level, 4 were other types of nonteaching school-day staff, 5 were parents, 1 was another type of community member, and the 12 remaining staff members were other types of nonschool-day staff with some or no college background.

As shown in Table 3, the majority of staff members during the summer of 2011 and SY 2011–12 were in paid positions. In addition, the majority of staff members were school-day teachers. Hiring school-day teachers and other school personnel had the advantages of staff who knew school rules and

Table 3

Central Kauaʻi Sub-grantee: Description of the Staff in Project Year 4

Center	School-day teachers (includes former and substitute teachers)	Center administrators and coordinators	Youth development workers or other nonschool-day staff with a college degree or higher	Other nonteaching school-day staff (e.g., librarians, guidance counselors, aides)	Parents	College students	High school students	Other community members (e.g., business mentors, senior citizens, clergy, etc.)	Other nonschool-day staff with some or no college
Kaumualiʻi Elem.	28 paid sy 11 paid summ	2 paid sy 1 paid summ	4 paid sy	—	3 paid sy	—	—	—	9 paid sy 5 paid summ
Kōloa Elem.	7 paid sy 6 paid summ	1 paid sy 1 paid summ	1 volunteer sy	1 paid sy	2 paid sy	—	—	1 paid sy	3 paid sy
Wilcox Elem.	12 paid sy 4 paid summ	1 paid sy 1 paid summ	2 paid summ	—	—	—	—	—	1 paid summ
Kamakahelei Middle	8 paid sy 3 paid summ	1 paid sy 1 paid summ	2 paid sy 2 paid summ	3 paid sy 4 paid sum	—	—	—	—	—
Kauaʻi High	6 paid sy 4 paid summ	2 paid sy 2 paid summ	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
TOTALS	61 paid sy 28 paid summ	7 paid sy 6 paid summ	6 paid sy 1 volunteer sy 4 paid summ	4 paid sy 4 paid summ	5 paid sy	—	—	1 paid sy	12 paid sy 6 paid summ

Note. None of the centers had staff members in the category: "College students" and "High school students." Some staff members were involved in the centers during the summer of 2011 and SY 2011–12 and is included in both counts. The total staff is 145 (48 during summer of 2011 and 97 during SY 2011–12).

procedures for the security and safety of the project participants. School-day teachers also provided consistency with classroom management, student behavior management, differentiated learning, curricula, and formative assessment.

The Evaluation Design

The purposes of this evaluation were to fulfill the annual state and federal evaluation requirements and to provide information to the sub-grantee stakeholders about the project implementation and outcomes as a basis for decision making to improve services to project participants. The project leaders also may consider the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of this evaluation to inform sustainability of the project or proposal writing for future funding of project activities.

To address the purposes of the evaluation, the evaluators and center staff collected implementation and outcome data, including student data in the form of attendance, demographics, academic achievement, and academic behavior; descriptive data about center activities, center operations, and center staffing; and other data relevant to the implementation of project services to participants and their families. Statutory and regulatory requirements specify criteria for the evaluation of sub-grantee projects. The reader is referred to the statute, Title IV, Part B of the ESEA of 1965 as reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) (USDE, 2001) and the non-regulatory guidance (USDE, 2003) for the program requirements.

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

The evaluation design includes plans for the evaluation of project implementation and project outcomes. At the beginning of the summer of 2011 and SY 2011–12, the CRDG evaluators and sub-grantee leaders and center coordinators agreed on the evaluation timeline and deliverables. CRDG evaluators provided the center staff with templates and copies of data-collection instruments. The evaluators also provided written instructions on completing the templates and instruments, and were available by e-mail and telephone for questions by the Central Kauaʻi project leaders or coordinators.

The Evaluation of Project Implementation

The main evaluation question is "Was the program implemented as planned in the grant proposal?" (HIDOE-SPMS, 2011a, p. 3). The associated nine sub-questions about implementation are (a) "If no, what changes were made and why?" (b) "What did the program finally look like?" (c) "What challenges have been faced in implementing the program and how are these challenges being addressed?" (d) "Which community-based partnerships, as planned in the grant application, have been established and maintained and which ones were not? Why?" (e) "Where was the program implemented?" (f) "What are characteristics of the school community?" (g) "How many people did it affect?" (h) "Are the program

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

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

Descriptive data about center activities were collected by distribution of the APR Form C7 to center coordinators. Evaluative data about center activities were collected by distribution of an evaluator-developed, on-line questionnaire to center staff, volunteers, contractors, and others who implemented activities. The on-line questionnaire was designed to elicit data about the extent and quality of implementation of the primary, secondary, core subject area, and academic enrichment activity categories defined on the APR. Respondents completed the questionnaire items in two parts: (a) rating the extent of implementation on a 4-point scale from *1* = none or very little, *2* = mediocre, *3* = moderate, and *4* = all or almost all and; (b) rating the quality of implementation on a 4-point scale from *1* = poor, *2* = mediocre, *3* = moderate, and *4* = very well. A caveat of this method is that there may be personal or social pressure for respondents to report only positive information about their implementation of activities. Another limitation was that there may be a small number of individuals who implemented some types of activities, thereby limiting the respondent group. However, we believed that it was valuable to collect evaluative data about implementation of activities from those who were directly involved with implementation.

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

The Evaluation of Project Outcomes

The evaluation questions about project outcomes were (a) What changes were found in regular center attendees' academic behaviors as reported by their language arts or mathematics day classroom teachers? (b) What changes were found in regular center attendees' academic performance as reported by their language arts or mathematics day classroom teachers? (HIDOE-SPMS, 2011a). The HIDOE-SPMS KPI outcome indicators are shown as changes in academic behaviors and academic achievement in English Language Arts and mathematics. HIDOE-SPMS determined that the outcome performance

objective for academic behavior is 75% or more of a center's regular attendees and for academic achievement is 60% or more of a center's regular attendees.

As defined by the 21st CCLC program, the center attendees who participated in 30 or more days of center activities were likely to have measurable effects. These center participants are referred to as "regular attendees," and outcome data were collected for regular attendees only. We collected attendance data on all center attendees from center staff. The attendance data were screened for double listings of students by alternative spelling or presentation of name (for example, middle name used as first name), grade level, names, gender, ID number and so forth. Then, we summed each student's days of participation and generated each center's list of regular attendees. These lists of regular attendees were used to generate teacher surveys and identify those attendees for reporting of changes in Fall-Spring report card grades and changes in pre-post assessment scores.

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

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

Of the 10 items on the teacher survey, four items were designated as KPIs for the HIDOE 21st CCLC project by the state program manager. These four KPIs from the teacher survey were "turning in his or her homework on time," "participating in class," "attending class regularly," and "behaving well in class." We applied the 21st CCLC criterion that 75% or more regular attendees' English Language Arts, mathematics, or day teachers were to report improvement for each KPI across the sub-grantee.

The study of outcomes for academic achievement in English Language Arts and mathematics was a pre-post design: (a) the difference between Fall and Spring semester report card grades (as an HIDOE-SPMS outcome indicator), and (b) the difference between pre-post assessment student-level scores that were administered in the host schools. The HIDOE-SPMS outcome indicator was the difference between Fall and Spring semester report card grades. We added the regular attendees' pre-post assessment scores in English Language Arts and mathematics to the evaluation of outcomes based on a decision with the previous HIDOE-SPMS state program manager. Center staff reported changes in regular attendees' report card semester grades when the grades increased one-half grade or more, decreased one-half grade or more, or no change. Changes in pre-post assessment scores were reported when the post-test scores were at least 5% higher or lower than the pre-test scores. The changes in semester report card grades and

changes in pre-post assessment scores were both reported as *1* = increase, *2* = decrease, *3* = no change, *4* = did not need to change, N/A, or no data. Center leaders and staff were provided with the criteria for an assessment that would be usable as a pre-post assessment for the evaluation. The assessment must be (a) administered in the center's host schools within the school year, (b) school- or grade-level assessments that were administered for school purposes (not for center purposes), (c) commercially developed and administered as instructed by the developers, and or (d) supported by literature that shows appropriate psychometric qualities of the assessment. There may be different assessments for each grade level within the school. Center coordinators were advised to follow instructions to the assessment when identifying the type of scores for comparison between the pre- and post-testing periods.

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

The center coordinators collected and provided the majority of the evaluation data, namely, student attendance, student demographics, student outcome data, annual performance reports, and community partnerships. The project directors provided updates about the project and logistical coordination with the evaluators during in-person conversations or by telephone or e-mail. Substantial collaboration between the project and evaluation staff was needed to plan and carry out the collection of some types of data.

During Project Year 4, we met with the center coordinators and, as possible, had discussions with project staff during site visits. During these discussions, we asked about center operations and activities (field trips, goals specific to the center, selection of students for the center, program materials and resources, staff characteristics, and parent/community activities). At site visits, center coordinators had the opportunity to ask questions about the evaluation, explain the selection process for activities, and show us documentation used for center management and program implementation.

Evaluation Data-Collection Schedule

Early in Spring 2012, the CRDG Evaluation Principal Investigator and a CRDG Evaluation Program Manager met with the Central Kaua'i project directors and center coordinators to discuss data-collection activities and data-collection schedule to determine if any clarification or modifications were needed. We presented an evaluation data-collection schedule for decision making purposes, to meet the needs of the evaluation, centers, and host schools. The main issues that the project director, center coordinators, and evaluators considered in planning the schedule of deadlines were (a) avoiding intersession dates when scheduling administration of questionnaires; (b) incorporating feasible intermediate deadlines for submitting attendance data to prevent last minute scrambling for data and data entry and also to provide sufficient time to correct errors in the original data submitted; (c) requiring the deadline to submit attendance/demographics data in the spring to provide sufficient time to review and/or

11

correct the submitted data, analyze the reviewed/corrected data to identify the counts of 30-day attendees, compile a list of 30-day attendees for CRDG to prepare the teacher survey packets, and also to provide a list to the centers which contain the names and grade levels of 30-day attendees whose grades and pre/post scores were needed as outcome data; and (d) optimizing the length of center activity time to allow center students to meet the 30-day attendance counts in the spring and take into account the close of the school year at the host schools when teachers are very busy and may not have much time to devote and focus on completing the teacher survey. Some adjustments in the schedule were agreed upon at the meeting with the project directors and center coordinators. Some informal changes were made to the deadlines during the year when requested by the center coordinators, and we accommodated the requests to the extent possible.

Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS) Reporting

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

The evaluation staff entered the PPICS data, and a Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee project director certified the data on the November 5, 2012 deadline. During review of data for this report, CRDG evaluation staff uncovered inconsistencies between the PPICS entries and the data reported to us by center coordinators and some clerical errors in the PPICS data. Since the PPICS database was locked and correction of the data was not possible in PPICS at the time of this report, the evaluation staff identified inconsistencies between the PPICS and evaluation report data, made corrections on the corresponding tables on the evaluation report and appendices, and included notations of those corrections in this section. We reported the inconsistencies to the Central Kauaʻi project directors and inquired if the project directors or center coordinators might have changed the PPICS database after we entered the data, but they did not believe that could have happened. Therefore, we have no explanation for the inconsistencies between PPICS and the data reported on the APR Form C7 by the center coordinators. In the course of our review, we found some clerical errors were made in entering the data from APR Form C7 to PPICS. These inconsistencies and errors are described below. In a meeting with a Central Kauaʻi project director on August 15, 2013, we agreed that the best source of data for this report are the APR C-7 data reported by the center coordinators. Those data are the basis for the descriptive findings in this report.

Inconsistencies and errors in PPICS that are correctly reflected in Appendix A. Some of these inconsistencies could not be explained, but seem to be changes to PPICS after we entered the data. Others are clerical errors made while the data were entered into PPICS. All corrections are reflected in Appendix A.

Findings about Project Implementation in Project Year 4

The main evaluation question about implementation is "Was the project implemented as planned in the grant proposal?" (HIDOE-SPMS, 2011a, p. 3). There were nine sub-questions about implementation. Of those nine sub-questions, six are addressed in this section: (a) "If no, what changes were made and why?" (b) "What did the project finally look like?" (c) "What challenges have been faced in implementing the project and how are these challenges being addressed?" (d) "Which community-based partnerships, as planned in the grant application, have been established and maintained and which ones were not? Why?" (e) "Are the project activities interesting and valuable to students, teachers, administrators, and community partners?" and (f) "What are the plans to ensure effective project implementation next year?" (HIDOE-SPMS, 2011a, p. 3)

The remaining three sub-questions about implementation are addressed in the introductory section of this report. Those three sub-questions are: (a) "Where was the project implemented?" and (b) "What were characteristics of the school community?" and (c) "How many people did it affect?"

Was the Project Implemented as Planned in the Grant Proposal?

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

Project characteristics. The Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee grant writer and original program administrator was the Central Kauaʻi SRS. That SRS retired after Project Year 2 and her successor SRS became the sub-grantee program administrator with duties as the project director. The former SRS/project director was contracted to facilitate project administration and data collection for the evaluation, while the current SRS was responsible for the project's fiscal matters. Both the former and current SRS managed and oversaw operations, implementation of the Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee 21st CCLC grant, and coordination of host school leaders and staff. Each center was managed by at least one center coordinator to oversee summer and school year operations and implementation of activities. As stated previously in this report, the Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee centers were physically located on the campuses of their host schools (also called their feeder schools). Center students were referred to the centers by teachers in the host schools or recruited by the centers based on the criteria stated in the grant proposal (see discussion earlier in this report specific to characteristics of center students).

High-need communities indicator 3.1: 100% of centers are located in high-poverty communities. Based on the review of community and host school demographics, the Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee centers were located in high-poverty communities. Shown as Table 5, the host school population that qualified for free- or reduced-cost lunch between SYs 2006–07 through 2010–11 were between 21.4% and 56.0%. These proportions are significant levels that may give school leaders reason to look for projects, such as the 21st CCLC program, to provide services designed to address the needs of this population. Based on the high levels of counts and percentages of students with free- and reduced-lunch status at the host schools shown in Table 5, as well as the poverty levels in the community shown as Table 2, we conclude that the centers were based in high-need communities.

Table 5

Central Kauaʻi Sub-grantee: Free or Reduced Lunch Counts and Percentages over School Years 2006–07 through 2011–12

Student profile	School-level counts and percentages[1]					2011–12 center-level counts	
	2006–07	2007–08	2008–09	2009–10	2010–11	Number of regular students on free or reduced lunch (% to total school enrollment for 2011–12)[2]	Total number of center students on free or reduced lunch (% to total school enrollment for 2011–12)[2]
Kaumualiʻi El.	246 (47.3%)	251 (48.0%)	269 (48.9%)	268 (49.2%)	318 (55.3%)	49 (8.5%)	149 (25.9%)
Kōloa El.	86 (47.0%)	80 (44.4%)	104 (47.9%)	136 (56.0%)	116 (48.9%)	30 (10.8%)	142 (51.4%)
Wilcox El.	245 (27.4%)	231 (25.5%)	288 (30.9%)	358 (39.2%)	402 (43.8%)	22 (2.3%)	135 (14.7%)
Kamakahelei Mid.	322 (33.7%)	297 (31.3%)	316 (34.5%)	321 (35.2%)	366 (41.2%)	80 (8.9%)	195 (21.9%)
Kauaʻi Hi.	301 (24.5%)	272 (21.4%)	330 (26.2%)	339 (28.3%)	396 (32.8%)	2 (0.1%)	113 (9.3%)

[1]The school level counts and percentages are based on the HIDOE School Status and Improvement Reports. Retrieved August 24, 2012 from: http://arch.k12.hi.us/school/ssir/ssir.html
[2]The total enrollment count used as a denominator is based on the Official Enrollment Count, 2011–12 School Year data from the October 12, 2011 HIDOE news release.

14

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) of the host schools. One of the goals of the 21st CCLC program is to provide services to help students meet state and local academic achievement standards (USDE, 2001). We present information about the status of the host schools' AYP achievement status in 2011–12 in Table 6 (Systems Accountability Office, System Evaluation & Reporting Section, 2012). Although many other variables in the school community contribute to the achievement of AYP, the centers provide services to students with the highest needs and, therefore, also contribute to the host schools' achievement of AYP.

In Project Year 4, one host school (Kōloa Elementary) met AYP. We compared the AYP status of the student population subgroups that did not meet the proficiency objective at the host school with similarly described attendees at the Central Kaua'i 21st CCLC project. For reading, the "all students" subgroup did not meet the reading proficiency objective at Kaumuali'i. The "all students" subgroup also did not meet the mathematics proficiency objective at Kaumuali'i and Kaua'i High schools. The "disadvantaged" student subgroup at Kaumuali'i, Kamakahelei Middle, and Kaua'i High schools did not meet the reading proficiency objective. For Mathematics, the "disadvantaged" student subgroup did not meet the proficiency objective at Kaumuali'i and Kaua'i High schools. The "disabled" subgroup did not meet the reading proficiency objective at Kamakahelei Middle school. The "disabled" subgroup also did not meet the mathematics proficiency objective at Kaumuali'i and Kamakahelei Middle schools. The "Asian/Pacific Islander" subgroup did not meet the reading proficiency objective at Kaumuali'i and Kamakahelei Middle schools and the mathematics proficiency objective at Kaumuali'i and Kaua'i High schools. The mathematics proficiency objective was not met by the "white" ethnicity subgroup at Wilcox school.

As shown in Table 6, for each student subgroup that did not meet the reading or mathematics proficiency objective in the host school, we show the percentage of the student subgroup as compared to the total center enrollment. The percentage of each center's enrollment is accurate to the extent that we received data about center student demographics. These percentages show that the centers provide some support to the student subgroups that need supplemental assistance in academic performance and behavior beyond the day school activities. We understand that the centers may not enroll large percentages of students in these subgroups for many reasons, including the reason that other projects and services are available to assist students in these subgroups to improve their academic performance.

Center staffing. As shown in Table 3, the majority of Central Kaua'i sub-grantee staff during Project Year 4 were school day teachers (28 during the summer and 61 during the school year). According to national research about the 21st CCLC program across the nation, it is advantageous to have center staff with these qualifications to build bridges between the host school and the extended day curriculum (Naftzger & Vinson, 2011). The second largest group of center staff were other nonschool-day staff with some or no college coursework. There are advantages for centers to employ host school staff, for example, depending on the position of staff member in the host school, the staff member would have familiarity with procedures for a safe environment for students, assessment procedures and use of data, instructional strategies, and project materials. The proportion of each type of staff to total staff cannot be calculated because some staff members were employed for both the summer of 2011 and during the school year, and therefore, made the calculation difficult from the data in Table 3.

Table 6

Central Kauaʻi Sub-grantee: Host School Achievement of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in Project Year 4

Center name	Met AYP?	NCLB status	Reading: Group(s) that did not meet the proficiency objective of 72%	Mathematics: Group(s) that did not meet the proficiency objective of 64%
Kaumualiʻi El.	Not met	School improvement year 2	•All students •Disadvantaged (subgroup is 51% of center enrollment) •Asian/Pacific Islander (subgroup is 83% of center enrollment)	•All students •Disadvantaged (subgroup is 51% of center enrollment) •Disabled (SPED) (subgroup is 13% of center enrollment) •Asian/Pacific Islander (subgroup is 83% of center enrollment)
Kōloa El.	Met	In good standing, unconditional	None	none
Wilcox El.	Not met	Restructuring	None	•White (subgroup is 12% of center enrollment)
Kamakahelei Mid.	Not met	Restructuring	•Disadvantaged (subgroup is 44% of center enrollment) •Disabled (SPED) (subgroup is 6% of center enrollment) •Asian/Pacific Islander (subgroup is 69% of center enrollment)	•Disabled (SPED) (subgroup is 6% of center enrollment)
Kauaʻi Hi.	Not met	Restructuring	•Disadvantaged (subgroup is 31% of center enrollment)	•All students •Disadvantaged (subgroup is 31% of center enrollment) •Asian/Pacific Islander (subgroup is 80% of center enrollment)

[1]Based on the 2010–2011 NCLB status final reports generated on July 13, 2012 (Hawaiʻi Department of Education, 2012).

16

Hours of operation (indicator 2.5). 75% of centers will offer services at least 15 hours per week on average during the school year and provide services when school is not in session, such as during the summer and holidays (HIDOE-SPMS, 2010). The Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee did not meet this target in Project Year 4. The Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee hours of operations for Project Year 4 are shown as Table 7.

During the summer of 2011, all five Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee centers implemented activities. These were the Kaumualiʻi, Kōloa, Wilcox, Kamakahelei Middle, and Kauaʻi High centers. During the summer of 2011, the centers offered activities for 4 to 6 weeks, 4 to 5 days per week, and 15 to 32 hours per week. The reader is referred to Table 7 for specific information about the number of hours and number of weeks of operation per center. During SY 2011–12, all five Central Kauaʻi centers offered activities: 27 to 35 weeks, 3 to 5 days a week, and 4 to 14 hours per week. This does not meet the outcome indicator of 15 hours per week, but we note that the centers offered high-need students a safe environment outside of regular school hours, almost daily, with opportunities for homework assistance, tutorials, enrichment activities, and enhancement of academic behaviors.

Characteristics of Clients for the Project

In Project Year 4, 1,643 students participated in activities provided by the Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee. The center-level counts of participating students are shown in Table 8 along with counts of students by grade level, free- and reduced-lunch status. The counts of participants by activity for each center are shown as Appendix A. Based on the review of the data, the Central Kauaʻi project met the goal of enrolling students with high need, that is, students who qualify for free- or reduced-cost lunch, SPED, and ELL services.

In deciding how to best select students for 21st CCLC services, stakeholders may consider the demographic characteristics of the center students as in demographic groupings in Table 8 and the student groups that did not meet the proficiency objectives shown in Table 6. Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee decision makers along with host school and other school community stakeholders who seek to supplement the efforts of the host schools may find the AYP data useful as basis for defining high-need student groups.

The Implementation of Core Academic Activities

The HIDOE-SPMS (2010) criterion for the implementation of core academic activities was, "100% of centers will offer high-quality services in at least one core academic area, such as reading and literacy, mathematics, and science." The Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee met and surpassed this KPI in Project Year 4, implementing core academic activities in reading and literacy and mathematics at moderate to high levels of extent and quality.

Core academic activities (indicator 2.1): 100% of centers will offer high-quality services in at least one core academic area, such as reading and literacy, mathematics, and science. To examine the core academic activities implemented at each center, the extent to which the activities were implemented, and the quality to which the activities were implemented, we gathered and reviewed data

Table 7

Central Kauaʻi Sub-grantee: Hours of Operation in Project Year 4

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
Kaumualiʻi El.	4	18	5	35	10	4
Kōloa El.	6	24	4	27	10	5
Wilcox El.	5	20	5	31	4	3
Kamakahelei Mid.	4	32	4	35	14	4
Kauaʻi Hi.	5	15	5	30	6	4

Table 8

Central Kauaʻi Sub-grantee: Description of Students, by Demographic Variables, Who Received Services in Project Year 4

	Enrolled		Grade levels		Free- or reduced-cost lunch		SPED		ELL	
Center	Total center students	30+ days students	Total center students	30+ days students	Total center students	30+ days students	Total center students	30+ days students	Total center students	30+ days students
Kaumualiʻi El.	271	86 (31.7%)	Gr PreK: 28 Gr K: 5 Gr 1: 53 Gr 2: 35 Gr 3: 63 Gr 4: 50 Gr 5: 38 no data: 0	Gr PreK: 11 Gr K: 1 Gr 1: 18 Gr 2: 13 Gr 3: 9 Gr 4: 27 Gr 5: 7 no data: 0	138 (50.9%) no data: 15	50 (18.5%) no data: 1	34 (12.5%) no data: 8	7 (2.6%) no data: 1	24 (8.9%) no data: 13	6 (2.2%) no data: 1
Kōloa El.	250	54 (21.6%)	Gr K: 60 Gr 1: 43 Gr 2: 37 Gr 3: 41 Gr 4: 34 Gr 5: 35 no data: 0	Gr K: 0 Gr 1: 0 Gr 2: 3 Gr 3: 24 Gr 4: 14 Gr 5: 13 no data: 0	138 (55.2%) no data: 0	30 (12.0%) no data: 0	14 (5.6%) no data: 0	1 (.4%) no data: 0	10 (4.0%) no data: 0	1 (.4%) no data: 0
Wilcox El.	317	64 (20.2%)	Gr K: 16 Gr 1: 46 Gr 2: 66 Gr 3: 60 Gr 4: 49 Gr 5: 80 no data: 0	Gr K: 0 Gr 1: 3 Gr 2: 1 Gr 3: 12 Gr 4: 16 Gr 5: 32 no data:	135 (42.6%) no data: 0	29 (9.2%) no data: 0	14 (4.4%) no data: 1	1 (.3%) no data: 0	40 (12.6%) no data: 0	10 (3.2%) no data: 0
Kamakahelei Mid.	441	199[1] (45.1%)	Gr 6: 141 Gr 7: 135 Gr 8: 165 no data: 0	Gr 6: 76 Gr 7: 59 Gr 8: 64 no data: 0	195 (44.2%) no data: 7	80 (18.1%) no data: 1	26 (5.9%) no data: 7	14 (3.2%) no data: 1	37 (8.4%) no data: 7	19 (4.3%) no data: 1
Kauaʻi Hi.	364	2 (.5%)	Gr 9: 4 Gr 10: 19 Gr 11: 215 Gr 12: 126 no data: 0	Gr 9: 1 Gr 10: 0 Gr 11: 0 Gr 12: 1 no data: 0	113 (31.0%) no data: 6	2 (.6%) no data: 0	6 (1.6%) no data: 247	0 no data: 0	15 (4.1%) no data: 9	0 no data: 0
TOTALS	1,643	405 (24.7%)			719 (43.8%)	191 (11.6%)	94 (5.7%)	23 (1.4%)	126 (7.7%)	36 (2.2%)

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

[1]There was a clerical error when data was entered into PPICS. The data displayed in this cell "199 students with 30 days or more" was corrected from "192 students with 30 days or more" as reported in PPICS. The data reported in this table is the correct data that should have been entered into PPICS.

about center activities implemented in the summer of 2011 and SY 2011–12. Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee centers met the target with each center delivering services to attendees in at least one core academic area during Project Year 4. A description of activities for the content area implemented at each center is shown as Appendix A. We summarized the data as shown in two different categorization displays of the activities. As shown in Table 9, the activities were categorized by the APR activity subject areas as implemented across the centers. Additionally, as shown in Table 10, the activities were categorized by the APR primary and secondary types of activities as implemented across the center.

During the summer of 2011, the center staff at all five centers provided activities in the core academic areas of reading and literacy and science. At the Kaumualiʻi, Kōloa, Wilcox, and Kauaʻi High centers, they provided activities in the core academic area of mathematics. During SY 2011–12, staff at all five centers (Kaumualiʻi, Kōloa, Wilcox, Kamakahelei Middle, and Kauaʻi High) delivered services in three core academic areas of reading/literacy, mathematics, and science.

Extent and quality of implementation of core academic activities. In addition to collection of of data about categories of activities, we collected and analyzed data from center staff regarding the extent of implementation and quality of implementation of core subject area activities. Because the data are from five or fewer respondents, we provide a summarized narrative of the data, shown as Table 11. Among the notable results are reading and literacy activities were implemented at moderate to high extent across the sub-grantee centers. Four centers implemented reading and literacy activities at moderate to high quality while one center implemented reading and literacy activities at mediocre quality. Mathematics activities were implemented at moderate to high extent and quality.

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

The Implementation of Academic Enrichment Activities

The Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee met this indicator in Project Year 4, with each center implementing enrichment activities.

Enrichment and support activities (indicator 2.2): 100% of centers will offer enrichment and support activities such as nutrition and health, art, music, technology, and recreation. The Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee met this indicator in Project Year 4, with each center implementing enrichment activities. As shown in Table 9 and 10, all Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee centers provided academic enrichment activities. During Summer 2011, the center staff at all five centers provided activities in at least one of the academic enrichment areas. Art and music activities were offered all five centers. Technology or telecommunications activities were offered at four centers: Kōloa, Wilcox, Kamakahelei Middle, and Kauaʻi High. Health or nutrition activities were offered at three centers: Kaumualiʻi, Kōloa, and Kauaʻi High. Other activities were offered at three centers Kōloa, Wilcox, and Kamakahelei. The descriptions of the other activities are shown in Table 9. Entrepreneurial education activities were offered at one center: Kauaʻi High.

During School Year 2011–12, the center staff at all five centers again provided activities in at least one of the academic enrichment areas. The findings are shown as Table 12. Art and music activities

Table 9

Central Kauaʻi Sub-grantee: Categories of Activity Subject Areas and When They were Implemented in Project Year 4
(Listed by Number of Subject Area Category)

Activity subject area categories
(Summ = Subject category for Summer 2011. SY = Subject category for SY 2011–12.)

	Core academic areas			Academic enrichment areas					
Center	Reading or literacy	Mathematics	Science	Arts and music	Entrepreneurial education	Technology or telecommuni-cations	Cultural activities or social studies	Health or nutrition	Other[a]
Kaumualiʻi El.	Summ: 2 SY: 5	Summ: 1 SY: 4	Summ: 1 SY: 4	Summ: 2 SY: 6	0	0	SY: 1	Summ: 1	SY: 2
Kōloa El.	Summ: 3 SY: 5	Summ: 3 SY: 4	Summ: 1 SY: 2	Summ: 3 SY: 4	0	Summ: 2 SY: 3	Summ: 2 SY: 2	Summ: 2 SY: 4	Summ: 1 SY: 6
Wilcox El	Summ: 2 SY: 3	Summ: 1 SY: 2	Summ: 1 SY: 2	Summ: 1 SY: 1	0	Summ: 1	0	0	Summ: 1 SY: 1
Kamakahelei Mid.	Summ: 1 SY: 1	SY: 1	Summ: 1 SY: 1	Summ: 1 SY: 1	SY: 1	Summ: 1 SY: 1	SY: 2	SY: 1	Summ: 2 SY: 1
Kauaʻi Hi.	Summ: 1 SY: 1	Summ: 1 SY: 1	Summ: 1 SY: 1	Summ: 1 SY: 1	Summ: 1 SY: 1	Summ: 1 SY: 1	Summ: 1 SY: 1	Summ: 1 SY: 1	0
TOTALS	Summ: 10 SY: 15	Summ: 6 SY: 12	Summ: 5 SY: 10	Summ: 8 SY: 13	Summ: 1 SY: 2	Summ: 5 SY: 5	Summ: 3 SY: 6	Summ: 4 SY: 5	Summ: 4 SY: 10

Note. The categories were defined on the 21st CCLC Annual Performance Report (Learning Point Associates, 2012). Some activities were placed in more than one subject category.

[a]The following are additional information regarding the data in the "Other" category.
Kaumualiʻi Elementary
    Other: SY: 2 = "Critical thinking skills" for the Scrabble and Backgammon (Fall and Spring) activity.
Kōloa Elementary
    Other: Summ: 1 = "Character Education" for the Hawaiian activity.
    Other: SY: 6 = "Physical Education" for the Track, PE for Kids, and Basketball activities; "Career" for the Junior Police Officers activity; "Dance" for the Chorus and Dance activity; and "Gardening" for the Earth Friends activity.
Wilcox Elementary
    Other: Summ: 1 = "Routines of Kindergarten" for the Jump Start activity.
    Other: SY: 1 = "Sports" for the Basketball/Homework Help activity.
Kamakahelei Inter.
    Other: Summ: 2 = "Physical Education" for the Summer "Camp Style" and Daily "classes" during Summer Camp activities.
    Other: SY: 1 = "Physical Education" for the Sports activity.

Table 10

Central Kauaʻi Sub-grantee: Categories of Activities and When They were Implemented in Project Year 4
(Listed by Number of Activities per Primary and Secondary Activity Category)

Primary activity categories and secondary activity categories
(Summ1= Primary activity category for Summer 2011. Summ2 = Secondary activity category for Summer 2011.
SY1 = Primary activity category for School Year 2011–12. SY2 = Secondary activity category for School Year 2011–12.)

Center	Homework help	Tutorial	Academic enrichment	Recreational	Career or job training for youth	Activity to promote youth leadership	Community service or service learning	Drug, and violence prevention, counseling, or character education	Mentoring	Other[a]	Activity had more than two program elements
Kaumualiʻi El.	SY1: 3	SY2: 2	Summ1: 5 SY1: 11	Summ1: 5 SY1: 2	0	SY1: 1	SY2: 1	0		0	0
Kōloa El.	SY1: 1	Summ2: 1 SY2: 2	Summ1: 6 SY1: 3 SY2: 1	Summ1: 1 Summ2: 1 SY1: 11 SY2: 1	Summ2: 1	SY1: 1	0	Summ2: 1		SY2: 9	Summ2: 1 SY2: 1
Wilcox El.	SY1: 1 SY2: 1	Summ2: 1 SY2: 1	Summ1: 2 SY1: 4	SY1: 2	0	0	0	0		Summ2: 1 SY2: 1	0
Kamakahelei Mid.	SY2: 1	SY1: 1	Summ1: 1 SY1: 1	Summ1: 1 SY1: 1	0	Summ2: 1	SY2: 1	0		Summ2: 1	0
Kauaʻi Hi.	0	Summ1: 1 SY1: 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Summ2: 1 SY2: 1	0	0
TOTALS	SY1: 5 SY2: 2	Summ1: 1 Summ2: 2 SY1: 2 SY2: 6	Summ1: 14 SY1: 21 SY2: 2	Summ1: 7 Summ2: 1 SY1: 21 SY2: 1	Summ2: 1	Summ2: 1 SY1: 2	SY2: 2	Summ2: 1	Summ2: 1 SY2: 1	Summ2: 2 SY2: 13	Summ2: 1 SY2: 1

Note. The categories were defined on the 21st CCLC Annual Performance Report (Learning Point Associates, 2012). Some activities were placed in more than one primary activity category or secondary activity category.

[a]The following are additional information regarding the data in the "Other" category.
  Kōloa Elementary
    Other: SY2: 9 = "Physical Education" for the Track and PE for Kids activity; "Learning to cook" for the Cooking and Cooking around the World activity; "Dancing" for the Hula and Chorus and Dance activity; "Music" for the Ukulele activity; "Gardening" for the Earth Friends activity; "How to make Jewelry" for the Jewelry activity;
  Wilcox Elementary
    Other: Summ2: 1 = "Transition students entering Kindergarten without preschool experience" for the Jump Start activity
    Other: SY2: 1 = "Music, dance, drama, singing" for the Creative arts/Ukulele activity
  Kamakahelei Middle
    Other: Summ2: 1 = "Fun Summer Camp games/skits/activities" for the Summer "Camp Style" Activities

Table 11

Findings About Academic Activities—Five or Fewer Respondents

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

Findings about the implementation of reading and literacy activities suggest that they were implemented at moderate to high extent and quality at four of the five centers in Project Year 4: Kaumualiʻi, Kōloa, Wilcox, and Kauaʻi High. The reading and literacy activities were implemented at moderate to high extent and mediocre quality at the Kamakahelei Middle center.

Findings about the implementation of mathematics activities suggest that they were implemented at moderate to high extent and quality at all five Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee centers in Project Year 4.

Findings about the implementation of science activities suggest that they were implemented at moderate to high extent and quality at four of the five centers in Project Year 4: Kaumualiʻi, Wilcox, Kamakahelei Middle, and Kauaʻi High. The science activities were implemented at mediocre extent and moderate to high quality at the Kōloa 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 at moderate to high extent quality at all five Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee centers in Project Year 4.

Table 12

Findings About Enrichment Activities—Five or Fewer Respondents

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

Findings about the implementation of art or music activities suggest that they were implemented at moderate to high extent and quality in homework help, tutorials, classes, integrated content, or enrichment activities at Kaumualiʻi, Kōloa, Kamakahelei Middle, and Kauaʻi High centers in Project Year 4. The art or music activities were implemented at mediocre extent and quality in tutorials and classes at the Kauaʻi High center in Project Year 4.

There were no reported entrepreneurial education activities at the Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee centers in Project Year 4.

Findings about the implementation of telecommunication or technology activities suggest that they were implemented at moderate to high extent and quality in tutorials and classes at Kaumualiʻi, Kōloa, Kamakahelei Middle, and Kauaʻi High centers in Project Year 4.

Findings about the implementation of sports activities suggest that they were implemented at moderate to high extent and quality in homework help, tutorials, classes, integrated content, or enrichment activities at Kaumualiʻi and Kamakahelei Middle centers in Project Year 4.

Findings about the implementation of cultural or social studies activities suggest that they were implemented at mediocre extent and moderate to high quality in tutorials, classes, integrated content, or enrichment activities at the Kaumualiʻi center in Project Year 4. The cultural or social studies art activities were implemented at mediocre extent and quality in tutorials and classes at the Kauaʻi High center in Project Year 4.

Findings about the implementation of health or nutrition-related activities suggest that they were implemented at high extent and quality in integrated content activities at Kaumualiʻi center in Project Year 4. The health or nutrition-related activities were implemented at mediocre extent and quality in tutorials and classes at the Kauaʻi High center in Project Year 4.

Findings about the implementation of service learning activities suggest that they were implemented at mediocre extent and quality in tutorials and classes at the Kauaʻi High center in Project Year 4.

were offered at all five centers. Cultural or social studies activities were offered at four centers: Kaumualiʻi, Kōloa, Kamakahelei, and Kauaʻi High. Other activities were offered at four centers: Kaumualiʻi, Kōloa, Wilcox, and Kauaʻi High. The descriptions of the other activities are shown in Table 9. Technology and telecommunication activities were offered at three centers: Kōloa, Kamakahelei, and Kauaʻi High. Health or nutrition activities were offered at three centers: Kōloa, Kamakahelei, and Kauaʻi High. Entrepreneurial education activities were offered at two centers: Kamakahelei and Kauaʻi High. **Activities to improve positive behavior.** Data were collected from center staff members about the extent and quality of implementation of activities, discussions, and reinforcement of positive behaviors. As shown in Table 13, center staff at four Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee centers reported extent of implementation for discussing appropriate positive behavior and reinforce behaviors ranged from "moderate" to "all or almost all" levels across centers. As shown in Table 13, Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee center staff reported the quality of implementation for discussing appropriate positive behavior and reinforce behaviors ranged from "moderate" to "very well" at four centers. Kaumualiʻi staff did not report implementing activities for positive behaviors.

Community involvement (indicator 2.3): **85% of centers will establish and maintain partnerships within the community that continue to increase levels of community collaboration in planning, implementing, and sustaining programs.** The Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee did not meet this indicator in Project Year 4 despite intense efforts by the sub-grantee leadership and staff to maintain the partners listed in the grant proposal and gain new partnerships.

As mentioned previously in this report, three partners mentioned in the grant proposal were secured and maintained throughout the four project years: (a) the KIUC, that worked through the KEDB, provided donations for the robotics activities at the sub-grantee centers and (b) the HIDOE Central Kauaʻi Complex provided the host school facilities to implement the project activities, referred the attendees that attended the respective center, and the SRS devoted part of her time and energy to managing the 21st CCLC sub-grantee project. Additionally, an additional partner was secured that provided services to the entire sub-grantee. This partner was CRDG at UHM-CoE, who provided evaluation services. Other organizations that were anticipated as partners encountered challenges, such as obtaining security clearance to work with center students and staff. The YMCA of Kauaʻi was not able to secure staffing or design a program of activities for implementation with the Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee.

One center (Kōloa) had an individual as a partner (who prefers to be anonymous) that was not anticipated at the time the grant proposal was written. This unnamed partner provided programming or activity-related services, goods or materials, volunteer staffing, funding or help to raise funds.

Services to parents and other adult family members (indicator 2.4): 85% of centers will offer services to parents, senior citizens, and other adult community members. This performance measure was not met in Project Year 4. Based on the SY 2011–12 APR data, two of the five centers implemented activities to involve parents and adult family members. We collected data from center staff about the extent and quality of implementation of center activities designed to provide services to adult family members shown as Table 14. Center staff reported that the extent of implementation for activities with parents were from "moderate" to "all or almost all" levels of extent at Kōloa, Wilcox, Kamakahelei Middle, and Kauaʻi High centers. Center staff reported

Table 13

Findings About the Activities to Improve Positive Behaviors—Five or Fewer Respondents

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

Findings about the implementation of discussions of appropriate and positive behaviors with students to reinforce positive behaviors suggest that they were implemented at moderate to high extent and quality in tutorials, classes, integrated content, and enrichment activities at Kaumualiʻi, Kōloa, and Kamakahelei Middle centers in Project Year 4. The activities to reinforce positive behavior were implemented at mediocre extent and quality in tutorials, classes, and integrated content at the Kauaʻi High center in Project Year 4.

Table 14

Findings about Support Activities for Parents—Five or Fewer Respondents

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

Findings about the implementation of activities with parents of center attendees suggest that they were implemented at mediocre extent and quality in enrichment activities at the Kaumualiʻi center in Project Year 4.

the quality of implementing activities with parents   were from "moderate" to "very well" levels of quality at the Wilcox center. The Kōloa center staff reported that the quality of implementation was "mediocre." The Kaumualiʻi center staff did not report data about services to parents and other adult family members.

Descriptive data about project activities were provided by center coordinators on the APR Form C-7. The descriptions included a primary and a secondary subject area for each activity. To gather evaluative data about activities implemented in Project Year 4, the evaluation team administered an on-line staff questionnaire that elicited the staff, contractors, or volunteers perceptions about the extent and quality of implementation of project activities.

Are the project activities interesting and valuable to students, teachers, administrators, and community partners? The evaluation staff referred to the categorizations of data as shown in Tables 9 and 10 to determine the intentionality of design for project activities. As shown in Table 10, the top two primary categories for the summer of 2011 activities were academic enrichment and recreation. The top two secondary categories were tutorial and other (specific information were added by coordinators). During SY 2011–12, the top two primary categories for activities were, again, academic enrichment and recreation. The top three secondary categories were other (specific information added by coordinators), tutorial, and homework help. Among primary and secondary categories were lower numbers of activities targeted under career or job training for youth and drug and violence prevention, counseling, or character education.

As shown in Table 9, the majority of activities implemented during Project Year 4 were in the core academic areas of reading or literacy, mathematics, and science. The sub-grantee also provided academic enrichment activities in the categories of arts and music, cultural activities or social studies, and technology or telecommunications during Project Year 4. During the summer of 2011, the sub-grantee staff implemented eight art or music activities and, during SY 2011–12, the sub-grantee staff implemented 13 art or music activities. Among core and academic enrichment activity categories, entrepreneurial education was implemented the least over all the centers, with one activity implemented during the summer of 2011 and two activities during SY 2011–12 at the Kamakahelei Middle and Kauaʻi High centers. Based on the descriptive data summarized in Tables 10 and 11 about sub-grantee activities, the evaluators addressed the project objectives regarding implementation of core and enrichment activities required under the grant.

In addition, we reviewed center attendance data for the purpose of determining the percentage of attendees at each center whose attendance was 30 or more days. Although the retention of attendees measured through their center attendance provides only a tenuous indicator of an attendee's interest in the center's project of activities, the percentage of those attendees whose attendance meets the federal criterion of a regular attendee is an indicator of a center's ability to enroll and retain its target students. Based on our review of the data shown in Table 8, these are the percentages of regular attendees to total center attendees: Kamakahelei Middle (45.1%), Kaumualiʻi (31.7%), Kōloa (21.6%), Wilcox (20.2%), and Kauaʻi High (0.5%). Across Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee centers, we found 24.7% of the 1,643 attendees were regular attendees. Although the measurement is tenuous, regular attendance of center attendees indicated the project's ability to retain and affect the targeted student population.

We summarized these data to address the evaluation sub-question about activities that are

interesting and valuable to stakeholders. We believe that the centers' scheduling of activities reflect the 21st CCLC program priorities, which are to provide academic enrichment activities designed to improve the academic achievement and behavior of students with the highest needs. We believe that the administrators and teachers who support the sub-grantee also have a vested interest and shared value system with the program. In our interactions with center leaders and staff, and our observations of center students at site visits, we have never heard of or observed a center student with behavior problems based on protesting his or her enrollment in the centers. We have heard of center leaders or staff shifting a student to another group because the other group may be more suitable for that student's needs and we consider that good program management. Center students participate in center activities voluntarily to some extent. However, many center students are quite young and probably do not feel that they have other options if their parents or teachers tell them they should attend the center activities. Students' long-term attendance of reaching the 30 or more days of attendance is one measure that students continued to participate in center activities because it is of value to them or their parents or teachers support their participation in the centers. The continued enrollment of students in the centers' regimen of emphasis on academic activities with enrichment activities over the five years of the grant may be considered the centers' stakeholders' value for the centers offering of activities. A center leader reported challenges with enrollment of the targeted group at some centers because the students also had problems with chronic absenteeism in the day school.

As reported by a Project Director, the Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee centers faced several challenges to project implementation, including sustainability, continued participation of attendees at some centers, and developing and maintaining community-based partnerships. The project director reported that one of the biggest challenges was sustainability, with the challenge of securing partners as a primary challenge for the project after grant funding ends. Another reported challenge is the participation of attendees. The project director acknowledged that some students in the target group had poor attendance in the day school, which followed to poor attendance in the centers. However, the Kamakahelei Middle center leadership and staff should be applauded for enlisting a large percentage of students from the host school to attend the 21st century project and creating such high levels of enthusiasm within the students to attend. The project director also reported that center coordinators attempted to increase enrollment through outreach in the host schools, enlisting day school teachers for referrals, and inquiring about students who need additional academic assistance.

The Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee also faced a challenge when trying to maintain the partnerships listed in the grant proposal due to financial reasons. The challenge of securing and maintaining partners was, in part, due to the struggles with obtaining security clearance for outside partners' employees to work with the center students as part of safety regulations center participants and staff.

Results of the Evaluation of Outcomes

The evaluation of outcomes addresses the HIDOE-SPMS KPIs and the program performance indicators established by the USDE for the 21st CCLC program. The evaluation questions for the study of outcomes are (a) what changes were found in regular center students' academic behaviors as

reported by their language arts or mathematics day classroom teachers? and (b) what changes were found in regular center students' academic performance as reported by their language arts or mathematics day classroom teachers?

Findings about Academic Behavior

Data about regular attendees' academic behavior collected with the 21st CCLC teacher survey were analyzed as counts, percentages, means, and standard deviations for each center, after excluding data for students who did not need improvement and when data were not provided (missing data). The findings for all the regular attendees are shown as Table 15. Of the 10 items on the teacher survey, four items were designated by the HIDOE-SPMS state program manager as KPIs with the criterion of 75% or more were regular attendees: (a) turning in his or her homework on time, (b) participating in class, (c) attending class regularly, and (d) behaving well in class. These four items designated as KPIs are shown in bold face in Table 15. We applied the 75% improvement criterion to all 10 academic behaviors on the teacher survey and indicated those centers where the outcome objectives were met by shaded cells in Table 15.

Findings by KPIs. The sub-grantee did not meet the 75% performance objective for the four KPIs in Project Year 4. For the KPI of "turning in homework on time," only the Kaua'i High center met or exceeded the 75% performance objective with 100% of its regular attendees improving in this behavior ($n = 2$). However, the percentages of regular attendees who improved in turning in their homework on time at the other centers were only slightly below the 75% mark: Kaumuali'i (73%), Kōloa (73%), Wilcox (74%), and Kamakahelei Middle (71%).

Of the five centers, the percentages of regular attendees at four centers met or exceeded the 75% mark of the KPI, "participating in class": Kaumuali'i (81%), Kōloa (94%), Wilcox (81%), and Kaua'i High (100%). The percentage of regular attendees at the Kamakahelei Middle center was only slightly under the target at 73%.

For the KPI of "attending class regularly," the percentage of regular attendees improving in this behavior at the Kaua'i High center only (100%) met or exceeded the 75% mark. The percentages of regular attendees improving in this behavior at other centers were well below the mark: Kaumuali'i (43%), Kōloa (55%), Wilcox (36%), and Kamakahelei Middle (45%).

Both the Kaua'i High center's regular attendees (100%) improved in the KPI of "behaving well in class*,"* exceeding the 75% target. However, the percentages of regular attendees that improved in the KPI at the three elementary centers were slightly below the mark: Kaumuali'i (71%), Kōloa (74%), and Wilcox (73%). The center at Kamakahelei Middle had 59% of its regular attendees improve toward the target.

Findings about non-KPI behaviors. There were six academic behaviors in addition to the KPI items included on the teacher survey and we will describe the findings for the non-KPI behaviors here. At least 75% of the regular attendees at three centers improved in "completing homework to the satisfaction [of the day school teacher completing the teacher survey]: Kaumuali'i (85%), Kōloa (81%), and Kaua'i High (100%). The other centers were approaching the target: Wilcox (70%) and Kamakahelei Middle (70%).

Table 15

Central Kauaʻi Sub-grantee: Overall Findings of the Teacher Survey About Student Behavior in Project Year 4

Changed behavior in terms of...	N and % of regular students showing improvement in behavior (The statistics are based on the number of regular students from the center whose teachers reported as needing improvement in their academic behavior. The behaviors in bold print were designated as key performance behaviors by the HIDOE-SPMS section.)[1]				
	Kaumualiʻi El.	Kōloa El.	Wilcox El.	Kamakahelei Mid.	Kauaʻi Hi.
turning in his or her homework on time (KPI)	32 (73%) n=44	22 (73%) n=30	14 (74%) n=19	70 (71%) n=98	2 (100%) n=2
completing homework to your satisfaction	39 (85%) n=46	26 (81%) n=32	16 (70%) n=23	74 (70%) n=106	2 (100%) n=2
participating in class (KPI)	38 (81%) n=47	34 (94%) n=36	21 (81%) n=26	80 (73%) n=110	2 (100%) n=2
volunteering (e.g., for extra credit or more responsibilities)	22 (50%) n=44	31 (86%) n=36	15 (58%) n=26	54 (62%) n=87	2 (100%) n=2
attending class regularly (KPI)	13 (43%) n=30	11 (55%) n=20	5 (36%) n=14	24 (45%) n=53	2 (100%) n=2
being attentive in class	34 (71%) n=48	24 (86%) n=28	16 (76%) n=21	69 (70%) n=99	2 (100%) n=2
behaving well in class (KPI)	24 (71%) n=34	20 (74%) n=27	11 (73%) n=15	44 (59%) n=74	2 (100%) n=2
academic performance	47 (87%) n=54	32 (94%) n=34	23 (85%) n=27	78 (69%) n=113	1 (50%) n=2
coming to school motivated to learn	32 (73%) n=44	23 (85%) n=27	10 (53%) n=19	77 (73%) n=106	2 (100%) n=2
getting along well with other students	27 (75%) n=36	19 (86%) n=22	10 (71%) n=14	56 (63%) n=89	2 (100%) n=2

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

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

Regular attendees at two centers improved in "volunteering": Kōloa (86%), and Kauaʻi High (100%) to meet or exceed the 75% target. The other centers were somewhat below the target: Kaumualiʻi (50%), Wilcox (58%), and Kamakahelei Middle (62%).

At least 75% of regular attendees at three centers improved in being "attentive in class": Kōloa (86%), Wilcox (76%), and Kauaʻi High (100%). The other centers were slightly below the target: Kaumualiʻi (71%) and Kamakahelei Middle (70%).

At least 75% of regular attendees at three centers improved in "academic performance": Kaumualiʻi (87%), Kōloa (94%), and Wilcox (85%). Kamakahelei Middle and Kauaʻi High were below the target at 69% and 50%, respectively.

At least 75% of regular attendees at two centers improved in "coming to school motivated to learn": Kōloa (85%) and Kauaʻi High (100%). The percentages of regular attendees that improved in this KPI at the Kaumualiʻi and Kamakahelei Middle centers were slightly below the 75% target at 73%, respectively. The Wilcox center was well below the 75% target at 53%.

At least 75% of regular attendees at three centers improved in "getting along well with other students"*:* Kaumualiʻi (75%), Kōloa (86%), and Kauaʻi High (100%). The Kaumualiʻi center had 71% of regular students improving in the behavior, which approached the 75% target. The Kamakahelei center was at 63% in Project Year 4.

Findings by center. In this section, we provide center-level counts of 75% or more regular attendees' improvement in the academic behavior. The reader is referred to Table 15 for specific information. At the Kaumualiʻi center, the percentage of regular attendees that met or exceeded the performance target for four academic behaviors, was just slightly under the performance target for four academic behaviors, and was well below the performance targets for two behaviors.

The percentage of regular attendees at the Kōloa center met or exceeded the performance target for seven of the academic behaviors and slightly under the mark for two other academic behaviors. For the academic behavior of "attending class regularly," the percentage of regular attendees were well below the performance target for the Kōloa center.

The percentage of regular attendees at the Wilcox center met the proficiency target for three academic behaviors and was slightly under the target for four other academic behaviors. The percentages of regular center students were well below the target for the academic behaviors of "volunteering*," "*attending class regularly," and "coming to school motivated to learn."

At the Kamakahelei Middle center, the percentages of regular attendees did not meet the performance targets for any of the academic behaviors, although the percentages were slightly under the target for five of the 10 academic behaviors.

Both of Kauaʻi High's regular center students improved on nine of the 10 academic behaviors included on the 21st CCLC teacher survey. It should be noted that because there were only two regular center students at the high school, these findings are not comparable across the centers. We note that this is an admirable achievement for the two regular center students.

Findings about Academic Achievement

The HIDOE-SPMS (2010) outcome indicator for academic achievement was, "60% of regular students will demonstrate improvement in reading/language arts and/or math." Two types of data were collected to examine the levels of regular attendees' academic achievement during Year 4: (a) Fall and Spring semester report card grades in reading/language arts and mathematics, and (b) pre-post reading and mathematics assessments administered in the centers' host schools. Center staff reported changes in regular attendees' report card semester grades when the grades increased one-half grade or more, decreased one-half grade or more, or no change. Changes in pre-post assessment scores were reported when the post-test scores were at least 5% higher or lower than the pre-assessment scores. The changes in semester report card grades and changes in pre-post assessment scores were both reported as *1* = increase, *2* = decrease, *3* = no change, *4* = did not need to change, N/A, or no data.

60% or more regular attendees improved reading/language arts and mathematics grades: Indicator 4.1a and 4.1b. Over all, as shown in Table 16, the Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee project, did not meet this performance measure. Two centers reached or exceeded the 60% criterion for regular attendees who improved in reading/language arts report card grades: Kaumualiʻi (70%) and Kōloa (80%). Furthermore, the same two centers reached or exceeded the 60% criterion for regular attendees who improved in mathematics report card grades: Kaumualiʻi (75%) and Kōloa (83%).

As shown in Table 16, there were three Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee centers that reached or exceeded the 60% criterion of regular attendees who improved their reading/language arts pre-post assessment scores: Kaumualiʻi (87%), Kōloa (79%), and Wilcox (71%). Furthermore, three centers reached or exceeded the 60% criterion of regular attendees who improved their mathematics pre-post assessment scores: Kaumualiʻi (65%), Kōloa (89%), and Wilcox (78%).

Dissemination of Results to the Public

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

Conclusions and Recommendations

In Project Year 4, the Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee project was a well-implemented, maturing project. The project was well aligned with the grant proposal, except for the loss of partnerships. The five centers in the sub-grantee emphasized academic activities with opportunities for center attendees to participate in enrichment activities. The expected effects from the intended implementation were not highly evident in the performance measures of semester report card grades and pre-post assessments administered in the host schools, and we recommend center-level formative assessments to diagnose and monitor students' needs for intervention and progress. We are aware that the centers have always used such assessments, this recommendation entails reporting results of the assessments in the evaluation report or for future grant proposals in the same terms as the semester grades and pre-post assessment scores, that is, in terms of numbers and percentages of students with 5% change of improved, went down, stayed the same, and did not to improve.

Table 16

Central Kaua'i Sub-grantee: Changes in Semester Grades and School-Based Assessments for Regular Students in Project Year 4

Center	Changes in **Language Arts** grades	Changes in pre-post test *Language Arts* scores	Changes in *Mathematics* grades	Changes in pre-post test *Mathematics* score
Kaumuali'i El.	Improved: 40 (70%) No change: 16 (28%) Went down: 1 (2%) Did not need to improve: 26 N/A: 0 No data: 3	Improved: 13 (87%) No change: 2 (13%) Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 10 N/A: 0 No data: 1	Improved: 47 (75%) No change: 12 (19%) Went down: 4 (6%) Did not need to improve: 20 N/A: 0 No data: 3	Improved: 35 (65%) No change: 10 (19%) Went down: 9 (17%) Did not need to improve: 9 N/A: 31 No data: 0
Kōloa El.	Improved: 43 (80%) No change: 11 (20%) Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 0	Improved: 41 (79%) No change: 4 (8%) Went down: 7 (13%) Did not need to improve: 2 N/A: 0 No data: 0	Improved: 45 (83%) No change: 9 (17%) Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 0	Improved: 48 (89%) No change: 3 (6%) Went down: 3 (6%) Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 0
Wilcox El.	Improved: 13 (32%) No change: 28 (68%) Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 0	Improved: 22 (71%) No change: 9 (29%) Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 10 N/A: 0 No data: 0	Improved: 8 (20%) No change: 32 (78%) Went down: 1 (2%) Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 0	Improved: 32 (78%) No change: 8 (20%) Went down: 1 (2%) Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 0
Kamakahelei Mid.	Improved: 55 (36%) No change: 78 (51%) Went down: 21 (14%) Did not need to improve: 28 N/A: 0 No data: 10	Improved: 0 No change: 0 Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 192 No data: 0	Improved: 32 (20%) No change: 99 (62%) Went down: 28 (18%) Did not need to improve: 33 N/A: 0 No data: 10	Improved: 0 No change: 0 Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 192 No data: 0
Kaua'i Hi.	Improved: 1 (50%) No change: 1 (50%) Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 0	Improved: 0 No change: 0 Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 2 No data: 0	Improved: 0 No change: 2 (100%) Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 0	Improved: 0 No change: 0 Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 2 No data: 0

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

[a]Counts for *Did not need to improve, N/A,* and *No data* were excluded from the denominator used to calculate percentages on this table.

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

There were a somewhat higher percentage of regular attendees to total center enrollees in Year 3 than in Year 4 (561 regular attendees in Year 3 or 32.2% of all center attendees, 405 regular attendees in Year 4 or 24.6% of all center attendees). The percentage of regular attendees who improved in their language arts report card grades was somewhat lower in Year 3 than in Year 4 (29.4% in Year 3, 37.5% in Year 4) and the percentages were about the same for mathematics report card grades (30.3% in Year 3, 32.6% in Year 4) between Fall and Spring semesters.

Based on the data and findings of this report, we provide the following recommendations, which are also shown in Table 17.

- Although the data showed that the Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee did not meet all four academic behavior KPIs, the centers were barely under the target for regular attendees' improvement in "participation in class" (four of five centers). This is very encouraging because participation in class is an important academic behavior to build on for academic achievement; it is a behavioral indicator of student engagement with the process of learning.

- For the academic behavior of "submitting homework on time," the day teachers reported that four of the centers were just under the 75% targeted mark with an average of 72.8% positive change at four centers. This is remarkably more than the previous year's improvement in the same behavior of 28.1%. Theoretically, as students' academic behaviors improve, it is assumed that their academic achievement will improve. Based on this finding, we recommend that the center leaders explore ways to address this issue. Homework assistance is implemented at the three elementary centers and at the middle school center. Perhaps center staff can work with center attendees to log a description of the homework that was addressed during center time, including the date presented and completed, and day teachers can communicate if all homework assigned were or were not presented to the center staff. Center attendees may also present their list of homework assignments to the center staff for assistance with prioritizing their efforts, which should facilitate timely completion of homework assignments.

- We note that the Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee center leaders and staff members targeted the student populations that aligned with the goals of the 21st CCLC program, "the highest need students." As shown by the demographic statistics in Table 6, the Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee students were from disadvantaged backgrounds. We recommend that the center staff continue and enhance their efforts to improve center students' academic behaviors. We recommend that center staff who tutor homework help or academic activities (reading, mathematics, or science) have teacher-level qualifications. Tutors with teacher-level qualifications are more familiar with administration and interpretation of diagnostic assessment data and implementing instructional strategies with individual students based on the assessment data. Further, if possible, professional development should be provided to tutors to prepare them to work with the types of students in the center, for instance, ELL students, SPED students, disadvantaged students, working in small groups. The centers' organization and intake for student enrollment have similarities to the Response-to-Intervention Tier 2 level, that is, the centers provide services to many students who need more assistance than can be provided in a regular classroom environment (Johnson, n.d.). Center leaders may consider providing center staff

34

Table 17

Central Kauaʻi Sub-grantee: Findings, Summary, and Recommendations in Project Year 4

Performance measure	Objective met or not met in 2011–12	Summary	Recommendations
Implementation objectives			
2.1. 100% of centers will offer high quality services in at least one core academic area, such as reading and literacy, mathematics, and science.	Met	Kaumualiʻi, Kōloa, Wilcox, Kamakahelei Middle, and the Kauaʻi High centers implemented reading and mathematics at moderate to above moderate levels. Kaumualiʻi, Wilcox, Kamakahelei Middle, and Kauaʻi High implemented science at moderate to high levels.	The criteria for the USDE and HIDOE were met. Activities were implemented as intended. In light of the achievement data, we support and recommend continuing this implementation plan for the core academic activities that includes 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	Data were collected about the implementation of seven content areas that may have been integrated into enrichment areas. Four of the five centers implemented at least two content areas. The implementation levels for some content areas were mediocre, but for other areas the implementation levels were moderate to high. Kōloa staff reported moderate to high levels of implementation in seven content areas. Wilcox staff reported above moderate to high levels of implementation in five content areas. Kaumualiʻi staff reported moderate levels of implementation in two content areas. Kauaʻi High is the exception which offered only the Personal Transition Plan (PTP) activities during Summer 2011 and SY 2011–12. However, the subjects report for the PTP activities included enrichment subjects.	The Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee implemented a variety of enrichment activities in Project Year 4. We recommend the continued and expanded emphasis on enrichment activities with intentional integration of academic components. 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.

(Table 17
Central Kauaʻi Sub-grantee: Findings, Summary, and Recommendations in Project Year 4, continued)

Performance measure	Objective met or not met in 2011–12	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	Of the five centers in the Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee, the Kōloa center established and maintained at least one partnership (a private citizen) within the community. There were three partners over all the sub-grantee, (a) CRDG, the external evaluator; (b) the HIDOE Central Kauaʻi Complex (facilitated centers activities by allowing implementation on the grounds of the host schools and the SRS to manage the centers); and (c) the KEDB that worked with KIUC (facilitated the robotics activities). An individual, who was not written in the grant proposal, partnered with the Kōloa center. There were challenges with securing partners, such as staffing, appropriate programming, and securing security clearance to work with center staff and students.	We encourage project leaders to continue their efforts to secure community partners. Involving partners in the centers provides opportunities for children and community organizations to work together toward the improvement of the children's educational experiences. These experiences broaden children's knowledge of and experiences with adults and their business ventures/ interests. The work with community organizations may also provide a possible partner to support sustainability of the project.

(Table 17
Central Kaua'i Sub-grantee: Findings, Summary, and Recommendations in Project Year 4, continued)

Performance measure	Objective met or not met in 2011–12	Summary	Recommendations
2.4. 85% of centers will offer services to parents, senior citizens, and other adult community members.	Not met	The performance measure was not met. However, there were two centers that did report implementing activities that offered services to parents, senior citizens, and other adult community members, but no description of the type of activity was provided.	We encourage project leaders to continue their efforts to provide activities to parents and other adult community members. In our experience evaluating several sub-grantees over a decade with the Hawai'i 21st CCLC program, it is challenging for sub-grantees to meet this performance measure because of parents/adults time commitments, transportation problems, and other reasons. However, family members are powerful influences on each other and parents' involvement in their children's education is a critical factor in academic achievement. We encourage centers to share about best practices for working with parents. Perhaps combined center events with a community theme may be attractive (fund raisers for sports teams or scholarships, make your own sundae). A few of these events alongside some enrichment learning activities (e.g., Legos, Mad Science, student-led drama or music, student cooking lunch from a recipe with handout explaining the nutritional value of the meal/ cultural background of the dish/ other). Other creative means of communicating with family members, such as via technology might be a consideration.

(Table 17
Central Kauaʻi Sub-grantee: Findings, Summary, and Recommendations in Project Year 4, continued)

Performance measure	Objective met or not met in 2011–12	Summary	Recommendations
2.5. 75% of centers will offer services at least 15 hours per week on average and provide services when school is not in session, such as during summer and holidays.	Not met	The performance measure was not met, but the centers offered services for a considerable amount of time during the Summer session at five of the centers. During the summer session, centers were open between four and six weeks. Three of the five centers were open five days a week and 15 to 20 hours per week. The exceptions were Kōloa and Kamakahelei Middle which were open four days a week for 24 and 32 hours per week, respectively. Although the centers did not meet this requirement for the school year, three of the five centers offered services for a considerable amount of time. Centers were open between 27 and 35 weeks. One center was open five days of the week and 10 hours per week. Three centers were open four days a week and 6 to 14 hours per week. One center was open three days per week and 4 hours per week.	We encourage project leaders to continue their efforts to increase the number of hours per week that they provide activities. In our experience evaluating several sub-grantees over a decade with the Hawaiʻi 21st CCLC program, it has always been a challenge for Hawaiʻi sub-grantees to meet this performance measure.
3.1. 100% of students are in centers located in high-poverty communities.	Met	The 2000 U.S. Census shows that the school community was slightly higher than the overall State average by almost 3% on one of the three poverty variables of families headed by a single mother. On the poverty variable of households with public assistance income, the school community was approaching the State average. On the poverty variable of families with children living in poverty, the school community was moderately lower than the State of Hawaiʻi. As shown in Table 6, the percentages of students with free- and reduced-lunch status at the centers were 31%–55.2%. This is quite high.	All centers are located in high-poverty communities. Additionally, the centers are providing services to students from disadvantaged backgrounds. It is important that the centers continue to provide services to this target group that may not have opportunities for the breadth and depth of learning opportunities as their peers.

(Table 17
Central Kauaʻi Sub-grantee: Findings, Summary, and Recommendations in Project Year 4, continued)

Performance measure	Objective met or not met in 2011–12	Summary	Recommendations
		Outcome objectives	
1.1a. 75% of regular program participants will have teacher-reported improvement in turning in homework on time as shown on the 21st CCLC teacher survey.	Not met	This indicator was met by Kauaʻi High center only. The other four centers were slightly under the target.	There are high levels of implementation of homework assistance activities at the centers (see Appendix A). We recommend exploring the use of a homework log to help students prioritize their work by date assigned and date due. The log might also be used to communicate with the day teachers about homework assignments work on with center staff.
1.1b. 75% of regular program participants will have teacher-reported improvement in classroom participation as shown on the 21st CCLC teacher survey.	Not met	This indicator was met at the Kaumualiʻi, Kōloa, Wilcox, and Kauaʻi High centers. The Kamakahelei center did not meet the target, but was very close to the mark at 73%.	We recommend that the tutors and staff continue their efforts toward improving students' academic behavior toward this objective. All tutors and contractors should be made aware of this objective and provide opportunities for students to practice active participation and discuss with students the importance of participation in day classes.
1.1c. 75% of regular program participants will have teacher-reported improvement in attending class regularly as shown on 21st CCLC teacher survey.	Not met	This indicator was met by the Kauaʻi High center only. The other four centers did not meet the indicator. (percentages of regular students with teacher-reported improvement were between 20 and 39%).	We recommend that center tutors and staff be made aware of this objective and discuss with center students the importance of regular attendance in the center and day classes. The findings on this indicator were the lowest of all the findings about academic behavior and may have had a negative effect on the levels on other academic behaviors. Center leaders and staff might consider working collaboratively to address the causes of students' frequent absenteeism and encourage regular attendance.
1.1d. 75% of regular program participants will have teacher-reported improvement in student classroom behavior as shown on the 21st CCLC teacher survey.	Not met	This indicator was met by the Kauaʻi High center only. However, the three elementary schools were barely under the 75% mark. The exception was the Kamakahelei center, with 16% of the regular attendees reported as improving in classroom behavior, well below the 75% mark.	We recommend that the project leaders ensure that all center tutors and staff are aware of this objective (i.e., implementing induction practices) and they discuss with center students the importance of regular attendance in the center and day classes. Center leaders and staff should align expectations and consequences for behaviors in the center activities with day classes.

(Table 17
Central Kauaʻi Sub-grantee: Findings, Summary, and Recommendations in Project Year 4, continued)

Performance measure	Objective met or not met in 2011–12	Summary	Recommendations
4.1.a. 60% of regular program participants will have teacher-reported improvement in reading/language arts and mathematics.	Not met	This indicator was met by Kaumualiʻi and Kōloa in Language Arts grades and test scores and Mathematics grades and test scores. Furthermore, Wilcox met in Language Arts test scores and mathematics test scores.	We recommend that the center staff who provide homework assistance and tutorial have the qualifications of regular day teachers. Further, we recommend that center project leaders consider providing professional development to center tutors and staff who implement the reading/ literacy and mathematics activities in (a) administration of formative assessments and use of the data to inform interventions and (b) providing interventions in small group settings, similar to the Response to Intervention Tier 2 trainings.

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

with professional development in working with center attendees in the small group arrangement. The project leaders may wish to explore the possibility of providing center tutors with professional development opportunities aligned with the needs of Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee's center attendees and with the delivery of center services. In Project Year 4, the largest group of center attendees had free- and reduced-lunch status (see Table 6).

- Homework that is complete and correct is essential to success in school, therefore, we strongly recommend that the Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee project leaders continue to devote sufficient center time to homework support and tutoring in reading and mathematics in all grade levels. 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.

- Our final recommendation is that the Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee staff plan and develop the academic components of the enrichment activities. For instance, academic components may be planned and developed to align with the day school programs or those academic components that naturally fit within the enrichment activity. We want to clarify that enrichment activities also should be implemented for recreational purposes. This is valuable, particularly for the Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee target groups. These children need to identify with schools as a place where they belong, enjoy, and are safe and comfortable. They need to regard school staff and other children as people that they like and with whom they can safely and comfortably interact. Students need to feel valued and that they can learn and correctly and ethically apply knowledge. We are, of course, reiterating the intent from the grant proposal, which stated that the environment of the Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee centers should provide experiences for these children to develop, learn, and grow.

What are the plans to ensure effective program implementation next year? There were positive findings about the implementation of academic and enrichment activities in Project Year 4, and we expect continued levels of implementation of activities into Project Year 5. All data suggest that there has been considerable effort to implement activities well, and the data show that the targeted mark for implementing academic and enrichment activities was met. The other project components that were not implemented to meet the targeted performance measures are highly affected by variables not in the control of center staff, such as parent activities, community partnerships, and operating an average of 15 hours per week, each involve the willingness of other groups of people to devote time and energy to center activities. Although we understand that it is more difficult to implement components that are largely dependent on the motivation of other parties, we hope that our recommendations will facilitate implementation toward the targeted performance measures.

We will keep communication lines open with the Central Kauaʻi project leaders to review this Project Year 4 evaluation report findings and recommendations to address any questions and to discuss any foreseeable challenges to implementing the recommendations. Sub-grantee consideration of the recommendations including any foreseeable challenges should be well documented to inform future evaluation efforts.

References

Baker, B. (2009). *21st Century Community Learning Centers Grant Resubmittal: Central Kauaʻi Complex (State of Hawaiʻi Department of Education)*. Lihue, Hawaiʻi: Hawaiʻi Department of Education.

Central Kauaʻi sub-grantee. (2011). Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS). *Grantee profile: Central Kauai complex objectives*. Retrieved from http://ppics.learningpt.org/ppics/objectives.asp.

Hawaiʻi Department of Education. (2012). *School Status & Improvement Report*. Retrieved August 24, 2012 from http://arch.k12.hi.us/school/ssir/ssir.html

Hawaiʻi Department of Education-Special Programs Management Section. (2010). Key *performance indicators: 21st Century Community learning Centers, 2010–2011*. Honolulu, HI: author.

Hawaiʻi Department of Education-Special Programs Management Section. (2011a). *Evaluation report template.* Honolulu, HI: author.

Hawaiʻi Department of Education-Special Programs Management Section. (2011b). *Sub-grantee 21st CCLC handbook: SY 11–12*. Hawaiʻi Department of Education.

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 the21st CCLC performance data: 2009–10*. Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates.

No Child Left Behind—Title IV—Part B, 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC). *Supporting student success through 21st CCLC opportunities.* Retrieved from http://doe.k12.hi.us/nclb/21stcclc/index.htm

Systems Accountability Office, System Evaluation & Reporting Section. (2012). *AYP reports by school: 2012 (AYP report)*. Honolulu, HI: Hawaiʻi Department of Education. Retrieved from http://arch.k12.hi.us/PDFs/nclb/2012/FinalAYPPallSch3/Pub201220928.pdf

U.S. Department of Education. *Title IV, Part B—21st Century Community Learning Centers*. (2001). Retrieved March 22, 2010, from http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg55.html

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Academic Improvement and Teacher Quality Programs. (2003, February). *21st Century Community Learning Centers: Non-regulatory guidance*. Washington, DC: author.

Appendix A

**Description of Academic and Enrichment Activities
Implemented at the Central Kaua'i Centers in Project Year 4
(Summer of 2011 through SY 2011–12)**

Table A1

Kaumualiʻi Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 4

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
			Summer 2011 activities				
LitArt	Summer	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students[1]	82 students per day	Reading or literacy	Academic enrichment learning program		4 weeks, 5 days per week, 4 hours per day[1]
Cooking	Summer	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students	72 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics	Academic enrichment learning program		4 weeks, 5 days per week, 4 hours per day[1]
Science	Summer	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students	17 students per day	Science	Academic enrichment learning program		4 weeks, 5 days per week, 4 hours per day[1]
Arts and Crafts/Art	Summer	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students[1]	108 students per day	Arts and music	Academic enrichment learning program		4 weeks, 5 days per week, 4 hours per day[1]
Music/Ukulele	Summer	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students	15 students per day	Arts and music	Academic enrichment learning program		4 weeks, 5 days per week, 4 hours per day[1]
Physical Education	Summer	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students	108 students per day	Health or nutrition	Recreational activity		4 weeks, 5 days per week, 4 hours per day[1]

[1]There was a clerical error when data was entered into PPICS. The data displayed in this cell is the correct data that should have been entered into PPICS.

				SY 2011–12 activities			
Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
LitArt	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Other: Spring semester program also targeted 3rd Grade students	10 students per day	Reading or literacy	Academic enrichment learning program		13 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day
Homework Help (Fall)	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Other: Economically disadvantaged Asian/Pacific Islander	37 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Science	Homework help		10 weeks, 4 days per week, 1 hour per day
Homework Help (Spring)	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average	43 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Science	Homework help		13 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day
Scrabble and Backgammon (Fall)	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Other: Economically disadvantaged Asian/Pacific Islander	8 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Other: Critical thinking skills	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	10 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day
Scrabble and Backgammon (Spring)	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Other: Economically disadvantaged Asian/Pacific Islander	8 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Other: Critical thinking skills	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	13 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day
Hands on Math for Grade K	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Other: Kindergarten students	18 students per day	Mathematics	Academic enrichment learning program	Tutoring	13 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day

(Table A1

Kaumualiʻi Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 4, continued)

			SY 2011–12 activities				
Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Math Homework and Games	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Other: Economically disadvantaged 3rd Grade students	10 students per day	Mathematics	Homework help	Tutoring	13 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day
Robotics (Fall)	School Year	•Other: Economically disadvantaged	5 students per day	Science	Academic enrichment learning program		15 weeks, 4 days per week, 2 hours per day
Robotics (Spring)	School Year	•Other: Economically disadvantaged	5 students per day	Science	Academic enrichment learning program		15 weeks, 4 days per week, 2 hours per day
Art Enrichment	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Other: Economically disadvantaged Asian/Pacific Islander	9 students per day	Arts and music	Academic enrichment learning program		10 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day
Arts and Crafts/Art	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities •Other: Economically disadvantaged Asian/Pacific Islander	10 students per day	Arts and music	Academic enrichment learning program		10 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day
Civic Leadership	School Year	None of the categories listed in the PPICS APR form applied to the students who participated in the activity and the center did not provide any categories.	14 students per day	None of the categories listed in the PPICS APR form applied to the students who participated in the activity and the center did not provide any categories.	Activity to promote youth leadership	Community service or service learning	13 weeks, 2 days per week, 2 hours per day

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Dance and Fitness	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Other: Economically disadvantaged 4th and 5th grade students	15 students per day	Arts and music	Recreational activity		16 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day
Dance and Yoga	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Other: Economically disadvantaged Asian/Pacific Islander	14 students per day	Arts and music	Recreational activity		10 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day
Hawaiiana	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Other: Economically disadvantaged Asian/Pacific Islander	8 students per day	Cultural activities or social studies	Academic enrichment learning program		10 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day
Music and Movement	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Other: Economically disadvantaged Asian/Pacific Islander	9 students per day	Arts and music	Academic enrichment learning program		10 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day
Music/Ukulele	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Other: Economically disadvantaged Asian/Pacific Islander	10 students per day	Arts and music	Academic enrichment learning program		10 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day

Table A2

Kōloa Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities in Project Year 4

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
			Summer 2011 activities				
Art	Summer	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities •Other: students with behavior issues	32 students per day[1]	•Reading or literacy •Arts and music •Cultural activities or social studies	•Academic enrichment learning program •The activity had more than two program elements	•Recreational activity	4 weeks, 4 days per week, 45 minutes per day
Computers	Summer	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities •Other: students with behavior issues	32 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Technology or telecommuni-cations	•Academic enrichment learning program •The activity had more than two program elements	•Career or job training for youth	4 weeks, 4 days per week, 45 minutes per day
Kindergarten Kamp	Summer	Other: Students who did not attend preschool (to help them transition into Kindergarten)	40 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Arts and music •Technology or telecommuni-cations •Health or nutrition	•Academic enrichment learning program •The activity had more than two program elements		2 weeks, 5 days per week, 3.5 hours per day
Accelerated Math	Summer	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities •Other: students with behavior issues	32 students per day	Mathematics	•Academic enrichment learning program •The activity had more than two program elements	•Tutoring	4 weeks, 4 days per week, 45 minutes per day

[1]There was a clerical error when data was entered into PPICS. The data displayed in this cell is the correct data that should have been entered into PPICS.

(Table A2

Kōloa Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities in Project Year 4, continued)

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Science	Summer	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities •Other: students with behavior issues	32 students per day	•Mathematics •Science •Health or nutrition	•Academic enrichment learning program •The activity had more than two program elements		4 weeks, 4 days per week, 45 minutes per day
Hawaiian[1]	Summer	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities •Other: students with behavior issues	32 students per day[1]	•Cultural activities or social studies •Other: Character education	•Academic enrichment learning program •The activity had more than two program elements	•Mentoring •Drug and violence prevention, counseling, or character education	4 weeks, 4 days per week, 45 minutes per day
Ukulele	Summer	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities •Other: students with behavior issues	32 students per day	Arts and music	•Recreational activity •The activity had more than two program elements	•Drug and violence prevention, counseling, or character education	4 weeks, 4 days per week, 45 minutes per day
			SY 2011–12 activities				
Homework Club	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities	12 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics	Homework help	Tutoring	27 weeks, 3 days per week, 1 hour per day

[1]There was a clerical error when data was entered into PPICS. The data displayed in this cell is the correct data that should have been entered into PPICS.

(Table A2

Kōloa Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities in Project Year 4, continued)

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
KidBiz3000	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities	20 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Science •Technology or telecommuni-cations	Academic enrichment learning program[1]		27 weeks, 1 day per week, 1 hour per day
Robotics	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities	15 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Science •Technology or telecommuni-cations	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	27 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day
Speak Japanese	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities	10 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Cultural activities or social studies		Academic enrichment learning program	27 weeks, 1 day per week, 1 hour per day
Spring Boost	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities	15 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Technology or telecommuni-cations	Academic enrichment learning program	Tutoring	1 week, 4 days per week, 3 hours per day
Art	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities	12 students per day	Arts and music	Recreational activity		27 weeks, 4 days per week, 1 hour per day
Basketball	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities	15 students per day	Other: Physical Education	Recreational activity		8 weeks, 1 day per week, 1 hour per day

[1]There was a clerical error when data was entered into PPICS. The data displayed in this cell is the correct data that should have been entered into PPICS.

(Table A2

Kōloa Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities in Project Year 4, continued)

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Cooking	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities	15 students per day	Health or nutrition	Recreational activity	Other: Learning to cook	27 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day
Cooking Around the World	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities	15 students per day	Health or Nutrition	Recreational activity	Other: Learning to cook	1 week, 4 days per week, 3 hours per day
Chorus and Dance	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities	15 students per day	•Arts and music •Other: Dance	Recreational activity	Other: Dance	27 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day
Earth Friends	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities	15 students per day	Other: Gardening	Recreational activity	Other: Gardening	27 weeks, 1 day per week, 1 hour per day
Hula	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities	15 students per day	•Arts and music •Cultural activities or social studies	Recreational activity	Other: Dancing	27 weeks, 1 day per week, 1 hour per day
Jewelry	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities	15 students per day	None of the categories listed in the PPICS APR form applied to the subject areas in this activity and the center did not provide any categories.	Recreational activity	Other: How to make jewelry	16 weeks, 1 day per week, 1 hour per day

(Table A2

Kōloa Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities in Project Year 4, continued)

Activity name	When implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Junior Police Officers	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities	5 students per day	Other: Career	Activity to promote youth leadership	•Drug and violence prevention, counseling, or character education •Community service or service learning	27 weeks, 5 days per week, 1.5 hours per day
PE for Kids	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities	15 students per day	•Health or nutrition •Other: Physical education	Recreational activity	Other: Physical education	16 weeks, 3 days per week, 1 hour per day
Track	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities	20 students per day	•Health or nutrition •Other: Physical education	Recreational activity	Other: Physical education	16 weeks, 3 days per week, 1 hour per day
Ukulele	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities	15 students per day	Arts and music	Recreational activity	Other: Music	27 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day

53

Table A3

Wilcox Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities in Project Year 4

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
			Summer 2011 activities				
Jump Start	Summer	Other: students entering Kindergarten without preschool experience	15 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Other: routines of Kindergarten	Academic enrichment learning program	Other: transition students entering Kindergarten without preschool experience	2 weeks, 5 days per week, 4 hours per day
Summer Program	Summer	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited English-proficient students	41 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Science •Arts and music •Technology and telecommunications	Academic enrichment learning program	Tutoring	3 weeks, 5 days per week, 4 hours per day
			SY 2011–12 activities				
Imagine Learning/Homework Help	School Year	Limited English proficient students	10 students per day	Reading or literacy	Homework help	Tutoring	29 weeks, 3 days per week, 1 hour per day
Kidbiz	School Year	None of the categories listed in the PPICS APR form applied to the students who participated in the activity and the center did not provide any categories.	14 students per day	Reading or literacy	Academic enrichment learning program		22 weeks, 2 days per week, 1.5 hours per day
LitArt	School Year	None of the categories listed in the PPICS APR form applied to the students who participated in this activity and the center did not provide any categories.	12 students per day	Reading or literacy	Academic enrichment learning program		22 weeks, 2 days per week, 1.5 hours per day
Junior LEGO	School Year	None of the categories listed in the PPICS APR form applied to the students who participated in the activity and the center did not provide any categories	14 students per day	•Mathematics •Science	Academic enrichment learning program		22 weeks, 2 days per week, 1.5 hours per day

(Table A3

Wilcox Elementary: Academic and Enrichment Activities in Project Year 4, continued)

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Robotics	School Year	None of the categories listed in the PPICS APR form applied to the students who participated in this activity and the center did not provide any categories.	20 students per day	•Mathematics •Science	Academic enrichment learning program		14 weeks, 1 day per week, 2 hours per day
Basketball/Homework Help	School Year	None of the categories listed in the PPICS APR form applied to the students who participated in the activity and the center did not provide any categories.	12 students per day	Other: Sports	Recreational activity	Homework help	22 weeks, 2 days per week, 1.5 hours per day
Creative arts/Ukulele	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Students with special needs or disabilities •Other: economically disadvantaged	36 students per day	Arts and music	Recreational activity	Other: music, dance, drama, singing	31 weeks, 2 days per week, 1.5 hours per day

Table A4

Kamakahelei Middle: Academic and Enrichment Activities in Project Year 4

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
			Summer 2011 activities				
Daily "classes" during Summer Camp	Summer	Other: At-risk/low-income students	120 students per day[1]	•Reading or literacy •Science •Arts and music •Technology or tele-communications •Other: Physical Education	Academic enrichment learning program	Activity to promote youth leadership	4 weeks, 4 days per week, 4 hours per day
Summer "Camp Style" activities	Summer	Other: At-risk/low-income students	120 students per day	Other: Physical Education	Recreational activity	Other: Fun Summer Camp games/skits/activities	4 weeks, 4 days per week, 3 hours per day
			SY 2011–12 activities				
Tutoring	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Limited-English-proficient students[1] •Students who have been truant, suspended, or expelled •Students with special needs or disabilities •Other: At-risk/low-income students	110 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Arts and music •Technology or tele-communications •Cultural activities or social studies	Tutoring	Homework help	35 weeks, 4 days per week, 1.5 hours per day
Gardening and Volunteerism Class	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Other: At-risk/low-income students	35 students per day	•Science •Entrepreneurial education •Cultural activities or social studies •Health or nutrition	Academic enrichment learning program	Community service or service learning	35 weeks, 4 days per week, 2 hours per day
Sports	School Year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise performing below average •Other: At-risk/low-income students	110 students per day	Other: Physical Education	Recreational activity		35 weeks, 4 days per week, 2 hours per day

[1]There was a clerical error when data was entered into PPICS. The data displayed in this cell is the correct data that should have been entered into PPICS.

Table A5

Kaua'i High: Academic and Enrichment Activities in Project Year 4

Activity name	When Implemented: Summer or school year	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
			Summer 2011 activities				
Kaua'i High School Personal Transition Plan (PTP)	Summer	Other: Students in the class of 2012	9 students per day[1]	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Science •Arts and music •Entrepreneurial education •Technology or tele-communication •Cultural activities or social studies •Health or nutrition	Tutoring	Mentoring	6 weeks,[1] 5 days per week, 3.5 hours per day
			SY 2011–12 activities				
PTP Tutorial	School Year	Other: Since 2010, Hawaii's Department of Education has required that a .5 credit be awarded and required for graduation as students complete a basic set of expectations in college/career exploration. Summer 2011 students were members of the class of 2012 who needed to complete their Personal Transition Plan portfolios needed for the graduation .5 credit requirement. Fall/Spring 2011–2012 students were members of the class of 2013 who need to work on completing their PTP portfolios. Also, students needing to recover credits for graduation have also benefitted from our Center having available a teacher/mentor to work with them in fulfilling requirements for lost credits.	10 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Science •Arts and music •Entrepreneurial education •Technology or tele-communication •Cultural activities or social studies •Health or nutrition	Tutoring	Mentoring	30 weeks, 4 days per week, 1.5 hours per day

[1]There was a clerical error when data was entered into PPICS. The data displayed in this cell is the correct data that should have been entered into PPICS.

Appendix B

Summary of Respondents' Comments about the Implementation of Core Academic Activities at the Central Kaua'i Centers in Project Year 4 (Summer of 2011 through SY 2011–12)

Table B1

Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Reading/Literacy, Mathematics, and Science Activities in the Central Kauaʻi Centers in Project Year 4

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
*i*1. receive assistance to address their individual needs (e.g., low achievement, LEP, SpEd, behavioral) for improving academic performance.	• Inclusion of sped students required small groups of 12 or less • Class size • Students were able to receive individual attention
*i*2. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in reading/history.	• small group chapter book reading with journaling and some art
*i*3. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in mathematics.	• students serviced had an age range that was too varied at times. • Class size
*i*4. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in science.	No comments provided.

Appendix C

Summary of Respondents' Comments about the Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities at the Central Kaua'i Centers in Project Year 4 (the Summer of 2011 through SY 2011–12)

Table C1

Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities in the Central Kaua'i Centers in Project Year 4

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
*i*5. participate in art and/or music activities	• It was difficult to get supplies in time for the start of the club activities. As a matter of fact the supplies didn't come until the end of the session. This was because of funding, it was difficult to get the materials paid for in time. • Expectations are shared and students made effort to meet them. • We wish that the students in the newcomers class would stay with us for the whole year but other clubs running at the same time compete for the students choices. • dance, drama, singing
*i*6. participate in entrepreneurial education activities (business ventures).	• Donated plants to school rummage sale
*i*7. participate in telecommunications and technology education activities.	• One problem that would need consideration is the storing of the practice box used in preparation for the robotics tournament. Currently it is stored in my classroom, and takes up display and walking space. I am concerned that someone will bump into it and hurt themselves. • lack of technology for students to use
*i*8. participate in sports activities (e.g., basketball, baseball, football, swimming).	• p.e. track
*i*9. participate in cultural activities/social studies activities.	• No comments provided.
*i*10. participate in health/nutrition-related activities.	• Planted & ate fruits/vegies
*i*11. participate in service learning activities (service activities in the school or local community).	• Maintained school garden
*i*12. CLC staff discuss appropriate, positive behavior with students and reinforce positive behaviors.	• Worked in teams; focus on social skills *Respect, responsibility, and safe are expected and the students worked on meeting that. • none

Appendix D

**Central Kaua'i Centers' Community Partners in Project Year 4
(Summer of 2011 through SY 2011–12)**

Table D1

Kaumualiʻi Elementary: Community Partners in Project Year 4

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Monetary value of contribution	Subcontractor?
Kaumualiʻi Elementary did not report any community partners during Project Year 4				

Table D2

Kōloa Elementary: Community Partners in Project Year 4

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Monetary value of contribution	Subcontractor?
Anonymous Individual (Summer 2011)	Public School — employee	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Volunteer Staffing •Funding or raised funds	$450	No
Anonymous Individual (SY 2011–12)	Other — No elaboration	•Goods or materials •Volunteer Staffing	$100	No

Table D3

Wilcox Elementary: Community Partners in Project Year 4

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Monetary value of contribution	Subcontractor?
Wilcox Elementary did not report any community partners during Project Year 4				

Table D4

Kamakahelei Middle: Community Partners in Project Year 4

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Monetary value of contribution	Subcontractor?
Kamakahelei Middle did not report any community partners during Project Year 4				

Table D5

Kaua'i High: Community Partners in Project Year 4

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of contribution	Monetary value of contribution	Subcontractor?
Kaua'i High did not report any community partners during Project Year 4				

Table D6

Central Kaua'i Sub-grantee Community Partners in Project Year 4

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

**Central Kaua'i Centers' Parent and Other Adult Activities in Project Year 4
(Summer of 2011 through SY 2011−12)**

Table E1

Kaumualiʻi Elementary: Parent Activities Implemented in Project Year 4

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

Table E2

Kaumualiʻi Elementary: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Parent Activities in Project Year 4

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
*i*13. parents of students who participate in the centers also receive support/guidance from the centers	No comments were provided.

73

Table E3

Kōloa Elementary: Parent Activities Implemented in Project Year 4

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

Table E4

Kōloa Elementary: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Parent Activities in Project Year 4

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
*i*13. parents of students who participate in the centers also receive support/guidance from the centers	No comments were provided.

Table E5

Wilcox Elementary: Parent Activities Implemented in Project Year 4

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

Table E6

Wilcox Elementary: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Parent Activities in Project Year 4

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
*i*13. parents of students who participate in the centers also receive support/guidance from the centers	No comments were provided.

Table E7

Kamakahelei Middle: Parent Activities Implemented in Project Year 4

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

Table E8

Kamakahelei Middle: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Parent Activities in Project Year 4

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
*i*13. parents of students who participate in the centers also receive support/guidance from the centers	No comments were provided.

Table E9

Kaua'i High: Parent Activities Implemented in Project Year 4

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

Table E10

Kaua'i High: Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Parent Activities in Project Year 4

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
*i*13. parents of students who participate in the centers also receive support/guidance from the centers	No comments were provided.