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

Campbell Complex, Leeward Complex Area, Island of Oʻahu

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

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

May 2014

Contents

Executive Summary

This evaluation report is about the Campbell sub-grantee's 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) project, also referred to as Growing through Engaging and Motivating Students (GEMS), which was in Year 4 of five years of funding during the period from the summer of 2012 through the spring of 2013. During this period, the Campbell sub-grantee included ten centers whose activities were implemented on the campuses of their respective host schools of ʻEwa Elementary, ʻEwa Beach Elementary, Holomua Elementary, Iroquois Point Elementary, Kaʻimiloa Elementary, Keoneʻula Elementary, Pōhākea Elementary, ʻIlima Intermediate, ʻEwa Makai Middle, and Campbell High. During the summer of 2012, eight centers provided activities. The center at Keoneʻula Elementary provided activities during the summer of 2012 only. During School Year 2012–13, nine centers provided activities. The Campbell High center provided activities during Spring 2013 only while preparing to transition to new program materials. A total of 1,292 students in Pre-Kindergarten through Grade 10 participated in Campbell sub-grantee center activities during Year 4.

The purposes of this evaluation are to (a) fulfill the annual evaluation reporting requirement of 21st CCLC program, and (b) provide feedback to stakeholders for the purposes of project improvement about the extent and quality of implementation of its program components and program outcomes in academic achievement and academic behavior of students who participated in center activities for 30 or more days.

The evaluators faced a major challenge to the collection of evaluation data in Project Year 4. The Hawaiʻi Department of Education (HIDOE) Data Governance Office (DGO) informed the evaluators that a data sharing agreement was necessary to collect data from the HIDOE, in particular, Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) or personally identifiable information (PII). The DGO and Curriculum Research & Development Group (CRDG) reached agreement on most of the issues toward a finalized data sharing agreement. However, the unresolved issue was free- and reduced- lunch data. The free- and reduced-lunch status data are required for reporting by the USDE for the 21st CCLC program as evidence that the centers are providing services to a key target group. We reported this remaining issue to the HIDOE Educational Specialist who is, to this date, continuing discussions with the DGO. The free- and reduced-lunch data are included with other center participants' demographics and outcome data in the data-collection instruments. Therefore, we had not received clearance to collect the centers' spreadsheets for this report. Data on the spreadsheets that were not available to us for this report are the center participants' grade levels, attendance, gender, ethnicity, free- and reduced-lunch status, special education status, English Language Learner (ELL) status, and

data based on attendance (teacher survey/academic behavior data, report card grades, and pre-post-test assessment scores).

During the preparation of this report, efforts were ongoing between CRDG and HIDOE to negotiate the remaining issue; however, because of the impending reporting deadline, the evaluators began drafting this report without the FERPA and PII data. In the event that the FERPA and PII data were available to us prior to the deadline for reporting into the 21st CCLC Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS), we were prepared to assist center leaders and staff with data entry into PPICS.

The Campbell 21st CCLC project leadership and CRDG evaluators were very concerned about the effect of these events on the data-collection timeline, amount of data that can be collected, and personnel that would be available to submit data and respond to evaluators' questions about the data. Specific concerns were that respondents' memories may have faded, staff members may have transitioned out of their schools, and staff members likely would be turning their attention and energy toward other tasks. The CRDG evaluators requested that, at the close of Project Year 4, the Campbell project manager collect and hold on to the data from center coordinators until there was further clarification and agreement from the DGO about types of data that could be collected. However, due to her limited e-mail box and computer storage space that was not possible. The evaluators proceeded to collect non-PII and non-FERPA data from the center coordinators, with the evaluators providing feedback about any missing data or data needing clarification.

Information gathered for this report were from completed Annual Performance Report (APR) forms, summer of 2012 administration of an on-line questionnaire about implementation of activities, community partner questionnaire, communications with the project director and center staff and aggregated data.

At the end of October 2013, the evaluators received aggregated student data for each center. This data were for annual Federal reporting to PPICS and also were used for the Year 4 report.

The final piece of 2012–13 data was submitted by the complex to the evaluators on January 16, 2014. The evaluators submitted the draft report was returned on March 13, 2014, and the project manager reviewed the draft report and returned comments on April 22, 2014. The final report was returned in May 2014. Unfortunately, the recommendations based on summaries of the Year 4 data were returned late in Year 5 for implementation in the project. We recommend that the project leaders consider the recommendations for project sustainability and writing of grant proposals to sustain the project.

In Year 4, the Campbell sub-grantee project leaders and staff met the HIDOE-Special Programs Management Section (SPMS) implementation performance indicators of (a) 100% of the centers implemented high quality services in at least one core academic area; (b) 100% of the centers offered enrichment and support activities; (c) 85% of centers established and maintained partnerships within the community to increase levels of community collaboration in planning, implementing, and sustaining programs; and (d) 100% of the centers were located in high-poverty communities. The sibling class, which was introduced in year 2, continued to be an implemented feature, providing safe and productive activities for siblings of center attendees.

Through Year 4, the Campbell 21st CCLC project leadership maintained internal project mechanisms for adjusting program materials and activities based on the needs of project participants. The Project Director used feedback from coordinators, students, and tutors to make adjustments for program improvement. Communication logs were used by the regular classroom teachers and tutors to provide connections between the regular school curricula to the 21st CCLC center program. Plans were made for the subsequent year (project year 5) to have resource teachers assigned to specific centers to assist tutors to make the connections to the regular school day curriculum (C. Young, personal communication, April 22, 2014).

In Year 4, the Campbell sub-grantee project leaders and staff did not meet the HIDOE-SPMS implementation performance indicators of (a) 85% of the centers offered services to parents, senior citizens, and other adult community members, (b) 75% of the centers offered services at least 15 hours per week on average during the school year and providing services when school is not in session, and (c) 60% of regular program participants will improve their teacher-reported achievement in reading/ Language Arts and mathematics.

In Year 4, we could not determine if the sub-grantee met the outcome indicators of 75% of regular program participants' improved academic behavior, such as turning in homework on time, classroom participation, regular attendance, and classroom behavior.

We concluded that, in Year 4, the Campbell sub-grantee was a mature, well-implemented project. Project implementation was well aligned with its grant proposal, except for some well-selected upgrades to programming and changes to community partners. In our experience as 21st CCLC sub-grantee evaluators, the changes in community partners are common over the five-year grant period. The Campbell sub-grantee project director has been consistently very resourceful in networking with many community organizations as potential partners for the center coordinators to select as appropriate for their center needs.

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

This is the Year 4 evaluation report for the Campbell sub-grantee's 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) Growing through Engaging and Motivating Students (GEMS) project, which covers the summer of 2012 through the School Year (SY) 2012–13. The Campbell sub-grantee project leaders contracted evaluators from Curriculum Research & Development Group (CRDG) at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, College of Education (UHM-CoE) to provide evaluation services. The CRDG evaluation team developed the design of the evaluation of implementation and outcomes for the Campbell sub-grantee GEMS project with input from the Campbell 21st CCLC project director and center coordinators. The evaluation was designed to address the state (and therefore, federal) requirements for the evaluation. The state program was managed through the Hawai'i Department of Education, Special Program Management Section (HIDOE-SPMS). This report is the result of the evaluation effort and includes a description of the GEMS project, evaluation design, data-collection methods, and findings about implementation and outcomes in 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 Campbell sub-grantee 21st CCLC grant proposal (HIDOE-SPMS, 2010; HIDOE-SPMS, 2011a; Wilson, 2008).

A Description of the Campbell 21st CCLC Project

In 2009, the Campbell sub-grantee received five years of funding for its 21st CCLC project under Title IV, Part B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 (U.S. Department of Education [USDE], 2001), authorized and amended as the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act. Since 2002, state education agencies have managed this federally funded competitive grant program under regulatory oversight from the USDE. According to the ESEA, the 21st CCLC program had the following purposes:

(1) provide opportunities for academic enrichment, including providing 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)

This section is based on the Hawaiʻi State Department of Education, Special Programs Management Section, 21st CCLC evaluation report template (HIDOE-SPMS, 2011a). We provide information about the 21st CCLC project as contextual information for the evaluation of implementation and outcomes. The grant proposal provided background information about the origins of the project and current project goals, which includes a description of the local community, the location of 21st CCLC project sites, and other background information about the project. We also interviewed project staff to collect information about formative changes within the project.

Origin of the Project

The Campbell sub-grantee's 21st CCLC grant proposal included statements and data to support the school community needs statements for obtaining the 21st CCLC grant. The ʻEwa plains, where the Campbell complex schools are situated, had an influx of families with school-aged children. This new population changed the demographic profiles of the schools. The school population increased to become the largest in the Campbell-Kapolei complex area. Wilson (2008) stated in the Campbell complex 21st CCLC grant proposal that the special populations of English Language Learners (ELL), special education (SPED), and Title I (an indicator of high percentages of students with low socio-economic status at the school), fell

> "just below 2% of the state averages for those population groups with the ELL group at Campbell Complex one of the highest in the Leeward District. The Title I population of the Campbell schools represents over a third of the total student population of the complex. At the present time, seven of the nine schools in the complex are receiving Title I funds: four schools have full funding, three schools will be target assist schools in [School Year] SY 09–10." (p. 3)

Further, only about 10.7% of the community worked in the complex area, meaning that the children of these families needed afterschool care, outside of school time services, and other educative programs for school aged children. Wilson (2008) wrote the Campbell 21st CCLC grant proposal with the hope of obtaining support for afterschool and other services outside of school times to address the needs of families who did not have funds to pay for these

types of services. The goal of the 21st CCLC services was to emphasize students' academic achievement based on research-based programs, including enrichment activities and technology experiences. Additionally, despite attendance at pre-Kindergarten, the HIDOE Trend Report for 2007–08 reported that only half of students were prepared to enter Kindergarten (HIDOE, 2008). A summer Kick Start program for the pre-Kindergarten children was incorporated in the planning of the proposed Campbell 21st CCLC grant (Wilson, 2008).

Where was the project implemented? In Year 4, the Campbell sub-grantee included 10 centers whose programs were implemented on the campuses of their host schools of ʻEwa Elementary, ʻEwa Beach Elementary, Holomua Elementary, Iroquois Point Elementary, Kaʻimiloa Elementary, Keoneʻula Elementary, Pōhākea Elementary, ʻIlima Intermediate, ʻEwa Makai Middle, and Campbell High. These 10 HIDOE public schools are part of the Campbell-Kapolei complex area on the Leeward coast of the island of Oʻahu, State of Hawaiʻi. The host school names, street addresses, web sites, and other information are shown as Table 1. 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 program.

The 21st CCLC statutes require that student activities are held before or after regular day-school hours, evenings, weekends, holidays, and summer. However, activities for pre-Kindergarten and adult family members may be held during regular day-school hours "since these times may be the most suitable for serving these populations" (USDE, 2003, p. 28).

How many people did it affect? The 21st CCLC project provided services to a total of 1,292 students in Pre-Kindergarten through Grade 10 from the summer of 2012 through SY 2012–13. Additional information about student subgroups in this population and the number of students served at each center are discussed with the findings about implementation in this report. In addition to providing services to school-aged children, the Campbell 21st CCLC centers provided adult family members with activities to encourage family involvement in the centers. An accurate count of adult family members who participated in the program was not available. During the summer of 2012, there were 102 paid staff and 3 volunteers. During SY 2012–13, there were 142 paid staff and 23 volunteers. Specific descriptions of the types of staff and counts per centers are provided with the findings about implementation in this report.

Table 1

Campbell Sub-grantee 21ˢᵗ CCLC: Location of Sites in Year 4

School name	Address	City	State	Zip	Phone	Grade levels
ʻEwa El.	91-1280 Renton Road	ʻEwa Beach	HI	96706	681-8202	K–6
ʻEwa Beach El.	91-740 Papipi Road	ʻEwa Beach	HI	96706	689-1271	K–6
Iroquois Point El.	5553 Cormorant Avenue	ʻEwa Beach	HI	96706	499-6500	K–6
Keoneʻula El.	91-970 Kaileolea Drive	ʻEwa Beach	HI	96706	689-1380	K–6
Kaʻimiloa El.	91-1028 Kaunolu Street	ʻEwa Beach	HI	96706	689-1280	K–6
Holomua El.	91-1561 Keaunui Drive	ʻEwa Beach	HI	96706	685-9100	K–6
Pōhākea El.	91-750 Ft. Weaver Road	ʻEwa Beach	HI	96706	689-1290	K–6
ʻEwa Makai Middle	91-6291 Kapolei Parkway	ʻEwa Beach	HI	96706	687-9500	7–8
ʻIlima Intermediate	91-884 Ft. Weaver Road	ʻEwa Beach	HI	96706	687-9300	7–8
James Campbell High	91-980 North Road	ʻEwa Beach	HI	96706-2746	689-1200	9–12

Goals of the Project

The Campbell sub-grantee 21st CCLC centers implemented activities to supplement programs in their respective host schools. The sub-grantee's objectives were to provide educational and other developmental services to students who have the greatest needs for learning opportunities. The project objectives, documented online in the Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS):

- "Increase the number of students meeting Reading and Math Standards."
- "Increase the number of regular center students improving in Reading / Literacy."
- "Increase the number of regular center students improving in mathematics."
- "Increase student engagement through enrichment activities that focus on critical thinking and inquiry."
- "Expand an after school program to integrate a range of content areas that motivate and engage students in the learning process."
- "Develop after school centers that offer high quality activities in core content areas such as English Language Arts, mathematics, or science to improve students' academic achievement."
- "Develop after school centers that offer high quality enrichment or support activities."
- "Provide opportunities for parents to connect to their child's learning experience through a range of activities and workshops."
- "Provide opportunities for parents and other adults to center students' learning experiences through a range of activities and workshops" (Campbell sub-grantee, 2012).

Clients involved in the program. The Sub-grantee 21st CCLC Handbook SY 2012–13 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: Pro Imp & Plan—2). In Year 4, 1,292 students were enrolled over all the 10 Campbell sub-grantee centers. Of the total number of project participants and from the available data collected from the sub-grantee centers, 724 (56.0%) qualified for free- or reduced-cost lunch, 119 (9.2%) qualified for ELL services, and 85 (6.6%) qualified for SPED services. These student demographics data were required to be reported by the USDE and HIDOE and reflect student populations who may have disadvantages or challenges for academic achievement. We provide additional information about the center students with the findings about project implementation later in this report.

Characteristics of the Program Materials and Resources

There were two sources of information about program materials and resources as summarized in this section. The information were collected by multiple methods: (a) center coordinators completed a section of the Learning Point Associates 21st CCLC 2012 Annual Performance Report (APR) from the federal on-line PPICS that elicited information about activities and materials, and (b) discussions with center leaders and staff.

Program materials and resources provided by partners. In alignment with its 21st CCLC grant proposal (Wilson, 2008), the Campbell sub-grantee 21st CCLC project materials included Renaissance Learning, Accelerated Reading and Accelerated Math. Leveled books (books considered appropriate for students' reading level) were used for reading instruction. The Campbell sub-grantee project leaders and staff implemented reading and mathematics activities using program materials they selected with the intention of meeting individual needs of attendees, providing pre- and post-assessments for summative purposes, and utilization of formative assessment. Additionally, day teachers provided input to inform the center staffs' work with individual center attendees.

The project leadership maintained internal project mechanisms for adjusting program materials and activities based on the needs of project participants. The Project Director used feedback from coordinators, students, and tutors to make adjustments for program improvement. Communication logs were used by the regular classroom teachers and tutors to provide connections between the regular school curricula to the 21st CCLC center program. Plans were made for the subsequent year (project year 5) to have resource teachers assigned to specific centers to assist tutors to make the connections to the regular school day curriculum (C. Young, personal communication, April 22, 2014).

The grant proposal included the goal that the project would provide enrichment activities such as robotics and multi-media/video production programs. The robotics program was implemented at the Holomua, Pōhākea, and ʻEwa Makai Middle centers. The multi-media/video production program was implemented at the Holomua, Pōhākea, and ʻEwa Makai Middle centers. In addition to the activities noted in the grant proposal, center coordinators selected and implemented enrichment activities at their respective centers to address the needs and interests of their center attendees. Individual centers contracted community partners to implement some science or technology enrichment activities. The subcontractors who implemented these enrichment activities provided the instructional materials for their respective activities. The categories and types of activities varied at each center and the reader is referred to Appendix A for a description of activities at each center.

Center staff distributed snacks to center attendees that were obtained under a federal school nutrition program.

In Year 4, the Campbell sub-grantee staff continued to implement tutorials in reading and mathematics with Renaissance Learning materials. Although the sub-grantee centers continued implementing Renaissance Learning materials, the evaluators were informed in February 2013, that the Campbell High center did not offer summer and fall of 2012 sessions. We also were told during summer through fall 2012 Campbell High center was transitioning from Renaissance Learning materials to the Skills Tutor program for reading and mathematics materials. A sub-grantee staff member reported that research and discussion meetings were organized and conducted with tutors. Some of those who participated in the meetings reported that the current materials were ineffective in supporting student acquisition and retention of content knowledge. The Skills Tutor program was selected because of the following features: (a) center staff judged the program as user-friendly for students and for tutors; (b) assessments are readily available, appropriate for the students, and tutors reported assessment results are easy to review and useful when making adjustments to student instruction; (c) the program adjusts to the ability of each student based on pre-assessment; and (d) each student works at his/her own pace. The Campbell High center purchased 100 licenses for the program that includes eight modules of reading and mathematics lessons. The program also provided the option to trade any module for another module within the Skills Tutor program. The option enabled tutors to provide each student with the appropriate level of support. The Campbell High center did not offer summer of 2012 through fall of 2012 sessions because of the transition from Renaissance Learning materials to the Skills Tutor program. Full implementation of Skills Tutor began with professional development during February 2013.

What resources (e.g., grant funds, physical facilities, in-kind personnel, community partnerships) were available? To encourage sub-grantees toward sustainability, fourth year grant funds of Hawai'i 21st CCLC sub-grantees are reduced by 25% of the first year amount, and in the fifth year, funds are reduced by 50% of the first year amount. The challenge for the Campbell sub-grantee was to maintain project service levels as funds are reduced.

The largest proportion of resources for the Campbell sub-grantee programming was provided by 21st CCLC grant funds. Host schools for the centers provided the physical facilities where the centers implemented activities. The Campbell sub-grantee project leaders developed relationships with community partners to implement and assist with enrichment activities. A listing of these partners by center is shown as Appendix B.

In what activities were project participants expected to take part? Center attendees participated in reading/literacy or mathematics tutorials and homework help as part of their day at a center. Additionally, attendees could participate in enrichment activities in the areas of science, sports, technology, culture/social studies, and art and music.

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. Center staff followed a weekly schedule implementing activities focused on delivering services to center 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 Campbell 21st CCLC project, the focus was on reading/literacy and mathematics with tutoring and homework help using curriculum and instructional materials chosen to meet student needs.

How was the project administered? The Campbell 21st CCLC sub-grantee was administered through a tiered management structure with program authority delegated from the Complex Area Superintendent to a project director who provided overall management of the project. The project director was assisted by center coordinators who managed the operations of their respective centers. Center coordinators, along with their staff implemented activities which focused on meeting the project objectives, providing services in reading/literacy, mathematics, and enrichment activities to meet the needs of center attendees and offered services to parents and adult family members of student attendees.

Who were the staff and others involved in the program? The information about the Campbell sub-grantee 2012–13 staff is shown as Table 2. In addition to the project director who provided managerial oversight of the project, center coordinators at every center provided operational management of the centers. Overall at the sub-grantee during the summer of 202, there were 102 paid staff and 3 volunteers. Overall at the sub-grantee during SY 2012−13, there were 142 paid staff and 23 volunteers.

During the summer of 2012, there were ten center coordinators and 95 staff members. Two center coordinators managed the ʻEwa Beach and Keoneʻula centers; there was one center coordinator for each of the following centers: ʻEwa Elementary, Iroquois Point Elementary, Kaʻimiloa Elementary, Pōhākea Elementary, ʻEwa Makai Middle and ʻIlima Intermediate. Of the 95 staff members, 62 staff members were school-day teachers, 19 were other nonteaching school-day staff, 11 were other non-school day staff, and the 3 remaining staff members were listed in other categories including 1 volunteer parent, and 2 volunteer high school students.

Table 2

Description of Staff at the Campbell Sub-grantee Centers in Year 4

sy=school year, summ=summer

Center	School-day teachers (includes former and substitute teachers)	Center administrators and coordinators	Other nonteaching school-day staff (e.g., librarians, guidance counselors, aides)	Parents	College students	High school students	Other non-school-day staff with some or no college
'Ewa El.	11 paid sy 6 paid summ	1 paid sy 1 paid summ					
'Ewa Beach El.	14 paid sy 10 paid summ	2 paid sy 2 paid summ	4 paid sy				6 paid summ
Holomua El.	20 paid sy	2 paid sy					
Iroquois Point El.	9 paid summ	1 paid sy 1 paid summ	9 paid summ	1 volunteer summ		2 volunteer(s) summ	
Ka'imiloa El.	16 paid sy 6 paid summ	1 paid sy 1 paid summ	6 paid summ		1 paid sy 4 volunteer(s) sy		
Keone'ula El.	8 paid summ	2 paid summ	2 paid summ				2 paid sy[b]
Pōhākea El.	26 paid sy 15 paid summ	1 paid sy 1 paid summ				15 volunteer(s) sy	5 paid sy 5 paid summ
'Ewa Makai Mid.	10 paid sy 3 paid summ	1 paid sy 1 paid summ	2 paid summ			2 volunteer(s) sy[a]	
'Ilima Int.	11 paid sy 5 paid summ	1 paid sy 1 paid summ	1 paid sy				
Campbell Hi.	8 paid sy	2 paid sy	2 volunteer(s) sy		1 paid sy		
Totals	116 paid sy 62 paid summ	12 paid sy 10 paid summ	5 paid sy 2 volunteer(s) sy 19 paid summ	1 volunteer(s) summ	2 paid sy 4 volunteer(s) sy	17 volunteer(s) sy 2 volunteer(s) summ	7 paid sy 11 paid summ

[a]Count includes high school and intermediate school students

[b]Count includes enrichment instructors.

Note. None of the centers had staff members in the category: "Youth development workers and other non-school day staff with a college degree or higher" and "Other community members (e.g., business mentors, senior citizens, clergy)." Some staff were involved in the centers during the summer of 2012 and SY 2012–13 and are included in both counts. The total number of staff positions was 270 (105 during the summer of 2012 and 165 during SY 2012–13).

During SY 2012–13, there were 12 center coordinators. With the exceptions of ʻEwa Beach Elementary, Holomua Elementary, and Campbell High centers which each had two center coordinators, the centers at the ʻEwa Elementary, Iroquois Point Elementary, Kaʻimiloa Elementary, Pōhākea Elementary, ʻEwa Makai Middle, and ʻIlima Intermediate each had one center coordinator. The sub- grantee employed 153 center staff members and volunteers. The paid staff was comprised of 116 school- day teachers, 7 other non-school-day staff, 5 other non-teaching school-day staff, and 2 college students. The volunteer staff was comprised of 17 volunteer high school students, 4 college students, and 2 other nonteaching school-day staff. Of the 17 high school students who volunteered to implement activities in Project Year 4, 15 worked at the Pōhākea center, and 2 worked at the ʻEwa Makai Middle center.

As shown in Table 2, the majority of staff members during the summer of 2012 and SY 2012–13 were in paid positions. The majority of staff members were school-day teachers. Hiring school-day teachers and other school personnel provided the advantages of having staff who knew school rules and procedures for the security and safety of the project participants. School-day teachers also provided consistency with classroom management, student behavior management, differentiated learning, curricula, and formative assessment.

The Evaluation Design

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

Original Evaluation Design

To address the evaluation purposes, the evaluators and center staff planned the collection of implementation and outcome data, including descriptive data about center activities, center operations, and center staffing; and other data relevant to the implementation of project services to participants. Statutory and regulatory requirements specify criteria for the evaluation of sub-grantee projects. The reader is referred to the statute, Title IV, Part B of the ESEA of 1965 as reauthorized by the NCLB (*ESEA of 1965, Title IV, Part B, 21st CCLC*, 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 Campbell sub-grantee 21st CCLC grant proposal (Wilson,

2008); (b) the HIDOE-SPMS (2010) KPIs; and (c) HIDOE-SPMS (2011a) evaluation report template. The HIDOE-SPMS (2010) KPIs are performance indicators adapted from USDE 21st CCLC KPIs and associated with the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA).

The evaluation design includes plans for the evaluation of project implementation and project outcomes. At the beginning of the summer of 2012 and SY 2012–13, the CRDG evaluators, sub-grantee leaders, and center coordinators agreed on an evaluation timeline and deliverables. CRDG evaluators provided the center staff with templates and copies of data-collection instruments. The evaluators also provided written instructions on completing the templates and instruments and were available by e-mail and telephone for questions from the Campbell project leaders and center coordinators.

The study of project implementation was post-only. Data about implementation were to be collected with the following methods: (a) center coordinators completed APR forms A, B, C-7, and D; (b) administration of an evaluator-developed questionnaire to center coordinators, staff members, volunteers, and contractors who delivered project activities to center attendees, (c) an evaluator-developed questionnaire about community partnerships; and (d) summaries of school community data from the HIDOE website.

The evaluation design for the study of outcomes was intended to be pre-post. The student-level outcome data focused on regular center attendees. As defined by the 21st CCLC program, the regular center attendees (participated in center activities for 30 or more days) likely have participated in sufficient levels of center activities to have measurable effects.

Intended outcome data of regular attendees were to include (a) the 21st CCLC teacher survey about academic behaviors which should have been administered to the elementary school regular classroom teachers, secondary school English Language Arts, or secondary school mathematics day teachers of regular center students, (b) comparisons of Fall and Spring semester report card grades in English Language Arts and mathematics, and (c) comparisons of scores for pre-post assessments in English Language Arts and mathematics.

Evaluation Data-Collection Schedule

On September 4, 2012, we met with the project director and center coordinators to discuss data-collection activities and agree on a schedule. We presented a draft evaluation data-collection schedule for discussion 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) determining 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) determining the deadline to submit attendance/demographics data in the spring to provide sufficient time to review and/or 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 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. The suspension of evaluation activities in March 2013 impacted the evaluation schedule as discussed in the subsequent section of this report.

Implemented Evaluation Activities

There were unforeseen and major challenges to data collection in Project Year 4 that affected the implementation of the originally planned evaluation activities. The 2012–13 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between CRDG and the Campbell sub-grantee was executed in November 2012. The Evaluation Principal Investigator (PI) sought permission from the HIDOE Data Governance Office (DGO) to obtain HIDOE data necessary to fulfill the terms of the MOA including Federal and state reporting requirements, the 21st CCLC PPICS online report, and the sub-grantee evaluation report. Therefore, the PI contacted the DGO about procedures for approval to collect data as stated in the MOA with the Campbell sub-grantee. As requested by the DGO staff, CRDG staff provided DGO staff with copies of the MOA, evaluation design, data-collection plans, and USDE and HIDOE documents about the 21st CCLC program and requirements for evaluation reports. In March 2013, DGO staff required that CRDG evaluators cease all evaluation activities with the sub-grantee. The CRDG evaluators asked the sub-grantee center staff to continue collecting 2012–13 data, to document their center activities, and instructed staff to store the data until CRDG received clearance from the DGO to collect the data. The CRDG PI was told that a data-sharing agreement would be drafted. Discussions between the DGO and the CRDG PI included issues such as assignment of the data-collection tasks and the timeline for destruction/retention of data.

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

the APR (center operations, staffing, description of activities, and identity of feeder schools) and description of community partners. The Campbell project director facilitated the data collection with center coordinators and submitted the non-PII and non-FERPA data to CRDG.

In June 2013, the DGO, CRDG evaluation staff, and a UHM attorney reviewed a draft data-sharing agreement that resolved the majority of issues and concerns; however, the parties continued efforts toward resolution of remaining issues. Throughout the negotiation process of the data sharing agreement, the CRDG evaluators continued to look toward methods of collecting data that do not contain PII. An executed data sharing agreement was required for the evaluation team to collect the following data: the center participants' first and last names, grade level, HIDOE student ID number, attendance, gender, ethnicity, free- and reduced-lunch status, special education status, ELL status, and data based on attendance (teacher survey/academic behavior data, report card grades, and pre-post assessment). Because access to center student attendance data was restricted, the evaluators also were unable to administer and collect data with the 21st CCLC teacher survey before the close of the 21st CCLC project year.

We believe that the DGO has an extremely important role to protect FERPA and PII data needed to fulfill the requirements of the evaluation report and PPICS. We also believe we had a very professional and collaborative working relationship with the DGO staff. The UH attorneys and the HIDOE Educational Specialist as well as other stakeholders were very supportive in facilitating progress toward the data-sharing agreement. We were able to come to agreement on most of the issues, for instance, parties responsible for tasks and data destruction/retention legal issues. The unresolved issue was the types of data that CRDG could collect, specifically, free- and reduced-lunch data. The free- and reduced-lunch status data are required for reporting to the USDE for the 21st CCLC program and is evidence that the centers are providing services to a key target group. The HIDOE DGO explained that free- and reduced-lunch status is a highly confidential piece of information and therefore would not include this data in the data sharing agreement. We reported this to the HIDOE Educational Specialist who has been in discussions with the DGO. Our understanding is that another Educational Specialist was involved in the discussions. We feel strongly that this situation is very unfortunate; however, extremely important issues are at stake for future sharing of HIDOE data between 21st CCLC sub-grantees and their evaluators.

The Campbell 21st CCLC project leadership and CRDG evaluators were very concerned about the effect of these events on the data-collection timeline, amount of data that can be collected, and personnel that will be available to submit and receive data. The Campbell 21st

CCLC project director and CRDG Evaluation Principal Investigator discussed these concerns multiple times. The Campbell project manager was very concerned that the center leaders would no longer be available to collect and submit data after June 2013. Other specific concerns were that respondents' memories may have faded, staff members may have transitioned out of their schools, and staff members would be turning their attention and energy toward other tasks. The CRDG evaluators shared these concerns and requested that the Campbell project manager collect and hold on to the data from center coordinators until there was further clarification and agreement from the DGO about types of data that could be collected. The evaluators proceeded to collect non-PII and non-FERPA data from the center coordinators, with the evaluators providing feedback about any missing data or data needing clarification. Toward the end of October 2013, the 21st CCLC State Program Manager facilitated a process with the Campbell staff for aggregating the PII and FERPA data. The Campbell staff member completed aggregating the data and submitted it to the evaluators. The final piece of 2012–13 data was submitted by the complex to the evaluators on January 16, 2014. The evaluators submitted the draft report was returned on March 13, 2014, and the project manager reviewed the draft report and returned comments on April 22, 2014. The final report was returned in May 2014.

Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS) reporting. 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.

Toward the end of October 2013, the HIDOE-SPMS program manager contacted CRDG evaluators for assistance to complete Federal PPICS data reporting. The program manager worked with an evaluation staff member to pilot the procedure to aggregate center attendance, demographic, and academic performance data from the spreadsheets of several Campbell centers. Once the procedure was finalized, a Campbell sub-grantee administrative assistant worked with the HIDOE-SPMS program manager to aggregate the data for the remaining sub-grantee centers. The evaluators completed data entry of the aggregated data for each sub-grantee center into PPICS. Following the sub-grantee project director's certification and the state program manager's certification of the PPICS data, the aggregated data also were reviewed for preparation of this report.

Multi-methods and collaboration for data-collection logistics. Unlike evaluation of previous project years, the evaluators were unable to employ multiple methods to collect data

from various stake-holders about the extent and quality of project implementation, variables that affect implementation and variables that may affect outcomes and outcome measures. In past evaluations, we used multiple methods to gain a fuller understanding about the project and to confirm or 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, site visits where we had some opportunities to observe and speak with tutors and contractors, and administrations of paper and on-line questionnaires. This year, the evaluators were unable to collect, review, and verify data through multiple methods. For example, in the month before suspension of evaluation activities in March, an evaluator had scheduled site visits at Campbell sub-grantee centers. With the suspension of evaluation activities, these site visits were postponed and could not be rescheduled. In past years, evaluators had the opportunity to review, cross-check, and seek clarification of center-level student data; in Project Year 4, the sub-grantee submitted aggregate data for the purpose of Federal and state reporting. In addition during SY 2012–13, evaluators were unable to administer the on-line questionnaire and the 21st CCLC Teacher Survey; therefore, we are unable to determine the extent and quality of implemented activities for SY 2012–13 and to determine the effects of center activities on the academic behavior of regular attendees.

Evaluative data for the Project Year 4 report. Data about project implementation and outcomes were provided by the Campbell sub-grantee project director and center coordinators. The project director 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, and student and adult activities. The center coordinators provided aggregated data about student demographics, attendance, and academic performance.

The evaluation team collected and reviewed the following implementation and outcome data for this report: (a) APR Forms A, B, C-7, and D; (b) evaluator-developed questionnaire about community partnerships; (c) summer of 2012 administration of the evaluator-developed questionnaire for center administration, staff, volunteers, and contractors; (d) aggregated attendee data from each center including attendance, demographics, grade level, qualification for educational services (i.e., special education/disability, free- or reduced-cost lunch, and ELL); and (e) summaries of school community data from the HIDOE website. The following sections of this evaluation report used the data listed above to complete the sub-grantee evaluation of implementation and outcomes in Project Year 4.

The Evaluation of Project Outcomes

The evaluation questions about outcomes are (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, p. 4).

As mentioned previously, there were constraints on data collection in Project year 4, and we were not able to collect data about regular participants' academic behaviors with the 21st CCLC Teacher Survey. We were able to collect and report data about regular participants' academic achievement in reading/ Language Arts and mathematics.

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). The nine sub-questions about implementation are (a) "If no, what changes were made and why?" (b) "What did the project finally look like?" (c) "What challenges have been faced in implementing the project and how are these challenges being addressed?" (d) "Which community-based partnerships, as planned in the grant application, have been established and maintained and which ones were not? Why?" (e) What were the characteristics of the school community? (f) "Are the project activities interesting and valuable to students, teachers, administrators, and community partners?" and (g) "What are the plans to ensure effective project implementation next year?" (HIDOE-SPMS, 2011a, p. 3). Two sub-questions were addressed in the introductory section of this report: (a) "Where was the project implemented?" and (b) "How many people did it affect?"

Was the project implemented as planned in the grant proposal?

Over the first three years of the grant (SY 2009–10 through SY 2011–12), the Campbell sub-grantee implemented the project based on the grant proposal with modifications based on some changing requirements of the state program manager, on the needs of the project attendees, or on initiatives planned and implemented for project improvement. As reported in the Project Year 1, Project Year 2, and Project Year 3 evaluation reports (Higa, Sagaysay, Oshiro, & Nakamura, 2010; Higa, Sagaysay, & Oshiro, 2011; Oshiro, Sagaysay, Nakamura, & Higa, 2012), the Campbell sub-grantee's project implementation encompassed the majority of activities stated in the grant proposal. Modifications in Project Year 2 (the summer of 2010 through SY 2010–11) were based on needs of center attendees, including a

sub-grantee emphasis on parent and family events, expanding the availability of enrichment activities, and offering an activity for siblings who waited unsupervised at host schools. In Project Year 3 (the summer of 2011 through SY 2011–12), Campbell sub-grantee project leaders continued planning and implementing project improvements based on the activities and foci of the grant proposal reported earlier with modifications based on needs of the center attendees and initiatives for project improvement. In Project Year 4 (the summer of 2012 through SY 2012–13), the sub-grantee continued to implement the project in a format similar to project year 3. The Campbell sub-grantee faced additional challenges to implement the project that are discussed in the next section.

Project characteristics. The Campbell sub-grantee project administrator was the School Renewal Specialist (SRS). Directed by the project administrator, the Campbell sub-grantee hired a project director for the 21st CCLC grant, who reported directly to the SRS. The project director managed implementation, oversaw operations of the Campbell sub-grantee 21st CCLC grant, and coordinated with the 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. Some information about center staffing was provided earlier in this report, and additional information is provided in a section below. As stated previously in this report, the Campbell sub-grantee centers were physically located on the campuses of their feeder schools (also called their host 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.

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 Campbell sub-grantee centers were located in high-poverty communities and the majority of host schools had high levels of students eligible for free- and reduced-lunch.

As a measure of community poverty levels, we provide the counts and percentages of the free- and reduced-lunch sub-populations at the Campbell sub-grantee host schools for SYs 2007–08 through 2011–12 in Table 3. The statistics for 2012–13 were not available at the time that this report was prepared. In SY 2011–12, the range of free- or reduced-lunch percentages in the host schools were 26.3% to 65.1%. The average of this range is 46.8% and the median is 46.8%, which approach half the host schools' total populations. These are increases from the previous year, when the average percentage of free- and reduced-lunch status at the host schools for the sub-grantee was 45.6%. We concluded from these data that the Campbell sub-grantee project was located in a high-poverty community.

Table 3

Campbell Sub-grantee: Free- or Reduced-Cost Lunch Counts and Percentages Over SY 2007–08 through SY 2012–13

Student profile	**School-level** counts and percentages[a]					2012–13 **center-level** counts and percentages of total center attendees	
	2007–08	2008–09	2009–10	2010–11	2011–12	Total number of center students on free- or reduced- lunch (% to total school enrollment for 2012–13)[c]	Number of regular students on free- or reduced-lunch (% to total school enrollment for 2012–13)[c]
ʻEwa El,	417 (44.6%)	440 (46.2%)	493 (50.3%)	569 (56.7%)	598 (55.2%)	82 (7.8%)	21 (2.0%)
ʻEwa Beach El.	182 (49.9%)	191 (53.4%)	233 (55.0%)	246 (48.5%)	305 (48.8%)	90 (12.7%)	68 (9.6%)
Holomua El.	317 (22.0%)	332 (23.6%)	331 (23.2%)	358 (25.9%)	421 (30.6%)	35 (2.5%)	34 (2.5%)
Iroquois Point El.	194 (29.0%)	243 (36.2%)	312 (43.5%)	306 (42.6%)	298 (40.5%)	80 (10.5%)	24 (3.1%)
Kaʻimiloa El.	350 (53.9%)	358 (57.0%)	381 (59.7%)	382 (62.6%)	429 (65.1%)	129 (19.6%)	56 (8.5%)
Keoneʻula El.	157 (21.0%)	175 (21.4%)	176 (22.0%)	224 (26.4%)	229 (26.3%)	12 (1.5%)	0
Pōhākea El.	285 (57.7%)	334 (62.4%)	334 (60.8%)	342 (60.5%)	347 (60.7%)	156 (26.4%)	104 (17.6%)
ʻEwa Makai Mid.	N/A	N/A	N/A	219 (37.3%)	304 (39.3%)	25 (3.1%)	7 (0.9%)
ʻIlima Int.	485 (37.3%)	560 (41.0%)	569 (42.6%)	409 (52.6%)	417 (56.6%)	84 (10.0%)	37 (4.4%)
Campbell Hi.	911 (36.6%)	1,047 (41.5%)	1,077 (40.8 %)	1,135 (43.0%)	1,242 (44.9%)	31 (1.1%)	10 (0.4%)
Campbell complex[b]	3,298 (36.3%)	3,680 (39.8%)	3,906 (41.1%)	4,190 (43.5%)	4,590 (45.0%)	N/A	N/A
State of Hawaiʻi[b]	66,339 (38.6%)	71,568 (42.0%)	74,924 (43.9%)	80,374 (47.3%)	85,813 (49.9%)	N/A	N/A

[a]The school level counts and percentages are based on the HIDOE School Status & Improvement Reports (HIDOE, 2012c).

[b]The Campbell Complex and State of Hawaiʻi counts and percentages are based on the HIDOE Trend Report 2011−12 (HIDOE, 2012b).

[c]The total enrollment count used as a denominator is based on the Official Enrollment Count, 2012–13 School Year data from the November 14, 2012 HIDOE news release. The total school enrollment with SPED enrollment count (column V) was used as a denominator if the center had SPED students. The total school enrollment without SPED enrollment count (column Q) was used as a denominator if the center did not have SPED students (HIDOE, 2012c).

18

Center staffing. As shown in Table 2, the majority of Campbell sub-grantee staff during the summer of 2012 and SY 2012–13 were school-day teachers (62 during the summer and 116 during the school year). The proportion of each type of staff to total staff cannot be calculated because some staff were employed during both the summer of 2012 and during the school year, and therefore, made the calculation difficult from the data in Table 2. The second largest group of paid center staff also worked in the host schools, but were in non-teaching positions, such as librarians, guidance counselors, or school aides. According to research about the 21st CCLC program across the nation, it is advantageous to have center staff with the qualifications of regular classroom teachers to build bridges between the host school and the extended day curriculum (Naftzger & Vinson, 2011). Host school staff would have familiarity with procedures for a safe environment for students, assessment procedures and use of data, instructional strategies, and project materials.

Hours of operation (indicator 2.5). *75% of centers will offer services at least 15 hours per week on average during the school year and provide services when school is not in session, such as during the summer and holidays* (HIDOE-SPMS, 2010). The Campbell sub-grantee did not meet this target in Project Year 4. The Campbell sub-grantee hours of operations for the summer of 2012 and SY 2012–13 are shown as Table 4.

During the summer of 2012, eight Campbell sub-grantee centers implemented activities. These were the ʻEwa, ʻEwa Beach, Iroquois Point, Kaʻimiloa, Keoneʻula, Pōhākea, ʻEwa Makai Middle, and ʻIlima Intermediate centers. During the summer of 2012, the centers provided activities for two to seven weeks, four to five days per week, and 11.07 to 25 hours per week. The Keoneʻula center was open for the summer of 2012 only and did not offer 21st CCLC activities during SY 2012–13. The center at Campbell High was preparing to transition to new program materials in the summer and fall of 2012 and only provided activities in Spring 2013. The reader is referred to Table 4 for specific information about the number of hours and number of weeks of operation per center.

During SY 2012–13, nine Campbell centers offered activities for 17 to 37 weeks, three to five days a week, 6 to 16 hours per week. This did not meet the outcome indicator of 15 hours per week, but we note that the centers offered high-need students a safe environment after school with opportunities for homework assistance, tutorials, enrichment activities, and enhancement of academic behaviors.

Characteristics of Clients for the Project

In Project Year 4, 1,292 students participated in activities provided by the Campbell sub-grantee. The evaluation staff examined aggregated data regarding the characteristics of attendees

at each sub-grantee center shown in Table 5 that included counts of students by grade level, free- and reduced-lunch status, SPED status, and ELL qualification. We also reviewed counts of participants by activity for each center shown as Appendix A.

We found that across the Campbell sub-grantee, 56% (724) of the 1,292 center attendees qualified for free- or reduced-cost lunch, 9% (119 of 1,292) qualified for ELL services, and 6% (85 of 1,292) qualified for SPED services. We found that half or more of the center attendees at six centers qualified for free- or reduced-cost lunch, specifically, 71% (82 of 116) of the attendees at ʻEwa, 53% (80 of 150) at Iroquois Point, 68% (129 of 189) at Kaʻimiloa, 68% (156 of 231) at Pōhākea, 59% (84 of 142) at ʻIlima Intermediate, and 55% (31 of 56) at Campbell High. The remaining centers reported the percentage of center attendees qualified for free- or reduced-cost lunch below 50%: 46% (90 of 197) for ʻEwa Beach, 44% (35 of 80) for Holomua, 28% (12 of 43) for Keoneʻula, and 28% (25 of 88) for ʻEwa Makai Middle.

The percentage of center attendees who qualified for ELL services were greater at four centers than the 9% (119 of 1,292) for the sub-grantee: 27% (15 of 56) for Campbell High, 20% (28 of 142) for ʻIlima Intermediate, 13% (25 of 189) for Kaʻimiloa, and 10% (24 of 231) for Pōhākea. The percentage of center attendees who qualified for SPED services were greater at four centers than the 6% (85 of 1,292) for the sub-grantee: 15% (23 of 150) for Iroquois Point, 11% (16 of 142) for ʻIlima Intermediate, 11% (6 of 56) for Campbell High, and 10% (8 of 80) for Holomua. Based on our review of the data, the Campbell GEMS 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 Table 5. Campbell sub-grantee decision-makers along with host school and other school community stakeholders who seek to improve Campbell sub-grantee activities or supplement the efforts of the host schools may find the data useful.

Which community-based partnerships, as planned in the grant application, have been established and maintained and which ones were not? Why?

In the grant proposal, the Campbell sub-grantee writers proposed to establish the following partnerships: Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID), CRDG at the UHM (external evaluators), Drug Free Hawaiʻi, Hale Pono Boys and Girls Club of ʻEwa Beach, Honolulu Academy of Arts: Art to Go Program, Honolulu Zoo: Zoo to You Outreach

Table 4

Campbell Sub-grantee in Project Year 4: Hours of Operation

Center	Summer 2012 (actual)			School Year 2012–13 (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
ʻEwa El.	2	16.25	5	18	16	4
ʻEwa Beach El.	5	20	5	28	8	4
Holomua El.	N/A (Multi-track school)			37	7	4
Iroquois Point El.	6	17.5	5	23	6	3
Kaʻimiloa El.	3.5	17.5	4	24	8	5
Keoneʻula El.	7	11.07	4	Not open		
Pōhākea El.	5	25	5	34	6	3
ʻEwa Makai Mid.	4	17.5	5	20	12	4
ʻIlima Int.	4	15	5	25	6	4
Campbell Hi.	Not open			17	8	4

Table 5

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

| | Counts of students served in Project Year 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Center | Enrolled | | | | | Grade levels | | Free- or reduced-cost lunch | | SPED | | ELL | |
	Total center students	30+ days students	Summer only	School year only	Both summer and school year	Total center students	30+ days students	Total center students	30+ days students	Total center students	30+ days students	Total center students	30+ days students
'Ewa El.	116	21	48	68	0	Pre-k: 48 Kindergarten: 0 1st grade: 0 2nd grade: 0 3rd grade: 23 4th grade: 17 5th grade: 14 6th grade: 14	Pre-k: 0 Kindergarten: 0 1st grade: 0 2nd grade: 0 3rd grade: 8 4th grade: 5 5th grade: 5 6th grade: 3	82 no data: 0	21 no data: 0	0 no data: 0	0 no data: 0	4 no data: 0	0 no data: 0
'Ewa Beach El.	197	113	51	117	29	Pre-k: 28 Kindergarten: 7 1st grade: 9 2nd grade: 21 3rd grade: 46 4th grade: 42 5th grade: 20 6th grade: 24	Pre-k: 0 Kindergarten: 6 1st grade: 6 2nd grade: 15 3rd grade: 27 4th grade: 29 5th grade: 16 6th grade: 14	90 no data: 32	68 no data: 0	13 no data: 28	8 no data: 0	13 no data: 29	8 no data: 1
Holomua El.	80	77	0	80	0	Pre-k: 0 Kindergarten: 3 1st grade: 1 2nd grade: 3 3rd grade: 1 4th grade: 28 5th grade: 20 6th grade: 24	Pre-k: 0 Kindergarten: 3 1st grade: 1 2nd grade: 1 3rd grade: 1 4th grade: 28 5th grade: 20 6th grade: 23	35 no data: 8	34 no data: 6	8 no data: 3	8 no data: 1	1 no data: 0	1 no data: 0
Iroquois Point El.	150	46	63	65	22	Pre-k: Kindergarten: 0 1st grade: 0 2nd grade: 24 3rd grade: 48 4th grade: 33 5th grade: 23 6th grade: 22	Pre-k: Kindergarten: 0 1st grade: 0 2nd grade: 7 3rd grade: 22 4th grade: 12 5th grade: 5 6th grade: 0	80 no data: 7	24 no data: 1	23 no data: 0	9 no data: 0	2 no data: 0	2 no data: 0
Ka'imiloa El.	189	74	93	96	0	Pre-k: 0 Kindergarten: 50 1st grade: 28 2nd grade: 15 3rd grade: 23 4th grade: 37 5th grade: 34 6th grade: 2	Pre-k: 0 Kindergarten: 0 1st grade: 0 2nd grade: 0 3rd grade: 19 4th grade: 31 5th grade: 23 6th grade: 1	129 no data: 2	56 no data: 0	3 no data: 0	2 no data: 0	25 no data: 0	11 no data: 0

Center	Counts of students served in Project Year 4							Free- or reduced-cost lunch		SPED		ELL	
	Enrolled					Grade levels							
Keone'ula El[a]	43	0	43	0	0	Pre-k: 0 Kindergarten: 10 1st grade: 14 2nd grade: 0 3rd grade: 0 4th grade: 19 5th grade: 0 6th grade: 0	Pre-k: 0 Kindergarten: 1st grade: 0 2nd grade: 0 3rd grade: 0 4th grade: 0 5th grade: 0 6th grade: 0	12 no data: 0	0 no data: 0	0 no data: 24	0 no data: 0	2 no data: 26	0 no data: 0
Pōhākea El.	231	147	44	122	65	Pre-k: 0 Kindergarten: 23 1st grade: 0 2nd grade: 0 3rd grade: 51 4th grade: 56 5th grade: 54 6th grade: 47	Pre-k: 0 Kindergarten: 0 1st grade: 0 2nd grade: 0 3rd grade: 35 4th grade: 44 5th grade: 33 6th grade: 35	156 no data: 0	104 no data: 0	10 no data: 0	7 no data: 0	24 no data: 0	18 no data: 0
'Ewa Makai Mid.	88	24	31	56	1	7th grade: 38 8th grade: 50	7th grade: 17 8th grade: 7	25 no data: 1	7 no data: 0	6 no data: 1	4 no data: 0	5 no data: 1	1 no data: 0
'Ilima Inter.	142	64	31	92	19	7th grade: 108 8th grade: 34	7th grade: 52 8th grade: 12	84 no data: 5	37 no data: 0	16 no data: 6	6 no data: 0	28 no data: 2	18 no data: 0
Campbell Hi.	56	11	0	56	0	9th grade: 20 10th grade: 36	9th grade: 0 10th grade: 11	31 no data: 0	10 no data: 0	6 no data: 0	1 no data: 0	15 no data: 0	11 no data: 0
TOTALS	1,292	577	404	752	136			724 no data: 55	361 no data: 7	85 no data: 62	45 no data: 1	119 no data: 58	70 no data: 1

[a]The Keone'ula center only provided programming during the summer of 2012. The Campbell High center only provided programming in Spring 2013.

Program, Mad Science of Hawai'i, Renaissance Learning, and sailors from USS Port Royal (Wilson, 2008).

During Project Year 4, the Campbell sub-grantee leaders secured several of the partners mentioned in the grant proposal: CRDG at the UHM-CoE (external evaluators), Honolulu Academy of Arts: Art to Go Program, Honolulu Zoo Society: Zoo to You Outreach Program, Renaissance Learning, and Mad Science of Hawai'i. The Campbell sub-grantee centers continued partnerships from Project Year 3 with Michael Wall DBA (Doing Business As) Playful Percussion, Aloha Amazing Science, Bricks 4 Kidz, Honolulu Theater for Youth, Jeffrey Pagay DBA Airbrush Creations Hawai'i, and Lorna Dias DBA Dancing Through Exercise. As stated in the Project Year 2 evaluation report (Higa, Sagaysay, Oshiro, & Nakamura, 2011), the project director was very resourceful with securing community partners.

There were no reports from project leaders or staff that the differences in partnerships from the grant proposals made a difference in the recruitment of students, attendance, academic achievement, academic behavior, or other intended project implementation or outcomes. The partnerships are shown in Appendix B.

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 Campbell sub-grantee met and surpassed this KPI in Project Year 4, implementing core academic activities in reading and literacy, mathematics, and science.

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, evaluators gathered and reviewed data about center activities from the summer of 2012 through SY 2012–13. Campbell sub-grantee centers met the target with each center delivering services to attendees in at least one core academic area from the summer of 2012 through SY 2012–13. A description of activities for the content area implemented at each center is shown as Appendix A. We present two different categorization displays of the activities. In Table 6, the activities were categorized by the APR activity subject areas as implemented across the centers. Additionally, in Table 7, the activities were categorized by the APR primary and secondary categories as implemented across the centers.

The activities implemented in Project Year 4 were categorized by core subject areas and are shown as Table 6. During the summer of 2012, the staff at eight centers provided

Table 6

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

| Center | Activity subject area categories (Summ = Subject category for the summer of 2012. SY = Subject category for SY 2012–13.) | | | | | | | | |
| | Core academic areas | | | | Academic enrichment areas | | | | |
	Reading or literacy	Mathematics	Science	Arts and music	Entrepreneurial education	Technology or telecommuni-cations	Cultural activities or social studies	Health or nutrition	Other[a]
'Ewa El.	Summ: 1 SY: 2	SY: 3	Summ: 1 SY: 4	Summ: 2 SY: 2	—	SY: 1	Summ: 2 SY: 1	—	—
'Ewa Beach El.	Summ: 8 SY: 6	Summ: 7 SY: 8	Summ: 3 SY: 4	Summ: 6 SY: 6	—	SY: 3	Summ: 8 SY: 2	Summ: 1	—
Holomua El.	SY: 8	SY: 4	SY: 3	SY: 4	—	SY: 2	—	SY: 1	SY: 2
Iroquois Point El.	Summ: 3	Summ: 1 SY: 1	Summ: 1 SY: 1	Summ: 4 SY: 2	—	Summ: 1	Summ: 1	—	Summ: 1
Ka'imiloa El.	Summ: 3 SY: 2	Summ: 3 SY: 1	Summ: 3 SY: 2	Summ: 4 SY: 2	—	SY: 1	SY: 1	Summ: 2	—
Keone'ula El.	Summ: 2	Summ: 3	—	Summ: 1	—	—	Summ: 1	Summ: 1	Summ: 3
Pōhākea El.	Summ: 1 SY: 3	Summ: 2 SY: 3	Summ: 1 SY: 2	Summ: 3 SY: 1	—	SY: 2	Summ: 3	Summ: 2	Summ: 2
'Ewa Makai Mid.	Summ: 1 SY: 3	Summ: 1 SY: 4	SY: 1	SY: 3	—	SY: 2	SY: 4	Summ: 1	Summ: 1
'Ilima Inter.	Summ: 1 SY: 2	Summ: 1 SY: 2	SY: 1	Summ: 1	—	—	SY: 1	Summ: 1	Summ: 2 SY: 1
Campbell Hi.	SY: 1	SY: 1	—	—	—	SY: 1	—	—	—
TOTALS	Summ: 20 SY: 27	Summ: 18 SY: 27	Summ: 9 SY: 18	Summ: 21 SY: 20	—	Summ: 1 SY: 12	Summ: 14 SY: 9	Summ: 8 SY: 1	Summ: 9 SY: 3

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.

Holomua Elementary

    Other: SY: 2 = "Physical Fitness" for the Hip Hop activity and "Physical Fitness" for the Honolulu Museum of Art-Art-To-Go-Program activity.

Iroquois Point Elementary

    Other: Summ: 1 = "Writing Process" for the Writing with Jean Kitsuki activity.

Keoneʻula Elementary

    Other: Summ: 3 = "Routine" for the Language Arts for Incoming Kindergarten activity; "Writing" for the Math for Incoming 1st Grade activity; and "Physical Education for the Health activity.

Pōhākea Elementary

    Other: Summ: 2 = "Social skills, listening and following directions, pre-kindergarten skills" for the Kick Start activity and "PE activities/Games/Sports" for the PE Activities/Games/Sports activity.

ʻEwa Makai Middle

    Other: Summ: 1 = "College Preparation Skills" for the AVID activity.

ʻIlima Intermediate

    Other: Summ: 1 = "Physical Education" for the Physical Education activity.

    Other: SY: 1 = "AVID" for the Tutoring activity.

Table 7

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

Center	Primary activity categories and secondary activity categories (Summ1= Primary activity category for the summer of 2012. Summ2 = Secondary activity category for the summer of 2012. SY1 = Primary activity category for School Year 2012–13. SY2 = Secondary activity category for School Year 2012–13.)								
	Homework help	Tutorial	Academic enrichment	Recreational	Career or job training for youth	Community service or service learning	Mentoring	Other[a]	Activity had more than two program elements
‘Ewa El.	SY2: 2	SY1: 2	Summ1: 2 SY1: 3	Summ1: 1	—	—	—	Summ2: 2	—
‘Ewa Beach El.	—	Summ1: 2 SY1: 2	Summ1: 7 Summ2: 3 SY1: 6 SY2: 3	SY2: 2	—	—	—	—	—
Holomua El.	SY2: 2	SY1: 2	SY1: 7	SY2: 7	—	—	—	—	—
Iroquois Point El.	—	Summ1: 2	Summ1: 3 Summ2: 2	Summ1: 1 SY1: 3	—	—	—	Summ2: 1 SY2: 2	—
Ka‘imiloa El.	—	Summ2: 1 SY1: 2	Summ1: 3 SY1: 1	Summ1: 1	—	—	—	Summ2: 5 SY2: 6	Summ1: 2 SY1: 3
Keone‘ula El.	—	Summ1: 5	Summ1: 4	Summ1: 1	—	—	—	Summ2: 1	—
Pōhākea El.	—	—	Summ1: 5 SY1: 4	—	—	—	—	Summ2: 5 SY2: 5	—
‘Ewa Makai Mid.	—	—	Summ1: 2 SY1: 4	Summ1: 1 SY1: 2	—	—	Summ2: 1	SY2: 3	—
‘Ilima Inter.	SY2: 1	Summ2: 2 SY1: 1 SY2: 2	Summ1: 2 SY1: 2	Summ1: 3	—	—	—	Summ2: 3	—
Campbell Hi.	—	SY2: 2	SY1: 3	—	—	—	—	—	—

(**Table 7**

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

Primary activity categories and secondary activity categories
(Summ1= Primary activity category for the summer of 2012. Summ2 = Secondary activity category for the summer of 2012.
SY1 = Primary activity category for School Year 2012–13. SY2 = Secondary activity category for School Year 2012–13.)

Center	Homework help	Tutorial	Academic enrichment	Recreational	Career or job training for youth	Community service or service learning	Mentoring	Other[a]	Activity had more than two program elements
TOTALS	SY2: 5	Summ1: 9 Summ2: 3 SY1: 9 SY2: 4	Summ1: 28 Summ2: 5 SY1: 30 SY2: 3	Summ1: 5 SY1: 5 SY2: 9	—	—	Summ2: 1	Summ2: 17 SY2: 16	Summ1: 2 SY1: 3

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.

ʻEwa Elementary
    Other: Summ2: 2 = "Introduce first experience of elementary school" for the Hawaiian Games activity and "Introduce first experience of elementary school" for the Playful Percussion with Michael Wall activity.
Iroquois Point Elementary
    Other: Summ2: 1 = "Art: Theater Drama Activities" for the Hawaiʻi Theater for Youth activity.
    Other: SY2: 2 = "Art" for the Art-with local artist Jeff Pagay activity and "Art: Theater Drama Activities" for the Hawaiʻi Theater for Youth activity.
Kaʻimiloa Elementary
    Other: Summ2: 5 = "Students were introduced to the rituals and routines of being a Kindergarten student" for the Kick Start Reading activity; "Students were introduced to the rituals and routines of being a Kindergarten student" for the Kick Start Math activity; "Art" for the Art to Go activity; "Music" for the Hip Hop activity; and "Science" for the Mad Science activity.
    Other: SY2: 6 = "Reading help" for the Renaissance Learning Reading activity; "Math help" for the Renaissance Learning Math activity; "Reading by following instructions, constructing a helicopter with legos" for the Bricks for Kids activity; "Dance and music" for the Hip Hop activity; "Science" for the Mad Science activity; and "Basics/Techniques of Photography and use of the camera and computer for editing and putting together a slide show" for the Photography activity.
Keoneʻula Elementary
    Other: Summ2: 1 = "Break between sessions" for the snack/recess activity.
Pōhākea Elementary
    Other: Summ2: 5 = "Pre-Kindergarten skills and activities were provided to incoming 2012–13 Kindergarten students" for the Kick Start activity; "Individual math assignments/tutoring help" for the Math activity; "Drama & Dance skills" for the Drama/Dance activity; "PE activities/Games/Sports" for the PE Activities/Games/Sports activity; and "Cultural: Polynesian Dances" for the Polynesian Dances activity.
    Other: SY2: 5 = "Individual/group reading assignments/tutoring for HSA benchmarks, "Meets, Exceeds" for the Reading SY 2012–13 activity; "Individual/group math assignments/tutoring for HSA benchmarks "Meets, Exceeds" for the Math SY 2012–13 activity; "Taiko Dance/Drum Skills" for the Dance-Taiko 2013 activity; "Media activities" for the Media Enrichment activity; and "Robotics Activities" for the Robotics Enrichment SY 2012–13 activity.

activities. Two centers, Holomua, which operates as a multi-track year-round school, and Campbell High did not offer a summer program. Four centers ('Ewa Beach, Iroquois Point, Ka'imiloa, and Pōhākea) delivered services in the three core academic areas of reading/literacy, mathematics and science. The 'Ewa, 'Ewa Beach, Iroquois Point, Ka'imiloa, and Pōhākea center staff, provided activities in the core academic area of science. Keone'ula, 'Ewa Makai Middle, and 'Ilima Intermediate center staff reported activities focused within reading/literacy and mathematics. 'Ewa center staff implemented a reading/literacy and science activity.

During SY 2012–13, staff at nine centers offered activities; Keone'ula only offered programming during summer. Staff at seven centers ('Ewa, 'Ewa Beach, Holomua, Ka'imiloa, Pōhākea, 'Ewa Makai Middle, and 'Ilima Intermediate) reported delivering services to attendees focused within the three core content areas of reading/literacy, mathematics, and science. Iroquois Point center staff reported delivering services to attendees focused within the content areas of mathematics and science. Campbell High center staff reported delivering services to attendees within the content areas of reading/literacy and mathematics. Of the nine Campbell sub-grantee centers active during SY 2012–13, we found that eight centers provided activities in the core academic area of reading/literacy, with the exception being Iroquois Point.

Staff at nine centers provided activities in the core academic area of mathematics. The staff at eight centers ('Ewa, 'Ewa Beach, Holomua, Iroquois Point, Ka'imiloa, Pōhākea, 'Ewa Makai Middle, and 'Ilima Intermediate) provided activities in the core area of science. There were nine centers that provided activities in at least two of the three core academic areas.

The evaluation staff referred to both sets of data to determine the intentionality of design for project activities. As shown in Table 7, the top two primary categories for the summer of 2012 activities were academic enrichment and tutorial activities. Among primary and secondary categories, the sub-grantee showed low numbers of activities targeted under homework help, very low numbers targeted under mentoring, and no numbers targeted under career or job training for youth and community service or service learning.

In addition to the collection of descriptive information about activities, we collected and analyzed data from center staff regarding the extent of implementation and the quality of implementation of core subject area activities. However, the data were only collected from summer of 2012 center staff, and there were only a few respondents who provided information about the extent and quality of implementation of core academic areas. We present the data from staff about the extent and quality of implementation as Tables 8 and 8a; however, those centers with a limited number of respondents (five or less) within the set of data, we present the data in summarized form rather than numerical, tabular format. The data also included the

Table 8

Campbell Sub-grantee in Project Year 4: Findings About the Extent of Implementation of Reading/Literacy, Mathematics, and Science Activities

Activity	Average ratings of the extent of implementation (standard deviation)																													
	‘Ewa Elem.			‘Ewa Beach Elem.			Holomua Elem.			Iroquois Point Elem.			Ka‘imiloa Elem.			Keone‘ula Elem.			Pōhākea Elem.			‘Ewa Makai Middle			‘Ilima Intermediate			Campbell High		
	n	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*
*i*1. Address students' individual needs (e.g., low achievement, LEP, SpEd, behavioral) for improving academic performance.	—ᵃ	—	—	7	3.4	0.8	—	—	—	—	—	—	9	3.4	0.5	6	4.0	0	—ᵃ	—	—	—ᵃ	—	—	—	—	—	—ᵃ	—	—
*i*2. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in reading/literacy.	—ᵃ	—	—	12	3.8	0.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	9	3.7	0.5	7	3.7	0.5	—ᵃ	—	—	6	3.8	0.4	—	—	—	—ᵃ	—	—
*i*3. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in mathematics	—ᵃ	—	—	10	3.7	0.7	—	—	—	—	—	—	7	3.4	0.5	7	3.9	0.4	—ᵃ	—	—	6	3.8	0.4	—	—	—	7	3.3	1.1
*i*4. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in science.	—ᵃ	—	—	0	0	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	3.0	0.6	—ᵃ	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Note. *1.0* = poor; *2.0* = mediocre; *3.0* = moderate; *4.0* = all or almost all for extent. The shaded cells indicate average item ratings of 3.0 and above which is interpreted as moderate to high levels of implementation.

ᵃThe number of respondents is less than or equal to 5 and the findings are reported within the report narrative.

Table 8a

Campbell Sub-grantee in Project Year 4: Findings About the Quality of Implementation of Reading/Literacy, Mathematics, and Science Activities

Activity	Average ratings of the quality of implementation (standard deviation)																													
	'Ewa Elem.			'Ewa Beach Elem.			Holomua Elem.			Iroquois Point Elem.			Ka'imiloa Elem.			Keone'ula Elem.			Pōhākea Elem.			'Ewa Makai Middle			'Ilima Intermediate			Campbell High		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
*i*1. Address students' individual needs (e.g., low achievement, LEP, SpEd, behavioral) for improving academic performance.	—[a]	—	—	7	3.4	0.8	—	—	—	—	—	—	9	3.3	0.5	6	4.0	0	—[a]	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—[a]	—	—
*i*2. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in reading/literacy.	—[a]	—	—	12	3.6	0.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	9	3.9	0.3	7	3.6	0.5	—[a]	—	—	6	3.5	0.8	—	—	—	—[a]	—	—
*i*3. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in mathematics	—[a]	—	—	10	3.7	0.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	7	3.4	0.5	7	3.9	0.4	—[a]	—	—	6	3.5	0.8	—	—	—	7	3.7	0.5
*i*4. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in science.	—[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	3.8	0.4	—[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

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

[a]The number of respondents is less than or equal to 5 and the findings are reported within the report narrative.

comments of questionnaire respondents shown in Appendix C. Respondents from four centers reported that reading/literacy activities were implemented at moderate levels of extent and quality. Respondents from five centers reported that the mathematics activities were also implemented at moderate levels of extent and quality.

Addressing the needs of individual students. As shown in Table 8 and 8a, three centers ('Ewa Beach, Ka'imiloa, Keone'ula) reported addressing individual student needs at moderate to all or almost all levels of extent of implementation and moderate to very well levels of implementation quality.

Findings about the implementation of academic activities, five or fewer respondents. This narrative summarizes the findings about centers or activities 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 due to an individual's pressure to positively represent their efforts.

The data presented in this narrative were omitted from tables with similar data, but higher counts of respondents. In this case, the data here were omitted from Tables 8 and 8a. The evaluators omitted the findings overall in cases with five or fewer respondents so that the narrative may include a description of the findings across all centers (if there were low counts of respondents from centers to address implementation of one content area), or findings across all content areas (if there were low counts of respondents from one center to address implementation across multiple content areas). In this case, there were five or fewer counts of respondents from the 'Ewa, Pōhākea, and Campbell High centers across at least two of the three academic areas. Therefore, those findings are reported here instead of on Tables 8 and 8a. There were also five or fewer respondents from the Keone'ula center for the science content area and at the 'Ewa, Pōhākea, 'Ewa Makai Middle, and Campbell High centers for addressing students' individual needs; therefore findings about implementation of science and addressing students' individuals needs are reported here instead of in Tables 8 and 8a.

Findings for the 'Ewa, Pōhākea, and Campbell High centers, suggest that reading activities were implemented at moderate extent and quality in Year 4. For the mathematics activities, the 'Ewa and Pōhākea centers reported that these activities were implemented at

moderate levels of extent and very well for quality. Additionally, center staff, contractors, and volunteers at the 'Ewa, Pōhākea, 'Ewa Makai Middle, and Campbell High centers reported addressing students' individual needs for improving academic performance at mediocre to all or almost all levels of extent and mediocre to very well levels of quality. The findings about the extent of implementation of science activities in Project Year 4 at the 'Ewa and Keone'ula centers suggest that the activities were implemented at moderate extent and quality.

The Implementation of Academic Enrichment Activities

Descriptive data about enrichment activities implemented in Project Year 4 are shown in Table 6. We reviewed the data about the categories of the enrichment activities to determine whether 100% of project centers met the implementation objective of providing enrichment activities to center attendees.

Enrichment and support activities (indicator 2.2). 100% of centers will offer enrichment and support activities such as nutrition and health, art, music, technology, and recreation. The Campbell sub-grantee met this indicator in Project Year 4, with each center implementing enrichment activities. During summer of 2012, eight of Campbell sub-grantee centers, ('Ewa, 'Ewa Beach, Iroquois Point, Ka'imiloa, Keone'ula, Pōhākea, 'Ewa Makai Middle, and 'Ilima Intermediate) offered enrichment and support activities. Keone'ula center only offered enrichment activities during summer of 2012 in the categories of arts and music, cultural activities or social studies, health or nutrition, and "other." Of the summer of 2012 enrichment and support activities, 21 activities were categorized as arts and music; 14 were categorized as cultural activities or social studies; 8 were health and nutrition; and 9 were categorized as "other." During SY 2012–13, 'Ewa, 'Ewa Beach, Ka'imiloa, and 'Ewa Makai Middle centers offered enrichment and support activities in the three categories of arts and music, technology or telecommunications, and cultural activities or social studies. Holomua center delivered activities in four categories identified as arts and music, technology and telecommunications, health or nutrition, and "other." Two centers offered enrichment activities in two categories; Pōhākea center in the categories of arts and music and technology and telecommunications, and 'Ilima Intermediate in the categories of cultural activities or social studies and "other." Two centers offered enrichment activities in only one category; Iroquois Point center offered an activity in arts and music, and Campbell High center offered an activity in technology and telecommunications. None of the sub-grantee centers offered an enrichment activity within the category of entrepreneurial education.

During the summer of 2012, the evaluators collected data through an on-line questionnaire and analyzed data from center staff regarding the extent and quality of

implementation of academic enrichment activities shown as Table 9 and 9a. However, as was the case with data collected and reviewed for the study of extent and quality of implementation of core academic areas, those centers where the number of respondents is less than five are reported as narrative summaries. Respondents from four centers reported that art and music activities were implemented at moderate extent and quality in Project Year 4. Furthermore, respondents from one center reported that cultural or social studies activities were also implemented at moderate extent and quality.

Findings about the implementation of academic enrichment activities, reported by five or fewer respondents. This narrative summarizes the findings about centers where data were provided by five or fewer respondents shown as Tables 9 and 9a. The data also included comments of questionnaire respondents. The comments are shown as Appendix D.

We are reporting findings with those minimal levels of respondents in this narrative format instead of data tables 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.

Respondents at six centers ('Ewa Beach, Ka'imiloa, Keone'ula, Pōhākea, 'Ewa Makai Middle, and Campbell High) reported that the extent of implementation of sports activities were mediocre to moderate and that the quality of implementation was moderate.

At the 'Ewa, Ka'imiloa, Pōhākea, 'Ewa Makai Middle, and Campbell High centers the respondents reported that cultural or social studies activities was implemented at mediocre to moderate extent and moderate quality, with the 'Ewa Beach center reporting that the activities were implemented at mediocre extent and very well quality.

In Project Year 4, respondents at five centers ('Ewa Beach, Ka'imiloa, Keone'ula, Pōhākea, and 'Ewa Makai Middle) reported that telecommunications or technology activities were implemented at mediocre to moderate levels of extent and moderate levels of quality.

Health and nutrition activities were implemented at the 'Ewa Beach, Ka'imiloa, and Campbell High centers. Respondents reported that the extent of implementation for these activities was at mediocre to moderate levels and the quality of implementation was moderate.

Table 9

Campbell Sub-grantee in Project Year 4: Findings About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities

Activity	Average ratings of the extent of implementation (standard deviation)																													
	ʻEwa Elem.			ʻEwa Beach Elem.			Holomua Elem.			Iroquois Point Elem.			Kaʻimiloa Elem.			Keoneʻula Elem.			Pōhākea Elem.			ʻEwa Makai Middle			ʻIlima Intermediate			Campbell High		
	n	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*
*i*5. art and/or music	—[a]	—	—	6	3.2	1.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	7	3.3	0.8	8	3.5	0.8	—	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—	—	—	6	3.2	1.3
*i*6. entrepreneurial education (business ventures)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
*i*7. telecommunications and technology education	—	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
*i*8. Sports (e.g., basketball, baseball, football, swimming)	—	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—[a]	—	—
*i*9. cultural activities/ social studies	—[a]	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—[a]	—	—	6	3.3	0.8	—[a]	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—[a]	—	—
*i*10. health/nutrition	—	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—[a]	—	—
*i*11. Service learning activities (service activities in the school or local community)	—	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Note. 1.0 = poor; 2.0 = mediocre; 3.0 = moderate; 4.0 = all or almost all for extent. The shaded cells indicate average item ratings of 3.0 and above which is interpreted as moderate to high levels of implementation.

[a]The number of respondents is less than or equal to 5 and the findings are reported within the report narrative.

Table 9a

Campbell Sub-grantee in Project Year 4: Findings About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities

Activity	Average ratings of the quality of implementation (standard deviation)																													
	ʻEwa Elem.			ʻEwa Beach Elem.			Holomua Elem.			Iroquois Point Elem.			Kaʻimiloa Elem.			Keoneʻula Elem.			Pōhākea Elem.			ʻEwa Makai Middle			ʻIlima Intermediate			Campbell High		
	n	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*
*i*5. art and/or music	—[a]	—	—	6	3.8	0.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	7	3.4	0.8	8	3.6	0.5	—	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—	—	—	6	3.7	0.8
*i*6. entrepreneurial education (business ventures)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
*i*7. telecommunications and technology education	—	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
*i*8.Sports (e.g., basketball, baseball, football, swimming)	—	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—[a]	—	—
*i*9. cultural activities/social studies	—[a]	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—[a]	—	—	6	3.5	0.6	—[a]	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—[a]	—	—
*i*10. health/ nutrition	—	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—[a]	—	—
*i*11. Service learning activities (service activities in the school or local community)	—	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

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

[a]The number of respondents is less than or equal to 5 and the findings are reported within the report narrative.

Respondents at three centers ('Ewa Beach, Ka'imiloa, and Keone'ula) reported that the implementation of service learning activities were moderate to all or almost all levels of extent and moderate to *very* well quality.

At the 'Ewa and 'Ewa Makai Middle centers, respondents reported that art and/or music activities were implemented at moderate extent and quality.

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 Campbell sub-grantee met this indicator in Project Year 4. Based on the APR data collected, 100% of Campbell sub-grantee centers established or maintained partnerships with community organizations. One partner, CRDG, provided services to the entire Campbell sub-grantee. One partner, Renaissance Learning provided services to nine centers. Eight centers ('Ewa, 'Ewa Beach, Holomua, Iroquois Point, Ka'imiloa, Pōhākea, 'Ewa Makai Middle, 'Ilima Intermediate) contracted one to nine additional partners per center. Two centers (Keone'ula, Campbell High) did not have any additional partners besides CRDG. Specific information about partnerships for the entire sub-grantee and individual centers are shown as Appendix B.

Services to parents and other adult family members (indicator 2.4): Services to parents and other adult community members: 85% of centers will offer services to parents, senior citizens, and other adult community members. Based on SY 2012–13 APR data, two (22%) of the nine centers implemented activities to involve parents and adult family members. We administered the on-line questionnaire during the summer of 2012. There were low levels of responses about services to parents and other adult family members, therefore, the findings are reported in narrative format only. 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 provided by low levels of respondents and may include some bias based on social or individual pressure to positively represent their efforts.

The data presented in this narrative was in response to one item on the on-line questionnaire, "parents of students who participate in the centers also receive support/guidance from centers." Center staff, contractors, or volunteers who directly implemented activities were asked to respond on four-point rating scales, the extent which such activities were implemented, and the quality to which such activities were implemented. Five or fewer respondents at four centers ('Ewa, 'Ewa Beach, Ka'imiloa, and Campbell High) reported that parent activities were implemented at the centers at all or almost all extent and moderate to very well quality. One center, (Pōhākea), reported that parent activities were implemented at their center at poor extent and moderate quality.

Reports of parent and other adult activities from sub-grantee center coordinators and staff were limited due to limited communication with evaluation staff from March through May 2013.

Are the project activities interesting and valuable to students, teachers, administrators, and community partners? Descriptive data about project activities were provided by center coordinators on APR Form C-7. The descriptions included a primary and a secondary subject area for each activity. To gather evaluative data about the implemented activities, an evaluator-developed, on-line questionnaire was administered to center staff, contractors, or volunteers who implemented center activities to gather their evaluative perceptions about the extent and quality of implementation of project activities.

We referred to both sets of data to determine the intentionality of design for project activities. As shown in Table 7, the top three primary categories for the summer of 2012 activities were academic enrichment, tutorial, and recreation. The top three secondary categories were other, academic enrichment, and tutorial. During SY 2012–13, the top three primary categories for activities were academic enrichment, tutorial, and recreation. The top three secondary categories were homework help, tutorial, and other. Among primary and secondary categories, the sub-grantee showed lower numbers of activities targeted under career or job training for youth and community service or service learning. As shown in Table 6, the Campbell sub-grantee provided the majority of activities targeted at the core academic areas of reading or literacy, mathematics, and science during the summer of 2012 and SY 2012–13. The sub-grantee also targeted academic enrichment activities in categories of arts and music, cultural activities or social studies, and technology or telecommunications during the summer of 2012 and SY 2012–13.

The sub-grantee provided eight health or nutrition activities during the summer of 2012 and provided one health or nutrition activity during SY 2012–13. Among core and academic enrichment activity categories, there were no entrepreneurial education activities in Project Year 4. Based on the descriptive data summarized in Tables 6 and 7 about sub-grantee activities, the sub-grantees addressed the project objectives regarding implementation of core and enrichment activities required under the grant.

Although the retention of attendees measured though their center attendance provides only a tenuous indicator of an attendee's interest in the center's project or 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. We reviewed the data shown in Table 5 examining the percentage of regular students to the total center enrollment. In Project Year 4, the following centers had percentages of regular attendees to

their total center attendees greater than 50%: 96% (77 of 80) for Holomua, 64% (147 of 231) for Pōhākea, and 57% (113 of 197) for ʻEwa Beach. The percentages of regular attendees at the remaining centers were less than 50%: 45% (64 of 142) for ʻIlima Intermediate, 39% (74 of 189) for Kaʻimiloa, 31% (46 of 159) for Iroquois Point, 27% (24 of 88) for ʻEwa Makai Middle, 20% (11 of 56) for Campbell High, 18% (21 of 116) for ʻEwa, and 0% (0 of 43) for Keoneʻula. Across Campbell sub-grantee centers, we found 45% (577) of the 1,292 attendees were regular attendees. This is a similar percentage level to the 46% (538) who were regular attendees of the 1,161 center students in Project Year 3. Also in Project Year 3, the following centers had percentages of regular attendees to total center attendees greater than 50%: 80% (150 of 186) for Pōhākea, 72% (70 of 97) for Holomua, 62% (48 of 77) for ʻIlima Intermediate, and 52% (79 of 159) for Kaʻimiloa. The percentages of regular attendees at the remaining centers were less than 50%: 49% (103 of 207) for ʻEwa Beach, 31% (22 of 69) for Campbell High, 27% (33 of 122) for Iroquois Point, 19% (150 of 186) for ʻEwa Makai Middle, 13% (20 of 147) for ʻEwa and 0% (0 of 40) for Keoneʻula. Although the measurement is tenuous, attendance of regular attendees indicated the project's ability to retain and affect the targeted student population.

What challenges were faced in implementation and how were they addressed? Over the years of evaluation activities for clients who have received 21st CCLC grants, the evaluators were aware that there would be a 25% reduction in the fourth year funding for the Campbell sub-grantee. The original evaluation design planned to collect data regarding the implementation of Campbell sub-grantee activities in Project Year 4 as the sub-grantee looked toward sustaining the project with less resources. Unfortunately, the evaluation team was unable to fully implement the evaluation design. Therefore, the evaluators only can infer from the limited available data that Campbell sub-grantee continued to implement core academic and enrichment activities beyond the stated KPI objectives. The sub-grantee continued to develop and implement project improvements during Project Year 4.

Findings about Outcomes in Project Year 4

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?"

As previously discussed in the section Implemented Evaluation Activities, the evaluators were unable to administer the 21st CCLC Teacher Survey during SY 2012–13; therefore, the 21st CCLC Teacher Survey data to determine outcome indicators of academic behaviors of regular attendees could not be collected and not included in this report. During the summer of 2012, center staff provided data about implementation of center activities to address attendees' academic behavior. Data were collected from center staff members about the extent and quality of implementation of activities, discussions, and behavioral reinforcement for attendee behaviors.

The HIDOE-SPMS outcome indicator for academic performance was "60% of regular students will demonstrate improvement in reading/language arts and/or math." Two types of data were collected in aggregate form to examine the levels of regular attendees' academic achievement during Project 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-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.

Limited Findings About Academic Behaviors

Data about staff implementation of behavioral supports were collected during the administration of the evaluator developed on-line questionnaire during the summer 2012. These data were limited to responses for a single item and were limited to a very small pool of respondents. Because of the low numbers of respondents, we are providing narrative reports of findings only to prevent any possibility for identification of the respondents. The reader should note that this narrative summarizes the points of view of five or fewer respondents and, therefore, may lack a broad perspective. Additionally, data with these very low levels of respondents may include some social bias to individual's pressure to positively represent their efforts.

The data presented in this narrative was in response to one item on the on-line questionnaire, "discuss appropriate positive behavior and reinforce the behaviors." Center staff, contractors, or volunteers who directly implemented activities were asked to respond on

four-point rating scales, the extent to which such activities were implemented, and the quality to which such activities were implemented.

The findings suggest that the ʻEwa, ʻEwa Beach, Kaʻimiloa, Keoneʻula, and Pōhākea centers implemented activities to improve students' behaviors at moderate to all or almost all extent of implementation and moderate to very well quality of implementation.

Findings About Academic Achievement

The HIDOE-SPMS program manager and a Campbell sub-grantee administrative assistant worked in collaboration to aggregate regular attendee data for online entry to PPICS. Data from the PPICS reporting effort included aggregated data of comparisons of Fall and Spring of SY 2012–13 language arts/reading grades, Fall and Spring of SY 2012–13 mathematics grades, and language arts/reading and mathematics pre-post assessment scores of regular center students. The evaluators reviewed these regular attendee data to determine the status of Campbell sub-grantee academic performance in comparison with the outcome indicators.

60% or more regular attendees improved reading/language arts and mathematics grades: Indicator 4.1a and 4.1b. The Campbell sub-grantee project did not meet the outcome indicator of 60% or more of regular attendee who evidenced improved reading/language arts or mathematics semester report card grades. However, as shown in Table 10, 60% or more of the regular attendees at two centers reached or exceeded the 60% criterion for improvement in reading/language arts report card grades: Holomua (83.3%), and Pōhākea (68.2%). Additionally, 60% or more of the regular attendees at two centers, Holomua (66.7%), and Pōhākea (77.4%), reached or exceeded the 60% criterion for improvement of mathematics report card grades.

60% or more regular attendees improved reading/language arts and mathematics pre-post assessment scores. Some host schools did not administer language arts or mathematics pre-post assessments that met the HIDOE-SPMS criteria of being (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, (d) may be different for each grade level within the school, and (e) supported by literature that shows appropriate psychometric qualities of the assessment.

The Campbell sub-grantee did not meet these outcome indicators in Project Year 4. The data about changes in regular attendees' pre-post assessment scores are shown as Table 10. The

Table 10

Campbell Sub-grantee in Project Year 4: Changes in Course Grades and School-Based Assessments for Regular Attendees

Center	Changes in **Language Arts** grades[a, b]	Changes in pre-post test *Language Arts* scores[a, b]	Changes in *Mathematics* grades[a, b]	Changes in pre-post test *Mathematics* score[a, b]
ʻEwa El.	Improved: 5 (23.8%) No change: 12 (57.1%) Went down: 1 (4.8%) Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 3 (14.3%) *n* = 21	Improved: 18 (85.7%) No change: 0 Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 3 (14.3%) *n* = 21	Improved: 3 (14.3%) No change: 12 (57.1%) Went down: 3 (14.3%) Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 3 (14.3%) *n* = 21	Improved: 0 No change: 0 Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 21 (100.0%) *n* = 21
ʻEwa Beach El.	Improved: 39 (34.8%) No change: 55 (49.1%) Went down: 18 (16.1%) Did not need to improve: 1 N/A: 0 No data: 0 *n* = 112	Improved: 0 No change: 0 Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 113 (100.0%) *n* = 113	Improved: 38 (33.9%) No change: 59 (52.7%) Went down: 15 (13.4%) Did not need to improve: 1 N/A: 0 No data: 0 *n* = 112	Improved: 0 No change: 0 Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 113 (100.0%) *n* = 113
Holomua El.	Improved: 35 (83.3%) No change: 7 (16.7%) Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 35 N/A: 0 No data: 0 *n* = 42	Improved: 50 (69.4%) No change: 9 (12.5%) Went down: 1 (1.4%) Did not need to improve: 5 N/A: 12 (16.7%) No data: 0 *n* = 72	Improved: 22 (66.7%) No change: 11 (33.3%) Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 44 N/A: 0 No data: 0 *n* = 33	Improved: 0 No change: 0 Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 77 (100%) *n* = 77
Iroquois Point El.	Improved: 17 (37.0%) No change: 23 (50.0%) Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 1 (2.2%) No data: 5 (10.8%) *n* = 46	Improved: 36 (78.3%) No change: 4 (8.7%) Went down: 2 (4.3%) Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 4 (8.7%) *n* = 46	Improved: 16 (34.8%) No change: 23 (50.0%) Went down: 1 (2.2%) Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 6 (13.0%) No data: 0 *n* = 46	Improved: 0 No change: 0 Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 46 (100%) *n* = 46
Kaʻimiloa El.	Improved: 19 (26.0%) No change: 44 (60.3%) Went down: 9 (12.3%) Did not need to improve: 1 N/A: 0 No data: 1 (1.4%) *n* = 73	Improved: 66 (89.2%) No change: 4 (5.4%) Went down: 2 (2.7%) Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 2 (2.7%) *n* = 74	Improved: 26 (35.1%) No change: 41 (55.4%) Went down: 6 (8.1%) Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 1 (1.4%) *n* = 74	Improved: 0 No change: 0 Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 74 (100%) *n* = 74
Keoneʻula El.	No regular (30-day) students. This center was open during the summer of 2012 only.			

(**Table 10**

Campbell Sub-grantee in Project Year 4: Changes in Course Grades and School-Based Assessments for Regular Attendees, continued)

Center	Changes in **Language Arts** grades[a, b]	Changes in pre-post test *Language Arts* scores[a, b]	Changes in *Mathematics* grades[a, b]	Changes in pre-post test *Mathematics* score[a, b]
Pōhākea El.	Improved: 92 (68.2%) No change: 38 (28.1%) Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 12 N/A: 4 (3.0%) No data: 1 (0.7%) *n* = 135	Improved: 67 (59.3%) No change: 14 (12.4%) Went down: 23 (20.3%) Did not need to improve: 34 N/A: 2 (1.8%) No data: 7 (6.2%) *n* = 113	Improved: 106 (77.4%) No change: 25 (18.2%) Went down: 1 (0.7%) Did not need to improve: 10 N/A: 0 No data: 5 (3.7%) *n* = 137	Improved: 62 (42.2%) No change: 75 (51.0%) Went down: 5 (3.4%) Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 5 (3.4%) *n* = 147
ʻEwa Makai Mid.	Improved: 5 (23.8%) No change: 10 (47.6%) Went down: 5 (23.8%) Did not need to improve: 3 N/A: 1 (4.8%) No data: 0 *n* = 21	Improved: 0 No change: 0 Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 24 (100.0%) *n* = 24	Improved: 2 (8.7%) No change: 15 (65.2%) Went down: 5 (21.7%) Did not need to improve: 1 N/A: 1 (4.4%) No data: 0 *n* = 23	Improved: 0 No change: 0 Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 24 (100.0%) *n* = 24
ʻIlima Inter.	Improved: 23 (37.1%) No change: 25 (40.3%) Went down: 10 (16.1%) Did not need to improve: 2 N/A: 4 (6.5%) No data: 0 *n* = 62	Improved: 0 No change: 0 Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 64 (100.0%) *n* = 64	Improved: 34 (55.7%) No change: 17 (27.9%) Went down: 6 (9.8%) Did not need to improve: 3 N/A: 4 (6.6%) No data: 0 *n* = 61	Improved: 0 No change: 0 Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 64 (100.0%) *n* = 64
Campbell Hi.	Improved: 6 (54.5%) No change: 3 (27.3%) Went down: 2 (18.2%) Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 0 *n* = 11	Improved: 7 (63.6%) No change: 2 (18.2%) Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 1 (9.1%) No data: 1 (9.1%) *n* = 11	Improved: 0 No change: 0 Went down: 0 Did not need to improve: 0 N/A: 0 No data: 11 (100.0%) *n* = 11	Improved: 4 (50.0%) No change: 2 (25.0%) Went down: 1 (12.5%) Did not need to improve: 3 N/A: 1 (12.5%) No data: 0 *n* = 8

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* are excluded from the denominator used to calculate the percentages on the above 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.

shaded cells indicate when the centers met the outcome indicator of 60% or more regular attendees improved reading/language arts or mathematics pre-post assessment scores. Of six centers reporting comparison of reading or language arts assessment scores from pre-test to post-test, five centers reported 60% or more regular attendees improving their scores between the pre- and post-assessment in reading/language arts: 'Ewa (85.7%), Holomua (69.4%), Iroquois Point (78.3%), Ka'imiloa (89.2%), and Campbell High (63.6%).

Two Campbell sub-grantee centers reported pre-post mathematics scores. Neither center reported meeting the target of 60% or more regular attendees increasing mathematics scores between pre- and post-assessment administrations.

The evaluators reviewed both the comparison of fall and spring semester grades and the comparison of pre-post assessment scores for reading/literature and mathematics to address changes in academic achievement of regular attendees. In our experience, we found that pre-post assessment scores of regular attendees have limited relationship with their grades.

Findings About Sub-grantee PPICS Objectives

In addition to the statutory and regulatory program objectives, the Campbell sub-grantee project leaders defined objectives aligned with the 21st CCLC objectives, aimed to meet the needs of program participants, and specific to the educational context of the host schools. These objectives stated in the PPICS were (a) "increase the number of students meeting Reading and Math Standards;" (b) "increase the number of regular center students improving in Reading / Literacy;" (c) "increase the number of regular center students improving in mathematics;" (d) "increase student engagement through enrichment activities that focus on critical thinking and inquiry;" (e) "expand an after school program to integrate a range of content areas that motivate and engage students in the learning process;" (f) "develop after school centers that offer high quality activities in core content areas such as English Language Arts, mathematics, or science to improve students' academic achievement;" (g) "develop after school centers that offer high quality enrichment or support activities;" (h) "provide opportunities for parents to connect to their child's learning experience through a range of activities and workshops;" and (i) "provide opportunities for parents and other adults to center students' learning experiences through a range of activities and workshops." The results and outcomes for these Campbell sub-grantee objectives were reported within PPICS and also are reported in this report as Table 11.

Table 11

Campbell Sub-grantee in Project Year 4: Sub-grantee Objectives

Objectives	Status of objective
(a) "Increase the number of students meeting Reading and Math Standards."	Did not meet, but progressed toward the stated objective[a]
(b) "Increase the number of regular center students improving in Reading / Literacy.	Did not meet, but progressed toward the stated objective
(c) "Increase the number of regular center students improving in mathematics."	Did not meet, but progressed toward the stated objective
(d) "Increase student engagement through enrichment activities that focus on critical thinking and inquiry."	Met the stated objective[a]
(e) "Expand an after school program to integrate a range of content areas that motivate and engage students in the learning process."	Met the stated objective[a]
(f) "Develop after school centers that offer high quality activities in core content areas such as English Language Arts, mathematics, or science to improve students' academic achievement."	Met the stated objective[a]
(g) "Develop after school centers that offer high quality enrichment or support activities."	Met the stated objective[a]
(h) "Provide opportunities for parents to connect to their child's learning experience through a range of activities and workshops."	Did not meet, but progressed toward the stated objective[a]
(i) "Provide opportunities for parents and other adults to center students' learning experiences through a range of activities and workshops."	Did not meet, but progressed toward the stated objective[a]

[a]As described earlier in this report, the evaluators had challenges with collecting the usual range of data in Project Year 4. The Campbell sub-grantee Project Director personally collected data to address these objectives for which the evaluators were not able to collect data. The Project Director entered the Status of Objective in the PPICS APR section for these objectives. Project Director Young based her conclusions on students' attendance, site visit observations, written and verbal feedback from site coordinators, tutors and students, and types of reading/math tutorial programs and enrichment activities that were held at the schools (C. Young, personal communication, December 3, 2013).

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 HIDOE web page, all sub-grantee external evaluation reports were made available to the public. Additionally, the Pōhākea center's host school included 21st CCLC information on its website.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Project Year 4 data that were submitted and reviewed suggest that the Campbell sub-grantee project was a well-implemented project. The evaluators have summarized the findings of the implementation evaluation, of the outcome evaluation, and our recommendations shown as Table 12. The project was well aligned with the grant proposal, except for changes in some community partners. The evaluators found that the project management and staff responded to match the needs of attendees with the capabilities and resources of partners and made well-advised changes to the intended plan. The Project Director used feedback from coordinators, students, and tutors to make adjustments to program activities and materials to meet the needs of project participants. Communications logs were used by the regular classroom teachers and tutors to provide connections between the regular school curricula to the 21st CCLC center program. Campbell sub-grantee center administration and staff continued to deliver project activities aligned with the purpose and objectives of the grant. The sub-grantee administration and center coordinators continued to plan and implement initiatives toward project improvement, notably at Campbell High center.

Our examination of Project Year 4 suggests that the Campbell 21st CCLC project is a mature and seasoned project. The number of attendees increased from the 1,161 in Project Year 3 to 1,292 in Project Year 4. The number of regular attendees increased 7.3% in Project Year 4 compared to Project Year 3 (538 regular attendees in Project Year 3, 577 regular attendees in Project Year 4). We also found that the percentages of regular attendees who improved in their language arts report card grades decreased (50% in Project Year 3, 41% in Project Year 4). The percentage of regular attendees who improved their mathematics report card grades decreased in Project Year 4 (52% in Project Year 3, 43% in Project Year 4). Our findings of Project Year 4 outcomes were limited to a smaller data set than in previous years.

Although our recommendations are based primarily on the limited set of Campbell sub-grantee data, we also gave consideration to our previous experiences with evaluations of other 21st CCLC sub-grantees when these recommendations were reviewed and finalized.

Table 12

Campbell Sub-grantee in Project Year 4: A Summary of Findings, Comments, and Recommendations

Performance indicator	Objective met or not met in Project Year 4	Summary	Recommendations
Implementation objectives The reader is reminded that evaluators implemented a limited set of evaluation activities.			
2.1. 100% of centers will offer high quality services in at least one core academic area, such as reading and literacy, mathematics, and science.	Met	All 10 sub-grantee centers implemented reading/literacy and mathematics activities. Eight of 10 sub-grantee centers implemented science activities.	The criteria for the USDE and HIDOE were met. Activities were implemented as intended, with the continuation (from Project Year 2) of the sibling class. This is a commendable initiative by the project director. In light of the achievement data, we support and recommend continuing this broader implementation plan for a consistent and sufficient amount of activity time for homework help and tutorials.
2.2. 100% of centers will offer enrichment and support activities such as nutrition and health, art, music, technology, and recreation.	Met	In Project Year 4, every Campbell sub-grantee center offered enrichment and support activities to center attendees. Staff at nine of 10 centers implemented arts and music activities. Staff at eight of 10 centers implemented cultural/social studies activities. Other types of enrichment activities were also implemented.	The Campbell sub-grantee has continued the pattern of implementing a variety of enrichment activities. Enrichment activities are valuable for students' enjoyment of learning, application of the content areas in practical situations, and development of global and higher-order thinking. We recommend the continued emphasis on enrichment activities with intentional integration of academic components.
2.3. 85% of centers will establish and maintain partnerships within the community that continues to increase levels of community collaboration in planning, implementing, and sustaining programs.	Met	100% of the centers established or maintained partnerships with community organizations. Some partnerships that were mentioned in the grant proposal continued to partner with the Campbell sub-grantee in Project Year 4. Other partners mentioned in the grant proposal were replaced by new partners. The project director has been consistently resourceful at networking with community businesses and organizations for the purpose of providing possible partnerships to the centers.	The processes of securing partners are to be continued, as partners can become important to project sustainability. We commend the project director's highly effective efforts at networking to find potential partners and recommend continuing the process of allowing center coordinators to select the most appropriate partners for their centers.

(Table 12

Campbell Sub-grantee in Project Year 4: A Summary of Findings, Comments, and Recommendations, continued)

Performance indicator	Objective met or not met in Project Year 4	Summary	Recommendations
Implementation objectives The reader is reminded that evaluators implemented a limited set of evaluation activities.			
2.4. 85% of centers will offer services to parents, senior citizens, and other adult community members.	Not met	In Project Year 4, staff at five (50%) of the ten centers reported implementing activities with parents and other adult family members. Staff reported on APR C-7 forms that two centers provided parent activities.	The center leaders' efforts have been commendable. The centers should continue their efforts to involve parents and other adult family members in the centers and their children's activities.
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 indicator was not met in Project Year 4. During the summer of 2012, eight centers offered activities for two to seven weeks, 11.07 to 25 hours per week. During SY 2012–13, nine centers offered activities for 17 to 37 weeks, 6 to 16 hours per week.	We recommend that center leaders continue to look for ways to expand the center hours of operations to meet the performance objective of 15 hours per week. We also recognize that the centers offered high-need students a safe environment during hours when school was not in session, with opportunities for homework assistance, tutorials, enrichment activities, and enhancement of academic behaviors.
3.1. 100% of students are in centers located in high-poverty communities.	Met	The host school demographics show that approximately half of the population is qualified for free- or reduced-lunch status. The Campbell sub-grantee has enrolled the targeted student population for the 21st CCLC. Of course, this means that there are challenges for improvement of academic performance and behaviors.	The project leaders are enrolling students from the appropriate target groups as defined by the 21st CCLC program and students who were referred by teachers. As shown in Table 5, there is a high number (724 of 1,292) of center students with free- and reduced-lunch status enrolled in the centers. These practices should be continued, as they enroll appropriate target groups.
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.	N/A	Data could not be collected at the time this report was prepared.	

(Table 12

Campbell Sub-grantee in Project Year 4: A Summary of Findings, Comments, and Recommendations, continued)

Performance indicator	Objective met or not met in Project Year 4	Summary	Recommendations
Implementation objectives The reader is reminded that evaluators implemented a limited set of evaluation activities.			
1.1b. 75% of regular program participants will have teacher-reported improvement in classroom participation as shown on the 21st CCLC teacher survey.	N/A	Data could not be collected at the time this report was prepared.	
1.1c. 75% of regular program participants will have teacher-reported improvement in attending class regularly as shown on the 21st CCLC teacher survey.	N/A	Data could not be collected at the time this report was prepared.	
1.1d. 75% of regular program participants will have teacher-reported improvement in student classroom behavior as shown on the 21st CCLC teacher survey.	N/A	Data could not be collected at the time this report was prepared.	
4.1.a. 60% of regular program participants will have teacher-reported improvement in reading/language arts and mathematics.	Not met	Of the 10 Campbell sub-grantee centers, two centers reached or exceeded the 60% criterion for regular attendees who improved in reading/language arts report card grades: Holomua (83.3%), and Pōhākea (68.2%). Two centers, Holomua (66.7%), and Pōhākea (77.4%), reached or exceeded the 60% criterion of regular attendees who improved their mathematics report card grades.	

First, the evaluators recommend that Campbell sub-grantee project leaders and staff devote sufficient time and focus to the transfer of academic behaviors and content area skills of the attendees from the centers to school classrooms. During homework help, tutorials, and enrichment activities, the efforts and attention of leadership and staff focused to improve the content knowledge and academic behaviors of center attendees, but must also include transfer of these skills within other circumstances and environments. Before center attendees can apply academic behaviors and content area skills in the classroom, staff must scaffold and provide linkages assisting attendees to identify and use opportunities that arise in the regular classroom. We believe the use of behaviors and content area skills by attendees in the classroom will require continuous communication and feedback between center staff and regular classroom teachers, formative assessment of center attendees' transfer of behaviors and skills at the center and in the school classroom, and professional development for project staff.

Second, we continue to recommend Campbell sub-grantee staff plan and develop the academic components of the enrichment activities. If enrichment activities are implemented by community partners, a consideration for selecting a partner might be that they implement activities with well-developed academic components. For example, 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. Also as grant funds are reduced, tight integration between academic components and enrichment activities from planning, through instruction, and finally assessment increases the effective use of sub-grantee resources.

Third, the Campbell sub-grantee project leadership and staff have sought during the four year of the grant to improve services to attendees. We recommend the sub-grantee continue the internal processes of project improvement. The project improvement processes of the sub-grantee also require internal documentation of improvement processes, recommendations, implemented recommendations, and formative and summative assessments of improvement activities.

Fourth, we encourage the Campbell sub-grantee to assess and respond to the needs of parents and adult family members of center attendees. The program's theory of action aligns the actions of the sub-grantee, the family, and the school toward sustaining improved academic and behavioral performance of center attendees. We have found the program objective, to meet the needs of parents and adult family members and challenges sub-grantees to meet these objectives. Although it is challenging, the sub-grantee must seek the involvement of parents

and adult family members to support and encourage their child/children's learning at home and in school.

Finally, we recommend Campbell sub-grantee leadership and stakeholders continue the current implementation of the project and plan for project sustainability after completion of the current grant. The project sustainability planning of project leadership and stakeholders must include development of project resources, review of the current project's evaluations, recommendations for improvement of project implementation, and proposed project continuation based on review of complex area and school community needs.

What are the plans to ensure effective program implementation next year? The Campbell sub-grantee project director is and has always been very conscientious about reviewing the project implementation, monitoring outcome status, and collaborating with centers to improve the project. Evaluators found positive indicators of implementation of academic and enrichment activities in Project Year 4, and we expect continued levels of implementation of activities into Project Year 5.

Sub-grantee consideration of the recommendations including any foreseeable challenges should be well documented to inform future project development.

References

Campbell sub-grantee. (2012). PPICS: Profile and Performance Information Collection System. *Grantee profile: Campbell Complex objectives*. Retrieved from http://ppics.learningpt.org/ppics/objectives.asp

Hawai'i Department of Education. (2008). *School accountability: Trends; Leeward district school year 2007–08*. Retrieved from http://arch.k12.hi.us/school/trends/2008/ leeward.html

Hawai'i Department of Education . (2012a). *AYP reports by school: 2012 reports*. Retrieved from http://arch.k12.hi.us/PDFs/nclb/2012/ FinalAYPallSch37Pub20120928.pdf

Hawai'i Department of Education. (2012b). *School accountability: Trends; Leeward district school year 2011–12*. Retrieved from http://arch.k12.hi.us/school/trends/2012/ leeward.html

Hawai'i Department of Education. (2012c). *School Status & Improvement Report*. Retrieved from http://arch.k12.hi.us/school/ssir/ssir.html

Hawai'i Department of Education, Special Programs Management Section. (2010). *Key performance indicators 21st Century Community Learning Centers: 2010–2011*. Honolulu, HI: author.

Hawai'i Department of Education, Special Programs Management Section. (2011a). *21st CCLC program: Evaluation report template*. Honolulu, HI: author.

Hawai'i Department of Education, Special Programs Management Section (2011b). *Sub-grantee 21st CCLC handbook: SY 2011–12*. Honolulu, HI: author.

Higa, T. F., Sagaysay, L., & Oshiro, E. M. (2011). *The Campbell sub-grantee's 21st Century Community Learning Center project*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, College of Education, Curriculum Research & Development Group.

Higa, T. F., Sagaysay, L., Oshiro, E. M., & Nakamura, A. D. H. (2010). *The Campbell Complex's 21st Century Community Learning Center Project*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, College of Education, Curriculum Research & Development Group.

Learning Point Associates. (2012). Teacher Survey. *Profile and Performance Information Collection System*. Retrieved from http://ppics.learningpt.org/ppics/ survey.asp

Naftzger, N., & Vinson, M. (2011). *21st Century Community Learning Centers Analytic Support for Evaluation and Program Monitoring: An overview of the 21st CCLC performance data: 2009–10* (Seventh Report). Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/ programs/21stcclc/ performance.html

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

U.S. Department of Education. (2003, February). *21st Century Community Learning Centers non-regulatory guidance*. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/programs/ 21stcclc/legislation.html

Wilson, J. (2008). *21st Century Community Learning Centers Grant Proposal* (grant proposal). Waipahu, HI: Hawaiʻi Department of Education.

Appendix A

Description of Academic and Enrichment Activities
Implemented at the Campbell Sub-grantee Centers in Project Year 4
(The Summer of 2012 through School Year 2012–13)

Table A1

'Ewa Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 4

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
			Summer 2012				
Hawaiian Games	Summer	Other: Pre-Kindergarten Students	48 students per day	Cultural activities or social studies	Recreational activity	Other: Introduce first experience of elementary school[1]	1 week, 1 day per week, 2 hours per day
Mad Science Dinosaurs	Summer	Other: Pre-Kindergarten Students	48 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Science • Arts and music	Academic enrichment learning program	__[1]	1 week, 1 day per week, 2 hours per day
Playful Percussion with Michael Wall	Summer	Other: Pre-Kindergarten Students	48 students per day	• Arts and music • Cultural activities or social studies	Academic enrichment learning program	Other: Introduce first experience of elementary school[1]	1 week, 1 day per week, 2 hours per day
			School year 2012–13				
GEMS Reading Program 2012–13	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students	68 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Science • Arts and music	Tutoring	Homework help	18 weeks, 4 days per week, 1.5 hours per day
GEMS Math Program 2012–13	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students	68 students per day	• Mathematics • Science • Arts and music	Tutoring	Homework help	18 weeks, 4 days per week, 1.5 hours per day
Bricks for Kids	School year	Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average	22 students per day	Mathematics	Academic enrichment learning program	__[1]	1 week, 1 day per week, 2 hours per day

(Table A1

'Ewa Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 4, continued)

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Ewa Elementary School Student Showcase	School year	Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average	22 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science • Technology or telecommunications	Academic enrichment learning program	—[1]	1 week, 1 day per week, 2 hours per day
Zoo To You	School year	Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average	17 students per day	• Science • Cultural activities or social studies	Academic enrichment learning program	—[1]	2 weeks, 1 day per week, 1 hour per day

[1]The evaluation staff identified inconsistencies between the PPICS and evaluation report data. The data displayed in this cell is the correct data that should have been entered into PPICS

Table A2

‘Ewa Beach Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 4

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
			Summer 2012				
Reading Instruction	Summer	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities	80 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Cultural activities or social studies	Tutoring	Academic enrichment learning program	5 weeks, 5 days per week, 2.5 hours per day
Math Instruction	Summer	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities	80 students per day	• Mathematics • Science	Tutoring	Academic enrichment learning program	5 weeks, 5 days per week, 2.5 hours per day
Art	Summer	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities	24 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Arts and music • Cultural activities or social studies	Academic enrichment learning program	__ [2]	2 weeks, 1 day per week, 2 hours per day
Hawai‘i Theater for Youth	Summer	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities	22 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science • Arts and music • Cultural activities or social studies	Academic enrichment learning program	Academic enrichment learning program	5 weeks, 2 days per week, 1 hour per day

(Table A2

'Ewa Beach Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 4, continued)

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Hip Hop	Summer	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities	15 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Arts and music • Cultural activities or social studies	Academic enrichment learning program	__2	2 weeks, 1 day per week, 1 hour per day
Physical Recreation	Summer	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities	45 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Arts and music • Cultural activities or social studies • Health or nutrition	Academic enrichment learning program	__2	1 week, 2 days per week, 3 hours per day
Playful Percussion	Summer	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities	30 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Arts and music • Cultural activities or social studies	Academic enrichment learning program	__2	2 weeks, 1 day per week, 1 hour per day
Ukulele Lessons	Summer	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities	24 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Arts and music • Cultural activities or social studies	Academic enrichment learning program	__2	1 week, 4 days per week, 1 hour per day

60

'Ewa Beach Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 4, continued)

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Writing	Summer	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities	19 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Cultural activities or social studies	Academic enrichment learning program	__[2]	5 weeks, 2 days per week, 2 hours per day
School year 2012–13							
Reading Instruction	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities[3] • Other: Students who are performing at average to above average ability.	32 students per day	Reading or literacy	Tutoring	Academic enrichment learning program	28 weeks, 4 days per week, 2 hours per day
Math Instruction	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities • Other: Students who are performing at average to above average ability.	33 students per day	Mathematics	Tutoring	Academic enrichment learning program	28 weeks, 4 days per week, 2 hours per day

(Table A2

'Ewa Beach Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 4, continued)

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Art with Jeff Pagay	School year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average •Limited-English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities •Other: Students who are performing at average or above average ability	24 students per day	•Reading or literacy •Mathematics •Arts and music	Academic enrichment learning program	—[2]	2 weeks, 2 days per week, 2 hours per day
Dancing Through Exercise	School year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average •Limited-English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities •Other: Students who are performing at average or above average ability	22 students per day	•Mathematics •Arts and music	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	2 weeks, 1 day per week, 2 hours per day
Hip Hop	School year	•Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average •Limited-English-proficient students •Students with special needs or disabilities •Other: Students who are performing at average or above average ability	25 students per day	•Mathematics •Arts and music	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	2 weeks, 1 day per week, 2 hours per day

62

(Table A2

'Ewa Beach Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 4, continued)

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Living Art	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities • Other: Students who are performing at average to above average ability.	22 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science • Arts and music • Technology or telecommunications • Cultural activities or social studies	Academic enrichment learning program		1 week, 2 days per week, 2 hours per day
Mad Science Workshops	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities • Other: Students who are performing at average to above average ability.	23 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science • Cultural activities or social studies	Academic enrichment learning program	—[2]	3 weeks, 4 days per week, 2 hours per day
Photography	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities • Other: Students who are performing at average to above average ability.	20 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science • Arts and music • Technology or telecommunications	Academic enrichment learning program	—[2]	4 weeks, 1 day per week, 2 hours per day

(Table A2

'Ewa Beach Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 4, continued)

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Sibling Homework Center	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities • Other: Students who are performing at average or above average ability. *Any students whose siblings were enrolled in afterschool tutoring/activities.	36 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science • Arts and music • Technology or telecommunications	Tutoring	Academic enrichment learning program	28 weeks, 4 days per week, 2 hours per day

[2]The evaluation staff identified inconsistencies between the PPICS and evaluation report data. The data displayed in this cell is the correct data that should have been entered into PPICS

64

Table A3

Holomua Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 4

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
			School year 2012–13				
Renaissance Learning-Accelerated Reading (AR)	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Other: Disadvantaged	27 students per day	Reading or literacy	Tutoring	Homework help	37 weeks, 3 days per week, 1.5 hours per day
Renaissance Learning-Accelerated Math (AM)	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Other: Disadvantaged	33 students per day	Mathematics	Tutoring	Homework help	37 weeks, 3 days per week, 1.5 hours per day
Arts and Craft	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average	18 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Arts and music	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	37 weeks, 1 day per week, 1.5 hours per day
Hip Hop	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average	18 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Arts and music • Health or nutrition • Other: Physical Fitness	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	1 weeks, 3 days per week, 1 hour per day
Honolulu Museum of Art-Art-To-Go-Program	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average	18 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Arts and music • Other: Physical Fitness	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	1 week, 3 days per week, 1 hour per day
Living Art Marine	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average	18 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Science	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	3 weeks, 1 day per week, 1.5 hours per day
Media	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average	18 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Arts and music • Technology or telecommunications	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	37 weeks, 1 day per week, 1.5 hours per day

(Table A3
Holomua Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 4, continued)

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Robotics	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average	18 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science • Technology or telecommunications	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	37 weeks, 1 day per week, 1.5 hours per day
Zoo-To-You	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average	18 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Science	Academic enrichment learning program	Recreational activity	3 weeks, 1 day per week, 1.5 hours per day

Table A4

Iroquois Point Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 4

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Summer 2012							
Reading Tutoring/Enrichment	Summer	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Other: Teacher recommendations based on classroom performance	85 students per day	Reading or literacy	Tutoring	Academic enrichment learning program	5 weeks, 5 days per week, 3 hours per day
Math Tutoring/Enrichment	Summer	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Other: Teacher recommendations based on classroom performance	85 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science • Arts and music • Technology or telecommunications	Tutoring	Academic enrichment learning program	5 weeks, 5 days per week, 3 hours per day
Art to Go	Summer	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students	20 students per day	Arts and music	Academic enrichment learning program		2 weeks, 1 day per week, 1.5 hours per day
Hawaiian Studies	Summer	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Other: All students in the program received these services	60 students per day	• Arts and music • Cultural activities or social studies	Academic enrichment learning program		1 weeks, 4 days per week, 1 hour per day
Hawai'i Theater for Youth	Summer	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students	25 students per day	Arts and music	Recreational activity	Other: Art: Theater-Drama Activities[3]	5 weeks, 1 day per week, 2 hours per day

(Table A4

Iroquois Point Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 4, continued)

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Writing with Jean Kitsuki	Summer	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students	24 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Other: Writing Process	Academic enrichment learning program		4 weeks, 1 day per week, 2 hours per day
School year 2012–13							
Art-with Local Artist Jeff Pagay	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students • Other: Regular education students	20 students per day	Arts and music	Recreational activity	Other: Art[3]	3 weeks, 1 day per week, 1 hour per day
Bricks for Kids	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students	29 students per day	• Mathematics • Science	Recreational activity		1 weeks, 1 day per week, 1 hour per day
Hawaiʻi Theater for Youth	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students	20 students per day	Arts and music	Recreational activity	Other: Art: Theater-Drama Activities[3]	3 weeks, 1 day per week, 1 hour per day

[3]The evaluation staff identified inconsistencies between the PPICS and evaluation report data. The data displayed in this cell is the correct data that should have been entered into PPICS.

Table A5

Kaʻimiloa Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 4

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Summer 2012							
Kick Start Reading	Summer	None of the categories listed in the APR C7 form applied	50 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science • Arts and music • Health or nutrition	The activity had more than two program elements	Other: Students were introduced to the rituals and routines of being a Kindergarten student.[4]	3.75 weeks, 5 days per week, 3.5 hours per day
Kick Start Math	Summer	None of the categories listed in the APR C7 form applied	50 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science • Arts and music • Health or nutrition	The activity had more than two program elements	• Tutoring • Other: Students were introduced to the rituals and routines of being a Kindergarten student.[4]	3.75 weeks, 5 days per week, 3.5 hours per day
Math and Reading Activities for Grades 1 & 2	Summer	Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average	41 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics	Academic enrichment learning program	Tutoring	3.75 weeks, 5 days per week, 3.5 hours per day
Art to Go	Summer	Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average	24 students per day	Arts and music	Academic enrichment learning program	Other: Art[4]	1 weeks, 1 day per week, 3 hours per day
Hip Hop	Summer	Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average	50 students per day	Arts and music	Recreational activity	Other: Music[4]	1 weeks, 1 day per week, 3 hours per day[4]

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Mad Science	Summer	Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average	50 students per day	Science	Academic enrichment learning program	Other: Science[4]	1 weeks, 3 days per week, 3 hours per day
School year 2012–13							
Renaissance Learning Reading	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students	20 students per day	Reading or literacy	Tutoring	Other: Reading Help[4]	19 weeks, 4 days per week, 1.75 hours per day
Renaissance Learning Math	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students	60 students per day	Mathematics	Tutoring	Other: Math Help[4]	19 weeks, 4 days per week, 1.75 hours per day
Bricks for Kids	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students	40 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Science	The activity had more than two program elements	Other: Reading by following instructions, constructing a helicopter with legos	1 week, 1 day per week, 2 hours per day
Hip Hop	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students	40 students per day	Arts and music	The activity had more than two program elements	Other: Dance and Music	1 week, 1 day per week, 2 hours per day

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Mad Science	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students	40 students per day	• Science • Cultural activities or social studies[4]	Academic enrichment learning program	Other: Science[4]	4 weeks, 1 day per week, 2 hours per day
Photography	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students	40 students per day	• Arts and music • Technology or telecommunications	The activity had more than two program elements	Other: Basics/Techniques of Photography and use of the camera and computer for editing and putting together a slide show.[4]	4 weeks, 1 day per week 2 hours per day

[4]The evaluation staff identified inconsistencies between the PPICS and evaluation report data. The data displayed in this cell is the correct data that should have been entered into PPICS.

Table A6

Keoneʻula Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 4

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
			Summer 2012				
Language Arts for incoming Kindergarten	Summer	Other: Incoming Kindergarteners with little (<6 months) to No pre-school experience	10 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Other: Routine	Tutoring		2 weeks, 5 days per week, 1 hour per day
Language Arts for incoming 1st Grade	Summer	Other: Struggling incoming 1st Graders who were referred by their Kindergarten teachers.	14 students per day	Reading or literacy	Tutoring		2 weeks, 5 days per week, 1 hour per day
Math for Incoming Kindergarten	Summer	Other: Incoming Kindergarten students with little (<6 months) to NO pre-school experience	10 students per day	Mathematics	Tutoring		2 weeks, 5 days per week, 1 hour per day
Math for incoming 1st Grade	Summer	Other: Struggling incoming 1st Graders who were referred by their Kindergarten teachers.	14 students per day	• Mathematics • Other: Writing	Tutoring		2 weeks, 5 days per week, 1 hour per day
Math for incoming 4th Grade	Summer	Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average	17 students per day	Mathematics	Tutoring		5 weeks, 4 days per week, 2 hours per day
Art	Summer	Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average	17 students per day	Arts and music	Academic enrichment learning program		5 weeks, 4 days per week, 2 hours per day

72

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

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Bricks for Kids	Summer	Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average	18 students per day	None of the categories listed in the APR C7 form applied	Academic enrichment learning program		1 week, 1 day per week, 1 hour per day
Hawaiian	Summer	Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average	17 students per day	Cultural activities or social studies	Academic enrichment learning program		2 weeks, 1 day per week, 1.5 hours per day
Health	Summer	Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average	17 students per day	• Health or nutrition • Other: Physical Education	Academic enrichment learning program		5 weeks, 4 days per week, 2 hours per day
Snack/Recess		• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Other: Incoming Kindergarteners with little (<6 months) to No pre-school experience, and struggling incoming 1st Graders who were referred by their Kindergarten teachers.	22 students per day	None of the categories listed in the APR C7 form applied	Recreational activity	Other: Break between sessions	7 weeks, 4 days per week, 0.5 hours per day

Table A7

Pōhākea Elementary Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 4

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
				Summer 2012			
Kick Start	Summer	• Students with special needs or disabilities • Other: Incoming Kindergarten students of SY 2012–13	48 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science • Arts and music • Cultural activities or social studies • Health or nutrition • Other: Social skills, listening and following directions, pre-kindergarten skills.	Academic enrichment learning program	Other: Pre-kindergarten skills and activities were provided to incoming 2012–13 Kindergarten students.[5]	5 weeks, 5 days per week, 4 hours per day
Math	Summer	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities • Other: Students who are performing on grade level–enrichment, Title I students	80 students per day	• Mathematics	Academic enrichment learning program	Other: Individual math assignments/tutoring help	5 weeks, 5 days per week, 4 hours per day
Drama/Dance	Summer	Other: Students attending summer school	40 students per day	• Arts and music • Cultural activities or social studies	Academic enrichment learning program	Other: Drama & Dance skills[5]	2 weeks, 4 days per week, 2 hours per day
PE Activities/ Games/ Sports	Summer	Other: Students attending summer school	40 students per day	• Health or nutrition • Other: PE activities/Games/Sports	Academic enrichment learning program	Other: PE activities/Games / Sports[5]	2 weeks, 4 days per week, 2 hours per day

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

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Polynesian Dances	Summer	Other: Students attending summer school	40 students per day	• Arts and music • Cultural activities or social studies	Academic enrichment learning program	Other: Cultural: Polynesian Dances[5]	2 weeks, 4 days per week, 2 hours per day
				School year 2012–13			
Reading SY '12–'13	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities • Other: Students who are have not yet met HSA benchmarks	80 students per day	Reading or literacy	Academic enrichment learning program	Other: Individual/group reading assignments/tutoring for HSA benchmarks, "Meets, Exceeds"[5]	34 weeks, 3 days per week, 1.5 hours per day
Math SY '12–'13	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students • Students with special needs or disabilities	80 students per day	Mathematics	Academic enrichment learning program	Other: Individual/group math assignments/tutoring for HSA benchmarks "Meets, Exceeds"[5]	34 weeks, 3 days per week, 1.5 hours per day
Dance-Taiko 2013	School year	• Other: Gr. 4-6 students at Pōhākea, ʻEwa Beach, Kaʻimiloa, Iroquois Point, Holomua	22 students per day	Arts and music	—[5]	Other: Taiko Dance/Drum Skills	11 weeks, 2 days per week 2 hours per day
Media Enrichment	School year	• Other: Students interested in media activities	10 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science • Technology or telecommunications	Academic enrichment learning program	Other: Media activities[5]	20 weeks, 3 days per week, 2 hours per day

(Table A7

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

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Robotics Enrichment SY 2012–13	School year	• Other: Students interested in robotics	10 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science • Technology or telecommunications	Academic enrichment learning program	Other: Robotics Activities[5]	20 weeks, 4 days per week, 1.5 hours per day

[5]The evaluation staff identified inconsistencies between the PPICS and evaluation report data. The data displayed in this cell is the correct data that should have been entered into PPICS.

Table A8

'Ewa Makai Middle Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 4

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
			Summer 2012				
Math Enrichment	Summer	Other: Students interested in Math Enrichment	12 students per day	• Mathematics	Academic enrichment learning program		4 weeks, 5 days per week, 3 hours per day
AVID	Summer	Other: Students interested in AVID Program	11 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Other: College Preparation Skills	Academic enrichment learning program	Mentoring	4 weeks, 5 days per week, 3 hours per day
Fitness & Strength	Summer	Other: Students interested in Physical Fitness	8 students per day	• Health or nutrition	Recreational activity		4 weeks, 5 days per week 3 hours per day
			School year 2012–13				
Math/Reading	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students • Other: Students who have not yet met HSA benchmarks	21 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics	Academic enrichment learning program	Other: Individual / Group math/reading assignments/tutoring for HSA benchmarks "Meets/Exceeds"[6]	20 weeks, 4 days per week, 1 hour per day
Math Counts	School year	Other: Students interested in math competition & applications	1 student per day	• Mathematics • Cultural activities or social studies	Recreational activity		20 weeks, 1 day per week, 1 hour per day

(Table A8

'Ewa Makai Middle Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 4, continued)

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Hula Dance	School year	Other: Students interested in Hula Dance	10 students per day	• Arts and music • Cultural activities or social studies	Recreational activity		20 weeks, 2 days per week, 2 hours per day
Media Enrichment	School year	Other: Students interested in media activities	1 student per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Arts and music • Technology or telecommunications • Cultural activities or social studies	Academic enrichment learning program	Other: Media activities[6]	20 weeks, 4 days per week, 2 hours per day
Robotics Enrichment SY 2012–2013	School year	Other: Students interested in robotics	7 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science • Technology or telecommunications	Academic enrichment learning program	Other: Robotics Activities[6]	20 weeks, 4 days per week 2 hours per day
Zumba Fitness	School year	Other: Students interested in Zumba Fitness	1 student per day	• Arts and music • Cultural activities or social studies	Recreational activity		20 weeks, 1 day per week, 2 hours per day

[6]The evaluation staff identified inconsistencies between the PPICS and evaluation report data. The data displayed in this cell is the correct data that should have been entered into PPICS.

78

Table A9

'Ilima Intermediate Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 4

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Summer 2012							
Accelerated Reading	Summer	None of the categories listed in the APR C7 form applied	49 students per day	Reading or literacy	Academic enrichment learning program	Tutoring	4 weeks, 5 days per week, 1 hour per day
Accelerated Math	Summer	None of the categories listed in the APR C7 form applied	49 students per day	Mathematics	Academic enrichment learning program	Tutoring	4 weeks, 5 days per week, 1 hour per day
Bowling Field Trip	Summer	None of the categories listed in the APR C7 form applied	44 students per day	Other: Building relationships	Recreational activity	Other: Building relationships	1 weeks, 1 day per week, 2.5 hours per day
Kite Making	Summer	None of the categories listed in the APR C7 form applied	49 students per day	Arts and music	Recreational activity	Other: Kite Making	1 week, 1 day per week, 1 hour per day
Physical Education	Summer	None of the categories listed in the APR C7 form applied	49 students per day	• Health or nutrition • Other: Physical Education	Recreational activity	Other: Physical Education[7]	3 weeks[7], 1 day per week, 1 hour per day
School year 2012–13							
Accelerated Reading	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students	16 students per day	Reading or literacy	Academic enrichment learning program	Tutoring	25 weeks, 4 days per week, 1 hour per day

(Table A9

'Ilima Intermediate Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 4, continued)

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
Accelerated Math	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students	30 students per day	Mathematics	Academic enrichment learning program	Tutoring	25 weeks, 4 days per week, 1 hour per day
Tutoring	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students	46 students per day	• Reading or literacy • Mathematics • Science • Cultural activities or social studies • Other: AVID	Tutoring	Homework help	25 weeks, 4 days per week, 0.5 hours per day

[7]The evaluation staff identified inconsistencies between the PPICS and evaluation report data. The data displayed in this cell is the correct data that should have been entered into PPICS.

Table A10

Campbell High Center: Academic and Enrichment Activities Implemented in Project Year 4

Activity name	When implemented: School year or summer	Targeted student category	Number of participants	Subject area(s)	Primary activity category	Secondary activity category	Amount of time provided
			School year 2012–13				
Academic Enrichment for Reading	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students	25 students per day	Reading or literacy	Academic enrichment learning program	Tutoring	17 weeks, 4 days per week, 2 hours per day
Academic Enrichment for Mathematics	School year	• Students who are not performing at grade level, are failing, or otherwise are performing below average • Limited-English-proficient students	10 students per day	Mathematics	Academic enrichment learning program	Tutoring	17 weeks, 3 days per week, 2 hours per day
Academic Enrichment for Graphic Design	School year	Limited-English-proficient students	7 students per day	Technology or telecommunications	Academic enrichment learning program		17 weeks, 1 day per week, 2 hours per day

Appendix B

Campbell Sub-grantee Centers: Community Partners in Project Year 4
(The Summer of 2012 through School Year 2012–13)

Table B1

Campbell Sub-grantee Community Partners in Project Year 4

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of Contribution	Subcontractor?
UH-COE/Curriculum Research and Development Group, (CRDG)	College or university	•Evaluation services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes

Table B2

'Ewa Elementary Center: Community Partners in Project Year 4

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of Contribution	Subcontractor?
Bricks 4 Kidz	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid Staffing	yes
Honolulu Zoo Society	Other unit of city or county government	•Programming or activity-related services •Paid staffing	yes
Mad Science of Hawaii	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes
Michael Wall	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes
Renaissance Learning	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials	yes

Table B3

'Ewa Beach Elementary Center: Community Partners in Project Year 4

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of Contribution	Subcontractor?
After School Snack Program	Other	•Goods or materials •Paid staffing	no
Honolulu Theatre for Youth	Community-based organization	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes
Jeffrey Pagay DBA Airbrush Creations Hawaii	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Paid staffing	yes
Literacy Connection (Jean Kitsuki)	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes
Lorna Dias DBA Dancing through Exercise Classes	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Paid staffing	yes
Mad Science of Hawaii	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes
Michael Wall	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes
Renaissance Learning	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials	yes

Table B4

Holomua Elementary Center: Community Partners in Project Year 4

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of Contribution	Subcontractor?
After School Snack Program	Other	•Goods or materials •Paid staffing	no
Hawaiian Sea Life, Inc.	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes
The Honolulu Museum of Art	Community-Based Organization	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes
Honolulu Zoo Society	Other unit of city or county government	•Programming or activity-related services •Paid staffing	yes
Lorna Dias DBA Dancing through Exercise Classes	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Paid staffing	yes
Mad Science of Hawaii	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes
Renaissance Learning	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials	yes

Table B5

Iroquois Point Elementary Center: Community Partners in Project Year 4

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of Contribution	Subcontractor?
Bricks 4 Kidz	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid Staffing	yes
The Honolulu Museum of Art	Community-Based Organization	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes
Honolulu Theatre for Youth	Community-based organization	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes
Jeffrey Pagay DBA Airbrush Creations Hawaii	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Paid staffing	yes
Literacy Connection (Jean Kitsuki)	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes
Mad Science of Hawaii	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes
Michael Wall	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes
Renaissance Learning	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials	yes

Table B6

Kaʻimiloa Elementary Center: Community Partners in Project Year 4

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of Contribution	Subcontractor?
After School Snack Program	Other	•Goods or materials •Paid staffing	no
Bricks 4 Kidz	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid Staffing	yes
Creavision Inc. (Kids Invent HI)	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes
The Honolulu Museum of Art	Community-Based Organization	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes
Honolulu Theatre for Youth	Community-based organization	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes
Honolulu Zoo Society	Other unit of city or county government	•Programming or activity-related services •Paid staffing	yes
Jeffrey Pagay DBA Airbrush Creations Hawaii	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Paid staffing	yes
Kimberly D. Moa	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes
Mad Science of Hawaii	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes
Michael Wall	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes
Renaissance Learning	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials	yes

Table B7

Keoneʻula Elementary Center: Community Partners in Project Year 4

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of Contribution	Subcontractor?
Except for the partner listed in Table B1 for the Campbell sub-grantee, this center had no other community partners during Project Year 4			

Table B8

Pōhākea Elementary Center: Community Partners in Project Year 4

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of Contribution	Subcontractor?
After School Snack Program	Other	•Goods or materials •Paid staffing	no
Creavision Inc. (Kids Invent HI)	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes
Hawaiian Sea Life, Inc.	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes
The Honolulu Museum of Art	Community-Based Organization	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes
Honolulu Theatre for Youth	Community-based organization	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes
Jeffrey Pagay DBA Airbrush Creations Hawaii	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Paid staffing	yes
Kimberly D. Moa	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes
Mad Science of Hawaii	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes
Renaissance Learning	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials	yes

Table B9

'Ewa Makai Middle Center: Community Partners in Project Year 4

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of Contribution	Subcontractor?
After School Snack Program	Other	•Goods or materials •Paid staffing	no
Renaissance Learning	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials	yes

Table B10

'Ilima Intermediate Center: Community Partners in Project Year 4

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of Contribution	Subcontractor?
After School Snack Program	Other	•Goods or materials •Paid staffing	no
Hawaiian Sea Life, Inc.	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes
Honolulu Theatre for Youth	Community-based organization	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials •Paid staffing	yes
Honolulu Zoo Society	Other unit of city or county government	•Programming or activity-related services •Paid staffing	yes
Jeffrey Pagay DBA Airbrush Creations Hawaii	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Paid staffing	yes
Renaissance Learning	For-profit entity	•Programming or activity-related services •Goods or materials	yes

Table B11

Campbell High Center: Community Partners in Project Year 4

Name of partner	Type of organization	Type of Contribution	Subcontractor?
Except for the partner listed in Table B1 for the Campbell sub-grantee, this center had no other community partners during Project Year 4			

Appendix C

**Comments about the Implementation of Core
Academic Activities During Summer of 2012**

Table C1

Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Reading/Literacy, Mathematics, and Science Activities in the Campbell Complex Centers During the Summer of 2012

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.	• grades i % 2 students were chosen on the basis of performance during the school year and the need to continue some kind of learning activities. • I'm glad that we could have a PPT to assist us with working with students who needed the extra help. • Was able to implement do to the help of a pt teacher. • Individual needs were addressed via tutoria assistance, individual assignments • Not enough time. • The group I worked with were low achievers in reading, writing and math. With a small group, I was able to accommodate each learner according to their needs and level but because of the short time (2 weeks), I spent more time on their greater needs; reading.
*i*2. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in reading/history.	• reading and writing with enrichment teaches • Students are given extra help in reading activities--sounds, story elements, extra reading practice on levelled books. • I wish more parents would take advantage of this program so their child will be better ready for school. • Focusing mostly on blending, segmenting words, and sight words. • No problems. Students did not have access to computers but we did book reports. It worked out well. • All students had 1.5 hrs of Reading activities via Books in specific grade level, fiction & non fiction. Teachers also read stories for group discussion and application to reading benchmarks. • Students at different reading levels had difficulty keeping up with the rest of the students. • AR wasn't set up. • Used the non-fiction reading selections and also audio-books to prepare for the upcoming AR program. • I spent most of the time teaching reading. the students needed more support on decoding and learning the strategies. With a small group, the quality of the learning that went on was great!
*i*3. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in mathematics.	• Because of the amount of time that I had I focused my lessons on Language arts. • extra time is given on basic addition and subtraction skills. • the ren learning website would shut down often • All students also had 1.5 hours of math assignments via Ren Learn. These individual assignments were selected by grade level benchmarks and objectives. • Students were at different levels and this made it difficult to help each student individually. • Went very well. Had to learn probram. • Use extensively the AM program. • I was responsible for the coordinating of all activities; I ensured all materials, supplies, schedule, and participants were available for this activity. • We spent most time learning number recog. and what comes after or before a number but because of time, I did not spend a lot of time on teaching math.
*i*4. participate in activities to improve their academic achievement in science.	• Enrichment activities from Mad Science were excellent. Students were engaged and enjoyed the activities. • I liked that we could get someone to come in and model for us science lessons.

Appendix D

**Comments about the Implementation of Enrichment
and Support Activities During the Summer of 2012**

Table D1

Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Enrichment and Support Activities in Campbell Complex Centers During the Summer of 2012

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
*i*5. participate in art and/or music activities	• More music enrichment offered such as Playful percussion throughout our Kick Start program • some music activities were done--mostly singing. • Enrichment music and dance activities were provided by Drama/Dance (classical plays &dance) ; Polynesian Dance focused on Maori Poi Balls, Maori Sticks and Hawaiian Pupu HInu Hinu Shell dance • I was responsible for the coordinating of all activities; I ensured all materials, supplies, schedule, and participants were available for this activity.
*i*6. participate in entrepreneurial education activities (business ventures).	• No comments provided.
*i*7. participate in telecommunications and technology education activities.	• Worked on learning how to use a laptop and logging on to myon. • Pohakea laptops were set up in Ewa Beach library for teachers to use for Reading (Kid Biz, Teacher selection) and VMath (Math benchmark objectives and calculation challenges on line with other students. Students learned via a map study where their student challenged lived. • integrated into other classes.
*i*8. participate in sports activities (e.g., basketball, baseball, football, swimming).	• The resource teacher was very knowledgeable. I can use her lessons during the school year. • Enrichment of PE were provided for Kindergarten, Gr. 3, 4, 5, 6 Skills were selected according to grade level expectations. • Need to change clothes. • We practiced valleyball skills and bowling skills to prepare for the field trip we had. • small class size
*i*9. participate in cultural activities/social studies activities.	• the makua that came to our class was terrific. • Students learned about Maori, Hawaiian, African (Playful Percussion), Honolulu Theatre of Youth literature acting of poems and other stories from other countries. • Well done. Need more time. • Drawing classes/Acting classes/Hawaiiana cultural art product making & sporting event • I was responsible for the coordinating of all activities; I ensured all materials, supplies, schedule, and participants were available for this activity.
*i*10. participate in health/nutrition-related activities.	• Talks on healthy snacks and the eating of a healthy lunch is often discussed. Pre K students are introduced to new foods. • I was responsible for the coordinating of all activities; I ensured all materials, supplies, schedule, and participants were available for this activity.
*i*11. participate in service learning activities (service activities in the school or local community).	• Lani our drama teacher was wonderful.kite

Appendix E

Comments about the Implementation of Academic Behavior
Support Activities During the Summer of 2012

Table E1

Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Appropriate and Positive Behavior Activities in the Campbell Complex Centers During the Summer of 2012

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
*i*12. CLC staff discuss appropriate, positive behavior with students and reinforce positive behaviors.	• Teachers continually talk about student behaviors. Positive reinforcements are given to good behavior and appropriate comments and help are given to 'bad behavior." • Ongoing reinforcement of positive behavior with group, teacher discussion work with 3 Rs of Respect, Relationship, Responsibilty • Went very well.

Appendix F

Comments about the Implementation of Parent and
Other Adult Activities During the Summer of 2012

Table F1

Comments About the Extent and Quality of Implementation of Parent and Other Adult Activities in the Campbell Complex Centers During the Summer of 2012

Activity	Comments (verbatim from questionnaire)
*i*13. parents of students who participate in the centers also receive support/guidance from the center.	• All parents attended their assigned parent meeting session • Parents were clearly communicated with.