Hawaiʻi 21st CCLC Evaluation Report Template – SY2017-18

1.   General Information

Please retain the pre-set formatting of 12 pt. font for narrative sections of the report and 10 pt. in the tables throughout this document.

Exhibit 1: Basic Information Table

Required Information	Enter Information
Date Evaluation Report Submitted	12/12/2018
Grantee Name	McKinley Complex Subgrantee
Program Director Name	Ron Nomura
Program Director Email	Ronald_Nomura/HONDO/HIDOE@notes.k12.hi.us
Evaluator Name	Betsy Bounds, Ph.D
Evaluator Email	Blb22@aol.com
Year of Grant	Funded in 2014. This is the 4th year of the grant

Exhibit 2: Center Information Table

Center	Name of Center	Grade Levels Served
Center 1	Central Middle School	6,7,8
Center 2	Kaiulani Elementary School	K,1,2,3,4,5
Center 3	Likelike Elementary School	K,1,2,3,4,5

Moving forward, please enter the centers in the same order for the tables to come.

2. Executive Summary

The McKinley Complex received a CCLC grant in October of 2014 to provide services in three schools: Likelike Elementary, Kaiulani Elementary and Central Middle School. The elementary schools serve students in grades K-5 and Central Middle School has grades 6-8. Central Middle school has 90% of their students eligible for free/reduced lunch; Likelike has 77% of their students eligible for free/reduced lunch and Kaiulani has 92% of their students eligible for free/reduced lunch. The project proposed to target elementary and middle school youth who face one or more challenges indicating they are "at-risk." The schools saw a need for positive after-school alternatives, and improved academic performance. The project proposed to have afterschool programming in partnership with After-School All-Stars Hawaii at Central Middle School and STEM Programs at Likelike and Kaiulani Elementary School. Kaiulani had limited programming while ASAS and Likelike had a regular program. Project goals are:

- Goal 1: The McKinley Complex will provide academic, artistic and cultural enrichment opportunities for students, grades K-8, who are enrolled in three high-poverty and low performing schools
- Goal 2: The McKinley Complex will provide academic, artistic and cultural enrichment opportunities for students, grades K-12, who are enrolled in three high-poverty and low performing schools.

The grant objectives addressed to continue the After School All Stars (ASAS) program at Central Middle School; create STEM programs; provide homework assistance; engage students in activities that improve STEM skills and knowledge; engage students in enrichment activities; refer students for tutoring and/or remediation that supports daily classroom instruction; cultivate partnerships with community experts in fields including sports, culture, hobbies, arts, citizenship and others; introduce families to post-secondary opportunities and engage families in activities; and offer daily afterschool programming for 3 hours a day/5 days each week.

The evaluation was designed to utilize quantitative and qualitative data in a formative and summative evaluation. The purpose of the evaluation is to determine implementation success, progress on objectives and program outcomes.

Data were initially collected quarterly but with the new APR requirements, data are collected each semester and after the summer program. Academic gains are determined with comparison of grades in ELA and Math from first to 4th quarter, data provided by iResults, and STAR results. To determine project effectiveness, surveys were distributed to parents and students in the Spring. In addition, teacher surveys were distributed to teachers of regular attendees to determine changes noted in the classroom. Information on the number of participants in activities and the number of partners is also collected.

Conclusions: Likelike Elementary School and Central Middle School have a fully implemented CCLC program serving a population that is characterized by high poverty. Each school had one or more partnerships with Central having 21 partnerships and Likelike had 6 partnerships. The partnerships make it possible to expand offerings and will contribute to sustainability of some elements of the program.

There was academic improvement that could be noted on changes in grades or on the benchmark testing from first to 4th quarter. At Likelike 82% improved from the first administration to the third. At Central, 52% of the students that needed to improve their grade in math did so and in ELA 56.3% of students improved.

At Central, results were the greatest for students attending 90 days or more with those students having the lowest percent of chronic absenteeism compared to other groups. This group also had the highest percent of proficiency on the SBAC.

- Each site has one or more partners; Central Middle School has 21 partners and Likelike has 6 partners.
- 286 family members participated at Central Middle School
- 75% of the participants attended for 30 days or more (100% at Central)
- 71% of those in CCLC were eligible for free/reduced lunch
- The largest percent of improvement in ELA was for 90-day attendees
- There was not a noticeable difference between CCLC and non-CCLC student in academic performance on the SBAC.

Based on results, the following recommendations are made:

1. Continue efforts to provide programming at Kaiulani Elementary.
2. Increase efforts to get parent/family participation
3. Ensure that programming targets academic areas of need for students
4. Be sure to document parent participation.
5. Work to increase the number of teacher surveys returned for regular attendees.
6. At Central Middle school, make sure that academic areas are targeted during CCLC.

3.   Program Description

3.A.   PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Provide a brief description of the program, including the following bullet points:
- Describe the organization operating the grant program.
- Provide the grant year (i.e., Year 1, Year 2, Year 3, etc.).
- Describe the community and schools involved in the program, including evidence that these are high-poverty communities.

- Did the organization offer any afterschool programming prior to the grant? If so, when was such programming first offered?

The program is under the direction of the Kaimuki McKinley Roosevelt Complex Area with Ron Nomura as project director. At Central Middle School, the student services are sub-contracted to After School All Stars (ASAS) who provides the daily academic and academic enrichment activities at the site. Likelike had a school year and summer program providing academic and enrichment activities. This report is for the 4th year of the grant.

At the start of this grant, demographic information indicated the community had a median income below the state average. Only half of the kindergartners went to preschool. About 17.5% of the residents had earned less than a high school diploma, higher than the 10.2% statewide. Currently, the percent of students eligible for free/reduced lunch at the grant schools is: 77% at Likelike; 90% at Central Middle School; and 92% at Kaiulani.

Previously McKinley complex had a CCLC grant serving all of the schools in the complex that ended a year before the current grant. After School All Stars (ASAS) provided the programming for Central Middle School at that time.

3.B.   PROGRAM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

All Hawaiʻi 21st CCLC grant programs are accountable to the state's Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) – see Section 4B: Evaluation Results. In addition to these KPIs, subgrantees must articulate their own program-specific goals and objectives.

3.B.1. Goals

What are the overall goals of your particular program? Please number each major goal. See example in grey. It is not necessary to have five goals, but space is provided in case you do.

1.	SAMPLE: Improve academic achievement in math
1.	Goal 1: The McKinley Complex will provide academic, artistic and cultural enrichment opportunities for students, grades K-8, who are enrolled in three high-poverty and low performing schools
2.	Goal 2: The McKinley Complex will provide academic, artistic and cultural enrichment opportunities for students, grades K-12, who are enrolled in three high-poverty and low performing schools.

3.B.2. Objectives

What specific measurable objectives are being used to address your program's goals? It is not necessary to have four objectives per goal, but space is provided just in case. Link objectives to the specific goals articulated above in section 3.B.1. See examples in grey below. Enter all that apply.

Goal	Objective	Measure
1 and 2	50% of regular participants achieve teacher-reported gains in turning homework in on time	Teacher survey
2	50% of regular participants achieve teacher-reported gains in	Teacher survey

	classroom participation	
	50% of regular participants achieve teacher-reported gains in attending class regularly	Teacher survey
	50% of regular participants achieve teacher-reported gains in classroom behavior	Teacher survey
	Services are offered in one ore more academic area	Activities schedule
	Each program offers enrichment and support services	Activities Schedule
	Each school establishes and maintains partnerships	Partnership list and description
	Each school offers services to family members of students enrolled in the program	Parent participation lists
	Offer programs for 15 hours a week	Program schedule

3.C.   PARTICIPANTS INVOLVED IN THE PROGRAM

3.C.1.   Attendance

Exhibit 3: Students Served in 2017-18 (including summer)

Center	2017-18 Enrollment – Total	2017 -18 Enrollment – Regular*	Grade Levels
Central	151	151	6,7,8
Likelike	74	17	K-5
Subgrantee Total	225	168	

* Regular attendees are those who have attended the program for 30 or more days.

Attendance Discussion
Describe attendance at each center and at the subgrantee level. Do you have any challenges with attendance? How have you encouraged attendance?

Central Middle School had 100% of the students attend for 30 days or more. Likelike had 17 students attend for 30 days or more and many that were close to 30 days. Both of the elementary schools should make an effort to have more students to have the opportunity and encouragement to attend for 30 days or more. Attendance is encouraged by the CCLC staff by individual encouragement, helping students see the benefits of the program and sometimes incentives. Communication with parents when students aren't attending regularly also occurs.

3.C.2   Participant Characteristics
What are the characteristics of program participants – use the following two tables to indicate for each site the characteristics of program participants including:

Exhibit 4: Characteristics of Students Served

Center	F/R Lunch		Special Needs		ELL		Male		Female	
Central	108	71.5%	16	10.65	33	21.9%	86	57%	65	43%
Likelike	51	68.9%	1	1.4%	18	24.3%	32	43.2%	42	56.8%
Subgrantee Total	159		17		51		118		107	

Exhibit 5: Race/Ethnicity of Students Served

Center	# AI/AN	% AI/AN	# Asian	% Asian	# NH/PI	% NH/PI	# Black	% Black	# Latino	% Latino	% White	% White	2 or more	% 2 or more
Central		%	41	27.2	94	62.3%	1	0.7%	#	%	2	1.3%		
Likelike	#	%	40	54.1	31	41.9	#	%	#	%	1	1.4%	2	2.7%
Subgrantee Total	0		81		125		1		0		3		2	

Note: AI/AN refers to American Indian/Alaska Natives; NH/PI refers to Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander.

3.D   SUMMER AND INTERSESSION PROGRAMMING

Describe activities offered during summer and intersession.

Central MS was unable to provide summer programming as the site was under construction. Likelike did offer a summer program in 2017.

In the table below, provide enrollment numbers and grade levels. The table will automatically compute total enrollment.

Exhibit 6: Students Served During Summer

Center	Summer Enrollment – Total	Grade Levels
Central (site under construction)	0	Grade levels served
Likelike	84	Grade levels served
Subgrantee Total	84	

3.E.   CHARACTERISTICS OF PROGRAM MATERIALS AND RESOURCES

3.E.1. Program Materials
What program materials were used (e.g., curriculum, online programs, reading materials, hands-on materials, equipment, tools)?

Program materials included instructional supplies, computer software, sports equipment and STEM program materials.

3.E.2   Resources
What resources (e.g., grant funds, physical facilities, in-kind personnel, community partnerships) were available?

Resources used by the program included the use of the school classrooms, sports fields and computer lab (in-kind). Grant funds paid for the After School All Stars program that included personnel and supplies.

3.F.   STAFF AND OTHERS INVOLVED IN THE PROGRAM

Provide a brief description of staff and roles. Complete the following tables as they apply to your program. Totals will be automatically computed.

In kind support from the project director Ron Nomura and business manager Elden Nakamura was provided by the Complex Area. The grant paid for assistance from Jean Stewart and a subcontract to ASAS provided the direct services to the students in the form of a variety of activities. They provided sports activities, academic activities and program coordination at Central Middle School. At the elementary schools, in-kind support was provided to coordinate the program and staff to provide academic support and enrichment were paid from grant funds.

Exhibit 7. Number of Staff by Position

Center	Adminis-trators		College Students		Community Members		High School Students		Parents		School Day Teachers		Non-Teaching School Staff		Sub-contracted Staff		Other	
	Paid	Vol	Paid	Vol	Paid	Vol	Paid	Vol	Paid	Vol	Paid	Vol	Paid	Vol	Paid	Vol	Paid	Vol
Central	#	1	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	1	#	12	28	#	#
Likelike	1	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	6	#	1	#	#	#	#	#
Subgrantee Total	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	2	0	12	28	0	0

Exhibit 8. Average Hours per Week by Position

Center	Adminis-trators	College Students	Community Members	High School Students	Parents	School Day Teachers	Non-Teaching School Staff	Sub-contracted Staff	Other
Central	5	#	#	#	#	#	#	10	#
Likelike	2	#	#	#	#	2	2	#	#
Subgrantee Total	7	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	0

3.G. PARTNERSHIPS

Partnership Data

Enter subgrantee-level partnership data in the appropriate fields in the table below.

Exhibit 9: Partners

Partner Contributions	Total Number of Partners	
Contribution Type	# Paid Partners	# Unpaid Partners
Provide evaluation services	1	#
Raise funds	#	#
Provide programming/activity related services	1	1
Provide goods	1	#
Provide volunteer staffing	#	21
Provide Paid Staffing	1	#
Other	#	#
Subgrantee Total	4	22

Partnership Description

Provide a brief description of successes with partnerships.

Central Middle School had 21 partners that provided a variety of services including field trips, use of resources, coaching, instruction, service learning opportunities, and other services. Likelike had 6 partners. One of Likelike's partners was Hawaii Five=O that helped them build an aquaponics garden.

Provide a brief description of challenges with partnerships.

Central and Likelike have both been successful in getting partners to enhance and expand their services and opportunities. There were no reported challenges with the partnerships though scheduling is sometimes a challenge to fit in all the activities.

3.H. PARENT/FAMILY INVOLVEMENT

Provide a brief description of your program's parent/family involvement component, including communications and outreach to parents and families, family programming and events, challenges and successes.

Activities to involve family members including providing information about the CCLC program, inviting parents to visit or volunteer, and including them in specific activities such as student performances, athletic events, field trips or showcases. The elementary schools did not report parent participation but Central had 286 family members participate in activities at CCLC although on the parent survey some Likelike parents reported participating.

4. Evaluation

4.A. EVALUATION PLAN

4.A.1. Evaluation Design Overview
Provide a one-paragraph brief overview of the evaluation design.

The purpose of the evaluation includes a process and outcome evaluation with the intent to measure project effectiveness. The intent of the implementation plan was to determine if services were implemented on time, identify barriers and resolution, and provide information about any areas that could be improved. The outcome evaluation plan was to address academic achievement gains using teacher reports on classroom behaviors and academic performance measure program effectiveness using data on participants and survey results.

4.A.2. Implementation Evaluation

Describe how program implementation is being documented.

What implementation questions are being answered?	Was the program provided as specified in the grant? Were there any challenges encountered and if so, how were they addressed, what efforts are being made to involve parents and partners? What partnerships have been developed? Are CCLC activities of interest and helpful to the students?
What data collection methods are being used (e.g. interviews, observations)?	Surveys and interviews
What is the timing of data collection?	Each semester

Central and Likelike have a fully implemented CCLC providing academic and academic enrichment services. Each of those schools has established partnerships. In general there is satisfaction with the program. It would be beneficial if Likelike could provide family services and/or document them. Kaiulani should expand their offerings to benefit their students.

4.A.3. Outcomes Evaluation
Describe how program outcomes are being evaluated.

What outcomes questions are being answered?	Did performance in math and ELA improve from 1st to 4th quarter? What improvement did teachers note in behavior, classroom participation, turning in homework and attendance? Were students and parents satisfied with the program offered and did they see some benefit? Are CCLC students performing better on the SBAC than non-CCLC students?
For each outcome, what measures and data collection methods are being used (e.g. attendance, grades, behavior	First and 4th quarter grades in ELA and Math were collected and compared. A teacher survey was distributed to determine improvement in the areas mentioned. Surveys were used to determine satisfaction and were sent to parents and

incidents)?	students.
What is the timing of data collection?	Surveys were distributed in the Spring and the grades were collected in Fall for first quarter and May for last quarter.

Having iResults data available really adds a lot to having a fuller and accurate picture for evaluation.

4.B.   EVALUATION RESULTS

4.B.1. Implementation Evaluation Results

Describe the results of the implementation evaluation, addressing the implementation questions described in your response to Section 4.A.2 above.

In meetings and discussions with project staff, some of the challenges noted were difficulty in finding qualified staff to provide programming. Kaiulani struggled to determine what could be done to offer programming and find staff. Likelike and Central were successful in providing a variety of programming, obtaining partners and Central was particularly successful in involving family members.

4.B.2   Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) – Objective 1

Objective 1: Participants will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.

Exhibit 10: Performance on KPI Objective 1 – Turning in Homework and Classroom Participation

Objective 1.2: Percentage of REGULAR program participants with teacher-reported improvements in turning in homework and participating in class.	
Center	**Percentage of REGULAR program participants with teacher-reported improvement in turning in homework and classroom participation (INSERT ONLY ONE PERCENTAGE FOR EACH CENTER)**
Central	57.8%
Likelike	41.7%

Exhibit 11: Performance on KPI Objective 1 – Student Classroom Behavior

Objective 1.2: Percentage of REGULAR program participants with teacher-reported improvement in student classroom behavior.	
Center	**Percentage of REGULAR program participants with teacher-reported improvement in teacher-reported student classroom behavior**
Central	40.6%
Likelike	34%

KPI Objective 1 Discussion

Please describe particular successes related to Objective 1. What data/evidence are these success and challenges based on?

Because the evaluation report calls only for results on regular participants, surveys done by Likelike and Central for students that were not regular attendees are not included in the results. There was a limited number of teacher surveys returned which limits drawing

conclusions. It is also important to note that not all of the students needed to improve in these areas.

Please describe particular challenges related to Objective 1. What data/evidence are these success and challenges based on?

Results would be more meaningful if there were more regular attendees at Likelike and if there were more responses obtained from Central Middle School. It is always a challenge to get the distributed teacher surveys returned and efforts to improve returns are needed. The question on turning in homework on time AND classroom participation makes it difficult to draw conclusions as well. Since the CCLC provides homework help, one might expect turning in homework to improve but not all students need to improve in classroom participation. What classroom participation means may differ among teachers as well.

4.B.3   Key Performance Indicators – Objective 2

Objective 2: 21st Century Community Learning Centers will offer a range of high-quality educational, developmental, and recreational services.

Exhibit 12: Performance on KPI Objective 2 – Core Educational Services

Objective 2.1: Centers will offer high-quality services in at least one core academic area, such as reading and literacy, mathematics, or science. (Click Yes or No for each academic area)				
Center	Reading & Literacy	Math	Science & Technology	Other (specify)
Central	Y	Y	Y	
Likelike	y	y	y	

Core Educational Services Discussion

Provide a brief description of evidence that these services are of high quality.

Efforts are made at each site to utilize staff that are trained and knowledgeable in the academic areas that they teach or supervise. The state standards are given to the CCLC staff to help them align instruction and academic enrichment activities. Classroom materials are used when students need homework help and a site coordinator serves as a liaison between the CCLC staff and school staff.

Exhibit 13: Performance on KPI Objective 2 – Enrichment Activities

Objective 2.2: Centers will offer enrichment and support activities such as academic assistance, remediation and enrichment, nutrition and health, art, music, technology, and recreation. (Click Yes or No for each enrichment area.)						
Center	Arts & Music	Physical Activity	Community Service	Leadership	Tutoring/ Homework Help	Other (Specify)
Central	y	y	y	y	y	
Likelike	y				y	ELL support

Exhibit 14: Performance on KPI Objective 2 - Services to Parents and Family Members

Objective 2.3: Centers will offer services to parents and other family members of students enrolled in the program.		
Center	Number of parents/ family members participating	Description of services to parents and other family members.
Central	286	Central Middle School had a variety of activities in which 286 family members participated. These included student showcases, athletic events and presentations
Likelike	#	. Likelike did not have specific parent activities but did provide information about CCLC to parents.

Parent/ Services Discussion

Provide a brief description of successes in providing services to parents and other family members.

Central Middle School was successful in involving parents in CCLC activities. The elementary schools did not make specific efforts to involve family members and it is hoped they do so in the future. However on some of the parent surveys from Likelike, some parents did report that they had participated in CCLC activities in attending an information meeting, volunteering at school, visiting while their child is working, using CompassLearning software, attending a student performance and participating in family nights.

Provide a brief description of challenges in providing services to parents and other family members.

It is definitely a challenge to involve family members. Schools sometime struggle with what they can do to involve more parents. One of the successful activities is to have student showcases or activities where parents want to come to an activity to see their student's work or performances.   It is also a challenge to capture all family involvement as sometimes parents come to school to volunteer or participate in a class activity and it isn't documented.

Exhibit 15: Performance on KPI Objective 2 – Hours per Week

Objective 2.4: Centers will offer services for 12 hours or more per week, and provide services when school is not in session, such as during the summer and holidays.		
Center	Number of hours per week services offered during the school year	Number of hours per week services offered during summer and holidays
Central	15	NA
Likelike	8	8

[**Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) – Objective 3**

Objective 3 - 21st Century Community Learning Centers will serve children and community members with the greatest need for expanded learning opportunities. (Not included here - Communities are already described in Section 3.A above.)]

4.B.4   Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) – Objective 4

Objective 4: Regular participants in 21st Century Community Learning Centers will demonstrate academic improvement based on formative and summative assessments given throughout the school year.

Exhibit 16: Performance on KPI Objective 4 – Academic Improvement in Reading/Language Arts

Objective 4.1: Participants in 21st Century Community Learning Centers will demonstrate academic improvement in reading/language arts.				
Center	**Percentage of regular program participants with IMPROVEMENT in reading/language arts from fall to spring**	**Primary Source of Data on Improvement:**		
		Grades/ Course marks?	**Assessment/ Test Scores?**	**Teacher Surveys**
Central	56.3%	X		
Likelike	82%*		X	

Exhibit 17: Performance on KPI Objective 4 – Academic Improvement in Math

Objective 4.2: Participants in 21st Century Community Learning Centers will demonstrate academic improvement in math.				
Center	**Percentage of regular program participants with IMPROVEMENT in math from fall to spring**	**Source of Data on Improvement:**		
		Grades/ Coursemarks?	**Assessment/ Test Scores?**	**Teacher Surveys**
Central	52.8%	X		
Likelike	82%*		X	

*STAR total scores were provided and not broken down so not able to separate ELA and Math IResults data were not made available for Likelike as of the time of this report so not able to utilize that.

KPI Objective 4 Discussion
Please describe particular successes or challenges related to KPI Objective 4.

At Likelike, the only scores provided were the total STAR results. Fourteen of the 17 regular attendees improved from the first administration to the third. At Central, grades in ELA and Math were obtained for 1st and 4th quarter. At Central, 36 students that were regular attendees and needed to improve in math and 19 had an improved grade. For ELA, 32 needed to improve their grade and 18 students had an improved grade. At Central, students that attended for more than 90 days had a higher rate of improvement (over 65%).

On the iResults data, when comparing students that attended for 30-59, 60-89 days, more than 90 days, unspecified or less than 30 days and non-CCLC students, the largest percent of

improvement in ELA was for 90-day attendees.   Results were available for Central Middle School for regular attendees and there was not a noticeable difference between CCLC and non-CCLC student in academic performance on the SBAC.

It has been a challenge in the past to obtain data needed in a timely manner. Schools often struggled with getting the data needed. With the availability of iResults data as provided this year, it makes a big difference in the quality and timeliness of being able to determine outcomes for the evaluation.

4.B.5   Achievement of Program-Specific Objectives

Please describe achievement of the program-specific objectives described earlier in Section 3.B.2. Copy objectives and measures from the table in section 3.B.2 into Exhibit 19 below. Make sure to select the whole text box by clicking on the three vertical dots to the upper left of the box. Complete the exhibit with results and the status toward meeting the objective. Sample in grey.

Exhibit 18: Progress on Program-Specific Objectives

Objective	Measure	Results	Met/Not Met
1.2 Reduce the gap in math achievement (percentage of students meeting grade level standard) between low-income vs. middle or high income students will be reduced by at least 5 percentage points.	*Smarter Balanced Assessment*	*The gap between percentage of low-income vs. middle or high income students meeting standard in 2017-18 was 9% compared to 15% in 2016-17*	*Met*
50% of regular participants achieve teacher-reported gains in turning homework in on time	Teacher survey	When combining Likelike and Central, 53.3% improved.	Met
50% of regular participants achieve teacher-reported gains in classroom participation	Teacher survey	The combined percent of students that improved in behavior was 37.8%	Not met
50% of regular participants achieve teacher-reported gains in attending class regularly	Teacher survey	Improvement was 5.9% at Central 20% Likelike	Not met
50% of regular participants achieve teacher-reported gains in classroom behavior	Teacher survey	29.4% Central 40% Likelike	Not met
Services are offered in one ore more academic area	Activities schedule	All schools offered services in more than one academic area	Met
Each program offers enrichment and support services	Activities Schedule	Central and Likelike offered enrichment and support services	Met
Each school establishes and maintains partnerships	Partnership list and description	Likelike and Central had multiple partnerships	Met
Each school offers services to family members of	Parent participation liy sts	Only Central documented services for family members	Not Met

students enrolled in the program			
Offer programs for 15 hours a week	Program schedule	Only Central offered 15 hours of service per week	Partially met (at Central only)

Achievement of Program-Specific Objectives Discussion
Describe whether objectives have changed since last year and particular success and challenges in meeting program-specific objectives.

One thing to note on the results of the teacher survey in terms of improved results, there were a number of students that did not need to improve in those areas. Having less than a 50% improvement is reflective only on those who needed to improve and who attended for 30 days or more. The objective of improvement in turning homework on time was met. Each school offered homework help as well as tutoring which may have contributed to the improvement.

At Likelike, 60% of students improved in coming to school motivated to learn and at Central, 35.3% improved in this area.

According to iResults data, the McKinley complex CCLC students that attended 90 days or more had the lowest percent of chronic absences and had the highest percent of students that met proficiency on the SBAC in both ELA and Math. There is a gap between SED, Sped, and EL students' results when compared with non-SED, Sped, and EL students which may indicate that these particular students might benefit from more intensive academic support. These results include Central and Kaiulani as Likelike results were not available at this time. Academic results on the SBAC at Central Middle School indicates that CCLC students are a little lower than that for non-CCLC students. This may indicate a need for more academic emphasis at this school in order to improve results.

4.C.   ADDITIONAL DATA

4.C.1   Success Stories

Partnerships have made it possible to offer variety of activities that would not otherwise be available.

4.C.2   Best Practices

Many of the activities served more than one purpose and integrated academic skills in the tasks. For example, students decorated rocks during an art class that would be placed into the Central Middle School garden. In another instance, students designed games to be used at a game night. The games incorporated math and English/Language Arts skills as they developed and played the games. At Likelike, the aquaponics garden helped students not only learn about gardening but also incorporated measurement and writing directions or recipes related to what is grown in the garden.

4.C.3 Student, Teacher, Parent, Staff or Community Input – *[if you used survey(s) please include instrument as an attachment and include results in the narrative.]*

Surveys were distributed in the Spring to parents and students (all students, not just regular attendees). At Likelike, results for the student survey are as follows:
I feel safe in the CCLC program: 88.2% yes; 11.8% sometimes; 0% no

I am learning something new in the CCLC program: 55.9% Yes; 35.3% sometimes and 8.8% No
I like what I do at CCLC: 91.2% yes; 8.8% sometimes
I'm getting good grades at school since coming to CCLC: 70.6% yes; 20.6% sometimes and 8.8% no
I like the activities at CCLC: 85.3% yes; 8.8% sometimes and 5.9% no

At Central, the questions asked by ASAS and results are as follows:
The Central ASAS program has helped me become a better reader: 30.6% strongly agree; 36.7% agree; 18.4% disagree; 4.1% strongly disagree 10.2% Does not apply
The Central ASAS program has helped me become better at math: 42.9% strongly agree; 34.7% agree; 12/2% disagree; 8.2% strongly disagree and 2% does not apply
The ASAS program has helped me to do better in school: 44.9% strongly agree; 46.9% agree; disagree 4.1%; 4.1% strongly disagree
I look forward to coming to the Central ASAS program: 57.1% strongly agree; 36.7% agree; 4.1% disagree; and 2% does not apply
If I had it to do over again, I would want to come to the Central ASAS program next year: 65.3% strongly agree, 20.4% agree, 10.2% disagree, and 4.1% does not apply
In addition, 89.6% indicated that the teachers cared about the students.

On the parent survey, results are as follows:

Central:
My child looks forward to coming to the Central ASAS program: 60% strongly agree, 30% agree and 10% indicate it does not apply
The Central ASAAS program has helped my child become a better reader: 60% strongly agree and 40% agree
The Central ASAS program has helped my child become better in math: 80% strongly agree and 20% agree
The Central ASAS has helped my child to do better in school: 80% strongly agree and 20% agree
The Central ASAS teachers care about the students: 70% strongly agree and 20% agree.
If I could do it over again, I would enroll my child in the Central ASAS program: 60% strongly agree; 30% agree and 10% does not apply

At Likelike, results are as follows:
The 21st CCLC is of great benefit to my child: 80% agree; 20% slightly agree
The CCLC staff communicates with me about my child's program: 45% agree, 30% slightly agree, 20% strongly disagree and 5% disagree

My child is safe at CCLC: 85% agree; 10% slightly agree and 5% strongly disagree
My child learns more by participating in the CCLC: 70% agree, 35% slightly agree and 5% strongly disagree
My child is more interested in school as a result of CCLC participation: 75% agree; 15% slightly agree and 10% strongly disagree

There is broad satisfaction in services provided at CCLC on the part of students and parents. Both groups think the students are learning more and doing better in school.

4.C.4   Pictures
Feel free to share any pictures you might have that show your 21st Century Community Learning Centers in progress.

Central Middle School Highlights

The arts and crafts class had a booth for guests to paint rocks that we plan to use to decorate the Central garden.

Amanda Martinez from the Youth Suicide and Bullying Prevention presented to Central All-Stars about suicide and bullying prevention. The students respond ver well to the presentation and were very engaged. Amanda did a great job focusing on student experiences with bullying and how to prevent/respond to it.

For Quarter 1 Ho'ike we had a game night in the Central auditorium. All the games were made by the Central All-Star students. Our rap class produced its first song which played throughout the night with our film class' slideshow. We also presented awards recognizing students who displayed great character and attitude throughout the first quarter.

5.   Sustainability Plan

5.A   ORIGINAL SUSTAINABILITY PLAN

Describe the original sustainability plan as indicated in the grant application.

> The plan for sustainability was to establish partnerships and participate in the Hawaii Afterschool Alliance.

5.B   UPDATED SUSTAINABILITY PLAN

Describe how programming levels will be sustained after the grant ends, including:

- What changes were made from the original sustainability plan?
- What community partners have been added?
- What community partners have dropped off?
- Describe any additional funding sources.

> The complex continues to work on establishing partnerships that will provide opportunities to sustain programs. ASAS has a number of established partnerships used to provide services at no additional cost. In addition, the complex will continue to seek other outside funds in order to continue the CCLC program at the schools

6.   Conclusions and Recommendations

6.A   CONCLUSIONS

> Central students who are regular attendees in CCLC are not meeting proficiency at a higher percentage than non-CCLC students which may indicate a need to target academic instruction to students based on their needs. Kaiulani could do more to offer extra hour services that could benefit their students. Likelike and Kaiulani could improve outreach to parents in order to increase their involvement. At Likelike, on a parent survey, parents reported participation but the administration did not report any. It would be helpful to make sure that parent participation is documented when it occurs.
> There were a limited number of teacher surveys returned and efforts to increase the number of surveys returned would help to better determine objective outcomes.

6.B   RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

> 1. Continue efforts to provide programming at Kaiulani Elementary.
> 2. Increase efforts to get parent/family participation

3. Ensure that programming targets academic areas of need for students
4. Be sure to document parent participation.
5. Work to increase the number of teacher surveys returned for regular attendees.
6. At Central Middle school, make sure that academic areas are targeted during CCLC.

6.C   EVALUATION DISSEMINATION

The evaluation results are provided to the Project Director, site coordinators and site principal. Results are shared in one or more ways such as on the school website, with the parent advisory committee, or at the complex area information dissemination.