Private Industry Council

21st Century Afterschool Program

Final Report: Cohort 10

Prepared by
Dr. Roger L. Briscoe
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Indiana, PA

December 2021

Table of Content

Executive Summary

The COVID-19 pandemic has created the largest disruption of education systems in human history, affecting nearly 1.6 billion learners in more than 200 countries. Closures of schools, institutions and other learning spaces have impacted more than 94% of the world's student population. This has brought far-reaching changes in all aspects of our lives. Social distancing and restrictive movement policies have significantly disturbed traditional educational practices. Reopening of schools after relaxation of restriction is another challenge with many new standard operating procedures put in place (Evaluation Backgrounder, 2015). Within a short span of the COVID-19 pandemic, many researchers have shared their works on teaching and learning in different ways. Several schools, colleges and universities have discontinued face-to-face teachings. There is a fear of losing 2020 academic year or even more in the coming future. The need of the hour is to innovate and implement an alternative educational system and assessment strategies. The COVID-19 pandemic has provided us an opportunity to pave the way for introducing digital learning (Kuhfeld et al., 2020).

Afterschool programs offer an important avenue for supplementing educational opportunities. These programs are spaces to improve attitudes toward school achievement and academic performance, particularly for low performing, underserved, or academically at-risk youth who can benefit greatly from additional academic help, and behavior. Over the course of more than 20 years, the 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) initiative has expanded and evolved to offer elementary, middle, and high schoolers enriching learning activities outside of the school day in literacy, math, science, the arts, and music, as well as hands-on experiences to help develop workforce skills (California Department of Education

(2018). Community Learning Centers practice a continuous improvement process that involves staff training, resources dedicated to program improvement, and quality monitoring to ensure that students are developing foundational skills they need to thrive in the classroom and in their daily lives. This includes how to work collaboratively, how to express their ideas, and how to think critically about their experiences (Evaluation Backgrounder, 2015).

The 21st CCLC program is designed to be a local collaborative effort where schools, cities, counties, community-based organizations (CBOs), and business partners come together to provide academic support and a safe environment for afterschool programs with students in high school, middle and elementary school. This report on the 21st CCLC is submitted as part of the local evaluation. To maximize impact on student learning, priority is placed on funding afterschool programs in neighborhoods where students have few or poor existing learning environments. Program quality is considered by the following strategies: alignment of activities to goals, the collaborations between schools and afterschool programs, the use of afterschool academic and social learning opportunities to enrich students' work in regular school, community and parent involvement, and staff education.

This report is for Cohort 10 which consists of the following schools: Bullskin Elementary School, Dunbar Township Elementary School, Springfield Elementary School, West Crawford Elementary School, Connellsville Middle School, Southmoreland Elementary School, and Southmoreland Middle School. These schools are a part of school districts that fit services for afterschool programs.

GPRA Measures

The reporting of data for evaluation will be based on the 5 GPRA measures (Grant Performance and Results Act) required by the federal government. *GPPRA Measure 1* is

Academic Achievement and will be measured by PSSA Scores where the scores are categorized as Below Basis, Basic, Proficient and Advanced. Grades will be used, and t Test analysis will be performed to determine if there was significant movement. The Teacher Surveys, Parent Surveys, and Student Surveys contain information that can describe positive and negative academic movement. *GPRA Measure 2 is Grade Point Average,* and it will be measured by GPA over the academic year. Growth will be determined by comparing performance from one academic quarter to the next (Q1 v Q2, Q1 v Q3, Q1 v Q4, and Q1 v Final grade). The Teacher Surveys and Parent Surveys will provide narratives of what they observed. *GPRA Measure 3 is School Day Attendance* and, it will be reported by the school day teacher in the report card. Other measures looking at attendance will come from Teacher Surveys and Parent Surveys. *GPRA Measure 4* is *Behavior* and, it will be reported by Teacher Surveys, Parent Surveys, and Student Surveys. Growth will be seen in reports of improvement on the surveys. *GPRA Measure 5 is Student Engagement in Learning* and, it will be reported by Teacher Surveys, Parent Surveys, and Student Surveys. Growth will be seen in reports of improvement on the surveys.

School Districts of Cohort 10: Connellsville School District and Southmoreland School District

Connellsville School District

The Connellsville Area School District is a large rural, public school district which covers the City of Connellsville, the Boroughs of Dawson, Dunbar, Ohiopyle, Seven Springs, South Connellsville and Vanderbilt and Bullskin Township, Connellsville Township, Dunbar Township, Saltlick Township, Springfield Township and Stewart Township in Fayette County, Pennsylvania. The district encompasses approximately 216 square miles (560 km^2). According to 2000 federal census data, Connellsville Area School District

serves a resident population of 38,303. By 2010, the district's population declined to 34,453 people, The educational attainment levels for the Connellsville Area School District population (25 years old and over) were 85.2% high school graduates and 11.6% college graduates. The district is one of the 500 public school districts of Pennsylvania. Connellsville Area School District was established in 1966. It is considered a Second-Class public school district due to its resident population exceeding 30,000 but being less than two hundred fifty thousand people.

According to the Pennsylvania Budget and Policy Center, 55.7% of the district's pupils lived at 85% or below the Federal Poverty Level as shown by their eligibility for the federal free or reduced-price school meal programs in 2012. In 2013, the Pennsylvania Department of Education, reported that 43 students in the Connellsville Area School District were homeless. In 2009, the district residents' per capita income was $15,194 a year, while the median family income was $35,638. In Fayette County, the median household income was $39,115. In the Commonwealth, the median family income was $49,501 and the United States median family income was $49,445, in 2010. By 2013, the median household income in the United States rose to $52,100. In 2014, the median household income in the USA was $53,700.

Per District officials, in school year 2007-08, the Connellsville Area School District provided basic educational services to 5,127 pupils. The district employed 370 teachers, 248 full-time and part-time support personnel, and 20 administrators. Connellsville Area School District received more than $41.4 million in state funding in school year 2007-08. In 2012-13, Connellsville Area School District reported an enrollment of 4,658. It employed 366 teachers, 235 support staff, and 21 administrators. In 2012-13, Connellsville Area School District received $44,484,555 in state funding. The district's enrollment declined 16.4 percent to 4,695 students between the 2004–05 and 2011–12, state Department of Education data show.

The Intermediate Unit IU1 provides the district with a wide variety of services like specialized education for disabled students, background checks for employees, state mandated recognizing and reporting child abuse training, speech and visual disability services and criminal background check processing for prospective employees and professional development for staff and faculty.

Connellsville Area Schools

Connellsville Area School District operates eleven schools including a career-technical school and a cyber academy is available to students in grades 7th through 12th.

- Connellsville Area Senior High School
- Connellsville Area Career & Technology Center is located above the high school and was built in 1972. The center serves about 500 students in grades 10-12. CACTC was renovated during the 2008-09 school term.
- Connellsville Area Junior High School (7th-8th)

Elementary Schools

There are eight elementary schools in the district, all facilitate classes for grades K-6.

- **Bullskin Township Elementary School** is located
- on Pleasant Valley Road (State Route 982) in Connellsville, PA, and was built in 1956. The last renovation was in 1998, when also a 4,000 sq ft (370 m^2). addition was added to the structure. About 450 students attend school. In 2010 and 2011 the school achieved **AYP** status. In 2011, 73% of students are reading on grade level. For Math 84.7% of students are on grade level.
- **Clifford N. Pritts Elementary School** is located on Indian Creek Valley Road (State Routes 381/711) in Melcroft, PA, and was built in 1968. There are about 300 students

attending this facility. In 2010 and 2011 the school achieved **AYP** status. In 2011, 66% of students are reading on grade level. For Math 70% of students are on grade level.

- **Connellsville Township Elementary School** is located on Rock Ridge Road in Connellsville, PA. The school was built in 1963 and houses the district's administration offices. The student census is around 175. In 2010 and 2011, the school achieved **AYP** status. In 2011, 56% of students are reading on grade level. For Math 64% of students are on grade level.
- **Dunbar Borough Elementary School** is located off Pechin Road in Dunbar, PA. The school was built in 1974 and has about 175 students. In 2011, Dunbar Borough Elementary School declined to **Warning** status under No Child Left Behind due to low student academic achievement. In 2010 the school achieved **AYP**. In 2011, 38.7% of students are reading on grade level. For Math 71% of students are on grade level.
- **Dunbar Township Elementary School** is located on Ridge Boulevard near Connellsville, PA. The school holds a census of about 600 and was built in 1966. In 2011, Dunbar Township Elementary School declined to **Corrective Action II 1st Year** status due to chronically low student academic achievement. In 2010, the school was in **Corrective Action I** level due to chronically low student math and reading achievement. In 2011, 58% of students are reading on grade level. Math 67% of students on grade level. The school administration was required to notify parents that they could transfer their child to a successful school within the district. The administration was also required to write a school improvement plan and submit the

plan to the Pennsylvania Department of Education for approval. In 2008, the school was in **School Improvement Level I** status due to low achievement.

- **South Side Elementary School** was located on Race Street in Connellsville, PA and was built in 1965, and demolished in 2018. There were about 325 pupils on the SSE Campus. In 2010 and 2011 the school achieved **AYP** status. In 2011, 67% of students are reading on grade level. For Math 74% of students are on grade level. South Side Elementary school was demolished in October 2018. A time capsule located in the cornerstone by Ritenour Demolition was donated to the Connellsville History Museum at the Carnegie Free Library and was opened in a ceremony celebrating the grand reopening of the museum. There was talk by the mayor of re-opening the basketball court/ice skating surface for community recreation purposes.
- **Springfield Township Elementary School** was built in 2004 and is located on School House Lane in Normalville, PA. In 2011 the school achieved **AYP** status. In 2010, the school was in **Warning** status due to low student achievement. In 2011, 61% of students are reading on grade level. For Math 764% of students are on grade level.
- **West Crawford Elementary School** was constructed in 1918 as the Dunbar Township High School. As part of the 1966 district merger, the school became a Junior High School and remained unchanged until 1999, at which time the 1912,1918, and 1942 sections were razed and an addition to the existing 1960 wing was made. The school was converted to an elementary school during the 2012-13 school term and cost $1.2 million in renovations for its new use.

Academic Achievement

In October 2015, Pennsylvania Auditor General Eugene DePasquale reported that eight schools in the Connellsville Area School District are among the 561 academically challenged schools that have been overlooked by the Pennsylvania Department of Education. The schools are: Bullskin Elementary School, Clifford N. Pritts Elementary School, Connellsville Twp Elementary School, Dunbar Boro Elementary School, Dunbar Twp Elementary School, South Side Elementary School, West Crawford Elementary School and Connellsville Area Junior High School. DePasquale also reported the Pennsylvania Department of Education failed to take any action to remediate the poorly performing schools to raise student academic achievement or to provide them with targeted professional assistance.

Opportunity Scholarship Schools

In April 2015, the Pennsylvania Department of Education released a report identifying that five Connellsville Area School District schools were among the lowest achieving schools for reading and mathematics in the state. They were Clifford N. Pritts Elementary School, Dunbar Boro Elementary School, Dunbar Township Elementary School, West Crawford Elementary School and Zachariah Connell Elementary School. In 2012, 2013 and 2014, only Zachariah Connell Elementary School was on the state's lowest achievement list. In 2011, five district schools were on the bottom 15% achievement list: Zachariah Connell Elementary School, Springfield Elementary School, Dunbar Township Elementary School, Connellsville Township Elementary School, and Connellsville Junior High School West. Parents and students may be eligible for scholarships to transfer to another public or nonpublic school through the state's Opportunity Scholarship Tax Credit Program passed in June 2012. The scholarships are limited

to those students whose family's income is less than $60,000 annually, with another $12,000 allowed per dependent. Maximum scholarship award is $8,500, with special education students receiving up to $15,000 for a year's tuition. Parents pay any difference between the scholarship amount and the receiving school's tuition rate. Students may seek admission to neighboring public school districts. Each year the PDE publishes the tuition rate for each individual public school district. Fifty-three public schools in Allegheny County are among the lowest-achieving schools in 2011. According to the report, parents in 414 public schools (74 school districts) were offered access to these scholarships. For the 2012-13 school year, nine public school districts in Pennsylvania had all their schools placed on the list including: Steelton-Highspire School District, Sto-Rox School District, Chester Upland School District, Clairton City School District, Duquesne City School District, Farrell Area School District, Wilkinsburg Borough School District, and William Penn School District. In 2014, Monessen City School District had all three of its schools added to the list. Funding for the scholarships comes from donations by businesses which receive a state business tax credit for donating.

Statewide Ranking History

Connellsville Area School District ranked 401 out of 493 Pennsylvania public school districts, by the Pittsburgh Business Times. The ranking is based on the last 3 years of student academic achievement as demonstrated by PSSAs results in: reading, writing, math and science and the three Keystone Exams (Literature, Algebra I, Biology I) in high school. Three school districts were excluded because they do not operate high schools (Saint Clair Area School District, Midland Borough School District, Duquesne City School District). The PSSAs are given to all children in grades 3rd through 8th. Adapted PSSA

examinations are given to children in the special education programs. Writing exams were given to children in 5th and 8th grades.

In 2009, the academic achievement of the students at Connellsville Area School District was in the bottom 6 percentile among 500 Pennsylvania school districts. Scale - (0-99; 100 is state best)

Graduation rate

In 2015, Connellsville Area School District graduation rate was 69.75%.

- 2014 - 73.50%
- 2013 - 75.29%
- 2012 – 71.00%
- 2011 - 67.99%
- 2010 - 76%, the Pennsylvania Department of Education issued a new, 4-year cohort graduation rate.

Connellsville High school

Connellsville Area Senior High School is located at 201 Falcon Drive, Connellsville. In 2015, enrollment was reported as 1,174 pupils in 9th through 12th grades, with 52.9% of pupils eligible for a free lunch due to the family meeting the federal poverty level. Additionally, 11.5% of pupils received special education services, while 3.9% of pupils were identified as gifted. The school employed 90 teachers. Per the PA Department of Education, 100% of the teachers were rated "Highly Qualified" under the federal No Child Left Behind Act. The school was built in 1970 and renovated in 2013 at a cost of $41 million. It included a new gymnasium and indoor swimming pool.

According to the National Center for Education Statistics, in 2013, the school reported an enrollment of 1,203 pupils in grades 9th through 12th, with 655 pupils eligible for a federal free or reduced-price lunch due to the family meeting the federal poverty level. In 2013, the school employed 91 teachers, yielding a student-teacher ratio of 13:1. According to a report by the Pennsylvania Department of Education, 100% of the teachers were rated "Highly Qualified" under No Child Left Behind.

2015 School Performance Profile

Connellsville Area Senior High School achieved 87.9 out of 100. This reflects on grade level reading, mathematics, and science achievement. The PDE reported that 88% of the High School's students were on grade level in reading/literature. In Algebra 1, 80.7% of students showed on grade level skills at the end of the course. In Biology I, 77% demonstrated on grade level science understanding at the end of the course. Statewide, 53 percent of schools with an eleventh grade achieved an academic score of 70 or better. Five percent of the 2,033 schools with 11th grade were scored at 90 and above; 20 percent were scored between 80 and 89; 28 percent between 70 and 79; 25 percent between 60 and 69 and 22 percent below 60. The Keystone Exam results showed: 73 percent of students statewide scored at grade-level in English, 64 percent in Algebra I and 59 percent in biology.

2014 School Performance Profile

Connellsville Area Senior High School achieved 86.9 out of 100. This reflects on grade level reading, mathematics, and science achievement. In reading/literature - 89.16% were on grade level. In Algebra 1, 77.8% demonstrated on grade level skills. In Biology, 76.6% demonstrated on grade level science understanding at the end of the course. Statewide, the percentage of high school students who scored proficient and advanced in Algebra I increased to

39.7% to 40.1%. The percentage of high school students who scored proficient and advanced in reading/literature declined to 52.5%. The percentage of high school students who scored proficient and advanced in biology improved from 39.7% to 41.4%.

Connellsville High School PSSA Results

Pennsylvania System of School Assessments, commonly called PSSAs are No Child Left Behind Act related examinations which were administered from 2003 through 2012, in all Pennsylvania public high schools. The exams were administered in the Spring of each school year. The goal was for 100% of students to be on grade level or better in reading and mathematics, by the Spring of 2014. The tests focused on the state's Academic Standards for reading, writing, mathematics and science. The Science exam included content in science, technology, ecology, and the environmental studies. The mathematics exam included: Algebra I, Algebra II, Geometry, and Trigonometry. The standards were first published in 1998 and are mandated by the Pennsylvania State Board of Education. In 2013, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania changed its high school assessments to the Keystone Exams in Algebra I, Reading Literature and Biology I. The exams are given at the end of the applicable course, rather than all in the spring of the student's 11th grade year.

Connellsville Area Junior High School

Connellsville Area Junior High School is located at Locust Street Extension, Connellsville. In 2015, enrollment was 749 pupils, in grades 7th and 8th, with 60.35% of pupils eligible for a free lunch due to family poverty. Additionally, 20% of pupils received special education services, while 4.14% of pupils were identified as gifted. According to a 2014 report by the Pennsylvania Department of Education, 100% of its teachers were rated "Highly Qualified" under No Child Left Behind. In 2012, the school was formed from the then closed

Connellsville Area Junior High School West and Connellsville Area Junior High School East which was housed in this building. Connellsville Area Junior High School is a federally designated Title I school.

According to the National Center for Education Statistics, in 2013, Connellsville Area Junior High School reported an enrollment of 773 pupils, in grades 7th and 8th, with 464 pupils receiving a federal free or reduced-price lunch due to family poverty. The school employed 62 teachers, yielding a student-teacher ratio of 12:1. According to a report by the Pennsylvania Department of Education, 100% of its teachers were rated "Highly Qualified" under No Child Left Behind.

The school was constructed in 1956 as Connellsville Joint High School, when the district was formed in 1966, the name was changed to Connellsville Area High School until the present school was built, then it became a Junior High School. There was extensive renovations and additions to the school in 1998. In 2012, with the board of education's decision in 2012 to consolidate the two Junior High Schools as an effect of Senior High Renovations, all seventh and eighth graders in the district attend classes in this building which was the former Junior High East.

2015 School Performance Profile: Middle School

The PDE withheld SPP scores. It reported that 49.5% of 8th grade students at Connellsville Area Junior High School students were on grade level in reading on the PSSAs given in April 2015. In math/Algebra I, 17% of 8th grade students showed on grade level skills. In science, 50% of the school's 8th graders demonstrated on grade level science understanding. No eighth-grade writing scores were reported. In 7th grade, 43% were on grade level in reading, while 26.7% showed on grade level for math skills. Statewide 58% of eighth (8th) graders were

on grade level in reading, while 29% demonstrated on grade level for math skills. Pennsylvania 7th graders were 58% on grade level in reading and 33% demonstrated on grade level for math skills.

2014 School Performance Profile: Middle School

Connellsville Area Junior High School achieved 65.9 out of 100. Reflects on grade level reading, mathematics, and science achievement. In reading/literature - 70% were on grade level. In Algebra 1/Math, 67.7% showed on grade level mathematics skills. In Science, just 51% of 8th graders showed on grade level science understanding. In writing, 57.9% of the 8th grade students demonstrated on grade level writing skills.

2013 School Performance Profile: Middle School

Connellsville Area Junior High School achieved 60.4 out of 100. Reflects on grade level reading, writing, mathematics and science achievement. In reading, just 62% of the students were on grade level. In Mathematics/Algebra I, 64% of the students showed on grade level skills. In Science, only 48.5% of the 8th graders demonstrated on grade level understanding. In writing, just 50% of the 8th grade students demonstrated on grade level writing skills. According to the Pennsylvania Department of Education, 2,181 public schools (less than 73 percent of Pennsylvania public schools), achieved an academic score of 70 or higher.

Southmoreland School District

Southmoreland School District is a small, suburban public school district located in northern Fayette County, Pennsylvania and southern Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania. The boroughs of Scottdale and Everson, as well as the townships of East Huntington and Upper Tyrone are within district boundaries.

Southmoreland School District encompasses approximately 43 square miles. According to 2000 federal census data, it serves a resident population of 15,639. In 2009, the district residents' per capita income was $15,876, while the median family income was $38,993. In the Commonwealth, the median family income was $49,501 and the United States median family income was $49,445, in 2010. According to District officials, in school year 2007-08, Southmoreland School District provided basic educational services to 2,146 pupils. It employed: 156 teachers, 77 full-time and part-time support personnel, and 10 administrators. Southmoreland School District received more than $12.6 million in state funding in school year 2007-08.

Graduation Requirements

The Southmoreland School Board has determined that a pupil must earn 25 credits to graduate, including: Math 4 credits, English 4 credits, social studies 4 credits, Science 4 credits, Physical Education 1.5 credits, Health 0.50 credit, Wellness/Life Management Skills 0.5 credit and electives 7.50 credits. Students who do not score proficient or advanced on the eleventh (11th) grade PSSA Reading and/or Math assessment must take a remedial course. By law, all Pennsylvania secondary school students must complete a project as a part of their eligibility to graduate from high school. This type of project is rigorous and its expectations are set by the individual school district. The graduation project is a career exploration project including several components that are accomplished over four years.

By Pennsylvania School Board regulations, for the graduating classes of 2015 and 2016, students must demonstrate successful completion of secondary level course work in Algebra I, Biology, English Composition, and Literature for which the Keystone Exams serve as the final

course exams. Students' Keystone Exam scores shall count for at least one-third of the final course grade.

SAT scores

In 2010-2011, 85 Southmoreland School District students took the SAT exams. The district's Verbal Average Score was 481. The Math average score was 507. The Writing average score was 457. Pennsylvania ranked 40th among state with SAT scores: Verbal - 493, Math - 501, and Writing - 479. In the United States 1.65 million students took the exam in 2011. They averaged 497 out of 800 verbal, 514 math and 489 in writing.

Middle school

In 2010 and 2011, Southmoreland Middle School achieved **AYP** status. In 2011, the attendance rate was 94%.

PSSA Results: 8th Grade Reading

- 2011 - 92% on grade level (2% below basic). In Pennsylvania, 81.8% of 8th graders on grade level.
- 2010 - 85% (6% below basic). State - 81%
- 2009 - 88% (6% below basic), State - 80%
- 2008 - 85% (5% below basic), State - 78%
- 2007 - 82% (5% below basic), State - 75%

PSSA Results: 8th Grade Math

- 2011 - 89% on grade level (3% below basic). State - 76.9%
- 2010 - 87% (5% below basic). State - 75%
- 2009 - 86% (5% below basic). State - 71%

- 2008 - 80% (10% below basic). State - 70%
- 2007 - 81% (9% below basic). State - 68%

PSSA Results: 8th Grade Science

- 2011 - 66% on grade level (15% below basic). State – 58.3% of 8th graders were on grade level.
- 2010 - 67% (16% below basic). State – 57%
- 2009 - 78% (16% below basic). State - 55%
- 2008 - 66% (12% below basic). State - 52%

PSSA Results: 7th Grade Reading

- 2011 - 74% on grade level (11% below basic). State – 76%
- 2010 - 78% (11% below basic). State - 73%
- 2009 - 75% (12% below basic). State - 71%
- 2008 - 73% (8% below basic). State - 70%
- 2007 - 77% (11% below basic). State - 67%

PSSA Results: 6th Grade Reading

- 2011 - 72% on grade level. (7% below basic). State - 69.9%
- 2010 - 72% (10% below basic). State - 68%
- 2009 - 70% (12% below basic), State - 67%

Mission of Afterschool Programs

Afterschool programs have operated for decades in communities across the country, and federal investment in afterschool programs has increased dramatically since the mid-1990s. However, even more investment in the field of, which includes before-school, afterschool, and

summer learning programs, is needed to keep up with the growing demand. Parents and voters overwhelmingly support afterschool programs and want to see more afterschool programs opportunities for children and increased funding for programs. As public demand and need for afterschool programs have grown, so too has the demand for accountability. This is particularly true for afterschool programs that utilize public dollars. After all, where tax dollars flow, so must accountability to taxpayers. Fortunately for afterschool programs advocates, a steady stream of afterschool programs evaluations is showing important gains for children, not only in terms of academic achievement but also in terms of safety, discipline, attendance, and avoidance of risky behaviors. In addition, researchers have found that afterschool programs encourage increased parental involvement, an important building block for student success. These updated evaluations backgrounder focuses on the impact of afterschool programs on academic outcomes, student behavior and parental concerns about children's safety (Evaluation Backgrounder, 2015).

The following questions are consistent with the mission of after-school programs and will direct the evaluation…

- What is the impact of afterschool programs on the academic performance of participating students? Does participation in afterschool programs appear to contribute to improved academic achievement?

  The question will be investigated with the data from the Teacher Surveys, Parent Surveys, Student Surveys, and school report data.

- Does participation in afterschool programs affect other behaviors such as: school day attendance, homework completion, positive behavior, and skill development?

  This question will be investigated with Teacher Surveys, Parent Surveys, and Student Surveys.

- What is the level of student, parent, staff, and administration satisfaction concerning the implementation and impact of afterschool programs? This question will be investigated with Student Surveys, Parent Surveys, and Staff Surveys.

Evaluation

Although there are current afterschool programs and services provided by school districts and community sources, none have been researched like the 21st Century Community Learning Centers. Academics and behavior were the focus of this project. Other aspects include exposure to culture, and parental involvement are equally as important, and make this project all-encompassing and well-rounded. The data and conclusions from these studies suggest that quality afterschool programs have a positive impact on several measures of student academic achievement, a positive influence on behavior and discipline and help relieve parents' worries about their children's safety.

An academic outcomes summary reveals that afterschool programs improve school attendance and engagement in learning, improve test scores and grades where students at greatest risk show greater gains, and frequency and duration of afterschool programs participation increases outcomes. The behavioral outcomes summary reveals keeping children safe, positive impact on children's self-concept and decision making, help working families and encourage parental participation, help keep children healthy, and reduces truancy and improves behavior in school (Leitner, 2016).

To fulfill the needs of this targeted population, 21st CLCC collaboration-based programs will provide academic education, homework assistance, character education, recreational programs, and nutritional services. These proposed services are required to improve individual student's success, improve families' access to adult education services, and the community's

likelihood of attaining economic stability and prosperity. The approach addresses academic and social needs through tutoring and academic coaching, character education, nutrition, social service support systems, and a variety of recreational and social activities for targeted children and their families. The range of services will promote lifelong learning, the training of staff will develop local capacity and commitment, and the collaborative efforts will promote the development of a trained workforce and eventual reduction in population decrease.

The program's main goal is to provide targeted services to identify at-risk students and their families through an afterschool and summer programs which focuses on academic and enrichment activities that will improve students' scholastic and social development and provide educational services for families of participating students.

To meet the needs of this targeted population, the 21st CLCC collaboration-based program will provide academic education, homework assistance, character education, recreational programs, and nutritional services. These proposed services are needed to improve individual student's success, improve families' access to adult education services, and the community's likelihood of attaining economic stability and prosperity.

Theoretical Bases for Evaluation

It is essential that an evaluation of afterschool programming be rooted in the research on effective, high-quality program provisions. Literature indicates that effective afterschool programs provide students with safety, opportunities for positive social development, and academic enrichment. There are several advantages to afterschool programs that have been effective and proven by research. Some advantages include improvement in school attendance, engagement in learning, improved test scores and grades, students at greatest risk show greatest

gains, and frequency and duration of afterschool program participation which increases engagement.

Improved School Attendance and Engagement in Learning

Teachers of students participating in Wisconsin 21st CCLC programs reported more than two-thirds improved their class participation, 60 percent saw improvements in their motivation to learn and 55 percent improved their behavior in class. Teachers also reported that 48 percent of students improved in volunteering for extra credit or responsibilities (Evaluations Backgrounder, 2015).

An evaluation of 83 out-of-school time programs in Oakland, CA, found that most participants reported that their afterschool program helped to prepare them to feel more confident about moving onto the next stage in school—80 percent of elementary school students said that their afterschool program helps them to feel ready to go to middle school, 70 percent of middle schoolers said that they felt more prepared to attend high school, 95 percent of high school students report that their afterschool program helped them believe that they could finish high school, and 89 percent feel more confident about going to college. Ninety-four percent of participants' parents reported that their child's attitude toward school had improved since joining their afterschool program. (California Department of Education, 2018).

Improved School Attendance and Engagement in Learning

Teachers of students participating in Wisconsin 21st CCLC programs reported more than two-thirds improved their class participation, 60 percent saw improvements in their motivation to learn and 55 percent improved their behavior in class. Teachers also reported that 48 percent of students improved in volunteering for extra credit or responsibility (Evaluations Backgrounder, 2015).

An evaluation of 83 out-of-school time programs in Oakland, CA, found that most participants reported that their program helped them feel more confident about moving onto the next stage in school—80 percent of elementary school students said that their program helps them to feel ready to go to middle school, 70 percent of middle schoolers said that they felt more prepared to go to high school, and 95 percent of high school students report that their afterschool program helped them believe that they could finish high school and 89 percent feel more confident about attending college. Ninety-four percent of participants' parents reported that their child's attitude toward school had improved since joining their afterschool program. (California Department of Education, 2018).

Improved Test Scores and Grades

Students who actively participated in the YMCA High School Youth Initiative—a comprehensive afterschool program serving low-income, urban communities—made greater gains in their grade point average and English language Arts and Math standardized test scores than their peers not participating in the program. Close to one-third of program participants (31 percent) improved their GPA, compared to 1 in 5 matched non-participants, 17 percent of participants improved their English language Arts test scores compared to 6 percent of non-participants and 4 percent of participants improved their math test scores versus just 2 percent of students not participating in the program (Evaluations Backgrounder, 2015)

Students at Greatest Risk Show Greatest Gains

An evaluation of the BELL (Building Education Leaders for Life) Summer program found that student participants, of whom approximately 80 percent performed below grade level at the start of the program, made significant gains in both reading and math. Students' average percentile rank score increased from 23rd to 32nd in math and from 26th to 35th in reading (1 =

lowest percentile and 99 = highest percentile). Additionally, middle school students furthest behind performing at grade level in reading and math saw the greatest improvement—gaining 7.2 months of reading skills and 7.5 months of math skills during the summer program (Evaluations Backgrounder, 2015)

Frequency and Duration of Afterschool Program Participation Increases Benefits

Research examining the effects of participation in afterschool programs found those who were consistent achieved greater gains in their math outcomes. Among low-income students, the higher the levels of participation in afterschool programs, the smaller the math achievement gap is between them and their high-income peers. The research also found that students regularly participating in afterschool programs improved their behavioral outcomes and school day attendance (Afterschool Alliance, 2019).

Students participating in Texas' 21st Century Community Learning Centers saw improvements in their school-day behavior, and the positive impact increased the longer students took part in the program. An evaluation by the American Institutes for Research found that students participating in the program for 30 days or more saw a 6 percent decrease in their disciplinary incidents, compared to their non-participating peers. Students participating in the program for 60 days or more saw a decrease in disciplinary incidents of 11 percent (American Institutes for Research, 2016).

As describe by the literature, features of effective afterschool programs generally include three critical components: (a) program structure, (b) program implementation, and (b) youth development.

Program Structure: involves setting up a goal-oriented program with a continuous improvement approach, a strong management, and connections with families and communities.

Program Implementation: the setting of clear goals and desired outcomes is essential for program success; with at least one goal directed at increasing children's personal or social skills.

Youth Development: focuses on the development of assets and competencies in all youth. Helping young people to achieve their full potential is the best way to prevent them from engaging in risky behaviors. Afterschool programs should give youth the opportunity to exercise leadership, build skills, and get involved. Also promotes self-perceptions and bonding to school, which led to positive social behaviors, increase academic achievement, and reduce behavioral problems (21st CCLC, 2019).

Methodology and Procedures

To address the evaluation questions, a survey approach was used with other data collection from the schools. The primary data sources – Student surveys, Parent surveys, Teacher surveys, and Staff surveys, along with academic grades (GPA), PSSA scores and observations by the local evaluator–provide detailed information about the afterschool program characteristics, operations, and outcomes.

Paired-Samples t-Test Statistics

The paired-samples t-test, sometimes called the dependent sample t-test, is a statistical procedure used to determine whether the mean difference between two sets of observations is zero. In a paired-samples t-test, each subject or entity is measured twice, resulting in pairs of observations. Common applications of the paired-samples t-test include case-control studies or repeated-measures designs. In this case, the researcher is using a repeated measures design. The interest is compared means for different academic quarters (Q1 v Q2, Q1 v Q3, Q1 v Q4, and Q1 v Final grade). The approach would be to measure the performance of a sample of students

during and after completing the academic year and analyze the differences between GPA means using a paired-samples t-test.

This is what the analysis would look like to determine significance…

T-Test

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	mpg1	21.0000	12	2.73030	.78817
	mpg2	22.7500	12	3.25087	.93845

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	mpg1 & mpg2	12	.604	.037

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	mpg1 - mpg2	-1.75000	2.70101	.77971	-3.46614	-.03386	-2.244	11	.046

Here is how to report the results of the t test:

A paired-samples t-test was performed to compare miles per gallon between fuel treatment and no fuel treatment.

There was a significant difference in miles per gallon between fuel treatment (M = 22.75, SD = 3.25) and no fuel treatment (M = 21, SD = 2.73); t (11) = -2.244, p = .046. Eleven is the degree of freedom (df).

Cohort 9 PSSA Scores

The goal for the PSSA scores is for all students in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to score proficient or above. The PSSA is an assessment system used to measure a student's progression toward mastery of the Core standards in English Language Arts (ELA), Math and

Science. Students in 3rd and 5th grades take ELA and Math while students in 4th grade take ELA, Math and Science.

PSSA Performance Levels

The Below Basic Level: reflects inadequate academic performance, and work at this level demonstrates a minimal command of and ability to apply the knowledge, skills and practices represented in the Pennsylvania standards. Consistent performance at this level indicates extensive additional academic support may be needed for engaging successfully in further studies in this content area.

The Basic Level: reflects marginal academic performance, and work at this level demonstrates a partial command of and ability to apply knowledge, skills and practices represented in the Pennsylvania standards. Consistent performance at this level indicates extensive additional academic support may be needed for engaging successfully in further studies in this content area.

The Proficient Level: reflects satisfactory academic performance, and work at this level demonstrates an adequate command of and ability to the knowledge skills, and practices represented in the Pennsylvania standards. Consistent performance at this level indicates academic preparation for engaging successfully in further studies in this content area.

The Advanced Level: reflects superior academic performance, and work at this level demonstrates a thorough command of and ability to apply the knowledge, skills, and practices represented in the Pennsylvania standards. Consistent performance at this level indicates advanced academic preparation for engaging successfully in further studies in this content area.

Adult Surveys

Staff, teachers, and parents were each surveyed once during the school year. The instruments were completed at the convenience of the participants and were picked up at the time of the site visits. Staff were surveyed and asked questions about program satisfaction, program effectiveness and program process. Teacher surveys asked questions about homework completion, participation, behavior in class, academic performance, motivation, and engagement in learning. Parent Surveys asked questions about program satisfaction, program processing, and participation in the program.

Student Surveys

The teachers distributed and administered the student surveys forms to all school students at the end of the program. The students were asked questions about overall satisfaction with the program, their performance academically and behaviorally across several categories.

Table 1

Parent Surveys **N=6**

There were 6 parents who responded to the Afterschool Enrichment Program Parent Surveys for Cohort 10. The answers are as follow…

1. The program addressed my child's specific needs.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
16.7%	50%	16.7%	16.7%

2. I had the opportunity to visit the program.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
16.7%	0%	66.7%	16.7%

3. The program offered my child a variety of academic enrichment activities.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
33.3%	66.7%	0%	0%

Please select the answer that best describes how your child has changed this year related to each of the following academic areas.

Subject	Did not need to improve	Improved	No Change	Declined
Reading	0%	16.7%	50%	33.3%
Math	0%	50%	33.3%	16.7%
Science	33 %	16.7%	33.3%	16.7%
Social Studies	16.7%	33.3%	33.3%	16.7%
Technology	16.7%	33.3%	33.3%	0%
Homework Completion	16.7%	66.7%	0%	16.7%
Self-Confidence	0%	50%	50%	0%
Attitude toward School/Learning	0%	50%	33.3%	16.7%
Attendance at School	50%	16.7%	33.3%	0%
Behavior at School	50%	0%	50%	0%

1. Rate your satisfaction with each of these program areas.

	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Unsatisfied
Overall Program	50%	33.3%	16.7%
Communication	33.3%	33.3%	33%

Academics	33.3%	50%	16.7%
Recreation	50%	50%	0%

2. The parent activities the program offered (i.e., ceramics with the Easter Bunny and Cookies with Santa) met my needs.

Yes, the activities met your needs	No, did not meet your needs	I did not participate in any parent activities	Parent activities were not offered to me.
66.7%	0%	33.3%	0%

(Missing data accounts for the percentages not equaling 100 percent).

Key Findings: Parent Surveys

The greatest levels of agreement or disagreement were, "The program addressed my child's specific needs," (16.7% *strongly agreed* and 50%, *agreed*), "I had opportunity to visit the program," (66.7%, *disagree* and 16.7% *strongly disagreed*), and "The program offered my child a variety of academic and enrichment activities.". When *strongly agree* (33.3%) and *agree* (67.7%) are combined you have 100% agreement. All parents (33.3%) did not visit the program.

Notice of "change or improvement" in the academic programs

The parents (16.7%) indicated that there was *improvement* in Reading, 50% said there was *no change*, and 33.3% said there was a *decline*.

For Math, 50% of the parents indicated that there was *improvement* in Math, 33.3% said *no change*, and 16.7% said there was a *decline*.

For Science, 33.3% of the parents indicated that there was *no need for improvement* in science, 33.3% said *no change*, and 16.7% said there was a *decline*, and 33.3% indicated that there was *improvement*.

For Social Studies, 33.3% of the parents indicated that there was *improvement* in Social Studies, 33.3% said *no change*, 16.7% said there was a *decline*, and 16.7% indicated there was *no need to improve*.

For Technology, 33.3% of the parents indicated that there was *improvement* in Technology, 33.3% said *no change*, and 16.7% indicated there was *no need to improve*.

For Homework Completion, 66.7% of the parents indicated that there was *improvement* in Homework Completion, 16.7% said there was a *decline,* and 16.7% indicated there was *no need to improve*.

Notice of "change or improvement" in the behavioral areas

For Self-confidence, 50% of the parents indicated that there was *improvement* and 50% said *no need for change*.

For Attitude Toward School and Learning, 50% of the parents indicated that there was *improvement,* 33.3% said *no change*, and 16.7% said there was a *decline*.

For Attendance at School, 16.7% of the parents indicated that there was *improvement*, 33.3% said *no change*, and 50% said there was *no need to improve*.

For Behavior at School, 0% of the parents indicated that there was *improvement*, 50% said *no change*, and 50% said there was *no need* to *improve*. These results indicated a strong sense of students behaving well in school as indicated by the parents.

Satisfaction for the Program Areas

For Overall Program, 50% of the parents indicated that they were *very satisfied,* 33.3% said *somewhat satisfied*, and 16.7% said they were *unsatisfied*.

For Communications, 33.3% of the parents indicated that they were *very satisfied,* 33.3% said *somewhat satisfied*, and 33.3% said they were *unsatisfied*.

For Academics, 33.3% of the parents indicated that they were *very satisfied*, 50% said *somewhat satisfied,* and 16.7% said they were *unsatisfied*.

For Recreation, 50% of the parents indicated that they were *very satisfied* and 50% said *somewhat satisfied*.

The Parent Activities of the Program

The Activities met my needs:

For meeting needs, 66.7% of the parents indicated *yes, the activities met my needs* and 33.3% said they *did not participate*. The parents showed a level of agreement (33.3% strongly agree and 66.7% agree) when asked about the variety of academic and enrichment activities offer

to students. The parents indicated that there was improvement for the academic classes taken by students. For academics, Reading improved at 16.7%, Math at 50%, Science at 16.7%, Social Studies at 33.3%, Technology at 33.3%, and homework completion at 66.7%. Behavioral issues had similar kinds of responses for improvement. Self-confidence improved at 50%, attitude toward school and learning at 50% and, attendance at school at 16.75%. The parents indicated that the students were showing a level of improvement for school attendance when 50% said there was no need for improvement.

The program should be sure that parents are aware of what is being offered and invite them on a regular basis as activities become available. All parents should be encouraged to go to and participate in the parent activities. When parent have confidence in the program, they can encourage their children to attend and participate. The parents observed benefits for their children and themselves.

Table 2

Student Surveys **N=48**

There were 48 student responses to the Student Surveys for Cohort 10. The answers are as follow…

1. *What is your overall satisfaction with the program?*

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Satisfied
64.6%	35.4%	0%

2. *What is your level of satisfaction regarding the program's academics?*

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Satisfied
81.3%	18.8%	0%

3. *What is your level of satisfaction regarding the program's recreations?*

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Satisfied
77.1%	20.8%	0%

4. *How do you feel you performed academically or behaviorally in the following categories?*

Subject	Improved	No Change	Declined	No Improvement Needed
Reading	66.7%	16.7%	10.4%	6.3%
Math	62.5%	31.3%	6.3%	0%
Science	66.7%	33.3%	0%	0%
Social Studies	56.3%	35.4%	8.3%	0%
Technology	58.3%	31.3%	6.3%	4.2%
Homework Completion	68.8%	31.3%	0%	0%
Self-Confidence	81.3%	10.4%	6.3%	2.1%
Attitude toward School/Learning	81.3%	14.6%	4.2%	0%
Attendance at School	64.6%	33.3%	0%	2.1%
Behavior at School	68.8%	31.3%	0%	0%

(Missing data accounts for the percentages not equaling 100 percent).

Key Findings: Student Surveys

Satisfaction with the Program

For Overall Satisfaction with the Program, 64.6% of the students indicated that they were *very satisfied,* and 35.4% said they were *somewhat satisfied* for *100%* satisfaction for the program when combined.

For Satisfaction with the Program's Academics, 81.3% said they were *very satisfied* and 18.8% said *somewhat satisfied* for *100%* satisfaction for academics when combined.

For Satisfaction regarding the Program's Recreation, 77.1% of the students indicated that they were *very satisfied*, and 20.8% said *somewhat satisfied* for *100%* satisfaction for recreation when combined. One student did not answer.

How do you feel you *Performed* Academically and Behaviorally in the following categories?

For Reading, 66.7% of the students indicated that there was *improvement*, 16.7% said *no change*, 10.4% said there was a *decline*, and 6.3% said there was *no need to improve*.

For Math, 62.5% of the students indicated that there was *improvement*, 31.3% said *no change*, and 6.3% said there was a *decline.*

For Science, 66.7% of the students indicated that there was *improvement*, 33.3% said *no change*, 0% said there was a *decline,* and 0% said there was *no need to improve*.

For Social Studies, 56.3% of the students indicated that there was *improvement*, 35.4% said *no change*, and 8.3% said there was a *decline,* and 0% said there was *no need to improve*.

For Technology, 58.3% of the students indicated that there was *improvement*, 31.3% said *no change*, 6.3% said there was a *decline,* and 4.2% said there was *no need to improve*.

For Homework Completion, 68.8% of the students indicated that there was *improvement*, 31.3% said *no change*, 0% said there was a *decline*, and 0% said there was *no need to improve*.

For Self-Confidence, 81.3% of the students indicated that there was *improvement*, 10.4% said *no change*, and 6.3% said there was a *decline,* and 2.1% said there was *no need to improve*.

For Attitude Toward School and Learning, 81.3% of the students indicated that there was *improvement*, 14.6% said *no change*, 4.2% said there was a *decline, and* 0% said there was *no need to improve.*

For Attendance at School, 64.6% of the students indicated that there was *improvement*, 33.3% said *no change,* and 0% said there was a *decline,* and 2.1% said there was *no need to improve*.

For Behavior at School, 68.8% of the students indicated that there was *improvement*, 31.3% said *no change*, 0% said there was a *decline,* and 0% said there was *no need to improve*.

The students indicated a high rate of satisfaction with the program itself, academics, and recreation. This was especially the case when *very satisfied* and *somewhat satisfied* are combined. The students showed a level of improvement when asked about the subject areas.

When asked about self-improvement the students demonstrated the same level for improvement. These are indicators that students valued the experience they were receiving while participating in the program. The students gave consistently high ratings when asked about behavioral issues of the program, such as homework completion, self-confidence, attitude toward school and learning, attendance, and their behavior. Students indicated that there was improvement (68.8%) in their behavior but that there was *no need to improve*, and this was by self-assessment.

Table 3

Annual Performance Report – Teacher Surveys **N=43**

There were 43 teacher responses to the Annual Performance Report – Teacher Surveys for Cohort 10. The answers are as follow…

	Did not need to Improve	Improved	No Change	Declined
Completing homework to your satisfaction	11.6%	30.2%	48.8%	9.3%
Participate in class	23.3%	37.2%	34.9%	2.3%
Volunteering	9.3%	20.9%	67.4%	2.3%
Attentive in class	20.9%	27.9%	44.2%	4.7%
Behaving well in class	39.5%	18.6%	41.9%	0%
Academic Performance	7%	30.2%	53.5%	9.3%
Coming to school motivated to learn	20.9%	27.9%	41.9%	9.3%
Engaging in Learning	20.9%	30.2%	46.5%	2.3%

* Missing data accounts for the percentages not equaling 100 percent.

The selection of answers by the teacher need clarification to help the reader with the perspective teachers had when answering the questions about the students. Here are the instructions. *Did Not Need to Improve*: which suggests that the student had already obtained an acceptable level of functioning, no improvement was needed during the school year, and the student maintained that level of performance. The other options were *Improved, No Change and Declined*. Instructions indicated that these three levels fall under these instructions: Acceptable Level of Functioning Not Demonstrated Early in School Year-Improvement: which suggests that the student was not functioning at a desirable level of performance with their behavior. If the student warranted improvement on a given behavior, please indicate the extent to which the student did or did not improve their behavior during the school year by indicating the applicable change level: *Improved*, *No Change*, or *Declined*.

Key Findings: Teacher Surveys

The teachers indicated that 48.8% of the students had *no change* when it came to completing homework to their satisfaction.

The teachers indicated that 37.2% of the students *improved* when it came to participating in class.

The teachers indicated that 67.4% of the students had *no change* when it came to volunteering.

The teachers indicated that 44.2% of the students had *no change* when it came to being attentive in class.

The teachers indicated that 41.9% of the students had *no change* when it came to behaving well in class.

The teachers indicated that 53.5% of the students had *no change* when it came to academic performance and 30.2% indicated that there was *improvement.*

The teachers indicated that 41.9% of the students had *no change* when it came to coming to school motivated to learn and 27.9% observed *improvement*.

The teachers indicated that 46.5% of the students had *no change* when it came to engaging in learning and 27.9% observed *improvement*.

An observation of the teachers reporting improvement by the students revealed that a high percentage reported that there was *no change* by the students. The percentages per question went from 34.9%-67.4%. *No change* received the highest percentage across all eight of the questions asked by the teachers. It would be worthwhile to interview a representative sample of the teachers to find out what was happening in class that led to these conclusions. All teachers indicated that there was some level of *decline* by the students on the eight questions that were asked.

Table 4

Staff Survey **N=7**

There were 7 staff responding to the Staff Surveys for Cohort 10. The answers are as follow…

1. What is your overall satisfaction with the program?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Satisfied
57.1%	42.9%	0%

2. What is your level of satisfaction regarding the program's communications?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Satisfied
28.6%	57.1%	14.3%

3. What is your level of satisfaction regarding the program's academics?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Satisfied
28.6%	57.1%	14.3%

4. What is your level of satisfaction regarding the program's collaboration?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Satisfied
14.3%	57.1%	28.6%

5. Rate your level of satisfaction with the implementation of the program.

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Satisfied
42.9%	57.1%	0%

6. Rate your level of satisfaction with the communication of the program.

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Satisfied
28.6%	57.1%	14.3%

7. Rate your level of satisfaction with the collaboration between the program and your school.

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Satisfied
0%	71.4%	28.6%

Key Findings: Staff Surveys

Overall satisfaction with the Program	Very Satisfied 51.7%	Somewhat Satisfied 42.9%	Not Satisfied 0%
Satisfaction with the Program's Communication	Very Satisfied 28.6%	Somewhat Satisfied 57.1%	Not Satisfied 14.3%
Satisfaction with the program's Academic	Very Satisfied 28.6%	Somewhat Satisfied 57.1%	Not Satisfied 14.3%
Satisfaction with the program's Collaboration	Very Satisfied 14.3%	Somewhat Satisfied 57.1%	Not Satisfied 28.6%

Satisfaction with the program's Implementation	Very Satisfied 42.9%	Somewhat Satisfied 57.1%	Not Satisfied 0%
Satisfaction with the program's Communication	Very Satisfied 28.6%	Somewhat Satisfied 57.1%	Not Satisfied 14.3%
Satisfaction with the program's Collaboration with your School	Very Satisfied 0%	Somewhat Satisfied 71.4%	Not Satisfied 28.6%

Remarks from Staff

What were the **advantages** of having the program in your school?	What were the **disadvantages** of having the program in your school?
1. I don't have to leave the building to be a part of the program.	1. None.
2. The students who came regularly seemed to enjoy it (recreation and free time).	2. It was not held in the school building causing some disorganization. Students who did not come every day had disrupting in learning.
3. Ease of access for the students. Convenient for parents.	3. There was not a lot of interest in the student body. Low numbers for attendance. Lack of teacher correspondence.
4. It helped the students who participated in academic and social-emotional areas.	4. No one from the building is involved in the program. Struggling students can be referred to me. There is a disconnect teachers collaborating and student enthusiasm.
5. Teachers had more control of the STEAM activities, password to Smart Board, etc.	5. Difficulty helping students with homework. Reached out to teachers several times. Only a few teachers responded.
6. The students get to learn a variety of topics that helped with their education and life.	6. Challenging and stressful during COVID-19 pandemic.
7. Great opportunity for our students.	7. None.

Between the seven survey questions and the comments for advantages and disadvantages, staff was able to provide some insight into making the program better. The perspective by which they viewed what happened in the program gives a difference viewpoint that should be considered. At least one staff member had selected not satisfied on five of the seven questions they were asked on the survey. It would be worth the time to consider interviewing the staff to see what suggestions they have for program improvement. One point that stood out was the issues that were presented when the program was not at the school. Certain challenges were spoken about by more than one staff member.

PSSA Rating Levels

The goal for the PSSA Ratings is for all students in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to score proficient or above. The PSSA is an assessment system used to measure students' progress toward mastery of the Core standards in English Language Arts (ELA), Math and Science. Students in 3rd and 5th grades take ELA and Math while students in 4th grade take ELA, Math and Science.

Table 5: Dunbar ES
PSSA Scores for Math, Reading, and Science

Dunbar ES	N	Below Basic	Basic	Proficient	Advanced	Total
Math	13	38.5%	30.5%	23.1%	7.7%	100%
Reading	13	15.4%	53.8%	23.1%	7.7%	100%
Science	13	0%	0%	30.8%	0%	100%*

*Missing data accounts for the Totals not equally 100%. (Some students did not take the PSSA science test (N=5).

Key Findings: PSSA for Math, Reading, and Science

For the students who responded to the PSSA assessment at Dunbar ES in Math, Reading, and Science, 38.5% were *Below Basic* in Math, 30.8% *Basic*, 23.1% *Proficient*, and 7.7%

Advanced. For Reading 15.4% were *Below Basic* in Reading, 53.8% were *Basic*, 21.3% *Proficient*, and 7.7% *Advanced*. For Science 0% were *Below Basic* in Science, 0% *Basic*, 30.8% *Proficient*, and 0% were *Advanced*. For math, 69.3% were *below standards* and 30.8% were at or *above standards*.

Table 6: Dunbar ES
Math by Grade Levels

Dunbar ES Grades	N	Below Basic	Basic	Proficient	Advanced	Total
3rd	5	0%	40%	40%	20%	100%
4th	4	75%	25%	0%	0%	100%
5th	4	50%	25%	25%	0%	100%

Key Findings: Math by Grade Levels

For the students who responded to the PSSA assessment at Dunbar ES in Math for 3rd grade, 0% were *Below Basic* in Math, 40% were *Basic*, 40% *Proficient*, and 20% *Advanced*. For 4th grade 75% were *Below Basic* in 4th grade, 25% were *Basic*, 0% *Proficient*, and 0% *Advanced*. For 5th grade 50% were *Below Basic* in 5th grade, 25% were *Basic*, 25% *Proficient*, and 0% were *Advanced*. When looking at the state standards where students are supposed to rank at *Proficient* or *above* (Advanced), 40% are *below standards* and 60% *above standards* for 3rd grade. By 4th grade, 100% *below standards* and 0% *above standards*. By 5th grade, 75% *below standards and* 25% at or *above standards*.

Table 7: Dunbar ES
Reading by Grade Levels

Dunbar ES Grades	N	Below Basic	Basic	Proficient	Advanced	Total
3rd	5	20%	40%	40%	0%	100%
4th	4	25%	25%	25%	25%	100%
5th	4	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%

Key Finding: Reading by Grade Levels

For the students who responded to the PSSA assessment at Dunbar ES in Reading for 3rd grade, 20% were *Below Basic* in Reading, 40% were *Basic*, 40% *Proficient*, and 0% *Advanced*. For 4th grade 25% were *Below Basic* in 4th grade, 25% were *Basic*, 25% *Proficient*, and 25% *Advanced*. For 5th 0% were *Below Basic* in 5th grade, 100% were *Basic*, 0% *Proficient*, and 0% were *Advanced*. When looking at the state standards where the students are supposed to rank at *Proficient* or *above* (Advanced), 60% are *Below Standards*, 40% *are above standards* for 3rd grade. For 4th grade, 50% are *Below Standards* and 50% *Above Standards*. By 5th grade, 100% are *Below Standards* and 0% at or *Above Standards*.

Table 8: Dunbar ES
Science by Grade Levels

Dunbar ES Grades	N	Below Basic	Basic	Proficient	Advanced	Total
3rd	5	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%*
4th	4	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
5th	4	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%*

*Missing data accounts for the Totals not equally 100%

*(Third graders do not take Science. All 5th graders missed taking the test).

Key Findings: Science by Grade Levels

For the students who responded to the PSSA assessment at Dunbar ES in Science, only the 4th graders had responses. 4th grade, 0% were *Below Basic* in 4th grade, 0% were *Basic*, 100%

Proficient, and 0% *Advanced*. When looking at the state standards where the students are supposed to rank at *Proficient* or *above* (Advanced), 0% are *Below Standards* and 100% *are at or above standards* for 4th grade.

Table 9: Bullskin ES

PSSA Scores for Math and ELA

Bullskin ES	N	Below Basic	Basic	Proficient	Advanced	Total
Math	9	44.4%	55.6%	0%	0%	100%
ELA	9	11.1%	55.6%	33.3%	0%	100%

Key Findings: Math and ELA by Grade Levels

For the students who responded to the PSSA assessment at Bullskin ES in Math, 44.4% were *Below Basic* in Math, 55.6% were *Basic*, 0% *Proficient*, and 0% *Advanced*. For ELA 11.1% were *Below Basic* in ELA, 55.6% were *Basic*, 33.3% *Proficient*, and 0% *Advanced*. When looking at the state standards where the students are supposed to rank at *Proficient* or *above* (*Advanced*), 100% are *below standards.* For ELA 66.7% were *below standards* and 33.3% were at or above standards.

Table 10: Bullskin ES

PSSA: Math by Grade Levels

Bullskin ES Grades	N	Below Basic	Basic	Proficient	Advanced	Total
3rd	2	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
4th	2	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
5th	5	40%	60%	0%	0%	100%

Key Findings: Math by Grade Levels

For the students who responded to the PSSA assessment at Bullskin ES in Math for 3rd grade, 0% were Below Basic in Math, 40% were Basic, 40% Proficient, and 20% Advanced. For 4th grade 75% were Below Basic in 4th grade, 25% were Basic, 0% Proficient, and 0% Advanced. For 5th grade 50% were Below Basic in 5th grade, 25% were Basic, 25% were Proficient, and 0% were Advanced. When looking at the state standards where students are supposed to rank at Proficient or above (Advanced), 40% are *below standards* and 60% above standards for 3rd grade. By 4th grade, 100% are *below standards*. By 5th grade, 75% *below standards* and 25% at or *above standards*.

Table 11: Bullskin ES
PSSA: ELA by Grade Levels

Bullskin ES Grades	N	Below Basic	Basic	Proficient	Advanced	Total
3rd	2	50%	50%	0%	0%	100%
4th	2	0%	50%	50%	0%	100%
5th	5	0%	60%	40%	0%	100%

Key Findings: ELA by Grade Levels

For the students who responded to the PSSA assessment at Bullskin ES in ELA for 3rd grade, 50% were Below Basic in ELA, 50% were Basic, 0% Proficient, and 0% Advanced. For 4th grade 0% were Below Basic in 4th grade, 50% were Basic, 0% Proficient, and 0% Advanced. For 5th grade 0% were Below Basic in 5th grade, 60% were Basic, 40% Proficient, and 0% were Advanced. When looking at the state standards where students are supposed to rank at Proficient or above (Advanced), 100% are *below standards* and 0% *above standards* for 3rd grade. By 4th

grade, 50% *below standards* and 50% are at or *above standards*. By 5th grade, 60% *below standards* and 40% at or *above standards*.

The Paired-Samples t-Test Statistics

Paired-samples t-test is a statistical technique that is used to compare two population means in the case of two samples that are correlated. Paired-samples t-test is used in before-after studies or when the samples are matched pairs. Significance is determined by where the probability of the comparison of the means is less than or equal to .05 (i.e., ≤ .05). The T-Test indicates that with 95% accuracy there is a difference between the means being tested. During the first quarter and final grades of the school year, comparisons of grades were made to see if there was a significant difference between the following paired comparisons…

The first quarter is compared against second quarter, third quarter, fourth quarter grades, and the final grades. Each set of comparisons were made for English/Language Arts (ELA), Math, and Science. The test scores are on a 4.0 GPA scale.

Table 12: Bullskin ES
Paired-Samples t-Test for Grades

Pairs	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	t	df	p
ScienceQ1-	7	69.57	11.40	-2.879	6	.014
ScienceQ3	7	85.71	7.697			
SpellingQ1-	7	86.71	11.84	1.910	6	.052
SpellingQ2	7	79.00	18.64			

Key Findings: Paired-Samples t-Test for Grades

It is important to notice whether the mean is larger for Q1 or the alternates Qs (Q2, Q3 Q4, and Final). The expectation is that the mean should be higher in the alternate Qs which prove that performance is increasing over time. If the mean for Q1 is higher, that shows performance is not increasing over time. There was a significant difference in performance for Bullskin ES in ScienceQ1and ScienceQ3 with the expectation that the mean would be greater for ScienceQ3 over ScienceQ1. The results for the means are what was expected where the mean of 69.57 for ScienceQ1 is less than the mean for ScienceQ3 (M=85.71). The same was not the case where SpellingQ1 (M=86.71) was higher than Spelling Q2 (M=79.00). This result was unexpected.

Table 13: Dunbar Twp. ES
Paired-Samples t-Test

Pairs	N	Mean	*Standard* Deviation	t	df	p
*MathQ1-	15	69.57	11.344	2.062	14	.014
MathQ2		85.71	13.747			
ReadingQ1-	16	79.13	10.519	2.328	15	.052
ReadingQ2		73.31	9.228			
*ScienceQ1-	10	71.60	12.527	-3.262	9	.014
ScienceQ3		81.60	7.397			
*ScienceQ1-	11	71.60	13.523	-4.247	10	.052
ScienceQ4		89.27	7.226			
*ScienceQ1-	11	71.60	13.523	-3.372	10	.014
Science.Final		89.27	9.509			
* Soc.StudiesQ1-	11	82.91	20.796	-2.161	10	.052
Soc.StudiesQ4		91.64	9.739			

Key Findings: Paired-Samples t-Test for Grades

The comparisons for Dunbar Twp. ES were quite different. The significant difference between the means were in the expected direction for five out of six of the comparisons. These outcomes are in support of the academic achievement outcomes of the program. There was a

significant difference in performance for Dunbar Twp. ES in MathQ1 (M=69.57) and MathQ2 (M=85.71) with the expectation that the mean would be greater for MathQ2 over MathQ1. The results for the means are what we expected where the mean of MathQ1 is less than the mean for MathQ2. The same is not the case when ReadingQ1 (M=79.13) is lower than ReadingQ2 (M=73.31). For the other comparison the results are ScienceQ1 had a lower mean (M=71.60) than ScienceQ3 (M=81.60). For ScienceQ1 had a lower mean (M=71.60) than ScienceQ4 (M=89.27). For ScienceQ1 had a lower mean (M=71.60) than Science Final (M=89.27). And for Soc.StudiesQ1 had a lower mean (M=82.91) than Soc.StudiesQ4 (M=91.64). This is what is expected. The Dunbar Twp. ES results for Science are most supportive of what is expected from the analysis. There was an increase from Q1 through the other alternatives (Q2, Q3, Final) This was achieved only for Science at Dunbar Twp. ES. Between the schools in Cohort 10.

Table 14: Springfield ES
Paired-Samples t-Test

Pairs	N	Mean	*Standard Deviation*	t	df	p
ScienceQ1-	7	69.57	11.40	-2.879	6	.014
ScienceQ3		85.71	7.697			
SpellingQ1-	7	86.71	11.842	1.910	6	.052
SpellingQ2		79.00	18.646			

Key Findings: Paired-Samples t-Test

There is a significant difference in performance for Springfield ES in ScienceQ1 (M=69.57) and ScienceQ3 (M=85.71) with the expectation that the mean would be greater for ScienceQ3 over ScienceQ1. The results for the means are what is expected where the mean of

ScienceQ1 is less than the mean for ScienceQ2. For Spelling there is a significant difference in performance in SpellingQ1 (M=86.71) and SpellingQ2 (M=79.00) with the expectation that the mean would be greater for SpellingQ2 over SpellingQ1. This was not the expected outcome. The students discovered early that a certain level of performance is expected in Science if they are to do well during the academic year.

Table 15: West Crawford ES
Paired-Samples t-Test

Pairs	*N*	Mean	*Standard* Deviation	t	df	p
ENGQ1-	36	74.72	10.311	-2.646	35	.006
ENGQ3		79.97	10.945			
ENGQ1-	36	74.72	10.311	-3.691	35	.001
ENG.Q4		83.08	12.300			
ENGQ1-	36	74.72	10.311	-2.807	35	.004
ENG.Final		78.94	9.856			
MathQ1-	36	66.72	12.344	-2.623	35	.001
MathQ4		78.14	16.229			
MathQ1-	36	66.72	12.344	-2.623	35	.006
Math.Final		70.75	14.393			
ReadQ1-	36	72.31	15.648	1.875	35	.035
ReadQ2		67.86	13.730			
ReadQ1	35	72.31	15.706	-1.940	35	.030
ReadQ4		77.26	12.234			
ScienceQ1-	37	71.05	17.857	-3.077	36	.002
ScienceQ3		78.00	12.188			
ScienceQ1-	37	71.05	17.857	-3.063	36	.002
ScienceQ4		77.90	13.627			
ScienceQ1-	37	71.05	17.857	-3.236	36	.001
Science.Final		80.60	12.849			

Key Findings: Paired-Samples t-Test

The significant difference between the means were in the expected direction for nine out of ten of the comparisons for West Crawford ES. These outcomes are in support of the academic achievement of the program.

There was a significant difference in performance for West Crawford ES in EnglishQ1 (M=74.72) and EnglishQ3 (M=79.97) with the expectation that the mean would be greater for EnglishQ2 over EnglishQ1. The results for the means are what was expected where the mean of EnglishQ1 is less than the mean for EnglishQ3. The same is the case when EnglishQ1 (M=74.72) is lower than EnglishQ4 (M=83.08). For the other comparisons the results are EnglishQ1 (M=74.72) had a lower mean than English Final (M=78.94). MathQ1 had a lower mean (M=66.72) than MathQ4 (M=78.14). MathQ1(M=66.72) had a lower mean than Math Final (M=70.75). For ReadingQ1 (M=71.31) had a higher mean than ReadingQ2 (M=67.86). This was not expected. For ReadingQ1 (M=72.31) had a lower mean than ReadingQ4 (M=77.26). For ScienceQ1 had a lower mean (M=71.05) than ScienceQ3 (M=78.00). For ScienceQ1 (M=71.05) had a lower mean than ScienceQ4 (M=77.90). For ScienceQ1 (M=71.05) had a lower mean than Science Final (M=80.60). This is what is expected. The West Crawford ES results for Science are most supportive of what is expected from the analysis. There was an increase from Q1 through the other alternatives (Q2, Q3, Q4, Final). This was achieved mostly for Science and English at West Crawford ES.

Evaluator Comments

Evaluator comments will focus on the data gathered from surveys and school grades in reference to the impact of the 21st Century Afterschool Program. The areas of investigation will be parent satisfaction, student satisfaction, staff satisfaction, and teacher satisfaction.

Parent Satisfaction

Parents who completed surveys expressed overall satisfaction (66.7%) with the program meeting their child's specific needs when "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" are combined where both are indicators of satisfaction. Parents were also asked whether they were satisfied with the

impact of the program on academic and enrichment activities (33.3% Strongly Agreed and 66.7% Agreed) and 100% agreed. Parents had strongly agreed that the program had positive impacts on their children. More specifically, they felt that their children's reading (16.7%), math (50%), science (16.7%), Technology (33.3%) and social studies (33.3%) skills had improved. In addition, behaviorally, parents felt that their children's self-confidence (33.3%), homework completion (50%), self-confidence (50%), attitude toward school learning (50%), attendance at school (16.7%) had improved. Behavior improving at school was not selected instead, parents selected *did not need to improve* 50% and *no change* 50%).

When asked, overall program satisfaction (50% very satisfied) and academics (33.3% very satisfied and 16.7% satisfied).

The parents considered how satisfied they were with the overall program to meet their needs (66.7% very satisfied), communication (33.3% very satisfied and 33.3% somewhat satisfied), academics (33.3% very satisfied and 50% somewhat satisfied) and Recreation (50% very satisfied and 50% somewhat satisfied). Lastly, parents responded to how well parent activities offered by the program met their needs. The parents responded that the program activities met their needs (66.7%). Parents are the catalyst who will continue keeping their children involved in the program. When parents are encouraged that the program is beneficial, then they can encourage their children to participate.

Student Satisfaction

Students responded 100% when asked about level of satisfaction regarding the program (64.6% very satisfied and 35.4% somewhat satisfied), academics, (81.3% very satisfied, and 18.8% somewhat satisfied are combined), and program's recreation (77.1% very satisfied and 20.8% somewhat satisfied). The responses have the potential to influence whether students will

continue with the program. Students indicated that they improved, academically in reading (66.7%), math (62.5%), science (66.7%), Technology (56.3%) and social studies (56.3%). In addition, behaviorally, students felt that there were improvements in homework completion (68.8%), self-confidence (81.3%), attitude toward school (81.3%), attendance at school (64.6%), and behavior at school (68.8%). Students also agreed that they were very satisfied (64.6%) and somewhat satisfied (18.8%) with the academics and recreation (77.1% very satisfied). Academic attitudes are important toward positive academic achievement. The students are showing that their satisfaction with the program is influencing them academically and behaviorally.

Teacher Satisfaction

Teachers who completed the survey expressed the same kinds of observations as the parents and students regarding improvement in performance academically and behaviorally during the afterschool programs. The teachers expressed students improved (30.2%) when asked if students completed homework to their satisfaction. When teachers were asked about improvement in participating in class, 37.2% indicated that there was improvement. The students did not show a level of improvement when it came to volunteering for extra credit or more responsibilities, 67.4% indicated that there was *no change*. The teachers expressed that 27.9% improved their attentiveness in class. When considering behaving well in class, 41.9% indicated that there was *no need* for the students to improve and 18.6% noticed improvement.
The other issues are coming to school motivated to learn (27.9%) and engaging in learning (30.2%). These issues take into consideration what will build a successful afterschool program.

Academic performance is an important consideration for program performance. The teachers did notice a 30.2% improvement in academic performance, which is one of the dimensions looked at by the state and reported in research for afterschool program success.

Evaluator Recommendations for Program Improvements

Program Improvement Based on Expected Outcomes of Afterschool Programs

The most important outcomes from this data collection and analysis are program improvements and implementations. This is consistent with data driven decision making. Implementation would be the result of observed areas of improvement by the evaluator. To improve the operation and effectiveness of the 21st Century Afterschool Program the following recommendations should be considered:

Student Diversity

Professional Development should continue with the teachers as they prepare for a more diverse population of students and concerns in the classroom. Today's classrooms are typified by academic diversity, students with learning disabilities, students from different cultural backgrounds, students whose first language is not English, advanced learners, students who underachieve for various complex reasons, motivated and unmotivated students, and students from diverse home environments.

There are distinct differences in afterschool program participation and demands across income levels and ethnicity. Participation in and demand for afterschool programs are much higher among children from low-income households compared to higher-income households, as well as higher among African American and Hispanic children than Caucasian children. Children from low-income households are more likely than their higher-income peers to participate in an afterschool program (20 percent versus 18 percent) and the demand for afterschool programs is much higher among low-income families than families that do not qualify for the Federal Free or Reduced-Price Lunch Program (50 percent versus 34 percent) (Leitner, 2016).

Cost and lack of a safe way for their children to get to and come home from afterschool programs are among the barriers that low-income households, African American families, and Hispanic families report keep them from enrolling their children in an afterschool program. Parents' overall satisfaction with their child's afterschool program remains high; in fact, parents today are much more satisfied than in the past with specific aspects of afterschool programs and hold stronger positive feelings regarding the benefits of afterschool programs. The 21st CLCC provides a save environment for the children with afterschool programs that meet at their school. Of course, there are exception, but many are at schools. Parents recognize that programs provide a wide range of activities and enriching learning opportunities for children both academically and behaviorally.

The value of summer learning to parents continue to grow. Public funding for summer learning programs is strongly supported by parents and participation in summer learning programs are on the rise. Additionally, 85 percent of parents indicate support for public funding for summer learning programs, an increase of two percentage points over the already very strong support registered in 2009.

Parents, teachers, staff, and students have shown that the 21st CCLC is operating in such a way that it is improving academically and socially that students' needs are being provided for in a meaningful way. Parents can take care of household matters (i.e., work and not worry about the safety of their child during afterschool programs hours to have peace of mind). With the information gathered from the evaluation it is possible to figure out what the next step should be in program improvement.

The 21st CCLC should continue with it is continuous improvement process that involves staff training, especially teachers with technology, resources dedicated to program improvement,

and quality monitoring to ensure that students are developing foundational skills they need to thrive in the classroom and in their daily lives. This includes how to work collaboratively, how to express their ideas, and how to think critically about their experiences.

Dissemination

This report along with other data which was collected should be shared with schoolteachers, policy holders and parents, as it would assist in support of the program by everyone involved. The data shows that the program is effective and impactful.
People value being associated with activities that have proven to be successful. From the baseline data of this initial report, teachers can be given areas of improvement based on student performance and parent survey data.

Promote Student-Teacher Relationships

To encourage student efficacy and mattering, teachers should let students know that they believe the students can and will succeed and that they are resilient students. Students need to know that teachers have high expectations for them. They need to know that teachers would want them to do their best, expect them to be successful, and believe they will do a good job.

Academic Attitudes

Continue to promote academic attitudes as they are associated with both directly and indirectly, toward achievement. This will result in students' improving their schoolwork habits, liking, and wanting to attend school regularly, and striving to be on time for school.

In summary, students and parents expressed that attending the program has led students to feel more efficacious with respect to their academic and personal skills. Students had a positive attitude regarding the afterschool program helping them to improve their academic habits. Parents generally agreed that attending the program resulted in an improvement in

students' classroom grades, as well as their cognitive competence concerning school and getting along with others.

Evaluator Observations

A trend in the data shows that academic performance is suffering students start the academic year doing well and by final grades there is a decline in performance (see pair t-test results). This could be an indication that subject areas are becoming more difficult as the school year progresses, and more attention should be focused on homework assistance. Afterschool programs like the 21st Century Afterschool Program is in position to address these needs. Afterschool programs are designed to help students in the management and completion of homework and long-term assignments. This level of management takes concentrated time and effort. Students can be given the opportunity to practice and master time management and organizational skills during the program while under teacher supervision. Students would have the opportunity to meet with experienced teachers and aides to discuss assignments, organize materials, and establish short and long-term goals.

Changes to the amount of time students spend doing homework during the afterschool program must be considered if time is to be spent productively to increase academic performance that would be reflected in final grades and state tests. In collaboration with the day schoolteacher, afterschool programs personnel can strengthen content areas by offering additional assistance in these recognized subject areas where students are displaying a decline as they approach final grades. Parents are not able to address these needs for various reasons including working outside the home, their child participating in their afterschool program, and the inability to handle the difficulties of homework assignments. Successful afterschool

programs are providing the help with homework along with academic enrichment and skill building for problem-solving. The afterschool programs can close a huge academic gap.

Final Evaluator's Comments

In conclusion, there is distress regarding the state of education in America. This urgency is passed on to the after-school programs to help our students to achieve academically. Afterschool programs, like the Private Industry Council 21st Century Afterschool Program, are viable in addressing some of the issues in education. Parents, teachers, and students expressed positive outcomes because of their participation in the program. Afterschool programs can provide these outcomes, especially in programs that have a positive youth development orientation. A student who has experienced a positive socializing process will internalize society's standards for positive behaviors and grow into a law-abiding contributing citizen. This contribution should be taken seriously. This is a start that must be improved with appropriate and continuous evaluation of these programs.

Bibliography

Kuhfeld, Megan, James Soland, Beth Tarasawa, Angela Johnson, Erik Ruzek, and Jing Liu. (2020). Projecting the potential impacts of COVID-19 school closures on academic achievement. (EdWorkingPaper: 20-226). Retrieved from Annenberg Institute at Brown University: https://doi.org/10.26300/cdrv-yw05

Evaluation's backgrounder: A summary of formal evaluations of the academic impact of afterschool programs. Authors: Afterschool Alliance. Publication Date – 2008. Source - Washington, DC: Afterschool Alliance. Retrieved May 13, 2009, from http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/documents/evaluation_backgrounder.pdf

21st Century Community Learning Centers: Inspiring Learning. Supporting Families. Earning Results (June 2019).

The Evidence Base for Afterschool and Summer. https://afterschoolalliance.org/documents/21stCCLC-Overview-2018.pdf. (April 2021).

O'Donnell, P. and Ford, J. (2013). The Continuing Demand for 21st Century Community Learning Centers across America: More than four billion dollars of unmet need; Peterson,

T., Fowler, S., and Dunham, T.F. (2013). “Creating the Recent Force Field: A Growing Infrastructure for Quality Afterschool and Summer Learning Opportunities.” Expanding Minds and Opportunities: Leveraging the Power of Afterschool and Summer Learning for Student Success. Washington, D.C.: Collaborative Communications Group.

California Department of Education. (2018). Report to the Legislature, Legislative Analyst’s Office and the Governor: Characteristics of Schools and Students Participating in After School Programs.

Leitner, D. (2016). 21st Century Community Learning Centers 2015-16 Evaluation Report. Pacific Research Associates.

21st CCLC: Inspiring Learning. Supporting Families. Earning Results. Afterschool Alliance (2019) http://afterschoolalliance.org/documents/21stCCLC-Overview-2021.pdf

American Institutes for Research. (2016). Texas 21st Century Community Learning Centers: 2014-15 Evaluation Report; American Institutes for Research. (2013). Texas 21st Century Community Learning Centers: Year 2 Evaluation Report.

Hartman, T., Hallar, B., & Gao, J. (2014) 21st CLCC Evaluations: A Citywide Perspective. Social Innovations Journal.

The Evidence Base for Afterschool and Summer. Research Brief. Afterschool Alliance (2021).

—

The Afterschool Alliance is a non-profit public awareness organization working to ensure that all children and youth have access to quality afterschool programs. (Afterschoolalliance.org).