

Newburgh Enlarged City School District

Susan Torres-Bender, Grant Facilitator

21st CCLC Annual Evaluation Report: Year 1



September 27, 2018

Prepared by
Lynn T. Moulton

B_{rockport}
R_{esearch}
I_{nstitute}

Brockport Research Institute
24 Brook Terrace
Brockport, NY 14420
585.703.5400

lynn.moulton@BrockportResearchInstitute.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	1
Project Description.....	3
Evaluation Framework and Plan.....	6
Implementation/Process Evaluation Findings.....	6
Conclusions and Recommendations.....	20
Appendix A: Logic Model.....	23
Appendix B: Evaluation Plan.....	25
Appendix C: Evaluation Framework and Methodology.....	31
Appendix D: Completed Stage 1 and Stage 2 Checklists.....	37
Appendix E: Saturday Family Learning Trip Summary.....	40
Appendix F: Student Survey Summary: Grades K-3.....	44
Appendix G: Student Survey Summary: Grades 4-5.....	47
Appendix H: Teacher Survey Summary.....	52

Executive Summary

BRI prepared this report following the Annual Evaluation Report Guide for Year 1 provided by the 21st CCLC grant Statewide Evaluator, Measurement Inc. This report will be shared with the following audiences: Newburgh Enlarged City School District (NECSD), NYSED Project Managers and State subcontractors, the Technical Assistance Resource Centers, and the Statewide Evaluator.

Project Summary

In April 2017, NECSD was awarded their five-year Round 7 21st CCLC funding to target 750 students in grades K-5 at four Title I elementary schools and their families. There are three components: the After School Academy (ASA), Saturday Family Learning Trips, and Parent University/Academy. The ASA contains academic, enrichment, and social-emotional components. The Boys and Girls Club – Newburgh (BGCN) is a community partner that provides six artists from its Newburgh Performing Arts Academy (NPAA) to present enrichment sessions. Two artists are at each of three of the schools while the fourth school utilizes staff to offer all enrichment sessions. Other enrichment options were also explored and implemented (e.g., Girls on the Run, Math & Movement).

The **Program Theory** succinctly states how NECSD will address the three key components of a 21st CCLC grant: academic enrichment outside of school hours, youth development, and family literacy/advocacy. A draft Program Theory based on text in NECSD's proposal narrative was presented at the November Program Advisory Council Team (PACT) meeting and agreed upon by the attendees. The Program Theory will be revised as needed, but as a minimum, reviewed annually for accuracy.

“Located within a high needs and diverse community, the Newburgh Enlarged City School District is committed to supporting and providing opportunities for its students and families beyond the school day. We will provide academic enrichment and programs as well as activities and services to enhance the growth and development of our students and their families. A major component is Saturday Family Learning Experiences where children and families learn together, thereby helping families develop skills to support their child in school.”

A grant facilitator, Ms. Susan Torres-Bender, was hired to coordinate and manage the many facets of the 21st CCLC grant including administering the Quality Self-Assessment (QSA), exploring sustainability options, recruiting of staff and students, ensuring that proper documentation and procedures are in place, submitting state and federal level reports, attending trainings, and leading a monthly PACT (i.e., advisory board) meeting. PACT meeting invitees include administrators from the four schools, the BGCN executive director, NECSD administrators, local evaluator, parents, teachers, and

students. The grant also includes professional development for various groups of 21st CCLC staff (e.g., Math & Movement, PBL, Project Lead the Way, etc.) and 21st CCLC teachers have monthly common planning time. Overall, the 21st CCLC grant allows NECSD to comprehensively address the need for academic enrichment, youth development, and adult education.

Key Findings

During Year 1 of the grant, NECSD was able to put in place the framework needed to ensure that successive years have a solid foundation. The ASA began on November 14, 2017 (for three buildings) and January 31, 2018 for Gardnertown. All Year 1 programming ended June 7. Each had a two-hour block with the same program structure, starting and ending whole group in the cafeteria (although Gidney Avenue Magnet School dismissed from their last activity block) and having equal portions of enrichment or arts and tutoring. The enrichment portion changed for each multi-week activity block with choices such as cooking, yoga, hip-hop, salsa, Girls on the Run, theater, art, and Spanish club. The tutoring time allowed students to play academic online games if they had no homework. Students with homework completed their assignments with tutoring as needed. At the conclusion of Year 1, 470 students had participated in 21st CCLC and 393 met the minimum of 30 hours or more to count as a “participation” for funding purposes. The goal was 750. The program fulfilled its goals in terms of serving target populations, however.

There were three Saturday Family Learning Trip destinations: Locust Grove Estate, Liberty Science Center, and National Geographic Encounter: Ocean Odyssey in Times Square. The Parent University/Academy was offered, but no parents attended.

The program was continually assessed through monthly stakeholder PACT meetings, the grant facilitator monitoring every site (including in-person visits to the four buildings), and maintaining the logic model (located in Appendix A). The grant facilitator diligently fulfilled all key responsibilities for coordinating, documenting, and monitoring program activities.

Key Recommendations

Key recommendations related to staff, parents/guardians, students, and implementation are provided to foster obtainment of the performance indicators of success. Of highest importance, is recruiting more teachers and students to meet enrollment targets, to avoid funding cuts, starting in Year 2. The parent involvement component for field trips and learning opportunities have much room for growth. Stakeholder feedback can be increased in the future, including greater participation in all surveys (students, teachers, and parents).

Project Description

Located within a high needs and diverse community, NECSD committed to supporting and providing opportunities for its students and families beyond the school day. During the first year of the grant, NECSD provided academic enrichment and programs, as well as activities and services to enhance the growth and development of students and their families. The 21st CCLC program was located in four schools that serve grades K – 5, with students from all grade levels being targeted and focusing on students that scored at levels 1 and 2 on the New York State assessments, students that are economically disadvantaged, students with limited English proficiency (LEP), and students with disabilities. Table 1 shows the enrollment at the four participating schools and the targeted numbers of grade K-5 students.

Table 1. School Enrollment and Targeted K-5 Students from Grant Proposal

School Name	K-5 Student Enrollment	Targeted K-5 Students	
		# of Students	% of Students
Balmville Elementary	493	150	30%
Gardnertown Leadership Academy	696	200	29%
Gidney Avenue Magnet School	801	200	25%
Horizons on the Hudson	518	200	39%
TOTAL	2,508	750	30%

One proposed school, Vail's Gate STEAM Academy, was not able to participate due to an existing after-school program for Academic Intervention Services (AIS) for 100 of its students. Instead, Gardnertown Leadership Academy joined the grant and started programming on January 31, 2018. The three other schools had begun programming on November 14, 2017.

As proposed, the project would serve a total of 750 students with student and family programming being offered in partnership with the BGCN's NPAA. NECSD and BGCN had successfully partnered in two earlier 21st CCLC grants with BGCN as the lead. By becoming the lead, NECSD looked to extend and target programming to meet the needs of more students and their families with a major component to include Saturday Family Learning Experiences where children and families learn together, thereby helping families develop skills to support their child in school.

The 21st CCLC grant also provides free programming for parents/guardians. Classes were offered in English, financial literacy, and GED/HSE although none were attended. The programs were advertised in the 21st CCLC newsletter, posted on each school's bulletin board, and posted on the district web site. Recommendations have been included to support this initiative.

The goals of the project are to increase the participating students' math and ELA achievement, increase their school attendance, decrease their referrals and negative behaviors during the regular school day, strengthen the relationships between the

schools and families, and increase the attendance of parents/guardians in Parent University/Academy programs (e.g., literacy).

Key Stakeholders

In addition to the students that participated in the programming, stakeholders include their parents/guardians and families, program staff, administrators at the four schools, the community partner's (BGCN) executive director and artists, and NECSD administrators (e.g., grant facilitator, director of grants, and assistant superintendent of curriculum). In addition to the BGCN artists, each school's program was staffed by teachers and classroom aides from that school. Each school also had a security monitor, nurse, and clerical typist during program time.

Program objectives and activities

The Program Objectives and Activities for the 2st CCLC program are presented in Appendix B, the evaluation plan. They correspond with the NYS 21st CCLC Objectives and Sub-objectives. To ensure that the program objectives and activities align with each school's regular academic program as well as student's academic needs, three schools utilized an administrator from the regular school day (the fourth school had an administrator that had previously worked in that building). Also, the after-school program at each school was staffed by teachers and aides from the regular school day. Common planning time was scheduled monthly to allow staff to plan 21st CCLC activities.

Performance measures

The performance measures for NECSD's 21st CCLC program are presented in Appendix B, the evaluation plan. The indicators of success and their corresponding method of measurement include:

Core Educational Services

- Students will demonstrate 95% attendance in the program (*Cayen* software stores attendance)

Enrichment and Support Activities

- Students will demonstrate 95% attendance in the program (*Cayen* software stores attendance)

Community Involvement

- All stakeholders including the BGCN and Director of Family and Community Engagement (FACE) will participate in 95% of meetings (meeting minutes will record attendance)
- Each site will host a Parent Academy event that includes at least 2 additional community organizations (grant facilitator maintains a program guide for parent programming, attendance by parents/guardians is recorded at all events)

Services to parents and other adult community members

- An increase of 50% in parents that attend at least one Parent University/ Academy program, including literacy programs (attendance records)
- Of parents who attended Parent University/ Academy programs, 90% will find the program favorable (exit survey)
- Students and parents/guardians will achieve a 95% attendance rate in the Saturday Family Learning Trips (attendance records)
- Of students and parents who attended Parent University/Academy programs, 90% will find the program favorable (exit survey)

Extended Hours

- Attendance in program activities will demonstrate at least 90 hours throughout the course of the program (*Cayen* software tracks attendance)

Achievement

- Students will increase ELA and math achievement by 10% (iReady scores from Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 will be compared)

Behavior

- 50% of referrals and negative behaviors during the regular school day will decrease (referrals from 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 will be compared)
- Students who participate in program will have a 75% increase of daily school attendance (absences from 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 will be compared)

Theory of action

NECSD's grant proposal described the theory upon which their 21st CCLC program was based. According to *After School Programs in the 21st Century: Their Potential and What It Takes to Achieve It* (Little, Wimer, & Weiss, 2008), research has shown that after-school programs can have an impact on academic achievement. Little, Wimer & Weiss (2008) confirm that after looking across many research and evaluation studies, children and youth who participate in after-school programs can reap a host of positive benefits in a number of interrelated outcome areas—academic, social/emotional, prevention, and health and wellness. There are many after-school programs that focus on an academic program for all types of learners, but programs that provided more than just academic support show an even higher improvement among participants. Little, Wimer, & Weiss (2008) emphasized in their research that balancing academic support with a variety of engaging, fun, and structured extracurricular or co-curricular activities that promote youth development in a variety of real-world contexts appears to support and improve academic performance. (2008, p. 4)

Status of Logic Model development

Along with the Program Theory, a draft of the Logic Model was presented at the November PACT meeting to graphically depict how the Program Theory will be

executed. It was approved and then revised in February 2018 to (1) specify Gardnertown Leadership Academy as the fourth school to be included in the grant since Vail's Gate was not participating, and (2) remove Newburgh Chess Club as a community partner. The Logic Model is included in Appendix A and includes the program indicators.

Intentional changes made since the original application

The two revisions made to the originally-approved project were necessary and justified. Because four grade K-5 schools were originally proposed, changing Vail's Gate to Gardnertown Leadership Academy was not a significant change and it was authorized by NYSED. Although the Newburgh Chess Club was not included in the original proposal, it was an attempt to add a community partner in addition to BGCN; it was not successful. Other community partnerships continue to be explored and the project and Logic Model will be updated as needed.

Evaluation Framework and Plan

NECSD contracted with Brockport Research Institute (BRI) for their external evaluation. BRI has maintained contact with the 21st CCLC program coordinator, Ms. Susan Torres-Bender on an ongoing basis through phone calls, emails, and site visits to monitor implementation during Year 1 of the grant.

Every funded program has objectives that relate to implementation (process) and outcomes. The evaluation plan aligns with the objectives and sub-objectives defined by NYS statutory. The logic model emphasizes that implementation fidelity will affect the intended outcomes on student achievement and behaviors. This report addresses fidelity of implementation, progress toward objectives, and recommendations for program improvement.

Details of the evaluation framework and plan of this project are included in Appendix C.

Implementation/Process Evaluation Findings

Fidelity of implementation

The evaluation plan in Appendix B presents findings for Year 1 fidelity of implementation based on Objective 1: "*21st Century Community Learning Centers will offer a range of high-quality educational, developmental, and recreational services for students and their families.*" with its five corresponding Sub-Objectives and NECSD's Program Objectives. as stated in NECSD's grant narrative.

NECSD provided **core educational services** in the subjects of reading and literacy, mathematics, and science as evidenced by document review and evaluator observations. Students attending the after-school program had access to teachers for

small group tutoring and academic-based online learning and were engaged learners. **Enrichment and support activities** were also provided to 21st CCLC students during the after-school program as well as during Saturday Family Learning Trips. **Community involvement** was evidenced by the formation of the PACT in order to collaborate and commit to planning, implementing, and sustaining programming. The PACT met eight times during Year 1 as coordinated by the grant facilitator with a base of attendees such as a BGCN representative, local evaluator, school administrators, with other stakeholders (e.g., parent, family member) attending on occasion. Recruitment for PACT members will continue in Year 2. **Services were offered to parents/guardians** of participating children but were not well-attended. This objective will continue to be addressed in Year 2. NECSD provided **extended hours** of programming during the school year (generally 6 hours per week from November 14, 2017 through June 7, 2018, with exceptions for holidays, school closings, etc.).

Unintended drift

As with any large project, there were a few areas of unintended program drift during implementation. Differences will undoubtedly occur when a proposed grant is put into place in the day-to-day reality of a school district. None of these items listed below are critical to the success of the grant.

- In order to accommodate the contractual obligations of staff, the program start time was shifted fifteen minutes later.
- Due to the late award of the grant, programming was not offered in Summer 2017.
- Although not included in the original proposal, *Cayen* software was procured to effectively track enrollment, attendance, and demographics of participating students in an organized platform that was developed specifically for 21st CCLC programs. It tracks students by grade level, attendance hours, and demographics as needed for the federal Annual Performance Report (APR). NECSD's current student management system was not designed to meet the reporting needs of a 21st CCLC grant.

Recommendations included in the mid-year report continued to be addressed during the remainder of Year 1 and will continue into Year 2. Recruiting teachers to staff the after-school programs was difficult in Year 1 due to the tight start-up schedule. Year 2 teacher recruitment started much earlier and changes in the format of the after-school program will help (e.g., three activity sessions rather than four, and allowing teachers to select which session(s) they would like to work in rather than committing to the entire year). Plans for continuing parent and student recruitment have been discussed. The QSA was used successfully by staff in Year 1 and plans are in place for its use in Year 2. Parents will continue to be recruited for the PACT.

Reach to the target population

After-school programming started November 14, 2017 for all schools except Gardnertown Leadership Academy which started after-school programming on January 31, 2018. Because sites are required to periodically report participation, that data was used to generate Table 2. This data was provided to NYSED in the district's interim report that was submitted by February 15, 2018 via online survey. Data was also provided by the grant facilitator for the March PACT meeting, and the June 30, 2018 data was provided to Measurement Inc. on the year-end spreadsheet with participants' summer (not applicable for NECSD in Year 1) and after-school days and hours. The enrollment at each school increased throughout Year 1 although each school did not reach its target.

Note that because this is the first year of the grant, NYSED has waived the requirement that students participate for 30 hours in the program to be considered a participant for funding purposes, so this data is provided for informational purposes only. The grant request for proposal details the effect on funding for not meeting the participation target for non-profit sites:

"In grant years two through five, if less than 95% of the student participation target set forth in the 2017-2018 application's Participating Schools Form and reflected in the Composite Budget has met the minimum threshold of at least 30 hours to be considered a participant for the purposes of this RFP, the grantee's budget will be proportionately reduced by the amount of the percentage deficiency. For example, if 94% of the projected participants have attended 30 hours or more, the grantees budget will be reduced by 1% in the year of the deficiency. In the event of a shortfall in participation goals, grantees will be required to submit a budget amendment (FS10A) to indicate from which budget categories the reduction will be taken. The Final expenditure Report (FS10F) will then need to reflect this reduced budget amount when it is submitted by September 30 following each program year. This budget reduction will affect the fiscal year for which the attendance was reported, not the subsequent year. The following year's budget amount will return to the original annual grant award. There will be no fiscal impact in year one."

Table 2. Student Participation in Year 1

Site Name	Proposed Enrollment	Actual Number of Students			
		February 12, 2018	March 19, 2018	June 30, 2018	June 30, 2018 with 30 hours of participation ²
Balmville	150	63	89	115	97
Gardnertown	200	85	98	104	91
Gidney Avenue	200	130	157	179	138
Horizons	200	58	71	73	67
TOTAL	750 ¹	336	415	470	393

¹ Note that 95% of 750 students is 713 students.

² There were several days that after-school programming had to be canceled due to serious events. On November 20, 2017, a fire and explosion occurred in the afternoon at a local cosmetics factory which affected many of NECSD's families and the district was in crisis protocol mode. Also, the district was closed May 16-18, 2018 due to a storm and subsequent power outage.

By the end of Year 1 (June 30, 2018), a total of 470 students were participating, which is 63% of the 750 that were proposed. At each school, student participation was limited by the number of teachers that were willing to take part in the 21st CCLC program and students were wait-listed until a teacher applied to work in the 21st CCLC program and went through the approval process with the Board of Education. District policy requires students to be instructed by certified teachers in both the enrichment and tutoring sessions with a 10:1 student to teacher ratio. Each NPAA artist may also lead a group of students provided that a teacher aide or teacher is present so there may be up to 20 students in those groups. Teachers are now more familiar with the 21st CCLC program and recruitment for Year 2 should be more successful. Teacher feedback to apply for Year 2 included changing from four to three activity blocks (multi-week sessions), allow staff to not work in all three activity blocks, and end programming in April due to the increase in student participation in other activities.

The proposed 21st CCLC program targeted students that are economically disadvantaged (as indicated by eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch), students with LEP, students with disabilities, and students that scored at levels 1 and 2 on the New York State assessments. *Cayen* reports these student demographics, and others, as required by the APR and was used to generate the data shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Participant Demographics

		Balmville Elementary		Gardnertown Academy		Gidney Avenue Magnet School		Horizons on Hudson	
		Student Count	% of total (n=113)	Student Count	% of total (n=101)	Student Count	% of total (n=180)	Student Count	% of total (n=73)
Racial/Ethnic Group	American Indian or Alaskan Native	1	0.9%	0	0%	1	0.6%	0	0.0%
	Asian	0	0%	0	0%	3	1.7%	2	2.7%
	Black or African American	37	32.7%	23	22.8%	45	25.0%	35	47.9%
	Hispanic or Latino	34	30.1%	62	61.4%	117	65.0%	30	41.1%
	Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	White	28	24.8%	7	6.9%	5	2.8%	3	4.1%
	Two or More Races	13	11.5%	9	8.9%	8	4.4%	3	4.1%
	Data not provided	0	0%	0	0%	1	0.6%	0	0%
Gender	Male	58	51.3%	42	41.6%	86	47.8%	37	50.7%
	Female	55	48.7%	59	58.4%	92	51.1%	36	49.3%
	Data not provided	0	0%	0	0%	2	1.1%	0	0%
Other	Limited English Proficiency (LEP)	15	13.3%	35	34.7%	68	37.8%	9	12.3%
	Eligible for Free/Reduced Lunch	90	79.6%	69	68.3%	144	80.0%	65	89.0%
	Special Needs	16	14.2%	16	15.8%	31	17.2%	15	20.5%
	Family members	22	N/A	48	N/A	108	N/A	36	N/A

The grant proposal states that the schools had the following percentages of students that were eligible for free/reduced-price lunch: Balmville at 62.10%, Gidney Avenue at 76.22%, and Horizons on Hudson at 66.89%. Gardnertown Leadership Academy was not included in the original proposal. When comparing those percentages to the percentages for the 21st CCLC participants in Table 3, the 21st CCLC students are at a higher percentage for each school. Obtaining more current data on the school-wide demographics would clarify if the school population has changed or there truly is a higher percentage of students eligible for free/reduced-price lunch that participate in the 21st CCLC program.

The four schools had varying participation of students with LEP. At each school, however, the 21st CCLC program had a higher percentage of students with LEP than the whole school population as reported by NECSD staff. Balmville had 13.3% students with LEP in the 21st CCLC program (compared with 9.4% in the whole school population), Gardnertown had 34.7% (compared to 25.4%), Gidney Avenue had 37.8% (compared to 34.9%), and Horizons on Hudson had 12.3% (compared to 11.6%).

When looking at the population of students with special needs, the 21st CCLC programs had similar percentages of students as compared to their respective whole school as reported by NECSD staff. Balmville had 14.2% of students with special needs participating in the 21st CCLC program (compared to 12.4% in the whole school population), Gardnertown had 15.8% (compared to 15.4%), Gidney Avenue had 17.2% (compared to 17.9%), and Horizons on Hudson had 20.5% (compared to 19.6%).

Observed Service Quality

The first round of observations of the after-school program occurred on December 19, 2017 by L. Moulton and S. Silverstone of BRI as summarized in Table 4. The site coordinators of the three schools were advised that the first observations are part of the evaluability process (the multi-stage checklist is included in Appendix D) and are not to be construed as high-stakes. Because programming at the Gardnertown Leadership Academy did not start until January 31, 2018, observations were not performed at that site.

Table 4. First Round Observations

Site Name	Date and Time	# of Students	# of Adults¹
Gidney Avenue Magnet School (GAMS)	December 19, 2017 2:45 – 4:10 p.m.	125	13
Balmville Elementary	December 19, 2017 4:20 – 4:55 p.m.	70	7
Horizons on Hudson (HOH)	December 19, 2017 5:10 – 6:00 p.m.	66	8

¹ This number includes certified teachers, teaching assistants, and NPAA artists. Each site also has a security monitor, registered nurse, and clerk/typist.

Ms. Torres-Bender guided the observations of the 21st CCLC programs at the three schools. Each of the after-school programs is directed by an administrator (principal or assistant principal), although an HOH administrator was not available after-school and a high school principal who had formerly worked at Horizons was brought in for the role. As shown in Table 5, the 21st CCLC program followed the same format at the four schools. The snack was not funded by the grant.

Table 5. Two-hour Timeline of 21st CCLC After-school Program

20 minutes	40 minutes	40 minutes	20 minutes
Snack & Physical Activity	K – 2 nd grade students: Enrichment or Arts	K – 2 nd grade students: Tutoring	Reflection & Dismissal
	3 rd – 5 th grade students: Tutoring	3 rd – 5 th grade students: Enrichment or Arts	

Because GAMS had an earlier start time for the regular school day than the other three schools, the after-school program was held 3:15 – 5:15 p.m. The after-school program at the other three schools was held 4:15 p.m. – 6:15 p.m.

Enrichment activities were provided by NECSD teachers while art activities were generally provided by the BGCN through their NPAA. Due to the later start date of Gardnertown Leadership Academy, however, they did not have NPAA artists until the second year of the grant so Gardnertown staff provided all the enrichment and arts activities. Two NPAA artists were provided at each of the other three schools and they rotated among the three schools. A community partner was originally scheduled to offer chess as another enrichment activity option but had to withdraw the offer. Additional community partners (e.g., Girls on the Run) were added during the school year to offer a wider range of activities.

The students signed up for the enrichment or art activity they would like to participate in for each of the four blocks of the school year. School staff made the final determination in order to have an appropriate number of students, while balancing student personalities, and ensuring exposure to different activities. The activity blocks are shown in Table 6. A showcase event was generally held at the end of each activity block for families to come to school and see demonstrations and displays of the enrichment activities (e.g., artwork, yoga, hip hop).

Table 6. Activity Blocks

	Balmville Elementary, Gidney Avenue, Horizons on Hudson	Gardnertown
1st Activity Block	November 14, 2017-January 11, 2018	N/A
2nd Activity Block	January 16, 2018-February 28, 2018	January 31, 2018-March 8, 2018
3rd Activity Block	March 6, 2018-April 19, 2018	March 13, 2018-April 19, 2018
4th Activity Block	April 24, 2018-June 7, 2018	April 24, 2018-June 7, 2018

The 21st CCLC grant was also used to provide an event that was held for families in the evening (e.g., a *Lights on for Afterschool* family night was held at the Newburgh Free Library on October 26, 2017), on Saturdays (e.g., three different field trip locations for students with a parent/guardian), and offered exclusively for parents/guardians (e.g., an ESL class). Only the after-school programming was observed in December 2017.

Based on the observations at the four schools, BRI assessed the evaluability for the Stage 2 checklist and implementation fidelity. The analysis revealed the following overarching findings across the sites observed:

- The types of activities that were observed and their schedule aligned with the grant proposal.

- Throughout the observation timeframe, students were being supervised, the staff was attentive, and the students were engaged.
- The number of adult and student participants met the required ratio of ten students to one adult.
- The 21st CCLC program is separated from the regular school day by having the students come to the cafeteria (i.e., get out of the classroom) for physical movement (e.g., the students participate in *Go Noodle* activities), generally led by a small group of students. A hearty, pre-assembled snack box was also provided.
- Attendance-taking was observed at all three sites.
- Attendance sheets were collected at each session by a clerical person and returned to the school's office where a site binder and student files are stored.
- Parent orientation is required but was not part of the observation.
- Each of the three schools had a bulletin board in the entry way to promote the 21st CCLC program to staff, students, and parents.
- The 21st CCLC program was promoted on each school's web page of the district's web site.

The second round of observations occurred in Spring 2018 as summarized in Table 7. Observations of Family Learning Trips and programming for parents were not performed.

Table 7. Point of Service Quality Observations

Site Name	Date and Time	Grades Observed (Observer)	# of Students	# of Adults
Gidney Avenue	March 20, 2018 3:00 – 5:00 p.m.	K – 2 (L. Moulton)	37	8
	March 20, 2018 5:00 – 5:15 p.m.	3 – 5 partial (L. Moulton)	9	1
	May 22, 2018 3:00 – 3:45 p.m.	3 – 5 partial (L. Moulton & T.Herman)	19	2
Balmville Elementary	April 18, 2018 4:15 – 6:15 p.m.	K – 2 (L. Moulton)	34	7
		3 – 5 (T. Herman)	40	4
Gardnertown	April 19, 2018 4:15 – 6:15 p.m.	3 – 5 (L. Moulton)	48	7
		K – 2 (T. Herman)	30	7
Horizons on Hudson	May 22, 2018 4:00 – 6:15 p.m.	K – 2 (L. Moulton)	21	6
		3 – 5 (T. Herman)	20	2

The observation analysis reveals the following implementation/process findings across the four observed sites:

A. Strengths

There were many strengths observed during the site visits. They can be grouped into categories of activities, students, and staff. Observed strengths related to 21st CCLC **activities** include:

- The types of activities observed, and their schedule, aligned with the grant proposal.
- Because students may not always have a need for homework tutoring, rooms are also equipped with computers for students to access academic-based online learning that was age-appropriate.
- Social-emotional program from the school day continued in the after-school program (e.g., a social-emotional mood color chart was observed).
- Small group tutoring utilized games to reinforce skills (e.g., sight word bingo).
- Options for enrichment include outdoor play (when appropriate) and gym time (e.g., Math & Movement).
- Spaces are conducive to the scheduled activity (e.g., classrooms, gym, cafeteria, stage).
- An appealing mix of enrichment activities is available and students self-select their activity, although staff has to balance the number of attendees for each. NPAA artists offer popular options such as drumming and hip hop.
- A hearty snack was provided to all students (note that the snack is not funded by 21st CCLC funds).
- Transitions occurred on time, were executed smoothly, and attendance was taken at each stage.

Observed strengths regarding **students** include:

- Throughout the observation timeframe, students were being supervised, were engaged, and behaved respectfully. There was only one observed incident of misbehavior and it was dealt with appropriately.
- Based on observation of varying ethnicities in attendance, the target population appears to be being served. Student enrollment data was reviewed to support this observation.
- Since some parents do not speak English, it is helpful for students to get homework tutoring at school.

Observed strengths regarding **staff** include:

- Staff was generally attentive, respectful, and interested in conversing with students.

- The number of adult and student participants was appropriate and as expected compared to the provided schedules.
- Staff continued to monitor students if they needed to go in the hallway to get to the restroom or another classroom.
- Because the grant facilitator visits and observes at each school regularly, the students are familiar with her and happy to talk with her regarding the 21st CCLC program.
- School Resource Officers were observed at all four schools.
- Nurses were observed at all four schools.
- Administrative staff was observed at all four schools.
- Bus transportation to bring students home was provided as proposed.

B. Areas for Improvement

- Ensure that staff are aware of professional expectations. There was one instance of seeing a teacher on her phone at an inappropriate time but the circumstances are not known. A different teacher was observed talking loudly “at” students rather than with them, although it may be attributed to the teacher’s personality and demeanor.
- If students do not have homework as a starting point for tutoring, ensure that they have options for academic reinforcement such as online tutoring, online academic-based games, academic-based group board games or academic-based individual puzzles.
- Daily schedules are not always quickly available. Ensure that schedules are provided to each school’s staff.
- Ensure that NPAA artists are aware of student ability levels and how to handle various behaviors.

Although not observed, Family Learning Trips were offered at all four schools for 21st CCLC students and one adult (i.e., parent, guardian, or sibling over 18 years of age). Appendix E has a description of the trips along with attendance and survey results.

Outcome objectives

The evaluation plan in Appendix B also presents findings for Year 1’s outcomes based on Objective 2: “*Participants of 21st Century Community Learning Center Programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.*” with its two corresponding Sub-Objectives and NECSD’s Program Objectives.

Achievement is evaluated by considering iReady scores, surveys of teachers regarding the participants, and self-report through student surveys. **Behavior** is evaluated by exploring changes in referrals and absences in the regular school day. The teacher and student surveys also contain supporting information on student behaviors.

Student achievement is evaluated using iReady assessments in reading and math that were administered in Fall 2017 and Spring 2018. Table 8 shows the changes in iReady

scores for each grade level. The count of test scores, n, can vary between a school's reading and math calculations due to students not being available for the Fall 2017, Spring 2018, or both, assessments (i.e., scores for both Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 are needed).

Table 8. Percent Increase in iReady Scores from Fall 2017 to Spring 2018

Site Name	Total enrollment in June 2018	Reading		Math	
		n	Increase (%)	n	Increase (%)
Balmville	115	96	8.4	88	7.5
Gardnertown	104	99	9.1	100	7.3
Gidney Avenue	179	165	8.5	164	9.0
Horizons	73	69	7.6	64	6.3

The number of students with iReady scores are quite close to the number of 21st CCLC students enrolled per building by June 2018, indicating fairly representative data. The iReady scores for both reading and math at all four schools increased by over 6% overall, but none reached the performance indicator of success goal of 10%.

In addition to quantitative measures, surveys were administered to 21st CCLC students in grades K-3 and grades 4-5, as well as teachers of 21st CCLC participants. Participating students in grades K-3 were surveyed in late May through early June 2018. A detailed description of this survey and the results are included in Appendix F and, although there was a limited number of responses, students reported that the 21st CCLC program had a positive impact on them in both academic and social-emotional areas.

A more extensive survey was administered to participating students in grades 4-5, also in late May through early June 2018. This instrument is referred to as the Short-term Student Outcomes Survey (SSOS) and is fully described in New York State's 21st Century Community Learning Centers Evaluation Manual. A description of this survey and the results are included in Appendix G. Similar to the grades K-3 survey, responses were limited, but students indicated that the 21st CCLC program had a positive impact on them in all outcome areas.

Teachers of participating students were also surveyed in May through June 2018 to solicit their feedback on ten different student outcomes, at the individual level. A detailed description of the teacher survey and results is included in Appendix H. Although specific results varied among the four schools, overall, 59.01% of teachers reported that the grant had either a great or moderate impact on their students.

Absences and referrals for the regular school day were reviewed to determine changes in student behavior (see Table 9). The participating students' absences from the 2016-

2017 and 2017-2018 school years were compared to determine if there was an increase, decrease, or no change. The same calculation methodology was applied to participating students' referrals. In both instances, students would need to have been enrolled at NECSD for the 2016-2017 academic school year for data to be available. Students with no referrals in both years were not included.

Table 9. Changes in Student Participant Behaviors from 2016-2017 to 2017-2018

Site Name	Absences				Referrals			
	n	Increased (%)	Same (%)	Decreased (%)	n	Increased (%)	Same (%)	Decreased (%)
Balmville	109	56.9	3.7	39.4	25	76.0	8.0	16.0
Gardnertown	97	38.1	3.1	58.8	9	77.8	0.0	22.2
Gidney Avenue	170	78.2	2.9	18.8	40	77.5	12.5	10.0
Horizons	71	43.7	7.0	49.3	25	84.0	8.0	8.0

Changes in participating students' absences, on average, did not follow any trend. At two schools, Balmville and Gidney Avenue, the majority of students experienced an increase in absences, while the other two schools saw more students decrease in absences. With various factors affecting student absences, it is possible that student absences from school are not highly correlated with 21st CCLC program participation, especially in Year 1.

When looking at the referrals for the 21st CCLC participants, the number of students, n, included in the calculation is low compared to the number of participating students at each school (Table 2). All four schools are below 35% of participating students having any referrals, while Gardnertown is below 10%. This indicates that there are not many students with referrals, although, on average, most of those students increased in the number of referrals from the 2016-2017 to 2017-2018 school years.

In addition to looking at absences and referrals, which will both continue to be reviewed over the course of the grant, the surveys administered to students and teachers included questions about attendance and behavior issues (see Appendices F, G, and H). The majority of the few students that responded to the grades K-3 survey indicated that the 21st CCLC program helped them want to come to school as well as stay out of trouble. This theme was echoed with the limited number of students that responded to the grades 4-5 survey. The teacher survey did not contain a specific attendance-related question, but class participation, attentiveness, and engagement all had varying levels of improvement, according to teacher reports, as well as student outcomes such as behaving well in class and getting along with others. Although there were a limited number of surveys completed by all three groups, they all indicate that the 21st CCLC program supported positive behaviors in all four schools' students.

Quality of the program's links to the school day/school day staff

There were several links between the 21st CCLC program and the regular school day and the school day staff, which helped establish continuity. These links were evidenced during site observations and observed in documents:

- At all four schools, teachers, aides, the nurse, and SRO from the regular school day staffed the after-school program. This ensured that school rules were followed, including those for indoor and outdoor play, and that behavior expectations were adhered to.
- Student homework from the regular school day was the starting point for small group tutoring in the after-school program.
- At three of the schools, not including Horizons on Hudson, the administrator in charge of the after-school program was an administrator from the regular school day (i.e., principal or assistant principal). The administrators shared the after-school commitment which gave them all experience with the 21st CCLC program. At Horizons on Hudson, the after-school administrator had previously worked there and was familiar with the school.

Participant outreach

Outreach efforts to recruit and retain students included:

- Distributing a dedicated 21st CCLC newsletter several times throughout the school year to all students at a school
- Maintaining a dedicated 21st CCLC bulletin board in each school's entry way. Each of the four bulletin boards followed a list of required items, as established by the grant facilitator, to ensure completeness and consistency.
- Sending flyers home with students regarding field trips and the *Lights on Afterschool* event
- Posting on the NECSD web site throughout the school year to show photos and videos of 21st CCLC activities
- Robo-calls were made to each school's families informing them of the opportunity to register for the 21st CCLC program

Parent engagement efforts

Parent engagement efforts included:

- Distributing a dedicated 21st CCLC newsletter several times throughout the school year that contained parent/guardian education opportunities and "showcase" announcements (i.e., at the end of an activity session, students would perform, demonstrate, and display what they had been working on after-school; refreshments were provided)

- Inviting parents to participate in the PACT meetings as advertised on the bulletin board, district web site, and 21st CCLC newsletter
- Sending flyers home with students for parents/guardians targeted to adult education opportunities
- Posting throughout the school year on the NECSD web site to announce education opportunities as well as highlight student activities

Performance assessment/internal quality improvement efforts

Throughout Year 1 of the grant, performance was assessed, and internal quality improvements were implemented.

- Staff was provided with several professional development opportunities including: social and emotional learning, tutoring, lesson planning, transitioning, safety, Project Lead the Way (PLTW) certified training, and Math & Movement.
- The QSA was administered twice to 21st CCLC staff.
- The evaluability process was completed and the Checklist submitted in late December 2017 to the grant facilitator for signing and submission to NYSED. It included fidelity checks on three of the schools' implementation through site observations and documentation review. Gardnertown Leadership Academy did not start 21st CCLC programming until January and therefore was not part of the evaluability process. The Checklist is included in Appendix D.
- An Aloha Visit was performed by representatives from the Rest of State (ROS) Technical Assistance Resource Center on April 20, 2018. This type of visit is for new 21st CCLC grant awardees and includes a documentation review but not observations of programming. The representatives found the documentation to be complete and thorough.
- The grant facilitator attended NYSED trainings in January 2018 and May 2018.
- Common planning time was provided monthly for each school's staff.
- The grant facilitator regularly observed each site's programming and was continuously monitoring and supporting the 21st CCLC programming.

Barriers to program implementation

Through discussions with the grant facilitator and at PACT meetings, the primary implementation barrier that limited grant implementation was identified as an insufficient number of teachers interested in working in the after-school program. All four schools had the maximum number of students participating in their respective programs based on their number of teachers. Each school maintained a waiting list of students through the end of the school year.

Because of the shortage of teacher participation, additional teachers were not available when needed for back-up (e.g., a 21st CCLC teacher being out sick) to ensure coverage. When this occurred, students would either be combined with other student

groups while maintaining a student-to-staff ratio of 10:1, or the school administrator or the grant facilitator would step in and to handle that teacher's assignment for the day.

Attempts to address this barrier include exploring options with the teacher's union and posting a request for ideas on the NYS 21st CCLC discussion forum. The layout of Year 2 has been modified at teacher request to have three sessions rather than four as in Year 1, end after-school programming in April 2019 rather than May 2019, and allow staff to select the session(s) they would like to work in and not require them to work for the entire after-school program year.

Although not a substantial barrier, there were several days that after-school programming had to be canceled due to serious events. These included the November 2017 fire and explosion and the May 15-18, 2018 district shutdown due to storms and related power outage.

Evaluation utilization

Once formally contracted in late September 2017 (which was after grant start-up)), BRI maintained ongoing communication with the grant facilitator throughout Year 1 to promote evaluation utilization. BRI implements a collaborative evaluation approach, communicating with project directors on a regular basis and seeking input for customizing data collection and analysis to best provide formative and summative feedback. BRI attended the monthly PACT meetings, either in person or by phone, and provided updates on the evaluation status including the steps required for the evaluation process. The mid-year report was provided in late March 2018 with the primary finding that insufficient staffing was limiting student enrollment, which was being addressed throughout Year 1. The executive summary of this report will be presented at a Year 2 PACT meeting. The evaluator has observed the grant facilitator taking follow-up steps to recruit teachers, promote project sustainability (e.g., provide professional development to incorporate Math & Movement materials into the after-school program), offer professional development, and recruit additional members for the advisory board. In addition, a Year 2 timeline for both the evaluator and grant facilitator will be collaboratively developed to make a concerted effort to improve aspects that were lacking rigor in Year 1 (e.g., survey administration).

Conclusions and Recommendations

Unique to Year 1, NECSD had a short period to prepare for the 21st CCLC program's staffing, partner collaboration, planning, and student recruitment before the start date of November 14, 2017 for three schools and January 31, 2018 for the fourth school. While there were some shortcomings in meeting the performance indicators of success, the Year 1 program built a framework that will be utilized for subsequent years.

The following recommendations are provided to foster obtainment of the performance indicators of success. They are grouped in categories of staff, parents/guardians, students, and implementation.

Recommendations regarding staff

1. Ensure that all teachers and staff at the four school sites are familiar with the 21st CCLC program, even those that do not work in it. This will allow them to provide student recruitment suggestions, facilitate communication with 21st CCLC teachers and staff, and possibly interest additional staff to work in the 21st CCLC program.
2. Continue to recruit teachers and teaching assistants for all four school sites.
3. Ensure that staff is aware that any need for time off should be requested as soon as possible to ensure coverage by a substitute teacher. Although the grant facilitator or the school's administrator can step in for short-term, unexpected needs, they have other roles and a back-up process with substitutes is in place.
4. Ensure that staff are utilizing common planning time and documenting that time using the template provided by the grant facilitator.
5. Ensure that professional development for staff continues to be offered as needed, attended, and documented.

Recommendations regarding parents/guardians

1. Continue to recruit parents/guardians for adult learning. Parents could be inventoried to have them describe what learning opportunities they would attend, what time(s) and locations are preferred, and any barriers to attendance that could be addressed.
2. Connect with the schools' PTO to collaborate on ways to connect with parents/guardians for programs, offer to present at their meetings, and invite them to attend the PACT meetings.
3. Consider providing flyers, worksheets, or an activity book that parents/guardians and their children can do at home to reinforce what they learn during program time (e.g., a nutrition chart with recipe ideas) as another avenue for parent learning.

Recommendations regarding students

1. Students should continue to be recruited at all four school sites. If necessary, they should be put on a waiting list in order that they are readily available when teacher(s) are added to the 21st CCLC staff.

Recommendations regarding implementation

1. Continue efforts to develop a written sustainability plan to solidify specific resources needed to continue supporting the program, including researching opportunities and applying for grant funding, and exploring local partnerships.
2. Review the Year 1 QSA results and implement corrective actions as possible. Schedule two administrations of the QSA surveys for Year 2.

3. Continue to recruit members for the PACT, including parents/guardians and teachers. Although the proposal indicates that students would be included in the PACT, because of their young age, student voice could be indirectly included in the meetings without actual attendance. Students could share a story or input via a small meeting with a principal during school time and then he/she could present it at the PACT. A video of student testimonials could also be played during PACT meetings.

Strategies to address ongoing challenges

The primary challenge that the 21st CCLC program had in Year 1 was not having an adequate number of teachers to staff the program to allow student enrollment to reach proposed levels at all four schools. Teacher staffing was low due to the quick start-up time required for the grant and therefore teachers already having other obligations and not being available to commit to a full year of after-school programming. To proactively solve this problem, teacher recruitment for Year 2 started in Year 1 and changes are being considered (e.g., allowing teachers to select which activity periods they would like to participate in rather than requiring a full year commitment). Official job postings for teachers and teacher aides were publicized as soon as allowed in order to have them ready for approval by the Board of Education.

Saturday Family Learning Trips received positive feedback from the limited number of students and parents that responded to surveys after attending a trip. The challenge was that there were a significant number of student-adult pairs that did not show up on the morning of the trip, even though reminders were sent home and automatic phone calls were made. In order to promote the importance of attending, repercussions may need to be instituted (e.g., not being able to attend the next Family Learning Trip).

Parent education was offered but not attended. Rectifying this may require reaching out to parents to determine times of day, days of the week, topics, and locations that would be best suited to have a successful program. A school's parent-teacher organization (PTO) may have ideas or needs that could be a starting point. Discussions with school counselors could help define the needs of that school's parents. It can be hard to reach the parents that need the most support so varying ideas may need to be tried before finding some success. The grant coordinator might want to discuss these various challenges with the 21st CCLC Resource Center and/or other grant coordinators for additional strategies to consider.

**Appendix A:
Logic Model**

NECSD 21st Century Community Learning Center - Logic Model - 2/2/2018				
Resources	Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Impact
<i>In order to accomplish our set of Activities we will need the following:</i>	<i>We will conduct the following activities (based on program objectives from proposal):</i>	<i>Once completed or underway, these activities will produce the following evidence of service delivery:</i>	<i>We expect that if completed or ongoing, these activities will lead to the following short-term changes:</i>	<i>We expect that if completed these activities will lead to the following long-term changes.</i>
<u>Community Partner</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boys & Girls Club – Newburgh <u>Students</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GAMS (200 K-5) • Horizons (200 K-5) • Balmville (150 K-5) • Gardnertown (200 K-5) <u>Family members</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GAMS (75) • Horizons (75) • Balmville (75) • Gardnertown (75) <u>Program Advisory Council Team (PACT)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assistant Super. of Curriculum • Director of Grants • Project Director • School Principals (4) • Community Partner representative (1) • Student representatives • Teacher representatives • Parent representatives <u>Staff</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certified teachers • Teacher aides • Nurses • Clerical typists • Security monitors <u>Supplies & Materials</u> <u>Program budget</u> <u>Program facilities (4 schools)</u> <u>Professional Development Opportunities</u>	<p>High quality academic support in the core subjects of reading and literacy, mathematics, and science</p> <p>Enrichment and youth development opportunities that reinforce the regular school day academic program such as nutrition and health, art, music, technology, and recreation</p> <p>Establish and maintain partnerships within the community that continue to increase levels of community collaboration in planning, implementing, and sustaining programs (i.e. Program Advisory Council Team).</p> <p>Engage families by offering services to parents of participating children including Saturday Family Learning Trips and Parent University/Academy.</p>	<p>Programming will be provided for 6 hours per week during the school year and for 3-4 hours on four Saturdays.</p> <p>Participant students will attend at least 1 hour of tutoring or academic enrichment activities every day they attend.</p> <p>Participant students will attend at least 1 hour of enrichment or youth development activities related to health, the arts, prevention education, recreation, service learning, or other areas every day they attend.</p> <p>Parents, students, and community partners will be included on the PACT, which will meet at least quarterly.</p> <p>Students and parents will achieve a 95% attendance rate in the Saturday Family Learning Trips.</p>	<p>Students will increase ELA and Math achievement by 10%.</p> <p>Students who participate in the program will have a 75% increase of daily school attendance.</p> <p>50% of referrals and behaviors during the regular school day will decrease.</p> <p>Strengthened relationships between schools and families.</p> <p>An increase of 50% in parents that attend at least one Parent University/ Academy program, including literacy programs.</p>	<p>Student participants improve academic achievement.</p> <p>Partnerships established and maintained that continue to increase levels of community collaboration in planning, implementing, and sustaining programs.</p> <p>Parents have an opportunity to benefit from, and be involved with, their child's education.</p>

**Appendix B:
Evaluation Plan**

Objective 1: 21st Century Community Learning Centers will offer a range of high-quality educational, developmental, and recreational services for students and their families.

Sub-Objective 1.1: Core educational services. 100% of Centers will offer high quality services in core academic areas, e.g., reading and literacy, mathematics, and science.

Program Objective 1.1-1: Students who participate in the After School Academy will improve their academic achievement by 5% utilizing instruments such as iReady Diagnostic, the NYS assessment program, and project-based learning activities centered around STEAM.

Activities to Support This Program Objective	Performance Indicator(s) of Success	How It Will Be Measured	Year 1 Findings
After School Academy	Students will demonstrate 95% attendance rate in the program.	Attendance records	Cayen maintains data on each student's attendance, as well as average daily attendance, for each school. The attendance rate can then be computed by taking the ratio of average daily attendance to total number of attendees: Balmville: 69/115 = 60% Gardnertown: 70/104 = 67% Gidney Avenue: 111/179 = 62% Horizons: 56/73 = 77% It would be expected to not reach a high attendance rate (i.e., 95%) in Year 1.

Sub-Objective 1.2: Enrichment and support activities. 100% of Centers will offer enrichment and youth development activities such as nutrition and health, art, music, technology and recreation.

Program Objective 1.2-1: Community learning center will provide activities that promote health and wellness, and social and emotional learning in order to demonstrate an increase in attendance and positive school behavior reports for all student participants.

Activities to Support This Program Objective	Performance Indicator(s) of Success	How It Will Be Measured	Year 1 Findings
Boys and Girls Club of Newburgh (BGCN) - Artists in Residence program (NPAA – Newburgh Performing Arts Academy)	Students will achieve 95% attendance within the program	Attendance records	Because enrichment and support activities occur daily with the academic portion of the after-school program, the attendance rate is the same as shown in Sub-Objective 1.1.
	95% of students will find the program favorable based on exit survey.	Student survey	Surveys were administered to students in grades K-3 (Appendix F) and grades 4-5 (Appendix G). Both had a limited number of responses, but had positive feedback on all outcome areas.
Saturday Family Learning Trips	Students and parents will achieve a 95% attendance rate in the program.	Attendance records	Attendance by students and parents/guardians was recorded at all Saturday Family Learning Trips. • Locust Grove Estate: 74% (74 out of 100) students and 72% (72 out of 100) parents/guardians attended

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liberty Science Center: 46.5% (93 out of 200) students attended and 43.0% (86 out of 200) parents/guardians attended • National Geographic Experience: 57.5% (115 out of 200) students attended and 50.0% (100 out of 200) parents/guardians attended <p>This performance indicator was not met in Year 1, although it was primarily due to adults signing up to attend and then not coming on the day of the trip. Changes to the sign-up process will be implemented in Year 2.</p>
	90% of students and parents will find the program favorable through an exit survey	Exit survey	<p>Students were surveyed regarding the Saturday Family Learning Trips along with their outcome surveys in May and June 2018. Survey results for the Saturday Family Learning Trips are included in Appendix E.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students in grades K-3: Of the 15 respondents, the majority (12 students) had not previously been to the Family Field Trip location and all of the students either “liked” or “kind of” liked the trip. • Students in grades 4-5: Of the 16 respondents, the majority (9 students) had not previously been to the Family Field Trip location and all but 1 student indicated that they “liked” the trip.
Sub-Objective 1.3: Community Involvement. 100% of Centers will establish and maintain partnerships within the community that continue to increase levels of community collaboration in planning, implementing and sustaining programs.			
Program Objective 1.3-1: Each program site will develop two new community partnerships throughout the course of the grant.			
Activities to Support This Program Objective	Performance Indicator(s) of Success	How It Will Be Measured	Year 1 Findings
PACT Advisory Council	All stakeholders including the Girls and Boys Club and Director of FACE (Family and Community Engagement) will participate in 95% of meetings.	Meeting agendas	Nine PACT meetings were scheduled: October 11, 2017, November 20, 2017, December 18, 2017, January 22, 2018, February 26, 2018 (cancelled due to a mandatory safety meeting being scheduled), March 19, 2018, April 23, 2018, May 21, 2018 (cancelled due to attendees not being available due to school being closed May 16-18 due to a storm and power outage), and June 12, 2018. Note that this exceeds the grant requirement of four meetings.
		Attendance	To date, stakeholder representation has been extensive although parent/guardian attendance has been minimal and no students have attended (student “voice” could be indirectly included in the

			meetings, without actual attendance; see Recommendations section).
Parent University/Academy	Each site will host a Parent Academy event that includes at least 2 additional community organizations.	Program guide	There was not any attendance by parents/guardians at learning opportunities.
		Attendance in programs	There was not any attendance by parents/guardians at learning opportunities.
Sub-Objective 1.4: Services to parents and other adult community members. 100% of Centers will offer services to parents of participating children.			
Program Objective 1.4-1: Approximately 60 adults will participate in financial management, technology classes, and/or other adult community programs.			
Activities to Support This Program Objective	Performance Indicator(s) of Success	How It Will Be Measured	Year 1 Findings
Parent University/Academy	An increase of 50% in parents that attend at least one Parent University/Academy program, including literacy programs.	Attendance records	There was not any attendance by parents/guardians at learning opportunities.
	Of parents who attended the program, 90% will find the program favorable.	Exit survey	There was not any attendance by parents/guardians at learning opportunities.
Saturday Family Learning Trips	Students and parents will achieve a 95% attendance rate in the program.	Attendance records	Because students and parents/guardians attend Saturday Family Learning Trips together, attendance is noted above in Sub-Objective 1.2.
	Of parents who attended program, 90% will find the program favorable based on exit survey	Exit survey	The parent survey is discussed in Appendix E. Most parents had not been to the Family Field Trip locations, overall were satisfied, and shared positive comments. There was not a sufficient number of surveys completed to conclude that 90% found the program favorable, but those that did complete a survey (32 parents) did find the program favorable.
Sub-Objective 1.5: Extended hours. More than 75% of Centers will offer services at least 15 hours a week on average and provide services when school is not in session, such as during the summer and on holidays.			

Program Objective 1.5-1: 50% of Students and parents will participate in programming opportunities on an average of at least 90 hours throughout the program.			
Activities to Support This Program Objective	Performance Indicator(s) of Success	How It Will Be Measured	Year 1 Findings
After School Academy, Boys and Girls Club – Artists in Residence, Saturday Family Learning Trips, Parent Academy	Attendance in program activities will demonstrate at least 90 hours throughout the course of the program	Attendance records	<p>Attendance data as reported to NYSED/Measurement Inc. on the year-end (6/30/2018) participation spreadsheet was used to determine the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balmville = 37% of participants (42 out of 115) reached 90 hours. • Gardnertown = 0% of participants (0 out of 103) reached 90 hours. This school started programming on January 31, 2018 so it is expected that the goal was not reached. 63% of participants (65 out of 103) reach 45 hours. • Gidney Avenue = 48% of participants (86 out of 179) reached 90 hours. • Horizons on Hudson = 33% of participants (24 out of 73) reached 90 hours. <p>Although none of the four schools fully reached this level of attendance, it is expected that attendance will improve in Year 2 due to families' interest and experience with the program.</p>

Objective 2: Participants of 21st Century Community Learning Center Programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.

Sub-Objective 2.1: Achievement. *Students regularly participating in the program will show continuous improvement in achievement through measures such as test scores, grades and/or teacher reports.*

Program Objective 2.1-1: Regular participation by students will demonstrate continuous improvement in academic achievement.

Activities to Support This Program Objective	Performance Indicator(s) of Success	How It Will Be Measured	Year 1 Findings
After School Academy	Students will increase ELA and Math achievement by 10%	Results on iReady Diagnostic	<p>All four schools had an increase in iReady scores in both reading and math.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balmville = 8.45% in reading, 7.5% in math • Gardnertown = 9.1% in reading, 7.3% in math • Gidney Avenue = 8.5% in reading, 9.0% in math • Horizons on Hudson = 7.6% in reading, 6.3% in math <p>The increases were below the desired amount of 10%, however.</p>

Sub-Objective 2.2: Behavior. Regular attendees in the program will show continuous improvements on measures such as school attendance, classroom performance and decreased disciplinary actions or other adverse behaviors.

Program Objective 2.2 – 1: Regular participation by students will demonstrate continuous improvement in behavior.

Activities to Support This Program Objective	Performance Indicator(s) of Success	How It Will Be Measured	Year 1 Findings
Grant activities for students (i.e., After School Academy, BGCN, and Saturday Family Learning Trips)	50% of referrals and behaviors during the regular school day will decrease.	For students participating in the program, referrals for the 2016-2017 school year will be compared to referrals for the 2017-2018 school year.	The number of students with referrals in both the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 school years was less than 35% of the participating students, and in the case of Gardnertown, less than 9%. Therefore, many students were not applicable to this performance indicator. Of the relevant students, on average, the majority had an increase in referrals. Surveys of students in grades K-3, grades 4-5, and teachers, however, reported better attitudes towards school although all three surveys had low numbers of responses.
	Students who participate in program will have a 75% increase of daily school attendance.	For students participating in the program, attendance for the 2016-2017 school year will be compared to attendance for the 2017-2018 school year.	Data on student absences from the 2016-2017 to 2017-2018 school years shows that, on average, student absences did not decrease. Surveys of students in grades K-3, grades 4-5, and teachers do report better attitudes towards school. All three surveys, however, had low numbers of responses.

**Appendix C:
Evaluation Framework and Methodology**

Evaluation Framework and Methodology

Every funded program has objectives that relate to implementation (process) and outcomes. The evaluation plan aligns with the objectives and sub-objectives defined by NYS statutory. The logic model emphasizes that implementation fidelity will affect the intended outcomes on student achievement and behaviors.

Evaluation Framework

Using the theory of change approach, New York State's statutory objectives include both an implementation objective and an outcome objective. The implementation objective is: "21st CCLCs will offer a range of high quality educational, developmental and recreational services for students and their families." The outcome objective is: "Regular attendees in 21st CCLC programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes."

For the mid-year and annual local-level reports, the evaluator presented findings for four key implementation issues: 1) fidelity of implementation, 2) reach to the target population, 3) observed service quality, and 4) potential implementation barriers.

The evaluation framework was developed during the grant proposal stage to correspond with the proposed goals, measurable objectives and the expected outcomes of the program. Throughout the course of the evaluation, BRI maintained regular contact with the NECSD grant facilitator to ensure that the data collection tools and analysis supports the measurement of their goals, objectives, and expected outcomes. The evaluation facilitates NECSD's preparedness for federal-level APR reporting, following New York State guidelines, for the 21st CCLC Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) Indicators:

1. *Percentage of regular program participants whose math/English grades improved from fall to spring.*
2. *Percentage of regular program participants who meet or exceed the proficient level of performance on State Assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics.*
3. *Percentage of regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation.*
4. *Percentage of students with teacher reported improvements in student behavior.*
5. *Percentage of 21st CCLCs reporting emphasis in at least one core academic area.*
6. *Percentage of 21st CCLCs offering enrichment and support activities in technology.*
7. *Percentage of 21st CCLCs offering enrichment and support in activities in other areas.*

The formative design includes regular consultation with the grant facilitator, presenting at the PACT meetings (either in person or by phone), and providing immediate feedback loops after observations and after the surveys close. The evaluation team presents

formative feedback to the site in a timely manner as opposed to waiting for the mid-year or annual report to share findings and recommendations. The mid-year report provides an opportunity for course correction each grant year. Teachers, students, and parents have opportunities to comment on the 21st CCLC program through surveys, the QSA, and/or participating in the PACT meetings. They also may provide informal feedback to the grant facilitator or site administrators at any time.

The summative design of the evaluation includes a presentation of findings about the program participants and activities via written reports and presentations to the PACT. The summative component includes annual student outcomes on academic performance and behavior (via self-report and a teacher survey). The summative design also includes presenting the end-of-year program statistics or outputs (e.g., number of participants, hours of attendance, changes in regular school day attendance), which are compared to the performance indicator(s) of success, as shown in Appendix B

There are multiple evaluation questions.

1. The first evaluation question relates to the need that the 21st CCLC grant is meant to address. In the NECSD proposal, the need for the grant is described as providing a safe haven to support the academic and enrichment needs of students and their families. The evaluation will therefore examine, “To what extent did the 21st CCLC program safely meet the academic and enrichment needs of students and families that the 21st CCLC grant is meant to address?”
2. “To what extent were the goals and objectives met?”
3. “With what quality were the goals and objectives met?”

The BRI 21st CCLC evaluation team consists of a lead evaluator (Lynn Moulton), the BRI Director of Evaluations (Tracy Herman), and the BRI President (Dr. Sara Silverstone). The lead evaluator is the first point of contact for NECSD and is responsible for day-to-day management of the project, ongoing consultation with the grant facilitator, logic model development, attending PACT meetings, completing the evaluability checklist, instrument design, survey programming, data collection (including observing twice per year, surveys, documents, and extant data), data analysis, and preparing the interim and annual reports per year. The lead evaluator attends the “welcome” or “monitoring” visit conducted by the 21st CCLC ROS Resource Center or Peaceful Schools as requested. The lead evaluator participates in one-to-one meetings with the BRI Director of Evaluations and in group meetings to share progress and new information with the BRI 21st CCLC evaluation team. The Director of Evaluations oversees the quality and timeliness of all the lead evaluator’s deliverables (e.g., advisory board meeting presentations, logic model, instrument development, survey programming, data analysis, reports). She provides job-embedded professional development as needed with each lead evaluator and maintains meeting agendas with minutes for all team meetings. When appropriate, the Director also communicates with the site and may join the lead evaluator for client meetings, PACT meetings, and/or assistance with observations. She ensures BRI contractually fulfills its obligations to NECSD. The BRI President maintains the ultimate responsibility for the quality of all BRI work and manages the financial component of our service. As needed, she provides

input to the evaluation team. The BRI team collectively shares the responsibility of attending an annual statewide meeting to go to the evaluator's track at the 21st CCLC Rest of State conference, as well keeping informed of NYSED and Measurement Inc. communications (e.g., phone calls, emails, discussion boards).

Evaluation Plan

The evaluation plan (located in Appendix B) mirrors the "Goals and Objectives" table included in NECSD's grant application. This table includes the variables or performance indicators, data sources/instruments, and data collection methods.

Below is a summary of all evaluation activities completed to implement the evaluation plan from July 2017 through June 2018:

- Sent a BRI representative to the 21st CCLC meeting for awardees held in Geneva on August 18, 2017. Although this was prior to BRI being awarded the contract with NECSD, BRI is contracted with additional 21st CCLC projects.
- Led a kick-off conference call at project start-up to introduce the evaluator and school staff to one another; reviewed the 21st CCLC program and evaluation timeline; shared documents; and establish a short-term list of tasks for both NECSD and BRI.
- Presented via telephone at the second Program Advisory Council Team (PACT) meeting held on November 20, 2017 at Gidney Avenue Magnet School. The first PACT meeting was held on October 11, 2017 at NECSD's central office prior to BRI's involvement with the project. During the November meeting, BRI reviewed the evaluation services; solicited input for the program theory; presented a preliminary logic model (see Appendix A for the approved logic model); reviewed program indicators and measures to be used in the evaluation; and described the stages of the evaluability process.
- Completed the Stage 1 evaluability checklist after the second PACT meeting. See Appendix D.
- Discussed NECSD's data collection plans to verify that procedures are in place for systemically and systematically recording and/or entering all required data necessary for program evaluation purposes.
- Advised on parental notification and consent for data collection activities.
- Advised on QSA implementation.
- Developed an informal observation protocol to use as part of the evaluability process.
- Performed on-going review of documents (e.g., grant proposal, employee handbook, program schedule).
- Attended the third PACT meeting in person. It was held on December 18, 2017 at Horizons on the Hudson School. During this meeting, BRI reviewed the evaluation documents, the evaluability checklist, and discussed upcoming evaluation tasks.
- Conducted the first round of observations on December 19, 2017 to observe program implementation fidelity and readiness to be evaluated.
- Completed the Stage 2 evaluability checklist. See Appendix D.

- Completed the evaluability process -Stage 3 and forwarded to the grant facilitator for submission to NYSED.
- Sent a BRI representative to the 21st CCLC conference for awardees in January 2018. Multiple BRI staff met with the NECSD 21st CCLC project director during the conference.
- Attended the fourth PACT meeting held on January 22, 2018 at Balmville Elementary via telephone.
- Advised on the NYSED mid-year report due February 15, 2018.
- Planned on participating in the fifth PACT meeting via telephone. The meeting was scheduled to be held on February 26, 2018 at Horizons on the Hudson School, however the meeting was postponed and then cancelled. Some participants were asked to respond to certain questions via email for continued discussion at the next PACT meeting to be held on March 19, 2018.
- Attended the fifth PACT meeting in person. It was held on March 19, 2018 at Balmville Elementary School. BRI presented on the NYSED mid-year report, the status of the local-level evaluator's mid-year report, and the upcoming evaluation tasks which include the second site visit observations and survey development. The agenda was based on the February topics with some additions.
- Attended the April 23, 2018 PACT via phone and presented what the survey process entailed (i.e., consent forms, administering)
- Provided parental consent form for student surveys in both English and Spanish.
- Customized teacher survey and programmed into Survey Monkey.
- Customized student survey for grades K-3 to be administered on paper, including questions on outcomes and Family Field Trips.
- Customized SSOS for grades 4-5 and programmed into Survey Monkey. Included additional questions on Family Field Trips.
- Created satisfaction survey for those parents that attended a Family Field Trip and programmed into Survey Monkey.
- Scheduled to attend May 21, 2018 PACT meeting but the meeting was canceled due to regular attendees not being available due to school being closed May 16-18, 2018 due to storm and power outage and it being the first day back to school.
- Attended June 12, 2018 PACT by phone. Discussed survey status. Recommendation received to use a focus group with students in grades K-3.
- Analyzed extant data, survey data, observation data, and documents to inform annual reporting.
- Providing ongoing consultation for monitoring program implementation and success, as well as recommendations, as appropriate.
- Became familiar with *Cayen* software tool that NECSD implemented for 21st CCLC data (e.g., enrollment, attendance, test scores).

The quantitative data analysis included calculating descriptive statistics (e.g. totals, averages) and comparing the students' performance from pre-test to post-test, looking for the percentage of gain. The qualitative data underwent content analysis to cull themes. As an example, after each day of observing, the evaluator summarized the overall level of grant implementation (success and gaps) and well as successes, then

generated recommendations. Finally, all data was triangulated to address the evaluation questions.

Stakeholders have involvement in the evaluation process through the opportunity to join the PACT (e.g., program staff and families; student voice would be via survey or focus group), participation in the QSA, and responding to the appropriate surveys. During Year 1, stakeholder involvement in evaluation was limited, as reflected by minimal participation in PACT meetings - one time a family member attended and a couple of times a PTO representative attended. Teachers of 21st CCLC students, students in grades K-3, students in grades 4-5, and attendees to Family Learning Trips had surveys available, with students requiring parental consent.

Evaluation data are used to monitor progress and inform continuous program improvement via presentations at PACT meetings and bi-annual reports. BRI encourages the grant facilitator to share reports and presentations (e.g., handouts at meetings) to all grant stakeholders. Findings may be disseminated to a wider audience via message boards in the hallways, newsletters to parents, website news, etc. The grant facilitator, district administration, school administration, teachers, and community partner are encouraged to use the evaluation findings and recommendations for continuous program improvement.

The strengths of the data collection instruments include BRI's use of recommended instruments provided by the statewide evaluator (i.e., the Out of School Time observation protocol and Short-term Student Outcomes Survey). In addition, the grant facilitator was given the option of providing each survey in electronic and/or hard copy format. This flexibility was intended to increase the survey participation rate. BRI modeled the teacher survey on the sample provided by Measurement Inc. and modified the SSOS for the grades K-3 students, in consultation with the grant facilitator to utilize a small sample of the SSOS questions (i.e., nine vs. fifty questions) with terminology/language that resonates and/or practices emphasized in the district. Therefore, these instruments would be considered a limitation, as they were piloted this year. A limit in the data collection methodology was teacher, student, and parent sampling for the surveys, due to the timing of the survey administration and the demand on teachers. Survey administration will be reviewed and adjusted for Year 2.

Engagement & Communication

The evaluation team strategically planned evaluation activities so they would not interfere with program activities by being flexible with the grant facilitator in scheduling meetings, survey administration periods, and observations, as long as they aligned with the general timelines established in the NYS 21st CCLC evaluation manual and updated timelines provided by the 21st CCLC Resource Center and/or NYSED.

If necessary, BRI would communicate any immediate concerns about observations (e.g., safety, school protocols, teacher or student behaviors) directly to the grant facilitator within 24 hours of the observation. As needed, communications could extend beyond the grant facilitator by including administrative staff, program staff, and/or the PACT members.

**Appendix D:
Completed Stage 1 and Stage 2 Checklists**

The Evaluability Process Checklist

Grantee Name Newburgh Enlarged Central School District Award Date April 28, 2017

Program Director Susan Torres-Bender Evaluator Name: Brockport Research Institute

Stage 1 - Initial Stage of the Evaluability Process: To be completed within two months of the funding award date. If funding award date was July 1, Stage 1 should be completed by August 31. For later funding award dates NYSED may revise this completion date for Year 1 only.

	Yes	No
1. Is an advisory group in place and functioning that adequately represents the program's key stakeholders?	X	
Explanation of extenuating circumstances, No. 1:		
2. Did the advisory group convene its first meeting within 2 months following the funding award date - By August 31 st ? (If yes, but at a later time, please provide a brief explanation as to why this occurred at a later date than advised)		X
Explanation of extenuating circumstances, No. 2: The Project Director was an external hire and was approved by the Board of Education on August 17, 2017 to start on September 1, 2017. The first PACT meeting was held on October 11.		
3. At the advisory group meeting, was the program theory agreed upon with all stakeholders?	X	
4. At the advisory group meeting, was a logic model of the program created and/or reviewed with stakeholder involvement that reflects the program theory?	X	
5. At the advisory group meeting, were the program objectives reviewed with stakeholders and re-assessed for alignment with the program theory?	X	
6. At the advisory group meeting did the evaluator review the indicators and measures that would be used and did the evaluator provide program stakeholders with the rationale for how and why they will effectively measure the implementation and outcomes of the program?	X	
Explanation of extenuating circumstances, Nos. 3-6:		
7. At the advisory group meeting, did the evaluator notify the stakeholders regarding activities that would take place as part of Stage 2 in the Evaluability Process and that they would occur one to two months following the program start date?	X	
8. At the advisory group meeting did the evaluator share the Evaluability processes that are included in Stage 2 so that program staff will be aware of program implementation expectations and their importance to the evaluation of the program?	X	

Stage 2- Follow-up Stage of the Evaluability Process: To be completed one to two months following the program start date, the evaluator will assess the following criteria during an on-site Evaluability Review (This will typically occur in November or December annually. NYSED may adjust the completion date for Stage 2 in Year 1 only if delays in program start-up occurred in the first year.)

	Yes	No
1. Based on the evaluator's observation of program activities and a review of program documents, is the program being implemented as designed? If NO, please clarify:	X	
2. Does the program have a timeline of program activities that will be occurring during the program year so that an evaluation timeline can be created and provided to the program staff and other stakeholders?	X	
3. Does the program have an employee handbook that clarifies internal policies and procedures?	X	
4. Is there a procedure in place for systemically and systematically recording and/or entering all required data necessary for program evaluation purposes?	X	
5. Are parents/guardians of participants being provided with, at intake into the program, the parental consent form asking for their permission to allow their child to participate in the evaluation of this program? At the State level this is required for the Short-term Student Outcomes Survey. At the local level it would include any additional means of collecting evaluation data from program participants which may include additional surveys, interviews, focus groups, etc.	X	

Check one of the following based on evaluator determination of program evaluability.

Yes, this program is ready to be evaluated.

No, this program is not ready to be evaluated at this time. (Please refer to Option 1 and Option 2 below)

OPTION 1: Date of anticipated re-review of program readiness and re-submission of Checklist (Not to exceed 30 days):

OPTION 2: I recommend that this program be referred to the Statewide Technical Resource Centers. Re-review date to be determined in consultation with the Statewide Technical Resource Centers.

Jason James Bond 12/14/17

Project Director's Signature Date

Lisa J. Moore 12/19/17

Local Program Evaluator's Signature Date

Stage 3: Submit this checklist to the NYSED two weeks following completion of Stage 2 or by December 31 Annually (NYSED may adjust the submission date in Year 1 if the Program had a delayed start-up date)

**Appendix E:
Saturday Family Learning Trip Summary**

Saturday Family Learning Trip Summary

The Saturday Family Learning Trips exposed students and adults to a variety of experiences. Each trip included a light breakfast, busing to the location, lunch, and busing back to the school where the trip originated. Food was not funded by the 21st CCLC grant. Students were not required to specifically bring a parent/guardian. An adult family member over 18 years old was sufficient. Although many students were accompanied by a parent, there were also grandparents and, in at least one instance, a great-grandparent that attended the Family Learning Trip.

There were three trip destinations. Locust Grove is a National Historic Landmark with a museum, nature preserve, antique exhibits, and art gallery. The Liberty Science Center explores how people communicate and the science of energy and how it is used around the world. The National Geographic Encounter: Ocean Odyssey was located in Times Square in New York City and allowed visitors to participate in a simulated interactive, immersive walk from the South Pacific to the coast of California.

Because there was not enough capacity for all students to attend each Family Learning Trip, participation was on a first come, first served basis. The table below shows the locations of the Family Learning Trips along with the attendees. The student and adult counts do not match in all cases due to a few adults being paired with two or more children due to siblings participating in the 21st CCLC program. Participation was below the desired level of 95% for each Family Learning Trip because, although adults registered themselves and their student and the trips appeared to be at capacity, many did not show up on the morning of the trip. This occurred even when automatic phone calls and flyers were utilized as reminders. Strategies for improving participation are being considered for Year 2.

Saturday Family Learning Trips

Data shown is formatted as: number of students, number of adults

Location (Date)	Balmville Elementary	Gardnertown Academy	Gidney Avenue	Horizons on Hudson	Total	Maximum Capacity	Participation (%)
Locust Grove Estate (4 trips during January & February 2018)	Not available	Not available ¹	Not available	Not available	74, 72	100, 100	74.0%, 72.0% (n = 100)
Liberty Science Center (April 14, 2018)	20, 17	21, 21	33, 29	19, 19	93, 86	200, 200	46.5%, 43.0% (n = 200)
National Geographic Encounter: Ocean Odyssey (May 12, 2018)	16, 12	26, 26	42, 38	31, 24	115, 100	200, 200	57.5%, 50.0% (n = 200)

¹ Only participating students in grades 3 and 4 were invited to attend the February 2018 field trip because Gardnertown had just begun participating in 21st CCLC on January 31, 2018 and there was not enough time to sign up students from grades K-2.

Students and parent/guardians were surveyed regarding their Family Learning Trip experience(s). Students in grades K-3 had a paper survey that was distributed to the same students that had parental consent to participate in the Grades K-3 Student

Survey (see Appendix F). Not all students that completed the Student Survey (21 students) also completed the Family Learning Trip survey (15 students): Locust Grove Estate had 4 responses, Liberty Science Center had 5 responses, and National Geographic Encounter had 7 responses. The majority (12 students) had not previously been to the Family Field Trip location and all of the students either “liked it” or “kind of” liked it; no one indicated that they did not like it. One student left a comment regarding the National Geographic Encounter, “I liked the 3D movie. We got swallowed by a shark. I would like to go on all field trips.”

Students in grades 4-5 were surveyed online using Survey Monkey. Students that had parental consent to participate in the Grades 4-5 Student Survey (see Appendix G) were asked the Family Learning Trip questions as an extension to the Student Survey. That way there was not a second survey to access and would therefore increase the number of responses.

- Five of the twenty respondents indicated that they had participated in the Locust Grove Estate trip. All five students indicated that they had never been there before, while four students indicated that they liked the trip and one indicated that he/she did not.
- Six of the twenty respondents indicated they had attended the Liberty Science Center Family Learning Trip. Although five students indicated that they had previously been there, all six indicated that they liked the trip.
- Five of the twenty respondents indicated that they had attended the National Geographic Encounter: Ocean Odyssey Family Learning Trip. Two students indicated that they had been there before and all five liked the trip.

Parents/guardians were also surveyed. Although an online survey was available through Survey Monkey, it was not utilized and paper surveys that were distributed at the conclusion of each Family Learning Trip were a more effective method of obtaining responses. Because the survey was being developed while field trips were occurring, only those field trips that occurred after the survey was available have responses.

Four parents of Horizons on Hudson students completed the survey regarding the Family Learning Trip to Liberty Science Center. None of the four had been there before and all agreed that it was interesting, they learned something new, and they enjoyed meeting other families. Overall, all four parents indicated that they were very satisfied and commented, “Appreciate field trips are on Saturday. It let us parent be more involved.” and “It is an amazing program and I am very grateful [son’s name] is involved in it!”

Ten parents of Gardnertown Leadership Academy students completed the survey regarding their visit to National Geographic Encounter. Eight parents indicated that they had not been there before. Eight of the parents indicated that, overall, they were very satisfied and the remaining two parents indicated that they were satisfied. Seven parents agreed that the trip was interesting to them as well as their student and that they both learned something, although two parents neither agreed, nor disagreed. Comments included, “It was amazing!” and “Gives me the chance at visiting many

places that I won't personally plan."

Ten parents of Gidney Avenue students completed the survey regarding the Family Learning Trip to National Geographic Encounter. Eight indicated that they had not been there before and agreed that the trip was well-organized, it was interesting to their student, and that their student learned something new. All but one parent indicated that, overall, they were very satisfied in general with the trip. Comments included, "I was able to learn as well as the children." and, translated from Spanish, "Because it's a way that my children are able to know other places and understand different things."

Eight parents of Horizons on Hudson students completed the survey regarding the Family Learning Trip to National Geographic Encounter. Seven indicated that they had not been there before. Seven indicated that, overall, they were very satisfied with the eighth indicating satisfied. Comments included, "new experiences are great and we don't get the chance otherwise," "very interesting to explore new things with the children," and "this is a wonderful way to bring family together."

Although the parents have students in each of the four schools, many realized that exposing their children to new places and experiences was beneficial and they appreciated being able to do it with them. Most parents indicated that they had not been to the Family Field Trip location prior to going with the 21st CCLC program.

**Appendix F:
Student Survey Summary: Grades K-3**

Student Survey Summary: Grades K-3

The Grades K-3 Student Survey is based on the Short-term Student Outcomes Survey (SSOS) contained in New York State's 21st Century Learning Centers Evaluation Manual. Because that survey is intended for students in grades 4-12, BRI developed an abbreviated version in consultation with the grant coordinator, that contains one or two questions from each of the eight outcome categories: academic (question 1), community involvement (question 2), life skills (question 3), positive core values (questions 4 and 5), positive life choices (question 6), sense of self (question 7), sense of future (question 8), and opportunity (question 9).

The Grades K-3 Student Survey was administered on paper in May and June 2018 to students at Balmville Elementary, Gidney Avenue Magnet School, and Horizons on Hudson to those students whose parent/guardian had returned the parental consent form. Because the form was only available close to the end of the 21st CCLC year, Gardnertown Leadership Academy opted to not participate in Year 1. For Year 2, parental consent for surveys is included in the online registration.





School staff read an introduction to small groups of students to inform them that: a parent/guardian had given consent for the student to participate in the survey, that their answers would be kept confidential, and that a summary would be shared in order to improve 21st CCLC programming. The students were also informed that they could skip any questions, that there were no right or wrong answers, and that their answers would not affect their participation in the 21st CCLC program. Students could decline to take the survey. An adult was allowed to read questions to those students having difficulty.

Parental consents were received for 24 students and 21 students responded to the survey. It is not clear if they declined to take the survey or if the 21st CCLC program had ended. Responses were received from:

- Balmville: 15 students (nine in 1st grade, three in 2nd grade, two in 3rd grade, one was not indicated)
- Gidney Avenue: 2 students (both in 1st grade)
- Horizons on Hudson: 4 students (two in Kindergarten, one in 1st grade, one in 2nd grade)

They were then shown a sample question that was already answered and then allowed to practice by answering a different sample question. The survey results are shown in the following table. Because of the low number of responses, they were combined and each school's is not shown separately. Note that because students were allowed to skip any question, the total number of responses for each question, n, is included in the table. Also, if students marked two answers to a question, both were disregarded.

Responses to Grades K-3 Student Survey

Coming to the After-School Program this year has helped me to...	Yes 	Kind of 	No 	I was already doing fine. 	Number of survey responses, n (max = 21)
1. Do better in school	15	4	2	0	21
2. Feel more important to my community	14	3	2	1	20
3. Do better at making friends	20	0	0	0	20
4. Care more about others	13	3	5	0	21
5. Tell the truth more often	14	4	1	1	20
6. Stay out of trouble	12	3	4	2	21
7. Feel better about myself	20	0	1	0	21
8. Want to come to school	16	4	1	0	21
9. Try new things	18	0	1	1	20

Although there are not sufficient responses to draw significant conclusions, the majority of students indicates that the 21st CCLC program had helped them in all nine outcomes.

The students were also asked “*What would you like to share about being in the after-school program?*” to allow them to offer additional insights. Two students responded (note: responses are presented as raw, uncleaned data):

- “*I liked playing the drums the most.*” ~2nd grade girl
- “*I like to do PBL*” ~2nd grade girl

Overall, the survey responses indicate that the 21st CCLC program had a positive impact on the grade K-3 students in both academic and social-emotional areas.

**Appendix G:
Student Survey Summary: Grades 4-5**

Student Survey Summary: Grades 4-5

The Short-term Student Outcomes Survey (SSOS) is fully described in New York State's 21st Century Community Learning Centers Evaluation Manual. The survey asks students for their feedback on how the 21st CCLC program affected them during the 2017-2018 academic calendar program.

School staff administered the survey via Survey Monkey in May and June 2018 to the total of 20 students from Balmville Elementary, Gidney Avenue Magnet School, Gardnertown Leadership Academy, and Horizons on Hudson whose parent/guardian had returned the parental consent form. For Year 2, parental consent for the surveys is included in the online registration.

The survey introduction informed the students that: a parent/guardian had given consent for the student to participate in the survey, that their answers would be kept confidential, and that a summary would be shared in order to improve 21st CCLC programming. The students were also informed that they could skip any questions, that there were no right or wrong answers, and that their answers would not affect their participation in the 21st CCLC program. An adult was allowed to read questions to those students having difficulty. Although students could decline taking the survey in one of the initial survey questions, all 20 consented to complete the survey. The breakdown of students by school and grade level is shown below.

Grades 4-5 Student Survey Responses

Site Name	4 th grade students	5 th grade students	TOTAL
Balmville	2	1	3
Gardnertown	6	5	11
Gidney Avenue	0	4	4
Horizons on Hudson	2	0	2
TOTAL	10	10	20

Ten girls (50%) and ten boys (50%) completed the survey. The survey questions were grouped into eight outcomes with the survey results shown in the following table. Note that because students were allowed to skip any question, the total number of responses received for each question, n, is included in the table.

Outcome Category		Yes	Kind of	No	I was already doing fine.	Number of responses, n (max = 20)
Positive Life Choices	Being involved in the 21st Century After-School Program has helped me to make healthier choices about...					
	What I eat	13	5	1	0	19
	Exercise	17	0	2	1	20
	Tobacco	6	1	8	3	18
	Alcohol	6	1	9	2	18
	Drugs	5	2	9	2	18
	Being involved in the 21st Century After-School Program has helped me to...	Yes	Kind of	No	I was already doing fine.	Number of responses, n (max = 20)
	Say 'no' to things I know are wrong	16	3	0	1	20
	Stay out of trouble	11	6	2	0	19
	Avoid violence and fighting	15	2	1	1	19
Academic	Coming to the 21st Century After-School Program has helped me to...	Yes	Kind of	No	I was already doing fine.	Number of responses, n (max = 20)
	Do better in school	16	3	0	0	19
	Improve my grades in school	10	8	0	1	19
	Try harder in school	16	1	0	1	18
	Participate more in class activities	13	6	0	0	19
	Become more interested in going to school	9	8	1	1	19
	Care more about my school	16	3	0	0	19
	Get along better with my classmates	14	4	1	0	19
	Get along better with my teachers	17	1	0	1	19
	Spend more time doing my homework	11	8	0	1	20
Community Involvement	Coming to the 21st Century After-School Program has helped me...	Yes	Kind of	No	I was already doing fine.	Number of responses, n (max = 20)
	Feel more important to my community	13	5	1	0	19
	Feel a stronger connection to my community	12	6	0	0	18
	Spend more time volunteering or helping others in my community	13	6	1	0	20
Life Skills	Because I came to the 21st Century After-School Program...	Yes	Kind of	No	I was already doing fine.	Number of responses, n (max = 20)
	I get along better with other people my age	18	2	0	0	20
	I am better at making friends	11	5	0	2	18
	I am better at telling others about my ideas and feelings	6	9	3	0	18
	I am better at listening to other people	16	1	0	2	19

	I work better with others on a team	9	8	2	0	19
	I make better decisions	14	3	2	0	19
	I am better at planning ahead	11	5	2	0	18
	I am better at setting goals	11	7	1	0	19
	I am better at solving problems	12	3	3	1	19
	I am more of a leader	17	2	0	0	19
	I am better at taking care of problems without violence or fighting.	15	2	1	1	19
Positive Core Values	Because I came to the 21st Century After-School Program...	Yes	Kind of	No	I was already doing fine.	Number of responses, n (max = 20)
	I care more about other people	14	4	1	0	19
	I care more about the feelings of other	15	4	0	0	19
	I tell the truth more often even when it is hard	15	2	0	2	19
	I am better at standing up for what I believe	12	5	1	0	18
	I am better at taking responsibility for my actions	14	4	0	2	20
Sense of Self	Coming to the 21st Century After-School Program has helped me to...	Yes	Kind of	No	I was already doing fine.	Number of responses, n (max = 20)
	Feel better about myself	16	2	0	2	20
	Feel that I have more control over things that happen to me	13	3	1	2	19
	Feel that I can make more of a difference	14	5	0	0	19
	Learn I can do things I didn't think I could do before	18	1	0	0	19
	Feel better about my future	12	5	1	1	19
	Feel I am better at handling whatever comes my way	10	7	0	2	19
Sense of Future	Coming to the 21st Century After-School Program has helped me to...	Yes	Kind of	No	I was already doing fine.	Number of responses, n (max = 20)
	Think about jobs or future careers	14	4	2	0	20
	Think about college or other training after high school	11	4	2	2	19
	Want to stay in school	16	3	0	0	19
	Think about my future	17	2	0	0	19
	Set goals for myself	16	2	1	0	19
Opportunity	Coming to the 21st Century After-School Program has helped me to...	Yes	Kind of	No	I was already doing fine.	Number of responses, n (max = 20)
	Try new things	20	0	0	0	20
	Do things here I don't get to do anywhere else	13	2	4	0	19

Like the grades K-3 student survey, there are not sufficient responses to draw significant conclusions. From reviewing the responses, however, the majority of students selected “Yes” or “Kind of” for all questions in the eight outcome areas.

The students were also asked “*What would you like to share about being in Program?*” to allow them to offer any additional insights. Sixteen students responded; several of their replies are included here (note: responses are presented as raw, uncleaned data):

- *“i like being in the program cause it lets you learn and to get along with other people”* ~4th grade student from Gardnertown
- *“being with friends”* ~4th grade student from Gardnertown
- *“The after school program is a really fun place to try new things.”* ~5th grade student from Gidney Avenue
- *“That it is fun and it helped me and show me different things.”* ~4th grade student from Balmville

Overall, the SSOS responses indicate that Year 1 of the 21st CCLC program had a positive impact on the grade 4-5 students in academic, enrichment, and social-emotional areas.

**Appendix H:
Teacher Survey Summary**

Teacher Survey Summary

The Teacher Survey was administered online via Survey Monkey in May through June 2018 and asked classroom teachers for feedback on students participating in the 21st CCLC program during the 2017-2018 academic calendar program. The survey was disseminated to all K-5 classroom teachers in the four schools that had 21st CCLC students. One hundred and twenty-two responses were received from 39 teachers. The table below shows the distribution of responses at each of the four schools, by grade level.

Number of Completed Teacher Surveys by School and Grade Level

School Name	K	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	TOTAL
Balmville Elementary (from 6 teachers)	3	10	0	1	0	5	19
Gardnertown (from 10 teachers)	1	0	3	1	14	11	30
Gidney Avenue (from 17 teachers)	7	14	12	2	2	12	49
Horizons on Hudson (from 6 teachers)	1	0	4	18	0	1	24
TOTAL	12	24	19	22	16	29	122

The teachers were asked in a retrospective pre-post-test “*To what extent has the student changed their behavior in terms of...*” followed by ten fundamental student outcomes, comparing Spring 2018 to Fall 2017 performance. The teachers were directed to respond in terms of the impact attributable to 21st CCLC programming. The table below summarizes the responses from teachers, by school. The responses in each cell of the table are stacked in alphabetical order: Balmville Elementary (n=19), Gardnertown Leadership Academy (n=30), Gidney Avenue Magnet School (n=49), and Horizons on Hudson (n=24).

Responses to Survey, By Building

STUDENT OUTCOMES	TEACHER RESPONSES (%)								
	Balmville, n = 19		Gardnertown, n = 30			Gidney Avenue, n = 49		HOH, n = 24	
	N/A	Did not need to improve	Improvement			No change	Decline		
Significant			Moderate	Slight	Slight		Moderate	Significant	
1. Turning in homework on time.	0%	47.4%	15.8%	10.5%	10.5%	10.5%	5.3%	0%	0%
	0%	26.7%	16.7%	20.0%	13.3%	20.0%	3.3%	0%	0%
	0%	24.5%	16.3%	26.5%	16.3%	14.3%	2.0%	0%	0%
	4.2%	20.8%	29.2%	12.5%	20.8%	12.5%	0%	0%	0%
2. Completing homework to your satisfaction.	0%	63.2%	10.5%	10.5%	5.3%	10.5%	0%	0%	0%
	0%	6.7%	40.0%	26.7%	20.0%	6.7%	0%	0%	0%
	0%	10.2%	26.5%	32.7%	14.3%	12.2%	4.1%	0%	0%
	4.2%	8.3%	37.5%	25.0%	12.5%	12.5%	0%	0%	0%
3. Participating in class.	0%	36.8%	5.3%	10.5%	5.3%	42.1%	0%	0%	0%
	0%	16.7%	26.7%	26.7%	20.0%	10.0%	0%	0%	0%
	0%	16.3%	12.2%	32.7%	22.4%	14.3%	2.0%	0%	0%
	0%	16.7%	33.3%	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%	0%	0%	0%
4. Volunteering (e.g., for more responsibilities)	0%	31.6%	5.3%	5.3%	15.8%	42.1%	0%	0%	0%
	0%	10.0%	26.7%	30.0%	23.3%	10.0%	0%	0%	0%
	0%	10.2%	8.2%	28.6%	32.7%	20.4%	0%	0%	0%
	0%	16.7%	33.3%	16.7%	12.5%	20.8%	0%	0%	0%
5. Being attentive in class.	0%	26.3%	5.3%	10.5%	0%	52.6%	0%	5.3%	0%
	0%	20.0%	13.3%	30.0%	20.0%	16.7%	0%	0%	0%
	0%	16.3%	10.0%	28.6%	18.4%	22.4%	2.0%	2.0%	0%
	0%	8.3%	37.5%	12.5%	16.7%	25.0%	0%	0%	0%
6. Behaving well in class.	5.3%	42.1%	5.3%	10.5%	0%	26.3%	5.3%	5.3%	0%
	3.3%	30.0%	3.3%	23.3%	20.0%	20.0%	0%	0%	0%
	0%	36.7%	4.1%	16.3%	16.3%	18.4%	8.2%	0%	0%
	0%	8.3%	37.5%	12.5%	20.8%	20.8%	0%	0%	0%
7. Engagement & interest in Math.	0%	21.1%	5.3%	15.8%	0%	57.9%	0%	0%	0%
	0%	3.3%	20.0%	40.0%	30.0%	6.7%	0%	0%	0%
	0%	20.4%	12.2%	26.5%	26.5%	12.2%	2.0%	0%	0%
	0%	12.5%	41.7%	25.0%	12.5%	8.3%	0%	0%	0%
8. Engagement & interest in Science.	0%	21.1%	5.3%	15.8%	0%	57.9%	0%	0%	0%
	0%	6.7%	16.7%	43.3%	26.7%	6.7%	0%	0%	0%
	0%	18.4%	10.2%	24.5%	30.6%	16.3%	0%	0%	0%
	0%	12.5%	37.5%	20.8%	16.7%	12.5%	0%	0%	0%
9. Getting along well with others.	0%	42.1%	5.3%	10.5%	0%	36.8%	5.3%	0%	0%
	3.3%	16.7%	20.0%	23.3%	16.7%	20.0%	0%	0%	0%
	4.1%	32.7%	8.2%	18.4%	14.3%	20.4%	2.0%	0%	0%
	0%	12.5%	33.3%	16.7%	16.7%	20.8%	0%	0%	0%
10. Displaying effort to "Seek first to understand"	0%	36.8%	5.3%	5.3%	5.3%	47.4%	0%	0%	0%
	0%	13.3%	23.3%	30.0%	26.7%	6.7%	0%	0%	0%
	0%	18.4%	16.3%	22.4%	16.3%	22.4%	4.1%	0%	0%
	0%	8.3%	37.5%	16.7%	20.8%	16.7%	0%	0%	0%

The teachers were also asked "Given the various factors that could contribute to changes in student behavior, in your opinion, to what extent did the 21st CCLC program impact the student?" The following table summarizes their responses.

Teachers' Perception of Grant Impact on Their Students

Site Name	To a great extent		To some extent		To a little extent		To no extent		I don't know	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Balmville	0.00%	0	26.32%	5	26.32%	5	47.37%	9	0.00%	0
Gardnertown	23.33%	7	46.67%	14	13.33%	4	13.33%	4	3.33%	1
Gidney Ave.	10.20%	5	63.27%	31	10.20%	5	10.20%	5	6.12%	3
Horizons	16.67%	4	25.00%	6	25.00%	6	12.50%	3	20.83%	5
TOTAL	13.11%	16	45.90%	56	16.39%	20	17.21%	21	7.38%	9

Balmville Elementary

There were 19 responses from six Balmville teachers. Of the six teachers, one worked in the 21st CCLC program and five did not.

Although there was at least minor improvement in all ten attributes, the teachers indicated that some students did not need to improve for each area, ranging from 21.1% (engagement and interest in science and math) to 63.2% for completing homework to their satisfaction. Higher percentages of “no change” were reported for engagement and interest in math (57.9%) and in science (57.9%), being attentive in class (52.6%), and displaying effort to “seek first to understand” (47.4%). In fact, these percentages were higher than other schools in these outcome areas. “Significant improvement” was highest for Balmville students with turning in homework on time (15.8%). Very few students had declines (at most 10.6% for behaving well in class).

Approximately half (52.6%) indicated that the 21st CCLC program had contributed “to some” or “to a little” extent, while nearly half (47.4%) also indicated “to no extent” (more than twice as much as the other schools).

Gardnertown Leadership Academy

There were 30 responses from 10 Gardnertown Leadership Academy teachers. Of the 10 teachers, seven worked in the 21st CCLC program and three did not.

While there was improvement in all ten attributes, the teachers indicated that some students did not need to improve for each area, ranging from 3.3% (engagement and interest in science and math) to 30.0% for behaving well in class. Percentages of “no change” reported were relatively low, peaking at 20.0% for turning in homework on time, behaving well in class, and getting along well with others.

“Significant improvement” was highest for Gardnertown students with completing homework to the teacher’s satisfaction (40.0%). In fact, this was the second highest percentage of “significant improvement” for any school and any outcome area. It was extremely rare for any Gardnertown students to have declines (at most 3.3%).

Of the four schools, the highest percentage of Gardnertown teachers reported the 21st CCLC program had a great impact on their students (23.33%). In addition, 46.67% felt the program had some impact on their students.

Gidney Avenue Magnet School

There were 49 responses from 17 Gidney Avenue teachers. Of the 17 teachers, five worked in the 21st CCLC program and twelve did not.

Although there was improvement in all ten attributes, the teachers indicated that some students did not need to improve for each area, ranging from 10.2% (completing homework to the teacher's satisfaction and volunteering) to 36.7% for behaving well in class. Higher percentages of "no change" were reported for being attentive in class (22.4%) and displaying effort to "seek first to understand" (22.4%). "Significant improvement" was highest for Gidney Avenue students with completing homework to the teacher's satisfaction (26.5%). Very few students had declines (at most 8.2% for behaving well in class).

More than any other school, Gidney Avenue had the highest percentage of teachers feeling the 21st CCLC program impacted their students "to some extent" (63.27%).

Horizons on Hudson

There were 24 responses from six Horizons on Hudson (HOH) teachers. Of the six teachers, two worked in the 21st CCLC program and four did not.

More than half of the student participants at HOH improved in all ten attributes, according to their teachers. HOH had the lowest percentage of students that did not need to improve for each area, ranging from 8.3% (completing homework to the teacher's satisfaction, being attentive in class, behaving well in class, and displaying effort to "seek first to understand") to 20.8% for turning in homework on time. At most, one-quarter of the students had "no change" for the ten outcome areas, with the highest percentage for being attentive in class. HOH had the highest percentage for "significant improvement" compared to the other three schools for nine out of ten outcome areas (hovering around one-third for each), with the exception of completing homework to the teacher's satisfaction (short by just 2.5%). No students had declines in any outcome area.

In terms of overall impressions about the grant impact level on their students, one-quarter felt "to some extent" and one quarter felt "to a little extent". Despite the high ratings, HOH had the highest percentage of teachers who reported they did not know the extent to which the 21st CCLC program impacted their student.

Overall Teacher Survey Conclusions

Each school had variations in areas where 21st CCLC student participants improved the most, areas where students were not in need of improvement, and areas for which there was no change. Therefore, the school-level analysis is informative to use for building-level assessments.

Overall, improvements at the “significant” level across the four elementary buildings were relatively mild, peaking at 29.5% for completing homework to the teachers’ satisfaction (n = 122). “Moderate improvement” was strongest for engagement and interest in math (27.9%) and in science (27.0%). Overall, very few students declined over the academic calendar.

Examining the teacher surveys in the aggregate shows the greatest percentage of teachers felt the 21st CCLC programming had “some extent” of impact on their students (45.90%). One quarter of teachers felt the program had no impacts on their students or they did not know.