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Introduction
The 21st Century Community Learning Center (CCLC) initiative is a federally funded program that provides funding for activities offered to school-age children and their families in high poverty areas. The activities are intended to improve students’ academic performance and offer enrichment activities in a safe environment outside the regular school day.

Methodology
The Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) partnered with the University of Tennessee College of Social Work Office of Research and Public Service (UT SWORPS) to conduct a statewide, multiphase evaluation of 21st CCLC programs. The evaluation encompasses both implementation and outcome assessments. The current report is a summary of the findings of two detailed reports in the Implementation series which strove to gain a better understanding of center setup, operations, service provision, and, to a lesser extent, student outcomes. The implementation evaluation was informed by several research questions designed to assess the progress that grantees are making in planning, implementing, or expanding extended learning opportunities. Those evaluation questions are highlighted throughout this summary.

The implementation evaluation also began addressing student outcomes. Research questions focused on the improvements that students are making in academic and social or emotional realms and were addressed via anecdotal/qualitative sources. Quantitative analysis of outcomes will utilize data pulled from the UT SWORPS students tracking application and the state EIS database.
Findings

Context

In 2010, UT SWORPS evaluators and statisticians pulled a sample of 36 centers that were representative of the 293 centers that were operating at the time. Centers were randomly selected based on the grade level served (elementary, middle, or high school), the size of the community in which they operate (rural, mid-sized, or urban), the program base (operated by a Local Educational Agency [LEA] or Community Based Organization [CBO]), and the number of years into their current funding cycle (1-5). Centers were visited in three rounds: first, a Pilot of four site visits that informed the Feasibility Study was conducted (see McCutcheon, Hadjiharalambous, Myers, & Homer, 2010); the second 16 visits occurred in the spring of 2010 (see McCutcheon & Myers, 2011); and the final 16 visits occurred during the 2010-2011 school year (see McCutcheon & Hardy, 2012). Figures 1 and 2 detail the characteristics of the sites visited for the evaluation.

![Figure 1. Profiles of the 36 Afterschool Centers Visited for the Evaluation](image)

*Seven centers served more than one age group
Figure 2. Location of the 36 Afterschool Centers Visited for the Evaluation

KEY:
- **Tennessee city (Memphis, Jackson, Nashville, Chattanooga, & Knoxville)**

- **Site visited in Pilot**
- **Site Visited in 1st Round**
- **Site Visited in 2nd Round**
Generally, the site visits lasted 2 days and were conducted by two UT SWORPS evaluators. Prior to the visit, an evaluator interviewed the selected site’s grantee director. Once on site, the evaluators interviewed the site coordinator, led focus groups with afterschool tutors and assistants, interviewed the feeder school principal(s), and observed an afterschool session from start to finish. At the end of the visit, the evaluators compiled a global observation form (see McCutcheon & Myers, 2011), determining whether the center achieved various metrics related to creating a supportive environment and encouraging positive interactions between student peers and between staff and students. The ratings of “yes” or “no” on the global observations are discussed throughout this summary.

One goal of interviewing grantee directors prior to the site visit was to understand the larger context of a program’s operations. When grantee directors were asked to identify the community need that prompted the application for 21st CCLC funding, three themes arose: (1) poor academic performance, (2) safety concerns, and (3) poor/isolated communities. While grantee directors reported that some schools and districts had been targeted for academic improvement by the state, necessitating intensive interventions, others wanted to give struggling students a chance to catch up: “[stakeholders] were seeing a need to give the students an extra opportunity to get back on the right track and make better academic decisions so more opportunities would be available to them after high school” (site coordinator in a mid-sized community). In fact, four of the five high school centers that were visited cited poor academics as the reason for including the center in the 21st CCLC grant. It follows that the goals of these programs were also academic in nature: completing homework, getting students “back on track” academically, and meeting the academic requirements of the Tennessee Standards.

Safety concerns often overlapped with poverty and isolation and were cited most frequently, but not exclusively, by centers serving younger students. Staff at centers serving elementary schoolers repeatedly noted the “latch-key kid” phenomenon, and they stated that poverty or the rural location of the community limited afterschool options for students. One concern was that these very young children were “going home with no supervision” (grantee director in a rural community). The centers serving middle schoolers also worried about students going home alone because “this is the age where they begin to experiment” (grantee director in a mid-sized community). As such, goals for these programs were to provide a safe place for the students and to teach some life skills and provide some resources that expose them to more opportunities than generally available in the community along with academics: “To move them from non-mastery to mastery and expose them to things they otherwise wouldn’t see” (site coordinator in a rural community).
During the phone interviews, grantee directors were asked what, if any, plans were in place to sustain the afterschool program if 21st CCLC funding was to end. The sites visited during the pilot and first round of visits had few concrete plans. Grantee directors of three centers reported using mixed funding streams that could offset the impact of the loss of 21st CCLC funding. Five other grantees mentioned other grants by name that they were in the process of applying for, but also noted that the economic downturn had dried up several funding streams at all levels (federal, state, and local). The general feeling was summed up by a rural grantee director: “We know we are supposed to be working toward self-sufficiency, but the reality is that we are a poor community, and we don’t have extra funds to run the program at this standard.”

During the second round of site visits, UT SWORPS evaluators heard more grantee directors and center staff discussing ideas and plans to secure funding if the 21st CCLC grant ended. One grantee director reported with complete confidence that their program would continue: “The afterschool program was here before the 21st CCLC funding so [the community agency] would step in and supplement the program” (grantee director in an urban community). More common, however, was the belief that some funding could be secured for afterschool tutoring, but the enrichment and recreation activities would likely be cut. Evaluators frequently heard statements such as the following from a rural grantee director: “We bring up funding every year and try to have a mindset of ‘what are we going to do if 21st CCLC goes away?’ Everyone agrees the program is important, but no one has the money to fund it.”

**Inputs**

Only three of the 36 sites visited operated off of the grounds of their feeder school. Sites that operated on school grounds used a variety of spaces for afterschool activities. Programs used cafeterias, libraries, gymnasiums, classrooms, and, in one case, occupied a portable classroom located behind the physical school building but still on school grounds. Sites were generally deemed safe and had sufficient space, furniture, and equipment to accommodate students and activities (see appendix A). At two thirds of centers (24, 66.7%), students were able to access resources and materials with ease. While 100% of the programs serving high school students allowed students easy access to materials, only 60% of programs serving elementary schoolers did, which appeared to be an age appropriate limitation to evaluators.
When compiling the global observation forms, UT SWORPS evaluators noted that staff at almost all centers provided a welcoming atmosphere to students and encouraged the participation of all students, regardless of ability level or other factors (see Appendix A). Staff members were observed greeting students by name, thanking students for listening and following directions, and acknowledging students’ individual needs or preferences. Staff at more than 85% of the centers related with students in positive ways, such as explaining the plan for the afterschool session and using positive reinforcements.

**Research Question:**

*To what extent do centers attract and retain qualified instructors?*

When hiring tutors, qualities such as “energetic” and a “good relationship with the students” were praised.

LEAs that were visited hired regular day teachers for academic activities and sometimes used community members for enrichment. One third of CBOs that were visited hired regular day teachers as tutors; the rest used community members.

Centers did not report retention issues with hired staff. Several took steps to reduce burnout, such as using flexible scheduling.

Centers using volunteers had to contrast the benefits (low cost, act as role models) to the risks (short-term commitment, less dependable).

The metric that evaluators observed staff engaging in the least was supporting students in building new skills or refining existing ones. Evidence of this was observed at only 65.7% (23 of 35) of centers. Those that were rated as not achieving this metric employed staff members who just told students the steps to solve math problems or solved the problem for the students, rather than working with them to discover the answers on their own. Tutors in a CBO that was rated as achieving this metric provided feedback to students completing a writing assignment with statements such as, “I like your ‘why’” and “I like how you are using new words.”

---

1 UT SWORPS evaluators did not observe typical afterschool activities at one center. Instead, they were treated to a special presentation by the participants.
Centers reported requiring up to 12-16 hours of training for staff annually. Several held orientations over the summer for all staff, but others only required new hires to attend. Generally, the centers that employed regular day teachers in the afterschool program did not require staff to attend any training beyond the inservice already required to maintain their licensure.

When searching out community partners, programs operating in urban areas and those operated by CBOs seemed to have an advantage over those in smaller communities and those operated by LEAs. In many cases, the CBOs were known entities within their communities, and partners would seek them out. Some urban centers reported having too many partners and having to extend the afterschool hours to accommodate all the sessions that community partners wanted to offer.

Rural programs and those run by LEAs had to be more creative in their approaches to finding community partners. For several programs, there was a lack of businesses in the community with which to partner. Other programs reported that the economic downturn had a negative impact on partnerships. Those businesses that remained open had reduced their outreach efforts.

Another difference between programs operated by CBOs and those operated by LEAs related to the afterschool programs’ relationship with the feeder schools. One principal summed up the ideal relationship: “The afterschool program should support what the school does, and the school should support the afterschool program.” For the LEA programs, the relationship is pre-existing. As one grantee director noted, “It is easy to maintain relationships with regular school day staff because the afterschool and regular school day staff are one and the same.” These staff made efforts to develop relationships with teachers who were not part of the afterschool by taking steps such as attending grade level meetings to discuss students’ needs and working with students to respect the regular day classrooms that the afterschool programs used.

Research Question:
What guidance and training do staff members receive?
Common topics include:
- First aid and CPR
- Warning signs of child abuse and neglect
- Detecting bullying
- Discipline strategies

Research Question:
What approaches do centers use to establish strong community partnerships? Which are most effective?
Keys to gaining partners:
- Reach out and be specific
- Have a curriculum or program for the partner to present
- Ask for a specific service (e.g., providing door prizes, use of a facility)
CBOs had to work harder to overcome the perceived barrier between the feeder schools and the afterschool programs. While some struggled with this relationship, others achieved a true partnership. At those successful centers, UT SWORPS evaluators noted that the staff of both the center and the school talked about ways to support each other. For example, at one CBO, the grantee director said, “Our job is to help these educators succeed.” In her interview, the principal of one of the feeder schools to this CBO noted that her students “have a lot of needs, and we do not have enough tutors. We depend on [the afterschool program] to assist them.” Those centers with weaker relationships appeared to have a communication barrier. A new site coordinator reported some of the difficulties he had with getting information regarding student progress: “We were asking kids for it [their report cards], and the school system said, ‘You can’t do that, you can’t receive a report card unless a parent signs off.’ So I said, ‘How do we do that?’ and they didn’t want to tell me.” A principal at a feeder to another CBO program did not recognize the site coordinator’s name and stated, “If [the site coordinator] came to the school more often and did a better job coordinating with the school […] things would improve.” A feeder school principal for another CBO noted that in years past, the afterschool program was not perceived as effective; however, this year the principal feels that the afterschool staff is making an effort to keep her informed about the program. The staff is “very good to come up and discuss anything with me. This year has been really good for communication.” Clearly, communication is one of the keys to a successful feeder school/afterschool program relationship.

**Activities**

Programs operated by LEAs made use of their relationship to the feeder school when recruiting students to the afterschool program. Frequently, they “invited” students to enroll in the program based on TCAP scores, classroom grades, or teacher recommendations—all of which are readily available to center staff. Several centers, usually those in rural areas, reported that they

### Research Question:

**How do centers recruit students for the program?**

LEAs often use academic reports and teacher referrals to target those students either failing or “on the bubble.” Strategies to recruit students who are not academically at risk include setting up booths at open houses, sending letters home with students, and using the school’s telephone call-out system and the school’s PA announcements.

CBOs frequently put flyers in the schools and have guidance counselors or teachers refer to their programs.
enrolled all academically “at-risk” students first, then offered the program to any students who needed child care services after school, even if they did not need the academic remediation services. Some centers went further by having an open door policy to accept all students who needed a place to go after school in an effort to reduce the number of “latch-key kids.” Others created multiple programs within the same center, but with different eligibility requirements. At these centers, students with academic needs were placed in one program that provided remediation, while students who needed child care went to a different area. In one of these programs, students who attended were charged a fee, but the fee was waived for those who participated in the academic remediation session.

Recruiting students due to the separation between the program and the feeder school was a hurdle that CBOs had to overcome. CBOs that were visited noted more recruiting success when developing the relationship with the school than when focusing on other recruiting strategies. Some of the centers that maintained a presence in the feeder school, often due to the site coordinator having an office on premises, reported a stronger relationship with the school and were seen as a resource by school personnel.

Centers that served high schoolers reported a unique set of recruiting challenges. Most of these programs were task oriented: recovering a credit, making up an assignment, earning time for time. Students worked through their backlog of work and then stopped attending when they were finished. Thus, high school programs were constantly in “recruiting mode,” promoting the program to students, teachers, and parents as an option for the student.

When asked about engaging students, centers pointed out that the top two reasons students reportedly dropped out were lack of transportation and the “long day dilemma.” When they could, centers provided transportation, but it was not always possible due to finances or logistics. In an effort to address the length of the school day for students attending the afterschool program, centers allowed students to attend only a few days a week, offered shorter sessions, or offered morning sessions as buses had already dropped off students 20-30 minutes prior to the start of the school day. Programs also offered incentives to students who attended more than 30 days. Staff reported taking students on trips to local attractions, such as theme parks, local swimming pools, and movie theaters. Others were able to offer rewards, such as entering students into a

Research Question:
What approaches are used by centers to engage and retain students? Which are most effective?

To prevent dropouts, centers offered transportation home after the session, flexible schedules to accommodate sports or other activities, and incentives to those who attended 30 or more days.

To engage students, centers offered activities that were not available during the regular school day, such as a music-themed curriculum, science labs, or guitar lessons. Staff reported that students also love having access to technology.
drawing for an iPod.

On the global assessments, UT SWORPS evaluators noted that more than half of the centers (21, 58.3%) designed their activities to engage students with different needs (see Appendix A). Some centers achieved this by having students work independently on computer programs targeting their specific needs, grouping students by grade level to work on assignments together, and targeting students who needed extra help by pulling them into groups with lower student:teacher ratios. Evaluators noted that the latter strategy was employed in academic, enrichment, and recreational activities. Engaging students with different needs was more of an issue among the centers operated by CBOs, where only four (33.3%) were rated “yes” on this metric; among centers operating in rural communities, 11 (57.9%) were rated “yes”; and among centers serving middle schoolers, five (38.5%) were rated “yes.”

Two thirds (24, 66.7%) of centers were rated as offering activities designed to engage students in fun and interesting ways. Evaluators noted that most students engaged in hands-on activities and appeared to enjoy activities in which they made something (e.g., a science activity in which they mixed chemicals to make “goo” and discussed polymers); utilized manipulatives (e.g., adapted board games, play money); or used technology. Again, engaging in hands-on activities was an issue among the centers operated by CBOs—only four (33.3%) were rated “yes”; among centers operating in rural communities, 11 (57.9%) were rated “yes”; and among centers serving high schoolers, only two (40.0%) were rated “yes.”

![Figure 3. Afterschool Sessions Observed During the Site Visits (Evaluators were able to observe two to four different activities at each program visited.)](image-url)
The most common **academic activity** observed during the site visits was time for homework completion. Some smaller programs had all students gather together but work independently. A tutor was available to assist if needed. Others separated students by grade or assignment to provide more focused assistance. **Academic enrichment sessions** targeting math, reading, and science were observed. Teachers used technology, such as Prometheus Boards, to create interactive lessons. Elementary and middle school teachers reported that students enjoyed any activity in which they were able to compete with each other. Students also appeared to enjoy the sessions involving manipulatives, such as using play money for a lesson on making change and dissecting owl pellets in a science lab discussing diet and habitat. The enrichment and recreation offerings were diverse and, according to site coordinators, were limited only by availability of supplies and the availability of a knowledgeable instructor. Several site coordinators relayed stories of students expressing an interest in an activity, such as guitar lessons, and the measures they took to find an instructor in their communities. Seven of the 36 centers visited only offered academic activities (remediation and/or enrichment): three high schools, one middle school, and three elementary school programs. Three of these programs, one from each grade level, had waiting lists of students who wanted to enroll. The other two high school programs were “drop in” programs designed to be flexible in terms of participation. The remaining elementary school programs operated at less than full capacity.

**Research Question:**

*To what extent do centers offer high-quality services in core academic areas?*

Sessions ranged from providing students worksheets to playing modified board games (such as a Candyland game incorporating math facts flash cards) to implementing a curriculum unique to the afterschool program. High school students worked through a credit recovery computer program independently; a tutor was available if needed.

**Research Question:**

*To what extent do centers offer enrichment and support activities beyond core academic areas?*

All but one center that was visited offered enrichment activities. Sessions observed included a stage production, winter guard flag squad, Tae Kwon Do, metal shop, nutrition, geocaching, guitar lessons, arts and crafts, and life skills, to name a few.
enrichment activities appeared during the site visits. Some of the more rigorous academic enrichment activities, like the robotics program mentioned above, invited students with strong academic standings to participate. These programs were designed to challenge students who were already excelling in traditional school settings. The other strategy was to operate the enrichment activities much like independent clubs and have students enroll in each activity individually. The activities were filled on a first come/first served basis. If a student wanted to enroll in an activity that was full, which happened frequently, they were offered another activity that had space available. Some activities had waiting lists or opened second sessions, while others were canceled due to lack of student interest.

Programs offered recreational activities that, according to some tutors, helped the students exert some energy and blow off steam after sitting in class all day long. Some explicitly stated that a goal of these recreational activities was to improve health and target the obesity rates plaguing children in Tennessee. Unfortunately, these efforts were countered by ineffective nutritional counseling and unhealthy snacks at many sites. UT SWORPS evaluators observed an enrichment activity on nutrition in which students were shown appropriate portion sizes of various healthy and unhealthy snacks but were allowed to eat multiple servings of the unhealthy options. Further, at only 11 of the 33 sites (34.4%) where snack time was observed did UT SWORPS evaluators feel students were offered healthy food. Centers offering healthy options served items such as unflavored milk, granola bars, applesauce, fresh fruit, cheese, and sandwiches. Snacks that did not achieve the “healthy” rating included Rice Krispy treats, ice cream sandwiches, canned fruit in syrup, potato chips, flavored milk, and artificially sweetened fruit drinks.

UT SWORPS evaluators asked about the methods that teachers and tutors employed to ensure the academics and enrichment activities link to the regular day classrooms without being repetitive or out of sync. Afterschool tutors who also functioned as regular day teachers reported being able to work with students more closely in the afterschool program due to smaller group sizes. They could focus on exactly the area in which an individual student was struggling. LEA programs with afterschool tutors who were not also regular day teachers utilized informal communication methods to discuss student needs. As one teacher in a rural LEA program pointed out, “It’s a small [school] building so we see each other every day so it’s easy for the teachers to tell us what the students need. It’s a big advantage.
being small.” Only occasionally did staff at LEAs discuss more formal methods of communication.

Again, communication was another area that required CBOs to put forth more effort in establishing successful partnerships, especially if they did not employ regular day teachers in the afterschool programs. Centers that employed regular day teachers frequently relied on those teachers to make contact with other school staff to discuss student needs. Staff of centers that did not employ regular day teachers or those who were located off of the grounds of the regular day school had to employ a variety of tactics to ensure that information about assignments and coursework was passed back and forth effectively. Often the burden of initiating communication fell on the site coordinator, and the energy put into developing the relationship had a direct impact on the amount of information and cooperation that was shared between the programs.

Regarding interacting with parents, centers’ responses fell on a continuum of levels of contact. Some centers reported that their parents followed a “no news is good news” philosophy. Staff was available if parents had concerns or questions but did not initiate interactions. Others attempted passive communication methods, sending information home with students for the parents. Staff at the centers where parents picked up students reported using that opportunity to tell parents if their child had not completed his or her homework. The next level on the continuum was observed at those centers that required the parents to sign the information sheets or the student’s completed homework and return it to the afterschool staff. Finally, some centers mandated a certain number of family contacts each school year.

Beyond communication, the majority of programs offered activities and classes for families. The most common activity was the Family Math Night or Family Reading Night, but Family Science Night and Family Game Night were also reported. The classes that were offered included recognizing signs of drug abuse, preparing your child to succeed on TCAPs, Seven Habits of Highly Effective People, and English as a Second Language, to name a few. Some centers opened up their facilities to parents who needed computer resources also.

---

**Research Question:**

*What approaches do centers use to establish effective working relationships with students’ families?*

Centers employed a range of contact strategies from intensive (center initiates contact) to passive (staff is available, but parents initiate contact).

Family nights were very popular and occurred at least once a semester, if not monthly.

Classes for families focused on the needs of the community (i.e., career options, ESL, and how to help with math homework).
**Outputs**

Programs’ hours of operation ranged from a low of 1 hour twice a week to a high of 2.5+ hours 6 days a week (see Figure 4). More than three fourths of centers (28, 77.8%) were open for at least 2 hours each day they operated. The most common schedule was either 5 days a week for 3 hours a day or 4 days a week for 2 hours a day. Half of all centers visited followed one of these two schedules. Several centers that operated on Fridays reported dropping the academic components of the program that day and having children participate in recreational or enrichment activities instead. While several programs operated morning sessions, they are not included in this description of hours of operation. Morning sessions were usually short, drop-in sessions for students who arrived at school early, partly because of the bus schedule and partly because they needed a little extra help with a concept or wanted someone to check over their homework before submitting it to their teacher.

---

2 One center operated 2.5 hours Monday through Friday and 6 hours on Saturdays.
Attendance policies at centers were usually viewed as guidelines rather than hard and fast rules. While some policies state that students are dropped from the program if they are absent 5 consecutive days, excessive absences were usually treated only as “red flags” that prompted some form of follow up with the student or the family. As one site coordinator noted, “We left the rules flexible because there are some kids that need to be here the days they are able to come. Situations change and if you put an arbitrary number on something usually it will come back to bite you.”

The programs serving high school students were again in a unique situation in that the students would attend only long enough to make up an assignment or recover a credit. Due to the flexibility these programs offer, site coordinators reported that only 15-20% of students attended 2-3 days a week. Teachers viewed success in these programs as a student completing their missing work and not returning. Rarely would a student attend 30 or more days.

For the programs serving younger students, most reported anywhere from two thirds to 75% to “most” students attending regularly (i.e., 2 or 3 days a week). Some of the centers with the lowest rates of attendance enrolled all students who expressed an interest in the program and then allowed them to come as needed. They had no attendance policies but rather opted to be available to the student at any time during their hours of operation. They tended to operate in rural communities where children had few other afterschool options.

The typical structure of daily activities observed included snack first and then homework sessions next. In some programs, younger students attended a recreation session immediately after snack to help

---

Figure 4. Hours per Day and Days per Week Centers Operated
them burn some of their pent up energy from the day before getting back to their academics. In programs that offered enrichment opportunities, students often focused first on academics, then moved to enrichment.

On the global assessments (see Appendix A), UT SWORPS evaluators observed that the great majority of centers (34, 94.4%) conducted well-planned sessions with clear expectations. However, fewer centers (24 of 35 observed, 68.6%) had schedules that allowed for flexibility. This was mostly an issue among those centers that served elementary school students (17 of 25, 68.0%). Few centers (16, 44.4%) allowed students to pick activities in which they wanted to participate. Over half of the centers visited (21, 58.3%) achieved a good balance between academic, enrichment, and recreational activities, but only a third (12, 33.3%) balanced structured and “free” time effectively. While one elementary school program that was visited devoted half of their afterschool time to free-play, another elementary program on the opposite end of the spectrum did not allow students to converse freely, even during snack time.

UT SWORPS evaluators also observed the students’ interactions with staff and with their peers. Evaluators felt that students at 80.6% (29) of the centers visited were adequately supervised to maintain safety. Some of the incidents that occurred in centers where students were not supervised adequately included staff sending a child with a health concern to the office alone to seek assistance, students playing basketball on a court without the knowledge of staff, and students arriving at the start of the program before staff members arrived.

At the majority of centers (31, 86.1%), students interacted with each other positively. When conflicts arose, evaluators noted that staff at more than two thirds of the centers (17 of 24, 70.8%) encouraged students to manage their feelings and resolve their conflicts appropriately, stepping in only if needed. For example, at one site, a student laughed when a classmate gave a wrong answer. The staff member quickly said, “It’s not funny; we’re not here to criticize. We’re here to help.” However, students had very few opportunities to practice leadership skills. At only 8 of 35 centers (22.9%) observed did evaluators witness students practicing leadership skills.
While no quantitative data regarding student or parent satisfaction is available for this report, UT SWORPS evaluators gathered qualitative data indicating the level of support that programs received. Seventeen of the 36 sites visited reported maintaining some form of waitlist at the time of the observation, either for the program as a whole, for one grade level, or for a specific activity. The fact that there is more demand than space available is a testament to the value that parents place on the afterschool program. Further, at one high school program that evaluators visited, parents were aware of the visit because the students performed a special presentation of an enrichment program for the evaluators. Several parents came not only to watch the presentation, but stayed afterward to meet with the evaluators and detail the benefits their children had received by participating in the program.

UT SWORPS evaluators sat in on 131 activity sessions during the three phases of site visits. In fewer than 10 of those sessions did evaluators note students explicitly disengaged from the activities (i.e., putting their heads down on their tables, asking if they had to come back the next day). Center staff told evaluators repeatedly that students “beg to stay.” One site coordinator remarked, “There is one girl trying to find a way to come back to the program after graduating from the school” (site coordinator in a rural community).

Research Question:

How satisfied are students and parents with center operations?

Qualitative evidence points to high levels of satisfaction among stakeholders:

- Half of the programs with enrollment caps have a waiting list.
- Parents at one center came during the observation to tell the evaluators about the positive impact the program had on their children.
- A site coordinator in a rural community shared that “rather than the child finishing up their homework at 8 pm, the child is done, and the family can now do things as a family rather than spending the night doing homework. I thought the focus was test scores, but here parents are saying we are helping their family.”

3 The evaluation plan includes a research question regarding parent and student satisfaction with center operations. In the evaluation plan, this question is to be addressed through the use of student and parent surveys developed by UT SWORPS evaluators and distributed to select participants of 21st CCLCs. These surveys were collected in spring 2012, and the subsequent report has a projected release date of fall 2012.
Intermediate Outcomes

Our afterschool program was one of the single most influential factors in overall school gains. (site coordinator in a rural community)

During the staff interviews, UT SWORPS evaluators asked for qualitative and anecdotal evidence of students’ academic and social improvements as a result of participating in the 21st CCLC program.  

Assessments administered during the regular school day were used by several afterschool programs, generally those operated by LEAs, to gauge student progress. Regular day teachers who worked in the afterschool programs also noted improvement on quizzes and assignments.

Staff pointed out several academic skills that students learned from participating in the 21st CCLC program, including test-taking strategies, independent thinking skills, and problem-solving techniques. Teachers and site coordinators also reported making great strides in getting students to complete and turn in their homework. Several mentioned seeing students “just get it” when they understood a concept with which they struggled during the regular school day.

When asked who was most likely to benefit from the academic activities offered by the program, staff reported that those students who put in the most effort received the most benefit: “Those students who stay focused and are more motivated to learn, get more out of the program” (program assistant in a mid-sized community). Another teacher in a rural community felt that “those who would not have as much support at home” get the most benefit from the program.

Research Question: Do programs improve academic outcomes such as grades, test scores, etc.?  

Qualitative evidence of improved outcomes:

- “The improvement is phenomenal for some... Not in all subjects across the board, but in some of them.” (site coordinator in a rural middle school)
- “Kids are being more successful on their spelling tests that I give each week.” (teacher in a rural elementary school)
- “Every time I go to graduation I see kids walk across the stage, and I think, ‘If it had not been for 21st Century...they would not be there, they would not have been getting that diploma.’” (grantee director for a rural high school program)

---

4 Quantitative intermediate and long-term outcomes will be addressed in future phases of the evaluation through the use of the web-based student tracking application, the state EIS, and through teacher, parent, and student surveys.
Staff reported that students benefit socially and emotionally from the afterschool program in two ways. First, students learn new skills through participating in the enrichment sessions. Students have learned karate, guitar, quilting, African dance, and piano, to name just a few. Second, the students gain social skills through their participation. As a program assistant noted, “Karate teaches them obedience, listening. The instructor is teaching them stuff and they don’t even realize it: respect, following directions. They are all life lessons.” Another noted that students are “[m]ore likely to get confident, have higher self-esteem as older ones will go and read to younger ones. Because even a poor fifth-grade reader will be able to help read to a second or a third grader and will enjoy it” (teacher in a rural community). Students also learn how to work as a team: “Working in groups and developing patience and tolerance for each other. Everybody pitches in” (teacher in a rural community).

Research Question:
Do programs enhance students’ social/ emotional development and sense of safety?

Staff reported that students receive several social and emotional benefits from participating, including:

- Increased confidence
- Improved self-esteem
- Respect
- Teamwork
- Patience and tolerance
- Improved discipline and work ethic
- More outgoing/less shy

Research Question:
Do programs help students show improvements in school attendance, study habits, homework completion, etc.?

Qualitative evidence of improved outcomes:

- “[T]hey get an independent learning mentality: We teach them how to find the answers on their own and that helps them in their school work.” (tutor in a mid-sized community)
- “Increased problem solving and working independently rather than being fed information.” (teacher in an urban community)
- “Academically we are making progress because the child is keeping up with their homework, their project.” (site coordinator in a rural community)
Innovative Practices

UT SWORPS evaluators observed several innovative or unique practices that centers employed to address common challenges faced by many 21st CCLC programs.

Staffing

- In an effort to overcome burnout, a few of the centers that were visited created flexible schedules for the teachers involved in the afterschool programs. Centers hired enough staff so that teachers could work only one or two days a week in the programs. The one concern for these centers was the increased number of teachers needed to fully staff the programs; however, all of the teachers from these programs expressed satisfaction with the way the programs operated.

- Sites using volunteers found that the volunteers were very engaged initially, but “then over time, the volunteer participation drops off and you are left with a hole in your program.” To combat this, one grantee has the potential partner be involved peripherally with a center for a year. If they continue after that first year, they can “be built in as a component of the program.” This helps ensure that they are invested in the program for the long-term.

Community Partners

- In order to build community partnerships, one site coordinator at a CBO in a rural community attended every community meeting or advisory panel discussion that even remotely pertained to the afterschool program. This allowed her not only to become more aware of the agencies and programs that were available in the community, but also to meet with their leaders and discuss tie-ins and collaborations with the afterschool program. “The networking really helps because all the other agencies have goals and objectives also.” She was able to truly partner with agencies because not only did she receive services such as presentations by community agencies, but she was also able to meet some of the community agency’s needs by having students in her afterschool program complete service learning projects.

- A grantee created a Community Partner Coordinator position to develop community partners for all of the centers operating under the grant. Site coordinators did not have to spend time trying to cultivate these relationships but could focus on service delivery instead. The grantee director felt that having this position created a level of responsibility that improved outcomes: “If it’s not focused and counted and measured, then it will fall by the wayside.”

Links to Feeder

- One school-based program that evaluators visited employed a part-time site coordinator who was not a staff member at the feeder school. To overcome this potential communication barrier between the program and the school, the site coordinator attended the school’s summer staff meeting to introduce herself and explain the program. She also put flyers using a distinctive color of paper in the teachers’ mailboxes. Finally, she relied heavily on other afterschool program staff who were employees of the feeder school to market the program among regular day teachers.
• A site coordinator at a rural elementary school was not a school staff member but worked part-time for the grantee and oversaw multiple sites. She was, therefore, not as available to school personnel as a site coordinator who also worked at the school during the day. To overcome this issue, each site utilized a “lead teacher,” who acted in the site coordinator’s stead. This lead teacher was a member of the school staff and became a conduit for information between the regular day school and the afterschool program. This person also took much of the paperwork and other non-teaching duties from the other center tutors, so they could focus on instruction.

• Site coordinators at two urban CBOs worked to conquer the barrier created by operating a program off-site from the feeder school by maintaining a visible presence in those schools. The site coordinators personally visited a feeder school every day to meet with teachers, principals, or other school staff. Some of this contact was an informal “check-in” with a student’s regular day teacher to discuss their progress and the areas with which they were still struggling. These site coordinators, however, also attended parent-teacher conferences to advocate for the student and model for the parent how to advocate for the student, so that the parent could continue to do so after the student left the program.

• A technique used by a program operated by a CBO involved having a site coordinator be a volunteer in the feeder school during the school day. This grantee paid the site coordinator for the volunteer hours that she spends helping out with lunch duty or being available “pretty much wherever I am needed. It is just a partnership with the school.” The school receives a free staff person, and the site coordinator has the opportunity to market the program.

• In an effort to ensure that the afterschool program was aligned with the regular day school’s instruction, one LEA program created pacing guides for the afterschool program that mirrored those used by the school. The afterschool guides were about two weeks behind the regular day school’s guides. The timing allowed the afterschool program to continue to reinforce the foundations learned while the regular day teacher was building on them in subsequent lessons.

• A site coordinator in an urban area relied on the automated call-out technology used by many school districts to keep abreast of student assignments and upcoming tests. The feeder schools for this center alerted parents to tests and some larger assignments via the automated call-out system. The site coordinator was added to that notification list, so he received the same phone calls as the parents. He found this to be an extremely helpful method for staying aware of students’ needs without burdening the regular day teachers.

Recruiting/Enrolling
• To encourage parents to enroll their children in the afterschool program, one center makes a formal presentation to the parents at a school event early in the academic year. They introduce the program and explain the manner in which students are targeted. The grantee director at this middle school program said, “We use the data to recruit... We share with parents that out of the 100 [students] invited [to participate in the program], only 40% of those who turn down the offer for help will graduate from high school... It’s a compelling story.”
Transportation was a barrier to enrollment for many programs. The staff at one feeder for a high school program worked to create an informal network of carpoolers. After the staff identified the students who needed credit recovery, they assembled them in a small group where they matched the students who lacked transportation with classmates who lived nearby and could provide rides home.

**Participation/Attendance**

- A high school had parents of students who enrolled in the credit recovery program sign a contract stating that they would ensure that their child attended the program and that the parents would follow through with the student at home. There was a strong sense in the program that the only way the extra help could be effective was for the parents to be involved and committed.

- One urban program utilized a rewards system that not only encouraged participants to meet certain behavioral and educational standards, but also enticed the children to attend the program and remain engaged throughout the school year. Students earned points for academic achievements like turning in their homework, raising their grades, and making honor roll. They also were rewarded for behavioral improvements or character development, such as being assertive, helping clean the classroom, or encouraging a peer. Students also lost points for being suspended from school, receiving D’s or F’s on their report card, arguing, or not following directions. The points were tracked on a bulletin board in the afterschool classroom. At the end of the year, students could trade in points for tangible items like shoes or iPods or even earn field trips.

- To combat the “long-day dilemma,” one program that serves elementary schoolers does not allow kindergartners to enroll until the spring semester. This allows the students (and their parents) to adjust to attending school for an entire day, and then if they still feel it is appropriate, they can try the afterschool program. For this program, students enroll in specific activities rather than in the afterschool program as a whole. A student attends one session that meets one day a week, further easing the transition. They also offer special activities designed for kindergartners.

**Activities**

- While several programs that were visited structured their day so that the recreational activity was the first activity, one middle school program pulled out the younger students for a special mini-session where they practiced focusing and calming techniques such as walking across a balance beam and completing a “connect the dots” worksheet. The site coordinator reported to evaluators that, due to the success they felt this strategy had with younger students, the school was planning on employing it before TCAP testing to help prepare students mentally to take the tests.

- To deal with the issue of childhood obesity, one program offered activities that specifically targeted health and fitness. The school coach is an afterschool staff member, and all of the students rotate through the recreational activity he leads, which is often something like dodge
ball or kickball. However, before the students can play a sport, they must participate in mandatory exercises, such as running laps across the gym.

- The concern for the students’ food security led one urban CBO to go one step further in its efforts to ensure the health and well-being of its students. At the end of the day, students are sent home with a “goodie bag” filled with healthy snacks such as granola bars, oranges, and juice. The bag also contains a treat such as a mini candy bar, reinforcing the concept of “everything in moderation.” Another LEA-based program filled students’ backpacks with snacks on Fridays to help them through the weekend when they do not have access to school meals.

- One grantee that was visited created an activities coordinator position. According to the grant, all enrichment activities must be research-based. The activities coordinator looks for activities that all centers in the grant can use that meet this criterion. Thus, individual site coordinators do not have to spend their time searching out these activities (although they are still welcome to bring in activities tailored to the needs of their population).

- In one center, the afterschool program has an agreement with the school that the students enrolled in the intensive academic afterschool program not receive any homework from their regular day teachers. The afterschool time can be used instead for concentrated skill practice in which the same concepts are targeted but are presented in different ways than in the regular classroom.

Parental Involvement

- One site employed a school-home coordinator who met with the teachers to collect referrals to the afterschool tutoring program. After the meetings, the school-home coordinator called the parents to discuss enrolling their children in the tutoring program. At the meetings with teachers, the coordinator also checked on the progress of students already in tutoring and determined if there was anything that the afterschool tutors could address with the student. The coordinator also called the parents with updates and served as a point of access for them.

- A site coordinator at an urban CBO program detailed the systematic approach that the umbrella organization takes to gain parental involvement. The CBO has a parental involvement coordinator who manages parent activities at all of the programs operated through the agency. Any parent enrolling their child in the afterschool program has to sign an agreement stating that they will be involved in the program and are committed to attending two parent meetings per year and volunteering for 6 hours in the program annually. The agency also offers activities for parents, such as parent nights, a parent advisory group, and workshops for adults. Finally, the staff at the afterschool program promotes parent involvement within the feeder schools and checks the child’s homework by modeling that behavior in their interactions with the family.

- Three centers that were visited focused on soliciting parent feedback. One grantee reported that their afterschool program was designed around feedback from parent surveys. This grantee also has an advisory board at each feeder school with at least one parent and two student members to provide ongoing feedback to the center. Another grantee organizes a “Parent Fair” at the start of the afterschool session where they introduce the afterschool program and also
invite other area agencies and programs to set up booths and provide information to parents
and families. Finally, a rural school hosts an annual forum where all stakeholders (students,
teachers, parents, community partners) are invited to discuss what did and did not work over
the course of the year. The program is adjusted annually based on the feedback received at this
forum. They also hold two parent meetings a year to get further feedback from parents and
families regarding activities that they would like to see the afterschool program undertake.

- One grantee sets contact goals for their sites. The program staff must have 30 parent contacts
  for each student over the course of the school year. Parent contact activities can include
  something as simple as parents signing the homework folder and returning it or can be more
  intensive, such as asking parents to come in and talk with staff, attend parent nights, or
  complete reading activities with their children at home. To encourage children to help engage
  their parents, after a certain amount or type of parent contact, the children can pick a toy from
  the treasure box.
Recommendations

Clearly, the 21st CCLC programs that were visited are adapting to meet the needs of students in their communities. No two centers are the same, even if operated by the same grantee. The recognition of this diversity is one of the true strengths of the 21st CCLC initiative and appears to be having an impact on both the academic and social/emotional lives of the students served. Based on the global observation forms (see Appendix A), there are some best practices where more centers struggled. Providing a healthy snack is one such area. Certainly, constraints such as cost and storage are factors to consider. Several centers that partnered with their school district’s food services were unable to choose the snacks they received. Centers that took on snack provision on their own were often able to provide more nutritious options to students.

Few centers provided students with an opportunity to practice leadership skills. When creating lessons, afterschool teachers should be encouraged to find ways to help students make plans and set goals for their education. Students should be encouraged to share ideas, opinions, and concerns and to take responsibility for themselves when appropriate. Some successful ways that centers implemented this recommendation included working with students to set academic achievement goals in remediation and providing students the opportunity to work together as teams toward a goal without teacher involvement or approval, which allowed for trial and error.

Two thirds of the centers visited did not achieve a good balance between structured and free time during the afterschool session. In some centers, children were not allotted any time to socialize or interact in any manner other than during the structured activities. Of course, for the centers that work with high school students to complete missed assignments or recover credits, free time may be an inappropriate use of resources for older youth with more demanding schedules. However, for the younger students who tend to need more of a respite from the rigidity of the regular school day, simply allowing students to talk freely during their snack period may provide a needed break that helps them focus later in the academic and enrichment activities.

Regarding the types of activities offered, UT SWORPS evaluators noted three areas that represent opportunities for centers to further improve practices: allowing students to choose from a variety of activities; having a good balance of academic, enrichment, and recreational activities; and offering activities designed to engage students with different needs. Providing a variety of activities for students that are designed to engage students with different abilities does not necessarily mean that centers need to operate multiple sessions for each activity block. That strategy can be prohibitively expensive. However, within an academic activity, instructors could offer mini-sessions that focus on the same objective but touch on different learning styles and allow students to choose the delivery method that suits their learning style. Within a recreation session, students could be allowed to choose an activity amongst two or three options.

Myriad solutions are available if tutors and site coordinators keep these best practices in mind when designing activities for students. Again, the ability of centers to implement programing that meets the needs of the students served while maintaining best practices is a strength of the 21st CCLC initiative.
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## Appendix A—Results from Global Observation Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic:</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>LEAs</th>
<th>CBOs</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Mid-size</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>HS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Sites Visited</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Sites Visited</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Supportive Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The physical environment is safe and free of health hazards.</td>
<td>97.2% (35)</td>
<td>100.0% (24)</td>
<td>91.7% (11)</td>
<td>87.5% (7)</td>
<td>100.0% (9)</td>
<td>100.0% (19)</td>
<td>100.0% (25)</td>
<td>92.3% (12)</td>
<td>100.0% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Program space/furniture/equipment accommodate the activities offered (e.g., there are enough resources for students to work with, materials are in good repair, etc.).</td>
<td>86.1% (31)</td>
<td>95.8% (23)</td>
<td>66.7% (8)</td>
<td>87.5% (7)</td>
<td>88.9% (8)</td>
<td>84.2% (16)</td>
<td>88.0% (22)</td>
<td>76.9% (10)</td>
<td>100.0% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Students can access resources/materials with ease independently (e.g., computers, library/books, games, etc.).</td>
<td>66.7% (24)</td>
<td>66.7% (16)</td>
<td>66.7% (8)</td>
<td>75.0% (6)</td>
<td>77.8% (7)</td>
<td>57.9% (11)</td>
<td>60.0% (15)</td>
<td>69.2% (9)</td>
<td>100.0% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Staff provides a welcoming atmosphere (e.g., staff directly addresses students by name, staff listens to students).</td>
<td>94.4% (34)</td>
<td>91.7% (22)</td>
<td>100.0% (12)</td>
<td>87.5% (7)</td>
<td>100.0% (9)</td>
<td>94.7% (18)</td>
<td>92.0% (23)</td>
<td>92.3% (12)</td>
<td>100.0% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic:</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>LEAs</td>
<td>CBOs</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Mid-size</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Session flow is well planned (e.g., staff conveys expectations/plans for the session).</td>
<td>94.4% (34)</td>
<td>100.0% (24)</td>
<td>83.3% (10)</td>
<td>75.0% (6)</td>
<td>100.0% (9)</td>
<td>100.0% (19)</td>
<td>96.0% (24)</td>
<td>84.6% (11)</td>
<td>100.0% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Schedule of planned activities allows for flexibility (i.e., provides routine without rigidity).</td>
<td>68.6% (24)</td>
<td>66.7% (16)</td>
<td>72.7% (8)</td>
<td>75.0% (6)</td>
<td>55.6% (5)</td>
<td>72.2% (13)</td>
<td>68.0% (17)</td>
<td>76.9% (10)</td>
<td>100.0% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Students can choose from a variety of activities. (e.g., student is presented with more than one option/choice of activity).</td>
<td>44.4% (16)</td>
<td>41.7% (10)</td>
<td>50.0% (6)</td>
<td>62.5% (5)</td>
<td>33.3% (3)</td>
<td>42.1% (8)</td>
<td>44.0% (11)</td>
<td>61.5% (8)</td>
<td>60.0% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. There is a good balance of academic, enrichment, and recreational activities for students to participate.</td>
<td>58.3% (21)</td>
<td>58.3% (14)</td>
<td>58.3% (7)</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>44.4% (4)</td>
<td>73.7% (14)</td>
<td>64.0% (16)</td>
<td>61.5% (8)</td>
<td>20.0% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. There is a good balance of structured and “free” time.</td>
<td>33.3% (12)</td>
<td>41.7% (10)</td>
<td>16.7% (2)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>22.2% (2)</td>
<td>42.1% (8)</td>
<td>40.0% (10)</td>
<td>30.8% (4)</td>
<td>20.0% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Activities are designed to engage students with different needs (e.g., ability level, learning style, interest).</td>
<td>58.3% (21)</td>
<td>70.8% (17)</td>
<td>33.3% (4)</td>
<td>62.5% (5)</td>
<td>55.6% (5)</td>
<td>57.9% (11)</td>
<td>60.0% (15)</td>
<td>38.5% (5)</td>
<td>80.0% (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Demographic:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities are designed to engage youth in fun and interesting ways (e.g., youth are engaged in hands-on learning, use of “real world” experiences to teach, etc.).</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>LEAs</th>
<th>CBOs</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Mid-size</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>HS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students are supervised to maintain safety (i.e., staff know where the youth are and what they are doing).</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>LEAs</th>
<th>CBOs</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Mid-size</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>HS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Healthy food and drinks are provided.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>LEAs</th>
<th>CBOs</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Mid-size</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>HS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Interactions (Staff/Student and Peer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff supports students in building new skills or refining existing skills (e.g., staff assists students without taking control; staff encourages students to think for themselves; staff verbally recognizes student efforts and accomplishments).</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>LEAs</th>
<th>CBOs</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Mid-size</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>HS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Demographics:

#### b. Staff relate to students in positive ways (e.g., staff communicates goals and expectations to students; conversations with students are not limited to directions or other “necessary talk”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>LEAs</th>
<th>CBOs</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Mid-size</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>HS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### c. Students have opportunities to practice leadership skills (e.g., staff encourages students to set goals/make plans, share ideas, opinions, and concerns, take responsibilities, time to reflect).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>LEAs</th>
<th>CBOs</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Mid-size</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>HS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### d. Students interact with one another in positive ways (e.g., students assist one another, are friendly and relaxed with one another, socialize informally, consider each other’s viewpoints, work collaboratively).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>LEAs</th>
<th>CBOs</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Mid-size</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>HS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### e. Staff encourages the participation of all regardless of level of ability or other factors (e.g., staff try to engage a student who may be isolated or not paying attention during an activity).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic:</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>LEAs</th>
<th>CBOs</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Mid-size</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>HS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### f. Staff encourages children to manage feelings and resolve conflicts appropriately/steps in only if needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic:</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>LEAs</th>
<th>CBOs</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Mid-size</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>HS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### g. Staff listens attentively and/or observes students (e.g., respond verbally or non-verbally to communicate feedback, pay attention to students as they complete tasks/interested in what students are saying or doing).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic:</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>LEAs</th>
<th>CBOs</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Mid-size</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>HS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[1n=3 \quad 2n=4 \quad 3n=7 \quad 4n=8 \quad 5n=10 \quad 6n=11 \quad 7n=14 \quad 8n=15 \quad 9n=17 \quad 10n=18 \quad 11n=20 \quad 12n=21 \quad 13n=24 \quad 14n=32 \quad 15n=34 \quad 16n=35\]