

Year 4 (2020-2021) NYS 21CCLC Annual Evaluation Report



Purpose of this Document

This Year 4 Annual Evaluation Report (AER) follows the format of the Year 4 Annual Evaluation Report Template and Guide for evaluators of Local 21st Century Community Learning Center (21st CCLC) programs in New York State, which was developed by Measurement Incorporated, the Statewide Evaluator, at the request of the State Program Coordinator. From MI,

It is recognized, as stated in the Evaluation Manual, that “Evaluation first and foremost should be useful to the program managers at all levels of the system...” and that “The Annual Report’s primary function is to present findings on the degree to which...objectives were met.” The Evaluation Manual further specifies that the AER should report on the study methodology, findings, and recommendations and conclusions.

While these represent the report’s “primary” functions, they do not reflect its only purpose. The AER also serves – along with other data sources – to inform NYSED Project Managers, Resource Center support specialists, and the Statewide Evaluator about program performance and accomplishments, which help guide the monitoring review and technical assistance processes. Indeed, many of the components of this report are directly aligned with NYSED policies and program expectations that are the focus of the monitoring visits that all programs receive. These alignments are highlighted throughout this template with references to **required indicators and evidence** in the revised Site Monitoring Visit Report (“SMV Report”).¹ *Because NYSED and the Resource Centers review a program’s AERs before each visit, information provided in this report that aligns with those indicators can be used to fulfill the documentation requirements of these visits.*

Additional purposes of this report include helping to inform NYSED and the State Evaluator about trends across sub-grantees, which help to guide NYSED’s policy decisions, as well as its mandated reporting to the U.S. Department of Education. In short, the AER supports program improvement at both the state and local levels and contributes to evidence that the federal government needs to make funding decisions. For all of these reasons, the information requested herein

¹ Retrieved from <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/sss/documents/21C%20Onsite%20Monitoring%20Report%202017-19.doc>.

should be of interest to all stakeholders and is consistent with that required by the **Evaluation Manual**¹ per the **Request for Proposals** for local program funding,² as well as **State monitoring guidelines**.³

The purpose of this report guide and template is to clearly identify, and to organize within a consistent structure, the information that is necessary for each of the above stakeholders. The template has been designed with the varying needs of these different stakeholders in mind. It is designed to strike a compromise between the brevity and accessibility that program managers require, and the depth of detail that state and federal stakeholders require. Summaries or graphics that would be useful to program staff can always be included within the comments of each section or included in the appendices.

Please note that NYSED, the Resource Centers, and the State Evaluation Team are acutely aware of the challenges over the past year created by the COVID-19 pandemic, such as school closures and resulting needs to conduct program activities virtually and/or through hybrid models; the need to redesign many program activities to accommodate these conditions; personal, financial and health crises faced by many families, resulting in reduced participation; the need to also redesign evaluation activities so they could be conducted remotely; the cancellation of state testing in Spring 2020; the interruptions to communications, distribution of surveys, and access to documents; and many other challenges. It is well understood that such conditions have had major impacts on all levels of programming, and that some project goals had to be modified, could not be measured, and/or could not be met. This template has been redesigned slightly to facilitate evaluators' ability to report on such limitations.

We encourage the author(s) of this report to use the “Explain” column in the Evaluation Plan and Results tables, as well as other comment and narrative sections of the report, to explain where the program and the evaluation were hampered by these conditions, as well as any strategies that were used to address the challenges.

This AER was written by the local evaluator of the Newburgh Enlarged City School District (NECSD) 21st CCLC grant, Brockport Research Institute and submitted to NYSED, MI, and the NECSD grant facilitator on September xx, 2021.



¹ “New York State’s 21st Century Community Learning Centers Evaluation Manual.” Retrieved from: <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/sss/21stCCLC/NYSEvaluationManual.pdf>

² Retrieved from <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/funding/2017-2022-21st-cclc/2017-2022-21st-cclc-grant-application.pdf>.

³ As outlined in New York State’s revised 21st CCLC “Site Visit Monitoring Report,” cited above.

Table of Contents

I.	Project Information & Formative Assessment.....	4
II.	Evaluation Plan & Results.....	7
III.	Observation Results.....	22
	a. First visit	22
	b. Second visit	27
IV.	Logic Model (LM)	30
V.	Conclusions & Recommendations	32
	a. Status of the implementation of recommendations from Year 3	32
	b. Documented or perceived impacts of implementing Year 3 recommendations, if known.....	33
	c. Strategies used to help ensure that evaluation findings were used to inform program improvement.....	33
	d. Conclusions and recommendations based on Year 4’s evaluation findings.....	33
	e. Conclusions and recommendations based on Year 3 evaluation findings that could not previously be addressed due to pending data, if applicable	34
VI.	Sustainability.....	35
VII.	Appendices	36
	Appendix A: Student Survey Summary: Grades K-3.....	37
	Appendix B: Student Survey Summary: Grades 4-5	44
	Appendix C: Saturday Family Learning Trip Summary	60
	Appendix D: iReady Assessment Summary.....	72
	Appendix E: Discipline Referral Summary	75
	Appendix F1: Teacher Survey Summary (Year 1 – Year 3)	78
	Appendix F2: Teacher Survey Summary (Year 4).....	85
	Appendix G: Student Attendance Summary.....	93

I. Project Information & Formative Assessment

Program Name	Newburgh Enlarged City School District (NECSD)		
Project Number	0187-21-7140		
Name of Lead Agency	Newburgh Enlarged City School District (NECSD)		
Name of Program Director	Susan Torres-Bender		
Name(s) of Participating Site(s) and grade level(s) served at each site	Site 1: Balmville Elementary School	Grade(s) Served:	Kindergarten – 5 th grade
	Site 2: Gardnertown Leadership Academy	Grade(s) Served:	Kindergarten – 5 th grade
	Site 3: Gidney Ave. Magnet School	Grade(s) Served:	Kindergarten – 5 th grade
	Site 4: Horizons On The Hudson	Grade(s) Served:	Kindergarten – 5 th grade
	Site 5: Vails Gate STEAM Academy	Grade(s) Served:	Kindergarten – 5 th grade
Target Enrollment	Total (Program-wide): 750	Actual # at/above 30 hours:	72 students
Evaluator Name and Company	Lynn T. Moulton, Brockport Research Institute		
Evaluator Phone and Email	(585) 703-5400, Lynn.Moulton@BrockportResearchInstitute.com		

Project Summary

In April 2017, Newburgh Enlarged City School District (NECSD) was awarded a five-year grant in Round 7 of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) funding. The proposed project targets 750 students in grades K-5 at four Title I elementary schools and their families. In Year 2, a fifth school, Vails Gate STEAM Academy, was added. The **Program Theory** from the proposal states how NECSD will address the three key components of all 21st CCLC grants: academic enrichment outside of school hours, youth development, and family literacy/advocacy.

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.

NECSD partners with the Boys & Girls Club-Newburgh (BGCN) to have them provide additional enrichment opportunities to supplement what the NECSD staff and Zylofone Studios, Inc. provide. In Year 1, BGCN provided two artists from their Newburgh Performing Arts Academy (NPAA) to each school while in Years 2 and 3, they provided a coach and an artist (e.g., visual arts, dance) to each school. Each followed curriculum provided by the Boys & Girls Clubs of America: Triple Play for the coaches and Youth Arts Activity Guide for the artists. Zylofone Studios, Inc. provided enrichment activities for students in grades K-2 in Year 2 (Balmville) and Year 3 (Balmville and Vails Gate) and became an official partner in Year 4. Because all 21st CCLC programming was held virtually in Year 4, the Fall Session (11/24/2020-2/11/2021) included pre-recorded videos by both BGCN and Zylofone Studios, Inc. Based on student feedback, BGCN may provide synchronous artist activities for the Spring Session (3/2/2021-4/29/2021).

Sites are required to report student data two times during the year. Mid-Winter enrollment data is provided to NYSED by mid-February (Years 1, 2, and 4) or March 31 (Year 3) via online survey while participation data at the end of the grant year is provided to Measurement Inc. on a spreadsheet

template. In Years 1-3, NECSD utilized a licensed online software product (*Cayen*) to store attendance data and generate the necessary reports. For Year 4, NYSED provided access to *EZReports* to every 21st CCLC site in New York State. This online platform also allows MI and NYSED to access sites’ data for state-level evaluation and program review. The following table summarizes the report data for all four grant years at each site.

Student Enrollment and Participation

Site Name	Year #	K-5 School Enrollment (# of students)	21 st CCLC Enrollment (# of students)			Students with 30 hours of Participation ¹ (# of students)	Difference between Proposed Enrollment & Students with 30 hours of Participation (# of students)
			Proposed	Mid-Winter	Final		
Balmville	1	493	150	63	115	97	-53
	2	462	100	101	118	86	-14
	3	453	100	152	152	95	-5
	4	410	100	26	20	8	-92
Gardnertown	1	696	200	85	104	91	-109
	2	669	100	96	186	82	-18
	3	682	100	127	128	98	-2
	4	599	100	49	50	26	-74
Gidney Avenue	1	801	200	130	179	138	-62
	2	803	200	171	188	158	-42
	3	817	200	184	184	114	-86
	4	595	200	40	24	9	-191
Horizons	1	518	200	58	73	67	-133
	2	483	150	122	147	111	-39
	3	487	150	147	148	130	-20
	4	416	150	30	32	10	-140
Vails Gate	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2	565	200	108	134	52	-148
	3	543	200	135	135	109	-91
	4	554	200	54	42	19	-181
TOTAL	1	2,508	750	336	470	393	-357
	2	2,982	750	598	773	489	-261
	3	2,982	750	711	747	546	-204
	4	2,574	750	199	168	72	-678

¹ Funding considerations

- Year 1: There were no student participation requirements. Full funding was provided.
- Year 2: Per the RFP, if the number of students “With 30 Hours of Participation” was below 713 students (95% of the 750 proposed total), funding was reduced by the corresponding percentage.
- Year 3: Due to the Coronavirus, NYSED adjusted the participation requirement to either (A) 45% of targeted students reach 30 hours of participation, or (B) 95% of targeted students reach 15 hours of participation. NECSD met funding requirement (A) and received full funding.
- Year 4: Due to ongoing disruptions and barriers caused by the pandemic, NYSED provided full funding to all 21st CCLC sites.

In the first two grant years, the 21st CCLC enrollment at each school increased from Mid-Winter to the end of the program (e.g., in Year 2, Balmville increased enrollment from 101 to 118 students). In Year 3, enrollment did not change significantly from Mid-Winter to Final due to the district closing in mid-March 2020. The enrollment data for Year 4 is inconsistent with three schools showing higher Mid-Winter enrollments as compared to Final. This is most likely due to the Mid-Winter data not having been certified in EZReports like the Final data is.

Students with 30 hours of participation, however, have not reached the proposed level at any of the schools as indicated by the negative values in the rightmost column. In the first three grant years, teacher staffing was a limiting factor to reaching proposed enrollment. Also, in Year 3, NECSD buildings closed on March 18, 2020, initially for fourteen days but then for the remainder of the school year like other districts in New York State. Regular school day instruction was transitioned to a virtual format and Year 3's 21st CCLC programming was discontinued due to staff, families, and students having their focus on becoming familiar with a different mode of learning. Also, not all students in grades K-5 had been provided with a computer to use at home and many did not have reliable internet access. Like during 21st CCLC program time, however, meals were provided (although families had to do a drive-through pick-up) and social-emotional resources were available (posted on the district website). COVID-19 issues continued into Year 4 with the regular school days starting in virtual mode in September and then transitioning to in-person by grade level through Fall 2020. Student and family interest in a virtual after-school program was not sufficient to meet the targeted numbers at any of the five schools. In general, students were not interested in participating in remote learning and activities, and many families needed their students to be in childcare. Issues with internet connectivity were also a deterrent to enrollment and consistent participation.

In addition to 21st CCLC programming that occurred during the academic school years, summer programming was held in Year 2 (Summer 2018) and Year 3 (Summer 2019) as per the grant proposal. Because of the late award date of the grant, summer programming was not held in Year 1 (Summer 2017). The Summer LEGO Academy utilized LEGO Education's WeDo 2.0 Curriculum of STEM-based projects which included English language arts components. In both years of the Summer LEGO Academy, 60 students were accommodated. In Year 2, 27 students reached 30 hours of participation during the summer, and then they did not participate in 21st CCLC during the school year: Balmville had 4, Gardnertown had 1, Gidney Avenue had 6, and Horizons had 16 students participate. Because Vails Gate did not start 21st CCLC programming until the Year 2 academic year, they did not participate in the summer academy. In Year 3, 28 students reached 30 hours of participation during the Summer LEGO Academy without continuing to participate in 21st CCLC during the school year: Balmville had four, Gardnertown had three, Gidney Ave. had seven, Horizons had eleven, and Vails Gate had three students. These summer-only students are included when determining the number of students with 30 or more hours for funding purposes, but they are not included when looking at outcomes (e.g., scores for i-Ready assessments were only included for students with 30 or more hours in the academic year, which in Year 3 was 518 students rather than 546 students).

Year 4's 21st CCLC program did not include a Summer LEGO Academy due to the district canceling all summer activities. Because the regular school day was scheduled to start in September with all virtual instruction, 21st CCLC programming was also offered in a virtual format. Although students transitioned to a hybrid mode of instruction for their regular school day (i.e., four days at school and Wednesdays at home), 21st CCLC remained all virtual. Students have in-person instruction during the regular day, then they join the 21st CCLC program when they arrive at their after-school destination (e.g., home, childcare location).

II. Evaluation Plan & Results

The following table is derived from the Template of Goals & Objectives submitted with the grant. Because the activities and measurability of the performance indicators (PIs) indicate a strong adherence to the original plan, this completed table may be used by NECSD as evidence to support compliance with SMV Indicator E-3(a): “Adherence to the Program’s Grant Proposal: Programming aligns with the **Template for Goals and Objectives** as it appears in the proposal and/or *NYSED-approved* program modifications”.

These definitions were used when completing the table:

- Target Populations: students, parents, staff; grade levels, sub-groups (e.g., special education), specific activity participants, etc. as applicable.
- "SMART" criteria: **Specific:** targets a specific, clearly defined area of improvement for a specific target group; **Measurable:** states a defined outcome that can be assessed, and how it is to be assessed, including instruments and analyses (SMART indicators can include qualitative assessment); **Achievable:** realistic given baseline conditions and available resources (note this may be difficult for State Evaluator to assess); **Relevant:** aligned to program mission, program activities, school day academics, GPRA indicators, etc.; **Time-bound:** specifies when the goal will be achieved (most will be annual).
- Activities to support this program objective: List of activity titles.
- PI Measures: Data collection instruments and methods used to assess the success of the PI (e.g., surveys, observations, interviews, focus groups, report cards, attendance rosters, behavior/disciplinary records, state assessments, other skills assessments).
- Analyses: Analyses of the above measures used to determine whether the PI was met.
- **Response rate** is defined as the number of respondents for whom data/information was obtained, divided by the total number in the target population for whom the PI was specified. (Note that the PI target population may be smaller than the total number of program participants, for example in activities that are not designed for all students, or if the PI is specified only for students attending a minimum number of hours.)
- “Was this PI met?” A designation of “Partial” can only be used to indicate that a Performance Indicator (PI) was fully met in at least one site, but not at all sites.

Objective 1: 21st CCLCs 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 (specify): Students who participate in the After-School Academy (ASA) will improve their academic achievement by 5% utilizing instruments such as i-Ready Diagnostic, the NYS assessment program, and project-based learning activities centered around STEAM.

Performance Indicator(s) (PI) of success	Target Population(s)	PI Meet SMART Criteria? (Y/N)	Activity(ies) to support this program objective	PI Measures data collection instruments & methods (Indicate title if published)	Describe the analysis conducted, including specific results that directly address the PI. Include any longitudinal assessments conducted beyond one program year.	Response Rate (if applicable):	Was this PI met? Select one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • Partial • Not met-pandemic • Not met-other • Not meas.-pandemic • Not meas.-other • Data Pending 	EXPLAIN: If Yes, No or Partial: present results (expressed in the same metric as the PI) If Partial, indicate # of sites where PI was <i>fully</i> met. If data pending, indicate when data expected. If not measured, explain why not. If not met due to pandemic, explain why not.
Students will demonstrate 95% attendance rate in the After	Students enrolled in the 21 st CCLC program	No. Based on the population	Academic-based portion of after school program	Daily attendance is recorded by school staff and entered into	<i>Cayen/EZReports</i> stores data on each student's daily attendance and then	N/A	Year 1: Not met-other	Year 1: Student attendance rates: Balmville: 69/115 = 60% Gardnertown: 70/104 = 67%

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

School Academy (ASA) program.		being served, a 95% attendance rate is most likely not attainable. In all grant years, many students have not had consistent attendance for the year.		an online data-tracking system (<i>Cayen</i> in Years 1-3 and <i>EZReports</i> in Year 4) that is dedicated to the 21 st CCLC grant.	calculates each school's average daily attendance. The attendance rate is computed as = 100 x (average daily attendance) / (total number of registered 21 st CCLC participants)			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 because summer camp was not offered and students were not necessarily enrolled in the entire program year
								Year 2: Not met-other Balmville: 67/113 = 59% Gardnertown: 78/181 = 43% Gidney Avenue: 124/175 = 70% Horizons: 71/117 = 61% Vails Gate: 77/130 = 59%
								Year 3: Not met-other, although the rate increased for four of the five schools from Year 2 Balmville: 81/148 = 55% Gardnertown: 78/128 = 61% Gidney Ave: 104/145 = 72% Horizons: 112/150 = 75% Vails Gate: 89/130 = 69%
								Year 4: Not met-pandemic Consistent attendance was hard for students to maintain. Balmville: 8/20 = 40.0% Gardnertown: 21/50 = 42.0% Gidney Ave: 8/24 = 33.3% Horizons: 9/32 = 28.1% Vails Gate: 16/42 = 38.1%

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 (specify): 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.

Performance Indicator(s) (PI) of success	Target Population(s)	PI Meet SMART Criteria? (Y/N)	Activity(ies) to support this program objective	PI Measures data collection instruments & methods (Indicate title if published)	Describe the analysis conducted, including specific results that directly address the PI. Include any longitudinal assessments conducted beyond one program year.	Response Rate (if applicable):	Was this PI met? Select one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • Partial • Not met-pandemic • Not met-other • Not meas.-pandemic • Not meas.-other • Data Pending 	EXPLAIN: If Yes, No or Partial: present results (expressed in the same metric as the PI) If Partial, indicate # of sites where PI was fully met. If data pending, indicate when data expected. If not measured, explain why not. If not met due to pandemic, explain why not.
Students will achieve 95% attendance in enrichment and youth development activities	Same as Program Objective 1.1-1	Same as Program Objective 1.1-1	Enrichment portion of after school program	Same as Program Objective 1.1-1	Same as Program Objective 1.1-1	N/A	Same as Program Objective 1.1-1	Because enrichment and youth development activities occur daily with the academic portion of the ASA, the attendance rate is the same as shown in Program Objective 1.1-1.

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

95% of students will find the enrichment program favorable based on exit survey.	Students enrolled in the 21 st CCLC program and, starting in Year 2, reaching 30 hours of participation	No, the target of 95% is high. A suggested target would be 80%.	Enrichment portion of after school program including those activities provided by the grant partner Boys and Girls Club of Newburgh (BGCN)	Student surveys, including data collection instruments and methods, are discussed in Appendix A (grades K-3) and Appendix B (grades 4-5)	Student surveys, including analysis and results, are discussed in Appendix A (grades K-3) and Appendix B (grades 4-5)	Year 1: Grades. K-3: 11.1% # in Pop: 190 # w/data: 21 Grades 4-5: 13.1% # in Pop: 153 # w/data: 20	Year 1: No, although the positive responses ranged from 88.2% to 89.6%.	Year 1: Three schools each had two NPAA artists that rotated for each of the enrichment Sessions. Because the fourth school, Gardnertown, had a later start date, school staff provided all arts activities. Although there were a limited number of survey responses from both age groups, there was positive feedback on all outcome areas. The majority of students in grades K-3 indicated an 88.2% positive response (76.8% “Yes” and 11.4% “Kind of”). The majority of students in grades 4-5 indicated an 89.6% positive response (69.7% “Yes” and 19.9% “Kind of”).
						Year 2: Grades. K-3: 74.1% # in Pop: 274 # w/data: 203 Grades 4-5: 57.4% # in Pop: 188 # w/data: 108	Year 2: No, although positive responses ranged from 68.6% to 85.1%	Year 2: Each of the five schools had a coach and artist from Boys & Girls Club – Newburgh (BGCN) with district staff also leading additional enrichment opportunities. The majority of students in grade K-3 from all five schools had positive feedback (i.e., “Yes” and “Kind of” responses) to the survey but none reached the 95% target: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balmville: 78.5% (67.8% + 10.7%) • Gardnertown: 68.7% (58.7% + 10.0%) • Gidney Ave: 77.2% (63.1% + 14.1%) • Horizons: 83.2% (70.9% + 12.3%) • Vails Gate: 82.9% (75.5% + 7.4%) The majority of students in grades 4-5 from all five schools also had positive feedback (i.e., “Yes” and “Kind of” responses) to the SSOS but none reached the 95% target: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balmville: 68.6% (51.3% + 17.3%) • Gardnertown: 69.5% (46.3% + 23.2%) • Gidney Ave: 85.1% (59.7% + 25.4%) • Horizons: 63.5% (44.4% + 19.1%) • Vails Gate: 71.3% (41.7% + 29.6%)
						Year 3: Grades. K-3: 13.7% # in Pop: 248 # w/data: 34 Grades 4-5: 11.9% # in Pop: 151 # w/data: 18	Year 3: Yes	Year 3: In Year 3, a general satisfaction question was added to both the grades K-3 survey and the grades 4&5 survey. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All students in grades K-3 that replied to the question either selected “It is great!” (20 students) or “It is OK.” (5 students). • Similarly, all students in grades 4&5 that replied to the question either selected “It is great!” (7 students) or “It is OK.” (6 students).
						Year 4: Grades. K-3: 48.3%	Year 4: Yes	Year 4: Both the Grades K-3 and Grades 4-5 surveys include a question regarding general satisfaction with the 21 st CCLC program.

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

						# in Pop: 29 # w/data: 14 Grades 4-5: 62.8% # in Pop: 43 # w/data: 27		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All students in grades K-3 that replied to the question either selected “It is great!” (9 students) or “It is OK.” (3 students). • Similarly, all students in grades 4-5 that replied to the question either selected “It is great!” (17 students) or “It is OK.” (6 students).
Students will achieve a 95% attendance rate to Saturday Family Learning Trips	Students that attend a Saturday Family Learning Trip	Yes	Saturday Family Learning Trips	Attendance is recorded by school staff at each Saturday Family Learning Trip and entered in the <i>Cayen</i> (Years 1-3) or <i>EZReports</i> (Year 4) software system. Saturday Family Learning Trips, including data collection instruments and methods, are discussed in Appendix C.	The attendance rate is computed as the total number of student attendees from a school compared to the number that were registered. In Years 1-3, the registration for all Saturday Family Learning Trips was at full capacity. Because Year 4’s Trips were virtual and the 21 st CCLC program had limited enrollment, there was not a need to cap Trip registrations. All interested students could have participated. Saturday Family Learning Trips, including analysis and results, are discussed in Appendix C.	N/A	Year 1: No, but attendance policies were revised and attendance improved in Year 2.	Year 1: For the three field trips, the overall student attendance rate was 56.4% (282 students attended out of 500 possible) This performance indicator was not met in Year 1, although it was primarily due to adults registering their students and themselves to attend and then not coming on the day of the trip. Consequences for “no shows” were implemented in Year 2 (i.e., the adult would not be allowed to register for future Saturday Family Learning Trips).
							Year 2: No, although Vails Gate reached an attendance rate of 93.3%.	Year 2: Averaged over the three field trips, the student attendance rate for each school was: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balmville: 86.7% (52 out of 60) • Gardnertown: 88.3% (53 out of 60) • Gidney Ave: 88.3% (53 out of 60) • Horizons: 86.7 (52 out of 60) • Vails Gate: 93.3% (56 out of 60)
							Year 3: No, although Gardnertown reached 92.5%	Year 3: Averaged across the two field trips, the student attendance rate for each school was: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balmville: 57.5% (23 out of 40) • Gardnertown: 92.5% (37 out of 40) • Gidney Ave: 77.5% (31 out of 40) • Horizons: 70.0% (28 out of 40) Vails Gate: 75.0% (30 out of 40)
							Year 4: Not met-pandemic	Year 4: The average student attendance rate was 71.4% for the two virtual Trips. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the first Trip, there were technical issues and some students were not aware that the Google Class Code was posted in their regular 21st CCLC Google Classroom. The video was available during winter recess. • Although the Hip Hop class was a live event, registration was low (8 students) and participation was low (4 students). It should be noted that some students did not have a family member with them and participated on their own.
90% of students will find the Saturday Family Learning Trip favorable based on exit survey.	Students that attend a Saturday Family Learning Trip	Yes	Saturday Family Learning Trips	Surveys for Saturday Family Learning Trips, including data collection instruments and methods, are	Surveys for Saturday Family Learning Trips, including analysis and results, are discussed in Appendix C.	Year 1 <u>Locust Grove</u> 12.2%, # in Pop: 74 # w/data: 9 <u>Liberty</u>	Year 1: Yes	Year 1: Students were surveyed regarding the Saturday Family Learning Trips along with their outcome surveys in May and June 2018. A low number of parent consents were collected, hence the small number of student surveys completed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students in grades K-3: Of the 15 respondents, the majority (12 students) had not previously been to any of the three Family

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

				discussed in Appendix C.		11.8% # in Pop: 93 # w/data: 11 <u>Nat. Geo.</u> 10.4% # in Pop: 115 # w/data: 2		Field Trip locations, 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 any of the three Family Field Trip locations and all but 1 student indicated that they “liked” the trip.
						Year 2: <u>Legoland</u> 68.4%, # in Pop: 98 # w/data: 67 <u>Aquarium</u> 45.3% # in Pop: 86 # w/data: 39 <u>West Point.</u> 91.4% # in Pop: 81 # w/data: 74	Year 2: Yes	Year 2: Students were surveyed regarding each Saturday Family Learning Trip at its conclusion. Students had generally not previously visited the locations and the majority liked or “kind of” liked participating. • Legoland: 100% (65 out of 65) • Aquarium: 100% (37 out of 37) • West Point: 97.3% (72 out of 74)
						Year 3: <u>Camp Mariah</u> 92.3%, # in Pop: 52 # w/data: 48 <u>Bounce Park</u> 69.1%, # in Pop: 97 # w/data: 67	Year 3: Yes	Year 3: As in Year 2, students were surveyed on paper regarding each Saturday Family Learning Trip at its conclusion. In both cases, the majority liked or “kind of” liked the trip. • Camp Mariah: 100% (48 out of 48) • Bounce Park: 95.5% (64 out of 67)
						Year 4: <u>Favorite Foods:</u> 11.5%, # in Pop: 26 # w/data: 3 <u>Hip Hop:</u> 75.0%, # in Pop: 4 # w/data: 3	Year 4: Yes	Year 4: Although registration and attendance were very low for both Saturday Family Learning Trips, students were surveyed online after each Trip and all students responding to the survey indicated that they liked the trip. • Favorite Foods: 100% (3 out of 3) • Hip Hop Dance Class: 100% (3 out of 3)

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.¹

Program Objective 1.3-1 (specify): Each program site will develop two new community partnerships throughout the course of the grant.

Performance Indicator(s) (PI) of success	Target Population(s)	PI Meet SMART Criteria? (Y/N)	Activity(ies) to support this program objective	PI Measures data collection instruments & methods (Indicate title if published)	Describe the analysis conducted, including specific results that directly address the PI. Include any longitudinal assessments conducted beyond one program year.	Response Rate (if applicable):	Was this PI met? Select one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • Partial • Not met-pandemic • Not met-other • Not meas.-pandemic • Not meas.-other • Data Pending 	EXPLAIN: If Yes, No or Partial: present results (expressed in the same metric as the PI) If Partial, indicate # of sites where PI was fully met. If data pending, indicate when data expected. If not measured, explain why not. If not met due to pandemic, explain why not.
All stakeholders will participate in 95% of Program Advisory Council Team (PACT) meetings (i.e., advisory board)	As listed here and shown in the Logic Model, there is a diverse target population for the PACT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum • Director of Grants • Grant Facilitator • Community Partner representative • From each school: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - School Principal - Student representatives - Teacher representatives - Parent representatives 	No. Because the PACT is required to meet four times per year, a more appropriate target would be to participate in 75% of the meetings. Due to the high number of invitees, however, it is unlikely that they could all attend 75% of the meetings.	PACT meetings	PACT meeting agendas and meeting minutes document the occurrence of the PACT meetings as well as the attendees.	The evaluator participates in the PACT meetings by phone or in-person and receives agendas and minutes from the grant facilitator.	N/A	Year 1: Not met-other. There was a high number of PACT meetings scheduled, along with a high number of invitees, making a 95% attendance rate unlikely.	Year 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nine PACT meetings were scheduled; 7 meetings were held: October 11, 2017, November 20, 2017, December 18, 2017, January 22, 2018, February 26, 2018 (canceled due to a mandatory safety meeting being scheduled), March 19, 2018, April 23, 2018, May 21, 2018 (canceled – attendees were not available after school was closed May 16-18 due to a storm and power outage), and June 12, 2018. Note that the number of PACT meetings scheduled exceeded the grant requirement of four meetings. • Stakeholder representation (i.e., school & district administrators, BGCN representatives, community representatives) was extensive although parent/guardian attendance was minimal and no students or teachers attended.
							Year 2: Not met-other. Due to the high number of stakeholders and the inability to find a common availability, this PI was not met but various communication methods were used.	Year 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four PACT meetings were held: August 20, 2018, December 3, 2018, March 4, 2019, and April 30, 2019. • Stakeholder representation varied even when meeting location and time were adjusted to accommodate needs. To include student, staff, and family input to the meetings, the grant facilitator surveyed these stakeholders anonymously to determine what they felt were the positive aspects of the 21st CCLC program as well as concerns and suggestions.
							Year 3: Not met-other. Due to the large number of	Year 3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four PACT meetings were held: August 28, 2019, December 19, 2019, March 23, 2020 (agenda shared and comments received by email due to school closings) and May 21, 2020.

¹ Note that this table might serve as a supplemental source of evidence documenting activities to engage and communicate with families, helping support grantees' compliance with Indicators in SMV Section G, particularly G-3, G-5, G-6, and G-7.

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

							<p>stakeholders, this PI is hard to attain.</p> <p>Communication among the grant facilitator, school admins, district admins, and CBO partner is strong, however.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation Forms were distributed to students, staff, and families to allow a means for them to have input to the meetings. Responses are included in the PACT meeting agenda. The staff form asks for positive aspects as well as concerns and suggestions. The student form asks why they like participating in the program, what activities they like best, and suggestions for changes/additions. The family form is written in both English and Spanish and asks what they like about the program, what adult classes they are interested in, and if they have any concerns or suggestions. • School administrators invite PTA/O representatives. • Due to the large number of stakeholders, in-person representation has varied. In order to share information, stakeholders are provided with the agenda before the meeting and minutes, including the evaluation update, which is distributed afterward. The grant facilitator visits each site periodically to follow up in-person with school staff and maintain communication.
							<p>Year 4: Not met-other</p> <p>Even in an especially challenging school year, there continued to be strong communication ties among the stakeholders.</p>	<p>Year 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four virtual PACT meetings were held: September 24, 2020, December 21, 2020, February 25, 2021, and April 26, 2021. via Google Meet. • Participation forms continue to be used as described in the Year 3 section. • School administrators invite PTA/O representatives. • Due to the large number of stakeholders, representation has varied. In order to share information, stakeholders are provided with the agenda before the meeting and minutes, including the evaluation update, which is distributed afterward. • The grant facilitator virtually observes each site’s programming weekly to follow up with school staff and maintain communication.
<p>Each site will host a Parent Academy event that includes at least 2 additional community organizations.</p>	<p>Parents/guardians and family members of students participating in the 21st CCLC program</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Showcase events at each school at the end of each Session, as well as the Lights On Afterschool event in October</p>	<p>Program documentation</p>	<p>The grant facilitator provides copies of the flyers to the evaluator.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Year 1: Partial, due to promotion of educational opportunities</p>	<p>Year 1: Flyers for English as a Second Language (ESL), Financial Literacy, General Education Diploma (GED), and High School Equivalency (HSE) classes were distributed to families and posted on each school’s bulletin board.</p>
							<p>Year 2: Yes</p>	<p>Year 2: Parent education occurred at the Lights On Afterschool event (October 2018) with training on the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and at showcase events (e.g., free blood pressure screenings and non-perishable food drive).</p>
							<p>Year 3: Yes</p>	<p>Year 3: Parent education occurred at the Lights On Afterschool events held at each school in October 2019. Each school hosted three or four community-based organizations. A Parent University included presentations and handouts by district guidance counselors on SEL. Principals conducted family orientations which are required for student participation. An orientation packet was sent home to</p>

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

								those that did not attend the orientation to be completed and returned for continued student participation.
								Year 4: Not met-pandemic Year 4: Similar to previous years, parent education was part of the Lights On Afterschool event (November 2020) which was held in conjunction with orientation.

Sub-Objective 1.4: Services to parents and other adult community members. 100% of Centers will offer services to parents of participating children.¹

Program Objective 1.4-1 (specify): Approximately 60 adults will participate in financial management, technology classes, and/or other adult community programs.

Performance Indicator(s) (PI) of success	Target Population(s)	PI Meet SMART Criteria? (Y/N)	Activity(ies) to support this program objective	PI Measures data collection instruments & methods (Indicate title if published)	Describe the analysis conducted, including specific results that directly address the PI. Include any longitudinal assessments conducted beyond one program year.	Response Rate (if applicable):	Was this PI met? Select one:	EXPLAIN: If Yes, No or Partial: present results (expressed in the same metric as the PI) If Partial, indicate # of sites where PI was fully met. If data pending, indicate when data expected. If not measured, explain why not. If not met due to pandemic, explain why not.
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • Partial • Not met-pandemic • Not met-other • Not meas.-pandemic • Not meas.-other • Data Pending 	
An increase of 50% in parents/guardians that attend at least one Parent University/Academy program, including literacy programs.	Parents/guardians of students participating in the 21 st CCLC program	No. Based on the targeted parents and results to date, 50% is an ambitious target.	Parent University/Academy	Attendance records	The grant facilitator would provide attendance records to the evaluator.	N/A	Year 1: No	Year 1: No parents/guardians attended these learning opportunities.
							Year 2: No	Year 2: No parents/guardians attended these learning opportunities.
							Year 3: No	Year 3: A Family Education Interest survey was posted on the 21 st CCLC web page in Fall 2019, in both English and Spanish, by the grant facilitator. The intent was to gather information regarding interest, availability, preferred language, and location for classes in Computer Basics and Introduction to Health Services. Five surveys were submitted. Adult education initiatives were not continued after the transition to a virtual school day in mid-March.
							Year 4: Not met-pandemic	Year 4: Parents were surveyed for interests but only five surveys were completed. It should be noted the district has a Family and Community Engagement (FACE) department that provides many activities, programs, and learning opportunities.
Of parents/guardians who attended the program, 90% will find the program favorable.	Parents/guardians of students participating in the 21 st CCLC program who attend a program	Yes	Parent University/Academy	Exit survey	A survey will be administered when an adult education program is attended.	N/A	Year 1: No	Year 1: No parents/guardians attended these learning opportunities.
							Year 2: No	Year 2: No parents/guardians attended these learning opportunities.
							Year 3: No	Year 3: No parents/guardians attended these learning opportunities.
							Year 4: Not met-pandemic	Year 4: No parents/guardians attended these learning opportunities.

¹ Note that this table might serve as a supplemental source of evidence documenting “Adult Learning Opportunities” helping to support grantees’ compliance with SMV Indicator G-8(d).

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

95% of registered adults will attend the Saturday Family Learning Trip	Adults registered for Saturday Family Learning Trips	N/A	See 1.2-1	See 1.2-1	See 1.2-1	See 1.2-1	See 1.2-1	Because students are required to have an adult accompany them on Saturday Family Learning Trips, the student attendance rate determines the adult attendance rate. See Objective 1.2-1 “Students will achieve a 95% attendance rate to Saturday Family Learning Trips”
90% of adults attending a Saturday Family Learning Trip will find the program favorable based on exit survey	Adults attending Saturday Family Learning Trips	Yes	Saturday Family Learning Trips	Surveys for Saturday Family Learning Trips, including data collection instruments and methods, are discussed in Appendix C	Surveys for Saturday Family Learning Trips, including analysis and results, are discussed in Appendix C	<p>Year 1 <u>Locust Grove</u> N/A <u>Liberty</u> 4.7% # in Pop: 86 # w/data: 4 <u>Nat. Geo.</u> 29.0% # in Pop: 100 # w/data: 29</p>	Year 1: Yes	Year 1: Most adults had not been to the Saturday Family Field Trip locations, overall were satisfied, and shared positive comments. There were low response rates to the surveys, but over 90% of respondents found the program favorable.
						<p>Year 2: <u>Legoland</u> 67.9%, # in Pop: 81 # w/data: 55 <u>Aquarium</u> 66.7% # in Pop: 69 # w/data: 46 <u>West Point.</u> 96.9% # in Pop: 64 # w/data: 62</p>	Year 2: Yes	Year 2: There were much higher response rates. Similar to Year 1, most adults indicated that they had not been to the Saturday Family Field Trip locations and greater than 90% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the excursion and are likely or very likely to attend another.
						<p>Year 3: <u>Camp Mariah</u> 95.6% # in Pop: 45 # w/data: 43 <u>Bounce Park</u> 89.7% # in Pop: 68 # w/data: 61</p>	Year 3: Partial	<p>Year 3: Response rates for adults were high (i.e., over 89%) for both trip locations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Camp Mariah – Although only 35 out of 43 surveys indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied (81.4%), responses to other survey questions and comments were favorable. • Bounce Trampoline Sports – 55 adults out of 60 responses (91.6%) indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

						Year 4: <u>Favorite Foods</u> 22.2% # in Pop: 18 # w/data: 4 <u>Hip Hop</u> 75.0% # in Pop: 4 # w/data: 3	Year 4: Not met-pandemic	Year 4: Registration and attendance were very low for both Saturday Family Learning Trips. Adults were surveyed online after each Trip. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Favorite Foods - 75% (3 out of 4) indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied. The one dissatisfied adult indicated that they did not how to sign into the field trip; his/her other responses and comments indicate enjoying the trip once logged in. • Hip Hop Dance Class – 100% (3 out of 3) indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---------------------------------	---

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 (specify): 50% of students will participate in programming opportunities on an average of at least 90 hours throughout the program.

Performance Indicator(s) (PI) of success	Target Population(s)	PI Meet SMART Criteria? (Y/N)	Activity(ies) to support this program objective	PI Measures data collection instruments & methods (Indicate title if published)	Describe the analysis conducted, including specific results that directly address the PI. Include any longitudinal assessments conducted beyond one program year.	Response Rate (if applicable):	Was this PI met? Select one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • Partial • Not met-pandemic • Not met-other • Not meas.-pandemic • Not meas.-other • Data Pending 	EXPLAIN: If Yes, No or Partial: present results (expressed in the same metric as the PI) If Partial, indicate # of sites where PI was fully met. If data pending, indicate when data expected. If not measured, explain why not. If not met due to pandemic, explain why not.
50% of students participating in 21 st CCLC will demonstrate at least 90 hours of activities throughout the course of the program	Students participating in the 21 st CCLC program	No. Based on the population that the grant is trying to reach, 90 hours of attendance is not realistic.	After-School Academy and Saturday Family Learning Trips	Attendance is recorded by school staff at each 21 st CCLC activity. In Years 1-3, the data was entered in the <i>Cayen</i> software system and <i>Cayen</i> was used to generate the attendance data required for the annual NYSED/MI year-end participation spreadsheet. Starting in Year 4, <i>EZReports</i> is being utilized.	The year-end participation spreadsheet was reviewed to determine student participation	N/A	Year 1: Not met-other	Year 1: Students that reached 90 hours: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balmville = 37% of participants (42/115) • Gardnertown = 0% of participants (0/103). This school started programming on January 31, 2018 so it is expected that the goal was not reached. 63% of participants (65/103) reach 45 hours. • Gidney Avenue = 48% of participants (86/179) • Horizons = 33% of participants (24/73)
							Year 2: Not met-other	Year 2: Students that reached 90 hours: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balmville = 13% of participants (15/118) • Gardnertown = 22% of participants (40/186). • Gidney Avenue = 16% of participants (31/188) • Horizons = 20% of participants (29/115) • Vails Gate = 0% of participants (0/134)
							Year 3: Not met-pandemic, due to 21 st CCLC program ending in mid-March although "Partial" if a prorated PI	Year 3: Students that reached 90 hours: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balmville = 3% of participants (4/152) • Gardnertown = 12% of participants (15/128) • Gidney Avenue = 5% of participants (10/184) • Horizons = 5% of participants (8/148) • Vails Gate = 1% of participants (2/135)

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

							of 60 hours is used (3 schools)	If using a rounded, prorated value of 60 hours (based on 90 x 6.5 months/10 months possible), however, three schools reached the PI: Balmville = 26% of participants (40/152) Gardnertown = 55% of participants (70/128) Gidney Avenue = 44% of participants (81/184) Horizons = 63% of participants (93/148) Vails Gate = 50% of participants (67/135)
							Year 4: Not met-pandemic	Year 4: Students that reached 90 hours: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Balmville = 0.0% of participants (0/20) Gardnertown = 4.0% of participants (2/50) Gidney Avenue = 4.2% of participants (1/24) Horizons = 0.0% of participants (0/32) Vails Gate = 4.8% of participants (2/42)

Objective 2: Participants of 21st CCLC 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 (specify): Regular participation by students will demonstrate continuous improvement in academic achievement.

Performance Indicator(s) (PI) of success	Target Population(s)	PI Meet SMART Criteria? (Y/N)	Activity(ies) to support this program objective	PI Measures data collection instruments & methods (Indicate title if published)	Describe the analysis conducted, including specific results that directly address the PI. Include any longitudinal assessments conducted beyond one program year.	Response Rate (if applicable):	Was this PI met? Select one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes Partial Not met-pandemic Not met-other Not meas.-pandemic Not meas.-other Data Pending 	EXPLAIN: If Yes, No or Partial: present results (expressed in the same metric as the PI) If Partial, indicate # of sites where PI was fully met. If data pending, indicate when data expected. If not measured, explain why not. If not met due to pandemic, explain why not.
Students will increase ELA and Math achievement by 10%	Students participating in the 21 st CCLC program and, starting in Year 2, reaching 30 hours of participation	Yes, although it may be more appropriate to have	After-School Academy	i-Ready Assessments were administered to students in fall and spring (or fall and	Results on i-Ready Assessments from fall to spring (fall to winter, for Year 3) were compared. Refer to Appendix D .	Refer to Appendix D	Year 1: No. Although all four schools had increases ranging from 6.3% to 9.1%.	Year 1: All four schools had increases in i-Ready scores in both reading and math. <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 Ave. = 8.5% in reading, 9.0% in math Horizons = 7.6% in reading, 6.3% in math

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

		different targets for each grade level & each subject area, or use proficiency (i.e., was not proficient and improved to proficient).		winter, for Year 3) of each academic year. Refer to Appendix D .			<p>Year 2: Partial Gardnertown and Vails Gate reached the target in reading, but none of the schools reached it in math.</p> <p>Year 3: No (If a prorated PI of 5% is used, four schools were successful in Reading and one in Math.)</p> <p>Year 4: Not met-pandemic</p>	<p>Year 2: All five schools had increases in i-Ready scores in both reading and math.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Balmville = 9.4% in reading, 6.8% in math Gardnertown = 11.6% in reading, 8.1% in math Gidney Ave. = 9.6% in reading, 7.3% in math Horizons = 8.6% in reading, 7.2% in math Vails Gate = 11.2% in reading, 8.7% in math <p>Year 3: All five schools had increases in i-Ready scores in both reading and math.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Balmville = 6.7% in reading, 3.1% in math Gardnertown = 6.6% in reading, 4.9% in math Gidney Ave. = 4.6% in reading, 3.4% in math Horizons = 5.3% in reading, 3.7% in math Vails Gate = 5.6% in reading, 5.0% in math <p>Year 4: Students in four schools had an increase in the average of their i-Ready scores in reading and math.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Balmville = -3.6% in reading, 1.7% in math Gardnertown = 5.7% in reading, 5.8% in math Gidney Ave. = 2.5% in reading, 3.0% in math Horizons = 1.6% in reading, -0.8% in math Vails Gate = 4.3% in reading, 3.0% in math
--	--	---	--	---	--	--	--	--

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 (specify): Regular participation by students will demonstrate continuous improvement in behavior.

Performance Indicator(s) (PI) of success	Target Population(s) ¹	PI Meet SMART Criteria? ² (Y/N)	Activity(ies) to support this program objective ³	PI Measures data collection instruments & methods ⁴ (Indicate title if published)	Describe the analysis conducted, including specific results that directly address the PI. Include any longitudinal assessments conducted beyond one program year.	Response Rate (if applicable):	Was this PI met? Select one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes Partial Not met-pandemic Not met-other Not meas.-pandemic Not meas.-other Data Pending 	EXPLAIN: If Yes, No or Partial: present results (expressed in the same metric as the PI) If Partial, indicate # of sites where PI was fully met. If data pending, indicate when data expected. If not measured, explain why not. If not met due to pandemic, explain why not.
50% of discipline referrals and poor behaviors during the regular school day will decrease.	Students participating in the 21 st CCLC program and, starting in Year 2, reaching 30 hours of participation	Yes.	After-School Academy and Saturday Family Learning Trips	Discipline referrals for all students are maintained by NECSD. Refer to Appendix E .	The number of discipline referrals from the previous academic year is compared to the number for the current	Refer to survey appendices for response rates for teachers, students K-3,	Year 1: Not met-other, although survey responses showing improved attitudes.	Year 1: The number of students with discipline 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, the majority had an increase in discipline referrals.

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

				Surveys administered to teachers and students. Refer to Appendices F1 and F2 (teachers), Appendix A (grades K-3) and Appendix B (grades 4-5).	academic year. Refer to Appendix E. Surveys administered to teachers, students in grades K-3, and students in grades 4-5 are reviewed to determine changes in attitudes. Refer to Appendices F1, F2, A, and B , respectively.	and students 4-5.		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.
							Year 2: Partial. Three schools met the PI and student survey responses indicated that 21 st CCLC helped them stay out of trouble.	Year 2: As in Year 1, the number of students with discipline referrals in both the 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 school years was less than 35% of the 21 st CCLC students at each school. Students at three schools, on average, decreased their number of referrals by over 55%: Balmville w/ 61.5%, Gardnertown w/58.3%, and Horizons w/55.6%. Student surveys indicate that the 21 st CCLC helped them stay out of trouble. Teachers from the five schools had varying levels of responses regarding discipline-based questions.
							Year 3: Not met-other	Year 3: Similar to previous years, the percentage of students with discipline referrals in both the previous and current school years is low (i.e., less than 32% in Year 3). Although each of the five schools had a percentage of students with decreased referrals, none reached the 50% PI: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balmville: 18.5% had decreased referrals • Gardnertown: 20.0% had decreased referrals • Gidney Ave: 40.0% had decreased referrals • Horizons: 44.4% decreased referrals • Vails Gate: 39.4% had decreased referrals Student surveys, however, again indicate that 21 st CCLC helped them stay out of trouble. The survey responses from the daytime teachers showed varying perceptions as to the impact of 21 st CCLC on students behaving well in class and getting along with others.
							Year 4: Yes	Year 4: There were 11 students with referrals in the previous school year (2019-2020) and none of them received referrals in the 2020-2021 school year.
Students who participate in program will have a 75% increase of daily school attendance.	Students participating in the 21 st CCLC program and, starting in Year 2, reaching 30 hours of participation	No. Based on the population that the grant targets, 75%	After-School Academy and Saturday Family Learning Trips	Daily school attendance records for all students are maintained by NECSD. Refer to Appendix G .	The number of absences occurring in the previous academic year is compared to the number for the current	Refer to survey appendices for response rates for teachers, students K-3,	Year 1: Not met-other	Year 1: Data on student absences from 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.

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

		<p>is too high. The PI should be restated as reducing absences, which is the measure being used.</p>		<p>Surveys administered to teachers and students. Refer to Appendices F1 and F2 (teachers), Appendix A (grades K-3) and Appendix B (grades 4-5).</p>	<p>academic year. Refer to Appendix G.</p> <p>Surveys administered to teachers, students in grades K-3, and students in grades 4-5 are reviewed to determine changes in attitudes. Refer to Appendices F, A, and B, respectively.</p>	<p>and students 4-5.</p>	<p>Year 2: Not met-other, although one school reached 73.6% of students with decreased absences. The other four schools ranged from 46.4% to 68.2% of students with decreased absences.</p>	<p>Year 2: Data on student absences from the 2017-2018 to 2018-2019 school years shows that, on average, at four schools, more students decreased their number of absences than increased, with Gidney Ave. reaching the highest number of students with decreased absences at 73.6%. Horizons had a slightly higher percentage of students with an increased number of absences. A small percentage at each school (6% and below) remained the same. Surveys of students indicate that 21st CCLC helped them want to come to school. Teachers from the five schools indicated varying levels of improvement.</p> <p>Year 3: Data from the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 school years showed that a high percentage of students increased their attendance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balmville: 79.5% increased attendance • Gardnertown: 71.2% increased attendance • Gidney Ave.: 77.7% increased attendance • Horizons: 68.9% increased attendance • Vails Gate: 58.1% increased attendance <p>Student surveys also indicated that 21st CCLC helped them want to come to school and stay in school. The survey of daytime teachers had questions regarding class participation, attentiveness, and engagement in math and science. Only one outcome at one school (Balmville students' math engagement) did not have the highest percentage of responses that students improved as compared to not changing and not needing to improve.</p> <p>Year 4: Comparing data from the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 school years showed that more students had worse attendance in Year 4. This was expected due to the frustrations of learning disruptions and various learning settings implemented throughout the school year. No students had the same level of attendance in a year-over-year comparison (i.e., the same number of absences).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balmville: 42.9% increased attendance • Gardnertown: 20.8% increased attendance • Gidney Ave.: 0.0% increased attendance • Horizons: 33.3% increased attendance • Vails Gate: 31.6% increased attendance <p>Student surveys indicated, however, that 21st CCLC helped them want to come to school and stay in school. The survey of daytime teachers included a question regarding attending class/online activities regularly. Averaged across the five schools, teachers reported that one-third of students (33.4%) had some level of improvement.</p>
							<p>Year 3: Partial Balmville and Gidney Ave reached a 75% increase in attendance</p>	
							<p>Year 4: Not met-pandemic</p>	

Provide a discussion of any particular strengths or limitations of above assessments or evaluation design and describe any efforts or plans to minimize limitations (**Required** if there were limitations).

Limitations (with efforts or plans to minimize)

1. In both Years 3 and 4, response rates to the grades K-3 student survey were low (13.7% and 48.3%). In those years, the surveys were administered while students were at home. The Year 2 response rate has been the highest (74.1%) due to the 21st CCLC program being in-person and allowing for paper surveys and therefore easier tracking of who had completed the survey. If the Year 5 grades K-3 student survey must be administered to students at home, they may be more accustomed to it, but also weekly feedback of survey counts could encourage students to participate and see higher numbers. If administered in person, paper surveys will be considered and discussed with school staff.
2. The grades 4-5 student survey had a 62.8% response rate (27 out of 43 students replied). This was actually slightly better than the Year 2 response rate of 57.4% (108 students out of 188). Whether students are at school or at home in the spring when the survey is administered, weekly feedback on survey counts can be provided. Paper surveys are not practical for this lengthy survey but could be considered.
3. For both types of student surveys, only the students that are currently attending the 21st CCLC program are asked to complete the survey. Ideally, this would be most of the students with 30-hours of participation, but some of these students may have stopped attending due to other commitments, moving, etc. It may not be possible to get a higher response rate than what has been achieved to date.

Strengths

1. In Year 4, there was a high response rate to the Teacher Survey: 91.0% of teachers responded (61 out of 67) and reported on outcomes for 120 students. In previous years, the response rate was less than 50.0%.
2. Clerical staff quickly became accustomed to *EZReports*. It will be easier for the grant facilitator to complete the federal APR reporting.

III. Observation Results

This section provides data and findings from each of the two required annual evaluator visits per site, as specified in the Evaluation Manual. The specified purposes of these visits, as defined in the Evaluation Manual, include the following.

First visit – Observe program implementation fidelity (Evaluation Manual, pp. 17-18). This visit includes verifying existence of, and *alignment* among:

- the grant proposal (including the Table for Goals and Objectives),
- logic model,
- calendar and schedule of activities,
- program timeline,
- program handbook,
- parental consent forms, and
- procedures for entering/documenting evaluation data.

This visit should also serve to identify any barriers to implementation.

Second visit – Conduct point of service quality reviews (Evaluation Manual, p. 29). This visit, during which an observation instrument such as the Out of School Time Protocol (OST) or Out of School Time Protocol Adapted for Virtual Learning (OST-A) is completed for selected activities, focuses on activity content and structure (including environmental context, participation, and instructional strategies), relationship building and the quality of interpersonal relationships, and the degree to which activities focus on skill development and mastery.

a. First visit

A summary of findings on **fidelity to program design** from the first required visit is provided.¹

Please specify date(s) of *first* round of Year 4 observations (MM/YY): 01/21 and 02/21 (See table below for specific dates).

Results: The first round of observations of the after-school program occurred in January and February of 2021 as summarized in the following table. The site administrators of the schools were advised that the first observations are part of the evaluability process and are not to be construed as high-stakes. Because these are shorter observations, student and adult counts may not be exact. Because there were fewer settings than in previous years, almost all virtual classrooms were observed. Typically, not all classrooms are observed.

¹ Copies of completed site observation protocols and/or other site visit summaries should be provided to program managers as a source of required supporting evidence to meet compliance for SMV Indicator H-1(c), “evidence of two site visits per site.”

First Round Observations

Site Name	Year #	Date and Time	Observer(s)	# of Students	# of Adults ¹
Gidney Avenue	1	December 19, 2017, 2:45 – 4:10 p.m.	L. Moulton, S. Silverstone	125	13
	2	December 4, 2018, 3:00 – 4:30 p.m.	L. Moulton, P. Williams	90	12
	3	November 21, 2019, 2:45 – 4:27 p.m.	L. Moulton, C. Flynn	95	12
	4	January 28, 2021, 3:30 – 5:30 p.m.	L. Moulton, C. Chandler	11	4
Balmville Elementary	1	December 19, 2017, 4:20 – 4:55 p.m.	L. Moulton, S. Silverstone	70	7
	2	December 5, 2018, 4:45 – 6:15 p.m.	P. Williams	69	14
	3	November 21, 2019, 4:56 – 6:20 p.m.	L. Moulton	76	16
	4	February 4, 2021, 4:30 – 6:30 p.m.	L. Moulton	11	3
Horizons on Hudson	1	December 19, 2017, 5:10 – 6:00 p.m.	L. Moulton, S. Silverstone	66	8
	2	December 5, 2018, 4:45 – 6:15 p.m.	L. Moulton	67	13
	3	November 21, 2019, 4:40 – 6:26 p.m.	C. Flynn	99	13
	4	February 10, 2021, 4:30 – 6:30 p.m.	C. Chandler	11	5
Gardnertown Leadership	1	Programming did not start until 1/31/18. First round observations were not performed.			
	2	December 4, 2018, 4:45 – 6:15 p.m.	L. Moulton, P. Williams	54	15
	3	November 19, 2019, 4:58 – 6:20 p.m.	L. Moulton	59	10
	4	February 10, 2021, 4:30 – 6:30 p.m.	L. Moulton	15	4
Vails Gate	1	Did not participate in Year 1	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2	December 5, 2018, 3:00 – 4:30 p.m.	L. Moulton, P. Williams	65	11
	3	November 19, 2019, 2:50 – 4:25 p.m.	L. Moulton	73	7
	4	February 3, 2021, 3:30 – 5:30 p.m.	L. Moulton, K. Madden	14	5

- ¹
- For Years 1-3, the # of Adults included certified teachers, teaching assistants, and partner staff from BGCN and Zylofone Studios, Inc. Each site also had a security monitor, registered nurse, and clerical typist.
 - For Year 4, the # of Adults includes certified teachers, teaching assistants, and, if an administrator was leading an activity, they were also counted. BGCN and Zylofone Studios, Inc. enrichment activities were prerecorded and not live so they are not included in the count. Site administrators and the grant facilitator were also observed dropping in on activities and are not included. Each site also has a clerical typist that was not observed.

In previous years when observations were performed on site, they were guided by Ms. Torres-Bender and/or a site administrator (each of the after-school programs is directed by an administrator who is a principal or assistant principal from the regular school day or a principal from another school). This year, however, each observer was provided with log-in credentials and could visit each Google Classroom and access the corresponding Google Meet group to view the activity just as any other participant could.

As shown in the following tables, the 21st CCLC program utilizes the same general format at each of the schools.

Years 1-3: Approximate Two-hour Timeline of 21st CCLC After-School Program

Each school included a segment of time for SEL (e.g., Vails Gate students would go to their tutoring location after snack and physical activity to have SEL and leave their coats and backpacks since they returned there before being dismissed). The snack was not funded by the 21st CCLC grant.

20 minutes	40 minutes	40 minutes	20 minutes
Snack & Physical Activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grades K-2: Enrichment or Arts • Grades 3-5: Tutoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grades K-2: Tutoring • Grades 3-5: Enrichment or Arts 	Reflection & Dismissal

Year 4: Approximate Two-hour Timeline of 21st CCLC After-School Program

NECSD provides weekly food distribution for all district families. Students generally eat their snack during the first 40 minute time block.

40 minutes	40 minutes	40 minutes
Opening Fitness, snack, and SEL ¹	Grades K-5: Tutoring	Grades K-5: Enrichment or Arts

¹ Horizons includes SEL time in the last ten minutes of the after-school program, rather than in the beginning.

Because Gidney Avenue and Vails Gate schools have an earlier start time for the regular school day than the other three schools, their after-school program is held 3:15 – 5:15 p.m. (Years 1-3) or 3:30 – 5:30 p.m. (Year 4). The after-school program at the other three schools is held 4:15 – 6:15 p.m. (Years 1-3) or 4:30 – 6:30 p.m. (Year 4). The Year 4 start time was shifted 15 minutes later than usual in order to allow those students with in-person classes time to get home, although they typically still miss a few minutes of programming. Families were surveyed and it was determined that the start times could not be shifted any later due to families not wanting the program to run any later into the evening.

Enrichment and art activities have been provided by several organizations during the grant years. The original grant partner, BGCN, as well as NECSD teachers have provided services in all four years. In Year 1, BGCN provided two NPAA artists to each school and then in Years 2 and 3 transitioned to an NPAA artist and a Triple Play coach at each school. Also, in Year 2, musical arts programming by a local non-profit, Zylofone Studios, Inc., was piloted with grade K-2 students at Balmville. In Year 3, Zylofone Studios, Inc. staff worked with Balmville and Vails Gate K-2 students. Other enrichment activities in Year 3 included a presentation by TheHappyOrg.org (Horizons), visits by West Point Cadets “College STEM Buddies (Gardnertown), and soccer skills and games by a volunteer coach for two of the three Sessions (Horizons). Year 4 enrichment options continue to include an NPAA artist and Zylofone Studios, Inc. music and movement (for students in grades K-2 only); although, both were pre-recorded and then presented by NECSD staff.

During Years 1-3 the students signed up for the enrichment activity of their choice for each of the Sessions with school staff making the final determination to have an appropriate number of students, balancing student personalities, and ensuring exposure to different activities. A showcase event was held at the end of each Session for families to come to school and see demonstrations and displays of the enrichment activities (e.g., artwork, yoga, hip hop). Community organizations were also invited to the showcases to increase family awareness of local resources. In Year 4, due to the lower number of students, there were fewer choices for enrichment activities with one still being lead by a NPAA artist and another being lead by a Zylofone Studios, Inc. presenter. Based on the average daily attendance of students at a school, there were only be one or two enrichment options. Students were generally grouped by grade levels K-2 and 3-5 for both tutoring and enrichment.

Session Schedules

Year #1	Session #	Balmville Elementary, Gidney Avenue, and Horizons on Hudson	Gardnertown
	1	November 14, 2017 - January 11, 2018	N/A
2	January 16, 2018 - February 28, 2018	January 31, 2018 - March 8, 2018	
3	March 6, 2018 - April 19, 2018	March 13, 2018 - April 19, 2018	
4	April 24, 2018 - June 7, 2018	April 24, 2018 - June 7, 2018	
Year #2	Session #	All 5 Schools	
	1	October 23, 2018 – December 13, 2018	
	2	January 15, 2019 – February 28, 2019	
	3	March 5, 2019 – April 18, 2019	

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

Year #3	Session #	All 5 Schools
	1	October 22, 2019 – December 12, 2019
	2	January 14, 2020 – February 19, 2020
	3	March 10, 2020 – March 12, 2020 (NECSD closed starting March 16, 2020) Original end date was scheduled as April 30, 2020
Year #4	Session #	All 5 Schools
	1 (Fall)	November 24, 2020 – February 11, 2021
	2 (Spring)	March 2 – April 29, 2021

The 21st CCLC programming also included: (1) evening events for families (e.g., *Lights on Afterschool* family nights were held at the Newburgh Free Library on October 26, 2017 and at each of the five schools on October 25, 2018, October 24, 2019, and November 24, 2020 (virtually) as well as showcase events at the end of each Session); (2) Saturday Family Learning Trips for students with a parent/guardian; and (3) classes exclusively for family members (e.g., English as a Second Language class). Only the after-school programming was observed by the evaluator.

During the Year 4 first-round observations at the schools, BRI assessed the fidelity of program implementation. The analysis revealed the following overarching findings across the five sites observed:

Implementation/Process

Topic	Site	Evidence/Notes
Implementation fidelity	All 5 schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A student to adult ratio of 10:1, or better, was consistently observed. • The overall program structure/schedule adhered to the proposal (snack & physical activity, enrichment, tutoring, dismissal). Although the proposal had K-2 and 3-5 students participating in enrichment and tutoring at opposite times, they are currently scheduled at the same time. This does not impact the program and allows flexibility to merge groups if student attendance is low. • Each school promotes the 21CCLC program to students in grades K-5 and students from all those grade levels have registered, except to date, Gardnertown has not had any K students (although seven have registered for the upcoming Spring Session). • Transitions were smooth (students either stay in the same Google Meet or join their next one). • The program lasted 2 hours although on occasion a student would arrive late or leave the Google Meet for short periods of time. • The district provides weekly food pick-ups that include a hearty snack. Snack contents were not observed. • Students generally knew what to do, did not need much direction, and were generally on task. If not, staff was able to quickly redirect or pull into the conversation. • Students are provided with art and music supplies as necessary for their enrichment program. • Though not observed, virtual family events were offered for all five school sites: a Lights on After School family night with orientation (11/24/2020), and two Saturday Family Learning Trips (12/19/2020 and 1/16/2021). • Attendance-taking was observed. • Positive relationships were observed: teacher to student and student to student. Interactions were pleasant and teacher-student relationships looked strong.

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

Unintended program drift	All 5 schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student enrollment and attendance are substantially lower than targeted. Refer to the following Outcomes table for student counts. The 21CCLC program continues to be promoted as the start date for the second rotation (3/2/2021) approaches. • Student attendance on Wednesdays is typically low due to all students having that as a virtual day for their regular school day.
	GAMS, VG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 21CCLC administrator at these two sites is not the school’s regular day principal or assistant principal, although one does have previous experience with the 21CCLC program. It does not appear to detract from program implementation.
	GAMS, GLA, HOH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each of these schools has one or more after-school teachers that are from other schools in the district (e.g., from Meadow Hill Global Explorations Magnet School). This does not appear to detract from program implementation.
Quality of program links to the school day and staff (may or may not be observed).	All 5 schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of teachers in the ASA also work at the same school during the regular school day. • Students are familiar with using Google Classroom and Google Meet from their regular school day.
	Balmville, GLA, HOH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A school administrator from the regular school day also works as the 21CCLC administrator.
Barriers to implementation and how they are being addressed	All 5 schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because students already have some or all virtual learning during the regular school day, families are not interested in additional online learning and have become screen weary. • Slow speed and inconsistent connectivity issues with Internet/Wifi during both the regular day and the after-school program deters students from attending the after-school program. • Because there are a low number of students attending the after-school program, there are only a couple of enrichment options for each grade band. During the observations, however, students were engaged and this did not appear to be an issue. • Students continue to be recruited for the 21CCLC program by sending flyers home and social media. • Students that are registered and absent are contacted by phone to determine the barrier(s) for their attendance. • Because of Internet/Wifi performance, some activities are performed without having the students’ camera or microphone on. This enhances the video presentation (e.g., Go Noodle physical activity) and allows it to play with better video and sound quality, but student engagement cannot be determined.
Lessons learned	All 5 schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As in Year 3, for those students participating in 21st CCLC, homework is optional on program days. • Also, as in Year 3, the tutoring focus for Year 4 is designated as: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tuesday-Math (Math & Movement, Greg Tang math), 2. Wednesday-ELA (guided reading, Florida Research Center, and other resources), 3. Thursday-Conferences with small student groups while other students work on reading or Greg Tang math games.
Recommendations	All 5 schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As student numbers increase, additional options for enrichment can be added. • Synchronous enrichment options would be preferred in order to allow interaction with the presenter. Without more student enrollment, however, grant funding may not be able to support this. • The program framework is configured such that it can easily be scaled up to handle additional students.

Outcomes

Topic	Site	Evidence/Notes
Serving target populations	All 5 schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Targeted participation of 750 students overall is low (Rotation I data): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Balmville: Target = 100 students; Enrolled = 26; Avg Daily Attendance = 8 ✓ Gardnertown: Target = 100 students; Enrolled = 32; Avg Daily Attendance = 15 ✓ Gidney Ave: Target = 200 students; Enrolled = 24; Avg Daily Attendance = 10 ✓ Horizons: Target = 150 students; Enrolled = 30; Avg Daily Attendance = 10 ✓ Vails Gate: Target = 200 students; Enrolled = 45; Avg Daily Attendance = 18 Cannot tell by observation if the students in the program are low academic performers; would need to compare to data. Some students have siblings and/or adults in the general location where they are online with the 21CCLC program (e.g., sitting at the kitchen table). Although not directly participating, the family members can see what the student is doing. This allowed a parent to have a timely discussion with the teacher regarding her child’s behavior.
Quality of student-teacher interactions	All 5 schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very positive interactions were observed among and between teachers and students. Respectful communications and pleasant tone. Very little need to discipline or redirect students. Students were generally following directions, on task, and had a low volume level.
Program successes	All 5 schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See above row. Although the school year has been challenging, the staff has been diligent in making sure that the 21CCLC program is available to students. When a technology glitch occurs for them or students, they take it in stride and either correct it or find a workaround (i.e., leave the Google Meet and reenter).
Lessons learned	All 5 schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome data analysis and survey results will be included in Annual Evaluation Report.
Recommendations	All 5 schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If needed, prioritize student enrollment for those with the greatest academic need.

b. Second visit

A summary of findings on **point of service quality review observations** from the second round of observations will be provided.¹

Please specify date(s) of *second* round of Year 4 observations (MM/YY): See table below for specific dates.

The second round of observations occurs in the Spring of the grant year to assess the point of service quality of the activities. As shown in the following table, during Years 1-3 two evaluators visited each school with each observing a different grade band of students as they participated in the after-school program. In Year 4, observations were performed virtually. The observers were provided with credentials to log into the NECSD Launchpad and could then access the Google Classrooms and their corresponding Google Meet sessions. The evaluators used the Out of School

¹ Copies of completed site visit summaries are provided to the grant facilitator as a source of required supporting evidence to meet compliance for SMV Indicator H-1(c), “evidence of two site visits per site.”

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

Time (OST) protocol that was adapted for virtual activities by MI in January 2021 and rotated settings. Note that counts of students may not be exact due to student cameras being off, students exiting/returning to Google Meet sessions, etc. Both the grant facilitator and each site’s 21CCLC administrator were seen observing also.

Point of Service Quality Observations

Site Name	Year #	Date (Time)	Grades Observed (Observer)	# of Students	# of Adults
Balmville	1	April 18, 2018 (4:15 – 6:15 p.m.)	K – 2 (L. Moulton) 3 – 5 (T. Herman)	34 40	7 4
	2	March 28, 2019 (4:28 – 6:18 p.m.)	3 – 5 (P. Williams)	26	14
		April 3, 2019 (4:00 – 6:15 p.m.)	K – 2 (L. Moulton)	29	13
	3	Not performed due to NECSD closure	N/A	N/A	N/A
	4	April 14, 2021 (4:30 – 6:30 p.m.)	K – 5 (L. Moulton)	5	4
Gardnertown	1	April 19, 2018 (4:15 – 6:15 p.m.)	3 – 5 (L. Moulton) K – 2 (T. Herman)	48 30	7 7
	2	April 2, 2019 (4:09 – 6:15 p.m.)	K – 2 (L. Moulton) 3 – 5 (K. Caccavaio)	40 45	13 13
	3	Not performed due to NECSD closure	N/A	N/A	N/A
	4	April 22, 2021 (4:30 – 6:30 p.m.)	Various (C. Chandler) Various (L. Moulton)	28	6
Gidney Avenue	1	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
	2	March 20, 2019 (2:45 – 5:15 p.m.)	K – 2 (P. Williams) 3 – 5 (L. Moulton)	70 69	11 11
3	Not performed due to NECSD closure	N/A	N/A	N/A	
4	April 13, 2021 (3:30 – 5:30 p.m.)	K-5 (C. Chandler)	5	3	
Horizons on Hudson	1	May 22, 2018 (4:00 – 6:15 p.m.)	K – 2 (L. Moulton) 3 – 5 (T. Herman)	21 20	6 2
	2	March 19, 2019 (3:50 – 6:15 p.m.)	K – 2 (P. Williams) 3 – 5 (L. Moulton)	31 45	9 11
	3	February 4, 2020 (3:40 – 6:30 p.m.)	K – 2 (P. Williams) 3 – 5 (L. Moulton, K. Ganley)	107	15
	4	April 22, 2021 (4:30 – 6:30 p.m.)	K – 5 (L. Moulton)	6	5
Vails Gate	1	Did not participate in Year 1	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2	March 5, 2019 (2:55 – 5:15 p.m.)	K – 5 (L. Moulton)	75	9
		April 3, 2019 (3:15 – 5:07 p.m.)	K – 5 (K. Caccavaio)	81	11
	3	February 5, 2020 (2:40 – 5:17 p.m.)	K – 2 (K. Ganley) 3 – 5 (L. Moulton)	89	18
4	April 13, 2021 (3:30 – 5:30 p.m.)	K – 2 (C. Chandler) 3 – 5 (L. Moulton)	2 10	2 3	

- Observation protocol used for point of service observations:¹
 - Out of School Time (OST) Protocol (**Years 1-3**)
 - Out of School Time Adapted for Virtual Activities (OST-A) Protocol (**Year 4**)
 - Other modified version of Out of School Time (OST) Protocol
 - Other observation protocol (attach sample in Appendix, or if published, indicate name): _____

Results:

Results from the second round of observations were very similar to the first round of observations. For example,

- Positive relationships were observed: teacher to student and student to student. Interactions were pleasant and teacher-student relationships looked strong.
- The overall program structure included the proposed components of SEL, physical activity, enrichment, tutoring, and snack.
- The students generally knew what to do, did not need much direction, and were generally on task. If not, staff was able to quickly redirect or pull into the conversation.

Key differences included:

- The Spring Session (which started March 2, 2021) had the BGCN artists live, rather than pre-recorded videos that NECSD staff presented. This allowed for increased student engagement.
- Students from the two “early” schools (Gidney Avenue and Vails Gate) that attended the BGCN enrichment sessions were combined into a single Google Meet session. The same was done for the three “late” schools. This cost-saving initiative did not detract from student engagement during the observations.
- BGCN’s enrichment activities were targeted to specific grade levels: Multicultural Arts for students in grades K-2 with Fitness/Dance to students in grades 3-5.
- The enrichment programming in cooking that was held by Gardnertown was open to family members on Wednesdays. This was an interesting twist on after-school programming in that it increased student participation (since Wednesdays are traditionally lower attendance days due to all students being virtual for that day) and engaged family members who would not have been able to do this if students were at school for 21st CCLC programming.

¹ Note: As specified in SMV Indicator D-3, grantees are also required to conduct program activity implementation reviews, using a form consistent with the research-based OST observation instrument. Evidence of the activities specified in Indicator D-3 [see D-3(a) and (b)] can be strengthened if the evaluator and grantee collaborate on learning from the findings of these similar point-of-service observations and grantee quality reviews.

IV. Logic Model (LM)

<i>NECSD 21st Century Community Learning Center</i>				
Logic Model				
<i>(9/2020)</i>				
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</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>
<p><u>Community Partners</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Boys & Girls Club of Newburgh Zylofone Studios, Inc. <p><u>Students</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GAMS (200 K-5) Horizons (150 K-5) Balmville (100 K-5) Gardnertown (100 K-5) Vails Gate (200 K-5) <p><u>Family members</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GAMS (75) Horizons (75) Balmville (75) Gardnertown (75) Vails Gate (75) <p><u>Program Advisory Council Team (PACT)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assistant Super. of Curriculum Director of Grants Grant Facilitator School Principals (5) Community Partner representative Student representatives Teacher representatives Parent representatives <p><u>Staff</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Certified teachers Teaching assistants Nurses Clerical typists Security monitors <p><u>Supplies & Materials</u></p> <p><u>Program budget</u></p> <p><u>Program facilities (5 schools)</u></p> <p><u>Professional Development Opportunities</u></p> <p><u>Common Planning Time</u></p>	<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>Summer Lego Academy to learn about design, engineering, and coding using motorized models and simple programming</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 in 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>75% of participating students will have an increase in daily school attendance.</p> <p>50% of participating students will have a decrease in discipline referrals and negative behaviors during the regular school day.</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>Surveys of students and parents attending Saturday Family Learning Trips will show satisfaction in ten outcome areas.</p> <p>Surveys of 21st CCLC students in grades K-3 and grades 4&5 will show satisfaction with the 21st CCLC program as well as increased positive attitudes and behaviors in eight outcome areas.</p> <p>Surveys of daytime teachers of 21st CCLC students will show overall positive impact and increased positive attitudes and behaviors in ten outcome areas.</p> <p>The NYS Network for Your Success Quality Self-Assessment (QSA) tool will be administered twice yearly to 21st CCLC parents, students, and staff.</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>

- Use the space below to summarize any aspects of the Logic Model that have changed since the prior program year,¹ or are still under development, and if so, why.

Comments:

The Year 4 Logic Model was presented and approved at the September 24, 2020 PACT meeting to graphically depict the implementation of the 21st CCLC Program.

Changes made from the original Logic Model have been:

1. (Year 2) Vails Gate School was added as a fifth school and was approved by NYSED as a Program Modification.
2. (Year 2) Common Planning Time was added as a Resource as it was inadvertently left off the Logic Model.
3. (Year 3) Summer Lego Academy was added as an Activity as it was inadvertently left off the Logic Model.
4. (Year 4) Zylofone Studios, Inc. was added as a Partner in a Fall 2020 Program Modification. The business closed and was only able to supply pre-recorded videos for use in the 21st CCLC program. They will be removed from the next version of the Logic Model.
5. (Year 4) The Logic Model was updated to include the surveys that are administered (Saturday Family Learning Trip, students in K-3, students in 4-5, and daytime classroom teachers) as well as the QSA. These had all been administered in previous years but not shown on the Logic Model.

¹ Note that annual reviews of the logic model are required, as per SMV Indicator H-2(b).

V. Conclusions & Recommendations

The 21st CCLC program's successes and lessons learned, as determined from evaluation findings, are presented here.¹

a. Status of the implementation of recommendations from Year 3

The Year 3 AER included several recommendations. The recommendations, as indicated by the underlined portions, and their status is discussed below. Some recommendations will carry over to Year 5 as presented in Part D below.

1. Promote the 21st CCLC program to staff in order to accommodate the targeted number of students. Each of the five schools must have an administrator, teachers, aides, nurse, clerk, and safety resource officer. Because the 21st CCLC program was implemented virtually, schools did not need to include a nurse and safety resource officer when staffing. Due to the low number of registered students, there was a sufficient number of teachers and aides. Each school had an administrator for the 21st CCLC program with three schools having an administrator from the regular school day and two having an administrator from another school or district administration.
2. Once the after-school program has commenced, continue to follow up on student participation to ensure that they are attending. Implementation of the grant in Fall 2020 will be virtual so this may be more challenging. Although student enrollment remained low, average daily attendance was lower yet. At the end of Year 4, enrollment varied from 20-50 students per school, while average daily attendance varied from 8-21 students per school. In a mid-semester survey to all families at the five 21st CCLC sites, parents/guardians indicated that they were not interested in additional virtual learning, they do not need the program since it does not include childcare, and, for Horizons and Balmville families, that it runs too late into the evening.
3. In addition to the required orientations for NECSD staff, provide professional development that will support their role in the 21st CCLC program (i.e., SEL training that was postponed from Year 3). Professional development was provided before both the Fall and Spring Sessions.
4. Ensure that all academic and enrichment sessions are scheduled to include a full roster of ten students per staff person. This will allow the maximum number of students to attend after-school programming. Due to the low number of students attending, staffing was not a limitation to student participation.
5. Follow up with grades 4-5 students (e.g., focus group, short survey) to determine the need for education regarding the harms of tobacco (including vaping), alcohol, and drugs. There was not a sufficient number of grade 4-5 students attending the 21st CCLC program to determine if there was a need for education on these topics.
6. Continue to explore partnerships with local organizations and expand on those currently in place with West Point and Mount Saint Mary College. Again, due to the low attendance in the 21st CCLC program, the existing partnerships with BGCN and Zylofone

¹ Note: as specified in SMV Indicator H-7, grantees are required to communicate evaluation findings to families and community stakeholders. Evidence of implementation of the activities specified in Indicator H-7(a) and (b) can be strengthened if the evaluator can help provide the grantee with a summary of sharable findings, such as reported in this summary.

Studios, Inc. were sufficient. Also, due to the 21st CCLC program being held fully virtually, there were not any in-person Saturday Family Learning Trips or in-person volunteers allowed so there was no way to utilize these resources.

7. Maintain a focus on adult education for families of 21st CCLC students. Explore options with district administration. Throughout Year 4, NECSD offered numerous adult education and social-emotional supports for families through the Family and Community Engagement department.

b. Documented or perceived impacts of implementing Year 3 recommendations, if known

The specific impacts of implementing the Year 3 recommendations are not known, especially due to the necessity to implement the Year 4 21st CCLC program completely in virtual mode. A key concern in Years 1-3 was the number of staff (which was a limiting factor to student participation), while in Year 4, student participation became the primary issue. The program staff has been consistently performing several recommendations and they are included as a reminder to continue.

c. Strategies used to help ensure that evaluation findings were used to inform program improvement

Ongoing communication between the grant facilitator and evaluator supports the overall grant implementation. By establishing a relationship and communication process, it allows for discussion and brainstorming of ideas (e.g., staffing strategies, student attendance supports) within the grant requirements.

d. Conclusions and recommendations based on Year 4's evaluation findings

Although it was presented in a completely virtual format, Year 4 of the grant implementation was aligned with the grant proposal. It is currently expected that Year 5 will return to an in-person program. The following conclusions and recommendations would apply to either format. Many of these are continuing recommendations from past years that should continue to be a focus.

1. Promote the 21st CCLC program to STAFF in order to accommodate the targeted number of students. Each of the five schools must have an administrator, teachers, aides, nurse, clerk, and safety resource officer. Allow staff flexibility with job sharing and include staff from schools not participating in the 21st CCLC.
2. Promote the 21st CCLC program to STUDENTS and FAMILIES in order to reach the targeted enrollment at each of the five schools. Utilize varying strategies such as sending home paper flyers, social media postings, teacher promotion, as well as presentations to families at PTA/PTO meetings and open houses.
3. Once the 21st CCLC program has commenced, continue to follow up on STUDENT participation to ensure that they are attending and determine what the roadblocks are to their participation so that they can be resolved. NYSED has stated that funding requirements will return to the original requirements of 95% of targeted students reaching 30 or more hours of participation for full funding.
4. In addition to the required orientations for STAFF, provide professional development that will support their role in the 21st CCLC program.

5. As highlighted in the September 2021 edition of the “21st CCLC Back to School 2021 Newsletter,” consider the well-being of STAFF. This can be done through professional learning opportunities related to mental, emotional, and behavioral health; referrals for mental health needs; workload planning and open communication lines to encourage staff to request help when needed; building of a healthy team dynamic to promote resiliency; and promoting healthy sleep habits. (Information derived from The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine.)
6. Also as highlighted in the September 2021 edition of the “21st CCLC Back to School 2021 Newsletter,” there are several strategies to support the mental health needs of STUDENTS. These include screenings to identify mental health needs; providing supports; creating healthy, safe, and supportive school climates; continuing to incorporate SEL with core curriculum (www.p12.nysed.gov/sss/documents/NYSSELBenchmarks.pdf); continuing to promote parental engagement and support parents/families; balancing academic learning opportunities with social, emotional, and behavioral support; and providing resources for the management of mental health and referrals to services. (Information derived from The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine.)
7. Promote the availability of Pandemic-EBT (P-EBT) benefits (hungersolutionsny.org/p-ebt-toolkit/) to FAMILIES. This resource is highlighted in the September 2021 edition of the “21st CCLC Back to School 2021 Newsletter” and provides food benefits to children who qualify for free or reduced-price school meals and had reduced in-person school attendance due to COVID-19.
8. Ensure that all academic and enrichment sessions are scheduled to include a full roster of ten students per staff person. This will allow the maximum number of STUDENTS to attend after-school programming
9. Follow up with grades 4-5 STUDENTS (e.g., focus group, short survey) to determine the need for education regarding the harms of tobacco (including vaping), alcohol, and drugs. Because there was a low number of grade 4-5 students attending the 21st CCLC program in Year 4, this recommendation was not specifically addressed. Consider follow-up in Year 5.
10. Continue to explore PARTNERSHIPS with local organizations and expand on those currently in place with West Point and Mount Saint Mary College. They have also had over a year of COVID-19 experience and maybe more capacity to provide virtual services if necessary. This will enhance the 21st CCLC program's sustainability.
11. Maintain a focus on adult education for FAMILIES of 21st CCLC students. Explore options with the Family and Community Engagement (FACE) department.

e. Conclusions and recommendations based on Year 3 evaluation findings that could not previously be addressed due to pending data, if applicable

There was not any data pending from Year 3 that precluded determining conclusions and recommendations.

VI. Sustainability

Have any discussions or planning taken place around sustaining the program beyond the expiration of the grant?

Yes No

If YES, please briefly list potential sustainability strategies here (bullet format is sufficient):

- Strengthen relationship with West Point and encourage expansion of their existing STEM outreach program to include more NECSD schools.
- Include West Point's Eisenhower Hall Theatre as a Saturday Family Learning Trip option.
- Continue to build on the relationship with Mount Saint Mary College to utilize college students for tutoring and enrichment activities.
- Determine what other community organizations have existing partnerships with NECSD, or would like to have a partnership, and establish communication. Plan for initial activities to pilot.
- Advertise for volunteers to help staff enrichment programming (e.g., local soccer coach who ran soccer skills activity).

VII. Appendices

The appendices contain the required documentation, including full, tabulated results of any quantitative assessment tools (surveys,¹ academic assessments, etc.):

- Appendix A: Student Survey: Grades K-3
- Appendix B: Student Survey: Grades 4-5
- Appendix C: Saturday Family Learning Trip Summary
- Appendix D: i-Ready Assessment Summary
- Appendix E: Discipline Referral Summary
- Appendix F1: Teacher Survey Summary (Year 1 – Year 3)
- Appendix F2: Teacher Survey Summary (Year 4)
- Appendix G: Student Attendance Summary

Although optional appendices, such as sample reports used to share ongoing evaluation results/data with the program² are not included, communication between the evaluator and grant facilitator generally occurs weekly with an increase during specific activities (e.g., observation planning and discussion, report generation, and review, PACT meeting planning and debriefing) and written evaluation update reports are submitted for each of the PACT meetings. These reports are not included here because they contain a summary of the current evaluation activities and have essentially the same information as found in the Interim Report and AER.

¹ Note: As specified in SMV Indicator H-4(a), local evaluators and program administrators are jointly responsible for administering annual surveys to student participants, and grantees are required to maintain documented evidence of this activity.

² Note: As specified in SMV Indicator H-3(b), local evaluators and program administrators are jointly responsible for maintaining ongoing communication with each other, and grantees are required to maintain documented evidence of this activity.

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

Student Survey Summary: Grades K-3

Description

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 was designed for students in grades 4-12, BRI developed an abbreviated version, in consultation with the grant coordinator, for the primary grades. (The SSOS was administered to students in grades 4 and 5 and a discussion is included in Appendix B.) The abbreviated version 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).

Survey Administration

Survey administration was adjusted year-to-year to attempt to improve rates of completion. During both Year 1 and Year 2, the survey was administered on paper to those students whose parent/guardian had given consent and, starting in Year 2, had also reached a 30-hour program participation threshold. In Year 1, consent was obtained using a stand-alone form that was only available close to the end of the 21st CCLC year and only a small number of forms were completed. In Year 2, the consent form was included in the online registration packet and almost all parents gave consent (i.e., when considering the participation requirement, four or less students at each school in the K-3 grade band did not receive consent). Again, in Year 3 and Year 4, the consent form was included in the online registration packet and almost all parents gave consent (i.e., for students with 30 hours of participation, only nine in Year 3 and only two in Year 4 did not have consent).

During Years 1 and 2, 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. Starting in Year 2, the survey included both English and Spanish text in order to maximize the response rate from Spanish-speaking students.

During Year 3, because regular school day instruction transitioned to virtual in March 2020, the survey (including consent, confidentiality, purpose, and instruction descriptions) was converted to an online format in Survey Monkey with both the English and Spanish text. A link to the survey was posted on the district’s 21st CCLC web page. The survey was promoted to students via a School Messenger Broadcast (phone calls and emails), social media posts (NECSD’s 21st CCLC Facebook page), and by having classroom teachers inform their students of its availability. Unfortunately, there was a low number of responses overall. Horizons did not promote the survey due to the belief that parents were probably being overwhelmed with school communications due to the closure.

Because the 21st CCLC program was completely virtual in Year 4, the survey was again made available via Survey Monkey. The survey was promoted by the 21st CCLC teachers and students were given program time over a three week period, starting April 6, 2021, to complete it. The survey remained open until May 26, 2021, although no additional responses were received.

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

The following table shows the response rates for all four years of the grant. This appendix continues with details of item-by-item responses disaggregated by school site, additional summary tables as well as qualitative/verbatim responses. A summary that highlights data trends completes this appendix.

Grades K-3 Student Survey Response Rates

NOTE: Data is disaggregated by school: Balmville (BAL), Gardnertown (GLA), Gidney Avenue (GAMS), Horizons (HOH), and Vails Gate (VG).

Year #	School	Administration Dates	# of Consents Received	# of Survey Responses						# of Students in Target Population ¹	Response Rate (%) ²	
				K	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	Grade Unknown	Total			
1	BAL	May & June 2018	24 total	0	9	3	2	1	15	63	23.8	
	GAMS			0	2	0	0	0	2	75	2.7	
	HOH			2	1	1	0	0	4	52	7.7	
									21	Grand Total	190	Grand Total
2	BAL	April 9-30, 2019	48	7	8	9	6	0	30	48	62.5	
	GLA		48	8	8	12	11	0	39	52	75.0	
	GAMS		78	9	14	20	20	0	63	81	77.8	
	HOH		57	8	13	10	16	0	47	60	78.3	
	VG		33	9	3	7	5	0	24	33	72.7	
									203	Grand Total	274	Grand Total
3	BAL	Survey was available online: April 7, 2020 - May 19, 2020	58	0	4	0	2	0	6	60	10.0	
	GLA		59	1	1	1	0	0	3	61	4.9	
	GAMS		55	0	4	2	0	0	6	57	10.5	
	HOH		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	VG		67	3	6	3	7	0	19	70	27.1	
									34	Grand Total	248	Grand Total
4	BAL	Survey was available online: April 6, 2021 - May 26, 2021	4	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	25.0	
	GLA		9	0	0	0	6	0	6	9	66.7	
	GAMS		3	0	1	0	1	0	2	3	66.7	
	HOH		6	0	0	1	1	0	2	6	33.3	
	VG		6	0	1	2	0	0	3	7	42.9	
									14	Grand Total	29	Grand Total

¹ The target population is those students who reached 30 hours of participation during the school year. Students with only summer hours were not included.





² Response Rate (%) = 100 x (number of responses) / (number in target population)

Survey Results





The survey results are shown in the following table.

Responses to Grades K-3 Student Survey

NOTE: Data is disaggregated by school for Year 2 since each school's response rate exceeded 60%: Balmville (BAL), Gardnertown (GLA), Gidney Avenue (GAMS), Horizons (HOH), and Vails Gate (VG).

Coming to the 21 st Century After-School Program this year has helped me to...	Year #	School	Yes (#) 	Kind of (#) 	No (#) 	I was already doing fine. (#) 	Question Skipped (#)
1. Do better in school	1	Combined	15	4	2	0	0
	2	BAL	22	3	0	4	1
		GLA	27	2	1	7	2
		GAMS	47	5	1	8	2
		HOH	31	5	1	10	0
VG	19	3	0	1	1		
3	Combined	23	2	0	1	8	
4	Combined	9	0	0	4	1	
2. Feel more important to my community	1	Combined	14	3	2	1	1
	2	BAL	19	3	3	4	1
		GLA	22	7	3	7	0
		GAMS	35	15	7	4	2
		HOH	30	6	8	3	0
VG	19	2	3	0	0		
3	Combined	16	5	1	1	8	
4	Combined	7	1	0	3	3	
3. Do better at making friends	1	Combined	20	0	0	0	1
	2	BAL	19	3	2	5	1
		GLA	27	2	3	7	0
		GAMS	42	8	4	6	3
		HOH	37	6	2	2	0
VG	18	1	2	3	0		
3	Combined	20	3	1	2	8	
4	Combined	7	1	1	2	3	
4. Care more about others	1	Combined	13	3	5	0	0
	2	BAL	22	2	2	4	0
		GLA	21	3	3	11	1
		GAMS	42	11	2	6	2
		HOH	36	8	0	3	0
VG	17	2	1	2	2		
3	Combined	21	1	0	3	9	
4	Combined	8	2	0	2	2	
5. Tell the truth more often	1	Combined	14	4	1	1	1
	2	BAL	16	4	1	9	0
		GLA	22	6	2	9	0
		GAMS	37	10	2	10	4
		HOH	28	9	8	2	0
VG	20	1	0	1	2		
3	Combined	16	4	2	4	8	
4	Combined	8	0	0	3	3	

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4





Coming to the 21 st Century After-School Program this year has helped me to...	Year #	School	Yes (#) 	Kind of (#) 	No (#) 	I was already doing fine. (#) 	Question Skipped (#)
6. Stay out of trouble	1	Combined	12	3	4	2	0
	2	BAL	19	4	0	7	0
		GLA	19	5	5	9	1
		GAMS	37	8	5	11	2
		HOH	27	6	8	6	0
VG	14	2	2	5	1		
3	Combined	13	5	0	7	9	
4	Combined	6	0	0	6	2	
7. Feel better about myself	1	Combined	20	0	1	0	0
	2	BAL	21	2	1	6	0
		GLA	23	3	3	9	1
		GAMS	38	8	5	9	3
		HOH	33	6	3	5	0
VG	18	2	1	0	3		
3	Combined	22	2	1	0	9	
4	Combined	8	0	1	3	2	
8. Want to come to school	1	Combined	16	4	1	0	0
	2	BAL	22	6	1	1	0
		GLA	22	6	4	5	2
		GAMS	37	8	6	10	2
		HOH	39	4	3	1	0
VG	17	2	2	1	2		
3	Combined	18	2	1	8	9	
4	Combined	10	0	0	2	2	
9. Try new things	1	Combined	18	0	1	1	1
	2	BAL	23	2	3	2	0
		GLA	23	1	2	7	6
		GAMS	43	7	1	10	2
		HOH	39	2	2	4	0
VG	21	1	0	0	2		
3	Combined	22	0	0	3	9	
4	Combined	9	0	2	1	2	

Overall Effect

Combining the responses for the nine questions provides a general indication of how the grade K-3 students perceive the overall effects of the 21st CCLC program. The following table summarizes the overall responses.

Grades K-3 Student Survey – Overall Summary of Responses

NOTE: Data is disaggregated by school for Year 2 since each school's response rate exceeded 60%: Balmville (BAL), Gardnertown (GLA), Gidney Avenue (GAMS), Horizons (HOH), and Vails Gate (VG).




Year #	School	Yes (%) 	Kind of (%) 	No (%) 	I was already doing fine. (%) 	Question Skipped (%)
1	Combined	75.1	11.1	9.0	2.7	2.1
2	BAL	67.8	10.7	4.8	15.6	1.1
	GLA	58.7	10.0	7.4	20.2	3.7
	GAMS	63.1	14.1	5.8	13.1	3.9
	HOH	70.9	12.3	8.3	8.5	0.0
	VG	75.5	7.4	5.1	6.0	6.0
3	Combined	55.7	7.8	2.0	9.4	25.1
4	Combined	57.1	3.2	3.2	20.6	15.9

In all four years of the grant, over 55% of responding K-3 students indicated that, overall, the 21st CCLC program had a positive effect. Each year also had students that indicated that they were already doing fine (20.6% in Year 4) with under 10% indicating that the 21st CCLC program had no effect (3.2% in Year 4).

General Satisfaction

In Year 3, a general satisfaction question was added to the survey, “How much do you like the 21st Century After-School Program?” The responses are shown in the following table.

Grades K-3 Student Survey – General Satisfaction

Year #	School	It is great! (#) 	It is OK. (#) 	I do not like it. (#) 	Question Skipped (#)
3	Combined	20	5	0	9
4	Combined	9	3	0	2

Although in both Year 3 and Year 4 there were a limited number of responses to the survey, those students that did not skip the question indicated that they were satisfied with the 21st CCLC after-school program. There were no responses that the program was not liked.

Student Comments

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. In Year 4, student responses included (note: responses are presented as raw, unedited data):

- *“It’s fun!”*
- *“I will share my favorite songs.”*
- *“I would like to share about being in the 21s Century After-school program is that I love to do the programs and made so much new friend too. I love to be here so so so much.”*
- *“21 Centry is the best for me!”*
- *“its fun and helpful”*
- *“Maybe having different activities offered for enrichment.”*
- *“I love being in a 21st Century After-School program”*
- *“I like when were in breakout rooms and When its time for art”*
- *“I like show and tell with my friends to see what they like and show them what i like”*

Summary

Since the overall response rate for Year 4 is 19.4%, the sample may not be truly representative of the entire population of students. However, the majority of students responding to the survey indicated that the 21st CCLC program had helped them in all nine outcomes. 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. It should be noted, however, that typically with low response rates, those who are motivated to participate are those more likely to have had a positive experience.

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

Student Survey Summary: Grades 4-5

Description

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 in eight outcome categories (academic, community involvement, life skills, positive core values, positive life choices, sense of self, sense of future, and opportunity) during the current academic year.

Survey Administration

During both Year 1 and Year 2, the survey was administered online via Survey Monkey to those students whose parent/guardian had given consent and, starting in Year 2, had reached a 30-hour program participation threshold. In Year 1, consent was obtained using a stand-alone form that was only available close to the end of the 21st CCLC year and only a small number of forms were completed. In Year 2, the consent form was included in the online registration packet and almost all parents gave consent (i.e., when considering the participation requirement, three or fewer students at each school in grades 4-5 did not receive consent). Again, in Year 3 the consent form was included in the online registration packet and almost all parents gave consent (i.e., for students with 30 hours of participation, only one did not have consent).

During Years 1 and 2, 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 in one of the initial survey questions and an adult was allowed to read questions to those students having difficulty. This information is included in the survey introduction. Starting in Year 2, the survey included both English and Spanish text in order to maximize the response rate from Spanish-speaking students.

During Year 3, because regular school instruction transitioned to virtual, a link to the online survey was posted on the district’s 21st CCLC web page. The survey was promoted to students via a School Messenger Broadcast (phone calls and emails), social media posts (NECSD’s 21st CCLC Facebook page), and by having classroom teachers inform their students of its availability. Unfortunately, there was a low number of responses and Horizons did not promote the survey due to feeling that parents were being overwhelmed with school communications due to the closure.

Because the 21st CCLC program was completely virtual in year 4, the survey was again made available via Survey Monkey. Like the Grades K-3 survey, the SSOS was promoted by the 21st CCLC teachers and students were given program time over a three week period, starting April 6, 2021, to complete it. The survey remained open until May 26, 2021, although no additional responses were received after the three-week window.

The following table shows the response rates for each school for each year of the grant. This appendix continues with details of item-by-item responses disaggregated by school site, additional summary tables as well as qualitative/verbatim responses. A summary that highlights data trends completes this appendix.

Response Rates to Grades 4-5 SSOS

NOTE: Data is disaggregated by school: Balmville (BAL), Gardnertown (GLA), Gidney Avenue (GAMS), Horizons (HOH), and Vails Gate (VG).

Year #	School	Administration Dates	# of Consents Received	# of Survey Responses			# of Students in Target Population ¹	Response Rate (%) ²
				4 th grade	5 th grade	Total		
1	BAL	June 5, 2018	3	2	1	3	34	8.8
	GLA	June 5-14, 2018	11	6	5	11	42	26.2
	GAMS	June 6, 2018	4	0	4	4	62	6.5
	HOH	June 13, 2018	2	2	0	2	15	13.3
							20 Grand Total	153 Grand Total
2	BAL	Feb. 26-27, 2019	33	16	10	26	34	76.5
	GLA	Feb. 26-March 6, 2019	29	6	7	13	29	44.8
	GAMS	Feb. 13-21, 2019	68	10	16	26	71	36.6
	HOH	Feb. 28-April 2, 2019	35	11	14	25	35	71.4
	VG	Feb. 14-26, 2019	19	7	11	18	19	94.7
						108 Grand Total	188 Grand Total	57.4 Overall
3	BAL	Survey was available online: April 7, 2020 - May 19, 2020	31	3	6	9	31	29.0
	GLA		34	0	0	0	34	0.0
	GAMS		49	0	2	2	50	4.0
	HOH		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	VG		36	1	6	7	36	19.4
						18 Grand Total	151 Grand Total	11.9 Overall
4	BAL	Survey was available online: April 6, 2021 - May 26, 2021	4	0	3	3	4	75.0
	GLA		17	6	7	13	17	76.5
	GAMS		6	1	1	2	6	33.3
	HOH		4	2	0	2	4	50.0
	VG		11	4	3	7	12	58.3
						27 Grand Total	43 Grand Total	62.8 Overall

¹ The target population is those students who reached 30 hours of participation during the school year. Students with only summer hours were not included.

² Response rate (%) = 100 x (number of responses) / (number in target population)

Survey Results

The survey results are shown in the following table.

Responses to Grades 4-5 SSOS, by School

NOTE: Data is disaggregated by school for Year 2 since there were 13 or more survey responses at each school: Balmville (BAL), Gardnertown (GLA), Gidney Avenue (GAMS), Horizons (HOH), and Vails Gate (VG).

Academic	Coming to the 21 st Century After-School Program has helped me to...	Year #	School	Yes (#)	Kind of (#)	No (#)	I was already doing fine. (#)	Question Skipped (#)
		1. Do better in school	1	Combined		16	3	0
2	BAL			13	5	0	6	2
	GLA			11	1	0	1	0
	GAMS			20	5	0	1	0
	HOH			13	5	0	4	3
VG			10	4	0	4	0	
3	Combined			8	3	0	3	4
4	Combined			13	6	2	3	3

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

	2. Improve my grades in school	1	Combined	10	8	0	1	1
		2	BAL	17	5	2	0	2
			GLA	8	4	0	1	0
			GAMS	15	10	0	0	1
			HOH	12	8	0	2	3
	VG	11	4	0	3	0		
	3	Combined	8	4	1	1	4	
	4	Combined	11	10	1	1	4	
	3. Try harder in school	1	Combined	16	1	0	1	2
		2	BAL	15	6	0	2	3
			GLA	6	4	1	2	0
			GAMS	24	2	0	0	0
			HOH	12	4	1	2	6
	VG	11	3	0	4	0		
	3	Combined	8	4	0	1	5	
	4	Combined	14	5	2	2	4	
	4. Participate more in class activities	1	Combined	13	6	0	0	1
		2	BAL	13	7	1	3	2
			GLA	5	4	1	3	0
			GAMS	16	9	1	0	0
HOH			18	1	0	3	3	
VG	10	3	1	4	0			
3	Combined	9	1	2	2	4		
4	Combined	15	4	3	1	4		
5. Become more interested in going to school	1	Combined	9	8	1	1	1	
	2	BAL	9	8	4	3	2	
		GLA	4	2	2	5	0	
		GAMS	18	6	1	1	0	
		HOH	11	6	4	1	3	
VG	7	5	4	2	0			
3	Combined	6	5	2	1	4		
4	Combined	12	7	2	0	6		
6. Care more about my school	1	Combined	16	3	0	0	1	
	2	BAL	12	6	4	2	2	
		GLA	7	3	0	3	0	
		GAMS	17	7	0	2	0	
		HOH	12	6	3	1	3	
VG	8	8	2	0	0			
3	Combined	7	5	2	0	4		
4	Combined	13	3	3	3	5		
7. Get along better with my classmates	1	Combined	14	4	1	0	1	
	2	BAL	9	11	2	2	2	
		GLA	6	3	2	2	0	
		GAMS	15	9	1	1	0	
		HOH	10	6	4	2	3	
VG	4	6	2	3	3			
3	Combined	7	2	2	3	4		
4	Combined	11	2	3	5	6		

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

	8. Get along better with my teachers	1	Combined	17	1	0	1	1
		2	BAL	16	2	0	4	4
			GLA	6	4	0	3	0
			GAMS	22	3	0	1	0
			HOH	13	4	2	3	3
	VG	8	6	0	3	1		
	3	Combined	8	2	0	4	4	
	4	Combined	16	0	2	4	5	
	9a. Spend more time doing my homework	1	Combined	11	8	0	1	0
		2	BAL	13	5	2	4	2
			GLA	7	3	1	2	0
			GAMS	17	8	1	0	0
			HOH	12	5	2	2	4
VG	10	4	2	1	1			
9b. Did you work on homework on days when there was 21 st Century After-School Program?	Year #	School	Very Often, or Always (#)	Some-times (#)	Rarely or Never (#)	N/A	Question Skipped (#)	
	3	Combined	6	6	2	N/A	4	
	4	Combined	11	6	7	N/A	3	
Community Involvement	Coming to the 21st Century After-School Program has helped me...	Year #	School	Yes (#)	Kind of (#)	No (#)	I was already doing fine. (#)	Question Skipped (#)
	10. Feel more important to my community	1	Combined	13	5	1	0	1
		2	BAL	16	6	0	2	2
			GLA	6	3	3	1	0
			GAMS	15	10	1	0	0
			HOH	10	5	5	2	3
	VG	7	6	3	2	0		
	3	Combined	8	3	0	3	4	
	4	Combined	12	8	1	4	0	
	11. Feel a stronger connection to my community	1	Combined	12	6	0	0	2
		2	BAL	17	5	0	1	3
			GLA	6	3	3	1	0
			GAMS	15	8	2	1	0
			HOH	10	6	3	2	4
	VG	3	12	1	1	1		
	3	Combined	9	4	0	1	4	
	4	Combined	12	7	2	2	4	
	12. Spend more time volunteering or helping others in my community	1	Combined	13	6	1	0	0
		2	BAL	12	7	1	4	2
GLA			4	4	4	1	0	
GAMS			15	8	3	0	0	
HOH			11	6	4	1	3	
VG	7	6	2	3	0			
3	Combined	10	4	0	0	4		
4	Combined	12	6	1	4	4		

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

Life Skills	Because I came to the 21 st Century After-School Program...	Year #	School	Yes (#)	Kind of (#)	No (#)	I was already doing fine. (#)	Question Skipped (#)
	Life Skills	13. I get along better with other people my age	1	Combined	18	2	0	0
2			BAL	12	7	1	3	3
			GLA	8	3	2	0	0
			GAMS	17	8	1	0	0
			HOH	10	7	0	5	3
VG		9	6	2	1	0		
		3	Combined	6	6	0	2	4
		4	Combined	10	5	3	5	4
14. I am better at making friends		1	Combined	11	5	0	2	2
		2	BAL	11	5	1	6	3
			GLA	5	3	3	2	0
			GAMS	16	7	3	0	0
			HOH	14	3	1	4	3
VG		8	4	3	2	1		
		3	Combined	6	4	1	3	4
		4	Combined	9	6	3	3	6
15. I am better at telling others about my ideas and feelings		1	Combined	6	9	3	0	2
		2	BAL	7	10	5	1	3
			GLA	3	4	5	0	1
			GAMS	14	8	3	0	1
	HOH		8	6	4	3	4	
VG	4	7	5	2	0			
	3	Combined	7	4	1	2	4	
	4	Combined	10	6	5	1	5	
16. I am better at listening to other people	1	Combined	16	1	0	2	1	
	2	BAL	13	3	1	5	4	
		GLA	5	4	3	1	0	
		GAMS	13	9	2	0	2	
		HOH	13	5	1	3	3	
VG	7	6	0	4	1			
	3	Combined	12	0	0	2	4	
	4	Combined	14	3	3	2	5	
17. I work better with others on a team	1	Combined	9	8	2	0	1	
	2	BAL	15	3	0	5	3	
		GLA	7	3	3	0	0	
		GAMS	14	8	1	1	2	
		HOH	12	5	4	1	3	
VG	8	6	1	3	0			
	3	Combined	8	5	1	0	4	
	4	Combined	13	5	1	4	4	
18. I make better decisions	1	Combined	14	3	2	0	1	
	2	BAL	12	3	0	5	6	
		GLA	6	4	1	2	0	
		GAMS	15	9	1	0	1	
		HOH	14	4	0	4	3	
VG	12	5	0	1	0			

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

		3	Combined	6	6	0	2	4
		4	Combined	12	5	3	2	5
	19. I am better at planning ahead	1	Combined	11	5	2	0	2
			BAL	16	5	1	1	3
		GLA	5	3	3	2	0	
		GAMS	14	10	2	0	0	
		HOH	8	9	3	2	3	
		VG	4	8	2	3	1	
	2	Combined	4	9	0	0	5	
		Combined	10	6	3	3	5	
	20. I am better at setting goals	1	Combined	11	7	1	0	1
			BAL	18	2	1	3	2
		GLA	7	1	2	3	0	
		GAMS	16	9	1	0	0	
		HOH	14	3	2	2	4	
		VG	12	2	2	1	1	
		3	Combined	6	4	2	1	5
		4	Combined	14	3	4	1	5
	21. I am better at solving problems	1	Combined	12	3	3	1	1
			BAL	14	5	1	4	2
GLA		4	3	4	2	0		
GAMS		12	11	2	1	0		
HOH		14	5	1	2	3		
VG		6	6	1	4	1		
3	Combined	8	2	1	2	5		
4	Combined	10	7	3	1	6		
22. I am more of a leader	1	Combined	17	2	0	0	1	
		BAL	13	7	1	3	2	
	GLA	5	3	3	2	0		
	GAMS	15	9	1	1	0		
	HOH	8	11	2	1	3		
	VG	5	6	5	1	1		
3	Combined	5	6	1	1	5		
4	Combined	10	7	3	3	4		
23. I am better at taking care of problems without violence or fighting.	1	Combined	15	2	1	1	1	
		BAL	11	8	3	2	2	
	GLA	7	2	1	3	0		
	GAMS	17	7	2	0	0		
	HOH	15	5	2	0	3		
	VG	6	7	3	1	1		
3	Combined	5	5	1	2	5		
4	Combined	11	2	7	2	5		

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

Positive Core Values	Because I came to the 21 st Century After-School Program...	Year #	School	Yes (#)	Kind of (#)	No (#)	I was already doing fine. (#)	Question Skipped (#)	
	24. I care more about other people	1	Combined		14	4	1	0	1
		2	BAL		11	8	0	5	2
			GLA		6	5	1	1	0
			GAMS		13	11	1	1	0
			HOH		13	7	0	2	3
	VG		7	8	0	3	0		
	3	Combined		8	3	0	3	4	
	4	Combined		14	3	1	5	4	
	25. I care more about the feelings of other people	1	Combined		15	4	0	0	1
2		BAL		11	8	2	3	2	
		GLA		5	4	2	2	0	
		GAMS		16	9	1	0	0	
		HOH		12	5	1	4	3	
VG		6	7	3	2	0			
3	Combined		9	2	1	2	4		
4	Combined		14	3	2	4	4		
26. I tell the truth more often even when it is hard	1	Combined		15	2	0	2	1	
	2	BAL		13	6	1	4	2	
		GLA		5	5	2	1	0	
		GAMS		17	8	1	0	0	
		HOH		9	8	1	3	4	
VG		9	5	2	1	1			
3	Combined		7	5	1	1	4		
4	Combined		12	4	4	2	5		
27. I am better at standing up for what I believe	1	Combined		12	5	1	0	2	
	2	BAL		16	4	0	4	2	
		GLA		7	3	1	2	0	
		GAMS		16	8	2	0	0	
		HOH		10	6	2	4	3	
VG		9	5	3	0	1			
3	Combined		8	3	1	1	5		
4	Combined		11	7	1	2	6		
28. I am better at taking responsibility for my action	1	Combined		14	4	0	2	0	
	2	BAL		13	5	1	5	2	
		GLA		7	5	0	1	0	
		GAMS		18	6	0	1	1	
		HOH		9	8	1	4	3	
VG		13	3	0	2	0			
3	Combined		7	5	0	2	4		
4	Combined		11	8	2	2	4		

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

Positive Life Choices	Being involved in the 21 st Century After-School Program has helped me to...	Year #	School	Yes (#)	Kind of (#)	No (#)	I was already doing fine. (#)	Question Skipped (#)	
	29. Say "no" to things I know are wrong	1	Combined		16	3	0	1	0
		2	BAL		15	2	2	4	3
			GLA		11	0	1	1	0
			GAMS		17	4	1	2	2
			HOH		10	4	3	5	3
			VG		8	7	1	2	0
		3	Combined		9	3	0	2	4
		4	Combined		13	5	2	0	4
	30. Stay out of trouble	1	Combined		11	6	2	0	1
		2	BAL		12	7	0	4	3
			GLA		5	5	0	3	0
			GAMS		14	6	1	1	4
			HOH		13	4	1	4	3
			VG		9	7	0	1	1
		3	Combined		3	8	0	2	5
		4	Combined		10	6	1	6	4
	31. Avoid violence and fighting	1	Combined		15	2	1	1	1
		2	BAL		10	10	0	3	3
			GLA		8	1	1	3	0
GAMS				15	5	3	1	2	
HOH				10	5	2	5	3	
VG				7	6	1	2	2	
3		Combined		6	4	1	2	5	
4		Combined		13	2	3	5	4	
Being involved in the 21 st Century After-School Program has helped me to make healthier choices about...	Year #	School	Yes (#)	Kind of (#)	No (#)	I was already doing fine. (#)	Question Skipped (#)		
32. What I eat	1	Combined		13	5	1	0	1	
	2	BAL		15	3	1	5	2	
		GLA		8	1	1	3	0	
		GAMS		15	5	5	1	0	
		HOH		13	2	4	3	3	
		VG		6	3	5	3	1	
	3	Combined		8	1	4	1	4	
	4	Combined		10	2	7	4	4	
33. Exercise	1	Combined		17	0	2	1	0	
	2	BAL		15	2	1	6	2	
		GLA		5	3	3	2	0	
		GAMS		18	4	2	1	1	
		HOH		9	3	7	3	3	
		VG		11	2	0	4	1	
	3	Combined		7	5	1	1	4	
	4	Combined		16	2	3	1	5	

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

	34. Tobacco	1	Combined	6	1	8	3	2
		2	BAL	3	2	15	4	2
			GLA	5	0	3	5	0
			GAMS	7	2	10	7	0
			HOH	3	1	13	3	5
	VG	6	0	6	4	2		
	3	Combined	6	0	7	1	4	
	4	Combined	5	0	11	5	6	
	35. Alcohol	1	Combined	6	1	9	2	2
		2	BAL	3	1	15	4	3
			GLA	4	0	4	5	0
			GAMS	6	2	11	7	0
			HOH	3	1	14	3	4
	VG	6	0	7	3	2		
	3	Combined	6	0	7	1	4	
	4	Combined	3	2	12	5	5	
36. Drugs	1	Combined	5	2	9	2	2	
	2	BAL	3	2	15	4	2	
		GLA	5	0	3	5	0	
		GAMS	7	1	10	7	1	
		HOH	2	2	14	3	4	
VG	7	0	6	3	2			
3	Combined	6	0	7	1	4		
4	Combined	3	1	13	5	5		
Sense of Self	Coming to the 21st Century After-School Program has helped me to...	Year #	School	Yes (#)	Kind of (#)	No (#)	I was already doing fine. (#)	Question Skipped (#)
	37. Feel better about myself	1	Combined	16	2	0	2	0
		2	BAL	16	4	0	3	3
			GLA	6	4	1	2	0
			GAMS	18	4	1	1	2
			HOH	14	3	3	2	3
	VG	6	4	2	6	0		
	3	Combined	7	3	1	3	4	
	4	Combined	14	5	2	3	3	
	38. Feel that I have more control over things that happen to me	1	Combined	13	3	1	2	1
		2	BAL	13	3	0	7	3
			GLA	6	3	2	2	0
			GAMS	12	10	3	0	1
			HOH	13	4	3	2	3
VG	4	9	3	2	0			
3	Combined	8	3	2	1	4		
4	Combined	11	4	3	4	5		

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

	39. Feel that I can make more of a difference	1	Combined	14	5	0	0	1
		2	BAL	18	0	1	4	3
			GLA	5	4	1	2	1
			GAMS	17	5	2	0	2
			HOH	13	5	2	2	3
	VG	5	8	2	2	1		
	3	Combined	9	3	2	0	4	
	4	Combined	11	5	4	2	5	
	40. Learn I can do things I didn't think I could do before	1	Combined	18	1	0	0	1
		2	BAL	16	5	0	2	3
			GLA	6	3	1	3	0
			GAMS	20	3	0	0	3
			HOH	14	3	0	4	4
	VG	10	4	1	2	1		
	3	Combined	11	3	0	0	4	
	4	Combined	17	0	1	4	5	
	41. Feel better about my future	1	Combined	12	5	1	1	1
		2	BAL	17	2	0	4	3
			GLA	6	4	2	0	1
			GAMS	18	5	1	0	2
HOH			11	5	3	3	3	
VG	6	6	3	2	1			
3	Combined	9	4	0	0	5		
4	Combined	14	5	1	2	5		
42. Feel I am better at handling whatever comes my way	1	Combined	10	7	0	2	1	
	2	BAL	17	1	1	4	3	
		GLA	5	4	1	3	0	
		GAMS	13	8	2	0	3	
		HOH	11	5	2	3	4	
VG	8	7	1	1	1			
3	Combined	7	4	0	3	4		
4	Combined	12	4	3	2	6		
Sense of Future	Coming to the 21st Century After-School Program has helped me to...	Year #	School	Yes (#)	Kind of (#)	No (#)	I was already doing fine. (#)	Question Skipped (#)
	43. Think about jobs or future careers	1	Combined	14	4	2	0	0
		2	BAL	17	1	0	5	3
			GLA	5	5	1	1	1
			GAMS	14	9	1	0	2
			HOH	10	5	2	4	4
	VG	8	3	6	1	0		
	3	Combined	8	3	1	1	5	
	4	Combined	15	2	2	4	4	
	44. Think about college or other training after high school	1	Combined	11	4	2	2	1
2		BAL	14	5	0	4	3	
			GLA	6	2	3	2	0

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

			GAMS	17	5	2	0	2	
			HOH	11	3	2	5	4	
			VG	5	6	6	1	0	
		3	Combined	8	2	1	2	5	
	4	Combined	15	3	0	4	5		
	45. Want to stay in school	1	Combined	16	3	0	0	1	
		2	BAL	15	2	1	5	3	
			GLA	8	1	1	3	0	
			GAMS	16	3	3	0	4	
			HOH	13	4	1	3	4	
		VG	4	4	7	1	2		
	3	Combined	7	3	2	1	5		
	4	Combined	11	4	2	4	6		
	46. Think about my future	1	Combined	17	2	0	0	1	
		2	BAL	16	2	1	4	3	
			GLA	6	4	2	1	0	
			GAMS	17	5	2	0	2	
			HOH	10	5	1	5	4	
		VG	10	3	3	1	1		
	3	Combined	9	2	0	2	5		
4	Combined	15	2	1	3	6			
47. Set goals for myself	1	Combined	16	2	1	0	1		
	2	BAL	20	0	0	3	3		
		GLA	5	4	2	2	0		
		GAMS	15	6	3	0	2		
		HOH	10	4	3	4	4		
	VG	10	5	2	1	0			
3	Combined	8	1	0	4	5			
4	Combined	14	3	1	3	6			
Opportunity	Coming to the 21st Century After-School Program has helped me to...		Year #	School	Yes (#)	Kind of (#)	No (#)	I was already doing fine. (#)	Question Skipped (#)
	48. Try new things	1	Combined	20	0	0	0	0	
		2	BAL	18	1	1	3	3	
			GLA	6	3	3	1	0	
			GAMS	20	3	1	0	2	
			HOH	15	3	0	1	6	
		VG	5	11	0	2	0		
	3	Combined	8	3	1	1	5		
	4	Combined	16	2	2	2	5		
	49. Do things here I don't get to do anywhere else	1	Combined	13	2	4	0	1	
		2	BAL	13	3	4	2	4	
			GLA	6	4	2	1	0	
			GAMS	13	7	4	0	2	
			HOH	9	4	2	4	6	
VG		6	8	2	2	0			
3	Combined	5	3	3	1	6			
4	Combined	10	6	3	1	7			

Homework Question

Question 9A was changed to 9b in Year 3 to obtain feedback from grade 4-5 students regarding the “homework optional” policy for 21st CCLC students. The majority of students (17 of the 27 responses) indicated that they worked on homework sometimes, very often, or always during program days. The following comments were submitted by the students specifically regarding this question (note: responses are presented as raw, unedited data):

Balmville students

- *“because i finish my homework before i go to the program” ~5th grade girl*
- *“i don't get homework.” ~5th grade boy*

Gardnertown students

- *“mostly i don't get to do it on the time before it so most of the time i finish it when i have time in our after school class.” ~5th grade girl*
- *“i really dont have something to explain about this but the reason why i wanna try to get a lot of things done” ~5th grade girl*
- *“Because i always get homework only in wednesday and i work with my friend and i get help from parents.” ~5th grade girl*
- *“because i need this and makes me get smarter” ~5th grade boy*
- *“In 21st century After school I always do my homework because 21st century is to have fun and help with homework.” ~4th grade boy*
- *“DO not give me homework.” ~4th grade boy*
- *“Porque me ayudado a mejorar con la escuela ser mejor participar en las clases .” which translates to “It helped me do better in school and participate better in classes.” ~5th grade girl*
- *“because i have too do it” ~4th grade girl*
- *“i did it because i like to do my homework” ~4th grade girl*

Gidney Avenue student

- *“because i dont have homework” ~5th grade boy*

Horizons on Hudson student

- *“no homework” ~4th grade boy*

Vails Gate students

- *“I never did homework on afterschool days because we never had homework because of covid 19. But if there was homework during covid 19 i would definetly do it.” ~5th grade boy*
- *“Never cause this year there was no homework.” ~5th grade girl*
- *“Beatles pizzas Domino's” ~4th grade girl*
- *“Yes math trival ela trival and getting fit and getting along with my teacher.” ~4th grade boy*
- *“because its fun” ~4th grade girl*

Based on the remarks, there is a mix of students that had homework assigned and those that did not (although it is not clear if that is related to participating in 21st CCLC or due to the regular school day being virtual).

Overall Effect

Combining the responses for the forty-nine questions, in the eight outcome areas categories as well as overall, provides a general indication of how the grade 4-5 students perceive the overall effects of the 21st CCLC program. The following table summarizes the overall responses.

Grades 4-5 Student Survey – Overall Summary of Responses

NOTE: Data is disaggregated by school for Year 2 since there were 13 or more survey responses at each school: Balmville (BAL), Gardnertown (GLA), Gidney Avenue (GAMS), Horizons (HOH), and Vails Gate (VG).

NOTE: Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

Year #	School	Outcome Category	Yes (%)	Kind of (%)	No (%)	I was already doing fine. (%)	Question Skipped (%)
1	Combined	All	66.2	18.9	6.4	3.5	5.0
2	BAL	All	51.3	17.3	7.3	13.8	10.3
	GLA	All	46.3	23.2	14.3	15.5	0.6
	GAMS	All	59.7	25.4	8.0	3.1	3.7
	HOH	All	44.4	19.1	11.0	11.4	14.0
	VG	All	41.7	29.6	12.8	12.1	3.7
3	Combined	Academic	41.4	19.8	6.8	9.3	22.8
		Community Involvement	50.0	20.4	0	7.4	22.2
		Life Skills	36.9	25.8	4.0	8.6	24.7
		Positive Core Values	43.3	20.0	3.3	10.0	23.3
		Positive Life Choices	35.4	14.6	18.8	7.6	23.6
		Sense of Self	47.2	18.5	4.6	6.5	23.1
		Sense of Future	44.4	12.2	4.4	11.1	27.8
		Opportunity	36.1	16.7	11.1	5.6	30.6
TOTAL		40.9	19.3	7.0	8.5	24.3	
4	Combined	Academic	48.6	17.1	8.3	8.8	17.1
		Community Involvement	44.4	25.9	4.9	12.4	12.4
		Life Skills	41.4	18.5	12.8	9.1	18.2
		Positive Core Values	45.9	18.5	7.4	11.1	17.0
		Positive Life Choices	33.8	9.3	24.1	16.2	16.7
		Sense of Self	48.8	14.2	8.6	10.5	17.9
		Sense of Future	51.9	10.4	4.4	13.3	20.0
		Opportunity	48.2	14.8	9.3	5.6	22.2
TOTAL		44.3	15.7	11.3	11.1	17.6	

Although there was a limited number of responses in Year 4 (27 for the five schools, with four to five respondents consistently skipping questions and occasionally six), the majority of the questions had affirmative answers (“Yes” or “Kind of”), especially when they are summed. There were a few questions where “No” was a prevalent response.

- “No” received the majority of responses in the Positive Life Choices section in the questions regarding tobacco, alcohol, and drugs. The wording of these questions, however, may have had students interpret their lack of experience with these choices as not needing help with them. Follow up to determine student need and potential inclusion in Year 5 programming is suggested.

- A few questions had four or more “No” responses: telling others about my ideas and feelings (#15), setting goals (#20), problem resolution (#23), telling the truth (#26), diet (#7), making a difference (#39). These topics are generally related to social-emotional health, and although SEL was included in both the regular school day and 21s CCLC programming, its effectiveness may have been diminished due to the virtual settings of both.

It should also be noted that this is a long survey and the number of students that skipped a question generally increased as the survey progressed. This can be seen as the percentage of skipped questions increased from below 20% to 22.2% in the final group of questions regarding Opportunity.

General Satisfaction

In Year 3, a general satisfaction question was added to the survey, “How much do you like the 21st Century After-School Program?” The responses are shown in the following table, which also includes Year 4 responses.

Grades 4-5 Student Survey – General Satisfaction

NOTE: Data is not disaggregated by school due to the low response rate.

Year #	School	It is great! (#)	It is OK. (#)	I do not like it. (#)	Question Skipped (#)
3	Combined	7	6	0	5
4	Combined	17	6	0	4

As in Year 3, although there were a limited number of responses to the survey, those students that did not skip the question indicated that they were satisfied with the 21st CCLC after-school program. In Year 4, 63.0% (i.e., 17 out of 27 students) replied “It is great!” There were no responses that the program was not liked in either year.

Student Comments

The students were also asked “Is there anything else you would like to share about being in the 21st Century Program?” to allow them to offer any additional insights. In Year 4, student responses included (note: responses are presented as raw, unedited data):

Balmville students

- “no” ~5th grade girl
- “nope” ~5th grade boy

Gardnertown students

- “It is really fun and it is something to do when im done with school” ~5th grade girl
- “nu its just it such i good program tho oooooo” ~5th grade girl
- “no ty” ~5th grade girl
- “My teacher is awesome” ~5th grade boy
- “In 21st century after school has new things and a lot of fun things.” ~4th grade boy
- “I love to be at the Arter school program now.” ~4th grade boy

- “to be at school and in the afternoon class” ~5th grade girl
- “Esto me ayudado a ser mejor persona a estudiante en la escuela” translates to “This helps me be a better person and student” ~5th grade girl
- “the teachers are kind and we learn knew things” ~4th grade girl

Gidney Avenue students

- “it is sometimes fun” ~4th grade girl
- “i have the best teachers” ~5th grade boy

Horizons on Hudson student

- “its too long and its cinda boring” ~4th grade boy

Vails Gate students

- “no” ~5th grade boy
- “No thank you.” ~5th grade girl
- “I LIKE THE 21ST CENTURY A LOT. I LIKE TO COME BACK.” ~4th grade boy
- “no” ~4th grade girl

Summary

Overall, as in previous years, the SSOS responses indicate that Year 4 of the 21st CCLC program had a generally positive impact on the grade 4-5 students in academic, enrichment, and social-emotional areas. It should be noted, however, that typically with low response rates, those who are motivated to participate are those more likely to have had a positive experience.

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

Saturday Family Learning Trip Summary

Description

The Saturday Family Learning Trips expose students and adults to a variety of experiences. Each in-person trip generally includes a light breakfast, busing to the location, lunch, and busing back to the school where the trip originated. Students are not required to specifically bring a parent/guardian; an adult family member over 18 years old is sufficient. Although many students are accompanied by a parent, there are also grandparents and, in at least one instance, a great-grandparent that attended the Saturday Family Learning Trip.

During Year 1, there were three trip destinations:

- Locust Grove Estate (Poughkeepsie, NY) – a National Historic Landmark with a museum, nature preserve, antique exhibits, and art gallery.
- Liberty Science Center (Jersey City, NJ) – a learning center with a wide variety of science and technology-based exhibits and hands-on activities.
- National Geographic Encounter: Ocean Odyssey (Times Square, New York City) – a simulated interactive experience which allows visitors to participate in a “walk” from the South Pacific to the coast of California.

A different set of three destinations were selected for Year 2:

- Legoland Discovery Center (Yonkers, NY) – a Lego-based family attraction with hands-on Lego challenges, 4D cinema, and interactive rides
- Maritime Aquarium (Norwalk, CT) – an aquarium that includes living exhibits that teach marine science and the environment in a hands-on approach.
- The Illusionists (West Point Naval Academy) – a live Broadway show at West Point that included many types of magic including levitation, mind-reading, and disappearance. Before the show, families met with Cadets to participate in a question and answer period, learn proper posture for marching, practice marching, and pose for photographs if interested.

In Year 3, the following Saturday Family Learning Trips were offered:

- Camp Mariah (Sharpe Reservation, Fishkill, NY) – a Fresh Air facility that provided STEM activities such as building and racing go-karts, exploring the camp’s grounds using orienteering skills, making paper, and engineering an egg drop container. This facility is not open to the general public but is available for group visits.
- Bounce Trampoline Park (Poughkeepsie, NY) – a morning of fun fitness activities (e.g., trampoline bouncing and games, air hockey, obstacle course including a foam pit) was provided to students and their accompanying adult to promote health and wellness.

Two virtual Saturday Family Learning Trips were offered in Year 4:

- How Our Favorite Foods are Made – a one-hour session held in Google Meet that was hosted live by a facilitator from NECSD with videos on the making of ice cream sandwiches, ketchup, candy canes, etc.
- Live Hip Hop Dance Class – a one-hour dance session hosted live by an NPAA artist.

During Years 1-3, because there was not enough capacity for all 21st CCLC students to attend each Saturday Family Learning Trip, participation was on a first come, first served basis. During Year 1, participation was below the desired level of 95%. Although trips appeared to be registered at capacity, many families did not show up on the morning of the trip. This pattern of no-shows occurred even with automatic phone calls and flyers as reminders. During Year 2, families were advised that missing a Saturday Family Learning Trip would exclude them from registering for future Saturday Family Learning Trips. This policy decreased the number of families no-shows. Although all three Year 2 Saturday Family Learning Trips

were fully pre-registered, some no-shows continued. Only the Saturday Family Learning Trip to Legoland Discovery Center reached the desired level of 95% participation by obtaining 98%.

The first Year 3 Saturday Family Learning Trip was to Camp Mariah. Although the trip registration was at full capacity of 100 students and accompanying adult, and all families were called to confirm, there were numerous no-shows. A very low attendance rate resulted (52 of the 100 students that had registered). Factors contributing to low attendance may have included: foggy weather on the day of the trip and/or buses departing from a single school (GAMS) rather than each school as had been done for prior trips. It is also notable that Camp Mariah is not open to the general public because it is a summer camp for the Fresh Air Program. This suggests that parents may be unfamiliar with the location which could have been another deterrent. The second trip, to Bounce Trampoline Park, exceeded the target of 95% participation level with all buses departing from GAMS. Due to budget constraints, a third Saturday Family Learning Trip was not planned and would not have been possible due to district closure.

Because the Year 4 Saturday Family Learning Trips were planned as virtual events and student enrollment in the 21st CCLC program is low, no limit on the number of attendees was needed; all students could attend if they desired. Unfortunately, similar to previous years, not all registered students attended (i.e., a total of 40 students registered for the Favorite Foods Trip and 26 attended while a total of 12 students registered for the Hip Hop Dance Class and 4 attended). Although a policy had been implemented in Year 2 that would exclude families that did not attend a Trip from registering for future Trips, it was not enforced due to confusion on how to log in to the Trips. It should be noted that there were students that attended the Saturday Family Learning Trip without a family member.

The following table includes a summary of the attendance for the Saturday Family Learning Trips.

Saturday Family Learning Trip Attendance Summary

Year #	Location (Date)	Attendance ¹ (NOTE: Data sets are formatted as: # students, # adults)						Maximum Capacity	Student Participation, by trip (%)
		Balmville Elementary	Gardnertown Academy	Gidney Avenue	Horizons on Hudson	Vails Gate	TOTAL		
1	Locust Grove Estate (4 trips; Jan. & Feb. 2018)	Not available	Not available ²	Not available	Not available	N/A	74, 72	100 students, each with an adult	74.0 (n = 100)
	Liberty Science Center (April 14, 2018)	20, 17	21, 21	33, 29	19, 19	N/A	93, 86	200 students, each with an adult	46.5 (n = 200)
	National Geographic Encounter (May 12, 2018)	16, 12	26, 26	42, 38	31, 24	N/A	115, 100	200 students, each with an adult	57.5 (n = 200)
	Student Participation, by school (%)	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	N/A	56.4 (n = 500)		
2	Legoland Discovery Center (December 8, 2018)	20, 17	19, 15	19, 15	20, 16	20, 18	98, 81	100 students, each with an adult	98.0 (n = 100)
	Maritime Aquarium (February 9, 2019)	17, 10	16, 13	17, 14	17, 16	20, 16	87, 69	100 students, each with an adult	87.0 (n = 100)
	The Illusionists at West Point (March 3, 2019)	15, 13	18, 14	17, 13	15, 11	16, 13	81, 64	100 students, each with an adult	81.0 (n = 100)
	Student Participation, by school (%)	86.7 (n = 60)	88.3 (n = 60)	88.3 (n = 60)	86.7 (n = 60)	93.3 (n = 60)	88.7 (n = 300)		
3	Camp Mariah (December 14, 2019)	3, 2	19, 17	13, 10	9, 9	8, 7	52, 45	100 students, each with an adult	52.0 (n = 100)
	Bounce Trampoline Park (February 22, 2020)	20, 13	18, 16	18, 14	19, 9	22, 16	97, 68	100 students, each with an adult	97.0 (n = 100)
	Student Participation, by school (%)	57.5 (n = 40)	92.5 (n = 40)	77.5 (n = 40)	70.0 (n = 40)	75.0 (n = 40)	74.5 (n = 200)		
4	How Our Favorite Foods are Made (December 19, 2020)	4, 1	6, 2	4, 4	6, 6	6, 5	26, 18	N/A	N/A
	Live Hip Hop Dance Class (January 16, 2021)	0, 0	2, 2	1, 1	0, 0	1, 1	4, 4	N/A	N/A
	Student Participation, by school (%)	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	71.4 (n = 42 ³)		

¹ The student and adult counts do not match in most cases due to adults being paired with two or more children due to siblings participating in the Trip. Also, because Year 4 Trips were held virtually, some students participated on their own without a family member.

² 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.

³ Total registration was 34 students for “How Our Favorite Foods are Made” and 8 students for the “Live Hip Hop Class.” Registration by school was not provided.

Survey Administration

Surveys have been administered for all four Years of the grant to both the students and their parent/guardians that participate. In Year 1, students were surveyed at the end of the school year regarding the Saturday Family Learning Trips along with their student survey. This delay was due to an extended time period needed to obtain parental consent. Beginning in Year 2, parental consent was included with the 21st CCLC registration. Following a discussion with the project staff, it was also decided that paper surveys would be administered at the conclusion of each Saturday Family Learning Trip.

Parents/guardians were also surveyed both of the first two years. For the first Saturday Family Learning Trip in Year 1 (Locust Grove Estate), an online survey was developed using Survey Monkey to provide parents/guardians access to the survey through their cellphones. There were no responses to the online survey, for reasons that are unclear. A paper version of the survey was developed for use starting with the next Saturday Family Learning Trip. Response rates remained low for the remaining two Saturday Family Learning Trips during Year 1. To improve response rates, field trip staff were provided with a checklist that included survey administration to both students and parents/guardians to help ensure that the surveys are distributed and collected.

In Year 3 the paper surveys continued to be used and response rates for both students and parent/guardians generally remained high. Student survey response rates at the five schools for Camp Mariah ranged between 75-100% and for the Bounce Trampoline Park ranged between 26-94%. The parent/guardian survey response rates at the five schools for Camp Mariah ranged from 82-100% and for the Bounce Trampoline Park ranged from 64-100%.

Year 4 surveys were offered to students and parents/guardians that participated in the Trip via links to Survey Monkey surveys. Spanish language text was included in both the student and adult surveys. Overall, although there were a limited number of participants and survey responses with both students and adults, the survey results were very positive. They enjoyed the activity and appreciated it was available.

Survey Results - Students

The following table summarizes the survey responses received from students that attended the Saturday Family Learning Trips.

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

Student Survey: Completion and Response Summaries

NOTE: Data is disaggregated by school: Balmville (BAL), Gardnertown (GLA), Gidney Avenue (GAMS), Horizons (HOH), and Vails Gate (VG).

Year #	Saturday Family Learning Trip	School	Maximum Possible # of Responses		# of Responses		Response Rate (%)		Have you been there before?			Did you like the Field Trip?		
									Yes	Not Sure	No	Yes	Kind of	No
1	Locust Grove Estate	BAL	N/A	Total 74	5	Total 9	N/A	Overall 12.2	0	0	5	3	2	0
		GLA	N/A		1		N/A		0	0	1	1	0	0
		GAMS	N/A		3		N/A		0	0	3	2	0	1
		HOH	N/A		0		N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Liberty Science Center	BAL	20	Total 93	3	Total 11	15	Overall 11.8	1	0	2	3	0	0
		GLA	21		3		14		2	0	1	3	0	0
		GAMS	33		2		6		2	0	0	2	0	0
		HOH	19		3		16		3	0	0	3	0	0
	National Geographic Encounter	BAL	16	Total 115	4	Total 12	25	Overall 10.4	0	0	4	4	0	0
GLA		26	2		8		0		0	2	2	0	0	
GAMS		42	3		7		2		0	1	3	0	0	
HOH		31	3		10		1		0	2	3	0	0	
2	Legoland Discovery Center	BAL	20	Total 98	0 ¹	Total 67	N/A	Overall 68.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
		GLA	19		16		84		7	1	8	16	0	0
		GAMS	19		19		100		8	1	10	18	1	0
		HOH	20		16		80		13	0	3	16	0	0
		VG	20		16		80		2	0	14	14	0	0
	Maritime Aquarium	BAL	16 ²	Total 86	16	Total 39	100	Overall 45.3	8	1	7	16	0	0
		GLA	16		10		63		0	0	10	8	0	0
		GAMS	17		0 ¹		N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
		HOH	17		0 ¹		N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
		VG	20		13		65		2	2	9	13	0	0
	The Illusionists at West Point	BAL	15	Total 81	13	Total 74	87	Overall 91.4	4	0	9	13	0	0
		GLA	18		18		100		3	0	15	18	0	0
GAMS		17	16		94		9		1	6	14	2	0	
HOH		15	13		87		1		1	10	10	2	1	
VG		16	14		88		5		0	9	12	1	1	
3	Camp Mariah	BAL	3	Total 52	3	Total 48	100	Overall 92.3	1	0	2	2	1	0
		GLA	19		17		89		5	0	12	16	1	0
		GAMS	13		13		100		1	0	12	9	4	0
		HOH	9		9		100		1	0	8	8	1	0
		VG	8		6		75		1	0	5	4	2	0
	Bounce Trampoline Park	BAL	20	Total 97	18	Total 67	90	Overall 69.1	13	2	2	16	1	0
		GLA	18		17		94		10	0	7	15	2	0
		GAMS	18		11		61		7	1	3	11	0	0
	HOH	19	5	26	2	0	3	4	1	0				
	VG	22	16	73	11	0	5	16	0	0				
4	How Our Favorite Foods are Made	BAL	4	Total 26	0	Total 3	0	Overall 11.5	This question was not asked in Year 4.			N/A	N/A	N/A
		GLA	4		1		25					1	0	0
		GAMS	6		1		17					1	0	0
		HOH	6		1		17					1	0	0
		VG	6		0		0					N/A	N/A	N/A
	Live Hip Hop Dance Class	BAL	0	Total 4	N/A	Total 3	N/A	Overall 75.0	This question was not asked in Year 4.			N/A	N/A	N/A
		GLA	2		1		50					1	0	0
		GAMS	1		1		100					1	0	0
	HOH	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
	VG	1	1	100	1	0	0							

¹ The survey was not administered.

² Although 17 students attended, one student had opted out of participating in surveys.

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

Survey Results – Parents/Guardians: The following table summarizes the completion of surveys by the parents/guardians.

Parent/Guardian Survey: Completion Summary

NOTE: Data is disaggregated by school: Balmville (BAL), Gidney Avenue (GAMS), Horizons (HOH), Gardnertown (GLA), and Vails Gate (VG).

Year #	Saturday Family Learning Trip	School	Maximum Possible # of Responses		# of Responses		Response Rate ¹ (%)	
1	Locust Grove Estate	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Liberty Science Center	BAL	17	Total 86	0	Total 4	0	Overall 4.7
		GLA	21		0		0	
		GAMS	29		0		0	
		HOH	19		4		4	
National Geographic Encounter	BAL	12	Total 100	0	Total 29	0	Overall 29.0	
	GLA	26		10		38		
	GAMS	38		10		26		
	HOH	24		9		38		
2	Legoland Discovery Center	BAL	17	Total 81	N/A ²	Total 55	N/A	Overall 67.9
		GLA	15		10		67	
		GAMS	15		14		93	
		HOH	16		15		94	
		VG	18		16		89	
	Maritime Aquarium	BAL	10	Total 69	11	Total 46	100	Overall 66.7
		GLA	13		08		62	
		GAMS	14		N/A ²		N/A	
		HOH	16		14		88	
		VG	16		13		81	
	The Illusionists at West Point	BAL	13	Total 64	9	Total 62	69	Overall 96.9
		GLA	14		15		100	
GAMS		13	14		100			
HOH		11	12		100			
VG		13	12		92			
3	Camp Mariah	BAL	2	Total 45	3	Total 43	100	Overall 95.6
		GLA	17		14		82	
		GAMS	10		10		100	
		HOH	9		10		100	
		VG	7		6		86	
	Bounce Trampoline Park	BAL	13	Total 68	13	Total 61	100	Overall 89.7
		GLA	16		14		88	
4	How Our Favorite Foods are Made	BAL	1	Total 18	1	Total 4	100	Overall 22.2
		GLA	2		1		50	
		GAMS	4		1		25	
		HOH	6		1		17	
		VG	5		0		0	
	Live Hip Hop Dance Class	BAL	0	Total 4	N/A	Total 3	N/A	Overall 75.0
		GLA	2		1		50	
		GAMS	1		1		100	
		HOH	0		N/A		N/A	
		VG	1		1		100	

¹ Response rate (%) = 100 x (# of Responses)/(# in target population). If the # of Responses was greater than the Maximum Possible # of Responses (i.e., the number of reported parent/guardian attendees), the Response Rate was capped at 100%.

² Survey was not administered.

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

The following tables summarize the survey responses received from the parents/guardians accompanying the students

Parent/Guardian Survey: Response Summary (Part 1 of 4)

NOTE: Data is disaggregated by school: Balmville (BAL), Gardnertown (GLA), Gidney Avenue (GAMS), Horizons (HOH), and Vails Gate (VG).

Year #	Saturday Family Learning Trip	School	Have you been there before?			In general, how satisfied were you with this Family Field Trip?					How likely are you to attend a Family Field Trip again?						
			Yes, one other time	Yes, more than one other time	No, only this time	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Very Unlikely	Unlikely	Neither	Likely	Very Likely		
1	Locust Grove Estate	Online survey was not utilized by parents/guardians. Changed to paper survey for future Saturday Family Learning Trips.															
	Liberty Science Center	BAL	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
		GLA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
		GAMS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
		HOH	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4		
	National Geographic Encounter	BAL	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
GLA		1	1	8	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	2	7			
GAMS		0	1	8	1	0	0	2	7	1	0	0	1	8			
HOH		1	1	7	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	2	6			
2	Legoland Discovery Center	BAL	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
		GLA	0	0	10	3	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	10		
		GAMS	0	0	14	1	0	0	2	10	0	0	0	2	12		
		HOH	3	1	11	1	0	0	5	9	2	0	0	1	11		
		VG	2	0	14	1	0	0	5	10	1	0	0	2	13		
	Maritime Aquarium	BAL	2	1	8	2	0	0	2	7	1	0	0	2	7		
		GLA	0	1	7	1	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	7		
		GAMS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
		HOH	3	1	10	0	0	0	2	12	1	0	0	2	10		
		VG	2	1	9	1	0	0	3	9	0	0	0	0	11		
	The Illusionists at West Point	BAL	0	1	8	1	0	0	4	4	1	0	0	2	3		
		GLA	2	0	13	0	0	0	5	10	0	0	0	1	12		
		GAMS	0	1	14	0	0	2	6	6	2	0	1	5	6		
		HOH	0	1	11	0	0	0	3	9	0	0	0	2	7		
		VG	0	1	10	0	0	1	6	6	1	0	0	1	9		
3	Camp Mariah	BAL	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	2		
		GLA	0	0	14	3	0	2	2	7	1	0	0	3	7		
		GAMS	1	1	8	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	9		
		HOH	0	0	10	0	0	0	1	9	0	0	0	0	9		
		VG	0	0	6	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	5		
	Bounce Trampoline Park	BAL	5	7	1	2	0	0	0	11	1	0	0	2	9		
		GLA	3	6	2	2	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	1	10		
		GAMS	4	1	4	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	1	7		
		HOH	1	7	3	1	0	0	2	8	1	0	0	2	8		
		VG	2	8	4	0	0	0	5	9	0	0	0	4	7		
4	How Our Favorite Foods are Made	BAL	This question was not asked in Year 4.			0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1		
		GLA				0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
		GAMS				0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		HOH				0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		VG				N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Live Hip Hop Dance Class	BAL	This question was not asked in Year 4.			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
		GLA				0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		GAMS				0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
		HOH				N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
		VG				0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Parent/Guardian Survey: Response Summary from Previous Years (Part 2 of 4)

Year #	Saturday Family Learning Trip	Summary
1	Locust Grove Estate	Online survey was not utilized by parents/guardians. Changed to paper survey for future Saturday Family Learning Trips.
	Liberty Science Center	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. All four parents indicated that they were very satisfied and commented, <i>“Appreciate field trips are on Saturday. It let us parent be more involved.”</i> and <i>“It is an amazing program and I am very grateful [son’s name] is involved in it!”</i>
	National Geographic Encounter	<p>Ten parents of Gardnertown Leadership Academy students completed the survey. 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 students and that they both learned something, although two parents neither agreed, nor disagreed. Comments included, <i>“It was amazing!”</i> and <i>“Gives me the chance at visiting many places that I won’t personally plan.”</i></p> <p>Ten parents of Gidney Avenue students completed the survey. 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 satisfied or very satisfied in general with the trip. That one parent indicated that they were very dissatisfied but his/her other responses are positive regarding the trip and it may have been mistakenly chosen. Comments included, <i>“I was able to learn as well as the children.”</i> and, translated from Spanish, <i>“Because it’s a way that my children can know other places and understand different things.”</i></p> <p>Nine parents of Horizons on Hudson students completed the survey. Seven indicated that they had not been there before. Seven indicated that, overall, they were very satisfied with the eighth indicating satisfied. Comments included, <i>“new experiences are great and we don’t get the chance otherwise”, “very interesting to explore new things with the children”,</i> and <i>“this is a wonderful way to bring the family together”.</i></p>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legoland Discovery Center • Maritime Aquarium • The Illusionists at West Point 	<p>Students had generally not previously visited the Saturday Family Field Trip locations although there were some exceptions (e.g., 13 out of 16 students from Horizons on Hudson indicated that they had been to Legoland Discovery Center). The Saturday Family Learning Trips are exciting to students based on all but three students liking or “kind of” liking all of the Year 1 and Year 2 locations. Comments from the students were generally positive, for example, <i>“I liked everything!”</i> (Legoland attendee), <i>“interacting with animals”</i> (Aquarium attendee), and <i>“My favorite part was the magic”</i> (Illusionist attendee). The few negative comments were more personal such as <i>“I did not like the sandwich”</i> (Legoland attendee), <i>“I didn’t like the jellyfish cause they were scary”</i> (Aquarium attendee), and <i>“Not being chosen to go on stage”</i> (Illusionist attendee).</p> <p>The adults recognized that exposing their children to new places and experiences is beneficial and they appreciated being able to do it with them. Most parents indicated that they had not been to the Saturday Family Field Trip locations before going with the 21st CCLC program, were satisfied or very satisfied with the excursion, and are likely or very likely to attend another. There were a few “very” responses of very dissatisfied or very unlikely, but they do not match the parent/guardian’s other responses and may have been mistakenly selected. Each of the ten statements on the survey (e.g., The field trip was well organized, I learned something new, etc.) were generally responded to favorably.</p>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Camp Mariah • Bounce Trampoline Park 	<p>Surveys of students and adults from the Camp Mariah trip were overall positive, despite the high number of no-shows. All of the students either liked or “kind of” liked the field trip and enjoyed the various activities (e.g., doing an egg drop challenge, building go-carts, and being outside). Surveys from the adults indicate that 81% were satisfied or very satisfied overall with the trip and in each of the ten follow-up questions, the majority responded positively. Comments from the adults were also very positive and expressed their appreciation for spending time with their students, learning about different places and topics, and meeting other students and adults.</p> <p>The Trip to Bounce Trampoline Park was very well-attended. The majority of student responses indicated that they had been there before and all of the students indicated that they liked or “kind of” liked the trip. Student comments included that their favorite part was the foam pit, the obstacle course, playing with all the kids, and <i>“having the whole district together.”</i> Similar to the student responses, the majority of adult responses indicated that they had been there before and 92% indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied overall with the trip. In eight of the ten follow-up questions, the adults had strong positive responses. The two topics that had fewer positive responses were “I learned something new” (46%) and “My student learned something new” (56%) with “neither agree nor disagree” responses at 44% and 42%, respectively. It should be noted that the facility was closed to the public when the Newburgh families were there which facilitated interaction among the students and adults.</p>

Parent/Guardian Survey: Response Summary for Year 4 (Part 3 of 4)

NOTE: Data is disaggregated by school: Balmville (BAL), Gardnertown (GLA), Gidney Avenue (GAMS), Horizons (HOH), and Vails Gate (VG).

Year #	Saturday Family Learning Trip	Statement	School	Responses			Sample of comments from Parents/Guardians (quotes are presented in raw, unedited format)
				Disagree	Neither agree, nor disagree	Agree	
4	How Our Favorite Foods are Made	1. The Family Fun Trip was well organized.	BAL GLA GAMS HOH VG	0 0 1 0 N/A	0 0 0 1 N/A	1 1 0 0 N/A	<i>“Confused about how to connect to the meet link.”</i>
		2. The Family Fun Trip was too far away.	BAL GLA GAMS HOH VG	This question was not asked in Year 4.			
		3. The Family Fun Trip was interesting to me.	BAL GLA GAMS HOH VG	0 0 0 0 N/A	0 0 0 0 N/A	1 1 1 1 N/A	<i>“My children really enjoyed and were interested in how things were made and were asking a lot of questions.”</i>
		4. The Family Fun Trip was interesting to my student.	BAL GLA GAMS HOH VG	0 0 0 0 N/A	0 0 0 0 N/A	1 1 1 1 N/A	
		5. I learned something new.	BAL GLA GAMS HOH VG	0 0 0 0 N/A	0 0 0 0 N/A	1 1 1 1 N/A	
		6. My student learned something new.	BAL GLA GAMS HOH VG	0 0 0 0 N/A	0 0 0 0 N/A	1 1 1 1 N/A	<i>“I think it's a good idea to keep the kids learning of things that they may not know and fun for them.”</i>
		7. The date and time of the Family Fun Trip was convenient.	BAL GLA GAMS HOH VG	0 0 0 0 N/A	0 0 0 1 N/A	1 1 1 0 N/A	
		8. Transportation was comfortable.	BAL GLA GAMS HOH VG	This question was not asked in Year 4.			<i>“My other kids are able to be involved. They learned something new and they had a good time.”</i>
		9. I enjoyed interacting with other families.	BAL GLA GAMS HOH VG	0 0 0 1 N/A	1 0 1 0 N/A	0 1 0 0 N/A	
		10. I appreciated having food provided.	BAL GLA GAMS HOH VG	This question was not asked in Year 4.			<i>“Friends weren't there.”</i>

Parent/Guardian Survey: Response Summary for Year 4 (Part 4 of 4)

NOTE: Data is disaggregated by school: Balmville (BAL), Gidney Avenue (GAMS), Horizons (HOH), Gardnertown (GLA), and Vails Gate (VG).

Year #	Saturday Family Learning Trip	Statement	School	Responses			Sample of comments from Parents/Guardians (quotes are presented in raw, unedited format)
				Disagree	Neither agree, nor disagree	Agree	
4	Live Hip Hop Dance Class	1. The Family Fun Trip was well organized.	BAL GLA GAMS HOH VG	N/A 0 0 N/A 0	N/A 0 0 N/A 0	N/A 1 1 N/A 1	<i>"She loves dance and she was very interested and didnt loose her focus.. she wasnt bored with it ."</i>
		2. The Family Fun Trip was too far away.	BAL GLA GAMS HOH VG	This question was not asked in Year 4.			
		3. The Family Fun Trip was interesting to me.	BAL GLA GAMS HOH VG	N/A 0 0 N/A 0	N/A 0 1 N/A 0	N/A 1 0 N/A 1	<i>"Tis was a great opportunity for xxx to engage with others, and he had a great time."</i>
		4. The Family Fun Trip was interesting to my student.	BAL GLA GAMS HOH VG	N/A 0 0 N/A 0	N/A 0 0 N/A 0	N/A 1 1 N/A 1	<i>"I hope that the school has more family fun trips. Thank You"</i>
		5. I learned something new.	BAL GLA GAMS HOH VG	N/A 0 0 N/A 0	N/A 0 1 N/A 0	N/A 1 0 N/A 1	<i>"We have always enjoyed the after school program and the field trips they have done we always attend."</i>
		6. My student learned something new.	BAL GLA GAMS HOH VG	N/A 0 0 N/A 0	N/A 0 0 N/A 0	N/A 1 1 N/A 1	
		7. The date and time of the Family Fun Trip was convenient.	BAL GLA GAMS HOH VG	N/A 0 0 N/A 0	N/A 0 0 N/A 0	N/A 1 1 N/A 1	<i>"It was fun and we need to be more active during this time."</i>
		8. Transportation was comfortable.	BAL GLA GAMS HOH VG	This question was not asked in Year 4.			<i>"Thank you for planning stuff for the kids to do and learn from during this difficult time for us all.. it is very appreciated"</i>
		9. I enjoyed interacting with other families.	BAL GLA GAMS HOH VG	N/A 0 0 N/A 0	N/A 0 0 N/A 0	N/A 1 1 N/A 1	
		10. I appreciated having food provided.	BAL GLA GAMS HOH VG	This question was not asked in Year 4.			<i>"This trip proved how out of shape my daughter and I are.....lol."</i>

Summary

Survey response rates increased from Year 1 to Year 2 for both students and parents/guardians. For students, this was due to adjusting the survey timing to right after the completion of the Saturday Family Learning Trip since Year 2 consents were in place at the onset of 21st CCLC programming. For parents, changing from an online to a paper survey was beneficial so that staff could distribute and collect the surveys and therefore be able to track the survey administration. The survey was added to the staff's Saturday Family Learning Trip checklist, and paper surveys allowed for a visual means for staff to know if parents/guardians had completed the survey. This applied to the student surveys as well.

Although student participation increased from Year 1 to Year 2, there were still parents/guardians that registered for the Saturday Family Learning Trip but did not attend even after paper, electronic, and phone call reminders were utilized. Starting in Year 2, parents/guardians that were “no-shows” were not allowed to register for future Saturday Family Learning Trips. This policy did not prevent a considerable number of no-shows for the initial Saturday Family Learning Trip in Year 3. The Camp Mariah trip only had 52 students attend although 100 had registered. The high rate of no-shows may have been due to the time of year for a partially outdoor location (chilly, foggy weather that December morning), students and adults not being familiar with the location because it is not open to the public and therefore not as appealing as more well-known locations (e.g., Year 3's trip to Bounce Trampoline Park had 97 out of 100 registered students attend), and confusion that there was a single departure location (Gidney Avenue School) rather than from each of the five schools.

Year 4's Saturday Family Learning Trips mirrored the challenges occurring with the virtual after-school program. Students and families are not looking to spend additional time on the computer and do not see the benefit of these learning opportunities. This is demonstrated by both the low number of students that register to participate in the Trip and the low number of those that actually participated. Students and parents/guardians that have participated in a Year 4 Trip(s), however, had positive experiences as indicated by their survey results and comments. One student commented, “*I got to spend time with my mom.*” which is a key aspect of the Trips. The interest in future virtual Saturday Family Learning Trips is limited and if they are to be offered in Year 5, they should be targeted to those who will commit to attending.

**Appendix D:
i-Ready Assessment Summary**

i-Ready Assessment Summary

Student achievement is evaluated using i-Ready assessments - an online tool used by NECSD and other school districts to measure student academic growth in various subject areas. Each of the five participating schools administers i-Ready assessments in reading and math in the fall, winter, and spring of each academic year. In Year 1 and Year 2 of the grant, the i-Ready scores from fall and spring were compared to determine a percent increase in score. In Year 3, however, due to the transition to virtual classes in March 2020, i-Ready assessments were not administered in the spring and therefore the scores from the winter i-Ready assessments were used to determine the percent increase from fall. In Year 4, i-Ready scores from fall to spring were compared. It should be noted that students took the fall i-Ready assessment while at home when the regular school day was still virtual. The administration of the spring i-Ready assessment was then done at school.

The following table shows the increases in i-Ready assessment scores at each school for reading and math for 21st CCLC students with 30 hours of participation during the school year. The count of students with both fall and winter/spring scores can vary between a school's reading and math data due to students not being available for the fall, winter/spring, or both assessments (i.e., scores for both fall and winter/spring are needed for a student's data to be included in the calculation).

Change in i-Ready Assessment Scores from Fall to Spring (Year 1, Year 2, and Year 4) or Fall to Winter (Year 3)

Site Name	Year #	Maximum Possible # of Students ¹	READING		MATH	
			# of Students with both Scores	i-Ready Score Increase (%)	# of Students with both Scores	i-Ready Score Increase (%)
Balmville	1	115	96	8.4	88	7.5
	2	82	67	9.4	65	6.8
	3	91	85	6.7	87	3.1
	4	8	8	-3.6	7	1.7
Gardnertown	1	104	99	9.1	100	7.3
	2	81	80	11.6	80	8.1
	3	95	95	6.6	95	4.9
	4	26	25	5.7	26	5.8
Gidney Avenue	1	179	165	8.5	164	9.0
	2	152	144	9.6	135	7.3
	3	107	106	4.6	105	3.4
	4	9	9	2.5	9	3.0
Horizons	1	73	69	7.6	64	6.3
	2	95	76	8.6	79	7.2
	3	119	114	5.3	110	3.7
	4	10	10	1.6	10	-0.8
Vails Gate	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2	52	52	11.2	52	8.7
	3	106	105	5.6	100	5.0
	4	19	19	4.3	19	3.0

¹ Starting in Year 2, only students who reached 30-hours of participation during the school year were included; students with only summer hours were excluded.

In Year 4, almost all of the 21st CCLC students had both fall and winter i-Ready scores. Only one Balmville student did not have a Spring 2021 math score and one Gardnertown student did not have a Fall 2020 reading score. This indicates that the calculated increases in i-Ready scores are representative of each school's 21st CCLC participants.

The performance indicator goal is a 10% increase for both reading and math i-Ready scores

- **Reading:** i-Ready scores at four schools increased by an average of 1.6% to 5.7%, with an average decrease of 3.6% at Balmville. Therefore, none reached the performance indicator goal.
- **Math:** i-Ready scores at four schools increased by an average of 1.7% to 5.8%, with an average decrease of 0.8% at Horizons. Therefore, none reached the performance indicator goal.

In addition to the quantitative measure of i-Ready scores, surveys were administered to 21st CCLC students in grades K-3, grades 4-5, and daytime teachers of 21st CCLC participants which included questions regarding academics.

- For students in grades K-3 (**Appendix A**), 9 out of 14 indicated that the 21st CCLC program had helped them to “do better in school.”
- Students in grades 4-5 participated in a more comprehensive survey (**Appendix B**) and for all eight questions in the Academic category (e.g., “do better in school,” “improve my grades in school,” “try harder in school”) they responded that the 21st CCLC program had helped them.
- A survey was also administered to daytime teachers of 21st CCLC participants (**Appendix F2**) that included academic topics. Teachers indicated that more students were proficient, or above proficient, in four academic areas (i.e., ELA, math, science, and social studies). For ELA, 15% of students improved, and in math, 15.9% of students improved. It should be noted that the survey was administered to daytime teachers of students with ten hours of participation (per NYSED’s instruction) in the 21st CCLC program and is, therefore, a larger sample size of students.

**Appendix E:
Discipline Referral Summary**

Discipline Referral Summary

One goal of the grant is for students who participate in the 21st CCLC program to have a decrease of 50% of discipline referrals during the regular school day. Changes in participating students' discipline referrals for the regular school day are compared in the following table.

Calculations are based on 21st CCLC students in grades 1-5. Kindergarten is not included since disciplinary referral data from the previous and current academic years are compared to determine if there was an increase, no change, or a decrease (e.g., for a student just completing 2nd grade, the number of discipline referrals received in 2nd grade is compared to the number received in 1st grade). Students were excluded if they were not enrolled in the district the previous year or if they did not have any discipline referrals in both the previous year and the current year. The count of applicable students and the percentages of students with each type of change (increase, same, decrease) are shown in the following table.

Changes in Discipline Referrals from Previous Year to Current Year

NOTE: Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

Site Name	Year #	Maximum Possible # of Students ¹	# of Students with Referrals in Previous and Current Years	Change in Student Discipline Referrals		
				Increased from Previous Year (%)	Same Number in both Years (%)	Decreased from Previous Year (%)
Balmville	1	115	24	75.0	8.3	16.7
	2	82	26	30.8	7.7	61.5
	3	91	27	77.8	3.7	18.5
	4	7	2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gardnertown	1	104	9	77.8	0.0	22.2
	2	81	12	41.7	0.0	58.3
	3	95	15	73.3	6.7	20.0
	4	26	2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gidney Avenue	1	179	36	75.0	13.9	11.1
	2	152	42	66.7	11.9	21.4
	3	107	25	56.0	4.0	40.0
	4	9	1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Horizons	1	73	23	82.6	8.7	8.7
	2	95	27	33.3	11.1	55.6
	3	119	18	44.4	11.1	44.4
	4	9	2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Vails Gate	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2	52	14	50.0	7.1	42.9
	3	106	33	48.5	12.1	39.4
	4	19	4	0.0	0.0	100.0

¹ Starting in Year 2, only students who reached 30 hours of participation during the school year were included; students with only summer hours were excluded.

It should be noted that for all five schools, for all four years of the grant, the number of students included in the calculations is relatively low compared to the number of 30-hour participants. For example, in Year 3, Balmville had students with referrals in both years which is only 29.7% of the 91 participants with 30 or more hours during the school year.

In Year 4, there were 11 students with referrals in both the previous (2019-2020) and current (2020-2021) school years. A review of the raw data (not shown in the table) shows that in the 2019-2020 school year, the number of referrals ranged from one to five, with an average of two referrals per student, and that all 11 students did not receive any referrals in the 2020-2021 school year.

In addition to looking at disciplinary referrals, feedback from surveys administered to students and teachers included questions about behavior issues.

- For example, the grades K-3 survey (**Appendix A**) asks if the 21st CCLC program helped the student “stay out of trouble” and the same number of responses were received for both “yes” and “I was already doing fine.”
- The grades 4-5 survey (**Appendix B**) includes several questions regarding behavior that the 21st CCLC program has helped them with, for example: “7. Get along better with my classmates,” “18. I make better decisions,” “23. Better at taking care of problems without violence or fighting,” and “30. Stay out of trouble.” All of these questions received the majority of affirmative responses of “Yes” and “Kind of.”
- The teacher survey (**Appendix F2**) did not contain a specific question regarding disciplinary referrals, but it did ask for feedback on students’ ability to “demonstrate self-regulation and persistence with challenging tasks.” Overall, 40.9% of students showed some level of improvement, 22.5% had no change, and 3.3% showed a decline in this behavior.

**Appendix F1:
Teacher Survey Summary (Year 1 – Year 3)**

Teacher Survey Summary (Year 1 – Year 3)

NOTE: The Teacher Survey Summary for Year 4 is included as Appendix F2.

Description

The Teacher Survey is administered online via Survey Monkey at the end of the 21st CCLC programming and asks daytime classroom teachers for feedback on students that have participated in the 21st CCLC program. Teachers complete a separate survey for each 21st CCLC student that they have in their regular school day class, which for many teachers means completing multiple surveys.

Survey Administration

The following table shows the distribution of responses from each of the schools disaggregated by grade level. During Year 1, the survey was administered to all K-5 classroom teachers in the four participating schools that had 21st CCLC students in their classrooms; a total of 122 responses were received. During Year 2, teachers were provided with a list of students in their classrooms that had participated in the 21st CCLC program for a minimum of 30 hours and were asked to complete the survey for each of the listed students. A total of 152 responses were initially received, but after removing duplicates and responses for those students with less than 30 hours of participation, 129 responses remained. During Year 3, the survey link was provided to each school's administrator with a list of students who had reached 30 hours of participation during the school year. The survey link and student list were then emailed to the daytime classroom teachers of those students. Even with the additional burden of virtual teaching, there were more responses from the teachers of all five schools than in Year 2. Responses regarding a total of 305 students were received out of a possible maximum of 518.

Teacher Survey Completion by School and Grade Level

School Name	Year #	Administration Dates	# of Teachers That Received Survey	# of Teachers That Responded (worked in 21 st CCLC program, did not)	Response Rate (%) ¹	# of Students Reported On, By Grade Level						# of Students Reported On
						K	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	
Balmville	1	May 11-June 15 2018	Unknown	6 (1, 5)	N/A	3	10	0	1	0	5	19
	2	April 2-June 14, 2019	17	4 (1, 3)	23.5	0	0	0	2	0	9	11
	3	March 25-May 12, 2020	24	8 (3, 5)	33.3	4	4	14	1	0	8	31
Gardnertown	1	May 11-June 15 2018	Unknown	10 (7, 3)	N/A	1	0	3	1	14	11	30
	2	April 2-June 14, 2019	20	7 (2, 5)	35.0	1	8	0	2	0	8	19
	3	March 25-May 12, 2020	34	17 (1, 16)	50.0	10	13	8	11	1	9	52
Gidney Avenue	1	May 11-June 15 2018	Unknown	17 (5, 12)	N/A	7	14	12	2	2	12	49
	2	April 2-June 14, 2019	19	10 (6, 4)	52.6	0	2	12	15	8	10	47
	3	March 25-May 12, 2020	35	11 (7, 4)	31.4	0	7	11	12	20	6	56
Horizons	1	May 11-June 15 2018	Unknown	6 (2, 4)	N/A	1	0	4	18	0	1	24
	2	April 2-June 14, 2019	20	11 (3, 8)	55.0	5	2	10	0	16	10	43
	3	March 25-May 12, 2020	28	20 (2, 18)	71.4	11	11	20	16	17	17	92
Vails Gate	1	N/A	N/A	N/A N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2	April 2-June 14, 2019	19	5 (3, 2)	26.3	0	1	0	0	1	7	9
	3	March 25-May 12, 2020	35	21 (7, 14)	60.0	9	13	14	12	11	15	74
TOTAL	1	May 11-June 15 2018	Unknown	39 (15, 24)	N/A	12	24	19	22	16	29	122
	2	April 2-June 14, 2019	95	37 (15, 22)	38.9	6	13	22	19	25	44	129
	3	March 25-May 12, 2020	156	77 (20, 57)	49.3	34	48	67	52	49	55	305

¹ Response Rate (%) = 100 x (number of responses) / (number in target population)

The survey asks the teachers “*To what extent has the student changed their behavior in terms of...*” followed by ten fundamental student outcomes, comparing the student’s current performance to that of the previous fall. The teachers are directed to respond in terms of the impact attributable to 21st CCLC programming.

Survey Results

The following table summarizes the responses from teachers, disaggregated by school.

Responses to Teacher Survey

NOTE: Data is disaggregated by school: Balmville (BAL), Gardnertown (GLA), Gidney Avenue (GAMS), Horizons (HOH), and Vails Gate (VG).

STUDENT OUTCOME	Year #	School	TEACHER RESPONSES (%)								
			N/A	Did not need to improve	Improvement			No change	Decline		
					Significant	Moderate	Slight		Slight	Moderate	Significant
1. Turning in homework on time.	1	BAL	0	47.4	15.8	10.5	10.5	10.5	5.3	0	0
		GLA	0	26.7	16.7	20.0	13.3	20.0	3.3	0	0
		GAMS	0	24.5	16.3	26.5	16.3	14.3	2.0	0	0
		HOH	4.2	20.8	29.2	12.5	20.8	12.5	0	0	0
	2	BAL	9.1	18.2	18.2	36.4	9.1	0	0	0	9.1
		GLA	0	63.2	15.8	5.3	0	15.8	0	0	0
		GAMS	2.1	40.4	19.1	14.9	10.6	12.8	0	0	0
		HOH	0	25.6	11.6	20.9	23.3	11.6	4.7	2.3	0
		VG	0	11.1	33.3	22.2	11.1	22.2	0	0	0
	3	BAL	3.2	38.7	0	6.5	19.4	32.3	0	0	0
		GLA	3.8	61.5	5.8	9.6	7.7	3.8	3.8	3.8	0
		GAMS	14.3	23.2	7.1	16.1	8.9	21.4	1.8	3.6	3.6
HOH		66.3	2.2	2.2	4.3	9.8	13.0	2.2	0	0	
VG		17.6	29.7	14.9	12.2	10.8	13.5	1.4	0	0	
2. Completing homework to your satisfaction.	1	BAL	0	63.2	10.5	10.5	5.3	10.5	0	0	0
		GLA	0	6.7	40.0	26.7	20.0	6.7	0	0	0
		GAMS	0	10.2	26.5	32.7	14.3	12.2	4.1	0	0
		HOH	4.2	8.3	37.5	25.0	12.5	12.5	0	0	0
	2	BAL	9.1	18.2	18.2	36.4	9.1	0	0	0	9.1
		GLA	0	36.8	15.8	15.8	10.5	15.8	5.3	0	0
		GAMS	2.1	36.2	21.3	19.1	8.5	12.8	0	0	0
		HOH	0	20.9	20.9	18.6	25.6	11.6	0	2.3	0
		VG	0	0	33.3	33.3	11.1	22.2	0	0	0
	3	BAL	3.2	32.3	0	6.5	22.6	35.5	0	0	0
		GLA	3.8	50.0	9.6	11.5	9.6	7.7	3.8	3.8	0
		GAMS	14.3	19.6	7.1	16.1	12.5	21.4	1.8	3.6	3.6
HOH		65.2	1.1	1.1	8.7	9.8	13.0	1.1	0	0	
VG		17.6	28.4	18.9	10.8	9.5	12.2	0	1.4	1.4	

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

STUDENT OUTCOME	Year #	School	TEACHER RESPONSES (%)								
			N/A	Did not need to improve	Improvement			No change	Decline		
					Significant	Moderate	Slight		Slight	Moderate	Significant
3. Participating in class.	1	BAL	0	36.8	5.3	10.5	5.3	42.1	0	0	0
		GLA	0	16.7	26.7	26.7	20.0	10.0	0	0	0
		GAMS	0	16.3	12.2	32.7	22.4	14.3	2.0	0	0
		HOH	0	16.7	33.3	16.7	16.7	16.7	0	0	0
	2	BAL	0	9.1	18.2	54.6	9.1	9.1	0	0	0
		GLA	0	42.1	10.5	10.5	10.5	26.3	0	0	0
		GAMS	0	36.2	14.9	21.3	17.0	8.5	2.1	0	0
		HOH	2.3	16.3	23.3	14.0	20.9	23.3	0	0	0
	3	BAL	3.2	19.4	0	19.4	25.8	32.3	0	0	0
		GLA	0.0	38.5	9.6	17.3	17.3	15.4	0	1.9	0
		GAMS	16.1	10.7	10.7	17.9	25.0	19.6	0	0	0
		HOH	0	21.7	12.0	30.4	19.6	16.3	0	0	0
4. Volunteering (e.g., for more responsibilities)	1	BAL	0	31.6	5.3	5.3	15.8	42.1	0	0	0
		GLA	0	10.0	26.7	30.0	23.3	10.0	0	0	0
		GAMS	0	10.2	8.2	28.6	32.7	20.4	0	0	0
		HOH	0	16.7	33.3	16.7	12.5	20.8	0	0	0
	2	BAL	0	18.2	27.3	36.4	0	9.1	9.1	0	0
		GLA	0	57.9	5.3	5.3	10.5	21.1	0	0	0
		GAMS	0	38.3	12.8	21.3	8.5	19.1	0	0	0
		HOH	0	16.3	14.0	27.9	14.0	25.6	2.3	0	0
	3	BAL	3.2	22.6	3.2	32.3	6.5	32.3	0	0	0
		GLA	0	32.7	13.5	9.6	23.1	21.2	0	0	0
		GAMS	16.1	5.4	10.7	21.4	21.4	25.0	0	0	0
		HOH	1.1	13.0	18.5	25.0	17.4	25.0	0	0	0
5. Being attentive in class.	1	BAL	0	26.3	5.3	10.5	0	52.6	0	5.3	0
		GLA	0	20.0	13.3	30.0	20.0	16.7	0	0	0
		GAMS	0	16.3	10.0	28.6	18.4	22.4	2.0	2.0	0
		HOH	0	8.3	37.5	12.5	16.7	25.0	0	0	0
	2	BAL	0	9.1	18.2	54.6	0	9.1	9.1	0	0
		GLA	0	52.6	0	0	10.5	36.8	0	0	0
		GAMS	0	38.3	17.0	14.9	14.9	12.8	0	2.1	0
		HOH	0	16.3	16.3	9.3	30.2	23.3	4.7	0	0
	3	BAL	6.5	25.8	3.2	16.1	19.4	29.0	0	0	0
		GLA	3.8	30.8	5.8	15.4	15.4	23.1	1.9	3.8	0
		GAMS	16.1	14.3	8.9	19.6	14.3	23.2	3.6	0	0

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

STUDENT OUTCOME	Year #	School	TEACHER RESPONSES (%)								
			N/A	Did not need to improve	Improvement			No change	Decline		
					Significant	Moderate	Slight		Slight	Moderate	Significant
		HOH VG	1.1 0	21.7 17.6	13.0 18.9	18.5 18.9	19.6 25.7	25.0 17.6	1.1 0	0 0	0 1.4
6. Behaving well in class.	1	BAL	5.3	42.1	5.3	10.5	0	26.3	5.3	5.3	0
		GLA	3.3	30.0	3.3	23.3	20.0	20.0	0	0	0
		GAMS	0	36.7	4.1	16.3	16.3	18.4	8.2	0	0
		HOH VG	0 0	8.3	37.5	12.5	20.8	20.8	0	0	0
	2	BAL	0	18.2	18.2	45.5	0	9.1	9.1	0	0
		GLA	0	57.9	5.3	0	10.5	26.3	0	0	0
		GAMS	0	40.4	2.1	19.1	8.5	25.5	0	4.3	0
		HOH VG	0 0	25.6	7.0	20.9	16.3	23.3	7.0	0	0
	3	BAL	6.5	41.9	0	12.9	6.5	32.3	0	0	0
		GLA	3.8	42.3	3.8	11.5	15.4	13.5	5.8	1.9	1.9
		GAMS	17.9	21.4	5.4	14.3	8.9	26.8	5.4	0	0
		HOH VG	4.3 0	30.4	6.5	13.0	17.4	28.3	0	0	0
		BAL GLA GAMS HOH VG	0 0 0 0	21.1 3.3 20.4 12.5	5.3 20.0 12.2 41.7	15.8 40.0 26.5 25.0	0 30.0 26.5 12.5	57.9 6.7 12.2 8.3	0 0 2.0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0
7. Engagement & interest in Math.	1	BAL	0	21.1	5.3	15.8	0	57.9	0	0	0
		GLA	0	3.3	20.0	40.0	30.0	6.7	0	0	0
		GAMS	0	20.4	12.2	26.5	26.5	12.2	2.0	0	0
		HOH VG	0 0	12.5	41.7	25.0	12.5	8.3	0	0	0
	2	BAL	0	9.1	18.2	45.5	9.1	0	9.1	9.1	0
		GLA	0	42.1	5.3	5.3	15.8	26.3	0	5.3	0
		GAMS	2.1	36.2	19.1	14.9	12.8	14.9	0	0	0
		HOH VG	0 0	18.6	18.6	20.9	11.6	30.2	0	0	0
	3	BAL	6.5	25.8	0	19.4	12.9	35.5	0	0	0
		GLA	0	26.9	15.4	13.5	21.2	21.2	0	1.9	0
		GAMS	16.1	8.9	8.9	23.2	14.3	28.6	0	0	0
		HOH VG	3.3 8.1	21.7	16.3	19.6	25.0	14.1	0	0	0
		BAL GLA GAMS HOH VG	0 0 0 0	21. 6.7 18.4 12.5	5.3 16.7 10.2 37.5	15.8 43.3 24.5 20.8	0 26.7 30.6 16.7	57.9 6.7 16.3 12.5	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	
8. Engagement & interest in Science.	1	BAL	0	21.	5.3	15.8	0	57.9	0	0	0
		GLA	0	6.7	16.7	43.3	26.7	6.7	0	0	0
		GAMS	0	18.4	10.2	24.5	30.6	16.3	0	0	0
		HOH VG	0 0	12.5	37.5	20.8	16.7	12.5	0	0	0
	2	BAL	0	9.1	9.1	54.6	9.1	0	18.2	0	0
		GLA	0	42.1	10.5	5.3	15.8	26.3	0	0	0
		GAMS	6.4	40.4	4.3	14.9	8.5	25.5	0	0	0
		HOH VG	0 0	14.0	11.6	18.6	23.3	32.6	0	0	0
	3	BAL	6.5	29.0	0	16.1	19.4	29.0	0	0	0
		GLA	3.8	30.8	15.4	7.7	19.2	21.2	0	1.9	0

Annual Evaluation Report – Year 4

STUDENT OUTCOME	Year #	School	TEACHER RESPONSES (%)								
			N/A	Did not need to improve	Improvement			No change	Decline		
					Significant	Moderate	Slight		Slight	Moderate	Significant
		GAMS	16.1	21.4	7.1	16.1	12.5	26.8	0	0	0
		HOH	1.1	18.5	15.2	26.1	23.9	15.2	0	0	0
		VG	16.2	17.6	18.9	17.6	9.5	18.9	1.4	0	0
9. Getting along well with others.	1	BAL	0	42.1	5.3	10.5	0	36.8	5.3	0	0
		GLA	3.3	16.7	20.0	23.3	16.7	20.0	0	0	0
		GAMS	4.1	32.7	8.2	18.4	14.3	20.4	2.0	0	0
		HOH	0	12.5	33.3	16.7	16.7	20.8	0	0	0
	2	BAL	0	9.1	18.2	45.5	9.1	0	18.2	0	0
		GLA	0	47.4	15.8	0	26.3	10.5	0	0	0
		GAMS	0	44.7	10.6	14.9	6.4	21.3	2.1	0	0
		HOH	0	18.6	11.6	11.6	32.6	23.3	2.3	0	0
	3	VG	0	0	33.3	22.2	0	33.3	11.1	0	0
		BAL	6.5	38.7	0	9.7	16.1	29.0	0	0	0
		GLA	5.8	46.2	3.8	9.6	15.4	11.5	7.7	0	0
		GAMS	17.9	25.0	5.4	14.3	5.4	32.1	0	0	0
10. Displaying effort to “Seek first to understand.”	1	HOH	2.2	35.9	12.0	8.7	21.7	19.6	0	0	0
		VG	0	32.4	14.9	10.8	18.9	20.3	2.7	0	0
		BAL	0	36.8	5.3	5.3	5.3	47.4	0	0	0
		GLA	0	13.3	23.3	30.0	26.7	6.7	0	0	0
	2	GAMS	0	18.4	16.3	22.4	16.3	22.4	4.1	0	0
		HOH	0	8.3	37.5	16.7	20.8	16.7	0	0	0
		BAL	0	9.1	27.3	45.5	0	0	9.1	0	9.1
		GLA	0	47.4	5.3	5.3	5.3	36.8	0	0	0
	3	GAMS	0	38.3	10.6	12.8	14.9	23.4	0	0	0
		HOH	2.3	16.3	14.0	16.3	18.6	32.6	0	0	0
		VG	11.1	0	33.3	11.1	11.1	22.2	11.1	0	0
		BAL	6.5	29.0	0	3.2	29.0	32.3	0	0	0
3	GLA	1.9	32.7	5.8	11.5	23.1	21.2	3.8	0	0	
	GAMS	25.0	10.7	5.4	14.3	16.1	28.6	0	0	0	
	HOH	0	13.0	17.4	22.8	25.0	21.7	0	0	0	
	VG	8.1	17.6	18.9	13.5	18.9	21.6	0	0	1.4	

The teachers are 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 Overall Grant Impact on Their Students

Site Name	Year #	To a great extent		To some extent		To a little extent		To no extent		I don't know	
		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Balmville	1	0	0	26.3	5	26.3	5	47.4	9	0	0
	2	0	0	36.4	4	45.5	5	9.1	1	9.1	1
	3	0	0	61.3	19	9.7	3	9.7	3	19.4	6
Gardnertown	1	23.3	7	46.7	14	13.3	4	13.3	4	3.3	1
	2	0	0	42.1	8	42.1	8	5.3	1	10.5	2
	3	19.2	10	25.0	13	26.9	14	17.3	9	11.5	6
Gidney Avenue	1	10.2	5	63.3	31	10.2	5	10.2	5	6.1	3
	2	2.1	1	40.4	19	42.6	20	10.6	5	4.3	2
	3	5.4	3	26.8	16	17.9	10	8.9	6	41.1	23
Horizons	1	16.7	4	25.0	6	25.0	6	12.5	3	20.8	5
	2	11.6	5	27.9	12	30.2	13	16.3	7	14.0	6
	3	16.3	15	44.6	41	18.5	17	7.6	7	13.0	12
Vails Gate	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2	11.1	1	44.4	4	11.1	1	22.2	2	11.1	1
	3	24.3	18	44.6	33	16.2	12	12.2	9	2.7	2
TOTAL	1	13.1	16	45.9	56	16.4	20	17.2	21	7.4	9
	2	5.4	7	36.4	47	36.4	47	12.4	16	9.3	12
	3	15.1	46	39.7	121	18.4	56	10.8	33	16.1	49

**Appendix F2:
Teacher Survey Summary (Year 4)**

Teacher Survey Summary (Year 4)

NOTE: The Teacher Survey Summary for Year 1 – Year 3 is included as Appendix F1.

Description

Starting in Year 4, a Teacher Survey was implemented in *EZReports* to collect feedback from daytime teachers of 21st CCLC students. The survey questions were developed by MI for state-wide administration to daytime teachers of 21st CCLC students that had reached 10 or more hours of participation. It should be noted that other data used for evaluation purposes in this AER is based on a student reaching a 30-hour participation threshold (e.g., to respond to a student survey). The teacher survey includes questions on both academic performance and behaviors. Teachers complete a separate survey for each 21st CLC student that they have in their regular school day class, which for many teachers means completing multiple surveys. A 21st CCLC site may download their site's data to Excel or view/print a preconfigured report. MI has access to statewide survey responses which are aggregated for use in state and federal reporting.

Survey Administration

The survey was administered via email to the daytime teachers of the students with 10 or more hours of participation in the 21st CCLC program. The teacher names and email addresses had been previously uploaded to *EZReports* by the grant facilitator. The email included a description of the survey with a link to complete the survey. *EZReports* allows for reminders to be sent to those teachers that did not complete the survey in order to encourage their participation. The initial email was sent May 6, 2021, with reminders sent weekly until May 27, 2021. The survey closed on June 30, 2021.

The following table summarizes the distribution of responses, disaggregated by school. It also lists the number of students at each school that reached the threshold of 10 hours and compares it to the number of students with feedback from the Teacher Survey.

Teacher Survey Completion by School and Grade Level

School Name	# of Teachers That Received Survey	# of Teacher Respondents (# worked in 21 st CCLC program, # did not)	Response Rate (%) ¹	# of Students Reported On, By Grade Level						Total # of Students Reported On	# of Eligible Students (i.e., with 10 or More Hours)
				K	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th		
Balmville	10	10 (0, 10)	100.0	1	4	4	1	3	3	16	16
Gardnertown	17	15 (4, 11)	88.2	1	0	5	9	9	15	39	44
Gidney Avenue	12	10 (1, 9)	83.3	1	3	1	1	6	2	14	18
Horizons	12	11 (1, 10)	91.7	0	0	3	5	5	6	19	20
Vails Gate	16	15 (5, 10)	93.8	2	2	3	7	8	10	32	33
TOTAL	67	61 (11, 50)	91.0	5	9	16	23	31	36	120	131

¹ Response Rate (%) = 100 x (number of teachers that responded) / (number of teachers that received survey)

It should be noted that for the 131 eligible students, surveys could only be sent to 129 teachers due to staff leaving the district.

Survey Results

Teachers were initially asked, “Through what type of class do you know this student?” The following table summarizes the responses with “Other” allowing the teacher to type in a response.

Class Type for Teacher’s Association with Student, by School

School Name	Class Type for Teacher’s Association with Student			
	“Self-contained classroom (all subjects)”	“ELA class”	“Mathematics class”	“Other” (# of times entry was repeated) NOTE: entries are presented in raw, unedited format
Balmville	3	0	0	13 “All subject areas including social emotional and character development” (2) “gen ed teacher classroom teacher” (3) “Gen ed grade 2” “ICT setting” ¹ “both ELA and math” “General education classroom” (2) “First grade- all subject areas” (2) “General education kindergarten”
Gardnertown	18	16	3	2 “Kindergarten” “Bilingual Class”
Gidney Avenue	9	0	0	5 “General Education 3rd grade” “ICT classroom all subjects” “1st grade class” (2) “Bilingual Classroom Grade 4”
Horizons	10	0	0	9 “All areas - General Education” (2) “General Ed teacher” (2) “Gen Ed Class” (2) “ICT 3rd grade- he is general ed.” “General Education Classroom” “2nd Grade Gifted & Talented classroom”
Vails Gate	14	4	2	12 “Dual Language. ELA and Social Studies” (4) “ICT” (3) “ENL classroom” “Gen ed” (3) “Kindergarten Class”
TOTAL	54	20	5	41 various responses

¹ ICT = Integrated Co-Teaching. A classroom with both a general education and a special education teacher containing students with and without disabilities.

Several written responses such as “Gen ed grade 2” and “Kindergarten Class” are equivalent to the “Self-contained classroom (all subjects)” option. When considering them together, most of the responses were that the teacher knew the student from a self-contained classroom.

The teachers were also required to answer, “Approximately when was the earliest date, since July 2020, that you came to know this student well enough to provide these ratings?”

Start Date of Teacher’s Association with Student, by School

School Name	Start Date of Teacher’s Association with Student (# of times entry was repeated)
Balmville	September 2019, January 2020, September 2020 (7), October 2020 (3), March 2021 (3), September 2021
Gardnertown	January 2020, September 2020 (28), November 2020 (2), December 2020 (5), February 2021, September 2021, October 2021
Gidney Avenue	September 2020 (13), January 2021
Horizons	September 2019 (2), September 2020 (11), October 2020 (3), March 2021, October 2021, November 2021
Vails Gate	September 2020 (21), October 2020, November 2020 (5), April 2021, September 2021 (2), October 2021, cannot remember

When reviewing the dates entered, it should be noted that most dates are September through November 2020 which indicates a relatively long-term association. There are a few dates that are later than when the survey was administered (e.g., October 2021) and perhaps the year was intended to be 2020.

The survey also included notes describing the Behavior Ratings to define the scale:

BEHAVIOR RATINGS: Ratings are conditional on your *initial* assessment of the student’s need for improvement:

Rating Scale:

- **Already Meeting Expectations:** indicates that the student was already meeting or exceeding age and grade-appropriate behavioral expectations when you first started working with this student during the current school year.
- **In Need of Improvement:** If the student was in need of improvement when you first started working with them, please use the provided scale (ranging from "**Significant Improvement**" to "**Significant Decline**") to indicate whether the student’s behavior changed in this area during the course of the school year.
- If you believe a given behavior does not apply to this student and class, select "Don’t Know/ Not Applicable (N/A)." (This option is only available for certain behaviors.)

Similarly, the survey also included a description of the scale for Proficiency Ratings.

PROFICIENCY RATINGS: For each subject on which you are able to rate this student, please provide your best assessment of the student’s grade appropriate proficiency, based on *State grade level standards*, comparing: A) when you "first started working with them" vs. B) "now", using the indicated scale.

Rating Scale: Proficiency levels according to State grade level standards:

- (1) = Well below proficient;
- (4) = Proficient;
- (7) = Well above proficient

Important Note: providing a rating of (4) "Proficient" for both points in time would indicate that the student made *normal grade progress* during that period.

If a given area of academic proficiency does not apply to this student and class, select "Don’t Know/ Not Applicable (N/A)" for *both* points in time.

The following tables summarize the responses from the daytime teachers, disaggregated by the school. All questions were required, but “Not Applicable/Don’t Know” was an option for most questions.

Responses to Teacher Survey – BEHAVIOR RATINGS

NOTE: Data is disaggregated by school: Balmville (BAL), Gardnertown (GLA), Gidney Avenue (GAMS), Horizons (HOH), and Vails Gate (VG).

NOTE: Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

BEHAVIOR	School	TEACHER RESPONSES (%)								
		Don't Know - N/A	Already Meeting Expectations	Improvement			No change	Decline		
				Significant	Moderate	Slight		Slight	Moderate	Significant
1. Attends class/online activities regularly.	BAL		62.5	18.8	6.3	6.3	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
	GLA	(not an option)	48.7	20.5	15.4	7.7	2.6	0.0	0.0	5.1
	GAMS		64.3	14.3	0.0	0.0	21.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
	HOH		47.4	0.0	0.0	15.8	21.1	10.5	5.3	0.0
	VG		40.6	12.5	25.0	3.1	6.3	0.0	3.1	9.4
2. Attentive and actively engaged in discussions, activities, and assignments (in-class or online).	BAL		50.0	18.8	6.3	12.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
	GLA	(not an option)	28.2	23.1	25.6	5.1	10.3	0.0	2.6	5.1
	GAMS		57.1	14.3	7.1	0.0	21.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
	HOH		31.6	0.0	10.5	21.1	31.6	5.3	0.0	0.0
	VG		37.5	21.9	25.0	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.4
3. Collaborates constructively with other students.	BAL	0.0	62.5	12.5	0.0	12.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
	GLA	7.7	25.6	28.2	15.4	12.8	5.1	0.0	2.6	2.6
	GAMS	0.0	64.3	7.1	7.1	0.0	21.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
	HOH	0.0	36.8	0.0	10.5	21.1	31.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
	VG	3.1	40.6	25.0	15.6	0.0	9.4	0.0	0.0	6.3
4. Demonstrates self-regulation and persistence with challenging tasks.	BAL		43.8	6.3	18.8	0.0	31.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
	GLA	(not an option)	20.5	20.5	15.4	25.6	15.4	2.6	0.0	0.0
	GAMS		64.3	7.1	7.1	0.0	21.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
	HOH		36.8	0.0	5.3	10.5	47.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
	VG		28.1	25.0	18.8	6.3	12.5	0.0	0.0	9.4
5. Completes homework/assigned independent work on time and to your satisfaction (Please rate completeness of work, not whether “correct”.)	BAL	0.0	50.0	12.5	6.3	12.5	18.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
	GLA	0.0	17.9	33.3	12.8	17.9	12.8	2.6	0.0	2.6
	GAMS	0.0	50.0	7.1	14.3	7.1	21.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
	HOH	0.0	31.6	0.0	0.0	26.3	21.1	15.8	0.0	5.3
	VG	0.0	31.3	28.1	12.5	6.3	12.5	0.0	0.0	9.4

Responses to Teacher Survey – PROFICIENCY RATINGS

NOTE: Data is disaggregated by school: Balmville (BAL), Gardnertown (GLA), Gidney Avenue (GAMS), Horizons (HOH), and Vails Gate (VG).

NOTE: Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

PROFICIENCY		School	TEACHER RESPONSES (%)							
			Don't Know - N/A	Above Proficient			(4) Proficient	Below Proficient		
				(7) Well Above	(6) Somewhat Above	(5) Slightly Above		(3) Slightly Below	(2) Somewhat Below	(1) Well Below
1. ELA	When you started working with them	BAL	6.3	31.3	12.5	0.0	6.3	18.8	6.3	18.8
		GLA	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.1	0.0	25.6	43.6
		GAMS	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	21.4	21.4	28.6	21.4
		HOH	0.0	5.3	5.3	10.5	26.3	31.6	10.5	10.5
		VG	0.0	6.3	9.4	3.1	15.6	15.6	40.6	9.4
	Proficiency Now	BAL	6.3	37.5	12.5	0.0	6.3	25.0	6.3	6.3
		GLA	7.7	2.6	2.6	10.3	15.4	33.3	17.9	10.3
		GAMS	0.0	7.1	7.1	0.0	50.0	28.6	7.1	0.0
		HOH	0.0	5.3	15.8	5.3	31.6	31.6	0.0	10.5
		VG	0.0	6.3	6.3	9.4	34.4	21.9	15.6	6.3
2. Math	When you started working with them	BAL	12.5	6.3	25.0	0.0	18.8	12.5	6.3	18.8
		GLA	15.4	0.0	0.0	2.6	12.8	10.3	15.4	43.6
		GAMS	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	14.3	35.7	21.4	21.4
		HOH	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.8	42.1	26.3	10.5	5.3
		VG	12.5	3.1	12.5	0.0	12.5	12.5	31.3	15.6
	Proficiency Now	BAL	6.3	12.5	18.8	6.3	25.0	18.8	6.3	6.3
		GLA	15.4	2.6	7.7	2.6	17.9	33.3	17.9	2.6
		GAMS	0.0	0.0	7.1	7.1	35.7	28.6	14.3	7.1
		HOH	0.0	0.0	10.5	15.8	36.8	26.3	5.3	5.3
		VG	15.6	3.1	9.4	9.4	25.0	15.6	15.6	6.3
3. Science	When you started working with them	BAL	31.3	6.3	18.8	0.0	12.5	18.8	0.0	12.5
		GLA	38.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.2	5.1	17.9	10.3
		GAMS	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	35.7	42.9	14.3	7.1
		HOH	5.3	0.0	0.0	10.5	57.9	15.8	5.3	5.3
		VG	37.5	6.3	0.0	3.1	37.5	6.3	9.4	0.0
	Proficiency Now	BAL	25.0	18.8	6.3	0.0	31.3	18.8	0.0	0.0
		GLA	38.5	0.0	2.6	7.7	25.6	15.4	10.3	0.0
		GAMS	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	42.9	28.6	7.1	7.1
		HOH	5.3	0.0	0.0	21.1	47.4	15.8	5.3	5.3
		VG	37.5	6.3	0.0	6.3	43.8	6.3	0.0	0.0
4. Social Studies	When you started working with them	BAL	18.8	6.3	18.8	12.5	12.5	6.3	12.5	12.5
		GLA	33.3	0.0	2.6	0.0	23.1	5.1	15.4	20.5
		GAMS	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	42.9	28.6	21.4	7.1
		HOH	5.3	0.0	5.3	5.3	52.6	21.1	5.3	5.3
		VG	21.9	6.3	6.3	3.1	40.6	12.5	9.4	0.0
	Proficiency Now	BAL	12.5	18.8	6.3	18.8	18.8	25.0	0.0	0.0
		GLA	33.3	2.6	7.7	0.0	25.6	12.8	17.9	0.0
		GAMS	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	64.3	21.4	7.1	7.1
		HOH	5.3	0.0	5.3	15.8	47.4	15.8	5.3	5.3
		VG	21.9	6.3	6.3	3.1	53.1	9.4	0.0	0.0

Summary

The following tables combine the responses received from the 61 teachers from the five schools regarding Behaviors and Proficiency. It summarizes the feedback received on the 120 students with 10 or more hours of participation in the 21st CCLC program.

Combined Responses to Teacher Survey – BEHAVIOR RATINGS

NOTE: Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

BEHAVIOR	TEACHER RESPONSES (%)								
	Don't Know - N/A	Already Meeting Expectations	Improvement			No change	Decline		
			Significant	Moderate	Slight		Slight	Moderate	Significant
1. Attends class/online activities regularly.	(not an option)	50.0	14.2	12.5	6.7	9.2	1.7	1.7	4.2
			Total of Improvements = 33.4				Total of Declines = 7.6		
2. Attentive and actively engaged in discussions, activities, and assignments (in-class or online).	(not an option)	37.5	17.5	18.3	8.3	12.5	0.8	0.8	4.2
			Total of Improvements = 44.1				Total of Declines = 5.8		
3. Collaborates constructively with other students.	3.3	40.8	18.3	11.7	9.2	13.3	0.0	0.8	2.5
			Total of Improvements = 39.2				Total of Declines = 3.3		
4. Demonstrates self-regulation and persistence with challenging tasks.	(not an option)	33.3	15.0	14.2	11.7	22.5	0.8	0.0	2.5
			Total of Improvements = 40.9				Total of Declines = 3.3		
5. Completes homework/assigned independent work on time and to your satisfaction (Please rate completeness of work, not whether "correct".)	0.0	31.7	20.8	10.0	14.2	15.8	3.3	0.0	4.2
			Total of Improvements = 45.0				Total of Declines = 7.5		

The following conclusions can be drawn from the data regarding Behaviors:

- Each of the five Behaviors had at least a third of students (33.4 to 45.0%) who showed some amount of improvement.
- Many students (31.7 to 50.0%) were already meeting expectations in the Behaviors.
- Less than one quarter of students (9.2 to 22.5%) had no change in the Behaviors.
- There were relatively few students (3.3 to 7.6%) who showed some amount of decline (i.e., regression) in Behaviors.

Combined Responses to Teacher Survey – PROFICIENCY RATINGS

NOTE: Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

PROFICIENCY		TEACHER RESPONSES (%)							
		Don't Know - N/A	Above Proficient			(4) Proficient	Below Proficient		
			(7) Well Above	(6) Somewhat Above	(5) Slightly Above		(3) Slightly Below	(2) Somewhat Below	(1) Well Below
1. ELA	When you started working with them	3.3	6.7	5.0	3.3	19.2	14.2	25.0	23.3
			Total Above Proficient = 15.0				Total Below Proficient = 62.5		
1. ELA	Proficiency now	3.3	9.2	7.5	6.7	25.8	28.3	11.7	7.5
			Total Above Proficient = 23.4				Total Below Proficient = 47.5		
2. Math	When you started working with them	10.0	1.7	6.7	4.2	18.3	16.7	18.3	24.2
			Total Above Proficient = 12.6				Total Below Proficient = 59.2		
2. Math	Proficiency now	10.0	3.3	10.0	7.5	25.8	25.0	13.3	5.0
			Total Above Proficient = 20.8				Total Below Proficient = 43.3		
3. Science	When you started working with them	27.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	34.2	13.3	10.8	6.7
			Total Above Proficient = 7.5				Total Below Proficient = 30.8		
3. Science	Proficiency now	26.7	4.2	1.7	9.2	36.7	15.0	5.0	1.7
			Total Above Proficient = 15.1				Total Below Proficient = 21.7		
4. Social Studies	When you started working with them	20.0	2.5	5.8	3.3	33.3	12.5	12.5	10.0
			Total Above Proficient = 11.6				Total Below Proficient = 35.0		
4. Social Studies	Proficiency now	19.2	5.0	5.8	5.8	40.0	15.0	7.5	1.7
			Total Above Proficient = 16.6				Total Below Proficient = 24.2		

Ultimately, fewer students were below proficient in all four subject areas.

- For ELA, teachers reported that 15.0% of students improved from below proficient to proficient or above proficient (i.e., 62.5% were initially below proficient, and ultimately 47.5% were below proficient).
- For Math, teachers reported that 15.9% of students improved from below proficient to proficient or above proficient (i.e., 59.2% were initially below proficient, and ultimately 43.3% were below proficient).
- For Science, teachers reported 9.1% of students improved from below proficient to proficient or above proficient (i.e., 30.8% were initially below proficient, and ultimately 21.7% were below proficient).
- For Social Studies, teachers reported 10.8% of students improved from below proficient to proficient or above proficient (i.e., 35.0% were initially below proficient, and ultimately 24.2% were below proficient).

Increases in level (4) proficiency were made in all subject areas (e.g., in ELA, an increase from 19.2% to 25.8% of students).

Increases in the total of levels (5) – (7) above proficiency were also made in all subject areas (e.g., in Math, an increase from 12.6% to 20.8% of students).

**Appendix G:
Student Attendance Summary**

Student Absence Summary

One goal of the grant is for students who participate in the 21st CCLC program to have a 75% increase in daily school attendance. Changes in participating students' absences for the regular school day are compared in the following table.

Calculations are based on 21st CCLC students in grades 1-5, not Kindergarten, since absences occurring in the previous and current academic years are compared to determine if there was an increase, no change, or a decrease (e.g., for a student just completing 5th grade, the number of absences they had in 5th grade is compared to their number in 4th grade). The count of applicable students and the percentages of students with each type of change (increase, same, decrease) are shown in the following table.

Change in Student Attendance from Previous Year to Current Year ¹

NOTE: Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

Site Name	Year #	Maximum Possible # of Students ²	# of Students with Absences in Previous and Current Years	Change in Student Attendance		
				Increased Absences from Previous Year (i.e., Worse Attendance) (%)	Same Number of Absences in both Years (%)	Decreased Absences from Previous Year (i.e., Better Attendance) (%)
Balmville	1	115	109	56.9	3.7	39.4
	2	82	73	41.1	2.7	56.2
	3	91	73	16.4	4.1	79.5
	4	7	7	57.1	0.0	42.9
Gardnertown	1	104	97	38.1	3.1	58.8
	2	81	67	46.3	6.0	47.8
	3	95	80	23.8	5.0	71.2
	4	26	24	79.2	0.0	20.8
Gidney Avenue	1	179	170	78.2	2.9	18.8
	2	152	140	23.6	2.9	73.6
	3	107	103	19.4	2.9	77.7
	4	9	9	100.0	0.0	0.0
Horizons	1	73	71	43.7	7.0	49.3
	2	95	84	51.2	2.4	46.4
	3	119	103	26.2	4.9	68.9
	4	9	9	66.7	0.0	33.3
Vails Gate	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2	52	44	31.8	0.0	68.2
	3	106	93	37.6	4.3	58.1
	4	19	19	68.4	0.0	31.6

¹ The Year 3 data on absences is for the school year only up until March 18, 2020. This affects both the Year 3 results, since Year 3 data is compared to Year 2, and also Year 4 results since Year 4 data is compared to Year 3.

² Starting in Year 2, only students who reached 30 hours of participation during the school year were included; students with only summer hours were excluded.

In Year 4, four schools had the same number of students included in the calculation as the number of 30-hour participants. The fifth school had almost the same number (i.e., Gardnertown had 24 out of 26 students). This indicates that the results are very representative of the 30-hour participants.

Because Year 4 was challenging for students, families, and schools due to ongoing pandemic issues, it is not surprising that attendance suffered. Also, because the Year 3 data is for only a partial school year, absences recorded for that year are most likely lower than what would have occurred in a full school year. None of the schools reached the goal of having 75% of students increase their attendance. There were some students that did improve their attendance, ranging from 20.8 to 42.9% of students, with Gidney Avenue not having any of the 21st CCLC students increase their attendance.

In addition to looking at absences, feedback from surveys administered to students and teachers included questions about attendance.

- In the grades K-3 survey (**Appendix A**), the majority of responses from the five schools indicated that the 21st CCLC program had helped them want to come to school (question 8).
- The grades 4-5 survey (**Appendix B**) includes two questions regarding the 21st CCLC program and if it has helped the student become more interested in going to school (question 5) and wanting to stay in school (question 45). The majority of answers for both questions were affirmative (i.e., combined “Yes” and “Kind of” responses).
- The teacher survey (**Appendix F2**) included a question about student attendance. At all five schools, there was a varying amount of improvement in attendance (the sum of improvements ranged from 14.3% to 43.6% of 21st CCLC students). Many 21st CCLC students, however, were already meeting expectations (ranging from 40.6% to 62.5%), some had no change in attendance (2.6% to 21.4%), and three schools indicated a decline in student attendance.