

21st Century Community Learning Centers

Summative Evaluation Report

Project Steam

St. Lucie County School District

Ft. Pierce, Florida



August 14, 2015

Submitted by
Kimberly A. Roberts
Debra Carlstrom, Ph.D.

This work is funded through a contract with the Florida Department of Education [560-2445B-5CCC2]

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

Program Highlights and Recommendations

1.0 Student Enrollment and Attendance	3
2.0 Student and Family Demographics	3
3.0 Program Operations	8
4.0 Staff Characteristics	9
4.1 Regular Staff by Paid and Volunteer Status	9
4.2 Student to Staff Ratio	11
4.3 Staff Training	11
5.0 Objectives and Outcomes	12
5.1 Objective Assessment	12
5.2 Other Findings	18
5.3 Student Success Snapshot	18
5.4 Overall Findings for Each Objective	19
6.0 Progress Toward Sustainability	19
7.0 Lessons Learned and Recommendations	20

1.0 STUDENT ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE

Project Steam served a total of 481 students during the 2014-2015 school year. Data for this table were collected by project teachers and inputted by the project managers into Excel spreadsheet for tabulation. Due to the date the grant was awarded the program began on January 7, 2015. The afterschool year program went for 89 days, five days a week for 2.5 each day. The average number of students was calculated using actual number of days in attendance. This includes students who did not start the program on the first day of school but entered at any time during the school year.

Table 1. Student Enrollment: Total and Regularly Participating Students for Summer 2014 and School Year 2014-2015.

Site Name	Total Enrolled Attending (at least one day)				Regularly Participating Enrollment (30 days or more)			
	Summer Only	School Year Only	Both Summer AND School Year	Total	Summer Only	School Year Only	Both Summer AND School Year	Total
C. A. Moore Elementary	0	141	0	141	0	67	0	67
Floresta Elementary	0	82	0	82	0	74	0	74
Lawnwood Elementary	0	131	0	131	0	71	0	71
Weatherbee Elementary	0	127	0	127	0	75	0	75

Note. Unduplicated counts shown. Students attending/enrolled in both operation periods are only reported under Summer AND School Year. Only Summer + Only School Year + Summer AND School Year = Total.

2.0 STUDENT AND FAMILY DEMOGRAPHICS

The data presented for student characteristics were collected from District IT databases. These databases are used for reporting school data to the state. From the records provided, Project Steam had 268 males (56%) and 268 females (44%) enrolled

in the project. Their ages ranged from 5 to 12 years of age. For the regularly attending student in Project Steam, there were 146 males (51%) and 138 females (49%).

Table 2. Student Demographics for Total Participating Students (All Students Served) and Regularly Participating Students.

Site Name	Total Participating Students				Regularly Participating Students			
	Gender			Age Range	Gender			Age Range
	Male	Female	DK*		Male	Female	DK*	
C. A. Moore Elementary	72	69	0	5-12	31	36	0	5-12
Floresta Elementary	42	40	0	5-12	38	33	0	5-12
Lawnwood Elementary	77	54	0	5-12	34	37	0	5-12
Weatherbee Elementary	77	50	0	5-12	43	32	0	5-12

Project Steam also had students with special needs. Overall, there were 60 students (13%) classified as Limited English Proficient and 48 students (10%) classified with a disability. The percent of students who were LEP at C.A. Moore were 15, Floresta were 7, Lawnwood were 14% and Weatherbee were 12% respectively. The percent of students who had a documented disability were C.A.Moore were 12, Floresta were 12, Lawnwood were 11 and Weatherbee 5, respectively.

Table 3. Students with Special Needs: Total Participating Students.

Site Name	Limited English Proficient			Identified with Disability		
	Yes	No	DK*	Yes	No	DK*
C. A. Moore Elementary	21	120	0	17	124	0
Floresta Elementary	6	76	0	10	72	0
Lawnwood Elementary	18	113	0	15	116	0
Weatherbee Elementary	15	112	0	6	121	0

Overall, the number of regularly attending students in Project Steam who were LEP was 50. This represented about 17% of the group. The percent of students who were LEP at C.A.Moore were 18%, Floresta were 14%, Lawnwood were 23% and Weatherbee 16%, respectively. Thirty-two (32) regularly attending students had a documented disability and represents 11% of the group. The percent of students who had a disability at C.A.Moore were 8, Floresta 14, Lawnwood were 17, and Weatherbee 5, respectively.

Table 4. Students with Special Needs: Regularly Participating Students.

Site Name	Limited English Proficient			Identified with Disability		
	Yes	No	DK*	Yes	No	DK*
C. A. Moore Elementary	12	55	0	6	61	0
Floresta Elementary	10	64	0	10	64	0
Lawnwood Elementary	16	55	0	12	59	0
Weatherbee Elementary	12	63	0	4	71	0

*DK = Don't Know.

Project Steam racial composition included students with various backgrounds. Overall the number of students (481) classified by race were: 7 Asian Pacific Islander, 266 Black or African American, 115 Hispanic or Latino, and 93 White or Caucasian American. The largest percent of student served were Black (55%), Hispanic (23%) and White (20%). For the 287 regularly attending students, the percent of Black, Hispanic and white students was 53, 24 and 21, respectively. Data for Table 5 were gathered from District IT records. As such, parent selection of race/ethnicity is a single element in the database and is reported as provided.

Table 5. Student Race and Ethnicity: Total and Regularly Participating Students.

Site Name	Total Participating Students						Regularly Participating Students					
	American Indian/ Alaska Native	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	White or Caucasian	Unknown**	American Indian/ Alaska Native	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	White or Caucasian	Unknown
C. A. Moore Elementary	0	0	120	10	11	0	0	0	54	7	6	0
Floresta Elementary	0	4	24	17	37	0	0	4	25	14	31	0
Lawnwood Elementary	0	3	70	46	12	0	0	2	36	24	9	0
Weatherbee Elementary	0	0	52	42	33	0	0	0	37	23	15	0

* Ethnicity categories are non-exclusive; students can be identified under multiple ethnicities.
 ** Unknown = Racial/ethnic group is unknown or cannot be verified.

Project Steam included students from K through Grade 5. Overall, the number of students, by grade served in the program were: 68 students in K (14%), 91 students in Grade 1 (19%), 83 students in Grade 2 (17%), 103 students in Grade 3 (21%), 69 students in Grade 4 (15%) and 67 students in Grade 5 (14%).

Table 6. Student Grade for Total Participating Students.

Site Name	Grade In School*													
	PK	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
C. A. Moore Elementary	0	23	30	24	34	13	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Floresta Elementary	0	11	16	16	12	17	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lawnwood Elementary	0	21	24	22	23	19	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Weatherbee Elementary	0	13	21	21	34	20	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* Grade levels are exclusive, as students can only be in one grade level. The total number of students where grade level is unknown are not indicated, but can be derived from this table.

Project Steam included students from K through Grade 5. Overall, the number of students, by grade served in the program were: 33 students in K (12%), 38 students in Grade 1 (13%), 48 students in Grade 2 (17%), 61 students in Grade 3 (21%), 58 students in Grade 4 (20%) and 49 students in Grade 5 (17%).

Table 7. Student Grade for Regularly Participating Students.

Site Name	Grade In School*													
	PK	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
C. A. Moore Elementary	0	8	12	14	13	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Floresta Elementary	0	5	11	8	12	28	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lawnwood Elementary	0	12	8	13	12	12	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Weatherbee Elementary	0	8	7	13	24	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

** Grade levels are exclusive, as students can only be in one grade level. The total number of students where grade level is unknown are not indicated, but can be derived from this table.*

481 (96%) participating students receive free or reduced-priced lunch. Three of the four schools had 100% of the participating students receiving free or reduced-priced lunch; C.A.Moore, Lawnwood and Weatherbee. 76% of Floresta participating students received free or reduced-lunch.

Table 8. Free/Reduced Lunch Status of Total Participating Students.

Site Name	Free or Reduced-Price Lunch		
	Yes	No	DK
C. A. Moore Elementary	141	0	0
Floresta Elementary	62	20	0
Lawnwood Elementary	131	0	0
Weatherbee Elementary	126	1	0

Overall, 287 (94%) of regularly attending students received free or reduced-priced lunch. For regularly attending students, three of the four schools had 100% of the

participating students receiving free or reduced-priced lunch; C.A.Moore, Lawnwood and Weatherbee. 83% of Floresta participating students received free or reduced-priced lunch.

Table 9. Free/Reduced Lunch Status of Regularly Participating Students.

Site Name	Free or Reduced-Price Lunch		
	Yes	No	DK
C. A. Moore Elementary	67	0	0
Floresta Elementary	56	18	0
Lawnwood Elementary	71	0	0
Weatherbee Elementary	75	0	0

3.0 PROGRAM OPERATIONS

Due to when the grant was awarded there was no summer program.

Table 10. Summer 2014 Operation.

Site Name	Total number of <u>weeks</u> THIS site was open:	Typical number of <u>days per week</u> THIS site was open:	Typical number of hours per week THIS site was open on:		
			WEEKDAYS	WEEKDAY EVENINGS	WEEKENDS
C. A. Moore Elementary	0	0	0	0	0
Floresta Elementary	0	0	0	0	0
Lawnwood Elementary	0	0	0	0	0
Weatherbee Elementary	0	0	0	0	0

Each school site program within the project operated from January 5 thru May 29, 2015, Monday through Friday during regular school days (total of 19 weeks or 89 days).

Table 11. School Year 2014-2015 Operation.

Site Name	Total # weeks THIS site was open	Total # days THIS site was open	Typical # days per week THIS site was open	Typical # hours per week THIS site was open				Total # days THIS site operated			
				Before School	During School	After School	Weekends / Holidays	Before School	During School	After School	Weekends/ Holidays
C. A. Moore Elementary	19	89	5	0	0	12.5	0	0	0	89	0
Floresta Elementary	19	89	5	0	0	12.5	0	0	0	89	0
Lawnwood Elementary	19	89	5	0	0	12.5	0	0	0	89	0
Weatherbee Elementary	19	89	5	0	0	12.5	0	0	0	89	0

4.0 STAFF CHARACTERISTICS

All staff from each school site was hired from the regular school day staff. Highly qualified teachers were utilized for the positions of teacher and site coordinator. The parent liaison during the school year was staffed by regular day para-professionals who were familiar with the school students and parents.

Table 12. Regular Staff by Paid and Volunteer Status.

Staff Type Chester A. Moore Elementary	Summer of 2014		2014-2015 School Year	
	Paid ¹	Volunteer	Paid ¹	Volunteer
School day teachers (former and substitute)	0	0	10	0
Center administrators and coordinators	0	0	2	0
Youth development workers and non-school day staff with college degree or higher	0	0	0	0
Other non-teaching school day staff	0	0	2	0
Parents	0	0	0	0
College students	0	0	0	0
High school students	0	0	0	0
Other community members	0	0	0	0
Other non-school day staff with some or no college	0	0	0	0
Other**	0	0	0	0

¹ For all staff categories *except* "Other", report only staff paid with 21st CCLC funds.
* These categories represent the regular responsibilities of program staff during the regular school day.
** Use this category if data do not fit in specific categories provided

Staff Type Floresta Elementary	Summer of 2014		2014-2015 School Year	
	Paid ¹	Volunteer	Paid ¹	Volunteer
School day teachers (former and substitute)	0	0	18	0
Center administrators and coordinators	0	0	1	0
Youth development workers and non-school day staff with college degree or higher	0	0	0	0
Other non-teaching school day staff	0	0	2	0
Parents	0	0	0	0
College students	0	0	0	0
High school students	0	0	0	0
Other community members	0	0	0	0
Other non-school day staff with some or no college	0	0	0	0
Other**	0	0	0	0

¹For all staff categories *except* "Other", report only staff paid with 21st CCLC funds.

* These categories represent the regular responsibilities of program staff during the regular school day.

** Use this category if data do not fit in specific categories provided

Staff Type Lawnwood Elementary	Summer of 2014		2014-2015 School Year	
	Paid ¹	Volunteer	Paid ¹	Volunteer
School day teachers (former and substitute)	0	0	23	0
Center administrators and coordinators	0	0	2	0
Youth development workers and non-school day staff with college degree or higher	0	0	0	0
Other non-teaching school day staff	0	0	0	0
Parents	0	0	0	0
College students	0	0	0	0
High school students	0	0	0	0
Other community members	0	0	0	0
Other non-school day staff with some or no college	0	0	0	0
Other**	0	0	0	0

¹For all staff categories *except* "Other", report only staff paid with 21st CCLC funds.

* These categories represent the regular responsibilities of program staff during the regular school day.

** Use this category if data do not fit in specific categories provided

Staff Type Weatherbee Elementary	Summer of 2014		2014-2015 School Year	
	Paid ¹	Volunteer	Paid ¹	Volunteer
School day teachers (former and substitute)	0	0	19	0
Center administrators and coordinators	0	0	2	0
Youth development workers and non-school day staff with college degree or higher	0	0	0	0
Other non-teaching school day staff	0	0	2	0
Parents	0	0	0	0
College students	0	0	0	0
High school students	0	0	0	0
Other community members	0	0	0	0
Other non-school day staff with some or no college	0	0	0	0
Other**	0	0	0	0

¹For all staff categories except "Other", report only staff paid with 21st CCLC funds.
* These categories represent the regular responsibilities of program staff during the regular school day.
** Use this category if data do not fit in specific categories provided

4.2 Student-to-Staff Ratio

Student to teacher ratio in academic activities and enrichment activities was on average 1:12 at each school site. Some classes had 1:14 while others had 1:10 depending on enrollment at the grade level.

4.3 Staff Training

St. Lucie Public Schools is committed to the professional growth of their employees and the improvement of their students. As such, staff was encouraged to participate in the numerous professional development and training opportunities offered to them during the year.

Date	Training Topic
November 20, 2014	Coordinators' training
December 15, 2014	Academic teacher training (Lawnwood)
February 25, 2015	Academic teacher training, Chester A. Moore
February 25, 2015	Academic teacher training, Floresta Elementary
February 25, 2015	Academic teacher training, Lawnwood Elementary
February 25, 2015	Academic teacher training, Weather Elementary
March 14, 2015	Academic teacher training, Weather Elementary

Mach 25, 2015	Coordinators' training, Safety
April 29, 2015	Academic teacher training for all teachers from all sites
May 20, 2015	Coordinators' training, Community Partner Parent Academy

5.0 OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES

5.1 Objective Assessment

ALL OBJECTIVES WERE MEASURED AT POST ONLY BECAUSE THE PROGRAM BEGAN IN JANUARY 2015

(1) 80% of regularly participating students will demonstrate an increase in reading from fall to spring as evidenced through report card grades.

- **Content Area:** Reading
- **Benchmark:** 80% of regularly attending students
- **Measure:** report card grades
- **Success Criterion:** maintain a letter grade of C or above or improve reading grade
- **Data Collection Timeframe:** pre, mid, post
- **Total Number of Participants Measured:** 152 (grades 3-5 have letter grades)
- **Total Number of Participants Meeting Success Criterion:** 131
- **Percent of Participants Meeting Success Criterion:** 86%
- **Programmatic Changes and Rationale:** Proposed Changes: No programmatic changes recommended at this time. Rationale: This data set includes only final grades for regularly attending participants since this was the first semester of program implementation. The data includes only grades 3-5 students with a regular reading course code, which may exclude students taking remedial or alternative courses. Grades K-2 were excluded because they do not receive a letter grade.
- **Data Collection/Evaluation Changes and Rationale:** In order to get a complete data set on all regularly attending students: (1) work with the district curriculum department to determine a satisfactory grade for K-2; or (2) change the objective to reflect the grading scale used with K-2. In addition, the curriculum department needs to clarify with course codes yield a grade for Reading.

(2) 80% of regularly participating students will demonstrate an increase in reading from fall to spring as evidenced through FAIR and AIR scores.

- **Content Area:** Reading
- **Benchmark:** 80% of regularly attending students
- **Measure:** FAIR and AIR scores (state standardized assessment)
- **Success Criterion:** score at least proficient to grade level
- **Data Collection Timeframe:** pre, mid, post
- **Total Number of Participants Measured:** 154
- **Total Number of Participants Meeting Success Criterion:** 46
- **Percent of Participants Meeting Success Criterion:** 30%

- **Programmatic Changes and Rationale:** Proposed Changes: No programmatic changes recommended at this time. Rationale: The program had only one semester of implementation rather than a full year. Also, FAIR and AIR were not administered by the district during the 2014-15 school year. This reported data set includes only post assessment data for the program, which started mid-year. Data reflects regularly participating Grade 3-5 students with an ELA score (N=154) on the Comprehensive Assessment 2 (a district standardized assessment). This was the only available data for the first semester of program implementation that yielded a proficiency score and had a standardized administration. Fourteen regularly attending grades 3-5 students did not have a Comp 2 score in the raw data file submitted by the district's assessment department. This is due to either absenteeism or participation in an alternate assessment for SWD.
- **Data Collection/Evaluation Changes and Rationale:** In order to get a complete data set on all regularly attending students: (1) change assessment data to the District Comprehensive Assessments 1 & 2; (2) ensure that participating schools test grades 1 and 2 students (which was optional this year); and (3) ensure that all students take the entire assessment.

(3) 80% of regularly participating students will demonstrate an increase in language arts from fall to spring as evidenced through FAIR and AIR scores.

- **Content Area:** Reading
- **Benchmark:** 80% of regularly attending students
- **Measure:** FAIR and AIR scores (state standardized assessment)
- **Success Criterion:** Score at least proficient to grade level
- **Data Collection Timeframe:** pre, mid, post
- **Total Number of Participants Measured:** 292 regularly attending students are in the program
- **Total Number of Participants Meeting Success Criterion:** 0 students were measured since FAIR and AIR were not administered this year. An alternative language arts assessment was not administered.
- **Percent of Participants Meeting Success Criterion:** N/A
- **Programmatic Changes and Rationale:** Proposed Changes: No programmatic changes recommended at this time. Rationale: The program had only one semester of implementation rather than a full year. Also, FAIR and AIR were not administered by the district during the 2014-15 school year. This reported data set includes only post assessment data for the program, which started mid-year. Data reflects regularly participating Grade 3-5 students with an ELA score (N=154) on the Comprehensive Assessment 2 (a district standardized assessment). This was the only available data for the first semester of program implementation that yielded a proficiency score and had a standardized administration. Fourteen regularly attending grades 3-5 students did not have a Comp 2 score in the raw data file submitted by the district's assessment department. This is due to either absenteeism or participation in an alternate assessment for SWD. The wording on this template is not correct.

- **Data Collection/Evaluation Changes and Rationale:** The wording on this template is not correct. Letter grades are not the success criterion for a standardized assessment. Also, in order to get a complete data set on all regularly attending students: (1) change assessment data to the District Comprehensive Assessments 1 & 2; (2) ensure that participating schools test grades 1 and 2 students (which was optional this year); and (3) ensure that all students take the entire assessment.

(4) 80% of regularly participating students will demonstrate an increase in writing from fall to spring as evidenced through report card grades.

- **Content Area:** Reading
- **Benchmark:** 80% of regularly attending students
- **Measure:** Report card grades
- **Success Criterion:** maintain a letter grade of C or above or improve language arts grade
- **Data Collection Timeframe:** pre, mid, post
- **Total Number of Participants Measured:** 152
- **Total Number of Participants Meeting Success Criterion:** 135
- **Percent of Participants Meeting Success Criterion:** 89%
- **Programmatic Changes and Rationale:** Proposed Changes: No programmatic changes recommended at this time. Rationale: This data set includes only final grades for regularly attending participants since this was the first semester of program implementation. The data includes only grades 3-5 students with a regular language arts course code, which may exclude students taking remedial or alternative courses. Grades K-2 were excluded because they do not receive a letter grade.
- **Data Collection/Evaluation Changes and Rationale:** In order to get a complete data set on all regularly attending students: (1) work with the district curriculum department to determine a satisfactory grade for K-2; or (2) change the objective to reflect the grading scale used with K-2. In addition, the curriculum department needs to clarify with course codes yield a grade for language arts.

(5) 80% of regularly participating students will demonstrate an increase in math skills from fall to spring as evidenced through district benchmark assessments

- **Content Area:** Math
- **Benchmark:** 80% of regularly attending students
- **Measure:** Local standardized assessment
- **Success Criterion:** Score at least proficient to grade level
- **Data Collection Timeframe:** pre, mid, post
- **Total Number of Participants Measured:** 154
- **Total Number of Participants Meeting Success Criterion:** 35
- **Percent of Participants Meeting Success Criterion:** 23%
- **Programmatic Changes and Rationale:** Proposed Changes: No programmatic changes recommended at this time. Rationale: The program had only one semester

of implementation rather than a full year. This reported data set includes only post assessment data for the program, which started mid-year. Data reflects regularly participating Grade 3-5 students with a Math score (N=154) on the Comprehensive Assessment 2 (a district standardized assessment). This was the only available data for the first semester of program implementation that yielded a proficiency score and had a standardized administration. Fourteen regularly attending grades 3-5 students did not have a Comp 2 score in the raw data file submitted by the district's assessment department. This is due to either absenteeism or participation in an alternate assessment for SWD.

- **Data Collection/Evaluation Changes and Rationale:** In order to get a complete data set on all regularly attending students: (1) change assessment data to the District Comprehensive Assessments 1 & 2; (2) ensure that participating schools test grades 1 and 2 students (which was optional this year); and (3) ensure that all students take the entire assessment.

(6) 80% of regularly participating students will demonstrate an increase in math skills from fall to spring as evidenced through grades.

- **Content Area:** STEM
- **Benchmark:** 80% of regularly attending students
- **Measure:** report card grades
- **Success Criterion:** maintain a letter grade of C or above or improve math grade
- **Data Collection Timeframe:** pre, mid, post
- **Total Number of Participants Measured:** 152
- **Total Number of Participants Meeting Success Criterion:** 132
- **Percent of Participants Meeting Success Criterion:** 87%
- **Programmatic Changes and Rationale:** Proposed Changes: No programmatic changes recommended at this time. Rationale: This data set includes only final grades for regularly attending participants since this was the first semester of program implementation. The data includes only grades 3-5 students with a regular math course code, which may exclude students taking remedial or alternative courses. Grades K-2 were excluded because they do not receive a letter grade.
- **Data Collection/Evaluation Changes and Rationale:** In order to get a complete data set on all regularly attending students: (1) work with the district curriculum department to determine a satisfactory grade for K-2; or (2) change the objective to reflect the grading scale used with K-2. In addition, the curriculum department needs to clarify with course codes yield a grade for math.

(7) 80% of regularly participating students will demonstrate an increase in science skills from fall to spring as evidenced through district benchmark assessments.

- **Content Area:** STEM
- **Benchmark:** 80% of regularly attending students
- **Measure:** Local standardized assessment
- **Success Criterion:** score at least proficient to grade level

- **Data Collection Timeframe:** pre, mid, post
- **Total Number of Participants Measured:** 154
- **Total Number of Participants Meeting Success Criterion:** 79
- **Percent of Participants Meeting Success Criterion:** 51%
- **Programmatic Changes and Rationale:** Proposed Changes: No programmatic changes recommended at this time. Rationale: The program had only one semester of implementation rather than a full year. This reported data set includes only post assessment data for the program, which started mid-year. Data reflects regularly participating Grade 3-5 students with a Science score (N=154) on the Comprehensive Assessment 2 (a district standardized assessment). This was the only available data for the first semester of program implementation that yielded a proficiency score and had a standardized administration. Fourteen regularly attending grades 3-5 students did not have a Comp 2 score in the raw data file submitted by the district's assessment department. This is due to either absenteeism or participation in an alternate assessment for SWD.
- **Data Collection/Evaluation Changes and Rationale:** Proposed Changes: In order to get a complete data set on all regularly attending students: (1) change assessment data to the District Comprehensive Assessments 1 & 2; (2) ensure that participating schools test grades 1 and 2 students (which was optional this year); and (3) ensure that all students take the entire assessment.

(8) 80% of regularly participating students will demonstrate an increase in science skills from fall to spring as evidenced through grades.

- **Content Area:** STEM
- **Benchmark:** 80% of regularly attending students
- **Measure:** report card grades
- **Success Criterion:** maintain a letter grade of C or above or improve science grade
- **Data Collection Timeframe:** pre, mid, post
- **Total Number of Participants Measured:** 152
- **Total Number of Participants Meeting Success Criterion:** 141
- **Percent of Participants Meeting Success Criterion:** 93%
- **Programmatic Changes and Rationale:** Proposed Changes: No programmatic changes recommended at this time. Rationale: This data set includes only final grades for regularly attending participants since this was the first semester of program implementation. The data includes only grades 3-5 students with a regular science course code, which may exclude students taking remedial or alternative courses. Grades K-2 were excluded because they do not receive a letter grade.
- **Data Collection/Evaluation Changes and Rationale:** In order to get a complete data set of all regularly attending students: (1) work with the district curriculum department to determine a satisfactory grade for K-2; or (2) change the objective to reflect the grading scale used with K-2. In addition, the curriculum department needs to clarify with course codes yield a grade for science.

(9) At least 75% of adult family members regularly participating 21st CCLC students that attend 21st CCLC activities will increase their knowledge of school and district resources (e.g., parent portal, parent center, parent academy, tutoring) that can support their child’s academic performance measured through attendance rosters and parent surveys.

- **Content Area:** Family Services- Performance
- **Benchmark:** 75%
- **Measure:** survey
- **Success Criterion:** increase knowledge by at least 10%, based on Parent Survey
- **Data Collection Timeframe:** pre, post
- **Total Number of Participants Measured:** 7
- **Total Number of Participants Meeting Success Criterion:** 0
- **Percent of Participants Meeting Success Criterion:** N/A
- **Programmatic Changes and Rationale:** Proposed Changes: Develop protocols for each school site for collecting attendance and survey data linked to students. Program Director will monitor the pre and post survey administrations. Rationale: A Parent Survey was developed and administered in May 2015. This data set was supposed to serve as a pilot for the instrument's validity and reliability. The survey will be finalized for use as a pre/post instrument in the 2015-16 school year. Only seven were collected from one school site.
- **Data Collection/Evaluation Changes and Rationale:** Need to link the parent attendance and pre/post surveys to a student. The assessment is to focus on parents of regularly attending students; thus the data need to be linked to the students.

(10) At least 50% of parents of regularly participating 21st CCLC students will become more involved with their child’s education through attendance at monthly workshops leading to parent’s having a more supportive attitude towards teachers and learning measured thru pre-post surveys.

- **Content Area:** Family Services- Performance
- **Benchmark:** 50%
- **Measure:** survey
- **Success Criterion:** increase knowledge by at least 10%, based on Parent Survey
- **Data Collection Timeframe:** pre, post
- **Total Number of Participants Measured:** 7
- **Total Number of Participants Meeting Success Criterion:** 0
- **Percent of Participants Meeting Success Criterion:** N/A
- **Programmatic Changes and Rationale:** Proposed Changes: Develop protocols for each school site for collecting attendance and survey data linked to students. Program Director will monitor the pre and post survey administrations. Rationale: A Parent Survey was developed and administered in May 2015. This data set was supposed to serve as a pilot for the instrument's validity and reliability. The survey will be finalized for use as a pre/post instrument in the 2015-16 school year. Only seven were collected from one school site.

- **Data Collection/Evaluation Changes and Rationale:** Need to link the parent attendance and pre/post surveys to a student. The assessment is to focus on parents of regularly attending students; thus the data need to be linked to the students.

(11) 80% of the regularly participating students will demonstrate their understanding (at grade level standards) of after school program science, reading and math content through the creation of an original student created artifact (e.g., portfolio, poster, poem, play, letter or story) meeting the appropriate criteria established in a teacher created checklist or rubric by the end of the program year.

- **Content Area:** Personal Enrichment- Arts & Culture
- **Benchmark:** 80%
- **Measure:** Authentic Assessment
- **Success Criterion:** meet appropriate criteria established in a teacher-created rubric or checklist
- **Data Collection Timeframe:** pre, mid, post
- **Total Number of Participants Measured:** 292
- **Total Number of Participants Meeting Success Criterion:** 0
- **Percent of Participants Meeting Success Criterion:** N/A
- **Programmatic Changes and Rationale:** Proposed Changes: The Program Director will monitor the use of rubrics to assess the objective at each school site. Rationale: Rubrics were developed in this first semester of program implementation so that a common score will be obtained from each of the four school sites. The Evaluator provided guidance to the Program Director regarding rubric design. The program director then developed the instrument to be used. This process took three out of the four months that the program was implemented. Thus, they were not actually used as a post measure. A decision was made to take the time to develop a sound instrument that can be used for pre/post data collection. The rubrics will be finalized for use as a pre/post measurement in the 2015-16 school year.
- **Data Collection/Evaluation Changes and Rationale:** No changes needed for the planned objective assessment. Collect the rubrics from each school site at the beginning and end of the 2015-16 school year.

(12) 80% of the regularly participating students will demonstrate their understanding (at grade level standards) of after school program science, reading and math content through the creation of an original student created artifact (e.g., portfolio, poster, poem, play, letter or story) meeting the appropriate criteria established in a teacher created checklist or rubric by the end of the program year.

- **Content Area:** Personal Enrichment- Arts & Culture
- **Benchmark:** 80%
- **Measure:** Authentic Assessment

- **Success Criterion:** meet appropriate criteria established in a teacher-created rubric or checklist
- **Data Collection Timeframe:** pre, mid, post
- **Total Number of Participants Measured:** 292
- **Total Number of Participants Meeting Success Criterion:** 0
- **Percent of Participants Meeting Success Criterion:** N/A
- **Programmatic Changes and Rationale:** Proposed Changes: The Program Director will monitor the use of rubrics to assess the objective at each school site. Rationale: Rubrics were developed in this first semester of program implementation so that a common score will be obtained from each of the four school sites. The Evaluator provided guidance to the Program Director regarding rubric design. The program director then developed the instrument to be used. This process took three out of the four months that the program was implemented. Thus, they were not actually used as a post measure. A decision was made to take the time to develop a sound instrument that can be used for pre/post data collection. The rubrics will be finalized for use as a pre/post measurement in the 2015-16 school year.
- **Data Collection/Evaluation Changes and Rationale:** No changes needed for the planned objective assessment. Collect the rubrics from each school site at the beginning and end of the 2015-16 school year.

(13) 80% of regularly participating students will demonstrate their understanding of how a healthy body and mind will produce a better student success rate in academic achievements as seen on pre/post assessment.

- **Content Area:** Personal Enrichment- Healthy and Physical Activity
- **Benchmark:** 80%
- **Measure:** Authentic Assessment
- **Success Criterion:** meet appropriate criteria established in a teacher-created rubric or checklist
- **Data Collection Timeframe:** pre, mid, post
- **Total Number of Participants Measured:** 292
- **Total Number of Participants Meeting Success Criterion:** 0
- **Percent of Participants Meeting Success Criterion:** N/A
- **Programmatic Changes and Rationale:** Proposed Changes: The Program Director will monitor the use of rubrics to assess the objective at each school site. Rationale: Rubrics were developed in this first semester of program implementation so that a common score will be obtained from each of the four school sites. The Evaluator provided guidance to the Program Director regarding rubric design. The program director then developed the instrument to be used. This process took three out of the four months that the program was implemented. Thus, they were not actually used as a post measure. A decision was made to take the time to develop a sound instrument that can be used for pre/post data collection. The rubrics will be finalized for use as a pre/post measurement in the 2015-16 school year.

- **Data Collection/Evaluation Changes and Rationale:** No changes needed for the planned objective assessment. Collect the rubrics from each school site at the beginning and end of the 2015-16 school year.

- **5.2 Other Findings**

Student Survey Findings: The student survey findings are favorable. The following summarizes this survey:

- 97% definitely or somewhat enjoyed program activities
- 92% definitely or somewhat feel that the adults at the program care about them
- 80% definitely feel safe at the program
- 92% report that the program definitely or somewhat helps them get along with others
- 96% report that the program definitely or somewhat helps them understand following rules
- 95% report that the program definitely or somewhat helps them solve problems
- 92% report that the program definitely or somewhat helps them with homework
- 94% report that the program definitely or somewhat helps them improve their grades

Parent Survey Findings: The parent survey findings also were favorable of the program. Between 90 and 97 percent of respondents reported to be satisfied or very satisfied on all items regarding program performance. In addition, 94% indicated that they would recommend the program and 94% will sign up again for the program.

Teacher Survey Findings: The teacher survey provides information from the teachers' perspectives. For the purpose of program evaluation, analysis focused on moderate or significant improvement of participants. A summary of findings are:

- 45% improved turning in homework
- 44% improved paying attention and participating
- 33% improved behavior in class (and 24% did not need to improve their behavior in class)
- 47% improved academic performance
- 35% improved getting along well with other students
- 29% had more involved parents

5.3 Student Success Snapshot

Project Steam began in January 2015. There were a number of students that demonstrated success at the conclusion of the program. One student in particular, reading fluency increased from the start of the program until the end of the program.

This student also improved their behavior and attendance in the regular day school due to the 21st Century program. Participating in the 21st Century program, he learned the importance of attending school and having good behavior. The theme of the schools after school program was Fill my Bucket. He not only received one on one help in reading to improve his fluency but also learned character skills. The 21st CCLC program will continue to strive to make a difference in the lives of the whole student.

5.4 Overall Findings for Each Objective

The objectives that were measured with report grades were met. The objectives measured with district standardized assessments were not met. The remaining objectives require development of measurement instruments (surveys and rubrics). Overall, the program is performing well for only one semester of implementation. The program should maintain programmatic goals for the 2015-16 school year, allowing a full year of data collection.

6.0 PROGRESS TOWARD SUSTAINABILITY

Table displays the names and types of organizations that contributed to the St. Lucie County 21st CLCC site, as well as the estimated value of the contribution and the type of service that was provided.

St. Lucie County School District in partnership with parents and community will continue to become premier centers of knowledge that are organized around students and the work provided to them. St. Lucie County School District's name will be tantamount with continuously improving student achievement and success of each individual. Our school district's promise is to move from good to great focusing on our

core business, the creation of challenging, engaging and satisfying work for each student, every day. The goal is to continue adding community partners to the list.

Table 14: Partnerships and Sub-Contracts

Agency Name	Type of Organization	Sub-Contractor (Yes/No)	Estimated Value (\$) of Contributions	Estimated Value (\$) of Sub-contract	Type of Service Provided
Girl Scouts	Service	No	\$7,500	0	Programming
Parent Academy	Service	No	\$7,500	0	Programming
UF-IFAS	Service	No	\$7,500	0	Programming
<i>Note: Value of subcontract must be ZERO if the agency is listed as "No" in the subcontractor column. Likewise, the value of the subcontract must be greater than ZERO if the agency is listed as "Yes" in the subcontractor column.</i>					

7.0 LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall, the program has been successful for one semester of implementation. Participant data regarding program objectives are approaching or meeting benchmarks regarding report card grades and district assessments. Some objectives required instrument design, which was completed in the first semester. These instruments, a parent survey and rubrics, will be used in the 2015-16 school year. Additionally, state developed student and parent surveys presented favorable results for program satisfaction.

At this time, specific program changes are not recommended. It is recommended that the Program Director closely monitor the implementation of program parent surveys and project rubrics during the 2015-16 year; thus providing a thorough set of data for evaluating the program objectives for family performance and health. A more thorough

program evaluation will be possible with pre, mid, and post data collection during the 2015-16 school year.