

**READ2SUCCEED, INC.**  
**21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers**  
(13U-2447B-7PCC1)  
(Cohort 13)

Summative Evaluation 2016-17



**Board of Directors**

Jose K. Fuentes– Board President  
Carlos Trueba – Treasurer  
Frank Fernandez– Secretary  
Alejandro Masferrer– Board Member

**Executive Director**

David Castrillion

**Program Director**

Dianna Daley

**Project Coordinator**

Adriana Jaramillo

August 11, 2017

*<http://www.r2succeed.org/>*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Table 1: Read2Succeed - Student Enrollment (attending one day or more).....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Table 2: Read2Succeed Regular Participating Students by Component .....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Table 3: Read2Succeed Students Enrolled 30 - Days or More (Federal objective criteria).....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Table 4: Read2Succeed - Average Daily Attendance (ADA) – Afterschool.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Table 5: Read2Succeed - Average Daily Attendance (ADA) – Weekend/Holiday.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Table 6: Read2Succeed - Average Daily Attendance (ADA) – 2016 Summer2016.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Table 7: Enrolled Students Gender Distribution .....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Table 8: Regularly Participating Students Gender Distribution .....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Table 9: Enrolled Students with Special Needs .....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Table 10: Regularly Participating Students with Special Needs .....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Table 11: Enrolled Students Race &amp; Ethnicity Distribution.....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Table 12: Regularly Participating Students Race &amp; Ethnicity Distribution.....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Table 13: Enrolled Students Grade Level Distribution .....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Table 14: Regularly Participating Students Grade Level Distribution .....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Table 15: Enrolled Students Family Demographics.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Table 16: Regularly Participating Students Family Demographics.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<b>PROGRAM OPERATIONS .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<i>Inputs.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<b>STAFF CHARACTERISTICS .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>OBJECTIVE ASSESSMENT .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<i>Table 22: Average Language Arts Improvement-Project Quarterly Report Card Grades.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Table 23: Average Language Arts Improvement-FSA .....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Table 24: Average Math Improvement-Project Quarterly Report Card Grades.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Table 25: Average Mathematics Improvement-FSA .....</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Table 26: Average Science Improvement-Project Quarterly Report Card Grades .....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Table 27: Average Science Improvement-FSA.....</i>	<i>17</i>

<i>Table 28: Average Behavior &amp; Problem- Solving Increase .....</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Table 29: Average Nutrition Knowledge Improvement .....</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Table 30: Average Fitness Improvement .....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Table 31: Adult Family Member Survey .....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>Table 32: Parent Satisfaction-Federal Parent Surveys .....</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>Table 33: Parent Involvement-Federal Teacher Surveys .....</i>	<i>23</i>
<b>SUSTAINABILITY .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<i>Table 34: Read2Succeed- Partners.....</i>	<i>24</i>
<b>PARENT, TEACHER, AND STUDENT SURVEYS .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<i>Table 35: Student Survey Results .....</i>	<i>27</i>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>28</b>

## INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this evaluation is to report the 2016-17 summative third- year findings of Read2Succeed's 21st Century Community Learning Center elementary project. The project is funded by a multi-year grant from the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program (21st CCLC) through the Florida Department of Education, Bureau of Family and Community Outreach. The grant fiscal reporting period covered in this report is from August 1, 2016, through June 31, 2017, and the programmatic reporting period is from June 13th, 2016 to June 8, 2017.

Agencies receiving this award are required to establish or expand 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs that provide at-risk students opportunities for academic enrichment, personal enrichment, and complement students' standard academic programs. The 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program also engages adult family members of actively participating students through educational and personal development opportunities. The 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs provide safe environments for students during non-school hours and may have one or multiple centers/sites. Program sites may be located in schools, community facilities, and/or faith-based facilities. Centers must provide a range of high-quality services to support student learning and development, including, but not limited to: tutoring and mentoring, academic enrichment (e.g., homework assistance, reading, math, science, and technology programs), music, art, service learning, character education, physical education and recreational activities, and dropout prevention.

Read2Succeed is a Community Based Organization (CBO) that served students at three locations Miami Heights Elementary, South Miami Heights Elementary, and Sweetwater Senior Center. These centers in turn served students at Miami Heights Elementary, South Miami Heights Elementary, and Sweetwater Elementary School.

## STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

### *Context*

1. *Did the appropriate students receive grant related services?*

Based on review of the 2016-17 FLDOE project application award, Read2Succeed was to serve students attending Miami Heights Elementary, South Miami Heights Elementary, and Sweetwater Elementary School. 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC criteria states the most at-risk students should be served, specifically school populations with 40% or more Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) status. Review of program records indicated all students participating in the project attended the targeted schools during the day making them eligible and appropriate for services. Table 15 demonstrates 96.% of participating students in the Read2Succeed 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program received free or reduced lunch. All students were enrolled into the program on a first come, first serve basis.

2. *How many students are receiving grant related services?*

Federal and state reporting requires the tracking of students in two categories: total enrolled students and regularly participating students. Total enrolled or “enrollment” in the program is categorized by student attendance of at least one day in the 21st CCLC program during the program reporting period. “Regularly participating” is categorized as student attendance of 30-days or more throughout the program reporting period. Student monthly attendance for each center was submitted electronically and aggregated for reporting by component and category. Table 1 indicates 237 students were enrolled in the program across all components.

*Table 1: Read2Succeed - Student Enrollment (attending one day or more)*

<b>All Students Served: Attending At Least One Day</b>				
Center	Total Enrolled	Summer Only	School Year Only	Both Summer and School Year
Miami Heights Elementary	95	33	24	38
South Miami Heights Elementary	76	9	33	34
Sweetwater Senior Center	66	22	21	23
All Centers	237	130	78	95

Table 2 demonstrates regularly participating students, those students in attendance for 30 or more days. Overall, (n=206, 86.9%) of all enrolled participants were regular participants.

*Table 2: Read2Succeed Regular Participating Students by Component*

<b>Regularly Participating Students: Attending 30-Days or More</b>				
Center	Regularly Participating Students	Summer Only	School Year Only	Both Summer and Academic Year
Miami Heights Elementary	74	12	24	38
South Miami Heights Elementary	72	6	32	34
Sweetwater Senior Center	60	17	20	23
All Centers	206	35	76	95

3. *How many students attended the program for more than 30-days?*

As in any program, without participation, gains cannot be made. The question is how much participation is needed to make gains. Projects were encouraged via the 21st CCLC RFA “to use the 30-day criterion (i.e., federal criterion) unless the objective focuses on activities that will not occur for more than 30 days (e.g., summer objectives).” Students were calculated across both components to calculate their “regular participation.” Table 3 indicates there were 206 regularly attending students for the summative reporting period. Therefore, n=206 will be utilized for project objective progression throughout the remainder of the summative reporting.

*Table 3: Read2Succeed Students Enrolled 30 - Days or More (Federal objective criteria)*

<b>Regularly Participating Students: Attending 30-Days or More</b>			
Center	Total Attending Less Than 30 Days	Total Regularly Attending 30 Day or more	Total Served (Total Enrollment)
Miami Heights Elementary	21	74	95
South Miami Heights Elementary	4	72	76
Sweetwater Senior Center	6	60	66
All Centers	31	206	237

4. What was the average daily attendance of the students receiving services?

Table 4: Read2Succeed - Average Daily Attendance (ADA) – Afterschool

Center	Targeted Afterschool Attendance	Afterschool Attendance Average	
		n	%
Miami Heights Elementary	58	51	87
South Miami Heights Elementary	60	56	93
Sweetwater Senior Center	40	36	89
All Centers	158	143	90

Table 5: Read2Succeed - Average Daily Attendance (ADA) – Weekend/Holiday

Center	Targeted W/H Attendance	W/H Attendance Average	
		n	%
Miami Heights Elementary	40	24	61
South Miami Heights Elementary	40	32	80
Sweetwater Senior Center	20	24	122
All Centers	100	80	88

Table 6: Read2Succeed - Average Daily Attendance (ADA) – 2016 Summer2016

Center	Targeted W/H Attendance	Summer Attendance Average	
		n	%
Miami Heights Elementary	60	45	75
South Miami Heights Elementary	40	35	88
Sweetwater Senior Center	50	36	72
All Centers	150	116	78

5. What were the demographics of enrolled students and regularly participating students (in attendance 30-days or more) at each program site during the project year?

Table 7 demonstrates regularly participating students were equally balanced with male participants at (49%,  $n=101$ ) and female participants at (51%,  $n=105$ ) respectively. Table 6 mirrors Table 7, representing total enrollment for purposes of federal reporting.

Table 7: Enrolled Students Gender Distribution

Center	Enrolled Students	Gender		
		Male	Female	Unknown

Miami Heights Elementary	95	46	49	-
South Miami Heights Elementary	76	31	45	-
Sweetwater Senior Center	66	41	25	-
All Centers	237	118	119	-

Table 8: Regularly Participating Students Gender Distribution

Center	Regularly Participating Students	Gender		
		Male	Female	Unknown
Miami Heights Elementary	74	35	39	-
South Miami Heights Elementary	72	29	43	-
Sweetwater Senior Center	60	37	23	-
All Centers	206	101	105	-

Table 9 demonstrates student demographic data indicated 8.25%,  $n=17$  of regularly participating students were identified in need of services to support English Proficiency and 10.2%,  $n=21$  were identified as Exceptional Student Education (ESE). Data for students identified as homeless indicated all students were not homeless. Table 8 mirrors Table 9, representing total enrollment for purposes of federal reporting.

Table 9: Enrolled Students with Special Needs

Center	Enrolled Students	Limited English Proficient		Identified with a Disability		Identified as Homeless		
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	DK
Miami Heights Elementary	95	12	83	16	79	-	-	95
South Miami Heights Elementary	76	1	75	8	68	-	-	76
Sweetwater Senior Center	66	7	59	7	59	-	-	-
All Centers	237	20	217	31	146	-	-	171

Table 10: Regularly Participating Students with Special Needs

Center	Regularly Participating Students	Limited English Proficient		Identified with a Disability		Identified as Homeless		
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	DK
Miami Heights Elementary	74	9	65	14	60	-	-	74
South Miami Heights Elementary	72	1	71	7	65	-	-	72
Sweetwater Senior Center	60	7	53	6	54	-	60	-



All Centers	206	17	189	21	179	-	60	-
-------------	-----	----	-----	----	-----	---	----	---

A majority of regularly participating students in the project were reported as Hispanic (75.7%,  $n=156$ ). Table 11 presents a detailed profile of race distribution indicating the remaining students were Black (16.5%,  $n=34$ ), followed by White (4.3%,  $n=9$ ), the Multiracial (2.4%,  $n=5$ ). Table 10 mirrors Table 11, representing total enrollment for purposes of federal reporting.

Table 11: Enrolled Students Race & Ethnicity Distribution

Center	Enrolled Students	Race					
		Multi-racial	American Indian/Alaska Native	Black	Hispanic	White	DK
Miami Heights Elementary	95	3		32	55	4	1
South Miami Heights Elementary	76	-	1	8	62	5	-
Sweetwater Senior Center	66	2	-	-	64	-	-
All Centers	237	5	1	40	181	9	1

Table 12: Regularly Participating Students Race & Ethnicity Distribution

Center	Enrolled Students	Race					
		Multi-racial	American Indian/Alaska Native	Black	Hispanic	White	DK
Miami Heights Elementary	74	3	-	26	40	4	1
South Miami Heights Elementary	72	-	1	8	58	5	-
Sweetwater Senior Center	60	2	-	-	58	-	-
All Centers	206	5	1	34	156	9	1

Table 13 demonstrates regularly participating students were distributed across all proposed grade levels with the largest number of students reported in 2nd grade (22.3%,  $n=46$ ) and the least in kindergarten (4.8%,  $n=10$ ). Table 12 mirrors Table 13, representing total enrollment for purposes of federal reporting.

Table 13: Enrolled Students Grade Level Distribution

Center	Enrolled Students	Grade						
		N	K	1	2	3	4	5
Miami Heights Elementary	95	3	24	26	16	15	11	-

South Miami Heights Elementary	76	5	11	9	18	17	16	-
Sweetwater Senior Center	66	3	15	20	10	6	12	-
All Centers	237	11	50	55	44	38	39	-

Table 14: Regularly Participating Students Grade Level Distribution

Center	Regularly Participating Students	Grade					
	n	K	1	2	3	4	5
Miami Heights Elementary	74	2	20	18	15	10	9
South Miami Heights Elementary	72	4	10	9	17	17	15
Sweetwater Senior Center	60	2	15	19	10	6	8
All Centers	206	10	45	46	42	33	32

Table 15 demonstrates over 96%,  $n=197$  of reported regularly participating students participated in the free or reduced lunch program.

Table 15: Enrolled Students Family Demographics

Center	Enrolled Students	Free or Reduced Price Lunch		
		Yes	No	DK
Miami Heights Elementary	95	94	-	1
South Miami Heights Elementary	76	74	2	-
Sweetwater Senior Center	66	59	4	3
All Centers	237	227	6	4

Table 16: Regularly Participating Students Family Demographics

Center	Regularly Participating Students	Free or Reduced Price Lunch		
	n	Yes	No	DK
Miami Heights Elementary	74	73	1	-
South Miami Heights Elementary	72	71	1	-
Sweetwater Senior Center	60	53	4	3
All Centers	206	197	6	1

## PROGRAM OPERATIONS

### Inputs

1. *Were funded activities implemented according to the approved operational schedule to ensure progress was made toward project objectives during the reporting period?*

21st CCLC Program guidance requires that each center must “begin services within one week of the school start date and continue through at least one week before the end of the school year.” Summer guidance suggests that minimum thresholds for summer include at least six weeks, four days per week, and four hours per day. The Read2Succeed project had a funding period of August 1, 2016, to July 31, 2017. Services began on the proposed start date of 8/29/16 at all centers. The Read2Succeed project proposed a total of 216 dates of service at each elementary center.

2. *What were the 2016 summer operations for the center in operation?*



Federal and state reporting guidelines require the reporting of typical operations. The 21st CCLC 2016- 17 Request for Application guidelines state that each proposed learning center is required to operate a minimum of “four days per week,” including summer. Table 17 demonstrates Read2Succeed centers operated five days a week; 8.5 hours per day; and 42.5 hours per week during the summer of 2016. Both centers had a total of 39 summer program dates of service with eight weeks of summer operation.

*Table 17: Read2Succeed’s – Summer 2016 Typical Operations*

<b>Summer 2016 Operations</b>					
Center	Typical Number of Operational Weeks	Typical Number of Days per Week	Typical number of <b>hours per week</b> THIS site was open on:		
			Weekday	Weekday Evening	Weekend/Holiday
Miami Heights Elementary	8	5	42.5	0	0
South Miami Heights Elementary	8	5	42.5	0	0
Sweetwater Senior Center	8	5	42.5	0	0

3. What were the 2016-17 school year operations for the centers in operation?

In addition to the minimum guidelines for yearly operation, program guidance states that each elementary center must operate a “minimum of twelve (12) afterschool hours per week”. Overall, as shown in Table 18, the elementary centers operated for 37 weeks during the school year, five days per week, for three hours per day. In addition, the centers operated on selected holidays for 8 hours per day.



Table 18: Read2Succeed’s – School Year to Date 2015 Typical Operations

School Year to Date 2016 Operations							
Center	Total Number Weeks of Operation	Typical Number Days per week	Typical Number of Hours per Week				
			Before School	During School Hours	After-school	Weekend /Holiday	
Miami Heights Elementary	37	5	-	0	20	8	
South Miami Heights Elementary	37	5	-	0	20	8	
Sweetwater Senior Center	37	5	-	0	20	8	

## STAFF CHARACTERISTICS

While the 21st CCLC format provides general guidance to create a strong program structure, the implementation of this format depends on the passion and dedication of staff, participants, and caregivers as well as well-informed practices. Read2Succeed maintained a consistent staff while adhering to their approved budget and staff to student ratios. Based on a review of project schedules, certified teachers were utilized in all academic components, as required by FLDOE, for at least one hour per day.

Read2Succeed staffing documentation indicates the project acquired the appropriate number of staff for the student to staff ratio of (10:1) for academic activities and ration of (15:1) for personal enrichment activities. Subsequent observations during site visitations substantiated appropriate student to staff ratios, and in some instances, the program was overstaffed for the number of students remaining in the program. All staff members received compensation solely from 21st CCLC funds.

For the 2016-17 there were 16 paid staff members supporting Miami Heights Elementary, as shown in Table 19. There were 12 staff members at South Miami Heights Elementary, as shown in Table 20. There were eight staff members at Sweetwater Senior Center, as shown in Table 21.

*Table 19: MHES Teacher and Staff Regular School Day Primary Responsibilities*

<b>Miami Heights Elementary Regular Staff Type</b>	<b>Summer of 2016</b>		<b>2016-2017 School Year</b>	
	<b>Paid<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Volunteer</b>	<b>Paid<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Volunteer</b>
School day teachers (former and substitute)	5	0	6	0
Center administrators and coordinators	2	0	2	0
Other non-teaching school day staff	5	0	6	0
Parents	0	0	0	0
College Students	1	0	1	0
High School Students	0	0	0	0
Community Members	0	0	1	0
Subcontracted Staff	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>

<sup>1</sup>For all staff categories *except* "Other", report only staff paid with 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC funds. These categories represent the regular responsibilities of program staff during the regular school day.

Table 20: SMHES Teacher and Staff Regular School Day Primary Responsibilities

South Miami Heights Elementary Regular Staff Type	Summer of 2016		2016-2017 School Year	
	Paid <sup>1</sup>	Volunteer	Paid <sup>1</sup>	Volunteer
School day teachers (former and substitute)	2	0	4	0
Center administrators and coordinators	3	0	3	0
Other non-teaching school day staff	1	0	2	0
Parents	0	0	0	0
College Students	1	0	2	0
High School Students	0	0	0	0
Community Members	0	0	0	0
Subcontracted Staff	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>

<sup>1</sup>For all staff categories *except* "Other", report only staff paid with 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC funds. These categories represent the regular responsibilities of program staff during the regular school day.

Table 21: SSC Teacher and Staff Regular School Day Primary Responsibilities

Sweetwater Senior Center Regular Staff Type	Summer of 2016		2017-2017 School Year	
	Paid <sup>1</sup>	Volunteer	Paid <sup>1</sup>	Volunteer
School day teachers (former and substitute)	2	0	2	0
Center administrators and coordinators	2	0	3	0
Other non-teaching school day staff	2	0	1	0
Parents	0	0	0	0
College Students	0	0	2	0
High School Students	0	0	0	0
Community Members	0	0	0	0
Subcontracted Staff	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>

<sup>1</sup>For all staff categories *except* "Other", report only staff paid with 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC funds. These categories represent the regular responsibilities of program staff during the regular school day.

**Professional Development**

Staff participated in professional development on August 25,2016, prior to the beginning of the year to review: the calendar of events, site enrollments, new documents and procedures, grant objectives, 5-star quality rating, rules and regulations, and meal procedures. During this orientation meeting, the curriculum administrator reviewed CHAMPs classroom management

procedures, program curriculum, and supplemental online program resources.

Subsequent professional development included “Promoting Health and Wellness” that provided ideas for integration of health and wellness curriculum best practices. During this session, participants learned food safety practices, cultural sensitivity, and emotional awareness around health and wellness. Participants were provided with a handout of online resources linked to Florida Standards. “Shining a Light on Self-Esteem” was facilitated in the spring to highlight the integration of Whole Child concepts. Teachers were provided with a theoretical basis of how self-esteem affects academic achievement, along with resources to support healthy self-esteem in project students.

## OBJECTIVE ASSESSMENT

### *Products*

- 1. Did 70% of the regularly participating students improve to a satisfactory English/ Language Arts, or maintain and above satisfactory level?*

Reading comprehension was targeted through Project Based Learning (PBL) activities that occurred daily in the program. In addition to PBL activities, students were offered additional assistance during daily homework time and skill building. Quarterly language arts report card grades were provided electronically from project administration. Read2Succeed (Elementary) students with paired grades were analyzed based on the numerical value associated with the 4-point grading scale (A=90-100; B=80-89; C=70-79; D=60-69; F=0-59).

The success criterion added to the quarterly grade measure was a “C or better.” It should be noted that success criterion for many of the objectives involves only the end of year assessment measure. Therefore, achievement related to paired assessments will have a different measurement population than the success criteria population; i.e., a student may not have paired language arts grades, but may have a fourth quarter language arts grade of a “C or better” increasing the number of usable instruments for the success criterion assessment.

*Table 22: Average Language Arts Improvement-Project Quarterly Report Card Grades*

Regularly Participating (30-Day)	Usable Instruments	Meeting Standard of Success at EOY
-------------------------------------	--------------------	---------------------------------------

N	n	n	%
171	170	114	67%

Table 22 demonstrates in language arts, usable instruments for 170 students. The success criterion was ( $n=114$ , 67%) of students maintained or improved to a C or better. - **Approaching benchmark**

**End- of- Year Programmatic Changes and Rationale**

**Proposed Changes:** Continue with current curriculum. Review for fidelity of implementation. Students may benefit from additional sessions in the upcoming year to increase knowledge acquisition.

**Rationale:** The program is short of the targeted success threshold of 65% with 59% of students increasing their scores from baseline.

**End- of- Year Data Collection/ Evaluation Changes and Rationale**

**Proposed Changes:** None  
**Rationale:** Objective meet

2. Did 65% of the regularly participating students attain an achievement level 3 (satisfactory) or above on English language Arts/ Writing?

Table 23: Average Language Arts Improvement-FSA

Regularly Participating (30-Day)	Usable Instruments	Meeting Standard of Success at EOY	
N	n	n	%
171	88	52	59%

Table 23 demonstrates in language arts, usable instruments for 88 students. The success criterion was ( $n=52$ , 59%) of students attain an achievement level 3 (satisfactory) or higher. – **Meaningful progress**



**End- of- Year Programmatic Changes and Rationale**

**Proposed Changes:** Continue with current curriculum. Review for fidelity of implementation. Students may benefit from additional sessions in the upcoming year to increase knowledge acquisition.

**Rationale:** The program is short of the targeted success threshold of 75% with 60% of students increasing their scores from baseline.

**End- of- Year Data Collection/ Evaluation Changes and Rationale**

**Proposed Changes:** None

**Rationale:** Objective meet

- 2. Did 75% of the regularly participating students improve to a satisfactory Math, or maintain and above satisfactory level?

Math skills were targeted through Project Based Learning (PBL) activities that occurred daily in the program based on grade level cohort assignment. In addition to PBL activities, students were offered additional assistance during daily homework time and through teacher led skill building exercises. Quarterly math report card grades were provided electronically from project administration. Read2Succeed students with paired grades were analyzed based on the numerical value associated with the 4-point grading scale (A-F) as previously described. The success criterion added to the quarterly grade measure was a “C or better.”

Table 24 demonstrates in mathematics, usable instruments for 171 students. The success criterion was (n=103, 60%) of students maintained or improved to a C or better. – **Meaningful Progress**

Table 24: Average Math Improvement-Project Quarterly Report Card Grades

Regularly Participating (30-Day)	Usable Instruments	Meeting Standard of Success at EOY	
N	n	n	%

171	171	103	60%
-----	-----	-----	-----

***End- of- Year Programmatic Changes and Rationale***

***Proposed Changes:*** Continue with current curriculum. Review for fidelity of implementation. Students may benefit from additional sessions in the upcoming year to increase knowledge acquisition.

***Rationale:*** The program is short of the targeted success threshold of 75% with 60% of students increasing their scores from baseline.

***End- of- Year Data Collection/ Evaluation Changes and Rationale***

***Proposed Changes:*** None

***Rationale:*** Objective meet

3. Did 70% of the regularly participating students attain an achievement level 3 (satisfactory) or above on mathematics.

Table 25: Average Mathematics Improvement-FSA

Regularly Participating (30-Day)	Usable Instruments	Meeting Standard of Success at EOY	
N	n	n	%
171	88	69	78%

Table 25 demonstrates in mathematics, usable instruments for 88 students. The success criterion was (n=69, 78%) of students attain an achievement level 3 (satisfactory) or higher. – ***Meets or exceeds benchmark***

***End- of- Year Programmatic Changes and Rationale***

**Proposed Changes:** Continue with current curriculum. Review for fidelity of implementation. Students may benefit from additional sessions in the upcoming year to increase knowledge acquisition.

**Rationale:** The program is short of the targeted success threshold of 75% with 60% of students increasing their scores from baseline.

***End- of- Year Data Collection/ Evaluation Changes and Rationale***

*Proposed Changes: None*

*Rationale: Objective meet*

- 3. *Did 60% of the regularly participating students will improve to a satisfactory Science, or maintain and above satisfactory level?*

Science skills were targeted through Project Based Learning (PBL) activities that occurred daily in the program based on grade level cohort assignment. In addition to PBL activities, students were offered additional assistance during daily homework time and through teacher led skill building exercises. Quarterly report card grades were provided electronically from project administration. Read2Succeed students with paired grades were analyzed based on the numerical value associated with the 4-point grading scale (A-F) as previously described. The success criterion added to the quarterly grade measure was a “C or better.”

Table 26 demonstrates in science, usable instruments for 169 students. The success criterion was (n=169, 73%) of students maintained or improved to a C or better. – ***Meets or Exceeds Benchmark***

*Table 26: Average Science Improvement-Project Quarterly Report Card Grades*

Regularly Participating (30-Day)	Usable Instruments	Meeting Standard of Success at EOY	
N	n	n	%

171	169	124	73%
-----	-----	-----	-----

***End- of- Year Programmatic Changes and Rationale***

***Proposed Changes: None***

***Rationale: Objective meet***

***End- of- Year Data Collection/ Evaluation Changes and Rationale***

***Proposed Changes: None***

***Rationale: Objective meet***

3. Did 50% of the regularly participating students attain an achievement level 3 (satisfactory) or above on Science.

Table 27: Average Science Improvement-FSA

Regularly Participating (30-Day)	Usable Instruments	Meeting Standard of Success at EOY	
N	n	n	%
171	24	15	63%

Table 27 demonstrates in science, usable instruments for 24 students. The success criterion was (n=15, 63%) of students attain an achievement level 3 (satisfactory) or higher. – ***Meets or exceeds benchmark***

***End- of- Year Programmatic Changes and Rationale***

***Proposed Changes: None***

***Rationale: Objective meet***

### ***End- of- Year Data Collection/ Evaluation Changes and Rationale***

*Proposed Changes: None*

*Rationale: Objective meet*

4. *Did 75% of the regularly participating students will improve their decision- making skills as measured by perceptual survey (student)*

*Table 178: Average Behavior & Problem- Solving Increase*

Regularly Participating (30-Day)	Usable Instruments	Meeting Standard of Success at EOY	
N	n	n	%
171	158	93	59%

Table 28 demonstrates in behavior & problem solving, usable instruments for 158 students. The success criterion was (n=93, 59%) of students attain an achievement level 3 (satisfactory) or higher. – ***Meaningful Progress***

### ***End- of- Year Programmatic Changes and Rationale***

***Proposed Changes:*** *In the upcoming project year, the program may consider whether curriculum is achieving the proposed results. The program may need to select and implement a new curriculum. Conversely, students may need additional dosage. Additional opportunities to role play should be incorporated to increase likelihood of knowledge acquisition.*

***Rationale:*** *The program is short of the targeted success threshold of 75% with 59% of students increasing their scores from baseline.*

### ***End- of- Year Data Collection/ Evaluation Changes and Rationale***

*Proposed Changes: None*

*Rationale: Objective meet*

5. *Did 75% of the regularly participating students maintain high performance or improve their health knowledge as measured by curriculum- based assessment?*

Project Based Learning was utilized as a vehicle for all enrichment activities. Staff designed PBL that focused on academics, but also the enrichment targeted areas proposed in the application such as nutrition. Baseline and post nutrition assessments were collected via a program created paper assessment that was scored and entered into an electronic database. The success criterion added to nutrition improvement was an “increase of 5%.”

*Table 29: Average Nutrition Knowledge Improvement*

Regularly Participating (30-Day)	Usable Instruments	Meeting Standard of Success at EOY	
N	n	n	%
171	157	104	66%

Table 29 demonstrates in personal enrichment health and nutrition, usable instruments for 157 students. The success criterion was ( $n=104$ , 66%) of students attain an achievement level 3 (satisfactory) or higher. – ***Approaching benchmark***

### ***End- of- Year Programmatic Changes and Rationale***

***Proposed Changes:*** Continue with current "Deal Me In" curriculum. Review for fidelity of implementation. Students may benefit from additional sessions in the upcoming year to increase knowledge acquisition. Conversely, they may also retain nutrition knowledge if incorporated into a PBL plan.

***Rationale:*** The program is short of the targeted success threshold of 75% with 66% of students increasing their scores from baseline. *End- of- Year*

### ***Data Collection/ Evaluation Changes and Rationale***

*Proposed Changes:* No major changes are necessary to nutrition assessment program collection; however, the project should work to collect student baseline and end of year data for all regular participants still enrolled in the program.

*Rationale:* Data completeness may better inform attainment of success criterion. Data for 157 out of 171 students was available for analysis.

6. *Did 75% of the regularly participating students increase their physical activity levels as measured by curriculum- based assessment.*

Students participated in physical fitness activities for a half hour daily based on their scheduled grade level cohort. To measure physical fitness improvement, the project selected the Progressive Aerobic Cardiovascular Endurance Run (PACER) assessment. The PACER is a multistage shuttle run designed to measure aerobic capacity, which is characterized by endurance, performance, and fitness. The objective of the PACER is to run as long as possible while keeping a specified pace. Students run back and forth across a 20-meter space at a pace that gets faster each minute. A point is scored for each 20-meter distance covered. The test is easier in the beginning but progressively gets more difficult. In comparison to distance running, the PACER is a more effective, fun, and easy way to measure aerobic capacity that encourages participation from all youth and is relatively easy to score and administer.

*Table 30: Average Fitness Improvement*

Regularly Participating (30-Day)	Usable Instruments	Meeting Standard of Success at EOY	
N	n	n	%
171	156	81	52%

Table 30 demonstrates in personal enrichment health and nutrition, usable instruments for 156 students. The success criterion was (n=81, 52%) of students attain an achievement level 3 (satisfactory) or higher. – Approaching benchmark

***End- of- Year Programmatic Changes and Rationale***

***Proposed Changes:*** *In the upcoming project year, the program may consider whether curriculum is achieving the proposed results. The program may need to select and implement a new curriculum. Conversely, students may need additional dosage.*

***Rationale:*** *The program is short of the targeted success threshold of 75% with 52% of students increasing their scores from baseline.*

***Data Collection/ Evaluation Changes and Rationale***

***Proposed Changes:*** *Consider utilizing PACER assessment as bi-weekly activity to familiarize students with assessment and collect additional measures.*

***Rationale:*** *Data completeness may better inform attainment of success criterion. Data for 156 out of 171 students was available for analysis.*

- 7. *Did 75% of the adult family members of regular participating students increase their awareness of community resources as measured by perceptual survey (parent)*

*Table 31: Adult Family Member Survey*

Regularly Participating (30-Day)	Usable Instruments	Meeting Standard of Success at EOY	
N	n	n	%
171	141	141	100%



Table 31 demonstrates in personal enrichment health and nutrition, usable instruments for 141 students. The success criterion was (n=141, 100%) of students attain an achievement level 3 (satisfactory) or higher. – Meet or exceeds benchmark

**End- of- Year Programmatic Changes and Rationale**

Proposed Changes: None  
 Rationale: Objective meet

**End- of- Year Data Collection/ Evaluation Changes and Rationale**

Proposed Changes: None  
 Rationale: Objective meet

**Other Findings**

**Adult Family Member Surveys**

Sub-grantees are required by the United States Department of Education (USDE) to communicate, distribute, and collect parent surveys as part of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC project requirements. Parent survey results were provided electronically from site administration via the FLDOE 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC statewide evaluation subcontractor. Question #1 of the survey: *How satisfied are you with this after school program as a whole* was utilized to show parent satisfaction with the overall program. Parent responses to this item were recorded on a 6-point scale from 1=Very Satisfied to 6=Not Applicable. Findings presented in Table 30 indicate 96.6% of responding parents agreed or strongly agreed with satisfaction with the afterschool program as a whole.

Table 3218: Parent Satisfaction-Federal Parent Surveys

Score/Descriptor	Frequency	Percent
1.0 = Very Satisfied	60	81.2
2.0= Satisfied	12	16.2
3.0= Not Sure	1	1.3
4.0= Unsatisfied	-	-
5.0= Very Unsatisfied	1	1.3
6.0= Not applicable	-	-
Total	74	100.0

## ***Teacher Survey***

Regular school day teacher surveys results were provided electronically from site administration via the FLDOE 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC statewide evaluation subcontractor and utilized to measure parent involvement. Question #12 of the survey: *Have the student's parents become more interested and/or involved in their child's schooling* was utilized to demonstrate increased parent involvement. Teacher survey results reviewed indicated (n=157) surveys were completed for regularly participating students. Teacher responses to this item were recorded on an 4-point scale from 1= Decline to 4=Did not

need to improve. Findings presented in Table 33 indicated 23 parents of regularly participating students had no change and 20.7 percent of regularly participating students did not need to change. Therefore, 64.7% or 102 of 157 consistent Likert responses showed improvement. ***-Approaching benchmark***

*Table 3319: Parent Involvement-Federal Teacher Surveys*

Score/Descriptor	Frequency	Percent
1.0 = Decline	-	-
2.0 = No Change	23	14.6
3.0 = Improved	102	64.7
4.0 = Did not Need to Improve	32	20.7
Total	157	100.0

## ***Student Snapshot***

A student with substantial academic gains within the program was selected for interview. Since the program only serves elementary students, interviewees were ranked with students in the higher grade levels selected first. The student selected was a female in the second grade who regularly attended the South Miami Heights site that demonstrated academic progress over the past year. The interview was conducted by telephone and focused on (1) student perception of program components (2) student enjoyment within the program (3) student perception of needed changes within the program (4) lessons learned from the academic instruction and (5) overall impressions of the program. School year 2016-17 objective assessments for the student

interviewee showed progress from the first quarter to the fourth quarter with her quarterly language arts grade increasing from a C/B; quarterly math grade increasing from a D/C; quarterly science grade increasing from a B/A; along with a 50 point increase in her nutrition knowledge assessment and increase of two laps in her PACER physical fitness assessment.

Our selected interviewee had important feedback reflecting how students see the program. When asked what components of the program were most helpful, she stated “homework help and when they explain things to me.” When asked about making changes to the program she added, “I wish the program had better food and we played outside more.” Our interviewee reported that the assistance of teachers “helped me and my friends.” When asked about lessons learned she responded, “that it’s okay to ask for help when you don’t get [understand] something.”

## SUSTAINABILITY

8. *Were partnerships formed to strengthen the sustainability and implementation of the proposed activities?*

Sustainability for purposes of this evaluation is defined as *the continuation of funding and resources for community programs impacting at-risk students in need of afterschool services over time*. Sustainability is a holistic concept – the ability to create lasting improvements in academic achievement and behavior of all targeted students for an extended period of time despite ongoing changes in funding sources, program models, service providers, community demographics and other factors. Table 34 outlines partnerships formed by Read2Succeed. Miami Dade County Public Schools and Miami Dade County donated facility use and the Center for Immigration Advancement provided immigration assistance to parents of participating students.

*Table 3420: Read2Succeed- Partners*

Organization	Organization Type	Contribution Type	Align to Need/Goal
--------------	-------------------	-------------------	--------------------

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Organization Type</b>	<b>Contribution Type</b>	<b>Align to Need/Goal</b>
Miami County Public Schools	SD	Facility Usage	Facility Use for After-School Program Site
CIMA – Center for Immigration Advancement	CBO	Partner will provide adult family member activity at no cost to the program.	Provide immigration and US Citizenship Assistance for program participants family members
Miami Dade County Parks Department (Euerka & Miller Pond Parks)	PRD	Facility Usage	Facility Use for After-School Program Site

## **PARENT, TEACHER, AND STUDENT SURVEYS**

To monitor progress and refine program activities, projects are required by the United States Department of Education (USDE) to communicate, distribute, and collect parent, teacher, and student surveys as part of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC project requirements. Stakeholder feedback is integral to the continuous improvement process and therefore, should be carefully examined for lessons learned or areas in need of improvement or further discussion.

Parent surveys ascertain parent opinions on issues related to staffing; activities; operations; site administration communication; child’s happiness with the program; and behaviors related to the federal reporting criteria. As stakeholders, parents are a key indicator of whether the program is facilitating basic communication of goals and objectives. Their opinions indicate whether key federal reporting criteria are being met such as quality homework completion, student’s ability to get along with others, and students staying out of trouble.

### **PARENT SURVEYS**

Overall, 74 parents completed the parent survey. A majority of respondents were female (85.1%) and a majority identified their ethnicity as Hispanic (79.7%), followed by Black (10.8%), and White (2.7%). A majority of parents (97.4%) were satisfied or very satisfied with the program as a whole.

All of the parents (100%) reported they were satisfied or very satisfied with the overall warmth and friendliness of the staff. Parents reported staff was able to relate to their children (98.6%) and they also related well to parents (100%). Additionally, (95.9%) of parents reported they were satisfied to some degree with the variety of activities offered. In addition, parents (1005%) were also satisfied with the safety of the program environment with four parents unsure.

When asked about participation in family activities, the majority of parents reported yes (89.2%) of that 81.9% felt the activities were beneficial. When questioned if parents felt their child was happy in the program, (98.6%) of respondents reported to be “satisfied” or “very satisfied.” In addition, a majority of parents (95.9%) reported satisfaction with the level of assistance in helping their child complete their homework with 2 parents reporting some level of dissatisfaction.

A majority of parents (98.6%) reported they would enroll their child in the program if it were offered next year. Given the scenario that program services would no longer be available, a majority of respondents indicated their children would be cared for by another relative (14.8%), cared for by a parent (25.6%), cared for by a friend or neighbor (8.1%), home alone (12.2%), other (44%), participating in another afterschool program (8.1%), or cared for by a sibling (5.4%).

Parent open responses surrounded more individualized help, expanded hours, and greater homework completion. A majority of parents expressed gratitude for the program and reported they would not change anything in the program.

## **TEACHER SURVEYS**

Regular school day teacher surveys are a required federal reporting component utilized to ascertain student behavior changes during the regular school day. As such, their opinions indicate the extent of program impact on other areas of the student’s life. Regular school day teachers completed the 12-question survey for 158 regularly participating students.

Teachers indicated that they saw improvement or that students did not need to improve in turning in their homework in on time (93%). They also reported improvement or that students did not need to improve in the quality of homework turned in (93.6%). Teachers reported students

showed significant improvement in paying attention and class participation (89 %); volunteerism in the classroom (78.9%); attending class regularly (91.7%); and positive behavior in class (85.9%). Most importantly; a majority of teachers indicated that students improved or did not need to improve their academic performance (87.3%) as a result of participation in the 21st CCLC program.

## STUDENT SURVEYS

Student surveys consisted of 8 questions that all grade levels responded to with a majority of questions rated on a three point Likert scale: “definitely,” “somewhat,” or “not at all.” Students in all grades completed the survey for a total of 160 responses. Responses to all questions answered on the survey were mostly positive. A majority (81.9%) reported they “definitely” enjoyed the activities in their afterschool program with (16.9%) reporting they somewhat enjoyed the activities. Center level data indicated that students who did not “definitely” enjoy the afterschool program were distributed equally amongst all centers. Table 35 provides results for all student survey responses with similar responses center wide for each question.

*Table 3521: Student Survey Results*

Survey Question	☺	☹	☹
	Definitely	Somewhat	Not at all
	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>
	%	%	%
Do you enjoy the activities in your afterschool program?	131 81.9	27 16.9	2 1.2
Does your afterschool program have adults who care about you?	134 83.8	22 13.8	4 2.4
Do you feel safe at your afterschool program?	135 84.4	19 11.9	6 3.7
Does your afterschool program help you get along well with others?	115 71.9	38 23.8	7 4.3
Does your afterschool program help you understand that following rules is important?	140 87.5	17 10.6	3 1.9
Does your afterschool program help you solve problems in a positive way?	127 79.4	27 16.9	6 3.7
Does your afterschool program help you improve your grades?	132 82.5	25 15.6	3 1.9

Survey Question	☺ Definitely	☹ Somewhat	☹ Not at all
	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>
	%	%	%
Does your afterschool program help you improve your grades?	100 62.5	44 27.5	16 10

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The Read2Succeed (Elementary) program had a shortened operational period with process issues surrounding enrollment of students late in the year and securing contracts, staff, and supplies towards the end of the school year. As such, the recommendations below provide suggestions to consider when beginning the new project year.

1. Out of all the academic objectives, students struggled the most in reading with only 72% of regular participants maintain or increasing their language arts grade to a C or better. It is suggested that program administration increase reading frequency in all activities and when possible provide one on one instruction time to those students identified at-risk during baseline data collection.
2. It is suggested the program increase the frequency of nutrition activities and progress monitor students in the classroom to ascertain knowledge gains. The project may also consider increasing the number of family nights devoted to nutrition education to involve learning at home. Only 53% of students increase their nutrition knowledge over project years.
3. It is suggested the project review current physical education lesson plans to ensure that activities are focused on the measure selected. Activities should include opportunities for students to increase their aerobic capacity.