

**SCHOOL BOARD OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA  
OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT**

**DR. FRANK TILL  
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS**

**Telephone: (954) 765-6271**

**Facsimile: (954) 760-7483**

February 6, 2002

TO: School Board Members

FROM: Katherine Blasik, Ph.D., Assistant Superintendent  
Office of Research and Evaluation

VIA: Frank Till  
Superintendent of Schools

SUBJECT: **THE 21<sup>st</sup> CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS,  
EVALUATION REPORT**

During the 1998-99 school year, the School Board of Broward County (SBBC), Florida, implemented four 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) in geographic areas identified as having the highest rates of poverty, middle school delinquency, teenage pregnancy, infant mortality, drug-related incidences, and low academic achievement. The centers were housed at Charles Drew Family Resource Center, McNicol Middle School, William Dandy Middle School, and Lauderhill Middle School. The goal of the program was to improve students' academic performance, expand students' learning opportunities, and reduce drug use and violence in the communities surrounding the four centers. The attached report details a summative evaluation whereby the impact of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program on student achievement, incidences of disruptive behavior, parental participation, and the implementation and sustainability of the program, were examined.

One objective of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program was that the academic performance of middle school students participating in after-school and weekend academic tutorials, and mentoring programs at the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC would improve by .5 grade levels over the preceding year. Evaluation findings revealed that while there were gains in the mean scores of students at every 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program site, there was no correlation between program exposure and FCAT performance, except in the case of William Dandy Middle School. At William Dandy Middle, there was a small correlation ( $r(120) = .211$ ) between the number of months that students were enrolled in the program and gains in reading assessment. No similar relationship was found to exist between the number of months students were enrolled in the program and gains in mathematics.

Another objective stated that the number of early adolescent and middle school students participating in after-school and weekend programs at 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC sites would increase by 15% over the preceding year. The actual increase in student participation in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program in the third year was 61%.

A third objective of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program stated that the number of acts of delinquency in the community and disciplinary actions in school by early adolescents and middle school students participating in counseling and recreational programs would decrease by 10% over the preceding year. Evaluation findings revealed that the percentage of behavior incidents for the 2000-01 school year increased by 14% over the preceding year.

The Department of Education (DOE) recommended that funding sources be identified to sustain the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program beyond December 31, 2001. To date, funding sources have been found for only two of the centers, Lauderhill Middle School and the Charles Drew Resource Center. Consequently, a recommendation was made for the Director of Vocational, Adult and Community Education to review the components of the program at William Dandy and McNicol Middle Schools to see what services were offered, and in the absence of funding, explore how the successful components might be continued.

Questions concerning the content of this evaluation report should be addressed to **Dr. Katherine Blasik, Assistant Superintendent, Research and Evaluation, at 760-7342, or Dr. Cary Sutton, Director, Research Services, at 765-6761.**

FT/KAB/COS/FMG:bt  
Attachment

cc: Senior Management  
Area Directors  
Drew Family Resource Center  
Ms. Debra Patterson, Principal, McNicol Middle School  
Ms. Merceda Stanley, Principal, William Dandy Middle School  
Mr. Phillip Patton, Principal, Lauderhill Middle School

**THE SCHOOL BOARD OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA  
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT**

**CURRICULUM & INSTRUCTION/STUDENT SUPPORT**

January 23, 2002

TO: Dr. Frank Till  
Superintendent of Schools

FROM: Earlean C. Smiley, Ed. D., Deputy Superintendent  
Curriculum & Instruction / Student Support

SUBJECT: **RESPONSE TO THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING  
CENTERS EVALUATION REPORT**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The Director of Vocational, Adult and Community Education will review the components of the program at William Dandy and McNicol Middle Schools to see what services were offered, and in the absence of funding, explore how the successful components might be continued.

**RESPONSE:**

The following strategies will be implemented no later than April 2002, in order to seek opportunities to continue successful components of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers at William Dandy and McNicol Middle Schools:

1. A meeting will be scheduled with the two middle school principals and their 21<sup>st</sup> Century site coordinators to review and discuss best practices.
2. A budget will be developed and funding sources identified to support the proposed continuation of successful program components.
3. Subsequent to the identification of funds at William Dandy and McNicol Middle Schools, district staff from the Vocational, Adult and Community Education Department will provide technical assistance and support.

ECS/FV/JJM:pm

cc: Senior Management  
Area Directors

Dr. Frank Till  
Superintendent of Schools

**21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS  
EVALUATION REPORT**



Broward County Public Schools

Dr. Robert D. Parks, Chairperson  
Judie S. Budnick, Vice-Chairperson

Carole L. Andrews  
Darla L. Carter  
Paul D. Eichner, Esq  
Beverly A. Gallagher  
Stephanie Arma Kraft, Esq.  
Lois Wexler  
Benjamin J. Williams

Katherine Blasik, Ph.D.  
Assistant Superintendent, Office of Research and Evaluation

Cary O. Sutton, Ed.D.  
Director, Research Services

Prepared by: Dr. Paul Rendulic, Consultant  
Monica Green, Evaluation Administrator, Research Services

February 2002

The School Board of Broward County, Florida prohibits any policy or procedure which results in discrimination on the basis of age, color, disability, gender, national origin, marital status, race, religion or sexual orientation.

THE SCHOOL BOARD OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA  
21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Community Centers  
Evaluation Report

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
II.	INTRODUCTION	1
III.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	1
IV.	PROGRAM DESCRIPTION	3
V.	FINANCIAL IMPACT	5
VI.	PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION	5
VII.	METHODS	6
VIII.	RESULTS	6
IX.	SUMMARY	22
X.	RECOMMENDATION	24
XI.	REFERENCES	24

THE SCHOOL BOARD OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA  
21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Community Centers

Evaluation Report

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

As with many other large urban communities, the inner city areas of Broward County suffer from a high prevalence of poverty, juvenile delinquency, drug use, violence and other behaviors which may limit a productive and rewarding life. During the 1998-99 school year, the School Board of Broward County (SBBC), Florida, implemented the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center (CCLC) program in three inner city areas identified by the Coordinating Council of Broward County as having the highest rates of poverty, middle school delinquency, teenage pregnancy, infant mortality, drug-related incidences, and low academic achievement. To this end, a consortium of four 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC was established to serve the residents of Collier City, Franklin Park, and Carver Ranches. The centers were housed at Charles Drew Family Resource Center, McNicol Middle School, William Dandy Middle School, and Lauderhill Middle School. The goal of the program was to expand the level and range of after-school services provided to middle school students and their parents. In addition, the program was designed to offer students, activities aimed at helping them to reach state and local performance standards in core academic areas.

The evaluation report provides a review of the literature related to the after-school programs and initiatives aimed at improving students' academic performance and behavior. This report also examined how the program was implemented, student academic performance in reading and mathematics, incidences of disruptive behavior, levels of student and parental participation, collaborative efforts with community agencies, and the ability of the program to be sustained beyond the end of the funding period (2000-01).

**EVALUATION QUESTIONS**

1. To what extent was the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program implemented as stipulated by the original plan for each of the four operating sites?
2. How satisfied are the current major stakeholders with the implementation of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program at each of the four operating sites?
3. To what extent did the middle school students who participated in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC learning activities improve on their academic performance when compared with the preceding year?
4. To what extent did the early adolescent and middle school students who participated in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program reduce the number of disciplinary actions in school when compared with the preceding year?
5. To what extent did the number of early adolescent and middle school students participating in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program increase over the preceding year?
6. To what extent did the number of parents participating in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program increase over the preceding year?

7. To what extent did the number of community agencies collaborating in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program increase over the preceding year?
8. What measures will be taken to sustain the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program beyond the period of federal funding?

### **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

During the period 1998-99 through 2000-01, the four 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC sites were allocated DOE funds totaling \$1,211,724. The funds were distributed as follows: William Dandy Middle received \$374,977, Hallandale/McNicol Middle received \$301,052, Charles Drew Family Resource Center was awarded \$297,360, while the smallest allocation (\$238,335) went to Lauderhill Middle. The School Board of Broward County incurred no other costs.

### **METHODS**

Three methods of data collection were employed to conduct this evaluation. They are as follows: semi-structured interviews, document review, and analysis of data provided by the Department of Research Services.

### **RESULTS**

In general, the program was implemented as planned with few exceptions. These exceptions /program modifications were made with the approval of the Department of Education (DOE) and were designed to meet the needs of those served by the program. Site coordinators expressed high levels of satisfaction with the materials, training, and district support.

One objective of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program concerned the academic performance of middle school students participating in after-school and weekend academic tutorials, and mentoring programs at 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC. The objective stated that students would improve their academic performance by .5 grade levels over the preceding year. Because grade equivalent scores were not available the academic performance of the students was instead measured by analyzing students' FCAT-NRT Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) scores.

Using the data that were available, correlations were computed to determine if any relationship existed between the number of months students were enrolled in the program and test score gains from 1998-99 and 2000-01. Gain scores were calculated by subtracting the score earned in 1998-99 from the score earned in 2000-01.

The analysis of the students' achievement data revealed that there were gains in the mean scores of the students at all the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC sites. However, it was found that there was no correlation between program exposure and the gains in both FCAT-NRT reading assessment and mathematics except in the case of William Dandy Middle. At William Dandy Middle, there was a small correlation ( $r(120) = .211$ ) between the number of months that students were enrolled in the program and gains in reading assessment. No similar relationship was found to exist between the number of months students were enrolled in the program and gains in mathematics.

The second objective related to student behavior. More specifically, the objective stated: “The number of acts of delinquency in the community and disciplinary actions in school by early adolescents and middle school students participating in counseling and recreational programs at the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program sites will decrease by 10% over the preceding year.” This objective was not met because the percentage of behavior incidents for 2000-01 increased by 14%.

The third objective focused on students’ participation in the program: “The number of early adolescents and middle school students participating in after-school and weekend programs at the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program sites will increase by 15% over the preceding year.” The findings revealed that the actual increase in student participation in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program in the third year was 61%.

A fourth objective of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program was that the number of parents participating in after-school and weekend programs at the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program sites will increase by 15% over the preceding year. However, adequate documentation of parental participation was not available, hence, this objective could not be measured.

The final objective of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program stated: “The number of community agencies collaborating in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program will increase by one per site.” Two of the sites met the objective while two sites did not. The Charles Drew Resource Center recruited four additional partners and Lauderhill Middle recruited nine new partners. On the other hand, the number of collaborating partners associated with William Dandy Middle remained at six, and McNicol Middle indicated no partnerships.

The Department of Education recommended that funding sources be identified to sustain the program beyond December 31, 2001. To date, funding sources have been found for only two of the centers, Lauderhill Middle and the Charles Drew Resource Center.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The site coordinators of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program were encouraged to find funding sources to sustain the program beyond December 31, 2001. Because funding sources have been found to extend program services for two of the centers, (i.e., Lauderhill Middle and the Charles Drew Resource Center), the Director of Vocational, Adult and Community Education is hereby asked to review the components of the program at McNicol and William Dandy Middle Schools to see what services were offered and in the absence of funding, explore how the successful components of the program might be continued.

# THE SCHOOL BOARD OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA

## The 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers Evaluation Report

### INTRODUCTION

The Broward County School District is ranked as the fifth largest school system in the United States. The school district encompasses a diverse student population from a variety of ethnic, cultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds. As with many other large urban communities, the inner city areas of Broward County evidence a high prevalence of poverty, juvenile delinquency, drug use, violence, and other behaviors which may limit a productive and rewarding life. During the 1998-99 school year, the School Board of Broward County (SBBC), Florida, implemented the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center (CCLC) program in three areas identified by the Coordinating Council of Broward County as having the highest rates of poverty, middle school delinquency, teenage pregnancy, infant mortality, drug-related incidences, and low academic achievement. The consortium of four 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC was established to serve the residents of Collier City, Franklin Park, and Carver Ranches. The centers were housed at Charles Drew Family Resource Center, McNicol Middle School, William Dandy Middle School, and Lauderhill Middle School.

The 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program was a three-year program designed with activities specifically directed at improving academic performance, expanding learning opportunities, and reducing drug use and violence in each of the areas surrounding the four centers. The evaluation report provides a review of the literature related to after-school programs and, more specifically to 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC initiatives aimed at improving students' academic performance and behavior. This report also examined how the program was implemented, the levels of student and parent participation, collaborative efforts with community agencies, and the ability of the program to be sustained beyond the end of the funding period (2000-01). The specific initiatives that were proposed within the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grant application are delineated later in this report under the section "Program Description."

#### *Review of Literature*

Principals, parents, community members, and state and local decision-makers want after-school programs because they provide academic assistance and a safe and secure environment for children. According to the Department of Education (2000), children who regularly attend high-quality after-school programs have better peer relations and emotional adjustment, better grades and conduct in school, more academic and enrichment opportunities, spend less time watching television, and have lower incidences of drug-use, violence, and pregnancy. While the importance of providing such opportunities to children is generally recognized, studies by the General Accounting Office (GAO), the National Institute on Out-of-School Time, and other surveys show a lack of affordable, accessible after-school opportunities for school-age children. Over 15 million children go home to an empty house everyday (Department of Education, 2000). A national review showed one in eight students do not complete high school (McMillen, 1997). Minorities, the poor, and the disabled fare even worse. Over 50 percent of students in 25% of the nation's poor, urban high schools fail to graduate (Braddock & McPartland, 1993). Suspension, expulsion, retention, failure, and alienation all contribute to dropout and low graduation rates.

Garrison (1987) asserts that in our diverse society, having numerous alternatives is essential to the health of our education system. The need for after-school programs reflected the enrollment of a growing population of school-age at-risk youths. Public schools are required to educate all children. Raywid (1981) found that the number of available programs for at-risk students increased to over 10,000 with an estimated three million children enrolled. For example, Chicago recently instituted a policy that bars social promotion, mandating that students pass standardized tests to be promoted. In an effort to avoid retention, they identified students at-risk for retention, and provided them with after-school assistance during the school year, and mandatory summer instruction. According to early research, the consequences of Chicago's policy on retention and after-school programming revealed that most students made impressive standardized test score gains. Also, students with the lowest scores registered the largest measured gains (Thompson & Cunningham, 2000).

Quality after-school programs can provide safe, engaging environments that motivate and inspire learning outside of the regular school day. While there is no one single formula for success in after-school programs, both practitioners and researchers have found that effective programs combine academic, enrichment, cultural, and recreational activities to guide learning and engage children and youths in meaningful activities. They also found that the best programs developed activities to meet the particular needs of the communities they serve (Gold & Mann, 1984).

According to U.S. Department of Education (1998), quality after-school programs should include tutoring and supplementing instruction in basic skills, such as reading, mathematics, and science; drug and violence prevention curricula and counseling; youth leadership activities; volunteer and community service opportunities; college awareness and preparation; homework assistance centers; courses and enrichment in the arts and culture; computer instruction; language instruction, including English as a second language; employment preparation or training; mentoring; activities linked to law enforcement; and supervised recreation and athletic programs and events. The 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program embodies all of these activities in its overall design.

*As described in its web-site, the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program is a key component of national efforts to keep children safe, to provide academic enrichment, and other recreational and enrichment opportunities, such as band, drama, art, and other cultural events for children; and to provide life-long learning opportunities for community members. The focus of this program, authorized under Title X, Part I, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, is to provide expanded learning opportunities for participating children in a safe, drug-free, and supervised environment. The 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center programs, enable schools to stay open longer, providing a safe place for homework centers, intensive mentoring in basic skills, drug and violence prevention counseling, helping middle school students to prepare to take college prep courses in high school, enrichment in the core academic subjects as well as opportunities to participate in recreational activities, chorus, band and the arts, technology education programs and services for children and youth with disabilities (21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center web site, [www.ed.gov/21stcclc/](http://www.ed.gov/21stcclc/)).*

By locating 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC within public schools, students receive educational enrichment and academic assistance directly linked to their classroom needs (Department of Education, 2000).

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The goal of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program was to expand the level and range of services provided to middle school students and their parents. The district envisioned that the extended program activities would contribute to improved academic performance, improved behavior patterns, and the prevention/reduction of drug use and violence for both the participating students and their families.

In general, the services offered at each of the four sites included: extended learning opportunities, day care, recreational and cultural activities, home-work tutorial, and health services. The district envisioned that by the end of the three-year program the delivery of these extended services would lead to the achievement of the following objectives:

- 1) The academic performance of middle school students participating in after-school and weekend academic tutorial, and mentoring programs at 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers will improve by .5 grade levels over the preceding year.
- 2) The number of acts of delinquency in the community and disciplinary actions in school by early adolescent and middle school students participating in counseling and recreational programs at 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers will decrease by 10% over the preceding year.
- 3) The number of early adolescent and middle school students participating in after-school and weekend programs at 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers will increase by 15% over the preceding year.
- 4) The number of parents participating in after-school and weekend programs at the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers will increase by 15% over the preceding year.
- 5) The number of community agencies collaborating in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers will increase by one per site.

The following is a description of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers program:

### *Charles Drew Family Resource Center*

The Charles Drew Family Resource Center served residents from the Collier City Community and all residents of the neighboring communities of Pompano Beach. The 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grant extended services offered at the center by providing childcare services, a teen parent support group, and teen counseling services, tutoring services, and recreational activities. The childcare services provided a safe and structured environment for the children of parents who participated in the center's activities between 3:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. The teen parent support group helped middle school-age parents to deal with economic and personal problems by focusing on communication and stress reduction strategies. The teen parent support group met once per month or on an as needed basis. Finally, the teen counseling services focused on crisis intervention, conflict resolution, sex education, and emotional stress. Tutoring services were available to assist students with their academic needs while various enrichment activities, such as field trips, provided the children with learning opportunities they would otherwise not experience.

### *McNicol Middle School*

Under the original grant proposal, the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program was implemented at Hallandale Adult Community Center. Due to low enrollment, the program was transferred to the McNicol Middle during the second year of the grant period. The 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grant expanded the services offered at McNicol Middle to include an after-school academy that offered FCAT preparation, and homework assistance. The after-school academy was aimed at increasing the reading and mathematics skills of low achieving, sixth, seventh, and eighth grade students, through experiential learning activities delivered by teachers and teacher assistants, four days per week at 1.5 hours per day.

### *William Dandy Middle School*

The William Dandy Middle 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program, served the residents of Franklyn Park community, Lauderdale Manors, Rock Island, Dillard, Larkdale, and Sunland communities. To better serve the needs of the surrounding community, it was proposed that the hours of the health clinic should be extended from 4:00 p.m. until 7:00 p.m. However, the site coordinator was unable to employ a nurse who was willing to work during those hours. Through the employment of additional staff, the after-school learning program was expanded to include FCAT tutoring, homework assistance, and computer-based instruction, Saturday school, and recreational activities. Parents were invited to participate in this computer-based instruction class as a way of involving them in their children's education while improving their own. The Urban League of Broward County provided cultural awareness training three times per week and twice per month on Saturdays to help promote multicultural understanding and communication between parents, students, and teachers. Finally, the school's full-service library (Media Center) remained open to the community until 6:00 p.m. to give students, parents, and area residents' access to reading materials and computer-based instruction.

### *Lauderhill Middle School*

The Lauderhill Middle 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC served students, parents, and area residents of Lauderhill, by offering the following activities: recreational activities conducted on the campus of Lauderhill Middle six days per week, extended health care services on Thursdays and Saturdays, academic enrichment activities, and a FCAT Saturday program. Recreational activities, which included organized sports, table games, aerobics and other activities were intended to promote teamwork, good health and fitness. Health services that were provided included health screenings, immunizations, and health education programs.

### *Collaboration of Partners*

The Collier City Community Development Center, the Urban League of Broward County, and the North Broward Hospital District were partners with the SBBC. Together the partnerships offered a variety of services to the four centers. Additionally, each of the four centers created specific partnerships with organizations such as: Memorial Healthcare Systems, Publix; Department of Children and Families, YMCA, Broward Sheriff's Office (BSO), and Broward County Health Department.

## FINANCIAL IMPACT

During the period 1998-99 through 2000-01, the four 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC sites were allocated DOE funds totaling \$1,211,724. Table 1 shows how the funds were disbursed to the four sites.

Table 1  
*Allocation of Funds to 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers.*

Schools	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	Total Allocation
Charles Drew Family R/C	\$99,722	\$97,916	\$99,722	\$297,360
Hallandale/ McNicol Middle	\$100,962	N/A	N/A	\$100,962
Lauderhill Middle	N/A	\$99,128	\$100,962	\$200,090
William Dandy Middle	\$77,428	\$83,479	\$77,428	\$238,335
Total Allocation	\$125,796	\$123,385	\$125,796	\$374,977
				\$1,211,724

The data in Table 1 show that the highest allocation was awarded to William Dandy Middle (\$374,977), while the smallest allocation went to Lauderhill Middle (\$238,335). The Program was transferred from Hallandale Adult to McNicol Middle during the second year of the program as a result no funds were allocated to Hallandale Adult for that period. The funds were used to underwrite the cost of staff salaries and fringe benefits, materials and supplies, instructional devices, and academic enrichment field trips. The School Board of Broward County incurred no other costs.

## PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION REPORT

The purpose of this evaluation is to determine the impact of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC activities on participating middle school students. More specifically, this evaluation focused on the academic and behavioral changes of participating students. In addition, this evaluation examined the implementation of the program and efforts made to sustain the program beyond the grant's funding period.

In particular, the evaluation was designed to address the following questions:

1. To what extent was the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program implemented as stipulated by the original plan for each of the four operating sites?
2. How satisfied are the current major stakeholders with the implementation of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program at each of the four operating sites?
3. To what extent did the middle school students who participated in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC learning activities improve on their academic performance when compared with the preceding year?
4. To what extent did the early adolescent and middle school students who participated in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program reduce the number of disciplinary actions in school when compared with the preceding year?
5. To what extent did the number of early adolescent and middle school students participating in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program increase over the preceding year?

6. To what extent did the number of parents participating in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program increase over the preceding year?
7. To what extent did the number of community agencies collaborating in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC increase over the preceding year?
8. What measures will be taken to sustain the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program beyond the period of federal funding?

## **METHODS**

The following three methods of data collection were employed to conduct this evaluation:

### *Semi-Structured Interviews*

On-site, semi-structured interviews were conducted with each of the four learning center coordinators. The purpose of these interviews was to collect data that would answer specific questions regarding the strategies that were employed to implement the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program at each of the four centers. The semi-structured interviews consisted of 11 items that were common across each of the four sites. In addition, two questions that were site specific were asked of the center coordinators. The Project Director participated in a telephone interview to collect specific information regarding the teen counseling program delivered at the Charles Drew Resource Center as well as providing specific insights regarding the implementation and outcomes of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program.

### *District Records*

Student demographic information, attendance, suspension, student outcomes, and standardized test information for all middle school students were obtained from the Department of Research Services.

### *Documents*

A variety of documents were reviewed at each of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC sites. These documents ranged from sign-in rosters to flyers announcing special events. These documents were reviewed to validate student and parent attendance, and to delineate the types of activities that were offered at each of the four centers. In addition, each 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC site coordinator prepared a collection of documents for the evaluation report. These documents were examined and pertinent data were used to help prepare this report.

## **RESULTS**

The evaluation results are presented by research question. Many of the research questions are answered by way of a subset of questions:

1. ***To what extent was the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program implemented as stipulated by the original plan for each of the four operating sites?***

A set of four specific questions were asked of each of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center site coordinators. Their responses are summarized in Table 2 on page 7.

Table 2

*Summary of the Four Evaluation Sub-Questions that Supported Evaluation Question 1.*

Sub-questions	Charles Drew	McNicol	William Dandy	Lauderhill
1. What activities/ functions were implemented at the center?	Weekdays 3 – 7 p.m. 1. Teen parent support group. 2. Child care Services. 4. Teen counseling. 5. Tutoring Services 6. Recreational activities.	Weekdays 4:30 – 7:30 p.m. 1. FCAT preparation 2. Homework assistance.	Weekdays 4:15 – 5:30 p.m. Sat. 8 a.m. – noon. 1. FCAT tutoring 2. Homework assistance 3. Computer-based instruction. 4. Recreational activities 5. Expanded media center hours. 6. Saturday school.	Weekdays 3:30 - 5:30 p.m. 1. FCAT Saturday 2. Recreational activities 3. Health Care Services. 4. Academic enrichment activities.
2. How were the activities/ functions implemented?	1. Decisions made by a planning committee, the principal, and assistant principal. 2. Teen counseling program subcontracted.	1. Shared decision-making team: principal, site coordinator, guidance counselor, security specialist, parents, and students met once per month.	1. Shared decision-making team: principal, assistant principal, teachers, and site coordinator.	1. Shared leadership committee of stakeholders.
3. What resources were required to implement the activities/ functions?	1. Support of school administration, staff, partnering organizations, and district offices.	1. Support of school administration, staff, partnering organizations, and district offices.	1. Support of school administration, staff, partnering organizations, and district offices.	1. Support of school administration, staff, partnering organizations, and district offices.
4. What factors were present that served as either barriers/ facilitators to program implementation?	1. Barrier: Competing programs. 2. Facilitator: Adult participation in programs, use of certified teachers, and support of community agencies.	1. Barrier: Slow decision-making. 2. Facilitator: Dedicated school site staff and district office support.	1. Barrier: Insufficient time. 2. Facilitator: Positive support from district program coordinator.	1. Barrier: Under funding. 2. Facilitator: Support of principal, school staff, district program coordinator, parents, and partners.

*i. What activities/functions were implemented at the center?*

*Charles Drew Resource Center*

The site coordinator at the Charles Drew Family Resource 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC stated that the program offered a wide variety of after-school activities for infants, students, and adults, Monday through Friday from 3:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. with some Saturdays for field trips. While many activities were available for students and parents in the surrounding area, the primary activities delivered at the site included: intensive reading and mathematics assistance for middle school students (tutoring service); child care for the children and siblings of those participating in the after-school activities; assistance with homework. The focus of the program was to assist individuals to improve their academic and social skills. According to available documentation, approximately 180 students and adults registered to participate in the 2000-01 program. The 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program district project coordinator stated that the teen counseling component of the program had been sub-contracted to the Collier City Community Agency. The agency provided after-school tutoring to promote enrichment activities while discouraging drug use, conflicts, and various field trips. In addition, the program also focused on teen pregnancy prevention.

*McNicol Middle School*

The site coordinator at McNicol Middle School reported that under the original grant application the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program was implemented at Hallandale Adult Community Center. The program was transferred to McNicol Middle School in March 2000. While the program was at Hallandale Community Adult, the hours of operation were from 2:45 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. Monday through Thursday and on weekends. To better meet the needs of residents in the surrounding community, the weekend component of the program was eliminated and the weekday hours of operation were extended to 4:30 p.m. through 7:30 p.m. The activities of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program were FCAT preparation and homework assistance. The FCAT preparation targeted improving students' reading performance. The reading improvement activities were very structured starting with 30 minutes of sustained reading, followed by work in the computer media learning lab, and then homework assistance. The activities for the remainder of the day included FCAT mathematics preparation, and playing trivia pursuit using science, social studies, and current events as the topics. The teacher to student ratio was about one to eleven, with 30 to 50 students participating daily. Eighty-four students registered for the program: 20 of these students were from the 6<sup>th</sup> grade; 28 from the 7<sup>th</sup> grade; and 36 from the 8<sup>th</sup> grade.

*William Dandy Middle School*

According to the site coordinator at William Dandy Middle, the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program operated Monday through Friday from 4:15 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. In addition, the Saturday school operated from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 pm. The after-school program provided additional academic instruction in mathematics, reading and writing. Teachers collaborated to ensure that after-school instruction was aligned with regular class work and assigned homework. Recreational activities were season based and included: precision marching and drill team, flag football, and track and field. Media Center hours were extended to Monday through Friday from 4:15 pm to 5:30 pm. From September through December the activities of the Saturday school program focused on student behavior modification. In January, however, the focus of the program switched from behavior modification to FCAT preparation.

### *Lauderhill Middle School*

The site coordinator at Lauderhill Middle reported that the center started out offering recreational activities from 3:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. These activities included television production, dance team, a precision marching and drill team (STEP) and various sports. The original grant proposal had the North Broward Hospital District extending its health services to students, parents, and local area residents. However, under the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grant, a school nurse was hired to deliver extended services. In addition, by partnering with agencies such as the Red Cross, Family Outreach, and the Smith Mental Health Community Center, counseling services were offered in the following areas: health, nutrition, teen pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases. Beginning with the 2000-01 school year, FCAT Saturday and other academic enrichment activities were added to the program with over 350 students participating on a regular basis. FCAT Saturday provided all middle school students with assistance in mathematics and reading.

### *ii. How were the activities/functions implemented?*

#### *Charles Drew Resource Center*

The Charles Drew Resource Center drew its participants from two high schools, three middle schools, and eight elementary schools within the Coral Springs Innovation Zone. Participants were made aware of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program activities through a newsletter and flyers that were distributed in churches and stores. The site coordinator stated that a planning committee met with the principal and assistant principal to develop and implement the activities at the Charles Drew Resource Center. The 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program district office project coordinator stated that the contract between the Collier City Community Agency and the School Board of Broward County specified the exact nature of the responsibilities and outcomes of the program operation. In accordance with the contract, bi-weekly visits from district office representatives were made to observe the program in operation and identify opportunities for support. These bi-weekly visits also helped to ensure contractor compliance.

#### *McNicol Middle School*

The site coordinator described the implementation of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center program as a shared decision-making process. The coordinator reported that an advisory committee consisting of the principal, the school guidance counselor, the school security specialist, parents and students met once per month from the beginning of the 2000-01 school year until FCAT preparation started in December 2000. Because the administration of the program was not transferred from Hallandale Adult Community Center, the principal also participated in the decision-making process. The principal of McNicol Middle also participated in the decision-making process. Under this structure, the principal of Hallandale Adult Community Center administered the financial affairs of the program while the principal of McNicol Middle was responsible for the operation of the program.

#### *William Dandy Middle School*

The site coordinator reported that the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program was implemented and functioned as a shared decision-making process. While the principal developed the policy for the program and the assistant principals carried out the policy, it was the teachers who actually implemented it. The site coordinator stated that this structure was effective because the stakeholders of the program had an active voice in the decision-making process.

*Lauderhill Middle School*

The site coordinator stated that, a shared leadership committee, consisting of 14 individuals, met almost daily to develop strategies for the implementation of the program. In addition, the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center site coordinator stated that the shared leadership committee consisted of: the principal, four assistant principals, a curriculum facilitator, a guidance director, writing, reading, and mathematics coaches; a community liaison, a family counselor, and the school nurse. The committee worked together as a team to identify and solve problems.

***iii. What resources were required to implement activities/functions?***

In general, the four 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC site coordinators stated that the continuous support provided by the school administration and staff assisted in the successful implementation of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program. The cooperation of the partnering organizations and the district office was described as helpful to the successful implementation of the program. Of course, without the grant funding, none of the program's successes would be realized.

***iv. What factors were present that served as either barriers and/or facilitators to the implementation of the program activities?***

*Charles Drew Resource Center*

The primary barriers to the implementation of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program were competing programs and activities such as: after-school sports and cheerleading programs at students' home schools. The site coordinator stated that these programs had the students' attention from September through December. The 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC district office project coordinator stated that the use of certified teachers was a significant benefit to the program. Finally, different agencies within the community provided various levels of support, including the donation of a school bus.

*McNicol Middle School*

The site coordinator reported that decisions were not always made in a timely manner. However, the site coordinator reported that, the cooperation and assistance of a dedicated school staff, the continuous support of the principal, and the ongoing commitment of the district coordinator compensated for the slow decision making process.

*William Dandy Middle School*

The site coordinator said that infrequent participation of the students was the biggest barrier against the program's success. The coordinator stated that the more time students spent in the program the better their chances were of making substantial progress in the area of academic improvement and behavior change. On the other hand, the site coordinator expressed appreciation for the level of positive support provided by the district staff.

*Lauderhill Middle School*

The site coordinator stated that one barrier to the successful implementation of programs, such as the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC, was inadequate funding. The site coordinator at Lauderhill Middle stated that the program at Lauderhill Middle was under funded. On the other hand, the site coordinator identified several factors that facilitated the implementation and continuation of the Lauderhill Middle 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program. More specifically, the site coordinator described the support of

district personnel as well as the principal and school staff as outstanding. Parents were credited for their support of the policies regarding student attendance and discipline.

*The District Office*

The 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC district office project coordinator stated that her office had a member of staff whose primary responsibility was to provide support for the site coordinators as well as to ensure compliance with the grant proposal. The project and site coordinators kept the principals apprised of any developments and ensured that the principals were involved in the program management. The district office handled all of the paper work, including requests for modifications of the program. The district office was also responsible for the administration of the budget. In addition, the district office identified funding resources and partnerships for all sites, these included: Walgreens, the Broward Sheriff's Office, Seven-Eleven and McDonalds.

***2. How satisfied are the current major stakeholders with the implementation of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program at each of the four operating sites?***

Each 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC site coordinator responded to a set of six specific questions related to their level of satisfaction with the implementation of the program. They were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with specific elements of the program on a five-point Likert scale ranging from Very Satisfied to Very Dissatisfied. Their responses are summarized in Table 3 on page 12.

Table 3

*Summary of Four Subsidiary Evaluation Questions Supporting Evaluation Question 2.*

Sub-questions	Charles Drew	McNicol	William Dandy	Lauderhill
1. How satisfied are site coordinators with information they received?	Very satisfied. Information was frequent and of high quality. National conference was excellent	Satisfied. Some information too broadly defined.	Very satisfied.	Very satisfied. National conference was excellent.
2. How satisfied are site coordinators with the training they received?	Very satisfied	Did not receive training because the program was transferred during the second year of grant	Very helpful. Previous site coordinator was very helpful in the transition. Used monthly meeting for self-training.	Very satisfied with district and national training.
3. How satisfied are site coordinators with the materials and other resources they received?	Very satisfied, but vendors were slow in delivering materials.	Very satisfied.	Very satisfied.	Very satisfied.
4. How satisfied are site coordinators with the support they received from the district?	Very satisfied with support; praised the guidance and support of district office.	Very satisfied with support; praised the guidance and support of district office.	Very satisfied with support; praised the guidance and support of district office.	Very satisfied with support; praised the guidance and support of district office.
5. How satisfied are site coordinators with the participation of students and parents?	Highest number of parents attended when their children participated in a special program.	Satisfied with student participation only. Lack of a recreational component limited student participation.	Good student and parental participation.	Very satisfied with both student and parental participation. Saturday program attendance exceeded expectations.
6. How satisfied are site coordinators with the outcomes at their site?	Would like to improve the tutorial program. Program is operating at its best based upon available resources.	Satisfied with outcomes.	Program provides many needed resources to what would otherwise be "latch key kids."	Attributed FCAT performance to program. Very satisfied with parental participation.

***i. How satisfied are the site coordinators with the information they received about the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program?***

*Charles Drew Resource Center*

The site coordinator expressed a very high level of satisfaction with the information received from the district regarding the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program. The site coordinator described the information received from the district as "frequent" and of "high quality." In addition, this site coordinator was able to attend a national conference at which she received excellent information.

*McNicol Middle School*

The site coordinator was “satisfied” with information received about the program. This site coordinator reported that she did not attend the national convention. The coordinator stated that some of the information was too broadly defined, hence too much was left for interpretation.

*William Dandy Middle School*

The site coordinator expressed a “high level of satisfaction” with the information received about the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program.

*Lauderhill Middle School*

The site coordinator was very satisfied with the information received about the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC from the district office. In addition, this site coordinator stated that she attended each of the national conferences and returned with information that was very useful to the administration of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program.

***ii. How satisfied are the site coordinators with the training they received to implement the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program at their site?***

*Charles Drew Resource Center*

The site coordinator stated that training received from the district coordinator was excellent. The site coordinator also stated that the training received at the national convention increased her knowledge.

*McNicol Middle School*

This site coordinator did not receive the training that other site coordinators received. The coordinator attributed this to the fact that the program was transferred to McNicol Middle School during the second year of the grant.

*William Dandy Middle School*

The site coordinator indicated that the training received from the district was very helpful. In addition, the previous site coordinator provided the current site coordinator with a substantial amount of training that facilitated a smooth transition. In addition, the site coordinator used the monthly meetings of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center site coordinators as a time for self-training.

*Lauderhill Middle School*

The site coordinator reported that she was very satisfied with the training received at both the national and district levels. The site coordinator stated “even a rookie could set up the program after going to the national training.”

***iii. How satisfied are the site coordinators with the materials and other resources they received to implement the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program at their site?***

All four of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC site coordinators stated that they were very satisfied with the quality and the amount of training materials they had received from the district coordinator. The only negative comment related to the speed with which the vendors responded to the requests for materials.

***iv. How satisfied are the site coordinators with the support they received from district level program coordinators?***

The four 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center site coordinators stated that they were very satisfied with the support they received from the district level program coordinators. They all had a high level of praise for the guidance and support that the district office personnel gave to the program.

***v. How satisfied are the site coordinators with the level of participation by students and parents in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program at their site?***

*Charles Drew Resource Center*

According to documentation maintained by the site coordinator, about 85% of the parents and students who registered for the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program, participated in the activities of the program. The coordinator stated that the highest percentage of parents attended activities when their children were performing. The 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC district office project coordinator reported that the teen counseling component of the program averaged 20 students per week. She also stated that based on the available resources the teen counseling program might have operated at its capacity.

*McNicol Middle School*

The site coordinator expressed “satisfaction” with the level of participation by the students, but “dissatisfaction” with parental participation. The site coordinator indicated that as the grading period approached, the level of student participation increased. The site coordinator also stated that the program did not contain a recreational component. This, she said, limited the appeal of the program to the students; however, the site coordinator pointed out that despite this limitation the participation of the students was exceptional.

*William Dandy Middle School*

The site coordinator stated that the level of student participation was very good. Approximately 450 of the 1,750 students in the school participated in the program. In addition, the site coordinator stated that over 300 parents attended the Alston Professional presentation.

*Lauderhill Middle School*

The site coordinator was very satisfied with the level of participation by both the students and the parents. The site coordinator stated that the number of students who voluntarily attended FCAT Saturday far exceeded the coordinator’s expectations. In addition, the site coordinator stated that a minimum of six parents came out daily to work and supervise the children during the time scheduled for recreational activities.

***vi. How satisfied are the site coordinators with the outcomes of the program participants at their site?***

*Charles Drew Resource Center*

In general, the site coordinator was satisfied with the outcomes of the program, but indicated that she would like to improve the middle school tutorials. Also, the site coordinator noted that the competitive nature of the sports and cheerleading programs at the students’ home school impacted the outcomes of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program.

*McNicol Middle School*

In general, the site coordinator was satisfied with the outcomes of the program. The site coordinator expressed the view that the academic performance of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC students might have influenced the school’s FCAT performance.

*William Dandy Middle School*

The site coordinator stated that the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center program provided many needed resources, including after-school care, to students that would otherwise be “latch key kids.” The site coordinator stated that the parents expressed their confidence and support in this program.

*Lauderhill Middle School*

The number of students who voluntarily attended FCAT Saturday far exceeded the coordinator’s expectations. In addition, the coordinator noted that a minimum of six parents came out daily to work with and supervise the children who participated in recreational activities.

The next two evaluation questions, three and four, focus on students’ academic performance and conduct across for two academic school years. More specifically, question three addresses improvements in the participating students’ academic performance, while question four focuses on students’ behavior while they were in school. To answer question 3, each 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC site coordinator provided the names of the participating students. The district constructed a data file containing two academic years (i.e., 1998-99 and 2000-01) of achievement and one academic year (2000-01) of demographic data. In addition, the data file was populated with related information for middle school students from the district who did not participate in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program. Based on the demographic characteristics of the participating students, a weighted sample of non-participating students was identified for comparison group purposes to answer question 4. Before examining the results pertaining to questions three and four, the demographic characteristics of the participating students are presented below in Tables 4 through 8.

Table 4  
*Participating Students’ Gender by Program Site for 2000-01 School Year.*

Gender	McNicol		Dandy		Lauderhill		Drew		Total	
	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Females	45	53.6	295	57.5	171	47.9	88	65.2	599	55.0
Males	39	46.4	218	42.5	186	52.1	47	34.8	490	45.0
Total	84	100.0	513	100.0	357	100.0	135	100.0	1,089	100.0

According to the records of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program site coordinators, a total of 1,089 middle school students registered for the program during the 2000 - 01 school year. Examination of the data in Table 4 shows that 55.0% of the student population were females, while 45.0% were males. The majority of the female students (n=295) were registered at William Dandy Middle, followed by Lauderhill Middle (n=171), Charles Drew (n=88) and McNicol Middle (n=45). On the other hand, Table 4 shows that the majority of the male participants (n=218) were also enrolled at William Dandy Middle, followed by Lauderhill Middle (n=186), the Charles Drew Resource Center (n=47), and finally McNicol Middle (n=39).

The distribution of the students by ethnicity and program site is displayed in Table 5 on page 16.

Table 5

*Participating Students' Ethnicity by Program Site for 2000-01 School Year.*

Ethnicity	McNicol		Dandy		Lauderhill		Drew		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Asian/Pacific Islander	3	3.6	1	0.2	2	0.6	1	0.7	7	0.6
Black	60	71.4	498	97.1	347	97.2	116	85.9	1,021	93.8
Hispanic	11	13.1	6	1.1	8	2.2	10	7.5	35	3.2
Native American	0	0.0	1	0.2	0	0.0	1	0.7	2	0.2
White	10	11.9	7	1.4	0	0.0	7	5.2	24	2.2
Total	84	100.0	513	100.0	357	100.0	135	100.0	1,089	100.0

As shown in Table 5, the majority of the 1,089 participating students were Black (n=1,021 or 93.8%). The next largest category consisted of Hispanic students (n=35 or 3.2%). Only 24 (2.2%) of the participants were White students. The Asian/Pacific Islander students (n=7) and Native American students (n=2) represented less than one percent of the number of participating students.

Table 6

*Participating Students' Free or Reduced Lunch Status by Program Site for 2000-01 School Year.*

Free/Reduced Lunch Status	McNicol		Dandy		Lauderhill		Drew		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Non FRL	31	36.9	110	21.4	55	15.4	46	34.1	242	22.2
Free/Reduced	53	63.1	403	78.6	302	84.6	89	65.9	847	77.8
Total	84	100.0	513	100.0	357	100.0	135	100.0	1,089	100.0

According to Table 6, the majority of the 1,089 of participating students received free or reduced lunch fees (n=847, or 77.8% of the participants). The highest percentage of participating students on free or reduced lunch was at Lauderhill Middle School (84.6%).

Table 7

*Participating Students' Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Status by Program Site for 2000-01 School Year.*

LEP Status	McNicol		Dandy		Lauderhill		Drew		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Non LEP	83	98.8	488	95.1	344	96.4	122	90.4	1,037	95.2
LEP	1	1.2	25	4.9	13	3.6	13	9.6	52	4.8
Total	84	100.0	513	100.0	357	100.0	135	100.0	1,089	100.0

Table 7 indicates that a small proportion of participating students (4.8%) were categorized as Limited English Proficiency (LEP). The largest percentage of LEP students was at the Charles Drew Resource Center (9.6%).

Table 8

*Participating Students' Exceptionality (ESE) Status by Program Site for 2000-01 School Year.*

ESE Status	McNicol		Dandy		Lauderhill		Drew		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Non ESE	80	95.2	435	84.8	276	77.3	122	90.4	913	83.8
ESE	4	4.8	78	15.2	81	22.7	13	9.6	176	16.2
Total	84	100.0	513	100.0	357	100.0	135	100.0	1,089	100.0

According to Table 8, a total of 176 students (16.2% of the participating students) were identified as having Exceptional Student Education (ESE) status. As reflected in the data,

Lauderhill Middle served the largest number of ESE students (n = 81 or 22.7%). Only four (4.8%) of the participants at McNicol Middle were classified as ESE.

**3. To what extent did the middle school students who participated in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC learning activities improve on their academic performance, as compared with the preceding year?**

Due to limitations in the data, determining when a particular student was enrolled in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program was not possible. Therefore, a comparison of pretest and posttest exposure scores on the FCAT-NRT was not possible. To provide some insight as to whether the program was related to gains achieved on the FCAT-NRT, correlations were computed to determine whether any relationship existed between duration of time in the program and test score gains from 1998-99 and 2000-01. Gains were calculated by subtracting the score earned in 1998-99 from the score earned in 2000-01. Students included in these analyses were non-mobile and continuously enrolled in the school from 1998-99 and 2000-01. Furthermore, students had been enrolled in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program for at least one month, and had scores in both 1998-99 and 2000-01.

Table 9  
*Participating Students' Mean Normal Curve Equivalent Standardized Scores for FCAT-NRT Reading Assessment by Program Site for the Period 1998-99 and 2000-01.*

Middle School	1998-99			2000-01			Gain Score	r
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD		
McNicol	28	32.8	17.0	28	42.6	17.5	9.7	-.249
Dandy	121	36.5	18.5	121	44.8	20.5	8.2	.211*
Lauderhill	52	33.6	15.5	52	42.9	18.4	9.2	-.009

Note. \* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 9 displays the students' performance on FCAT-NRT Reading assessment for 1998-99 and 2000-01. In this analysis, the students' FCAT-NRT scores were converted to Normal Curve Equivalents (NCE). As shown in Table 9, in 1998-99, the students at McNicol Middle had gain scores of 9.7 NCE points, Lauderhill Middle students had gain scores of 9.2 and William Dandy Middle students had gain scores of 8.2.

Table 10  
*Participating Students' Mean Normal Curve Equivalent Standardized Scores for FCAT-NRT Mathematics by Program Site for the Period 1998-99 and 2000-01.*

Middle School	1998-99			2000-01			Gain Score	r
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD		
McNicol	28	34.0	16.9	28	46.9	14.9	12.8	.060
Dandy	117	44.5	24.0	117	52.2	20.1	7.6	.059
Lauderhill	52	41.5	21.9	52	43.7	16.8	2.17	-.030

Table 10 displays the students' performance on FCAT-NRT mathematics for 1998-99 and 2000-01. The data in Table 10 revealed that the students' at McNicol Middle had gains of 12.8 NCE points, students at William Dandy Middle showed test score gains of 7.6 NCE points, while the students at Lauderhill Middle registered gains of 2.17 points.

Of the six correlations computed, only one indicated a significant relationship. At William Dandy, there was a small correlation between the number of months the students were enrolled in the program and the gains in reading ( $r(120) = .211$ ). No similar relationship was found to exist between the number of months students were enrolled in the program and gains in mathematics. Consequently, student-to-student differences in gain scores were not related to amount of time spent in the program.

**4. To what extent did the early adolescent and middle school students who participated in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program activities reduce the number of disciplinary actions in school, as compared with the preceding year?**

The first analysis examined the number of disciplinary actions, measured by “internal” and “external” suspensions, of program students across three academic school years beginning with 1998-99. A second analysis compared the number of disciplinary actions reported during the most recent academic year (2000-01) for 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program students versus the number of incidents reported for the comparison group.

Table 11  
*Three-Year Comparison of Participating Students' Number of Internal and External Suspensions by Program Site.*

Middle School	1998-99			1999-00			2000-01		
	Int.	Ext.	Total	Int.	Ext.	Total	Int.	Ext.	Total
McNicol	4	2	6	12	18	30	25	18	43
Dandy	55	56	111	78	18	96	5	89	94
Lauderhill	<u>42</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>111</u>	<u>120</u>	<u>231</u>	<u>137</u>	<u>133</u>	<u>270</u>
Combined	101	116	217	201	156	357	167	240	407

The total number of disciplinary actions, i.e., internal and external suspensions, reported for the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program students is reported in Table 11 by academic year and by school. In general, the data reflected an increase in the number of behavioral incidents from the baseline period of 1998-99. During the 1998-99 school year the total number of internal and external suspensions was reported as 217, increasing to a total of 407 during 2000-01. Moreover, the increase in incidents is reflected in both categories of “internal” and “external” suspensions.

For the 2000-01 school year the largest number of disruptive behavior incidents involving 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program students was reported at Lauderhill Middle (270 reported incidents). By comparison, these same 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC students incurred a total of 100 suspensions during 1998-99. The site coordinator at Lauderhill Middle stated that the changes in disciplinary policy that was implemented by the principal could have influenced the increase in the number of disruptive behavior incidents. The 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC students at William Dandy Middle showed a slight improvement from their 1998-99 levels. During 1998-99 school year, the students at William Dandy Middle had 111 reported behavior incidents that resulted in either “internal” or “external”

suspensions. These same students had a total of 94 suspensions during the 2000-01 academic year.

Table 12

*Three-Year Comparison of the Proportion of 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Student Suspension to Total School Population by Program Site.*

Middle School	1998-99			1999-00			2000-01		
	<u>21<sup>st</sup></u>	<u>Pop.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>21<sup>st</sup></u>	<u>Pop.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>21<sup>st</sup></u>	<u>Pop.</u>	<u>%</u>
McNicol	6	181	3.3	30	537	5.6	43	1,076	4.0
Dandy	111	270	41.1	96	216	44.4	94	228	41.2
Lauderhill	<u>100</u>	<u>239</u>	<u>46.0</u>	<u>231</u>	<u>419</u>	<u>55.1</u>	<u>270</u>	<u>673</u>	<u>40.1</u>
Combined	217	690	31.4	357	1,172	30.5	407	1,977	20.6

Note. 21<sup>st</sup> = Total number of internal and external suspension for 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC students

Pop. = Total number of internal and external suspension for school site

% = Proportion of 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC suspensions to total school site

Table 12 displays the proportion of suspensions (i.e., total internal and external suspensions) incurred by 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program students in relation to the total number of suspensions reported for all students by school site. The data revealed that, while the number of internal and external suspensions increased steadily from the 1998-99 school year to the 2000-01 school year, the proportion of 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC students incurring suspensions remained constant or decreased. For instance, the proportion of students at William Dandy Middle incurring suspensions remained about the same over the three-year period: 1998-99 (41.1%); 1999-00 (44.4%); and 2000-01 (41.2%). On the other hand, the proportion of students at Lauderhill Middle incurring suspensions decreased from 46.0% in the 1998-99 school year to 40.1% in the 2000-01 school year.

The next analysis under this evaluation question compared the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center students' frequency of "Internal" and "External" suspensions for 2000-01 school year with the suspensions of the weighted sample comparison group.

Table 13

*Chi-Square Analysis on the Program Students' Internal 2000-01 Suspensions Versus a Weighted Comparison Group.*

Group	# Inter. Susp.	% Inter. Susp.	Chi-Square	<i>p</i>
21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC Students	167	53.9%	1.9	<i>ns</i>
Comparison Group	143	46.1%		

As reflected in Table 13, the total number of internal suspensions incurred by the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program students during the 2000-01 school year was 167 (or 53.9%) compared with a total of 143 (or 46.1%) for the weighted sample comparison group. A chi-square analysis was performed on the frequency of internal suspensions using a .05 level of significance. The resulting chi-square value of 1.9 was not statistically significant ( $p < .17$ ). There was no significant difference between the internal suspension rates of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program students and the comparison group.

Table 14

*Chi-Square Analysis on the Program Students' External 2000-01 Suspensions Versus a Weighted Comparison Group.*

Group	# Ext. Susp.	% Ext. Susp.	Chi-square	<i>p</i>
21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC Students	240	58.7%	12.3	.001
Comparison Group	169	41.3%		

A separate analysis comparing the frequency of external suspensions of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program students and a weighted sample comparison group was also conducted. As shown in Table 14, for the 2000-01 school year, external suspensions incurred by 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program students totaled 240 (or 58.7%) compared with a total of 169 (or 41.3%) for the comparison group. A chi-square analysis was performed on the frequency of external suspensions using a .05 level of significance. The resulting chi-square value of 12.3 was found to be statistically significant ( $p < .001$ ). The 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program students had a significantly higher frequency of external suspension rates than the comparison group.

***5. To what extent did the number of early adolescent and middle school students participating in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program increase over the preceding year?***

Documentation developed by each of the four 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC site coordinators and data provided by the district office were used to develop the middle school student participation for 2000-01. As previously stated in the program description section of this report, the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program was transferred from the Hallandale Adult Community Center to McNicol Middle during the second year of the program.

Table 15

*Participating Students by Program Site.*

School Year	Participation by Program Site			
	McNicol	Dandy	Lauderhill	Charles Drew
1999-00	25	339	248	65
2000-01	84	513	357	135

Examination of the data in Table 15 revealed that the highest level of participation for 2000-01 was found at William Dandy Middle School (n=513) followed by Lauderhill Middle School (n=357). As reflected in Table 15, participation in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program for 2000-01 increased substantially over the preceding year. For instance, the number of students participating in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program at the William Dandy Middle increased by 174 students. During the same year, Lauderhill Middle experienced an increase of 109 students. The total number of participants for 1999-2000 and 2000-01 were 677 and 1,089 respectively. The overall growth rate was therefore 61%.

***6. To what extent did the number of parents participating in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program increase over the preceding year?***

Interviews with the site coordinators regarding the extent to which parents participated in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC and review of available documentation did not produce the information necessary to fully answer this evaluation question. Instead, more anecdotal information was provided describing the typical levels of parental participation during the weekly program in contrast to parent turn out for special events. The results of these interviews are summarized as follows:

*Charles Drew Resource Center*

The site coordinator stated that specific documentation on parental participation was not available. The site coordinator further stated that the programs focused on teenage parents and their pre-school aged children. Therefore, in many cases the parents of the students were also program participants. The site coordinator stated that parents came out in large numbers when their children were performing. Specific attendance information was not available.

*McNicol Middle School*

The site coordinator stated that the program had one Open House event for parents. This event was held on October 30, 2000. Specific attendance information was not available.

*William Dandy Middle School*

The program at this site included extended library services for parents. Based on information obtained from members of the staff at the Media Center and the library, the site coordinator stated that the program had good parental participation. The library staff was not aware that specific documentation on the number of parents involved should have been maintained. They plan on maintaining a log in the future.

*Lauderhill Middle School*

According to the site coordinator, about six parents attended the center on a daily basis to participate with their children in health and recreational activities. A series of five workshops (Mega skills Workshop Program) were offered for parents and a total of 18 parents attended. Additional attempts were made to get parents involved through the FCAT preparation activities. Grade level workshops were offered for the parents with the following attendance: 6<sup>th</sup> grade (13 parents); 7<sup>th</sup> grade (27 parents); and 8<sup>th</sup> grade (13 parents).

**7. To what extent did the number of community agencies collaborating in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program increase over the preceding year?**

*Charles Drew Resource Center*

The site coordinator stated that during the 2000-01 school year, a total of seven community agencies were identified as collaboration partners with this site. For the current school year, a total of eleven agencies partnered with the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program at the Charles Drew Resource Center.

*McNicol Middle School*

According to available documentation and the site coordinator, there were no collaborative partnerships between community agencies and the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program at this site. A review of available documentation on the program prior to its transfer to McNicol Middle from the Hallandale Adult Community Center revealed that the same situation existed, i.e., there were no collaborative partnerships with community agencies. Partnerships developed by the district office with the Broward Sheriff's Office (BSO) and Walgreens provided resources to this program.

*William Dandy Middle School*

The site coordinator reported that a total of six community agencies collaborated with the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program at William Dandy Middle School during 2000-01 school year.

*Lauderhill Middle School*

According to available documentation and the site coordinator, 14 community agencies collaborated with the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program at this site for the 2000-01 school year. This level of collaboration with community agencies represented a sizeable increase over the 1999-00 school year when five such partnerships were reported.

**8. *What measures will be taken to sustain the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program beyond the period of federal funding?***

Efforts by the four site coordinators to identify and acquire the funding necessary to sustain the program beyond the grant period are described below:

*Charles Drew Resource Center*

The 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC site coordinator completed a grant-writing workshop and received various materials that she will use to identify and acquire funding to sustain the program at this site beyond 2000-01 school year. The program was subsequently awarded the Governor's Family Literacy Grant in the amount of \$50,000 for the 2001-02 school year. The site coordinator estimated that an additional \$75,000 of funding was required to sustain the program for the 2001-02 school year.

*McNicol Middle School*

The site coordinator stated that efforts have been made to identify additional funding to sustain the program beyond the 2000-01 school year. Without additional funding the program activities will return to pre-21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program levels. The 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC district office project coordinator pointed out that the site coordinator's ability to develop partnerships was impacted by the lateness of the site's entry into the program.

*William Dandy Middle School*

According to the documentation reviewed and information obtained from the site coordinator, no sources of funding had been identified or acquired that could be used to sustain the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program at William Dandy Middle beyond the 2000-01 school year.

*Lauderhill Middle School*

The site coordinator stated that the Young Men Christian Association (YMCA) and the City of Lauderhill would remain as active financial partners with the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC beyond the 2000-01 school year. Their financial support will enable all of the current program activities to be maintained.

*District Office*

According to the district office project coordinator, two of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC sites, Lauderhill Middle and the Charles Drew Resource Center will be sustained beyond 2000-01.

**SUMMARY**

The 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program was designed and implemented to meet the specific needs of the students, parents, and area residents within the communities served by the centers. The design of the program at each site was in response to data collected through focus groups and interviews in the specific community.

While each program implemented unique components, certain activities were found to be common across the program site. Specifically, each of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC implemented activities aimed at improving the students' FCAT reading and mathematics performance. This objective was met in different ways. Some of the centers provided health and nutritional services to participants while others included adult learning activities. In general, the programs were implemented as planned with minor exceptions. These exceptions were made with the approval of the funding agency and were designed to meet the needs of those served by the program. One such deviation was the transfer of the program from the Hallandale Adult Community Center to McNicol Middle.

An important issue to the implementation of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program involved the resources required to implement and maintain activities and functions of the programs. The programs were implemented under the concept of shared leadership or shared decision-making. In each of the four centers, the site coordinators interacted with the principals, assistant principals, and other instruction related professionals to identify opportunities for improvement within the operation of the program at their specific site. In addition, the program coordinator from the district office provided guidance and support to the site coordinators.

When asked about what resources were needed to implement the program, the four 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC site coordinators pointed out that continuous support from the school site administration and staff was essential. They also attributed the successful implementation of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program to the cooperation of the partnering organizations and the support of the district office.

Site coordinators were asked to describe their level of satisfaction with the implementation of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program. They expressed high levels of satisfaction with the availability of materials, training, the level of support they received from the district, and the information they received about the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program. Those site coordinators who attended the national convention received an added benefit that helped them with the implementation of the program. On the other hand, coordinators expressed disappointment with the level of parental participation.

One objective of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program concerned the academic performance of middle school students participating in after-school and weekend academic tutorials, and mentoring programs at 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers. The objective stated that students would improve their academic performance by .5 grade levels over the preceding year. Because grade equivalent scores were not available the academic performance of the students was instead measured by analyzing students' FCAT-NRT Normal Curve Equivalent scores.

Using the data that were available, correlations were computed to determine if any relationship existed between the number of months the students were enrolled in the program and test score gains from 1998-99 and 2000-01. Gain scores were calculated by subtracting the score earned in 1998-99 from the score earned in 2000-01.

The analysis of the students' achievement data revealed that there were gains in the mean scores of the students at all the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC sites. However, it was found that there was no correlation between program exposure and the gains in both FCAT-NRT reading assessment and mathematics except in the case of William Dandy Middle. At William Dandy Middle, there was a small correlation ( $r(120) = .211$ ) between the number of months that students were enrolled in

the program and gains in reading assessment. No similar relationship was found to exist between the number of months students were enrolled in the program and gains in mathematics.

The second objective related to student behavior. More specifically, the objective stated: "The number of acts of delinquency in the community and disciplinary actions in school by early adolescents and middle school students participating in counseling and recreational programs at the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program sites will decrease by 10% over the preceding year." This objective was not met because the percentage of behavior incidents for 2000-01 increased by 14%.

The third objective focused on students' participation in the program: "The number of early adolescents and middle school students participating in after-school and weekend programs at the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program sites will increase by 15% over the preceding year." The findings revealed that the actual increase in student participation in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program in the third year was 61%.

A fourth objective of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program was that the number of parents participating in after-school and weekend programs at the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program sites would increase by 15% over the preceding year. However, adequate documentation of parental participation was not available, as a result this objective could not be measured.

The final objective of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program stated: "The number of community agencies collaborating in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program will increase by one per site." Two of the sites met the objective while two sites did not. The Charles Drew Resource Center recruited four additional partners and Lauderhill Middle recruited nine new partners. On the other hand, the number of collaborating partners associated with the William Dandy Middle remained at six, and McNicol Middle indicated no partnerships.

The Department of Education recommended that funding sources be identified to sustain the program beyond December 31, 2001. To date, funding sources have been found for only two of the centers, Lauderhill Community Middle and the Charles Drew Resource Center.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The site coordinators of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program were encouraged to find funding sources to sustain the program beyond December 31, 2001. Because funding sources have been found to extend program services for two of the centers (i.e., Lauderhill Community Middle and the Charles Drew Resource Center), the Director of Vocational, Adult and Community Education is hereby asked to review the components of the program at McNicol and William Dandy Middle Schools to see what services were offered and in the absence of funding, explore how the successful components of the program might be continued.

### **REFERENCES**

21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center Web Site. Retrieved October 9, 2001. Available: [www.ed.gov/21stcclc](http://www.ed.gov/21stcclc).

Braddock, J., & McPartland, J. (1993). Education of early adolescents. *Review of Research in Education*, 19, 135-170.

Department of Education (June, 1998). *Safe and Smart: Making After-School Hours Work for Kids*. Retrieved October 7, 2001. Available: [www.ed.gov/pubs/SafeandSmart](http://www.ed.gov/pubs/SafeandSmart).

Department of Education (2000). *21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers: Providing quality Afterschool Learning Opportunities for America's Families*. Retrieved October 5, 2001. Available: [www.ed.gov/pubs/Providing\\_Quality\\_After-school\\_Learning](http://www.ed.gov/pubs/Providing_Quality_After-school_Learning).

Garrison, R.W. (1987, Nov). *Alternative School for Disruptive Youth: NSSC Resource Paper*. Malibu CA: National School Safety Center, Pepperdine University, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Gold, M., & Mann, D. (1984). *The Contribution of Alternative School Programs to the Safety of American Schools*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 218551).

McMillen, A. (1997). *Dropout Rates in the United States*. Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

Raywid, M.A. (1981). The First Decade of Public School Alternatives. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 62, 551-554.

Thompson, C.R., & Cunningham, E.K. (2000). *Retention and Social Promotion: Research and Implications for Policy*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 449 241).