

---

**EVALUATION FINDINGS:  
FOCUS ON 2005-2006**

**WORTHINGTON, MN  
21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTER**

**November 13, 2006**

**S. A. Stephens, Ph.D  
Center for Assessment and Policy Development**

---

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **Program Implementation**

- The Worthington 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program design reflects what is known about improving the academic and social behavior of students, including supporting parent involvement.
- The program has attracted a large number of diverse students to its activities. However, the total number of students served has declined over the three years of implementation, from 834 in 2003-04 to 616 in 2005-06.
- Students of all groups participated at very high levels, although the number of days attended varied by the type of program. This includes many Hispanic students, who are often underrepresented in afterschool programs in other communities.
- The program has implemented an innovative Parent Liaison program for language minority and immigrant students and their families and begun offering a series of workshops to encourage and support parent involvement in their children's education.

- Parent liaisons increased the average number of visits made to participating families to over 5 per year in 2005-06.

### **Students Who Consistently Benefited the Most**

- Students who had relatively poor school attendance records were able to substantially increase their attendance.
  - Between 2002-03 and 2003-04, students in the lowest attendance group increased their school attendance, on average, by 9 school days.
  - Between 2003-04 and 2004-05, students in the lowest attendance group increased their school attendance, on average, by 14 school days.
  - Between 2004-05 and 2005-06, students in the lowest attendance group increased their school attendance, on average, by 11 school days.
- Students in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program, overall and by subgroup, generally did not show marked improvement in academic performance as measured by standardized tests.
- Teachers saw modest improvements in student behaviors associated with learning.

### **Students Who Participated in More than One Program Year**

- Students who participated in two or three years of the 21CCLC program did not experience any greater or different benefits from those who participated only in 2005-06.

### **Implications**

The following are actions worth consideration for future years:

- Continue to make a special effort to recruit at-risk students who appear to benefit from participation in the program – in particular, students with relatively poor school attendance – this may require more proactive outreach with many students and their families
- Continue to provide supports and encouragement to the families of vulnerable students, particularly immigrant, non-English speaking and/or low income families – there is strong research evidence that parent involvement in children’s education makes a crucial difference in school engagement and learning

- Recognize that a large proportion of participating students are in the middle school grades (6<sup>th</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup>) and that most middle school students are only receiving academic assistance – this may miss a valuable opportunity to support other areas of youth development
- Ensure that the program can and does meet the special needs and interests of its diverse students – this may require bolstering the academic assistance program and expanding culturally specific activities, as well as providing opportunities for older students to exercise greater independence and leadership
- Continue the Parent Liaison program and target its services particularly to students with poor school attendance
- Encourage parents of middle school students to participate in PIQE and ensure that the information and suggestions offered are appropriate for that age group and for immigrant families

## CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND<sup>1</sup>

A number of factors have led to the recent increase in afterschool programs – increased maternal employment, concerns about the safety of unsupervised children, public safety concerns, and interest in improving students' academic performance. Afterschool programs are now offered by almost half of all public schools. The 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center (21<sup>st</sup> CCLC) program of the federal government is intended to build on and expand the network of locally and privately funded afterschool programs

### History

The 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers were initiated in 1994 during the Clinton administration and reauthorized under the “No Child Left Behind Act.” The program has grown to provide almost \$1 billion to 2,250 school districts and 7,000 public schools.

Worthington, MN, received a 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grant from the State of Minnesota in early 2003 and began implementation that spring, building on existing programs. Its experiences during the spring of the 2002-03 school year led ISD 518 to modify its programs. In the fall of 2003-04, the Worthington 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program implemented the following primary components:

- Soccer programs, particularly for high school and middle school students but including upper elementary students as well
- QUEST, a set of enrichment activities offered at various community sites, including the school buildings
- ASAP, a program that combined homework help and tutoring with enrichment activities for students identified and referred by teachers as doing poorly in school
- Parent Liaison program, which provided home visits and group activities by bilingual staff for Hispanic and Southeast Asian families, many of whom were recent immigrants to the United States

These components were continued in the 2004-05 school year. In 2005-06, in addition to continuing these components, the Worthington 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program introduced PIQE (Parent Institute for Quality Education), a series of workshops for parents to give them information and strategies for becoming more involved with their child's school and education.

---

<sup>1</sup> Based on review of the field by Mathematica Policy Research (*When Schools Stay Open Late: The National Evaluation of 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers Program: New Findings*, M. Dynarski et al., US Department of Education, October 2004).

The Worthington 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program has been successful in recruiting students for all of its programs, exceeding its targets substantially. Although there were some initial delays and gaps in staffing, the Parent Liaison program is now fully operational and the PIQE program was continued and expanded in the 2006-07 school year.

### **Best Practices in Afterschool Programs**

There are two sources for understanding what makes an effective afterschool program. One is evaluation reports and the other is field experience. A valuable source for information on evaluation findings is the Harvard Family Research Project's Out-of-School Time Learning and Development Project and OST Evaluation Database ([www.gse.harvard.edu/hfrp/projects/afterschool](http://www.gse.harvard.edu/hfrp/projects/afterschool)). The Promising Practices in After-School Programs lists on its web site ([www.afterschool.org](http://www.afterschool.org)) promising practices from the field.

Both research and experience suggest a number of factors associated with effective programs – programs that attract and retain students and are associated with positive outcomes for those students. The Worthington 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program includes many of these factors in its design:

- Provides transportation to eliminate that barrier to participation, which is particularly important in a rural setting
- Offers a menu of enrichment program choices that rotates several times during the year
- Makes use of existing community resources and youth programs to strengthen and expand their scope and extend 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC resources
- Targets at-risk students identified through teacher referral
- Mixes at-risk with other students in enrichment activities to encourage positive relationships and reinforce positive norms
- Provides sustained academic assistance for those who need it
- Links academic assistance with regular school program by use of teachers as after school staff
- Supports program participation as well as school attendance by offering family support services to language minority and immigrant families

- Is culturally responsive and offers enrichment activities that reinforce students' cultural background (music, dance, crafts and language)
- Is available throughout the school year, but not everyday – allowing students and their families the flexibility of taking part in other activities and handling other responsibilities

The only major factors for positive youth development that the Worthington 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC does currently include are community service and youth participation in program design. These will be increasingly important to build into the program if it continues to recruit and serve many middle school students.<sup>2</sup>

### **Evidence of Afterschool Effectiveness**

There have been numerous studies of afterschool programs similar to the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC concept. There is some evidence that these programs can reduce negative behaviors, increase pro-social behaviors, ensure student safety and increase academic achievement. However, other studies have found no effects on these outcomes. The question of whether afterschool programs are effective in improving school performance and other positive school-related behaviors such as attendance is especially critical as it is now part of the national educational accountability system set up by NCLB.

In April 2005 the U. S. Department of Education released the final report of an evaluation of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program conducted by Mathematica Policy Research.<sup>3</sup> This large study of approximately 5,300 students in 79 schools in over 30 school districts looked at several important outcomes, including:

- School attendance
- Homework completion
- Grades
- Test scores

---

<sup>2</sup> Two recent reports highlight strategies for afterschool programs that have been particularly successful with middle and high school students: *Negotiating Among Opportunity and Constraint: The Participation of Young People in Out-of-School-Time Activities*, R. Chaskin and S. Baker, Chapin Hall Center for Children, 2006; and *Helping Youth Succeed Through Out-of-School Time Programs*, American Youth Policy Forum, January 2006.

<sup>3</sup> *When Schools Stay Open Late: The National Evaluation of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers Program: Final Report*, S. James-Burdumy et al., April 2005.

- Positive social behaviors
- Parent involvement

Overall, this study found few differences between students who participated in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program at their school and those who did not. The programs did not increase homework completion, grades, or test scores for either elementary or middle school students. There were mixed effects on developmental outcomes and social behaviors.

Similar findings were noted by the RAND Corporation in its research review of afterschool program evaluations, “Making Out-of-School-Time Matter,” published in 2005. This brief notes that “[a]nalysis of the most rigorous evaluations suggests that these programs have had, at best, modest positive effects on academic achievement, academic attainment, and reducing risky behaviors...” (page 2).

### **Expectations for the Worthington 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC**

The results from these evaluations suggest that expecting the Worthington 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC to make a huge difference in participating students’ behavior and performance probably is not realistic. At the same time, the Worthington 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC has certain characteristics that suggest it might be more effective than the national average. These include:

- Targeting of students at academic risk
- Special efforts to engage language minority and immigrant students including offering culturally specific programming
- Outreach and support to families of language minority and immigrant student participants
- Involvement of regular classroom teachers in the academic portion of the afterschool program

Unfortunately, the evaluation of the Worthington program does not have the benefit of a control or comparison group with which to compare results from participating students. Instead, the evaluation relies on individual student change in attendance and test scores and on teacher reports to measure whether the program made a difference. At a minimum, participation is hoped to be associated with better school attendance, school-related and other behavior, and academic performance.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> It is possible to observe no change in these measures for participating students even for an effective program, if an overall downward trend for all students suggests that, in the absence of the program, the outcomes for participating students also would have declined. However, there is no reason to believe that students in the Worthington schools are experiencing declines in these school outcomes. .

Given the requirements of NCLB, there is a special interest in determining whether students in some of the subgroups are benefiting from the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program. These include:

- Students whose family income makes them eligible for free or reduced price school lunches
- Students who are English Language Learners (formerly known as Limited English Proficiency)
- Students from minority and immigrant groups (predominantly Hispanic and Southeast Asian, but African and African-American as well)

Therefore, this evaluation examines student behaviors for these and other subgroups.

Also, the Worthington 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program has two major components – one that combines academic assistance with enrichment for students identified as at academic risk, and another that enrolls other students in the enrichment activities only. The expectation is that the students in the combined program (ASAP), because they receive additional services and because they are considered at risk of poor school performance without additional support, would be more likely to show benefits of participation. Therefore, separate analyses were conducted for students in the ASAP component, as well as for all participating students.

### **Organization of This Report**

The remainder of this report is organized into seven chapters. Chapter Two describes the students participating in the Worthington 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program in terms of their demographic and background characteristics and their previous school experiences. Chapter Three provides information on the patterns of participation of students. Chapter Four reports on the analysis of school attendance, and Chapter Five on the analysis of test scores. Chapter Six is focused on teacher reports of behavior changes. The final chapter draws some implications from the results and suggests some potential modifications to the program design.



## CHAPTER TWO: PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

The 2005-06 Worthington 21CCLC program had six components – a soccer program, an enrichment program (QUEST), an academic assistance program (ASAP) in which some students also participated in enrichment activities, a Parent Liaison program for families of Asian and Hispanic students, a parent education/involvement program called PIQE (Parent Institute for Quality Education), and a summer school program during the summer of 2005.

### Numbers of Participants

In 2005-06, enrollment in these programs were:

- Soccer only: 86 students
- QUEST only: 225 students
- ASAP only: 128 students
- In both ASAP and QUEST: 177 students
- In the Parent Liaison program: families of 207 students
- In the PIQE program: families of 112 students
- In summer school: 109 students

Attachment A shows the numbers of students in 2005-06 as well as in the previous years – 2003-04 and 2004-05. Total students in soccer, QUEST and ASAP across all the programs declined over this period – from 834 in 2003-04 to 764 in 2004-05 to 616 in 2005-06. Of these 616 students, 221 were new to the program in 2005-06, 177 had also been enrolled in one previous year, and 218 had participated in all three years. Compared to soccer and QUEST participants, a large proportion (43 percent) of ASAP participants had been in the program all three years and only 26 percent joined the program for the first time in 2005-06.<sup>5</sup>

This chapter describes some of the background characteristics and school experiences of these program participants. Information on these characteristics is presented in Table 1. Where there are substantial differences between the characteristics of participants in 2005-06 from those in 2003-04 and 2004-05, they will be noted; otherwise, the patterns noted here apply to participants in all three years.

---

<sup>5</sup> For soccer only participants, 23 percent had been involved in all three years and 57 percent joined in 2005-06; for QUEST only participants, the comparable figures are 29 percent and 41 percent.

## **School Level**

The ASAP participants predominantly (78 percent in 2005-06) came from the upper elementary and middle school grades. This had been true in previous years as well.

The QUEST program drew almost exclusively from the primary and upper elementary grades. In previous years, QUEST participants were predominately, but not exclusively elementary school students, accounting for between 76 and 86 percent of QUEST participants.

In 2005-06 the soccer program was only for elementary students, a major difference from previous years. The soccer program participants were fairly evenly distributed across the school levels in 2003-2004. In 2004-2005 almost all participants in the soccer program were high school students.

Because the Parent Liaison program has focused on ASAP participants, the majority in this program (over 70 percent) were also in the upper elementary and middle school grades. On the other hand, the PIQE parent education/involvement program drew mostly parents of elementary school students (87 percent).

Summer school students were more evenly divided among the grade groups, although most (44 percent) were in the primary grades.

## **Family Income Level**

As in the previous years, the majority (close to two-thirds) of ASAP and Parent Liaison program students came from families meeting the income eligibility for free school lunches, compared to about one-third of soccer and QUEST participants. The QUEST and soccer programs had about half of their participants eligible for either free or reduced price lunches, while more than 75 percent of ASAP participants met that income eligibility criteria.

The PIQE program and summer school participants also were more likely to come from lower income families. Only one-quarter of the families of these participants did not meet the income eligibility criteria.

## **Racial or Ethnic Group<sup>6</sup>**

The largest group in almost all the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs (soccer, ASAP, Parent Liaison, PIQE, and summer school) were Hispanic students. This is contrary to the pattern in

---

<sup>6</sup> Because of the very small number of African-American and Native American students in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program, results for these groups are not discussed in this report.

many communities where Hispanic youth are underrepresented in afterschool programs.<sup>7</sup> White students were the largest group in the QUEST program. Asian students and their families were more likely to participate in soccer, ASAP and Parent Liaison programs than in QUEST, PIQE or summer school.

### **English Proficiency**

Paralleling the racial/ethnic distribution across the programs, more program participants in ASAP, Parent Liaison and PIQE programs were limited in English proficiency (around one-quarter) than in soccer or QUEST program, where the vast majority (over 90 percent) were English proficient.

### **Special Education**

About one-quarter of ASAP students, one-third of those in summer school, and one-fifth of those in the Parent Liaison program were identified as special education students, while few of the soccer, QUEST or PIQE participants were.

### **Prior Year School Attendance**

One important characteristic of students considered in this report is their school attendance rate in the previous school year – that is, in 2004-05 for participants in the 2005-06 program.

While overall rates of school attendance are very high in Worthington (in the mid-90s), participating students were divided into four attendance groups – from lowest (percent of school days attended in 2004-05 below 91 percent) to highest (98 percent or higher). The middle two groups had attendance rates of 91 to 94 percent (Group 2) and 95 to 97 (Group 3). The lowest group missed 18 or more days of school – more than 3 weeks – significantly reducing their educational opportunities. The next lowest group missed at least 10 days – two weeks – of school.

The majority of participants in all the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs were in the upper two school attendance groups and less than 10 percent were in the lowest group. Participants in the ASAP and Parent Liaison program components were somewhat more likely to be in the lowest school attendance group and more than one-quarter were in the two lowest groups combined.

### **Prior School Year Standardized Test Scores**

---

<sup>7</sup> *What Are Kids Getting Into These Days? Demographic Differences in Youth Out-of-School Time Participation*, C. Wimer et al., Harvard Family Research Project, March 2006.

Students in grades 3 through 7 are administered a standardized test (the Minnesota MAP test), usually twice a year in the fall and the spring (spring scores are used in this report). Students are grouped into one of five “levels” indicating their mastery of grade-level basic skills in reading and mathematics. Scores categorized as level one (percentile score below 33) or level two (percentile score between 33 and 49) are considered to represent skill levels below proficiency.

The majority (two-thirds at the end of the 2004-05 school year in reading and just over half in mathematics) of ASAP students were classified as having level one skills in reading and mathematics and close to another one-quarter in level two.

Students receiving Parent Liaison services also demonstrated low proficiency in reading and mathematics in the previous school year. Only between one-fifth and one-third of these students had scores in the proficient range. The PIQE program drew somewhat more families of students scoring well on these tests, but still the majority (from just over half to two-thirds) of students from PIQE families fell in the lowest two levels.

Most summer school students did poorly in reading (almost three-quarters) and more than half did poorly in mathematics

### **Years in 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC**

A large proportion (over 40 percent) of ASAP and Parent Liaison students had participated in all three years of Worthington’s 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC. Just over half of summer school students and over one-third of the students in PIQE families also participated every year. Many soccer (57 percent) and QUEST (41 percent) students were involved for the first time in 2005-06.

### **Summary**

The ASAP, summer school, and Parent Liaison components of the Worthington 21CCLC program enrolled substantial numbers of students who might be considered at risk of academic failure – with poor school attendance and low test scores – and whose families faced economic and cultural stresses. These components also served substantial numbers of middle school students.

In previous years the Parent Liaison program, compared to ASAP participants, had enrolled more students who came from low income families and who had some difficulty with the English language. This was not true in 2005-06, when the proportions were very similar between the ASAP and Parent Liaison programs. This may have resulted from increased targeting of Parent Liaison services to ASAP participants.

Given the nature of the Parent Liaison program and its staff, more students from Hispanic and Asian families were in that program than in ASAP as a whole.<sup>8</sup> Similarly, since recruitment for the 2005-06 PIQE program focused on Hispanic families, almost two-thirds of the students associated with that program were identified as Hispanic.

On the other hand, the QUEST program had more participants who were in elementary school and were white and English proficient. These program participants were less likely to have family incomes low enough to be eligible for free or reduced price lunches. They were also less likely to be in the lowest school attendance group.

The PIQE program, newly introduced in the spring of 2006, was targeted initially to Hispanic families, although more than one-quarter of its participants had students identified as “white” in school records. Compared to the ASAP and Parent Liaison program, this parent education/involvement component was more likely to draw in families of students who were regular school attenders and did satisfactorily on standardized achievement tests.

These patterns suggest that Worthington experiences the same association between family income and minority status and school success as in other American communities. They also suggest that having the QUEST only program brings in students from different backgrounds with whom the ASAP and Parent Liaison participants can interact. Further, the Parent Liaison program seems to be reaching families who are likely to need additional support in helping their children become successful in school. As is often the case when a new program begins, the PIQE parent education/involvement component began with families who are more likely already somewhat engaged with their child’s education, given good attendance and test performance indicators. As the program matures, it may be able to reach parents of more struggling students as well.

---

<sup>8</sup> Note that 16 percent of the families served in the Parent Liaison program had students identified as “white” in school records. It is unclear whether there are errors in school records, families self-identify as “white” or Parent Liaisons serve non-Hispanic, non-Asian families.

## CHAPTER THREE: PROGRAM ATTENDANCE

In order to benefit from the Worthington 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program, students must attend. There are several indicators of program participation – intensity (measured by frequency of attendance and/or amount of time in attendance), duration (number of weeks, months, or years a student has been attending), and breadth (the range of activities in which the student participates). This report presents findings on all three for the 2005-06 program.

In general, the assumption is that the more often students attend, the more they will benefit.<sup>9</sup> Four measures of program attendance are examined in this chapter – number of program days attended, percent of program days attended, whether the criteria to be considered a program completer were met and number of years in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program. In addition, the number of visits received by families in the Parent Liaison program is also examined.

The chapter reports overall attendance rates and looks at differences in attendance across several subgroups, as shown in Table 2. Again, unless specifically noted, the patterns observed in 2005-06 also applied in 2003-04 and 2004-05.

### All Groups

Overall, most 2005-06 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC participants attended just under 40 days of activities and about half were considered program completers. Since the percent of program days attended is based on the number of days actually enrolled, not the number of days offered, there is a large difference between percent of enrolled days attended (97 percent) and the completion rate (53 percent). On average, 2005-06 participants had also participated in one other program year.

In 2005-06 families in the Parent Liaison program received, on average, more than 5 visits during the year. This is considerably more than in the previous two years, where the average was approximately 3 visits.

### Program Type

ASAP participants were somewhat more likely to have participated in a prior year's program, and therefore be enrolled as soon as the 2005-06 program began. The ASAP program also met more frequently than did QUEST or soccer. Therefore, ASAP participants attended many more program days and had a much higher program

---

<sup>9</sup> This is called a linear model of the relationship between participation/attendance and benefits. There are other possible models for this relationship, including a threshold model and a curvilinear model. See "Understanding and Measuring Attendance in Out-of-School Time Programs" available on the Harvard Family Research Project web site [www.gse.harvard.edu/hfrp](http://www.gse.harvard.edu/hfrp).

completion rate than did students in either of the other two activities. There were no differences in average number of Parent Liaison contacts, however.

### **Parent Liaison and PIQE Programs**

Students whose families were receiving services from the Parent Liaisons attended 14 more days of afterschool activities in 2005-06. This was very similar to the experience in the 2003-04 program, although in 2004-2005 participants in the Parent Liaison program attended only 4 more days on average than those who were not.

PIQE families received many more (about 70 percent more) Parent Liaison visits than those not participating in PIQE.

### **Summer School Program**

Many summer school students had been enrolled in 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs during the 2004-05 school year. Consequently, they were also more likely to enroll early in the 2005-06 program and attend more program days on average than students who had not participated in summer school. Their families also received about one more visit from a Parent Liaison.

### **School Level**

Elementary school participants attended fewer program days and were less likely to be program completers in 2005-06 than older students. However, middle school students attended more days overall, due partly to the fact that they had been previous participants as well as their greater involvement in ASAP, which offered more program days.

There were no substantial differences in the number of parent liaison visits received by the families of students at the different grade levels.

### **Family Income Level**

Program attendance differed moderately among students with different family income levels as measured by eligibility for school lunch subsidy. Students eligible for free school lunches attended about 10 more days than those eligible for reduced price lunches and about 16 more days than students not eligible for subsidy.

### **Racial or Ethnic Group**

In 2005-06, white students (and the small number of African-American and Native American students) attended 10 to 20 fewer program days than did Hispanic or Asian students. This reflects the differential participation of the latter groups of students in the ASAP program, which offered more program days.

In earlier years, as a result of some staffing delays and turnover, Asian families had received 1.5 to 2 more Parent Liaison visits on average than did Hispanic families. In 2005-06, the average number of visits was about equal between the two groups.<sup>10</sup>

### **English Proficiency**

Students who were not native English speakers participated in the 21CCLC program more frequently (by about 17 days) than students who were not limited in their English proficiency. Being English proficient was associated with slightly fewer Parent Liaison visits.

### **Special Education**

Special education students had the same pattern of program attendance as did students with limited English proficiency.

### **Prior Year School Attendance**

In 2005-06, there were no differences among students in number of program days attended or program completion rates based on their school attendance in the 2004-05 school year. This is in contrast to previous program years, in which students in the lowest school attendance group attended somewhat fewer program days than students in the higher attendance groups, although their completion rates did not differ.

In the past, students with the poorest school attendance had received the fewest number of Parent Liaison visits. In 2005-06, the families of these students received the most visits on average (6.2), although the best school attenders did not receive many fewer (5.7 on average). It was the middle groups, particularly the next to lowest school attenders (who missed between 10 and 17 days of school), that received substantially fewer Parent Liaison visits.

Note that the students who had the best school attendance records in 2004-05 had participated in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program the longest (almost 2.5 years on average).

### **Prior School Year Standardized Test Scores**

---

<sup>10</sup> There were 32 families in the Parent Liaison program whose students were identified as “white” based on school records and 3 identified as African-American.



Students with satisfactory standardized test scores in 2004-05 participated in the 2005-06 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program less often than students who did poorly. This is primarily due to the fact that more of the latter were in ASAP, which had more program days.

Note that the average number of years in the program was about 2.5 in all categories of test results. This is associated with the fact that standardized tests are not given until grade 3 and the younger students had had less opportunity to participate in more than one year of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program.

### **Number of Years in the Program**

Students who had been in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program in prior years attended more days of the 2005-06 program. This is likely associated with the opportunity these students had to enroll in the program at the beginning of the 2005-06 year. Also, more returning students were in the ASAP program, which offered more program days.

### **Summary**

The ASAP program was successful in achieving high levels of student participation as measured by percent of program days attended and program completion status. Receiving Parent Liaison services appears to have contributed to program participation. Given that the PIQE program is a new component, it is not surprising that participation in this program was not associated with higher program participation.

In contrast to previous year's findings and the experience of other afterschool programs, in 2005-06 middle school students participated at relatively high levels. Also, unlike the previous year's findings, Hispanic and Asian students, student from lower income families, and students with limited English proficiency attended the program more often than other students. This suggests that the program may be becoming more effective in recruiting and retaining participants who are likely to benefit the most.

In 2005-06, attention was paid to making sure the Parent Liaisons were in touch with the families of students with poor attendance records. This is a marked contrast with the previous finding that students in the Parent Liaison program who were poor school attenders received only about half the number of visits as did students with better attendance. At the same time, families of good attenders also received a large number of visits on average, while those in the middle attendance groups received many fewer. Some additional attention to the allocation of Parent Liaison resources might be valuable.

## **CHAPTER FOUR: SCHOOL ATTENDANCE**

Just as it is assumed that afterschool program benefits depend on student attendance, so it is that school attendance is considered a prerequisite for doing well in school. This chapter looks at patterns of school attendance, which is defined as the percent of days attended of total days enrolled for each individual student. The results for all students participating in 2005-06 are shown in Table 3 and for ASAP students only in Table 3a. Unless stated otherwise, the findings for all 2005-06 students are the same as for ASAP students and similar to those from previous years.

### **Total**

School attendance rates for Worthington's 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC student participants were high, averaging 95 percent in 2004-05 and 96 percent in 2005-06. There was virtually no change overall in school attendance patterns.

### **Program Type**

Students in each of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs – soccer, QUEST, ASAP, Parent Liaison, PIQE and summer school – had very similar rates of school attendance, and there was no discernible change in school attendance between the prior and the program years.

### **Program Completion Status**

Program completers and non-completers had virtually the same school attendance rates in both 2004-05 and 2005-06 and therefore, no change in school attendance rate.

### **Number of Years in Program**

Overall, there were very few differences in school attendance rates among students who had participated in one, two or three years of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program.

Analysis of just those students who were in the lowest school attendance group in 2004-05 indicates that 60 percent moved up at least one attendance level in 2005-06. This rate was the same regardless of the number of years the student had been in the program.

### **School Level**

The 2005-06 program did not include high school students. In the past, high school students had been the only grade group with substantially lower school attendance compared with elementary and middle school students. However, even then, the change in school attendance for high school students was equivalent to only 2 school days.

## **Family Income Level**

There were no differences in school attendance rates or change in these rates between 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 by family income level.

## **Racial or Ethnic Group**

Among 2005-06 program participants, all racial/ethnic groups generally had similar attendance in 2004-2005, unlike in previous years when Hispanic students had somewhat lower school attendance rates than Southeast Asian or white students. While none of the groups experienced much change in school attendance rates across school years, the average Hispanic school attendance rate in 2005-06 remained 2 percentage points lower than the other groups.

## **English Proficiency**

Overall, whether or not students are English language learners is not associated with their average school attendance nor with change in attendance rates between years.

While the 2003-2004 results suggested that students with limited English proficiency who received parent liaison services experienced a small (3 to 4 day) increase in school attendance, this finding was not replicated in either 2004-2005 nor in 2005-06.

## **Special Education**

Students were in the special education program did not have any different school attendance patterns than those not receiving those services.

## **Prior Year School Attendance**

The largest change in school attendance rates was observed for those students who had been relatively poor attenders in the previous school year. While these students still had attendance rates that were about 5 percentage points lower than highest attenders, they narrowed the difference considerably – by 10 percentage points. On average, these students – those in the lowest school attendance group based on the prior school year – increased their attendance by 11 school days in 2005-06. In 2003-04 the increase was 9 school days in 2003-2004 and in 2004-05 it was more than 14 days.

Table 3a presents findings for 2005-06 ASAP students only. Among these students, those in the lowest attendance group from the previous year also experienced a significant increase of 10 days in school attendance in 2005-06.

## **Program Participation and School Attendance**

While in previous years, there had been a significant positive association between program participation and school attendance in the program year and increase in school attendance rate from the prior school year, neither was not observed in 2005-06.

Number of parent liaison visits was not significantly correlated with school attendance during the program year nor with changes in school attendance across school years.

### **Prior School Year Standardized Test Scores**

The level of proficiency demonstrated by students in reading and mathematics in the previous school year was not associated with any significant changes in school attendance.

### **Summary**

There were few differences in school attendance rates or in changes in attendance rates by student or family demographic characteristics. However, one group – students with relatively poor attendance in the previous school year -- appeared to benefit substantially from participation in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC in increasing their rates of school attendance. Because generally students who are not in school during the day do not attend the 21CCLC program, this link is strong. It appears that being able to participate in these afterschool activities is a powerful motivator for students who previously less engaged in school.

## CHAPTER FIVE: ACHIEVEMENT TEST SCORES

There are many possible ways to measure academic achievement or performance, but the one that is most often used is standardized test scores – specifically, the national percentile score.<sup>11</sup> Using these scores eliminates concerns about differences across teachers in grading policies and patterns. They also make comparisons across school years possible by standardizing the test results on a common scale and computing a score on that scale that has the same meaning from one year to the next. That is, a percentile score in one year may be based on different numbers of questions and different specific content, but the score represents the individual student’s position on the same scale.

At the same time, these scores are difficult to change, as they rest on knowledge and skills accumulated over the grades and are affected by student characteristics, family circumstances, and quality of schooling as well as by specific interventions such as afterschool programs.

This chapter looks at the national percentile scores of Worthington students on standardized achievement tests for reading and mathematics administered in the spring of 2005 and the spring of 2006.<sup>12</sup> These results are presented in Table 4 for all participating students and Table 4a for ASAP students only. Unless otherwise noted, these results are the same as those from the analysis of previous years’ data.

### **Total**

On average, Worthington students participating in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC scored in the high 30s for reading and the mid 40s for mathematics. This can be interpreted to mean that Worthington students scored higher than about 30 to 40 percent of students across the nation who have taken this test. The students participating in Worthington’s 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs had relatively low scores.

There were no significant or substantial changes in test performance for these students between spring 2005 and spring 2006.

---

<sup>11</sup> The national percentile score on a nationally normed standardized test is the point at which, on a one hundred point scale, that percent of students across the nation would score lower than the student.

<sup>12</sup> The scores were available only for one-third of the ASAP students in 2003-2004 and for about 60 percent in 2004-2005.

## **Program Type**

Students whose families received Parent Liaison services or participated in the PIQE program did not show any significantly different patterns of change in test scores, compared to other students. While summer school students had lower test scores in the spring of 2005 compared to students not attending summer school, they did not experience any substantial change in performance by spring 2006.

## **School Level**

Only students in grades 3 through 7 take the Minnesota MAP test, so measures of change in test scores are only available for a subset of students. Specifically, the only two school level groups with data for analysis are students in the upper elementary grades (3<sup>rd</sup> through 5<sup>th</sup>) and in the middle school grades (6<sup>th</sup> through 7<sup>th</sup>).

There were no consistent, substantial changes in reading and mathematics scores by grade level.

## **Family Income Level**

While students from families whose income is too high to be eligible for free or reduced price lunches generally score better than students from less well-to-do families, there is no significant difference in how scores change for students from the different income groups.

## **Racial or Ethnic Group**

There were no significant differences in how test scores changed across the racial/ethnic groups.

## **English Proficiency**

Test score changes did not differ between students who were English proficient and those who were not.

## **Special Education**

Changes in test scores were essentially the same for students who were and who were not eligible to receive special education services.

## **Prior Year School Attendance**

Students' test scores and changes in scores between school years were not affected by their previous school attendance record.

## **Prior School Year Standardized Test Scores**

Overall, there was no consistent pattern of substantial changes in national percentile scores for any of the levels based on the prior year's tests. Some changes indicated better test performance and others indicated worse test performance. Sometimes students at each level did better and sometimes worse. Even though students in the lowest groups did better on the spring 2006 test, the amount of change (around 4 percentile points) does not represent a meaningful improvement.

## **Summary**

No factors were found to be associated with consistent, substantial improvements in standardized achievement test scores among 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC participants. Previous findings that poor performers were able to increase their test scores substantially were not replicated.

## CHAPTER SIX: TEACHER REPORTS

Teachers of ASAP participants were asked to complete a checklist at the end of the school year indicating the extent to which a specific set of ten student behaviors may have changed from the beginning of the year. These behaviors include those that relate directly to academic performance (such as completing assignments), those that relate to student attention to school work (such as paying attention), and those that relate to the student's social relationships at school (getting along with other students).<sup>13</sup>

Teachers were asked to choose one of the following categories for each of these behaviors – significant improvement, moderate improvement, slight improvement, no change, slight decline, moderate decline, and significant decline. Teachers were also provided a category of “did not need to improve.” In order to facilitate analysis and interpretation, these responses were given a numeric value from 5 (significant improvement) to –5 (significant decline), with zero assigned to “no change” responses. When computing the average response (mean value), only students that teachers indicated did need to improve were included in the analysis

### Overall Responses

Table 5 presents the percent of responses in each category for each question. In general, teachers seldom reported a significant degree of improvement in students' behavior. Teachers also rarely noted a decline of any degree in student behavior.

Teachers reported that about 15 to 20 percent of students stayed the same on 9 of the 10 behaviors. Almost half of these teachers' students showed change in volunteering for extra credit or more responsibilities.

On some behaviors, teachers indicated that most of their students did not need to improve. These included regular class attendance (63 percent), getting along with peers (48 percent), and behavior in class (41 percent). Generally, the rest of the students were distributed fairly evenly among the other response categories, from moderate improvement to no change to decline.

Two behaviors – turning in homework on time and coming to school motivated to learn – were reported by teachers to vary considerably in how they changed over the school year across their students. Some improved, some declined, some stayed the same, and some needed no improvement.

---

<sup>13</sup> A different but closely related set of characteristics was used in teacher surveys in 2003-04 and 2004-05.



There were four behaviors for which the majority of teacher responses indicated improvement:

- Academic performance (a total of 69 percent of students were reported as having demonstrated at least some improvement)
- Completing homework to the teacher's satisfaction (53 percent showed improvement)
- Participating in class (52 percent improved)
- Being attentive in class (51 percent showed improvement)

These reports suggest that, while standardized tests did not show substantial improvement, teachers saw changes in behaviors that indicate or support learning.

The average teacher reports are shown in Table 6. The overall values of these reports is around or a little above 1. This indicates that, on average, teachers reported slight improvement on each behavior.

### **Program Type and Number of Years of Participation**

Average teacher reports across all 10 behaviors did not differ by whether the family was involved in the Parent Liaison or PIQE programs, whether the student went to summer school, whether or not the student completed the program, or how many years the student had participated.

### **School Level**

There are no substantial differences across students in different grade levels in average change scores on any of the student behaviors.

### **Family Income Level**

The average change scores were not significantly different across family income levels.

### **Racial or Ethnic Group**

There were no significant differences in average change scores by racial or ethnic group.

### **English Proficiency**

No significant differences in change scores were reported for students based on whether or not they were English language learners.

### **Prior Year School Attendance**

There were no significant differences in change scores across groups of students defined by their prior year's school attendance.

### **Prior School Year Standardized Test Scores**

There were no significant differences in change scores across groups of students defined by their prior year's test scores.

### **Summary**

Teacher reports of student behaviors in three areas – academic activities, attending behaviors in the classroom, and social behaviors with peers and adults at school -- represent three important, related but different sets of student behaviors believed to be related to school success.

Overall, students in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program were reported to have shown only a little improvement over the school year on the 10 behaviors over the school year. There were no consistent or strong differences in teacher reports of changes in student behaviors across various student groups.

## CHAPTER SEVEN: SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

The Worthington 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program combines a set of program characteristics that represent much of what is known about improving the academic and social behavior of students. It has been able to attract and engage a large number of diverse students to its activities and to retain substantial numbers of participants for multiple years. It has implemented the innovative Parent Liaison program for language minority and immigrant students and their families and successfully begun parent education and involvement sessions for these and other families.

### Summary of Benefits

One group of students appears to have especially benefited from participating in the Worthington 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program. Students who had relatively poor school attendance records were able to substantially increase their attendance, by as much as 14 school days.

No other group of students consistently or substantially showed improvement in their school attendance. Nor was standardized test performance by any student group substantially improved.

### Implications

The results of this examination of Worthington's 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program suggests the following with regard to decisions about continuation, expansion or revision of the program's design:

- Continue to make a special effort to recruit at-risk students who appear to benefit from participation in the program – in particular, students with relatively poor school attendance – this may require more proactive outreach with many students and their families
- Continue to provide supports and encouragement to the families of vulnerable students, particularly immigrant, non-English speaking and/or low income families – there is strong research evidence that parent involvement in children's education makes a crucial difference in school engagement and learning
- Recognize that a large proportion of participating students are in the middle school grades (6<sup>th</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup>) and that most middle school students are only receiving academic assistance – this may miss a valuable opportunity to support other areas of youth development

- Ensure that the program can and does meet the special needs and interests of its diverse students – this may require bolstering the academic assistance program and expanding culturally specific activities, as well as providing opportunities for older students to exercise greater independence and leadership
- Continue the Parent Liaison program and target its services particularly to students with poor school attendance
- Encourage parents of middle school students to participate in PIQE and ensure that the information and suggestions offered are appropriate for that age group and for immigrant families

**TABLE 1:  
CHARACTERISTICS OF 2005-06 21CCLC PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS,  
BY TYPE OF PROGRAM  
(percent)**

	<b>SOCCER ONLY</b>	<b>QUEST</b>	<b>ASAP</b>	<b>Parent Liaison</b>	<b>PIQE</b>	<b>Summer School</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>GENDER</b>							
• <b>Female</b>	29	57	49	49	45	53	49
• <b>Male</b>	71	43	51	51	55	47	51
<b>SCHOOL LEVEL</b>							
• <b>Primary (K-2)</b>	66	41	21	28	42	44	35
• <b>Upper Elementary (3-5)</b>	34	57	25	35	45	28	38
• <b>Middle (6-8)</b>	0	2	53	37	13	28	27
<b>FAMILY INCOME LEVEL</b>							
• <b>Eligible for free lunch</b>	30	37	64	61	56	63	49
• <b>Eligible for reduced lunch</b>	12	14	12	16	19	12	13
• <b>Not eligible</b>	58	48	24	23	25	25	38

	<b>SOCCER ONLY</b>	<b>QUEST</b>	<b>ASAP</b>	<b>Parent Liaison</b>	<b>PIQE</b>	<b>Summer School</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>ETHNIC GROUP</b>							
• <b>White</b>	24	52	24	16	28	32	41
• <b>Hispanic</b>	57	33	57	67	66	57	43
• <b>Asian</b>	13	9	13	16	4	6	10
• <b>African/African-American</b>	5	5	5	1	3	5	5
• <b>Native American</b>	1	<1	1	0	0	0	1
<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY</b>							
• <b>Limited</b>	5	9	26	25	25	24	17
• <b>Sufficient</b>	95	91	74	75	75	76	83
<b>SPECIAL EDUCATION</b>							
• <b>Yes</b>	16	10	26	20	14	32	19
• <b>No</b>	84	90	74	80	86	68	81

	<b>SOCCER ONLY</b>	<b>QUEST</b>	<b>ASAP</b>	<b>Parent Liaison</b>	<b>PIQE</b>	<b>Summer School</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>PRIOR YEAR SCHOOL ATTENDANCE GROUP<sup>14</sup></b>							
• <b>Group 1: Lowest</b>	2	2	8	6	3	4	5
• <b>Group 2</b>	14	12	19	18	17	16	16
• <b>Group 3</b>	39	37	32	33	32	32	35
• <b>Group 4: Highest</b>	45	49	41	43	48	48	44
<b>PRIOR SCHOOL YEAR READING TEST GROUP<sup>15</sup></b>							
• <b>Level 1</b>	30	21	66	50	40	72	49
• <b>Level 2</b>	10	23	22	27	26	17	21
• <b>Levels 3-5</b>	60	55	12	23	35	11	30
<b>PRIOR SCHOOL YEAR</b>							

<sup>14</sup> For students enrolled in the 2005-2006 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program, the prior year was 2004-2005. G1 = lowest attendance, G4 = highest attendance; G1 = less than 91 percent, G2 = between 91 and 94 percent, G3 = between 95 and 97 percent, and G4 = greater than 98 percent.

<sup>15</sup> Only students in grades 3 through 7 in 2004-2005 (n=325 for reading, 324 for mathematics).

	<b>SOCCER ONLY</b>	<b>QUEST</b>	<b>ASAP</b>	<b>Parent Liaison</b>	<b>PIQE</b>	<b>Summer School</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>MATHEMATICS TEST GROUP</b>							
• <b>Level 1</b>	15	18	51	43	35	55	37
• <b>Level 2</b>	0	11	17	20	16	17	14
• <b>Levels 3-5</b>	85	71	32	38	49	28	49
<b>NUMBER OF YEARS IN 21CCLC</b>							
• <b>One year (2005-06 only)</b>	57	41	26	26	33	18	36
• <b>Two years (including 2005-06)</b>	20	30	31	29	31	30	29
• <b>Three years (including 2005-06)</b>	23	29	43	44	36	51	35



**TABLE 2:  
PROGRAM ATTENDANCE DURING PROGRAM YEAR  
FOR 2005-06 PARTICIPANTS**

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Mean # Total Program Days Attended</b>	<b>Mean % Total Program Days Attended</b>	<b>Mean # Parent Liaison Contacts<sup>16</sup></b>	<b>Percent Program Completers</b>	<b>Number of Years in Program, including 2005-06<sup>17</sup></b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	39	97%	5.1	53%	2.0
<b>PROGRAM TYPE</b>					
• <b>QUEST (Enrichment, No Academic)</b>	18	99	5.5	24	1.9
• <b>ASAP (Academic &amp; Enrichment)</b>	63	96	5.0	89	2.2
• <b>Soccer Only</b>	6	98	5.1	0	1.7
<b>PROGRAM COMPLETER</b>					
• <b>Completer</b>	64	97	5.1	NA	2.2
• <b>Non-completer</b>	10	98	5.2	NA	1.8
<b>PARENT LIAISON</b>					
• <b>Yes</b>	48	97	5.1	63	2.2
• <b>No</b>	34	97	NA	47	1.9
<b>PIQE</b>					
• <b>Yes</b>	38	98	6.3	45	2.0
• <b>No</b>	39	97	3.7	54	2.0

<sup>16</sup> Average contacts for students in the Parent Liaison program.

<sup>17</sup> Can range between 1 and 3 years.

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Mean # Total Program Days Attended</b>	<b>Mean % Total Program Days Attended</b>	<b>Mean # Parent Liaison Contacts<sup>16</sup></b>	<b>Percent Program Completers</b>	<b>Number of Years in Program, including 2005-06<sup>17</sup></b>
<b>SUMMER SCHOOL</b>					
• Yes	71	94	5.8	87	2.3
• No	32	98	4.9	45	1.9
<b>SCHOOL LEVEL</b>					
• Primary (K-2)	28	98	5.3	34	1.5
• Upper Elementary (3-5)	34	97	5.5	49	2.2
• Middle (6-8)	58	95	4.7	83	2.3
<b>FAMILY INCOME LEVEL</b>					
• Eligible for free lunch	46	97	5.4	65	2.1
• Eligible for reduced lunch	36	98	4.6	50	1.9
• Not eligible	30	97	4.9	37	1.9
<b>ETHNIC GROUP</b>					
• White	28	98	5.3	35	1.9
• Hispanic	47	97	5.2	63	2.0
• Asian	49	96	4.9	77	2.2
• African or African-American	38	97	6.0	59	1.9
• Native American	25	97	0	50	1.7

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Mean # Total Program Days Attended</b>	<b>Mean % Total Program Days Attended</b>	<b>Mean # Parent Liaison Contacts<sup>16</sup></b>	<b>Percent Program Completers</b>	<b>Number of Years in Program, including 2005-06<sup>17</sup></b>
<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY</b>					
• <b>Limited</b>	53	97	5.7	73	1.9
• <b>Sufficient</b>	36	97	4.9	49	2.0
<b>SPECIAL EDUCATION</b>					
• <b>Yes</b>	50	97	5.2	51	2.1
• <b>No</b>	36	97	4.9	62	2.0
<b>ATTENDANCE GROUP IN PRIOR YEAR<sup>18</sup></b>					
• <b>Group 1:</b> • <b>Lowest</b>	42	96	6.2	54	1.7
• <b>Group 2</b>	45	96	3.6	61	1.8
• <b>Group 3</b>	39	96	4.8	54	2.1
• <b>Group 4:</b> • <b>Highest</b>	45	97	5.7	62	2.4
<b>PRIOR SCHOOL YEAR READING TEST GROUP<sup>19</sup></b>					
• <b>Level 1</b>	56	95	5.2	77	2.5
• <b>Level 2</b>	45	97	4.4	69	2.6
• <b>Levels 3-5</b>	29	99	6.1	40	2.3

<sup>18</sup> G1 = lowest attendance, G4 = highest attendance; G1 = less than 91 percent, G2 = between 91 and 94 percent, G3 = between 95 and 97 percent, and G4 = greater than 98 percent

<sup>19</sup> Only students in grades 3 through 7 in 2004-2005.

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Mean # Total Program Days Attended</b>	<b>Mean % Total Program Days Attended</b>	<b>Mean # Parent Liaison Contacts<sup>16</sup></b>	<b>Percent Program Completers</b>	<b>Number of Years in Program, including 2005-06<sup>17</sup></b>
<b>PRIOR SCHOOL YEAR MATHEMATICS TEST GROUP</b>					
• <b>Level 1</b>	57	95	5.4	78	2.5
• <b>Level 2</b>	55	97	5.2	78	2.5
• <b>Levels 3-5</b>	34	98	4.9	51	2.4
<b>NUMBER OF YEARS IN 21CCLC</b>					
• <b>One year (2005-06 only)</b>	29	98	5.0	39	NA
• <b>Two years (including 2005-06)</b>	40	97	5.3	55	NA
• <b>Three years (including 2005-06)</b>	47	96	5.2	64	NA

**TABLE 3:  
SCHOOL ATTENDANCE OF 2005-06 PARTICIPANTS  
DURING PREVIOUS AND CURRENT SCHOOL YEARS  
(only students with attendance data in both 2005-06 and 2004-05)**

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Mean % School Days Attended Year Prior to Program Year</b>	<b>Mean % School Days Attended In Program Year</b>	<b>Mean Change in Percent of School Days Attended, Prior Year to Program Year</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	95	96	<1
<b>PROGRAM TYPE</b>			
• <b>QUEST (Enrichment, No Academic)</b>	96	96	<1
• <b>ASAP Combined (Academic &amp; Enrichment)</b>	95	96	<1
• <b>Soccer Only</b>	96	97	<1
<b>21<sup>ST</sup> CCLC COMPLETER STATUS</b>			
• <b>Completer</b>	95	96	<1
• <b>Non-completer</b>	95	96	<1
<b>PARENT LIAISON</b>			
• <b>Yes</b>	95	96	<1
• <b>No</b>	95	96	<1
<b>PIQE</b>			
• <b>Yes</b>	95	96	<1
• <b>No</b>	95	96	<1
<b>SUMMER SCHOOL</b>			
• <b>Yes</b>	96	96	<1

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Mean % School Days Attended Year Prior to Program Year</b>	<b>Mean % School Days Attended In Program Year</b>	<b>Mean Change in Percent of School Days Attended, Prior Year to Program Year</b>
• No	95	96	<1
<b>YEARS IN PROGRAM</b>			
• One year (2005-06 only)	95	96	<1
• Two years (including 2005-06)	97	96	<1
• Three years (including 2005-06)	97	96	<1
<b>SCHOOL LEVEL</b>			
• Primary (K-2)	95	96	<1
• Upper Elementary (3-5)	96	97	<1
• Middle (6-8)	94	96	<1
<b>FAMILY INCOME LEVEL</b>			
• Eligible for free lunch	95	95	<1
• Eligible for reduced lunch	95	97	<1
• Not eligible	96	97	<1
<b>ETHNIC GROUP</b>			
• White	96	97	<1
• Hispanic	95	95	<1
• Asian	95	97	<1

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Mean % School Days Attended Year Prior to Program Year</b>	<b>Mean % School Days Attended In Program Year</b>	<b>Mean Change in Percent of School Days Attended, Prior Year to Program Year</b>
• <b>African or African-American</b>	96	98	<1
• <b>Native American</b>	Not enough cases	Not enough cases	Not enough cases
<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY</b>			
• <b>Limited</b>	95	96	<1
• <b>Sufficient</b>	95	96	<1
<b>SPECIAL EDUCATION</b>			
• <b>Yes</b>	95	95	<1
• <b>No</b>	95	97	<1
<b>SCHOOL ATTENDANCE GROUP IN PRIOR YEAR<sup>20</sup></b>			
• <b>Group 1: Lowest</b>	84	92	6.2 **
• <b>Group 2</b>	94	94	<1
• <b>Group 3</b>	97	90	<1
• <b>Group 4: Highest</b>	99	97	-1.6
<b>PRIOR SCHOOL YEAR READING TEST GROUP<sup>21</sup></b>			

<sup>20</sup> G1 = lowest attendance, G4 = highest attendance; G1 = less than 91 percent (n=26), G2 = between 91 and 94 percent (n=80), G3 = between 95 and 97 percent (n=173), and G4 = greater than 98 percent (n=223).

<sup>21</sup> Only students in grades 3 through 7 in 2004-2005. Levels defined by percentile scores; 1-32 = level 1 (n for reading =158, n for math=120), 33-49 = level 2 (n for reading = 70, n for math = 46), 50-99 = level 3 (n for reading = 223, n for math = 158).

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Mean % School Days Attended Year Prior to Program Year</b>	<b>Mean % School Days Attended In Program Year</b>	<b>Mean Change in Percent of School Days Attended, Prior Year to Program Year</b>
• <b>Level 1</b>	97	96	<1
• <b>Level 2</b>	97	96	<1
• <b>Levels 3-5</b>	97	97	<1
<b>PRIOR SCHOOL YEAR MATHEMATICS TEST GROUP</b>			
• <b>Level 1</b>	97	96	<1
• <b>Level 2</b>	98	96	-1.5
• <b>Levels 3-5</b>	97	97	<1



**TABLE 3a:  
ATTENDANCE OF 2005-06 PARTICIPANTS  
DURING PREVIOUS AND CURRENT SCHOOL YEARS  
(only ASAP students with attendance data in both 2005-06 and 2004-05)**

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Mean % School Days Attended in 2004-05</b>	<b>Mean % School Days Attended in 2005-06</b>	<b>Mean Change in Percent of School Days Attended</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	96	96	<1
<b>21<sup>ST</sup> CCLC COMPLETER STATUS</b>			
• <b>Completer</b>	97	96	<1
• <b>Non-completer</b>	93	95	<1
<b>PARENT LIAISON</b>			
• <b>Yes</b>	97	96	<1
• <b>No</b>	96	96	<1
<b>PIQE</b>			
• <b>Yes</b>	97	97	<1
• <b>No</b>	96	96	<1
<b>SUMMER SCHOOL</b>			
• <b>Yes</b>	97	96	<1
• <b>No</b>	96	96	<1
<b>YEARS IN PROGRAM</b>			
• <b>One year (2005-06 only)</b>	94	96	<1
• <b>Two years (including 2005-06)</b>	97	96	<1

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Mean % School Days Attended in 2004-05</b>	<b>Mean % School Days Attended in 2005-06</b>	<b>Mean Change in Percent of School Days Attended</b>
• <b>Three years (including 2005-06)</b>	97	96	<1
<b>SCHOOL LEVEL</b>			
• <b>Primary (K-2)</b>	95	96	<1
• <b>Upper Elementary (3-5)</b>	98	97	-1.2
• <b>Middle (6-8)</b>	96	96	<1
<b>FAMILY INCOME LEVEL</b>			
• <b>Eligible for free lunch</b>	96	95	<1
• <b>Eligible for reduced lunch</b>	97	96	<1
• <b>Not eligible</b>	96	97	<1
<b>ETHNIC GROUP</b>			
• <b>White</b>	96	96	<1
• <b>Hispanic</b>	96	95	<1
• <b>Asian</b>	97	97	<1
• <b>African or African-American</b>	99	98	-2.0
• <b>Native American</b>	Not enough cases	Not enough cases	Not enough cases
<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY</b>			
• <b>Limited</b>	97	96	<1

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Mean % School Days Attended in 2004-05</b>	<b>Mean % School Days Attended in 2005-06</b>	<b>Mean Change in Percent of School Days Attended</b>
• Sufficient	96	96	<1
<b>SPECIAL EDUCATION</b>			
• Yes	96	95	<1
• No	96	96	<1
<b>SCHOOL ATTENDANCE GROUP IN PRIOR YEAR<sup>22</sup></b>			
• Group 1: Lowest	86	91	5.7
• Group 2	94	95	1.0
• Group 3	97	96	<1
• Group 4: Highest	99	97	-2.0
<b>PRIOR SCHOOL YEAR READING TEST GROUP<sup>23</sup></b>			
• Level 1	97	96	-1.1
• Level 2	97	96	<1
• Levels 3-5	97	96	<1
<b>PRIOR SCHOOL YEAR MATHEMATICS TEST GROUP</b>			
• Level 1	97	96	<1

<sup>22</sup> G1 = lowest attendance, G4 = highest attendance; G1 = less than 91 percent, G2 = between 91 and 94 percent, G3 = between 95 and 97 percent, and G4 = greater than 98 percent

<sup>23</sup> Only students in grades 3 through 7 in 2004-2005.

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Mean % School Days Attended in 2004-05</b>	<b>Mean % School Days Attended in 2005-06</b>	<b>Mean Change in Percent of School Days Attended</b>
• <b>Level 2</b>	98	95	-2.2
• <b>Levels 3-5</b>	97	97	<1

**TABLE 4:  
PERCENTILE READING AND MATHEMATICS TEST SCORES,  
SPRING 2005 AND SPRING 2006  
(All participants)**

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Reading -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring 2005</b>	<b>Reading -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring 2006</b>	<b>Reading -- Change in Percentile Score</b>	<b>Math -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring 2005</b>	<b>Math -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring 2006</b>	<b>Math -- Change in Percentile Score</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	38	41	1.0	48	44	-5.1
<b>PROGRAM COMPLETER</b>						
• <b>Completer</b>	31	34	2.1	41	36	-5.5
• <b>Non-completer</b>	51	50	-1.0	61	57	-5.5
<b>PARENT LIAISON</b>						
• <b>Yes</b>	36	34	<1.0	43	37	-5.8
• <b>No</b>	40	44	2.1	51	48	-5.3
<b>PIQE</b>						
• <b>Yes</b>	41	40	<1.0	52	46	-6.2
• <b>No</b>	38	41	1.1	47	44	-5.3
<b>SUMMER SCHOOL</b>						
• <b>Yes</b>	25	27	2.3	33	32	-4.1
• <b>No</b>	42	44	<1.0	52	47	-5.9
<b>YEARS IN PROGRAM</b>						
• <b>One (2005-06)</b>	48	43	2.0	57	43	-10.5
• <b>Two</b>	36	40	2.9	46	44	-4.4

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Reading -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring 2005</b>	<b>Reading -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring 2006</b>	<b>Reading -- Change in Percentile Score</b>	<b>Math -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring 2005</b>	<b>Math -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring 2006</b>	<b>Math -- Change in Percentile Score</b>
• <b>Three</b>	37	40	<1.0	47	45	-4.8
<b>SCHOOL LEVEL</b>						
• <b>Primary (K-2)</b>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
• <b>Upper Elementary (3-5)</b>	44	46	1.6	55	51	-3.9
• <b>Middle (6-8)</b>	29	29	<1.0	37	28	-8.5
<b>FAMILY INCOME LEVEL</b>						
• <b>Eligible for free lunch</b>	31	32	<1.0	41	35	-5.9
• <b>Eligible for reduced lunch</b>	43	43	1.2	56	45	-9.7
• <b>Not eligible</b>	47	52	2.4	56	57	-3.0
<b>ETHNIC GROUP</b>						
• <b>White</b>	47	52	1.3	60	57	-6.3
• <b>Hispanic</b>	32	31	<1.0	40	33	-7.4
• <b>Asian</b>	36	42	1.3	49	48	-1.5
• <b>African or African-American</b>	37	38	-3.6	28	39	10.1
• <b>Native American</b>	Too few cases	Too few cases	Too few cases	Too few cases	Too few cases	Too few cases
<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY</b>						

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Reading -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring 2005</b>	<b>Reading -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring 2006</b>	<b>Reading -- Change in Percentile Score</b>	<b>Math -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring 2005</b>	<b>Math -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring 2006</b>	<b>Math -- Change in Percentile Score</b>
• <b>Limited</b>	19	21	2.8	28	29	1.2
• <b>Sufficient</b>	41	44	<1.0	52	47	-6.6
<b>SPECIAL EDUCATION</b>						
• <b>Yes</b>	21	23	<1.0	32	30	-3.4
• <b>No</b>	43	45	1.2	53	48	-6.1
<b>ATTENDANCE GROUP IN 2004-05</b>						
• <b>Group 1: Lowest</b>	40	43	2.7	39	27	-13.6
• <b>Group 2</b>	38	38	<1.0	46	43	-4.3
• <b>Group 3</b>	35	36	<1.0	46	42	-6.8
• <b>Group 4: Highest</b>	41	45	2.2	50	48	-4.4
<b>PRIOR SCHOOL YEAR READING TEST GROUP</b>						
• <b>Level 1</b>	17	22	4.5	NA	NA	NA
• <b>Level 2</b>	40	41	1.1	NA	NA	NA
• <b>Levels 3-5</b>	71	67	-4.7	NA	NA	NA
<b>PRIOR SCHOOL YEAR MATHEMATICS TEST GROUP</b>						
• <b>Level 1</b>	NA	NA	NA	18	22	3.8
• <b>Level 2</b>	NA	NA	NA	40	39	-1.7

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Reading -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring 2005</b>	<b>Reading -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring 2006</b>	<b>Reading – Change in Percentile Score</b>	<b>Math – Mean Percentile Score – Spring 2005</b>	<b>Math – Mean Percentile Score – Spring 2006</b>	<b>Math – Change in Percentile Score</b>
• <b>Levels 3-5</b>	NA	NA	NA	73	60	-13.3



**TABLE 4a:  
PERCENTILE READING AND MATHEMATICS TEST SCORES,  
SPRING 2005 AND SPRING 2006  
(ASAP participants only)**

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Reading -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring 2005</b>	<b>Reading -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring 2006</b>	<b>Reading -- Change in Percentile Score</b>	<b>Math -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring 2005</b>	<b>Math -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring 2006</b>	<b>Math -- Change in Percentile Score</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	27	30	2.1	37	31	-6.3
<b>PROGRAM COMPLETER</b>						
• <b>Completer</b>	27	29	2.0	37	31	-10.5
• <b>Non-completer</b>	31	30	2.5	39	31	-5.9
<b>PARENT LIAISON</b>						
• <b>Yes</b>	29	29	<1	38	31	-5.9
• <b>No</b>	26	30	3.8	36	31	-6.7
<b>PIQE</b>						
• <b>Yes</b>	29	33	5.2	44	38	-5.1
• <b>No</b>	27	29	1.5	36	30	-6.5
<b>SUMMER SCHOOL</b>						
• <b>Yes</b>	24	27	2.7	34	31	-4.9
• <b>No</b>	29	31	1.8	39	31	-7.0
<b>YEARS IN PROGRAM</b>						
• <b>One</b>	25	27	<1	33	26	-7.8
• <b>Two</b>	25	29	3.7	36	31	-7.8

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Reading -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring 2005</b>	<b>Reading -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring 2006</b>	<b>Reading -- Change in Percentile Score</b>	<b>Math -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring 2005</b>	<b>Math -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring 2006</b>	<b>Math -- Change in Percentile Score</b>
• Three	29	31	1.6	38	33	-5.6
<b>SCHOOL LEVEL</b>						
• Primary (K-2)	NA	33	NA	NA	47	NA
• Upper Elementary (3-5)	25	30	5.8	37	34	-3.2
• Middle (6-8)	29	29	<1	37	28	-8.5
<b>FAMILY INCOME LEVEL</b>						
• Eligible for free lunch	26	28	1.8	35	29	-6.5
• Eligible for reduced lunch	33	33	<1	48	35	-14.1
• Not eligible	28	33	3.6	37	35	-1.7
<b>ETHNIC GROUP</b>						
• White	33	36	2.7	46	37	-10.0
• Hispanic	27	27	2.1	35	28	-6.5
• Asian	23	29	2.0	36	35	-2.3
• African or African-American	Too few cases	Too few cases	Too few cases	Too few cases	Too few cases	Too few cases
• Native American	Too few cases	Too few cases	Too few cases	Too few cases	Too few cases	Too few cases
<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY</b>						

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Reading -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring 2005</b>	<b>Reading -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring 2006</b>	<b>Reading -- Change in Percentile Score</b>	<b>Math -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring 2005</b>	<b>Math -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring 2006</b>	<b>Math -- Change in Percentile Score</b>
• <b>Limited</b>	18	22	3.7	26	28	1.3
• <b>Sufficient</b>	30	32	1.7	40	32	-8.5
<b>SPECIAL EDUCATION</b>						
• <b>Yes</b>	17	21	3.6	28	24	-4.3
• <b>No</b>	31	32	1.5	41	33	-7.1
<b>PRIOR SCHOOL YEAR READING TEST GROUP</b>						
• <b>Level 1</b>	17	21	4.2	NA	NA	NA
• <b>Level 2</b>	40	38	-1.7	NA	NA	NA
• <b>Levels 3-5</b>	64	61	-2.4	NA	NA	NA
<b>PRIOR SCHOOL YEAR MATHEMATICS TEST GROUP</b>						
• <b>Level 1</b>	NA	NA	NA	18	21	3.3
• <b>Level 2</b>	NA	NA	NA	39	33	-6.4
• <b>Levels 3-5</b>	NA	NA	NA	66	45	-21.7
<b>ATTENDANCE GROUP IN 2004-05</b>						
• <b>Group 1: Lowest</b>	35	40	2.4	34	27	-6.2
• <b>Group 2</b>	25	27	1.2	32	29	-3.9
• <b>Group 3</b>	25	26	1.2	36	29	-7.0

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Reading -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring 2005</b>	<b>Reading -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring 2006</b>	<b>Reading – Change in Percentile Score</b>	<b>Math – Mean Percentile Score – Spring 2005</b>	<b>Math – Mean Percentile Score – Spring 2006</b>	<b>Math – Change in Percentile Score</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Group 4: Highest</b></li> </ul>	28	32	2.8	39	34	-6.3

**TABLE 5:  
TEACHER-REPORTED CHANGE IN STUDENT BEHAVIOR FROM  
BEGINNING OF 2005-06 SCHOOL YEAR, FOR ASAP STUDENTS ONLY  
(percent)**

Type Of Behavior	Significant Improvement	Moderate Improvement	Slight Improvement	No Change	Decline	Did Not Need to Improve
<b>ACADEMIC BEHAVIORS</b>						
Turning in homework on time	3.6	14.4	25.2	18.6	12.1	27.1
Completing homework to teacher satisfaction	4.9	19.6	27.5	17.0	12.8	18.3
Participating in class	5.2	23.5	23.2	20.9	6.2	20.9
Academic performance	7.8	28.4	33.0	14.4	11.2	5.2
<b>ATTENDING BEHAVIORS</b>						
Attending class regularly	4.9	8.5	9.8	11.1	3.0	62.7
Being attentive in class	3.9	20.3	26.5	15.7	10.5	23.2
Behaving well in class	5.6	12.7	16.3	15.4	9.5	40.5
Coming to school motivated to learn	7.8	16.3	20.3	20.6	8.5	26.5
<b>SOCIAL BEHAVIORS</b>						
Getting along with other students	4.6	9.2	15.0	18.3	4.6	48.4
Volunteering (for extra credit or more responsibilities)	2.9	8.5	20.9	46.1	3.2	18.3

**TABLE 6:  
TEACHER REPORT OF CHANGE SCORES BY GROUP, FOR 2005-06 ASAP STUDENTS ONLY  
(mean value)<sup>24</sup>**

STUDENT GROUP	ACADEMIC BEHAVIORS				ATTENDING BEHAVIORS				SOCIAL BEHAVIORS	
	Homework in on time	Homework to teacher satisfaction	Participates in class	Academic performance	Attends school regularly	Pays attention in class	Behaves well in class	Is motivated to learn	Gets along with other students	Volunteers
<b>TOTAL</b>	.9	1.1	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.1	.7
<b>21<sup>st</sup> CCLC COMPLETER STATUS</b>										
• <b>Completer</b>	.9	1.1	1.4	1.5	1.3	1.2	1.0	1.2	1.1	.7
• <b>Non-Completer</b>	.8	.8	1.3	1.3	2.3	1.3	1.6	1.3	1.2	.5
<b>PARENT LIAISON</b>										
• <b>Yes</b>	.9	1.2	1.4	1.6	1.6	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.1	.7
• <b>No</b>	.9	1.0	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.2	.9	1.2	1.1	.7

<sup>24</sup> Slight improvement = 1, moderate improvement = 3, significant improvement = 5, no change = 0, slight decline = -1, moderate decline = -3, significant decline = -5. Does not include students whose behavior was reported as not needing to improve.

	ACADEMIC BEHAVIORS				ATTENDING BEHAVIORS				SOCIAL BEHAVIORS	
STUDENT GROUP	Homework in on time	Homework to teacher satisfaction	Participates in class	Academic performance	Attends school regularly	Pays attention in class	Behaves well in class	Is motivated to learn	Gets along with other students	Volunteers
<b>PIQE</b>										
• Yes	.9	1.5	1.5	2.0	2.4	1.5	1.7	1.5	1.4	1.1
• No	.9	1.0	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.1	1.0	1.2	1.1	.6
<b>SUMMER SCHOOL</b>										
• Yes	.7	.9	1.7	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.1	1.2	.9	.7
• No	1.0	1.1	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.1	1.1	1.3	1.2	.7
<b>NUMBER OF YEARS IN 21CCLC</b>										
• One year (2005-06 only)	1.2	1.2	1.6	1.9	1.6	1.4	1.2	1.6	1.1	.8
• Two years (including 2005-06)	.9	1.4	1.6	1.5	1.9	1.4	1.4	1.6	1.6	.7
• Three years (including 2005-06)	.7	.8	1.1	1.2	1.0	.9	.8	.7	.8	.6

	ACADEMIC BEHAVIORS				ATTENDING BEHAVIORS				SOCIAL BEHAVIORS	
STUDENT GROUP	Homework in on time	Homework to teacher satisfaction	Participates in class	Academic performance	Attends school regularly	Pays attention in class	Behaves well in class	Is motivated to learn	Gets along with other students	Volunteers
<b>SCHOOL LEVEL</b>										
• Primary (K-2)	.8	1.1	1.5	2.0	2.5	1.5	1.1	1.7	1.3	1.1
• Upper Elementary (3-5)	1.8	1.9	2.2	2.1	1.9	2.0	1.4	1.9	1.5	1.3
• Middle (6-8)	.6	.7	1.0	.9	1.1	.7	.9	.8	.9	.3
<b>FAMILY INCOME LEVEL</b>										
• Eligible for free lunch	1.0	1.2	1.4	1.5	1.3	1.1	1.1	1.3	1.2	.7
• Eligible for reduced lunch	.7	1.0	1.5	1.3	1.7	1.7	1.5	1.5	1.3	.7
• Not eligible	.8	.8	1.4	1.4	1.8	1.1	1.0	1.0	.7	.6



	ACADEMIC BEHAVIORS				ATTENDING BEHAVIORS				SOCIAL BEHAVIORS	
STUDENT GROUP	Homework in on time	Homework to teacher satisfaction	Participates in class	Academic performance	Attends school regularly	Pays attention in class	Behaves well in class	Is motivated to learn	Gets along with other students	Volunteers
<b>ETHNIC GROUP</b>										
• White	.9	.9	1.5	1.5	1.3	1.3	1.1	1.1	1.3	.6
• Hispanic	1.0	1.2	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.3	.7
• Asian	.6	1.2	1.3	1.3	2.5	.6	.3	1.0	.9	.7
• African or African-American	.4	.6	1.1	1.6	1.4	1.3	.1	.6	-.1	.4
• Native American	Not enough cases									
<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY</b>										
• Limited	1.1	1.3	1.7	1.8	2.1	1.3	1.1	1.6	1.1	.9
• Sufficient	.8	1.0	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	.6

	ACADEMIC BEHAVIORS				ATTENDING BEHAVIORS				SOCIAL BEHAVIORS	
STUDENT GROUP	Homework in on time	Homework to teacher satisfaction	Participates in class	Academic performance	Attends school regularly	Pays attention in class	Behaves well in class	Is motivated to learn	Gets along with other students	Volunteers
<b>SPECIAL EDUCATION</b>										
• Yes	.7	1.0	1.4	1.3	1.5	1.2	1.4	1.3	1.1	.5
• No	1.0	1.1	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.2	1.0	1.2	1.1	.7
<b>PRIOR SCHOOL YEAR ATTENDANCE GROUP<sup>25</sup></b>										
• Group 1: Lowest	.4	.5	.8	.7	1.3	.6	1.0	.9	.2	.6
• Group 2	.8	1.1	1.1	1.5	1.4	1.5	1.4	1.6	1.5	.5
• Group 3	.9	.9	1.2	1.5	1.7	1.3	1.3	1.0	1.2	.5
• Group 4: Highest	1.0	1.3	1.8	1.6	1.2	1.2	.9	1.4	1.1	.9

<sup>25</sup> G1 = lowest attendance, G4 = highest attendance; G1 = less than 91 percent, G2 = between 91 and 94 percent, G3 = between 95 and 97 percent, and G4 = greater than 98 percent

	ACADEMIC BEHAVIORS				ATTENDING BEHAVIORS				SOCIAL BEHAVIORS	
STUDENT GROUP	Homework in on time	Homework to teacher satisfaction	Participates in class	Academic performance	Attends school regularly	Pays attention in class	Behaves well in class	Is motivated to learn	Gets along with other students	Volunteers
<b>PRIOR SCHOOL YEAR READING TEST GROUP<sup>26</sup></b>										
• Level 1	1.1	1.3	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.2	.7
• Level 2	.9	.7	1.0	1.3	.7	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.2	.5
• Levels 3-5	.7	1.0	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.2	.7
<b>PRIOR SCHOOL YEAR MATHEMATICS TEST GROUP</b>										
• Level 1	1.0	1.3	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.4	.6
• Level 2	1.1	.8	1.1	1.3	.9	1.1	.8	.9	.8	.5

<sup>26</sup> Only students in grades 3 through 7 in 2004-2005.

	ACADEMIC BEHAVIORS				ATTENDING BEHAVIORS				SOCIAL BEHAVIORS	
STUDENT GROUP	Homework in on time	Homework to teacher satisfaction	Participates in class	Academic performance	Attends school regularly	Pays attention in class	Behaves well in class	Is motivated to learn	Gets along with other students	Volunteers
• Levels 3-5	.6	.5	1.4	1.6	1.6	.9	1.0	.6	1.3	1.2

ATTACHMENT A: 2005-2006 PROGRAM PARTICIPATION (numbers of students)							
	In Soccer Program Only	In Enrichment Program Only	In Academic Assistance Only	In Academic Assistance Program Combined with Other Activities	In Parent Liaison Program	In PIQE Program	In Summer School 2005
<b>2003-2004</b>	151	298	NA	385	195	NA	NA
<b>2004-2005</b>	34	380	NA	350	219	NA	NA
<b>2005-2006</b>	86	225	128	177	207	112	109

<b>In One Year Only</b>	49	92	27	53	54	37	20
<b>In Two Years</b>	17	67	37	56	61	35	33
<b>In All Three Years</b>	20	66	64	68	92	40	56

**APPENDIX:**  
**FINDINGS FROM 2003-04 AND 2004-05**

**TABLE 1:  
CHARACTERISTICS OF 21CCLC PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS,  
BY TYPE OF PROGRAM AND PROGRAM YEAR**

Percent of participants in 2003-2004/Percent of participants in 2004-2005  
(Percent of students participating in both years)

	<b>SOCCER ONLY</b>	<b>QUEST</b>	<b>ASAP</b>	<b>Parent Liaison</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>GENDER</b>					
• <b>Female</b>	29/41 (39)	59/49 (41)	46/47 (48)	52/48 (49)	47/48 (44)
• <b>Male</b>	71/59 (61)	41/51 (59)	54/53 (52)	48/52 (51)	53/52 (56)
<b>SCHOOL LEVEL</b>					
• <b>Primary (K-2)</b>	34/0 (0)	40/33 (29)	22/26 (19)	27/22 (19)	31/27 (23)
• <b>Upper Elementary (3-5)</b>	27/0 (0)	46/43 (44)	35/36 (39)	41/36 (34)	37/38 (39)
• <b>Middle (6-8)</b>	14/9 (9)	12/20 (24)	42/38 (42)	30/36 (40)	27/29 (32)
• <b>High (9-12)</b>	25/91 (91)	2/4 (3)	1/0 (0)	3/6 (7)	5/6 (6)
<b>FAMILY INCOME LEVEL</b>					
• <b>Eligible for free lunch</b>	39/44 (57)	47/37 (39)	58/61 (61)	73/67 (68)	51/48 (50)
• <b>Eligible for reduced lunch</b>	7/3 (4)	11/14 (14)	15/8 (8)	12/13 (11)	12/11 (11)
• <b>Not eligible</b>	54/53 (39)	42/49 (47)	27/31 (31)	15/19 (20)	37/41 (39)
<b>ETHNIC GROUP</b>					
• <b>White</b>	24/35 (17)	52/59 (57)	32/29 (29)	2/<1 (0)	43/44 (42)
• <b>Hispanic</b>	33/44 (57)	30/27 (27)	52/56 (56)	78/78 (79)	41/41 (43)
• <b>Asian</b>	8/18 (22)	13/12 (13)	12/12 (11)	20/22 (21)	12/12 (12)
• <b>African/ African-American</b>	3/3 (4)	5/2 (3)	3/2 (2)	0/0 (0)	4/2 (3)
• <b>Native American</b>	0/0 (0)	0/0 (0)	<1/<1 (<1)	0/0 (0)	<1/<1 (<1)
<b>ENGLISH</b>					

	<b>SOCCKER ONLY</b>	<b>QUEST</b>	<b>ASAP</b>	<b>Parent Liaison</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>PROFICIENCY</b>					
• <b>Limited</b>	3/39 (55)	6/15 (9)	21/32 (29)	28/44 (40)	17/24 (21)
• <b>Sufficient</b>	97/61 (55)	94/85 (91)	79/68 (71)	72/56 (60)	83/76 (79)
<b>PRIOR SCHOOL YEAR READING TEST GROUP<sup>27</sup></b>					
• <b>Level 1</b>	NA/NA	NA/NA	NA/56 (53)	NA/49 (46)	NA/NA
• <b>Level 2</b>	NA/NA	NA/NA	NA/24 (25)	NA/32 (30)	NA/NA
• <b>Levels 3-5</b>	NA/NA	NA/NA	NA/20 (22)	NA/19 (24)	NA/NA
<b>PRIOR SCHOOL YEAR MATHEMATICS TEST GROUP</b>					
• <b>Level 1</b>	NA/NA	NA/NA	NA/52 (51)	NA/61 (56)	NA/NA
• <b>Level 2</b>	NA/NA	NA/NA	NA/25 (25)	NA/20 (25)	NA/NA
• <b>Levels 3-5</b>	NA/NA	NA/NA	NA/23 (24)	NA/19 (19)	NA/NA
<b>PRIOR YEAR SCHOOL ATTENDANCE GROUP<sup>28</sup></b>					
• <b>Group 1: Lowest</b>	14/29 (43)	9/7 (7)	15/11 (8)	18/10 (10)	13/10 (10)
• <b>Group 2</b>	20/21 (26)	23/14 (7)	20/16 (10)	25/18 (10)	21/16 (10)
• <b>Group 3</b>	31/12 (9)	33/37 (21)	33/38 (25)	35/38 (25)	33/36 (23)
• <b>Group 4: Highest</b>	35/38 (22)	35/41 (63)	32/34 (57)	22/34 (55)	34/38 (57)
<b>SPECIAL EDUCATION</b>					

<sup>27</sup> Only for students in grades 3 through 7 in the ASAP program in 2004-2005.

<sup>28</sup> For students enrolled in the 2004-2005 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program, the prior school year was 2003-2004; for students enrolled in the 2003-2004 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program, the prior school year was 2002-2003; for students enrolled in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program in both years, the prior school year was 2002-2003. G1 = lowest attendance, G4 = highest attendance; G1 = less than 91 percent, G2 = between 91 and 94 percent, G3 = between 95 and 97 percent, and G4 = greater than 98 percent



	<b>SOCCER ONLY</b>	<b>QUEST</b>	<b>ASAP</b>	<b>Parent Liaison</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
• <b>Yes</b>	NA/0 (0)	NA/7 (9)	NA/26 (28)	NA/17 (17)	NA/16 (18)
• <b>No</b>	NA/100 (100)	NA/93 (91)	NA/73 (72)	NA/83 (83)	NA/84 (82)

**TABLE 2:**  
**PROGRAM ATTENDANCE DURING PROGRAM YEAR**  
 Participants in 2003-2004/Participants in 2004-2005<sup>29</sup>  
 (Participants in both years)

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Mean # Total Program Days Attended</b>	<b>Mean % Total Program Days Attended</b>	<b>Mean # Parent Liaison Contacts<sup>30</sup></b>	<b>Percent Program Completers</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	27/62 (66)	82/83 (84)	2.8/3.0 (2.9)	47/62 (60)
<b>PROGRAM TYPE</b>				
• <b>QUEST (Enrichment, No Academic)</b>	13/NR (NR)	68/NR (NR)	2.9/2.6 (2.6)	16/20 (22)
• <b>ASAP (Academic &amp; Enrichment)</b>	40/62 (65)	79/84	2.8/3.1 (3.1)	78/89 (93)
• <b>Soccer Only</b>	18/NR (NR)	75/NR (NR)	1.7/2.1 (2.1)	27/NR (NR)
<b>PARENT LIAISON</b>				
• <b>Yes</b>	38/64 (66)	77/83 (83)	2.3/3.2 (2.9)	69/75 (77)
• <b>No</b>	23/60 (65)	74/83 (85)	0/0 (0)	41/71 (51)
<b>SCHOOL LEVEL</b>				
• <b>Primary (K-2)</b>	24/62 (62)	78/89 (89)	2.9/2.9 (2.7)	37/49 (47)
• <b>Upper Elementary (3-5)</b>	26/58 (60)	79/87 (86)	2.5/3.0 (3.1)	43/59 (59)
• <b>Middle (6-8)</b>	29/65 (72)	65/77 (80)	3.3/3.2 (3.2)	56/64 (66)
• <b>High (9-12)</b>	38/NA (NA)	69/NA (NA)	<1/3.0 (1.5)	95/71 (78)
<b>FAMILY INCOME LEVEL</b>				

<sup>29</sup> Program attendance data were not provided for QUEST and soccer participants in the 2004-2005 program year.

<sup>30</sup> Average contacts for students in the Parent Liaison program.

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Mean # Total Program Days Attended</b>	<b>Mean % Total Program Days Attended</b>	<b>Mean # Parent Liaison Contacts<sup>30</sup></b>	<b>Percent Program Completers</b>
• <b>Eligible for free lunch</b>	29/61 (65)	74/83 (83)	2.7/2.5 (3.0)	53/64 (69)
• <b>Eligible for reduced lunch</b>	31/63 (64)	75/82 (85)	2.9/4.6 (2.5)	55/64 (46)
• <b>Not eligible</b>	22/63 (68)	75/85 (85)	3.3/0 (3.1)	37/47 (52)
<b>ETHNIC GROUP</b>				
• <b>White</b>	21/61 (64)	75/82 (83)	2.3/0 (0)	33/42 (44)
• <b>Hispanic</b>	31/61 (65)	73/84 (85)	2.5/2.5 (2.5)	57/66 (71)
• <b>Asian</b>	34/66 (70)	79/83 (82)	4.0/4.6 (4.5)	62/70 (75)
• <b>African or African-American</b>	28/61 (75)	71/89 (93)	0/0 (0)	59/51 (46)
• <b>Native American</b>	27/41 (NA)	74/76 (NA)	0/0 (0)	50/50 (NA)
<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY</b>				
• <b>Limited</b>	38/64 (69)	78/87 (87)	2.6/3.1 (2.9)	72/70 (82)
• <b>Sufficient</b>	25/60 (65)	74/82 (83)	2.8/2.8 (3.1)	44/51 (54)
<b>PROGRAM COMPLETER</b>				
• <b>Completer</b>	45/67 (69)	82/86 (86)	2.7/3.1 (3.0)	100
• <b>Non-completer</b>	NA/27 (34)	NA/67 (67)	NA/2.7 (2.6)	0
<b>PRIOR SCHOOL YEAR READING TEST GROUP</b>				
• <b>Level 1</b>	NA/65 (67)	NA/82 (83)	NA/2.9 (2.8)	NA/94 (95)
• <b>Level 2</b>	NA/58 (59)	NA/82 (82)	NA/3.1 (3.1)	NA/85 (86)
• <b>Levels 3-5</b>	NA/62 (70)	NA/86 (89)	NA/2.8 (2.8)	NA/93 (97)
<b>PRIOR SCHOOL YEAR MATHEMATICS TEST GROUP</b>				

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Mean # Total Program Days Attended</b>	<b>Mean % Total Program Days Attended</b>	<b>Mean # Parent Liaison Contacts<sup>30</sup></b>	<b>Percent Program Completers</b>
• <b>Level 1</b>	NA/62 (65)	NA/81 (82)	NA/2.9 (2.9)	NA/90 (92)
• <b>Level 2</b>	NA/63 (67)	NA/85 (85)	NA/3.0 (2.9)	NA/90 (92)
• <b>Levels 3-5</b>	NA/64 (68)	NA/85 (88)	NA/2.9 (2.9)	NA/95 (97)
<b>ATTENDANCE GROUP IN PRIOR YEAR<sup>31</sup></b>				
• <b>Group 1: Lowest</b>	31/56 (58)	71/81 (78)	2.2/1.6 (1.4)	63/64 (63)
• <b>Group 2</b>	29/58 (59)	73/78 (79)	2.6/2.9 (2.2)	57/57 (59)
• <b>Group 3</b>	28/65 (64)	73/85 (84)	3.0/3.2 (3.2)	49/59 (61)
• <b>Group 4: Highest</b>	29/66 (69)	80/86 (86)	2.9/3.4 (3.2)	50/59 (62)
<b>SPECIAL EDUCATION</b>				
• <b>Yes</b>	NA/61 (64)	NA/85 (83)	NA/1.0 (0.9)	NA/77 (83)
• <b>No</b>	NA/62 (66)	NA/83 (84)	NA/0.9 (1.0)	NA/55 (55)

<sup>31</sup> G1 = lowest attendance, G4 = highest attendance; G1 = less than 91 percent, G2 = between 91 and 94 percent, G3 = between 95 and 97 percent, and G4 = greater than 98 percent

**TABLE 3:**  
**SCHOOL ATTENDANCE**  
**DURING PREVIOUS AND CURRENT SCHOOL YEARS**  
**(only students with attendance data in both years)**  
 Percent in 2003-2004 program/Percent in 2004-2005 program  
 (Percent in both years)

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Mean % School Days Attended Year Prior to Program Year</b>	<b>Mean % School Days Attended In Program Year</b>	<b>Mean Change in Percent of School Days Attended, Prior Year to Program Year</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	95/95.9 (96.0)	95/96.8 (96.6)	<0.1/+0.9 (<0.1)
<b>PROGRAM TYPE</b>			
• <b>QUEST (Enrichment, No Academic)</b>	96/96.7 (96.8)	96/97.3 (96.6)	<0.1/+0.8 (+0.6)
• <b>ASAP Combined (Academic &amp; Enrichment)</b>	95/95.6 (95.8)	95/96.2 (96.5)	<0.1/+0.7 (+0.5)
• <b>Soccer Only</b>	94.93.2 (90.8)	94/94.4 (96.1)	<0.1/+1.2 (+2.4)
<b>PARENT LIAISON</b>			
• <b>Yes</b>	95/95.8 (95.9)	95/96.2 (96.6)	<0.1/<0.1 (+0.2)
• <b>No</b>	96/96.0 (96.1)	95/96.9 (96.5)	<0.1/+1.0 (+0.9)
<b>SCHOOL LEVEL</b>			
• <b>Primary (K-2)</b>	96/95.9 (96.1)	96/97.2 (97.1)	<0.1/+1.4 (+1.2)
• <b>Upper Elementary (3-5)</b>	96/96.6 (96.8)	96/97.8 (97.5)	<0.1/+1.4 (+1.1)
• <b>Middle (6-8)</b>	95/95.0 (96.0)	95/94.8 (95.2)	<0.1/-0.8 (-0.7)
• <b>High (9-12)</b>	88/93.3 (90.5)	87/95.4 (95.0)	-1.0/+2.0 (+3.5)
<b>FAMILY INCOME LEVEL</b>			
• <b>Eligible for free lunch</b>	95/95.1 (95.4)	95/96.4 (96.7)	<0.1/+1.3 (+1.0)
• <b>Eligible for reduced lunch</b>	96/95.3 (95.1)	96/96.8 (95.4)	<0.1/+1.2 (+1.1)

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Mean % School Days Attended Year Prior to Program Year</b>	<b>Mean % School Days Attended In Program Year</b>	<b>Mean Change in Percent of School Days Attended, Prior Year to Program Year</b>
• Not eligible	96/97.1 (97.0)	96/97.0 (96.6)	<0.1/<0.1 (<0.1)
<b>ETHNIC GROUP</b>			
• White	96/96.8 (96.8)	96/97.0 (96.6)	<0.1/+0.4 (+0.3)
• Hispanic	94/94.5 (94.8)	94/96.2 (96.6)	<0.1/+1.6 (+1.5)
• Asian	96/97.5 (97.4)	97/97.0 (96.0)	<0.1/-0.6 (-0.8)
• African or African-American	96/96.7 (96.6)	97/97.9 (96.2)	<0.1/+1.0 (+1.3)
• Native American	Too few cases	Too few cases	Too few cases
<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY</b>			
• Limited	95/95.4 (95.5)	96/96.8 (96.9)	+1.2 /+1.4 (+1.4)
• Sufficient	95/96.1 (96.2)	95/96.7 (96.6)	<0.1/+0.5 (+0.4)
<b>SCHOOL ATTENDANCE GROUP IN PRIOR YEAR<sup>32</sup></b>			
• Group 1: Lowest	85/85.5 (85.2)	91/93.7 (96.1)	+5.0/+8.3 (+8.1)
• Group 2	93/93.5 (92.7)	95/94.7 (96.3)	+1.3/+1.4 (+1.3)
• Group 3	97/96.8 (95.6)	96/97.0 (96.4)	-0.9/+0.7 (+0.7)
• Group 4: Highest	99/99.1 (98.5)	97/98.1 (96.7)	-1.6/-0.7 (-0.7)
<b>PRIOR SCHOOL YEAR READING TEST GROUP</b>			
• Level 1	NA/96.2 (96.4)	NA/96.3 (96.3)	NA/<0.1 (<0.1)
• Level 2	NA/96.5 (96.6)	NA/97.5 (97.4)	NA/+0.9 (+0.8)

<sup>32</sup> G1 = lowest attendance, G4 = highest attendance; G1 = less than 91 percent, G2 = between 91 and 94 percent, G3 = between 95 and 97 percent, and G4 = greater than 98 percent

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Mean % School Days Attended Year Prior to Program Year</b>	<b>Mean % School Days Attended In Program Year</b>	<b>Mean Change in Percent of School Days Attended, Prior Year to Program Year</b>
• <b>Levels 3-5</b>	NA/94.3 (94.2)	NA/96.3 (96.6)	NA/+1.9 (+2.4)
<b>PRIOR SCHOOL YEAR MATHEMATICS TEST GROUP</b>			
• <b>Level 1</b>	NA/96.4 (96.4)	NA/96.4 (96.5)	NA/<0.1 (<0.1)
• <b>Level 2</b>	NA/94.8 (94.7)	NA/97.2 (97.1)	NA/+2.2 (+2.5)
• <b>Levels 3-5</b>	NA/95.8 (96.4)	NA/96.0 (96.5)	NA/+0.2 (+0.1)
<b>21<sup>ST</sup> CCLC COMPLETER STATUS</b>			
• <b>Completer</b>	95/95.7 (95.8)	95/96.7 (96.8)	<0.1/+0.9 (+0.9)
• <b>Non-completer</b>	96/96.3 (96.3)	96/96.7 (96.1)	<0.1/+0.5 (+0.3)
<b>SPECIAL EDUCATION</b>			
• <b>Yes</b>	NA/95.3 (95.6)	NA/96.6 (96.3)	NA/+1.2 (+0.9)
• <b>No</b>	NA/96.1 (96.1)	NA/96.7 (96.6)	NA/+0.6 (+0.6)

**TABLE 4:  
PERCENTILE READING AND MATHEMATICS TEST SCORES,  
SPRING SCORES IN YEAR PRIOR TO PROGRAM YEAR COMPARED WITH  
SPRING SCORES OF PROGRAM YEAR  
(ASAP participants only)**

2003-2004 program participant scores/2004-2005 program participant scores<sup>33</sup>

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Reading -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring in Prior School Year</b>	<b>Reading -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring in Program Year</b>	<b>Reading – Change in Percentile Score</b>	<b>Math – Mean Percentile Score – Spring in Prior School Year</b>	<b>Math – Mean Percentile Score – Spring in Program Year</b>	<b>Math – Change in Percentile Score</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	33/33 (33)	34/29 (29)	<1.0/-3.4 (-3.1)	33/35 (35)	33/37 (37)	<1.0/+2.8 (+3.3)
<b>PARENT LIAISON</b>						
• <b>Yes</b>	29/32 (33)	30/28 (28)	<1.0/-3.3 (-3.2)	27/33 (35)	30/33 (33)	+2.6/+1.7 (+1.9)
• <b>No</b>	36/33 (34)	37/30 (31)	<1.0/-3.4 (-3.1)	36/36 (36)	35/40 (40)	-1.0/+3.7 (+4.5)
<b>SCHOOL LEVEL</b>						
• <b>Primary (K-2)</b>	NA/NA	42/NA	NA/NA	NA/NA	47/NA	NA/NA
• <b>Upper Elementary (3-5)</b>	30/32 (34)	33/27 (29)	+3.4/-5.3 (-5.5)	30/35 (37)	34/36 (38)	+3.8/+2.0 (+1.9)
• <b>Middle (6-8)</b>	38/33 (32)	35/27 (29)	-2.7/<1.0 (<1.0)	35/34 (33)	32/39 (33)	-3.4/+4.0 (+5.1)
• <b>High (9-12)</b>	NA/NA	NA/NA	NA/NA	NA/NA	NA/NA	NA/NA
<b>FAMILY INCOME LEVEL</b>						
• <b>Eligible for free lunch</b>	28/29 (30)	31/28 (28)	+2.9/-1.2 (<1.0)	27/32 (33)	29/36 (34)	+1.8/+4.2 (+3.1)
• <b>Eligible for reduced lunch</b>	34/38 (36)	27/31 (30)	-6.8/-8.6 (-8.5)	33/37 (38)	33/44 (43)	0.0/+5.6 (+5.5)
• <b>Not eligible</b>	42/37 (39)	42/31 (32)	<1.0/-6.4 (-6.3)	41/38 (38)	40/38 (39)	-1.8/<1.0 (+3.3)

<sup>33</sup> All participants in the 2004-2005 program year for whom there were testing data had also been participants in the 2003-2004 program year.



<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Reading -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring in Prior School Year</b>	<b>Reading -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring in Program Year</b>	<b>Reading – Change in Percentile Score</b>	<b>Math – Mean Percentile Score – Spring in Prior School Year</b>	<b>Math – Mean Percentile Score – Spring in Program Year</b>	<b>Math – Change in Percentile Score</b>
<b>ETHNIC GROUP</b>						
• <b>White</b>	41/41 (41)	42/47 (35)	<1.0/-5.1 (-5.2)	42/41 (41)	40/46 (45)	-2.0/+5.0 (+4.9)
• <b>Hispanic</b>	29/31 (32)	30/27 (28)	+1.4/-3.1 (-3.0)	25/33 (34)	27/34 (35)	+2.0/+1.0 (+1.7)
• <b>Asian</b>	31/26 (25)	27/23 (23)	-4.2/-3.2 (-1.7)	35/31 (32)	38/36 (37)	+3.2/+4.5 (+4.7)
• <b>African or African-American</b>	Too few cases	Too few cases	Too few cases	Too few cases	Too few cases	Too few cases
• <b>Native American</b>	Too few cases	Too few cases	Too few cases	Too few cases	Too few cases	Too few cases
<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY</b>						
• <b>Limited</b>	13/25 (24)	13/24 (25)	<1.0/-1.2 (<1.0)	12/29 (30)	16/31 (33)	+3.5/+2.6 (+4.6)
• <b>Sufficient</b>	35/35 (36)	36/31 (31)	<1.0/-4.0 (-4.3)	34/36 (37)	34/39 (39)	<1.0/+3.5 (+3.7)
<b>SPECIAL EDUCATION</b>						
• <b>Yes</b>	NA/23 (24)	NA/21 (21)	NA/-2.6 (-3.5)	NA/29 (29)	NA/30 (29)	NA/+1.7 (+2.4)
• <b>No</b>	NA/36 (37)	NA/33 (34)	NA/-3.7 (-2.1)	NA/37 (38)	NA/40 (41)	NA/+3.3 (+3.7)
<b>PROGRAM COMPLETER</b>						
• <b>Completer</b>	NA/32 (31)	NA/29 (27)	NA/-3.1 (-3.5)	NA/35 (33)	NA/38 (38)	NA/+3.1 (+5.2)
• <b>Non-Completer</b>	NA/37 (38)	NA/33 (35)	NA/-5.9 (-2.3)	NA/33 (39)	NA/36 (37)	NA/<1.0 (<1.0)
<b>QUARTILE IN SPRING 2002-2003<sup>34</sup></b>						

<sup>34</sup> 2002-2003 quartile group was for either reading or math, depending on the subject being analyzed.

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Reading -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring in Prior School Year</b>	<b>Reading -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring in Program Year</b>	<b>Reading – Change in Percentile Score</b>	<b>Math – Mean Percentile Score – Spring in Prior School Year</b>	<b>Math – Mean Percentile Score – Spring in Program Year</b>	<b>Math – Change in Percentile Score</b>
• <b>Quartile 1: Lowest</b>	14/NA	19/NA	+5.4/NA	14/NA	19/NA	+5.3/NA
• <b>Quartile 2</b>	35/NA	35/NA	<1.0/NA	35/NA	34/NA	<1.0/NA
• <b>Quartile 3</b>	62/NA	57/NA	-4.9/NA	60/NA	52/NA	-8.1/NA
• <b>Quartile 4: Highest</b>	86/NA	73/NA	-13.4/NA	80/NA	79/NA	-1.0/NA
<b>PRIOR SCHOOL YEAR READING TEST GROUP</b>						
• <b>Level 1</b>	NA/18 (17)	NA/19 (19)	NA/+1.6 (+1.9)	NA/26 (27)	NA/30 (31)	NA/+4.5 (+4.8)
• <b>Level 2</b>	NA/39 (39)	NA/35 (37)	NA/-3.8 (-1.4)	NA/38 (38)	NA/39 (39)	NA/+1.1 (<1.0)
• <b>Levels 3-5</b>	NA/66 (66)	NA/49 (48)	NA/-17.1 (-18.0)	NA/53 (53)	NA/54 (56)	NA/<1.0 (+2.2)
<b>PRIOR SCHOOL YEAR MATHEMATICS TEST GROUP</b>						
• <b>Level 1</b>	NA/22 (23)	NA/20 (20)	NA/-2.2 (-2.2)	NA/18 (17)	NA/25 (25)	NA/+7.2 (+7.2)
• <b>Level 2</b>	NA/40 (41)	NA/35 (37)	NA/-4.9 (-4.6)	NA/40 (40)	NA/41 (42)	NA/+1.3 (+2.4)
• <b>Levels 3-5</b>	NA/49 (48)	NA/44 (44)	NA/-4.3 (-3.5)	NA/68 68	NA/62 (63)	NA/-5.0 (-4.0)
<b>ATTENDANCE GROUP IN YEAR PRIOR TO PROGRAM YEAR<sup>35</sup></b>						
• <b>Group 1: Lowest</b>	25/34 (33)	29/30 (32)	+3.4/-1.6 (-2.5)	29/42 (42)	26/39 (38)	-3.0/<1.0 (-4.0)

<sup>35</sup> G1 = lowest attendance, G4 = highest attendance; G1 = less than 91 percent, G2 = between 91 and 94 percent, G3 = between 95 and 97 percent, and G4 = greater than 98 percent

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Reading -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring in Prior School Year</b>	<b>Reading -- Mean Percentile Score -- Spring in Program Year</b>	<b>Reading – Change in Percentile Score</b>	<b>Math – Mean Percentile Score – Spring in Prior School Year</b>	<b>Math – Mean Percentile Score – Spring in Program Year</b>	<b>Math – Change in Percentile Score</b>
• <b>Group 2</b>	38/34 (34)	39/33 (33)	<1.0/<1.0 (<1.0)	37/31 (31)	39/30 (30)	+2.0/-1.5 (-1.5)
• <b>Group 3</b>	32/32 (34)	32/29 (30)	<1.0/-2.5 (-2.1)	29/33 (35)	30/36 (36)	+1.2/+4.9 (+3.2)
• <b>Group 4: Highest</b>	36/33 (33)	36/38 (29)	<1.0/-4.4 (-4.0)	36/36 (35)	36/39 (40)	<1.0/+3.7 (+5.0)

**TABLE 5:  
TEACHER-REPORTED CHANGE IN STUDENT BEHAVIOR  
FROM BEGINNING OF MARKING PERIOD  
(ASAP Program Participants Only)**

Percent in 2003-2004 program/Percent in 2004-2005 program  
(Percent in both years)

<b>TYPE OF BEHAVIOR</b>	<b>A Lot Better (5)</b>	<b>Somewhat Better (3)</b>	<b>A Little Better (1)</b>	<b>Worse (-2)</b>	<b>No Change (0)</b>
<b>ACADEMIC BEHAVIORS</b>					
<b>Participates in class discussions</b>	6/3 (3)	24/25 (21)	15/7 (9)	7/4 (6)	48/61 (61)
<b>Completes classwork</b>	7/5 (6)	21/20 (19)	17/7 (8)	8/4 (5)	47/64 (62)
<b>Completes homework</b>	10/10 (10)	20/12 (12)	13/9 (9)	9/6 (7)	49/63 (62)
<b>ATTENDING BEHAVIORS</b>					
<b>Arrives to class on time</b>	6/3 (4)	<1/6 (7)	6/4 (4)	7/4 (5)	80/83 (80)
<b>Pays attention in class</b>	9/5 (5)	19/27 (21)	23/8 (9)	6/4 (5)	43/56 (60)
<b>Talks in class at inappropriate times</b>	12/6 (7)	9/13 (14)	2/6 (7)	1/3 (3)	75/72 (69)
<b>Fidgets or gets out of seat at inappropriate time</b>	8/3 (5)	8/11 (9)	2/3 (4)	0/3 (4)	82/80 (78)
<b>Listens and follows directions</b>	8/5 (3)	20/17 (15)	19/8 (10)	4/4 (5)	49/66 (67)
<b>SOCIAL BEHAVIORS</b>					
<b>Gets in arguments with other students</b>	9/3 (5)	7/3 (4)	3/2 (1)	<1/1 (1)	80/91 (88)
<b>Is disrespectful to adults</b>	6/2 (1)	3/4 (6)	4/2 (2)	0/<1 (<1)	88/91 (90)

<b>TYPE OF BEHAVIOR</b>	<b>A Lot Better (5)</b>	<b>Somewhat Better (3)</b>	<b>A Little Better (1)</b>	<b>Worse (-2)</b>	<b>No Change (0)</b>
<b>Is disruptive to class routine</b>	7/4 (5)	4/8 (9)	4/3 (3)	0/1 (2)	85/84 (81)
<b>Has negative attitude toward school</b>	6/3 (3)	6/6 (6)	4/3 (2)	1/2 (2)	83/86 (87)

**TABLE 6:**  
**TEACHER REPORT OF CHANGE INDEX SCORES BY GROUP**  
**(ASAP participants only)**

Participants in 2003-2004/Participants in 2004-2005  
 (Participants in both years)

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Mean Score on Academic Behaviors</b>	<b>Mean Score on Attending Behaviors</b>	<b>Mean Score on Social Behaviors</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	1.0/0.8 (0.8)	0.8/0.7 (0.6)	0.5/0.3 (0.3)
<b>PARENT LIAISON</b>			
• <b>Yes</b>	1.0/0.8 (0.8)	0.7/0.6 (0.6)	0.4/0.3 (0.3)
• <b>No</b>	1.0/0.9 (0.8)	0.9/0.7 (0.6)	0.6/0.3 (0.3)
<b>SCHOOL LEVEL</b>			
• <b>Primary (K-2)</b>	0.6/1.1 (1.0)	0.8/0.9 (0.9)	0.7/0.4 (0.3)
• <b>Upper Elementary (3-5)</b>	1.2/0.7 (0.5)	0.8/0.5 (0.5)	0.4/0.3 (0.4)
• <b>Middle (6-8)</b>	NA/0.9 (0.9)	NA/0.6 (0.7)	NA/0.3 (0.3)
• <b>High (9-12)</b>	NA/NA	NA/NA	NA/NA
<b>FAMILY INCOME LEVEL</b>			
• <b>Eligible for free lunch</b>	1.2/0.9 (0.9)	0.9/0.7 (0.7)	0.5/0.4 (0.5)
• <b>Eligible for reduced lunch</b>	0.8/0.8 (0.9)	0.5/0.5 (0.6)	0.3/0.2 (0.3)
• <b>Not eligible</b>	0.7/0.8 (0.6)	0.7/0.6 (0.5)	0.5/0.2 (0.2)
<b>ETHNIC GROUP</b>			
• <b>White</b>	0.8/0.8 (0.8)	0.9/0.7 (0.7)	0.5/0.3 (0.3)
• <b>Hispanic</b>	1.1/0.8 (0.7)	0.8/0.6 (0.6)	0.5/0.3 (0.4)
• <b>Asian</b>	1.0/0.9 (0.8)	0.6/0.6 (0.4)	0.3/0.2 (0.2)
• <b>African or African-American</b>	Too few cases	Too few cases	Too few cases
• <b>Native American</b>	Too few cases	Too few cases	Too few cases

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Mean Score on Academic Behaviors</b>	<b>Mean Score on Attending Behaviors</b>	<b>Mean Score on Social Behaviors</b>
<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY</b>			
• <b>Limited</b>	1.1/0.8 (0.7)	0.9/0.7 (0.5)	1.1/0.3 (0.2)
• <b>Sufficient</b>	1.0/0.9 (0.8)	0.8/0.6 (0.7)	0.4/0.3 (0.4)
<b>21<sup>st</sup> CCLC COMPLETER STATUS</b>			
• <b>Completer</b>	1.0/0.9 (0.8)	0.8/0.7 (0.6)	0.5/0.3 (0.4)
• <b>Non-Completer</b>	1.1/0.8 (0.7)	0.8/0.5 (0.4)	1.0/<0.1 (0)
<b>PRIOR SCHOOL YEAR READING TEST GROUP</b>			
• <b>Level 1</b>	NA/0.9 (0.9)	NA/0.6 (0.6)	NA/0.3 (0.4)
• <b>Level 2</b>	NA/0.9 (1.0)	NA/0.6 (0.6)	NA/0.2 (0.3)
• <b>Levels 3-5</b>	NA/0.6 (0.6)	NA/0.5 (0.4)	NA/0.4 (0.4)
<b>PRIOR SCHOOL YEAR MATHEMATICS TEST GROUP</b>			
• <b>Level 1</b>	NA/1.0 (1.0)	NA/0.6 (0.7)	NA/0.3 (0.4)
• <b>Level 2</b>	NA/0.8 (0.7)	NA/0.6 (0.6)	NA/0.2 (0.3)
• <b>Levels 3-5</b>	NA/0.7 (0.6)	NA/0.4 (0.3)	NA/0.5 (0.5)
<b>PRIOR SCHOOL YEAR ATTENDANCE GROUP<sup>36</sup></b>			
• <b>Group 1: Lowest</b>	1.4/1.1 (1.1)	1.1/0.6 (0.7)	0.9/0.5 (0.5)
• <b>Group 2</b>	1.0/0.8 (0.8)	1.0/0.9 (1.0)	0.5/0.6 (0.7)

<sup>36</sup> G1 = lowest attendance, G4 = highest attendance; G1 = less than 91 percent, G2 = between 91 and 94 percent, G3 = between 95 and 97 percent, and G4 = greater than 98 percent

<b>STUDENT GROUP</b>	<b>Mean Score on Academic Behaviors</b>	<b>Mean Score on Attending Behaviors</b>	<b>Mean Score on Social Behaviors</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Group 3</b></li> </ul>	0.9/0.9 (1.0)	0.7/0.8 (0.8)	0.3/0.3 (0.4)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Group 4: Highest</b></li> </ul>	1.0/0.7 (0.7)	0.6/0.5 (0.5)	0.4/0.2 (0.2)