

SFUSD

Program Evaluation &
Research Department

Final
Evaluation
Report

**After School
Education and
Safety Program**

2004-2005

Ingrid Roberson
Evaluator

IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

SCHOOL NAME	CDS_CODE	PROGRAM_ID
AP GIANNINI	6059828	38-R2002-587
APTOS	6062020	38-R2002-587
BEN FRANK	6059836	38-R2002-587
BESSIE CARMICHAEL	6040752	38-R2003-002
BRET HARTE	6040760	38-R2004-344
BRYANT	6040778	38-R2003-002
CESAR CHAVEZ	6041149	38-R2002-588
CLAIRE LILIENTHAL	6102479	38-R2002-587
CLEVELAND	6040836	38-R2002-588
DR. CHARLES DREW	6104673	38-R2004-344
DR. GEORGE CARVER	6093496	38-R2004-344
DEAVILIA	6040927	38-R2002-588
DENMAN	6059869	38-R2002-587
EL DORADO	6040950	38-R2004-344
EVERETT	6062038	38-R2003-001
FAIRMOUNT	6040984	38-R2004-344
FILIPINO	6089577	38-R2002-588
FRANCIS SCOTT KEY	6041008	38-R2003-002
FRANCISCO	6059844	38-R2002-587
GLEN PARK	6041073	38-R2004-344
GLORIA R DAVIS	6113237	38-R2002-587
GOLDEN GATE	6041081	38-R2002-588
GORDON J LAU	6040877	38-R2002-588
GUADALUPE	6041123	38-R2002-588
HARVEY MILK	6040919	38-R2002-588
HILLCREST	6041156	38-R2003-002
HORACE MANN	6022046	38-R2002-587
JAMES LICK	6062053	38-R2002-587
JEAN PARKER	6041206	38-R2002-588
JOHN MUIR	6041255	38-R2004-344
JOHN SWETT	6041263	38-R2004-344
JOHN YEHALL CHIN	6113252	38-R2002-588
JUNIPERO SERRA	6041289	38-R2004-344
LEONARD R. FLYNN	6041347	38-R2004-344
LUTHER BURBANK	6059877	38-R2002-587
MALCOLM X	6041586	38-R2002-588
MARINA	6041578	38-R2002-588
MARSHALL	6041412	38-R2003-002
MARTIN LUTHER KING	6059885	38-R2002-587
MCKINLEY	6041420	38-R2004-344
MIRALOMA	6041438	38-R2003-002
MONROE	6041446	38-R2002-588
PAUL REVERE	6041487	38-R2004-344

POTRERO HILL	6072052	38-R2003-001
PRESIDIO	6062079	38-R2002-587
ROOSEVELT	6059901	38-R2003-001
SANCHEZ	6041545	38-R2004-344
SF COMMUNITY	6093488	38-R2002-588
SHERMAN	6041578	38-R2002-588
SHERIDAN	6041560	38-R2002-588
SPRING VALLEY	6041610	38-R2004-344
STARR KING	6041602	38-R2004-344
SUNNYSIDE	6041610	38-R2002-588
TREASURE ISLAND	6041669	38-R2004-344
TWENTY FIRST CENTURY	6041032	38-R2004-344
ULLOA	6041685	38-R2003-002
WEBSTER	6040893	38-R2002-588
WILLIAM COBB	6040968	38-R2004-344
VIS VALLEY ES	6041701	38-R2002-588
VIS VALLEY MID	6059919	38-R2002-587

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

San Francisco Unified School District's goal is to create and sustain "safe havens" at public schools where students and community members can access significant expanded learning opportunities and integrated education, health, social service, recreation, and cultural programs in the out-of-school hours. In 2004-2005, 65 out of 118 school sites (49 elementary schools and 16 middle schools) provided students with expanded learning opportunities. This following are highlights of findings from the 2004-2005 evaluation.

Increased Academic Achievement

The after school program was especially successful at the middle school level. More after school middle school students than Non-after school middle school students met state standards as measured by the California Standards Test. While overall middle school students' GPAs declined, after school students showed an increase in GPA.

- After School Program results in improved scores on the CST and CAT-6 for middle school students in mathematics. On the California Standards Test in Math, there is an eight percent increase in the number of students meeting state standards. On the California Achievement Test in Math, there is statistically significant growth for middle school students as compared to non-significant growth for Non-ASE students.
- Also for middle school students in terms of grade point average, while overall middle school GPAs declined by .04 points, students who attend the after school program for 90 days or more show an increase in their GPA at statistically significant levels.
- At the elementary level, on the California Standards Test, for those elementary students that attend after school program, there is a nine percent increase in the number of students meeting state standards in English Language Arts and a seven percent increase in Mathematics

Improved Confidence in Reading, Writing and Speaking Skills

Elementary and middle schools students were satisfied with their after school program as reported on student surveys.

- In terms of improvement as a result of being in the after school program, three-fourths of middle school students as compared to two-thirds of elementary students agree that they are more confident about their reading skills, participating in a group discussion and expressing their ideas and agree they are better students, speaker and writers.

- In terms of adult relationships with after school staff, elementary students felt that teachers and other grown-ups care about them, believe that they can do a good job and listen when they have something to say. At the middle school level, on average, four-fifths of middle schools student agreed that there is an adult who wants them to do their best, who cares about them, who tells them they do a good job, who listens to them, and who believes in their success.

Strong Staff, Community-Based Partnerships and Regular Day School Support

The top three strengths identified across after school program coordinators were as follows: 1) enrichment programming (66%), 2) structured physical activity (51%) and 3) attendance/enrollment and coordination/collaboration with school day (43% each). Coordinators elaborated on the enabling factors identifying after school staff, community-based partnerships, and regular school day support as reasons for their programmatic strengths.

- Staff coordinators commended the quality of the after school staff in their commitment and service to the after school program, resulting in high quality, high interest program activities especially with respect to enrichment activities such as salsa, hip hop, yoga, judo, tennis, art, and claymation.
- In addition to a strong staff, coordinators commented that community partnerships assisted in expanding the menu of enrichment activities that their after school program could offer to student.
- Several site coordinators identified school support with principal and teachers as being pivotal in providing a strong academic component from communication expectations to actual staff development in core content areas.

Overall, the 65 after school sites are achieving the goal of creating and sustaining “safe havens” at public schools where students and community members can access significant expanded academic and enrichment opportunities in the out-of-school hours.

PROGRAM DESIGN

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The After School Education and Safety Program, initiated by the Legislature in 1998 (SB 1756), provides funds to establish local after school education and enrichment programs. This program offers schools the opportunity to broaden the base of support for education by developing opportunities through the collaborative efforts of parents, teachers, community-based organizations and private sector. In 2004-2005, 65 out of 118 school sites (49 elementary schools and 16 middle schools) provided students with extended learning opportunities (see Table 1).

Table 1: Schools in After School Education and Safety Program

49 Elementary Schools		
Alvarado	Guadalupe	Sanchez
Bessie Carmichael	Harvey Milk	San Francisco Community
Bret Harte	Hillcrest	Sheridan
Bryant	Jean Parker	Sherman
Cesar Chavez	John Muir	Spring Valley
Cleveland	John Swett	Starr King
Claire Lilienthal	John Yehall Chin	Sunnyside
Dr. Charles Drew	Junipero Serra	Sunset
Dr. George Washington Carver	Lawton	Treasure Island
El Dorado	Leonard R. Flynn	Twenty-First Century
ER Taylor	Malcolm X	Ulloa
Fairmount	Marshall	Visitation Valley
Filipino Education Center	McKinley	Webster
Francis Scott Key	Miraloma	William DeAvila
Glen Park	Monroe	William Cobb
Golden Gate	Paul Revere	
Gordon J. Lau	Rosa Parks	
16 Middle Schools		
A.P. Giannini	Francisco	Marina
Aptos	Gloria R. Davis	Presidio
Ben Franklin	Horace Mann	Roosevelt
Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.	James Denman	Visitation Valley
Enola D. Maxwell	James Lick	
Everett	Luther Burbank	

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

San Francisco Unified School District's goal is to create and sustain "safe havens" at public schools where students and community members can access significant expanded learning opportunities and integrated education, health, social service, recreation, and cultural programs in the out-of-school hours. There are four programmatic objectives:

1. Improve the rate at which students meet or exceed state and local standards in core academic subjects such as reading and mathematics.
2. Improve the social, recreational, and personal behaviors of students to allow them to sustain academic achievement and avoid drug use and violence.
3. Serve as a resource for parents and other community members.
4. Increase the ability of schools, parents, students, and community based organizations to plan, collaborate, and sustain after school programs.

PROGRAM STRATEGIES, RESOURCES AND ACTIVITIES

The three components of the program include the following:

1. Educational and Literacy Program: Students study reading, math, writing, science, social studies, computers, art and music.
2. Enrichment and Recreational Program: Students participate in intramural sports, physical education, arts and crafts, cooking, dance, aerobics, and field trips.
3. Positive, Safe and Healthy Environment Program: Students participate in life skills, diversity programs, drug and violence education, conflict mediation, multiple intelligence curricula, counseling and anger management.

The After School Education and Safety Program provides a safe place for students to go after school where they can participate in numerous education and enrichment activities

EVALUATION DESIGN

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

At SFUSD, the Department of Program Evaluation and Research employs an approach to evaluation that is participatory (Cousins & Earl, 1992), utilization-focused (Patton, 1986, 1994), and integrated with processes of continuous improvement and program planning (Fetterman, Kaftarian & Wandersman, 1996). Our approach is based on the idea that participation of program directors and coordinators in the evaluation process is key to insuring that program planners and managers use evaluation data to support decision-making. The involvement of program directors and coordinators has the potential to encourage program staff to think more systematically about the relationship between program activities and objectives. Such systematic reflection would be aimed at building a “culture of learning” (Patton, 1997, p. 147) to lead to continuous program improvement.

Evaluations are designed to address both program implementation (formative evaluation) and outcomes (summative evaluation) and are question-driven. Evaluators and program staff collaborate to develop evaluation questions that are linked to the program objectives and activities, and to the interests of all program stakeholders. In addition, research on the best practices in the project’s domain of activity informs the evaluation framework. The evaluation design involves a mix of qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis methods, such as standardized measures and tests, focus groups, surveys, and on-site observation. Each evaluation design involves the triangulation of multiple sources of data brought to bear on crucial evaluation questions.

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

This evaluation is guided by the stated goal of the After School Education and Safety Program’s which is to create and sustain “safe havens” at public schools where students and community members can access significant expanded learning opportunities and integrated education, health, social service, recreation, and cultural programs in the out-of-school hours. The specific objectives as aligned with stated goal are as follows:

1. Improve the rate at which students meet or exceed state and local standards in core academic subjects such as reading and mathematics.
2. Improve the social, recreational, and personal behaviors of students to allow them to sustain academic achievement and avoid drug use and violence.
3. Serve as a resource for parents and other community members.
4. Increase the ability of schools, parents, students, and community based organizations to plan, collaborate, and sustain after school programs.

DATA COLLECTION METHODS

Multiple sources of data were gathered to help answer evaluation questions.

Program Documentation

Program documents were reviewed to gain a more detailed understanding of the preparation and continued professional development of coordinators, lead teachers, and mentors. Documents reviewed included: calendars, agendas and handouts.

Coordinator Survey

In 2004-2005, 37 elementary (75% response rate) and 13 middle (81% response rate) after school coordinators completed a survey. For the entire K-8 after school program, a total of 50 coordinators completed a survey, yielding a 77% overall program response rate.

The survey was designed to obtain information on student enrollment, parent involvement, staffing and professional development, partnerships, collaboration with regular school day program, and program strengths and challenges.

Student Survey

As compared to last with a total of 242 students completing a student survey, in 2004-2005, 805 elementary (20% response rate) and 364 middle (10% response rate) school students completed a survey. For the entire K-8 after school program, a total of 1,169 out of 7,728 student completed a student survey, yielding a 15% overall program response rate.

The survey was designed to obtain information on how students feel about the after-school program literacy activities, how students feel about their own literacy abilities, whether students feel they have improved as a result of participating in after-school programs and youth safety and resilience.

Academic Achievement Data

To analyze the key outcomes of improved student academic performance, state and district measures were used. The state measures included the performance on the California Standards Test (CST) and the California Achievement Test (CAT-6) from Spring 2004 to Spring 2005. District measures included the grade point average as well as student attendance rates from Spring 2004 to Spring 2005. To further understand the impact of the After School Learning and Safe Partnerships Program, ASE student performance is compared to non-ASE students on state and district measures.

Limitations of the Data

Performance and gains on the CST, the CAT-6 and GPA are the indicators used to assess academic achievement. Since many factors influence standardized test scores and grades, any gains in student academic performance cannot be attributed with a high degree of confidence to a single intervention.

EVALUATION FINDINGS

The evaluation findings section of this report is organized according to the objectives of the After School Education and Safety Program. Each objective is presented followed by the findings.¹ Supports and barriers to implementation of the program are further discussed in the next section of this report under “Issues to Consider for Continuous Improvement”.

OBJECTIVE 1: IMPROVE THE RATE AT WHICH STUDENTS MEET OR EXCEED STATE AND LOCAL STANDARDS IN CORE ACADEMIC SUBJECTS SUCH AS READING AND MATHEMATICS.

Students who participated in their school’s after school program were compared to students at schools with the after school program, but who never participated. These two groups were compared on four measures 1) California Standards Test, 2) California Achievement Test, 3) Grade Point Average, and 4) Average Daily Attendance (see Tables 2-7). The following are highlights of findings:

- After School Program results in improved scores on the CST and CAT-6 for middle school students in mathematics. On the California Standards Test in Math, there is an eight percent increase in the number of students meeting state standards. On the California Achievement Test in Math, there is statistically significant growth for middle school students as compared to non-significant growth for Non-ASE students.
- Also for middle school students in terms of grade point average, while overall middle school GPAs declined by .04 points, students who attend the after school program for 90 days or more show an increase in their GPA at statistically significant levels.
- At the elementary level, on the California Standards Test, for those elementary students that attend after school program, there is a nine percent increase in the number of students meeting state standards in English Language Arts and a seven percent increase in Mathematics

¹ Objectives are aligned with the evaluation questions in the “Before and After School Programs Evaluation Guide.”

Table 2: ASE and Non-ASE Student Performance on CST-ELA

Level	CST-ELA 04 Percent Proficient	CST-ELA 05 Percent Proficient	04-05 Percent Change
Elementary			
All ASE	23%	32%	9%
Non-ASE Participants	43%	49%	6%
Middle			
All ASE	35%	38%	3%
Non-ASE Participants	44%	49%	5%

Table 3: ASE and Non-ASE Student Performance on CST-Math

Level	CST-Math 04 Percent Proficient	CST-Math 05 Percent Proficient	04-05 Percent Change
Elementary			
All ASE	39%	46%	7%
Non-ASE Participants	56%	61%	5%
Middle			
All ASE	35%	43%	8%
Non-ASE Participants	43%	49%	6%

At the elementary level, there was an increase in the percentage of both participating and non-participating ASE students performing at or above proficient in English Language Arts and Mathematics. For those that attend after school program, there is nine percent increase in the number of students meeting state English Language Arts standards.

At the middle school level, the percentage of students meeting standards in Mathematics increased eight percentage points for ASE students.

Table 4: ASE and Non-ASE Student Performance on CAT-6 Reading - MATCHED

Level	CAT Reading 04 Mean NCE	CAT Reading 05 Mean NCE	04-05 NCE Change	Significance
Elementary				
All ASE	47.27	46.53	-.74	.007
Non-ASE Participants	48.92	48.29	.63	.044
Middle				
All ASE	46.34	49.01	2.67	.000
Non-ASE Participants	47.39	49.89	2.50	.000

Table 5: ASE and Non-ASE Student Performance on CAT-6 Math - MATCHED

Level	CAT Mathematics 04 Mean NCE	CAT Mathematics 05 Mean NCE	04-05 NCE Change	Significance
Elementary				
All ASE	58.11	59.41	1.30	.000
Non-ASE Participants	59.87	61.38	1.51	.000
Middle				
All ASE	52.38	52.95	.57	.019
Non-ASE Participants	53.08	53.53	.45	No

At both the elementary and middle school level, there was a positive increase in math scores on the CAT-6 at statistically significant levels. There was a positive increase in Reading scores at statistically significant levels only for middle schools.

Of special interest, at the middle school level, there was no statistically significant increase in math scores for Non-ASE participants.

Table 6: ASE and Non-ASE Student Average Daily Attendance - MATCHED

Level	ADA 04	ADA 05	04-05 ADA Change	Significance
Elementary				
All ASE	94.96%	95.36%	.40%	.000
ASE >120 days	95.86%	96.44%	.58%	.000
ASE > 90 days	92.16%	93.18%	1.02%	.011
ASE > 60 days	92.67%	93.24%	.57%	No
ASE > 30 days	92.06%	93.37%	1.31%	.006
ASE < 30 days	91.64%	92.34%	.70%	No
Non-ASE	95.07%	95.39%	.32%	.000
Middle				
All ASE	91.92%	88.56%	-3.36%	.000
ASE >120 days	95.45%	94.34%	-1.11%	.000
ASE > 90 days	94.25%	92.77%	-1.48%	.000
ASE > 60 days	92.51%	90.15%	-2.36%	.000
ASE > 30 days	90.77%	85.85%	-4.92%	.000
ASE < 30 days	90.91%	85.96%	-4.95%	.000
Non-ASE	91.70%	88.33%	-3.37%	.000

At the elementary level, attendance increased at statistically significant levels for both ASE and NON-ASE participants.

At the middle school level, attendance decreased at statistically significant levels for both ASE and NON-ASE participants. However, there is a relationship between regular and after school day attendance, suggesting that the After School Program may have had a mitigating affect on middle school student attendance.

Table 7: ASE and Non-ASE Student GPA and Gains - MATCHED

Level	GPA 03	GPA 04	Difference	Significance	
Middle					
All ASE	2.80	2.76	-.04	.000	
ASE >120 days		3.03	3.04	.01	.000
ASE > 90 days		2.82	2.90	.08	.000
ASE > 60 days		2.65	2.63	-.02	.000
ASE > 30 days		2.56	2.57	.01	.000
ASE < 30 days		2.58	2.44	-.14	.000
Non-ASE	2.83	2.79	-.04	.000	

Similar to findings with average daily attendance, while grade point average dropped for ASE and NON-ASE participants, the more a student attended their after school program (with the exception of those attending between 60-89 days), the more likely there was a increase in their grade point average at statistically significant levels. Again, there is a relationship between attendance and grade point average, suggesting that the After School Program may have had a mitigating affect on middle school grade point averages.

OBJECTIVE 2: IMPROVE THE SOCIAL, RECREATIONAL, AND PERSONAL BEHAVIORS OF STUDENTS TO ALLOW THEM TO SUSTAIN ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AND AVOID DRUG USE AND VIOLENCE.

Table 8: Alignment between District Objective and State Evaluation Guide Question

Objective	Evaluation Guide Question
Improve the social, recreational, and personal behaviors of students to allow them to sustain academic achievement and avoid drug use and violence	1. What anecdotal evidence is there about changes in students' behavior?

Students were surveyed on their perception of the impact as a results of their participation in the after school program. The following are highlights of findings:

- In terms of improvement as a result of being in the after school program, three-fourths of middle school students as compared to two-thirds of elementary students agree that they are more confident about their reading skills, participating in a group discussion and expressing their ideas and agree they are better students, speaker and writers.
- In terms of adult relationships with after school staff, elementary students felt that teachers and other grown-ups care about them, believe that they can do a good job and listen when they have something to say. At the middle school level, on average, four-fifths of middle schools student agreed that there is an adult who wants them to do their best, who cares about them, who tells them they do a good job, who listens to them, and who believes in their success.
- With respect to program rules, elementary and middle schools students agreed that program rules are clear and are fairly enforced. Four-fifths of elementary and middle school student agreed that they know what will happen if they break a rule.

Table 9: Student Survey - Improvement as a Result of Being in After-School Program

	Elementary (n=805)	Middle (n=364)
As a result of being in this program, I am more confident of my own reading skills.	69%	77%
I am a better student since participating in this program.	67%	75%
As a result of being in this program, I feel more confident participating in a group discussion.	66%	74%
As a result of being in this program, I speak well in front of other people.	62%	72%
As a result of being in this program, I am more confident expressing (or talking about) my ideas.	63%	72%
As a result of being in this program, my writing skills have improved.	69%	70%

**Percentages reflect students who responded “strongly agree” or “agree”.*

Elementary and middle schools students’ opinions diverge when it comes to assessing their improvement as a result of being in ASE with on-average three-fourths of middle school students as compared to two-thirds of elementary students agreeing with survey statements. Approximately three-fourths of middle schools students surveyed felt more confident about their reading skills, participating in a group discussion and expressing their ideas. Furthermore, three-fourths of middle schools students believe they are a better student, speak well in front of other people and have improved writing skills.

Table 11: Student Survey – Program Rules

	Elementary (n=805)	Middle (n=364)
I know what will happen to me if I break a rule.	83%	89%
This program has clear rules.	79%	84%
Rules are enforced fairly in this program.	75%	79%

**Percentages reflect students who responded “strongly agree” or “agree”.*

Table 10: Student Survey – Adult Relationships

	Elementary (n=805)	Middle (n=364)
Care about you?	81%	80%
Believe you can do a good job?	78%	86%
Listen when you have something to say?	72%	80%
Tell you when you do a good job?	68%	80%
Who notices when I’m not there.	n/a	77%
Who believes I will be a success.	n/a	81%

**Percentages reflect students who responded “strongly agree” or “agree”.*

In terms of program rules, both elementary and middle schools students agreed that program rules are clear and are fairly enforced. Four-fifths of elementary and middle school student agreed that they know what will happen if they break a rule.

However, in terms of adult relationships, once again, middle schools students indicated higher satisfaction with after school adult relationships than elementary students. Elementary students felt that teachers and other grown-ups care about them, believe that they can do a good job and listen when they have something to say. At the middle school level, on average, four-fifths of middle schools student agreed that there is an adult who wants them to do their best, who cares about them, who tells them they do a good job, who listens to them, and who believes in their success.

OBJECTIVE 3: SERVE AS A RESOURCE FOR PARENTS AND OTHER COMMUNITY MEMBERS.

Table 12: Parent After School Events

Events	Workshops/Skill Building
Back to School Night	Child Behavior Management
Holiday Party	ESL Classes
Math Night	Technology/Computer Classes
Family Literacy Night	Parenting Skills/Education
Assembly	Cultural Adjustment
Lights on After-school	Mentor Training
School Site Council	Study Skills/Organization Skills
Family Nutrition Night	

ASE programs report the above types of events and workshops for parents. In addition to events and workshops, after school programs are in constant communication with parents through:

- Phone calls (92%),
- Individual meetings (83%),
- Letters (81%),
- Flyers (73%) and
- Emails (12%).

ASE programs communicate with parents on the following:

- Positive behavior (87%),
- Behavior issues (94%),
- Academics (79%), and
- Social events (79%)

ASE program coordinators take seriously the after school-to-home connection.

OBJECTIVE 4: INCREASE THE ABILITY OF SCHOOLS, PARENTS, STUDENTS, AND COMMUNITY BASED ORGANIZATIONS TO PLAN, COLLABORATE, AND SUSTAIN AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS.

Table 13: Alignment between District Objective and State Evaluation Questions

Objective	Evaluation Guide Questions
Increase the ability of schools, parents, students, and community based organizations to plan, collaborate, and sustain after school programs.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Describe the ASE staff. 2. Describe the collaborative 3. Is the program receiving reimbursement for snacks? 4. How has the ASE changed from what was originally envisioned? 5. How has the ASE been integrated with the regular school programs and teachers? 6. What other information is important for the program partnership and CDE to know about the program?

Describe the ASE staff.

All ASE school sites were asked to report on the staff that made up their after school program.

Table 14: Description of ASE Staff

Staff Position	Number
Number of Credentialed Teachers	315
Number of Paid Instructional Aides	43
Number of College/High School Student Workers	230
Number of CalWorks (employees and volunteers)	15
Number of Parents	41
Number of Other Community Members	197
Other Volunteers	110

Did the program experience a lot of turnover in staff?

Sites reported high retention of staff from community-based organizations such as the YMCA and related community centers as well as high retention of instructional aides and volunteers. A major part of the After School Education staff are the District level program coordinators. To ensure consistence of program implementation SFUSD has increased the number of District Coordinators from three to eight. District Coordinators work with the 65 participating schools to insure proper implementation, coordination, and communication across the sites. Three of the eight district coordinators have been in their position for all four years of grant.

What staff development activities have been implemented?

School Health Programs Department’s ExCEL Coordinators continue to be instrumental in insuring quality staff development for all the ASE participating schools. At the beginning of the 2004-2005 school year, the coordinators organized a professional development institute. The institute provided teambuilding, orientation, professional development, networking, and strategic planning opportunities for all ASE coordinators, lead teachers, and community partners. A full day’s worth of professional development was conducted that focused on how each site can best meet the needs of the diverse youth they serve. Practical methods for designing curriculum, providing quality enrichment programs, coordinating with other school service providers, creating a “seamless” school day that includes after school programming, creating family friendly schools, implementing service learning, and developing youth-centered programming were discussed. The ASE District coordinators also held monthly coordinator and lead teacher meetings that focused mostly on staff development. Table 19 below describes all the meetings held during the year.

Table 15: Professional Development Meetings

Site Coordinator Meeting Topics	Lead Teachers Meeting Topics
Youth Development	Assessments
Citywide Resources	Service Coordination
Service Coordination	Individualized Plans
Case Management	Literacy Activities
Collaboration	Tutoring Techniques
Integration w/ School	Math Activities
Family Involvement	Safe Schools
Diversity	Youth Development
Safe Schools	Transitions
Behavior Management	Evaluation
Sustainability	
Evaluation	

Describe the collaborative. Who are the ASE partners and how are their contributions reflected in program content?

As mentioned earlier, the After School Education Collaborative in San Francisco consists of eight District coordinators. The 65 schools are split up among the eight coordinators who are staff of San Francisco School Health Programs Department. These individuals are responsible for coordinating the overall program throughout the District. They organize professional development, as well as monitor budgets, curriculum, and overall implementation of each school's program. Although each site has the freedom to design their program as they see fit to meet the needs of the school's population, the District coordinators insure that each site is implementing programming to the standards outlined in the grant.

At each school site there is a leadership team consisting of the school site administrator, the site coordinator, certificated lead teacher, CBO partner, parent liaison, and student representative. In addition, each school site counsel is responsible for insuring that the After School Learning Program is directly linked to the school site plan, and each school site is encouraged to involve additional teachers, students, parents, volunteers, and community partners in the design and implementation of the program.

As a District collaborative, School Health Programs along with the District coordinators require that each site send a representative to the monthly "Leadership" meetings. Each month, both a site coordinator and lead teacher meeting are held whereby general organizational information as well as professional development is presented.

Collaboration between school sites and community organizations is encouraged for every site. A major tenet of the San Francisco collaborative is that collaboration among agencies enhances and builds community, aids in better understanding and serving youth and their families, and improves communication and services among other agencies. Some of the community agencies that work collaboratively with After School Learning sites include the YMCA, YWCA, Park and Recreation, Instituto Familia de la Raza, the San Francisco Beacon Initiative, Jamestown Community Center, San Francisco State University, Omega Boys Club, and Edgewood Center for Children and Families.

Is the program receiving reimbursement for snacks from the USDA through the National School Fund or the Child Care Food Program every day the program is open for all qualifying students?

Yes. Every school participating in After School Education receives USDA reimbursement for snacks.

How has the ASP changed from what was originally envisioned in the grant application?

In the original grant San Francisco specified five major goals:

- To improve literacy and math skills
- To improve coordination of academic and support services between school day and after school programs

- Provide positive alternatives for youth at risk of gang involvement, drug abuse, and high risk taking behaviors
- Increase opportunities for professional development
- Create job training for child/youth care providers

These objectives are still the main focus of the collaborative, however, as the programs and implementation process have improved in the last three years, the overarching goals and mission statement of After School Learning have been refined.

Overall, SFUSD plans to create and sustain “safe havens” at public school, where students and community members can access significant expanded learning opportunities and integrated education, health, social service, recreation, and cultural programs in the out-of-school hours. Within this mission statement, several objectives that parallel the original objectives have been outlined:

- Improve the rate at which students meet or exceed state and local standards in core academic subjects such as reading and mathematics.
- Improve the social, recreational, and personal behaviors of students to allow them to sustain academic achievement and avoid drug use and violence.
- Serve as a resource for parents and other community members.
- Increase the ability of schools, parents, students, and community based organizations to plan, collaborate, and sustain after school programs.

The work plan outlined in the original grant to help meet these goals continues to be the plan that the collaborative is following.

How has the ASE been integrated with the regular school programs and teachers and other educational reforms at the school(s)?

All school sites that have the ASE are required to integrate the program into their school site plan in order to align the after school program with the goals and objectives of the regular school day. In addition, each site is required to submit a work plan to School Health Programs Department that includes objectives, activities, timelines, responsible staff/partners, targeted students, and evaluation tools. These work plans must also show ways in which each program is working toward creating a seamless school day. Each site is also required to work with a lead teacher who, among other things, is responsible for serving as a liaison between regular school day and after school.

What other information, if any, is important for the program partnership and CDE to know about the program?

San Francisco Unified School District has now completed it’s fourth year of implementing the ASE. School Health Programs Department continues to be extremely successful in

putting together an “Expanded Learning Team” that has provided on-going support, technical assistance, and professional development to all the sites. The team has been dedicated to ensuring that quality services are being provided to students at each of the 65 school sites that include a balanced mix of academics aligned with grade level standards and a broad range of enrichment activities. They have also served as a link between community resources and have helped sites navigate through often-cumbersome District policies. Overall, it is believed that much of the success of San Francisco’s After School Education is due to the high levels of organized coordination of services and support provided by the ExCEL Team.

ISSUES TO CONSIDER FOR CONTINUAL IMPROVEMENT

Supports and barriers to implementation of the program goals are discussed in this section of the report. Recommendations are made for its continuous improvement.

SUPPORTS

After School Coordinators were asked to identify strengths of their after school program. The top three strengths across coordinators were as follows: 1) enrichment programming (66%), 2) structured physical activity (51%) and 3) attendance/enrollment and coordination/collaboration with school day (43% each). Coordinators elaborated on the enabling factors identifying the following:

Strong After School Staff

Staff coordinators commended the quality of the after school staff in their commitment and service to the after school program, resulting in high quality, high interest program activities especially with respect to enrichment activities such as salsa, hip hop, yoga, judo, tennis, art, and claymation as captured by the quotes below:

We have excellent program leaders who are all capable of managing their groups and providing excellent enrichment.

Each program leader has been trained and is skilled in the areas of programs in which they teach.

Staff support and involvement without them this program and it's activities cannot exist.

Strong Community-Based Partnerships

In addition to a strong staff, coordinators commented that community partnerships assisted in expanding the menu of enrichment activities that their after school program could offer to students as demonstrated below:

We have involvement from many outside agencies which gives our program a wide variety of enrichment program[ming].

We have professional and capable artists through SF Arts that provide a strong enrichment program... Forming partnerships with Cleveland Boys and Girls Club and SF Community have provided enrichment support.

Strong Regular School Day Support

Several site coordinators identified school support with principal and teachers as being pivotal in providing a strong academic component from communication expectations to actual staff development in core content areas as expressed in the following:

Teaches shape homework assignment with ASP staff and work with students during one-third academic time from 2:40-3:40.

We partner with five of the regular school day teachers to coordinate with regular school day academically as well as create a seamless transition. We collaborate with those teachers to provide academic support.

Communication with site administrator/teachers is great. Support from site administrator/teachers/lead teacher makes the academic alignment a smooth process.

The principal, lead teacher and teachers help the after school program so that's what makes it very successful.

BARRIERS

In addition, after school coordinators were asked to identify challenges to their after school program. The top three challenges across coordinators were as follows: 1) parent involvement (66%), 2) attendance/enrollment and staff development (40% each). Coordinators identified the following as barriers to successful implementation and impact of the after school program:

Time and Language Barriers with Parents

After school coordinators identified difficulties in communicating with parents due to language barriers. In addition, coordinators indicated that lack of time for parents (due to work and overall hectic schedules) made it difficult to get parent involved in meetings and other events.

Time and Financial Constraints for Staff Development

Coordinators also indicated that time and money are barriers to providing staff development. Essentially, staff development is in addition to regular after school programming time, making it difficult to find the time before or after the program for professional development. Furthermore, coordinators noted that money targeted for staff development is not readily available.

RECOMMENDATION

Collaboration across after school sites that address needs for translation as well as staff development.

Given that there are 65 school sites with after school programs, services might be shared in translating important after school documents such as newsletter or flyers. Centrally, translation services might be provided for key after school recruitment documents.

In terms of professional development, following the regular school day model, after school programs could have two in-service days with no students for important staff development and collaboration. In addition, school sites could pool resources by clustering together for staff development in areas of common interest.