21st Century Community Learning Centers

Statewide Evaluation Report

2018 - 2019

Submitted by: Agency of Education

Report Compiled by VT Afterschool, Inc.

Erin Schwab, Research Analyst

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

Vermont
Afterschool

Table of Contents

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

Introduction and History

In 2010, the Vermont Agency of Education (VTAOE) contracted with Vermont Afterschool to create an evaluation plan for the state's expanded learning programs that receive funding from the federal 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21C) initiative. The plan was established to ensure that 21C school year and summer programs serve the neediest students, support high quality programming and thrive under effective leadership.

During each of the four years that followed (2010-11 through 2013-14), data for these outcomes were collected from 21C-funded projects and each of their corresponding program sites. Project directors submitted data through two separate systems: the federally maintained Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS) and VTAOE's annual performance reports (APRs). In 2014, the US Department of Education announced the suspension of PPICS in favor of a new data collection system.

Also in 2014, the Agency of Education and Vermont Afterschool reassessed the statewide evaluation plan. A task force comprising program leaders from around the state, representatives from Vermont Afterschool and the VTAOE 21C Coordinator established four new goal areas along with results and measures for each of them. The following goal areas were established:

1) Access and equity are assured for all students.
2) All 21C-funded programs are of high quality.
3) All 21C-funded programs have effective leaders.
4) All 21C-funded programs are sustainable.

Under each goal area, related results were created to help concretely define each of them. Each result comprises between one and six specific measures for which data are submitted. Most measures identify site-level, project-level, or statewide targets to be met.

Directors of 21C projects and coordinators of 21C sites have been submitting their evaluation data for each measure into a streamlined online system beginning in 2014-15. VTAOE created and launched two online surveys through a single platform (SurveyMonkey.com): one for collecting project-level data (such as the credentials of project directors) and one for collecting site-level data (such as the numbers of operational weeks per year). In 2017-18, Cognito Forms (cognitoforms.com) replaced Survey Monkey as the data collection platform due to its ability to allow directors to complete their APRs in more than one sitting with the "save and return" feature.

In 2018-19, 26 projects throughout Vermont received funding from the 21C initiative to run expanded learning programs. These projects operated 102 individual sites in school buildings across 13 (out of 14 total) Vermont counties. All sites provided out-of-school time programming during the school year. Ninety-seven sites provided summer learning enrichment for its students, whether on-site or at a nearby school. During the school year, 12,289 PreK-12 students in Vermont were enrolled in 21C programming, and 5,737 students attended on a regular basis. "Regular basis" is defined as 30 days or more throughout the year. Stated as percentages, 14.6% of students in Vermont attended 21C programming and

6.8% students in Vermont attended 21C programming on a regular basis in 2017-18.

Twenty-first Century Community Learning Centers strive to serve the neediest students. These students are defined as those who qualify to receive either free or reduced price school lunches. There were 36,269 such students enrolled in Vermont schools in 2018-19. Of the students that attended programming on a regular basis, 3,435 were eligible for free or reduced price lunch in 2018-19. Overall, 9.5% of the 36,269 students statewide who were eligible for free or reduced price lunch attended 21C programming on a regular basis. Compared with the 6.8% of students statewide who were enrolled in programming on a regular basis, this percentage shows the relative success that 21C programs had in serving some of the neediest students at a more-than-representative rate in 2018-19.

VT's PreK-12 students in 2018-19	Free/reduced lunch students in 2018-19
83,710 students enrolled in VT schools	**36,269** free/reduced lunch students enrolled in VT schools
5,737 students attended 21C programming on a regular basis	**3,435** free/reduced lunch students attended 21C programming on a regular basis
6.8% students attended 21C programming on a regular basis	**9.5%** free/reduced lunch students attended 21C programming on a regular basis

The focus of this report is to provide measure-by-measure comparisons of statewide evaluation results between the years 2014-15 and 2018-19, the five years of data for the revised goal areas and results. The report also includes a qualitative analysis of the barriers and challenges that programs faced in 2018-19, as described by directors and site coordinators through open-ended responses on their APRs. Throughout this report, the terms "programs" and "program sites" are used in addition to "sites" to refer to 21C-funded sites.

Highlighted Strengths, Improvements, and Challenge Areas in 2018-19

The following section of the report highlights the areas of strength and areas in which programs generally showed improvement over the past few years. It also includes areas that were challenging for programs. The section is broken down by each of the four goal areas: Access and Equity, Quality Programming, Program Leadership, and Program Sustainability.

Access and Equity

➢ **AREA OF STRENGTH: 21C program sites have been consistently open for a number of weeks, days per week, and hours per week during the school year to give regular attendees plenty of opportunities to reap the benefits of participation.** On average, 21C program sites operated for a total of 34 weeks during the school year, which was consistent with the previous year and greater than the statewide average target of 32

weeks per year. Eighty-two percent of sites operated for more than 32 weeks per year. In addition, nearly three-quarters of sites (74%) operated for five days per week, which was a 2% increase from the previous year. On average, sites were open 4.7 days per week consistently each year beginning from 2014-15. The average number of hours of operation per week held steady at 12 hours per week. While this number of hours was shy of the statewide average goal of 14 weekly hours, it still would have allowed students to be in programming at least until 5pm each day on average. Overall, 21C sites have been consistently providing a sufficient dosage of school year programming over the past five years.

> **AREA OF IMPROVEMENT: Overall, programs that ran during summer operated for a sufficient number of weeks, days, and hours per week in 2018-19 and many increases were seen from the previous years.** Between the summers of 2017 and 2018, the percentages of summer sites that operated for at least five weeks, at least five days per week, and at least 21 hours per week all increased. Seventy-nine percent of sites provided five or more weeks of programming in 2018, and the average number of weeks was 5.2. Nearly all summer sites (96%) provided five days per week of programming, which was a 5% increase from the previous summer. Between the summers of 2016 through 2018, the percentage of programs that provided at least 21 hours per week of programming rose from 73% to 86% to 90%. In 2018, the statewide average of weekly summer programming hours was 37.2, which is almost the same as a full-time workweek. The statewide average number of days per week of operation was 4.96 in 2018, which is essentially 5 days per week. Families with full time working parents that are able to send their kids to such summer programs such as these surely benefit from the extent of such opportunities.

> **CHALLENGE: Some programs, particularly those operating in middle and high schools faced specific challenges with consistently serving attendees on a regular basis**. Each year since 2014-15, the statewide percentage of total 21C attendees that participated in programming on a regular basis was slightly below 50%. Most recently, in 2018-19, 47% of total statewide attendees were regular attendees; that is, they participated in programming for at least 30 days during the school year, which effectively works out to be less than one day per week over the course of the entire school year. While the goal for the state average was to have 33% of students statewide as regular attendees was met, it is worth looking into the reason that more than half of 21C attendees did not attend programming on a regular basis each year. There were nine sites whose regular participants did not make up more than a quarter of their total attendees, and eight of these nine sites were middle schools and high schools. Furthermore, for the sites that served at least one-third of their participants on a regular basis, what about those students who did not attend programming regularly? What were the reasons? An examination of the open-ended APR responses sheds some

insight. Program leaders cited various reasons for student recruitment and retention. These issues included from transportation challenges, school sports conflicts, and figuring out the right mix of activities that are both "fun and engaging" for middle and high school students.

Quality Programming

➢ **AREA OF STRENGTH: 21C programs are providing opportunities for students to engage in physical activity and are serving healthy food options.** In 2018-19, almost all 21C sites (97%) provided the opportunity for students to participate in at least 20 minutes of physical activity per every two hours of programming offered. This was also the case in both 2016-17 and 2017-18. After full school days of mostly sedentary academic activity, options for physical activity during after school hours allow students to move their bodies and help them stay healthy. Additionally, 92% of program sites scored at least 4.0 on the Nourishment scale of the Youth Program Quality Assessment, indicating that they provide drinking water and healthy food and snack options to students at appropriate times.

➢ **AREA OF IMPROVEMENT: There was a ten percent increase in 21C program sites that provided at least one strategy beyond homework help that was specifically designed to help students that were struggling academically between 2017-18 and 2018-19.** In 2017-18, 71% of 21C program sites provided extra academic help to struggling students as part of their programming. In 2018-19, 81% of sites did so. This increase marked the largest increase of any measure on the entire evaluation. That said, in the previous year (2016-2017), 81% of sites had provided this extra academic support, which was preceded by 79% in both 2014-15 and 2015-16. The improvement between the most recent two years represented a return to the typical rate. It is unclear as to the reason for the dip in 2017-18, but nonetheless it is a positive change to see that roughly four out of every five program sites do offer academic support beyond homework help for students that need it.

➢ **CHALLENGE: Among measures related to programs providing opportunities for students to experience their interests in depth, percentages have been on the decline.** For example, 81% of program sites had at least five of its program offerings meet for a minimum of ten days, which was a 6% decrease from the previous year. Similar decreases were seen that were related to culminating end projects and experiences. When students participate in culminating activities they have chances to reflect on their participation and feel proud of their achievements. Such experiences can also help them understand their experiences in a larger context and connect their learning to life. It also gives teachers and staff opportunities to measure the students' achievements when necessary. In 2018-19, two percent of sites demonstrated that all of their programs

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

provided such opportunities. To be fair, some program sites have many programming opportunities and not all easily lend themselves to culminating activities. However, it is worth noting that in 2015-16, almost triple the percentages of sites (5.7%) had been able to report that all programs provided culminating experiences, and this percentage has decreased each year since that year. In 2018-19, 54% of sites demonstrated that *all or most* programs had the opportunity to create culminating end products and/or performances, which was down from 55% in the previous year and 59% in the year before that. It is worth examining the reasons that these culminating experiences are on the decline and not available for all (or even most) programming options at all sites. This could possibly be connected to the aforementioned challenge of getting students to attend programming on a regular basis.

Program Leadership

➢ **AREA OF STRENGTH: All 21C project directors had at least three years of experience in their field in 2018-19.** This was the first year since the statewide evaluation data collection began that this measure reached 100%. It is a seven percent increase from the previous three years, in which 93% of directors had three or more years of experience in each of those years. Consistency in leadership can contribute to program strength.

➢ **CHALLENGE: On their APRs, program leaders representing 16 sites and 10 projects wrote that recruiting and retaining quality staff is a barrier to program success.** While the numbers on the evaluation measures themselves indicated that the targets for retention rates for directors and site coordinators were met, open-ended responses on the APR revealed that recruiting and retaining quality staff continually elude some program leaders and staff. They articulated various reasons for this, from the part time nature of the work, to scheduling issues for teachers, to college students leaving for long school breaks, to geographical isolation, and to lower-than-desired pay rates for staff. When 21C program leaders have to spend so much time and effort recruiting and hiring staff, it affects their ability to tend to day-to-day operations and run quality programming. In the previous year (2017-18), recruiting and retaining quality staff had also been an issue for a large number of projects and sites.

Project Sustainability

➢ **AREA OF STRENGTH: Eighty-five percent of projects worked with two or more community partners that contributed at least $1000 over the course of the year.** Community partners are valuable resources for programs, as their support can increase programs' ability to operate sustainably. Financial sustainability can be difficult for programs to achieve, especially when they rely so heavily on their federal 21C grant funds. Over the past five years, 21C projects have shown a continued ability to gain and retain valuable community partners. In particular, between 2017-18 and 2018-19, the

percentage of projects that was able to report having two strong community partners increased from 76% to 85%. On average, projects had six community partners that contributed $1000 or more in 2018-19.

➢ **AREA OF IMPROVEMENT: In terms of financial sustainability, 21C projects have increased in their ability to raise non-21C dollars and diversify their funding sources.** In 2018-19, the total statewide aggregate cash funding from sources other than 21C funds was $6.43 million. This was the highest amount since 2014-15 and an increase of approximately $540,000 from the previous year. In addition, 83% of projects that had been in operation for more than five years had at least five different sources of funding contributing to their annual operating budgets. This was an increase from 75% in the previous year.

➢ **CHALLENGE: While 21C projects have improved in their abilities to procure different sources of funding in the past several years, a significant portion of projects still rely heavily on 21C funding in order to operate** (that is, among programs that have been in operation for at least five years). In 2018-19, 57% of projects received more than half of their funding from 21C funds. This percentage has increased steadily since 2014-15, when 29% of 21C projects received at least half of their funding from 21C dollars.

Action Items for 2019-20 and Beyond

➢ **Continue to support high quality afterschool and summer learning programming, especially those opportunities that serve the neediest students**. Over the course of the past five years that the current statewide evaluation plan has been in place, 21C programs in Vermont have excelled in serving students on free and reduced price lunches and those on IEPs at representative rates. They are doing so with continuous improvement planning to maintain program quality; they run for a sufficient amount of hours, days, and weeks; they have effective leaders; and they make efforts to garnish support from community partners and from the school districts in which they serve. It is possible that they would not be as successful at sustaining these efforts without continued support from the federal 21C initiative. Consistent funding provides increased opportunities for 21C-funded projects to improve the quality of their sites and in turn provide valuable expanded learning opportunities for the children and youth that attend them.

➢ **Support high quality afterschool and summer learning programming in recruiting and retaining quality staff**. The most frequently cited barrier to program success among 21C project and site leaders was the challenge of easily hiring and retaining quality staff. A few leaders suggested that increased base pay rates might help alleviate the problems of recruitment issues and high turnover. Additional funding to help ensure that staff

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

salaries are high enough to prevent frequent staff turnover could help alleviate these challenges for programs. One project director noted on the APR that they had helped alleviate this issue by offering "break incentive" pay to college school students who would have normally left for higher-paying jobs during college breaks. This bonus pay helped maintain staff consistency during part of the year when there had been an issue with staff leaving.

➢ **Support projects in developing best practices for fostering youth leadership in order to increase program engagement and participation.** By allowing middle and high school students to help decide on program offerings, programs can help to engage students, thus increasing participation and supporting youth voice. As stated, one challenge for programs is to have students attend programming on a regular basis. In addition, two projects and eight sites articulated on their APRs that maintaining student interest in programming was a barrier to success in 2018-19. One project director wrote about a particular solution implemented by his or her program by stating, "*The biggest challenge is getting a variety of students to want to be a part of [the program]. I started a student action plan committee and I give them the opportunity to decide what programs we are going to offer. This truly increases the quality of programming because students know what other students want. They bounce ideas off each other and even come up with candidates for instructors.*" Other projects might benefit from allowing youth to help decide on programming offerings. However, since this would be a new concept to many 21C projects and sites, it is recommended that program leaders be supported in such an endeavor.

Taking this idea a step further, some program leaders might be interested in having older students not only choose the program offerings, but also lead their own programs: another sure way to increase engagement that also requires a higher level of support and training. One director who had this idea in 2018-19 commented, "*One challenge that I encountered this year was balancing respecting students' desires to run and lead their own programs with the need to maintain the integrity of the program/activity… Students have [many] ideas and want to use their voices. It is my job…to help them do that. I found that just letting them go at it alone is not the right way. They do need more support, even if they say they do not want an advisor. An advisor helps students stay on track and motivate them to keep going. I was disappointed that I was unable to provide that support this year and without clear leadership, they were unable to get off the ground.*" By supporting 21C projects in figuring out how to best advise students on deciding on and leading programs, projects can increase students' engagement and thus increase enrollment and regular participation. Ultimately, students will gain more from programming that they feel excited to attend.

➢ **Support projects in dealing with challenging student behaviors by supporting social emotional learning (SEL) initiatives and related professional development**

opportunities. The second-most commonly stated barrier to success among program sites on their APRs in 2018-19 was dealing with student behavioral issues. This was a problem according to leaders of 12 sites. According to one site coordinator, "*The social-emotional needs of many of our students can be a challenge as we work to support all students and staff.*" Another site coordinator commented, "*An increase of students living with trauma has increased and afterschool staff have struggled at times with behavior management. We continue to adjust our professional development offerings to better support staff working with students exposed to various levels of trauma.*" Other sites, one of which did not have a formal written behavioral policy in place, could also likely benefit from professional development that is focused on dealing with challenging behaviors among students and improving social-emotional support.

➢ **Consider revising the statewide evaluation to exclude measures that are no longer relevant, append those that would help quantify issues commonly described in the open-ended items on the APR, and refine measures to help increase understanding.** For example, Measures 2.3b, 2.4b, and 2.4c refer to the Youth and School Age Program Quality Assessment (PQA). Since 21C projects and sites are required to complete the SEL PQA in 2019-20, these items will no longer be relevant in next year's report. Depending on the future requirements for measuring continuous quality improvement, it might be worthwhile to exchange the Youth/School Age PQA-specific measures (2.3b, 2.4b, and 2.4c) with ones that are more generally related to continuous quality improvement. As far as adding new measures, it might be useful to add one or two that refer to recruitment and retention of staff (rather than simply directors and site coordinators), since staff recruitment and retention of quality staff is so frequently stated in the APR comments. A measure could also be added to help understand how projects are doing in supporting youth voice. In terms of measure revision, 3.3a (about projects having no more than one third of their site coordinators in their first or second year of tenure at each of their sites), lacks clarity; its interpretation often leads to some level of ambiguity. Finally, there are some measures such as 2.2a (related to culminating end products and/or performances) and 2.3a (about physical activity) for which the resulting percentages are often either so high or so low that it is difficult to truly understand how and where quality improvement can be implemented. For these such measures, more nuanced wording might be considered to help increase understanding and interpretation of the results and trends. Purpose

Identified Barriers and Challenges for 21C Projects and Sites

On both the 2018-19 Project Level and Site Level APRs, 21C directors and coordinators were asked to respond to a question about the barriers and challenges that they encountered over the past year. Responses ranged in length from a few words to several paragraphs. A qualitative analysis on all of the responses was performed and each response was tagged with one or more

particular categories. The table below lists those categories and includes both the number of sites and the number of projects whose responses fell into each category. The barriers/challenges are listed in descending order of how frequently they were described by program sites.

Barriers/Challenges described by 21C projects and sites on 2017-18 APRs	Number of projects that identified barrier/challenge	Number of sites that identified barrier/challenge
1) Recruiting and retaining quality staff	10 projects (38%)	16 sites (16%)
2) Student behavioral issues	--	12 sites (12%)
3) Staffing issues	--	10 sites (12%)
4) Student recruitment/maintaining student interest	2 projects (8%)	8 sites (10%)
5) Program space	2 projects (8%)	7 sites (7%)
6) Transportation issues	2 projects (8%)	7 sites (7%)
7) Staff management and schedule coordination	--	6 sites (6%)
8) Communication with parents and families	--	5 sites (5%)
9) Providing training for staff	--	5 sites (5%)
10) Communication with school leadership and/or school teachers and staff	--	4 sites (4%)
11) Work overload for director/staff	1 project (4%)	2 sites (2%)
12) Providing enough pay for staff	--	2 sites (2%)
13) Procuring community support	--	2 sites (2%)
14) Providing healthy food options	--	2 sites (2%)
15) Data administration and paperwork	1 project (4%)	1 sites (1%)
16) Staff communication issues	1 project (4%)	1 sites (1%)

Among the most commonly stated barrier and challenges were recruiting and retaining quality staff; student behavioral issues; staffing issues (such as meeting student-teacher ratios and keeping consistent staff over the course of programs); student recruitment/maintaining student interest; program space; and transportation issues. Some of the less commonly described challenges which were noted by anywhere between one and six sites were: staff management and schedule coordination; communication with parents and families; providing training for staff; communication with school leadership; work overload for director/staff; providing enough pay for staff; procuring community support; providing healthy food options; data administration and paperwork; and staff communication issues.

Evaluation Results for 2014-15 through 2018-19

The following section includes numeric results from the APRs that inform the Goal Areas set by the Vermont Agency of Education, in collaboration with Vermont Afterschool and leaders from the field. Each Goal Area comprises three to four results, which each contain between one and six measurable outcomes. The four goal areas are as follows:

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

1)   Access and equity are assured for all students.
2)   All 21C-funded programs are of high quality.
3)   All 21C-funded programs have effective leaders.
4)   All 21C-funded programs are sustainable.

The following section outlines each goal area along with their corresponding results and measures for each year from 2014-15 until 2018-19.

Goal Area 1: Access and equity are assured for all students.

Children and youth that participate in quality afterschool and summer learning programming experience a wealth of positive outcomes, both socially and academically. Families with disposable income are often well equipped to enroll their children in a diverse array of high quality out-of-school time learning experiences. Vermont's 21C programming is intended to serve the students who might not otherwise have had the opportunity to enroll – such as students from families with lower incomes. The programs themselves need to be in operation for a sufficient amount of time over the course of both the school year and summer so that participants have many opportunities to engage in learning and experience positive outcomes. Finally, the students themselves must commit to attending on a regular basis in order the gain the most that they can from the experience. The four results and corresponding measures contained in Goal Area 1 were developed with the intention of ensuring that equity and access to 21C programs are ensured for all students in Vermont.

Result 1.1: 21C programs serve students with limited opportunities to learn outside of the school day.

Compared with their peers, students from lower income families have fewer opportunities to learn outside of the school day. The achievement gap widens as students from wealthier families attend private dance lessons, sports camps and tutoring sessions while students from lower income families may struggle to keep up with their peers academically, socially and behaviorally. These lower income students (defined as those who are eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunch at school) can greatly benefit from opportunities for learning beyond the school day (Huang, et al. 2000).

Measure 1.1a states that 21C-funded sites should have a rate of free/reduced lunch students among regular attendees that meets or exceeds the school rate. Measure 1.1b states that the total statewide percentage of regular attendees that are eligible for free/reduced price lunch should exceed 40%. For both of these measures, the presense of the Community Eligibility Provision in Vermont affects the efficacy of the results. Beginning in 2014-15, schools that had more than 40% if its students directly certified for free meals had the opportunity to participate in the program, thus being able to provide breakfast and lunch to their entire student populations at no charge. The presense of CEP affects how some sites report their numbers of free/reduced lunch students and also how the percentages of low income students in those schools are

---

reported by the state. Therefore, 21C program sites that operated at CEP-designated schools were removed from the analysis for both measures.

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

Measure 1.1a: 21C-funded sites have a free and reduced lunch rate among regular attendees that meets or exceeds the school rate.

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
60% of sites had a free/reduced lunch rate of regular attendees that met or exceeded school rate	**54%** of sites had a free/reduced lunch rate of regular attendees that met or exceeded school rate	**61%** of sites had a free/reduced lunch rate of regular attendees that met or exceeded school rate	**69%** of sites had a free/reduced lunch rate of regular attendees that met or exceeded school rate	**74%** of sites had a free/reduced lunch rate of regular attendees that met or exceeded school rate
87% of regular attendees statewide represented in the calculation above	**62%** of regular attendees statewide represented in the calculation above	**76%** of regular attendees statewide represented in the calculation above	**63%** of regular attendees statewide represented in the calculation above	**65%** of regular attendees statewide represented in the calculation above

In 2018-19, 74% of non-CEP sites had a free/reduced lunch rate among regular attendees that met or exceeded the school rate. This was the highest percentage of such sites since 2014-15. In general the percentage of non-CEP sites that have met or exceeded their school free/reduced lunch rates among regular attendees over the past five years have been increasing: in 2014-15, 60% of sites had a free/reduced lunch rate that met or exceeded the school rate. In 2015-16, 54% of sites had such a rate; in 2016-17, 61% of sites had such a rate, and in 2017-18, 69% of sites had such a rate.

For both Measures 1.1a and 1.1b, the resulting percentages must be regarded with the knowledge that they represent only the regular attendees statewide that do not attend sites at schools that participate in the Community Eligibility Provision. In 2014-15, the calculation excluded 12 CEP sites and represented sites that served 87% of statewide regular attendees; in 2015-16, 62% of regular attendees were represented after the exclusion of 31 CEP sites; in 2016-17, 76% of regular attendees were represented after the exclusion of 21 CEP sites (and for Measure 1.1a, two additional non-CEP sites for which the school free/reduced lunch rate was unavailable); in 2017-18, 63% of regular attendees were represented after the exclusion of 31 CEP sites (and for Measure 1.1a, and two additional non-CEP sites for which the school free/reduced lunch rate was unavailable); and in 2018-19, 65% of regular attendees were represented after the exclusion of 29 CEP sites (and for Measure 1.1a, one additional site for which the school free/reduced lunch rate was unavailable).

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

Measure 1.1b: At the state level, the overall free and reduced lunch rate among regular attendees is greater than 40%.

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
53% of regular attendees statewide were eligible for free or reduced lunch	**52%** of regular attendees statewide were eligible for free or reduced lunch	**58%** of regular attendees statewide were eligible for free or reduced lunch	**54%** of regular attendees statewide were eligible for free or reduced lunch	**54%** of regular attendees statewide were eligible for free or reduced lunch
Target reached	Target reached	Target reached	Target reached	Target reached
87% of regular attendees statewide represented in the calculation above	**62%** of regular attendees statewide represented in the calculation above	**76%** of regular attendees statewide represented in the calculation above	**64%** of regular attendees statewide represented in the calculation above	**66%** of regular attendees statewide represented in the calculation above

Regarding Measure 1.1b more specifically, in 2018-19, 41% of PreK-12 students enrolled in Vermont's public schools were eligible for free or reduced price lunch. In 2014-15 when the evaluation items were developed, approximately 40% of the students in the state had free/reduced lunch status. In order to show that statewide programming is accessible to all students, it was decided that at least 40% of 21C regular attendees statewide should be those students who are eligible free or reduced price lunches. This target was reached among non-CEP sites every year from 2014-15 through 2018-19. Each year since 2014-15, this percentage has been above 50% with the peak being in 2016-17 at 58%. In 2018-19, the calculated percentage of regularly-attending students that were eligible for free or reduced lunch was 54%; this calculation excluded students from 29 CEP sites, so the actual percentage is likely higher, but ultimately unknown. For the results in each of the four preceding years, the percentages also exclude students from CEP sites and are likely higher.

The 2018-19 result percentage represented 66% of the total statewide regular attendees after excluding students at CEP schools. This percentage of regular attendees represented by the calculation was similar to that of 2015-16 and 2017-18 in which 62% and 64% of regular statewide attendees were represented, respectively. In 2014-15, 87% of regular attendees statewide were represented, and in 2016-17, 76% of statewide regular attendees were represented by the calculation.

Measure 1.1c: At the state level, the overall rate of regular attendees on Individual Education Plans (IEP) meets or exceeds the state average of 15%.

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
17% of regular attendees statewide were on IEPs	**19%** of regular attendees statewide were on IEPs	**19%** of regular attendees statewide were on IEPs	**20%** of regular attendees statewide were on IEPs	**20%** of regular attendees statewide were on IEPs

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Target reached	Target reached	Target reached	Target reached	Target reached

Students who are on Individual Education Plans (IEPs) in Vermont should also be represented equally among their peers as regular attendees in 21C programming, in order access and equity to be upheld. In both 2017-18 and 2018-19, 20% of regular 21C attendees statewide were on IEPs, and since this was more than the statewide average of 15%, this target was met. In each of the three other years that preceded 2017-18, the percentages of students on IEPs who were regular attendees exceeded 15% and the target was met: in 2014-15, 17% of regular attendees statewide were on IEPs; and in both 2015-16 and 2016-17, 19% of regular attendees statewide were on IEPs.

Result 1.2: 21C-funded programs are open for enough hours, days, and weeks to meet student and family needs during the school year.

Programs that operate for a sufficient number of weeks, days per week and hours per week during both the school year and summer are best able to foster social, behavioral, and learning gains among the children and youth they serve (Policy Study Associates, 2004). In addition, in order for working families to take full advantage of afterschool programming, their children should have opportunities to attend programming from approximately 3pm until 5:00 or 6:00 pm each weekday over the course of the academic year. Measures 1.2a, 1.2b, and 1.2c were developed to ensure that sufficient school year dosage is in place.

Measure 1.2a: 21C-funded sites offer enough program weeks to match or exceed the current national mean by operating for at least 32 weeks during the school year.

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
70% of sites offered at least 32 weeks of programming during the school year	**66%** of sites offered at least 32 weeks of programming during the school year	**74%** of sites offered at least 32 weeks of programming during the school year	**80%** of sites offered at least 32 weeks of programming during the school year	**82%** of sites offered at least 32 weeks of programming during the school year

In 2018-19, 82% of 21C sites offered at least 32 weeks of programming during the school year. This was the highest percentage of the five years going back to 2014-15. In 2014-15, 70% of sites offered at least 32 weeks of programming; in 2015-16, 66% of sites offered at least 32 weeks; in 2016-17, 74% of sites offered at least 32 weeks; and in 2017-18, 80% of sites offered at least 32 weeks. The median number of weeks of programming offered in 2018-19 was 34 weeks (offered by 13 program sites) and the mode was 32 weeks (offered by 25 program sites). The minimum number of weeks of programming offered was 23 (offered by one site); and two sites representing two different projects offered as many as 40 weeks of programming.

Measure 1.2b: 21C-funded sites offer enough program days to match or exceed the current national mean by operating for at least 5 days per week during the school year.

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
69% of sites offered at least 5 days per week of programming during the school year	**69%** of sites offered at least 5 days per week of programming during the school year	**72%** of sites offered at least 5 days per week of programming during the school year	**72%** of sites offered at least 5 days per week of programming during the school year	**74%** of sites offered at least 5 days per week of programming during the school year

The percentage of school-year sites offering five days per week of programming has also been on the rise in the past five years. In 2018-19, nearly three-quarters of all sites (74%) offered programming every day of the school week. This was an increase from both 2016-17 and 2017-18 in which 72% of sites offered five days of programming. In both 2014-15 and 2015-16, 69% of site had offered five days of programming. In 2018-19, 74 sites offered five days of programming, 26 sites offered four days of programming, and one site offered three days of programming. One site offered seven days of weekly programming. No sites offered fewer than three days of programming.

Measure 1.2c: 21C-funded sites offer enough program hours to match or exceed the current national mean by operating for at least 14 hours per week during the school year.

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
35% of sites offered at least 14 hours per week of programming during the school year	**30%** of sites offered at least 14 hours per week of programming during the school year	**30%** of sites offered at least 14 hours per week of programming during the school year	**35%** of sites offered at least 14 hours per week of programming during the school year	**28%** of sites offered at least 14 hours per week of programming during the school year

It is recommended that 21C program sites offer at least 14 hours per week of programming during the school year. Over the past four years, there was never a time when more than 35% of sites met this goal. In both 2015-16 and 2016-17, 30% of sites offered at least 14 weekly hours and during 2014-15 and 2017-18, 35% of sites offered at least 14 weekly hours during the school year. In the most recent year of programming (2018-19), there was a decrease: 28% of programs offered at least 14 hours of programming, which was the lowest percentage of all five years. That year, the median number of weekly hours of programming offered was 11 (offered by nine sites) and the mode was 10 hours (offered by 23 sites). One site offered five weekly hours which was the least of all of the sites, and two sites from one particular project offered 20 weekly hours, which was the most offered by any 21C site that year. The table below shows a further breakdown of the weekly hours offered in 2018-19.

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

Sites by number of operational hours per week, 2018-19 school year

Hours per week offered in 2018-19	Number of sites offering those hours
5 to 7	2 sites
8 to 10	41 sites
11 to 13	30 sites
14 to 16	25 sites
17 or more	4 sites

Measure 1.2d: At the state level, the average number of program weeks offered at sites will match or exceed the current national mean of at least 32 weeks during the school year.

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Sites operated for an average of **33 weeks**	Sites operated for an average of **34 weeks**	Sites operated for an average of **33 weeks**	Sites operated for an average of **34 weeks**	Sites operated for an average of **34 weeks**
Target reached	Target reached	Target reached	Target reached	Target reached

On the state level, 21C programs operated for an average of 34 weeks during the 2018-19 school year. This was no change from the previous year. In both 2014-15 and 2016-17, they operated for 33 weeks, and in 2015-16, they operated for 34 weeks.

Measure 1.2e: At the state level, the average number of program days offered at sites will match or exceed the current national mean of at least 5 days per week during the school year.

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Sites operated for an average of **4.7 days / week**	Sites operated for an average of **4.7 days / week**	Sites operated for an average of **4.7 days / week**	Sites operated for an average of **4.7 days / week**	Sites operated for an average of **4.7 days / week**
Target reached (with rounding)	Target reached (with rounding)	Target reached (with rounding)	Target reached (with rounding)	Target reached (with rounding)

On the state level, 21C programs operated for an average of 4.7 days per week during the 2018-19 school year and each of the four years that preceded it. Technically, the target was not reached, but since it is unrealistic to expect sites to run programming for more than five days per week, reaching the target would effectively require all sites to operate for five days per week. Therefore, we consider the target to have been reached since 4.7 rounds to 5.0. That said, in future years we would like to see the 28 programs that operated for fewer than five days per week to increase their days per week program offerings.

Measure 1.2f: At the state level, the average number of program hours offered at sites will match or exceed the current national mean of at least 14 hours per week during the school year.

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Sites operated for an average of	Sites operated for an average of	Sites operated for an average of	Sites operated for an average of	Sites operated for an average of

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
12 hours / week	**12 hours / week**	**11 hours / week**	**12 hours / week**	**12 hours / week**
Target not reached	Target not reached	Target not reached	Target not reached	Target not reached

The average number of hours per week of school year programming offered has held steady at the statewide level. Programs operated for an average of 12 hours per week during the 2018-19 school year. In 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2017-18, they also operated for an average of 12 hours per week and in 2016-17, they operated for 11 hours per week on average.

Result 1.3: 21C-funded programs provide enough summer programming to address summer learning loss.

In Vermont, summer break can last between 10-11 weeks depending on the number of snow days used in the previous winter. Summer learning loss, particularly for students from lower income families is a risk during that period. Additionally, working families across the income spectrum need safe and supportive programming environments for their children during the summer months when school is not in session.

Measure 1.3a: 21C-funded sites that offer summer programming are open for enough program weeks to match or exceed the current national mean by operating for at least 5 weeks during the summer.

Summer 2014	Summer 2015	Summer 2016	Summer 2017	Summer 2018
66% of sites that offered summer programming offered at least 5 weeks	**69%** of sites that offered summer programming offered at least 5 weeks	**70%** of sites that offered summer programming offered at least 5 weeks	**77%** of sites that offered summer programming offered at least 5 weeks	**79%** of sites that offered summer programming offered at least 5 weeks

The percentage of program sites offering at least five weeks of summer programming has risen each year since 2014. In the summer of 2014, 66% of sites offered at least five weeks of programming; in 2015, it was 69%; in 2016, it was 70%; in 2017, it was 77%; and in 2018, it was 79%. In summer of 2018, 46 sites met this target by offering programming for five weeks and an additional 24 sites offered between six and eight weeks of programming. Thirteen sites did not offer any amount of summer programming that year. They were not included in the calculation of these percentages.

Measure 1.3b: 21C-funded sites that offer summer programming are open for enough program days to match or exceed the current national mean by operating for at least 5 days per week during the summer.

Summer 2014	Summer 2015	Summer 2016	Summer 2017	Summer 2018
83% of sites that offered summer programming offered at least 5 days/week	**84%** of sites that offered summer programming offered at least 5 days/week	**88%** of sites that offered summer programming offered at least 5 days/week	**91%** of sites that offered summer programming offered at least 5 days/week	**96%** of sites that offered summer programming offered at least 5 days/week

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

The percentage of summer sites offering five days of programming during their weeks of operation has also steadily been on the rise since 2014. In the summer of 2014, 83% of sites that offered summer programming met this target by offering five days per week of programming. In 2015, this percentage rose to 84%; in 2016, it was 88%; in 2017, it was 91% of sites, and in 2018, 96% of summer sites offered five days per week of programming. Eighty-four sites that offered summer programming offered five days per week. Otherwise, three sites offered four days, one site that offered two days per week, and one site offered seven days per week of summer programming.

Measure 1.3c: 21C-funded sites that offer summer programming are open for enough program hours to match or exceed the current national mean by operating for at least 21 hours per week during the summer.

Summer 2016	Summer 2017	Summer 2018
73% of sites that offered summer programming offered at least 21 hours/week	**86%** of sites that offered summer programming offered at least 21 hours/week	**90%** of sites that offered summer programming offered at least 21 hours/week

In the summer of 2018, 90% of sites that offered summer programming offered at least 21 hours per week of programming. This was an increase from the previous year in which 86% of sites that offered summer programming offered at least 21 hours per week and an increase from 73% in 2016. Prior to 2016, sites that offered fewer than 25 hours of weekly summer programming were only given the option "<25 hours," as a response on the 21C APR rather than with the specific number of hours, thus making it impossible to accurately calculate this measure for those years. In summer of 2018, the number of hours of weekly programming offered by summer sites ranged from six hours (offered by one site) to 50 hours (offered by 16 sites). The median number of hours offered statewide was 35 per week.

Measure 1.3d: At the state level, the average number of program weeks offered at sites will match or exceed the current national mean of at least 5 weeks during summer.

Summer 2014	Summer 2015	Summer 2016	Summer 2017	Summer 2018
Summer sites operated for an average of **5.2 weeks**	Summer sites operated for an average of **5.1 weeks**	Summer sites operated for an average of **5.1 weeks**	Summer sites operated for an average of **5.2 weeks**	Summer sites operated for an average of **5.2 weeks**
Target reached	Target reached	Target reached	Target reached	Target reached

Each year between 2014 and 2018, the average number of weeks of summer programming offered among summer 21C sites did in fact exceed five weeks. In summers 2014, 2017 and 2018 summer sites operated for an average of 5.2 weeks; and in summers 2015 and 2016, sites operated for an average of 5.1 weeks.

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

Measure 1.3e: At the state level, the average number of program days offered at sites will match or exceed the current national mean of at least 5 days per week during summer.

Summer 2014	Summer 2015	Summer 2016	Summer 2017	Summer 2018
Summer sites operated for an average of **4.8 days / week**	Summer sites operated for an average of **4.8 days / week**	Summer sites operated for an average of **4.9 days / week**	Summer sites operated for an average of **4.9 days / week**	Summer sites operated for an average of **4.96 days / week**
Target reached (with rounding)	Target reached (with rounding)	Target reached (with rounding)	Target reached (with rounding)	Target effectively reached

In summers 2014 and 2015, the average number of days per week that 21C summer sites were in operation was 4.8 days; in summers 2016 and 2017 the average number of days per week that they were open was 4.9. In the most recent summer for which we have data (2018), that average has peaked at nearly 5.0 (4.96). The target of five days was essentially met each year. Although technically each of these averages were less than the target of five days, realistically, the only way for the average to exceed 5.0 would have been for all sites to offer five day programming weeks (or for several sites to also have offered weekend programming).

Measure 1.3f: At the state level, the average number of program hours offered at sites will match or exceed the current national mean of at least 21 hours per week during summer.

Summer 2016	Summer 2017	Summer 2018
Summer sites operated for an average of **32 hours / week**	Summer sites operated for an average of **36 hours / week**	Summer sites operated for an average of **37 hours / week**
Target reached	Target reached	Target reached

In the summer of 2016, 21C summer program sites offered an average of 32 hours of programming per week. This average increased to 36 hours of programming the following summer ant to 37 hours per week in 2018. Dividing this number of hours by the weekly average days for that year (4.96) shows that programs offered an average of 7.5 hours of daily programming, or almost the length of a full adult workday.

Note: Prior to 2016, sites that offered fewer than 25 hours of weekly summer programming were only given the option "<25 hours," as a response on the 21C APR rather than with the specific number of hours, thus making it impossible to accurately calculate this measure for those years.

Result 1.4: 21C-funded programs have a solid base of regular attendees.

Regular attendance is a prerequisite to achieving desirable outcomes of expanded learning opportunities. In addition of ensuring that programs are in operation for a sufficient amount of time and the neediest students are adequately served, programs must also ensure that enrolled

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

students are attending on a regular basis – and if they are not, to identify possible reasons for this. Students who are "regular attendees" are said to attend at least 30 days of programming per year.

Measure 1.4a: 21C-funded sites will serve at least one-third of their total participants on a regular basis (with regular basis defined as at least 30 days/year).

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
84% of sites served at least 1/3 of participants for at least 30 days	**85%** of sites served at least 1/3 of participants for at least 30 days	**81%** of sites served at least 1/3 of participants for at least 30 days	**76%** of sites served at least 1/3 of participants for at least 30 days	**80%** of sites served at least 1/3 of participants for at least 30 days

In 2018-19, four out of every five sites (80%) served at least one-third of their participants on a regular basis. This was an increase from 2017-18 in which just over three-quarters of 21C sites (76%) did so. That year (2017-18) was a low point; in 2014-15, 84% of sites reached the target of serving at least one-third of their attendees regularly; in 2015-16, 85% of sites reached this target; and in 2016-17, 81% of sites reached this target. In 2018-19, the percentages of regular attendees served on a regular basis among sites ranged from 4% to 100%, depending on the site. The median percentage of regular attendees among all attendees for 21C sites in 2017-18 was 50%. Program sites varied widely in the extent to which they served students on a regular basis.

Measure 1.4b: At the state level, the average number of regular attendees will meet or exceed one-third of the total participants served.

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
46% of total attendees statewide were regular attendees (served <30 days)	**46%** of total attendees statewide were regular attendees (served <30 days)	**45%** of total attendees statewide were regular attendees (served <30 days)	**43%** of total attendees statewide were regular attendees (served <30 days)	**47%** of total attendees statewide were regular attendees (served <30 days)
Target reached	Target reached	Target reached	Target reached	Target reached

The overall statewide percentage of 21C attendees served on a regular basis slightly decreased between 2014-15 and 2017-18 and then pickup up again slightly in 2018-19. In both 2014-15 and 2015-16, 46% of attendees were served on a regular basis statewide. In 2016-17, this percentage decreased to 45% followed by 43% in 2017-18. In the most recent year (2018-19), 47% of total statewide attendees were served on a regular basis. In 2018-19, there were 12,289 students that were enrolled in 21C programming and 5,632 attended on a regular basis.

Goal Area 2: All 21C-funded programs are of high quality

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

This goal is intended to ensure that 21C funding goes toward programs that are intentionally designed to be of high quality. They should support student learning, allow participants to explore topics in depth, provide healthy food options, and provide ample time for physical activity. In addition, programs should engage their staff in continuous improvement planning with the Youth Program Quality Intervention (YPQI).

Result 2.1: 21C-funded programs support learning.

Afterschool and summer learning programs can supplement learning that occurs during the regular school day. Result 2.1 measures the extent to which these programs do in fact support learning. It is important for programs to be designed to be able to help students who might be struggling academically. Methods that go beyond homework help are likely to help boost the academic performance of such students.

Measure 2.1a: 21C-funded sites have at least one program strategy, beyond homework help, that is specifically designed to support students who are performing below grade level or struggling academically.

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
79% of sites offered a strategy beyond homework help for students struggling academically	**79%** of sites offered a strategy beyond homework help for students struggling academically	**81%** of sites offered a strategy beyond homework help for students struggling academically	**71%** of sites offered a strategy beyond homework help for students struggling academically	**81%** of sites offered a strategy beyond homework help for students struggling academically

In 2018-19, 81% of 21C program sites offered at least one strategy beyond homework help for students who were performing below grade level or otherwise struggling academically. This was the same percentage as 2016-17, and a slight increase from 2014-15 and 2015-16 when 79% of sites offered such strategies in both of those years. In 2017-18, 71% of sites had offered academic support. A few examples of such program strategies offered, as written in the APRs were as follows:

- *We have connected families with tutors upon request or offered a space for tutors to meet with individuals during program time.*
- *The Early Promise Program consists of three educators who come by and take students individually for one on one work in subjects they are struggling with. Screen reader support is enabled.*
- *We provide 1: 1 tutoring with the student, with their teacher's directions and guidance of what the individual need to work on. The teacher follows up with the progress the student is making with examples of the student's works, before and after showing improvement.*
- *Step It Up is an academic assistance club that is offered to fifth and sixth grade, and seventh and eighth grade. These clubs are instructed by core teachers and are designed to give students the extra help they need from those who can help them best. Students in these clubs use this time to*

catch up on past work, get help with current projects and anything else needed to build confidence and help them meet their goals. Students that attend these clubs are recruited by teachers who intermittently assess student achievement throughout the year to address the need for academic assistance.

- *Students that are performing below grade level on state and local assessments are offered tutoring in math or literacy. Twenty-six students participated in fall tutoring and 22 in the spring session.*

Result 2.2: 21C-funded programs allow participants to experience interests in depth.

Programs should also allow students time to pursue interests through activities that are not available during the regular school day. Rather than simply being introduced to such activities, students should be given opportunities to explore them in depth. Culminating products and performances are ways to facilitate in-depth learning and exploration of specific interests. A few examples of culminating products and/or performances that projects submitted through their APRs are as follows:

- *Students in a Game Creators club worked on chrome books to learn about coding. Each week students learn new skills to add to their online game creations. Students were able to share and try each other's games at the end of the 9-week session.*
- *Our dance class learned different dance moves each week. Then took all the moves they learned, picked their favorite songs to dance to and created a 5 min dance routine. They were responsible for working together to come up with all the choreography for the dance recital, which was performed in front of all our families at our family night celebration.*
- *Students gave a public performance of a musical. Students' roles, by their choice, were as actors, costume designers, stage crew, and make-up artists. Students learned theatre and public performance skills.*

Under this result, there were originally only two measures (2.2a and 2.2b). Measure 2.2a stated, "Each 21C-funded site will demonstrate that ALL programs have the opportunity to create culminating end products and/or performances." Since 21C sites provide a wide variety of programming options, it is difficult for most of them to be able to respond "Yes" to this item since it qualifies that ALL of their programming options must meet these criteria. Since the percentage for this measure has been consistently low, two variations on this measure were amended in order to reveal a more detailed view of the extent to which sites offered culminating activities. The original Measure 2.2a was relabeled as Measure 2.2a.i and subsequently Measures 2.2a.ii and 2.2a.iii were amended.

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

Measure 2.2a.i: Each 21C-funded site will demonstrate that ALL programs had the opportunity to create culminating products and/or performances.

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
4.5% of sites had culminating products / performances for ALL programming	**5.7%** of sites had culminating products / performances for ALL programming	**4.9%** of sites had culminating products / performances for ALL programming	**3.0%** of sites had culminating products / performances for ALL programming	**2.0%** of sites had culminating products / performances for ALL programming

Each year, a relatively small percentage of program sites were able to respond positively that they offered opportunities for culminating products or performances related to all of their programming options. In 2015-16, 4.5% offered such experiences; in 2015-16, 5.7% of sites did so; in 2016-17, 4.9% of sites did so' and in 2017-18, 3.0% of sites offered such experiences for all of their programming offerings. Finally, in 2018-19, 2.0% of sites had culminating products for all of their programs. It is important to note that this decrease in percentage does not necessarily mean that any program sites removed opportunities for culminating projects that they once had in place; rather it might indicate that programs *added* programming options, but those added options do not (yet) necessarily have opportunities for culminating experiences.

Measure 2.2a.ii: Each 21C-funded site will demonstrate that ALL or MOST programs had the opportunity to create culminating products and/or performances.

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
40% of sites had culminating products / performances for ALL or MOST programming	**54%** of sites had culminating products / performances for ALL or MOST programming	**59%** of sites had culminating products / performances for ALL or MOST programming	**55%** of sites had culminating products / performances for ALL or MOST programming	**54%** of sites had culminating products / performances for ALL or MOST programming

Measure 2.2a.ii shows that the percentage of sites that were able to report that all *or most* of their programs had the opportunity to create culminating end products and/or performances; this percentage increased from 40% in 2014-15 to 54% in 2015-16 to 59% in 2016-17. In 2017-18, 55% of sites reported that they offered culminating experiences for all or most of their programming options. This rate decreased by one percentage point in 2018-19.

Measure 2.2a.iii: Each 21C-funded site will have at least five examples of culminating activities.

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
85%* of sites had at least 5 examples of culminating activities	**79%*** of sites had at least 5 examples of culminating activities	**85%*** of sites had at least 5 examples of culminating activities	**67%** of sites had at least 5 examples of culminating activities	**65%** of sites had at least 5 examples of culminating activities

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

Each year since 2014-15, most sites were able to report that their programs offered at least five examples of culminating products or performances. In both 2014-15 and 2016-17, 85% of sites had at least five examples of culminating activities and in 2015-16, 79% of sites had at least five such examples. Subsequently, there had been a bit of a decline in this percentage. In 2017-18, two-thirds (67%) of sites were able to report at least five examples of culminating activities and in 2018-19, 65% of sites were able to report five examples of culminating activities.

*Note: On the APR in 2014-15 through 2016-17, the corresponding data entry item asked respondents to "list the best completed examples of culminating end products or performances." This wording yields results that might be qualitatively different from the results that are intended. Respondents listing their "best examples" may not necessarily have listed *all* examples, and as such, the resulting percentages may not quite reflect all of the cumulative products and end performance offerings. To account for this potential discrepancy, the APR item was revised in 2017-18 and respondents were instructed simply to enter the total number of end products and performances available with their program offerings. In 2017-18, the average number of end product offerings per program site was 15 and the median was 12. Sites offered quite the range of options; some responded that they had fewer than ten such offerings, and one site responded that it offered 60 or more such culminating experiences in conjunction with their program offerings.

Measure 2.2b: Each 21C-funded site will have at least 5 of its program offerings meet for a minimum of 10 days.

2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
89% of sites had at least 5 programming offerings meet at least 10 days	**83%** of sites had at least 5 programming offerings meet at least 10 days	**87%** of sites had at least 5 programming offerings meet at least 10 days	**81%** of sites had at least 5 programming offerings meet at least 10 days

Beginning in 2015-16, there was an item on the site-level APR that asked for the number of unique programming options that met for 10 or more days during afterschool time. In 2015-16, 89% of sites indicated that five or more of their program offerings met for a minimum of 10 days, and in 2016-17, 83% of sites did so. In 2017-18, 87% of sites had at least five programming offerings that met for 10 days or more; and in 2018-19, 81% of sites responded that they did so. That year, the average number of programming options per site that met for at least 10 days was 18 and the median was 12. The number of programming options per site that met for at least 10 days ranged from one to 104 per site.

Result 2.3: 21C-funded programs provide healthy food and physical activity options.

After a full school day of mostly sedentary activity, students cannot be expected to engage in expanded learning opportunities to their fullest potential without proper nourishment and opportunities for exercise. Hunger Free Vermont noted that 15% of Vermont's children under 18 live in food insecure households (Hunger in Vermont, 2019). This rate is likely higher among

Vermont's regularly attending 21C participants since almost two-thirds of them were from low-income households in 2018-19, as indicated by the fact that they were eligible for free or reduced price lunches.

Measure 2.3a: 21C-funded sites provide the opportunity for at least 20 minutes of physical activity daily for every two hours of programming offered.

2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
90% of sites provided sufficient time for physical activity	**97%** of sites provided sufficient time for physical activity	**97%** of sites provided sufficient time for physical activity	**97%** of sites provided sufficient time for physical activity

The outcomes for Measure 2.3a show that the vast majority of 21C sites provided physical activity for their students on a regular basis. Beginning in 2015-16, there was an item on the site-level APR about whether the opportunity for at least 20 minutes of physical activity for every two hours of programming was offered. It clarified that physical activity time could include outdoor time, physical activity enrichment choices, or physical activity embedded into programs. In each of the three years spanning 2016-17 to 2018-19, 97% of sites responded either "Yes" or "Yes- most but not all days" to this APR item. This was an increase from 2015-16 in which 90% responded positively.

The response "Yes- most but not all days" was considered an indicator of the goal being met for the purpose of this analysis. In 2017-18, 12 sites provided this response. They are being given the benefit of the doubt; there could certainly have been weather-related instances that hindered well-intended plans for outdoor physical activity on a number of days. Perhaps an open-ended clarifying item on the APR in the future could help clear up ambiguity around this response.

Measure 2.3b: 21C-funded sites will score 4.00 or above on the Nourishment scale of the Safe Environment domain of YPQA.

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
91% of sites scored 4.00 or higher on YPQI's Nourishment scale	**94%** of sites scored 4.00 or higher on YPQI's Nourishment scale	**97%** of sites scored 4.00 or higher on YPQI's Nourishment scale	**97%** of sites scored 4.00 or higher on YPQI's Nourishment scale	**92%** of sites scored 4.00 or higher on YPQI's Nourishment scale

Measure 2.3b relates to the Youth Program Quality Assessment (YPQA). In particular, it deals with the Nourishment scale, which contains three items: (1) drinking water is available and easily accessible to all children, (2) food and drinks are plentiful and available at appropriate times for all children during the session, and (3) available food and drink are healthy. The extent to which each item was implemented informed the score for each site, which could have ranged from 1.00 to 5.00.

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

YPQA implementation in 2018-19 was different than it had been in the previous four years. For the first time, 21C sites were not required to complete an entire School Age or Youth Program Quality Assessment, but rather they had a few additional options. They could have alternatively chosen a "deep dive" approach by completing only one or more specific scales of the tool that represented an identified area for improvement. The other option they could have chosen would have been to complete the new social-emotional learning (SEL) assessment tool for their programs. This is all to say that in 2018-19, Nourishment scores are available for only 65 sites, as opposed to all 101, which might partly explain the slightly decreased percentage of programs completing the Nourishment scale that scored at least 4.00 on it.

In 2018-19, the statewide average Nourishment score was 4.74. Out of the 65 sites that completed self-assessments with the YPQA that year, 48 sites earned perfect scores of 5.00 on this scale. Similar outcomes were seen in the preceding years. In 2017-18, the statewide average score was 4.89 and 82 out of 95 sites had obtained a perfect Nourishment score. In 2016-17, the statewide average score was 4.85 and of the 96 sites that completed the YPQA that year, 77 of them achieved a perfect score of 5.00. In 2015-16, the statewide average was 4.83, and of the 95 sites that completed self-assessments though YPQI, 69 of them had perfect scores of 5.00.

Result 2.4: 21C-funded programs strive for continuous improvement with the Youth Quality Program Intervention.

Between the years of 2014-15 and 2017-18, every 21C-funded site that was in at least their second year of operation was required to complete a self-assessment using either the Youth Program Quality Assessment (YPQA; designed for grades 4-12) or the School Age Program Quality Assessment (SAPQA; designated for grades K-6) each year. They were expected to involve their staff in the planning, implementation, and program improvement elements of the process in order to work toward ensuring quality programming year after year. In 2018-19, as explained previously, each program site in at least their second year of funding had a few different options. Regardless, they were still required to involve their staff in the process.

Measure 2.4a: 21C-funded sites that are in at least their second year of operation involve staff in the completion of self-assessments and program improvement plans through YPQI each year.

2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
72% of sites in at least 2nd year of operation involved staff in YPQI completion	**92%** of sites in at least 2nd year of operation involved staff in YPQI completion	**94%** of sites in at least 2nd year of operation involved staff in YPQI completion	**93%** of sites in at least 2nd year of operation involved staff in YPQI completion

In 2018-19, 93% of sites that were in at least their second year of operation involved their staff in the process. In 2017-18, 94% of sites completed the YPQI process and involved their staff. Perplexingly, six sites indicated on their APRs that they did in fact involve staff in the completion process but they did not actually submit any YPQI self-assessments or improvement plans. Therefore, they were not considered to have successfully completed this measure. In

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

2016-17, 92% of 21C sites in at least their second year of funding both completed YPQI self-assessments and involved staff in the process. In 2015-16, 72% of sites that were in at least their second year of funding and completed a self-assessment responded positively to the question on the APR related to staff involvement in the process.

Measure 2.4b: 21C-funded sites that are in at least their third year of operation show improvement in their YPQA self-assessment domain scores from the previous year.

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
60% of sites in at least 3rd year of operation improved YPQA scores from previous year	**78%** of sites in at least 3rd year of operation improved YPQA scores from previous year	**54%** of sites in at least 3rd year of operation improved YPQA scores from previous year	**52%** of sites in at least 3rd year of operation improved YPQA scores from previous year	**39%** of sites in at least 3rd year of operation improved YPQA scores from previous year

Measure 2.4b looks at improvement in YPQA self-assessment scores between years. Sites with at least three years of 21C funding were expected to have completed at least two consecutive years of self-assessments using YPQI. Due to the requirement change in 2018-19 and a number of program sites completing just a portion of the Youth PQA or School Age PQA and due to some program sites completing the SEL PQA, fewer sites could have their scores between 2017-18 and 2018-19 directly compared. That said, out of 67 sites that had programs completed a full Youth or School Age PQA in both years, 39% showed an improvement in scores. This percentage is significantly lower than in previous years, which may be because programs that would have shown improvement were focused on another option – either the SEL PQA or the "deep dive" option in which they may have chosen a single scale or domain to evaluate and improve.

Between 2016-17 and 2017-18, 89 program sites completed the YPQA and 52% of them improved their scores between the two years. Between 2015-16 and 2016-17, 60 sites completed YPQI in both years, and 54% improved their scores. Three sites used different assessment tools between the two years. Seventy-two sites completed self-assessments in both 2014-15 and 2015-16. Fifty-six of these sites (78%) had higher scores in the second year. Between 2013-14 and 2014-15, 60% of sites improved their scores between the two years.

Measure 2.4c.i: The Vermont state average of 21C programs' YPQI domain scores meets or exceeds the national average of external assessment domain scores for the School Age Program Quality Assessment.

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
4.00 (out of 5.00) was the statewide average School Age PQA score	**4.34 (out of 5.00)** was the statewide average School Age PQA score	**4.30 (out of 5.00)** was the statewide average School Age PQA score	**4.32 (out of 5.00)** was the statewide average School Age PQA score	**4.26 (out of 5.00)** was the statewide average School Age PQA score

Both the YPQA and SAPQA comprise four domains, each of which comprises multiple scales. Each scale contains several items on which sites rate themselves with scores of 1.00 (item not

implemented), 3.00 (item partially implemented), or 5.00 (item fully implemented). Average scores for each scale, domain, and for the overall assessment are subsequently calculated.

This measure purports to compare statewide scores to the national average of external assessors. However, comparisons between assessments conducted externally and those conducted internally are impossible to compare. Program staff have tendencies to score themselves higher on self-assessments than external assessors would. External assessors also become specifically trained to assess programs that are not their own. Because of this discrepancy, for the purpose of the 21C statewide evaluation, comparisons are made between years rather than against national averages. In 2018-19, the average score for sites that used the School Age PQA was 4.26, which was very similar to the scores in the three previous years (4.32 in 2017-18, 4.30 in 2016-17 and 4.34 in 2015-16). In 2014-15, this statewide average score was 4.00. The 2018-19 average is based on 56 sites that chose to do the full School Age PQA to fulfill the YPQA requirement.

Measure 2.4c.ii: The Vermont state average of 21C programs' YPQI domain scores meets or exceeds the national average of external assessment domain scores Youth Program Quality Assessment.

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
4.02 (out of 5.00) was the statewide average Youth PQA score	4.44 (out of 5.00) was the statewide average Youth PQA score	4.37 (out of 5.00) was the statewide average Youth PQA score	4.18 (out of 5.00) was the statewide average Youth PQA score	4.09 (out of 5.00) was the statewide average Youth PQA score

In the most recent year (2018-19), eleven sites completed the entire Youth PQA to fulfill the YPQA requirement, and the average overall score from those assessments was 4.09 out of 5.00. In 2017-18, 21C sites that conducted self-assessments using the Youth PQA scored an average of 4.18 overall. This was a slight decrease from the previous year in which the average score for sites that used the YPQA was 4.37, which had decreased from 4.44 in 2015-16. The lowest overall average score from sites that used the YPQA was 4.02 in 2014-15.

For a more in-depth analysis of the YPQI results for 2018-19, contact Vermont Afterschool's Research Analyst Erin Schwab (erinschwab@vermontafterschool.org) for a full report.

Goal Area 3: All 21C-funded programs have effective leaders

The third Goal Area was developed to ensure that 21C programs are led by educated individuals who have a strong background in the field and who continually work to develop themselves professionally. It was also developed to ensure that programs are able to retain these quality staff.

Result 3.1: 21C-funded programs are led by experienced leaders.

Directors and site coordinators with high levels of experience and expertise are best equipped to provide the most positive and beneficial expanded learning experiences for children and youth. Result 3.1 looks at the education and experience of directors and site coordinators.

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

Measure 3.1a: 21C programs will be led by directors with significant levels of expertise (bachelor's degree or higher in related field).

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
91% of projects had directors with bachelor's degrees or higher	**100%** of projects had directors with bachelor's degrees or higher	**93%** of projects had directors with bachelor's degrees or higher	**93%** of projects had directors with bachelor's degrees or higher	**92%** of projects had directors with bachelor's degrees or higher

In the most recent year of analysis, 92% of project directors (24 out of 26 total directors) had a bachelor's degree or higher. In both 2017-18 and 2016-17, 93% of 21C project directors in Vermont held bachelor's degrees or higher. This was a decrease from 2015-16 in which all directors did so. In 2014-15, 91% of project directors had at least bachelor's degrees. In 2018-19, two directors had associate's degrees, 15 had bachelor's degrees, 10 had master's degrees, and two had doctorate degrees.

Measure 3.1b: 21C programs will be led by directors with significant levels of experience (3+ years of experience).

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
97% of projects had directors with at least 3 years of related work experience	**93%** of projects had directors with at least 3 years of related work experience	**93%** of projects had directors with at least 3 years of related work experience	**93%** of projects had directors with at least 3 years of related work experience	**100%** of projects had directors with at least 3 years of related work experience

All 26 21C project directors had at least three years of related work experience in 2018-19. This was the first year in which this was the case. In 2017-18, 27 out of the 29 project directors (93%) had three or more years of related work experience. The remaining two directors each had one year of experience (one with a bachelor's degree and one with an associate's degree). In both 2015-16 and 2016-17, 93% of directors also had at least three years of related work experience, and in 2014-15, 97% of directors did so.

Measure 3.1c: 21C sites will be led by site coordinators with significant levels of expertise (bachelor's degree or higher in related field).

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
75% of sites had coordinators with bachelor's degrees or higher	**77%** of sites had coordinators with bachelor's degrees or higher	**74%** of sites had coordinators with bachelor's degrees or higher	**75%** of sites had coordinators with bachelor's degrees or higher	**71%** of sites had coordinators with bachelor's degrees or higher

In each year from 2014-15 through 2017-18, roughly three-quarters of 21C sites had at least one coordinator who held at a bachelor's degree or higher. In 2014-15 and 2017-18, this percentage was 75%, in 2015-16, it was 77%, and in 2016-17, it was 74%. In the most recent year (2018-19), this percentage took a slight dip and 71% of all site coordinators had bachelor's degrees or higher.

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

There were 72 total sites in 2018-19 that achieved this measure. Of these 72 sites, 16 of them reported information for two site coordinators. Thirteen of those 16 sites reported that both coordinators had at least a bachelor's degree. The remaining seven sites with two coordinators were considered to have successfully met the measure because one of their two coordinators had at least a bachelor's degree. Of the 30 sites that did not meet the measure, two reported information for two site coordinators, both of whom had less than bachelor's degrees.

Measure 3.1d: 21C sites will be led by site coordinators with significant levels of experience (3+ years of experience).

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
97% of sites had coordinators with at least 3 years of related work experience	**96%** of sites had coordinators with at least 3 years of related work experience	**91%** of sites had coordinators with at least 3 years of related work experience	**93%** of sites had coordinators with at least 3 years of related work experience	**94%** of sites had coordinators with at least 3 years of related work experience

In each year since 2014-15, more than 90% of sites had at least one coordinator with three or more years of related work experience. In 2014-15, 97% of sites had at least one such coordinator, in 2015-16 96% of sites had one, in 2016-17 91% of sites had one, in 2017-18 93% of sites had one, and most recently, in 2081-19, 94% of sites had one site coordinator with at least three years of related work experience. In 2018-19, 96 total sites had at least one coordinator with three or more years of related experience. Of these sites, 18 reported two coordinators with at least this much experience. Of the six sites that did not meet the target for this measure, all six had only one site coordinator, each with two years of experience.

Result 3.2: 21C-funded programs utilize high quality staff to run programs.

Staff that are licensed educators are often able to help students make connections between topics that they learn during the regular school day and those which they explore in afterschool settings. Therefore, the following four measures look at the percentages of staff for both school year and summer programs that were licensed educators.

Measure 3.2a: 21C sites will be staffed by at least one-third licensed educators during the school year.

2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
59% of school year sites were staffed by at least 1/3 licensed educators.	**50%** of school year sites were staffed by at least 1/3 licensed educators.	**53%** of school year sites were staffed by at least 1/3 licensed educators.	**54%** of school year sites were staffed by at least 1/3 licensed educators.

During the 2018-19 school year, 54% of 21C program sites were staffed by at least one-third licensed educators. This was a slight increase from the previous year in which 53% of school year sites had met the target. In 2016-17, this percentage was 50% and in 2015-16, it was 59%. No data are available for 2014-15. In 2018-19, the 55 sites that were staffed by one-third licensed educators were as follows: 17 sites had between 33%-39% of their staff as licensed educators; 17

had 40%-49% of their staff as licensed educators, six sites had 50%-60% of their staff as licensed educators; nine sites had 60%-70% of their staff as licensed educators; and six sites had 70% or more of their staff as licensed educators. Of the sites that did not successfully employ at least one-third licensed educators, six sites did not actually have any licensed educators on staff; 22 sites had 4%-19% licensed educators; and 19 sites had 20%-32% licensed educators.

Measure 3.2b: 21C sites that operate in the summer will be staffed by at least one-third licensed educators in the summer.

Summer 2015	Summer 2016	Summer 2017	Summer 2018
58% of summer sites were staffed by at least 1/3 licensed educators.	**49%** of summer sites were staffed by at least 1/3 licensed educators.	**56%** of summer sites were staffed by at least 1/3 licensed educators.	**56%** of summer sites were staffed by at least 1/3 licensed educators.

In the summer of 2018, summer programming was available to students from 89 of the total 102 21C-funded schools. Summer programming itself took place at 71 physical locations (schools), so this measure looks at those 71 schools that ran summer programming and the staff that worked there, 40 (56%) employed staff that included at least one-third licensed teachers.

In the summer of 2015, 58% of these all summer locations met the goal of having at least one-third of their respective staff members as licensed teachers. In summer 2016, 49% of those summer sites successfully had at least one-third of their staff as licensed educators. In summer 2017, there 56% of summer sites were staffed by at least one-third licensed educators.

Measure 3.2c: At the state level, at least one-third of the staff working in 21C programs during the school year will be licensed educators.

2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
38% of total school year staff statewide were licensed educators	**34%** of total school year staff statewide were licensed educators	**35%** of total school year staff statewide were licensed educators	**37%** of total school year staff statewide were licensed educators
Target reached	Target reached	Target reached	Target reached

In 2015-16, 38% of total 21C school year staff were licensed educators. This percentage decreased to 34% the following year, in 2017-18 increased slightly to 35% and most recently (2018-19) was at 37%. In all four years, more than one-third of the staff statewide were licensed educators, so the target was reached for this measure.

Measure 3.2d: At the state level, at least one-third of the staff working in 21C programs during the summer will be licensed educators.

Summer 2015	Summer 2016	Summer 2017	Summer 2018
38% of total summer staff	**36%** of total summer staff	**38%** of total summer staff	**34%** of total summer staff

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

Summer 2015	Summer 2016	Summer 2017	Summer 2018
statewide were licensed educators	statewide were licensed educators	statewide were licensed educators	statewide were licensed educators
Target reached	Target reached	Target reached	Target reached

In both the summers of 2015 and 2017, 38% of 21C summer staff statewide were licensed educators. In the summer of 2016, 36% of total summer staff statewide were licensed educators and in 2018, 34% of total summer staff were licensed educators. Therefore the target was met in all four years for which data are available.

Result 3.3: 21C-funded programs have appropriate staff retention rates.

Sites that have low turnover rates among leadership can best work toward improving the experiences for children and youth who attend programming at their sites. *Measures 3.3a* and *3.3b* look at the tenure of directors and site coordinators of 21C programs. These Measures are closely connected to *Measures 3.1b* and *3.1d* regarding staff experience. As programs increase their retention rates by reducing staff turnover, both directors and site coordinators will be able to report more years of related experience

Measure 3.3a: 21C-funded projects have no more than a third of their site coordinators in their first or second year of tenure at each of their particular sites.

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
80% of projects had no more than 1/3 of their site coordinators in 1st or 2nd year of tenure at each site.	**43%** of projects had no more than 1/3 of their site coordinators in 1st or 2nd year of tenure at each site.	**69%** of projects had no more than 1/3 of their site coordinators in 1st or 2nd year of tenure at each site.	**68%-82%** of projects had no more than 1/3 of their site coordinators in 1st or 2nd year of tenure at each site. **(exact percentage is ambiguous; see explanation below)**	**58%-65%** of projects had no more than 1/3 of their site coordinators in 1st or 2nd year of tenure at each site. **(exact percentage is ambiguous; see explanation below)**

After having seen a significant dip between 2014-15 and 2015-16, the retention rate of site coordinators improved so that in 2016-17 69% of projects had no more than one-third of site coordinators in their 1st or 2nd year of tenure at each site. In 2017-18, as many as 82% of projects successfully met the target, but it may have been as few as 68%. In 2018-19, between 58% and 65% of projects had no more than one third of their site coordinators in their first or second year of tenure at each site. These discrepancies had to do with the fact that some sites had two coordinators, one of whom is in their first or second year of tenure and the other of whom is not. The following explanation outlines the process for computing the measure and seeks to untangle the reason for this ambiguity.

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

This single measure has some layers of complexity, so the process for calculating these percentages was as follows. It is necessary to look at both individual sites and the projects to which they belong to in order to calculate it. The phrase, "at each of their particular sites" is a key component of this measure. It underlines the importance of looking at each individual site within a project rather than at the total number of site coordinators for a project. For example, a two-site project might have one site with a single coordinator and another site with two site coordinators. If for example, the single coordinator was in their first year of tenure and the two site coordinators with the other site were both had over two years of tenure, then by simply tallying coordinators, it would appear that this project has successfully completed the measure because two-thirds of the site coordinators would have been sufficiently experienced. However, only one site would have actually reaped the benefits of coordinator experience. Therefore, this measure was calculated to take into consideration whether each individual site met the criteria; in this hypothetical example, this project would not have successfully completed this measure because 50%, which is greater than 33% of its sites would not have sufficiently experienced sufficient site-level leadership.

It is therefore logical to begin by looking at the individual sites and the tenure of their site coordinator or coordinators to determine whether each had met the criteria of the measure. Sites could have had either one or two site coordinators. In 2018-19, most sites (84) reported information for only one site coordinator. Of these 84 sites, the site coordinators for 26 of them were in their first or second year of tenure. The remaining 58 coordinators had sufficient tenure. Eighteen sites reported information for two coordinators. Of these 18 sites, 14 of them reported that both site coordinators had at least two years of experience in their current positions. For two of the four remaining sites, the corresponding coordinators were split: one had sufficient tenure and the other was in their first or second year. The other two sites reported that both coordinators were in their first or second year of tenure. The chart below lays out these figures.

Sites with…	Sites with 1 coordinator in 2018-19	Sites with 2 coordinators in 2018-19
…0 site coordinators in 1st or 2nd yr	**58 sites** had no coordinators in 1st or 2nd year of tenure	**14 sites** had no coordinators in 1st or 2nd year of tenure
…1 site coordinator in 1st or 2nd yr	**26 sites** had one coordinator in 1st or 2nd year of tenure *Target not met*	**2 sites** had only one coordinator in 1st or 2nd year of tenure *Unclear if target was met*
…2 site coordinators in 1st or 2nd yr	--	**2 sites** had both coordinators in 1st or 2nd year of tenure

Sites with at least one coordinator in 1st or 2nd year of tenure

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
42 sites (40%) had at least one coordinator in 1st or 2nd year of tenure	**30 sites (29%)** had at least one coordinator in 1st or 2nd year of tenure	**27 sites (27%)** had at least one coordinator in 1st or 2nd year of tenure	**30 sites (30%)** had at least one coordinator in 1st or 2nd year of tenure

For the two sites in 2018-19 that had one coordinator with sufficient years of tenure and the other with insufficient years of tenure, it is not clear as to whether they met the criteria for the measure. On the one hand, they did possess one site coordinator with sufficient experience. On the other hand, compared with sites that had two coordinators with sufficient experience or even a single-coordinator site with a well-tenured leader, it is unclear as to whether their site-level leadership would have been as effective. One of the sites was from a multi-site project that two sites that met the criteria and one site that did not, so the status of the project as a whole remains unclear. The other site was a single-site project, so it also remains unclear as to whether the project achieved the target. For this reason, the resulting percentage for this Measure for 3.3a is presented as a range.

Measure 3.3b: At the state level, no more than a third of the 21C directors are in their first or second year of tenure at their program.

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
27% of directors statewide were in their first or second year of tenure	**23%** of directors statewide were in their first or second year of tenure	**17%** of directors statewide were in their first or second year of tenure	**14%** of directors statewide were in their first or second year of tenure	**19%** of directors statewide were in their first or second year of tenure
Target reached	Target reached	Target reached	Target reached	Target reached

Measure 3.3b is the only one for which a decrease in percentage over the years is desired. Most recently, 19% of directors in the state were in their first or second year of tenure (five of the 26 directors). This was a slight increase following the lowest percentage in the previous year (14% in 2017-18). In 2016-17, five of the 29 directors (17%) were in their first or second year of tenure. This was a slight decrease from the previous year in which seven of the 30 directors (23%) were in their first or second year of tenure. In 2014-15, just over one-quarter (27%) of directors in the state we in their first or second year of tenure. In all five years, the target was met since not more than one-third of directors statewide were in their first or second year of tenure.

Result 3.4: 21C leaders participate in professional development and networking opportunities.

Directors that regularly work toward improving and developing their professional skills and knowledge are best equipped to provide the most positive and beneficial expanded learning experiences for children and youth. They are required to engage continuously in professional development opportunities to keep current with the field of afterschool and summer learning and acquire new skills and resources for running their programs and managing their staff.

Measure 3.4a: 21C project directors participate in at least 25 total hours of professional development opportunities per year.

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
85% of project directors participated in at least 25 total hours of PD opportunities.	**80%** of project directors participated in at least 25 total hours of PD opportunities.	**86%** of project directors participated in at least 25 total hours of PD opportunities.	**90%** of project directors participated in at least 25 total hours of PD opportunities.	**85%** of project directors participated in at least 25 total hours of PD opportunities.

In 2018-19, all but four 21C project directors participated in at least 25 hours of professional development. Ten directors participated in 25-50 hours, eight directors participated in 50-100 hours, and four directors participated in more than 100 hours.

In 2017-18, all but three directors (90%) had participated in at least 25 annual hours of professional development. In 2016-17, all but four directors (86%) of project directors achieved the goal of participating in at least 25 hours of professional development programming, which was an increase from 80% of directors who did so in 2015-16. In 2015-16, six of the 30 directors did not complete at least 25 hours of professional development. In 2014-15, 85% of directors met this goal.

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

Goal Area 4: All 21C-funded programs are sustainable

The methods to ensure that 21C-funded afterschool and summer learning programs are sustainable are outlined as the three results for Goal Area 4.

Result 4.1: 21C-funded programs link with the school day.

School buildings are the primary locations for both school year and summer learning opportunities. School principals who understand the importance of the programming that take place in their schools are most likely to help those programs sustain themselves by providing resources, support and potential connections to new partners or funding sources. Principals who can effectively communicate the benefits of their school's afterschool and summer learning programs are well suited to help advocate for the programs at the school district, supervisory union, or even state levels.

Measure 4.1a: The associated building principal of each 21C site meets with program director and/or site coordinator at least once a month or a total of nine times during the calendar year.

2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
90% of sites met with building principal at least 9 times during year	**89%** of sites met with building principal at least 9 times during year	**94%** of sites met with building principal at least 9 times during year	**92%** of sites met with building principal at least 9 times during year

It is crucial for program leaders to meet with their associated building principals regularly in order to build strong connections and advocate for their programs. This was the case for leaders of 90% of 21C sites in 2015-16, 89% of sites in 2016-17, 94% of sites in 2017-18, and 92% of sites in 2018-19. The associated item on the site-level APR was a straightforward yes/no question that read, "Does the project director or site coordinator meet with the associated building principal at least once per month OR at least a total of nine times during the calendar year?"

Result 4.2: 21C-funded programs utilize diverse sources of funding.

Funding from the federal 21st Century Community Learning Centers initiative gives schools throughout Vermont monetary resources as well as training opportunities to help make quality expanded learning opportunities available to school age children and youth. While this funding is crucial, project leaders also need to work to ensure that their programs can survive even without it. Projects funded with 21C dollars that are also able to obtain funding from a diverse array of sources have more financial security and sustainability than projects that rely heavily on just a few sources. Projects that have been in operation for five years or more are expected to have had enough time to establish and secure funding from at least four funding sources other than 21C.

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

Measure 4.2a: 21C-funded projects that have been in operation for more than five years have at least five different sources of funding contributing to their annual operating budget.

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
83% of projects in operation >5 years had at least 5 funding sources	**74%** of projects in operation >5 years had at least 5 funding sources	**87%** of projects in operation >5 years had at least 5 funding sources	**75%** of projects in operation >5 years had at least 5 funding sources	**83%** of projects in operation >5 years had at least 5 funding sources

In 2018-19, there were 26 projects that had been in operation for more than five years and 19 of them (83%) had at least five sources of funding (including 21C funds) contributing to their annual operating budget. In 2017-18, there had been 18 projects out of 23 that were in operation for at least five years and had five or more funding sources. Before that (in 2016-17), there were 23 projects that had been in operation for more than five years and 20 of them (87%) received funding from at least five different sources. In 2015-16, there were 23 projects that had been in operation for more than five years and 17 of them (74%) received funding from at least five sources. In 2014-15, 83% of projects in operation for more than five years had at least five unique sources of funding. In-kind donations were not included in the tallies for these years.

Measure 4.2b: 21C-funded projects that have been in operation for more than five years receive no more than 55% of their annual funding from a single funding source.

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
71% of projects in operation >5 years had no more than 55% of funding from single source	**61%** of projects in operation >5 years had no more than 55% of funding from single source	**57%** of projects in operation >5 years had no more than 55% of funding from single source	**58%** of projects in operation >5 years had no more than 55% of funding from single source	**57%** of projects in operation >5 years had no more than 55% of funding from single source

Measure 4.2b originally read, "21C-funded projects that have been in operation for more than five years receive no more than 50% of their annual funding from a single funding source." The percentage was increased to 55% because more 21C money was awarded in 2014-15 to cover a statewide licensed teacher retirement issue that year. In 2018-19, 13 out of the 26 projects that had been in operation for at least five years (57%) had no more than 55% of their funding coming from the 21C grant.

It is worth pointing out that there were seven newly funded 21C sites in 2018-19, and some or all of them may have come in with 100% funding from the 21C initiative. All seven belonged to existing projects. Two of the sites came in at the same time as a merger between two already funded supervisory unions. In that particular case, the percent of funding from the 21C initiative had increased from 52% in 2017-18 (which was the total 21C funding divided by the total expenditure for both projects) to 76% in 2018-19 after the merger and acquisition of the new sites. Without specific site-level funding data, it is difficult to say for sure whether this specific increase in dependence on 21C funds was the direct result of acquiring two newly

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

funded sites, but it is likely. While there were a few other projects that gained new sites in 2018-19, none of them experienced such a pronounced increase in reliance on 21C funding between the two years as the previously described case.

In 2017-18, 14 of the 23 projects in operation for more than five years (58%) had no more than 55% of their funding come from a single source. In 2016-17, thirteen of the 23 projects that were in operation for more than five years (57%) in 2015-16 had accomplished this goal. Fourteen out of the 23 projects that were in operation for more than five years (61%) in 2015-16 had no more than 55% of their funding come from a single source. In 2014-15, 71% of projects in operation for at least five years had accomplished this goal.

Measure 4.2c: At the state level, aggregate cash funding from sources other than federal 21C funds will exceed 5.5 million dollars.

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
$6.15 million was the statewide aggregate cash funding from sources other than 21C funds	**$5.81 million** was the statewide aggregate cash funding from sources other than 21C funds	**$6.23 million** was the statewide aggregate cash funding from sources other than 21C funds	**$5.89 million** was the statewide aggregate cash funding from sources other than 21C funds	**$6.43 million** was the statewide aggregate cash funding from sources other than 21C funds
Target reached	Target reached	Target reached	Target reached	Target reached

A total of 5.5 million dollars in federal funding are allocated annually to 21C projects in Vermont. The sum of funds from other sources such as schools, supervisory unions, fundraising and state funds was 6.43 million dollars in 2018-19. This was the highest amount since 2014-15. In all years, the target was reached and 2018-19 in particular stands out as a high point.

Result 4.3: 21C-funded programs benefit from meaningful community partnerships.

Community partners that can support 21C projects by contributing financially can help with programs' long-term sustainability. While any amount of monetary of in-kind contribution from partners are helpful for programs, this Result and corresponding Measure look only at community partners who contributed at least $1000. This provides a baseline for comparison purposes.

Measure 4.3a: 21C-funded projects work with a minimum of two community partners that contribute the equivalent of at least $1000/year each in resources or support to the program.

2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
76% of projects had at least 2 community partners contributing at least $1000/year	**70%** of projects had at least 2 community partners contributing at least $1000/year	**76%** of projects had at least 2 community partners contributing at least $1000/year	**76%** of projects had at least 2 community partners contributing at least $1000/year	**85%** of projects had at least 2 community partners contributing at least $1000/year

In 2018-19, 85% of projects (22 out of 26) were able to report that they had at least two community partners contributing at least $1000 per year. This was a significant percentage increase from the previous year. The average number of partners reported was 6.3 per project. The four projects that did not meet the target reported not having any partners at the $1000 per year level. Five projects reported having ten or more partners. In 2017-18, just over three-quarters (76%) of 21C projects were able to report that they had at least two community partners that contributed at least $1000. In previous years, similar percentages of 21C projects were able to report having at least two community partners that contributed at least $1000 (76% in both 2014-15 and 2016-17; and 70% in 2015-16).

Conclusion

This report summarizes and compares statewide evaluation data that were collected for all 21C-funded projects and individual sites for the years between 2014-15 and 2018-19. These data were collected via electronically submitted annual performance reports in both years. The submissions were aggregated and analyzed to inform all of the measures within each of the results of the four Goal Areas on the evaluation plan. Overall, improvement was seen between the most recent two years, 2017-18 and 2018-19 on 19 measures. Fifteen of the measures showed decreased performance between the two years and fifteen measures showed consistent performance. This report also included a qualitative analysis of the barriers and challenges that 21C program leaders experienced in 2018-19. The most commonly described challenges were those related to staff recruitment and retention, student behavioral issues, staffing issues, student recruitment, and program space. Action items for 2019-20 and beyond include continuing to support 21C school year and summer programming, supporting programs in recruiting and retaining quality staff, supporting projects in developing best practices for fostering youth leadership, supporting projects in dealing with challenging student behaviors, and updating the statewide evaluation.

Sources

Huang, D., Gribbons, B., Kim, K. S., Lee, C., & Baker, E. L. (2000). A decade of results: The impact of the LA's BEST after school enrichment initiative on subsequent student achievement and performance. Los Angeles: UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation, Graduate School of Education & Information Studies; Huang, D., Kim, K. S., Marshall, A., & Perez, P. (2005). Keeping kids in school: An LA's BEST example—A study examining the long-term impact of LA's BEST on students' dropout rates. Los Angeles, CA: National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing.

Policy Study Associates (2004). Building Quality, Scale, and Effectiveness in After-School Programs: Summary. Report of the TASC Evaluation.

Vermont Agency of Education. (2019). 2019 Free & Reduced Eligibility Report. Retrieved October 6, 2019, from https://education.vermont.gov/data-and-reporting

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION

Hunger in Vermont (2019). Retrieved November 26, 2019, from Hunger Free VT: https://www.hungerfreevt.org/hungerinvermont

VERMONT
AGENCY OF EDUCATION