



*Independence Charter School 21st Century Program
Cohort 7: Local Evaluation Report, 2016-2017*

Prepared for:

Independence Charter School

Mr. Odamis Fernandez-Sheinbaum
1600 Lombard Street
Philadelphia, PA 19146

Prepared by:

By The Numbers

P.O. Box 89
West Decatur, PA 16878
814-342-7080 (Phone)
814-342-7079 (Fax)
Email: solutions@bythenumbers.info

OCTOBER 2017

Independence Charter School 21st Century Program Cohort 7: Local Evaluation Report, 2016-2017

1. Introduction

In October 2014 Independence Charter School (ICS) received a three-year grant from the 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) program, Cohort 7. The goal of the 21st CCLC program is to provide students in high-poverty communities across the United States the opportunity to participate in academic enrichment and youth development programs designed to enhance their well-being. ICS is a tuition-free, K-8 charter school in Philadelphia that serves an ethnically diverse and economically disadvantaged student population of over 800 children. ICS has a nationally recognized global studies program that emphasizes academic excellence and second-language acquisition.

ICS is a school-wide Title I building. Its School Performance Profile (SPP) indicates that about one-half (50%) of its students are economically disadvantaged, 5% are English Language Learners (ELLs), and 12% are in Special Education.¹ The racial/ethnic composition of ICS students is 41% African American, 26% white, 18% Hispanic, 5% Asian, and 10% multi-racial. Objectives of the ICS 21st CCLC Cohort 7 grant include improving academic achievement on local and state assessments in reading, math, and science; improving school attendance; and reducing disciplinary referrals.

ICS has a “Path A” 21st Century program providing programming after school for students and during the summer for students and parents. The target student population for the ICS program is those who show the most academic, social, and economic need based on assessment scores and input from building administrators, teachers, and staff. This includes ELL students. The program provides remediation and acceleration in STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Mathematics) utilizing resources from the regular school-day curricula and community partners. Community partners provide services such as enrichment curriculum and activities, tutoring, and volunteer staffing services.

The ICS program uses small-group, interactive STEAM activities and one-on-one learning as appropriate to each student. The program also provides time for students to work on homework and school-day projects. After-school programming is provided Monday through Friday during the school year for 13 hours per week, 3:15-5:30 pm on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays, and 1:30-5:30 pm on Wednesdays (the regular school day at ICS ends early on Wednesdays). Programming during the summer is provided Mondays through Fridays for 20 hours per week, 8:30 am – 12:30 pm each day. For parents, during 2016-2017, the ICS 21st Century program offered 5 parent literacy workshops during the summer to help parents learn how to promote literacy at home. There were also Open House events for parents and the community at large.

¹ <http://paschoolperformance.org/Profile/7227>

The ICS 21st CCLC Cohort 7 program collaborates with Springboard Collaborative, a Philadelphia-based organization offering school-year and summer programs designed to accelerate progress in reading during the school year and halt the “summer slide” in reading that often occurs.² Springboard Collaborative trains teachers to coach the families of their struggling readers to improve progress during the academic year. In the summer, Springboard Collaborative offers an intensive, five-week summer literacy program for Pre-K through 4th grade students and their families.

Partners with the ICS 2st CCLC program that provide enrichment activities include PECO, an energy company that provides environmental education; Lintons Managed Services, which provides nutrition education; the Academy at Palumbo High School, whose juniors and seniors volunteer to tutor 21st CCLC students; the Vetri Community Partnership, which provides healthy eating and lifestyle activities and education for families of 21st CCLC students; Rhythm Kids Music Together, which helps students learn patterns and develop mathematics processing skills; and the Food Trust, which through its HYPE program teaches middle school students healthy eating lifestyles and mentoring to be leaders in health and nutrition.³ There were no 21st CCLC field trips during 2016-2017.

By The Numbers, a Pennsylvania-based consulting firm, was contracted by ICS to be the external evaluator of its 21st CCLC Cohort 7 program. This is our local evaluation report for 2016-2017. It is the third annual local evaluation report for the ICS Cohort 7 grant.

2. Evaluation Timeline and Activities

Data for this evaluation report were collected through four avenues. First, we received data on student academic achievement and growth, and student behavior, for individual students in the 21st CCLC program from staff at ICS. Second, we received copies of Quarterly Performance Reports (QPRs) submitted by ICS to the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) during 2016-2017. Third, we made a site visit to ICS in April 2017 to meet with program staff and teachers, and observe after-school 21st CCLC programming. Questions during our site visits focused on program accomplishments, problems and barriers in meeting program goals, what is going well with the program, and lessons learned. Fourth, we communicated via email with program staff during 2016-2017.

3. Participating Students

ICS was approved to serve 85 students during the 2016-2017 school year: 55 elementary school students and 30 middle school students. The program was also approved to serve 123 students during summer 2017: 105 elementary school students and 18 middle school students.

² <http://springboardcollaborative.org/>

³ The partnerships with Rhythm Kids and HYPE developed during 2016-2017 but programming will begin during 2017-2018.

We received data from ICS on 125 students who attended the 21st CCLC program for at least one day during the 2016-2017 program year, 106 elementary school students and 19 middle school students. Among these 125 students, 91 (73%) were regular attendees. Regular attendees—also referred to as regular program participants or just regular participants—are defined as students attending the 21st CCLC program for at least 30 days. Most of our calculations in this report are based on the 91 regular attendees since most of the student-related performance indicators refer to regular attendees.

Of the 91 regular attendees, 80 (88%) were in elementary school and 11 (12%) were in middle school. Among those in elementary school, the largest cohorts were in kindergarten (18 students), 1st grade (16 students), and 5th grade (15 students). Numbers of students in the other elementary school grades ranged from 9 to 12. Among those in middle school, 5 students were in 6th grade, 5 in 7th grade, and 1 in 8th grade.

Figures in the QPRs indicate that 127 students attended the 21st CCLC program for at least one day during the 2016-2017 school year: 106 elementary school students and 21 middle school students. These figures are very close to the totals in the data we received from ICS. Figures in the QPRs also indicate that 87 students attended the program for at least one day during summer 2017: 61 elementary school students and 26 middle school students.

We received demographic information for 89 of the 91 regular attendees in the data from ICS. Of these 89 students, 49 (55%) were male and 40 (45%) were female. In terms of race/ethnicity, 47 (53%) were African-American, 24 (27%) were Hispanic, 7 (8%) were Asian, 4 (4%) were white, and 7 (8%) were mixed race/ethnicity. About two-thirds (66%) of these students were economically disadvantaged based on free or reduced-price school lunch eligibility status. One-tenth (10%) were English Language Learners (ELL)/ESL and about one-sixth (16%) had an individualized education plan (IEP).

4. 21st Century Federal Performance (GPRA) Indicators

This section reports the federal Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) objectives, measures, and indicators for the 21st CCLC program at ICS. There are three federal GPRA performance measures for Cohort 7 21st CCLC programs: (1) Students regularly participating in the program will meet or exceed state and local academic achievement standards in reading and math; (2) Students regularly participating in the program will show improvement in the performance measures of school attendance, classroom performance and/or reduced disciplinary referrals; and (3) Participants in 21st CCLC programs will demonstrate additional positive educational, social, and behavioral changes. Some performance indicators under these GPRA measures are for elementary program participants, some are for middle/high school participants, and some are for participants regardless of statutory area.

Table 1. Federal Performance Measure 1: Student Academic Achievement

Federal Performance Indicator	Target (%)	2016-2017 Achievement (%)
The percentage of elementary 21 st CCLC regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring (GPRA 1.1)	48.5%	21% (= 13/63)
The percentage of middle or high school 21 st CCLC regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring (GPRA 1.2)	48.5%	20% (= 2/10)
The percentage of all 21 st CCLC regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring (GPRA 1.3)	48.5%	21% (= 15/73)
The percentage of elementary 21 st CCLC regular program participants whose reading/English grades improved from fall to spring (GPRA 1.4)	48.5%	20% (= 13/65)
The percentage of middle or high school 21 st CCLC regular program participants whose reading/English grades improved from fall to spring (GPRA 1.5)	48.5%	10% (= 1/10)
The percentage of all 21 st CCLC regular program participants whose reading/English grades improved from fall to spring (GPRA 1.6)	70%	19% (= 14/75)
The percentage of elementary 21 st CCLC regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above in reading on state assessments (PSSA) (GPRA 1.7)	45%	10% (= 1/10)
The percentage of middle/high school 21 st CCLC regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above in mathematics on state assessments (PSSA or Keystone Exam) (GPRA 1.8)	25%	0% (= 0/6)

Table 2. Federal Performance Measure 2: Student Academic Behavior

Federal Performance Indicator	Target (%)	2016-2017 Achievement (%)
The percentage of elementary 21 st CCLC regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation (of students needing to improve) (GPRA 1.9)	90%	85% (= 52/61) Homework Completion 81% (= 46/57) Class Participation
The percentage of middle and high school 21 st CCLC program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation (of students needing to improve) (GPRA 1.10)	93%	33% (= 3/9) Homework Completion 38% (= 3/8) Class Participation
The percentage of all 21 st CCLC regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation (of students needing to improve) (GPRA 1.11)	77%	79% (= 55/70) Homework Completion 75% (= 49/65) Class Participation

Table 3. Federal Performance Measure 3: Student Educational, Social, and Emotional Development

Federal Performance Indicator	Target (%)	2016-2017 Achievement (%)
The percentage of elementary 21 st CCLC participants with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior (of students needing to improve) (GPRA 1.12)	75%	<p>73% (= 38/52) Behaving in Class</p> <p>69% (= 35/51) Getting Along Well with Other Students</p>
The percentage of middle and high school 21 st CCLC participants with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior (of students needing to improve) (GPRA 1.13)	75%	<p>14% (= 1/7) Behaving in Class</p> <p>17% (= 1/6) Getting Along Well with Other Students</p>
The percentage of all 21 st CCLC participants with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior (of students needing to improve) (GPRA 1.14)	75%	<p>66% (= 39/59) Behaving in Class</p> <p>63% (= 36/57) Getting Along Well with Other Students</p>

A. Student Academic Achievement

Federal performance indicators for student academic achievement are reported in Table 1. Improvement on report cards is defined at the federal level as a positive move of half a letter grade or five percentage points or more. ICS operates on a trimester system, so fall grades are for the first trimester and spring grades are for the third trimester. For state assessments, which are also part of federal performance indicators for student academic achievement, improvement is defined as a positive move of one or more proficiency levels.

The scales used for mathematics and reading/ELA (English Language Arts) report card grades at ICS, and the items that are graded, vary by grade level. For kindergarten, math grades are calculated on an integer 1-3 scale in five areas (Counting and Cardinality, Numbers and Operations in Base Ten, Operations and Algebraic Thinking, Geometry, and Measurement and Data). We used the grade in Numbers and Operations in Base Ten, so that an improvement for federal purposes is an increase of 1 ($5\% \times 3 = 0.15$, rounded up to 1). Kindergarten reading grades are calculated on an integer 1-3 scale in three areas (Word Attack Strategies & Vocabulary, Reading Comprehension, and Fluency). We used the Reading Comprehension grade, so that an improvement for federal purposes is an increase of 1 ($5\% \times 3 = 0.15$, rounded up to 1).

For 1st grade math, report card grades are calculated on an integer 1-4 scale in three areas (Numbers and Operations in Base Ten, Operations and Algebraic Thinking, and Geometry). We used the grade in Numbers and Operations in Base Ten. For 1st grade reading, grades are calculated on an integer 1-4 scale in three areas (Word Attack Strategies & Vocabulary, Reading Comprehension, and Fluency). We used the Reading Comprehension grade. In both cases, an improvement for federal purposes is an increase of 1 ($5\% \times 4 = 0.2$, rounded up to 1). For 2nd grade math, report card grades are calculated on an integer 1-4 scale in four areas (Numbers and Operations in Base Ten, Geometry, Measurement and Data, and Operations and Algebraic Thinking). We used the grade in Numbers and Operations in Base Ten. For 2nd grade reading, grades are calculated on an integer 1-4 scale in three areas (Word Attack Strategies & Vocabulary, Reading Comprehension, and Fluency). We used the Reading Comprehension grade. In both cases, an improvement for federal purposes is an increase of 1 ($5\% \times 4 = 0.2$, rounded up to 1).

For 3rd grade and 4th grade math and ELA, report card grades are calculated on a 0-100 scale in multiple areas which can vary by student. Improvement for federal purposes is an increase of 5 points or more. For 3rd and 4th grade math, there was one area common to all 21st CCLC students, Numbers and Operations in Base Ten, so we used that. For 3rd and 4th grade ELA, we used the one area common to all 21st CCLC students, Reading Literature.

For grades 5-8, report card grades at ICS are letter grades ranging from F to A+, so that improvement for federal purposes is an increase of a half a letter grade or more. For 5th grade, we used report card grades in Mathematics and ELA. For 6th, 7th, and 8th grades, we used report card grades in Math Problem Solving and ELA.

In total, we received matched fall 2016 and spring 2017 report card grades for all 91 regular attendees. Calculation of performance at the federal level excludes students already achieving at the

highest level, so those students in kindergarten through 4th grades with fall report grades in the highest 5% possible (e.g. 96-100 for grades on a 100-point scale) are excluded from the report card calculations. Similarly, students in grades 5-8 obtaining an A+ in the fall are excluded from the report card calculations. Students initially scoring proficient or advanced on the PSSA (Pennsylvania System of School Assessment) Exam are excluded from those federal performance calculations.

GPRA 1.1 is the percentage of elementary 21st CCLC regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring, and GPRA 1.2 is the percentage of middle or high school 21st CCLC regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring, with a target of 48.5% in both cases. GPRA 1.3 is the percentage of all 21st CCLC regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring, also with a target of 48.5%. At the elementary school level, fall math grades for 17 regular attendees with matched fall and spring report card grades were at the highest level for federal purposes, and so were excluded from the calculations. At the middle school level, the fall math grade for 1 regular attendee was at the highest level. About one-fifth of regular attendees not already at the highest level improved their mathematics grades from fall to spring (21% for elementary school students, 20% for middle school students, and 21% overall), so that ICS made progress on these indicators but did not achieve the target level of progress.

GPRA 1.4 is the percentage of elementary school 21st CCLC regular program participants whose reading/English grades improved from fall to spring, with a target of 48.5%. GPRA 1.5 is the percentage of middle or high school 21st CCLC regular program participants whose reading/English grades improved from fall to spring, with a target of 48.5%. GPRA 1.6 is the percentage of all 21st CCLC regular program participants whose reading/English grades improved from fall to spring, with a target of 70%. Fifteen of the elementary school regular attendees with matched fall and spring report card grades were already at the highest level in the fall and so were excluded from the calculations. One middle school regular attendee was already at the highest level in the fall. Among the remaining students, about one-fifth improved their reading/English report card grades from fall to spring (20% for elementary school students, 10% for middle school students, and 19% overall), so that ICS made some progress on these indicators.

GPRA 1.7 is the percentage of elementary school 21st CCLC regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above in reading on state assessments, with a target of 45%. We received matched 2016 and 2017 ELA PSSA scores for 22 elementary school regular attendees. Twelve of the 22 scored proficient or advanced in 2016 and so are excluded from the calculations. Among the remaining 10, one (10%) improved from not proficient to proficient or above. Therefore, ICS made some progress on this indicator but was not close to the target level of progress.

GPRA 1.8 is the percentage of middle/high school 21st CCLC regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above in mathematics on state assessments, with a target of 25%. For students at ICS, the relevant state assessments are solely the PSSA exams and not the Keystone exams because ICS covers grades K-8. We received matched 2016 and 2017 mathematics PSSA scores for 9 middle school regular attendees. Three of the 9 scored proficient or advanced in 2016 and so are excluded from the calculations. Among the remaining 6, none (0%) improved from not proficient to proficient or above.

B. Student Academic Behavior

Performance on student behavior indicators is typically measured using results from the PPICS (Profile and Performance Information Collection System) Teacher Survey. The PPICS Teacher Survey asks teachers of participating students about their students' performance in ten areas: turning in homework on time, completing homework to the teacher's satisfaction, participating in class, volunteering (e.g. for extra credit), attending class regularly, being attentive in class, behaving well in class, academic performance, coming to school motivated to learn, and getting along well with other students. Response options for each area are: did not need to improve, significant improvement, moderate improvement, slight improvement, no change, slight decline, moderate decline, and significant decline. We received partially or wholly completed PPICS Teacher Surveys for 90 of the 91 regular attendees.

Federal performance indicators for student academic behavior are reported in Table 2. GPRA 1.9 is the percentage of elementary school 21st CCLC regular program participants with teacher-reported improvements in homework completion and class participation, among those students rated as needing to improve. The target for GPRA 1.9 is 90%. GPRA 1.10 is the percentage of middle or high school 21st CCLC regular program participants with teacher-reported improvements in homework completion and class participation, among those students rated as needing to improve, with a target of 93%. GPRA 1.11 is the percentage of all 21st CCLC program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation, among those students rated as needing to improve, with a target of 77%.

For homework completion, 19 regular attendees with PPICS Teacher Survey data were rated as not needing to improve. Among the 70 needing to improve, 55 students (79%) were rated as having improved. At the elementary school level, 52 of 61 students (85%) needing to improve were rated as having improved. At the middle school level, 3 of 9 students (33%) needing to improve were rated as having improved. For class participation, 25 regular attendees were rated as not needing to improve. Among the 65 needing to improve, 49 students (75%) were rated as having improved. At the elementary school level, 46 of 57 students (81%) needing to improve were rated as having improved. At the middle school level, 3 of 8 students (38%) needing to improve were rated as having improved. These figures indicate that ICS made very good progress on GPRA indicators 1.19-1.11, coming close to or exceeding most of the target levels of progress.

C. Student Educational, Social, and Emotional Development

Federal performance indicators for student educational, social, and emotional development are reported in Table 3. Like the federal student behavior indicators, these are typically measured using results from the PPICS Teacher Survey.

GPRA 1.12 is the percentage of elementary school 21st CCLC participants with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior, among those students rated as needing to improve, with a target of 75%. GPRA 1.13 is the percentage of middle and high school 21st CCLC participants with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior, among those students rated as needing to improve, with a target of

75%. GPRA 1.14 is the percentage of 21st CCLC participants with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior, among those students rated as needing to improve, again with a target of 75%.

On the PPICS Teacher Survey, the two questions most closely tied to student educational, social, and emotional development are behaving well in class and getting along well with other students. For behaving well in class, 31 regular attendees with PPICS Teacher Survey data were rated as not needing to improve. Among the 59 needing to improve, 39 students (66%) were rated as having improved. At the elementary school level, 38 of 52 students (73%) needing to improve were rated as having improved. At the middle school level, 1 of 7 students (14%) needing to improve were rated as having improved. For getting along well with other students, 33 regular attendees were rated as not needing to improve. Among the 57 needing to improve, 36 students (63%) were rated as having improved. At the elementary school level, 35 of 51 students (69%) needing to improve were rated as having improved. At the middle school level, 1 of 6 students (17%) who needed to improve were rated as having improved. These figures indicate that ICS came close to the target levels of progress on GPRA indicators 1.12 (elementary school students) and 1.14 (all students), but did not come close on indicator 1.13 (middle school students).

D. Summary: Federal Performance Indicators

Overall, the results for the GPRA performance indicators show that the ICS 21st CCLC Cohort 7 program is making good progress toward improving student academic achievement, student academic behavior, and student educational, social, and emotional development. Bright spots include teacher-reported improvements in regular attendees' homework completion, class participation, in-class behavior, and getting along well with other students. Areas in need of improvement relative to the GPRA indicators include mathematics and ELA report card grades and PSSA Exam proficiency levels in ELA and mathematics.

5. 21st Century Local Performance Indicators

The ICS Cohort 7 program includes four performance indicators associated with federal performance measure 1, student academic achievement, which are local rather than GPRA indicators. There are seven local indicators associated with federal performance measure 2 (student academic behavior), and four local indicators associated measure 3 (student educational, social, and behavioral development), which are not GPRA indicators. There are also three local performance indicators not directly associated with any of the three GPRA measures. These indicators are listed in Table 4.

A. Student Academic Achievement

Two of the local indicators associated with federal performance measure 1, student academic achievement, are the percentages of regularly attending students who improve their state reading and math assessment performance levels from the prior year to the current year. The target is 50% for both indicators. These indicators are different from GPRA 1.7 and 1.8 for two reasons. First, the GPRA indicators are limited to elementary school (1.7) and middle/high school (1.8) regular attendees,

whereas the local indicators count regular attendees at all statutory levels. Second, the GPRA indicators only count those who improve from not proficient to proficient or above, whereas the local indicators count everyone who started as not advanced and improve their level. This means that going from below basic in 2016 to basic in 2017 would not count as an improvement for federal purposes but would count as an improvement on these local indicators.

We received matched 2016 and 2017 ELA and mathematics PSSA scores for 31 regular attendees. Five students scored advanced in 2016 in ELA, and 3 scored advanced in 2016 in mathematics; these students are excluded from the calculations. Among the remaining 26 in ELA, 3 (12%) improved their performance from 2016 to 2017. Among the 28 remaining in math, 3 (11%) improved their performance from 2016 to 2017. ICS therefore did not meet its 50% target for these two indicators.

One of the local indicators associated with federal performance measure 1 is the percentage of regularly attending students improving their academic performance as measured by the PPICS Teacher Survey, with a target of 75%. Among the 79 regular attendees with Teacher Survey data on their academic performance, 14 were rated as not needing to improve. Among the remaining 65, 58 students (89%) were rated as having improved. ICS therefore exceeded its target for this indicator.

The final local indicator associated with federal performance measure 1 is the percentage of regularly attending students improving in literacy based on pre/post assessments using STAR Reading, with a target of 50%. STAR Reading is a standardized, computer-adaptive assessment designed to assess 46 reading skill areas in 11 domains. In the ICS Cohort 7 grant proposal, this performance indicator was measured using Achieve3000. It was changed because ICS discontinued use of Achieve3000 and is now using STAR Reading. We received matched STAR Reading pretests and posttests for 47 regular attendees. As measured by normal curve equivalent (NCE) levels at pretest and posttest, 20 of these 47 students (43%) improved in literacy, somewhat short of the 50% target.

STAR Reading pretests were generally administered during fall 2016 and posttests were generally administered during spring 2017, with an average difference of about 6 months between them. Students progressing normally would be expected to gain anyway during that time, even without participating in the 21st CCLC program. NCEs take this into account by expressing student performance at pretest and posttest relative to the scores of other students nationally of similar ages.

B. Student Academic Behavior

One of the local indicators associated with federal performance measure 2, student academic behavior, is the percentage of regularly attending students who improve their school attendance by reducing their number of days of unexcused absences from the prior year to the current year, with a target of 60%. A second local indicator is the percentage of regularly attending students who improve their school attendance by reducing their number of days tardy from the prior year to the current year, with a target of 60%.

Table 4. Local Performance Indicators

Local Performance Indicator*	Associated Federal Performance Measure	Target (%)	2016-2017 Achievement (%)
The percentage of regularly attending students who improve their state reading assessment performance level from the prior year to the current year	#1 (Academic Achievement)	50%	12% (= 3/26)
The percentage of regularly attending students who improve their state math assessment performance level from the prior year to the current year	#1 (Academic Achievement)	50%	11% (= 3/28)
The percentage of regularly attending students improving their academic performance as measured by the Teacher Survey	#1 (Academic Achievement)	75%	89% (= 58/65)
The percentage of regularly attending students improving in literacy based on pre/post assessments using STAR Reading	#1 (Academic Achievement)	50%	43% (= 20/47)
The percentage of regularly attending students who improve their school attendance by reducing their number of days of unexcused absences from the prior year to the current year	#2 (Academic Behavior)	60%	50% (= 18/36)
The percentage of regularly attending students who improve their school attendance by reducing their number of days tardy from the prior year to the current year	#2 (Academic Behavior)	60%	50% (= 19/38)
The percentage of regularly attending students who improve their school behavior by reducing their number of discipline incidents from the prior year to the current year	#2 (Academic Behavior)	75%	57% (= 4/7)
The percentage of regularly attending students who improve their school behavior by reducing their number of days suspended from the prior year to the current year	#2 (Academic Behavior)	75%	— data not received

Local Performance Indicator*	Associated Federal Performance Measure	Target (%)	2016-2017 Achievement (%)
The percentage of regularly attending students improving their class attendance as measured by the Teacher Survey	#2 (Academic Behavior)	75%	53% (= 20/38)
The percentage of regularly attending students improving their class participation as measured by the Teacher Survey	#2 (Academic Behavior)	75%	75% (= 49/65)
The percentage of regularly attending students improving their class attentiveness as measured by the Teacher Survey	#2 (Academic Behavior)	75%	63% (= 40/64)
The percentage of regularly attending students improving their volunteering in class as measured by the Teacher Survey	#3 (Educational/Social/Emotional)	75%	54% (= 30/56)
The percentage of regularly attending students improving their motivation to learn as measured by the Teacher Survey	#3 (Educational/Social/Emotional)	75%	70% (= 42/60)
The percentage of regularly attending students improving their ability to get along well with others as measured by the Teacher Survey	#3 (Educational/Social/Emotional)	75%	63% (= 36/57)
The percentage of students promoted to the next grade or graduating at the end of the school year	#3 (Educational/Social/Emotional)	90%	97% (= 88/91)
The percentage of family members participating in family literacy adult literacy ESL classes who attend at least 5 sessions	Locally Defined Indicator	75%	— data not received
The percentage of family members attending at least 5 family literacy adult literacy ESL sessions with a comparable pretest and posttest adult assessment who make a gain on the assessment	Locally Defined Indicator	50%	— data not received
The average percentage of attendees of advisory board meetings who are parents/guardians of student participants	Locally Defined Indicator	20%	— data not received

* Each student improvement indicator is calculated for those students needing to improve in that area. Students already at the highest level in a particular area are excluded from the calculations for that area.

We received matched 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 school year data on unexcused absences and days tardy for all 91 regular attendees. Fifty-five students did not have any unexcused absences during 2015-2016 and so are removed from the calculations. Among the remaining 36, 18 students (50%) reduced their number of days of unexcused absences between 2015-2016 and 2016-2017. Fifty-three students did not have any days tardy during 2015-2016 and so are removed from the calculations. Among the remaining 38, 19 students (50%) reduced their number of days tardy between 2015-2016 and 2016-2017. ICS therefore made progress on both these indicators but did not achieve the 60% target.

A third local indicator is the percentage of regularly attending students who improve their school behavior by reducing their number of discipline incidents from the prior year to the current year, with a target of 75%. Eighty-four of the 91 regular attendees had no disciplinary infractions in 2015-2016 and so are removed from the calculations. Among the remaining 7, 4 students (57%) reduced their number of discipline incidents between the 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 school years. ICS therefore made progress on this indicator but did not achieve the 75% target.

A fourth local indicator is the percentage of regularly attending students who improve their school behavior by reducing their number of days suspended from the prior year to the current year. We did not receive data specific to in-school or out-of-school suspensions for 2015-2016 or 2016-2017, although suspensions are one category of discipline incidents.

The remaining local indicators associated with federal performance measure 2 utilize data from the PPICS Teacher Survey: the percentage of regularly attending students improving their (a) class attendance, (b) class participation, or (c) class attentiveness, with a target of 75% in each case. Among the 89 regular attendees with Teacher Survey data on class attendance, 51 students were rated as not needing to improve. Among the remaining 38, 20 students (53%) were rated as having improved. Among the 90 regular attendees with Teacher Survey data on class participation, 25 were rated as not needing to improve. Among the remaining 65, 49 students (75%) were rated as having improved. Among the 90 regular attendees with Teacher Survey data on class attentiveness, 26 students were rated as not needing to improve. Among the remaining 64, 40 students (63%) were rated as having improved. ICS therefore met its target level of progress on one of these indicators (class participation) and made progress on the other two indicators.

C. Student Educational, Social, and Emotional Development

Three of the local indicators associated with federal performance measure 3, student educational, social and emotional development, utilize data from the Teacher Survey: the percentage of regularly attending students improving their (a) volunteering in class, (b) motivation to learn, or (c) ability to get along well with other students, with a target of 75% in each case. Among the 88 regular attendees with Teacher Survey data on volunteering in class, 32 students were rated as not needing to improve. Among the remaining 56, 30 students (54%) were rated as having improved. Among the 90 regular attendees with Teacher Survey data on motivation to learn, 30 students were rated as not needing to improve. Among the remaining 60, 42 students (70%) were rated as having improved. Among

the 90 regular attendees with Teacher Survey data on ability to get along well with other students, 33 students were rated as not needing to improve. Among the remaining 57, 36 students (63%) were rated as having improved. ICS therefore made progress on each of these indicators but did not achieve the 75% target.

The remaining local indicator associated with federal performance measure 3 is the percentage of students promoted to the next grade or graduating at the end of the school year, with a target of 90%. All but three of the 91 regular attendees (97%) during 2016-2017 either graduated or were promoted to the next grade during 2017-2018. ICS therefore exceeded its target level of progress for this indicator.

D. Parent-Related Local Performance Indicators

The ICS Cohort 7 project has three locally defined local performance indicators that are parent-related. Two concern the ESL classes offered as part of the ICS Cohort 7 program. The first indicator is the percentage of family members participating in family literacy adult literacy ESL classes who attend at least 5 sessions, with a target of 75%. The second indicator is the percentage of family members attending at least 5 family literacy adult literacy ESL sessions with a comparable pretest and posttest adult assessment who make a gain on the assessment, with a target of 50%. The third locally defined, parent-related indicator is the average percentage of attendees of Advisory Board meetings who are parents/guardians of student participants, with a target of 20%. We did not receive the data necessary to calculate these indicators.

E. Summary: Local Performance Indicators

Overall, the results for the local performance indicators agree with the results for the federal performance indicators in showing that the ICS 21st CCLC Cohort 7 program is making good progress toward improving student academic achievement, student academic behavior, and student educational, social, and emotional development. Bright spots on the local performance indicators include teacher-reported improvements in regular attendees' academic performance, class participation, motivation to learn, class attentiveness, and ability get along well with others. Similar to the federal performance indicators, weaker spots on the local performance indicators include PSSA performance levels.

6. Stakeholder Feedback

A. Staff and Teacher Interviews

We interviewed the ICS 21st CCLC program leadership staff and teachers about the Cohort 7 program during our April 2017 site visit. Six teachers were interviewed. Interview topics included how the program is currently working for students and parents, progress in improving the academic performance and behavior of participating students, problems or challenges faced in improving academic performance and behavior, what is going well with the program overall, any major challenges facing the program as a whole, and ways in which the program could be improved.

With respect to how the program is currently working for students, interviewees indicated that the students targeted with invitations to enroll in the program were those struggling with academic or behavioral issues, or students struggling with homework completion at home. In particular, students scoring at the basic or below basic level on the PSSA ELA and/or mathematics exams were invited. Also invited were students who scored below benchmark in STAR Reading.

With respect to parents, interviewees stated there were no ESL classes during 2016-2017, a change from 2015-2016. However, like 2015-2016, there were parent Open Houses during 2016-2017 that focused on the home learning environment: what does learning look like at home, and how can learning continue outside of the school walls?

Interviewees indicated that participating students are making good progress in completing homework, doing homework correctly, and turning homework in on time. Participating students typically do homework every day during 21st CCLC time, along with enrichment activities including reading, music, art, design, and natural sciences. Projects done by 21st CCLC students as enrichment activities included developing a topographic map of Philadelphia (4th grade students); making a model of a shark, an application of the concept of density (1st grade); using soapy water and soap bubbles to make rainbows, an application of the concept of diffusion (1st grade); using popsicle sticks and tape to make a sling, an application of the concept of a simple machine (1st grade); and printing designs of various objects using a 3D printer (multiple grades).

Interviewees felt that 21st CCLC students were making significant progress with reading, especially Kindergarten students. They also felt that 21st CCLC students during 2016-2017 exhibited a greater sense of responsibility for their own academic performance and more awareness of expectations for 21st CCLC participation. Interviewees stated that regular communication between 21st CCLC teachers and school-day teachers about what topics the 21st CCLC program should be addressing during after-school time has been very helpful.

Interviewees also felt that student behavior improved during the 2016-2017 school year. They indicated that there were some cliques at the start of the school year, but that by spring 2017 those cliques had dissolved. Interviewees stated that important factors in improving student behavior include being proactive with students who exhibit behavioral issues, and daily conversations (such as a mid-day check-in) with students whose behavioral issues persist. Interviewees also stated that 21st CCLC class sizes were smaller during 2016-2017 than prior years, which helped limit behavioral issues. Interviewees felt that students paid more attention during 2016-2017 to their behavior reports, and that students were more aware that they were being held accountable for their behavior.

Interviewees stated that challenges to improving student academic performance include students who are “riled up” at the end of the school day; other, younger students who are tired at the end of the school day; and insufficient teaching resources to provide 21st CCLC students with the one-on-one help that many of them need. Interviewees indicated that some ICS alumni volunteer to assist teachers during 21st CCLC time in providing students with one-on-one help. Another challenge is in maintaining regular attendance in the 21st CCLC program, as many students have after-school activities

in addition to 21st CCLC. Also, if students feel that the 21st CCLC program is becoming repetitive, they may skip it.

Interviewees stated that challenges to improving student behavior include events that transpire during the school day but spill over into 21st CCLC time; and conflicts on the playground, when students are playing games and become upset.

In terms of what is going well with the 21st CCLC program overall, interviewees indicated that the teachers at ICS are very dedicated, with several involved in 21st CCLC; the program helps teachers to build relationships with participating students; parents of 21st CCLC students feel the program is valuable and reliable; students in the program generally want to be there; and there are other students who would join if there were space available. Interviewees also stated that the 21st CCLC program coordinator “runs a good ship,” is “very organized,” and is “on the ball.”

When asked about major challenges facing the program, interviewees stated that staffing was a challenge early in the 2016-2017 school year, but that now the program has good coverage and an adequate list of substitute teachers. A related challenge mentioned by interviewees is that teacher pay in the 21st CCLC program is relatively low.

In terms of how the 21st CCLC program could be improved, interviewees mentioned higher teacher pay; additional partners to provide enrichment activities; smaller class sizes, especially at the lower grade levels (K-2) where students are not as able to work independently; putting a greater focus on literacy during 21st CCLC time as an entrée into a longer-term program throughout the school year to improve literacy learning outcomes; more activities for students at the lower grade levels involving physical movement and taking place outdoors, such as gardening; expanding the peer tutoring program for 21st CCLC students offered by the Academy at Palumbo High School; and more professional development opportunities for 21st CCLC teachers.

B. Community Advisory Board

The QPRs indicate that no Community Advisory Board meetings were held during 2016-2017. Three Advisory Board meetings are recommended, but not required, during each program year.

7. Parent and Family Involvement

According to the QPRs, ICS held a total of nine parent and family involvement events during 2016-2017: four Open Houses, and five family literacy events during summer 2017. The recorded attendance at these nine events ranged from 2 to 94, with an average attendance of about 62. The Open Houses included student presentations on their 21st CCLC activities, and sharing information with parents about summer family literacy activities. At least one Open House event is required each quarter in order to be in compliance with 21st CCLC program requirements, and ICS met this requirement.

The family literacy events during summer 2017 focused on helping parents choose the right books for their children, making predictions, decoding and defining, understanding the story, and re-reading for fluency.

8. Conclusions

The findings in this evaluation report indicate that the ICS 21st CCLC Cohort 7 program is making good progress toward improving student academic achievement, student academic behavior, and student educational, social, and emotional development. Bright spots include teacher-reported improvements in regular attendees' academic performance, homework completion, class participation, in-class behavior, motivation to learn, class attentiveness, and getting along well with other students. Areas in need of improvement relative to the GPRA indicators include mathematics and ELA report card grades and PSSA Exam proficiency levels in ELA and mathematics.

The original ICS 21st CCLC grant was for 3 years. ICS has subsequently been approved for years 4 (2017-2018) and 5 (2018-2019) of Cohort 7. Recommendations for improvement coming out of the staff and teacher interviews to consider for years 4 and 5 include the following:

- Continue to recruit additional community partners to provide enrichment activities. The list of partners during 2016-2017 was good, but it could be greater in a city as large and diverse as Philadelphia.
- Expand the volunteer peer tutoring program for 21st CCLC students offered by the Academy at Palumbo High School.
- Continue to recruit ICS alumni volunteers to assist teachers during 21st CCLC time in providing students with one-on-one help.
- If feasible in terms of the ICS 21st CCLC budget, hire additional 21st CCLC teachers in order to reduce class sizes at the lower grade levels (K-2) where students are not as able to work independently.