
After School Programs in the 21st Century: Their Potential and What It Takes to Achieve It

Research Companion

Research Companion to an Issues and Opportunities in
Out-of School Time Evaluation Research Brief From

Harvard Family Research Project

Claire Brown Goss, Christopher Wimer, and Priscilla M.D. Little

February 2008



Harvard Family Research Project
Harvard Graduate School of Education

Harvard Family Research Project · Harvard Graduate School of Education
3 Garden Street · Cambridge, MA · 02138
www.hfrp.org · Email: hfrp_pubs@gse.harvard.edu · Tel: 617-495-9108 · Fax: 617-495-8594

Table of Contents

Does Participation Make a Difference?

Academic Performance Findings.....	1
Social/Emotional Development Findings.....	10
Crime, Drug, and Sex Prevention Findings.....	13
Health and Wellness Promotion Findings.....	16

What Does It Take?

Access to and Sustained Participation in Programs.....	19
Quality Programming.....	23
Strong Partnerships.....	30

Does Participation Make a Difference?

Academic Performance

Findings



Harvard Family Research Project
Harvard Graduate School of Education

Does Participation Make a Difference? Academic Performance Findings

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Birmingham, J., Pechman, E. M., Russell, C. A., & Mielke, M. (2005). <i>Shared features of high-performing after-school programs: A follow-up to the TASC evaluation</i>. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates.</p>	<p>Who: 262 youth across 10 sites</p> <p>Where: New York, NY (urban)</p> <p>What: This study examined high-performing after school projects funded with grants from The After-School Corporation (TASC) to determine project characteristics that may have contributed to improvements in youth's academic achievement.</p>	<p>Interviews with site staff, observation of programs, review of standardized test scores, school attendance, and demographics</p>	<p>Successful programs had weekly schedules that included homework help, project-based activities, arts and crafts, performing arts, and recreation. Occasionally projects offered specialized academic support such as individual tutoring or small-group instruction. Projects offered three or four opportunities a week for youth to participate in varied arts and sports activities.</p> <p>Both academic enrichment and arts activities scored significantly higher than sports activities on the activity content and structure scale. In addition, activities that were categorized as intentionally skill building had significantly higher scores on this scale than did activities that were not intended to be skill building.</p>

Does Participation Make a Difference? Academic Performance Findings

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Cooper, H., Charlton, K., Valentine, J C., & Muhlenbruck, L. (2000). Making the most of summer school: A meta-analytic and narrative review. <i>Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development</i>, 65(1), 1–118.</p>	<p>Who: 93 studies on summer school</p> <p>Where: Varied (urban, suburban, rural)</p> <p>What: Meta-analysis of various studies</p>	<p>Meta-analytic and narrative analysis</p>	<p>Summer school programs focused on lessening or removing learning deficiencies have a positive impact on the knowledge and skills of participants. Overall, students completing remedial summer programs can be expected to score higher than the control group on outcome measures.</p> <p>Summer school programs focusing on acceleration of learning or on multiple goals also have a positive impact on participants roughly equal to programs focusing on remediation.</p>

Does Participation Make a Difference? Academic Performance Findings

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Espino, J., Fabiano, L., & Pearson, L. M. (with Kirkwood K. P., Afolabi, K., & Pasatta, K.). (2004). <i>Citizen Schools: Evidence from two student cohorts on the use of community resources to promote youth development. Phase II report of the Citizen Schools evaluation.</i> Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates.</p> <p>Fabiano, L., Pearson, L. M., & Williams, I. J. (2005). <i>Putting students on a pathway to academic and social success: Phase III findings of the Citizen Schools evaluation.</i> Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates</p> <p>Fabiano, L., Pearson, L. M., Reisner, E. R., & Williams, I. J. (2006). <i>Preparing students in the middle grades to succeed in high school: Findings from Phase IV of the Citizen Schools evaluation.</i> Washington, D.C.: Policy Studies Associates.</p>	<p>Who: ~350 eighth-grade students</p> <p>Where: Boston, Massachusetts (urban)</p> <p>What: Citizen Schools provides hands-on after school apprenticeships, academic skill-building, leadership skills development, and homework help.</p>	<p>Review of standardized student achievement scores, college attendance and dropout rates, etc.; Boston Public Schools also assigned quality ratings and tracked high school selection.</p>	<p>Former 8th Grade Academy participants selected high-quality high schools at a significantly higher rate than matched participants.</p> <p>Former 8th Grade Academy participants attended school at significantly higher rates in their ninth-grade year than comparisons</p> <p>Former 8th Grade Academy youth with high exposure (but not overall) had significantly lower suspension rates in their ninth-grade year than matched nonparticipants</p> <p>Former 8th Grade Academy participants had significantly better ($p < .05$) grade 9 English course grades than comparisons overall</p> <p>Former 8th Grade Academy youth with high exposure (but not overall) were promoted on-time to grade 10 at a significantly higher rate than comparisons</p> <p>Former 8th Grade Academy participants had significantly higher grade 10 math course grades than comparisons.</p>

Does Participation Make a Difference? Academic Performance Findings

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Huang, D., Gribbons, B., Kim, K. S., Lee, C., & Baker, E. L. (2000). <i>A decade of results: The impact of the LA's BEST after school enrichment initiative on subsequent student achievement and performance</i>. Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation, Graduate School of Education & Information Studies, University of California;</p> <p>Huang, D., Kim, K. S., Marshall, A., & Perez, P. (2005). <i>Keeping kids in school: An LA's BEST example—A study examining the long-term impact of LA's BEST on students' dropout rates</i>. Los Angeles, CA: National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing.</p> <p>Huang, D., Coordt, A., La Torre, D., Leon, S., Miyoshi, J., Pérez, P., & Peterson, C. (2007). <i>The afterschool hours: Examining the relationship between afterschool staff-based social capital and student engagement in LA's BEST</i>. Los Angeles: UCLA/CRESST.</p>	<p>Who: 14,000 second through fifth graders in 100 elementary schools</p> <p>Where: Los Angeles, CA (urban)</p> <p>What: LA's BEST Program is an after school program that aims to create a safe environment where students receive enhanced opportunities through the integration of an educational support structure, as well as educational enrichment and recreational activities to supplement and deepen the regular program.</p>	<p>Review of standardized test scores, school absence, courses taken, and student transience' drop-out rates of former program participants</p>	<p>Higher levels of participation in LA's BEST led to better subsequent school attendance, which in turn, related to higher Academic achievement on standardized tests of mathematics, reading, and language arts.</p> <p>Students who participated in LA's BEST had significantly fewer absences in grades 6 and 7.</p> <p>Students who participated in LA's BEST reported higher aspirations regarding graduation and postsecondary education</p> <p>Participation in LA's BEST for at least a year in grades two through five had a positive impact on high school drop-out rates; also, greater participation resulted in a further reduction of the drop-out rates.</p> <p>The dropout reduction rate was greater for low-income children.</p>

Does Participation Make a Difference? Academic Performance Findings

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Klein, S. P., & Bolus, R. (2002). <i>Improvements in math and reading scores of students who did and did not participate in the Foundations After School Enrichment Program during the 2001–2002 school year</i>. Santa Monica, CA: Gansk & Associates.</p>	<p>Who: ~500 students in grades 1–5</p> <p>Where: Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Florida (urban and rural)</p> <p>What: Foundations operates extended-day enrichment programs before school, after school, and during the summer that are focused on content-rich experiences with daily activities emphasizing academic subjects and the physical, social, and emotional development of participants.</p>	<p>Math and reading comprehension standardized tests</p>	<p>There were highly statistically significant improvements in both reading and math scores between pretest and posttest</p> <p>Foundations students were progressing faster than the national norm group in math skill development, and they were keeping pace with the norm group in reading.</p>
<p>Lauer, P. A., Akiba, M., Wilkerson, S. B., Apthorp, H. S., Snow, D., & Martin-Glenn, M. L. (2006). Out-of-school time programs: A meta-analysis of effects for at-risk students. <i>Review of Educational Research</i>, 76, 275–313</p>	<p>Who: Meta-analysis of 35 studies on after school programs</p> <p>Where: Urban, suburban, rural</p> <p>What: Synthesis of out-of-school time program studies that employed control or comparison groups to estimate program effects for students at risk of failure in reading or math</p>	<p>Meta-analysis of outcomes data from after school program evaluations</p>	<p>Studies showed that programs had significant and positive effects on reading and math achievement.</p>
<p>Redd, Z., Cochran, S., Hair, E., & Moore, K. (2002). <i>Academic achievement programs and youth development: A synthesis</i>. Washington DC: Child Trends.</p>	<p>Who: Studies on 12 programs</p> <p>Where: Varied (urban, suburban, rural)</p> <p>What: Synthesis of research on academic achievement programs</p>	<p>Meta-analysis of studies</p>	<p>Programs that target social/emotional outcomes appear to be more effective at reaching these outcomes than academic-based programs.</p>

Does Participation Make a Difference? Academic Performance Findings

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Reisner, E. R., White, R. N., Birmingham, J., & Welsh, M. (2001). <i>Building quality and supporting expansion of After-School Projects: Evaluation results from the TASC After-School Program's second year</i>. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates; White, R. N., Reisner, E. R., Welsh, M., & Russell, C. (2001). <i>Patterns of student-level change linked to TASC participation, based on TASC projects in Year 2</i>. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates.</p>	<p>Who: Up to 240 sites</p> <p>Where: New York City and State (urban, suburban, rural)</p> <p>What: TASC has a two-part mission: (a) to enhance the quality of after school programs in New York by emphasizing program components associated with student success and program sustainability and (b) to increase the availability of after school opportunities in New York by providing resources and strategies for establishing or expanding after school projects.</p>	<p>Focus groups of staff, parents and youth; program observation; review of participation data; surveys to staff, parents and youth; achievement scores from standardized tests</p>	<p>Among all TASC PreK–8 participants, the average change in scores on the math test was 1.4 standardized scale score points more after 2 years of participation than would be predicted from students' characteristics. The difference between this change in performance and that of nonparticipants was significant.</p> <p>High school TASC participants passed more Regents exams earlier in their high school career than did nonparticipants.</p> <p>The average number of credits earned among high school TASC participants was significantly higher than the average for nonparticipants</p> <p>After 1 year of TASC exposure, the average attendance rate among all participants increased when compared with for nonparticipants. The attendance gains associated with active TASC participation were largest in the middle grades. For each of Grades 5–8, the difference between participants and nonparticipants in attendance gains was positive and significant</p>

Does Participation Make a Difference? Academic Performance Findings

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Russell, C. A., Reisner, E. R., Pearson, L. M., Afolabi, K. P., Miller, T. D., & Mielke, M. B. (2006). <i>Evaluation of DYCD's Out-of-School Time Initiative: Report on the first year</i>. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.</p>	<p>Who: 13,000 elementary, middle and high school students in New York City</p> <p>Where: New York, NY (urban)</p> <p>What: The New York City (NYC) Department of Youth and Community Development's (DYCD) Out-of-School Time (OST) Programs for Youth Initiative provides funds to support OST programs across NYC.</p>	<p>Interviews with program staff, observation of program, review of OST participation, staff, parent and participant surveys, assessments of staff strategies, activity structure, and relationships</p>	<p>Participants who attended programs with a strong academic focus reported more academic benefits from participation and higher academic self-esteem. Higher levels of arts activities were also positively associated with self-reported academic benefits and academic self-esteem.</p>
<p>U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Under Secretary. (2003). <i>When schools stay open late: The national evaluation of the 21st-Century Learning Centers program, first year findings</i>. Washington, DC: Author.</p>	<p>Who: 4,400 middle school students in 34 school districts and 62 centers in these districts</p> <p>Where: national (urban, rural)</p> <p>What: 21st CCLC programs must provide expanded learning opportunities with a variety of activities that offer high-quality expanded learning opportunities for youth in the community and that contribute to reduced drug use and violence.</p>	<p>Review of programs contexts; observations of sites; review of participant grades, school attendance; surveys of parents, teachers, and students provided background information about school characteristics, out-of-school time, program content, and program functioning and staffing; SAT-9 reading and math test scores</p>	<p>Social studies grades were higher by a statistically significant margin.</p> <p>Teachers reported a statistically significant increase in classroom effort by middle school participants compared to comparison students</p> <p>A subgroup analysis found improved math grades for Black and Hispanic middle school students and no math grade improvement for White students.</p>

Does Participation Make a Difference? Academic Performance Findings

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Vandell, D., Reisner, E., and Pierce, K. (2007). <i>Outcomes linked to high-quality afterschool programs: Longitudinal findings from the study of promising practices</i>. Irvine, CA: University of California and Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates.</p>	<p>Who: ~3,000 elementary and middle school students</p> <p>Where: 8 states (urban and rural)</p> <p>What: 35 after school programs that were based either in schools or in community centers that coordinated with nearby schools</p>	<p>Teacher and youth surveys on child social, academic, and problematic functioning, standardized test scores on math and reading</p>	<p>Elementary school students who regularly attended the high-quality after school programs (alone or in combination with other activities) across 2 years demonstrated significant gains in standardized math test scores, compared to their peers who were routinely unsupervised during after school hours.</p> <p>Program Only and Program Plus students also posted gains in teacher reports of work habits and task persistence over the 2-year period. The students also reported gains in their work habits. These gains in work habits and task persistence may have provided important support that contributed to the gains in math achievement.</p>

Does Participation Make a Difference?

Social/Emotional Development Findings



Harvard Family Research Project
Harvard Graduate School of Education

Does Participation Make a Difference? Social/Emotional Development Findings

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Durlak, R., & Weissberg, R. (2007). <i>The impact of after-school programs that promote personal and social skills</i>. Chicago, IL: CASEL</p>	<p>Who: Meta-analysis of 73 after school programs</p> <p>Where: National sample, programs that serve children ages 5 to 18</p> <p>What: Examination of outcomes of after school programs that offered interventions to promote social and personal skills. Only evaluations using experimental designs are included.</p>	<p>Meta-analysis of outcomes data from after school program evaluations</p>	<p>Across studies, after school programs improved youth self-esteem and self-confidence, particularly in programs with a strong intentional focus on improving social and personal skills.</p>
<p>LeCroy, C. W. (2003). <i>Experimental evaluation of "Go Grrrls."</i> Tucson, AZ: Author.</p>	<p>Who: 118 middle school girls</p> <p>Where: Tuscon, AZ (urban)</p> <p>What: Go Grrrls is a preventive after school intervention program focusing on the promotion of middle school girls' positive psychosocial development to help them navigate through early adolescence.</p>	<p>Surveys/questionnaires</p> <p>Assessments of body image, self-efficacy, assertiveness, self-liking, and more</p>	<p>Intervention group reported significantly greater increases in girls' body image, assertiveness, self-efficacy, self-liking, and competence.</p>

Does Participation Make a Difference? Social/Emotional Development Findings

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Phillips, R. S. C. (1999). Intervention with siblings of children with developmental disabilities from economically disadvantaged families. <i>Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services</i>, 80(6), 569–577.</p>	<p>Who: 180 mostly low-income elementary and middle school students (average age 11 years old)</p> <p>Where: Urban</p> <p>What: The Siblings of Children With Developmental Disabilities After School Support Program serves children who have siblings with developmental disabilities. By providing services for the non-developmentally disabled siblings, the program attempts to alleviate families' stress and improve participants' socio-emotional adjustment, family functioning, and sibling relationships through group discussion, structured and unstructured recreation, and homework help</p>	<p>Assessments of socio-emotional functioning, depression, anxiety, social support, and family-related stress</p>	<p>Program had a significantly positive impact on participants in outcome areas like lower depression, lower anxiety, and increased self-esteem.</p>
<p>Taylor, A., LoSciuto, L., Fox, M., & Hilbert, S. (1999). <i>The mentoring factor: An evaluation of Across Ages. Intergenerational program research: Understanding what we have created.</i> Binghamton, NY: Haworth.</p>	<p>Who: 562 sixth graders</p> <p>Where: Philadelphia, PA (urban)</p> <p>What: Across Ages program uses older adults (age 55 and over) as mentors for youth. Mentors help "at-risk" youth develop awareness, self-confidence, and skills to help resist drugs and overcome obstacles.</p>	<p>Review of degree of participation, surveys of youth demographics and attitudes, assessments of situations involving drugs, stress, problem-solving, knowledge of substance abuse, and more</p>	<p>Youth development findings include that intervention group reported significantly better attitudes towards school, older people, and community service.</p> <p>Youth in the mentor group reported significantly higher self-control and self-confidence levels than youth who participated in other components but not mentoring.</p>

Does Participation Make a Difference?

Crime, Drug, and Sex Prevention Findings



Harvard Family Research Project
Harvard Graduate School of Education

Does Participation Make a Difference? Crime, Drug, and Sex Prevention Findings

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Carter, S. L., Straits, K. J. E., & Hall, M. <i>Project Venture: Evaluation of a positive, culture-based approach to substance abuse prevention with American Indian youth</i>. Paper presented at the Symposium for Experiential Education Research, St. Paul, MN, November 3, 2006.</p>	<p>Who: ~350 middle school students from two schools</p> <p>Where: New Mexico (urban, suburban, rural)</p> <p>What: Project Venture is an outdoor/experiential program that aims to help youth develop a positive self-concept, effective social and communication skills, a community service ethic, self-efficacy, and improved decision-making and problem-solving skills in order to build in youth generalized resilience that can be transferred to drug resistance and other prevention and youth development outcomes.</p>	<p>CSAP's National Youth Survey (EMT Associates, 2000), which assesses actual substance use as well as related risk and protective factors, was administered to program and control youth.</p>	<p>Program youth demonstrated significantly less growth in substance use than control youth as measured by the four outcome measures (alcohol use, cigarette use, marijuana use, and combined substance use) taken together.</p> <p>A nonsignificant trend showed less growth over time for the treatment group compared to the control group in cigarette and composite drug use. This trend was significant for alcohol use, with less growth over time observed for the treatment group than for the control group.</p>
<p>Goldschmidt, P., Huang, D., & Chinen, M. (2007). <i>The long-term effects of after-school programming on educational adjustment and juvenile crime: A study of the LA's BEST after-school program</i>. Los Angeles: UCLA/CRESST.</p>	<p>Who: 2,300 students from 24 schools</p> <p>Where: Los Angeles, CA (urban)</p> <p>What: LA's BEST Program is an after school program that aims to create a safe environment where students receive enhanced opportunities through the integration of an educational support structure, as well as educational enrichment and recreational activities to supplement and deepen the regular program.</p>	<p>Retrospective examination of previously collected data on student demographics, student behavior, and consistency of enrollment.</p>	<p>Analyses found LA's BEST has a positive impact on the reduction of juvenile crime, especially for those intensely engaged in the program</p> <p>Cost-benefit analyses indicated an average societal saving of \$2.50 for each \$1.00 invested in the program.</p>

Does Participation Make a Difference? Crime, Drug, and Sex Prevention Findings

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Philliber, S., Kaye, J. W., & Herrling, S. (2001, May). <i>The national evaluation of the Children's Aid Society Carrera-Model Program to prevent teen pregnancy</i>. Accord, NY: Philliber Research Associates.</p>	<p>Who: 941 adolescents at 12 sites</p> <p>Where: National (urban, suburban, rural)</p> <p>What: CASCM was implemented in 1984. Launched in one of Children's Aid Society's community centers in Harlem, the program practices a holistic approach aiming to empower youth, help them develop a desire for a productive future, and aid young people in improving their sexual literacy and their understanding of the consequences of sexual activity.</p>	<p>Review of attendance and participant follow-up data. Interviews were conducted with program staff. Annual surveys of youth included information on sexual knowledge, sexual behavior, contraceptive use, health-related knowledge and behavior, educational outcomes and opinions, work readiness measures, and delinquency/drug-use behavior. Pretests and posttests were administered each year on knowledge related to sexuality topics.</p>	<p>At the third-year follow-up, program girls had significantly lower pregnancy rates and births than did control group girls. The risk of pregnancy and of having given birth in the program group was less than half of that risk in the control group.</p> <p>Half of program girls reported choosing not to have sex when pressured, in comparison to 39% of control group girls</p> <p>Program youth demonstrated significantly greater knowledge gains in the areas of physiology, contraception, gender differences, sexuality, and pregnancy than did control youth.</p>
<p>Weiss, F. L., & Nicholson, H. J. (1998). Friendly PEERsuasion against substance use: The Girls Incorporated model and evaluation. <i>Drugs & Society</i>, 12(1/2), 7–22.</p>	<p>Who: 350 girls between the ages of 11 and 14 at four sites</p> <p>Where: National (urban, suburban, rural)</p> <p>What: Girls Inc. developed its Friendly PEERsuasion™ program uses a social-influence and life-skills model of prevention, using a combination of adult leadership and peer reinforcement to develop the ability for girls to identify and respond critically to messages and social pressures that encourage substance abuse.</p>	<p>Four questionnaires were administered to all study participants over various time points. These questionnaires collected demographic background information as well as background information related to substance abuse risks and outcome-related self-reports of substance use and reactions to situations involving substance use.</p>	<p>Participation in the program was significantly related to delayed onset of drinking among participants who reported never having drunk alcohol prior to the program.</p> <p>Participation in the program led some girls to report leaving gatherings where others were drinking alcohol.</p> <p>The estimated effect of program participation was a 14 percentage point reduction in the likelihood of drinking during the study period.</p>

Does Participation Make a Difference?

Health and Wellness Promotion Findings



Harvard Family Research Project
Harvard Graduate School of Education

Does Participation Make a Difference? Health and Wellness Promotion Findings

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Lauver, S. C. (2002). <i>Assessing the benefits of an after-school program for urban youth: An impact and process evaluation</i>. Philadelphia: Author.</p>	<p>Who: 227 middle school students</p> <p>Where: Philadelphia, PA (urban)</p> <p>What: Cooke Middle School After School Recreation Program (CASP) complements the school's more academic-based programs by offering activities designed to promote students' physical, emotional, and social well-being.</p>	<p>Focus groups, program observation, data review of attendance records, survey of background characteristics, activity involvement, self-esteem, conflict resolution skills, school and neighborhood safety, perceptions about school, time spent on various activities and homework, and future expectations</p>	<p>There was a statistically significant program impact for time spent on strength training activities at least one hour per week, with 80% of the program group spending time in these activities as compared to 61% of the control group.</p>
<p>Mahoney, J. L., Lord, H, & Carryl, E. (2005). Afterschool program participation and the development of child obesity and peer acceptance. <i>Applied Developmental Science</i>, 9(4), 202–215.</p>	<p>Who: ~600 children enrolled in Grades 1–3</p> <p>Where: Urban</p> <p>What: The Yale Study of Children's After-School Time examines youth who were part of a northeast city's citywide after school initiative in the public school district. The remainder of sample had alternative after school arrangements including care from parents and other adults and self/sibling care. The study's main goal is to examine the role of ASP participation in children's development of body mass index, obesity status, and indicators of peer acceptance over time.</p>	<p>Data review of attendance, body mass index of youth, parent surveys about after school time, youth surveys about peer relationships, teacher surveys about student popularity</p>	<p>Controlling for baseline obesity, poverty, and race/ethnicity, follow-up obesity prevalence was significantly lower for program participants than nonparticipants.</p> <p>Greater program participation was significantly associated with lower BMI at follow-up after controlling for baseline BMI and demographic factors.</p>

Does Participation Make a Difference? Health and Wellness Promotion Findings

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Story, M., Sherwood, N. E., Himes, J. H., Davis, M., Jacobs, Jr., D. R., Cartwright, Y., et al. (2003). An after-school obesity prevention program for African-American girls: The Minnesota GEMS Pilot Study [Supplement 1]. <i>Ethnicity & Disease</i>, 13(1), 54–64.</p>	<p>Who: 59 girls, average 9 years old</p> <p>Where: Minneapolis, MN (urban)</p> <p>What: Girlfriends for KEEPS is an obesity prevention program for low-income African American girls that consists of physical activity and dietary change interventions through un, culturally appropriate, interactive, hands-on activities, emphasizing skill building and practice of the particular health behavior message for each week.</p>	<p>Checklists on attendance, focus groups, dietary questionnaires, Body Mass Index assessments, an array of assessments measuring frequency of healthy choices, physical activity, parent surveys of lifestyle and diet</p>	<p>Treatment group girls had lower caloric intake, lower percent of calories derived from fat, and more servings of water per day compared to control group girls.</p> <p>Physical activity measures demonstrated consistently greater activity levels in the treatment group compared to the control group at posttest.</p> <p>At posttest, treatment girls reported significantly higher scores on the healthy choice behavioral intentions, diet knowledge, and preferences for physical activity scales than did control girls.</p>
<p>Yin, Z., Gutin, B., Johnson, M., Hanes, Jr., J., Moore, J. B., Cavnar, M., Thornburg, J., Moore, D., & Barbeau, P. (2005). An environmental approach to obesity prevention in children: Medical College of Georgia FitKid Project year 1 results. <i>Obesity Research</i>, 13, 2153–2161.</p>	<p>Who: ~500 youth, average age 8 years old</p> <p>Where: Augusta/Richmond County, Georgia (urban)</p> <p>What: The Medical College of Georgia FitKid Project was designed to fill low-socioeconomic-status youth's after school hours with moderate-to-vigorous physical activity. The program emphasizes enjoyment and improvement in games and sport activities.</p>	<p>Data review of attendance, surveys about physical activity, academic assessments, various physiological assessments</p>	<p>Program youth decreased in percent body fat while control youth gained slightly, and program youth showed greater bone mass density and cardiovascular fitness gains than control youth.</p>

What Does It Take?

Access to and Sustained Participation in Programs



Harvard Family Research Project
Harvard Graduate School of Education

What Does It Take? Access to and Sustained Participation in Programs

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Borman, G., Dowling, N, Fairchild, R., Boulay, M., & Kaplan, J. (2006). <i>The longitudinal achievement effects of multi-year summer school: Evidence from the Teach Baltimore Randomized Field Trial</i>. Baltimore, MD: Center for Summer Learning.</p>	<p>Who: Kindergarten and elementary school students</p> <p>Where: Baltimore, MD (urban)</p> <p>What: Teach Baltimore is an academically intensive summer program that recruits and trains university students to provide approximately 8 weeks of reading and writing instruction to low-income elementary students to combat summer learning loss.</p>	<p>Review of demographic information, standardized tests administered and reviewed</p>	<p>The effect of attending at least two of three summers at an average or better attendance rate was estimated as equivalent to 50% of one grade level in vocabulary, 40% of one grade level in comprehension, and 41% of one grade level in total reading relative to controls who were similar in profile to those program youth who were regular attendees.</p>
<p>Chaskin, R. J., & Baker, S. (2006). <i>Negotiating among opportunity and constraint: The participation of young people in out-of-school-time activities</i>. Chicago: Chapin Hall Center for Children</p>	<p>Who: 99 10th-grade students</p> <p>Where: Chicago, IL (urban)</p> <p>What: Four schools located in communities that fell into the highest and lowest quartiles of availability (measured by number of youth-serving organizations) and socioeconomic status (measured by median family income)</p>	<p>In-depth, semi-structured interviews with students about becoming engaged in activities, barriers to program participation, influences of neighborhood and school contexts, etc.</p>	<p>Youth identify a gap between what is available in programming and what would be compelling to them.</p> <p>Youth want opportunities to be free from unnecessary rules, inflexible adults, and strict expectations. Youth want a more flexible resource—safe space, facilities, access, ownership—that provides the occasion for more autonomous exploration, interaction, and relaxation.</p>

What Does It Take? Access to and Sustained Participation in Programs

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Goerge, R., Cusick, G. R., Wasserman, M., & Gladden, R.M. (2007). <i>After-school programs and academic impact: A study of Chicago's After School Matters</i>. Chicago, IL: Chapin Hall Center for Children.</p>	<p>Who: 3,411 teenagers from 24 schools</p> <p>Where: Chicago, IL (urban)</p> <p>What: After School Matters program, which lets older youth become paid apprentices or club members in arts, sports, technology, and communications programs</p>	<p>Review of program participation, school attendance and course failure</p>	<p>Youth who participated at the highest levels failed a significantly lower percentage of their core courses and also had higher graduation rates than similar youth who did not participate in the program.</p> <p>Benefits to academic performance appeared to dissipate after youth stopped their attendance, indicating the importance of sustained participation.</p>
<p>Huang, D., Coordt, A., La Torre, D., Leon, S., Miyoshi, J., Pérez, P., & Peterson, C. (2007). <i>The afterschool hours: Examining the relationship between afterschool staff-based social capital and student engagement in LA's BEST</i>. Los Angeles: UCLA/CRESST.</p>	<p>Who: 14,000 second through fifth graders in 100 elementary schools</p> <p>Where: Los Angeles, CA (urban)</p> <p>What: LA's BEST Program is an after school program that aims to create a safe environment where students receive enhanced opportunities through the integration of an educational support structure, as well as educational enrichment and recreational activities to supplement and deepen the regular program.</p>	<p>Review of standardized test scores, school absence, courses-taken, and student transience; drop-out rates of former program participants</p>	<p>Starting follow-up from grades 2, 3, 4, or 5, more program participation was related to better subsequent attendance, when the influence of gender, ethnicity, income, and language status was controlled for.</p>

What Does It Take? Access to and Sustained Participation in Programs

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Jenner, E. J., & Jenner, L. W. (2004). <i>Academic outcomes in Louisiana's 21st Century Community Learning Centers</i>. Baton Rouge, LA: Policy & Research Group.</p>	<p>Who: ~1200 youth in grades 3 and 5</p> <p>Where: Two rural and two urban programs in Louisiana</p> <p>What: 21st Century Community Learning Centers programs provide homework assistance, targeted remediation, academics, arts, technology, and recreational activities in an effort to provide safe, enriching environments for youth during out-of-school hours.</p>	<p>Project director interviews, program observation, review of program attendance, and review of standardized test scores</p>	<p>Participants (30 days or more) showed a significant improvement over nonparticipants on core standardized test scores.</p> <p>Those who attended 60 or more days and 90 or more days experienced nearly the same academic impact over nonparticipants on core scores.</p>

What Does It Take? Quality Programming



Harvard Family Research Project
Harvard Graduate School of Education

What Does It Take? Quality Programming

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Arbreton, A. J. A., Goldsmith, J., & Sheldon, J. (2005). <i>Launching literacy in after-school programs: Early lessons from the CORAL Initiative</i>. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.</p>	<p>Who: 23 sites serving elementary school youth</p> <p>Where: California (urban)</p> <p>What: The CORAL initiative in California works to link communities, institutions, and residents around the common goal of improving youth academic achievement through the provision of structured literacy programming and enriching out-of-school time opportunities.</p>	<p>Interviews with staff, parent focus groups, detailed program observation, youth, staff and teacher surveys, review of standardized test scores</p>	<p>In the highest rated groups, staff provided clear instructions, taught organized lessons, employed strategies to motivate and challenge youth, and had activities ready when youth finished a lesson.</p>
<p>Birmingham, J., Pechman, E. M., Russell, C. A., & Mielke, M. (2005). <i>Shared features of high-performing after-school programs: A follow-up to the TASC evaluation</i>. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates.</p>	<p>Who: 262 youth across 10 sites</p> <p>Where: New York, NY (urban)</p> <p>What: This study examined high-performing after school projects funded with grants from The After-School Corporation (TASC) to determine project characteristics that may have contributed to improvements in youth's academic achievement.</p>	<p>Interviews with site staff, observation of programs, review of standardized test scores, school attendance, and demographics</p>	<p>In activities where instructional strategies promoting skill building and mastery were evident, staff provided specific individual feedback and encouragement to youth.</p> <p>Observations revealed that staff were equitable and inclusive, encouraging the participation of all youth; used positive behavior-management techniques, such as setting appropriate limits and communicating clear expectations for behavior; showed positive affect toward all youth; used a caring tone and positive language and attentively listened to and/or observed youth; payed attention as they completed a task; and responded to what they said.</p>

What Does It Take? Quality Programming

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Durlak, R., & Weissberg, R. (2007). <i>The impact of after-school programs that promote personal and social skills</i>. Chicago, IL: CASEL</p>	<p>Who: Meta-analysis of 73 after school programs</p> <p>Where: National sample, programs that serve children ages 5 to 18</p> <p>What: Examination of outcomes of after school programs that offered interventions to promote social and personal skills. Only evaluations using experimental designs are included.</p>	<p>Meta-analysis of outcomes data from after school program evaluations</p>	<p>Youth engaged in programs that used the following formula: sequential (program used a sequenced set of activities to achieve the objectives related to skill development); active (program used active forms of learning to help youth learn new skills); focused (program had at least one program component specifically devoted to developing personal or social skills); and explicit (program targeted and identified the specific personal or social skills youth were expected to learn) improved significantly in their academic performance (school bonding, grades, and achievement test scores).</p> <p>Youth in programs with same formula exhibited significant declines compared to control group youth in their problem behaviors and drug use.</p>

What Does It Take? Quality Programming

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Gerstenblith, S., Soule, D., Gottfredson, D., Lu, S., Kellstrom, M., Womer, S., & Bryner, S. (2005). After-school programs, antisocial behavior, and positive youth development: An exploration of the relationship between program implementation and changes in youth behavior. In J. Mahoney, J. Eccles, & R. Larson, (Eds.), <i>Organized Activities as contexts for development: Extracurricular activities, after-school and community programs</i> (pp. 457–477). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.</p>	<p>Who: ~400 youth in fourth through eighth grade from 21 sites</p> <p>Where: State of Maryland (urban, suburban, rural)</p> <p>What: Maryland After School Community Grant Program aims to strengthen youth resiliency and prevent substance abuse, violence, and delinquency among youth by increasing the availability of high quality, structured after school programs.</p>	<p>Review of program administration and program component logs; interviews with program directors; site observations; review of student school records; students survey on school attachment, rebellious behavior, drug use, etc.; and assessments of youth's social skills and attachment to prosocial adults</p>	<p>Programs rated by observers as having more efficient procedures higher levels of behavior management and higher levels of overall structure showed significantly smaller increases in youth's rebellious behavior from pretest to posttest.</p> <p>Programs rated by observers as having higher levels of overall structure were more likely than other programs to show gains in youth's intentions not to use drugs.</p> <p>The percentage of time spent in recreation predicted increases in delinquent behavior, after school violent crime, and peer drug models for middle school participants.</p>
<p>Grossman, J., Campbell, M., & Raley, B. (2007). <i>Quality time afterschool: What instructors can do to enhance learning</i>. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.</p>	<p>Who: ~400 youth at 5 Beacon Centers</p> <p>Where: Philadelphia, PA (urban)</p> <p>What: Beacon Centers are school-based community centers that include a range of services to all community members</p>	<p>Youth surveys of activities, staff surveys about strategies, activity observations, and interviews with instructors</p>	<p>Based on quantitative analysis, the most important strategies used by staff to promote engagement and learning at the programs were effective group management to make students get the most out of activities and feel respected by staff and peers; and positive support for youth to help youth better enjoy the activities and remain engaged.</p>

What Does It Take? Quality Programming

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Huang, D., Coordt, A., La Torre, D., Leon, S., Miyoshi, J., Pérez, P., & Peterson, C. (2007). <i>The afterschool hours: Examining the relationship between afterschool staff-based social capital and student engagement in LA's BEST</i>. Los Angeles: UCLA/CRESST.</p>	<p>Who: ~2,200 youth in grades 3, 4 and 5</p> <p>Where: Los Angeles, CA (urban)</p> <p>What: LA's BEST Program is an after school program that aims to create a safe environment where students receive enhanced opportunities through the integration of an educational support structure, as well as educational enrichment and recreational activities to supplement and deepen the regular program.</p>	<p>Staff surveys on communication, teamwork and staff efficacy; youth surveys on goals, program engagement and value of education</p>	<p>The majority of students reported being comfortable with and trusting LA's BEST staff.</p> <p>Over 50% of students responded "yes" that staff care about them, provide help when needed, and inform them that they can accomplish anything if they work hard.</p> <p>Findings suggest that students who feel supported and encouraged by staff are also more likely to place a higher value on education and have higher aspirations for their futures.</p> <p>Finings suggest that staff members who were caring and encouraging fostered values of education, and their students appreciated school more and found it more relevant to their own lives, and ultimately were more engaged both in the after school program and in school.</p>

What Does It Take? Quality Programming

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Intercultural Center for Research in Education, & National Institute on Out-of-School Time (2005). <i>Pathways To Success For Youth: What Works In Afterschool: A Report of the Massachusetts Afterschool Research Study (MARS)</i>. Boston, MA: United Way of Massachusetts Bay.</p>	<p>Who: 400 youth in 78 programs</p> <p>Where: Massachusetts (urban, suburban, and local)</p> <p>What: Diverse statewide sample of afterschool programs that were: in operation for two years or more; serve either elementary or middle school youth or both; have regularly enrolled youth who attend at least four days per week</p>	<p>Teacher and staff surveys on individual youth covering academic and non-academic outcomes</p>	<p>Youth more engaged in programs with a well-paced schedule, with appropriate amounts of time with each activity. In addition, well-organized programs with clear routines promote higher youth engagement, suggesting more meaningful experiences for youth.</p>
<p>Russell, C. A., Reisner, E. R., Pearson, L. M., Afolabi, K. P., Miller, T. D., & Mielke, M. B. (2006). <i>Evaluation of DYCD's Out-of-School Time Initiative: Report on the first year</i>. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.</p>	<p>Who: 13,000 elementary, middle, and high school students in New York City</p> <p>Where: New York, NY (urban)</p> <p>What: The New York City (NYC) Department of Youth and Community Development's (DYCD) Out-of-School Time (OST) Programs for Youth Initiative provides funds to support OST programs across NYC.</p>	<p>Interviews with program staff, observation of program, review of OST participation, staff, parent and participant surveys, assessments of staff strategies, activity structure, and relationships.</p>	<p>Programs with higher rates of youth retention differed from programs with low retention rates because by having higher director salaries, more advanced education credentials, parent liaison on staff, youth reported greater sense of belonging, more positive interactions between youth and staff, higher academic self-esteem, strong academic or arts focus, improved academic performance through enrichment.</p>
<p>Vandell, D. L., Shumow, L., & Posner, J. (2005). After-school programs for low-income children: Differences in program quality. In J. Mahoney, J. Eccles, & R. Larson, (Eds.), <i>Organized activities as contexts for development: Extracurricular activities, after-school and community programs</i> (pp. 437–456). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum</p>	<p>Who: Elementary-age students</p> <p>Where: Urban</p> <p>What: Two after school programs engaged in research case study</p>	<p>Interviews with program directors; structured observations of programs</p>	<p>Observations revealed that the children at the lower quality program experienced many negative and punitive interactions with staff, and these children were unengaged in program activities.</p>

What Does It Take? Quality Programming

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Vandell, D., Pierce, K., Brown, B., Lee, D., Bolt, D., Dadisman, K., & Pechman, E. (2006). <i>Developmental outcomes associated with the afterschool contexts of low-income children and adolescents</i>. A paper presented at the Society for Research on Adolescence Annual Meeting, March 23-26.</p>	<p>Who: 1,796 third and fourth graders, 1,118 sixth and seventh graders</p> <p>Where: 8 states (national)</p> <p>What: Review of after school programs to examine if various groups are associated with academic, behavioral, and social outcomes in youth</p>	<p>Observations of program, review of attendance reports, child reports of other program involvement, family characteristics collected, teacher and child reports on child functioning</p>	<p>Researchers found that in comparison to a less-supervised group, school-age children who frequently attended high-quality after school programs, alone and in combination with other supervised activities, displayed better work habits, task persistence, social skills, prosocial behaviors, and academic performance, and less aggressive behavior at the end of the school year.</p> <p>Attending high-quality programs was associated with a number of positive developmental outcomes including teacher reports of work habits, task persistence, and academic performance.</p>

What Does It Take? Strong Partnerships



Harvard Family Research Project
Harvard Graduate School of Education

What Does It Take? Strong Partnerships

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Arbreton, A. J. A., Sheldon, J., & Herrera, C. (2005). <i>Beyond safe havens: A synthesis of research on the Boys & Girls Clubs</i>. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.</p>	<p>Who: 21 national sites included</p> <p>Where: National (urban, suburban, rural)</p> <p>What: Boys & Girls Clubs of America (BGCA) provides fun, safe places for youth during out-of-school hours, where they can be involved in caring relationships with adults and peers and feel a sense of membership and connectedness. BGCA provides varied and diverse programming supported by caring staff.</p>	<p>Review of various studies on delinquency prevention programs, job readiness, and overall Club experiences</p>	<p>Clubs' partnerships with agencies such as schools, probation and police officers, and other community-based providers provided benefits such as facilitating referrals and access to school academic records.</p> <p>Clubs with strong ties to community agencies were able to expand youth opportunities. For example, one Club offered youth a leadership course led by staff from a local U.S. Army post. At another Club, a local advertising agency offered a course in which youth designed and produced an antigang ad campaign. Broader Horizons and Career Prep also relied on the experience and expertise of professionals in the community to host field trips, describe their jobs, or in a few CP programs, lead training sessions. Strong community partnerships also enabled CP staff to more easily find employment for program graduates.</p> <p>Partnerships tended to last longer when they involved ongoing, regular collaboration.</p>

What Does It Take? Strong Partnerships

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Bennett, E. T. (2004). <i>Family involvement and school performance in the Chinatown YMCA 21st Century Community Learning Center</i>. Unpublished master's thesis, Fordham University, New York.</p>	<p>Who: 69 Chinese or Chinese American students</p> <p>Where: New York, NY (urban)</p> <p>What: The Chinatown YMCA 21st CCLC provides a variety of services to students at risk of school failure, in addition to a family program designed to increase parent and family capacity for involvement in their children's education.</p>	<p>Review of demographic information; review of family attendance from daily attendance sheets; and school performance measures by collecting teachers' perceptions of a child's improvement in 10 categories</p>	<p>The treatment group demonstrated significantly higher scores than the comparison group on improvement in turning in homework on time, improvement in satisfactory homework completion, improvement in academic performance, and improvement in attendance.</p>
<p>Birmingham, J., Pechman, E. M., Russell, C. A., & Mielke, M. (2005). <i>Shared features of high-performing after-school programs: A follow-up to the TASC evaluation</i>. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates.</p>	<p>Who: 262 youth across 10 sites</p> <p>Where: New York, NY (urban)</p> <p>What: Examination of high-performing after school projects funded with grants from The After-School Corporation (TASC) to determine project characteristics that may have contributed to improvements in youth's academic achievement</p>	<p>Interviews with site staff, observation of programs, review of standardized test scores, school attendance, demographics.</p>	<p>The projects' relationships with their partners built the foundations of their success and sustainability. In these partnerships, the sponsoring organization gave the site coordinator the autonomy and flexibility to manage the project day to day, while providing administrative and fiscal support. Site coordinators were then able to use their expertise to select activities and to make staffing decisions. Regular communication between the sponsor and the site coordinator, which often took the form of weekly updates, monthly reports, meetings, or phone conversations, kept both parties up to date.</p>

What Does It Take? Strong Partnerships

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Intercultural Center for Research in Education, & National Institute on Out-of-School Time (2005). <i>Pathways To Success For Youth: What Works In Afterschool: A Report of the Massachusetts Afterschool Research Study (MARS)</i>. Boston, MA: United Way of Massachusetts Bay.</p>	<p>Who: 400 youth in 78 programs</p> <p>Where: Massachusetts (urban, suburban, and local)</p> <p>What: Diverse statewide sample of after school programs that were: in operation for two years or more; serve either elementary or middle school youth or both; have regularly enrolled youth who attend at least four days per week</p>	<p>Teacher and staff surveys on individual youth covering academic and nonacademic outcomes</p>	<p>Programs that utilized certified teachers and other school staff tended to rate higher on these program quality indicators.</p> <p>Results indicate that strong relationships with teachers and principals of a school, probably facilitated by location at the school, may be helpful in promoting positive outcomes for youth, such as youth's homework completion, homework effort, positive behavior, and initiative.</p>
<p>Massachusetts 2020. (2004). <i>Research report: The Transition to Success Pilot Project</i>. Boston, MA: Author. Available at www.mass2020.org/finaltransition.pdf</p>	<p>Who: 116 third through eighth graders across 6 programs</p> <p>Where: Boston, Massachusetts (urban)</p> <p>What: Transition to Success Pilot Project is an after school program designed to help students who are at-risk academically and connect parents and families more deeply with their child's school.</p>	<p>Review of program attendance, test scores, and grades; surveys on student motivation and behavior from program staff, parents and students; qualitative reports from site coordinators; and teacher interviews about program students</p>	<p>Three quarters of parents of program students reported that the program helped them connect with their child's teachers and that their involvement in their child's school has increased because of his/her involvement in this after-school program</p> <p>Eighty percent of parents reported that their child's participation in the program has enabled them to understand their child's work in school better.</p>

What Does It Take? Strong Partnerships

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Michelsen, E., Zaff, J.F., & Hair, E. (2002). <i>Civic engagement programs and youth development: A synthesis</i>. Washington, DC: Child Trends.</p>	<p>Who: Synthesis of studies</p> <p>Where: National (urban, suburban, rural)</p> <p>What: Exploration of the role civic engagement programs play in youth outcomes</p>	<p>Various measures used within reviewed studies</p>	<p>Combining engagement activities with increased civic knowledge results in improvement of youths' attitudes toward others and the likelihood of their becoming involved in community service.</p> <p>Civic engagement programs aimed at acquiring civic knowledge can be effective if paired with opportunities to engage in community service. Combining regular programming with opportunities for service bolsters outcomes.</p>
<p>U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Under Secretary. (2003). <i>When schools stay open late: The national evaluation of the 21st-Century Learning Centers program, first year findings</i>. Washington, DC: Author.</p>	<p>Who: 4,400 middle school students in 34 school districts and 62 centers in these districts;</p> <p>Where: National (urban, rural)</p> <p>What: 21st Century Community Learning Centers programs must provide expanded learning opportunities with a variety of activities that offer high-quality expanded learning opportunities for youth in the community and that contribute to reduced drug use and violence.</p>	<p>Review of programs contexts; observations of sites; review of participant grades, school attendance; surveys of parents, teachers, and students provided background information about school characteristics, out-of-school time, program content, and program functioning and staffing; and SAT-9 reading and math test scores</p>	<p>At the middle school level, programs were associated with increased parent involvement at their child's school. Parents of program participants were more likely to volunteer at their child's school and attend open houses or parent-teacher organization meetings three or more times per year</p> <p>Centers serving elementary students increased the percentage of parents helping their child with homework at least three times in the last week. Centers also increased the percentage of parents asking their child about class work. Centers also increased parent attendance at after school events.</p>

What Does It Take? Strong Partnerships

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Under Secretary, Policy and Program Studies Service. (2004). <i>Early implementation of supplemental educational services under the No Child Left Behind Act: Year one report</i>. Washington, DC: Author. www.policystudies.com/studies/school/nclb.html;</p> <p>U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, Policy and Program Studies Service. (2005). <i>Case studies of supplemental services under the No Child Left Behind Act: Findings from 2003–04</i>. Washington, DC: Author. www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/disadv/supplementalyear2/index.html</p>	<p>Who: 6 states and 9 middle and high schools that were implementing SES</p> <p>Where: National (urban, suburban, rural)</p> <p>What: NCLB requires low-performing schools to offer Supplemental Educational Services (SES) to students from low-income families. Services include academic instruction given outside the regular school day.</p>	<p>Interviews and focus groups about SES implementation</p>	<p>Many districts gave schools sample letters to send to families of eligible youth. In some cases, school staff called parents to encourage them to enroll. One district administrator reported that teachers were instrumental in explaining services to parents. Several teachers in this district said that many parents were persuaded to sign up because their child’s teacher was providing the SES.</p> <p>Districts increasingly relied on school staff to help coordinate SES. Some principals noted that they were required to help with SES logistics, including ensuring that providers had space and that parents turned in permission forms. Further, some districts allowed schools to define eligibility beyond low-income status. Principals relied on teachers to determine which youth most needed SES. School staff in some districts said they wanted to play a bigger role in defining eligibility.</p>

What Does It Take? Strong Partnerships

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Vandell, D. L., Reisner, E. R., Pierce, K. M., Brown, B. B., Lee, D., Bolt, D., & Pechman, E. M. (2006). <i>The study of promising after-school programs: Examination of longer term outcomes after two years of program experiences</i>. Madison: Wisconsin Center for Education Research.</p>	<p>Who: 35 sites serving ~2,900 students</p> <p>Where: National (urban, suburban, rural)</p> <p>What: Examination of various after school programs to determine which are high-quality and have promising practices for disadvantaged youth</p>	<p>Observations to determine if programs met study criteria; teacher, youth and parent surveys measuring work habits, social/behavioral trends, substance use, peer reliance, etc.; and teacher, youth, and parent surveys to examine youth outcomes</p>	<p>As youth age, their interests diversify, and they begin to participate in a wide variety of experiences.</p>
<p>Walker, K. E., & Arbreton, A. J. A. (2004). <i>After-school pursuits: An examination of outcomes in the San Francisco Beacon Initiative</i>. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.</p> <p>Walker, K. E., & Arbreton, A. J.A. (2001). <i>Working together to build Beacon Centers in San Francisco: Evaluation findings from 1998–2000</i>. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.</p>	<p>Who: 666 youth</p> <p>Where: San Francisco, CA (urban)</p> <p>What: The San Francisco Beacon Initiative aims to create supportive relationships, safe places to spend leisure time, interesting and challenging learning experiences, and opportunities for meaningful roles and responsibilities of low-income youth through out-of-school time activities.</p>	<p>Review of budget documents; interviews with stakeholders, program staff, school staff; program observation, review of school records; youth surveys; and review of standardized test scores</p>	<p>The availability of suitable partners depended largely on the range and number of organizations within the neighborhood. To offset the dearth of services evident in two of these communities, center staff called on agencies in other areas of the city and on community residents, who acted as independent contractors, to provide activities for youth.</p> <p>The centers employed neighborhood adults as safety and support team staff and as activity providers. The Meadow Beacon Center, in particular, partially compensated for its surrounding community's low number of youth-service agencies by hiring community residents as providers.</p>

What Does It Take? Strong Partnerships

Study	Program and Sample	Measures	Relevant Findings
<p>Weiss, A. R., & Brigham, R. A. (2003). <i>The family participation in after-school study</i>. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education.</p>	<p>Who: 622 students Where: National (urban, suburban, and rural) What: A group of sites that have received 21st Century Community Learning Centers funding in multiple years and that continue to receive funding.</p>	<p>Surveys using domains of family involvement that asked about the type of family involvement activities offered and the frequency with which they were offered</p>	<p>When asked about challenges in implementing family participation, coordinators cited parents' work schedules, family culture and language, and residence of families outside of the school neighborhood.</p> <p>In addition, 25% of coordinators indicated "other" challenges, such as "parent apathy" or "lack of parent interest." Some respondents indicated that parents had many activities and obligations competing for their time and so were unable to commit to program activities. Other reported challenges concerned transportation, childcare, lack of adequate staffing, and funding</p>