

**LA COPS 21st Century Community
Learning Centers Program:
Evaluation of After-School
Program Implementation, 2002-2003**

Los Angeles Unified School District

June 2003

Research conducted by:

**Michael Butler
Gina Jesse
Van Villanueva**

**Public Works, Inc.
90 N. Daisy Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91107
(626) 564-9890
(626) 564-0657 fax**

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	i
I. Introduction and Study Methods.....	1
Prior Research of After School Programs	
Program Goals and Objectives	
Evaluation Overview and Objectives	
Accountability and Reporting Requirements	
Report Organization	
II. Description of the LA COPS Program.....	10
Characteristics of LA COPS Schools	
Overview of Programs and Activities	
After-School Program Attendance	
Leadership and Staffing	
Program Funding	
District Involvement and Support	
III. Program Implementation Findings.....	18
Academic Intervention and Support	
Enrichment and Extracurricular Activities	
School Linkages	
School-to-Career	
Parent and Community Involvement	
Safety	
Accountability and Sustainability	
IV. Survey Findings.....	32
Survey Methods	
Interpreting Survey Results	
Program Staff Survey Results	
Student Survey Results	
Summary of Survey Results	
V. Achievement Data	43
Standardized Test Scores	
Outcome Data Collected from Teachers	
Impact on Student Classroom Behaviors and Performance	
Achievement Data Summary	
VI. Conclusions and Lessons Learned	49
VII. Appendices	
Appendix A: Site Visit Guides and Observational Protocols	
Appendix B: Program Staff Survey	
Appendix C: Student Survey	
Appendix C: Parent Survey	
Appendix E: Teacher Survey by Site	
Appendix F: Crime Data by Site	
Appendix G: Bibliography	

LA COPS Evaluation, Executive Summary

Initiated in 1999-2000, LA COPS is an initiative of the LAUSD, the Los Angeles Police Department and the Los Angeles Police Academy Schools Foundation (LAPAMS) in collaboration with other community partners throughout the city. Formed to address the need for meaningful, after-school programming serving at-risk youth, the LA COPS program is funded as part of the 21st Century Learning Program, a federal effort to develop public schools into community learning centers. Five high schools (Dorsey, Monroe, Reseda, San Pedro, and Wilson) participated in LA COPS, receiving approximately \$2.5 million in federal funds annually for the last three years, with a no cost extension allowed a fourth year of program implementation.¹

Program Goals and Objectives

The LA COPS program set the following goals and objectives:

- Creation and operation of five community learning centers to expand learning opportunities and produce larger population of high school youth who meet and exceed local and state academic standards in core subjects;
- Creation of a “learning village” at each high school for the local community, including high school students, parents and siblings, other children in the community, seniors, out-of-school youth and others, including the disabled;
- Provision of a safe environment free of violence and drugs for students and the community;
- Organization of local community members into partners and volunteers working with the high school in the creation of these learning villages;
- Development of a network of learning villages so that communities can mobilize and expand opportunities for computer-assisted learning (CAI), collaboration projects, distance learning and creative problem solving throughout the City of Los Angeles; and,
- Creation of a “Zone” at each site that would serve as an on-site printing and business operation central to the LA COPS goals of connecting each school to its local community, providing career-based training to students and serving school and community needs.

¹ Total of \$7,450,343 over three years.

Evaluation Overview

In February 2002, Public Works, Inc. (PW) was contracted to evaluate the third year of the LA COPS program. PW is a Pasadena-based non-profit organization dedicated to working with schools, government, parents and communities in the areas of accountability, assessment and evaluation services. PW has extensive experience evaluating educational reform initiatives and after-school programs in both school and community settings. The evaluation design includes both process and outcome measures using a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods including:

- Program Attendance Data. PW assisted sites in improving existing systems for documenting attendance in the LA COPS program and extracted data on after-school program attendance in 2001-2002 and 2002-2003.
- Achievement Data. Standardized test scores of students with frequent (i.e., 30 or more days) after-school participation in LA COPS during 2001-2002 were collected and analyzed. In addition, teachers of students with 10 or more days of participation in LA COPS during 2001-2002 and/or 2002-2003 were surveyed to obtain information on changes to student classroom performance and behaviors.
- Surveys. Surveys were administered to LA COPS students and after-school program staff in 2002 and 2003. Parents were surveyed only in 2002.
- Focus groups and interviews. Focus groups and interviews were conducted to ascertain strengths and challenges in program implementation and development. Interviews were conducted with site coordinators, and community partners and representatives. Additionally, focus groups were held with LA COPS instructional staff and students.
- Observations of program activities and services. Observations of each site documented program environment and examined student engagement in activities, staff supervision and interaction with students, and parental and community involvement within the context of program activities.

Key Findings and Conclusions

Summary of Program Accomplishments and Challenges

In terms of program accomplishments, LA COPS was successful in providing high school students with access to on-site academic tutoring and homework assistance. One site, Wilson High School, was particularly successful in linking after-school tutoring to the regular school day instructional program via a formal student referral mechanism. LA COPS also succeeded in providing students with access to work-based learning opportunities designed to help students explore a career focus and clarify postsecondary goals. In addition, all sites now have a functioning Zone that is providing a beneficial service for school staff and increasingly links these high

schools to surrounding businesses and community organizations. Lastly, four of the five LA COPS sites witnessed a significant decline in both on-campus and community crime.

LA COPS was less successful in establishing the kind of firm school linkages needed to create a “seamless” day connecting after-school programming to the regular school day’s instructional program. This is clearest in the low level of regular student participation after-school relative to overall school enrollment. Parent Involvement also proved to be an on-going challenge. Similarly, efforts to harness community resources and seek out additional financial resources have not guaranteed the sustainability of after-school programs at LA COPS sites.

Student Participation and After-School Attendance

- **Although many students took advantage of after-school opportunities, few participated in LA COPS on a regular basis. The typical regular LA COPS student attendee was one who possessed initiative to attend activities voluntarily.**

Although the last two years have seen more students participating at most sites, the numbers of regular attendees remained low given the overall size of each high school. The proportion of high school students participating in at least one LA COPS activity during the 2001-2002 school year varied from 27% to 53%. In 2002-2003, student participation fluctuated between 20%-50% depending on the site. LA COPS after-school programs were less successful in involving students in regular participation in after-school programs. The number of frequent attendees (defined under Federal guidelines as 30 or more days of after-school participation in an entire school year) was relatively small, varying between 35-61 students in 2001-2002 and 9-67 students during 2002-2003.

Students who had an active desire to improve their academic achievement through tutoring and homework assistance were the primary attendees of LA COPS programs. Athletes participating in weight training were the most typical attendees of after-school extracurricular activities. Similarly, the students participating in School-to-Career activities offered after-school comprised a narrow subset of students.

With only one site employing a formal referral process for low achieving students, organized efforts to recruit students based on identified academic needs were absent. Most sites relied primarily on word-of-mouth to promote after-school programs. Therefore, the typical regular LA COPS student attendee was one who possessed initiative to attend activities voluntarily and/or was already enrolled in a specialized program (e.g., ROP) that could be augmented via participation in LA COPS.

- **Program offerings were based on available school, community, and human resources.**

At the inception of LA COPS, students were surveyed to collect data on their areas of interest in order to design after-school programming around student needs. While key areas of student interest were identified, the establishment of programs was ultimately contingent upon securing staff willing to supervise the program. At most sites, academic tutoring received priority for staffing. However, tutors were not always available to assist students in subject areas other than mathematics despite expressed student demand. With regards to enrichment activities, students interviewed stated a desire to have more opportunities to earn elective credits required for high school graduation during after-school hours. Instead, LA COPS sites tended to offer extracurricular activities in the arts or technology staffed by an interested teacher. Many of these classes served only a small number of regular after-school participants. With the sunset of grant funds, many of the extracurricular courses were eliminated in order to maintain tutoring after-school.

Impact on Student Achievement

- **Lack of large-scale regular student participation in LA COPS limits our ability to discern any systematic academic impact accruing from student participation in LA COPS.**

Due to the small number of regular after-school participants, it is impossible to determine whether LA COPS succeeded in raising student achievement. Put another way, an insufficient number of students were impacted by the program to generalize the academic impact of participation in after-school programming.

Data from students' English teachers suggests that the benefits of participation in LA COPS were more behavioral than academic. According to English teachers, the majority of students improved in an array of classroom behaviors indirectly related to improved classroom performance such as regular classroom attendance, turning in homework, and paying attention in class. However, the data collected from teachers suggests many of the students attending LA COPS were already achieving grade level standards in English/language arts.

Linking After-School Programs to School-wide Goals

- **Stronger school linkages are necessary to increase regular student participation in academic support services available through LA COPS.**

There were not strong linkages with the regular school day at most LA COPS sites. Clearly, there are challenges involved in inducing high school students to participate in academic services and support after-school. However, only one LA COPS site developed a formal teacher referral system that targeted students for after-school participation based on academic performance and followed up to ensure that students participated. Instead, most programs advertised after-school tutoring and

relied on teachers or counselors to refer needy students. Most typically, students referred themselves to tutoring. As a result, student participation in academic intervention services ebbed and flowed based on grading periods.

In addition, low levels of attendance limited the kinds of academic support and intervention that could be provided in an after-school setting. With students attending once or twice per week on their own volition, instructors had few incentives to develop a structured curriculum to target academic skills. Toward the end of the grant, more sites began to suggest that students take advantage of tutoring assistance after-school in order to successfully pass the California High School Exit Exam. However these efforts to tie LA COPS to the regular day instructional program did not evolve into the establishment of mandatory classes or after-school modules extended over several weeks to address academic weaknesses in math or language arts. As a result, these efforts were unsuccessful in boosting the numbers of regular (i.e., 30 or more day) attendees.

- **LA COPS was successful in providing students with access to work-based learning opportunities. Nonetheless, the School-to-Career component received less priority within the larger design of LA COPS.**

LA COPS provided some students with work-based learning opportunities. Students employed by the Zones received hands-on experience in running a business. Similarly, students employed as peer and cross-age tutors were able to learn about the education field firsthand. Although these connections between after-school programming and career/postsecondary education at LA COPS sites were promising, after-school program staff and students participating in LA COPS were least likely to rate the School-to-Career component of after-school program positively. By and large, it is hard to escape the conclusion that the School-to-Career connection was marginalized within a larger context of tutoring and extracurricular activities at LA COPS sites. In addition, other than the relationship that each Zone enjoys with the on-site Regional Occupational Program (ROP), LA COPS sites have not established linkages with existing career-oriented academies on their host high school campuses.

Impact on Parent and Community Involvement

- **LA COPS was successful in involving community partners. Involving parents proved to be an on-going challenge.**

Sustained parent involvement in LA COPS never took hold in the program. While survey results indicated a high level of parental awareness of programs, large-scale parental participation in LA COPS was limited to a few events at two of the sites. LA COPS sites were more successful in engaging the larger community, particularly in publicity and support for the Zones. Outreach to local chambers of commerce have been successful in generating business for the Zones. Similarly, sites with cross-age tutoring programs succeeded in raising the profile of the high school as a

provider of community service. Several sites also succeeded in integrating a community partner as the instructor or provider of extracurricular programming.

Impact on Campus Safety and Security

- **LA COPS programs have been key to cultivating and maintaining campus safety after school for staff and students after school.**

Survey results overwhelmingly indicate that students and staff feel safe on campus after school. LA COPS contributed to efforts in securing this safety by not only increasing student and staff presence after school, but also securing funding for additional safety staff and patrols. Crime data collected support the improvement of safety surrounding the campuses. Although not necessarily a cause-and-effect relationship, juvenile arrests have declined in the areas surrounding all five LA COPS sites since 1999 according to Los Angeles Police Department statistics. In addition, four of the five high schools have also shown declines in on-campus crimes between 1999 and 2002.

Outlook for Sustainability

- **Sustainability is uncertain at all LA COPS sites.**

During the fourth and last year of the 21st Century Learning Centers program grant, most sites significantly scaled back extracurricular programming, focusing on Zone operations and after-school tutoring. However, these services may not be sustainable due to the lack of firm school linkages evident at most LA COPS sites.

Work to secure outside funding has been limited to the LA COPS coordinator, and to some extent the Zone manager, individuals who often lack the time to devote to development and sustainability. Despite some success in obtaining outside funding to maintain after-school programs and services, the amounts that have been secured are insufficient to sustain LA COPS in its present form. Most typically, schools are leveraging existing resources such as Title I funds to sustain discrete aspects of their after-school programs.

In sum, all LA COPS sites face daunting challenges in terms of sustaining after-school programming now that funds from the 21st Century Learning Center Program grant are exhausted. The overall decline in state and federal funds available for after school programming has reduced the availability of grant funds for which sites can apply. On site, school budgets have been reduced, leaving little discretionary funding available to support after school activities.

I. Introduction and Study Methods

Like other urban school districts throughout the nation, the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) serves many children who struggle daily with the challenges of high crime, gang activity and socio-economic hardship. Formed to address the need for meaningful, after-school programming serving at-risk youth, the LA COPS Community Learning Centers (LA COPS) program involves five high schools located in urban communities throughout Los Angeles:

- Dorsey High School
- Monroe High School
- Reseda High School
- San Pedro High School
- Wilson High School

Initiated in the 1999-2000 school year, LA COPS is an initiative of the LAUSD, the Los Angeles Police Department and the Los Angeles Police Academy Schools Foundation (LAPAMS) in collaboration with other community partners throughout the city. All five high schools participating in LA COPS have on-site police academies and received some funding support from LAPAMS during the start-up of after-school programming. Academies are school-within-a-school programs that provide students with a smaller, more personal learning experience, career focused academic and vocational curricula, and partnerships with employers that provide career awareness and work-based learning opportunities. However, the after-school programs and services available through LA COPS are not limited to (or solely intended for) students from the police academies.

The LA COPS program is funded as part of the 21st Century Learning Program, a federal effort to develop public schools into community learning centers. Reauthorized in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, the 21st Century Learning Program included an appropriation of \$1 billion for nation-wide after-school programs in fiscal year 2002 and \$993.5 million in fiscal year 2003 in order to respond to the growing number of children and young people left unsupervised during out-of-school hours. Locally, LA COPS received approximately \$2.5 million in federal funds annually for three years.¹ Availability of carryover funds allowed the LA COPS program to continue for 2002-2003, a fourth year of program implementation.

The focus of the 21st Century Learning Center Program is to provide expanded academic enrichment opportunities for children attending low performing schools. Tutorial services and academic enrichment activities are designed to help students meet local and state academic standards in subjects such as reading and math. In addition, the 21st Century Learning Center Program provides youth development activities; drug and violence prevention programs; technology education programs; art, music and recreation programs; counseling; and, character education to enhance the academic component of after-school learning.

¹ Total of \$7,450,343 over three years.

The 21st Century Learning Program funds about 6,800 rural and inner-city public schools in 1,420 communities to provide effective and meaningful after-school academic and enrichment opportunities for at-risk youth. Consistent with the thrust of No Child Left Behind, the 21st Century Learning Center Program is transitioning from a federal to a state administered program.

Prior Research on After-school Programs

The National Institute on Out-of-School Time (NIOST) published a fact sheet in 2001 which indicated that approximately 8 million children ages 5 to 14 regularly spend time without adult supervision (NIOST, 2003). In California, an estimated 1.2 million (approximately one-third of those eligible) children ages 5 to 14 would benefit from a subsidized after-school program because they are left unsupervised after-school (Children Now, 2001). Programs serving older children and youth are even less available. For example, as of 1991, less than 1% of all middle school students (7th and 8th graders) participated in after-school programs (US DOE, July 1997).

When the after-school hours of adolescent youth are specifically considered, studies show that unsupervised out-of-school time creates opportunities for students of all ages to engage in high-risk behavior (US DOE, July 1997). Those who are left unsupervised tend to “hang out with similar aimless friends” and “may join gangs or engage in premature sexual activity, drug and alcohol use, and other anti-social behavior” with idle youth being particularly prone to negative influences in urban areas (Schwartz, 1996; Marx, 1989). In addition, studies show that students are more likely to perform poorly in school if their out-of-school time is unsupervised (Office of Education Research and Improvement, 1999).

Historically, there has been a great deal of variation in the scope and aims of after-school programs serving school-age youth. Programs range in orientation from those emphasizing daycare to programs serving defined academic needs. Others emphasized youth enrichment activities while others combined various mixtures of different programmatic elements (Fashola, October 1998). Since 1998 however, government-sponsored programs have begun to connect after-school programs more directly to measures of student achievement (EdSource, February 2002). Increasingly, the current emphasis on performance standards and testing has led school districts to look at after-school programming as a venue to develop and reinforce academic skills (Shumow, 2001).

At the same time, there is broad recognition that after-school programs need to blend academic support, recreational opportunities and cultural experiences in order to meet the multiple needs of students and parents (Institute for Urban and Minority Education, 1998). In addition, when adolescents themselves (ages 11-15) are asked what they seek in an after-school program, they note the importance of leadership and guidance from caring adult staff, especially since many students now come from single-parent families or have limited relationships with extended families (S. W. Morris & Company, Inc., 1992).

To date, the studies on after-school programs mostly report findings on programs serving elementary and middle schools. These studies demonstrate that students who consistently participate in more balanced after-school programs are likely to experience improved achievement in math and reading and to improve school attendance (Bissell, Dugan, Ford-Johnson & Jones, 2002; Department of Education, U.C. Irvine, 2002). There is also a body of research developing which suggests that creating interventions that combine academic assistance with positive adult role models, cultural sensitivity and student leadership opportunities (such as tutoring younger children) are particularly effective at serving the needs of urban adolescent youth in schools with high drop-out rates and high proportions of students whose primary language is not English (Vaznaugh, 1995).

As a result, there has been a recent effort to ensure that after-school programs meet a broad range of adolescent and teen needs, including academic support, job preparedness, leadership skills and cultural enhancement. Programs effective at meeting these needs blend academic support, recreational opportunities and cultural experiences in a program that ties provision of these services to the communities in which the programs are located (Institute for Urban and Minority Education, 1998). Increasingly, the research on after-school programs suggests that successful programs result from a collaboration of partners addressing specific community needs (NW Regional Educational Library, 1999).

While the *need* for after-school programs is well founded and there are plenty of descriptions of how to develop successful after-school initiatives, research on the impact of after-school programs has only just begun to evaluate the *effectiveness* of these programs on participant outcomes. Even among the studies that do exist (see below) the results are limited to elementary and, less frequently, middle school students participating in after-school programs.

Research has demonstrated that students who regularly attended after-school programs exhibited a host of positive *behavioral* outcomes including, improved school conduct, less time spent watching TV and lower incidence of pregnancy, drug-use and violence (U.C. Irvine, 2002, U.C. Irvine, 2001; U.S. Department of Education, 2001; Reno and Riley, 2000). However, the impact of after-school programs on academic measures such as standardized test scores is less evident.

A longitudinal evaluation of the LA's Best After-School Program conducted by UCLA found that long-term participation in the elementary after-school program led to significantly higher rates of school day attendance even after controlling for student characteristics. While a direct attribution to participation in the after-school program could not be made, increased school day attendance was linked to positive achievement in mathematics, reading and language arts performance in standardized tests (Huang, Gribbons, Kim, Lee & Baker, 2000).

An evaluation of California's After-school Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnerships Program (ASLSNPP) for the period 1999 to 2001 conducted by University of California at Irvine (UCI) found that participation in after-school programs significantly and positively impacted SAT-9 test scores among the group of lowest performing elementary and middle school participants. While descriptive

statistics suggested a generally positive trend among all participants, these findings were not statistically significant (U.C. Irvine, 2002).

In a comprehensive evaluation conducted by Public *Works*, Inc. on PasadenaLEARNs, an after-school program that serves 19 schools in the Pasadena Unified School District, participation in the program was found to positively affect school day attendance (Public *Works*, Inc. 2003). The effect of participation on school day attendance was particularly strong among after-school participants who attended that program on a frequent basis. Multivariate analyses demonstrated no differences between participants and non-participants on standardized tests scores in either math or reading after controlling for student demographics and prior achievement.

Most recently, the U.S. Department of Education released the first year findings of the national evaluation of the 21st Century Learning Program conducted by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. Entitled, “When Schools Stay Open Late,” this is the largest examination to date of school-based after-school programs. The first year evaluation findings concluded that there was limited academic impact from participation in after-school programs. Compared to a similar group of students not participating in after-school programs, elementary participants did not have better reading test scores or grades. For middle school students, after-school participants had slightly higher grades, particularly among African-American and Hispanic middle school students, but the overall differences were small. For both elementary and middle school students, frequent attendance in after-school programming was not associated with greater academic outcomes.

Despite the lack of firm evidence linking after-school programs to quantitative academic outcomes, after-school programs have an impact on safety and are rated high by students, parents, and teachers. For example, PasadenaLEARNs program, parents, participants, school staff and community partners were in consensus that the program provides a valuable service to the Pasadena area. Students at all grade levels reported feeling safer in the after-school program than they did during the school day. Participants and their parents were both pleased that students received extra help with homework and school work and most teachers reported that their students in the program completed homework most of the time (Public *Works*, Inc. 2003). Similarly, an evaluation of the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) After-school Enrichment Program found that the program provided students with a safe environment after-school in urban, low socio-economic areas (Public *Works*, Inc. 2003).

In sum, the research tells us that there is some evidence that students who participate in after-school programs have demonstrated positive academic and behavioral outcomes. For example, after-school participants tend to have higher rates of regular school day attendance even after controlling for other demographic characteristics. However, the research has provided scant results attributing positive academic outcomes on standardized tests *directly* to participation after-school programs, particularly when comparing after-school participants to control groups of similar students not involved in after-school programming. In addition, participation in after-school programs appears to have spillover benefits on student

behaviors in school and helps improve campus and community safety. It is against this backdrop of a growing body of research on the effectiveness of after-school programs that this study of LA COPS was initiated.

Program Goals and Objectives

The 21st Century Learning Program was structured to address the research on the effectiveness of after-school programs. Grantees must:

- 1) Involve the community in order to create a learning center for all;
- 2) Provide strong academic support coupled with enrichment opportunities and career learning experiences;
- 3) Provide activities and opportunities through which students can have contact and develop relationships with positive adult role models in a safe environment; and
- 4) Involve parents and families whenever possible in the context of the overall learning community created.

In 1999, LA COPS established community learning centers—safe “learning villages”—in five of the city’s urban communities where student academic achievement is low and community crime rates are high. The program was designed to serve students at five high schools, with plans for serving elementary and middle school students from surrounding feeder schools as well as parents and the community at large.

The LA COPS program set the following goals and objectives:

- Creation and operation of five community learning centers to expand learning opportunities and produce larger population of high school youth who meet and exceed local and state academic standards in core subjects;
- Creation of a “learning village” at each high school for the local community, including high school students, parents and siblings, other children in the community, seniors, out-of-school youth and others, including the disabled;
- Provision of a safe environment free of violence and drugs for students and the community;
- Organization of local community members into partners and volunteers working with the high school in the creation of these learning villages;
- Development of a network of learning villages so that communities can mobilize and expand opportunities for computer-assisted learning (CAI), collaboration projects, distance learning and creative problem solving throughout the City of Los Angeles; and,
- Creation of a “Zone” at each site that would serve as an on-site printing and business operation central to the LA COPS goals of connecting each school

to its local community, providing career-based training to students and serving school and community needs.

Evaluation Overview and Objectives

In February 2002, Public Works, Inc. (PW) was contracted to evaluate the final two years of the LA COPS program. The evaluation included the 2001-2002 and 2002-2003, Year 3 and Year 4 of the 21st Century Learning Program grant. PW is a Pasadena-based non-profit organization dedicated to working with schools, government, parents and communities in the areas of accountability, assessment and evaluation services. PW has extensive experience evaluating educational reform initiatives and after-school programs in both school and community settings.

The LA COPS evaluation design includes both process and outcome measures using a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods. Process measures provide information on the quality of implementation within and across the five sites including identification of key barriers and challenges as well as successful implementation strategies. Outcome measures provide evidence of program effectiveness, particularly related to student achievement. Together, process and outcome measures provide sufficient information to point toward whether and how students achieve or gain because of participation in the program.

The primary objectives of the evaluation are to:

- Monitor and describe implementation of after-school programs in the five high schools;
- Provide site and District stakeholders with information on the status of program implementation and outcomes in order to improve the delivery of services;
- Determine the impact of program activities on student achievement and related indicators of success as well as parent and community involvement; and
- Determine the progress made at each site towards the attainment of original goals of the LA COPS grant.

During 2001-2002, the evaluation focused a great deal of attention on improving the systems for electronically documenting student attendance. Once on-site attendance databases had been updated, we were able to examine student participation in the LA COPS program. The number of regular after-school participants at each site was low relative to overall school enrollment. While many students attended after-school programming for periodic tutoring, few students regularly attended after-school programs.

Among the regular (i.e., 30 or more days of attendance) after-school participants, the majority of after-school participants from 2001-2002 were performing below

the 50th percentile for both Math and Reading at all five sites. There were small improvements in student grades for these students and substantial improvement in behaviors reported on by teachers such as homework completion, classroom participation, readiness to learn, and relationships with other students.

The evaluation concluded that each of the five LA COPS sites had created a learning village that provides a unique set of program offerings based on the school, community and human resources available to it. All sites developed a tutoring and homework assistance component and most had a functioning Zone. Other program components such as parent involvement and school linkages were only weakly implemented and/or only impacted a small number of students. Similarly, efforts to take advantage of community resources and seek out additional financial resources had not guaranteed the sustainability of after-school programs at LA COPS sites.²

For the current report, PW used a variety of data collection strategies including:

- Program Attendance Data. PW assisted sites in improving existing systems for documenting attendance in the LA COPS program and extracted data on after-school program attendance in 2001-2002 and 2002-2003. Findings related to LA COPS program attendance are included in Section II of this report.
- Focus groups and interviews. Focus groups and interviews were conducted based on protocols (see Appendix A) designed to ascertain strengths and challenges in program implementation and development. Interviews were conducted with site coordinators, and community partners and representatives. Additionally, focus groups were held with LA COPS instructional staff and students. Findings linked to focus groups and interviews are included in Section III of this report.
- Observations of program activities and services. Observations of each site documented program environment and examined student engagement in activities, staff supervision and interaction with students, and parental and community involvement within the context of program activities. Findings linked to program observations are included in Section III of this report.
- Surveys. Surveys were administered to LA COPS students and after-school program staff in 2002 and 2003. Parents were surveyed only in 2002. Survey methodology is described in Section IV of this report (see Appendix B for a copy of the staff survey and Appendix C for the student. Parent surveys are in Appendix D).
- Achievement Data. Standardized test scores of students with frequent (i.e., 30 or more days) after school participation in LA COPS during 2001-2002 were collected and analyzed. In addition, teachers of students with 10 or more days of participation in LA COPS during 2001-2002 and/or 2002-2003 were surveyed to obtain information on changes to student classroom

² See *LA COPS 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program: Evaluation of After-School Program Implementation, 2001-2002*, Public Works, Inc. (July 2002)

performance and behaviors. Achievement data and data from the survey of teachers is included in Section V of this report (see Appendix F for detailed teacher survey results).

Accountability and Reporting Requirements

All 21st Century Learning Program grantees are required to submit site-level reports to the Federal government documenting the effectiveness of after-school programs. In addition, PW prepared supplemental evaluation reports which presented a more holistic overview of the LA COPS program across the five sites. For the 2001-2002 evaluation, the following reports were prepared:

- Progress Report (Spring 2002). This report included a summary of qualitative data linked to program evaluation at each grantee site. Examples of mandatory report elements include: project goals and status, staffing, program services and activities, documentation of numbers of students served, records of community collaboration, program budgetary information, and success stories/lessons learned. These reports were delivered to the U.S. Department of Education in May 2002.
- Supplemental Evaluation Report. Although not required by the U.S. Department of Education, PW produced a supplemental evaluation report that expanded upon the progress reports generated for each site. An aggregate picture of LA COPS was thereby produced, including survey data and recommendations for program improvement, elements not covered in the Federal reporting requirements. This report was submitted to LAUSD in July 2002.
- Achievement Reports (Fall 2002). These reports included quantitative data linked to student achievement of LA COPS participants from 2001-2002 for each site receiving funds. Federal requirements call for the reporting of achievement data on “regular” after-school participants, defined as 30 or more days of attendance in a 12-month school year (i.e., July 1 to June 30). The indicators documented in this report include standardized test scores, English and mathematics grades, and school attendance. PW delivered reports for each site to the U.S. Department of Education in October 2002.

For 2002-2003, the only required deliverable for the U.S. Department of Education was a brief final report summarizing each sites’ cumulative experience as a 21st Century Learning Center grantee. All sites were asked to discuss the extent to which they met overall goals and objectives, describing implementation challenges and lessons. The final report also asked for a description of evaluation activities other than those required by the U.S. Department of Education and for plans for sustainability beyond the grant. PW delivered these reports in June 2003.

This report represents a summative final evaluation report based on the fourth year (2002-2003) of LA COPS implementation. This report follows the same format as the third year Supplemental Evaluation Report submitted in July 2002. Cumulative

evaluation findings are presented in a more holistic fashion and augmented with additional information including student and program staff survey data. Comparisons are drawn between third and fourth year evaluation data to highlight changes made during that time. Additionally, the report includes conclusions on program progress toward achieving original 21st Century CLC Grant goals.

Report Organization

This evaluation report is organized as follows:

- **Section II** presents a descriptive overview of the LA COPS program, including information on participating schools, student attendance, collaborative partnerships, and an overview of after-school programming.
- **Section III** presents findings linked to the implementation of the LA COPS program at the five high school sites funded by the 21st Century Learning Program based on site interviews, focus groups, and program observations.
- **Section IV** provides data from the surveys administered to LA COPS staff, participating students, and parents.
- **Section V** presents finding on the effectiveness of LA COPS in improving student outcomes among regular after-school participants.
- **Section VI** presents conclusions and lessons learned based on the findings presented in Sections II-V.
- **Section VII** contains all appendices and supplemental data associated with this evaluation report including a bibliography of resources on research related to after-school programs.

II. Description of the LA COPS Program

The five high schools participating in the LA COPS program include Dorsey, Monroe, Reseda, San Pedro and Wilson. These urban high school sites represent the geographic and demographic diversity of the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). The LA COPS sites were intended to lay the foundation for a network District-wide of learning villages with functioning after-school programs and technological capabilities at high school campuses.

Characteristics of LA COPS Schools

As shown in Table 2.1, the host schools for LA COPS at the five LAUSD high schools vary considerable in terms of school size and demographic characteristics. LA COPS includes very large high schools (e.g., Monroe) as well as sites that are considered small (e.g., Dorsey) within LAUSD. The sites also differ considerably in terms of ethnic representation and the proportion of English Language Learners (ELLs). In terms of achievement, the schools tend to look more similar. Academic Performance Index (API) scores and rankings³ show that most of the high schools involved with LA COPS are low performing, typically in the bottom 20-30% of public schools statewide.

Table 2.1: Demographic and Achievement Characteristics of LA COPS Schools, 2002-2003

	Total Enrollment	African American	Hispanic	White	Asian/Pac Islander	ELL	F/R Meal*	2002 API (Base)	2002 API Rank
Dorsey	2209	55.8%	43.4%	0.2%	0.2%	14.4%	68.7%	n/a ⁴	n/a
Monroe	4897	3.9%	84.1%	4.1%	2.3%	34.5%	65.8%	546	2
Reseda	2454	8.4%	70.1%	13.2%	5.7%	22.9%	65.4%	574	3
San Pedro	3344	10.4%	60.8%	23.7%	2.6%	8.8%	32.2%	n/a ⁵	n/a
Wilson	3033	1.9%	90.7%	0.8%	6.0%	19.1%	63.6%	535	2

Source: California Department of Education

*2002-2003 Figures unavailable; figures given are from 2001-2002

Overview of Programs and Activities

The LA COPS programs at each site share similarities because of the common grant goals they seek to achieve. At the same time, each after-school program speaks to the needs of the local student population and larger community, taking advantage of

³ The Academic Performance Index is a composite score between 20-1000 based on student scores on standardized tests, the California Standards Test, and the California High School Exit Exam. In addition to the composite score, schools receive an annual ranking between 1-10.

⁴ A 2002 API base score was unavailable for Dorsey High School because an insufficient number of students was tested. Dorsey's base API in 2001 was 442 with a statewide ranking of 1.

⁵ A 2002 API base score was unavailable for San Pedro High School because an insufficient number of students was tested. Dorsey's base API in 2001 was 640 with a statewide ranking of 6.

resources that exist. Basic program components common to all LA COPS sites are as follows:

- **Academic Intervention and Support.** Each site has developed a program of after-school tutoring and academic assistance to meet the needs of underachieving students.
- **Enrichment and Extracurricular Activities.** Enrichment and extracurricular opportunities exist at all LA COPS programs including the arts, academic reinforcement and physical fitness classes, among others.
- **School Linkages.** LA COPS publicized after-school services to students and school staff at host schools. School linkages also encompassed the establishment of relationships with school administrators and referral mechanisms for recruiting students into after-school programming.
- **School-to-Career Opportunities.** Each site offers some form of career education program or internship opportunity. Several sites employ students as tutors of peer and younger students. In addition, the Zones, school-based enterprises offering xerographic services (see additional description below) provide students with practical work experience while also generating funds for long-term sustainability of after-school programs.
- **Community/Parent Involvement.** All LA COPS sites are attempting to establish linkages to parents and businesses and other organizations in their surrounding communities.
- **Safety.** All LA COPS programs endeavored to enhance after-school safety. Efforts included strengthened on-site security as well as links to local law enforcement.
- **Accountability and Sustainability.** All LA COPS sites were responsible for accurate and comprehensive reporting of student attendance in after-school programs. Sites also worked to secure outside funding and to leverage existing school resources in order to sustain after-school programs beyond the 21st Century Learning Center Programs grant.

After-School Program Attendance

Documenting Student Participation

A central component of 21st Century Learning Center accountability hinges on accurate records of student attendance in after-school programs and activities. Annually, the U.S. Department of Education required all grantees to report on the total number of students and adults served by funded after-school programs. In addition, the U.S. Department of Education required reporting of student achievement data on all “regular” after-school participants, defined as students attending 30 or more days in a school year (July 1-June 30).

Soon after PW began evaluating the LA COPS program in February 2002, it became clear that site-based systems for tracking student attendance in after-school programs and activities were in need of improvement. There were a large number of inconsistencies across sites in collection tools used, the actual data collected, and the number of electronic records being updated. In large part, the staff of LA COPS were untrained and thereby ill-equipped to use the electronic database that had been prepared for them by the prior District evaluator. As a result, much of the attendance data was limited to paper records (e.g., sign-in sheets) rather than stored in a manner to facilitate analysis.

In response, LA COPS staff and site coordinators cooperated with PW staff to ensure that data for 2001-2002 was accurately accounted for in preparation for Federal annual performance reporting. PW then worked with LA COPS site coordinators to examine technical deficiencies in the existing attendance collection system, identify staff training needs, modify the attendance database, and implement procedures to ensure timely entry of attendance data into the electronic system.

For 2002-2003, the attendance database was then redesigned with several new features to streamline and improve the data collection process for the future. These included new user-friendly navigation tools and the capability to print a variety of program specific reports. Roll sheets were developed to improve the efficiency and accuracy of activity attendance collection. Attendance reports were also developed to help program staff track days of attendance by student and activity.

PW conducted two training sessions focused on the modifications to the database. The first training was held with the LA COPS site coordinators in June 2002, while a more in-depth training followed with the clerical staff at each site in December 2002. Further, additional training literature and guidance was provided regarding generation of attendance reports for purposes of reporting data in April 2003. Ongoing technical assistance was also provided and offered to each site as needed.

Due to the focus placed on improving procedures for documenting student attendance, most LA COPS sites made improvements in recording and monitoring the number of after-school participants during 2002-2003. These sites have done a much better job of holding students and teachers more accountable for gathering attendance data by providing sign-in sheets and developing consistent attendance procedures. However, improvements are still needed to ensure accurate and comprehensive documenting of student attendance *by activity* within each LA COPS program.

Student Participation in After-School Programs

Based on the data extracted from the on-site database at each LA COPS site in Spring 2002 and 2003, the proportion of high school students participating in at least one LA COPS activity has varied considerably from site-to-site (see Table 2.2). In 2001-2002, student participation was highest at Reseda (53%) and lowest at San Pedro (27%). In 2002-2003, overall after-school participation remained highest at Reseda (50%) with the lowest proportion of students attending after-school activities

at Dorsey (20%).⁶ Overall attendance declined at all but one site (San Pedro) between 2001-2002 and 2002-2003.

Table 2.2: Student Participation in LACOPS, 2001-2002 and 2002-2003

School	2001-2002			2002-2003		
	School Enrollment	LA COPS Participants		School Enrollment	LA COPS Participants	
	N	N	% of school	N	N	% of school
Dorsey	2244	856	38.1%	2211	449	20.3%
Monroe	4481	2017	41.3%	4675	1386	29.6%
Reseda	2551	1349	52.9%	2460	1219	49.6%
San Pedro	3441	921	26.8%	3318	1165	35.1%
Wilson	2930	1256	42.9%	2789	1175	42.1%
TOTAL	15647	6399	40.9%	15453	5394	34.9%

Source: CDE DataQuest Website and site-based databases at LACOPS sites.

Federal guidelines indicate that 21st school grantees are responsible for reporting on the achievement of “frequent attendees” defined as students who participate in after-school programming 30 days or more in a given school year. Table 2.3 shows the number of participants by varying levels of program attendance at each LA COPS site during 2001-2002 and 2002-2003.

Table 2.3: Frequency of Student Attendance, 2001-2002 and 2002-2003⁷

School	2001-2002			2002-2003		
	30 or more days	20 or more days	10 or more days	30 or more days	20 or more days	10 or more days
Dorsey	48	77	158	9	21	72
Monroe	35	75	248	25	77	234
Reseda	61	106	236	63	123	260
San Pedro	50	101	226	14	42	155
Wilson	55	96	201	67	127	247
Total	249	455	1069	178	390	968

Source: Site-based databases from LA COPS sites

As can be seen in Table 2.3, the number of frequent (30 or more days) after-school attendees is relatively small, varying between 35-61 students in 2001-2002 and 9-67 students during 2002-2003. The number of 30 or more day attendees increased at two sites and declined at three sites from 2001-2002 to 2002-2003. When the threshold is lowered to 20 or 10 days of attendance, the number of “frequent” after-school attendees is higher at all sites. Nonetheless, the same pattern of

⁶ LA COPS participants reported in Tables 2.2 and 2.3 are limited to all students in grades 9-12 attending LA COPS at least once between July 1, 2001 and June 30, 2002 and July 1, 2002 and May 30, 2003.

⁷ Includes all students K-12 included in site-based attendance database records.

declining attendance across the last two years is evident, with increases at two sites, stability at one, and declines at two others.

Moreover, these attendance figures demonstrate that LA COPS after-school programming has not involved many students on a regular basis. Instead, after-school programming available through LA COPS is organized on a “drop in, drop out” basis. In other words, the after-school programs at these high school campuses are voluntary and allow students to use the program services on an as needed basis rather than enrolling students in classes or modules sequenced over several weeks.

Efforts to involve parents and other adults in LA COPS were not successful. In 2001-2002, there were less than ten adult participants attending LA COPS programs 10 or more days per year. Data on adult participants was not collected for 2002-2003.

Efforts to involve elementary and middle school students were not emphasized at LA COPS sites. San Pedro, for example, was the only site to formalize linkages by offering a satellite after-school tutoring location at Dana Middle School staffed by high school students. LA COPS programs at Wilson and Monroe engaged elementary students off-site via cross-age tutoring programs coordinated through LA COPS. However, LA COPS sites did not systematically record participation of elementary and middle school students. As such, there are no accurate numbers reflecting the degree of participation by students in grades K-8.

Leadership and Staffing

The day-to-day leadership of LA COPS at each site rests with a site coordinator. Two of the five LA COPS site coordinators are teachers serving as coordinator in a part-time capacity (i.e., they work on the LA COPS project while concurrently carrying a full-time teaching load). One site has a school counselor serving as the part-time coordinator. One site has hired an independent contractor to serve as a part-time LA COPS site coordinator. Only one site has an on-site full-time coordinator employed by LAUSD.

Each of the site coordinators is responsible for the hiring and supervision of staff including instructors providing academic assistance and support (often high school teachers from the school site), high school students serving as tutors, employees of the Zone, clerical and data entry support personnel and parent/community liaisons. Only one site, Dorsey, has a formal parent liaison. Other staff, such as college center or tutoring coordinators, and Zone managers typically function as representatives to the community. In addition, site coordinators exercise oversight over student and community volunteers.

The primary linkage to the regular school day program is the relationship between the LA COPS site coordinator and a high school administrator, generally an assistant principal. At all sites, school personnel also support the LA COPS program in the areas of payroll, custodial and clerical duties.

LA COPS program staff members are primarily drawn from the ranks of regular school day teachers from the host high school sites in both 2001-2002 (Table 2.4a) and 2002-2003 (Table 2.4b). In addition, high school (and in some cases college) students serve as tutors. At two sites, students also serve in other clerical and administrative capacities.

Table 2.4a: LA COPS Staffing by School, 2001-2002

School	School Day Teacher	College Student	High School Student	Parents	Community	Other
Dorsey	6	2	3	0	1	2
Monroe	18	0	15	1	1	0
Reseda	2	1	4	0	3	0
San Pedro	19	1	25	1	2	2
Wilson	15	2	10	1	1	0
Total	60	6	57	3	8	4

A small number of community members also staff LA COPS programs, including the Parent Center representative at Dorsey, and the College Corner coordinator at Wilson, who are responsible for connecting LA COPS programs with parents in the community. Community members staff a variety of site-specific programs (e.g., the legal clinic at Monroe) as well as some of the Zones (see Section III for more information on community partners).

Table 2.4b: LA COPS Staffing by School, 2002-2003

School	School Day Teacher	College Student	High School Student	Parents	Community	Other
Dorsey	6	0	1	0	2	0
Monroe	6	3	37	1	3	3
Reseda	16	0	8	0	2	0
San Pedro	14	1	15	3	1	2
Wilson	25	0	8	0	2	3
Total	65	2	63	4	8	8

Source: Self-reported data from LA COPS site coordinators

Overall staffing totals remain consistent for school day teachers across all five sites. However, declines are evident at sites where cuts were made in staff due to reduced funding and consequent elimination of programming. In Monroe, where both extracurricular and tutoring programs suffered cuts, the number of school day teachers declined by two-thirds. Conversely, Wilson school day teacher nearly doubled, which may be in response to their expansion of tutoring services and active recruitment of Math teachers for after-school tutoring.

High school students serving as staff in the programs also showed an overall increase. However this is primarily in response to Monroe's expansion of the cross age tutoring program connected to LA COPS. Reseda was the only other site to increase in the number of high school students serving as program staff. Decreases

were seen at all other sites with the sunset of grant funds, reducing opportunities for students to participate in work-based learning as part of LA COPS.

Program Funding

The original LA COPS grant proposal was funded for three years - 1999-2000, 2000-2001, and 2001-2002. LA COPS secured a no-cost extension to enable it to continue operation during 2002-2003 with the use of carryover funds while each site works toward sustainability.

Carryovers have occurred each year of the grant due to the delays that were experienced in getting the Zone operations underway at each site. Presently, Zones are in full operation at four sites and in partial operation at one additional site. With the end of the grant and the no cost extension, funding for maintaining LA COPS is uncertain. Although sites have made efforts to secure outside funds and/or leverage funds from host schools, after-school programs and activities will likely be provided at a significantly lower level.

The most significant budget expense for these programs each year has been personnel. While these costs will continue, significant initial outlays were also made for equipment, facilities renovation and contract obligations. Since all major facilities renovation and equipment expenditures have been made, these are not continuing costs to future program operation. Therefore, the majority of the secured funding will be for personnel working at the school sites in the after-school programs.

District Involvement and Support

District-level supervision of the LA COPS program is under the jurisdiction of the Instructional Technology Branch and involves LAUSD personnel with expertise in secondary and adult career education and school-to-career initiatives. LAUSD administrative staff provides fiscal advice and training and supervisory support to ensure the implementation of the grant. LAUSD has also provided training in budgeting and fiscal management.

On-going Monitoring and Coordination

To ensure the identification of problems and resolutions on a timely basis, LA COPS site coordinators meet with LAUSD staff monthly to update each other on program progress, share best practices, identify problems and concerns and receive training as needed on budgetary and operational matters. Further, District staff monitor grant implementation progress through regular site visits and telephone contact five days a week. In the past, District staff have visited sites on a monthly basis. District staff also serve as liaisons to federal and state officials with regards to LA COPS program activities and progress.

Training and Oversight of the Zones

Most recently, District staff have focused on facilities renovations at each LA COPS site. Specifically, emphasis was placed on preparing for the final site (Dorsey) to open the Zone. As Zones became fully operable, ROP teachers and site coordinators needed more guidance in how to provide effective business management of Zone operations while keeping those operations student-centered. The District developed a plan for professional development focused on technical and business management development of the Zone. In addition, training was provided to ROP teachers specifically in how to better engage students in technical training at the Zones. District staff are also continuing training on the accounting legalities of employing student staff for the Zones.

Instructional Use of Technology

The District worked with sites to increase student use of Zone computer labs during after-school hours. LAUSD supported the installation and training on Lifetime Learning, a computer-based tutoring program that allows for assessment of student progress and varied academic assistance. District staff also worked to implement a distance learning program that will engage students in arts, design and animation coursework. In this way, the District is helping LA COPS sites maximize the number of students gaining access to technology after-school.

III. Program Implementation Findings

The section below describes and reports findings related to the key components of the LA COPS program.

Academic Intervention and Support

The academic intervention component of the LA COPS program provides tutoring, extended library hours, and homework assistance to high school students. At some sites, elementary and middle school students also receive some academic support services. At most sites, extended library hours and/or computer lab availability are also available to students.

Tutoring

Each site offers a program of after-school tutoring and homework assistance for high school students. Math tutoring is the most typical after-school tutoring service although some sites included regular tutoring in other academic subjects. Tutoring programs serve a broad range of high school students including under-achieving students, athletes interested in maintaining eligibility for extracurricular participation and high-performing students who seek to be competitive in their college applications.

Attendance data from 2002-2003 illustrates that tutoring was the most popular after-school activity at three of the five LA COPS sites, both overall (i.e., all participants with one or more days of attendance) and among regular attendees (i.e., 30 or more days).

Three LA COPS sites also provide tutoring and other academic intervention services to students from feeder elementary and/or middle school students. For example, Monroe's LA COPS program includes a cross-age tutoring program that employs high school students as tutors at local elementary schools for out-of-school time support for younger children. San Pedro's LA COPS program includes regular tutorial services at Dana Middle School. One school has expanded their cross-age tutoring services into local community-based organizations that provide

Nonetheless, data on program attendance indicate that student participation in tutoring is inconsistent and services are often under-utilized. As the relatively small number of LA COPS participants with 30+ days of participation attests, few students use the tutoring services available after-school on a consistent basis. Instead, students use tutoring services on an "as needed" basis with tutoring services most heavily impacted near grading periods at the end of semester terms.

Nearly all LA COPS sites employ only informal mechanisms for referring students from the regular school day to after-school tutoring or intervention programming, a factor which likely explains the low levels of regular participation. Wilson is the only site that systematically identified students for after-school tutoring based on academic achievement. In line with a redesign of the program to focus more explicitly on supporting academic achievement, the Wilson LA COPS program

developed a referral form that requires teachers to identify the reason for referral to after-school tutoring, duration of time assigned for tutoring, and number of days required. Due, in part, to the stronger linkage to the regular school day instructional program, Wilson's LA COPS program showed increases in the number of "regular participants" in all categories (10, 20, and 30 day attendees).

Reseda also tried to boost consistent student attendance via an incentive system that rewarded consistent attendance through a raffle and an awards banquet for students who attended LA COPS activities 25 days or more. This incentive system helped increase the amount of regular attendees at Reseda, particularly student participants attending 10 and 20 or more days during the 2002-2003 school year.

In general, students attended tutoring and homework assistance in order to receive additional guidance and support in mathematics. Tutors were less available for students seeking support in other subject areas such as Spanish or Science. In addition, because most students self-referred themselves to tutoring, there were insufficient numbers of tutors available to students during periods close to semester finals and grading. In other words, the lack of a systematic mechanism for referring students to tutoring resulted in an inability to plan for staffing of tutoring that would meet student needs.

Apart from tutoring, only two sites offer overt academic intervention programs as part of LA COPS programming. At Monroe, students may utilize Plato Math and English, computerized academic intervention programs with built in assessments to monitor student progress. After-school staff at Monroe reported a 70-80% improvement among students using Plato programs after-school. Wilson's after-school program includes funding for a "Second School" Coordinator who, along with school counselors, identifies students at-risk of not graduating. These students are then enrolled in after-school courses at a local skills center and case managed toward the completion of the course hours needed to earn the credits for high school graduation.

Enrichment and Extracurricular Activities

Academic enrichment activities were offered at four of the five LA COPS sites. Examples of academic enrichment programs include the following:

- Coffee House Readers, a supportive reading program at Reseda;
- Scrabble Club at San Pedro; and,
- On-site community college courses at Wilson.

Other after-school offerings provided via LA COPS are more extracurricular in nature and tend to focus on the arts, health and fitness, and/or the cultivation of student skills such as leadership.

Arts

Student participation in the fine and performing arts after-school focused on taking advantage of on-site teacher expertise and support available from local community organizations. For example, Reseda offers students the Zine Workshop, an arts program that integrates student writing with the arts as students construct an autobiographical student magazine. The Zines are designed to build self-confidence and self-identity. Love's Child program, a connection that is funded by the California Department of Health Services and an outgrowth of last year's relationship with Haven Hills, provides staff and services for the Zine Workshop.

In 2002-2003, funding constraints resulted in the elimination of most after-school programming linked to the arts. At several sites, arts enrichment courses encompassing music, art and art history, theater, and dance were either reduced in size or eliminated. For example, courses in ceramics, sewing, oil painting, and guitar offered in 2002 were eliminated at Monroe over the course of the 2002-2003 school year due to a reduction of funds delegated to enrichment courses. Similarly, a Folklorico class at Wilson was eliminated at the end of the 2001-2002 school year.

Health and Fitness

Weight training is the primary health and fitness program offered, and is provided several days a week after-school at most sites. Students report that they are attending these classes to build personal health and self-esteem, as well as for supplemental conditioning for sports activities. For example, at Monroe's newly opened Fitness Center, the weight training coordinator meets with students to develop a comprehensive personal health plan. Each student receives consultation not only on how to properly use equipment, but also to develop new eating and work habits to reach long term goals. The consultation is a requirement for participation, and creates a larger awareness for a comprehensive healthy lifestyle.

Weight training/conditioning has also been the most popular program among LA COPS participants. These classes enjoyed high levels of attendance among both irregular and frequent after-school participants. Two sites expanded hours and days of operation during the 2002-2003 school year in response to high demand. Health and fitness programs have not been subject to cuts as other enrichment programs due to this popularity, as well as the ease of staffing this extracurricular activity. Generally staffed by a regular school day Physical Education teacher or a coach, this after-school activity has not experienced a high degree of staff turnover. Funding is required for the staff only, since facilities were already in existence at three sites. Monroe earned a Fitness Center grant, approximately \$50,000, to renovate existing facilities and buy equipment.

Student Leadership

After-school activities involving student leadership vary widely from site to site but generally involve small numbers of students. Some sites, such as Dorsey, have an explicit student leadership component built into LA COPS. Dorsey offers a peer mediation program that trains students as "mediators" in resolving conflicts on

campus and promoting tolerance and non-violence. The program has become a vehicle for building ties with a local community-based organization that offered to provide the mediation training. When funding ceases, West Angeles community Development Center will take over coordination of the mediation program to continue providing this service to Dorsey students.

At other sites, students develop leadership skills through work-based learning opportunities. For example, at Monroe, approximately 30 students serve as cross age tutors and 2-3 students work at the Legal Self-Help Center. These positions require students to work under little supervision with young children, as well as adults. Wilson also has involved many students in a cross age tutoring program through their collaboration with Teach for America. San Pedro has over 10 students serving as tutors to middle school students. Several students interviewed stated that often they serve as mentors to the younger students, offering advice and assistance where needed. Many have used their involvement as tutors as springboards into other leadership positions at their school.

Student Access to Enrichment and Extracurricular Activities

Overall, student access to academic enrichment and extracurricular opportunities at each site depends on staff availability. Although most sites surveyed students to gauge interests, the menu of after-school offerings was developed based on teacher availability and/or knowledge of a community partner with expertise in a specific area. In this sense, student access to extracurricular and academic enrichment activities at LA COPS sites was “supply driven” rather than based on expressed student demand. This is clearest in the continuation of program offerings with sparse student participation. For example, activities such as Acme Animation Club, Coffee House Readers, Scrabble Club, and Zine Workshop have continued despite garnering low levels of attendance in comparison with other after-school programs.

Activities where there is large student interest have not always been created or sustained due to lack of staff. At Wilson, the popular Folklorico activity was discontinued when the staff member left the school. Further, students at Wilson interviewed have expressed a desire for more physical activities, such as expansion of weight training or inclusion of more sports activities. However, staffing of after-school tutoring was prioritized leaving extracurricular programs unstaffed.

School Linkages

School linkages encompass those aspects of the program that encourage the integration of after-school components with the regular school day instructional program. As such, school linkages involve efforts to publicize and promote after-school participation, including mechanisms for referring students to after-school programs based on identified needs and interests. In addition, school linkages involve the degree of collaboration and interaction among regular school day staff and after-school staff in the design, management, and monitoring of programs and activities for students offered after-school. Lastly, school linkages imply a desire to create a “seamless” day that involves an increasing proportion of students in after-

school activities including academic support, academic enrichment, and extracurricular activities.

LA COPS Visibility and Publicity

Coordinators at all five sites made efforts to raise the profile of LA COPS programs on campus. Several sites utilize the school's morning bulletin for broadcasting information about LA COPS course offerings. Site coordinators have also spoken at school staff meetings, typically at the beginning of each semester, to publicize LA COPS programs and services. One school includes LA COPS programs in the daily bulletin on their website. Some sites also display signs and bulletin boards that advertise LA COPS activities, often including pictures of student participants engaged in activities. According to students interviewed, there is a campus-wide awareness of LA COPS programs.

School Administrative Support

Most sites instituted regular program management meetings between site administrators and the LA COPS coordinator. Collaboration was more intensive and concrete when linked to a specific project such as opening the Zone or, in the case of Wilson, designing the system for student referral to after-school tutoring. Typically, an assistant principal was assigned as a liaison to LA COPS although some principals played a more active role.

At some sites, turnover among site administrators resulted in less overt school support and involvement in LA COPS. At these sites, LA COPS programs tended to become isolated from larger school-wide initiatives. In addition, larger concerns sometimes eclipsed priorities for after-school programming. For example, several sites reduced funds for extracurricular programs in order to channel resources into programs with a more overt academic focus. Lacking formal mechanisms for referring or following up with students, these efforts by school administrators tended to have an adverse affect on overall after-school attendance since students were no longer attending extracurricular activities and were not attending tutoring on a regular basis.

Referral Mechanisms

Despite publicity and personal relationships, the core aspect of school linkages is missing at most LA COPS sites. As indicated in the section above on academic intervention and tutoring, referral processes are weak and informal at all but one LA COPS site. Although teachers at the schools sometimes refer academically at-risk and under-performing students, there is nothing systematic in how after-school options are linked to the regular instructional program. For example, LA COPS sites did not design after-school mathematics tutoring in conjunction with math teachers. Likewise, methods are lacking to insure that students go to tutoring unless the referring teacher is part of the after-school staff and/or providing the tutoring.

Instead, the referral process for LA COPS tended to rely on students identifying and referring themselves. Interviews with participating students confirmed that students

self-refer themselves and the number of students participating in after-school tutoring increases when report cards are issued. Many also stated that they heard about tutoring from their teacher, who also served as an after-school tutor, in a general announcement format and not on an individual basis. Further, the extracurricular activities, such as Weight Training, that are the most popular have several referral sources. P.E. teachers, as well as team coaches, constantly refer students to weight training, whereas smaller programs such as Acme Animation Club have only one teacher referring and is usually limited to only students enrolled in the regular day class that hear about the program. In sum, students seek out after-school support on an “as-needed” basis to bring up course grades or because they have a specific extracurricular interest that is being taught after-school.

The one exception to this pattern is Wilson which developed multiple methods for ensuring that students in academic need were referred to and received tutoring. Faculty members refer students for tutoring and homework assistance using written referral forms, with some teachers giving students extra credit for attending LA COPS. Students have the referral signed by the tutor with appropriate notes upon completion of the session. The student then takes the signed form back to the referring teacher, thereby ensuring follow-up. To ensure that academically at risk students are targeted for referral, letters are sent home to parents of students with Ds or Fs along with a tutoring consent tear-off that encourages the parent to enroll their child into after-school tutoring right away.

Although program staff at the other four LA COPS sites report serving high numbers of students in tutoring each day, attendance database numbers illustrate that these are not the same students each day. The typical tutoring participant is an occasional attendee who attends LA COPS just a few times on a self-initiated basis.

School-to-Career

LA COPS programs at each site have been able to offer career and technical training and work experience to students in two primary ways. The Zones at three sites provide an on-site training resource for students in reprographics business and customer service skills. In addition, cross-age tutoring programs are available at three sites and provide work-based learning opportunities for students based on a community service model. One site also has a Saturday Enrichment program for Pre-K through 6th grade students. Some sites have also begun to solidify linkages to postsecondary education during after-school hours. These efforts are described in more detail below.

The Connecting Zones

The Zone at each site is a dedicated space on each high school campus staffed by students who are supervised by a Zone Manager. Organized along the lines of the Kinko’s printing business model, each Zone is equipped with business copiers (black and white and color), multimedia computers with Internet access, fax machines, telephone lines, and other tools for creating presentations. Key functions of the Zone include:

- Increasing technology access. The Zones provide community and student access to computer lab and Internet services in socio-economically disadvantaged communities;
- Providing career exposure to students. The Zones employ students in technical training in advanced printing and graphic design techniques that would offer day students (primarily students participating in Regional Occupational Programs or ROPs) a work-based learning opportunity and after-school student interns a career-based learning opportunity that prepares them for the world of work.
- Sustaining after-school programs. The Zones are student-run businesses that provide revenue which was intended to help sustain the long-term presence of after-school programming. Usage of the Zone by local businesses, community members, and parents was seen as a way to raise the profile of after-school programming and build on-going support for LA COPS.

The Zones have provided students with work-based learning opportunities in business and reprographics at three of the five LA COPS sites. Both student workers and paid student interns serve clients in a real-world business setting as they complete copying projects, handle customer inquiries, meet deadlines, and process orders and cash transactions.

At the beginning of the 2001-2002 school year, Zones were fully operational at Monroe, Reseda, and San Pedro. Wilson became fully operational in October 2002, and Dorsey opened its Zone's doors in March 2003. Monroe, Reseda and San Pedro took the lead on opening their Zones primarily due to the ability to secure facilities on school site quickly.

Decisions on phasing in the Zones at each LA COPS site were made by LAUSD based on funding availability, construction priorities, and site-specific challenges. There were a variety of factors influencing the pace of Zone establishment including problems in identifying appropriate space for the Zone, and then preparing it environmentally to house the Zone. Next, delays occurred in the construction of Zone space, largely due to delays in coordinating with District construction departments, shifting of District construction priorities and other delays. Further, personnel changes at the District and shifts in policy made it difficult to complete processing of information related to site identification and construction. Finally, monies were frozen at the District level during 2002-2003 that prevented Zones from purchasing needed materials and supplies. However, despite these delays, each site has opened their Zone for business to their respective school faculty and staff, and both have efforts in progress to promote services to surrounding organizations and businesses.

During 2002-2003, the existence of the Zone served to strengthen school linkages between LA COPS and the Regional Occupational Program (ROP) at some sites. For example, the Regent Zone at Reseda employs two student workers with additional students from the school's ROP class also working in the Zone when a

large xerographic job comes in. The Zone manager has begun to include the Zone in lesson planning for his ROP class. The Pirate Zone at San Pedro also plans on capitalizing on their close relationship with the school's ROP to incorporate the Zone into a planned career pathway that will involve more students in work-based learning.

Although Zones act as vehicles in providing students quality work-based learning opportunities, they serve a minute fraction of the student population as a whole. At each site, less than three students serve as regular part-time employees. ROP students circulate through the Zone, but seldom on a consistent basis. Efforts to incorporate the Zones into the larger ROP program may prove successful in increasing the amount of students exposed to work-based learning opportunities. However, only one site has formal plans in place regarding incorporation of the Zone into program curricula.

Cross-Age and Peer Tutoring

Tutoring programs at all LA COPS sites provide students with opportunities to serve as paid cross-age and peer tutors, either on-site or at local elementary and middle schools. Coordinators for the cross age tutoring programs vary by site. At Monroe and Wilson, regular day school staff serve as coordinators, while at San Pedro a teacher from Dana Middle School heads up the program, although the LA COPS coordinator does assist in hiring tutors. A community member with a degree in Early Childhood Education coordinates the Saturday Enrichment Program at that site. Cross age tutoring programs grew out of the need for students at all grade levels to receive additional individual attention, as well as the ability for high school students to develop mentoring and leadership skills by providing this assistance. At Wilson, the program provides an after-school work-based learning component to the Future Teacher of America students that was not present before.

Participating students develop an understanding of child development and build leadership and organizational skills that transfer to both their academic endeavors and everyday lives. Cross-age tutoring programs have been the most successful in exposing many students to work-based learning opportunities. For example, Monroe has tripled the amount of schools served by its cross age tutoring program, and has further expanded to increase placement of student volunteers in local community organizations.

Cross-age tutoring provided more school-to-career opportunities than the Zone, but still involve a narrow subset of students. For example, at Wilson, only seniors in the Future Teachers of America program were able to serve as cross age tutors. At Monroe, positions as cross age tutors, as well as student workers in the Legal Self Help Center, were limited to students in particular academies and those who were high achieving/honors students. While 30 students are in the cross age tutoring program, only two to three students have worked in the Legal Self Help Center. With many students already serving on a volunteer basis, funding is less of an issue than increasing visibility and access of opportunities to students.

Other Work Opportunities for Students

LA COPS programs have also employed small numbers of students in other capacities. For instance, some students are working on attendance data entry for the LA COPS program, gaining office and clerical skills that may help them in future employment. Additionally, Monroe's self-help legal clinic provides a small number of student workers with experience within the field of law, specifically employment law. In this program student workers learn interviewing skills, use of Excel spreadsheets, and other skills that may serve them in good stead in the job market.

Postsecondary Links

One site has been successful in building strong postsecondary links through the LA COPS program. Wilson has begun to develop postsecondary links to two-year community and four-year colleges as part of the LA COPS mandate to develop an "extended learning village." LA COPS has funded extra hours for College Corner operations, allowing Wilson to offer several community college courses on campus. Students at Wilson are able to obtain dual (high school and college) credit for participation after-school in academic electives including psychology, sociology, art, criminal justice, and sign language courses. The College Corner at Wilson was among the most popular after-school offering in terms of student attendance

Parent and Community Involvement

LA COPS sites have largely prioritized community involvement rather than parent involvement. A major focus of community outreach has focused on building a clientele for the Zone within the community. In addition, LA COPS sites are building relationships with businesses and community-based organizations to expand after-school options for students.

Community Partners

According to information compiled from site coordinators, each of the five LA COPS sites has been able to build relationships with community partners in the last two years (see Table 3.1a and Table 3.1b below). For example, a lawyer from a community legal services organization works with and supervises students at Monroe's on-site legal clinic. Similarly, collaborations with community organizations have allowed sites to expand the range of enrichment opportunities available after-school (e.g., Zine Workshop at Reseda and peer mediation at Dorsey). At San Pedro, a community member serves as the paid Zone Manager, while a LA COPS-funded staff person at Dana Middle School nearby supervises LA COPS-funded tutoring there.

Table 3.1.a: Community Partners by School, 2001-2002

School	National & Community Organizations	Businesses	County & Municipal Agencies	Postsecondary Education	Faith Based Organizations
Dorsey	0	1	6	0	1
Monroe	4	1	14	0	0
Reseda	8	3	7	1	0
San Pedro	5	2	5	1	0
Wilson	5	3	5	3	0
Total	22	8	37	4	1

Table 3.1b: Community Partners by School, 2002-2003

School	National & Community Organizations	Businesses	County & Municipal Agencies	Postsecondary Education	Faith Based Organizations
Dorsey	0	1	6	0	1
Monroe	6	1	14	0	0
Reseda	8	3	7	0	0
San Pedro	0	10	2	2	3
Wilson	5	3	5	2	0
Total	19	18	34	4	4

Source: Self-reported data from LA COPS sites

Sites have been able to maintain their community member involvement within several aspects of LA COPS. Businesses primarily contribute to LA COPS by using the Zone for their reprographic needs. As such, this area has seen growth that parallels the growth of the Zones. Additionally, some sites, such as Wilson and Reseda, have secured donations from local businesses for scholarship and awards to students for frequent attendance. Further, county and municipal agencies have also contributed funds to leverage with LA COPS. Two sites benefit from the Community Policing Grant, while others collaborate with their Police Academy Magnet faculty on site. Other sites have been successful in working with area agencies, such as local chambers of commerce, to generate business for the Zone.

Zone Connections

The Zones are developing ties in local school communities in order to cultivate clients for these school-based enterprises. For example, the site coordinator from the Monroe LA COPS program regularly attends local Chamber of Commerce meetings, as well as the North Hills Community Council, to solicit community clients. Outreach efforts primarily consist of meetings such as these, with the LA COPS coordinator traveling into the surrounding community to promote program services to local businesses and organizations. Additionally, Zone Managers report engaging in similar outreach efforts, concentrating on promotion of Zone services to increase consistent business for the Zone. Several sites have also placed posters and other signage in the community to advertise LA COPS, but efforts have been limited.

The three sites that have had fully operational Zones for the past two years have been able to generate increases in Zone revenue from 2001-2002 to 2002-2003.

San Pedro is currently generating an average of \$2000-\$3000 in monthly revenue, followed by Monroe (\$2200-\$2500), and Reseda (\$1,500). Wilson's Seymour Zone became fully operational in November 2002, and is beginning to establish a consistent client base within school faculty. Dorsey's End Zone opened its doors in March 2003, with sustainability contingent upon continuing administrative support.

Collaboration with Community

LA COPS sites have built community relationships aimed at expanding student access to after-school extracurricular programs and enrichment activities.

Examples of community collaborations already underway include:

- Dorsey's collaboration with West Angeles Community Development Corporation in establishing a peer mediation program for student-led conflict resolution leaders on-campus.
- Monroe's collaboration with the North Hills Community Council and local Chamber of Commerce to generate consistent business for the Zone.
- Reseda's collaboration with Love's Child Foundation to develop an on-going project that integrates writing and the arts designed to help with development of student self-confidence and identity.
- San Pedro's collaboration with CSU, Dominguez Hills through their CAPI grant to hire a college tutor attending El Camino College.
- Wilson's collaboration with local businesses to secure donations for school events and student scholarships.

Parent Connections

Involving parents in after-school programming has been a challenge. In general, efforts to recruit parent volunteers have met limited success. Parent education workshops have garnered moderate to high levels of attendance, but are limited in number and scope. Despite interest by some parents, district procedures for processing parents as employees for after-school programs discouraged parents who might otherwise have become involved in LA COPS programming. Moreover, with the end of grant funding in sight, LA COPS site coordinators de-emphasized or discontinued efforts to involve parents in after-school programming.

Two sites were able to achieve some modest success in the area of parent involvement. For example, the College Corner coordinator at Wilson has been able to provide college financial aid workshops to approximately 500 parents, according to the College Corner coordinator. At San Pedro, staff have reported an increase in phone calls received from parents inquiring on their child's participation in after-school tutoring. One tutor interviewed stated that she witnessed no fewer than three phone calls received by teachers from concerned parents about their child's

progress, and received no less than 10 students per day requiring signatures and time verification for the parent’s desire to monitor their kid’s whereabouts.

Safety

As outlined in the 21st Century grant application, the five LA COPS high schools are located in urban communities of Los Angeles that struggle with high crime, gang activity, and socio-economic hardship. To varying degrees, all LA COPS programs made progress in creating safe campus environments after-school, free of violence and drugs for students and the community to enjoy.

Safety and security at LA COPS sites has been enhanced by coordination of campus security personnel. Each site has arranged for security to oversee LA COPS programs after-school, either funded by LA COPS or the school itself.

Two schools, Monroe and Wilson, received a supplementary Community Policing grant that provides money for additional school and city police patrols. Reseda has also worked directly with the local police division to increase patrols after-school and thus increase the safety of the neighborhood environment. Sites report an increased community presence linked to improved perceptions of high school campus safety. In particular, elementary and middle school students are more likely to be on campus after-school since the inception of LA COPS.

Survey results (see Section IV) and on-site interviews confirm that students and staff at LA COPS sites feel safe after-school. Moreover, staff and student participants feel that LA COPS has brought new life to the school campus after-school. Buildings that were once off limits now house tutoring, academic enrichment, and extracurricular classes. On two sites, old facilities have been completely renovated to house a Zone (Dorsey) and Fitness Center (Monroe). The presence on campus of staff, student athletes, and school leaders has contributed to a safer atmosphere overall.

Although it is difficult to posit a cause-and-effect relationship, juvenile arrests have declined in the areas surrounding all five LA COPS sites since 1999 according to Los Angeles Police Department statistics (see Table 3.2).

Table 3.2: Net Change in Juvenile Arrests in Surrounding LAPD Districts (1999-2001)

School	Part I Crimes ⁸	Part II Crimes ⁹	Total--All Offenses
Dorsey	-10.93%	-9.65%	-13.07%
Monroe	-17.03%	-47.32%	-39.14%
Reseda	-35.48%	-42.50%	-38.37%
San Pedro	-19.06%	-12.96%	-5.81%
Wilson	-12.77%	-33.96%	-30.98%

⁸ Part I crimes include homicide, assault with a deadly weapon, and robbery.

⁹ Part II crimes include battery, chemical substance abuse, property crimes, destructive devices, loitering/trespassing, weapon possession, and sex offenses.

In addition, four of the five high schools (Monroe, Reseda, San Pedro, and Wilson) have also shown substantial declines in on-campus crimes since 1999. Table 3.3 shows the decline of juvenile arrests on school site from 1998-1999 school year to the 2001-2002 school year. Please consult Appendix E for detailed crime data.

Table 3.3: Net Change in Juvenile Arrests by School Site (1998-2001)

School	Total--All Offenses
Dorsey	25.60%
Monroe	-21.10%
Reseda	-83.80%
San Pedro	-49.50%
Wilson	-72.50%

Accountability and Sustainability

In preparation for the cessation of outside funding, each LA COPS site is taking steps to sustain after-school programming over the longer term. Sites are also working to improve internal evaluation and accountability, primarily through more systematic record keeping tied to program attendance.

Securing Outside Funds

All LA COPS sites have endeavored to secure additional outside funding to continue program services after the 21st Century grant terminates. For example, some sites have obtained outside grants for increased security and/or technology. Other sites have developed community and business resources that provide services and work-place learning opportunities for students. Still others have built relationships with local businesses and community organizations to fund supplies and scholarships for students. Coordinators and staff have been proactive in increasing exposure of Zone services to surrounding community organizations and businesses, so that funds generated by site-based copying can be used to continue after-school programming.

Nonetheless, sites have been largely unsuccessful in securing sufficient outside funding to ensure program sustainability. Zone revenues, while improving, will not cover the costs of continuing after-school services in their present form. Similarly, existing outside grants will not be sufficient to continue the current level of programming.

Improving Program Accountability

During 2002-2003, several LA COPS sites made improvements in recording and monitoring the number of after-school participants. These sites have done a much better job of holding students and teachers more accountable for gathering attendance data by providing sign-in sheets and developing consistent attendance procedures. However, significant efforts are still needed to ensure accurate and comprehensive documenting of student attendance within each LA COPS activity.

Indeed, increasing and accounting for program attendance is the key area where LA COPS sites continue to need improvement. As described in Section II of this report, student participation in after-school programs is low relative to school enrollment and tends to be infrequent rather than regular.

Additionally, shared accountability for the success of LA COPS program has been elusive at most sites. Low levels of school linkages resulted in a high degree of program isolation for LA COPS from school-wide initiatives. As mentioned earlier, only one site has a formal student referral process in place, and is the same site that incorporated LA COPS programs into the school-wide initiative for improving student achievement. While improvements have been made to the system for tracking student attendance, larger school buy-in is needed to bridge the gap between after-school services and the regular school day.

IV. Survey Findings

In addition to the surveys of English teachers described in Section IV, PW designed and administered surveys to after-school program staff (instructors, tutors, and site coordinators) and participating students grades 9-12. These surveys were used to collect information on program awareness and implementation. This section of the report focuses on survey data collected from LA COPS staff members and students.

Survey Methods

Surveys of program staff were distributed by the coordinator at each site and returned to a confidential collection point during Spring 2002 and Spring 2003. As shown in Table 4.1, of the 75 surveys distributed to program staff in 2003, 44 were received reflecting a response rate of 59%. This was a similar response rate to that achieved in Spring 2002. However, staff surveys were collected from four of the five LA COPS sites in 2003 compared to all five sites in 2002.¹⁰

Table 4.1: Program Staff Survey Response Rates, Spring 2002 and 2003

School	Spring 2002			Spring 2003		
	Completed Surveys	Distributed Surveys	Response Rate	Completed Surveys	Distributed Surveys	Response Rate
Dorsey	10	20	50%	0	15	0%
Monroe	11	20	55%	10	15	67%
Reseda	9	20	45%	10	15	67%
San Pedro	15	20	75%	14	15	93%
Wilson	15	20	75%	10	15	67%
Total	60	100	60%	44	75	59%

It is important to note that the after-school program staff surveyed in 2002 and 2003 represent separate survey samples. In other words, the same individuals were not necessarily surveyed in both years. Instead, all program staff employed at the time of the survey administration were included. A copy of the staff survey and results for 2003 are included in Appendix B.

In Spring 2002, student surveys were distributed by program staff during regularly scheduled LA COPS activities and classes in late May and early June. Of the 1,676 surveys distributed¹¹, 828 were received reflecting a response rate of 49.4% (see Table 4.2 below). For Spring 2003, after-school program staff distributed student surveys during regularly scheduled LA COPS activities and classes in April. Based on the average weekly attendance of students at the five sites in 2001-2002, 1,255 surveys were distributed.¹² Of these, 769 were received reflecting a response rate of 61.3% (see Table 4.2 below). As in the case of after-school program staff, these

¹⁰ No after-school program staff surveys were collected from Dorsey High School.

¹¹ The number of student surveys distributed was based on combined estimates of weekly student attendance based on database records from the five LA COPS sites.

¹² Average weekly attendance was computed by computing figures from the attendance database using selected week in January 2002 and 2003 that was representative of an average week of program attendance.

surveyed groups represent two separate samples rather than the same student surveyed over two years. A copy of the student survey and results for 2003 are included in Appendix C.

Table 4.2: Student Survey Response Rates, Spring 2002 and 2003

School	2002			2003		
	Completed Surveys	Avg. Weekly Population	Response Rate	Completed Surveys	Avg. Weekly Population	Response Rate
Dorsey	151	259	58.3%	87	102	85.3%
Monroe	64	269	23.8%	108	160	67.5%
Reseda	247	572	43.2%	218	451	48.3%
San Pedro	226	288	78.5%	162	186	87.0%
Wilson	140	288	48.6%	194	356	54.5%
Total	828	1676	49.4%	769	1255	61.3%

In Spring 2002, surveys to parents were sent home with students with instructions to return completed surveys to program staff and/or directly to the program coordinator on-site. Program staff that received parent surveys were instructed to forward them to the coordinator. Of the 2513 surveys distributed to an estimated parent population, 154 were received reflecting a response rate of 6.1% (see Table 4.3). This is an extremely low response rate, substantially below the 20%-30% that the evaluation had hoped to achieve. Due to low response rates achieved in 2002, parent surveys were not distributed in 2003. A copy of the parent survey and results for 2002 are included in Appendix D.

Table 4.3: Parent Survey Response Rates, 2002 only

School	Completed Surveys	Parent Population ¹³	Response Rate
Dorsey	6	388	1.5%
Monroe	8	403	2.0%
Reseda	85	858	9.9%
San Pedro	45	432	10.4%
Wilson	10	432	2.3%
Total	154	2513	6.1%

Interpreting Survey Results

The surveys function as a window into stakeholders’ perceptions of the LA COPS program in five major areas (Academic Intervention, Extracurricular Enrichment, School-to-Career, Parent/Community Involvement, and Safety/Security) covered on both the staff and student surveys. In addition to these five areas shared in common, program staff were asked to respond to items in the areas of School Linkages, Evaluation and Accountability, and Sustainability.

¹³ The number of surveys distributed to parents was based upon formula of [(Average Student Weekly Population) * (1.5)]

For most of the survey items respondents were asked to respond to statements based on a Likert Scale (4=Strongly Agree, 3=Agree, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree). Respondents could also reply with “Don’t Know.” Mean (average) scores were calculated for each of the areas of the survey based on responses. Overall mean scores reflect an average level of satisfaction, agreement, and/or understanding of LA COPS and its programs amongst those surveyed. Mean scores above 3.0 indicate a high level of agreement with the survey items in a given category. Survey items with a mean of 2.5 or below indicate areas where respondents are less positive.

In comparing survey results from 2002 to 2003, it is important to note that the survey respondents are not necessarily the same individuals. Turnover in after-school program staff, as well as changes among student participants, limit our ability to directly compare the survey results over time. For example, of students surveyed during April 2003, only 38% stated they participated in LA COPS the previous year. Further, less than one-fifth of the students surveyed had participated in LA COPS for more than six months (19%), with the 22% attending only one to two months prior to the survey administration. In addition, cuts in extracurricular programs at several sites resulted in a high level of turnover among instructors working in LA COPS.

Program Staff Survey Results

As with 2002 program staff surveyed, a majority of April 2003 program staff surveyed serve in tutoring (68%) and/or homework assistance (43%) programs. Further, staff primarily work two (32%) or three (23%) days per week. Over half (59%) of program staff in 2003 reported seeing only 1-20 different students each week.

Overall Results

As shown in Table 4.4a, LA COPS staff members have consistently rated Academic Intervention and Safety highly. Similarly, LA COPS staff have given the lowest ratings to School-to-Career opportunities available after-school. At the same time, School-to-Career is the area where staff ratings increased most between 2002 and 2003. Substantial changes were also seen in staff perceptions of Safety (positive) and Parent/Community Involvement (negative).

Table 4.4a: Area Mean Scores by Year

Survey Area	2002 (n=59)	2003 (n=44)	Change
Academic Intervention	3.44	3.53	+.09
Extracurricular Enrichment	2.38	2.38	+0.0
School to Career	1.86	2.06	+.20
Parent/Community Involvement	2.46	2.33	-.13
Safety	3.34	3.47	+.13

Some areas of the Program Staff Survey do not have corresponding links in the Student Survey. These areas are School Linkages, Evaluation & Accountability and Sustainability. Notwithstanding the program implementation results presented in

Section III, after-school program staff rated Evaluation & Accountability high in both years, with less positive (but still high) ratings for School Linkages (see Table 4.4b). In both years, program staff rated Sustainability low. Nonetheless, staff perceptions of the program increased in most areas covered by the survey.

Table 4.4b: Area Mean Scores by Year

Survey Area	2002 (n=59)	2003 (n=44)	Change
School Linkages	2.58	2.73	+.15
Evaluation & Accountability	2.85	3.03	+.18
Sustainability	1.83	2.04	+.21

In the section below, we present selected survey items with the percentage of respondents reporting “agree” or “strongly agree” in order to further elucidate the summary presented above.

Academic Intervention

Survey responses in Table 4.5 suggest that instructors, tutors, and other staff serving in the LA COPS program are largely satisfied with the accessibility of academic intervention options after-school hours. It is important to note that many of the LA COPS programs expanded and/or gave greater emphasis to staffing of academic intervention and support offerings in 2002-2003. This may explain the staff’s more positive ratings between 2002 and 2003.

Table 4.5: Academic Intervention (% Agree and Strongly Agree)

Survey Item	2002 (n=59)	2003 (n=44)	Change
LA COPS provides courses and opportunities for students to improve academic skills	93.2% (n=55)	90.9% (n=40)	-2.3%
Students who need assistance completing homework can do so during LA COPS.	88.2% (n=52)	95.3% (n=41)	+7.1%
Students who need individualized tutoring can get needs met during LA COPS.	84.8% (n=50)	91.7% (n=39)	+6.9%

Extracurricular Activities

Staff ratings of extracurricular activities while high, are well below the high ratings given to Academic Intervention. In fact, program staff tended to be most positive about extracurricular activities with a link to the augmentation or reinforcement of academic skills (see Table 4.6). By contrast, smaller percentages of staff feel that LA COPS is meeting the non-academic aspects of youth development. These findings parallel the fact that many LA COPS programs cut extracurricular programs and activities during the final year of the grant. With declining availability of funding, most programs opted to allocate resources to academic support often at the expense of other extracurricular activities offered after-school.

Table 4.6: Extracurricular Enrichment (% Agree and Strongly Agree)

Survey Item	2002 (n=59)	2003 (n=44)	Change
LA COPS provides extracurricular options that augment and reinforce student academic skills and learning.	69.4% (n=41)	73.8% (n=37)	+4.4%
LA COPS provides extracurricular options to meet students' emotional and social needs.	64.4% (n=38)	59.5% (n=25)	-4.9%
LA COPS provides extracurricular options that benefit student leadership skills.	57.6% (n=34)	59.5% (n=25)	-1.9%

It is important to note that a large proportion (nearly one-third) of respondents answered “Don’t Know” to a majority of the survey items for Extracurricular Activities suggesting a low level of awareness about what kinds of extracurricular options are available to students outside of the regular school day.

School-to-Career

Staff survey results support the premise that School to Career opportunities are limited and do not encompass a large cross section of the population of students participating in LA COPS. School to Career remained the lowest rated component among staff (2.06) (see Table 4.7). Although there was some improvement between 2002 and 2003 in terms of staff perceptions of career-based programming available through the Zones, survey items on the degree of career and postsecondary preparation via LA COPS did not get high ratings (see Table 4.7 below). Additionally, one-third of respondents answered “Don’t Know” to survey items, indicating a lack of awareness regarding how LA COPS provides students with opportunities for career and college preparation.

Table 4.7: School to Career (% Agree and Strongly Agree)

Survey Item	2002 (n=59)	2003 (n=44)	Change
LA COPS promotes student exposure to the world of work and future careers	64.4% (n=38)	61.0% (n=25)	-3.4%
LA COPS promotes student preparation for postsecondary education.	74.4% (n=44)	68.3% (n=28)	-6.1%

School Linkages

When asked about awareness for the LA COPS program among staff and students at their host schools, after-school staff were most positive that teachers and counselors are informed about LA COPS (see Table 4.8). Staff were decidedly less positive about the referral processes used to encourage student participation in LA COPS. Nearly one-quarter (27%) of respondents said that they were unaware of the process or set of procedures for referring students to LA COPS. The lack of firm connections for referring students to after-school tutoring and other support services is buttressed by the fact that all but one of the LA COPS sites rely upon informal mechanisms for student referral to after-school programming.

Table 4.8: Staff Respondents Assessment of School Linkages (% Agree and Strongly Agree vs. Don't Know)

Survey Item	2002 (n=59)		2003 (n=44)	
	Agree	Don't Know	Agree	Don't Know
Most teachers are aware of services and options available through LA COPS.	83.1% (n=49)	10.2% (n=6)	79.6% (n=35)	9.1% (n=4)
Most counselors are aware of services and options available through LA COPS.	86.5% (n=51)	10.2% (n=6)	84.1% (n=37)	9.1% (n=4)
Most high school students are aware of services and options available through LA COPS.	76.2% (n=45)	13.6% (n=8)	72.7% (n=32)	11.4% (n=5)
There is a clear process or set of procedures for referring high school students to LA COPS.	59.3% (n=35)	25.4% (n=15)	59.1% (n=26)	27.3% (n=12)

Parent and Community Involvement

As shown in Table 4.9, after-school program staff agree that parents have knowledge of LA COPS programs and services. Moreover, many more staff members noted that parents are aware of these services in 2003 compared to 2002. However, program staff are less optimistic about the level of communication to parents regarding participation in LA COPS. Given that most respondents were staff for tutoring and homework assistance activities, this low level of feedback given to parents is indicative of the lack of linkages between after-school programming and the regular school day.

Table 4.9: Parent and Community Involvement (% Agree and Strongly Agree)

Survey Item	2002 (n=59)	2003 (n=44)	Change
Parents of participating students know what services and opportunities exist as part of LA COPS.	54.2% (n=32)	71.4% (n=30)	+17.2
Parents of participating students receive information about student progress in the LA COPS program.	42.4% (n=25)	42.8% (n=18)	+0.4

Safety

Safety remained one of the highest rated components of the LA COPS program for program staff in 2002 and 2003 (see Table 4.10). Based on the survey results, it appears that student behavior is not a safety or security issue after school. During interviews, staff surveyed stated that they feel safe working in the LA COPS program.

Table 4.10: Safety (% Agree and Strongly Agree)

Survey Item	2002 (n=59)	2003 (n=44)	Change
LA COPS provides a safe environment.	96.6% (n=57)	97.7% (n=42)	+1.1%
The facilities of the school are secure during after-school hours.	84.7% (n=50)	88.4% (n=38)	+3.7%
Safety and securing personnel are visible during after-school hours.	79.7% (n=47)	86.1% (n=37)	+6.4%

Evaluation & Accountability

The survey also included items for program staff to respond to regarding program goals, data collection, and overall program accountability. As shown in Table 4.11, the vast majority of after-school program staff understand program goals, objectives, and accountability measures. Establishment of a revised attendance data collection system at each site during 2002-2003 may have contributed in the increase of staff perception of attendance procedures.

Table 4.11: Staff Respondents Assessment of Evaluation and Accountability (% Agree and Strongly Agree vs. Don't Know)

Survey Item	2002 (n=59)		2003 (n=44)	
	Agree	Don't Know	Agree	Don't Know
As a staff person, I understand what I am held accountable for.	96.6% (n=57)	3.4% (n=2)	88.6% (n=39)	11.4% (n=5)
Clear procedures are in place for collecting data on student attendance.	88.1% (n=52)	8.5% (n=5)	93.2% (n=41)	6.8% (n=3)
Most staff understand the goals and objectives of the LA COPS program.	81.3% (n=48)	15.3% (n=9)	84.1% (n=37)	4.5% (n=2)
Clear procedures are in place for collecting data on student achievement.	49.1% (n=28)	32.2% (n=19)	59.1% (n=26)	15.9% (n=7)

A bigger issue, however, may rest with the fact that LA COPS staff are largely unaware of the achievement data that is collected, reported to the federal government, and used to hold the program accountable. Indeed, survey responses largely indicate that staff believe they understand program goals and objectives. However, attendance and achievement data collected do not support staff assertions regarding levels of student participation in the program and achievement benefits for these students. In addition, student achievement results linked to LA COPS accountability have not been shared with most after-school staff.

Sustainability

The last part of the staff survey asked staff respondents about plans for sustainability beyond the federal funding cycle. Based on the survey responses (see Table 4.12)

and on-site interviews, some staff are aware that the program is in need of securing funds to sustain programming. However, the large number of “Don’t Know” responses is evident. Based on interviews with after-school program staff, awareness of sustainability efforts is generally limited to the site coordinator and Zone manager.

Table 4.12: Staff Respondents Assessment of Sustainability (% Agree and Strongly Agree vs. Don’t Know)

Survey Item	2002 (n=59)		2003 (n=44)	
	Agree	Don’t Know	Agree	Don’t Know
Program staff is working on a plan for continuation of the program when grant funding ceases.	49.1% (n=29)	49.2% (n=29)	59.1% (n=26)	25.0% (n=11)
The LA COPS program has relationships with community and business that lay the foundation for continued program support.	35.6% (n=21)	59.3% (n=35)	29.5% (n=13)	50.0% (n=22)

Student Survey Results

Overall Results

As shown in Table 4.13, students involved in LA COPS were largely positive about most aspects of after-school programming. Looking at the five broad areas covered by the survey, student respondents were most positive about Academic Intervention (3.12) and Safety (3.09) in both years. Nonetheless, students participating in 2002-2003 were less positive about after-school programming compared to students surveyed in the 2001-2002 school year. School to Career was the lowest rated component for both years.

Table 4.13: Area Mean Scores by Year

Survey Area	2002 (n=828)	2003 (n=769)	Change
Academic Intervention	3.25	3.12	-.13
Extracurricular Enrichment	3.21	2.98	-.23
School to Career	3.06	2.58	-.48
Parent/Community Involvement	3.16	2.75	-.41
Safety	3.30	3.09	-.21

In the section below, we present selected survey items with the percentage of respondents reporting “agree” or “strongly agree” in order to further elucidate the summary presented above.

Academic Intervention

Half of all student respondents cited academic need as the primary reason for participating in LA COPS. As shown in Table 4.14, the majority of students surveyed agree that LA COPS has provided opportunities to improve academic skills, complete homework, and receive tutoring. In comparison to 2002, fewer students were positive about the availability of all types of academic assistance provided by LA COPS. These survey results may be linked to the fact that all but one site experienced a reduced level of staffing with a reduction of funding available during the final year of the 21st Century Learning grant.

Table 4.14: Academic Intervention (% Agree and Strongly Agree)

Survey Item	2002 (n=828)	2003 (n=769)	Change
LA COPS provides course and opportunities for students to improve academic skills	82.6% (n=622)	73.2% (n=563)	-9.4%
Students who need assistance completing homework can do so during LA COPS.	77.4% (n=596)	71.3% (n=548)	-6.1%
Students who need individualized tutoring can get needs met during LA COPS.	66.3% (n=504)	60.5% (n=465)	-5.8%

Extracurricular Activities

Less than ten percent (9.8%) of respondents listed an interest in extracurricular activities as their primary reason for attending LA COPS. Nonetheless, the majority of student surveyed reported that extracurricular options aimed at boosting academic skills and learning exist (see Table 4.15). More than half of the after-school student participants surveyed also indicated that extracurricular options available through LA COPS benefit student leadership skills.

Table 4.15: Extracurricular Enrichment (% Agree and Strongly Agree)

Survey Item	2002 (n=828)	2003 (n=769)	Change
LA COPS provides extracurricular options that augment and reinforce student academic skills and learning.	67.2% (n=508)	61.6% (n=474)	-5.6%
LA COPS provides extracurricular options to meet students' emotional and social needs.	58.3% (n=399)	42.2% (n=324)	-16.1%
LA COPS provides extracurricular options that benefit student leadership skills.	61.2% (n=460)	59.1% (n=455)	-2.1%

Students were least positive about extracurricular options linked to emotional and social needs. In both years, this was the lowest rated aspect of extracurricular area. It was also the area where student perceptions show the most change over the two-year period. This finding likely reflects the fact that many LA COPS sites reduced or eliminated many of the extracurricular programs available through LA COPS. At most sites, this was a conscious decision to focus more on academic support, as well as a fiscal imperative due to declining program funds.

School-to-Career

While the majority of students surveyed in 2002 agreed that LA COPS provides students with opportunities to explore and prepare for college and careers, this proportion was significantly lower among students surveyed in 2003 compared to those surveyed in 2002 (see Table 4.16). Data from program observations and the attendance database at each site indicated that School-to-Career activities offered through LA COPS do not involve a large number of students. Student exposure to work-based learning is limited to students working in the Zones and those serving as cross-age and peer tutors. In addition, direct connections to postsecondary education were observed at only one of the five sites.

Table 4.16: School to Career (% Agree and Strongly Agree)

Survey Item	2002 (n=828)	2003 (n=769)	Change
LA COPS promotes student exposure to the world of work and future careers	56.1% (n=425)	45.8% (n=352)	-10.3%
LA COPS promotes student preparation for postsecondary education.	61.5% (n=462)	48.4% (n=372)	-13.1%

Parent and Community Involvement

As shown in Table 4.17, more than half of the after-school student participants surveyed said that their parents are aware of the opportunities that LA COPS provides. Unlike after-school program staff, students participating in LA COPS rated parent awareness lower in 2003 than 2002. Student perceptions may reflect the fact that none of the LA COPS sites developed a formal mechanism for communicating with parents about individual student progress in the after-school program. These results highlight the lack of firm connections between parents and high school after-school programs as well as the lower priority attached to parent involvement in the final year of the grant.

Table 4.17: Parent and Community Involvement (% Agree and Strongly Agree)

Survey Item	2002 (n=828)	2003 (n=769)	Change
Parents of participating students know what services and opportunities exist as part of LA COPS.	61.9% (n=468)	56.1% (n=431)	-5.8%
Parents of participating students receive information about student progress in the LA COPS program.	50.5% (n=378)	38.1% (n=293)	-12.4%

Safety

Students participating in LA COPS have consistently rated safety high. As shown in Table 4.18, the majority of students in both years felt that LA COPS provided a safe learning environment. However, fewer students reported feeling safe after-school in 2003 compared to 2002. These results suggest that schools may need to pay closer attention to safety after-school.

Table 4.18: Safety (% Agree and Strongly Agree)

Survey Item	2002 (n=828)	2003 (n=769)	Change
LA COPS provides a safe environment.	83.2% (n=633)	77.1% (n=593)	-6.1%
The facilities of the school are secure during after-school hours.	70.4% (n=531)	60.6% (n=466)	-9.8%
Safety and securing personnel are visible during after-school hours.	70.4% (n=531)	61.2% (n=471)	-9.2%

Summary of Survey Results

Both LA COPS after-school program staff and participating students give the same overall rankings to the five areas they share in common. In general, staff respondents were more positive about all components of the program compared to student respondents. Nonetheless, staff and students expressed the most satisfaction with Academic Intervention services and Safety during after-school hours. Staff and students largely feel that academic support services are available to students who are willing to take advantage of after-school options. Similarly, the investment in after-school safety succeeded in convincing staff and students that LA COPS provides a safe and secure learning environment outside of school hours, perceptions largely borne out by crime statistics (see Section III).

Both staff and students rated the School-to-Career component of the program lowest. This is unsurprising given the fact that only a small number of students were involved in work-based learning opportunities through the Zones or cross-age/peer tutoring. Moreover, only one LA COPS program formed concrete links to postsecondary education via on-site community college courses. Middle rankings were given to Extracurricular Activities and the Parent/Community Involvement components of LA COPS by both staff and students. These are areas that have declined in priority due to staffing cuts and limited funding for expansion.

V. Achievement Data

A central focus of the 21st Century Learning Center Program is to provide expanded academic enrichment opportunities for children attending low performing schools. Through tutorial services and academic enrichment activities, after-school programs funded by the 21st Century Learning Center Program are intended to improve student achievement.

Student achievement of LA COPS participants was collected in two formats. First, 2000 and 2001 SAT-9 test scores were collected on all LA COPS after-school participants with at least 30 days of after-school attendance in 2001-2002. Standardized test data for frequent 2002-2003 after-school participants will not be available until August or September 2003.¹⁴ Second, teachers of LA COPS participants with at least 10 days of after-school participation in 2001-2002 and/or 2002-2003 were surveyed to gather information on changes to students' grades, classroom performance, and productive academic behaviors (see Appendix D for copy of the teacher survey). Outcome findings obtained from both of these data collection methods are provided in the section below.

Standardized Test Scores

Tables 5.1 and 5.2 reveal how frequent LA COP participants performed on the Math and Reading portions of the SAT-9 in 2001 and 2002.¹⁵ Following Federal annual performance report guidelines, the data presented show how many students achieved within four ranges of performance (quartiles) based on their national percentile rank score.

As shown in Table 5.1, students participating in LA COPS on a frequent basis tended to move from the lowest level of performance (Quartile 1) to the next level of performance (Quartile 2) in mathematics. By contrast, there was very little change among students already achieving above the national average represented by the 50th percentile.

¹⁴ In addition, the standardized test administered in Spring 2003 is the California Achievement Test (CAT-6) rather than the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT-9) in use 1999-2002. Results of the two tests will not be directly comparable as they are based on different norms.

¹⁵ Some caveats affecting availability of data are necessary. First, Federal guidelines require the reporting of data on students with 30 or more days of after-school program attendance. Second, Federal guidelines specify that reporting occur only for students for whom there are two years of standardized test data. Third, the standardized testing program used in California does not test 12th graders (i.e., a student participating in 11th grade in one year would not have test data the following year to include in outcome reporting). Taking these factors into account, the total number of 2001-2002 LA COPS students with outcome data to report was only 115 students across five sites. With such small numbers of students, it is difficult to draw conclusions regarding the effectiveness of LA COPS on student achievement.

Table 5.1: Math SAT-9, Number of Frequent LA COPS participants by quartile

	Quartile 1: 0-25 th percentile		Quartile 2: 26th-50 th percentile		Quartile 3: 51st-75 th percentile		Quartile 4: 76th-99 th percentile	
	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Dorsey (n=13)	5	5	3	6	4	1	1	1
Monroe (n=14)	4	1	1	5	6	4	3	4
Reseda (n=42)	18	10	9	17	9	8	7	8
San Pedro (n=16)	2	3	4	2	5	5	5	6
Wilson (n=29)	12	5	8	9	5	11	4	4
Total (n=115)	41	24	25	39	29	29	20	23

The results shown in Table 5.2 are based on very low numbers of students making it impossible to draw definitive conclusions about the impact of after-school participation on student achievement. Using the 2002 data reported to the U.S. Department of Education according to guidelines for the 21st Century Learning Centers program, the data indicate that less progress was made among after-school participants in Reading. Students achieving in the Quartile 1 tended to remain at this low level of achievement. No shifts occurred that would indicate that low performing students moved to higher levels of achievement. Instead, students at the higher levels of performance (i.e., Quartile 3) made additional progress between 2001 and 2002.

Table 5.2: Reading SAT-9, Number of Frequent LA COPS participants by quartile

	Quartile 1: 0-25 th percentile		Quartile 2: 26th-50 th percentile		Quartile 3: 51st-75 th percentile		Quartile 4: 76th-99 th percentile	
	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Dorsey (n=13)	6	6	4	5	3	1	0	1
Monroe (n=14)	3	2	6	5	2	3	2	3
Reseda (n=42)	30	27	4	9	7	4	6	7
San Pedro (n=16)	3	5	6	5	6	3	2	4
Wilson (n=29)	15	19	9	5	4	4	2	2
Total (n=115)	57	59	29	29	22	15	12	17

Outcome Data Collected from Teachers

In order to collect outcome data for LA COPS participants other than standardized test scores, the evaluation surveyed teachers of students with at least 10 days of after-school participation. The 10-day benchmark was used in hopes that these students would reach the 30-day attendance “regular” requirement set by the Federal government by the end of the school year.¹⁶

Lists were generated of 2001-2002 LA COPS participants with ten or more days of after-school attendance between July 1, 2001 and March 31, 2002. The English teachers of these students were surveyed in Spring 2002. For 2002-2003 after-school participants, English teachers were surveyed in February 2003 if the student participated in after-school programs or activities at least ten times between July 1, 2002 and January 17, 2003. Teachers were asked to rate each student included on the survey. Specifically, teachers were asked to note changes in the following:

Academic Performance

- Level of performance (below, at, or above grade level)
- Changes in academic grades (increased, decreased, stayed the same)
- Classroom performance satisfactory or better (yes, no)

Classroom Behaviors

- Being attentive in class (yes, no)
- Behaving well in class (yes, no)
- Participating in class (yes, no)
- Volunteering for extra credit or responsibilities (yes, no)
- Attending class (yes, no)
- Coming to school ready and prepared to learn (yes, no)

Homework

- Turning in homework on time (yes, no)
- Completing homework to satisfaction (yes, no)

Surveys of English teachers were distributed by the coordinator at each site and returned to confidential collection point. As shown in Table 5.3a, of the 152 teachers surveyed in 2002, 142 returned completed surveys for a response rate of 93%. Further, of the 245 students included in the 2002 surveys, data was collected on 200 students, for a response rate of 82%.

¹⁶ For 2001-2002 LA COPS participants, teacher survey data reported to the U.S. Department of Education included only those students who reached the 30-day attendance requirement by July 1, 2002.

Table 5.3a: English Teacher Survey Response Rates, 2002

School	# Teachers Completing Surveys	Teacher Surveys Distributed	Response Rate	# of Students for whom we collected data	# Students included in Surveys	Response Rate
Dorsey	22	23	95.7%	19	24	79.2%
Monroe	45	49	91.8%	22	42	52.4%
Reseda	31	33	93.9%	79	86	91.9%
San Pedro	23	26	88.5%	23	36	63.9%
Wilson	21	21	100.0%	57	57	100.0%
Total	142	152	93.4%	200	245	81.6%

As shown in Table 5.3b, of the 108 teachers surveyed in 2003, 95 returned completed surveys for a response rate of 88%. Further, of the 333 students included in the surveys during 2003, data was collected on 280 students, for a response rate of 84%.

Table 5.3b: English Teacher Survey Response Rates, 2003

School	# Teachers Completing Surveys	Teacher Surveys Distributed	Response Rate	# of Students for whom we collected data	# of Students included in Surveys	Response Rate
Dorsey	9	9	100%	20	20	100.0%
Monroe	28	29	96.6%	55	57	96.5%
Reseda	18	27	66.7%	79	123	64.2%
San Pedro	21	22	95.5%	57	63	90.5%
Wilson	19	21	90.5%	63	70	90.0%
Total	95	108	88.0%	280	333	84.1%

Student Grades

As shown in Table 5.4, more than 70% of students attending LA COPS regularly in 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 performed at or above grade level in their English class according to English teachers surveyed.

Table 5.4: Grade Level Performance in English (Number of Students by Category)

	2001-2002			2002-2003		
	Below	At	Above	Below	At	Above
Dorsey	5	12	2	3	13	4
Monroe	3	15	4	26	27	4
Reseda	26	19	30	16	27	26
San Pedro	6	9	8	11	27	17
Wilson	17	27	12	11	26	22
Total	57	82	56	67	120	73

As shown in Table 5.5, slightly more than half of the students improved their English grade among both 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 regular LA COPS participants (56% and 60%, respectively). Overall, very few students had teacher-reported decreases in English grades.

Table 5.5: Change in English Grade (Number of Students by Category)

	2001-2002			2002-2003		
	Increased	Decreased	No Change	Increased	Decreased	No Change
Dorsey	7	1	10	13	0	5
Monroe	7	2	8	32	7	15
Reseda	52	4	23	56	2	20
San Pedro	13	2	7	27	3	25
Wilson	26	4	20	25	0	26
Total	105	13	68	153	12	91

Impact on Student Classroom Behaviors and Performance

As shown in Table 5.6, teachers tended to rate LA COPS student participants highly for the entire battery of survey items regarding classroom academic performance, behaviors and completion of homework.¹⁷ Teachers of approximately 80% of all regular LA COPS attendees noted that improvements had occurred in both 2002 and 2003.

Table 5.6: English Teacher Ratings of Classroom Behavior and Homework

	2002	2003
Had classroom academic performance that was satisfactory or better	82.4% (n=154)	77.0% (n=214)
Improved in turning in his/her homework on time	79.8% (n=146)	76.4% (n=210)
Improved in completing homework to your satisfaction	76.8% (n=142)	79.1% (n=219)
Improved in participating in class	76.8% (n=142)	81.6% (n=226)
Improved in volunteering (e.g., for extra credit or more responsibilities)	63.2% (n=115)	63.3% (n=169)
Improved in attending class regularly	87.7% (n=150)	80.9% (n=208)
Improved in being attentive in class	79.9% (n=139)	81.5% (n=211)
Improved in behaving well in class	80.7% (n=138)	81.9% (n=208)
Improved in coming to school ready/prepared to learn	79.7% (n=137)	83.1% (n=221)
Improved in getting along well with other students	82.4% (n=140)	85.8% (n=224)

According to English teachers surveyed, students have improved in coming to school ready and prepared to learn. Students are also showing improvement in

¹⁷ The number of students (n) for individual questions fluctuate due to limited choices for a response to the chart's questions. Since teachers were given only "yes" or "no" answers, many left the questions blank if no change was made. Further, number totals are not consistent across questions due to this same reason. Several teachers added a notation next to blank responses to provide this explanation.

getting along with their peers. A majority of students continued to improve on turning in homework on time, as well as completing it to the satisfaction of the English teachers surveyed. Several teachers noted that the improvement of submitting homework regularly attributed in to improvements in students' grades. Improvements in volunteering (e.g., taking on extra credit or additional responsibilities) received the lowest teacher rating for both years of the survey.

Achievement Data Summary

Student Achievement and Performance. Overall, teachers report that grades for 30-day or more attendees mostly improved or stayed the same. In each of the last two school years, there has been general improvement in students' grades. Moreover, teachers noted that the majority of students regularly participating in LA COPS were achieving at or above grade level.

Mixed results were seen from the five sites regarding Math and Reading SAT-9 results. While there was some improvement in Math, Reading scores did not change much from 2000 to 2001 among regular LA COPS participants in 2001-2002 for whom there were available data. Increases in Math may be related to the fact that all LA COPS sites emphasized math tutoring and homework assistance.

Student Behavior and Classroom Participation. Results overall showed a substantial improvement by 30-day attendees across all 5 sites in behaviors reported on by teachers for both 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 LA COPS participants. Teachers observed improvement in students getting along better with their peers, as well as an improvement in attending class regularly and turning in homework on time.

VI. Conclusions and Lessons Learned

Overview of Program Accomplishments and Challenges

In terms of program accomplishments, LA COPS was successful in providing high school students with access to on-site academic tutoring and homework assistance. One site, Wilson High School, was particularly successful in linking after-school tutoring to the regular school day instructional program via a formal student referral mechanism. LA COPS also succeeded in providing students with access to work-based learning opportunities designed to help students explore a career focus and clarify postsecondary goals. In addition, all sites now have a functioning Zone that is providing a beneficial service for school staff and increasingly links these high schools to surrounding businesses and community organizations. Lastly, four of the five LA COPS sites witnessed a significant decline in both on-campus and community crime.

LA COPS was less successful in establishing the kind of firm school linkages needed to create a “seamless” day connecting after-school programming to the regular school day’s instructional program. This is clearest in the low level of regular student participation after-school relative to overall school enrollment. Parent Involvement proved to be an on-going challenge. Similarly, efforts to harness community resources and seek out additional financial resources have not guaranteed the sustainability of after-school programs at LA COPS sites.

Key Findings

- **The typical regular LA COPS student attendee was one who possessed initiative to attend activities voluntarily.**

Data on LA COPS attendance illustrates that there were not large numbers of regular student participants in LA COPS. Although the last two years have seen more students participating at most sites, the numbers of regular attendees remained low given the overall size of each high school. Students who had an active desire to improve their academic achievement through tutoring and homework assistance were the primary attendees of LA COPS programs. Athletes participating in weight training were the most typical attendees of after-school extracurricular activities. Similarly, the students participating in School-to-Career activities offered after-school comprised a narrow subset of students.

With only one site employing a formal referral process for low achieving students, organized efforts to recruit students based on identified academic needs were absent. Most sites relied primarily on word-of-mouth to promote after-school program. Therefore, the typical regular LA COPS student attendee was one who possessed initiative to attend activities voluntarily and/or was already enrolled in a specialized program that could be augmented via participation in LA COPS.

- **Stronger school linkages are necessary to increase regular student participation in academic support services available through LA COPS.**

There were not strong linkages with the regular school day at most LA COPS sites. Clearly, there are challenges involved in inducing high school students to participate in academic services and support after-school. However, only one LA COPS site developed a formal teacher referral system that targeted students for after-school participation based on academic performance and followed up to ensure that students participated. Instead, most programs advertised after-school tutoring and relied on teachers or counselors to refer needy students. Most typically, students referred themselves to tutoring. As a result, student participation in academic intervention services ebbed and flowed based on grading periods.

In addition, low levels of attendance limited the kinds of academic support and intervention that could be provided in an after-school setting. With students attending once or twice per week on their own volition, instructors had few incentives to develop a structured curriculum to target academic skills. Toward the end of the grant, more sites began to suggest that students take advantage of tutoring assistance after-school in order to successfully pass the California High School Exit Exam. However these efforts to tie LA COPS to the regular day instructional program did not evolve into the establishment of mandatory classes or after-school modules extended over several weeks to address academic weaknesses in math or language arts. As a result, these efforts were unsuccessful in boosting the numbers of regular (i.e., 30 or more day) attendees.

- **Lack of large-scale regular student participation in LA COPS limits our ability to discern any systematic academic impact accruing from student participation in LA COPS.**

Due to the small number of regular after-school participants, it is impossible to determine whether LA COPS succeeded in raising student achievement. Put another way, an insufficient number of students were impacted by the program to generalize the academic impact of participation in after-school programming.

Data from students' English teachers suggests that the benefits of participation in LA COPS were more behavioral than academic. According to English teachers, the majority of students improved in an array of classroom behaviors indirectly related to improved classroom performance such as regular classroom attendance, turning in homework, and paying attention in class. However, the data collected from teachers suggests many of the students attending LA COPS were already achieving grade level standards in English/language arts.

- **Program offerings were based on available school, community, and human resources.**

At the inception of LA COPS, students were surveyed to collect data on their areas of interest in order to design after-school programming around student needs. While key areas of student interest were identified, the establishment of programs was ultimately contingent upon securing staff willing to supervise the program. At most sites, academic tutoring received priority for staffing. However, tutors were not always available to assist students in subject areas other than mathematics despite expressed student demand. With regards to enrichment activities, students interviewed stated a desire to have more opportunities to earn elective credits required for high school graduation during after-school hours. Instead, LA COPS sites tended to offer extracurricular activities in the arts or technology staffed by an interested teacher. Many of these classes served only a small number of regular after-school participants. With the sunset of grant funds, many of the extracurricular courses were eliminated in order to maintain tutoring after-school.

- **LA COPS was successful in providing students with access to work-based learning opportunities. Nonetheless, the School-to-Career component received less priority within the larger design of LA COPS.**

LA COPS provided some students with work-based learning opportunities. Students employed by the Zones received hands-on experience in running a business. Similarly, students employed as peer and cross-age tutors were able to learn about the education field firsthand. Although these connections between after-school programming and career/postsecondary education at LA COPS sites were promising, after-school program staff and students participating in LA COPS were least likely to rate the School-to-Career component of after-school program positively. By and large, it is hard to escape the conclusion that the School-to-Career connection was marginalized within a larger context of tutoring and extracurricular activities at LA COPS sites. In addition, other than the relationship that each Zone enjoys with the on-site Regional Occupational Program (ROP), LA COPS sites have not established linkages with existing career-oriented academies on their host high school campuses.

- **LA COPS was successful in involving community partners. Involving parents proved to be an on-going challenge.**

Sustained parent involvement in LA COPS never took hold in the program. While survey results indicated a high level of parental awareness of programs, large-scale parental participation in LA COPS was limited to a few events at two of the sites. LA COPS sites were more successful in engaging the larger community, particularly in publicity and support for the Zones. Outreach to local chambers of commerce have been successful in generating business for the Zones. Similarly, sites with cross-age tutoring programs succeeded in raising the profile of the high school as a provider of community service. Several sites also succeeded in integrating a community partner as the instructor or provider of extracurricular programming.

- **LA COPS programs have been key to cultivating and maintaining campus safety after school for staff and students after school.**

Survey results overwhelmingly indicate that students and staff feel safe on campus after school. LA COPS contributed to efforts in securing this safety by not only increasing student and staff presence after school, but also securing funding for additional safety staff and patrols. Crime data collected support the improvement of safety surrounding the campuses. Although not necessarily a cause-and-effect relationship, juvenile arrests have declined in the areas surrounding all five LA COPS sites since 1999 according to Los Angeles Police Department statistics. In addition, four of the five high schools have also shown declines in on-campus crimes between 1999 and 2002.

- **Sustainability is uncertain at all LA COPS sites.**

During the fourth and last year of the 21st Century Learning Centers program grant, most sites significantly scaled back extracurricular programming, focusing on Zone operations and after-school tutoring. However, these services may not be sustainable due to the lack of firm school linkages evident at most LA COPS sites.

Work to secure outside funding has been limited to the LA COPS coordinator, and to some extent the Zone manager, individuals who often lack the time to devote to development and sustainability. Despite some success in obtaining outside funding to maintain after-school programs and services, the amounts that have been secured are insufficient to sustain LA COPS in its present form. Most typically, schools are leveraging existing resources such as Title I funds to sustain discrete aspects of their after-school programs.

In sum, all LA COPS sites face daunting challenges in terms of sustaining after-school programming now that funds from the 21st Century Learning Center Program grant are exhausted. The overall decline in state and federal funds available for after school programming has reduced the availability of grant funds for which sites can apply. On site, school budgets have been reduced, leaving little discretionary funding available to support after-school activities.

APPENDIX A:

**Site Visit Guides
and
Observational Protocols**

LA COPS Site Visit Coordinator Protocol

Overall Program Coordination and Management

*Key Question: To what extent has LACOPS programming changed since 2001-02?
Why?*

1. What progress has been made in the program/your particular activity this year?
 - Any program changes?
 - Any scheduling changes?
 - Any staffing changes?
 - Any changes regarding community involvement?
 - Any changes regarding parent/family involvement?
2. If there were changes, what caused the changes?
 - Were the changes in response to identified challenges or barriers?
 - Were the changes in response to suggestions? From whom?
 - Were any of the changes linked to findings from the previous year's evaluation?
3. What were the changes designed to accomplish?
 - Improve student attendance?
 - Improve content of courses?
 - Improve instructional delivery?
 - Improve program coordination?
 - Improve school linkages?
 - Utilize leveraged funds?
 - Improve participation by feeder school students?
 - Improve relationships with community organizations?

4. Any challenges/barriers you have encountered?

Academic Intervention

Key Question: To what extent is LACOPS programming providing academic intervention and instructional support to students who are struggling academically?

Academic Courses

5. Is LACOPS the only academic assistance program provided on campus? If not, how does it differ from other programs?

6. Any progress or changes to academic intervention for 2002-03?

- Staffing changes? Time/Day changes?
- How students are referred to the program?
- Content of intervention/academic assistance courses?

7. What incentives are in place to encourage consistent student attendance? Does the school cooperate with any of these incentives?

8. What kinds of student assessments are used in the LACOPS program? How is this information shared with the regular day teachers?

9. How does your site differentiate between academic intervention and homework assistance and tutoring? Are they seen as separate?

10. Have you experienced any barriers or challenges in providing academic intervention and instructional support?

11. How many students are receiving services? What is preventing you from expanding intervention and support?

12. What additional kinds of courses would you like to see in the LACOPS program?

13. What evidence would you cite to demonstrate the success of academic intervention and/or instructional support programming at your site?

Tutoring/Homework Assistance

14. How do students find their way to after-school tutoring and homework assistance?

15. Have you experienced any barriers or challenges in providing homework assistance and tutoring?

16. How many students are receiving services? What is preventing you from expanding this component of your program?

17. What evidence would you cite to demonstrate the success of homework assistance and/or tutoring?

Extracurricular Enrichment

Key Question: To what extent is LACOPS programming providing extracurricular enrichment activities that meet the needs of students?

18. Is LA COPS the only source of extracurricular enrichment activities provided on campus? If not, how does it differ from other programs?

19. Any progress or changes to extracurricular enrichment for 2002-03?

- Staffing changes? Time/Day changes?
- How students are recruited to the program?
- Content of enrichment courses?

20. What incentives are in place to encourage consistent student attendance? Does the school cooperate with any of these incentives?

21. What drives the “menu” of extracurricular options? To what extent do you solicit feedback from students on what they want? Do staff members have input into what enrichment courses/programs are offered?

22. Have you experienced any barriers or challenges in providing extracurricular and enrichment services?

23. How many students are receiving services? What is preventing you from expanding?

24. What additional kinds of courses would you like to see in the LACOPS program?

25. What evidence would you cite to demonstrate the success of the extracurricular and enrichment component of your program?

School Linkages

Key Questions: To what extent is LACOPS programming linked to the curricular and instructional program offered during the regular school day? How are these connections manifest?

26. How much visibility of LACOPS exists at your school? Do most teachers and other school staff (e.g., counselors) know about LACOPS? How do they know about the program?

27. How does LACOPS get most of its participants? Please describe the recruitment and/or referral process if one exists.

- How do you advertise? Signage? Flyers?
- Do teachers refer? Counselors?
- From whom would you like more cooperation?

28. What kinds of efforts/supplies would be helpful to improving outreach and participant recruitment?

29. What kind of communication is there between LACOPS and regular school day teachers?

- Do you or other LA COPS staff present at faculty meetings? Department meetings?
- Is there an effort to develop center programming that builds on core academic day curricula?

30. What kinds of communication typically occur between you and site administrators?

- What do you talk about?
- How often?

31. Who else is a liaison on-site?

32. In what ways has the school influenced changes in LACOPS?

- Goals and objectives?
- Program content?
- Staffing?

33. What kind of support does the school provide regarding use of facilities? Is the relationship cooperative and open?

- Are there space and facilities problems that need to be addressed?

School to Career

Key Question: What is the benefit of participating in a work-based learning experience in an after school setting?

34. What progress has there been toward opening or enhancing operations of the Connecting Zone?

- How much monthly revenue is the Zone generating?
- Who are its clients?
- How many students are working in the Zone?

35. What about other work-based experiences like job shadowing or internships?

36. In the larger sense, what connections exist between the school and LACOPS in terms of STC efforts and planning?

- How is the ROP coordinator involved?
- Are there any links to other STC efforts (e.g., Perkins, academies, etc.)

37. What connections with local business have been developed to foster career-based experiences and training for students?

- Who connects students to work-based learning opportunities?
- What are the challenges to developing ties to businesses locally?

38. Have connections been made with the community colleges locally to develop career path programming and ties?

Parent/Community Involvement

Key Questions: To what extent are parents informed and connected to after school programming?

39. How much visibility of LACOPS exists in the surrounding community? What do parents and other community members know about LA COPS?

40. How are you addressing the issue of family/parent involvement?

- Do you offer parent education classes?
- Is child care available?
- Are there distance learning opportunities?

41. Has the level of family/parent involvement increased or decreased?

- What specific programs have you designed to develop this involvement?

42. What are the challenges in increasing family involvement?

43. What are the success stories?

Safety

Key Question: Does LACOPS provide a safe and welcoming environment for learning to occur in an extended day setting?

44. How is security for after school program staff and participants provided?

45. What has been done to improve safety on the campus after-school?

46. What are your primary safety issues?

- Transportation to and from the center?
- Lighting?
- Unauthorized persons on campus?

47. Do you believe participants and staff feel comfortable and safe during program hours?

48. How would you improve safety in the after school program?

Evaluation/Accountability

Key Questions: How is the program documenting its success? How would the program “prove” that it is effective to an outside skeptic?

49. What are the biggest challenges to effective attendance and record keeping on student participation?

- Student sign in?
- Instructors turning in forms?
- Utilizing the Access database?
- Backlog of sign in sheets to enter?

50. Have systems improved since last year?

51. Is the 30-day goal for student participation realistic? Why or why not? What could be done to increase the proportion of students participating at least 30 times in a school year?

52. Other than program attendance, what do you think LA COPS should be held accountable for?

53. How would you showcase your success to a curious parent or teacher? How has LACOPS had a positive affect on student achievement, school environment or student behavior?

54. (If technology is a part of the program) How are you tracking progress in student computer literacy? Do you see any change in student computer literacy and the skills required for graduation?

Sustainability

Key Question: What steps have been taken to ensure that the services provided by LACOPS will be extended beyond the grant period?

55. What funds have you leveraged as part of LA COPS (e.g., categorical funds)?

56. What steps have been taken to secure future funding for LACOPS on your site?

- Outside grants?
- Zone revenues?
- In-kind contributions?
- Donations?
- Volunteers?

57. What are the current sources under development?

58. Once the grant monies are exhausted at the end of 2002-2003, what will happen to LA COPS at your site?

- Continue at same level?
- Continue but at a lower level of impact?
- Transform into something else?
- Likely to disappear?

LA COPS 2003 Student Focus Group Protocol

Background of Participants

1. What after-school courses or programs are you involved in?

Academic Intervention _____
Tutoring/Homework Assistance _____
Extracurricular Enrichment _____
School-to-Career/Zone _____
Other _____
Total # participants _____ # Male _____ # Female _____

2. What is your grade level?

Elementary _____ 6th _____ 7th _____ 8th _____ 9th _____ 10th _____ 11th _____ 12th _____

3. How often do you attend after-school activities in a typical week?

Once _____ Twice _____ Three _____ Four _____ Five _____

4. When you are participating in LA COPS, how long do you typically stay?

One Hour _____ Two Hours _____ Three Hours _____

5. Do you attend the same course/program each time?

Yes _____ No _____

6. How long have you been participating in the LA COPS program?

1-3 months _____ 4-6 months _____ 7-12 months _____ Over one year _____

School Linkages

Key Questions: To what extent is LACOPS programming linked to the curricular and instructional program offered during the regular school day? How are these connections manifest?

7. How did you first become involved in the after-school program?

- Referred by teacher?
- Referred by counselor?
- Suggestion from friend?
- To learn about a new interest/area?
- To participate in a fun activity?
- To hang out with friends?
- Exposure to careers/college?

8. What is your primary reason for currently participating in the after-school program?

- Required by teacher or counselor?
- To do better in school?
- To learn about a new interest/area?
- To participate in a fun activity?
- To hang out with friends?
- Exposure to careers/college?

9. What would you be doing if you were not at LA COPS?

10. Do most students at this school know about LA COPS?

- Is the program well advertised on-campus? How? *Probe: signage, announcements, flyers, etc.*
- How do student perceive the program?

11. What might the school do to increase the number of students participating in after-school activities?

Academic Intervention

Key Question: To what extent is LACOPS programming providing academic intervention and instructional support to students who are struggling academically?

12. What subject are you receiving support in?

13. Has participating in academic support after-school helped you in any way?

- Have your grades improved?
- Do you feel like you get along better with peers? teachers? administrators?
- Do you enjoy school more?
- Are you absent less? Tardy less?

14. Do after-school program teachers communicate with your classroom teachers? Would you like them to?

15. What would you do to improve academic services offered during the after-school program?

Tutoring/Homework Assistance

16. What subject are you receiving support in?

17. Has participating in tutoring after-school helped you in any way?

- Have your grades improved?
- Did better on tests/quizzes?
- Do you feel like you get along better with peers? teachers? administrators?
- Do you enjoy school more?
- Are you absent less? Tardy less?

18. Do you regularly participate in after-school tutoring? Probe: seeking long-term assistance or cramming for a short-term goal (i.e., passing an exam)

19. Who typically serves as your tutor? *Probe: student peers, teachers, community members or other adults, etc.*

20. What would you do to improve the tutoring services offered during the after-school program?

Extracurricular Enrichment

Key Question: To what extent is LACOPS programming providing extracurricular enrichment activities that meet the needs of students?

21. Which extracurricular enrichment activities are you involved in?

22. Why did you begin attending your activity? *Probe: new interest or long-standing participation.*

23. Is there any connection between this activity and success in school? Can you pinpoint any academic benefits that might come from participating in this activity?

- Have your grades improved?

24. What other positive things do you gain from participating in this activity?

- Do you feel like you get along better with peers? teachers? administrators?
- Do you enjoy school more?
- Are you absent less? Tardy less?

25. From your perspective, how does the school decide which extracurricular activities to offer after-school? Is there any way for students to voice their preferences?

26. What would you do to improve the extracurricular/enrichment programs offered during the after-school program?

School to Career

Key Question: What is the benefit of participating in a work-based learning experience in an after school setting?

27. How did you get involved in working in the Connecting Zone? What attracted you?

28. Have you ever served as a cross-age tutor (i.e., tutoring younger students)?
29. Apart from the Zone and tutoring, are other jobs for students in the after-school program? *Probe: internships, job shadowing.*
30. Has participating in a work setting after-school helped you in any way?
- Have your grades improved?
 - Do you feel like you get along better with peers? teachers? administrators?
 - Do you enjoy school more?
 - Are you absent less? Tardy less?
31. Are any of your after-school program experiences preparing you for a future job or career? Decide upon an educational path after high school?
32. Would you be interested in after-school programs that helped you learn more about educational or job opportunities?

Parent/Community Involvement

Key Questions: To what extent are parents and/or community members informed and connected to after-school programming?

33. Do you have a parent or other adult family member involved at all in LA COPS?
34. What might encourage your parent(s) or another family member to become involved? *Probe: certain courses, childcare, transportation, etc.*
35. What does your parent(s) know about the LACOPS program? What should they know? *Probe: Courses offered, teachers, etc.*

Safety

Key Question: Does LACOPS provide a safe and welcoming environment for learning to occur in an extended day setting?

Safety

36. Do you feel comfortable and safe attending the program?
37. How would you improve safety in the after-school program? *Probe: transportation, lighting, limiting campus access, additional security personnel, etc.*

**LA COPS 2003
After-School Program Staff Protocol**

Background of Participants

1. What after-school courses or program are you involved in?

Academic Intervention _____
Tutoring/Homework Assistance _____
Extracurricular Enrichment _____
School-to-Career/Zone _____
Clerical _____
Other _____

Total # participants _____

2. Are you a regular school day teacher at this school?

Yes _____ No _____

2a. If yes, which subjects do you teach?

English ____ Math ____ Social Studies ____ Science ____ Other _____

2b. If no, what is your affiliation?

Teacher at other school _____ Community Organization _____ Other (specify)

3. How long have you been working in the LA COPS program?

First year ____ Second year ____ Third year ____ Fourth year ____

Academic Intervention

Key Question: To what extent is LACOPS programming providing academic intervention and instructional support to students who are struggling academically?

4. What academic courses are available after-school?

5. On an average day, how many students are receiving services?

6. Any changes to academic intervention for 2002-03?

- Content of intervention/academic assistance courses?
- Staffing changes? Time/Day changes?

- How students are referred to the program?
- Assessment used?

7. What evidence would you cite to demonstrate the success of academic intervention and/or instructional support programming at your site?

Tutoring/Homework Assistance

8. What tutoring/homework assistance services are available after-school?

9. On an average day, how many students are receiving services?

10. Any changes to tutoring/homework assistance for 2002-03?

- Staffing changes? Time/Day changes?
- How students are referred to the program?

11. What evidence would you cite to demonstrate the success of homework assistance and/or tutoring?

Extracurricular Enrichment

Key Question: To what extent is LACOPS programming providing extracurricular enrichment activities that meet the needs of students?

12. What extracurricular/enrichment programs are available after-school?

13. On an average day, how many students are participating?

14. What drives the “menu” of extracurricular options? To what extent do you solicit feedback from students on what they want? Do staff members have input into what enrichment courses/programs are offered?

15. Any changes to extracurricular enrichment for 2002-03?

- Staffing changes? Time/Day changes?
- Selection of courses/programs?
- How students are referred to the program?

16. What evidence would you cite to demonstrate the success of extracurricular and enrichment activities?

School to Career

Key Question: What is the benefit of participating in a work-based learning experience in an after school setting?

17. What progress has there been toward opening or enhancing operations of the Connecting Zone?

- How much monthly revenue is the Zone generating?
- Who are its clients?
- How many students are working in the Zone?

18. To what extent are students participating in other work-based experiences like job shadowing or internships?

19. What connections with local business have been developed to foster career-based experiences (e.g., job shadowing, internships, etc.) and training for students?

20. What connections with community colleges have been developed to foster postsecondary and career preparation?

21. What evidence would you cite to demonstrate the success of STC or Zone activities offered through LA COPS?

School Linkages

Key Questions: To what extent is LACOPS programming linked to the curricular and instructional program offered during the regular school day? How are these connections manifest?

22. Do most teachers and other school staff (e.g., counselors) know about LACOPS? How do they know about the program?

- How do you advertise? Signage? Flyers?
- Do teachers refer? Counselors?
- From whom would you like more cooperation?

23. What kind of communication is there between LACOPS program staff and regular school day teachers?

24. Have there been any changes (positive or negative) in terms of linking LA COPS more directly to the regular school day program?

Parent/Community Involvement

Key Questions: To what extent are parents and/or community members informed and connected to after-school programming?

25. Are parents participating in any of the after-school classes offered through LA COPS?

26. Are there any community organizations working with you to deliver or improve after-school services?

- Which organizations are involved?

- What is the nature of the cooperation/support?

27. What evidence would you cite to demonstrate the success of LA COPS in fostering parent/community involvement?

Safety

Key Question: Does LACOPS provide a safe and welcoming environment for learning to occur in an extended day setting?

28. How is security for after-school program staff and participants provided?

29. What are the primary after-school safety issues?

- Transportation to and from the center?
- Lighting?
- Unauthorized persons on campus?

30. How would you improve safety in the after-school program?

**LA COPS
Tutoring Observation Checklist**

Name of School: _____

Tutoring/Homework Assistance Subject: _____

Teacher/Student Ratio: _____

Type of Support Provided: (Circle one.)

Independent work
with one on one
support

Group
instruction

Peer discussion/
small group with
teacher support

Other
(describe)

Gender Grade How tutoring has helped, etc.

Comments:

LA COPS OBSERVATIONAL CHECKLIST

Academic Intervention

➤ <u>Tutoring/Homework Assistance</u>	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
1. Students are engaged in learning.	4	3	2	1
2. Tutor/student ratios appropriate.	4	3	2	1
3. There is a distinction between tutoring and homework assistance	4	3	2	1
4. An appropriate learning environment exists in terms of noise, student behavior, and other distractions	4	3	2	1
5. Tutors work effectively w/students.	4	3	2	1
6. Cross-age tutors work effectively w/students.	4	3	2	1

Describe the following:

⇒ Time:

⇒ Ratio:

⇒ Staff:

⇒ Curriculum:

⇒ Physical location:

➤ <u>Academic Courses</u>	4	3	2	1
1. Students are engaged in standards-based learning activities.	4	3	2	1
2. Students understand what is expected of them.	4	3	2	1
3. The “added value” of extended day academic content is evident.	4	3	2	1
4. Students are engaged in project-based learning.	4	3	2	1
5. Students work in an engaging classroom	4	3	2	1

	setting.				
6.	Students demonstrate appropriate classroom behavior.	4	3	2	1
7.	Student/teacher ratios meet student needs.	4	3	2	1
8.	The programs have sufficient materials and supplies.	4	3	2	1

Describe the following:

⇒ Time:

⇒ Ratio:

⇒ Staffing:

⇒ Curriculum:

⇒ Physical location:

Extracurricular Enrichment

1.	Students are engaged in activities offered.	4	3	2	1
2.	Students are working toward an individual or group goal, as appropriate to activity.	4	3	2	1
3.	The “added value” of extended day extracurricular content is evident.	4	3	2	1
4.	Students are engaged in project-based learning.	4	3	2	1
5.	Students work in an engaging classroom setting.	4	3	2	1
6.	Students demonstrate appropriate behavior.	4	3	2	1
7.	Student/teacher ratios meet student needs.	4	3	2	1
8.	The programs have sufficient materials and supplies.	4	3	2	1

Describe the following:

- ⇒ Time:
- ⇒ Ratio:
- ⇒ Staffing:
- ⇒ Curriculum:
- ⇒ Physical location:

School to Career

1.	The Connecting Zone provides students with a “real world” work experience.	4	3	2	1
2.	Students are demonstrating professional work-related competencies.	4	3	2	1
3.	Students speak and behave in a manner appropriate for the workplace.	4	3	2	1
4.	Students work within a hierarchy of responsibilities and understand their duties and role.	4	3	2	1
5.	Instructors mentor students in an appropriate workplace manner.	4	3	2	1
6.	The work/learning environment is organized.	4	3	2	1
7.	Adequate materials and supplies exist.	4	3	2	1
8.	The presence of local business interests is evident on site.	4	3	2	1

Describe the following:

- ⇒ Time:
- ⇒ Ratio:
- ⇒ Staffing:
- ⇒ Curriculum:

⇒ Physical location:

Parent/Community Involvement

1.	Community participation is evident.	4	3	2	1
2.	Parents are comfortable participants in program.	4	3	2	1
3.	Cross age participants are on-site.	4	3	2	1
4.	Other evidence of community or parent participation exists.	4	3	2	1
5.	Childcare is available on-site.	4	3	2	1

Safety

1.	The site is well lit and clean, including entries and exits.	4	3	2	1
2.	Security personnel are visible.	4	3	2	1
3.	The site is protected by appropriate gates and fences.	4	3	2	1
4.	Students feel secure.	4	3	2	1
5.	Safety procedures are in place.	4	3	2	1
6.	Students have safe transport home after dark.	4	3	2	1

APPENDIX B:
Program Staff Survey
2003 Results

**LA COPS 21st Century Grant
Program Staff Survey (2003)
N=44**

For what school are you filling out this survey?

Dorsey HS	Monroe HS	Reseda HS	San Pedro HS	Wilson HS
0.0% (N=0)	18.2% (N=8)	22.7% (N=10)	31.84% (N=14)	27.3% (N=12)

❖ **You are considered a:**

Paid Program Staff	Funded partner staff
95.5% (N=42)	4.5% (N=2)

❖ **Your Services and/or Job Duties(check all that apply):**

Academic Intervention	20.5% (N=9)	Homework Assistance	43.2% (N=19)
Tutoring	68.2% (N=30)	Health Programs	4.5% (N=2)
Enrichment/Extracurricular	22.7% (N=10)	Safety Programs	0.0% (N=0)
Sports	11.4% (N=5)	Computer Lab	9.1% (N=4)
Connecting Zone or Other Career Prep	4.5% (N=2)	Other	11.4% (N=5)

❖ **How many days per week do you work in the LACOPS program?**

1	2	3	4	5
16.3% (N=7)	32.6% (N=14)	23.3% (N=10)	14.0% (N=6)	14.0% (N=6)

❖ **What days of the week do you work in LACOPS? (Check all that apply.)**

Mon.	Tues.	Weds.	Thurs.	Fri.	Other
70.5% (N=31)	45.5% (N=20)	68.2% (N=30)	63.6% (N=29)	20.5% (N=9)	2.3% (N=2)

❖ **How many hours per week do you work directly with students?**

1-5	6-10	11-15	15+
78.0% (N=32)	12.2% (N=5)	4.9% (N=2)	4.9% (N=2)

❖ **How many students do you work with per day?**

1-5	6-10	11-15	15+
30.2% (N=13)	20.9% (N=9)	14.0% (N=6)	34.9% (N=15)

❖ **How many different students do you work with per week?**

1-10	10-20	20-30	30+
------	-------	-------	-----

LA COPS Evaluation Report, 2002-2003

30.2% (N=13)	30.2% (N=13)	14.0% (N=6)	25.6% (N=11)
-----------------	-----------------	----------------	-----------------

❖ How often do you meet with other LACOPS program staff to discussion curriculum, program coordination, etc.?

1x/mo	2x/mo	2+x/mo
59.5% (N=22)	21.6% (N=8)	18.9% (N=7)

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

	Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Agree 3	Strongly Agree 4	Don't Know DK
Academic Intervention	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
1) The LACOPS program provides courses and/or opportunities for students to improve academic skills (e.g., reading, writing, mathematics).	2.3% (N=1)	2.3% (N=1)	13.6% (N=6)	77.3% (N=34)	4.5% (N=2)
2) Program courses in core academic subjects reinforce learning and classroom academic instruction occurring during the regular school day.	2.3% (N=1)	0.0% (N=8)	18.6% (N=28)	65.1% (N=43)	14.0% (N=6)
3) Instructors of academic intervention courses are teaching using standards-based instructional methods.	2.3% (N=1)	0.0% (N=0)	23.3% (N=10)	46.5% (N=20)	27.9% (N=12)
4) Students participating in academic courses have been referred by teachers or counselors based on identified academic needs.	2.3% (N=1)	2.3% (N=1)	27.3% (N=12)	43.2% (N=19)	25.0% (N=11)
5) Instructors of academic intervention courses regularly assess student progress.	2.3% (N=1)	4.5% (N=2)	27.3% (N=12)	36.4% (N=16)	29.5% (N=13)
6) Results of student progress are shared with the student.	2.3% (N=1)	7.0% (N=3)	37.2% (N=16)	27.9% (N=12)	25.6% (N=11)
7) Result of student progress are shared with teachers in the regular day program.	4.9% (N=2)	14.6% (N=6)	34.1% (N=14)	17.1% (N=7)	29.3% (N=12)
8) I have seen evidence that the academic courses offered as part of LACOPS are benefiting student achievement.	2.3% (N=1)	0.0% (N=0)	32.6% (N=14)	46.5% (N=20)	18.6% (N=8)
9) There are adequate materials and supplies for academic intervention courses.	2.3% (N=1)	7.0% (N=3)	32.6% (N=14)	23.3% (N=10)	34.9% (N=15)
10) There are incentives for students to encourage consistent student attendance in academic intervention courses during after school hours.	2.3% (N=1)	4.7% (N=2)	34.9% (N=15)	41.9% (N=18)	16.3% (N=7)

LA COPS Evaluation Report, 2002-2003

Homework Assistance and Tutoring	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
1) Students who need assistance in completing homework can get their needs met during the LACOPS after school program.	0.0% (N=0)	0.0% (N=0)	27.3% (N=12)	67.4% (N=29)	4.7% (N=2)
2) Students who need individualized tutoring over an extended period of time can get their needs met during the LACOPS after school program.	0.0% (N=0)	2.3% (N=1)	20.9% (N=9)	69.8% (N=30)	7.0% (N=3)
3) The LACOPS program at this site differentiates between homework assistance and tutoring.	0.0% (N=0)	19.0% (N=8)	28.6% (N=12)	26.2% (N=11)	26.2% (N=11)
4) The staff/student ratio during tutoring meets students' instructional needs.	0.0% (N=0)	4.7% (N=2)	58.1% (N=25)	27.9% (N=12)	9.3% (N=4)
5) The staff/student ratio during homework assistance meets students' instructional needs.	0.0% (N=0)	4.7% (N=2)	58.1% (N=25)	30.2% (N=13)	7.0% (N=3)
6) Cross-age tutors (i.e., older students mentoring younger students) provide effective tutoring assistance.	0.0% (N=0)	7.0% (N=3)	37.2% (N=16)	30.2% (N=13)	25.6% (N=11)
7) There are adequate materials and supplies for tutoring and/or homework assistance programs.	0.0% (N=0)	7.0% (N=2)	37.2% (N=21)	30.2% (N=12)	25.6% (N=8)
8) There are incentives for students to encourage consistent student attendance in tutoring and/or homework assistance courses during after school hours.	0.0% (N=0)	0.0% (N=0)	41.9% (N=18)	37.2% (N=16)	20.9% (N=9)

Extracurricular Enrichment	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
1) The LACOPS program at this site provides extracurricular options that augment the students' educational experience by reinforcing learning.	0.0% (N=0)	2.4% (N=1)	26.2% (N=11)	47.6% (N=20)	23.8% (N=10)
2) The LACOPS program at this site provides extracurricular options that benefit students' leadership skills.	2.4% (N=1)	2.4% (N=1)	33.3% (N=14)	26.2% (N=11)	35.7% (N=15)
3) The LACOPS program at this site provides extracurricular options that meet students' emotional and social needs.	0.0% (N=0)	4.8% (N=2)	26.2% (N=11)	33.3% (N=14)	35.7% (N=15)
4) Student interest plays an important role in determining the types of extracurricular programs offered at this site.	0.0% (N=0)	4.8% (N=2)	31.0% (N=13)	35.7% (N=15)	28.6% (N=12)
5) This program provides an adequate range of extracurricular options for students.	0.0% (N=0)	2.4% (N=1)	35.7% (N=15)	28.6% (N=12)	33.3% (N=14)
6) There are adequate materials and supplies for extracurricular programs.	0.0% (N=0)	7.3% (N=3)	39.0% (N=16)	24.4% (N=10)	29.3% (N=12)
7) There are incentives for students to encourage consistent student attendance in extracurricular courses during after school hours.	0.0% (N=0)	4.8% (N=2)	45.2% (N=19)	26.2% (N=11)	23.8% (N=10)

LA COPS Evaluation Report, 2002-2003

School Linkages	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
1) Most teachers in the regular high school are aware of the services and options for students available through the LACOPS program.	0.0% (N=0)	4.9% (N=2)	39.0% (N=16)	46.3% (N=19)	9.8% (N=4)
2) Most counselors in the regular high school are aware of the services and options for students available through the LACOPS program.	0.0% (N=0)	0.0% (N=0)	34.1% (N=14)	56.1% (N=23)	9.8% (N=4)
3) Most high school students are aware of the services and options available through the LACOPS program.	2.4% (N=1)	7.3% (N=3)	43.9% (N=18)	34.1% (N=14)	12.2% (N=5)
4) There is a clear process or set of procedures for referring high school students to the LACOPS program.	0.0% (N=0)	7.3% (N=3)	29.3% (N=12)	34.1% (N=14)	29.3% (N=12)
5) The school does a good job of referring student who would most benefit from participation in the LACOPS program.	0.0% (N=0)	4.9% (N=2)	41.5% (N=17)	34.1% (N=14)	19.5% (N=8)
6) The high school has influenced the kinds of programs and courses offered as part of LACOPS.	0.0% (N=0)	4.9% (N=2)	36.6% (N=15)	36.6% (N=15)	22.0% (N=9)
7) LACOPS program staff meets regularly with day school staff to coordinate on program content and offerings.	4.9% (N=2)	9.8% (N=4)	31.7% (N=13)	22.0% (N=9)	31.7% (N=13)
8) There are opportunities for LACOPS instructors to communicate with regular day high school teachers, counselors and administrators.	0.0% (N=0)	9.8% (N=4)	43.9% (N=18)	29.3% (N=12)	17.1% (N=7)
9) Assessment results and/or evaluations of student progress are shared with classroom teachers in the regular day program.	0.0% (N=0)	15.0% (N=6)	45.0% (N=18)	15.0% (N=6)	25.0% (N=10)
10) This high school provides tangible support to the LACOPS program.	0.0% (N=0)	2.5% (N=1)	45.0% (N=18)	42.5% (N=17)	10.0% (N=4)
11) Current publicity efforts and outreach activities are effective in recruiting students at the high school.	0.0% (N=0)	12.5% (N=5)	37.5% (N=15)	37.5% (N=15)	12.5% (N=5)

LA COPS Evaluation Report, 2002-2003

School to Career	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
1) Most students in the high school are aware of the career preparation and business efforts occurring in the Connecting Zone.	0.0% (N=0)	4.9% (N=2)	41.5% (N=17)	14.6% (N=6)	39.0% (N=16)
2) Most school staff (e.g., teachers and counselors) are aware of the career preparation and business efforts occurring in the Connecting Zone.	0.0% (N=0)	2.4% (N=1)	31.7% (N=13)	24.4% (N=10)	41.5% (N=17)
3) Career-based programming in addition to the Connecting Zone exists.	0.0% (N=0)	0.0% (N=0)	34.1% (N=14)	22.0% (N=9)	43.9% (N=18)
4) The LACOPS program promotes student exposure to the world of work and future careers.	0.0% (N=0)	4.9% (N=2)	29.3% (N=12)	31.7% (N=13)	34.1% (N=14)
5) The LACOPS program promotes student preparation for postsecondary education.	0.0% (N=0)	2.4% (N=1)	36.6% (N=15)	31.7% (N=13)	29.3% (N=12)

Parent/Community Involvement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
1) Parent involvement is an important focus on the LACOPS program.	0.0% (N=0)	9.5% (N=4)	38.1% (N=16)	23.8% (N=10)	28.6% (N=12)
2) Most parents of participating students know what services and opportunities exist as part of the LACOPS program.	0.0% (N=0)	7.1% (N=3)	50.0% (N=21)	21.4% (N=9)	21.4% (N=9)
3) Parents of participating students receive information about their child's progress or performance in the LACOPS program.	0.0% (N=0)	11.9% (N=5)	33.3% (N=14)	9.5% (N=4)	45.2% (N=19)
4) The LACOPS program effectively recruits volunteers to help in the program.	0.0% (N=0)	7.1% (N=3)	42.9% (N=18)	21.4% (N=9)	28.6% (N=12)
5) The parent/community liaison has developed ties with parents and members of the community that are building program participation across all ages.	0.0% (N=0)	4.9% (N=2)	26.8% (N=11)	14.6% (N=6)	53.7% (N=22)
6) The program has strong ties to local business that result in in-kind or monetary support.	2.4% (N=1)	4.8% (N=2)	23.8% (N=10)	7.1% (N=3)	61.9% (N=26)
7) Increasing parent participation in the program is an important LACOPS goal.	0.0% (N=0)	2.4% (N=1)	50.0% (N=21)	19.0% (N=8)	28.6% (N=12)
8) Community members regularly use the on-site computer lab to increase their computer literacy skills.	2.4% (N=1)	7.1% (N=3)	28.6% (N=12)	9.5% (N=4)	52.4% (N=22)
9) Parents and other community members can access LACOPS services via distance learning.	4.8% (N=2)	4.8% (N=2)	28.6% (N=12)	7.1% (N=3)	54.8% (N=23)
10) Current publicity efforts and outreach activities are effective to recruit adult participants from the community.	0.0% (N=0)	7.3% (N=3)	41.5% (N=17)	2.4% (N=1)	48.8% (N=20)

LA COPS Evaluation Report, 2002-2003

Safety	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
1) The LACOPS program provides a safe environment for students and other program participants.	0.0% (N=0)	0.0% (N=0)	27.9% (N=12)	69.8% (N=30)	2.3% (N=1)
2) As a staff member, I feel safe working in the LACOPS program.	0.0% (N=0)	0.0% (N=0)	27.9% (N=12)	72.1% (N=31)	0.0% (N=0)
3) Safety and security personnel are visible on the campus during after school hours.	0.0% (N=0)	9.3% (N=4)	34.9% (N=15)	51.2% (N=22)	4.7% (N=2)
4) The facilities of the school are secure during after school hours.	0.0% (N=0)	9.3% (N=4)	25.6% (N=11)	62.8% (N=27)	2.3% (N=1)
5) This program has a plan in place in the event of a crisis or emergency.	0.0% (N=0)	2.3% (N=1)	32.6% (N=14)	41.9% (N=18)	23.3% (N=10)
6) Student behavior is not a safety or security problem during after school hours.	0.0% (N=0)	2.3% (N=1)	30.2% (N=13)	62.8% (N=27)	4.7% (N=2)

Evaluation & Accountability	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
1) Clear procedures are in place for collecting and recording data on student attendance.	0.0% (N=0)	0.0% (N=0)	48.8% (N=20)	51.2% (N=21)	0.0% (N=0)
2) Clear procedures are in place for collecting and recording data on student progress (e.g., assessment data).	0.0% (N=0)	17.5% (N=7)	40.0% (N=16)	25.0% (N=10)	17.5% (N=7)
3) Technical assistance is available when questions about record keeping arise.	2.4% (N=1)	2.4% (N=1)	48.8% (N=20)	34.1% (N=14)	12.2% (N=5)
4) Most staff understand the goals and objectives of the LACOPS program.	0.0% (N=0)	4.9% (N=2)	56.1% (N=23)	34.1% (N=14)	4.9% (N=2)
5) As a staff person, I understand what I am held accountable for.	0.0% (N=0)	0.0% (N=0)	37.5% (N=15)	60.0% (N=24)	2.5% (N=1)
6) I could summarize the benefits of LACOPS participation to a curious parent or teacher.	0.0% (N=0)	7.3% (N=3)	46.3% (N=19)	43.9% (N=18)	2.4% (N=1)
7) Data collected on student attendance are used to guide program planning.	0.0% (N=0)	2.4% (N=1)	48.8% (N=20)	34.1% (N=14)	14.6% (N=6)
8) Data collected on student achievement are used to guide program planning.	0.0% (N=0)	9.8% (N=4)	39.0% (N=16)	26.8% (N=11)	24.4% (N=10)

Sustainability	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
1) Program staff is working on a plan for the continuation of the program after grant funding ceases.	2.6% (N=1)	2.6% (N=1)	23.1% (N=9)	43.6% (N=17)	28.2% (N=17)
2) I have personally been involved in discussions about continuing LACOPS after the initial grant is finished.	7.7% (N=3)	28.2% (N=11)	23.1% (N=9)	23.1% (N=9)	17.9% (N=7)
3) The program has relationships with community and business organizations that will provide a foundation for continuing support of the program in the future.	0.0% (N=0)	10.3% (N=4)	17.9% (N=7)	15.4% (N=6)	56.4% (N=22)

LA COPS Evaluation Report, 2002-2003

Other Issues	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
1) There is sufficient program staff working in LACOPS to meet student needs.	0.0% (N=0)	7.3% (N=3)	53.7% (N=22)	26.8% (N=11)	12.2% (N=5)
2) There are sufficient <u>activities and services</u> offered to meet student needs.	0.0% (N=0)	12.2% (N=5)	43.9% (N=18)	31.7% (N=13)	12.2% (N=5)
3) There is sufficient <u>space</u> to meet the needs of the current program.	2.4% (N=1)	12.2% (N=5)	39.0% (N=16)	41.5% (N=17)	4.9% (N=2)
4) <u>Transportation</u> is not a barrier to program participation.	9.8% (N=4)	9.8% (N=4)	41.5% (N=17)	22.0% (N=9)	17.1% (N=7)
5) <u>Teacher retention</u> is not a problem for the program.	0.0% (N=0)	4.9% (N=2)	53.7% (N=22)	24.4% (N=10)	17.1% (N=7)
6) <u>Student retention</u> is not a problem for the program.	2.4% (N=1)	12.2% (N=5)	51.2% (N=21)	19.5% (N=8)	14.6% (N=6)

APPENDIX C:
Student Survey
2003 Results

LACOPS Student Survey (2003)

N=769

Directions: We are conducting an evaluation of the LACOPS program and would like your opinions to help us better serve students after school. The survey should take you 10 minutes to completed. All information will be confidential and used only for evaluation purposes. Please do not write your name on the survey. You should return the survey to your instructor before leaving today. Thanks!

1. What is the **primary** reason you are involved in the LACOPS program? (check one)

I needed help with homework.	25.4% (N=195)	I needed tutoring in academic subjects (e.g., math, English).	18.3% (N=141)
I wanted to work on computer skills.	4.8% (N=37)	I was interested in extracurricular activities offered through the program.	9.8% (N=75)
I was referred by a teacher or counselor at school.	6.4% (N=49)	I wanted to work in the print shop program (the Zone).	0.7% (N=5)
My parent/guardian wanted me involved in after school supervision.	2.6% (N=20)	My friends are in the program	5.5% (N=42)
Other (please describe)	10.3% (N=79)		

2. How many days per week do you participate in LACOPS? (check one)

1	2	3	4	5
24.4% (N=188)	29.9% (N=230)	17.6% (N=135)	12.7% (N=98)	13.5% (N=651)

3. Which days of the week do you participate in the LACOPS program? (Check all that apply.)

Mon.	Tues.	Weds.	Thurs.	Fri.
62% (N=477)	43.6% (N=335)	66.3% (N=510)	49.4% (N=380)	19.1% (N=147)

4. Where would you be if LACOPS did not exist?

Home with you or another adult	24.3% (N=187)	Home alone	26.7% (N=205)
Friend's house	17.4% (N=134)	Another community program	9.8% (N=75)
Relative's house	3.9% (N=30)	Other	24.7% (N=190)

5. How long have you participated in the LACOPS program? (Please check one.)

1-2 months	3-4 months	5-6 months	6+ months	Don't Know
22.4% (N=172)	14.6% (N=112)	9.8% (N=75)	19.2% (N=148)	31.7% (N=262)

6. Did you participate in LACOPS last year?

Yes	37.7% (N=290)	No	61.5% (N=437)
-----	------------------	----	------------------

7. Is there usually an adult at your home between 2:30 and 5:00 pm?

Yes	63.3% (N=487)	No	35.9% (N=276)
-----	------------------	----	------------------

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

Academic Intervention	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
8) I have received assistance in completing homework during the LACOPS program.	7.4% (N=57)	3.9% (N=30)	38.9% (N=299)	32.4% (N=249)	11.3% (N=87)
9) I have received individualized tutoring over an extended period of time during LACOPS.	10.3% (N=79)	10.1% (N=78)	35.5% (N=273)	25.0% (N=192)	12.9% (N=99)
10) The LACOPS program has provided opportunities for me to improve academic skills (e.g., reading, writing, mathematics).	6.5% (N=50)	5.1% (N=39)	35.5% (N=273)	37.7% (N=290)	8.5% (N=65)
Extracurricular Enrichment					
11) I have participated in extracurricular options that helped me academically.	6.9% (N=53)	13.5% (N=104)	40.3% (N=310)	21.3% (N=164)	11.7% (N=90)
12) I have participated in extracurricular options that developed my leadership skills.	8.2% (N=63)	13.5% (N=104)	36.9% (N=284)	22.2% (N=171)	12.1% (N=93)
13) I have participated in extracurricular options addressing my emotional/social needs.	13.0% (N=100)	22.8% (N=175)	25.9% (N=199)	16.3% (N=125)	15.1% (N=116)
14) The courses and programs offered through LACOPS meet student interests and needs.	4.3% (N=33)	6.4% (N=49)	44.5% (N=342)	27.7% (N=213)	10.3% (N=79)
Parent/Community Involvement					
15) I have learned new things through involvement in the LACOPS program.	4.7% (N=36)	9.4% (N=72)	40.6% (N=312)	28.6% (N=220)	9.5% (N=73)
16) My parents know what services and opportunities exist as part of LACOPS.	10.7% (N=82)	12.0% (N=92)	34.9% (N=268)	21.2% (N=163)	14.0% (N=108)
17) My parents know who to talk to if they have a concern about the LACOPS program.	14.3% (N=110)	19.9% (N=153)	23.0% (N=177)	19.6% (N=151)	15.1% (N=116)
18) My parents usually talk to me about school and homework.	6.0% (N=46)	4.7% (N=36)	23.3% (N=179)	23.3% (N=179)	2.7% (N=21)
19) My parents have received information about my progress or performance in LACOPS.	17.6% (N=135)	19.8% (N=152)	24.7% (N=190)	13.4% (N=103)	16.9% (N=130)
School to Career					
20) I have gained exposure to the world of work and future careers through LACOPS.	10.7% (N=82)	22.5% (N=173)	33.3% (N=256)	12.5% (N=96)	13.7% (N=105)
21) I have received guidance on further education and college through LACOPS.	9.5% (N=73)	21.8% (N=168)	31.9% (N=245)	16.5% (N=127)	12.2% (N=94)
Safety					
22) The LACOPS program provides a safe environment for students.	3.0% (N=23)	3.8% (N=29)	39.1% (N=301)	38.0% (N=292)	8.8% (N=68)
23) Safety and security personnel are visible on the campus during after school hours.	6.4% (N=49)	15.6% (N=120)	35.2% (N=271)	26.0% (N=200)	10.0% (N=77)
24) The facilities of the school are secure during after school hours.	7.4% (N=57)	9.6% (N=74)	37.3% (N=287)	23.3% (N=179)	15.2% (N=117)
25) Student behavior is not a safety or security problem during after school hours.	9.0% (N=69)	12.4% (N=95)	33.4% (N=257)	22.4% (N=172)	16.6% (N=128)
Overall Program Impact	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
26) Since participating in LACOPS, I am more motivated to attend school.	8.6% (N=66)	13.9% (N=107)	34.3% (N=264)	22.5% (N=173)	12.7% (N=98)
27) I look forward to coming to the LACOPS program.	4.8% (N=37)	5.9% (N=45)	24.2% (N=186)	17.4% (N=134)	7.7% (N=59)

LA Cops Evaluation Report, 2002-2003

28) Since participating in LACOPS, I am doing better in my academic classes.	4.9% (N=38)	8.2% (N=63)	39.3% (N=302)	26.1% (N=201)	12.9% (N=99)
29) I have benefited from homework assistance and tutoring offered as part of LACOPS	6.4% (N=49)	7.8% (N=60)	36.5% (N=281)	30.3% (N=233)	10.8% (N=83)

30. What is your current grade level? (circle 1)

6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th
0.3% (N=2)	0% (N=0)	0.3% (N=2)	21.5% (N=165)	30.9% (N=238)	23.7% (N=182)	18.3% (N=141)

31. Please check the school that you attend: (check one)

High Schools						
Dorsey	Monroe	Reseda	San Pedro	Wilson	Other	
11.3% (N=87)	13.9% (N=107)	28.3% (N=218)	18.1% (N=139)	24.1% (N=185)	1.2% (N=9)	
Middle Schools						
Audubon	Sepulveda	Mulholland	Dana	El Sereno	Other	
0% (N=0)	0.1% (N=1)	0% (N=0)	3.0% (N=23)	0% (N=0)	0% (N=0)	
Elementary Schools		24.8% (N=191)				

32. What school program are you enrolled in?

Regular	Magnet	Academy
59.9% (N=461)	23.8% (N=183)	8.6% (N=66)

33. What is the best part of the LACOPS program? What do you enjoy most and why?

Response Given: 80.1% (N=616)
 No Response Given: 19.9% (N=153)

34. If you could change one thing about the LACOPS program, what would you improve?

Response Given: 75.7% (N=582)
 No Response Given: 24.3% (N=187)

APPENDIX D:

**Parent Survey
2002 Results**

**LACOPS Parent Survey
N=154**

Directions: Your child has been identified as a participant in the LACOPS program, an after school enrichment program offered at five LAUSD high schools as part of a Federal grant. We are conducting an evaluation of the LACOPS program and would like your opinions to help us better serve students and parents. The survey should take you 10 minutes to completed. All information will be confidential and used only for evaluation purposes. Please do not write your name on the survey. Your child should return the survey this week by bringing to the after school program.

1. What is the **primary** reason that your child is enrolled in the LACOPS program? (check one)

My child needed help with homework.	25.2% (N=6)	My child needed tutoring in academic subjects (e.g., math, English).	35.7% (N=51)
My child wanted to work on computer skills.	7.7% (N=11)	My child wanted to take a class that was offered through the program.	7.0% (N=10)
My child was referred by a teacher or counselor at school.	4.9% (N=7)	My child wanted to work in the print shop program (the Zone).	2.1% (N=3)
I need childcare/after school supervision for my child.	0.6% (N=1)	Don't Know	11.9% (N=17)
Other (please describe)	4.4% (N=7)		

2. How many days per week does your child participate in LACOPS? (check one)

1	2	3	4	5
19.6% (N=31)	20.9% (N=33)	25.3% (N=40)	20.9% (N=33)	13.3% (N=21)

3. Which days of the week does your child participate in the LACOPS program? (Check all that apply.)

Mon.	Tues.	Weds.	Thurs.	Fri.	Other
58.5% (N=93)	56.6% (N=90)	79.2% (N=126)	55.3% (N=88)	13.8% (N=22)	6.9% (N=1)

4. Have you ever met with a staff person from the LACOPS program? If yes, who?

Site Coordinator	Teacher	Tutor	Community Liaison	Other
10.1% (N=16)	39.6% (N=63)	11.3% (N=18)	0.6% (N=1)	12.6% (N=20)

5. Where would your child be if LACOPS did not exist?

Home with you or another adult	36.5% (N=58)	Home alone	27.7% (N=44)
Friend's house	11.9% (N=19)	Another community program	14.5% (N=23)
Relative's house	5.7% (N=9)	Other	14.5% (N=23)

6. How long has your child participated in the LACOPS program? (Please check one.)

1-2 months	3-4 months	5-6 months	more than 6 months	Don't Know
21.5% (N=34)	10.8% (N=17)	18.4% (N=29)	28.5% (N=45)	20.9% (N=33)

7. Did your child participate in LACOPS last year?

Yes	44.3% (N=70)	No	55.7% (N=88)
-----	-----------------	----	-----------------

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	DK

Academic Intervention	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
8) My child has received assistance in completing homework during the LACOPS after school program.	6.4% (N=10)	7.7% (N=12)	46.8% (N=73)	30.1% (N=47)	9.0% (N=14)
9) My child has received individualized tutoring over an extended period of time during the LACOPS after school program.	6.0% (N=9)	13.2% (N=20)	42.4% (N=64)	25.8% (N=39)	12.6% (N=19)
10) The LACOPS program has provided opportunities for my child to improve academic skills (e.g., reading, writing, mathematics).	6.5% (N=9)	5.8% (N=68)	44.2% (N=53)	34.4% (N=14)	9.1% (N=14)
Extracurricular Enrichment	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
11) My child has participated in LACOPS extracurricular options that reinforce learning.	4.0% (N=6)	11.9% (N=18)	48.3% (N=73)	17.9% (N=27)	17.9% (N=27)
12) My child has participated in LACOPS extracurricular options that reinforce leadership skills.	6.7% (N=10)	16.0% (N=24)	34.0% (N=51)	18.7% (N=28)	24.7% (N=37)
13) My child has participated in LACOPS extracurricular options that address emotional and social needs.	11.8% (N=18)	20.3% (N=37)	34.0% (N=52)	10.5% (N=16)	23.5% (N=36)
14) The courses and programs offered through LACOPS meet my child's interests and needs.	5.9% (N=9)	8.5% (N=13)	47.7% (N=73)	25.5% (N=39)	12.4% (N=19)

LA Cops Evaluation Report, 2002-2003

Parent/Community Involvement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
15) I know what services and opportunities exist as part of the LACOPS program.	7.9% (N=12)	17.8% (N=27)	40.8% (N=62)	14.5% (N=22)	19.1% (N=29)
16) If I have a concern about my child's participation in the LACOPS program, I know who to talk to.	15.5% (N=24)	19.4% (N=30)	34.8% (N=54)	20.6% (N=32)	9.7% (N=15)
17) I have received information about my child's progress or performance in the LACOPS program.	15.0% (N=23)	20.9% (N=32)	33.3% (N=51)	17.6% (N=27)	13.1% (N=20)
18) The LACOPS program recruits parent and community volunteers to help in the program.	12.3% (N=19)	16.1% (N=25)	30.3% (N=47)	12.3% (N=19)	29.0% (N=45)
19) The LACOPS program is well-publicized in the community.	8.6% (N=13)	15.8% (N=24)	34.9% (N=53)	17.8% (N=27)	23.0% (N=35)

School to Career	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
20) My child has gained exposure to the world of work and future careers through the LACOPS program.	7.2% (N=11)	11.8% (N=18)	45.1% (N=69)	15.0% (N=23)	20.9% (N=32)
21) My child has received guidance on further education and college through the LACOPS program.	7.8% (N=12)	12.3% (N=19)	40.9% (N=63)	16.9% (N=26)	22.1% (N=34)

Safety	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
22) The LACOPS program provides a safe environment for students.	4.0% (N=6)	6.3% (N=10)	48.3% (N=73)	30.5% (N=46)	10.6% (N=16)
23) Safety and security personnel are visible on the campus during after school hours.	5.3% (N=8)	6.0% (N=9)	41.7% (N=63)	25.2% (N=38)	21.9% (N=33)
24) The facilities of the school are secure during after school hours.	4.7% (N=7)	9.4% (N=14)	43.6% (N=65)	21.5% (N=32)	20.8% (N=31)
25) Student behavior is not a safety or security problem during after school hours.	6.8% (N=10)	15.5% (N=23)	34.5% (N=51)	20.3% (N=30)	23.0% (N=34)

Program Impact	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
26) Since my child began participating in LA COPS, he/she has been more motivated to attend school.	7.4% (N=11)	12.8% (N=19)	43.0% (N=64)	24.8% (N=37)	12.1% (N=18)
27) Since my child began participating in LA COPS, he/she has been doing better in his/her classes.	6.7% (N=10)	7.4% (N=11)	51.0% (N=76)	22.8% (N=34)	12.1% (N=18)
28) I have seen evidence that homework assistance and tutoring offered as part of LACOPS are benefiting my child's achievement.	7.3% (N=11)	6.7% (N=10)	40.7% (N=61)	30.0% (N=45)	15.3% (N=23)

LA Cops Evaluation Report, 2002-2003

29. What types of after school activities do you think your child needs most? (Check two.)

Tutoring and homework assistance	48.4% (N=77)	Academic enrichment (targeting reading, writing, and math skills)	40.9% (N=65)
Music, arts, crafts, drama	15.1% (N=24)	Physical education/Fitness	7.5% (N=12)
My child was referred by a teacher or counselor at school.	6.3% (N=10)	My child wanted to work in the print shop program (the Zone).	5.0% (N=8)
Career education/Job Opportunities	18.2% (N=29)	Information on College	13.8% (N=16)
Don't Know	8.8% (N=14)		
Other (please describe)	1.3% (N=2)		

30. Have **YOU** ever participated in an LACOPS program or service?

Yes	7.5% (N=12)	No	86.2% (N=137)
-----	----------------	----	------------------

If yes, what have you been involved in? (Check all that apply.)

Computer lab or training	3.1% (N=5)	Parent education	3.1% (N=5)
English language (ESL) class	4.4% (N=7)	Safety classes	0.6% (N=1)
Health classes	0.6% (N=1)	Other (please describe)	1.9% (N=3)

31. How many school age children do you have?

1	2	3	4	5	6+
24.5% (N=36)	41.5% (N=61)	23.8% (N=35)	6.1% (N=9)	2.7% (N=4)	0.7% (N=1)

32. What grade levels are your children? (circle all that apply)

K-2	3-5	6-8	9	10	11	12
19.5% (N=31)	21.4% (N=34)	32.1% (N=51)	33.3% (N=53)	30.2% (N=48)	27.0% (N=43)	15.7% (N=25)

33. Please check the schools that you children attend: (check all that apply)

Dorsey HS	Monroe HS	Reseda HS	San Pedro HS	Wilson HS	Other HS
3.1% (N=5)	4.4% (N=7)	52.2% (N=83)	20.1% (N=32)	4.4% (N=7)	5.0% (N=8)
Audubon MS	Sepulveda MS	Mulholland MS	Dana MS	El Sereno MS	Other MS
0.6% (N=1)	3.1% (N=5)	5.7% (N=9)	6.9% (N=11)	7.5% (N=12)	23.9% (N=38)
Elementary					
42.8% (N=91)					

34. How many adults live in your house?

LA Cops Evaluation Report, 2002-2003

1	2	3	4	5	6+
18.0% (N=27)	56.7% (N=85)	16.7% (N=25)	4.0% (N=6)	4.0% (N=6)	0.7% (N=1)

35. Are all adults in your household employed?

Yes	63.1% (N=94)	No	36.9% (N=55)
-----	-----------------	----	-----------------

36. Is there usually an adult at your home between 2:30 and 5:00 (when your children finish school)?

Yes	65.3% (N=98)	No	34.7% (N=52)
-----	-----------------	----	-----------------

37. Until what time do you need childcare? (Circle one)

Do not need childcare	4:00 pm	5:00 pm	6:00 pm	7:00 pm
74.5% (N=105)	6.4% (N=9)	9.2% (N=13)	7.1% (N=10)	2.8% (N=4)

38. How many days per week do you need childcare? (Circle one)

Do not need childcare	1 day	2 days	3 days	4 days	5 days
73.6% (N=103)	2.9% (N=4)	2.1% (N=3)	2.1% (N=3)	2.9% (N=4)	16.4% (N=23)

39. Please use the space below to provide any additional feedback on the LACOPS after school program.

Response Given: 25.2% (N=119)
 No Response Given: 74.8% (N=40)

APPENDIX E:
Teacher Survey by Site

LA COPS Evaluation Report, 2002-2003

Two samples of English teachers of LA COPS participants with at least 10 days of after-school participation in 2001-2002 and/or 2002-2003 were surveyed to gather information on changes to students' grades, classroom performance, and productive academic behaviors. These results are presented by LA COPS site below.

Change in English Grade Among LA COPS Participants (Number of Students)

	2001-2002			2002-2003		
	Increased	Decreased	No Change	Increased	Decreased	No Change
Dorsey	7	1	10	13	0	5
Monroe	7	2	8	32	7	15
Reseda	52	4	23	56	2	20
San Pedro	13	2	7	27	3	25
Wilson	26	4	20	25	0	26
Total	105	13	68	153	12	91

Assessment of Classroom Performance (% Yes)

	Dorsey		Monroe		Reseda		San Pedro		Wilson	
	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Had classroom academic performance that was satisfactory or better	68.4% (n=13)	60.0% (n=12)	84.2% (n=16)	62.3% (n=38)	87.0% (n=60)	86.1% (n=68)	82.6% (n=19)	78.9% (n=45)	80.7% (n=46)	83.6% (n=51)
Improved in coming to school ready/prepared to learn	63.2% (n=12)	90.0% (n=18)	93.3% (n=14)	66.7% (n=40)	74.6% (n=44)	92.5% (n=62)	87.0% (n=20)	78.9% (n=45)	82.5% (n=47)	90.3% (n=56)
Improved in getting along well with other students	100% (n=17)	95.0% (n=19)	87.5% (n=14)	76.3% (n=45)	67.8% (n=40)	79.7% (n=55)	90.9% (n=20)	90.7% (n=49)	87.5% (n=49)	94.9% (n=56)

LA COPS Evaluation Report, 2002-2003

Student Classroom Behavior Among LA COPS Participants (% Yes)

	Dorsey		Monroe		Reseda		San Pedro		Wilson	
	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Improved in participating in class	78.9% (n=15)	80.0% (n=16)	78.9% (n=15)	76.7% (n=46)	79.7% (n=55)	81.8% (n=63)	78.9% (n=15)	86.0% (n=49)	71.4% (n=40)	82.5% (n=52)
Improved in volunteering (e.g., for extra credit or more responsibilities)	78.9% (n=15)	65.0% (n=13)	47.4% (n=9)	51.7% (n=30)	73.8% (n=48)	70.3% (n=52)	68.2% (n=15)	73.2% (n=41)	49.1% (n=28)	55.9% (n=33)
Improved in attending class regularly	89.5% (n=17)	65.0% (n=13)	68.4% (n=13)	66.1% (n=39)	91.5% (n=54)	80.0% (n=52)	86.3% (n=19)	92.3% (n=48)	82.5% (n=47)	91.8% (n=56)
Improved in being attentive in class	73.7% (n=14)	65.0% (n=13)	63.2% (n=12)	73.3% (n=44)	78.0% (n=46)	83.3% (n=50)	81.8% (n=18)	89.3% (n=50)	86.0% (n=49)	85.7% (n=54)
Improved in behaving well in class	89.5% (n=17)	85.0% (n=17)	87.5% (n=14)	68.3% (n=41)	69.0% (n=40)	78.5% (n=51)	77.3% (n=17)	89.6% (n=43)	87.7% (n=50)	91.8% (n=56)

Homework Completion Among LA COPS Participants (% Yes)

	Dorsey		Monroe		Reseda		San Pedro		Wilson	
	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Improved in turning in his/her homework on time	100% (n=19)	75.0% (n=15)	94.7% (n=18)	54.2% (n=32)	79.1% (n=53)	88.2% (n=67)	81.8% (n=18)	80.7% (n=46)	67.9% (n=38)	79.4% (n=50)
Improved in completing homework to your satisfaction	100% (n=19)	85.0% (n=17)	57.9% (n=11)	60.7% (n=37)	82.6% (n=57)	88.3% (n=68)	81.8% (n=)	78.9% (n=45)	64.9% (n=37)	83.9% (n=52)

APPENDIX F:
Crime Data by LA COPS Site,
1998-2002

Changes in Juvenile Crime: 1999-2001

Prepared by GJ, 06/13/03

Type of Crime	Monroe HS (Foothill-Devonshire- Van Nuys)	Reseda HS (West Valley Station)	Wilson HS (Hollenbeck Station)	San Pedro HS (Harbor Station)	Dorsey HS (Southwest Station)
Part I Crimes:					
Homicide	9	0	-2	2	2
Rape	-4	0	-2	0	-1
Robbery	-46	-29	-27	1	31
Aggravated Assault	-55	-26	13	-17	-14
Burglary	-104	-12	-4	-29	-22
Larceny	-35	-130	1	-15	-33
Vehicle Theft	-16	-18	-3	1	-9
Total Part I Crimes	-251	-215	-24	-57	-46
Percentage Difference	-17.03%	-35.48%	-12.77%	-19.06%	-10.93%
Part II Crimes:					
Other Assaults	-76	-12	-2	-23	2
Forgery/Counterfeit	0	-6	-2	-4	-1
Embezzlement/Fraud	-2	-7	-5	0	0
Receive Stolen Prop	-7	-6	4	-2	-7
Weapon (Carry/Possess)	-45	-8	-13	-7	-10
Prostitution/Allied	13	-2	1	0	2
Sex (excl Rape/Prst)	7	3	3	1	4
Against Family/Child	0	0	0	-1	0
Narcotic Drug Laws	-213	-82	-37	-19	-8
Liquor Laws	-18	-35	-5	-10	-2
Drunkenness	1	-2	-2	2	-1
Disturb the Peace	2	-4	3	-2	1
Disorderly Conduct	-2	-22	2	2	6
Gambling	-1	-3	-3	-1	-1
Driving Under the Influence	-3	-2	-2	-1	1
Moving Traffic Violation	-35	5	-10	3	0
Misc. Other Violations	-2910	-494	-409	-26	-39
Federal Offenses					
Non-Criminal Detention	-461	-29	-83	-53	-83
Pre-Deliq Arrest(601 WIC)	-53	-19	-3	8	-7
Total Part II Crimes:	-3803	-725	-563	-133	-143
Percentage Difference	-47.32%	-42.50%	-33.96%	-12.96%	-9.65%
CHP Arrests	1	-1	0	0	0
Other Agencies	115	-16	-26	104	-20
Total All Offenses And All Agencies	-3937	-953	-613	-86	-271
Percentage Difference	-39.14%	-38.37%	-30.98%	-5.81%	-13.07%

Net Change in Juvenile Arrests by School Site (1998-2002)

School	Part I Crimes			Part II Crimes							Total- All Offenses
	Homicide	ADW	Robbery	Battery	Chemical Substance Abuse	Property Crimes	Destructive Devices	Loiter/ Tresspass	Possession of Weapon	Sex Offenses	
Dorsey HS											
99-00	0.00%	0.00%	87.50%	-50.00%	57.14%	21.21%	0.00%	-33.33%	14.29%	0.00%	21.95%
00-01	0.00%	-60.00%	-6.67%	250.00%	0.00%	-7.50%	0.00%	66.67%	-87.50%	0.00%	-5.00%
01-02	0.00%	0.00%	-57.10%	186.00%	4.50%	-5.40%	200.00%	-90.00%	-100.00%	200.00%	8.42%
Total	0.00%	-60.00%	-25.00%	1400.00%	64.30%	-6.10%	200.00%	-88.90%	-100.00%	200.00%	25.60%
Monroe HS											
99-00	100.00%	-50.00%	100.00%	0.00%	-23.81%	128.57%	0.00%	-100.00%	-20.00%	0.00%	35.09%
00-01	-100.00%	0.00%	-100.00%	66.67%	94.12%	-12.50%	0.00%	100.00%	-100.00%	100.00%	9.09%
01-02	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	-63.60%	-35.70%	0.00%	-100.00%	0.00%	-100.00%	-46.40%
Total	0.00%	-50.00%	-100.00%	66.67%	-42.90%	28.60%	0.00%	-100.00%	-100.00%	100.00%	-21.10%
Reseda HS											
99-00	0.00%	300.00%	-100.00%	-86.67%	-29.17%	-16.13%	0.00%	200.00%	40.00%	-50.00%	-38.75%
00-01	0.00%	-33.33%	0.00%	250.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	-66.67%	-100.00%	-100.00%	4.08%
01-02	0.00%	-100.00%	0.00%	-71.40%	-100.00%	-62.50%	0.00%	-100.00%	200.00%	0.00%	-74.50%
Total	0.00%	0.00%	-100.00%	-86.70%	-100.00%	-71.00%	0.00%	-100.00%	-60.00%	-100.00%	-83.80%
San Pedro HS											
99-00	0.00%	33.33%	200.00%	27.27%	-65.00%	0.00%	100.00%	-28.57%	-14.29%	200.00%	-20.95%
00-01	0.00%	-75.00%	-100.00%	-85.71%	-42.86%	17.86%	-100.00%	100.00%	-87.50%	50.00%	-42.17%
01-02	0.00%	600.00%	100.00%	200.00%	50.00%	-54.50%	100.00%	200.00%	-100.00%	133.33%	10.40%
Total	0.00%	133.33%	-50.00%	-27.30%	-70.00%	-46.40%	100.00%	-85.70%	-100.00%	700.00%	-49.50%
Wilson HS											
99-00	0.00%	200.00%	-33.33%	100.00%	80.00%	-51.02%	0.00%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%	-12.50%
00-01	0.00%	-66.67%	-50.00%	0.00%	-18.52%	45.83%	0.00%	-88.89%	-200.00%	200.00%	-7.14%
01-02	0.00%	-100.00%	-100.00%	150.00%	-100.00%	-60.00%	0.00%	-100.00%	300.00%	-100.00%	-66.20%
Total	0.00%	-100.00%	-100.00%	400.00%	-100.00%	-71.40%	0.00%	-100.00%	50.00%	-100.00%	-72.50%

APPENDIX G:
Bibliography

- Baker, Dwayne, Peter Witt (1995). *Evaluation of an After-School Program for At-Risk Youth*. San Antonio, TX: 1995 Leisure Research Symposium.
- Bissell, Joan (February, 2002). *Evaluation of California's After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnerships Program: 1999-2001*. Irvine, CA: Department of Education, University of California, Irvine and Healthy Start and After School Partnerships Office, California Department of Education.
- Bissell, Joan, Cynthia Dugan, Ann Ford-Johnson & Peter Jones (March, 2002). *Evaluation of the YS-CARE After-school Program for California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKS): A Program of the Los Angeles Unified School District in collaboration with the Los Angeles County Department of Public Social Services*. Irvine, CA: Department of Education, University of California, Irvine and Research Support Services.
- Children Now (2001). *After-school Care for Children: Challenges for California*.
- Department of Educational Services (1987). *Latchkey Guidelines: Urban Model (Cleveland City School District) After School Child Care Program for Latch Key Children*. Columbus, OH: Cleveland Public Schools, Ohio State Department of Education.
- EdSource (February 2002). *Expansion of Out-of-School Program Aims at Improving Student Achievement*.
- Fashola, Olatokumbo S. (October 1998). *Review of Extended-day and After-school Programs and their Effectiveness*. Baltimore, MD: St. Johns University.
- Huang, Denise, Barry Gribbons, Kyung Sung Kim, Charlotte Lee, & Eva Baker (June, 2000). *A Decade of Results: The Impact of the LA's BEST After School Enrichment Program on Subsequent Student Achievement and Performance*. Los Angeles, CA: Bandai Foundation and UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation.
- Hynes, Kathryn, Susan O'Connor & An-Me Chung (2001). *Literacy: Exploring Strategies to Enhance Learning in After-School Programs*. Wellesley, MA: National Institute on Out-of-School Time.
- Institute for Urban and Minority Education (1998). *Urban After-School Programs. Evaluations and Recommendations*. New York, NY: Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Columbia University.
- Marx, Fern (1989). *After-school programs for Low-income Young Adolescents: Overview and Program Profiles*. Wellesley, MA: Center for Research on Women.
- National Institute on Out-of-School Time (2003). *Making the Case: A Fact Sheet on Children and Youth in Out-of-School Time*. Wellesley, MA: National Institute on Out-of-School Time, Center for Research on Women.
- National Institute on Out-of-School Time (2000). *Making an Impact on Out-of-School Time: A Guide for Corporation for National Service Programs Engaged in After-school, Summer, and Weekend Activities for Young People*. Wellesley, MA: National Institute on Out-of-School Time, Center for Research on Women.
- NW Regional Educational Library (1999). *After-School Programs: Good for Kids, Good for Communities*. <http://www.nwrel.org/request/jan99/article10.html>.

O'Connor, S. and K. McGuire (1998). *Homework Assistance and Out-of-School Time: Filling the Need, Finding the Balance*. Wellesley, MA: National Institute on Out-of-School Time.

Office of Educational Research and Improvement (1999). *Bringing Education to After-school Programs: After-school Programs*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education. www.ed.gov/pubs/After_School_Programs/Afterschool_Programs.html.

Office of Educational Research and Improvement (1999). *Bringing Education to After-school Programs: Reading in After-school Programs*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education. www.ed.gov/pubs/After_School_Programs/Reading_Programs.html.

Office of the Undersecretary (2003). *When Schools Stay Open Late: The National Evaluation of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program, First year Findings*. Research by: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. and Decision Information Resources Inc. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Public Works, Inc (2002). *Evaluation of the Los Angeles County Office of Education After-School Enrichment Program; 2001-2002 Final Baseline Report*. Pasadena, CA, Public Works, Inc.

Public Works, Inc. (2003). *Evaluation of the PasadenaLEARNs After-school Program Final Evaluation Report, 2001-2002*. Pasadena, CA, Public Works, Inc.

Schwartz, Wendy (1996). *After-school Programs for Urban Youth*. New York, NY: Institute on Urban and Minority Education, Columbia University.

Shumow, Lee (2001). *Academic Effects of After-School Programs*. Champaign, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education.

S. J. Morris & Company, Inc. (1992). *What Adolescents Want and Need from Out-of-School Program: A Focus Group Report*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development.

University of California, Irvine (February, 2002). *Evaluation of California's After-school Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnerships Program: 1999-2001*. Irvine, CA: Department of Education, University of California, Irvine and Healthy Start and After-school Partnerships Office, California Department of Education.

University of California, Irvine (May, 2001). *Evaluation of California's After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnerships Program: 1999-2000*. Irvine, CA: Department of Education, University of California, Irvine, and Healthy Start and After School Partnerships Office California Department of Education.

U. S. Department of Education (2002). 21st Century Community Learning Centers Home Page. <http://www.ed.gov/21stcclc/>.

U. S. Department of Education (1997). *Keeping Schools Open as Community Learning Centers. The Benefits of Schools as Community Learning Centers*. <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/LearnCenters/benefits.html>.

Vaznaugh, Adriana (1995). *Dropout Intervention and Language Minority Youth*. Washington, D.C.: <http://www.askeric.org/plweb-cgi/obtain.pl>.

