



Oakland Fund for Children and Youth Meeting of the Planning and Oversight Committee (POC)

November 2nd, 2016 • 6:00pm-9:00pm
Oakland City Hall, Hearing Room #4
1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Oakland, CA 94612

AGENDA

1. Call to Order
 - *Introductions & Announcements*
 - *Agenda Review/Modifications*
2. Open Forum
3. Adoption of Prior Meeting Minutes from October 5th 2016 *action*
4. Oakland Public Ethics Commission - Government Ethics for Public Servants Presentation *informational*
5. OFCY FY2015-2016 Program Evaluation Reports
 - *Social Policy Research Associates – OFCY Final Report FY2015-2016* *action*
 - *Public Profit, LCC – Oakland School-Based After School FY2015-16 Findings Report*
6. Administrative Matters
 - *General Announcements*
 - *Upcoming Meetings/ Scheduling*
7. Adjournment

Public Comment: The POC welcomes you to its meetings and your interest is appreciated.

- If you wish to speak before the POC, please fill out a speaker card and hand it to the staff of the POC.
- If you wish to speak on a matter not on the agenda, please sign up for Open Forum and wait for your name to be called.
- If you wish to speak on a matter on the agenda, please approach the Committee when called, give your name, and your comments.

Please be brief and limit your comments to the specific subject under discussion. Only matters within the POC's jurisdiction may be addressed. Time limitations shall be at the discretion of the Chair.

In compliance with Oakland's policy for people with chemical allergies, please refrain from wearing strongly scented products to meetings. In compliance with the American Disabilities Act, if you need assistance to participate in the meetings for the Oakland Fund for Children and Youth Planning & Oversight Committee, please contact the Oakland Fund for Children and Youth at 510-238-6379. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City of Oakland to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility. If you have questions regarding this agenda or related materials, please contact our office at the number above.

MINUTES TO BE APPROVED
Oakland Fund for Children and Youth (OFCY)
Planning and Oversight Committee (POC) Meeting

Oakland City Hall, 1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Hearing Room #4, Oakland, CA 94612

Wednesday, October 5, 2016

6:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.

Committee Members present: Gerald Williams, Francois Barrilleaux, Kathy Teng Dwyer, Ajani Torres-Cedillo, Steven Wirt, Zaira Hernandez, Max Chacana, Noni Session, Julie Waters, Astrid Regalado

Committee Members absent: Kisha Jackson, Jared Utley, Anakarita Allen

Staff Members present: Sandra Taylor, Mike Wetzel, Scott Kim and Sachelle Heavens

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:21pm.

2. Open Forum

There were no public comments.

3. Adoption of Prior Meeting Minutes from September 21st 2016

Astrid Regalado made a motion, seconded by Max Chacana to approve the meeting minutes from the September 21, 2016 POC meeting. The POC unanimously approved the minutes of the meeting.

4. OFCY 2016-2017 Grants Overview

OFCY staff discussed the grants overview for the 150 recommended funded programs FY2016-2017.

5. Oakland Public Ethics Commission – Government Ethics for Public Servants Fact Sheet

Staff distributed a fact sheet to the POC that described City employees' compliance with the City of Oakland's government ethics, campaign finance, transparency, and lobbyist registration laws that aim to promote fairness, openness, honesty, and integrity in government.

6. OFCY 2016-2017 Independent Evaluator Update

The deadline for the RFP proposal applications for the FY2016-2017 independent evaluator is November 1, 2016. An evaluation committee, composed of POC Members Julie Waters, Gerald Williams, Steven Wirt, Noni Session and Francois Barrilleaux, will convene separately to discuss the applications on November 17.

7. Administrative Matters

- *General Announcements*

Staff reminded the POC about the October 20 Lights On After School event. The list of OFCY funded school based after school programs will be sent to the POC via email. POC members were invited and encouraged to attend.

- *Upcoming Meetings/ Scheduling*

The next POC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, November 2 at 6pm.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:26 pm.



Final Report
FY2015-2016

Prepared by:

Mika Clark
Rachel Estrella
Heather Lewis-Charp

Social Policy Research
Associates (SPR)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

SPR would like to thank the Oakland Fund for Children and Youth staff members who have worked with us on this evaluation project, including Sandra Taylor, Mike Wetzel, Scott Kim, Debra Chester, and Terry Hill.

Thanks also to the OFCY Planning and Oversight Committee for their ongoing feedback and support.

Finally, we would like to give a special thanks to the staff, participants, and volunteers of the OFCY programs for completing surveys, hosting observation visits, and generously sharing insights about their programs.



CONTENTS

- Introduction 1
 - Data Sources..... 1
 - Overview of the Report 2
- Programs 3
 - Location 4
 - Program Size and Capacity..... 6
- Participants 7
 - Recruitment..... 7
 - Participant Characteristics 8
 - Services Received 11
- Performance and Quality 13
 - OFCY Performance Measures 13
 - Quality 15
- Outcomes 24
 - Youth Outcomes..... 24
 - Youth Development Outcomes 25
 - Youth Engagement Outcomes..... 27
 - Youth Workforce Development Outcomes 29
 - Academic Outcomes 30
 - Early Childhood Outcomes 33
- Conclusion 37

INVENTORY OF EXHIBITS

| Exhibit No. | Title |
|-------------|---|
| 1 | Data Sources |
| 2 | Overview of OFCY Programs in FY2015-2016 |
| 3 | Overview of Participants |
| 4 | Total and Average Hours of Service Received for Children and Youth |
| 5 | Total and Average Hours of Service Received for Adult Participants |
| 6 | Performance by Funding Strategy |
| 7 | Average Program Quality Scores |
| 8 | Youth Outcome Measures |
| 9 | Progress Towards Youth Development Outcomes (percent of respondents who agree or strongly agree) (n=4,026 youth in 51 programs) |
| 10 | Progress Towards Youth Engagement Outcomes (Percent of respondents who agree or strongly agree) (n = 2,608 youth in 31 programs) |
| 11 | Progress Towards Youth Workforce Development Outcomes (Percent of respondents who agree or strongly agree) (n = 451 youth in 10 programs) |
| 12 | Progress Towards Academic Outcomes (Percent of respondents who agree or strongly agree) (n = 967 youth in ten programs) |
| 13 | Changes in Youth Outcomes Over Time (FY2014-2015 and FY2015-2106) |
| 14 | Early Childhood Outcomes |
| 15 | Progress Towards Parent Outcomes (Percent of respondents who agree or strongly agree) (n = 291 parents and caregivers in nine programs) |
| 16 | Average Parent Outcome Scores for CY2014-2015 and FY2015-2016 |
| 17 | Progress Towards Educator Outcomes (Percent of respondents who agree or strongly agree) (n = 140 educators in three programs) |
| 18 | Average Educator Outcome Scores for CY2014-2015 and FY2015-2016 |

Oakland Fund for Children and Youth

Final Evaluation Summary - October 2016

FY2015-2016

Background

The Oakland Fund for Children and Youth (OFCY), created in 1996 through a ballot initiative, represents a large investment on the part of Oakland residents to support the dreams and voices of young people and their families. OFCY provides strategic funding to programs for children and youth, with the goal of helping them to become healthy, happy, educated, engaged, powerful, and loved community members.


This Final Evaluation Report focuses on the performance, quality, and outcomes of 65 OFCY community-based programs. Data was drawn from Cityspan data, OFCY's youth survey, surveys of parents and instructors engaged in early childhood programs, staff surveys, interviews with 28 program staff, observations of 34 programs using the Program Quality Assessment (PQA), and information gathered during in-depth site visits to six programs. Due to limitations in the data, the evaluation findings are not generalizable to all OFCY participants but instead reflect trends.

- *I used to think that I never could do anything and when I came [to this program], they told me that I could do anything that I put my mind to.*
– Youth Participant
- *I think it's the difference between staying at home and watching TV and being isolated in your home. So it's a difference between having a place to go and not having a place to go.*
– Program Staff

Overview of Programs

OFCY funds a wide variety of programs in order to meet the diverse needs of youth and families. While they share a common focus on empowering Oakland residents, programs vary considerably along many dimensions, including their size, target populations, and approaches to youth development. The 65 programs summarized in this report include programs with a focus on early childhood, student success in school, youth leadership and community safety, and the transition to adulthood, including youth workforce development.

OFCY programs provide direct services to support children and youth from birth to 20 years. OFCY funding strategies each have a more focused target population including children from birth to 5 and their parents, middle school students transitioning to high school, and LGBTQ youth and families.



Key findings on programs:

- During FY2015-2016, OFCY committed \$6,734,081 to programs, excluding school-based after school programs. On average, OFCY programs received \$103,601 in funding, with grants ranging from \$30,000 to \$321,875.
- OFCY funding, which provided 49% of programs' budgets on average, plays a pivotal role in supporting early childhood and youth programming in Oakland. Programs in the *Healthy Development of Young Children* area relied most heavily on OFCY funding.
- Programs used a number of strategies to enhance their programming within their limited budget, including partnering with other organizations for programming space, supportive services, training, and mentoring; recruiting volunteers; and utilizing youth participants as interns.


Overview of Participants

During FY2015-2016, OFCY programs served 17,522 youth and 2,136 adults across all neighborhoods in Oakland, with over 20% of participants coming from 94601, around Fruitvale and along International Boulevard, and 40% coming from other neighborhoods in East Oakland, reflecting where the majority of OFCY program sites are located. The *Student Success in School* (31%) strategy served the most participants, followed by *Youth Leadership and Community Safety* (29%), and *Healthy Development of Young Children* (27%).


Key findings on participants:

- The vast majority of OFCY youth participants were children and youth of color, with African American (33%) and Hispanic (37%) children and youth making up most of the participants, followed by Asian/Pacific Islander (12%), multiracial (3%), and Caucasian/White children and youth (3%).
- Close to 40% of youth receiving services from OFCY-funded programs received “light touch” services (fewer than 10 hours), while 26% received “intensive” services (120 hours or more).
- The age ranges most frequently served were 13-14 year olds (23%), 15-16 year olds (16%), 3-4 year olds (14%), and 11-12 year olds (12%). Less than 1% of youth participants were older than 20 years old, the upper range of OFCY’s target age range.


Program Site Location




Participants' Home Zipcode



Avg. Hours of Service by Age



Ethnicity



Avg. Hours of Service By Funding Area



Note: This graphic includes ethnicity information for youth enrolled in OUSD for SY15-16.

Performance

OFCY's two core program performance measures focus on progress towards meeting thresholds for enrollment and projected units of service. Results are highlighted below. SPR also used two additional measures, including percentage of participants who receive 40 or more hours of service (72% met this threshold) and percentage of participants who complete a participant survey (51% of all participants).

Percent of Programs Meeting OFCY Performance Threshold



Key findings for performance:

- Programs made good progress toward enrollment and units of service projections. Across all programs, 88% met the threshold for enrollment, and 85% met the threshold for units of service.
- Overall, 51% of OFCY participants completed a participant survey, an increase of 8% over FY2014-2015.
- Close to three-quarters of programs provided an average of at least 40 hours of service to youth participants. Youth Leadership and Community Safety programs were the most likely to meet this target.


Quality

OFCY draws on multiple data sources to assess program quality, including structured observations using the Program Quality Assessment (PQA) and the annual participant surveys. The survey and PQA tool capture quality along five dimensions on a 5-point scale. SPR added *diversity* to these dimensions and, responding to grantee feedback, we also added *partnerships, relevance, and responsiveness* for *Healthy Development of Young Children* programs.

Key findings for program quality:


- Consistently high Program Quality Assessment (PQA) scores and youth survey results point to the generally high quality of OFCY programs.
- Overall, youth programs received the highest scores in the area of Safety. With a PQA score of 3.7 across programs, engagement is the only area where programs averaged less than a 4 (on a 5-point scale).
- Healthy Development of Young Children programs received the highest scores for responsiveness (averaging 4.68) and safe environment (averaging 4.66).
- Programs that provided more intensive services generally received higher quality scores from participants.
- Youth perception of program quality differed by age. Across program strategies, older youth gave higher scores in all quality dimensions, with the largest difference being in the areas of engagement and diversity.

Youth Programs



Healthy Development of Young Children Programs

(caregiver and educator survey results only)



Outcomes

OFCY’s goal is to put young people on the “right track” so that they can thrive and become healthy and happy members of Oakland’s community. Results from participant surveys indicate that programs are making strong progress towards this goal:


General Youth Development Outcomes



Select Framework-Specific Outcomes



Early Childhood Outcomes



■ Mental Health Consultation
■ Parent & Child Engagement/Summer Pre-K

* n/a for Mental Health Consultation programs.

Quotes from Focus Groups

“For our family, it’s been really helpful, just having professionals who can offer us feedback about parenting our children, even just little ways of handling situations so that it wouldn’t escalate to a whole tantrum. It’s really helped us a lot.”

“It changed my thinking about school... I’m about to enter high school, and this year, my eighth grade year going into freshman year, it’s like, “okay, I need to get this, and this.” My grades this year have not gone below a B... I said to my friend, in tenth grade I’m going to start college classes.”

“[The program] teaches us to communicate about what we dislike and how we can change how we act. [It teaches us] how we can change how we act towards peers and how to approach someone when we don’t like something instead of yelling or [using] violence.”

“I gained self-confidence. [Before the program], I always hated my body so much... Now, I don’t give a flying freak about society’s expectations. I love my body and I love myself.”

Key findings for youth outcomes:

- Despite a small decrease in scores compared to FY2014-2015, youth outcomes were very positive.
- Youth in programs with smaller enrollment reported more progress towards making connections to caring adults.
- Different types of programs excelled in different areas of youth development. For example, youth from Youth Workforce Development programs were the most likely to agree to questions mapped to *improved decision-making and goal setting* as well as *development and mastery of skills*, while youth from Youth Engagement programs showed the greatest progress toward the outcome *greater connections to caring adults*.

Key findings for early childhood outcomes:

- Educator outcomes for Mental Health Consultation programs increased significantly compared to FY2014-2105, while parent outcomes in parent and child engagement programs decreased modestly.
- Both caregivers and educators showed the greatest progress toward *increased access to resources and support*, demonstrating the important role that OFCY programs play in connecting families and early childhood programs to the community.

INTRODUCTION

I used to think that I never could do anything and when I came [to this program], they told me that I could do anything that I put my mind to. – Youth Participant

The Oakland Fund for Children and Youth (OFCY) was created through a ballot initiative in 1996: OFCY’s mission is to provide steady and strategic funding for programs that serve children and youth from birth through age 20. Through its funding, OFCY promotes the core values of social and economic equity, child and youth development, and community and collaboration so that young people can become healthy, happy and engaged community members who, like the young person quoted above, feel that they can do anything they put their minds to.

Social Policy Research Associates (SPR) was contracted by OFCY to evaluate 65 programs, representing 51% of the programs funded by OFCY in FY2015-2016.¹ These 65 community-based programs operate throughout the City of Oakland and reach young people of all ages, from infancy through young adulthood. The early childhood programs also serve adults that interact with and support young children, particularly parents, caregivers, and educators. (Program descriptions are included as Appendix A.) This Final Report includes a description of the children, youth, and adults served by these programs during FY2015-2016, as well as an assessment of the services provided, program quality and performance, and outcomes.

Data Sources

The Final Report draws on quantitative and qualitative data sources, summarized in Exhibit 1. These data are used to describe OFCY programs and their participants, measure program quality, assess programs’ ability to meet service projections, and explore progress towards outcomes.

Exhibit 1: Data Sources

| Data Source | Description |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Cityspan | OFCY’s client management system, Cityspan, is used to track youth and adult characteristics and hours and types of services received. Youth and adults who enrolled in at least one program activity were included in the Final Report. During FY2015-2016, data were available for 17,522 children and youth and 2,136 adults that received program services. |
| Youth Surveys | Participant surveys gathered participants’ perspectives on program quality and program outcomes. A total of 4,026 youth surveys were completed by youth in grade 3 or higher. |
| Parent/Caregiver and Educator Surveys | Parents and caregivers in parent and child engagement programs and educators who received services from mental health consultation programs also completed surveys. In all, 140 educators and 291 caregivers submitted surveys. |

¹ During FY2015-2016, OFCY funded 127 programs, including 65 community- and school-based programs and 62 school-based, afterschool programs.

| | |
|---|--|
| Program Quality Assessment (PQA) Observations | Certified site visitors conducted structured observations at 34 of OFCY's 65 community-based programs (52%) using the Weikart Program Quality Assessment (PQA) tool. The PQA tool captures four key dimensions of program quality: safety, supportive environment, interaction, and engagement using over 60 questions, which observers rate on a scale of 1, 3, or 5. For programs that did not receive a PQA visit to assess for quality, SPR staff conducted phone interviews or in-depth site visits in Spring 2016. ² |
| Program Director Interviews | During spring 2016, SPR interviewed program directors at all Early Childhood strategies (12 programs), Career and Youth Workforce Development (10 programs), and Youth Leadership and Community Safety programs (6 programs). These interviews gathered information on (1) agency and program, (2) program structure, (3) recruitment strategies and youth characteristics, (4) program approaches, (5) diversity and inclusion, (6) evaluation processes, and (7) program strengths and challenges. |
| In-depth Site Visits | During spring 2016, SPR conducted half-day site visits to six programs, including one program from each of the following strategies: Career and Youth Workforce Development, Youth Leadership and Community Safety programs, Parent and Child Engagement in Early Learning and Development, Academic Support for Older Youth, Community-Based Out-of-School Time, and Safe Community Spaces for LGBTQ Youth. Each visit consisted of an interview with the program director (see above), focus groups with youth participants, an interview with a program partner (when applicable), and an observation of program activities. The purpose of these site visits was to gain an in-depth understanding of these programs, as well as to surface promising practices and lessons learned. |
| Program Survey | In Fall 2015, 64 of 65 program directors completed the program survey. The survey captured information about program resources, staffing (including race/ethnicity, gender, and tenure), funding, partnerships, and evaluation practices. |

Overview of the Report

The report begins with an overview of OFCY community-based programs, including information about program size, location, and capacity. It then describes the characteristics of OFCY program participants (e.g. age ranges, race and ethnicity, gender, neighborhoods where participants live) and the types and intensity of services they received. Next, it describes findings on program performance and quality and highlights key youth development outcomes. We conclude with considerations for OFCY and for grantees as they continue their efforts to strengthen programs to ensure positive outcomes for Oakland children and youth.

² As an alternative to the structured PQA observations, program quality at all Early Childhood strategies, Career and Youth Workforce Development programs, and Youth Leadership and Community Safety programs were assessed through interviews and in-depth site visits in spring 2016. In addition, SPR conducted in-depth site visits in lieu of structured PQA observations at three selected programs from the Academic Support for Older Youth, Community-Based Out-of-School Time, and Safe Community Spaces for LGBTQ Youth strategies.

PROGRAMS

*The planning that goes into the program, the commitment from the staff who are just really dedicated to the mission of what we're trying to do – because we want to see these kids go on to a higher education and to dream big – those things continue to be strengths. –
Program Director*

For FY2015-2016, OFCY committed to investing \$11.1 million to support programs located throughout Oakland.³ All programs aim to support Oakland's children and youth, from birth to 20 years of age, to become healthy, happy, educated, engaged, powerful, and loved community members. Programs vary considerably, however, along many dimensions, including their size, target population, and approaches to youth development. The 65 programs summarized in this report fall under four main areas, each comprising multiple funding strategies:

- **Healthy Development of Young Children programs** include early interventions and supports for families and young children to set the stage for healthy development and future outcomes. Specific funding strategies in this area include: *Mental Health and Developmental Consultations in Early Childhood Care* (3 programs), *Parent and Child Engagement in Early Learning and Development* (8 programs), and *Pre-Kindergarten Summer Camp* (1 program).
- **Student Success in School programs** support the transformative goals of the community schools' movement in Oakland and contribute to positive outcomes for children and youth. Specific funding strategies in this area include: *Transition Programs for Youth into Middle and High School* (4 programs) and *Youth Leadership in Community Schools* (3 programs).⁴
- **Youth Leadership and Community Safety programs** are designed to provide safe and supportive environments for youth while providing enriching, high quality programming, and to nurture youth and community leadership. Specific funding strategies in this area include: *Community-Based Out-of-School Time* (11 programs), *Summer* (10 programs) and *Youth Leadership and Community Safety* (6 programs).
- **Transition to Adulthood programs** address two critical needs facing youth as they grow into self-sufficient adults: 1) understanding of and connections to the workforce; and 2) the skills and qualifications to be able to achieve their career goals. Specific funding strategies in this area include: *Youth Career and Workforce Development* (10 programs), *Academic Support for Older Youth* (4 programs), and *Safe Community Spaces for LGBTQ Youth* (5 programs).

Community-Based Out-of-School Time made up the largest percentage of grantees (17%), followed by *Youth Career and Workforce Development* and *Summer Programs* (15% each). As in the previous year, the smallest funding strategies in terms of number of programs continued to be *Pre-Kindergarten Summer Camp* (2%; 1 program), *Mental Health and Developmental Consultations in Early Care and Education* (5%; 3 programs), and *Youth Leadership in Community Schools* (5%; 3 programs).

³ Of the \$11.1 million invested by OFCY, \$6.7 million supported the 65 youth programs covered in this report, and \$4.4 million supported the 62 school-based after school programs covered in a separate report, prepared by Public Profit.


⁴ This strategy area also includes programs under the *School-Based After School Programming for Elementary and Middle School Children* funding strategy (62 programs), which are not included in this report.

Exhibit 2 illustrates key characteristics of OFCY programs, including the location of their sites, OFCY funding amount, program budget, and OFCY grant as a percentage of program budget. With some exceptions, programs maintained the same funding, budget, and reliance on OFCY as in FY2014-2015 as well as many of the same locations.

Location

Exhibit 2: Overview of OFCY Programs in FY2015-2016

Location



Program Location (Zipcode and Neighborhood)

| | |
|--|-----|
| 94601: Fruitvale, East Oakland | 19% |
| 94607: West Oakland and Chinatown | 12% |
| 94612: Downtown | 12% |
| 94606: Highland Park, San Antonio, East Lake | 11% |
| 94621: East Oakland: Webster Tract, East of Coliseum | 10% |
| 94605: Eastmont, Seminary, Havenscourt, Millsmont | 9% |
| 94603: Sobrante Park, Elmhurst, E. 14th Street | 7% |
| 94609: Temescal, Pill Hill, Bushrod Park | 6% |
| 94619: Maxwell Park, Leona Heights, Redwood Heights | 5% |
| 94610: Adams Point, Lakeshore, Crocker Highlands | 4% |
| 94608: San Pablo and Market Street Corridor | 3% |
| 94602: Glenview, Lincoln, Oakmore | 2% |
| 94611: Piedmont Avenue and Montclair | 1% |

Zip codes with fewer than 1% of program sites: 94618, 94577, and 94103


Funding

Total Funding

\$6,734,081

By Funding Area


| | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|
| Youth Leadership and Community Safety | \$2,169,141 |
| Transitions to Adulthood | \$1,960,882 |
| Healthy Development of Young Children | \$1,666,288 |
| Student Success in School | \$937,770 |



Budget


Average Projected Program Budget

\$247,342



Average Grant


\$103,601



Avg. Grant as Percentage of Program Budget

(How much of the budget comes from OFCY?)

49%



OFCY programs, excluding school-based afterschool programs,⁵ continued to be hosted at sites located throughout Oakland. The greatest concentration (19%) of program sites is located in the 94601 zip code, clustered along International Boulevard and in Fruitvale. Uptown and Downtown Oakland (94612, 12%) are home to a large concentration of programs, as is Chinatown and West Oakland (94607, 12%). Program sites are clustered in areas participants live in (East Oakland, Fruitvale) or that are readily accessible by public transportation networks (Downtown and Chinatown).

Between the second and third year of the grant, the total number of program sites decreased by about 10%. *Youth Career and Workforce Development* and *Transition Programs for Youth into Middle and High School* dropped the most sites while *Community-based Out-of-School Time* added the most sites. *Youth Career and Workforce Development*, despite dropping some program locations, continued to have the most sites due to a wide variety of job placement opportunities for youth, including those in transportation (Caltrans, BART), hospital and health clinics (e.g., Alta Bates, Kaiser Permanente, and Children's Hospital & Research Center Oakland), parks and recreation (YMCA, Coliseum, Metro Golf Links), and city agencies (e.g., East Bay Municipal Utilities District (EBMUD), City of Oakland - Public Works Agency).

Several program staff mentioned that one of their biggest concerns is making sure that young people are safe while participating in programs, especially given the level of violence in the communities where they live and attend programs. This concern appeared most relevant for those youth participating in programs that work on community improvement projects—projects that require participants to be out in the community. A staff member said, “we want [youth] to be visible in the community, but [the violence] is something that all of us worry about.”

Foundation and government grants are the most common types of external support for OFCY programs.

Examples of external funding sources for OFCY-funded programs include Wells Fargo Foundation, The California Endowment, College Bound Brotherhood, Gap Foundation, the East Bay College Fund, SAMHSA, Workforce Innovation Opportunity Act, and Alameda County.

Many programs receive in-kind support and funding from their sponsoring agencies.

For example, the YouthBridge Career and Workforce Development Program received funding from Better Health East Bay, a foundation supported by the Alta Bates Summit Medical Center, Eden Medical Center and Sutter Delta Medical Center.

OFCY Funding

During FY2015-2016, OFCY funded a portfolio of programs with a total funding amount of \$6,734,081. On average, programs received \$103,601 in funding, with grants ranging from \$30,000 (Prescott Circus Theatre, a small, emerging *Summer Program*) to \$321,875 (Integrated Early Childhood Consultation Program at the Jewish Family & Children's Services of the East Bay, a collaborative of three agencies under the *Mental Health and Developmental Consultations in Early Care and Education* strategy). A total of nine programs received grants of less than \$50,000, and only four programs received grants of \$200,000 or more.

OFCY programs are expected to diversify their funding sources and draw on outside funding to augment their program budgets. It is expected that they secure a targeted match of at least 25% of their total OFCY grant. Examples of projected matches include leveraged support from sponsoring agencies and grant funding from foundations or government agencies. Of 65 programs, at the mid-

⁵ Throughout the remainder of this report, we refer to OFCY programs, excluding school-based afterschool programs, as *OFCY programs*. School-based afterschool programs are summarized in a separate report, prepared by Public Profit.

point of FY2015-2016, 64 programs anticipated a funding match of 25% or more, with one program just shy of the target.⁶

During FY2015-2016, OFCY programs continued to rely extensively on OFCY funding, with OFCY grants making up on average 49% of programs' projected budgets. This underscores the important role that OFCY plays in supporting early childhood and youth programming in Oakland, as well as the challenges programs face in procuring other sources of funding.

Programs varied in how much they relied on OFCY funding. Programs in the funding strategies under *Healthy Development of Young Children* were most dependent on OFCY funding (69% of program budget on average) while programs in the funding strategies under *Transitions to Adulthood*, excluding *Safe Community Spaces for LGBTQ Youth* programs, were the least dependent (34% of program budget on average).⁷ As in the previous year, smaller programs with budgets under \$150,000 (29% of programs) were significantly more likely to rely on OFCY funding than larger programs with budgets over \$350,000 (20% of programs): OFCY grants comprised, on average, 58% of smaller program budgets versus 34% of larger program budgets.

Program Size and Capacity

The challenges are when we have to turn people away, because we are full. That is the hardest part, ... I think if we were larger, we'd be able to add more... times or more days. – Program Director

Although OFCY programs vary significantly in size, most tend to be small, with an average annual budget of just under \$250,000. In the final year of the grant cycle, Prescott Circus Theatre Summer Program (\$40,000) and La Clinica de La Raza's Juntos program (\$60,931) remained the smallest programs with relatively constant budgets while the largest programs, Alameda Health System's Model Neighborhood Program (\$694,196) and College Track-Oakland (\$995,660), increased their budgets by 22% and 14% respectively.⁸

Similar to FY2014-2015, limited funding challenged many organizations. To address these challenges, programs continued to use many of the same strategies they used in FY2014-2015 to enhance their programming and build capacity without requiring additional staff or funding. For example, some programs relied on youth interns to provide an "extra set of hands" and administrative support. Other programs partnered with other partner organizations to provide services the program current staff could not offer, such as one-on-one mentoring, internships, staff training, guest speakers, and donated facility space. Some programs used consultants to provide discrete services as a way to reduce labor costs.

Staff turnover presented another challenge to organizational capacity. In fact, half of the programs we interviewed reported experiencing staffing transitions over the last year. Program directors identified multiple ways turnover affected the experience of program participants: slowing the development of trust between participants and the program and disrupting the sense of collaboration among staff. Programs that experienced low staff turnover provided professional

⁶ The only program whose project match was not at least 25% of its OFCY grant was program Health Initiatives for Youth's LGBTQIY Youth Safe Space Initiative (24.22%)

⁷ Programs under two of the strategies in *Transitions to Adulthood* did not rely as heavily on OFCY funding: *Academic Support for Older Youth* (32%) and *Youth Career and Workforce Development* (34%). However, programs under *Safe Community Spaces for LGBTQ Youth* relied considerably on OFCY funding (67% of program budget).

⁸ The larger program budgets in FY2015-2016 could be due, in part, to inconsistencies in reporting match funds.

development opportunities and built clear pathways for advancement within the organization to retain staff.

Several programs found ways to train staff at little or no cost by integrating reflection activities into staff meetings and partnering with educational institutions, such as Cal State East Bay or First 5. One organization filmed staff members while delivering programming and used the videos as an opportunity for staff to reflect on their practice and receive feedback from their colleagues.

PARTICIPANTS

The youth that we're serving are at-risk youth. We're in this community, and there's issues that youth here have that youth in other areas don't have... the kids will come in and [say], "Yeah, there was a shooting by my house yesterday," like it's not a big deal. –Program Staff

During FY2015-2016, 17,522 youth and 2,136 adults participated in OFCY-funded community-based programs. Programs under the area of *Student Success in School* served the most participants (31%), followed by *Youth Leadership and Community Safety* (29%) and *Healthy Development of Young Children* (27%). Enrollment also varied by individual programs: four programs served less than 25 youth children or youth, while one program (Pass 2 Peer Mentoring Program, Oakland Kids First) served over 2,000. While children and youth participants were spread across all programs and funding strategies, over 66% of adult participants received services through *Parent and Child Engagement in Early Learning and Development* programs.

This section describes the characteristics of participants in OFCY programs, how they are recruited, and the hours of services they received. Due to limited available data on adult participants, the discussion of participant characteristics focuses on youth served by OFCY programs, summarized in Exhibit 4 on page 11.

Program staff are diverse but do not mirror the race/ethnicity of participants.

During FY2015-2016, a third of staff were African American (33%), followed by Hispanic (22%) and white (16%). *Mental Health and Developmental Consultations in Early Care and Education* programs had the highest proportion of white staff (55%) while programs under *Youth Leadership and Community Safety* had the highest percentage of Hispanic staff (43%) and *Safe Community Spaces for LGBTQ Youth* had the highest percentage of African American staff (59%). For the most part, programs serving predominantly one racial/ethnic group were led by staff of the same race/ethnicity, while programs that served a more diverse group of participants were generally operated by a diverse team of staff with no more than 60% of staff from one particular group.

Recruitment

Enrollment has increased over time...Recruitment is not an issue. We're able to recruit people throughout the year. The most effective recruitment strategy has been the word-of-mouth from the young people themselves. – Program Director

Of the program staff we interviewed, most said that recruitment went well during the FY2015-2016 program cycle. Several programs that had struggled with recruitment early in the three-year funding cycle found that it became much easier after they had established a reputation within the community for providing valuable services. The most frequently cited recruitment practices were encouraging youth participants and parents to conduct outreach on behalf of the program, consistently reaching out and doing presentations at key partners (particularly schools), providing stipends to older youth, and engaging and building relationships with the families of younger youth. Furthermore, a few of the parent-child engagement programs formally hired former participants to conduct outreach for the program.

Program staff did cite challenges, however, in keeping youth consistently engaged and in recruiting hard-to-reach populations such as systems-involved youth, foster youth, youth on probation, and new immigrant populations. Staff reported that these populations are hard to reach because of the sheer challenges they face, including most predominantly housing instability, making it difficult for them to commit to programs.

Other obstacles to program recruitment include limited transportation to and from the programs and establishing set hours of operation to accommodate participants, given that OUSD schools often operate on different schedules. Youth are also very busy with school, work and family responsibilities, which can make it challenging for them to consistently participate in programs. One program indicated that they are working hard to be flexible with students so that they know that they “might take a break because of sports or something like that and then come back in April again.”

Kids are really, really busy....
Between their studies, their sports, their families, and some work, time is a real issue. As we get better and better at serving kids, there are more and more opportunities that come along, so it gets to be difficult to find time for kids to have the experiences.

- Program Staff

Participant Characteristics

OFCY programs provide direct services to children and youth from birth to 20 years and their parents. Within this broad age group, specific OFCY funding strategies have a more focused target population including children from birth to 5 and their parents, middle school students transitioning to high school, and LGBTQ youth and families. During FY2015-2016, OFCY programs served participants from all neighborhoods in Oakland, with over 20% of participants coming from 94601, around Fruitvale and along International Boulevard, and over 45% coming from other neighborhoods in East Oakland, reflecting where the majority of OFCY program sites are located. Although, as discussed above, nearly 15% of program sites are located in the Downtown and Uptown neighborhoods in 94612, only 2% of participants lived in this zip code.



Following are trends in participant characteristics, illustrated in Exhibit 3 on page 9:

- **OFCY programs continued to reach a very diverse population.** The vast majority of OFCY youth participants were children and youth of color, with African American (33%) and Hispanic (37%) children and youth making up most of the participants, followed by Asian/Pacific Islander (12%), and multiracial children and youth (3%). Caucasian/white children and youth made up only 3% of those served. Compared to the Oakland Unified School District (OUSD), OFCY programs served a higher percentage of African American youth and lower percentages of Hispanic and Caucasian/white youth.
- **Approximately 9% of programs targeted specific racial/ethnic group for services.** These programs included programs sponsored by ethnic-specific agencies, such as Youth Law Academy at Centro Legal de La Raza and EBAYC: API Youth Promoting Advocacy and Leadership. Diversity of populations served went beyond race and ethnicity. For example, early childhood programs targeted special populations that were not captured in Cityspan data, including migrant populations, new immigrants, children with disabilities or developmental delays, and LGBTQ families.

Exhibit 3: Overview of Participants

Home Neighborhoods and Zip Code of Participants


Darker areas correspond to more participants



Note: Fewer than 1% of participants were missing zip code information.

Youth Characteristics (17,522)

Ethnicity: OFCY Participants Compared to OUSD




Gender



Note: Fewer than 1% of youth either identified as transgender or were missing gender information.

Age



- The ethnicity of participants varied by the type of program.** As was observed in the FY2014-2015 Final Report, Healthy Development of Young Children programs served fewer African American and Asian/Pacific Islander participants than other programs did.⁹ For example, in FY2015-2016, 59% of participants from Safe Community Spaces for LGBTQ Youth were African American, compared to 18% of child participants in the Parent and Child Engagement strategy. Programs in the Youth Leadership and Community Safety strategy served the highest proportion of Asian/Pacific Islander youth (24% of compared to 12% for programs overall), primarily because one of the largest of the five organizations in this strategy specifically focuses on Asian/Pacific Islander youth.
- Ages of participating children and youth continued to vary greatly, depending on program and funding strategy.** Across all programs, the age ranges most frequently served were 13-14 year olds (23%), 15-16 year olds (16%), 3-4 year olds (14%), and 11-12 year olds (12%). As to be expected, the vast majority of children under the age of 5 were served through programs funded through *Healthy Development of Young Children*; the average age of these participants was 4. On the other end of the spectrum, the majority of youth aged 19 and above were served through programs under *Transitions to Adulthood*. The average age for participants in these programs was 16. Across all programs, less than 1% of youth participants were older than 20 years old, the upper range of OFCY's target age range.
- Improved adult participant data suggests OFCY programs are reaching diverse parents, most often female and in their thirties.** With demographic data available for 65%-75% of adult participants, a picture of parent and caregiver participants is beginning to emerge. Of the parents with ethnicity information in Cityspan, most were Hispanic/Latino (41%) or African American (21%) and female (65%). Across all parent play group programs, the average age was 36, and 40% were between 30 and 40 years of age. Important to note is that while OFCY programs served a diverse group of parents, the individual programs themselves often attracted a specific population and were less diverse themselves. Of the seventeen programs that served at least ten adults, eight of the programs served primarily one ethnicity¹⁰.

Most program staff are female, but staff gender varies by strategy and program. Across all OFCY-funded programs 70% of program staff were female. Over 90% of staff at early childhood programs under *Healthy Development of Young Children* were female while males made up roughly half of staff members at *Youth Leadership and Community Safety* (50%), *Youth Career and Workforce Development* (46%), and *Safe Community Spaces for LGBTQ Youth* (45%) programs. A total of 5 programs were led entirely by male staff while 13 programs were led by all female staff during FY2015-2016.

⁹ The relatively smaller number of Asian children served by Healthy Development of Young Children programs may be attributed to demographic patterns within Oakland. Asian children account for 6% of all Oakland children under the age of 5, while they account for 13% of all children ages 5-19 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2015 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates).

¹⁰ Defined as having at least two-thirds of participants with known ethnicity coming from one ethnic group.


Services Received

OFCY programs provide a broad range of services that vary in intensity depending on the particular program and the target population. As illustrated in Exhibit 4, the three largest service areas for youth participants in OFCY programs were 1) academics, 2) youth leadership and civic engagement, 3) and health and recreation. In comparison, adult participants received the most hours in family engagement and academics, as illustrated in Exhibit 5 on the following page.


Exhibit 4: Total and Average Hours of Service Received for Children and Youth

Youth Participants


Overall and by Category



By Age



By Ethnicity



By Funding Area



Key findings about services received by youth include the following:¹¹

- **Close to 40% of youth receiving services from OFCY-funded programs received “light touch” services (fewer than 10 hours), while 26% received “intensive” services (120 hours or more).** There are likely several reasons that participants receive “light touch” or more “intensive” services. First, some services provided by OFCY programs, such as workshops or transition services, are designed to be light touch but with a broad reach. Second, programs experience higher rates of attrition at the start of their programs, as individuals may “try out”

¹¹ The findings related to average hours of service do not include programs in the Mental Health and Developmental Consultation in Early Care and Education strategy because services for that strategy are provided at a classroom, not participant, level.


a number of programs and activities before committing for a longer period. As a result, participants who decided not to continue participating in programming appear to have received lighter touch services.

- **Average hours of service was highest for children aged 5-10.** Average hours of service peaked for children aged 5-8 (140 hours) and youth aged 9-10 (134 hours) with a considerable dip for youth aged 13-14 (49 hours). The marked decline in hours of service for youth aged 13-14 could be explained by the participation of a high number of 13-14 year olds in *Transitions programs*, most of which delivered relatively light-touch services in the spring, possibly in the form of workshops or transition support for moving into high school the following fall.
- **Average hours of service for youth varied widely across funding strategies and programs.** Across all of the programs, average hours of service per child or youth participant ranged from seven hours to 409 hours. At the end of FY2014-2015, programs under the *Safe Community Spaces for LGBTQ Youth* funding strategy had the fewest average hours of service (22) per youth participant while Summer Programs had the most (164). Other funding strategies that, on average, provided a high-level of service to children and youth were *Youth Leadership and Community Safety* (45), *Youth Career and Workforce Development* (114), and *Community-based Out-of-School Time Programs* (115). Summer programs provide more hours of service because youth are able to attend the programs for full days over the summer. Variations in hours of service for year-round programs likely are due to program design, in that some programs have a more light-touch service model.


Exhibit 5: Total and Average Hours of Service Received for Adult Participants

Adult Participants


Overall and by Category



By Ethnicity



By Strategy



Key findings about services received by adults include the following:

- **On average, parents and caregivers received less hours of services than youth received.** On average, adult participants received 34 hours of service, versus an average of 80 hours of service for youth participants. Academic and family engagement services accounted for almost all services received.

- **The level of service received by parents and caregivers varied by strategy and race/ethnicity but not by gender or age.** On average, adult participants in *Parent and Child Engagement in Early Learning and Development* programs received 44 hours of services, more than any other strategy that served at least 20 adult participants.¹² Across all playgroup programs, 31% of adult participants received 40 hours or more of services. In comparison, only 10% of adults in other programs received 40 hours or more of services. This difference is driven by program design, as *Parent and Child Engagement in Early Learning and Development* programs serve parents as the primary client, while other programs focus primarily on youth and serve parents as a means to enhance their services to youth. Unlike youth participants, white adult participants received more than the average hours of service (51.5), while African American parents received about the average (33). Similar to youth, there were no significant differences in the hours of service received by male and female adult participants.

PERFORMANCE AND QUALITY

We used OFCY's data... We spent quite a bit of time going through the data and looking at the student survey results. Actually, the teachers were very, very engaged and responsive around some of the student support [and interaction] data that was reported. –Program Staff Member

As indicated in the quote above, OFCY provides programs with individual data reports that they can use to support professional development and improve their programs over time. In this way, the OFCY performance measures and program quality data are a vital feedback mechanism for OFCY staff, Oakland city council, OFCY-funded programs, and key stakeholders across the city.

Because OFCY programs are diverse, OFCY focuses on the most universal of program elements: Is the program enrolling youth or participants? Is the program safe? Are participants engaged? Are participants staying with the program long enough to get a significant level of service? Do participants have opportunities to provide input on the program and how it provides services?

OFCY measures program quality through structured program observations, using the Weikart Program Quality Assessment (PQA) tool, Cityspan data, and participant surveys. In this section, we highlight key findings on performance and identify strategies that programs might use to strengthen their performance on individual measures.

OFCY Performance Measures

OFCY has two official performance measures for funded programs: program enrollment and progress towards projected units of service (total hours of service). At the beginning of each fiscal year, programs set their anticipated enrollment and units of service in their work plans. Each quarter, programs are checked against their targets. The specific performance thresholds for the end of the year are the following:

- **OFCY Thresholds for Enrollment by the end of the Year:** By the end of Quarter 4, all programs have enrolled at least 80% of projected unduplicated youth¹³ for the fiscal year.
- **OFCY Thresholds for Units of Service by the end of the Year:** By the end of Quarter 4, all programs have achieved at least 80% of their projected units of service for the fiscal year.

¹² This analysis does not include adults served by Mental Health Consultation programs.

¹³ OFCY asks programs project the number of unduplicated youth and adult participants. The term *youth* is used for participants ranging from birth to 20, including children served by programs under *Healthy Development of Children*.

In addition to these official performance measures, this Final Report presents two additional performance measures for OFCY programs, which are designed to provide targets for OFCY programs in the areas of levels of service and survey completion rate.

- **Percentage of youth participants who receive 40 or more hours of service.** Research shows that the amount of hours of services youth and adults receive is positively correlated with outcomes. The purpose of tracking this metric is to better understand variations in the amount of service provided to youth and adult participants, and to encourage programs to aim for higher levels of service.
- **Percentage of participants who complete an OFCY participant survey.** A benchmark for response rates for the participant survey is important because the survey serves as a critical data source for understanding participant experiences in the OFCY-funded programs as well as progress towards outcomes.

Findings related to progress towards projections, summarized in Exhibit 6 on the following page, include:¹⁴

- **Programs made good progress toward enrollment and units of service projections.** Across all programs, 88% met the threshold for enrollment, and 85% met the threshold for units of service. Only two programs fell short in both areas.
- **There was some variation in progress by both overall funding area and specific funding strategy.** Programs under *Youth Leadership and Community Safety* made the most consistent progress towards both enrollment and units of service, with all programs meeting their enrollment targets and 89% of programs meeting their units of service target. *Safe Community Spaces for LGBTQ Youth* programs, which fall under the *Transitions to Adulthood* funding area, were the least likely to meet their performance targets in both areas.
- **Overall, 51% of OFCY participants completed a participant survey, an increase of 8% over FY2014-2015.**¹⁵ The response rate was highest among *Youth Leadership and Community Safety* programs (70%) and lowest among *Student Success in School* programs (21%). Smaller programs and programs that provided more intensive services generally had higher response rates than other programs.¹⁶
- **Close to three-quarters of programs provided an average of at least 40 hours of service to youth participants.** Youth Leadership and Community Safety programs were the most likely to meet this target.


¹⁴ For progress toward enrollment and units of service goals by individual program, see Appendix A.

¹⁵ Survey respondents include youth in grades three and above, caregivers in the *Parent and Child Engagement in Early Learning and Development* programs, and educators in the *Mental Health and Developmental Consultations* programs. *Mental Health and Developmental Consultation* programs were not included in the count of participants who completed a survey because these programs did not have a target survey completion rate.


¹⁶ The response rate among programs that served less than 150 youth was 62%, compared to 37% for other programs. The response rate among programs that provided at least 40 hours of service per youth was 60%, compared to 18% for other programs.

Exhibit 6: Performance by Funding Strategy

Percent of Programs Meeting Performance Thresholds



Rate of Participant Survey Completion




Quality

OFCY draws on multiple data sources to assess program quality, including structured observations using the Program Quality Assessment (PQA) and the annual participant surveys. **Both the structured observation tool and the youth surveys are aligned to five dimensions of program quality that research has identified as important for ensuring high quality youth programs: 1) safety;**


2) *supportive environment*; 3) *interaction*; 4) *engagement*, and 5) *diversity*.¹⁷ In this section, we highlight findings on each of these core dimensions of program quality by drawing on PQA, youth survey data, and qualitative interview data.

Exhibit 7: Average Program Quality Scores

Youth Programs




Healthy Development of Young Children Programs
(caregiver and educator survey results only)




Comparison between FY2014-2015 and FY2015-2016

By PQA Scores



By Youth Survey Scores



■ FY2014-2015 ■ FY2015-2016

¹⁷ SPR added the dimension of diversity to the PQA observation tool and surveys in fall 2014. All but one of the programs visited in Summer and Fall 2015 received overall scores of either *Performing* or *Thriving*, the two highest categories of performance. Programs that received overall scores of 4.5 or higher (on a 5-point scale) across all four dimensions were categorized as *Thriving*; programs that received average scores between from 3.0 up to 4.5 were categorized *Performing*; and programs that received average scores below 3.0 were categorized as *emerging*.

Safe Environment

We provide a real safe place for people to come and get emotional nourishment. And so I think that's the greatest strength I think of all. People come because they get to feel real safe. They get to let things down that they don't let down, but they need to process. And we are also constantly building community. – Program Director

The PQA tools define safety along two key dimensions: physical and emotional, with the majority of the measures focused on the physical environment. Physical safety measures address the presence of emergency supplies and procedures as well as the extent to which the program environment is free of health hazards, contains appropriate furniture, and includes healthy food and drinks. The emotional aspect of safety focuses primarily on the promotion of a positive climate—in this way it overlaps slightly with the *supportive environment* quality dimension.

Strategies for Promoting Physical and Emotional Safety

Ensuring the physical safety and emotional well-being was described as a high priority for our interview respondents, with several noting that this is particularly important, given the presence of trauma in their communities. Strategies for promoting safety include:

- **Having clear procedures and trained staff for dealing with violence.** While episodes of violence are rare within program spaces, staff underscored the importance of being *prepared* for such events, given the presence of violence in the community or in the home. Strategies for ensuring violence preparedness include having clear lockdown procedures and dedicated staff that are trained to address violent behavior. Multiple respondents highlighted the expertise of their staff in ensuring safety.
- **Ensuring the physical space supports safety.** Program interview respondents shared that “paying attention to the environment” and making sure that it promotes a feeling of safety is critical. For early childhood programs, this may mean holding parent groups in rooms across from the nursery and keeping doors open so that parents can easily see their children. It may also mean having security guards on hand so that families experiencing domestic violence can feel safe in the program space. One staff from a youth program shared that her program provides a “quiet room” that youth can go to if they feel agitated or need a separate space for calm.
- **Having staff trained to address mental health issues and conflict resolution.** Several programs have mental health workers on staff or rely on partners with mental health expertise to support the emotional health of participants and program staff and to address issues as they arise. Program respondents also underscored the benefits of having staff with strong conflict mediation skills, who can step in with tools such as calming exercises or restorative circles to ease tensions and address conflicts.
- **Focusing on relationship-building.** Staff emphasized the importance of relationship building and “community building” as a core component of their efforts to create a safe space for their participants. Frequent “one-on-ones” with staff and participants was cited several times as a core strategy, as was the development of community agreements to ensure a positive environment that supports relationship building, and the facilitation of relationships across program participants.

As was true in FY2015-2016, survey results and site visit scores were highest in the safety domain, indicating that programs excel in providing a safe environment for children and youth. Survey results for respondents in the early childhood programs were especially high, with a mean rating of 4.6 across all survey items. Youth survey results were also fairly high in this area, with some interesting

variances. As with FY2014-2015, white youth gave slightly higher safety ratings compared to other racial groups, with a mean score of 4.21 (the lowest scores came from the “other/decline to state” category, whose mean score was 3.98). While youth survey results indicate that, on average, youth are most likely to report feeling that the adults in the program support the youth and treat them fairly, they were less likely to respond as positively with respect to their peers--the only survey item in this domain that received mean scores less than 4.0 were in response to the survey item: *Youth at this program respect each other*, which had a mean score of 3.99.

Supportive Environment

I'd been talking to [staff members] about things and problems I have in school since sophomore year. Like all the ups and downs. So I feel like they know me pretty well. Every time...as we come in and walk in class [the staff member] just asks me, oh, how are you doing? Not just as a greeting. It's more of a sincere...checking in if we're okay, [or] not okay. And with me, specifically, if I feel like I'm not okay I can tell them about it and they give me solutions. – Youth Participant

The PQA tool defines a supportive environment as one that allows “adults to support youth in learning and growing and by providing opportunities for active learning, skill building, and the development of healthy relationships.” This dimension, therefore, reflects the ability of youth to form positive relationships with adults within the organization in a way that supports their own autonomy and growth.

Strategies for Connecting to Young People’s Lives Outside of the Program

The youth survey results suggest that one area for program growth is making sure that there are adults within the programs that understand what is occurring in young people’s lives outside of the context of the program. The following are key strategies, identified by program staff members and youth, for how programs can make that link.

- **Formal intake process that includes a counseling session.** The intake process is a key time that some programs use to get to know youth in detail, and helps to build a foundation on which program staff can understand the behaviors and engagement in the program.
- **One-on-one meetings with staff.** These provide an opportunity for youth to talk about the really challenging issues in their lives. Due to staffing limitations at many programs, these meetings can occur only a couple of times during a program cycle. The more frequently they happen, however, the more likely youth will have the developed the trust they need in order to open up about what is happening in their lives. One program staff described that through these meetings staff, “get a strong sense of what is going on with young people, and also young people get to see us in action in terms of listening to them.”
- **Parent orientations and outreach.** Having an open and honest dialogue with parents can be key to understanding what youth are dealing with in school or in their community. Parent outreach provides an opportunity for staff to meet with parents, forming an essential connection for follow-up if needed. This has an added benefit of helping with program retention as buy-in from parents is a key to ensuring that youth are able to attend the program regularly.
- **Referrals to therapists and counseling if needed (and wanted).** It is useful for youth to know that program can connect them with additional counseling support if needed.

In general, site visitors ranked programs relatively high on the dimension of supportive environment (4.6 on a 5-point scale).¹⁸ Program staff went out of their way, for instance, to provide a welcoming atmosphere and in pacing activities in a way that is appropriate to youth. Programs received lower average scores when it came to clearly articulating what skills young people were developing, using open-ended questions, and providing opportunities for youth to make connections between the activities and their prior knowledge.

Youth surveys rated this dimension lower than did site visitors, but on par with other dimensions of quality (4.2 out of a 5-point scale). The lowest rating on the survey was in response to the prompts, “at least one adult here understands what my life is like outside of the program” and “there is at least one adult in this program who notices when I’m upset about something.” The highest ratings were to the prompts “the adults in this program tell me what I am doing well,” and there is “an adult at this program that cares about me.”

Interaction

They’re teaching us how to present ourselves to people. Like how to hold yourself to higher standards, how to communicate with people, [and] how to act in public and stuff like that... I see [the program leader] as like a mother figure in some way. – Youth Participant

The PQA tool defines interaction as the promotion of “a positive peer culture where youth support each other, experience a sense of belonging, participate in small groups as members and as leaders, and have opportunities to partner with adults.” This dimension, therefore, focuses on opportunities for participants to positively interact with one another and includes aspects of youth leadership, such as opportunities for youth to help one another.

Although this dimension was high overall (4.1 on a 5-point scale), it ranked on the lower end of the PQA core quality dimensions. Programs received lower scores on dimensions related to encouraging children to manage feelings and resolve conflicts appropriately. For instance, site visitors noted that, when in a conflict, staff did not ask youth to explain the situation or look for possible solutions. Programs received much higher ratings on promoting a sense of belonging and interacting with youth and children in positive ways by, for instance, making eye-contact with youth, circulating among children, and providing structured opportunities for youth to interact.

Youth survey results for interaction were in keeping with the PQA scores (4.1 on a 5-point scale) and like the PQA they showed that programs were better at promoting belonging than at strengthening problem solving skills. On average, in surveys youth indicated that programs have helped them to get along with other young people their age and that they “feel like they belong at” the program. They were less positive about whether program participation has strengthened their ability to handle problems and challenges when they arise.

¹⁸ The tool uses a scale of 1, 3, and 5 with descriptions of the ratings at each level for each of the questions. In general, rating of 1 indicates that the practice was not observed while the visitor was on site, or that the practice is not a part of the program, a rating of 3 indicates that the practice is implemented relatively consistently across staff and activities, and a rating of 5 indicates that the practice was implemented consistently and well across staff and activities.

Strategies for Helping Youth Manage Conflict and Challenges

One area for program improvement emerging from the quality data is the ability of programs to support young people in navigating interpersonal and life challenges. In the context of most youth development programs, youth are developing skills to interact with peers, program staff, teachers or parents. In the context of a youth workforce program, on the other hand, youth often need support in learning how to interact with supervisors and colleagues. The following are strategies that program staff and youth identified as useful key strategies for supporting these skills.

- **Conflict mediation and restorative justice techniques.** Some programs provide structured workshops for youth on communication and conflict resolution skills, such as how to cool down emotionally, listen attentively, not jump to conclusions, propose solutions, and be willing to forgive. Youth also learn strategies for mediating one another's conflicts.
- **Weekly small group to address interpersonal conflicts.** One program leader said that they hold a weekly meeting to address interpersonal conflicts and bullying, much of which has occurred through electronic communication (e.g. text messaging or social media). This group provides a forum for youth to talk through these issues in a face-to-face format.
- **Meaningful collaborative work.** Almost all of the program staff who were interviewed mentioned the importance of having youth work collaboratively together. These types of context were viewed as essential for building interpersonal skills, and if the tasks are sufficiently challenging they realize how they can better achieve their goals if they work together.
- **Community and team-building activities.** Program staff members highlighted a variety of activities designed to build relationships and deepen a sense of trust with those in the program. These include ice-breakers and discussion circles, where youth can talk about their challenges.

Engagement

We are given an opportunity to put our voice out into public. Like not just within our school... We were given the opportunity to have an open dialogue with someone who can make change and to express our own ideas to that person, which was really cool to me.

– Youth Participant

The PQA tool defines engagement as the promotion of youth agency and leadership, particularly the opportunity for young people to “plan, make choices, reflect, and learn from their experiences.” This dimension overlaps with “interaction” in key respects, particularly when it comes to opportunities for youth to lead their peers, but is focused more narrowly on opportunities for youth to provide feedback, make plans, and have choices about what they do in the program.

As was true last year, site visitors gave programs the lowest ratings for engagement (3.7 on a 5-point scale). This is at least in part because assessing this dimension during a one-time observation is challenging. Programs, for instance, received lower scores in dimensions related to youth having opportunities “to make plans” and “reflect on their experiences.” Programs performed most positively on promoting opportunities for youth to make choices based on their interests. It is notable that youth leadership and safety programs scored higher than other programs on this dimension (3.8), while transitions to adulthood programs scored the lowest (3.6).

In contrast to the relatively low PQA scores on this dimension, youth survey results show engagement to be on par with other dimensions of quality (4.2 on a 5-point scale). Youth were most likely to

respond positively to the prompt, “In this program, I try new things” and “I am interested in what we do at this program.” They were less likely to respond positively to the prompt, “I have been asked for my opinion on how to make this program better. This resonates well with the PQA findings in that, while youth are building skills in key areas of interest, the programs could be better at promoting youth leadership and decision-making.

Strategies to Promote Youth Input, Feedback and Reflection

A key part of engagement is making sure that youth have opportunities to provide input, feedback and reflection. The following are strategies that program staff identified as key strategies during our interviews and focus groups. To increase this aspect of program quality, programs can increase the types and frequency of these opportunities.

- **Evaluation forms and surveys.** Several of the program staff members who were interviewed indicated that they gathered youth input and feedback through evaluation forms and year-end surveys. These were generally used by program staff to help them plan for the next program cycle. Several programs also said that they have “grievance forms” that youth can fill out if they have an issue with a particular staff member or an aspect of the program.
- **Group debrief after activities or “check-out” at end of the program day.** Several program staff mentioned that they do a daily close-out activity where youth reflect on what they learned during the day, what they liked, and what could be improved. At least one program said they focus on soliciting positive reflections on the activities of the day.
- **Journals and written reflections.** A few programs have youth write reflections in journals on a daily or weekly basis. For instance, at one youth workforce program, youth give a recap of their day at the worksite, obstacles that they faced, how obstacles were addressed, and questions or concerns moving forward. This format is particularly useful for revealing and working through interpersonal issues that youth are having with colleagues or supervisors.
- **Leadership Committees.** Youth leadership or advisory committees are a key strategy for ensuring that youth get a voice in program design and in important governance decisions. Although this was not a common strategy among OFCY grantees interviewed for this report, one workforce program has a youth committee that takes the lead in getting feedback from program participants, while another has youth serve on the organization’s board.

Diversity

We certainly try to talk about different cultural backgrounds or different needs of different families, how they may be interpreting a certain behavior based on their own culture, which may be different from the family’s culture. I think we have to be willing to raise the question and the issue. They may not be willing to go there with us but at least we’ve raised it.

– Program Director

In 2014 Oakland was named the “most diverse city in America”¹⁹ and Oakland’s rich diversity is indeed one of the city’s greatest strengths. In order to explore the ways in which OFCY-funded programs understand, support, and embrace the diversity of the children, youth, and families they serve, SPR added diversity-focused measures to all data collections tools (i.e. the PQA as well as all surveys and interview protocols.) These questions focus on: (1) program staff’s ability to understand

¹⁹ <http://www.eastbayexpress.com/CultureSpyBlog/archives/2014/12/17/oakland-named-the-most-diverse-city-in-america>

and work well with participants from diverse backgrounds, (2) the extent to which attending to diversity is a priority for the program, (3) specific activities programs engage in to address diversity, and (4) the extent to which programs support youth in feeling comfortable in diverse settings.

Survey data are largely positive with respect to diversity. As with last year, survey respondents in early childhood programs gave high ratings in terms of staff diversity competency. Parents participating in pre-K programs and playgroups gave staff high ratings in terms of their ability to work with families from different backgrounds (4.68 average). This satisfaction may stem from the fact that the staff of pre-K and playgroup programs are generally diverse and consistently represent the primary racial groups served in the program. Teachers also gave early childhood mental health consultants high ratings around their understanding of the diversity of the community they serve and how to effectively and appropriately support them (4.43 average). While youth survey scores were fairly strong with respect to the extent to which program participation enabled them to feel more comfortable around people who were different from them (4.06 average), their ratings on the extent to which program staff understood their family's culture were not as strong (3.81 average). Average scores across both of these youth survey items are lower than last year (4.21 and 3.98 respectively).

Strategies to Support Diversity and Inclusion

Program staff described a variety of strategies for promoting and nurturing diversity in their programs. These strategies address diversity and inclusion at multiple levels, including staff, participants, and curricula:

- **Embracing language.** Multiple interview respondents shared the importance of honoring linguistic diversity and reducing language barriers by having bilingual staff and ensuring that program materials are translated into different languages. Other respondents noted the importance of practicing sensitivity around language in general, e.g. making sure to use participants' preferred gender pronouns.
- **Engaging in diversity-focused activities.** Several programs engage in cultural celebrations to honor the ethnic diversity in their community while others go deeper, encouraging their participants to "connect to their roots" or immersing participants in ethnic studies curriculum. Respondents also noted that an important aspect of embracing diversity includes adapting to changing demographics (e.g. the rise in Central American population or the Yemeni community).
- **Attending to staff diversity.** Program directors note the importance of having staff that reflect the diversity of the participants they serve. Respondents note that having staff that speak the same language, come from the same cultural background, or live in the same neighborhoods as program participants makes it easier for participants to feel comfortable and form trusting connections with staff.
- **Encouraging reflection.** Respondents highlighted the importance of creating an intentional space to encourage staff to reflect about diversity and inclusion. One respondent emphasized the importance of working with program staff to consider how race and culture impact their work, to consider how cultural differences might be a factor in the classroom or in staff's behavior or response to participant behavior.
- **Engaging in targeted recruitment.** Some programs reported engaging in targeted recruitment efforts to meet desired diversity levels, not just in terms of racial and ethnic diversity but also in gender diversity. Some strategies include intentional recruitment of target populations while others partner with agencies that serve these populations.

PQA data on diversity is mixed. While all programs visited received the highest rating of 5 with respect to the extent to which program staff model inclusive, tolerant attitudes and behaviors, their scores on the extent to which their program space, materials and content reflect the diversity of youth served averaged 4.33. One challenge for this particular measure is that not all programs own their program space—some share space with other programs or institutions and they are thus not always able to create a space that is more reflective of the cultures of their participants.

Additional Early Childhood Quality Dimensions

OFCY-funded early childhood programs operate differently from youth programs. A key difference is that in their efforts to support the healthy development of young children, early childhood programs focus on providing quality services to the *adults* that are instrumental to their development (i.e. parents, caregivers, and educators). Quality measures for this strategy are comprised of six domains—three which they hold in common with the other strategies (safety, supportive environment, and diversity) and three additional domains that are unique to this strategy: partnerships, relevance, and responsiveness.

- **Partnerships.** Programs score higher on this domain if they strategically build and leverage partnerships to improve service delivery. Survey scores were relatively high in this domain, with EC MHC grantees receiving a mean score of 4.18 and Pre-K and Playgroup programs receiving a mean score of 4.39. EC programs underscored the importance of these partnerships, sharing that they relied on their partners to connect families with necessary resources, to share facilities and resources, and to leverage the connections and expertise of those partners. As one respondent noted, “Org-to-org lateral learning is a really important resource. It’s an important strategy for learning how to serve our community better.”
- **Relevance.** This dimension assesses the program’s ability to promote access to relevant, high quality content and curriculum. As with last year, average parent agreement ratings in this domain were favorable (4.43), with the highest ratings in this domain being in response to the prompt *the staff seem knowledgeable about children's needs* (4.65). Educator scores were somewhat lower in this domain (4.24 average) but this score was higher than last year’s mean score of 4.15. To ensure program relevance, a common strategy used by multiple programs includes child-specific assessments (the most frequently named assessment was the ASQ).
- **Responsiveness.** Program are “responsive” if they have a clear process for assessing and responding effectively to participant needs. Participants in the playgroup and Pre-K programs gave programs high ratings in the area of responsiveness, with an average score of 4.7. A common strategy for ensuring responsiveness includes frequent and consistent check-ins with parents and working with partner programs to help ensure that families get the resources they need. The mean score for responsiveness in the EC MHC programs was 4.48, which is higher than last year’s score of 4.39. Strategies for ensuring better responsiveness include reaching out to participants to remind them of staff availability, conducting participant surveys, and holding staff meetings to discuss emerging issues.

Overall Findings Related to Program Quality

The following are overarching findings related to program quality.

- **Data consistently points to the generally high quality of OFCY programs.** Although there are differences in how site visitors and youth rank different dimensions of program quality, the PQA and survey ratings are consistently high. When looking across both the PQA and the

youth survey results, engagement (3.7 on the PQA) is the only area where programs averaged less than a 4 (on a 5-point scale).

- **Programs that offered more hours of service per participant received higher quality scores overall.** Youth programs that provided at least 60 hours of service per youth received higher PQA scores, especially in the dimensions of safety, engagement and interaction. Youth from these programs gave higher scores overall and especially in the area of interaction, although the difference was not statistically significant. Although the difference in youth survey scores were not statistically significant, they were notable overall and in the dimension of interaction. Parent and child engagement programs that offered at least 40 hours of service excelled in the dimensions of relevance and partnership.
- **Ethnic-specific programs (those serving 60% or more of one ethnicity) received higher survey scores.** For youth programs, the difference was statistically significant in the area of safety. Ethnically specific playgroup programs received higher overall scores in safety, relevance, and partnership.
- **Older youth tended to rate programs higher than younger youth.** On average, out-of-school youth and 11th and 12th grade youth gave programs higher ratings in all quality dimensions, with the largest difference being in the areas of engagement and diversity.

OUTCOMES

The OFCY evaluation of community-based programs draws on surveys and qualitative data to assess five distinct sets of outcomes. Four sets of outcomes are for youth participants, grade 3 and higher, while one set of outcomes is for the parents, caregivers and educators who are engaged through OFCY's early childhood development programs. The following section begins with a discussion of youth outcomes, followed by an overview of parent outcomes, and concludes with a comparison to outcome scores from FY2014-2015. Detailed logic models for how programs contribute to each of these sets of outcomes are included in Appendix B.²⁰


Youth Outcomes

Exhibit 8 illustrates the specific outcomes that the evaluation is tracking for youth participants. As illustrated in the exhibit, the evaluation assumes that effective youth programs provide a strong foundation for youth development. Programs are assessed, therefore, on their ability to support core youth development outcomes, such as greater connections to adults, increased confidence, improved decision-making, and the development of skills and interests.

Beyond promoting general youth development, OFCY youth programs specialize in supporting specific sets of skills and experiences. Youth engagement programs focus on building knowledge of community, leadership, risk avoidance, and individual agency. Academic support programs aim to build academic confidence and goal-setting, promote school attendance, and enhance college awareness and readiness. Finally, youth workforce programs focus on enhancing young peoples' understanding of careers, increasing their connections with professionals, and orienting them to professional expectations and behaviors.

²⁰ These frameworks were developed with input from OFCY grantees. For the most part, they align with OFCY's funding strategies for the 2013-2016 funding cycle, although some adjustments were made in mapping specific programs to frameworks.

Exhibit 8: Youth Outcome Measures



Each of these sets of outcomes are discussed in the subsequent sections.


Youth Development Outcomes

We examined progress towards the following youth development outcomes for all youth programs: (1) *connections to caring adults*, (2) *increased confidence and self-esteem*, (3) *improved decision-making and goal setting*, and (4) *development and mastery of skills*.

As illustrated in Exhibit 9, **youth generally reported very positive outcomes**. Youth showed the most progress in the area of *developing and mastering skills*, followed by *improved decision making and goal setting*. Youth showed the most room for growth in developing *greater connections to caring adults*. Across all of the questions mapped to youth development outcomes, youth were least likely to agree or strongly agree with the statement “at least one adult here understands what my life is

like outside the program” (67%) and most likely to agree with the statement “in this program, I try new things” (87%).

Exhibit 9: Progress Towards Youth Development Outcomes
(Percent of respondents who agree or strongly agree)
 (n = 4,026 youth in 51 programs)



Key findings related to general youth development outcomes:

- **Youth in programs with smaller enrollment reported more progress towards making connections to caring adults.** On average, 80% of youth in programs that enrolled fewer than 150 youth agreed or strongly agreed with the questions mapped to *greater connections to caring adults* compared to 76% of youth in larger programs. This finding suggests that programs that enroll more than 150 youth could benefit from additional support to promote strong relationships between adults and participants, perhaps drawing on some of the best practices from the smaller programs.
- **Older youth show the greatest outcomes.** Youth in grade 11 and 12, as well as those that are out- of-school, showed the highest outcomes. For example, on average 87% of older youth agreed or strongly agreed with the questions mapped to development and mastery of skills compared 78% of youth in 10th grade and below.
- **Different types of programs excelled in different areas of youth development.** For example, youth from Youth Workforce Development programs were the most likely to agree to questions mapped to *improved decision-making and goal setting* as well as *development*

and mastery of skills, while youth from Youth Engagement programs showed the greatest progress toward the outcome *greater connections to caring adults*.²¹ In general, youth from academic programs were the least likely to meet youth development outcomes, suggesting that these programs may benefit from a stronger integration of youth development within the academic programming.

- **Asian and Pacific Islander youth had lower outcomes than other ethnic groups.** The average youth development outcome score was four percentage points lower for Asian and Pacific Islander youth compared to other youth. Across all programs, 72% of Asian and Pacific Islander youth agreed with questions tied to the outcome *greater connections to caring adults*, compared to 76% of youth from other ethnicities.

Participant Perspectives on Youth Development Outcomes

Connections to Caring Adults

It's deep connection in conversation and a sense of family and, even if you've done something bad, they'll always be here for you.

[A staff member] creates a sacred space.... It is a zone where you could say anything... She doesn't push you beyond your limit, so it creates a safe space.

Increased Confidence and Self Esteem

I gained self-confidence. [Before the program], I always hated my body so much...I could pick out all the things wrong with my body... I used to be so self-conscious about my body because of society's expectations. Now, I don't give a flying freak about society's expectations. I love my body and I love myself.

It helps me grow up. It helps me be mature. It helps me be the person I am today, because without [this program], I wouldn't be open to so many things.

Development and Mastery of Skills


I took this leadership role [in the program], and I feel like that really, really boosted my confidence a lot, not just because I got to boss the other kids.... I felt a sense of responsibility and I feel like that sense of responsibility that I developed [in this program] carried on into my daily life. I feel like a leader.

Youth Engagement Outcomes

Youth engagement is the first of the three focal framework areas for youth programs. The majority of OFCY programs fall into the category of youth engagement, including transition programs, community-based afterschool programs, and youth leadership and community safety. As illustrated in Exhibit 10, youth enrolled in programs mapped to the youth engagement evaluation framework completed questions, designed to capture progress towards the following youth engagement-specific outcomes: (1) *knowledge of and engagement in community*, (2) *increased leadership capacity*, (3) *increased risk avoidance and conflict resolution*, and (4) *increased sense of empowerment and agency*.

²¹ On average, 92% of youth from Workforce Development programs agreed or strongly agreed with questions mapped to *improved decision-making and goal setting*, compared an average of 80% at other programs. On average, 79% of youth from Youth Engagement programs agreed or strongly agreed with questions mapped to *greater connections to caring adults*, compared to an average of 76% of youth from other programs.

Exhibit 10: Progress Towards Youth Engagement Outcomes
(Percent of respondents who agree or strongly agree)
(n = 2,608 youth in 31 programs)



Youth showed the most progress in the areas of *increased sense of empowerment and agency* (79%) and similar progress in areas of *increased leadership capacity* (76%) and *increased risk avoidance* (74%). Youth in the youth engagement programs showed the most room for growth in developing an *increased knowledge of and engagement in community* (71%). However, programs that enrolled fewer than 150 youth reported greater outcomes in this area than larger programs, by about five percentage points. Looking across all of the questions mapped to youth engagement outcomes, youth were least likely to agree or strongly agree with the statement “Since coming to this program, I did volunteer work or community service” (62%) and most likely to agree with the statement, “In this program, adults listen to what I have to say” (84%) and “this program taught me how to stand up for myself” (79%).

Overall, year-round programs received higher outcome scores than summer programs did, especially in the area of *increased sense of empowerment and agency* (83% versus 77%) and *increased knowledge of and engagement in community* (74% versus 70%), suggesting that programs are more likely to meet these outcomes when youth are engaged over a longer period of time. In keeping with the youth development findings, older youth were most likely to meet youth engagement outcomes, while Asian and Pacific Islander youth were the least likely.

Youth Perspectives on Youth Engagement Outcomes

Knowledge of and Engagement in Community

We talk about African American, Japanese, Chinese and also Hispanic injustices in the United States, like internment camps. We talked about housing difficulties for African American's right after the Civil Rights Movement... We learned a lot about different events that effect different groups of people.

Increased Risk Avoidance and Conflict Resolution

I have trouble communicating my concerns to the staff at my school. So [the program staff] gave me advice, step by step, what I should do first if I have like a conflict or a situation I want to give my perspective on. So, like, talk to your teacher, then go up the chain of staff... I feel like that was really beneficial for me.

[The program] teaches us to communicate about what we dislike and how we can change how we act. [It teaches us] how we can change how we act towards peers and how to approach someone when we don't like something instead of yelling or [using] violence.

Increased Sense of Empowerment and Agency

[This program] makes me realize how important one person's voice is.... I shouldn't just keep everything bottled up and just complain about it later. But, [instead I should] try to make a change. ... I feel like [the program] gives me a more general perspective that everyone is a valuable asset in a community. Everyone can make a change. Everyone has an impact.


Youth Workforce Development Outcomes

Youth workforce development is the second of the three focal framework areas. As illustrated in Exhibit 11, youth enrolled in the 11 year-round youth workforce programs completed additional questions, designed to capture progress towards the following youth workforce development-specific outcomes: (1) *increased awareness of educational requirements for specific careers*, (2) *knowledge of careers and career paths*, (3) *connections to working professionals*, (4) *increased professionalism*, and (5) *placement into internships or jobs*.

Youth in these programs made the most progress in the areas of *increased professionalism* (90%), *increased awareness of educational requirements for specific careers* (88%), and *increased knowledge of careers and career paths* (84%). Youth showed less progress in the other two outcome areas: *increased connections to working professionals* (76%) and *placement into internship or job* (75%). As in the case of the youth development and youth engagement outcomes, older youth were more likely to meet workforce development outcomes than their younger peers were.

Across all of the questions mapped to workforce development-focused programs, youth were least likely to agree or strongly agree with the statement "Because of this program, I have a paying job now or lined up for the future" (58%). Youth were most likely to agree or strongly agree with the statements: "At this program, I learned what is expected in a work setting" (91%) and "As a result of this program, I understand the importance of an education for getting the job I want" (91%).

Exhibit 11: Progress Towards Youth Workforce Development Outcomes
(Percent of respondents who agree or strongly agree)
(n = 451 youth in 10 programs)




*Note: Outcome 5 identifies the percentage of youth who were placed into an internship or a job. Therefore, the percentage of youth met Outcome 5 is greater than the average of those who met the sub-outcomes under Outcome 5.

Academic Outcomes

Academic focused programs mapped to the third framework area. As illustrated in Exhibit 12, youth enrolled in programs mapped to the academic evaluation framework completed additional questions designed to capture progress towards the following academic-specific outcomes: (1) *confidence in accessing educational opportunities*, (2) *ability to develop academic goals*, (3) *improved school attendance*, (4) *increased leadership capacity*, and (5) *college readiness*.

Exhibit 12: Progress Towards Academic Outcomes
(Percent of respondents who agree or strongly agree)
 (n = 967 youth in ten programs²²)



Youth in academic-focused programs showed the most progress in the areas of *increased college readiness* and *increased ability to develop academic goals*, followed by *increased confidence in accessing educational opportunities*. Across all academic outcomes questions, youth were least likely to agree or strongly agree with the statement “Since coming to this program, I am more of a leader” (62%). Youth were also less likely to agree to prompts such as “because of this program, I attend school more regularly,” “this program helped prepare me for college,” (66%) and “Because of this program I participate in more class discussions and activities at school” (66%). In contrast, students were most likely to agree with the statement “I learned how to do things in this program that help with my school work” (78%) and “Because of this program, I know where to go to get help with my schoolwork” (77%).

In general, programs that provided 60 hours or more of services exhibited more progress towards academic outcomes, especially in the area of *improved school attendance*. These programs were able to provide more intensive services, which likely helped to support stronger outcomes. Programs that enroll fewer than 150 youth had significantly higher scores for the outcome *increased college*

²² Of the 375 surveys completed by youth enrolled in academic-focused programs, 10 surveys did not have completed academic-specific questions, the second page of the survey.

readiness (on average 87% compared to 67% of larger programs). As we found for other youth programs, older youth consistently made more progress on academic outcomes than their younger peers.

Youth Perspectives on Academic Outcomes

Academic engagement

[Before the program], I didn't like school a lot. I still don't like school, but I like school a little bit more than I used to... I know that after school I'm coming here, so it makes it feel better to go into school than going to school like I used to and then just going home.

Academic goals

It changed my thinking about school... I'm about to enter high school, and this year, my eighth grade year going into freshman year, it's like, "okay, I need to get this, and this." My grades this year have not gone below a B... I said to my friend, in tenth grade I'm going to start college classes.


Increased leadership capacity

I notice that in my school discussions, I'm getting a lot better at saying what I have to say and not going on tangents. I think that's for the most part because of [this program]. Because, there's always an active discussion going on. We've been building that since day one.

Changes in Youth Outcomes Over Time

Overall, as illustrated in Exhibit 13, the percentages of youth meeting outcome measures for FY2015-2016 are between five and nine percentage points lower than they were in FY2014-2015. This shift may be caused by an increased survey response rate. Survey completion increased dramatically among youth programs this year, due to efforts to gather surveys from all participants, including those who were not involved in year-round programming. This may have resulted in a higher response rate among youth participants who received “light touch” services or that were loosely attached to the program.

Exhibit 13: Changes in Youth Outcomes Over Time (FY2014-2015 and FY2015-2106)




Early Childhood Outcomes

Programs focused on early childhood differ significantly from youth-focused programs, as this strategy concentrates on improving outcomes for *adults* (parents, caregivers, and educators) who interact with children ages 0-5. This strategy therefore warrants a very different set of expected outcomes than those of youth programs. The participants surveyed for this strategy were parents and caregivers participating in community playgroups or whose children were participants in the summer pre-kindergarten program, and educators receiving support from mental health consultants. Adult participant surveys, parent focus group data, and interview data with directors of all early childhood programs make up our key data sources for measuring progress on outcomes in this area.

As demonstrated in Exhibit 14, key outcomes for this funding strategy are (1) *increased knowledge of child development*, (2) *increased access to resources and support*, (3) *greater understanding of and increased confidence in managing children's behavior*, (4) *improved skills to support children's academic and socio-emotional development*, (5) *increased involvement by parents/caregivers in their children's learning and growth*.

Exhibit 14: Early Childhood Outcomes




Parent Outcomes

Results from parent and caregiver surveys are consistently positive across all outcome domains. The lowest scoring outcome area was outcome 3: *increased confidence in managing children's behavior*, which received the lowest average agreement rating, though that rating was still fairly strong at 86%. Within this outcome area, parents most positively responded to the prompt asking whether programs “helped them to identify their child's needs” (88%), and least positively to the prompt about “understanding how to respond effectively when their child is upset” (85%). That this was the lowest scoring survey item across all survey measures is a good indicator that the programs are achieving their overall goals of supporting parents and caregivers in ensuring stronger developmental outcomes for their children. This finding is consistent with qualitative data. One parent in the focus group described how playgroup program staff helped increase her confidence around behavior management:

For our family, it's been really helpful, just having professionals who can offer us feedback about parenting our children, even just little ways of handling situations so that it wouldn't escalate to a whole tantrum. It's really helped us a lot.

**Exhibit 15: Progress Towards Parent Outcomes
(Percent of respondents who agree or strongly agree)
(n = 291 parents and caregivers in nine programs²³)**



The outcome area that showed the greatest progress overall (90%) was outcome 2: *increased access to resources and support*. Within this outcome area, the survey measure that received the highest average agreement rating (95%) was *My child and I have made new friends as a result of this program*. This indicates that programs are successful at meeting core goals of relationship building across parents and caregivers and reducing their sense of isolation. Several parents and a grandparent in the caregiver focus groups affirmed this finding, saying how important it is for them to “be around other parents and learn from each other.” At least two shared that they live in small apartments and do not have ready access to places where they can meet other parents while providing their toddlers with safe spaces to play. One focus group participant shared how playgroups were particularly helpful for building a sense of community for fathers:

²³ Of the 375 surveys completed by youth enrolled in academic-focused programs, 10 surveys did not have completed academic-specific questions, the second page of the survey.

We've been coming since my six-year old was six months and I know that for my husband--he was the main one that has been bringing her--they provided a really strong community for him to feel connected and, as a dad, just feeling like he wasn't the only dad that was caring for his babies.

Having a solid understanding of child development at different ages and stages and being able to confidently apply that understanding provides parents and caregivers with a strong foundation to effectively nurture and support their children. Survey results indicate that parents and caregivers made strong progress on this front, particularly in their increased understanding of child development (89%), their ability to identify their child's needs (88%), and in their greater understanding of what kinds of behavior is typical at their child's age (92%). Moreover, results indicate that parents and caregivers participating in these programs are gaining access to other resources to help them be a better parent and to help their children learn (88%).

Certain program characteristics were associated with higher outcome scores. Specifically, larger budgets, lower enrollment, and greater average hours of service were all related to higher scores. Not surprisingly, these findings suggest that parents benefit most from programs that provide more intensive services and are well resourced.

Finally, when compared to last year's results, there was a slight decrease in scores across all survey measures, although the drop was smaller among parent-playgroup programs than it was for youth programs.²⁴

Exhibit 16: Average Parent Outcome Scores for CY2014-2015 and FY2015-2016




Educator Outcomes

Survey data indicate that, as was true last year, mental health consultation programs were strongest in meeting their goals for outcome area 2: *increased access to resources and support* (90%, as compared to 85% last year). The survey measures that received the highest scores overall fell in this outcome area and, interestingly, indicates that the respondents highly valued the *relationship* they had with their mental health consultants. The survey measure that received the highest individual score was *I have a good relationship with the mental health consultant* (99%), followed by *the mental health consultant works as a partner with me to meet children's mental health needs* (97%).

²⁴ The decrease was statistically significant for the overall composite score and the following outcomes: *increased knowledge of child development, increased confidence in managing children's behavior, and improved skills to support academic and socio-emotional development*. The comparison to last year's scores does not include the Summer Pre-K program because they used a different version of the parent survey last year and thus did not have comparable outcome scores.

**Exhibit 17: Progress Towards Educator Outcomes
(Percent of respondents who agree or strongly agree)
(n = 140 educators in three programs²⁵)**



Outcome area 4: improved skills to support children’s academic and socioemotional growth received the lowest scores, though these scores improved significantly when compared to last year (84% this year, as compared to 75% last year). This outcome area contains the lowest scoring measure across all domains: “the mental health consultant has helped me to strengthen my relationship with parents and caregivers” (77%) received the lowest score, though this score reflects a healthy improvement over last year’s score of 69%.

One important change to highlight is the strong improvement in outcome area 3: increased confidence in managing children’s behavior. Last year, this was one of the lowest-scoring outcome areas (75%) and it was signaled as an area for growth for program directors in this

²⁵ Of the 375 surveys completed by youth enrolled in academic-focused programs, 10 surveys did not have completed academic-specific questions, the second page of the survey.

strategy, who described their goals in this area as working towards teacher empowerment and helping teachers feel good about their work. This year the scores in this outcome area improved significantly, to an average of 86%—an 11% increase.

Moreover, the survey measure around teacher confidence received the highest increase (12%) in scores, coming in at 87% this year as compared to last year’s score of 75%. This may be a reflection of their efforts to better engage staff and build relationships with teachers and their partners. One program staff described it as part of their collaborative process:

We work very closely with the child development specialist in figuring out what a specific child needs, and then talking to the teacher about that. It really varies from teacher-to-teacher, but it’s really just about trying to talk about it and figure it out together...There’s definitely more of a concerted effort to meet and talk things out and co-create what’s needed.

Finally, in keeping with the findings presented in this section, it is notable that educators were the only respondent group to consistently demonstrate more positive outcomes in FY2015-2016 than in FY2014-2015. This increase was across all measures, with the biggest increase reflected in outcome 3: increased confidence in managing children’s behavior (from 75% last year to 86% this year—an 11% increase).²⁶

Exhibit 18: Average Educator Outcome Scores for CY2014-2015 and FY2015-2016



CONCLUSION

When the Oakland City Council supported a ballot initiative to reauthorize another 12 years of dedicated funding from the city’s unrestricted general revenues to programming for youth under age 21, they signaled their commitment to out-of-school time (OST).²⁷

This quote is from a 2011 report by the National League of Cities (NLC), commissioned by the Wallace Foundation, that highlighted Oakland as one of 27 municipalities that have the “most highly developed out-of-school time (OST) systems,” with a track record of “bringing key partners together around a shared vision for supporting young people.” As OFCY moves forward with its next three-year funding cycle, staff members and key stakeholders should continue to focus on systems and data improvements that can strengthen Oakland’s unique city-wide approach to supporting families and youth.

The NLC report identifies a number of best practices for municipalities looking to strengthen their afterschool programming, with a focus on the iterative nature of system and program improvement. Among these is a focus on multi-year planning, increasing the reliability of information, expanding participation, and an ongoing commitment to promoting program quality. OFCY has invested in the

²⁶ The difference in outcome scores was statistically significant overall and for *increased confidence in managing children’s behavior* and *improved skills to support academic and socioemotional development*.

²⁷ National League of Cities Institute for Youth, Education, and Families (2011). *Municipal Leadership for AfterSchool: Citywide Approaches Spreading Across the Country*.

core building blocks of a strong system, through its strategic planning process, use of common Management Information System (MIS), transparent approach to sharing data with grantees and the community, and efforts to strengthen programs over time. The following are suggestions for how OFCY can continue to improve its data systems and tools moving forward.

- **Make adjustments to evaluation tools to allow for more detailed analysis of respondent characteristics and outcomes.** In our analysis this year, SPR identified a number of tweaks that would be useful for strengthening OFCY’s evaluation tools moving forward. For instance, it would be useful to add demographic fields to adult surveys, so that outcomes for parents and teachers participating in early childhood interventions can be examined by ethnicity. Similarly, the youth surveys would benefit from the addition of several questions focused on the intensity and frequency of their involvement in program activities.
- **Develop additional performance measures.** SPR’s decision to include the survey response rate as a performance measure has led to a marked increase in the survey response rate. It would be useful for OFCY to identify additional performance measures based on its goals and priorities. For instance, OFCY can develop threshold performance measures for specific dimensions that are common across programs, such as “participants report learning something new.” This is an area where most programs score very high, so it would be a red flag if a program did not perform well in this area.
- **Continue to nurture a learning community among OFCY grantees.** Beyond funding, one of the greatest ways that OFCY can help expand the strength of youth programming in Oakland is to support networking and peer exchange. The grantee meetings are a great opportunity for grantees to exchange ideas and form connections, but they are infrequent (3-4 times a year). OFCY may want to think about other ways to support program exchange. For instance, OFCY might consider gathering a list of program activities, resources, and/or events through a monthly online survey, which then could be shared back out with grantees in an informal newsletter. Such a newsletter could also include trainings or resources available through city agencies. This could help program leverage resources and services from one another.
- **Increase capacity-building support for grantees.** Grantee interviews and convening survey responses indicate a strong desire for grantees to increase their knowledge, skills, and their organizational capacity to better support the communities they serve. Beyond providing funding resources specifically for capacity building, there are other, cost-effective ways in which OFCY can support grantee capacity building. For example, building on the point highlighted above, OFCY could develop a monthly list of online or local in-person trainings provided by partner agencies, such as First 5 Alameda County. It could also consider devoting the second half of their grantee convenings to trainings designed to focus on specific capacity building needs of grantees, which could be identified through surveys or through the analysis of quality and performance data. OFCY experimented with this format last year by holding a training on trauma-informed care during the second half of a grantee convening— survey results indicate it was extremely successful—suggesting that this may be a good strategy to pursue moving forward.

OFCY plays a critical role in sustaining and strengthening the ecosystem of child- and youth-focused programs in Oakland. OFCY’s consistent and thoughtful support enables grantees to grow and leverage their formidable strengths in service of Oakland’s children and families—to improve outcomes for the children and youth of Oakland and to ensure that the adults charged with their development and care are equipped with the knowledge and skills to ensure that all of Oakland’s children can thrive.

APPENDIX A: PROGRAM-LEVEL INFORMATION

The following table provides program-level information at the end of FY2015-2016, including the number of unduplicated youth who participated in program activities and progress towards projected enrollment for the fiscal year, actual units of service and progress towards projected units of service for the fiscal year, average hours of service per youth participant, and overall PQA score, if applicable. Please note that not all programs received a Program Quality Assessment site visit and therefore may not have a PQA score.

| Strategy | Agency | Program | Enrollment | | Units of Service ²⁸ | | Average Hours | Overall PQA Score | Overall Survey Score |
|---|--|--|------------|-------------|--------------------------------|-------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| | | | Actual | % Projected | Actual | % Projected | | | |
| Academic Support for Older Youth | Centro Legal de la Raza | Youth Law Academy | 68 | 92% | 2824 | 101% | 41 | | 4.4 |
| Academic Support for Older Youth | College Track | College Track Oakland | 295 | 107% | 26038.92 | 128% | 88 | 4.67 | 4.08 |
| Academic Support for Older Youth | Youth Radio | Pathways to Higher Education and Careers | 212 | 265% | 5530.9 | 118% | 26 | 4.67 | 3.88 |
| Academic Support for Older Youth | Youth Together, Inc. | Youth Together's Academic Support For Older Youth | 413 | 203% | 7259.33 | 57% | 18 | 4.17 | 4.29 |
| Community-based Out-of-School Time Programs | American Indian Child Resource Center | Culture Keepers | 41 | 137% | 5803.08 | 85% | 141 | 3.99 | 3.69 |
| Community-based Out-of-School Time Programs | Bay Area Outreach & Recreation Program | Sports & Recreation for Youth with Physical Disabilities | 44 | 98% | 3932.92 | 90% | 74 | 4.48 | 4.45 |
| Community-based Out-of-School Time Programs | City of Oakland - Office of Parks and Recreation | Oakland Discovery Centers | 379 | 84% | 33977.92 | 112% | 90 | 3.8 | 4.33 |
| Community-based Out-of-School Time Programs | Dimensions Dance Theater, Inc. | Rites of Passage | 159 | 133% | 24216.5 | 168% | 152 | 4.76 | 4.3 |

²⁸ For programs in the Parent and Child Engagement in Early Learning and Development strategy, Units of Service includes service provided to both children and parents, while Average Hours only includes hours of service provided to child participants.

| Strategy | Agency | Program | Enrollment | | Units of Service ²⁸ | | Average Hours | Overall PQA Score | Overall Survey Score |
|---|---|---|------------|-------------|--------------------------------|-------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| | | | Actual | % Projected | Actual | % Projected | | | |
| Community-based Out-of-School Time Programs | East Bay Asian Local Development Corporation | Lion's Pride Afterschool and Summer Youth Program | 91 | 114% | 26383.17 | 78% | 290 | 4.1 | 3.81 |
| Community-based Out-of-School Time Programs | East Oakland Boxing Association | SmartMoves Education and Enrichment Program | 481 | 80% | 100176.4 | 157% | 208 | | 4.16 |
| Community-based Out-of-School Time Programs | Girls Incorporated of Alameda County | Girls in Oakland Achieve and Lead | 208 | 149% | 9072.08 | 120% | 44 | 4.42 | 4.22 |
| Community-based Out-of-School Time Programs | Native American Health Center | Indigenous Youth Voices | 306 | 191% | 32096.42 | 109% | 101 | 4.29 | 4.3 |
| Community-based Out-of-School Time Programs | Refugee Transitions | Newcomer Community Engagement Program | 345 | 173% | 17792.25 | 120% | 34 | 3.99 | 4.04 |
| Community-based Out-of-School Time Programs | San Francisco Study Center (Brothers on the Rise) | Brothers, UNITE! | 156 | 312% | 10796.75 | 112% | 69 | 4.55 | 3.94 |
| Community-based Out-of-School Time Programs | | Media After School (MAS) | 134 | 134% | 13674.67 | 196% | 102 | 4.5 | 4 |
| Mental Health and Developmental Consultations in Early Care and Education | Family Paths | The Early Childhood Mental Health Collaborative | 1164 | 101% | 3806.45 | 97% | 17 | | 4.33 |
| Mental Health and Developmental Consultations in Early Care and Education | Jewish Family & Children's Services of the East Bay | Integrated Early Childhood Consultation Program | 911 | 125% | 5387.67 | 159% | 30 | | 4.18 |

| Strategy | Agency | Program | Enrollment | | Units of Service ²⁸ | | Average Hours | Overall PQA Score | Overall Survey Score |
|---|--|---|------------|-------------|--------------------------------|-------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| | | | Actual | % Projected | Actual | % Projected | | | |
| Mental Health and Developmental Consultations in Early Care and Education | Lincoln Child Center | Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation | 404 | 115% | 2459.92 | 99% | 80 | | 4.43 |
| Parent and Child Engagement in Early Learning and Development | Children's Hospital & Research Center Oakland | Integrated Developmental Playgroups Program | 246 | 378% | 9668.9 | 86% | 22 | | 4.51 |
| Parent and Child Engagement in Early Learning and Development | City of Oakland - Office of Parks and Recreation | Sandboxes to Community Empowerment | 175 | 175% | 29825 | 216% | 94 | | 4.3 |
| Parent and Child Engagement in Early Learning and Development | East Bay Agency for Children | Parent Child Education Support Program | 67 | 93% | 8118.5 | 231% | 46 | | 4.85 |
| Parent and Child Engagement in Early Learning and Development | Lotus Bloom Child & Family Center | Multicultural Playgroups | 295 | 246% | 44511.43 | 142% | 78 | | 4.62 |
| Parent and Child Engagement in Early Learning and Development | Oakland Parents Together | Listening to Children Parent Cafes | 43 | 54% | 3902.5 | 46% | 34 | | 4.33 |
| Parent and Child Engagement in Early Learning and Development | Our Family Coalition | Building Strong Children in LGBTQ Families | 183 | 166% | 6593.25 | 269% | 16 | | 4.23 |
| Parent and Child Engagement in Early Learning and Development | Safe Passages | Safe Passages Baby Learning Communities | 283 | 81% | 8380.28 | 111% | 18 | | 4.76 |


| Strategy | Agency | Program | Enrollment | | Units of Service ²⁸ | | Average Hours | Overall PQA Score | Overall Survey Score |
|---|--|--|------------|-------------|--------------------------------|-------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| | | | Actual | % Projected | Actual | % Projected | | | |
| Parent and Child Engagement in Early Learning and Development | Through the Looking Glass | Chatterbox | 19 | 158% | 2116.08 | 132% | 59 | | 4.95 |
| Pre-Kindergarten Summer Camp | Oakland Unified School District | OUSD Summer Pre-K | 68 | 189% | 2544.25 | 53% | 37 | | 4.07 |
| Safe Community Spaces for LGBTQ Youth | AIDS Project East Bay | Save Our LGBTI-Youth (SOL) | 74 | 49% | 2067.42 | 83% | 27 | 4.05 | |
| Safe Community Spaces for LGBTQ Youth | Destiny Arts Center | Moving in the Movement | 20 | 69% | 3379.33 | 102% | 136 | | 4.56 |
| Safe Community Spaces for LGBTQ Youth | Health Initiatives for Youth (HIFY) | Health Initiatives for Youth's LGBTQIQ Youth Safe Space Initiative | 162 | 191% | 1233.67 | 89% | 7 | 2.94 | 3.77 |
| Safe Community Spaces for LGBTQ Youth | La Clinica de La Raza | Juntos | 15 | 21% | 705.5 | 65% | 47 | 4.45 | 4.18 |
| Safe Community Spaces for LGBTQ Youth | Youth UpRising | YU's Queer & Allies Initiative | 79 | 67% | 1002 | 92% | 12 | 3.97 | 4.07 |
| Summer Program | Aim High for High School | Aim High / Oakland - 3 Sites | 395 | 100% | 61715.58 | 109% | 156 | 4.53 | 3.93 |
| Summer Program | City of Oakland - Office of Parks and Recreation | Summer Camp Explosion | 617 | 206% | 109073 | 151% | 177 | 4.18 | 3.95 |
| Summer Program | College Track | College Track Summer Program | 194 | 255% | 13109 | 149% | 68 | 4.83 | 3.97 |
| Summer Program | Destiny Arts Center | Camp Destiny | 143 | 102% | 6008.25 | 92% | 42 | 4.4 | 3.77 |
| Summer Program | East Bay Asian Youth Center (EBAYC) | Summer Matters | 566 | 162% | 76090.5 | 176% | 134 | 4.4 | 3.89 |
| Summer Program | East Oakland Youth Development Center | Summer Cultural Enrichment Program | 224 | 112% | 91629.5 | 263% | 409 | 4.41 | 4.21 |

| Strategy | Agency | Program | Enrollment | | Units of Service ²⁸ | | Average Hours | Overall PQA Score | Overall Survey Score |
|---|---|--|------------|-------------|--------------------------------|-------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| | | | Actual | % Projected | Actual | % Projected | | | |
| Summer Program | Family Support Services of the Bay Area | Kinship Summer Youth Program | 55 | 100% | 9161 | 109% | 167 | 4.63 | 4.64 |
| Summer Program | Girls Incorporated of Alameda County | Concordia Park Summer Program | 113 | 153% | 14645.5 | 116% | 130 | 4.65 | 3.66 |
| Summer Program | Lincoln Child Center | Oakland Freedom School | 140 | 140% | 22514.5 | 128% | 161 | 4.4 | 4.18 |
| Summer Program | Prescott Circus Theatre | Prescott Circus Theatre Summer Program | 42 | 140% | 5234.25 | 140% | 125 | 4.57 | 4.21 |
| Transition programs for youth into middle and high school | Alternatives in Action | Fremont Initiative for Reaching Success Together (FIRST) Transitions Program | 808 | 367% | 28347.75 | 52% | 35 | 3.95 | 3.98 |
| Transition programs for youth into middle and high school | East Bay Asian Youth Center (EBAYC) | Break The Cycle | 392 | 196% | 18325.72 | 147% | 47 | 3.93 | 3.7 |
| Transition programs for youth into middle and high school | Oakland Kids First | PASS-2 Peer Mentoring Program | 2224 | 124% | 23687.67 | 121% | 11 | 4.77 | 4.34 |
| Transition programs for youth into middle and high school | Safe Passages | Safe Passages Transitions Program | 206 | 41% | 41433 | 128% | 201 | 4.16 | 4.54 |
| Youth Career and Workforce Development | Alameda Health System | Model Neighborhood Program | 162 | 74% | 14076.95 | 105% | 87 | | 4.15 |
| Youth Career and Workforce Development | Beyond Emancipation | Gaining Resources and Opportunities for Work (GROW): a Culinary Training Program | 45 | 180% | 5135 | 76% | 114 | | 4.31 |
| Youth Career and Workforce Development | Center for Media Change | Hack the Hood Summer Bootcamp | 21 | 117% | 1964.5 | 93% | 94 | | 4.22 |


| Strategy | Agency | Program | Enrollment | | Units of Service ²⁸ | | Average Hours | Overall PQA Score | Overall Survey Score |
|--|--|---|------------|-------------|--------------------------------|-------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| | | | Actual | % Projected | Actual | % Projected | | | |
| Youth Career and Workforce Development | East Side Arts Alliance | ArtWorks at ESAA | 78 | 52% | 20181.75 | 83% | 255 | | 4.54 |
| Youth Career and Workforce Development | Juma Ventures | Pathways to Advancement | 128 | 191% | 5610 | 83% | 44 | | 4.16 |
| Youth Career and Workforce Development | OUSD College & Career Readiness Office | Exploring College & Career Options in Oakland (ECCO!) | 93 | 107% | 14106 | 100% | 152 | | 4.13 |
| Youth Career and Workforce Development | The Unity Council | Oakland Youth Engaged (OYE) | 85 | 160% | 7420.5 | 51% | 84 | | 4.24 |
| Youth Career and Workforce Development | Youth Employment Partnership | Career Try-Out | 90 | 125% | 14696.92 | 102% | 163 | | 3.62 |
| Youth Career and Workforce Development | Youth Radio | Pathways to Digital | 152 | 217% | 16822.05 | 95% | 111 | | 4.1 |
| Youth Career and Workforce Development | | Youth Bridge Career and Workforce Development Program | 218 | 242% | 22831 | 119% | 105 | | 4.36 |
| Youth Leadership and Community Safety | East Bay Asian Youth Center (EBAYC) | API Youth Promoting Advocacy and Leadership (AYPAL) | 118 | 118% | 39554 | 113% | 335 | | 4.53 |
| Youth Leadership and Community Safety | Human Services Department | Friday Night in the Park Program Support | 31 | 129% | 1736.75 | 113% | 56 | | 3.89 |
| Youth Leadership and Community Safety | La Clinica de La Raza | Youth Brigade | 37 | 123% | 3517.75 | 76% | 93 | | 3.86 |
| Youth Leadership and Community Safety | Peace Development Fund | BAY-Peace: Better Alternatives for Youth | 128 | 160% | 8825.58 | 112% | 69 | | |
| Youth Leadership and Community Safety | Project Re-Connect | Project Re-Connect | 33 | 82% | 1338.5 | 49% | 28 | | 4.18 |
| Youth Leadership and Community Safety | Safe Passages | Get Active Urban Arts Program | 124 | 168% | 13707.75 | 117% | 111 | | 4.26 |
| Youth Leadership in Community Schools | Alternatives in Action | Life Academy | 850 | 131% | 93339.5 | 95% | 108 | 4.9 | 3.86 |

| Strategy | Agency | Program | Enrollment | | Units of Service ²⁸ | | Average Hours | Overall PQA Score | Overall Survey Score |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|------------|-------------|--------------------------------|-------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| | | | Actual | % Projected | Actual | % Projected | | | |
| Youth Leadership in Community Schools | Oakland Unified School District | OUSD Peer Restorative Justice Program | 1186 | 86% | 7971 | 183% | 7 | 4.97 | 4.34 |
| Youth Leadership in Community Schools | Spanish Speaking Citizens' Foundation | Leading the Independence of our Barrios for Raza Empowerment (LIBRE) | 248 | 216% | 7857 | 98% | 29 | 3.38 | 4.01 |


APPENDIX B: EVALUATION FRAMEWORKS




Academic Support



Youth Workforce Development



Youth Engagement



APPENDIX C: MAPPING OF PROGRAMS TO FRAMEWORKS BY FUNDING STRATEGY

| Program | Agency | Framework | Funding Strategy |
|--|---|-----------|---|
| Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation | Lincoln Child Center | ECE | Mental Health and Developmental Consultations in Early Care and Education |
| Integrated Early Childhood Consultation Program | Jewish Family & Children's Services of the East Bay | ECE | Mental Health and Developmental Consultations in Early Care and Education |
| The Early Childhood Mental Health Collaborative | Family Paths | ECE | Mental Health and Developmental Consultations in Early Care and Education |
| Building Strong Children in LGBTQ Families | Our Family Coalition | ECE | Parent and Child Engagement in Early Learning and Development |
| Chatterbox | Through the Looking Glass | ECE | Parent and Child Engagement in Early Learning and Development |
| Integrated Developmental Playgroups Program | Children's Hospital & Research Center Oakland | ECE | Parent and Child Engagement in Early Learning and Development |
| Listening to Children Parent Cafes | Oakland Parents Together | ECE | Parent and Child Engagement in Early Learning and Development |
| Multicultural Playgroups | Lotus Bloom Child & Family Center | ECE | Parent and Child Engagement in Early Learning and Development |
| Parent Child Education Support Program | East Bay Agency for Children | ECE | Parent and Child Engagement in Early Learning and Development |
| Safe Passages Baby Learning Communities | Safe Passages | ECE | Parent and Child Engagement in Early Learning and Development |
| Sandboxes to Community Empowerment | City of Oakland - Office of Parks and Recreation | ECE | Parent and Child Engagement in Early Learning and Development |
| OUSD Summer Pre-K | Oakland Unified School District | ECE | Pre-Kindergarten Summer Camp |
| Break The Cycle | East Bay Asian Youth Center (EBAYC) | Academic | Transition programs for youth into middle and high school |
| Fremont Initiative for Reaching Success Together (FIRST) Transitions Program | Alternatives in Action | Academic | Transition programs for youth into middle and high school |
| PASS-2 Peer Mentoring Program | Oakland Kids First | Academic | Transition programs for youth into middle and high school |
| Safe Passages Transitions Program | Safe Passages | Academic | Transition programs for youth into middle and high school |
| Leading the Independence of our Barrios for Raza Empowerment (LIBRE) | Spanish Speaking Citizens' Foundation | Academic | Youth Leadership in Community Schools |
| Life Academy/ McClymonds | Alternatives in Action | Academic | Youth Leadership in Community Schools |
| Aim High / Oakland - 3 Sites | Aim High for High School | Academic | Summer Program |
| College Track Summer Program | College Track | Academic | Summer Program |
| College Track Oakland | College Track | Academic | Academic Support for Older Youth |
| Pathways to Higher Education and Careers | Youth Radio | Academic | Academic Support for Older Youth |
| Youth Law Academy | Centro Legal de la Raza | Academic | Academic Support for Older Youth |
| Youth Together's Academic Support For Older Youth | Youth Together, Inc. | Academic | Academic Support for Older Youth |

| Program | Agency | Framework | Funding Strategy |
|--|---|------------------|---|
| OUSD Peer Restorative Justice Program | Oakland Unified School District | Youth Engagement | Youth Leadership in Community Schools |
| Brothers, UNITE! | San Francisco Study Center (Brothers on the Rise) | Youth Engagement | Community-based Out-of-School Time Programs |
| Culture Keepers | American Indian Child Resource Center | Youth Engagement | Community-based Out-of-School Time Programs |
| Girls in Oakland Achieve and Lead | Girls Incorporated of Alameda County | Youth Engagement | Community-based Out-of-School Time Programs |
| Indigenous Youth Voices | Native American Health Center | Youth Engagement | Community-based Out-of-School Time Programs |
| Lion's Pride Afterschool and Summer Youth Program | East Bay Asian Local Development Corporation | Youth Engagement | Community-based Out-of-School Time Programs |
| Media After School (MAS) | Community Initiatives | Youth Engagement | Community-based Out-of-School Time Programs |
| Newcomer Community Engagement Program | Refugee Transitions | Youth Engagement | Community-based Out-of-School Time Programs |
| Oakland Discovery Centers | City of Oakland - Office of Parks and Recreation | Youth Engagement | Community-based Out-of-School Time Programs |
| Rites of Passage | Dimensions Dance Theater, Inc. | Youth Engagement | Community-based Out-of-School Time Programs |
| SmartMoves Education and Enrichment Program | East Oakland Boxing Association | Youth Engagement | Community-based Out-of-School Time Programs |
| Sports & Recreation for Youth with Physical Disabilities | Bay Area Outreach & Recreation Program | Youth Engagement | Community-based Out-of-School Time Programs |
| Camp Destiny | Destiny Arts Center | Youth Engagement | Summer Program |
| Concordia Park Summer Program | Girls Incorporated of Alameda County | Youth Engagement | Summer Program |
| Kinship Summer Youth Program | Family Support Services of the Bay Area | Youth Engagement | Summer Program |
| Oakland Freedom School | Lincoln Child Center | Youth Engagement | Summer Program |
| Prescott Circus Theatre Summer Program | Prescott Circus Theatre | Youth Engagement | Summer Program |
| Summer Camp Explosion | City of Oakland - Office of Parks and Recreation | Youth Engagement | Summer Program |
| Summer Cultural Enrichment Program | East Oakland Youth Development Center | Youth Engagement | Summer Program |
| Summer Matters | East Bay Asian Youth Center (EBAYC) | Youth Engagement | Summer Program |
| API Youth Promoting Advocacy and Leadership (AYPAL) | East Bay Asian Youth Center (EBAYC) | Youth Engagement | Youth Leadership and Community Safety |
| BAY-Peace: Better Alternatives for Youth | Peace Development Fund | Youth Engagement | Youth Leadership and Community Safety |
| Friday Night in the Park Program Support | Human Services Department | Youth Engagement | Youth Leadership and Community Safety |
| Get Active Urban Arts Program | Safe Passages | Youth Engagement | Youth Leadership and Community Safety |
| Project Re-Connect | Project Re-Connect | Youth Engagement | Youth Leadership and Community Safety |
| Youth Brigade | La Clinica de La Raza | Youth Engagement | Youth Leadership and Community Safety |
| Health Initiatives for Youth's LGBTQIQ Youth Safe Space Initiative | Health Initiatives for Youth (HIFY) | Youth Engagement | Safe Community Spaces for LGBTQ Youth |

| Program | Agency | Framework | Funding Strategy |
|--|--|------------------|--|
| Juntos | La Clinica de La Raza | Youth Engagement | Safe Community Spaces for LGBTQ Youth |
| Moving in the Movement | Destiny Arts Center | Youth Engagement | Safe Community Spaces for LGBTQ Youth |
| Save Our LGBTI-Youth (SOL) | AIDS Project East Bay | Youth Engagement | Safe Community Spaces for LGBTQ Youth |
| YU's Queer & Allies Initiative | Youth UpRising | Youth Engagement | Safe Community Spaces for LGBTQ Youth |
| ArtWorks at ESAA | East Side Arts Alliance | Youth Workforce | Youth Career and Workforce Development |
| Career Try-Out | Youth Employment Partnership | Youth Workforce | Youth Career and Workforce Development |
| Exploring College & Career Options in Oakland (ECCO!) | OUSD College & Career Readiness Office | Youth Workforce | Youth Career and Workforce Development |
| Gaining Resources and Opportunities for Work (GROW): a Culinary Training Program | Beyond Emancipation | Youth Workforce | Youth Career and Workforce Development |
| Hack the Hood Summer Bootcamp | Center for Media Change | Youth Workforce | Youth Career and Workforce Development |
| Model Neighborhood Program | Alameda Health System | Youth Workforce | Youth Career and Workforce Development |
| Oakland Youth Engaged (OYE) | The Unity Council | Youth Workforce | Youth Career and Workforce Development |
| Pathways to Advancement | Juma Ventures | Youth Workforce | Youth Career and Workforce Development |
| Pathways to Digital | Youth Radio | Youth Workforce | Youth Career and Workforce Development |
| Youth Bridge Career and Workforce Development Program | Alta Bates Summit Foundation | Youth Workforce | Youth Career and Workforce Development |



OAKLAND SCHOOL-BASED AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS EVALUATION

2015-16

FINDINGS REPORT



Prepared for the Planning and Oversight Committee of the Oakland Fund for Children and Youth and the Oakland Unified School District, After School Programs Office



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank all the individuals and agencies that contributed to this evaluation report.

The City of Oakland Human Services Department and the Oakland Unified School District's After School Programs Office greatly contributed to the design and structure of the report. We thank Oakland Fund for Children & Youth Director Sandra Taylor, OFCY Program Planner Mike Wetzel, and Julia Fong-Ma, the OUSD Coordinator of After School Programs, for their support.

All Oakland school-based after school programs participated in the evaluation, including distributing and collecting surveys and hosting our team for site visits. Their active participation in the evaluation is key to the success of this report.

We would also like to thank the OFCY Planning and Oversight Committee who we name individually below. We appreciate the Evaluation Subcommittee for their guidance, leadership, and commitment to independent evaluation, with special thanks to Chair Gerald Williams.

Finally we thank the children and youth of Oakland, and the parents, caregivers, teachers, and service providers who support Oakland youth so that they become healthy, happy, educated, engaged, powerful and loved community members.

2015-16 OAKLAND PLANNING AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (POC) MEMBERS*

| District | POC Member - Adult | POC Member - Youth |
|------------|--|---|
| Mayor | Marcus Montague | <i>(Mayor selects a single youth or adult member)</i> |
| At Large | Julie Waters | -- |
| District 1 | Gerald Williams | Bolor-Erdene Erdenebat |
| District 2 | Kathy Teng Dwyer | Kevin Wong |
| District 3 | Sheilagh Polk (Cat Brooks) - through Nov. 2015 | Jared Utley |
| District 4 | Steven Wirt | Ajani Torres-Cedillo |
| District 5 | Anakarita Allen | Karen Lara |
| District 6 | Frederick Price | M. Shawn Cunningham II |
| District 7 | Kisha Jackson | -- |

*As of May 2016.

IMAGES

Photo Credit for cover images (report cover) and About Oakland School-Based After School Programs sections (page 8): Morgan Shidler Photography (<http://www.morganshidler.com/>)



EVALUATION TEAM

Corey Newhouse - *Project Director*
 Jocelyn Michelsen - *Senior Research Associate*
 Femi Vance - *Senior Research Associate*
 Julie Lo - *Director*
 Amy Goldman - *Research Assistant*
 Saily Willis - *Project Assistant*



OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
 Community Schools, Thriving Students



Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| 2015-16 OAKLAND AFTER SCHOOL..... | 5 |
| EVALUATION EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... | 5 |
| ABOUT OAKLAND SCHOOL-BASED AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS..... | 10 |
| AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM LOCATIONS & PARTNERS..... | 11 |
| ABOUT OAKLAND AFTER SCHOOL PARTICIPANTS..... | 12 |
| ABOUT THE SCHOOL-BASED AFTER SCHOOL PARTNERSHIP | 13 |
| FUNDING..... | 14 |
| OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT | 16 |
| OAKLAND FUND FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH | 17 |
| EVALUATION OVERVIEW..... | 18 |
| ACCESS & ATTENDANCE IN OAKLAND AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM..... | 19 |
| ACCESS & ATTENDANCE | 20 |
| PROGRAM QUALITY | 28 |
| OAKLAND’S QUALITY IMPROVEMENT CYCLE | 29 |
| PROGRAM QUALITY FINDINGS | 30 |
| <i>Point of Service Quality Ratings by Program</i> | 32 |
| SCHOOL-BASED AFTER SCHOOL OUTCOME DOMAINS..... | 38 |
| ACADEMIC BEHAVIORS | 39 |
| ACADEMIC BEHAVIORS FINDINGS | 40 |
| SENSE OF MASTERY | 42 |
| SENSE OF MASTERY FINDINGS | 43 |
| SOCIAL & EMOTIONAL SKILLS | 45 |
| SOCIAL & EMOTIONAL SKILLS FINDINGS | 46 |
| PHYSICAL WELL-BEING | 47 |
| PHYSICAL WELL-BEING FINDINGS..... | 48 |
| SCHOOL CONNECTEDNESS | 49 |
| SCHOOL CONNECTEDNESS FINDINGS | 50 |
| COLLEGE & CAREER EXPLORATION | 51 |
| COLLEGE & CAREER EXPLORATION FINDINGS..... | 52 |
| ACADEMIC OUTCOMES | 54 |
| FINDINGS FROM ACADEMIC DATA ANALYSES | 54 |
| INTERPRETING THE FINDINGS | 56 |
| DIFFERENCES IN YOUTH OUTCOMES..... | 58 |
| DIFFERENCES IN YOUTH REPORTS OF QUALITY | 58 |
| CALIFORNIA HEALTHY KIDS SURVEY: OUSD AND OAKLAND SCHOOL-BASED AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS | 60 |

| | |
|---|----|
| DIFFERENCES IN OUTCOME DOMAINS | 61 |
| DATA COMPANION..... | 63 |
| DATA COMPANION A. DATA SOURCES BY DATA TYPE | 63 |
| DATA COMPANION B. SITE VISIT METHODOLOGY | 64 |
| DATA COMPANION C. SURVEY METHODOLOGY | 66 |
| DATA COMPANION D. YOUTH SURVEY COMPOSITES..... | 67 |
| <i>Youth Survey Composites by Program</i> | 70 |
| DATA COMPANION E. AFTER SCHOOL PARTICIPANTS' DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION | 77 |
| DATA COMPANION F. YOUTH SURVEY DATA | 78 |
| <i>Differences in Youth Survey Responses by Participants' Grade, Gender, and Race/Ethnicity</i> | 80 |

2015-16 OAKLAND AFTER SCHOOL EVALUATION EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

✓ **Oakland School-Based After School Partnership:**

Formed in 2004 by OFCY and OUSD's After School Programs Office.

- ### ✓ **Funding Sources:** The Partnership brings over \$18 million to programs through OFCY grants, State and Federal grants managed by OUSD, and additional community-based funding sources.
-

In 2015-16 the Oakland School-Based After School Partnership funded 82 school-based after school programs serving over 18,000 youth across Oakland. The Partnership, formed in 2004, is a collaboration between the Oakland Fund for Children and Youth (OFCY) and the Oakland Unified School District's After School Programs Office (ASPO). Together, the School-Based Partners dedicate over \$18 million to programs, which includes over \$4.35 million annually in local funding through OFCY grants to community agencies to manage programs; a matching \$11.27 million in state After School Education and Safety (ASES) funding and federal 21st Century Learning, which are managed through OUSD; an additional \$2.5 million garnered by community agencies from sources such as in-kind donations, philanthropic grants, and contract and service agreements with local agencies.

ABOUT THE EVALUATION PROJECT

-
- ### ✓ **Theory of Action:** Youth who regularly participate in a high quality after school program gain skills and experience that benefit them both now and in the future.

- ### ✓ **Data Sources:** Youth surveys; site visits (n=82); program attendance records; youth demographic records; District academic data.
-

An annual evaluation assesses the ways in which school-based after school programs promote positive outcomes in youth. The 2015-16 evaluation is guided by the Theory of Action (see page 18), which holds that students who regularly attend high quality after school programs will gain skills and experience that lead to academic and future success. In accordance with the Theory of Action, this report presents how often children and youth attend school-based after school programs, the quality of programs, and the direct outcomes and benefits to participating children and youth, as well on students' academic outcomes in the context of their program participation.

Data sources for the 2015-16 evaluation include youth surveys, site visits to 82 programs, program attendance records and youth demographic records from Cityspan, and District academic data.

YOUTH SERVED IN OAKLAND AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS

✓ **Youth Served:** 18,291

In the 2015-16 program year, school-based after school programs served 18,291 youth across Oakland: 11,146 were served through programs jointly funded by OUSD and OFCY; 6,373 were served through OUSD-funded programs; and 772 were served through OFCY-funded programs. After school programs are open to all students¹ at the program's host school at low or no cost.²

✓ **Participant Diversity:** Oakland after school youth are 45% Latino/a, 35% African American, 13% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 7% White. Programs serve slightly more boys (52%) than girls (48%).

After school participants are a diverse group. More than four in 10 after school youth are Latino/a (45%), making up the highest proportion of participants. About one-third of participants are African-American (35%), followed by smaller proportions of Asian/Pacific Islander (13%) and White (7%) youth. Boys and girls are equally represented among racial/ethnic groups. Likewise, roughly equal proportions of boys (52%) and girls (48%) attend all after school programs.

✓ **Oakland Neighborhoods Served:** Almost half (47%) of all participants live in the Fruitvale, Coliseum, and East Oakland zip codes.

After school programs served youth throughout Oakland (Figure 1 on page 11), but nearly half (47%) of participants were concentrated in three zip codes: 94601, 94621, and 94603; these zip codes represent the Coliseum, Fruitvale, and East Oakland areas.

✓ **English Learners:** About 25% of after school participants are English Learners.

About one-quarter of after school participants are English Learners. Program staff and community partners managing Oakland's after school programs develop activities to suit the unique interests and needs of their student population.

PROGRAM ACCESS & ATTENDANCE

✓ **Enrollment Targets:** OFCY grantees exceeded their 2015-16 program enrollment goals.

Programs supported by OFCY funding are expected to reach 100% of their enrollment goals; 80% is the minimally acceptable performance level. Figure 5 on page 19 indicates that, as a whole, OFCY grantees are exceeding their enrollment goals, with elementary programs reaching 123% of their goal enrollment and middle school sites reaching 170%; high school sites (included in this report but not funded through OFCY's School-Based After School strategy) achieved 131% of their goal enrollment.

✓ **Program Attendance:** Overall, youth attended an average of 90 days, with expected variations by grade level.

On average, children and youth in school-based after school attended 90 days of programming; attendance varied by grade level, with elementary participants

¹ Host schools determine specific criteria for priority student enrollment, such as low academic performance or social needs.

² Per grant legislation, school-based 21st Century and After School Education and Safety programs may charge a fee, but may not turn away youth for inability to pay.

-
- ✓ **Program Access:** After school programs served 50% of the students in their host school.
-

attending 132 days on average, middle school participants attending an average of 91 days, and high school participants attending 46 days on average. Available evidence indicates that school-based programs served half (50%) of the students in their host schools. The proportion of youth served varies by program type, as shown in Table 4 on page 20.

PROGRAM QUALITY

-
- ✓ **Program Quality Assessments:** The vast majority of the 82 programs observed were found to be Thriving (40%) or Performing (59%).

Site Visits: Point-of-service quality measures capture youths' experience in activities, and was measured during one observation using the Youth or School-Age Program Quality Assessment (PQA) at 82 programs. Year-over-year data reveal that on the whole, programs are making steady inroads into improving program quality. In the 2015-16 program year, 33 of 82 (40%) programs were designated as "Thriving" and only one program (~1%) was categorized as "Emerging."

- ✓ **Youth Surveys:** Youth self-reported about their perceptions of their program's quality and about their experiences and learning in key outcome areas. Youth agreed that their program helps them to improve their academic behaviors (about 80%); to get along better with peers (about 80%); to exercise more (nearly 75%); and to feel like a part of their school (about 80%). Nearly 5,900 youth completed the survey during the 2015-16 program year; surveys were matched to youths' academic records (when available).
-

Youth Surveys: Youth surveys included questions about youths' program experiences in the four quality domains that align with the PQA site visit tool. In all four domains, youth reported positive experiences overall, and their responses were aligned to sites' PQA scores in each area. The vast majority of all youth reported feeling safe in their program (87% of elementary, 78% of middle, and 91% of high school participants), a necessary precursor to the other aspects of program quality. In addition, youth across all three grade-groups also reported high levels of Interactive experiences in their programs, with 89% of elementary, 81% of middle, and 88% of high school youth agreeing; these results align well with data from site visits.

Youth surveys also asked participants about their experiences and learning in certain key outcome areas: Academic Behaviors; Mastery; Social & Emotional Skills; Physical Well-Being; School Connectedness; and College & Career Exploration. In particular, about eight in 10 youth overall reported improving their academic behaviors and developing a sense of mastery in their after school program. As well, about 80% of youth total reported being better at getting along with peers, a key component of social and emotional learning. Nearly three-quarters agreed that their program helps them to exercise more, putting them on the path to increased physical well-being. About eight in 10 participants said their program helped them feel like a part of their school, and the same proportion reported having avenues for college and career exploration in their high school-age programs.

DIFFERENCES IN YOUTHS' AFTER SCHOOL EXPERIENCE

✓ Program Quality

Differences: Analysis exposed some age-, gender-, and race/ethnicity-based differences in how youth experience their after school program. The most notable differences were between middle school girls and boys, and Latino/a youth versus their peers.

Differences in Program Quality: There were modest differences between boy and girl participants' perspectives of program quality, as measured through youth surveys. Most notably, middle school boys reported higher levels of program engagement.

There were also some race/ethnicity-based differences in youths' views on program quality. Among high school youth, Latino/a participants were less likely to report opportunities for choice or mastery in their program. For example, 56% of elementary-aged Latino/a youth reported doing things that are too easy for them at their after school program, compared to 52% of their peers.

✓ Outcome Domain

Differences: Gender and age were the factors that drove youths' differing views on the survey's outcome domains. Differences between middle school boys' and girls' responses were observed in every domain in the youth survey.

Differences in Outcome Domains: Encouragingly, all of the youth differences revealed during analysis of the survey's outcome domains represented a 15-percentage-point-or-fewer difference. Gender comparisons showed that middle school-aged boys were more likely than girls of the same age to report strengthening their physical well-being, improving their college and career readiness, and feeling engaged in school.

Additionally, more middle school boys than girls reported that their after school program helped them to feel more confident about their college and career readiness across all items in the domain. Furthermore, 83% of boys reported that they happy to be at their school compared to 71% of girls. Smaller, statistically significant differences between middle school boys and girls exist across all domains on the survey.

ACADEMIC OUTCOMES

✓ Academic Data

Sources: School day attendance/chronic absenteeism; SBAC scores for math and ELA; and OUSD's high school readiness measure. When possible, we compared youth to non-participants in the same schools.

The academic outcomes examined included school day attendance (chronic absence) rates, Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) scores,³ and high school readiness.⁴ For measure, analysis focused both on surfacing the overall trends for after school participants versus non-participants in the same schools, and on exploring any differences by race/ethnicity and/or gender.

In 2015-16, after school program participants had notably higher school attendance rates than their peers. On average, after school participants attended 96% of all school days and non-participants attended 94%; this difference is

³ The Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) is an online summative assessment that tracks students' progress toward Common Core State Standards in Math and English Language Arts (ELA). The SBAC is administered once per year to students in grades 3-8 and grade 11. Only 2015-16 SBAC scores were available for analysis in the present report, so students' progress year-over-year was not included here.

⁴ OUSD uses a High School Readiness variable, which measures the degree to which 8th graders are prepared for the rigor and expectations for high school. The variable comprises a combination of attendance, course grades, and behavior; a student is considered high school-ready when all four of the following have been met: total weighted GPA of 2.5 or higher; school attendance rate of 96% or better; no grades D or F in their final core math or English courses in 8th grade; and no suspensions in 8th grade.

✓ **Academic
(Contributory)**

Outcomes Findings:

Encouragingly, after school participants have higher school day attendance rates than non-participants, and are less likely to be chronically absent. Eighth graders in after school are also on par with their non-participant peers in terms of high school readiness. However, participants are more likely to test below grade level in ELA and math than their peers, and English Learners are extremely likely to test below grade level in both core subjects, as measured through SBAC benchmarks. There were some important limitations with the academic data; these are noted here and in the Data Companion.

statistically significant.⁵ Another measure of school day attendance is chronic absenteeism, defined as missing 10% or more of all school days. Young people in after school were less likely to be chronically absent than non-participants: about 11% of after school participants were chronically absent, compared to 16% of non-participants; this difference is statistically significant.⁶

OUSD uses the SBAC assessment as a measure of students' math and English Language Arts (ELA) competencies. Throughout all grade levels, after school participants were less likely to be at grade level in ELA and math. For ELA, overall 26% of after school participants tested at or above grade level, versus 28% of non-participants in the same schools. For math, overall 18% of after school participants tested at or above grade level, compared to 23% of their peers in the same schools; this finding for math scores is statistically significant.⁷ Analysis of SBAC scores by sub-groups (race/ethnicity, gender, grade, English Learner status) revealed some variation in these trends.

In terms of high school readiness, 8th graders in Oakland after school programs were on par with their peers: 42% of 8th graders in after school were high school ready by the end of the 2015-16 school year, versus 43% of 8th graders in the same schools.

Our analysis of participants' academic outcomes (or contributory outcomes) is based on available data for 16,584 participants whose student records we matched using their Cityspan participant and OUSD Aeries identifiers. Only 2015-16 SBAC results for students' ELA/literacy and math benchmarks are available at this time, a limitation to our analysis of youths' growth during and between program year(s). The SBAC results are available for youth in 3rd-8th and 11th grades. The conclusions that can be reliably drawn from the available data are therefore limited.

⁵ Statistically significant at $p < .05$ level using chi-square test for association.

⁶ Statistically significant at $p < .05$ level using chi-square test for association.

⁷ Statistically significant at $p < .05$ level using chi-square test for association.

ABOUT OAKLAND SCHOOL-BASED AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS

The Oakland School-Based After School Partnership funded 82 programs located across Oakland, which served 18,291 children and youth in the 2015-16 program year.



SNAPSHOT OF OAKLAND AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Oakland after school programs offer a critical support to schools, youth, and their families. Research indicates that after school programs are more than just a safe haven for youth. High quality after school programs can support youth academically and socially.⁸ Some studies show that minorities and youth in low-income communities benefit even more from after school programs than their more affluent peers, suggesting that after school programs are especially important for these young people.⁹

In the 2015-16 program year, the School-Based After School Partnership funded 82 after school programs that operated at OUSD or public charter schools, including 47 elementary, 21 middle, and 14 high school programs. Throughout this report evaluation findings are reported by grade level, acknowledging that youth at various developmental stages have different needs. Eighteen partner agencies manage day-to-day operations, staffing, and program delivery. During program hours youth receive a mix of academic support, recreational/physical, and enrichment activities. The 82 school-based after school programs serve youth from across Oakland and participants' home zip code data indicates that nearly half of all youth (47%) reside in the Coliseum, Fruitvale, and East Oakland areas.¹⁰



⁸ Durlak, J.A., Weissberg, R.P., & Pachan, M. 2010. A meta-analysis of after-school programs that seek to promote personal and social skills in children and adolescents. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 45(3-4), 294-309.

⁹ Mahoney, J. L., Parente, M. E., & Zigler, E. F. (2010). After-school program participation and children's development. In J. Meece & J. S. Eccles (Eds.), *Handbook of research on schools, schooling, and human development* (pp. 379-397). New York, NY: Routledge.

¹⁰ Percentages by Zip codes references in these areas are: 94601 (20%), 94621 (15%), and 94603 (12%)

AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM LOCATIONS & PARTNERS

Publicly-funded after school programs in Oakland provide a mix of academic support, recreational/physical, and enrichment activities. In the 2015-16 program year, OFCY and OUSD supported 18 community-based organizations operating 82 K-12 programs across Oakland.



PROGRAMS OPERATED BY 18 COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS

- Number of Programs in Parenthesis
- Alternatives in Action (4)
 - Bay Area Community Resources (28)
 - Citizen Schools (1)
 - Eagle Village Community Center Youth & Family Services, Inc. (3)
 - East Bay Agency for Children (4)
 - East Bay Asian Youth Center (11)
 - East Oakland Youth Development Cntr. (2)
 - Girls Incorporated of Alameda County (1)
 - Higher Ground (5)
 - Lighthouse Community Charter (1)
 - Oakland Leaf (6)
 - Safe Passages (6)
 - SFBAC, Learning for Life (4)
 - Spanish Speaking Citizens' Foundation (1)
 - Ujima Foundation (1)
 - YMCA of the East Bay (2)
 - Youth Together (1)
 - Youth Uprising (1)

AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM LOCATIONS

ELEMENTARY

- Achieve Academy
- Acorn Woodland
- Allendale
- Bella Vista
- Bridges Academy
- Brookfield
- Burckhalter
- Carl Munc
- Cleveland
- Community United
- East Oakland Pride
- Emerson
- Encompass Academy
- Esperanza Academy
- Franklin
- Fred T. Korematsu
- Fruitvale
- Futures Elementary
- Garfield
- Glenview
- Global Family School

- Grass Valley
- Greenleaf
- Hoover
- Horace Mann
- Howard
- International Community School
- La Escuelita
- Lafayette
- Laurel
- Learning Without Limits
- Lincoln
- M.L. King, Jr.
- Manzanita Community School
- Manzanita Seed
- Markham
- New Highland Academy
- Parker
- Peralta
- Piedmont Avenue
- Place @ Prescott
- Reach Academy
- Rise

- Sankofa
- Sequoia
- Sobrante Park
- Think College Now

MIDDLE SCHOOLS

- Alliance Academy
- ASCEND
- Bret Harte
- Claremont
- Coliseum College Prep Academy MS
- Edna Brewer
- Elmhurst Community Prep
- Frick
- Greenleaf MS
- Lazear
- Life Academy MS
- Lighthouse
- Madison
- Melrose Leadership
- Montera
- Roosevelt
- Roots

- United For Success
- Urban Promise Academy
- West Oakland Middle
- Westlake

HIGH SCHOOL

- Bunche
- Castlemont High
- Coliseum College Prep Academy
- Dewey
- Fremont Federation High School
- Life Academy HS
- McClymonds
- Met West
- Oakland High
- Oakland International High
- Oakland Technical
- Rudsdale Continuation
- Skyline
- Street Academy

AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

Publicly-funded after school programs in Oakland provide a mix of academic support, recreational/physical, and enrichment activities. Within these broad categories, program staff and community partners develop activities to suit the unique interests and needs of the student population.

- Academic Support
- Physical Activity
- Enrichment
- College & Career
- Leadership Development



OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Community Schools, Thriving Students

ABOUT OAKLAND AFTER SCHOOL PARTICIPANTS

In the 2015-16 program year, school-based programs served 18,291 youth across Oakland. After school participants are a diverse group comprised of mostly ethnic/racial minorities. As shown in Table 1, more than four in ten after school youth are Latino/a (42%), making up the highest proportion of participants. About one-third is African-American (35%), followed by smaller proportions of Asian/Pacific Islander (13%) and White (7%) youth. Boys and girls are equally represented among racial/ethnic groups (see page 78 for more information). Likewise, roughly equal proportions of boys (52%) and girls (48%) attend all after school programs.

TABLE 1: PARTICIPANTS' RACE/ETHNICITY


| Racial/Ethnic Category | ES | MS | HS | Total |
|--------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| Latino/a | 40% | 49% | 38% | 42% |
| African American | 38% | 29% | 36% | 35% |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 13% | 12% | 14% | 13% |
| White | 6% | 6% | 7% | 7% |
| Unknown/Not Reported | 2% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | 1% | <1% | <1% | <1% |
| Other/Multi-Racial* | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% |

Source: Cityspan Attendance System for attendance records from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

About one in four (26%) of after school participants are English Learners. Program staff and community partners managing Oakland's after school programs develop activities to suit the unique interests and needs of their student population.

After school programs served youth throughout Oakland (Figure 1), but nearly half (47%) of participants were concentrated in three zip codes: 94601, 94621, and 94603; these zip codes represent the Coliseum, Fruitvale, and East Oakland areas and suggest that school-based after school programs are successfully targeting the youth most likely to benefit from publicly-funded after school.

FIGURE 1: SCHOOL-BASED AFTER SCHOOL PARTICIPANTS BY ZIP CODE



Source: Cityspan Attendance System for attendance records from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

ABOUT THE SCHOOL-BASED AFTER SCHOOL PARTNERSHIP

The School-Based After School Partnership funds comprehensive school-based after school programs children and youth in Oakland. The Oakland Unified School District's (OUSD) After School Programs Office (ASPO) and the Oakland Fund for Children and Youth (OFCY) formed the Oakland School-Based After School Partnership in 2004.

The goals of the Partnership are to provide equitable access to high quality after school programs that help children to be:

- Engaged and succeeding in school;
- College and career ready; and
- Physically and emotionally well.

These after school program goals are aligned with efforts in Oakland to improve young people's educational outcomes, including Oakland's investment in the Kids First!-legislated goal to "Help Children and Youth Succeed in School and Graduate High School" and the Oakland Unified School District's (OUSD) Full Service Community Schools initiative that seeks to provide health, education, and social services to youth, their families, and the community.

FUNDING

The school-based after school programs are jointly funded through a planned and committed investment of local funds from the School-Based Partners. These funds blend local, state, and federal dollars provided to programs to ensure quality services that are free or low-cost. This report includes information collected at 82 school-based after school programs. Fifty-nine (59) of the 82 programs are mutually supported by both OFCY and OUSD, five programs are supported exclusively by OFCY grant funds, and 18 programs are supported exclusively by state and federal after school funding through OUSD. Table 2 presents the 2015-16 funding levels from these sources.

Examining the funding level of the School-Based Partners individually demonstrates the significant financial investment in Oakland’s youth (see Table 2). OFCY supports 62 elementary and middle schools through the School-Based After School funding strategy (and in addition funds two school-based high school after school programs through a separate funding strategy, which are included in this report), and OUSD funds 77 programs through the After School Education and Safety (ASES), 21st Century Community Learning Center (21st CCLC), and After School Safety and Enrichment for Teens (ASSETS) grant programs administered by the California Department of Education.

TABLE 2: FUNDING BY ASES, 21ST CCLC, ASSETS, & OFCY GRANTS¹¹

| Program Type | ES (n=47) | MS (n=21) | HS (n=14) | Total (N=82) |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| ASES + 21st CCLC /ASSETS | \$5,277,918 | \$3,522,104 | \$2,479,455 | \$11,279,477 |
| OFCY Funds | \$2,912,000 | \$1,443,000 | \$130,000 | \$4,485,000 |
| Matched Funding ¹² | \$1,152,302 | \$715,045 | \$655,909 | \$2,523,257 |
| Total | \$9,342,220 | \$5,680,149 | \$3,063,646 | \$18,287,734 |
| Per-Student Investment* | \$1,970 | \$2,222 | \$2,364 | \$2,128 |

Source: OFCY Matched Source report accessed via Cityspan Attendance tracking system and OUSD grant records.

*Based on Average Daily Attendance.

¹¹ Data provided in this table is drawn from multiple sources; due to missing data noted in the table, we advise interpreting data with caution.


¹² Matched funds that programs receive through donations, in-kind support, and service agreements are not reported for four OUSD-only funded programs.

In addition, OFCY programs report over **\$2.5 million** in leveraged funding from sources like in-kind donations, philanthropic grants, and contracts/service agreements with other local agencies. The total for Matched Funding is over \$2.5 million, which OUSD sites leveraged over \$900,000 in funds to support their program and jointly funded OFCY and OUSD programs leveraged over 1.5 million. High school programs have the highest per-student investment per average daily attendance (ADA), followed by middle and elementary school programs.

OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

The Oakland After School Programs Office (ASPO) is committed to supporting the Oakland Unified School District's (OUSD) vision of developing "Community Schools, Thriving Students."

FIGURE 2: OUSD'S COMMUNITY SCHOOLS MODEL FOR CHANGE AND ACTION



HOW AFTER SCHOOL SUPPORTS THE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS MODEL

The Oakland Unified After School Programs Office keeps the OUSD's Community Schools Model at the forefront of its planning and program decisions. OUSD's larger goal is to develop each school into a Full Service Community School (FSCS), which will make OUSD one of the first Full Service Community Districts in the country. The above figure is used to illustrate the primary supports needed to develop schools into FSCS. These supports are shown as circles in the figure above and include:

- High quality and effective instruction.
- Preparing youth for success in college and careers.
- Safe, healthy and supportive schools.
- Accountability for quality.
- A full service community district.

The Oakland after school programs contribute to the community schools model by providing youth multiple, aligned supports. The 2015-16 after school programs evaluation describes the supports provided to young people in OUSD-funded after school programs and assesses the resulting youth and program level outcomes.

OAKLAND FUND FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH

The Oakland Fund for Children and Youth (OFCY) funds 127 youth service programs for children and youth in a variety of community- and school-based settings. OFCY programs guide and support children and youth throughout the formative periods of their lives, from birth through age 20.

FIGURE 3: OFCY FUNDS FOUR GRANT STRATEGIES THAT SUPPORT CHILDREN AND YOUTH FROM BIRTH TO ADULTHOOD



ABOUT OFCY

The 127 programs funded by the Oakland Fund for Children and Youth (OFCY) play an important role for students, families, the Oakland Unified School District, and the community as a whole. OFCY funds programs to advance four primary goals:

- To support the healthy development of young children.
- To help children and youth succeed in school and graduate high school.
- To prevent and reduce violence, crime, and gang involvement among children.
- To help youth transition to a productive adulthood.


OFCY's funding for school-based after school programs represents Oakland's investment and primary strategy to make progress toward the Kids First!-legislated goal to "Help Children and Youth Succeed in School and Graduate High School." OFCY-funded programs help promote social and economic equity, child and youth development, and community collaboration

OFCY grantees served 25,894 youth in the 2015-16 program year. The 62 programs in the *School-Based After School Strategy* served nearly 39% of youth (9,994).

EVALUATION OVERVIEW

This evaluation assesses Oakland’s Theory of Action, which states that widespread access to high-quality youth development programs helps young people who attend programs regularly to be physically and emotionally well, engaged and succeeding in school, and ready for college and career.

FIGURE 4: THEORY OF ACTION FOR OAKLAND AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS



The items in gray are not measured in the present evaluation due to data limitations. We use direct outcomes as indicators of progress toward items with an asterisk (*) because long-term assessments of these outcomes are unavailable.

TABLE 3: EVALUATION QUESTIONS & OAKLAND SCHOOL-BASED AFTER SCHOOL PARTNERSHIP GOALS

| SCHOOL-BASED PARTNERSHIP GOAL | EVALUATION QUESTION |
|--|--|
| Youth have access to free or low-cost after school programming | What progress have Oakland after school programs made toward target enrollment and daily attendance rates? |
| Youth experience high quality after school programs | In what ways are Oakland after school programs providing high quality services? |
| Youth are: Engaged and succeeding in school College and career ready and; Physically and emotionally well | Are youth demonstrating progress in outcomes that contribute to: a) school engagement and academic success b) college and career readiness; and c) physical and emotional wellbeing? |

The Theory of Action above informs the 2015-16 Oakland school-based after school programs evaluation, and Action is the basis for the Oakland School-Based After School Partnership’s goals for programs. It is expected that access to high quality after school programs helps young people who attend these programs regularly to be physically and emotionally well, engaged and succeeding in school, and ready for college and career. Evidence that youth are making progress toward these intermediate (direct) outcomes includes improvement in social skills, a sense of emotional and physical safety, increased physical activity, college and career exploration, and consistent practice of academic behaviors and other skills.

The evaluation questions presented above assess progress made on each of the three components of the Theory of Action: access, program quality, and youth outcomes. Multiple data sources demonstrate progress; these include youth surveys, program observations, youth attendance, and academic achievement measures. The relevant data sources are described in each report section. A Data Companion accompanies this report, and describes site visit and survey methodology and presents the results from supplemental data analysis.

ACCESS & ATTENDANCE IN OAKLAND AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Oakland after school programs provide widespread access to children and youth. The majority of school-based after school programs met or exceeded their enrollment and attendance targets.

FIGURE 5: 2015-16 PROGRESS TOWARDS OFCY ENROLLMENT TARGET*




FIGURE 6: 2015-16 PROGRESS TOWARDS CDE ATTENDANCE TARGET





FIGURE 7: 2015-16 PARTICIPANT ATTENDANCE RATE



Source: Cityspan Attendance System for attendance records from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016. * Note: high schools are not funded through OFCY's School-Based After School strategy.

ATTENDANCE & RETENTION


This evaluation uses five measures here – enrollment, attendance, retention, hours of service, and average days per youth – to better understand the extent to which Oakland's youth are participating regularly in after school programs.

OFCY grantees are expected to reach 100% of their enrollment goals; 80% is the minimally acceptable performance level. Figure 5 indicates that, as a whole, OFCY grantees are exceeding their enrollment goals across all grade levels.

Attendance is defined as the number of visits to a program. After school programs funded by ASES and 21st CCLC must meet an 85% attendance target established by the California Department of Education (CDE) to sustain funding. Figure 6 highlights the average progress toward attendance targets for elementary, middle, and high school programs. On average, elementary programs meet their attendance targets. Middle, and to a lesser extent, high school programs are approaching their attendance targets.

Participant attendance rates measure youths' ongoing participation in the program while enrolled. It is calculated as the number of days attended divided by the number of days enrolled in the after school program. Participants' attendance rates are calculated for those activities that require ongoing participation; therefore, drop-in activities are not included in the calculation. Figure 7 shows the average participant attendance rate for elementary, middle, and high school programs. Elementary school students are required to attend programs five days a week, for middle school students the requirement is three days a week, and high school students do not have an attendance requirement.

FIGURE 8: NUMBER OF YOUTH SERVED



Source: Cityspan Attendance System for attendance records from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

ACCESS & ATTENDANCE

Oakland school-based after school programs make an effort to serve as many youth in their host schools as their program capacity will allow.

Available evidence indicates that school-based programs served half of the students in their host schools. The proportion of youth served varies by program type, as shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4: PERCENT OF HOST SCHOOL STUDENTS ATTENDING SCHOOL-BASED AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS¹³

| Program Type | % of Host School |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|
| Elementary School Programs (n=47) | 34% |
| Middle School Programs (n=17) | 60% |
| High School Programs (n=14) | 74% |
| Overall Average (n=78) ¹⁴ | 50% |

Sources: Cityspan Attendance System for attendance records from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016 and DataQuest for host school enrollment figures.

The hours of service measures represents the average number of hours individual youth spent in given activity or content areas during the course of the school year (Table 5). There is no program-level goal for this measure; instead it is used to describe how often the average young person participated in subject area hours during the academic year.

The average number of hours individual youth spent in specific activities under the Student Success grant during the course of the school year was 357 hours. The amount of time spent in each activity varied by grade level, with elementary school programs hosting the most hours across all types of activities and high school programs hosting the fewest hours. Program participants spent the most time on average in enrichment (149 hours) and academic (146 hours) activities (Table 5).

¹³ Percentage of host school figures are based on total enrollment figures.

¹⁴ Enrollment figures not available for Lazear Charter Academy, Life Academy Middle School, Greenleaf Middle School, and Coliseum College Prep Academy Middle School.

TABLE 5: AVERAGE HOURS OF SERVICE FOR SCHOOL-BASED AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS UNDER THE STUDENT SUCCESS GRANT*

| | Average Hours of Service: ¹⁵ | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|-----------|---------------------|-------|-------|
| | Enrichment | Academics | Character Education | Other | Total |
| Elementary School Programs (n=42) | 188 | 187 | 11 | 74 | 461 |
| Middle School Programs (n=19) | 98 | 92 | 9 | 22 | 222 |
| High School Programs (n=3) | 4 | 19 | 8 | 2 | 33 |
| Overall Average (n=64) | 149 | 146 | 10 | 52 | 357 |

Source: Cityspan Attendance System for attendance records from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

*Only students with reported hours (n=7,925) in the Student Success category were reported for this table, and not all OFCY sites had reported hours. (ES=4,584 students, MS=3,208 students, and HS=133 students.)

The charts on this page and on the following pages provide outcome data for enrollment, hours of service, attendance and participation:

Enrollment - The number of children and youth served. This information is reported for all programs and progress towards goals is calculated for any programs receiving OFCY funding. Programs aim to serve at least 80% of their target enrollment annually.

Units of Service - The number of service hours provided to youth during the program year. This information is reported for any programs receiving OFCY funding. The minimal satisfactory performance benchmark for this service goal is set at 80% by OFCY.

Progress Towards Attendance Goals - Per California Department of Education (CDE), the targeted attendance goal is set at 85% of the program’s capacity. Progress towards that goal is measured by the number of times any youth attends the program.

¹⁵ Activities were grouped from existing database categories as follows: Enrichment (mentorship, community building, sports, technology, performing and visual arts, gardening, cultural activities, and cooking), Academics (counseling, peer led training, academic support/tutoring, project based learning, and exploratory education/career field trips), Character Education (conflict resolution and violence prevention, leadership development, outreach and discussion groups), and Other (gender specific programs, other, snacks/meals, and family engagement).

Average Days Attended - The average number of days participants attended a given program. There is no program-level goal for this measure; instead it is used to describe how often the average young person attends a school-based after school program during the academic year. In the 2015-16 year, OUSD-based programs were open for approximately 180 school days.¹⁶

Participation Rate - This measures youths' ongoing involvement with the program. This rate is calculated for those activities that require ongoing participant involvement; drop-in activities are not included in the calculation. There is no program-level goal for this measure; however, it helps programs think about the extent to which they are retaining youth.

¹⁶ Some programs were open during school breaks; the figure reported reflects days where school was in session only.

TABLE 6: ENROLLMENT, ATTENDANCE & RETENTION BY PROGRAM

| Lead Agency / Program | Enrollment | | | Units of Service | | | Youth Participation | | |
|---|------------|--------|------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---|------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Goal | Actual | Progress Towards Annual Goal | Goal | Actual | Progress Toward Annual Target <i>(shaded if below 80%)</i> | Progress towards Attendance Goals** <i>(shaded if below 80%)</i> | Average Days Per Youth | Average Attendance Rate |
| Elementary School Programs | | | | | | | | | |
| Bay Area Community Resources | | | | | | | | | |
| Bridges Academy | 117 | 121 | 103% | 32,631 | 35,310 | 108% | 87% | 112 | 90% |
| Emerson | 115 | 102 | 89% | 56,224 | 96,299 | 171% | 89% | 136 | 88% |
| Esperanza Academy | 120 | 114 | 95% | 52,204 | 60,773 | 116% | 110% | 148 | 92% |
| Fred T. Korematsu | 116 | 113 | 97% | 53,357 | 73,450 | 138% | 88% | 122 | 79% |
| Glenview | NA | 103 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 103% | 156 | 95% |
| Global Family Learning Without Limits | 110 | 124 | 113% | 50,732 | 57,382 | 113% | 111% | 126 | 95% |
| Grass Valley Elementary | 116 | 120 | 103% | 51,262 | 63,543 | 124% | 112% | 146 | 90% |
| Greenleaf | 95 | 124 | 131% | 40,350 | 47,627 | 118% | 88% | 112 | 91% |
| Hoover | 115 | 135 | 117% | 55,111 | 62,881 | 114% | 73% | 141 | 92% |
| Howard | 100 | 114 | 114% | 56,695 | 63,616 | 112% | 107% | 147 | 98% |
| Lafayette | 120 | 171 | 143% | 66,745 | 106,699 | 160% | 90% | 163 | 97% |
| Markham | 90 | 110 | 122% | 36,264 | 46,547 | 128% | 85% | 119 | 84% |
| Martin Luther King, Jr. | 166 | 170 | 102% | 62,692 | 80,173 | 128% | 76% | 137 | 87% |
| PLACE @ Prescott Elementary | 125 | 150 | 120% | 56,717 | 54,881 | 97% | 90% | 134 | 87% |
| Reach Academy | 83 | 173 | 208% | 51,585 | 67,483 | 131% | 124% | 112 | 81% |
| Sankofa Academy | 210 | 252 | 120% | 65,445 | 78,978 | 121% | 84% | 119 | 80% |
| Eagle Village Community Center Youth and Family Services, Inc. | | | | | | | | | |
| Parker | 100 | 140 | 140% | 63,456 | 55,371 | 87% | 99% | 110 | 81% |
| East Bay Agency for Children | | | | | | | | | |
| Achieve Academy | 100 | 111 | 111% | 46,451 | 58,178 | 125% | NA | 128 | 91% |
| East Oakland Pride | 100 | 133 | 133% | 47,904 | 46,770 | 98% | 93% | 109 | 90% |
| Peralta | NA | 224 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 149% | 104 | 63% |

| Lead Agency / Program | Enrollment | | | Units of Service | | | Youth Participation | | |
|--|------------|--------|------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---|------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Goal | Actual | Progress Towards Annual Goal | Goal | Actual | Progress Toward Annual Target <i>(shaded if below 80%)</i> | Progress towards Attendance Goals** <i>(shaded if below 80%)</i> | Average Days Per Youth | Average Attendance Rate |
| Sequoia | NA | 94 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 91% | 149 | 90% |
| East Bay Asian Youth Center | | | | | | | | | |
| Bella Vista | 75 | 109 | 145% | 44,795 | 55,320 | 123% | 109% | 156 | 95% |
| Cleveland | 75 | 101 | 135% | 43,631 | 51,584 | 118% | 102% | 157 | 91% |
| Franklin | 100 | 137 | 137% | 58,175 | 71,733 | 123% | 99% | 159 | 97% |
| Garfield | 140 | 256 | 183% | 81,445 | 102,562 | 126% | 101% | 122 | 86% |
| La Escuelita | 75 | 86 | 115% | 44,795 | 46,033 | 103% | 90% | 165 | 98% |
| Lincoln | 120 | 165 | 138% | 70,974 | 87,967 | 124% | 97% | 164 | 97% |
| Manzanita Community School | 75 | 104 | 139% | 43,631 | 44,862 | 103% | 89% | 134 | 91% |
| East Oakland Youth Development Center | | | | | | | | | |
| Futures Elementary | 120 | 131 | 109% | 58,914 | 61,192 | 104% | 101% | 118 | 90% |
| Girls Incorporated of Alameda County | | | | | | | | | |
| Acorn Woodland | 115 | 129 | 112% | 48,299 | 50,379 | 104% | 101% | 123 | 90% |
| Horace Mann | 120 | 152 | 127% | 62,360 | 54,364 | 87% | 96% | 100 | 85% |
| Higher Ground Neighborhood Development Corp. | | | | | | | | | |
| Allendale | 100 | 103 | 103% | 50,163 | 51,908 | 103% | 91% | 138 | 90% |
| Brookfield | 100 | 108 | 108% | 46,247 | 48,032 | 104% | 90% | 133 | 91% |
| New Highland Academy | 100 | 93 | 93% | 49,641 | 45,583 | 92% | 82% | 138 | 87% |
| Rise Community School | 100 | 94 | 94% | 49,127 | 38,667 | 79% | 68% | 114 | 86% |
| Sobrante Park | 100 | 99 | 99% | 49,441 | 51,856 | 105% | 89% | 148 | 92% |
| Oakland Leaf Foundation | | | | | | | | | |
| Encompass Academy | 85 | 198 | 233% | 41,226 | 54,802 | 133% | 146% | 110 | 91% |
| International Community School | 85 | 95 | 112% | 23,167 | 32,877 | 142% | 77% | 117 | 82% |
| Learning Without Limits | 85 | 94 | 111% | 43,367 | 42,984 | 99% | NA | 128 | 91% |
| Think College Now | 120 | 102 | 85% | 33,915 | 36,859 | 109% | 89% | 124 | 84% |
| Safe Passages | | | | | | | | | |

| Lead Agency / Program | Enrollment | | | Units of Service | | | Youth Participation | | |
|--|------------|--------|------------------------------|------------------|-----------|---|---|------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Goal | Actual | Progress Towards Annual Goal | Goal | Actual | Progress Toward Annual Target <i>(shaded if below 80%)</i> | Progress towards Attendance Goals** <i>(shaded if below 80%)</i> | Average Days Per Youth | Average Attendance Rate |
| Community United | 120 | 137 | 114% | 57,517 | 67,714 | 118% | 114% | 128 | 90% |
| SFBAC, Learning for Life | | | | | | | | | |
| Carl B. Munck | 130 | 117 | 90% | 59,812 | 47,008 | 79% | 103% | 138 | 77% |
| Fruitvale | 100 | 148 | 148% | 55,901 | 62,721 | 112% | 123% | 130 | 88% |
| Laurel | 84 | 101 | 120% | 54,443 | 51,562 | 95% | 89% | 137 | 95% |
| Manzanita Seed | 120 | 190 | 158% | 80,596 | 90,604 | 112% | 164% | 135 | 87% |
| Ujimaa Foundation | | | | | | | | | |
| Burckhalter | 100 | 136 | 136% | 68,202 | 67,908 | 100% | 123% | 139 | 90% |
| YMCA of the East Bay | | | | | | | | | |
| Piedmont | 105 | 111 | 106% | 57,801 | 46,176 | 80% | 100% | 140 | 90% |
| Elementary School Overall/Average | 4,747 | 6,194 | 123% | 2,323,404 | 2,619,213 | 113% | 100% | 132 | 89% |
| Middle School Programs | | | | | | | | | |
| Alternatives in Action | | | | | | | | | |
| Life Academy | NA | 169 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 71% | 145 | 86% |
| Bay Area Community Resources | | | | | | | | | |
| Alliance Academy | 110 | 187 | 170% | 55,994 | 41,190 | 74% | 83% | 73 | 63% |
| Claremont | 95 | 256 | 269% | 53,434 | 40,677 | 76% | 101% | 55 | 53% |
| Elmhurst Community Prep | 220 | 249 | 113% | 53,183 | 46,606 | 88% | 41% | 65 | 64% |
| Madison | 280 | 325 | 116% | 61,732 | 61,628 | 100% | 90% | 97 | 67% |
| Melrose Community Bridges Program | 120 | 143 | 119% | 54,509 | 47,115 | 86% | 74% | 98 | 76% |
| Urban Promise Academy | 120 | 290 | 242% | 47,634 | 41,524 | 87% | 80% | 51 | 42% |
| Citizen Schools | | | | | | | | | |
| Greenleaf | NA | 115 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 135 | 95% |
| Eagle Village Community Center Youth and Family Services, Inc. | | | | | | | | | |
| Montera | NA | 317 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 58 | 61% |
| Westlake | 120 | 485 | 404% | 40,989 | 49,731 | 121% | 81% | 34 | 75% |

| Lead Agency / Program | Enrollment | | | Units of Service | | | Youth Participation | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------|--------|------------------------------|------------------|---------|---|---|------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Goal | Actual | Progress Towards Annual Goal | Goal | Actual | Progress Toward Annual Target <i>(shaded if below 80%)</i> | Progress towards Attendance Goals** <i>(shaded if below 80%)</i> | Average Days Per Youth | Average Attendance Rate |
| East Bay Asian Youth Center | | | | | | | | | |
| Roosevelt | 160 | 326 | 204% | 100,280 | 176,008 | 176% | 91% | 154 | 93% |
| East Oakland Youth Development Center | | | | | | | | | |
| Roots International Academy | 120 | 216 | 180% | 42,258 | 33,815 | 80% | 56% | 54 | 41% |
| Lighthouse Community Charter School | | | | | | | | | |
| Lighthouse Community Charter | 200 | 218 | 109% | 60,681 | 64,625 | 107% | NA | 126 | 87% |
| Oakland Leaf Foundation | | | | | | | | | |
| ASCEND | 131 | 160 | 122% | 37,330 | 51,070 | 137% | NA | 118 | 88% |
| Bret Harte | 112 | 250 | 223% | 52,780 | 59,896 | 113% | 71% | 85 | 71% |
| Safe Passages | | | | | | | | | |
| Coliseum College Prep Academy | 179 | 211 | 118% | 23,876 | 39,218 | 164% | 112% | 111 | 80% |
| Edna Brewer | 171 | 183 | 107% | 35,974 | 36,115 | 100% | 63% | 65 | 78% |
| Frick | 95 | 135 | 142% | 18,265 | 15,319 | 84% | 40% | 81 | 65% |
| United For Success | 120 | 236 | 197% | 45,895 | 62,451 | 136% | 65% | 95 | 75% |
| Spanish Speaking Citizens' Foundation | | | | | | | | | |
| Lazezar Charter Academy | 160 | 169 | 106% | 47,226 | 52,676 | 112% | NA | 129 | 91% |
| YMCA of the East Bay | | | | | | | | | |
| West Oakland Middle School | 144 | 182 | 126% | 35,028 | 36,477 | 104% | 73% | 75 | 59% |
| Middle School Overall/Average | 2,657 | 4,822 | 170% | 867,067 | 956,139 | 108% | 75% | 91 | 72% |
| High School Programs | | | | | | | | | |
| Alternatives in Action | | | | | | | | | |
| Fremont Federation High School | NA | 809 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 70% | 13 | 32% |
| Life Academy | 325 | 425 | 131% | 49,083 | 46,670 | 95% | 111% | 70 | 58% |
| McClymonds | 325 | 425 | 131% | 49,083 | 46,670 | 95% | 105% | 39 | 35% |
| Bay Area Community Resources | | | | | | | | | |
| Bunche | NA | 103 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 85% | 22 | 58% |

| Lead Agency / Program | Enrollment | | | Units of Service | | | Youth Participation | | |
|-------------------------------|------------|--------|------------------------------|------------------|--------|---|---|------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Goal | Actual | Progress Towards Annual Goal | Goal | Actual | Progress Toward Annual Target <i>(shaded if below 80%)</i> | Progress towards Attendance Goals** <i>(shaded if below 80%)</i> | Average Days Per Youth | Average Attendance Rate |
| Met West | NA | 169 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 119% | 132 | 77% |
| Oakland Technical | NA | 1,635 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 94% | 10 | 12% |
| Rudsdale Continuation | NA | 241 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 116% | 47 | 55% |
| Street Academy | NA | 150 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 105% | 70 | 60% |
| East Bay Asian Youth Center | | | | | | | | | |
| Dewey | NA | 417 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 94% | 58 | 66% |
| Oakland High | NA | 764 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 85% | 18 | 35% |
| Oakland International High | NA | 365 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 83% | 34 | 24% |
| Safe Passages | | | | | | | | | |
| Coliseum College Prep Academy | NA | 270 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 133% | 79 | 50% |
| Youth Together | | | | | | | | | |
| Skyline | NA | 485 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 61% | 26 | 37% |
| Youth Uprising | | | | | | | | | |
| Castlemont High | NA | 723 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 95% | 21 | 11% |
| High School Overall/Average | 650 | 6,980 | 131% | 98,166 | 93,340 | 95% | 97% | 46 | 44% |

Source: Cityspan Attendance System for attendance records from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

*Enrollment totals are presented for all programs. Enrollment Goal and % Progress Towards Enrollment Goal figures are presented only for programs that receive OFCY funding. Grade level totals for % Progress Towards Enrollment goal exclude programs that do not receive OFCY funding.

** Progress towards attendance goals figures are not available for charter-based programs.


***Enrollment and Units of Service Goals and Actuals for the Youth Development Leadership Program at McClymonds & Life Academy Community Schools are shared between sites. The program is funded by OFCY through the Youth Leadership in Community Schools funding strategy.

†This figure represents the number of unique middle school students attending Life Academy Middle School program.

PROGRAM QUALITY

Point-of-service quality, captured through site visits, provides a snapshot of youths' experience in after school; understanding quality is paramount because for youth to reap positive outcomes, they must regularly participate in high quality programs. Site visit results indicate that most 2015-16 programs are considered either Performing or Thriving. Youth perspectives were well aligned with site visit ratings of program quality.

FIGURE 9: MORE OAKLAND AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS ARE THRIVING IN 2015-16 THAN IN ANY OTHER YEAR



Sources: Site evaluation visits conducted by Public Profit during the 2011-12 through 2015-16 program years. Numbers listed in the figure above are a total count of programs for each category. High school level data not shown for the 2014-15 program year due to insufficient sample size. * Note: high school data are presented in a different color scheme because these programs are not funded by OFCY and there are relatively few programs in the sample.

HIGHLIGHTS

Point-of-service (POS) quality captures youths' experience in activities, and was measured during one observation using the Youth or School-Age Program Quality Assessment (PQA) at 82 programs. Youth surveys (N = 5,895) complement the program observations.

Year-over-year data reveal that as a whole, programs are steadily improving program quality (Figure 9) and they consistently meet or exceed local standards. In the 2015-16 program year, 33 of 82 (40%) programs were designated as "Thriving," and only one program (~1%) was categorized as "Emerging."

OAKLAND'S QUALITY IMPROVEMENT CYCLE

In 2009, the Oakland School-Based Partnership adopted the Program Quality Assessment (PQA) tools as part of its ongoing commitment to supporting program quality. At that time, The Partnership also adopted the performance categories described above (Emerging, Performing, and Thriving). Taken together, site visit data and these performance categories provide a snapshot of program quality for all school-based after school programs. To support programs, the School-Based Partners began to align professional development with the domains of the PQA. Beginning in 2011-12, the School-Based Partners required each grantee to prepare a quality action plan (QAP) that documented programs' quality and youth outcome related goals.

In 2013, Oakland shifted to thinking beyond a snapshot of program quality to empowering programs to engage in a continuous quality improvement process: Assess, Plan, and Improve. During this process, programs conduct a self-assessment using the PQA, review external site visit scores, submit a QAP, and carry out the steps identified in their plan. The School-Based Partners created an intensive system of support for programs which includes:

- Monthly trainings to build Site Coordinators' and Lead Agencies' capacity to lead the quality improvement process.
- A series of trainings linked to practices in the PQA tools.
- Ten professional learning communities for program staff.
- On-site coaching and technical assistance.

Using data to inform continuous quality improvement is a key component of the system. All programs have year-round access to their self-assessments, external assessments, and program improvement plans via an online support system. School-Based Partners and professional development providers also have access to PQA scores and improvement plans so that ad hoc supports can be provided as needed.

Table 8 (page 32) shows that 97% of programs required to do so conducted a self-assessment in 2015-16, and 71 out of 82 programs submitted a quality action plan. By and large, the data demonstrate that programs are actively engaged in the continuous quality improvement cycle. Charter programs were exempt from participating in the self-assessment process, and so their data for this measure are not included in Table 8.

PROGRAM QUALITY FINDINGS

Public Profit conducted one site visit at each program using the PQA, a research-based observation tool used by out of school time programs nationally.¹⁷ The PQA has two versions: the School-Aged Program Quality Assessment (SAPQA) for grades K-5, and the Youth Program Quality Assessment (YPQA) for grades 6-12 (and for K-8 programs). The PQA includes five quality domains¹⁸: Safe Environment, Supportive Environment, Peer Interaction, Youth Engagement, and Academic Climate.¹⁹ Scores on the PQA range from 1 to 5, with higher numbers indicating stronger quality.

Table 7 describes the average scores for elementary, middle, and high school programs. Detailed site level scores on the PQA and the performance category for all of the Oakland after school programs are included in Table 8, starting on page 32.

TABLE 7: PROGRAM PERFORMANCE SCORES BY QUALITY DOMAIN

| Quality Domain | Elementary (n=47) | Middle (n=21) | High (n=14) |
|------------------|----------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Overall Rating* | 4.42 | 3.99 | 4.19 |
| Safe | 4.86 | 4.75 | 4.71 |
| Supportive | 4.55 | 4.45 | 4.67 |
| Interaction | 4.35 | 3.64 | 3.92 |
| Engagement | 3.91 | 3.10 | 3.46 |
| Academic Climate | 3.83 | 3.31 | 4.12 |

Source: Site visits representing 82 programs, October 2015 through February 2016.
*Overall Rating excludes the Academic Climate domain average.

PQA ratings demonstrate that elementary, middle, and high school programs provided youth with physically and emotionally safe programs and offered supportive environments characterized by opportunities for learning and positive relationships. Elementary programs scored the highest overall rating. The fourteen high schools that received a site visit scored nearly a 5 in the safety domain.

The Safe and Supportive domains lay the foundation for the more advanced staff practices assessed in Interaction and Engagement. Staff in elementary school programs consistently exhibited practices that promoted peer interaction. Middle and high school programs rated lower

¹⁷ A certified assessor from OUSD After School Programs Office visited programs that only received funds from OUSD. Public Profit visited all other programs.

¹⁸ Please refer the Data Companion for a detailed description of each of the quality domains.

¹⁹ The Academic Climate observation protocol was developed specifically for OUSD programs and is not included in the calculation of the overall program quality score.

on Interaction and Engagement than elementary school programs, though these programs were still within acceptable performance ranges. Site visit results suggest that all programs could benefit from an intentional focus on fostering youth engagement defined as opportunities for choice, reflection, and planning.

As well, youth survey respondents were asked questions about the quality of their after school program in these same four domains; youth survey results align well with findings from site visit data. In particular, youth reported feeling safe in their after school program, with 87% of elementary, 78% of middle, and 91% of high school participants agreeing. Even greater proportions of youth survey respondents agreed that their after school program's environment is a supportive one, with 91% of elementary, 82% of middle, and 91% of high school youth concurring. Youth reports about the degree to which their program supported Interaction remain high: 89% of elementary, 81% of middle, and 88% of high school students said that their program afforded them opportunities for interactive activities. Finally, though the scores dip slightly, most youth reported opportunities for engagement in their after school program, with 70% of elementary, 63% of middle, and 77% of high school respondents agreeing. Overall, youth found the foundational elements of safety and support to be very strong in their programs, with the harder-to-achieve domains of Interaction and Engagement still highly-rated (though presenting some opportunities for continued focus); these findings align well with the data trends found in site visit scores for the 2015-16 program year.

POINT OF SERVICE QUALITY RATINGS BY PROGRAM

TABLE 8: OAKLAND SCHOOL-BASED AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS PQA SCORES BY GRANTEE

| Lead Agency/Program | 2015-16 POS Rating | 2014-15 POS Rating | Overall (Excludes Academic Climate) | I. Safe Environment | II. Supportive Environment | III. Peer Interaction | IV. Active Engagement | V. Academic Climate | Quality Action Plan Submitted | Self-Assessment Completed |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Bay Area Community Resources</i> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bridges Academy | Performing | Performing | 4.26 | 4.84 | 4.08 | 4.44 | 3.67 | 2.61 | Yes | Yes |
| Emerson | Thriving | Thriving | 4.86 | 4.92 | 5.00 | 4.83 | 4.67 | 4.56 | Yes | Yes |
| Esperanza Academy | Performing | Performing | 4.40 | 4.90 | 4.37 | 4.50 | 3.83 | 2.67 | Yes | Yes |
| Fred T. Korematsu | Performing | Performing | 3.96 | 4.84 | 4.32 | 4.44 | 2.25 | 2.67 | Yes | Yes |
| Glenview | Performing | Thriving | 4.33 | 4.63 | 4.13 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 3.17 | Yes | Yes |
| Global Family Learning Without Limits | Thriving | Thriving | 4.69 | 5.00 | 4.65 | 4.44 | 4.67 | 3.72 | Yes | No |
| Grass Valley Elementary | Thriving | Thriving | 4.93 | 4.92 | 4.80 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | Yes | Yes |
| Greenleaf | Performing | Thriving | 3.90 | 4.67 | 4.31 | 3.29 | 3.33 | 3.78 | Yes | Yes |
| Hoover | Performing | Thriving | 3.64 | 4.52 | 4.00 | 3.06 | 3.00 | 2.28 | Yes | Yes |
| Howard | Performing | Thriving | 4.13 | 5.00 | 4.17 | 4.00 | 3.33 | 3.83 | Yes | Yes |
| Lafayette | Performing | Thriving | 3.68 | 4.70 | 3.61 | 4.39 | 2.00 | 1.94 | Yes | Yes |
| Markham | Performing | Performing | 4.15 | 4.80 | 4.03 | 4.17 | 3.58 | 3.28 | Yes | Yes |
| Martin Luther King, Jr. | Thriving | Performing | 4.58 | 4.92 | 4.87 | 4.61 | 3.92 | 4.22 | Yes | Yes |
| PLACE @ Prescott Elementary | Performing | Performing | 4.03 | 4.72 | 4.65 | 3.67 | 3.08 | 3.61 | Yes | Yes |
| Reach Academy | Performing | Performing | 3.99 | 4.92 | 3.59 | 4.06 | 3.42 | 3.00 | Yes | Yes |
| Sankofa Academy*** | Performing | Performing | 3.49 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 2.17 | 3.17 | 3.67 | Yes | Yes |

| Lead Agency/Program | 2015-16 POS Rating | 2014-15 POS Rating | Overall (Excludes Academic Climate) | I. Safe Environment | II. Supportive Environment | III. Peer Interaction | IV. Active Engagement | V. Academic Climate | Quality Action Plan Submitted | Self-Assessment Completed |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>Eagle Village Community Center Youth and Family Services, Inc.</i> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Parker*** | Performing | Performing | 4.03 | 4.90 | 4.45 | 4.08 | 2.67 | 2.89 | Yes | Yes |
| <i>East Bay Agency for Children</i> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Achieve Academy | Thriving | Performing | 4.71 | 4.84 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.00 | 5.00 | Yes | Not required** |
| East Oakland Pride | Thriving | Thriving | 4.81 | 5.00 | 4.75 | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.39 | Yes | Yes |
| Peralta | Thriving | Performing | 4.86 | 4.93 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.11 | Yes | Yes |
| Sequoia | Thriving | Thriving | 4.52 | 5.00 | 4.59 | 5.00 | 3.50 | 3.22 | Yes | Yes |
| <i>Easy Bay Asian Youth Center</i> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bella Vista | Performing | Performing | 4.24 | 5.00 | 4.39 | 4.39 | 3.17 | 3.94 | Yes | Yes |
| Cleveland | Thriving | Performing | 4.90 | 4.92 | 5.00 | 4.83 | 4.83 | 5.00 | Yes | Yes |
| Franklin | Thriving | Thriving | 4.75 | 5.00 | 4.73 | 4.28 | 5.00 | 4.11 | Yes | Yes |
| Garfield | Thriving | Thriving | 4.93 | 5.00 | 4.73 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.56 | Yes | Yes |
| La Escuelita | Performing | Performing | 4.36 | 5.00 | 4.80 | 4.22 | 3.42 | 4.11 | Yes | Yes |
| Lincoln | Thriving | Thriving | 4.96 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.83 | 4.39 | Yes | Yes |
| Manzanita Community School | Performing | Thriving | 3.96 | 4.51 | 3.96 | 4.06 | 3.33 | 2.67 | Yes | Yes |
| <i>East Oakland Youth Development Center</i> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Futures Elementary | Performing | Performing | 3.65 | 4.59 | 3.67 | 3.50 | 2.83 | 3.39 | No | Yes |
| <i>Girls Incorporated of Alameda County</i> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Acorn Woodland | Thriving | Performing | 4.66 | 4.92 | 5.00 | 4.39 | 4.33 | 3.94 | Yes | Yes |
| Horace Mann | Thriving | Performing | 4.56 | 4.87 | 5.00 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 3.56 | Yes | Yes |
| <i>Higher Ground Neighborhood Development Corp.</i> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Allendale | Performing | Performing | 4.45 | 5.00 | 4.20 | 4.11 | 4.50 | 2.89 | Yes | Yes |

| Lead Agency/Program | 2015-16 POS Rating | 2014-15 POS Rating | Overall (Excludes Academic Climate) | I. Safe Environment | II. Supportive Environment | III. Peer Interaction | IV. Active Engagement | V. Academic Climate | Quality Action Plan Submitted | Self-Assessment Completed |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Brookfield | Performing | Thriving | 4.38 | 5.00 | 4.67 | 5.00 | 2.83 | 3.28 | Yes | Yes |
| New Highland Academy | Thriving | Thriving | 4.63 | 5.00 | 4.79 | 4.06 | 4.67 | 3.39 | Yes | Yes |
| Rise Community School | Thriving | Thriving | 4.81 | 4.92 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.33 | 5.00 | Yes | Yes |
| Sobrante Park | Thriving | Thriving | 4.58 | 5.00 | 4.64 | 4.58 | 4.08 | 3.94 | Yes | No |
| Oakland Leaf Foundation | | | | | | | | | | |
| Encompass Academy | Thriving | Thriving | 4.77 | 4.92 | 5.00 | 4.17 | 5.00 | 5.00 | Yes | Yes |
| International Community School | Thriving | Performing | 4.51 | 4.92 | 4.80 | 4.33 | 4.00 | 4.56 | Yes | Yes |
| Learning Without Limits | Performing | Performing | 4.34 | 4.79 | 4.45 | 3.78 | 4.33 | 3.94 | Yes | Not required** |
| Think College Now | Performing | Performing | 4.32 | 4.76 | 4.11 | 4.83 | 3.58 | 4.00 | Yes | Yes |
| Safe Passages | | | | | | | | | | |
| Community United | Thriving | Performing | 4.81 | 5.00 | 4.87 | 4.88 | 4.50 | 5.00 | No | Yes |
| SFBAC, Learning for Life | | | | | | | | | | |
| Carl B. Munck | Thriving | Performing | 4.52 | 4.72 | 4.80 | 4.54 | 4.00 | 3.78 | No | Yes |
| Fruitvale | Performing | Performing | 4.38 | 4.92 | 4.71 | 3.89 | 4.00 | 3.78 | Yes | Yes |
| Laurel | Thriving | Thriving | 4.57 | 4.92 | 4.76 | 4.11 | 4.50 | 4.39 | Yes | Yes |
| Manzanita Seed | Thriving | Performing | 4.79 | 5.00 | 4.65 | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.17 | Yes | Yes |
| Ujimaa Foundation | | | | | | | | | | |
| Burckhalter | Thriving | Performing | 4.72 | 4.76 | 5.00 | 4.78 | 4.33 | 5.00 | Yes | Yes |
| YMCA of the East Bay | | | | | | | | | | |
| Piedmont | Performing | Performing | 4.13 | 4.76 | 4.39 | 4.06 | 3.33 | 4.39 | No | Yes |
| Elementary School Overall/Average | | | 4.42 | 4.86 | 4.55 | 4.35 | 3.91 | 3.83 | | |

MIDDLE SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Alternatives in Action

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|------------|----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|
| Life Academy | Performing | Thriving | 4.01 | 4.69 | 4.79 | 4.42 | 2.17 | 3.33 | Yes | Yes |
|--------------|------------|----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|

Bay Area Community Resources

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|
| Alliance Academy | Performing | Performing | 3.77 | 4.70 | 4.37 | 3.33 | 2.67 | 3.72 | Yes | Yes |
| Claremont | Emerging | Performing | 2.83 | 3.56 | 2.86 | 2.25 | 2.67 | 1.67 | Yes | Yes |
| Elmhurst Community Prep | Performing | Performing | 3.56 | 4.33 | 3.71 | 3.54 | 2.67 | 2.11 | Yes | Yes |
| Madison | Performing | Performing | 3.80 | 4.84 | 4.74 | 2.79 | 2.83 | 4.22 | Yes | Yes |
| Melrose Community Bridges Program | Thriving | Performing | 4.59 | 5.00 | 4.69 | 4.50 | 4.17 | 3.72 | No | Yes |
| Urban Promise Academy | Performing | Performing | 3.88 | 4.92 | 4.69 | 3.42 | 2.50 | 3.50 | Yes | Yes |

Citizen Schools

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|------------|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|
| Greenleaf | Performing | Performing | 4.13 | 4.90 | 4.65 | 3.79 | 3.17 | 4.00 | Yes | Yes |
|-----------|------------|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|

Eagle Village Community Center Youth and Family Services, Inc.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|------------|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|
| Montera | Performing | Performing | 4.16 | 5.00 | 4.71 | 3.58 | 3.33 | 3.44 | Yes | Yes |
| Westlake | Performing | Thriving | 3.42 | 4.93 | 4.01 | 2.42 | 2.33 | 2.28 | Yes | Yes |

East Bay Asian Youth Center

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|----------|----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|----|-----|
| Roosevelt | Thriving | Thriving | 4.77 | 5.00 | 4.65 | 4.58 | 4.83 | 4.44 | No | Yes |
|-----------|----------|----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|----|-----|

East Oakland Youth Development Center

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|
| Roots International Academy | Thriving | Performing | 4.75 | 4.67 | 4.92 | 4.42 | 5.00 | 5.00 | Yes | Yes |
|-----------------------------|----------|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|

Lighthouse Community Charter School

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|----------------|
| Lighthouse Community Charter | Performing | Performing | 4.06 | 4.72 | 4.51 | 4.00 | 3.00 | 2.50 | Yes | Not required** |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|----------------|

Oakland Leaf Foundation

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|------------|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|----------------|
| ASCEND | Performing | Performing | 4.17 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 3.58 | 3.67 | 3.19 | Yes | Not required** |
|--------|------------|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|----------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|----------------|
| Bret Harte | Thriving | Thriving | 4.66 | 4.92 | 4.90 | 4.83 | 4.00 | 3.89 | Yes | Yes |
| Safe Passages | | | | | | | | | | |
| Coliseum College Prep Academy | Performing | Performing | 4.37 | 4.92 | 4.71 | 3.33 | 4.50 | 3.72 | Yes | Yes |
| Edna Brewer | Performing | Performing | 4.03 | 5.00 | 4.71 | 3.75 | 2.67 | 3.22 | No | Yes |
| Frick | Performing | Performing | 4.17 | 4.70 | 4.77 | 4.38 | 2.83 | 4.56 | Yes | Yes |
| United For Success | Performing | Performing | 3.78 | 4.59 | 4.60 | 3.58 | 2.33 | 3.56 | No | Yes |
| Spanish Speaking Citizens' Foundation | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lazeur Charter Academy | Performing | Performing | 3.07 | 4.70 | 3.54 | 2.54 | 1.50 | 1.83 | Yes | Not required** |
| YMCA of the East Bay | | | | | | | | | | |
| West Oakland Middle School | Performing | Performing | 3.73 | 4.90 | 4.34 | 3.33 | 2.33 | 1.61 | Yes | Yes |
| Middle School Overall/Average | | | 3.99 | 4.75 | 4.45 | 3.64 | 3.10 | 3.31 | | |
| HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAMS | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alternatives in Action | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fremont Federation | Performing | -- | 3.95 | 4.67 | 4.33 | 3.96 | 2.83 | 3.78 | No | Yes |
| Life Academy* | Thriving | Thriving | 4.90 | 4.72 | 4.87 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | Yes | Yes |
| McClymonds* | Performing | | 4.32 | 4.92 | 4.69 | 4.00 | 3.67 | 4.39 | Yes | Yes |
| Bay Area Community Resources | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bunche | Performing | Performing | 3.81 | 4.27 | 4.74 | 4.08 | 2.17 | 3.67 | Yes | Yes |
| Met West | Performing | -- | 3.57 | 4.72 | 4.61 | 2.46 | 2.50 | 3.94 | No | Yes |
| Oakland Technical | Performing | Performing | 3.57 | 4.71 | 4.21 | 3.71 | 1.67 | 3.50 | Yes | Yes |
| Rudsdale Continuation | Performing | Performing | 4.13 | 4.90 | 4.71 | 3.92 | 3.00 | 3.72 | Yes | Yes |
| Street Academy | Thriving | -- | 4.52 | 4.50 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.17 | 5.00 | Yes | Yes |
| East Bay Asian Youth Center | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dewey | Thriving | Performing | 4.58 | 4.90 | 4.84 | 4.25 | 4.33 | 3.94 | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|
| Oakland High | Thriving | -- | 4.63 | 5.00 | 4.87 | 4.33 | 4.33 | 4.33 | Yes | Yes |
| Oakland International High | Performing | Performing | 3.74 | 4.74 | 4.18 | 3.21 | 2.83 | 3.72 | Yes | Yes |
| Safe Passages | | | | | | | | | | |
| Coliseum College Prep Academy | Thriving | -- | 4.54 | 4.80 | 4.71 | 4.17 | 4.50 | 4.33 | Yes | Yes |
| Youth Together | | | | | | | | | | |
| Skyline | Performing | Performing | 4.21 | 4.61 | 4.79 | 3.79 | 3.67 | 4.22 | No | Yes |
| Youth Uprising | | | | | | | | | | |
| Castlemont High | Performing | -- | 4.15 | 4.44 | 4.79 | 3.54 | 3.83 | 4.17 | Yes | Yes |
| High School Overall/Average | | | 4.19 | 4.71 | 4.67 | 3.92 | 3.46 | 4.12 | | |

Source: Site visits representing 82 programs, October 2015 through February 2016.

Charters submit to and receive planning support from OFCY, others submit to and receive planning support from OUSD.

* Based on their OFCY grant, these sites are considered to be a single program with multiple sites, and therefore received one visit. Only one site visit was conducted in 2014-2015 to Life Academy to represent both Life Academy and McClymonds for OFCY's funding of the AIA program. In 2015-16 these two sites were visited separately.

** Charters are not required to engage in the self-assessment process.

***Parker and Sankofa K-8 programs were required to use the YPQA tool.

SCHOOL-BASED AFTER SCHOOL OUTCOME DOMAINS


OUTCOME DOMAINS INTRODUCTION



This report features seven outcome domains prioritized by the School-Based After School Partnership. The extent to which young people experience positive benefits is assessed through youth surveys (N=5,895). Differences in outcomes by gender, grade level, race, and English Language proficiency are discussed when they are statistically significant. Survey methodology can be found in the Data Companion.

The youth survey findings in each domain are discussed on two levels throughout the following sections:


- Youth Survey Composites** – A **composite** is used as a global measure of each outcome domain. The composite indicates the proportion of youth who answered positively to all but one of the survey questions related to that outcome domain. For example, a youth who scores highly on the Physical Well-Being Composite answered positively to at least two of the three related survey questions. Survey composites are reported separately for elementary (ES), middle (MS), and high school (HS) youth.
- Grade Level Composites**– Each domain section includes a description of the percentage of youth in elementary, middle, and high school programs who had positive responses to the outcome composites. Grade level composites are presented on the second page of every outcome section. Instructions on how to read the diagram are shown to the right of the example plot below:



ACADEMIC BEHAVIORS

Academic behaviors are the habits that show youth are making an effort to learn,²⁰ such as studying and finishing homework. When youth consistently engage in academic behaviors, they are more likely to improve their academic performance.²¹

FIGURE 10: ACADEMIC BEHAVIORS AT-A-GLANCE



Sources: Youth participant surveys administered in spring 2016, n=3,009 (ES), n=1,811 (MS), n=1,075 (HS); site visits conducted by Public Profit, October 2015 through February 2016.

[PQA RATINGS]

Number of Programs with PQA Ratings in Academic Climate of 3+

ELEMENTARY
39 / 47

MIDDLE
15 / 21

HIGH
14 / 14

HIGHLIGHTS

- **About eight out of 10 youth developed academic behaviors** – Over 80% of elementary and high school youth and nearly three-quarters (73%) of middle school youth developed academic behaviors.
- **Youth learned to set goals in their after school programs** – Over 75% of elementary, middle and high school youth reported being better at setting goals.
- **After school participants improved their study skills** – Eighty percent of elementary and high school youth gained study skills, as did over two-thirds (70%) of middle school youth.
- **Youth learned better homework habits** – Ninety-one percent of elementary, 79% of middle, and 78% of high school youth reported improvements in homework completion.

²⁰ Farrington, C.A., Roderick, M., Allensworth, E., Nagaoka, J., Keyes, T.S., Johnson, D.W., & Beechum, N.O. (2012). Teaching adolescents to become learners. The role of non-cognitive factors in shaping school performance: A critical literature review. Chicago: University of Chicago Consortium on Chicago School Research.


²¹ Ibid

ACADEMIC BEHAVIORS FINDINGS

Oakland after school programs provided academically enriching environments, with two thirds (68%) of programs scoring 3.0 or higher on the PQA Academic Climate ratings. This quality learning environment likely contributed to improved academic performance for youth, with eight out of 10 participants reporting that they developed stronger academic behaviors through their after school program. Youth in middle school programs, however, indicated that they could have used more support practicing academic behaviors, especially study skills.

Figure 11 provides an estimate of how many youth per program developed academic behaviors as measured by the survey composite. On average, 81% of youth in each program reported improved academic behaviors.

FIGURE 11: RANGE AND AVERAGE PERCENT OF YOUTH IN AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS WHO REPORT IMPROVED ACADEMIC BEHAVIORS BY GRADE LEVEL



Source: Youth participant surveys administered in spring 2016.

Among elementary schools, on average 85% of youth in each program reported having improved academic behaviors. As shown by the gold bar, this varied by site, ranging from 44% up to 100% of participants. Middle school programs reported the lowest improved academic behaviors, with an average of 73% of participants in each program reporting improved academic behaviors. This ranged by site from 48% to 94% of participants. In high schools, programs had an average of 81% of participants with improved academic behavior, ranging by site from 65% to 95%. The findings indicate that, on average, elementary, middle, and high school programs promote academic behaviors at a similar rate. As with other ratings, high school programs had the smallest range of site performance, and elementary schools had the largest.

ENGAGEMENT: SCHOOL-AGE PLANNING

Martin Luther King, Bay Area Community Resources

Key Takeaway: *BACR's afterschool program at Martin Luther King Jr. (MLK) Elementary provides an opportunity for its participants to engage in thoughtful planning activities. Through the use of personalized journals, students are given time to individually reflect and brainstorm how they will approach an activity before engaging in the activity itself. This allows participants to tap into their own expertise and gives them practice in creating plans to complete a task.*

About the Program: BACR's overall mission is to promote the healthy development of individuals and families, encourage service and volunteerism, and help build community. MLK Elementary School emphasizes in creating a safe space for its participants, increasing parent engagement, and providing high quality social emotional learning. In addition, the Site Coordinator made efforts to align with the school's goal of bringing in more STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Math) programming, and program staff have introduced more interactive science and math enrichment activities during after school hours.


In one session observed, staff planned an activity for participants where they made magnets. Staff gave specific learning targets and held up an example of a finished magnet made out of different materials (batteries, copper wires, paper clips). She explained that there are multiple ways to create a magnet, and their task was to use create a magnet using different materials. She then asked students to take out their Adventure Books (individual personal journals) and think then write down or draw how they thought the materials could come together to form a magnet. She specifically said, "Now that you see what the finished product looks like, how do you think all these items on the table will make the magnet on the table? You can draw or write in your adventures books the answer to this question." After ten minutes of reflection time, she asked the participants to find a partner to share their ideas with. After sharing, she handed out the materials with instructions on creating a magnet and asked students to put together their magnets with their partner.

Providing time at the start of the activity for students to reflect on creating a magnet allows them to tap into their own thinking and encourages them to create a plan of action. This allows for creativity to flow, ownership over the activity, and a sense of anticipation to see if their ideas worked or not. Participants had to think about how the materials could come together and what steps to take. Asking participants to then share their ideas with another partner allows participants to compare and contrast, and come up with a plan together on creating a magnet using both of their ideas, perhaps modifying their original ideas. Doing this type of brainstorming prior to an activity is a great way to introduce and promote the idea of making plans to tackle a project before starting something new.

SENSE OF MASTERY

A sense of mastery is feeling that one has learned a skill to a desired level. When youth have a sense of mastery, they feel competent at a new skill, become more competent at a difficult skill, and see themselves as leaders.

FIGURE 12: SENSE OF MASTERY AT-A-GLANCE



[PQA RATINGS]

Number of Programs with PQA Ratings in Supportive Environment of 3+

ELEMENTARY
47 / 47

MIDDLE
20 / 21

HIGH
14 / 14

Sources: Youth participant surveys administered in spring 2016, n=3,009 (ES), n=1,811 (MS), n=1,075 (HS); site visits conducted by Public Profit, October 2015 through February 2016.

HIGHLIGHTS


- **About eight out of 10 youth developed a sense of mastery** – Over 85% of elementary and high school youth and over three-quarters (77%) of middle school youth reported developing a sense of mastery.
- **Youth reported becoming more competent at a difficult skill** – More than eight out of 10 high school (82%), elementary school (82%), and middle school (76%) youth reported being better at something they used to think was hard.
- **After school participants feel more confident about their skills** – Nearly nine out of 10 elementary (88%) and high school (89%) youth and roughly three-quarters (79%) of middle school youth felt more confident about what they can do.
- **Many youth see themselves as leaders** – About three-quarters of elementary (74%) and high school (76%) youth and 64% of middle school youth reported being more of a leader.

SENSE OF MASTERY FINDINGS

Program staff encouraged and supported youth to learn new skills, with 81 out of 82 sites receiving a PQA rating of 3.0 or higher for Supportive Environment. In particular, elementary (85%) and high school (88%) youth reported benefitting from these supports.

Figure 13 provides an estimate of how many youth per program learned new skills and become more confident about what they can accomplish as measured by the survey composite. On average, 83% of youth in each program reported developing a sense of mastery.

FIGURE 13: AVERAGE PERCENT OF YOUTH IN AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS WHO REPORT AN IMPROVED SENSE OF MASTERY BY GRADE LEVEL



Source: Youth participant surveys administered in spring 2016.

Among elementary schools, on average 85% of youth in each program reported an improved sense of mastery. As shown by the gold bar, this varied by site, ranging from 56% up to 100% of participants per site. For middle schools, programs had about eight in ten (77%) participants report an improved sense of mastery. This ranged by site from 55% to 97% of participants. In high schools, programs had an average of 88% of participants with a sense of mastery, ranging by site from 77% to 100%. The findings show that, on average, elementary, middle, and high school programs promoted skill building at a similar rate. Again, high school programs had the smallest range, while elementary schools had the largest.

INTERACTION: LEADERSHIP
Castlemont High School, Girls Inc.

Key Takeaway: *At Youth UpRising's youth program at Castlemont High School, participants are given real, meaningful opportunities to grow their leadership skills. Throughout the different classes within the program, staff intentionally offer multiple roles for youth to lead different parts of the curriculum. Youth lead discussions, co-facilitate activities and have substantial responsibilities. In addition, as part of their job readiness strategy, Youth UpRising uses industry standard language for all leadership roles and responsibilities in their program. For example, some of the roles are spokesperson, facilities manager and administrative supporter. This allows youth to get used to the terminology used in jobs they will acquire post-graduation, adding to their job readiness training.*

About the Program: Youth UpRising's mission is to transform East Oakland into a healthy and economically robust community by developing the leadership of youth and young adults. Staff in all of their programs offer extensive leadership roles using industry terms for youth to take on to build their skills and be career ready. Youth UpRising provides Castlemont High School, located in deep East Oakland, comprehensive, fully integrated health, wellness, educational, career, arts, and cultural programming.


In the Driver's Education session, as youth were coming in, staff allowed students to pick a specific role for the day: spokesperson, administrative assistant, facilities manager, and culture keeper. The spokesperson's responsibility was to report back to the large group after any small group discussions, the facilities manager was in charge of setting up the space and keeping it clean, the administrative assistant helps co-facilitate and assist in any tasks the staff member needed, and the culture keeper was responsible for reviewing the agreements and ensuring everyone adhered to them. After the roles were designated, the culture keeper went through the agreements and lead the check-in, while the staff member only stepped in when the culture keeper asked for help in remembering all the agreements. Next, the administrative assistant read aloud the learning targets for the activity. Staff then lead a discussion and the spokesperson charted the discussion on the board. Throughout the session, youth were an integral part of delivering the lesson plan.

In all the sessions observed, staff members shared responsibility of all tasks with youth, allowing them to grow as leaders and practice skills that help prepare them for the workforce. Using real life terminology and sharing control with youth are great ways to prepare youth for the realities of work and allow participants to both grow their leadership potential and gain job readiness skills.

SOCIAL & EMOTIONAL SKILLS

Social and emotional skills are used to initiate and maintain positive relationships with peers and adults, manage and communicate one's emotions, and understand one's capabilities. These skills are gaining attention for the ways in which they help young people be successful in school and in life.²²

FIGURE 14: SOCIAL & EMOTIONAL SKILLS AT-A-GLANCE



[PQA RATINGS]

Number of Programs with PQA Ratings in Peer Interaction of 3+



Sources: Youth participant surveys administered in spring 2016, n=3,009 (ES), n=1,811 (MS), n=1,075 (HS); site visits conducted by Public Profit, October 2015 through February 2016.

HIGHLIGHTS

- **High school youth build social and emotional skills** – 81% of high school and over two-thirds of elementary (76%) and middle (66%) school youth reported building these skills in their program.
- **Over eight in 10 youth in all grade levels got along better with others** – Over 80% of elementary, middle, and high school youth reported getting along better with peers.
- **Participants felt good about themselves in their programs** – Nearly nine in 10 elementary (87%) and high school youth (89%) and 78% of middle school youth reported feeling good about themselves in their program.
- **High school youth are better at communicating their ideas and feelings** – Eighty-one percent (81%) of high school and more than two-thirds of elementary (71%) and middle (68%) school youth are better at talking about their feelings.


²² Gootman, L., & Schoon, I. (2013) The impact of non-cognitive skills on outcomes for young people: Literature review. London: Institute of Education and Social Research, University of London

SOCIAL & EMOTIONAL SKILLS FINDINGS

PQA ratings of Peer Interaction, the domain that measures supports for pro-social interactions, indicated that almost all elementary school programs (98%) had a rating of 3.0 or higher. Similarly, 93% of high school programs that received a PQA visit had ratings of 3.0 or higher. A modestly smaller proportion of middle school programs (81%) had ratings of 3.0 or higher in the Peer Interaction domain. This suggests that Oakland after school programs provided youth a quality environment in which youth could gain social and emotional skills. However, youth reports of social emotional skill development were slightly inconsistent with the PQA findings, particularly when looking across grade levels. Middle school youth reported comparably lower rates of agreement than high school youth in the social and emotional skill composite and in areas such as expressing their feelings.

Figure 15 provides an estimate of how many youth per programs developed social and emotional skills as measured by the survey composite. On average, 74% of youth in each program reported stronger social and emotional skills.

FIGURE 15: AVERAGE PERCENT OF YOUTH IN AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS WHO REPORT STRONGER SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL SKILLS BY GRADE LEVEL




Source: Youth participant surveys administered in spring 2016.

Among elementary schools, on average 76% of participants in each program gained stronger social and emotional skills. As shown by the gold bar, this varied by site, ranging from 36% up to 100% of participants per site. Middle school programs fostered strong social and emotional skills for an average of 65% of participants per site. This ranged by site from 44% to 84% of participants. In high schools, programs had an average of 81% of participants with stronger social and emotional skills, ranging by site from 66% to 90%. The findings show that, on average, elementary and high school programs promote strong social and emotional skills at a higher rate. Youth survey results suggest that middle school programs may consider continuing to focus on strengthening their social emotional activities to better support participants.

PHYSICAL WELL-BEING

Activities that promote physical well-being engage youth in physical activity, such as exercising, and help youth learn about healthy habits, such as eating a balanced diet.

FIGURE 16: PHYSICAL WELL-BEING HIGHLIGHTS AT-A-GLANCE



Source: Youth participant surveys administered in spring 2016, n=3,009 (ES), n=1,811 (MS), n=1,075 (HS).


HIGHLIGHTS

- **Many youth reported learning about how to promote their physical well-being** – More than 70% of elementary school (85%), middle school (71%) and high school (75%) youth reported learning ways to promote their physical well-being.
- **After school participants made positive choices related to their well-being** – More than 80% of elementary (85%) and high school (82%) youth and roughly three-quarters of middle school (74%) youth reported their after school program helped them to say “no” to things they know are wrong.
- **Youth learned healthy habits** – Over 70% of elementary (77%) and high school (72%) youth and 63% of middle school youth reported learning how to be healthy at their after school programs.
- **Nearly three-quarters of youth exercise more** – Eighty percent (80%) of elementary school youth and more than 60% of middle (70%) and high school (61%) youth exercise more.

PHYSICAL WELL-BEING FINDINGS²³

Elementary school youth reported the strongest growth in learning about overall wellness behaviors. Figure 17 provides an estimate of how many youth per program increased physical activity and healthy eating skills as measured by the survey composite. On average, 79% of youth in a single program reported improved wellness behaviors.

FIGURE 17: AVERAGE PERCENT OF YOUTH IN AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS WHO REPORT STRONGER WELL-BEING BEHAVIORS BY GRADE LEVEL



Source: Youth participant surveys administered in Spring 2016.


Among elementary schools, on average 79% of youth in each program reported strong wellness behaviors. As shown by the gold bar, this varied by site, ranging from 60% up to 100% of participants per site. Middle school programs promoted strong wellness for an average of 71% of participants. This ranged by site from 47% to 88% of participants. In high schools, programs promoted strong wellness behaviors for an average of 75% of participants, ranging by site from 58% to 95%. The findings show that, on average, elementary, middle, and high school programs promoted well-being behaviors at a similar rate. Youth survey results suggest that middle and high school based programs may consider increasing the amount of physical activity offered and expand program activities to include wellness behaviors.

²³ This outcome section is not mapped to a specific quality domain because scores for an associated quality domain are unavailable. Therefore, there is no scatterplot displaying quality alongside youth reports of wellness behaviors.

SCHOOL ENGAGEMENT

Youth are connected to their schools when they feel a sense of belonging. They may also participate in more school activities and talk about what happens at school with their families.

FIGURE 18: SCHOOL ENGAGEMENT AT-A-GLANCE



Source: Youth participant surveys administered in spring 2016, n=3,009 (ES), n=1,811 (MS), n=1,075 (HS).


HIGHLIGHTS

- **Many after school youth felt more connected to their school** – About eight in 10 (77%) of elementary and high school youth reported feeling more connected with their schools since attending their after school program. Sixty-eight percent (68%) of middle school youth reported the same.
- **Youth felt like a part of their school** – Nearly nine in 10 (86%) high school youth reported feeling like a part of their school since coming to after school. About eight in 10 (83%) of elementary and 78% of middle school youth reported the same.
- **Youth talked with their families about school** – About two-thirds of elementary (71%), middle (61%) and high school (70%) youth increased how often they talked with their families about school.

SCHOOL CONNECTEDNESS FINDINGS

Figure 19 provides an estimate of how many youth per program developed stronger connections to their school as estimated by the survey composite. Seventy-five percent of youth reported stronger school connectedness.

FIGURE 19: AVERAGE PERCENT OF YOUTH IN AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS WHO REPORT STRONGER SCHOOL CONNECTEDNESS BY GRADE LEVEL




Source: Youth participant surveys administered in spring 2016.

Among elementary schools, on average 77% of participants in each program felt connected to their school. As shown by the gold bar, this varied by site, ranging from 35% up to 99% of participants per site. Nearly two-thirds (68%) of middle school participants in each program felt connected, on average. This ranged by site from 47% to 88% of participants. In high schools, programs had an average of 77% of participants who felt connected, ranging by site from 60% to 92%. Elementary and high schools had the highest level of school engagement, and middle schools the lowest.

COLLEGE & CAREER EXPLORATION

College and career exploration activities are opportunities that support youth in looking towards the future, by helping them identify both the skills that relate to careers of interest and the degree programs needed to pursue those careers. Programs for high school-aged youth tend to place greater emphasis on college and career, though programs at all grade levels are expected to introduce students to these concepts.

FIGURE 20: COLLEGE & CAREER EXPLORATION AT-A-GLANCE



Sources: Youth participant surveys administered in spring 2016, n=3,009 (ES), n=1,811 (MS), n=1,075 (HS).

HIGHLIGHTS


- **High school youth reported exploring college and career opportunities** – Nearly nine in 10 (88%) high school youth report opportunities in their after school program for college and career exploration. Fewer elementary (69%) and middle school (68%) youth reported the same opportunities. This pattern reflects, in part, the fact that programs for high school-age youth place a greater emphasis on college and career readiness.
- **Youth reported feeling ready for their next academic step** – Nine out of 10 high school youth (90%) reported feeling more confident about finishing high school since attending their after school program. Seventy-five percent (75%) of elementary youth feel ready for middle school and 70% of middle school youth feel ready for high school.
- **Middle and high school youth learned more about college** – Close to nine out of 10 high school youth (85%) and 68% of middle school youth reported learning more about college options in their after school program. More than half of elementary (54%) youth also reported doing so.
- **Learning about career options are a part of high school programs** – About eight in 10 (78%) of high school youth reported learning about future occupations. Sixty-eight percent (68%) of elementary and 56% of middle school youth learned more about jobs they would like to have in the future.

COLLEGE & CAREER EXPLORATION FINDINGS

Nearly nine in 10 high school youth (88%) reported exploring college and career opportunities in their after school program. Elementary and middle school survey results indicated that programming at these earlier levels provided opportunities for younger students to be college and career ready. Sixty-nine percent of elementary school youth and 68% of middle school youth reported becoming familiar with college and career options.

Figure 21 provides an estimate of how many youth per program felt prepared for college and career as measured by the survey composite. On average, 72% of youth in a single program reported learning about college and career options.

FIGURE 21: AVERAGE PERCENT OF YOUTH IN AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS WHO REPORT LEARNING ABOUT COLLEGE AND CAREER OPTIONS BY GRADE LEVEL



Source: Youth participant surveys administered in spring 2016.

Among elementary schools, on average 69% of youth in each programs felt prepared for college and career. As shown by the gold bar, this varied by site, ranging from 29% up to 100% of participants per site. Middle school programs on average had 68% of youth who felt prepared for the future. This ranged by site from 34% to 91% of participants. In high schools, on average programs had 88% of participants who felt prepared for the future, ranging by site from 73% to 100%. This is an area of strength for high school programs. Middle and elementary school programs have more varied rates of youth agreement, likely reflecting program-level variations in focus on this topic for younger students.

TRENDS ACROSS OUTCOME DOMAINS

Oakland after school programs provided strong support for academic behaviors, youth sense of mastery, and physical wellbeing. On average more than eight out of 10 students reported growth in these areas. Elementary and high schools tended to score higher on these areas than middle schools. However, elementary schools had a much greater range between programs compared to high schools. Mathematically, this may be due to the fact that there are many more elementary schools than high schools, or suggest that programs at the elementary school level were less consistent than at the high school level.

Overall, programs had the lowest composite score in the area of college and career exploration, with just under seven in 10 participants reporting that they felt prepared for college and career. This domain also had some of the greatest range in experience, with some programs scoring very low and some very high. High school students reported the highest scores and lowest variation between programs, suggesting that this activity is more consistently a focus at the higher grade-levels.

ACADEMIC OUTCOMES

Academic outcomes, such as test scores and school attendance, are indicators of young people's progress in school. Research shows that youth who attend programs for multiple years are more likely to improve their academic outcomes.²⁴

The academic outcomes examined in the school-based after school evaluation included school day attendance (chronic absence) rates, Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) scores,²⁵ and high school readiness.²⁶ For each of these measures, analysis focused both on surfacing the overall trends for after school participants versus non-participants in the same school, and on exploring any differences by race/ethnicity, or gender.



FINDINGS FROM ACADEMIC DATA ANALYSES

In 2015-16, the **rate of school day attendance** was notably higher for after school program participants than non-participants. On average, after school participants attended 96% of all school days and non-participants attended 94%; this difference is statistically significant.²⁷ This indicates that after school participation has a positive association with school day attendance.

Another measure of school day attendance is **chronic absenteeism**, defined as missing 10% or more of all school days. Youth who attend after school are much less likely to be chronically absent than their peers: about 11% of after school participants were chronically absent from the school day, compared to 16% of non-participants; this difference is statistically significant.²⁸ This indicates that after school participation has a small, negative association with chronic absenteeism.

OUSD uses the SBAC assessment as a measure of students' **math and English Language Arts (ELA) competencies**. Consistently, throughout all grade levels, after school participants were less likely to be at or above grade level in both ELA and math. For ELA, overall 26% of after school participants tested at or above grade level, versus 28% of non-participants in the same schools. For math, overall 18% of after school participants tested at or above grade level, compared

²⁴ Roth, J., Malone, L., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2010). Does the amount of participation in afterschool programs relate to developmental outcomes? A review of the literature. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. 45(3-4), 310-24.

²⁵ The Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) is an online summative assessment that tracks students' progress toward Common Core State Standards in Math and English Language Arts (ELA). The SBAC is administered once per year to students in grades 3-8 and grade 11. Only 2015-16 SBAC scores were available for analysis in the present report, and so students' progress year-over-year was not included here.

²⁶ OUSD uses a High School Readiness variable, which measures the degree to which 8th graders are prepared for the rigor and expectations for high school. The variable comprises a combination of attendance, course grades, and behavior; a student is considered high school-ready when all four of the following have been met: total weighted GPA of 2.5 or higher; school attendance rate of 96% or better; no grades D or F in their final core math or English courses in 8th grade; and no suspensions in 8th grade.

²⁷ Statistically significant at $p < .05$ level using chi-square test for association.

²⁸ Statistically significant at $p < .05$ level using chi-square test for association.

to 23% of their peers; this finding for math scores is statistically significant.²⁹ Analysis of SBAC scores by sub-groups (race/ethnicity, gender, grade) revealed some variation in these trends. Generally speaking, girls (both participants and non-participants) in all race/ethnicity categories were more likely than boys to be at or above grade level in ELA. As well, some race/ethnicity categories were more likely than others to be at or above grade level in both math and ELA.

Research shows that high school graduation rates are dramatically impacted by three factors: by children's reading level by the end of 3rd grade; by residing in a high-poverty neighborhood; and by experiencing family poverty.³⁰ Thirty-five percent (35%) of youth experiencing these combined factors fail to graduate high school on time;³¹ this is why it is so important to monitor children's ELA proficiency as rising 4th graders. In Oakland, 19% of after school participants in 3rd grade tested at or above grade level for their SBAC ELA scores, compared to 22% of non-participants in the same schools.

Examining at the effects of after school participation on SBAC scores did not provide enough variation to be conclusive; in other words, the analysis did not reveal that the frequency of after school attendance contributed to score variations on the 2015-16 assessment.

About one-quarter of after school participants were **English Learners** in 2015-16, whereas children and youth designated as English Learners made up about 38% of other youth in the same schools (and 30% of OUSD overall, including schools that do not host a school-based after school program). Of the English Learners participating in after school,³² almost none met the SBAC math or ELA benchmarks, with only 5% at or above grade level in math and only 2% at or above grade level in ELA.

In terms of high school readiness, 8th graders in Oakland after school programs were on par with their peers: 42% of 8th graders in after school were high school ready by the end of the 2015-16 school year, versus 43% of 8th graders in the same schools.

²⁹ Statistically significant at p<.05 level using chi-square test for association.

³⁰ The Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2012) Double Jeopardy: How Third-Grade Reading Skills and Poverty Influence High School Graduation. Baltimore, MD: Donald J. Hernandez. Retrieved from aecf.org.

³¹ *Ibid*

³² Note that because the testing period for English Learner re-designation does not align with the after school program year, and because two years' worth of SBAC data were not available, English Learner re-designation rates were not analyzed in this report.

INTERPRETING THE FINDINGS

The academic data analyses presented above revealed that Oakland after school programs are meeting their overarching goal of serving children, youth, and neighborhoods with the highest needs. Anecdotal information about programs' recruitment policies suggests that they prioritize students with the highest academic need, which may help explain the differences observed between participants and non-participants.

The findings also helped reveal that students struggling with core subjects are not limited to after school programs; rather this is a District-wide issue. After school programs can contribute to children and youths' academic successes, but they are neither designed nor equipped to solve the problem on their own.

The findings do point to some potential areas for continued support and focus for Oakland after school programs:

- *Increased school day alignment.* Encouraging and supporting after school programs in building fruitful relationships with participants' school day teachers is a way to help after school align programmatic content with what youth are already learning during the school day.
- *Targeted professional development for after school line staff.* Providing line staff and site coordinators with additional, specific skills in literacy and math content is a way to help youth-facing staff become more proficient in identifying and supporting youth who are struggling in core subject areas.
- *Targeted supports for youth more likely to test below grade level.* Latino/a and African American youth were revealed by the academic analyses to be particularly in need of support in core subject areas; line staff and site coordinators should formulate specific and sustained plans to work with youth on their math and literacy skills, especially the youth who are most likely to need help.

PROMISING PRACTICE

INTERACTION: BELONGING AND SCHOOL-AGE LEADERSHIP

Brookfield Elementary, Higher Ground

Key Takeaway: *Higher Ground afterschool program at Brookfield Elementary, children have opportunities to practice leadership skills and develop a sense of belonging. For each activity, children are given opportunities to lead and get to know each. Through these, children are able to practice group processing skills and feel a sense of belonging.*

About the Program: Part of the Higher Ground agency, Brookfield’s mission is to “provide services that address the intellectual development of children through behavioral health treatment, after school enrichment, professional development, service learning projects, and school/community based service coordination for youth and the organizations that serve them in the school and community setting.” To help accomplish this mission, children are exposed to different enrichment activities, such as sports, dancing, gardening and cooking and academic enrichment activities to build skills and help with homework completion and accuracy. The program and its activities give children leadership roles, such as time manager, bathroom clerk or concierge, through rotation.

During snack time and check-in, staff members provided opportunities for children to lead and get to know each other. The site coordinator began the program with, “When I say Brook, you say Field,” and everyone else followed along with the chant. The site coordinator proceeded to ask the group to indicate how their day was going by giving her a thumbs up, down or sideways. Most gave a thumbs up. The student announcer read the schedule and announcements for the day. After the announcements were read, the group broke out into song and dance about Brookfield. As they were singing and dancing, the site coordinator circulated to give participating students tickets, which they can exchange for prizes.

In Cheer, the girls practiced and learned new cheer skills, chants, stunts, jumps and motions. Two girls led the class in a cheer. After the group practiced a few teams, staff broke the girls in four groups. In these groups, the girls rehearsed the cheer and helped each other with the steps. Staff circulated to each group several times to break down the steps and to encourage them by saying, “Keep doing it” and “The more we do it, the better we will get at it.” After the groups practice, everyone came together for the groups can perform their cheers.

Brookfield exemplifies belonging and school-age leadership. By including all children throughout the program offerings, children are able to build pride within the after school program and feel comfortable with staff and other children. During snack time and check-in, children were engaged in chants about Brookfield and also identified with the program by being rewarded for good behavior. In addition, children had opportunities to practice leadership skills. By allowing children to help each other or even lead an activity, children are able to take responsibility and build confidence.

DIFFERENCES IN YOUTH OUTCOMES

Certain youth or groups of youth may experience after school programs differently than their peers; testing for any significant differences by race/ethnicity and gender is important to understanding and responding to these differences.

There may be some categories of youth who benefit more from after school programs than others. To explore the extent to which this is the case in Oakland, Public Profit examined youth outcomes by gender and race/ethnicity. Notable statistically significant differences of 10-percentage points or more are reported here³³. Smaller differences (+/- five percentage points and under) are noted in the Data Companion .

DIFFERENCES IN YOUTH REPORTS OF QUALITY

Youth surveys are an important avenue for incorporating youth voice into the evaluation findings, and are also an important source of complementary data to measures of program quality. A sample of youth participants answered a series of questions on program quality (N=5,895), specifically about features of the after school program that may not be apparent during site visits. Table 9 presents the percentage of youth who felt positively about the different components of program quality. Overall, the majority of youth rated program quality high. Youth at all levels found their programs to be supportive and to promote positive interaction among youth and staff. All programs may need additional support in promoting engagement based on youth survey responses, which echo the PQA ratings. The responses to individual survey items related to Quality Domains are listed in the Data Companion.

TABLE 9: POSITIVE YOUTH SURVEY RESPONSES REGARDING PROGRAM QUALITY

| Quality Domain | Elementary (n=3,009) | Middle (n=1,811) | High (n=1,075) |
|----------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Safe | 87% | 78% | 91% |
| Supportive | 91% | 82% | 91% |
| Interaction | 89% | 81% | 88% |
| Engagement | 70% | 63% | 77% |

Source: Youth participant surveys administered in spring 2016.

There were modest differences between boy and girl participants' perspectives of program quality. Most notably, middle school boys reported higher levels of program engagement. For example, 66% of middle school-aged boys reported having opportunities in their program to "choose what I do and how I do it," compared to 57% of girls. Similarly,

³³ Based on the group sizes, a 10-percentage point difference represents approximately 250 youth in terms of gender and race/ethnicity. Chi-square statistical tests are used to identify statistically significant group differences.

80% of middle school boys agreed with the statement, “I am interested in what we do at this program,” compared to 71% of girls of the same age.

There were also some race-ethnicity-based differences in terms of youths’ views about program quality. Among high school youth, Latino/a participants were less likely to report opportunities for choice in their program. Seventy-seven percent (77%) of Latino/a high school participants agreed with the statement, “In this program, I get to choose what I do and how I do it,” compared to 80% of their peers. Fifty-six percent (56%) of elementary-aged Latino/a youth reported doing things that are too easy for them at their after school program, compared to 52% of their peers.


The gender and race/ethnicity differences point to specific aspects of engagement to which programs can direct their attention, namely providing youth with choices and challenging activities, particularly for middle school girls and Latino/a youth. As noted previously, Latino/a youth comprise the majority of after school participants served by OUSD and OFCY programs; therefore, increasing engagement for this group will significantly impact the overall engagement level in Oakland’s after school programs.

CALIFORNIA HEALTHY KIDS SURVEY: OUSD AND OAKLAND SCHOOL-BASED AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Encouragingly, results from the 2015-16 Oakland Unified School District California Healthy Kids Surveys (CHKS) for elementary-age youth indicate that youth in Oakland after school reported slightly lower levels of verbal bullying and physical bullying, compared to 2015-16 reports from OUSD.³⁴ While 16% of OUSD elementary youth reported being verbally bullied at least once, 19% of Oakland after school elementary-aged youth reported the same. Oakland after school elementary program participants reported moderately lower levels of physical harassment than elementary-aged youth at the District level. Only 11% of Oakland after school elementary youth reported being physically harassed, compared to 19% for OUSD.³⁵ Oakland after school elementary participants were more likely to report (86%) that an adult steps in when one of their peers is being bullied, as compared to OUSD students (70%).

Findings from the Oakland School-Based After School youth survey and the OUSD CHKS survey indicate that participants reported similar levels of verbal bullying. Middle school youth were more likely to report verbal bullying than high students. For example, 22% of Oakland after school middle school youth reported that other kids spread mean rumors or lies about them compared, compared to 8% of high school youth (Figure 22).

FIGURE 22: OUSD STUDENTS AND OSB ASP REPORTED SIMILAR LEVELS OF VERBAL BULLYING




Sources: Youth participant surveys administered in spring 2016 (MS n=1,811; HS n=1,075); OUSD California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS), 2015-16.

³⁴ CHKS is only given to fifth graders at the elementary school level, seventh graders at the middle school level, and ninth and eleventh graders at the high school level.

³⁵ Both the Oakland School-Based After School Youth Survey and the CHKS surveys used the following scale for the middle school and high level: “0 Times,” “1 Time,” “2 to 3 Times” and “4 or More Times.” The elementary school versions used: “No, never,” “Yes, some of the time,” “Yes, most of the time,” and “Yes, all of the time.”

Similar to verbal bullying, rates of physical bullying were lower in high schools than middle schools. High school-aged Oakland after school participants reported lower rates of physical bullying (5%), compared to high school youth in the District (13%). However, Oakland after school middle school youth reported much higher rates (24%) than middle school youth in the District did (19%).

FIGURE 23: OAKLAND AFTER PARTICIPANTS REPORTED VARYING LEVELS OF PHYSICAL HARRASSMENT



Sources: Youth participant surveys administered in spring 2016, n=1,811 (MS), n=1,075 (HS); OUSD California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS), 2015-16.

Oakland after school participants were asked additional similar survey questions from the OUSD CHKS. In general, Oakland after school participants reported higher levels of agreement for items on safety, engagement, support, and social-emotional skills. For example, 92% of Oakland high school-aged after school participants reported that they feel safe in their program, compared to 52% of OUSD high school students who reported that they feel safe in their school.³⁶ Even though Oakland after school participants had mostly higher positive rates than OUSD students, it is important to keep in mind that these surveys do not represent the whole population of OUSD or the after school program, and that CHKS data was not matched to compare after school participants with non-participants.

DIFFERENCES IN OUTCOME DOMAINS

All youth differences by race/ethnicity and gender were less than 15-percentage points and are noted in the Data Companion.

Gender comparisons showed that middle school-aged boys were more likely than girls of the same age to report strengthening their physical

³⁶ The scales for these surveys slightly vary. The evaluation used a binary scale (“Yes” or “No”), while CHKS used a five-point Likert-type scale (“Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree”). For the analysis of CHKS data, only “Agree” and “Strongly Agree” were examined.

well-being, improving their college and career readiness, and feeling engaged in school.

Table 10 shows that 70% of boys reported learning ways to be healthy in their after school program, compared to 59% of girls; as well, 78% of boys reported exercising more since coming to their after school program, compared to 64% of girls. Additionally, more middle school boys than girls reported that their after school program helped them to feel more confident about their college and career readiness across all items in the domain. Furthermore, 83% of boys reported that they are happy to be at their school compared to 71% of girls. Smaller statistically significant differences between middle school boys and girls exist across all domains. These are detailed in the Data Companion.

TABLE 10: MIDDLE SCHOOL GENDER DIFFERENCES IN YOUTH OUTCOMES

| | Boys | Girls |
|--|------|-------|
| Physical Well-Being | | |
| Since coming to this program, I exercise more. | 78% | 64% |
| This program helps me to learn how to be healthy. | 70% | 59% |
| College & Career Exploration | | |
| This program helps me feel more prepared for high school. | 77% | 67% |
| In this program, I learn more about college. | 75% | 65% |
| In this program, I learn of jobs I can have when I grow up. | 63% | 52% |
| School Engagement (Academic Outcomes) | | |
| Since coming to this program, I am happy to be at this school. | 83% | 71% |

Sources: Cityspan Attendance System for attendance records from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016. Youth participant surveys administered in spring 2016, n=1,405.

Similar to middle school gender difference patterns, high school (66%) and elementary school (82%) boys were more likely to report that “Since coming to this program, I exercise more” as compared to high school (57%) and elementary school (78%) girls.

DATA COMPANION

DATA COMPANION A. DATA SOURCES BY DATA TYPE

The table below describes the data sources for each section in the 2015-16 Oakland School-Based Evaluation Findings Report.

| Report Section | Data Sources |
|---|--|
| Access & Attendance in the Oakland After School Programs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program enrollment and attendance data from Cityspan. • Program targets based on OFCY performance goals. • Program targets based on OUSD service goals determined by CDE. |
| Program Quality | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Point of Service Quality Assessments (Site Observations): Point of service quality (POSQ) assessments were completed by the OUSD After School Program Office and by Public Profit using the Program Quality Assessment Tool, a research-based structured observation tool which assesses program quality in the following domains: Safe Environment, Supportive Environment, Engagement, Interaction, and Academic Support. <i>Elementary school programs</i> were evaluated using the School-Aged version of the Program Quality Assessment Tool (SA-PQA). <i>Middle and high school programs</i> were evaluated using the Youth version of the Program Quality Assessment Tool (Y-PQA). <i>K-8 programs</i> (n=2) were evaluated using the using the Youth version of the Program Quality Assessment Tool (Y-PQA). |
| School-Based After School Outcome Domains | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth Surveys: Youth who participated in after school programs supported by the Oakland School-Based Partnership were given a survey in March through May 2016 to investigate their opinions regarding program quality and a variety of outcomes related to their involvement in the after school program (i.e., social skill development, academic attitudes, etc.). • Program Enrollment and Attendance Data from Cityspan: Youth attendance data was used in conjunction with student surveys to examine relationships between attendance levels and youth outcomes. • Academic Data from the OUSD Quality, Accountability, and Analytics Department: Students' school attendance and district test results were analyzed to evaluate youth participants' academic outcomes. |

DATA COMPANION B. SITE VISIT METHODOLOGY

Site visits provide observationally based data about key components of program quality, as research has demonstrated that point of service quality is strongly related to positive outcomes for youth.

Each program received one visit by the evaluation team between October 2015 and February 2016. Visits to programs hosted by elementary schools were conducted using the School-Age Program Quality Assessment (SAPQA) and visits to programs hosted by middle or high school were conducted using the Youth Program Quality Assessment (YPQA). The PQA is a research-based point of service quality (POSQ) observation tool used by out-of-school time programs nationally. Site visitors have been certified as statistically reliable raters by the Weikart Center for Youth Program Quality.


The YPQA includes five domains:

1. **Safe Environment** – Youth experience both physical and emotional safety. The program environment is safe and sanitary. The social environment is safe.
2. **Supportive Environment** – Adults support youth to learn and grow. Adults support youth with opportunities for active learning, for skill building, and to develop healthy relationships.
3. **Interaction** – There is a positive peer culture in the program, encouraged and supported by adults. Youth support each other. Youth experience a sense of belonging. Youth participate in small groups as members and as leaders. Youth have opportunities to partner with adults.
4. **Engagement** – Youth experience positive challenges and pursue learning. Youth have opportunities to plan, make choices, and reflect and learn from their experiences.
5. **Academic Climate** – Activities in the program intentionally promote the development of key academic skills and content-area knowledge.

The quality domains are inter-related and build upon one another. Broadly speaking, programs need to assure that youth enjoy a Safe and Supportive environment before working to establish high quality Interaction, Engagement, and Academic Climate. For example, a program in which young people are afraid to try new things for fear of being ridiculed by others - an example of an unsupportive environment - is not likely to be an interactive, engaging place for kids.

Figure 24 characterizes the relationship between the PQA quality domains. Research indicates that the foundational programmatic elements of physical and emotional safety (described in the Safe and the Supportive Environment domains) support high quality practice in other domains. In general, programs' ratings will be higher for the foundational domains than for Interaction, Engagement, or Academic Climate.

FIGURE 24: PROGRAM QUALITY ASSESSEMENT DOMAINS



Adapted from *Youth PQA Handbook* by High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, 2007.

Program quality elements are rated according to visitors' observations and staff responses to follow-up questions. Ratings of 1, 3, or 5 are assigned based on the extent to which a particular practice is implemented. The PQA is a rubric-based assessment, with brief paragraphs describing different levels of performance for each program quality area. Though the specific language varies by practice, the ratings indicate the following levels of performance:

- A rating of one (1) indicates that the practice was not observed while the visitor was on site, or that the practice is not a part of the program.
- A rating of three (3) indicates that the practice is implemented relatively consistently across staff and activities.
- A five (5) rating indicates that the practice was implemented consistently and well across staff and activities.

DATA COMPANION C. SURVEY METHODOLOGY

Youth survey results are used in this evaluation to understand youths' perception of the quality of the program they attend and to report youths' growth in the outcomes domains described in this report.

Selection of Youth

Program staff are asked to administer the youth survey to as many of their youth participants as possible. At a minimum, programs are asked to return the quantity of completed surveys equal to 75% of the estimated average daily attendance for their program. For example, if a program's average daily attendance is 100 youth, this program is expected to return a minimum of 75 surveys. However, actual response rates vary by program and the total survey count (N=5,895) represents roughly 75% of the 7,822 youth who attend Oakland After School programs on the average day. The survey count (N=5,895) represents 32% of the 18,291 unduplicated total youth served by after school programs during the course of the program year.

Procedure for Administering the Survey

The evaluation team distributed mostly online surveys to programs in March 2016 and collected surveys in May 2016. Program staff completed a test survey to determine if they needed hard copies. Surveys are available in English, Chinese, Spanish and Vietnamese to meet the language preferences of all youth.

Survey Results

Survey questions are listed on pages 67-69. Results for individual questions are listed in several sections, starting on page 70.

Interpreting Results

While the evaluation team makes every effort to assure results are reported as accurately as possible, readers are advised to interpret results with caution.

Self-administered survey responses capture a point-in-time perspective from youth, whose responses may be influenced by unknown factors. One measure to determine the accuracy of youth responses is the inclusion of the following question on the 2015-16 survey: "Choose 'no' to this question." Twenty-one (21%) of respondents answered this question incorrectly (by choosing 'yes'). While this alone is not sufficient evidence to exclude cases, it does suggest that the self-report survey has limitations.

DATA COMPANION D. YOUTH SURVEY COMPOSITES

Youth Survey Composites – A **composite** is used as a global measure of each outcome domain. The composite indicates the proportion of youth who answered positively to all but one of the survey questions related to that outcome domain. For example, a youth who scores highly on the Physical Well-Being Composite answered positively to at least two of the three related survey questions. The table below (Table 11) includes the survey questions that were used for each composite.

TABLE 11: DESCRIPTION OF YOUTH SURVEY COMPOSITES*

| Quality Domain / Outcome Composite | Elementary | Middle | High |
|------------------------------------|---|--|------|
| Program Quality - Safe | I feel safe in this program. | | |
| | If someone bullies my friends or me at this program, an adult steps in to help. | | |
| | In this program, other kids hit or push me when they are not just playing around. | How many times in this program have you been pushed, shoved, slapped, hit or kicked by someone who wasn't just kidding around? | |
| | When I am in this program, other kids spread mean rumors or lies about me. | How many times in this program have you had mean rumors or lies spread about you? | |
| Program Quality - Supportive | In this program, there is an adult who wants me to do my best. | The adults in this program expect me to try hard to do my best. | |
| | The adults here tell me what I am doing well. | | |
| | The adults in this program listen to what I have to say. | | |
| | There is an adult at this program who cares about me. | There is an adult at this program who really cares about me. | |
| Program Quality - Interaction | In this program, I get to help other people. | | |
| | I feel like I belong at this program. | | |

| Quality Domain / Outcome Composite | Elementary | Middle | High |
|---|---|---|---|
| Program Quality - Engagement | In this program, I get to choose what I do and how I do it. | | |
| | In this program, I try new things. | | |
| | In this program, I do things that are too easy for me. | | |
| | I am interested in what we do in this program. | | |
| Academic Behaviors | In this program, I learn how to use my time to finish all my school work. | In this program, I learn how to organize my time to finish my school work. | |
| | This program helps me learn ways to study (like reading directions). | This program helps me to learn good study skills (like reading directions, taking tests). | |
| | This program helps me do my homework. | Because of this program, I am better at getting my homework done. | |
| | Since coming to this program, I know how to set goals for myself. | Since coming to this program, I am better at setting goals for myself. | |
| College & Career Exploration | In this program, I learn of jobs I can have when I grow up. | In this program, I learn about the kinds of jobs I'd like to have in the future. | |
| | In this program, I learn more about college. | This program helps me feel more confident about going to college. | |
| | This program helps me feel ready to go to middle school. | This program helps me feel more prepared for high school. | This program helps me believe I can finish high school. |
| Community Engagement | <i>No Elementary Version</i> | This program helps me to feel like a part of my community. | |
| Sense of Mastery | This program helps me feel good about what I can do. | This program helps me to feel more confident about what I can do. | |
| | Since coming to this program, I am better at something that I used to think was hard. | | |
| | Since coming to this program, I am more of a leader. | | |

| Quality Domain / Outcome Composite | Elementary | Middle | High |
|--|--|--|------|
| School Engagement (Academic Outcomes) | Since coming to this program, I feel close to people at this school. | | |
| | This program helps me to feel like a part of my school. | | |
| | Since coming to this program, I talk with my family about school more often. | | |
| | Since coming to this program, I am happy to be at this school. | | |
| Social Emotional Skills | When I'm in this program, I feel good about myself. | | |
| | This program helps me talk about my feelings. | Since coming to this program, I am better at telling others about my ideas and feelings. | |
| | This program helps me to listen to others. | Since coming to this program, I am better at listening to others. | |
| | This program helps me get along with adults. | Because of this program, I am better at getting along with adults. | |
| | This program helps me get along with other people my age. | Since coming to this program, I get along better with other people my age. | |
| Physical Well-Being | This program helps me to learn how to be healthy. | | |
| | This program helps me say "no" to things I know are wrong. | Since coming to this program, I am better at saying "no" to things I know are wrong. | |
| | Since coming to this program, I exercise more. | | |

*The survey question "Choose the answer 'no' to this question" which appeared on the youth surveys is omitted from this table. The question was used to detect positive response bias, and results are not reported in this document.

YOUTH SURVEY COMPOSITES BY PROGRAM

TABLE 12: OAKLAND SCHOOL-BASED AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS SITE VISIT SCORES AND YOUTH SURVEY RESULTS BY PROGRAM

| Lead Agency/Program | N= | Youth Survey Results: Program Quality | | | | Youth Survey Results: Youth Outcomes | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----|---------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------|------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
| | | Safe Environment | Supportive Environment | Interaction | Engagement | Academic Behaviors | College & Career Exploration | Sense of Mastery | School Engagement (Academic Outcomes) | Social Emotional Skills | Physical Well-Being |
| ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Bay Area Community Resources</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bridges Academy | 60 | 92% | 94% | 92% | 63% | 87% | 67% | 93% | 88% | 88% | 89% |
| Emerson | 61 | 90% | 98% | 97% | 82% | 91% | 84% | 95% | 84% | 89% | 86% |
| Esperanza Academy | 52 | 85% | 86% | 78% | 47% | 81% | 66% | 68% | 77% | 61% | 81% |
| Fred T. Korematsu | 29 | 76% | 100% | 86% | 75% | 93% | 55% | 93% | 86% | 79% | 86% |
| Glenview | 55 | 100% | 100% | 100% | 95% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 98% | 100% | 100% |
| Global Family Learning Without Limits | 61 | 98% | 98% | 97% | 91% | 100% | 89% | 97% | 91% | 85% | 97% |
| Grass Valley Elementary | 58 | 93% | 94% | 91% | 71% | 98% | 80% | 93% | 83% | 78% | 84% |
| Greenleaf* | 51 | 96% | 98% | 100% | 50% | 100% | 58% | 96% | 92% | 90% | 98% |
| Hoover | 62 | 75% | 93% | 92% | 79% | 96% | 75% | 95% | 75% | 79% | 89% |
| Howard | 53 | 89% | 88% | 84% | 64% | 96% | 86% | 90% | 70% | 63% | 76% |
| Lafayette | 139 | 100% | 100% | 99% | 100% | 100% | 99% | 100% | 99% | 100% | 100% |
| Markham | 42 | 100% | 100% | 100% | 48% | 100% | 90% | 100% | 98% | 100% | 100% |
| Martin Luther King, Jr. | 56 | 85% | 98% | 96% | 60% | 94% | 86% | 94% | 91% | 91% | 90% |
| Melrose Community Bridges Program** | 37 | n/a** | 89% | n/a** | 80% | 85% | 44% | 94% | 91% | 76% | 89% |
| PLACE @ Prescott Elementary | 51 | 83% | 96% | 94% | 56% | 86% | 42% | 86% | 59% | 64% | 90% |
| Reach Academy | 53 | 73% | 85% | 82% | 45% | 85% | 65% | 80% | 60% | 61% | 75% |
| Sankofa Academy* | 62 | 60% | 78% | 80% | 47% | 61% | 50% | 61% | 47% | 41% | 67% |

| Lead Agency/Program | N= | Youth Survey Results: Program Quality | | | | Youth Survey Results: Youth Outcomes | | | | | |
|---|-----|---------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------|------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
| | | Safe Environment | Supportive Environment | Interaction | Engagement | Academic Behaviors | College & Career Exploration | Sense of Mastery | School Engagement (Academic Outcomes) | Social Emotional Skills | Physical Well-Being |
| <i>Eagle Village Community Center Youth and Family Services, Inc.</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Parker | 62 | 72% | 80% | 75% | 46% | 81% | 58% | 69% | 52% | 48% | 61% |
| <i>East Bay Agency for Children</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Achieve Academy | 59 | 89% | 95% | 89% | 76% | 85% | 61% | 88% | 89% | 85% | 85% |
| East Oakland Pride | 56 | 95% | 95% | 93% | 87% | 87% | 65% | 93% | 85% | 82% | 84% |
| Peralta | 76 | 99% | 95% | 96% | 88% | 74% | 37% | 87% | 86% | 79% | 72% |
| Sequoia | 52 | 88% | 92% | 84% | 69% | 73% | 51% | 86% | 75% | 69% | 94% |
| <i>Easy Bay Asian Youth Center</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bella Vista | 60 | 92% | 95% | 95% | 86% | 93% | 92% | 93% | 85% | 90% | 92% |
| Cleveland | 51 | 72% | 63% | 68% | 35% | 51% | 44% | 56% | 35% | 44% | 64% |
| Franklin | 81 | 96% | 95% | 96% | 81% | 95% | 89% | 89% | 80% | 90% | 86% |
| Garfield | 113 | 96% | 99% | 97% | 93% | 98% | 97% | 96% | 93% | 92% | 98% |
| La Escuelita | 55 | 89% | 90% | 85% | 85% | 91% | 71% | 81% | 75% | 69% | 81% |
| Lincoln | 101 | 98% | 88% | 94% | 72% | 80% | 76% | 71% | 68% | 78% | 86% |
| Manzanita Community School | 64 | 78% | 86% | 93% | 73% | 90% | 64% | 90% | 90% | 82% | 84% |
| <i>East Oakland Youth Development Center</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Futures Elementary | 48 | 93% | 100% | 96% | 65% | 100% | 73% | 98% | 91% | 93% | 93% |
| <i>Girls Incorporated of Alameda County</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Acorn Woodland | 58 | 88% | 88% | 85% | 65% | 85% | 53% | 96% | 74% | 72% | 89% |
| Horace Mann | 49 | 70% | 72% | 64% | 42% | 44% | 50% | 57% | 55% | 59% | 67% |

| Lead Agency/Program | N= | Youth Survey Results: Program Quality | | | | Youth Survey Results: Youth Outcomes | | | | | |
|---|-----|---------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------|------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
| | | Safe Environment | Supportive Environment | Interaction | Engagement | Academic Behaviors | College & Career Exploration | Sense of Mastery | School Engagement (Academic Outcomes) | Social Emotional Skills | Physical Well-Being |
| <i>Higher Ground Neighborhood Development Corp.</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Allendale | 41 | 73% | 83% | 79% | 50% | 89% | 77% | 78% | 56% | 59% | 89% |
| Brookfield | 62 | 96% | 85% | 81% | 57% | 89% | 73% | 85% | 88% | 68% | 83% |
| New Highland Academy | 98 | 85% | 92% | 91% | 71% | 89% | 67% | 87% | 83% | 87% | 89% |
| Rise Community School | 37 | 75% | 67% | 88% | 59% | 78% | 61% | 67% | 71% | 75% | 72% |
| Sobrante Park | 38 | 83% | 97% | 97% | 65% | 89% | 97% | 95% | 88% | 86% | 97% |
| <i>Lighthouse Community Charter School</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lighthouse Community Charter* | 44 | 68% | 80% | 85% | 72% | 80% | 66% | 84% | 73% | 73% | 74% |
| <i>Oakland Leaf Foundation</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASCEND* | 35 | 79% | 89% | 94% | 71% | 86% | 80% | 89% | 77% | 76% | 91% |
| Encompass Academy | 39 | 90% | 100% | 100% | 92% | 95% | 69% | 100% | 82% | 95% | 97% |
| International Community School | 48 | 85% | 87% | 79% | 70% | 93% | 68% | 74% | 69% | 72% | 77% |
| Learning Without Limits | 53 | 67% | 89% | 79% | 80% | 66% | 48% | 75% | 57% | 63% | 86% |
| Think College Now | 49 | 72% | 73% | 71% | 59% | 80% | 64% | 68% | 60% | 60% | 70% |
| <i>Safe Passages</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Community United | 52 | 92% | 96% | 92% | 59% | 92% | 73% | 92% | 82% | 88% | 94% |
| <i>SFBAC, Learning for Life</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Carl B. Munck | 43 | 76% | 88% | 74% | 38% | 62% | 29% | 60% | 43% | 36% | 60% |
| Fruitvale | 56 | 98% | 96% | 91% | 82% | 95% | 66% | 91% | 89% | 87% | 95% |
| Laurel | 59 | 89% | 88% | 79% | 64% | 61% | 31% | 78% | 63% | 60% | 81% |
| Manzanita Seed | 100 | 88% | 90% | 79% | 67% | 75% | 44% | 80% | 68% | 63% | 77% |

| Lead Agency/Program | N= | Youth Survey Results: Program Quality | | | | Youth Survey Results: Youth Outcomes | | | | | |
|---|-------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------|------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
| | | Safe Environment | Supportive Environment | Interaction | Engagement | Academic Behaviors | College & Career Exploration | Sense of Mastery | School Engagement (Academic Outcomes) | Social Emotional Skills | Physical Well-Being |
| <i>Spanish Speaking Citizens Foundation</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lazear Charter Academy* | 50 | 74% | 81% | 83% | 49% | 75% | 57% | 68% | 73% | 71% | 64% |
| <i>Ujimaa Foundation</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Burckhalter | 36 | 94% | 91% | 85% | 63% | 94% | 83% | 91% | 69% | 61% | 91% |
| <i>YMCA of the East Bay</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Piedmont | 65 | 83% | 89% | 87% | 58% | 80% | 69% | 88% | 80% | 69% | 83% |
| Elementary Overall | 2,972 | 87% | 91% | 89% | 70% | 85% | 69% | 86% | 77% | 76% | 85% |
| MIDDLE SCHOOL PROGRAMS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Alternatives in Action</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Life Academy* | 110 | 79% | 80% | 83% | 58% | 67% | 56% | 71% | 67% | 64% | 63% |
| <i>Bay Area Community Resources</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alliance Academy | 83 | 79% | 80% | 80% | 59% | 80% | 68% | 79% | 71% | 68% | 76% |
| Claremont | 73 | 73% | 82% | 81% | 67% | 59% | 66% | 72% | 66% | 62% | 72% |
| Elmhurst Community Prep | 60 | 81% | 85% | 78% | 64% | 70% | 68% | 82% | 75% | 72% | 83% |
| Madison | 44 | 86% | 84% | 91% | 63% | 89% | 91% | 84% | 72% | 75% | 80% |
| Melrose Community Bridges Program* | 34 | 100% | 94% | 100% | 43% | 78% | 72% | 76% | 65% | 70% | 87% |
| Sankofa* | 37 | 65% | 89% | 86% | 58% | 64% | 73% | 80% | 67% | 67% | 86% |
| Urban Promise Academy | 71 | 70% | 58% | 61% | 49% | 52% | 34% | 55% | 51% | 44% | 56% |
| <i>Citizen Schools</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Greenleaf* | 37 | 56% | 78% | 62% | 41% | 73% | 70% | 69% | 62% | 58% | 61% |

| Lead Agency/Program | N= | Youth Survey Results: Program Quality | | | | Youth Survey Results: Youth Outcomes | | | | | |
|---|-----|---------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------|------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
| | | Safe Environment | Supportive Environment | Interaction | Engagement | Academic Behaviors | College & Career Exploration | Sense of Mastery | School Engagement (Academic Outcomes) | Social Emotional Skills | Physical Well-Being |
| <i>Eagle Village Community Center Youth and Family Services, Inc.</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Montera | 77 | 95% | 83% | 86% | 74% | 48% | 64% | 77% | 66% | 64% | 47% |
| Westlake | 80 | 77% | 74% | 75% | 58% | 55% | 58% | 68% | 63% | 57% | 60% |
| <i>East Bay Asian Youth Center</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Roosevelt | 302 | 90% | 94% | 92% | 86% | 94% | 88% | 89% | 85% | 84% | 88% |
| <i>East Oakland Youth Development Center</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Roots International Academy | 51 | 63% | 76% | 73% | 48% | 73% | 60% | 75% | 54% | 62% | 67% |
| <i>Lighthouse Community Charter School</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lighthouse Community Charter* | 49 | 77% | 88% | 79% | 59% | 58% | 55% | 64% | 67% | 55% | 58% |
| <i>Oakland Leaf Foundation</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASCEND* | 36 | 75% | 89% | 97% | 83% | 77% | 86% | 97% | 75% | 77% | 83% |
| Bret Harte | 128 | 72% | 78% | 79% | 54% | 65% | 60% | 73% | 60% | 56% | 63% |
| <i>Safe Passages</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Coliseum College Prep Academy* | 149 | 77% | 78% | 71% | 42% | 71% | 60% | 72% | 65% | 60% | 65% |
| Edna Brewer | 136 | 78% | 75% | 76% | 54% | 67% | 54% | 69% | 56% | 56% | 60% |
| Frick | 99 | 71% | 88% | 83% | 64% | 78% | 70% | 81% | 66% | 67% | 81% |
| United For Success | 100 | 70% | 84% | 80% | 61% | 80% | 75% | 81% | 67% | 61% | 67% |
| <i>Spanish Speaking Citizens' Foundation</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lazezar Charter Academy* | 25 | 58% | 64% | 56% | 52% | 56% | 68% | 60% | 56% | 52% | 72% |
| <i>YMCA of the East Bay</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| West Oakland Middle School | 67 | 73% | 94% | 94% | 79% | 86% | 82% | 86% | 80% | 77% | 80% |

| Lead Agency/Program | N= | Youth Survey Results: Program Quality | | | | Youth Survey Results: Youth Outcomes | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------|------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
| | | Safe Environment | Supportive Environment | Interaction | Engagement | Academic Behaviors | College & Career Exploration | Sense of Mastery | School Engagement (Academic Outcomes) | Social Emotional Skills | Physical Well-Being |
| <i>Middle School Overall</i> | 1,848 | 78% | 82% | 81% | 63% | 73% | 68% | 77% | 68% | 66% | 71% |
| HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAMS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Alternatives in Action</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fremont Federation High School | 64 | 87% | 94% | 90% | 81% | 79% | 92% | 84% | 69% | 81% | 73% |
| Life Academy* | 75 | 93% | 89% | 82% | 77% | 72% | 73% | 81% | 65% | 72% | 74% |
| McClymonds | 74 | 79% | 85% | 86% | 74% | 75% | 86% | 89% | 75% | 73% | 82% |
| <i>Bay Area Community Resources</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bunche | 22 | 95% | 100% | 100% | 95% | 95% | 100% | 100% | 86% | 86% | 95% |
| Oakland Technical | 76 | 95% | 92% | 89% | 83% | 74% | 89% | 89% | 75% | 85% | 59% |
| Rudsdale Continuation | 97 | 93% | 98% | 87% | 87% | 92% | 95% | 95% | 86% | 87% | 84% |
| Street Academy | 63 | 81% | 87% | 76% | 71% | 82% | 82% | 77% | 67% | 72% | 67% |
| <i>East Bay Asian Youth Center</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dewey | 98 | 95% | 89% | 88% | 75% | 90% | 91% | 90% | 81% | 84% | 81% |
| Met West | 88 | 97% | 95% | 94% | 78% | 65% | 95% | 88% | 89% | 90% | 85% |
| Oakland High | 76 | 97% | 96% | 95% | 87% | 82% | 93% | 92% | 78% | 88% | 76% |
| Oakland International High | 89 | 93% | 89% | 95% | 77% | 93% | 93% | 87% | 90% | 82% | 82% |
| <i>Safe Passages</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Coliseum College Prep Academy* | 121 | 86% | 78% | 76% | 53% | 74% | 78% | 79% | 60% | 66% | 58% |
| <i>Youth Together</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Skyline | 64 | 98% | 94% | 95% | 84% | 90% | 92% | 95% | 92% | 89% | 82% |

| Lead Agency/Program | N= | Youth Survey Results: Program Quality | | | | Youth Survey Results: Youth Outcomes | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------|------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
| | | Safe Environment | Supportive Environment | Interaction | Engagement | Academic Behaviors | College & Career Exploration | Sense of Mastery | School Engagement (Academic Outcomes) | Social Emotional Skills | Physical Well-Being |
| <i>Youth Uprising</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Castlemont High | 68 | 94% | 97% | 85% | 83% | 82% | 86% | 91% | 77% | 86% | 74% |
| High School Overall | 1,075 | 91% | 91% | 88% | 77% | 81% | 88% | 88% | 77% | 81% | 75% |

Source: Youth participant surveys administered in spring 2016.

*This program submitted surveys for more than one age group.

**Due to an error during survey distribution, data was not collected for this domain.

DATA COMPANION E. AFTER SCHOOL PARTICIPANTS' DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

TABLE 13: COUNT OF PARTICIPANTS' GENDER & RACE/ETHNICITY BY PROGRAM TYPE

| | Male | Female | Total |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Elementary Schools Overall | 3,099 | 3,120 | 6,219 |
| Latino/a | 1,183 | 1,283 | 2,466 |
| African American | 1,167 | 1,205 | 2,372 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 445 | 378 | 823 |
| White | 199 | 179 | 378 |
| Unknown/Not Reported | 75 | 54 | 129 |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | 21 | 16 | 37 |
| Other/Multiple or Bi-Racial | 9 | 5 | 14 |
| Middle Schools Overall | 2,731 | 2,539 | 5,270 |
| Latino/a | 1,329 | 1,236 | 2,565 |
| African American | 795 | 749 | 1,544 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 341 | 305 | 646 |
| White | 170 | 169 | 339 |
| Unknown/Not Reported | 77 | 65 | 142 |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | 11 | 8 | 19 |
| Other/Multiple or Bi-Racial | 8 | 7 | 15 |
| High Schools Overall | 3,593 | 3,209 | 6,802 |
| Latino/a | 1,392 | 1,209 | 2,601 |
| African American | 1,298 | 1,152 | 2,450 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 517 | 468 | 985 |
| White | 255 | 248 | 503 |
| Unknown/Not Reported | 112 | 110 | 222 |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | 12 | 10 | 22 |
| Other/Multiple or Bi-Racial | 7 | 12 | 19 |

Sources: Cityspan Attendance System for attendance records from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

DATA COMPANION F. YOUTH SURVEY DATA

Youth surveys are used to assess the extent to which participating young people experience positive benefits. For discussion regarding these results, refer to the 2015-16 Oakland School-Based After School Programs Evaluation Findings Report.

We present the results of youth surveys in the three ways described below. Survey questions are presented by outcome sections aligned with the Findings Report.

- **Differences in Youth Survey Responses** – We describe the percent of youth in elementary, middle and high school programs that had positive responses to each of survey and results are annotated with differences by gender, days attended, and ethnicity.
- **By Gender and Grade Level** – We describe the percent of youth in elementary, middle and high school programs by gender that had positive responses to each of survey item.
- **By Gender and Race/Ethnicity** – We describe the percent of youth in elementary, middle and high school programs by race/ethnicity that had positive responses to each of survey item.

In previous years' reports, we have included analysis by Days Attended (the percent of youth in elementary, middle and high school programs by the number of days youth attended their afterschool program). That analysis is not included in the 2015-16 Findings Report because our thorough investigations showed that youth program attendance in each grade group is too homogeneous to allow for useful comparisons.

Gender and race/ethnicity information for youth survey respondents was matched to youth survey responses, when available,³⁷ from youths' Cityspan participation records. To protect the confidentiality of youth survey respondents, results for any sub-groups with a sample size less than or equal to five are excluded from detailed tables, but included in aggregate analysis within the Findings Report.

YOUTH SURVEY RESPONDENTS' DEMOGRAPHICS

TABLE 14: SCHOOL-BASED SURVEY RESPONDENTS' RACE/ETHNICITY

| Race/Ethnicity Category | ELEMENTARY | | MIDDLE | | HIGH | |
|--------------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Latino/a | 942 | 40% | 593 | 42% | 354 | 49% |
| African American | 825 | 35% | 435 | 31% | 235 | 33% |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 388 | 16% | 270 | 19% | 88 | 12% |
| White | 130 | 6% | 64 | 5% | 16 | 2% |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | 15 | 1% | 4 | 0% | 7 | 1% |
| Other/Multiple or Bi-Racial | 19 | 0% | 4 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Unknown/Not Reported | 50 | 2% | 35 | 3% | 17 | 2% |
| Total | 2,369 | 100% | 1,405 | 100% | 717 | 100% |

Sources: Cityspan Attendance System for attendance records from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016. Youth participant surveys administered in spring 2016.

³⁷ Demographic information for community-based charter programs is based on youths' self-reports. Of the total 4,491 surveys, 156 are from youth participants at community-based charter programs.

TABLE 15: SCHOOL-BASED SURVEY RESPONDENTS' RACE/ETHNICITY

| | MALE | | FEMALE | | OVERALL | |
|--------------------------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS | | | | | | |
| Latino/a | 425 | 45% | 517 | 55% | 942 | 40% |
| African American | 370 | 45% | 455 | 55% | 825 | 35% |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 203 | 52% | 185 | 48% | 388 | 16% |
| White | 55 | 42% | 75 | 58% | 130 | 6% |
| Unknown/Not Reported | 23 | 46% | 27 | 54% | 50 | 2% |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | 9 | 60% | 6 | 40% | 15 | 1% |
| Other/Multiple or Bi-Racial | 0 | 0% | 19 | 100% | 19 | 0% |
| Total | 1,085 | 46% | 1,284 | 54% | 2,369 | 100% |
| MIDDLE SCHOOLS | | | | | | |
| Latino/a | 282 | 48% | 311 | 52% | 593 | 42% |
| African American | 185 | 43% | 250 | 57% | 435 | 31% |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 146 | 54% | 124 | 46% | 270 | 19% |
| White | 26 | 41% | 38 | 59% | 64 | 5% |
| Unknown/Not Reported | 21 | 60% | 14 | 40% | 35 | 3% |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | 2 | 50% | 2 | 50% | 4 | 0% |
| Other/Multiple or Bi-Racial | 0 | 0% | 4 | 100% | 4 | 0% |
| Total | 662 | 47% | 743 | 53% | 1,405 | 100% |
| HIGH SCHOOLS | | | | | | |
| Latino/a | 177 | 50% | 177 | 50% | 354 | 49% |
| African American | 112 | 48% | 123 | 52% | 235 | 33% |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 60 | 68% | 28 | 32% | 88 | 12% |
| White | 10 | 63% | 6 | 38% | 16 | 2% |
| Unknown/Not Reported | 11 | 65% | 6 | 35% | 17 | 2% |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | 4 | 57% | 3 | 43% | 7 | 1% |
| Other/Multiple or Bi-Racial | - | 0% | - | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Total | 374 | 52% | 343 | 48% | 717 | 100% |

Sources: Cityspan Attendance System for attendance records from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016. Youth participant surveys administered in spring 2016.

DIFFERENCES IN YOUTH SURVEY RESPONSES BY PARTICIPANTS' GRADE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY

The following section contains differences in responses by three youth characteristics.³⁸ Notable results are discussed in the “Differences in Youth Outcomes” section. The tables in this section are presented at the grade level; detailed results by gender or ethnicity follow this section.

A chi-square test for association was conducted in the manner described below:

- Gender and positive responses to youth survey items.
- Ethnicity categories and positive responses to youth survey items. ³⁹⁻⁴⁰

Survey items are presented by outcome theme, and annotated to indicate items for which statistically significant differences (at $p < .05$) and mean differences over 5% were found. To see results for individual sub-groups, continue on to the next pages, where detailed results are presented by gender and race/ethnicity.

³⁸ Survey results are presented for youth responses where matched demographic data was available. Survey respondents from Community Charter schools self-reported demographic information used in the results presented in this section.

³⁹ Unknown/Not Reported, American Indian/Alaskan Native and Other/Multiple or Bi-Racial were excluded due to representing 3% of the total sample.

TABLE 16: POSITIVE YOUTH RESPONSES REGARDING PROGRAM QUALITY, BY GRADE GROUP
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL:

| <i>Significant (at p<.05)</i> | <i>Survey Question</i> | OVERALL | GENDER: | | ETHNICITY: | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---------|---------|------|------------|-------|-----|-------|
| | | | BOY | GIRL | HIS/LAT | AF AM | API | WHITE |
| | SAFE ENVIRONMENT | | | | | | | |
| ⊕ | In this program, other kids hit or push me when they are not just playing around. | 10% | 9% | 10% | 10% | 13% | 4% | 9% |
| | When I am in this program, other kids spread mean rumors or lies about me. | 15% | 13% | 17% | 16% | 20% | 4% | 14% |
| | If someone bullies my friends or me at this program, an adult steps in to help. | 86% | 87% | 85% | 87% | 85% | 89% | 83% |
| | I feel safe in this program. | 89% | 89% | 88% | 90% | 86% | 91% | 91% |
| | SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT | | | | | | | |
| | There is an adult at this program who cares about me. | 93% | 93% | 93% | 92% | 94% | 93% | 91% |
| | In this program, there is an adult who wants me to do my best. | 95% | 96% | 95% | 95% | 96% | 96% | 92% |
| ⊙ | The adults here tell me what I am doing well. | 89% | 89% | 88% | 89% | 89% | 90% | 83% |
| | The adults in this program listen to what I have to say. | 86% | 87% | 85% | 88% | 83% | 85% | 85% |
| | INTERACTION | | | | | | | |
| | I feel like I belong at this program. | 84% | 84% | 83% | 85% | 81% | 85% | 83% |
| | In this program, I get to help other people. | 87% | 86% | 87% | 87% | 86% | 90% | 85% |
| ⊕ ⊙ | This program helps me to make friends. | 84% | 85% | 82% | 86% | 80% | 86% | 78% |
| | ENGAGEMENT | | | | | | | |
| | I am interested in what we do in this program. | 86% | 86% | 86% | 88% | 84% | 85% | 87% |
| | In this program, I get to choose what I do and how I do it. | 58% | 57% | 59% | 60% | 51% | 70% | 60% |
| ⊕ | In this program, I try new things. | 93% | 91% | 94% | 94% | 92% | 91% | 94% |
| ⊙ | In this program, I do things that are too easy for me. | 52% | 53% | 51% | 56% | 53% | 45% | 43% |

⊕ Gender difference is statistically significant (p<.05) ⊙ Ethnicity difference is statistically significant (p<.05)

Sources: Cityspan Attendance System for attendance records from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2016. Youth participant surveys administered in spring 2016, n=2,369. Shaded cells in each column represent statistically significant differences that are greater than +/-5 percentage points change from the reference group.

MIDDLE SCHOOL:

| Significant (at p<.05) | Survey Question | OVERALL | GENDER: | | | ETHNICITY: | | |
|-------------------------------|---|---------|---------|------|---------|------------|------|-------|
| | | | BOY | GIRL | HIS/LAT | BOY | GIRL | WHITE |
| SAFE ENVIRONMENT | | | | | | | | |
| ✳ | In this program, other kids hit or push me when they are not just playing around. | 23% | 27% | 20% | 21% | 28% | 18% | 16% |
| | When I am in this program, other kids spread mean rumors or lies about me. | 21% | 19% | 23% | 20% | 27% | 14% | 17% |
| | If someone bullies my friends or me at this program, an adult steps in to help. | 81% | 83% | 79% | 81% | 76% | 88% | 84% |
| | I feel safe in this program. | 86% | 87% | 85% | 87% | 81% | 90% | 86% |
| SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT | | | | | | | | |
| ⊙ | There is an adult at this program who cares about me. | 84% | 84% | 83% | 79% | 85% | 90% | 84% |
| | In this program, there is an adult who wants me to do my best. | 91% | 92% | 91% | 91% | 90% | 95% | 94% |
| | The adults here tell me what I am doing well. | 82% | 84% | 80% | 82% | 77% | 86% | 80% |
| ✳ | The adults in this program listen to what I have to say. | 80% | 84% | 77% | 82% | 73% | 88% | 83% |
| INTERACTION | | | | | | | | |
| ✳ | I feel like I belong at this program. | 78% | 81% | 76% | 77% | 74% | 85% | 84% |
| ✳ ⊙ | In this program, I get to help other people. | 77% | 80% | 74% | 74% | 75% | 85% | 84% |
| | This program helps me to make friends. | 75% | 77% | 74% | 77% | 73% | 76% | 70% |
| ENGAGEMENT | | | | | | | | |
| ✳ | I am interested in what we do in this program. | 76% | 80% | 71% | 75% | 74% | 80% | 83% |
| ✳ | In this program, I get to choose what I do and how I do it. | 61% | 66% | 57% | 60% | 56% | 71% | 71% |
| ✳ | In this program, I try new things. | 83% | 85% | 81% | 83% | 78% | 90% | 83% |
| | In this program, I do things that are too easy for me. | 50% | 50% | 49% | 52% | 49% | 45% | 42% |

✳ Gender difference is statistically significant (p<.05)

⊙ Ethnicity difference is statistically significant (p<.05)

Sources: Cityspan Attendance System for attendance records from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2016. Youth participant surveys administered in spring 2016, n=1,405. Shaded cells in each column represent statistically significant differences that are greater than +/-5 percentage points change from the reference group.

HIGH SCHOOL:

| <i>Significant (at p<.05)</i> | <i>Survey Question</i> | OVERALL | GENDER: | | | ETHNICITY: | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---------|---------|------|---------|------------|------|-------|
| | | | BOY | GIRL | HIS/LAT | BOY | GIRL | WHITE |
| SAFE ENVIRONMENT | | | | | | | | |
| ⊙ | In this program, other kids hit or push me when they are not just playing around. | 5% | 5% | 6% | 3% | 7% | 9% | 6% |
| | When I am in this program, other kids spread mean rumors or lies about me. | 9% | 8% | 10% | 7% | 13% | 6% | 13% |
| | If someone bullies my friends or me at this program, an adult steps in to help. | 91% | 90% | 91% | 91% | 91% | 94% | 94% |
| | I feel safe in this program. | 92% | 91% | 94% | 93% | 91% | 97% | 100% |
| SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT | | | | | | | | |
| ⊙ | There is an adult at this program who cares about me. | 90% | 86% | 93% | 87% | 92% | 95% | 81% |
| | In this program, there is an adult who wants me to do my best. | 95% | 94% | 95% | 94% | 95% | 98% | 94% |
| ⊙ | The adults here tell me what I am doing well. | 90% | 88% | 92% | 88% | 94% | 90% | 81% |
| | The adults in this program listen to what I have to say. | 91% | 91% | 92% | 92% | 91% | 93% | 88% |
| INTERACTION | | | | | | | | |
| ⊙ | I feel like I belong at this program. | 85% | 84% | 87% | 82% | 87% | 93% | 94% |
| | In this program, I get to help other people. | 86% | 84% | 88% | 84% | 87% | 88% | 100% |
| ⊙ | This program helps me to make friends. | 83% | 84% | 82% | 79% | 85% | 92% | 88% |
| ENGAGEMENT | | | | | | | | |
| ⊙ | I am interested in what we do in this program. | 87% | 86% | 87% | 84% | 89% | 93% | 88% |
| ⊙ | In this program, I get to choose what I do and how I do it. | 80% | 80% | 80% | 77% | 81% | 91% | 88% |
| | In this program, I try new things. | 87% | 86% | 88% | 85% | 89% | 88% | 81% |
| | In this program, I do things that are too easy for me. | 54% | 53% | 56% | 54% | 54% | 55% | 67% |

⊙ Gender difference is statistically significant (p<.05) ⊙ Ethnicity difference is statistically significant (p<.05)

Sources: Cityspan Attendance System for attendance records from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2016. Youth participant surveys administered in spring 2016, n=717. Shaded cells in each column represent statistically significant differences that are greater than +/-5 percentage points change from the reference group.

TABLE 17: POSITIVE YOUTH RESPONSES REGARDING OUTCOME DOMAINS, BY GRADE GROUP

ELEMENTARY:

| Survey Question | OVERALL | GENDER | | ETHNICITY | | | |
|---|---------|--------|------|-----------|-------|-----|-------|
| | | BOY | GIRL | HIS/LAT | AF AM | API | WHITE |
| SCHOOL ENGAGEMENT (ACADEMIC OUTCOMES) | | | | | | | |
| ⊙ Since coming to this program, I talk with my family about school more often. | 70% | 69% | 70% | 74% | 68% | 64% | 61% |
| ⊙ This program helps me to feel like a part of my school. | 83% | 83% | 83% | 87% | 79% | 81% | 81% |
| ⊙ Since coming to this program, I feel close to people at this school. | 78% | 79% | 78% | 82% | 74% | 77% | 83% |
| ⊙ Since coming to this program, I am happy to be at this school. | 84% | 85% | 84% | 87% | 80% | 87% | 79% |
| ACADEMIC BEHAVIORS | | | | | | | |
| ⊙ In this program, I learn how to use my time to finish all my school work. | 90% | 91% | 89% | 92% | 87% | 93% | 78% |
| ⊙ This program helps me do my homework. | 92% | 91% | 92% | 93% | 91% | 94% | 83% |
| ⊙⊙ This program helps me learn ways to study (like reading directions). | 81% | 83% | 80% | 84% | 81% | 79% | 70% |
| ⊙⊙ Since coming to this program, I know how to set goals for myself. | 84% | 86% | 82% | 86% | 83% | 79% | 79% |
| SENSE OF MASTERY | | | | | | | |
| Since coming to this program, I am more of a leader. | 74% | 74% | 74% | 74% | 79% | 66% | 64% |
| ⊙ This program helps me feel good about what I can do. | 88% | 89% | 87% | 90% | 86% | 88% | 84% |
| Since coming to this program, I am better at something that I used to think was hard. | 83% | 84% | 82% | 84% | 83% | 83% | 78% |
| COLLEGE AND CAREER EXPLORATION | | | | | | | |
| ⊙ In this program, I learn of jobs I can have when I grow up. | 68% | 71% | 66% | 66% | 71% | 70% | 60% |
| ⊙ In this program, I learn more about college. | 55% | 57% | 53% | 50% | 56% | 67% | 39% |
| ⊙⊙ This program helps me feel ready to go to middle school. | 74% | 77% | 72% | 77% | 75% | 69% | 63% |
| PHYSICAL WELL-BEING | | | | | | | |
| ⊙ Since coming to this program, I exercise more. | 80% | 82% | 78% | 81% | 80% | 81% | 65% |
| This program helps me to learn how to be healthy. | 77% | 77% | 76% | 79% | 76% | 77% | 65% |

| Significant (at $p < .05$) | Survey Question | OVERALL | GENDER | | | ETHNICITY | | |
|--|--|---------|--------|------|---|-----------|-----|-------|
| | | | BOY | GIRL | HIS/LAT | AF AM | API | WHITE |
| | This program helps me say "no" to things I know are wrong. | 86% | 86% | 86% | 86% | 86% | 87% | 84% |
| SOCIAL EMOTIONAL SKILLS | | | | | | | | |
| ⊙ | When I'm in this program, I feel good about myself. | 88% | 89% | 87% | 90% | 86% | 87% | 85% |
| ⊙ | This program helps me to listen to others. | 86% | 87% | 85% | 90% | 83% | 86% | 80% |
| | This program helps me talk about my feelings. | 70% | 70% | 70% | 72% | 68% | 73% | 61% |
| | This program helps me get along with other people my age. | 86% | 87% | 85% | 87% | 85% | 88% | 83% |
| ⊙ | This program helps me get along with adults. | 81% | 83% | 80% | 84% | 78% | 82% | 74% |
| ★ Gender difference is statistically significant ($p < .05$) | | | | | ⊙ Ethnicity difference is statistically significant ($p < .05$) | | | |

Sources: Cityspan Attendance System for attendance records from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2016. Youth participant surveys administered in spring 2016, n=2,369
Shaded cells in each column represent statistically significant differences that are greater than +/-5 percentage points change from the reference group.

MIDDLE SCHOOL:

| Significant (at $p < .05$) | Survey Question | OVERALL | GENDER | | ETHNICITY | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|---------|--------|------|-----------|-------|-----|-------|
| | | | BOY | GIRL | HIS/LAT | AF AM | API | WHITE |
| | SCHOOL ENGAGEMENT (ACADEMIC OUTCOMES) | | | | | | | |
| ⊗ | Since coming to this program, I talk with my family about school more often. | 63% | 67% | 59% | 65% | 60% | 60% | 69% |
| ⊗ | This program helps me to feel like a part of my school. | 78% | 82% | 75% | 80% | 72% | 83% | 78% |
| | Since coming to this program, I feel close to people at this school. | 75% | 76% | 74% | 76% | 72% | 77% | 67% |
| ⊗ ⊙ | Since coming to this program, I am happy to be at this school. | 77% | 83% | 71% | 80% | 67% | 87% | 76% |
| | ACADEMIC BEHAVIORS | | | | | | | |
| ⊗ | In this program, I learn how to use my time to finish all my school work. | 85% | 89% | 80% | 85% | 82% | 92% | 73% |
| ⊗ | This program helps me do my homework. | 80% | 83% | 76% | 81% | 75% | 88% | 63% |
| ⊗ | This program helps me learn ways to study (like reading directions). | 72% | 77% | 67% | 72% | 69% | 79% | 62% |
| ⊗ | Since coming to this program, I know how to set goals for myself. | 77% | 81% | 73% | 78% | 74% | 79% | 73% |
| | SENSE OF MASTERY | | | | | | | |
| ⊙ | Since coming to this program, I am more of a leader. | 66% | 68% | 64% | 62% | 71% | 66% | 61% |
| ⊗ | This program helps me feel good about what I can do. | 80% | 84% | 76% | 81% | 76% | 84% | 75% |
| ⊗ | Since coming to this program, I am better at something that I used to think was hard. | 77% | 80% | 74% | 78% | 73% | 80% | 72% |
| | COLLEGE AND CAREER EXPLORATION | | | | | | | |
| ⊗ | In this program, I learn of jobs I can have when I grow up. | 57% | 63% | 52% | 57% | 54% | 62% | 50% |
| ⊗ | In this program, I learn more about college. | 69% | 75% | 65% | 69% | 67% | 76% | 56% |
| ⊗ | This program helps me feel more prepared for high school. | 72% | 77% | 67% | 72% | 67% | 76% | 68% |
| | PHYSICAL WELL-BEING | | | | | | | |
| ⊗ ⊙ | Since coming to this program, I exercise more. | 71% | 78% | 64% | 73% | 64% | 78% | 48% |
| ⊗ | This program helps me to learn how to be healthy. | 64% | 70% | 59% | 65% | 60% | 67% | 58% |

Significant
(at $p < .05$)

| Survey Question | OVERALL | GENDER | | ETHNICITY | | | |
|--|---------|--------|------|-----------|-------|-----|-------|
| | | BOY | GIRL | HIS/LAT | AF AM | API | WHITE |
| This program helps me say "no" to things I know are wrong. | 74% | 75% | 73% | 76% | 71% | 78% | 63% |
| SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL SKILLS | | | | | | | |
| ⊕ When I'm in this program, I feel good about myself. | 79% | 83% | 75% | 77% | 76% | 86% | 78% |
| ⊕ This program helps me to listen to others. | 78% | 81% | 75% | 80% | 72% | 83% | 66% |
| ⊕ This program helps me talk about my feelings. | 69% | 72% | 66% | 68% | 65% | 77% | 63% |
| This program helps me get along with other people my age. | 81% | 83% | 79% | 82% | 76% | 87% | 70% |
| ⊕ This program helps me get along with adults. | 73% | 78% | 69% | 75% | 65% | 80% | 72% |

⊕ Gender difference is statistically significant ($p < .05$)

⊙ Ethnicity difference is statistically significant ($p < .05$)

Sources: Cityspan Attendance System for attendance records from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2016. Youth participant surveys administered in spring 2016, $n=1,405$. Shaded cells in each column represent statistically significant differences that are greater than +/-5 percentage points change from the reference group.

HIGH SCHOOL:

| Significant (at p<.05) | Survey Question | OVERALL | GENDER | | ETHNICITY | | | |
|---------------------------|---|---------|--------|------|-----------|-------|-----|-------|
| | | | BOY | GIRL | HIS/LAT | AF AM | API | WHITE |
| | SCHOOL ENGAGEMENT (ACADEMIC OUTCOMES) | | | | | | | |
| | Since coming to this program, I talk with my family about school more often. | 72% | 71% | 73% | 69% | 76% | 75% | 94% |
| | This program helps me to feel like a part of my school. | 88% | 87% | 89% | 86% | 88% | 93% | 88% |
| | Since coming to this program, I feel close to people at this school. | 79% | 80% | 78% | 79% | 76% | 87% | 94% |
| | Since coming to this program, I am happy to be at this school. | 82% | 83% | 81% | 81% | 79% | 91% | 94% |
| | ACADEMIC BEHAVIORS | | | | | | | |
| | In this program, I learn how to use my time to finish all my schoolwork. | 85% | 84% | 87% | 85% | 86% | 89% | 88% |
| | This program helps me do my homework. | 78% | 78% | 79% | 78% | 79% | 80% | 81% |
| | This program helps me learn ways to study (like reading directions). | 83% | 83% | 83% | 81% | 85% | 86% | 88% |
| ⊙ | Since coming to this program, I know how to set goals for myself. | 86% | 87% | 85% | 82% | 88% | 92% | 100% |
| | SENSE OF MASTERY | | | | | | | |
| ★⊙ | Since coming to this program, I am more of a leader. | 76% | 73% | 80% | 72% | 83% | 72% | 87% |
| | This program helps me feel good about what I can do. | 89% | 88% | 90% | 89% | 90% | 91% | 93% |
| | Since coming to this program, I am better at something that I used to think was hard. | 83% | 81% | 85% | 80% | 85% | 84% | 100% |
| | COLLEGE AND CAREER EXPLORATION | | | | | | | |
| | In this program, I learn of jobs I can have when I grow up. | 78% | 77% | 78% | 77% | 79% | 80% | 81% |
| | In this program, I learn more about college. | 83% | 81% | 85% | 80% | 86% | 88% | 88% |
| ★⊙ | This program helps me feel believe I can finish high school. | 92% | 90% | 94% | 91% | 93% | 97% | 93% |
| | PHYSICAL WELL-BEING | | | | | | | |
| ★⊙ | Since coming to this program, I exercise more. | 62% | 66% | 57% | 58% | 66% | 64% | 73% |
| ⊙ | This program helps me to learn how to be healthy. | 76% | 78% | 73% | 72% | 78% | 83% | 80% |
| | This program helps me say "no" to things I know are wrong. | 83% | 83% | 83% | 81% | 84% | 93% | 88% |
| | SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL SKILLS | | | | | | | |
| ⊙ | When I'm in this program, I feel good about myself. | 90% | 89% | 92% | 87% | 94% | 93% | 100% |
| | This program helps me to listen to others. | 88% | 88% | 89% | 89% | 86% | 93% | 94% |
| ⊙ | This program helps me talk about my feelings. | 81% | 81% | 82% | 78% | 83% | 92% | 88% |
| | This program helps me get along with other people my age. | 84% | 84% | 85% | 84% | 84% | 91% | 87% |
| ⊙ | This program helps me get along with adults. | 83% | 81% | 84% | 78% | 86% | 91% | 100% |

★ Gender difference is statistically significant (p<.05)

⊙ Ethnicity difference is statistically significant (p<.05)

Sources: Cityspan Attendance System for attendance records from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2016. Youth participant surveys administered in spring 2016, n=717. Shaded cells in each column represent statistically significant differences that are greater than +/-5 percentage points change from the reference group.