List of Acronyms

21st CCLC	21st Century Community Learning Centers
AIR	American Institutes for Research
APT-O, APT-Q	Assessing Afterschool Program Practices Tool
ASB PQA	Academic Skill-Building Program Quality Assessment
CBO	community-based organization
CTE	career and technical education
ED	U.S. Department of Education
EL	English learners
EOC	end of course
ESEA	Elementary and Secondary Education Act
ESL	English as a second language
ESSA	Every Student Succeeds Act
FAFSA	Free Application for Federal Student Aid
GED	General Equivalency Diploma
HLM	hierarchical linear modeling
KPI	key performance indicator
LEAG	Local Evaluation Advisory Group
LESI	Local Evaluation Support Initiative
NCES	National Center for Education Statistics
NIOST	National Institute on Out-of-School Time

TAPR	Texas Academic Performance Report
TEA	Texas Education Agency
TEKS	Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills
Texas ACE	Texas Afterschool Centers on Education
Tx21st	Texas 21st Student Tracking System
YPQA	Youth Program Quality Assessment

21st

Table ES.2: Texas Afterschool Centers on Education (Texas ACE) Grantees by Programming Period

	Grantees				Centers			
Program Year	Cycle 7	Cycle 8	Cycle 9	Total	Cycle 7	Cycle 8	Cycle 9	Total
2014–15	42	34	n/a	76	266	213	n/a	479
2015–16	42	34	n/a	76	264	213	n/a	477
2016–17	n/a[a]	34	32	66	n/a[a]	209	251	460
Unduplicated count 2014–15 through 2016–17	42	34	32	108	267	216	251	734

Source. American Institutes for Research analysis of Tx21st Student Tracking System data.
Note. n/a = not applicable because the cycle in question was not in operation during the specified academic year.
Also, operational and attendance data only exists for 728 centers during this period as 6 centers from Cycle 7 and 8 grantees were found to not hav1(s)-33peraticl an(s)-3(i-7(a)-7(nc)-3(e(gr)-an3.3(i)-onl)-1.1(y Tw( )TjETEMC/P <</MCID 51>>BDCLblBT-

x

- Center staff who were interviewed generally felt that their activities aligned with local goals while also trying to support the statewide Texas ACE objectives related to quality programming and improving student outcomes.
- Logic models were underused to support monitoring of alignment to Texas ACE program goals and objectives, based on interview feedback with the centers visited. These models were infrequently used to orient new staff to program goals and objectives.
- Staff development occurred in a variety of ways according to the site visit data. Most Texas ACE programs offered staff orientation, either in traditional form or ways such as on-the-job training. Some Texas ACE programs had staff who were school-day teachers and participated in professional development (PD) through their school or district rather than Texas ACE. Other PD focused on student academic and behavior needs, as well as classroom management and program quality.
- Partners were important for Texas ACE implementation, and local nonprofit organizations were the most common partner provider, with many other types of organizations also supporting programs by providing enrichment activities, donations (e.g., monetary), and other opportunities, such as career days for participating students.
- Texas ACE program staff tended to view the program as an extension of the school day and sought to align the program with the school day. School-day and Texas ACE relationships were critical for creating strong school linkages, as seen through district and school support and site coordinator presence on campus.
- The role of Texas ACE advisory boards varied across centers, with approximately half of the centers reporting that both the advisory board and Texas ACE staff shared decision-making responsibilities. Advisory boards also generally supported programs in other ways, including contributing to planning, monitoring, and oversight.
- Family engagement was an important component of Texas ACE based on interviews and focus groups with program staff. Texas ACE programs connected with families through parent surveys, attendance at school events, communications sent home to parents, activities designed to build relationships with parents, attendance at citywide events, and home visits. Through the interviews, two broad categories of family activities emerged related to the types of activities that Texas ACE uses to engage with families: (a) activities to help family members support student development and (b) activities to advance parent life and job skills. English as a second language (ESL) classes paired with college and career readiness classes were most frequently cited as a high need for family

- Formal quality assessment measures, however, were not widely used; informal observations were more common to support monitoring. Student-level data were commonly mentioned to support performance assessment efforts. Student data from teachers—both formal grades and informal feedback—were the most important source of data for programs in relation to understanding student needs, whereas other data such as Texas ACE participation data or standardized test scores were secondary.

On Formal Quality Assessments

"We actually developed a rubric, a quality rubric, and we're still revamping it because we went through all these descriptors and so we make observations, we give feedback, we redirect when need be, and we adjust course."

—Project Director

Chapter 4: Program Quality and Youth Experiences in Programming

- Analysis of program quality data collected at 20 centers in spring 2017 found moderate levels of quality. This finding suggests that opportunities for growth exist across elementary, middle, and high school centers to achieve high and consistent quality program delivery.
- Overall, many centers are still developing practices and supports that facilitate meaningful interactions among participating youth and promote high levels of engagement.
- Higher scores on the program quality assessment (PQA) in the supportive environment domain give reason to believe that many centers are moderately successful in adopting practices that help create a supportive learning environment for participating youth (see Figure ES.2).
- The results also demonstrated that program quality may have an influence on youth experiences in programming. Youth participating in centers with higher PQA scores were more likely to report experiencing positive affect and a greater sense of relevance in terms of Texas ACE programming they participated in on a given day compared with centers with lower PQA scores.

Figure ES.2: Average School-Age Program Quality Assessment and Youth Program Quality Assessment Scores by Program Quality Assessment Domain

Source. PQA scores obtained during spring 2017 site visits conducted at 20 centers.
Note. PQA: program quality assessment; SAPQA: School-Age Program Quality Assessment;

(Devaney et al., 2016; Naftzger et al., 2013). For the present evaluation, a positive effect on mathematics scores was found only when youth in Grades 4–8 participated in 120 days or more of programming during the 2015–16 and 2016–17 school years.

- Youth

This page int entionally left blank

AIR®

AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH®

Established in 1946, the American Institutes for Research (AIR) is an independent, nonpartisan, not-for-profit organization that conducts behavioral and social science research on important social issues and delivers technical assistance, both domestically and internationally, in the areas of education, health, and workforce productivity.

MAKING RESEARCH RELEVANT

AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH

1000 Thomas Jefferson Street NW

Washington, DC 20007-3835 | 202.403.5000

www.air.org

LOCATIONS

Domestic: Washington, DC (HQ), Monterey, Sacramento, and San Mateo, CA; Atlanta, GA; Honolulu, HI; Chicago and Naperville, IL; Indianapolis, IN; Metairie, LA; Waltham, MA; Frederick and Rockville, MD; Chapel Hill, NC; New York, NY; Columbus, OH; Cayce, SC; Austin, TX; Arlington and Reston, VA; Seattle, WA

International: Algeria; Ethiopia; Germany; Haiti; Zambia

í î ï00_ ì ó/ î ì