



Ho'ona'auao
Strategic Result Multi-Program
Evaluation Report

March 2015



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Contents

Executive Summary 2

Introduction 6

Program budgets 8

Purpose of evaluation 8

Methodology 9

Output and outcome measure selection 9

Limitations of data available 9

Data analysis 10

Results 10

Quantitative results 10

Qualitative results 13

Financial impact comparison 14

Program, school, and state average comparison 14

Findings 16

Best Practices 17

Future considerations 19

Recommendations 19

References 21

Appendix 22

Ho’ona’auao aims for Native Hawaiians to gain knowledge and excel in educational opportunities at all levels, resulting in maximizing choices of life and work. To measure the progress in accomplishing this priority, two quantifiable results were outlined: by 2018, an increase of Native Hawaiian students who (1) exceed reading standards from 55% to 65%; and (2) exceed math standards from 32% to 45%.

The State of Hawai’i Department of Education (DOE) administers the Hawai’i State Assessment (HSA), a standards-based assessment that provides information about student achievement performance relative to the Hawai’i Content and Performance Standards (HCPS). The HSA testing for reading and mathematics are given to students in Grades 3 to 8, and 10. Results are categorized in one of the following: well-below proficiency, approaches proficiency, meets proficiency, or exceeds proficiency. In school year 2014, the Hawai’i Common Core Standards replaced the HCPS as the standards and the Smarter Balanced assessment was created to align with Hawai’i Common Core.

The following programs discussed have provided tutoring activities that aimed to improve HSA reading and math testing scores and serve as the basis for this evaluation:

- After-School All-Stars O’ahu
- After-School All-Stars Hawai’i Island
- Goodwill Industries of Hawai’i Ola Program

Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of this summative evaluation is to provide a comparison between the performance and services and activities of the programs identified to determine the following:

- What impact the services and activities of the aforementioned programs had with the individual school participants;
- How those results contributed to the overall progress towards achieving OHA’s strategic results;



- What practices were used or could be used in OHA-funded education programs; and
- Findings and recommendations that could assist internal OHA stakeholders in future planning, design, and implementation of OHA-funded education programs.

Findings

By comparing each program's results with those of the individual school services and the statewide average, After-School All-Stars O'ahu was in line with or exceeded the results of the school and the statewide average, while After-School All-Stars Hawai'i Island and Goodwill did not.

In considering factors that could have attributed to those results, issues identified that attributed to low and inconsistent attendance included the large geographical area with limited transportation means to attend sessions and a periodic staffing turnover that disrupted program continuity.

In reviewing the contract's performance measures, it was determined that they did not provide clarity of participant progress needed to determine actual progress as opposed to separating them into the categories of *well-below proficiency*, *approaches proficiency*, *meets proficiency*, or *exceeds proficiency* which is how the HSA results are organized. By confining the language of the performance measures to either *meet or exceed* or *performed below proficiency*, there is no way to determine at what level the student is at in progressing towards achieving greater academic performance.

Research has shown the following factors are associated with successful schools (Connecticut State Education Resource Center, 2015; Coryn et al., 2007):

- *Collaborative school governance.*
- *Decisions linked to data.*
- *Well-established, stable, dedicated teaching forces.*
- *Focused learning communities.*
- *Strong, engaged leaders.*
- *Clear and common focus.*
- *High standards and expectations.*
- *Supportive, personalized, and relevant learning.*
- *Parent/community involvement.*
- *Shared monitoring, accountability, and assessment.*
- *Curriculum and instruction.*
- *Professional development.*
- *Time and structure.*



In looking at the structure and activities delivered by each program, the elements of the programs have been in line with these factors in unique ways that were passed down either from the schools in terms of the academic performance requirements, passed down from OHA via the service contracts, or internally fostered by each organization.

Given the additional activities conducted, an opportunity to answer if those activities really did have an impact on the quantitative results were presented. Each programs' activities were intended to increase knowledge through multiple means that would result in greater student self-confidence and ultimately enhance the ability for greater academic performance and test scores.

In conducting background research about the HSA, it should be noted that special education students or those with learning disabilities are administered the same HSA as those who aren't in special education or have learning disabilities. This undoubtedly prevented the overall optimal success from being achieved. Because this is a policy issue instead of a being a programmatic one, anyone reviewing or analyzing performance data of programs within the purview of OHA or those within the DOE should consider this issue as an underlying contributing factor.

In school year 2015 the HSA will be replaced by the new Smarter Balance assessments, replacing reading and math. Because of this impending replacement, there is no indication as to how the new testing results will be categorized, whether the categorization will be similar or different than that of the current HSA test results. Therefore, upon determining how the Smarter Balance testing results will be categorized, OHA's Grants Division should be open to amending the performance measure reporting requirements to reflect the DOE's testing results. By changing the reporting requirements to be in line with the DOE's results, a clearer comparison between the school and statewide averages can be made and a definitive determination of actual progress can be identified.

Recommendations

Programmatic recommendations

- Until the exact impact of the use of extra-curricular activities can be measured in the group of participants, reduce the amount of extra-curricular activities to focus more on the math and reading tutoring and test preparation activities.
- Consider surveying participants to receive direct feedback from them as to if the extra-curricular activities helped and if so, how.
- Identify the number of students with characteristics that may have a direct impact on the students' performance (i.e. special education placement, learning disability, etc.) in the quarterly progress reporting.
- Continue discussions with participants' parents and the schools to identify more accommodating locations to hold sessions.



Administrative recommendations

- The Grants Division and Grant Monitor(s) overseeing education programs need to have a line of communication with the DOE to be apprised of the Smarter Balance testing structure and result categorization.
- Upon determining how the Smarter Balance testing results will be categorized, consider amending the performance measure reporting requirements to reflect the DOE's testing results. This will allow for easier comparison with school and statewide averages as well as determine the actual progress that the cohort of students are making.
- Continue monitoring the quantitative results submitted quarterly by the programs to look for trends that will assist in determining what program activities are or aren't working and work with the provider to adjust the time dedicated to specific activities to maximize overall program effectiveness.
- The grant contract's *Scope of Services* section needs to be written to clearly define what the services provided will be versus the current practice of referring to the submitted program proposal. The current way of writing the *Scope of Services* section of the contract allows ambiguity in what program activities are conducted and how their effectiveness is measured.



HO'ONA'AUAO
STRATEGIC RESULT MULTI-PROGRAM EVALUATION
INTRODUCTION

In the *2010-2018 Strategic Plan* by the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA), six strategic priorities are identified, one of them being ho'ona'auao (education). Ho'ona'auao aims for Native Hawaiians to gain knowledge and excel in educational opportunities at all levels, resulting in maximizing choices of life and work. To measure the progress in accomplishing this priority, three quantifiable results were outlined: by 2018, an increase of Native Hawaiian students who (1) exceed reading standards from 55% to 65%; (2) exceed math standards from 32% to 45%; and (3) who earn post-secondary degrees or certificates in the University of Hawai'i (UH) system by 12%.

The State of Hawai'i Department of Education (DOE) administers the Hawai'i State Assessment (HSA), a standards-based assessment that provides information about student achievement performance relative to the Hawai'i Content and Performance Standards (HCPS). The HSA testing for reading and mathematics are given to students in Grades 3 to 8, and 10. Results are categorized in one of the following: well-below proficiency, approaches proficiency, meets proficiency, or exceeds proficiency. In school year 2014, the Hawai'i Common Core Standards replaced the HCPS as the standards and the Smarter Balanced assessment was created to align with Hawai'i Common Core.

The programs discussed further have submitted performance measure results that coincide with the HSA performance of students in the schools served by the programs.

After-School All-Stars Hawai'i– O'ahu and Hawai'i Island. The mission of After-School All-Stars (ASAS) is to provide comprehensive programs in the after-school hours that keep children safe and on track to succeed in school and in life. Founded in 2009, ASAS Hawai'i was formed to provide alternatives for at-risk youth to engage in productive activities during the hours of 3 p.m. to 6 p.m.

During the contract period, ASAS had contracts with Nānākuli Intermediate School, Wai'anae Intermediate School, and King Intermediate School on O'ahu and Kea'au Middle School, Ka'u Intermediate School, and Pāhoa Intermediate School on Hawai'i Island.

The program activities were intended to improve academic performance, specifically improvement in the HSA math and reading scores. This program was implemented with the following objectives:



- Provide tutoring and homework support during after-school hours in the three Hawai'i County and O'ahu middle schools identified previously. The activities that work to increase academic gains in ASAS student participants include:
 - Structured “homework hour” each day of the week;
 - Standards-based testing readiness activities;
 - Culture-based activities with partners on Hawai'i Island and O'ahu;
 - Staff training to improve skills in tutoring and culture-based education with partners including Kamehameha Schools, Strategies for Success, Flocabulary, and !Mpact People; and
 - On-site interaction with teachers and families to support each student’s social, emotional, and academic development.
- Rigorously evaluate academic and behavioral progress within the programs. An independent evaluator oversaw the data collection from each site on both islands. The activities linked to research and evaluation include:
 - Collection of student data, including program and school attendance. Behavioral, academic, demographic, and HSA scores; analyses of data by school and overall across ASAS programs;
 - Exploratory research to compare test scores of Native Hawaiian students to the general student population, comparing test scores of ASAS participants with the general student population, and looking for trends over time; and
 - Assess processes that contribute to academic gains through quantitative and qualitative indicators.
- Establish a replicable after-school model that demonstrates improved academic outcomes of Native Hawaiian middle school youth.

Goodwill Industries of Hawai'i. Like ASAS, the Ola Program has partnered with several schools in Hawai'i Island to provide on-site tutoring either during and after-school at the Ola Program sites in East or West Hawai'i Island or in the school.

Each student entering the program created an Individual Plan (IP) with an assigned staff member as a means of ensuring that the student had direct input in their personal goals, needs and preferences, and cultural identification. The purpose of using an IP with a staff member is to empower and therefore build a stronger dialogue. All participants were administered the standards-based CASAS Assessment during the project period to establish their baseline proficiency and again later in the project period to determine the student’s progress.

Because remediation may have been required, Goodwill established three different course tracks for students to enter based on their demonstrated proficiency and therefore to continue pursuing their goals:



- **Acceleration Classes for Basic Academic Skills 1 (BASE 1):** The BASE 1 course was designed for students who require an intensive review and training on the basic educational building blocks. This track includes 12 hours of a combination of classroom, small group, or one-on-one tutoring per week. Students in this track use the Programmed Logic for Automatic Teaching Operations (PLATO) learning system supplemented with workbook assignments, study skills enhancement activities, written quizzes, classroom games, and other instruction tools according to the specific needs of each participant.
- **Acceleration Classes for Basic Academic Skills 2 (BASE 2):** BASE 2 was designed for students who test at the equivalent of the 6th grade level in both math and reading and still requires remediation work. This track includes a minimum of 12 hours of classroom, small group, or one-on-one tutoring per week. Students in this course use the PLATO system supplemented with workbook assignments, study skills enhancement activities, written quizzes, classroom games, and other instruction tools.
- **High School Standardized Testing:** This track was designed for students who test at a minimum equivalency of the 9th grade level in both math and reading. In this track, the PLATO system and General Educational Development (GED) workbooks are incorporated into the class instruction to prepare students to take the 10th grade HSA or GED test. Course work is supplemented with test taking skill development materials, workbook assignments, and classroom activities.

Program budgets. The following budget information in Table 1 provides a brief overview of the funding provided by OHA to the individual programs for fiscal year 2013, totaling \$262,344.

Table 1. Total operating budget amounts

| Grantee | 2013 |
|---|-----------|
| After-School All-Stars - Hawai'i Island | \$72,914 |
| After-School All-Stars - O'ahu | \$64,430 |
| Goodwill Industries of Hawai'i | \$125,000 |
| Total OHA Funding | \$262,344 |

Purpose of the evaluation. The purpose of this summative evaluation is to provide a comparison between the performance and services and activities of the programs identified to determine the following:

- What impact the services and activities of the aforementioned programs had with the individual school participants;
- How those results contributed to the overall progress towards achieving OHA's strategic results;
- What practices were used or could be used in OHA-funded education programs; and



- Findings and recommendations that could assist internal OHA stakeholders in future planning, design, and implementation of OHA-funded education programs.

METHODOLOGY

This evaluation incorporates quantitative and qualitative results extrapolated during the program review and evaluation process and secondary research gathered from outside sources. During the program review and evaluation process, documents such as the grant contract, budgets, progress and closeout reports, individual program evaluations, and interviews with program staff provided the information which formed the basis of this evaluation. The program's activities and goals were stated throughout the program contracts including the scope of services and the program proposals. Quarterly progress reports allowed the service providers the opportunity to identify key activities, issues or challenges that were encountered during the contract period that had an impact on the program's implementation and progress in achieving the individual goals and successes of the programs.

Output and outcome measure selection. Before the execution of the service contract for the providers incorporated in this evaluation, OHA's *Performance Measures Table* form was included that identified the performance outputs and outcomes and their targets for the projects' periods. During the course of the projects' periods, the providers submitted quarterly progress reports that provided to-date performance data and narrative responses that identified additional activities, barriers to success or other issues relevant to the program.

Fifteen performance measures were consistent across the three programs, and therefore all fifteen were selected for comparison in this evaluation and discussed further in the *Quantitative Results* section ahead. The narrative responses and additional activities addressed will be discussed further in the *Qualitative Results* section.

Limitations of data available. The performance measures that are included in the *Performance Measures Table* do not address the HSA results of well-below proficiency, approaches proficiency, meets proficiency, or exceeds proficiency- instead, the performance measures categorizes the progress of HSA test-takers as completed, and either met or exceeded or performed below proficiency.

Data analysis. A quantitative data analysis was done by dividing the performance targets by the actual performance. By doing this, the results will show a percentage that corresponds with how close to achieving the performance targets the programs have done. A qualitative data analysis was done by reviewing the narrative responses from each program by identifying additional activities and issues related to the programs and using that information to create a holistic perspective to address not only if results were achieved or not, but also why.



RESULTS

Over the course of the contract periods, the three programs showed scattered results based on their performance relative to the performance targets. The *Quantitative Results* section discusses the results based on all performance measures reported, the *Qualitative Results* section summarizes the narrative data incorporated in the programs, and the *Financial Impact Comparison* section determines how much OHA funding on average was used to service the number of Native Hawaiian participants.

Quantitative results

Table 2 takes the performance targets and compares those targets with the cumulative actual performance of the programs using all fifteen performance measures. In directional results that identify students who met or exceeded standards-based testing in reading or math, an inverse relationship exists with the measures that identify students who performed below proficiency in those testing.



Table 2. Summary of proposed and actual performance targets by program

| Performance Measure | ASAS O‘ahu | ASAS Hawai‘i | Goodwill Industries |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | Proposed / Actual | Proposed / Actual | Proposed / Actual |
| Total number of: | | | |
| Students enrolled | 598/672 (112%) | 550/505 (82%) | 60/80 (133%) |
| Native Hawaiian students enrolled | 352/476 (135%) | 275/228 (83%) | 40/56 (140%) |
| Standards-based testing readiness activities facilitated | 23-day/ 10-day (54%) | 21-day/ 11-day (52%) | 120/142 (118%) ^a |
| Students who completed standards-based reading testing | 574/600 (105%) | 539/307 (57%) | 48/80 (168%) |
| Native Hawaiian students who completed standards-based reading testing | 337/430 (128%) | 248/140 (56%) | 32/56 (175%) |
| Students who completed standards-based math testing | 586/600 (41%) | 528/305 (58%) | 48/80 (167%) |
| Native Hawaiian students who completed standards-based math testing | 348/430 (124%) | 243/134 (55%) | 32/56 (175%) |
| Students who met or exceeded standards-based reading testing | 324/281 (87%) | 308/143 (46%) | 48/8 (17%) |
| Native Hawaiian students who met or exceeded standards-based reading testing | 183/144 (79%) | 142/65 (46%) | 32/3 (9%) |
| Students who met or exceeded standards-based math testing | 202/158 (78%) | 216/127 (59%) | 48/6 (13%) |
| Native Hawaiian students who met or exceeded standards-based math testing | 115/97 (84%) | 100/50 (50%) | 32/5 (16%) |
| Students who performed below proficiency in standards-based reading testing | 274/319 (116%) | 242/177 (73%) | 12/72 (600%) |
| Native Hawaiian students who performed below proficiency in standards-based reading testing | 172/286 (166%) | 111/79 (71%) | 8/53 (663%) |
| Students who performed below proficiency in standards-based math testing | 396/82 (21%) | 334/217 (65%) | 12/74 (617%) |
| Native Hawaiian students who performed below proficiency in standards-based math testing | 240/333 (139%) | 153/103 (67%) | 8/51 (638%) |

Note. ^aGoodwill Industries reported a cumulative total for testing readiness activities facilitated versus an average.



Unlike Table 2 above which compares the proposed and actual individual performance result, Table 3 below adjusts the quantitative results by comparing the actual performance results that corresponds to either the total number of students enrolled or the total number of Native Hawaiian students enrolled. Because there is no difference in the number of standards-based testing readiness activities facilitated, that measure was omitted from Table 3.

Table 3. Program results based on number of students enrolled

| Performance Measure | ASAS O‘ahu | ASAS Hawai‘i | Goodwill Industries |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Total number of: | | | |
| Students enrolled | 672 | 505 | 80 |
| Native Hawaiian students enrolled | 476 | 228 | 56 |
| Students who completed standards-based reading testing | 600 of 672 (89%) | 307 of 505 (61%) | 80 of 80 (100%) |
| Native Hawaiian students who completed standards-based reading testing | 430 of 476 (90%) | 140 of 228 (61%) | 56 of 56 (100%) |
| Students who completed standards-based math testing | 600 of 672 (89%) | 305 of 505 (60%) | 80 of 80 (100%) |
| Native Hawaiian students who completed standards-based math testing | 430 of 476 (90%) | 134 of 228 (59%) | 56 of 56 (100%) |
| Students who met or exceeded standards-based reading testing | 281 of 672 (42%) | 143 of 505 (28%) | 8 of 80 (10%) |
| Native Hawaiian students who met or exceeded standards-based reading testing | 144 of 476 (30%) | 65 of 228 (29%) | 3 of 56 (5%) |
| Students who met or exceeded standards-based math testing | 158 of 672 (24%) | 127 of 505 (25%) | 6 of 80 (8%) |
| Native Hawaiian students who met or exceeded standards-based math testing | 97 of 476 (20%) | 50 of 228 (22%) | 5 of 56 (9%) |
| Students who performed below proficiency in standards-based reading testing | 319 of 672 (47%) | 177 of 505 (35%) | 72 of 80 (90%) |
| Native Hawaiian students who performed below proficiency in standards-based reading testing | 286 of 476 (60%) | 79 of 228 (35%) | 53 of 56 (95%) |
| Students who performed below proficiency in standards-based math testing | 82 of 672 (12%) | 217 of 505 (43%) | 74 of 80 (93%) |
| Native Hawaiian students who performed below proficiency in standards-based math testing | 333 of 476 (70%) | 103 of 228 (45%) | 51 of 56 (91%) |



Qualitative results

During the course of each program, additional activities were added to the curriculum that expanded beyond the scope of one-on-one direct tutoring and HSA preparation. These activities included the following:

- ASAS Hawai'i Island
 - Contracted an independent evaluator to oversee the tracking and evaluation of the project to prepare data collection procedures for site coordinators, train site coordinators on processes for safe and secure data handling, and developed a data evaluation plan.
 - Established partnerships with the participating schools, community-based organizations, and the participants' parents to expand the scope of services that included organizations such as Special Olympics Hawai'i, Boys and Girls Club, Alu Like, and the Kea'au Youth Business Center.
 - Created a grade tracking system that would organize grades and test scores to identify students who are struggling in their english and math classes and provide additional support.
 - Included cultural classes in ceramics, gardening, yoga, and pillow making.
 - Field trip to Mamaki Farm to learn the medicinal value of mamaki- Hawai'i's native/endemic nettle.
- ASAS O'ahu
 - The independent evaluator contracted for ASAS Hawai'i Island also assisted with the O'ahu program.
 - Established partnerships with schools and community-based organizations such as Alu Like and Ma'o Farms.
 - Included enrichment classes in the curriculum such as science, creative writing, leadership, and healthy fun.
 - Launched the Career Exploration Opportunities program to present career options, workplace skills, financial literacy, problem solving, and communication skills.
 - Used the same grade tracking system that was used in the ASAS Hawai'i Island program.
- Goodwill Industries
 - Field trips to the Lyman Museum and to Mission House.
 - Guest speakers from the Coalition for a Tobacco Free Hawai'i and the Hawai'i County Police Department's Vice Section.
 - Attended the 10th Annual Career Opportunities Expo at Hilo's Hongwanji Sangha Hall where students were provided with information about various career options, seek summer opportunities to pursue such as employment or community volunteer internships, and completed job interviews.
 - Attended a SafeTalk (Suicide Alertness For Everyone Tell Ask Listen Keep Safe) presentation where they were given information on how to assist people who have suicidal thoughts and how to provide information and share available resources.



- o Supported students in achieving their graduation requirements as stipulated by the mandated Personal Transition Plan (PTP) as required of all graduating public school seniors in the state.
- o Students also worked on job readiness and life skills that relate to their educational, financial, and employment goals.

Financial impact comparison

To provide a financial perspective of how the financial allocations of each program were used to service each participant, Table 4 below illustrates an average of how much each program’s funds were spent on average per Native Hawaiian participant enrolled in each program. The formula used in this comparison takes the total contract value divided by the total number of Native Hawaiian participants per program.

Table 4. Financial impact

| | Total Contract Value | Total Native Hawaiian Participants | Total Cost Per Participant |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| ASAS Hawai'i Island | \$72,914 | 228 | \$319.80 |
| ASAS O'ahu | \$64,430 | 476 | \$135.36 |
| Goodwill | \$125,000 | 56 | \$2,232.14 |
| OHA | \$262,344 | 760 | \$345.19 |

Program, school, and state average comparison

While reviewing the quantitative results does show an underperformance in each program, greater clarity can be gained by comparing those results with the performance of Native Hawaiian students who tested proficient in State HSA reading and math testing for school year and the State average. Table 5 compares the programs’ adjusted percentage of reading proficiency with the school average percentage and the State average percentage for proficiency in reading testing. In Table 5, the data in the *Program Average Percentage* column is consistent across the schools serviced in the program because the performance data was submitted cumulatively by grantee instead of by individual school serviced. The *State Average* column is consistent in accordance with OHA’s 2010-2018 Strategic Results: Hawai'i Standard Assessment Indicator Sheet 2014. School percentages were taken from the *Strive HI: Student Group Performance Report School Year 2012-2013*.



Table 5. Program, school, and state average reading proficiency percentage comparison

| Program | Program Average Percentage | Individual School Percentage | State Average Percentage |
|------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Goodwill | | | |
| Hilo High | 5% | 47% | 64% |
| Hilo Inter | 5% | 73% | 64% |
| Ka 'Umeke Ka'eo PCS | 5% | 33% | 64% |
| Ke Ana Laahana PCS | 5% | Unreported ^a | 64% |
| Kealakehe High | 5% | 63% | 64% |
| Konawaena High | 5% | 67% | 64% |
| Waiakea High | 5% | 48% | 64% |
| ASAS- Hawai'i | | | |
| Kau High & Pahala Elem | 29% | 55% | 64% |
| Keaau Middle | 29% | 62% | 64% |
| Pahoa High & Inter | 29% | 54% | 64% |
| ASAS- O'ahu | | | |
| King Inter | 30% | 79% | 64% |
| Nānākuli High & Inter | 30% | 48% | 64% |
| Waianae Inter | 30% | 50% | 64% |

Note. ^aKe Ana Laahana Public Charter School results were not reported in the *Strive HI: Student Group Performance Report School Year 2012-2013*.

Table 6 compares the programs' adjusted percentage of math proficiency with the school average percentage and the state average percentage for proficiency. In table 5, the data in the *Program Average Percentage* column was also submitted cumulatively by grantee instead of by individual school serviced. The *State Average Percentage* column was also reported in the same indicator sheet as well as the school percentages being reported in the student group performance report.



Table 6. Program, school, and state average math proficiency percentage comparison

| Program | Program Average Percentage | Individual School Percentage | State Average Percentage |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Goodwill | | | |
| Hilo High | 9% | 8% | 49% |
| Hilo Inter | 9% | 58% | 49% |
| Ka 'Umeke Ka'eo PCS | 9% | 21% | 49% |
| Ke Ana Laahana PCS | 9% | Unreported ^a | 49% |
| Kealakehe High | 9% | 54% | 49% |
| Konawaena High | 9% | 33% | 49% |
| Waiakea High | 9% | 34% | 49% |
| ASAS- Hawai'i | | | |
| Kau High & Pahala Elem | 22% | 31% | 49% |
| Keaau Middle | 22% | 50% | 49% |
| Pahoa High & Inter | 22% | 43% | 49% |
| ASAS- O'ahu | | | |
| King Inter | 20% | 68% | 49% |
| Nānākuli High & Inter | 20% | 30% | 49% |
| Waianae Inter | 20% | 40% | 49% |

Note. ^aKe Ana Laahana Public Charter School results were not reported in the *Strive HI: Student Group Performance Report School Year 2012-2013*.

Based on the comparison of both reading and math proficiencies, all the three programs underperformed relative to the individual schools and the State average percentages. ASAS- O'ahu's average percentage exceeded the other programs in reading proficiency while ASAS Hawai'i's average percentage exceeded the other programs in math proficiency.

As reported in the *2010-2018 Strategic Results: Hawai'i Standard Assessment Indicator Sheet 2012 and 2014*, Native Hawaiian student reading proficiency increased from 62% to 64%, falling just short of the strategic goal of 65%, while math proficiency increased from 48% to 49%, exceeding the strategic goal of 45%.

FINDINGS

In considering factors that could have attributed to these results, factors were identified during the course of discussions with program staff from both Goodwill and ASAS Hawai'i Island that appears to be limited to Hawai'i Island. Specific issues identified that attributed to low and inconsistent attendance included:



- Large geographical area with limited transportation means coupled with parents' schedules which further limits transportation options.
- Because some program staff are college-level students, there is a periodic turnover in staffing causing retention and continuity challenges.

In reviewing the contract's performance measures, it was determined that they did not provide the clarity of participant progress needed as opposed to separating them into the categories of *well-below proficiency*, *approaches proficiency*, *meets proficiency*, or *exceeds proficiency* which is how the HSA results are organized. By confining the language of the performance measures to either *meet or exceed* or *performed below proficiency*, there is no way to determine at what level the student is at in progressing towards achieving greater academic performance.

Best practices

Research has shown the following factors are associated with successful schools (Connecticut State Education Resource Center, 2015; Coryn et al., 2007):

- *Collaborative school governance.* In higher growth schools, governance tends to be a collaborative, shared process where teachers, parents, and the community feel empowered by participating in school governance and decision-making.
- *Decisions linked to data.* Higher growth schools link their assessment strategies to curricular and instructional strategies. Data is used to focus on areas of difficulty and student weaknesses, link content to state standards, identify students needing additional instruction, tutoring, supplementary programming, and other educational indicators.
- *Well-established, stable, dedicated teaching forces.* What distinguishes lower and higher growth schools is the quality of teachers and the continuity and devotion of those teachers to their students, school, mission and vision, and its administrators.
- *Focused learning communities.* This refers to the way teachers interact with one another outside of their classrooms that may make a positive contribution to student success and academic achievement in the classroom.
- *Strong, engaged leaders.* School leadership is focused on enhancing skills, knowledge, and motivation of the organization and creating a common culture of high expectations based on the use of skills and knowledge to improve students' performance. Leadership creates a collaborative atmosphere between the school and the community while establishing positive systems to improve leadership, teaching, and student performance.
- *Clear and common focus.* Administrators, teachers, students, and parents share and commit to clearly articulated and understood common goals based on the fundamental belief that all students can learn and improve their performance.



- *High standards and expectations.* Staff is engaged in an ambitious and rigorous course of study in which the performance standards are clear and consistent and learning conditions are modified and differentiated.
- *Supportive, personalized, and relevant learning.* Supportive learning environments provide positive personalized relationships for all students while engaging them in rigorous and relevant learning.
- *Parent/community involvement.* Parents and community members help develop, understand, and support a clear and common focus on core academic, social, and personal goals contributing to improved student performance and have a role in achieving these goals. The school community works together to actively solve problems and create solutions.
- *Shared monitoring, accountability, and assessment.* Teaching and learning are continually adjusted on the basis of data collected through a variety of valid and reliable methods that indicate student progress and needs. Successful results are more likely when students are viewed as everyone's responsibility and teachers know what is going on with their students and those of other teachers.
- *Curriculum and instruction.* Schools have aligned curriculum with core learning expectations to improve the performance of all students. Students achieve high standards through rigorous, challenging learning. Staff delivers an aligned curriculum and implements research-based teaching and learning strategies. Students are actively involved in their learning through inquiry, in-depth learning, and performance assessments.
- *Professional development.* Ongoing professional development aligned with the school's common focus and expectations to improve students' performance is focused and informed by research and school/classroom-based assessments.
- *Time and structure.* Schools are flexibly structured to maximize the use of time and accommodate the lives of students, staff, and community in order to improve the performance of all students and extends beyond the traditional school day and year and outside of the school building.

While these practices are primarily aimed at the individual school's functions, these practices can be applied to the additional activities of the three programs included. In looking at the structure and activities delivered by each program, the elements of the programs have been in line with these practices in unique ways that were passed down either from the schools in terms of the academic performance requirements, passed down from OHA via the service contracts, or internally fostered by each organization.

Given the quantitative results, the additional activities present an opportunity to answer if those activities really did have an impact on the quantitative results. In evaluating the individual programs, discussions were held with program staff from both ASAS and Goodwill. Each program's



activities were intended to increase knowledge through multiple means that would result in greater student self-confidence and ultimately enhance the ability for greater academic performance and test scores. Jones, Chan, & Polonsky (2008) had done an evaluation of the ASAS national-level program structure and affirmed that participation in ASAS programs developed higher self-esteem and more positive attitudes towards school and academics and led to improved student behavior, school attendance, and academic achievement. Also, Georgiou (1999) indicated that the level of an individual's internal motivation is considered the most important aspect in the attempt to gain knowledge and student performance.

Future considerations

In conducting background research about the HSA, it should be noted that special education students or those with learning disabilities are administered the same HSA as those who aren't in special education or have learning disabilities. This undoubtedly prevented the overall optimal success from being achieved. Because this is a policy issue instead of a being a programmatic one, anyone reviewing or analyzing performance data of programs within the purview of OHA or those within the DOE should consider this issue as an underlying contributing factor.

In school year 2015 the HSA will be replaced by the new Smarter Balance assessments, replacing reading and math. Because of this impending replacement, at the time of this writing there is no indication as to how the new testing results will be categorized, whether the categorization will be similar or different than that of the current HSA test results. Therefore, upon determining how the Smarter Balance testing results will be categorized, OHA's Grants Division should be open to amending the performance measure reporting requirements to reflect the DOE's testing results. By changing the reporting requirements to be in line with the DOE's results, a clearer comparison between the school and statewide averages can be made and a definitive determination of actual progress can be identified.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Programmatic recommendations

- Until the exact impact of the use of extra-curricular activities can be measured in the group of participants, reduce the amount of extra-curricular activities to focus more on the math and reading tutoring and test preparation activities.
- Consider surveying participants to receive direct feedback from them as to if the extra-curricular activities helped and if so, how.
- Identify the number of students with characteristics that may have a direct impact on the students' performance (i.e. special education placement, learning disability, etc.) in the quarterly progress reporting.



- Continue discussions with participants' parents and the schools to identify more accommodating locations to hold sessions.
- Create and incorporate a staffing succession plan in preparation for a staffing turnover.

Administrative recommendations

- The Grants Division and Grant Monitor(s) overseeing education programs need to have a line of communication with the DOE to be apprised of the Smarter Balance testing structure and result categorization.
- Upon determining how the Smarter Balance testing results will be categorized, consider amending the performance measure reporting requirements to reflect the DOE's testing results. This will allow for easier comparison with school and statewide averages as well as determine the actual progress that the cohort of students are making.
- Continue monitoring the quantitative results submitted quarterly by the programs to look for trends that will assist in determining what program activities are or aren't working and work with the provider to adjust the time dedicated to specific activities to maximize overall program effectiveness.
- The grant contract's *Scope of Services* section needs to be written to clearly define what the services provided will be versus the current practice of referring to the submitted program proposal. The current way of writing the *Scope of Services* section of the contract allows ambiguity in what program activities are conducted and how their effectiveness is measured.



REFERENCES

- Connecticut State Education Resource Center. Retrieved on March 2, 2015 from http://ctserc.org/s/index.php?option=com_content&view=section&id=8&Itemid=28
- Coryn, C.L.S., Schröter, D.C., Miron, G., Kana'iaupuni, S.K., Tibbetts, K.A., Watkins-Victorino, L.M. & Gustafson, O.W. (2007). School Conditions and Academic Gains among Native Hawaiians: Identifying Successful School Strategies: Executive Summary and Key Themes. Kalamazoo: The Evaluation Center, Western Michigan University
- Georgious, S.N. (1000). Parental attributions as predictors of involvement and influences on child achievement. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 69, 409-429.
- Jones, C., Chan, W., & Polonsky, M. (2008). Chicago public schools students succeeding academically through non-academic after-school activities: the 2008 after-school all-stars program. Retrieved on January 16, 2015 from <http://eevala.org/documents/CPSasas2008.pdf>
- Office of Hawaiian Affairs 2010-2018 STRATEGIC RESULTS: Hawai'i Standard Assessment Indicator Sheet 2012. Retrieved January 15, 2015, from <http://19of32x2yl33s8o4xza0gf14.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/ED-IndicatorSheets-StateAssessment2012-final.pdf>
- Office of Hawaiian Affairs 2010-2018 STRATEGIC RESULTS: Hawai'i Standard Assessment Indicator Sheet 2014. Retrieved January 15, 2015, from <http://19of32x2yl33s8o4xza0gf14.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/ED-IndicatorSheets-StateAssessment2014-011714-final.pdf>
- State of Hawai'i Department of Education Strive HI: Student Group Performance Report School Year 2012-13. (2013, October 21). Retrieved January 17, 2015, from <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/StriveHIIndexReports/StudentGroupPerformanceReportSY12-13SCHOOLS.pdf>



APPENDIX



APPENDIX A. LOGIC MODEL

| Program | Resources | Data Available | Coinciding Activities/Services | Non-Coinciding Activities/Services | Coinciding Outputs | Coinciding Outcomes |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| After-School All-Stars O`ahu | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grantee staff Students' families Department of Education schools Community partners Program funds | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quarterly progress reports Grant monitor's report Performance measures tables Prior individual program evaluations Program budgets Notes from staff interviews and contact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serviced schools on O`ahu and East Hawai`i island Tutoring services Standards-based testing readiness activities Culturally-based extra-curricular activities including field trips Career exploration and guest speaker visits | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contracted an independent evaluator to oversee data collection | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total number of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> students enrolled Native Hawaiian students enrolled standards-based testing readiness activities facilitated students who completed standards-based reading testing Native Hawaiian students who completed standards-based reading testing students who completed standards-based math testing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total number of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> students who met or exceeded standards-based reading testing Native Hawaiian students who met or exceeded standards-based reading testing students who met or exceeded standards-based math testing Native Hawaiian students who met or exceeded standards-based math testing students who performed below proficiency in standards-based reading testing Native Hawaiian students who performed below proficiency in standards-based math testing |
| After-School All-Stars Hawai`i | | | | | | |
| Goodwill Industries of Hawai`i | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serviced schools in East and West Hawai`i island Individualized planning Separate course tracks based on student preparation level Utilized the CASAS Assessment testing to determine student needs | | | |