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BACKGROUND and STRUCTURE

The following report provides a summary analysis conducted by external evaluator Stillmeadow-Benchmark Associates of data tracked and reported for the 21st Century Community Learning Center (21CCLC) programming for the school year 2021-2022 and the prior summer’s programming (summer 2021). Where appropriate, a breakout of detailed results is provided by student group, with this report focused on those of elementary and middle school age:

Older students (ages 14 and up) participated in the Saturday Academy and acted as Junior Mentors, supporting the Lead Teachers to mentor the younger boys. In this role, they continue as afterschool participants, as the process of mentoring benefits them through community service and social-emotional teaching and learning.

As this is a program targeting Black boys and young men, results were not tracked or reported by other demographic groupings. Such demographic breakouts would yield small samples in many cases, with misleading percentages.

The students participating in the program during the 2021-2022 school year attended many schools, with Drew Elementary School (ES) students making up the plurality of school-age students, DC Scholars, and Cornerstone accounting for less than 10 students each, and each of the other home schools noted below accounting for fewer than 5 students.

- Anne Beers ES
- Two Rivers Middle School
- Gholson Middle School
- Kelly Miller Middle School
- EW Stokes – East End
- KIPP Promise Academy
- KIPP Valor
- KIPP Quest
As previously reported (Evaluation Report, School Year 2020-2021), the structure and focus of LPTM afterschool and summer programming are unique when compared to the vast majority of out-of-school-time programs. Key differences include:

1) Programming has, at its core, artistic expression and LPTM’s proprietary Human Development System (HDS). These are woven throughout academic, social-emotional learning and enrichment activities. In the words of the program:

   Our flagship Arts and Education Mentoring Program (AEMP) engages elementary and middle school-aged youth in an arts-based process, channeling their life experiences through acrylic and fabric stitched collage paintings, original poetry, prose, oratory, movement, music, and cinematography. Apprentices share life experiences and create their paintings together based on those experiences. Each colorful, sewn, canvas collage illustrates a shared story and reflects their courage to create their own destiny. Our signature style of canvas on canvas art serves as a metaphor, a way of sewing 'life pieces' into 'masterpieces' - masterpieces in the art they create the lives they lead, and the communities we build together. Conducted five days per week from 3:00 – 6:30 pm, the program also provides rigorous homework assistance, tutoring, literacy training, and math skills development.

The Human Development System integrates artistic enrichment, academics, and the building of developmental assets to support social-emotional learning and is woven into all aspects of LPTM programming. For Apprentices, HDS is seen as part of unlocking their potential through creative expression, collaboratively creating masterpieces that will activate their innate creative abilities. Note that students are called Apprentices in recognition of their role as active participants in, and contributors to, their own development. Thus Apprentice is the terminology used interchangeably with student throughout this report.

2) The scope of the program, as designed by staff and as practiced by Apprentices, is much broader than academic or even social-emotional gains. Framing the scope of the program in the staff’s words: At Life Pieces, we are changing how Black boys see themselves; we are changing how the world sees Black boys and young men; and our Black boys and young men are helping the world discover our shared humanity.

3) Perhaps most uniquely, LPTM’s typical student is involved with the program over 1 to 3 decades rather than 1 or 2 years. Starting as early as age 3, a large number of students literally grow up in the program, growing to become mentors and ultimately (for several youth) becoming staff, the fruition of a positive youth development
model. Of the program staff during this evaluation period, 7 were first involved with LPTM as Apprentices.

The summer of 2021 and the 2021-2022 school year saw a transition out of virtual programming (both in school and afterschool) and a reduction in requirements for social distancing and other COVID-related restrictions. However, the impact of COVID continued with:

- A marked reduction in students enrolling in DCPS schools, including Drew Elementary;
- Students with learning losses greater than those seen in past years, combining the impact of being out of school during the summer and receiving only distance learning from their home schools for nearly two years; and
- Some difficulty with data sources that had ‘dried up’ during the pandemic, including teacher surveys.

Despite these limitations, the following data sources were gathered for the 2021-2022 school year, and the resulting alterations to the evaluation model included:

- **Attendance rates**, including average days attended, as well as the number of students attending 30-59 days, 60-89 days, and 90 days or more.

- **Pre/post grades** utilized as a measure of academic performance, and these grades were more representative of student performance than they were for virtual learning classes (where attendance alone was 50% of the grade).

- **PARCC assessments** conducted by DCPS schools for the first time since 2019. At the time of this report, LPTM had not received PARCC scores from DCPS. Because there was no 2021 or 2020 PARCC, the 2022 scores, once received, will be used as point-in-time measures, assessing the number and percentage of students who approached, met, or exceeded expectations by April of the school year. It will not be possible to identify those who moved from below expectations to meet expectations, or those whose score and/or performance level improved in comparison to the prior year.

- **Parent engagement** assessed by the historical measure of parents attending parent/family-focused events throughout the year, and also by tracking weekly parent contacts by staff (depending on parent availability), which included discussion of **Homework** (any issues with completion of homework, including parent needing support, parent noting that child completes homework as part of school day, etc.); **Family Engagement** (student’s involvement with other family members, parent’s involvement with student’s social and academic learning, and relationships); **Apprentice’s Well-being** (self-worth, hopefulness, life-satisfaction); **Apprentice Activity** (their interests, motivation to do or try new things); **What parents want for their son(s) from LPTM classes**; and **What support or services the parent would like from LPTM**.

- **Social-Emotional Assessment (S-EA)** to demonstrate social-emotional learning and the attainment of developmental assets in multiple domains, including School
and School Affiliation (Learning Engagement), Socialization and Peer Relationships, and Adult Relationships and Sense of Future.

- **Classroom Observations** during the schoolyear and summer conducted by the External Evaluator and his staff (a retired teacher with experience in elementary, middle, and high schools). In response to the different structures for outdoor classrooms and the reduced value in virtual settings of the reporting via the Program Quality Assessment (PQA) question format, the reporting shifted to focus on thematic observations in 2021. This approach includes key learning principles and best practices in group instruction (many of which are also underlying drivers for the PQA) and was found to be more valuable to the average user/reader of the evaluation report than reporting scores for each question.

- **Addition of KWLs**: K being what the students wanted to KNOW, W being what they WANTED TO LEARN, AND L being what they did, in fact learn. These were of greatest value in looking at what students learned as a group in the summer program.

  NOTE: While Teacher Surveys are not a primary source in the planned evaluation model, it is part of the evidence to be collected in relation to increased learning engagement. However, the expectations of DCPS and charter school teachers changed during virtual classes, and this appears to be a reason that teachers did not return surveys at the end of the school year for LPTM and many other 21CCLC programs.

**OUTCOMES**

**ATTENDANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTENDANCE Number of Days</th>
<th>% of TREEHOUSE Apprentices N = 12</th>
<th>% of KINGS 1 and 2 Apprentices N = 36</th>
<th>% of Legacy Apprentices N = 26</th>
<th>% of All Apprentices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 days</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 of 36 3%</td>
<td>5 of 26 19%</td>
<td>6 of 75 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 -59 days</td>
<td>1 of 12 8%</td>
<td>2 of 26 6%</td>
<td>6 of 26 23%</td>
<td>9 of 75 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-89 days</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5 of 36 14%</td>
<td>3 of 26 12%</td>
<td>8 of 75 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 days or more</td>
<td>11 of 12 92%</td>
<td>28 of 36 78%</td>
<td>12 of 26 46%</td>
<td>51 of 75 68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  NOTE: Four students attended outside of these groups.
OUTCOMES: ATTENDANCE

- More than 9 out of 10 Apprentices (92%) were regularly attending students (30 days or more).
- More than two-thirds of Apprentices (68%) attended 90 days or more.
- On average (across all students) an Apprentice attended 102 of the possible 162 days, or 63%. As students grew older, their attendance rates dropped from 79% with Treehouse participants, 70% for Kings (I and II – to groups in same age range) and 47% for Legacy. These in-person numbers are much higher than the prior years’ experience, possibly showing a rebound from the effects of the pandemic.

OBJECTIVE – ACADEMIC GROWTH

**40% of LPTM students will improve their Math and/or English Language Arts (ELA) grade during the 2020-2021 school year, as measured by the change in their grade between the first and last grading terms.**

ACADEMIC GROWTH, GRADES

Grades were tracked for Apprentices who attended DCPS and the two private/charter schools serving as home schools for more than 5 students, utilizing the first and fourth grading periods of the 2021-2022 school year. As grades were not received from DCPS in time for this report, they were collected directly from the Drew Elementary (DCPS), DC Scholars, and Cornerstone Public Charter Schools.

Students who began the year with the highest grade (e.g., 4 out of 4 or an A) in the first marking period were not part of the pre/post grade pool since they could not be expected to improve. Thus, results for this objective were measured by the percentage of students:

a. For whom grades were reported for the first and last terms; and
b. Who began the year with less than the highest possible grade in the first marking period.

*Fields highlighted in green indicate groups exceeding the target of 40% improving their grades.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTENDANCE Average Attendance</th>
<th>TREEHOUSE Apprentices</th>
<th>KINGS 1 and 2 Apprentices</th>
<th>Legacy Apprentices</th>
<th>All Apprentices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average # of days attended</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of possible days</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OUTCOMES: ACADEMIC GROWTH, GRADES

Small samples weaken the validity of correlations, so outcomes are best looked at in terms of the growth among all students rather than a smaller (e.g. Cornerstone) sample.

- 21 of 32 students, or 66%, improved their Reading grade, exceeding the target of 40% by more than 25%. This compares to 50% who improved the prior year.
- 18 of 28 students, or 64%, improved their Math grade, exceeding the target of 40% by nearly 25%. This compares to 41% who improved the prior year.
■ The percentage of students improving was substantially higher for both Reading and Math than the target, and than the prior year.
■ Students attending Drew and Cornerstone exceeded the performance target of 40% for both Math and Reading, while students attending DC Scholars fell 7-11% below the target.

Even small improvements in academic performance are notable here given the recent body or research that ties the loss of in-person learning environments over the prior two years to greater levels of learning loss that have historically been seen in summer. Only 7% of Drew Students, for example, met expectations on the PARCC in 2022, and only 3% of ELA students did so! The emerging research also points to greater loss among low income students (100% of LPTM Apprentices were eligible for free or reduced lunch) and among minority students (again, 100% of Apprentices identify as Black / African American).

As part of the summer program, students also created KWL charts documenting what the children **Knew** about Zimbabwe and India before beginning programming, what they **Wanted to know** about the community, and what they **Learned** about the communities by the end of the summer. While there were no grades or assessments related to the KWLs, each group of Apprentices created their own KWL chart to document their learning, demonstrating the specific regional knowledge about the communities of Zimbabwe and India gained though summer classes and activities. After they spoke to children from India and Zimbabwe and met cultural ambassadors from both nations, Apprentices documented a variety of new knowledge. The group of 6 and 7 year-olds wanted to learn what language they spoke in Zimbabwe, and by the end of the summer, were able to count to 10 in Shona, a Zimbabwean language. The same group also learned more about the animals in India and what many Indian people’s housing is like. Our older Apprentices explained that they learned that Zimbabwe is diverse and has a population of various races and ethnic groups, and that people speak various languages in both countries. They also documented new knowledge about Zimbabwe’s history of imperialism and segregation and Zimbabwean family structure and the “totems” that families possess.

**OBJECTIVE**

25% of LPTM students will meet or exceed expectations in Math and/or ELA by April 2021, as measured by achieving levels 4 or 5 on the PARCC standardized assessment.

*Analysis of this objective will not be possible until PARCC scores requested earlier in the year are received.*
OBJECTIVE
45% of parents of LPTM students will demonstrate increased engagement with their child’s academic and social-emotional development, as measured by parent self-reports of actively providing support for their child.

A revised tracking tool has been created to successfully capture informal parent contacts, as well as formal contacts and participation in engagement events, and that form was in use for the 2021-2022 school year. Utilizing regular contacts with parents (weekly, depending on parent availability), staff discussed the status of Apprentice/family relationships, specific engagement with their child’s learning, unmet needs or concerns, and any requests the parents had. Specifically, they were asked to discuss (as appropriate):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homework (any issues with completion of homework, including parent needing support, parent noting that child completes homework as part of school day, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family engagement (student’s involvement with other family members, parent’s involvement with student’s social and academic learning, and relationships)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprentice’s Well-being (self-worth, hopefulness, life-satisfaction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprentice Activity (their interests, motivation to do or try new things)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did the parent say they want for their son(s) from LPTM classes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What support or services did the parent say they would like from LPTM?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things to follow up on in next call</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a much greater number of formal contacts with a larger percentage of parents as compared to the prior year. Based on data summarized in the formal contacts tracked by staff, 45 of 75 parents reported positive/strengthened engagement with their child and 27 parents also spoke to their involvement with the child’s learning, homework, and educational needs.

There were many additional informal contacts as well, through texting and other media, and LPTM’s Family Engagement Consultant and Ambassador invited Apprentices’ family members to ‘open hours’ to meet and discuss the family’s well-being and health, needs, and Apprentice growth. Parents received help with job interviews, accessing health care and other needs.

OUTCOMES: PARENT ENGAGEMENT

- 45 of 75 parents (60%) reported positive/strengthened engagement with their child (providing examples), exceeding the 40% engagement objective
- 27 of the parents (20%) also spoke to their involvement with the child’s learning, homework, and educational needs.
In addition to the parent contact tracking, there were six in-person events during the summer of 2021 and the 2021-2022 school year for which parent attendance was tracked. Numbers are estimates, as only 8/11, 11/20, and 5/20 events involved sign-in sheets with exact numbers. Moreover, the parent numbers include the same parent for multiple events, and without a sign in sheet for all events it is not possible to arrive at an unduplicated count. Thus, this data provides further insight into the level of parent engagement with their child’s education but is not broken out as a separate outcome.

**6/26/21: 25th Anniversary Celebration:** Apprentices, 45 family members, 50 community members came together for games, art stations, and food outdoors at the Marvin Gaye Greening Center. There was a special ceremony for the Legacy Class, and Council Member Vincent Gray dedicated June 26th, 2021, officially as "Life Pieces To Masterpieces Day".

**8/11/21: Summer Presentation & Celebration:** 61 family members (55 in-person plus 6 virtual), 30 community members (10 in-person plus 20 virtual) came to the Marvin Gaye Greening Center where each class presented artwork, performed dance, and showcased their partnership with our friends in India and Zimbabwe. Lunch was served outdoors to everyone for the celebration.

**11/17/21: Courage on Canvas (VIRTUAL):** 20 family members joined more than 400 community members for LPTM’s signature art showcase, presented in a virtual setting at courageoncanvas.org online.

**11/20/21: Fall Fest:** 40 family members joined their sons for LPTM’s fall fest, which included various arts and learning stations, pumpkin painting, marshmallow roasting, and more.

**5/20/21: My Brother's Journey Screening and Celebration:** 15 Family Members came out to join 300 community members for the debut private screening of LPTM’s first documentary, shown at Smithsonian's National Museum of African American History and Culture.

**OBJECTIVES:**

40% of students will demonstrate increased engagement with learning, as measured by the Academic Engagement component of the S-EA and classroom observations, as well as anecdotal information from interviews with key staff at students’ day schools.

40% of students will demonstrate social-emotional learning in one or more key domains, including socialization and relationships with their parent and other positive adults, as measured by the Social-Emotional Assessment (S-EA) and classroom observations.
ENGAGEMENT WITH LEARNING, SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL ASSESSMENT (S-EA)

The Social-Emotional Assessment (S-EA) measures social-emotional learning and the attainment of developmental assets in multiple domains, including School and School Affiliation (Learning Engagement), Socialization and Peer Relationships, and Adult Relationships and Sense of Future. The end of year S-EA was not administered for the 2021-2022 school year due to a turnover in the staff responsible for evaluation data, and staff at day schools were not available for the planned interviews. However, the S-EA was administered at the end of 2020-2021 school year and at the beginning of school year 2021-2022. With most Apprentices carrying over from the summer into the school year, a pre/post comparison for the summer program can be made utilizing those two assessments. In addition, classroom observations conducted during the summer of 2022 and the 2021-22 school year provide data on learning engagement.

The S-EA tool was developed from three nationally validated assessments and has been in use with 21CCLC programs in DC for 8 years. Each cluster is consistent with the factors in the original instrument and the clusters also contain the minimum number and type of questions necessary for validity from each parent tool. Responses are meaningful when taken as a cluster. For this objective, the results for the six questions related to school/learning engagement as a group indicate the percentage of students who demonstrated increased academic engagement. Data is reported in two ways:

1) Percentage of students demonstrating improvement (through validated self-report). This number, while most indicative of growth, required valid pre and post responses, meaning a student had to be present for both administrations of the tool (in this case at the end of one school year and early in the next; and they had to answer the relevant questions in both instances. In addition, students who reported the highest level of an asset (Strongly Agreed) were removed from the sample as they could not show improvement. It is interesting to note that of the youth answering Strongly Agree in the spring assessment – used as a baseline for summer – nearly 2/3 had multiple (2-10) years in the program. And because this assessment was conducted in the spring, every respondent had a least a year in the program – so this was different in nature than a pre/post given in fall as the school year starts and again in spring as it nears the end.

The Apprentices who meet all of these criteria represent a relatively small sample (typically less than 10 from each group). Thus results are reported for all students rather than the small subgroups, acknowledging that each subgroup (e. g., Treehouse) may be at a different developmental stage, and percentages are only meaningfully applied to each cluster of factors rather than individual questions within the clusters.

2) Percentage of students with discreet assets / social-emotional skills at the end of the year. This number was based on the percentage answering strongly agree or agree at the end of the year, regardless of their original or ‘pre’ response. Indeed, a small number did not complete a baseline S-EA. While the sample for this outcome was much larger, it tells us a student attained an asset, but not whether they did so during the past school year. Given that many of the LPTM apprentices have been with LPTM for multiple years, they might have also developed that asset in their prior time with the program.
Thus, both data sets must be judged as possible indicators of a correlation between attending LPTM’s afterschool program and growth in developmental assets – in this case learning engagement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL/LEARNING ENGAGEMENT</th>
<th>STUDENTS REPORTING IMPROVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I belong here</td>
<td>5 of 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel close to the people at LPTM</td>
<td>6 of 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am happy to be at LPTM</td>
<td>6 of 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teachers treat me fairly at LPTM</td>
<td>9 of 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe at LPTM</td>
<td>3 of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I care about LPTM</td>
<td>4 of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy learning</td>
<td>6 of 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average for this cluster of assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>78%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENTAL ASSET GROUP</th>
<th>STUDENTS REPORTING ASSETS AT END OF YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School and School Affiliation (Learning Engagement)</td>
<td><strong>89%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(194 of 219 responses)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization and Peer Relationships</td>
<td><strong>78%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(118 of 152 responses)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Relationships and Sense of Future</td>
<td><strong>85%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(230 of 270 responses)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>85%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: Fields shaded green indicate a percentage of students higher than the target of 40%.*

**OUTCOMES: ENGAGEMENT WITH LEARNING, SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL ASSESSMENT**

- 78% of all Apprentices (all three groups) indicated growth in their learning engagement, looking at the combined average for the cluster of 7 factors measured. This is nearly double the target of 40%.
On average 85% of more of Apprentices in all three groups indicated possession of each the three clusters of developmental assets by the end of the year.

Looking at the possession/attainment or each of the three clusters of factors by the end of the year, 89% of Apprentices possessed the cluster of assets demonstrating Learning Engagement, 85% possessed the cluster of asset demonstrating positive Adult Relationships and a positive Sense of Future, and 78% possessed the cluster of assets demonstrating Socialization and Positive Peer Relationships.

ENGAGEMENT WITH LEARNING, CLASS OBSERVATIONS

As part of assessing the level of learning engagement among Apprentices, the following program components, classroom activities and aspects of teacher performance were identified in observations of in-person classes in May of 2022 (utilizing 2 S-BA staff) and again in during summer camp in late July (by the External Evaluator alone). The latter observations are for summer 2022 but are included in this report as they represent in-person programming most akin to that in the 2021-2022 school year. The PQA tool used (in multiple versions) by the External Evaluator for in-person observations for multiple years was utilized once again, but the results are being reported thematically rather than question by question. The results are still rooted in best practices and proven (as well as emerging) educational approaches, but more accessible to the program staff as they review commentary on classroom components including (but not limited to) project-based instruction, small group dynamics, and the incorporation of feedback and reflection.

OUTCOMES: ENGAGEMENT WITH LEARNING: CLASS OBSERVATIONS

Overall Themes: Afterschool Classes

- Classes consistently utilized the core process of the 4 Cs (in adjacent graphic) to frame activities and respond to behavioral concerns, which gave students a common ‘handle’ in differing situations to support and guide their learning.
- Instructors typically explained the planned activity before starting, and in most cases confirmed Apprentices’ understanding of what they were going to do in advance. This reduced the time some students would spend disengaged and/or frustrated.
- The majority of activities and at least a portion of each class observed were project based, providing opportunities for active participation by Apprentices rather than passively taking in information. This supported a high level of engagement overall.
- All classes worked within common themes drawn from the LPTM shield (graphic below) as part of the Human Development System framework (developed by LPTM). During the May observations, for example, the theme was Leadership. and there were multiple opportunities for youth voice and leadership observed in the classes.
Most of the instructors incorporated a reflection component that gave students a chance to reflect and/or comment on the class activity and their experience and learning.

**Treehouse Class** (youngest students)
- Teacher announced agenda for the class, but the specific activity was chosen by students rather than the instructor.
- Engagement was maintained throughout the class by a range of physical and verbal activities for Apprentice.
- Leadership theme incorporated, even with this youngest group, via reading on smart screen.

**Kings I Class**
- Check-in with each student before they entered class, allowing instructors to identify any Apprentice needs and gauge the ‘temperature’ of the group. Students kept emotions charts.
- Teacher engaged students in read aloud through a series of questions (that required more than yes or no answers). Same process was used during a video, and other activities, all built around a common theme.
- Students were given voice through voting on what the character in the story should do at key decision points, and why. They also had a voice through their work in small groups, where a lot of idea sharing and give and take were noted.
- Closing circle incorporated the 4 Cs and provided an opportunity for reflection.

**Kings II Class**
- Continued the focus on core principle, in this case leadership, which included discussion of influence.
- Instructor laid out planned activity in advance, which was also described on a flip chart (for visual learners).
- Video used was created by an older LPTM Apprentice, now a Junior Mentor, and he led the discussion of the video (peer instruction).
- Student worked in small groups for art component (project-based), creating their own individual works but using each other as resources for ideas, feedback, etc. Good energy and consistent engagement throughout the room.
- Some Apprentices struggled with behavior, teacher switched up activity acknowledging that some students were not having a good day and “when that happens, we do something different”. Behavioral issues were addressed through 1:1s with help of Junior Mentors.
Legacy Class

- While waiting to transition, instructors filled the delay with a word search game that kept students engaged.
- Group stood and greeted all newcomers to class. This was done without prompting, but also lower energy than in other classes, maybe becoming ‘pro forma’ for this group.
- Group was lower energy than other classes, which the teacher acknowledged to the Apprentices, and the energy increased as the class progressed.
- Apprentices in an informal (self-chosen) working group actively engaged another student without a group and invited them to join.
- Conflict occurred between two Apprentices and was addressed by pulling those students aside for a discussion led by an older Junior Mentor.
- Artist instructor led discussion of the artistic process for the planned project, which gave Apprentices a chance to brainstorm ideas for their artwork related to the theme of leadership.
- Reflection was incorporated through student’s sharing their work and tying each piece back to leadership.

Additional Observations: Summer Program

- Utilized small group work with informal student leaders.
- Focused on cultural awareness and learning about other countries (that students voted on from a possible list of countries and cultures where staff had identified resources in that country and in the District such as restaurants with that country’s cuisine, connections at an embassy.)
- With longer program hours in the summer, activities were spread across classes (allowing more flexibility in the scope and/or complexity of the projects).
- Activating Athletes classes, while focused on physical activity and games, incorporated substantive discussion of LPTM principles and the process behind disciplinary action taken when one or two students were disruptive.
- Several Apprentices were struggling the day of this observation, which required more intensive and more frequent interventions from teachers, but controls and restrictions implemented by staff were balanced with discussion of the struggle some students were having and efforts to support those students (through 1:1 time and alone/meditation time) as well.

Next Steps and Recommendations

Available data expanded with the reduction of COVID restrictions for DCPS and charter/private schools, and the resulting measurable outcomes, demonstrated a strong correlation between participation in LPTM programs and improvement in the key indicators of academic growth (improved grades), academic and social-emotional well-being (possession and growth in developmental assets), and parent engagement. In each case the percentage of Apprentices (students) exceeded the target, in some instances by as much as double that target.
It is important to note that outcomes should be seen as correlated to LPTM programming rather than there being a demonstrable cause and effect relationship. It was not feasible to create a true experimental model and meaningful data was not reliably available for comparable ‘control’ or comparison groups. However, the correlations identified include:

- The percentage of LPTM students who improved their grades was substantially higher for both Reading and Math grades than the target of 40%, and than the improvement seen the prior year.
- 45 of 75 parents (60%) specifically demonstrated positive/strengthened engagement with their child, exceeding the 40% engagement objective, and 20% also spoke to their involvement with their child’s learning, homework, and educational needs.
- On average 85% or more of Apprentices in all three groups indicated possession of each of the three clusters of assets by the end of the year: Social-Emotional factors (Learning Engagement), Socialization and Positive Peer Relationships, and Positive Adult Relationships and a Positive Sense of Future.
- 78% of all Apprentices (all three groups) indicated growth in their learning engagement. This is nearly double the target of 40%.

Combined with class observations, these correlated outcomes make a strong case for continuing LPTM’s approach to afterschool and summer out-of-school programing. It is recommended that:

- Staff planning teams utilize the results of the report and the recommended discussions to assure continuous improvement.
- The evaluation report be shared with the stakeholders, including the Board of directors, parents, and funders.

To strengthen the evaluation process going forward:

- LPTM should utilize both baseline and end of year versions of the Teacher Survey.
- LPTM should conduct the Social-Emotional Assessment in a pre/post model so that Social-Emotional Learning gains during the school year can be assessed. The staff and Evaluator should work together to determine whether there is an assessment broader in scope that would provide more information on the attainment and growth in developmental assets (such as the Holistic Student Assessment utilized in LPTM’s Color Me Community program).