

**TRAVIS COUNTY COLLABORATIVE AFTERSCHOOL PROGRAM
SUMMARY REPORT**

October, 2011



OVERVIEW

Since August 2004, the Austin Independent School District’s (AISD) Department of School, Family, and Community Education has managed and operated the Travis County Collaborative Afterschool Program (TCCAP). Across activities and partners, the TCCAP program broadly focuses on the following common primary objectives through enrichment and prevention activities: increase students’ school attendance, decrease students’ discipline referrals, and increase students’ academic achievement.

In 2010–2011, the TCCAP program served 1,195 students attending Ann Richards, Pearce, Garcia, and Webb Middle Schools, with an annual budget of \$544,880. Activities were focused on keeping students engaged in their education, increasing academic achievement, improving life skills, building character, preparing students for college and careers, and helping to create a safer community.

DESCRIPTION OF STUDENTS

A total of 1,195 students were served by the TCCAP program across four campuses (Table 1). Students were grouped into three participation categories: core participants, with 30 or more days of participation; participants, with between 1 and 29 days of participation; and same school non-participants, the comparison group who did not attend a TCCAP program. On average, core participants attended the TCCAP program for 59 days during the school year, and participants attended for 10 days.

Table 1. Students, by 2010–2011 Participation Status at TCCAP Campus

TCCAP campus	Number (percentage) of students			Total
	Core participants	Participants	Non-participants	
Ann Richards	2 (1%)	81 (15%)	456 (84%)	539
Garcia	74 (10%)	244 (31%)	457 (59%)	775
Pearce	220 (42%)	128 (24%)	181 (34%)	529
Webb	122 (17%)	324 (45%)	271 (38%)	717
Total	418 (16%)	777 (30%)	1,365 (54%)	2,560

Source. TCCAP participant records for 2010–2011, AISD student records

Note. This is an unduplicated count of TCCAP participants and non-participants. Core participants are students who participated for 30 or more days, participants are students who participated between 1 and 29 days.

Table 2. Student Grade Level, by Campus and TCCAP Participation Status, 2010–2011

Campus and participation status		Grade				
		6	7	8	9	10
Ann Richards (n = 539)	Core participant	100%	-	-	-	-
	Participant	20%	25%	22%	16%	17%
	Non-participant	23%	26%	23%	16%	11%
Garcia (n = 775)	Core participant	50%	24%	26%	-	-
	Participant	32%	30%	38%	-	-
	Non-participant	27%	35%	38%	-	-
Pearce (n = 529)	Core participant	28%	36%	36%	-	-
	Participant	27%	33%	40%	-	-
	Non-participant	8%	40%	52%	-	-
Webb (n = 717)	Core participant	52%	30%	17%	-	-
	Participant	27%	38%	35%	-	-
	Non-participant	28%	37%	34%	-	-

Source. TCCAP participant records for 2010–2011, AISD student records

Table 3. Student Gender, by Campus and TCCAP Participation Status, 2010–2011

Campus and participation status		Gender	
		Female	Male
Ann Richards (n = 539)	Core participant	100%	NA
	Participant	100%	NA
	Non-participant	100%	NA
Garcia (n = 775)	Core participant	30%	70%
	Participant	49%	51%
	Non-participant	45%	55%
Pearce (n = 529)	Core participant	47%	53%
	Participant	62%	38%
	Non-participant	49%	51%
Webb (n = 717)	Core participant	39%	61%
	Participant	47%	53%
	Non-participant	46%	54%

Source. TCCAP participant records for 2010–2011, AISD student records

Table 4. Student Ethnicity, by Campus and TCCAP Participation Status, 2010–2011

Campus and participation status		Ethnicity					
		Asian	African American	Hispanic	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	Two or more races	White
Ann Richards (n = 539)	Core participant	-	50%	50%	-	-	-
	Participant	2%	9%	64%	< 1%	3%	21%
	Non-participant	4%	25%	56%	-	1%	15%
Garcia (n = 775)	Core participant	-	53%	47%	-	-	-
	Participant	-	36%	62%	-	1%	1%
	Non-participant	-	32%	65%	-	1%	1%
Pearce (n = 529)	Core participant	2%	43%	53%	-	< 1%	1%
	Participant	-	22%	76%	-	1%	2%
	Non-participant	-	19%	75%	-	-	6%
Webb (n = 717)	Core participant	-	11%	89%	-	-	1%
	Participant	< 1%	11%	88%	-	< 1%	1%
	Non-participant	< 1%	7%	87%	-	1%	4%

Source. TCCAP participant records for 2010–2011, AISD student records

Table 5. Student Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Status, by Campus and TCCAP Participation Status, 2010–2011

Campus and participation status		LEP status
Ann Richards (n = 539)	Core participant	0%
	Participant	2%
	Non-participant	1%
Garcia (n = 775)	Core participant	20%
	Participant	23%
	Non-participant	25%
Pearce (n = 529)	Core participant	25%
	Participant	30%
	Non-participant	28%
Webb (n = 717)	Core participant	45%
	Participant	43%
	Non-participant	35%

Source. TCCAP participant records for 2010–2011, AISD student records

DATA ANALYSES

The following analyses examined the relationship between participation in TCCAP programs and several school outcomes (i.e., attendance rates, discipline removal rates, and grade point average). Program facilitators tracked TCCAP program participation in a database, and AISD student records provided information regarding school-related outcomes.

Attendance rates were calculated for all TCCAP program participants. Discipline outcomes were analyzed only for the 755 students who participated in prevention programs at one of the four campuses (Table 6). Academic achievement outcomes were analyzed for the 369 students who participated in TCCAP programs for academic enrichment and support (Table 7). Seventy-one students participated in other activities that were not classified as either academic or prevention programs (e.g., neighborhood sports, outdoor adventure, and sports block). Table 8 presents the list of classes that fall under the Academic or Prevention program categories. Table 9 presents the program goals with relation to school outcomes.

Table 6. Students Who Attended TCCAP Prevention Programs, by Campus, 2010–2011

Prevention program	Number of students		
	Core participants	Participants	Total
Ann Richards	1	80	81
Garcia	54	131	185
Pearce	97	70	167
Webb	97	225	322
Total	249	506	755

Source. TCCAP participant records for 2010–2011

Table 7. Students Who Attended TCCAP Academic Programs, by Campus, 2010–2011

Academic achievement program	Number of students		
	Core participants	Participants	Total
Ann Richards	0	0	0
Garcia	43	46	89
Pearce	124	26	
Webb	37	93	130
Total	204	165	369

Source. TCCAP participant records for 2010–2011

Table 8. TCCAP Classes by Program Type

Academic programs		Prevention programs	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business Professionals • Camping and GeoTracking • Club Tech • Culinary skills • ESL • Homework Haven/Help • Tutoring (Math, Reading) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science Enrichment • SEEK • STEMS • Sustainable Foods • The Story Project • Yearbook/Journalism • Young Money Makers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cistahood • Creative Snack • Date Smart • Girl Power • Healthy Habits • Passport to Manhood 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smart Girls • Smart Moves • Torch Club • Young Knights

Table 9. Program Goals, by School Outcomes

School outcomes	Measurement	Program goal
Attendance	Attendance rates	Core participants would have the highest attendance rates compared with attendance rates of those who participated less than 30 days and of those who did not participate. It also was expected that the attendance rates for core participants would be at least 2% higher than attendance rates for non-participants.
Discipline	Discipline referral rates	Core participants would have the lowest discipline referral rates compared with the referral rates of those who participated less than 30 days and of those who did not participate. It also was expected that 30% of students who participated in prevention programs would have a decrease in referrals from the Fall to Spring semester of the 2010-2011 school year.
Academic Achievement	Grade point average	Core participants would have the highest mean GPA, compared with the mean GPA of those who participated less than 30 days and of those who did not participate. It also was expected that the mean GPA of core participants and participants would increase by 5% from the Fall to the Spring semester of the 2010-2011 school year.

Source. Travis County Collaborative Afterschool Program work statement, 2010–2011.

AFTERSCHOOL PROGRAM OUTCOMES

Attendance outcomes. Attendance was calculated for all students who were enrolled at TCCAP campuses during 2010–2011. Attendance rates for core participants were higher than were rates for participants and non-participants at Garcia, Pearce, and Webb. In addition, core participants' attendance rates exceeded non-participants' attendance rates by 2% at these three campuses.

Table 10. Attendance Rates, by TCCAP Participation Status and Campus

School and participation status		Mean attendance rate
		2010–2011
Ann Richards (<i>n</i> = 539)	Core participant	94.54
	Participant	96.71
	Non-participant	97.11
Garcia (<i>n</i> = 775)	Core participant	96.46
	Participant	93.62
	Non-participant	93.53
Pearce (<i>n</i> = 529)	Core participant	95.69
	Participant	91.10
	Non-participant	90.58
Webb (<i>n</i> = 717)	Core participant	95.22
	Participant	92.78
	Non-participant	91.34
All TCCAP campuses		93.98

Source. TCCAP participant records for 2010–2011, AISD student records

Discipline outcomes. Student discipline removals were included for analysis when the resultant action was a student being suspended (i.e., in-school and out-of-school suspension) or placed in a disciplinary alternative education program (DAEP; e.g., the Alternative Learning Center). These removals were divided into two categories for the purposes of analyses: those for which a removal was mandatory and those for which a removal was discretionary. For example, mandatory removals included drug and alcohol violations, as well as assaults on other students or adults on campus; discretionary removals included persistent misbehavior. All mandatory discipline offenses resulted in a removal from campus, as required by law. Discretionary removals were those offenses that did not require a removal by law, but for which a student was removed anyway.

At Ann Richards, Garcia, and Pearce, core participants had the lowest mandatory referral rates. At Ann Richards and Pearce, core participants had the lowest discretionary referral rates (Table 11). Core participants at Pearce met the goal of a 30% decrease in

mandatory referrals from fall to spring semester. Core participants and participants at Garcia and Webb and participants at Pearce met the goal of a 30% decrease in discretionary referrals from fall to spring semester (Table 12).

Table 11. Discipline Removal Rates, by TCCAP Prevention Program Participation Status

Campus and prevention program participation status		Discipline removal rate	
		Mandatory removals	Discretionary removals
		2010–2011	2010–2011
Ann Richards (n = 539)	Core participant	0.00	0.00
	Participant	0.00	0.13
	Non-participant	0.00	0.02
Garcia (n = 775)	Core participant	0.00	0.85
	Participant	0.08	1.16
	Non-participant	0.07	0.74
Pearce (n = 529)	Core participant	0.04	0.98
	Participant	0.14	2.03
	Non-participant	0.12	1.05
Webb (n = 717)	Core participant	0.04	0.73
	Participant	0.04	0.84
	Non-participant	0.04	0.49
All TCCAP campuses		0.05	0.65

Source. TCCAP participant records for 2010–2011, AISD student records

Note. Discipline removal rates were calculated only for students who participated in TCCAP prevention programs. Removal rates refer to only those discipline offenses for which the resulting disciplinary action was removal from the campus (e.g., suspension or placement in a disciplinary alternative education program). All mandatory discipline offenses resulted in a removal from campus, as required by law. Discretionary removals were those offenses that did not require a removal by law, but resulted in a removal.

Table 12. Percentage Decrease in Discipline Referrals From Fall to Spring Semester, by TCCAP Prevention Program Participation Status

Campus and prevention program participation status		Percentage decrease in discipline referrals	
		Mandatory removals	Discretionary removals
		2010–2011	2010–2011
Ann Richards (n = 539)	Core participant	N/A *	N/A*
	Participant	N/A*	0%
	Non-participant	N/A*	33%
Garcia (n = 775)	Core participant	N/A*	47%
	Participant	22%	31%
	Non-participant	31%	35%
Pearce (n = 529)	Core participant	33%	26%
	Participant	0%	37%
	Non-participant	31%	39%
Webb (n = 717)	Core participant	0%	43%
	Participant	29%	40%
	Non-participant	36%	38%
All TCCAP campuses		28%	36%

Source. TCCAP participant records for 2010–2011, AISD student records

Note. Discipline removal rates were calculated only for students who participated in TCCAP prevention programs.

* This group had no discipline referrals.

Academic achievement outcomes. Mean school-year GPA was calculated only for students who participated in TCCAP academic programs. No students at Ann Richards attended academic programs. Core participants had higher mean school-year GPAs than did participants and non-participants at Garcia and Webb (Table 13). Mean school-year GPA decreased from the fall to spring semester for all participation groups and across all campuses (Table 14). However, at Garcia, core participants had the smallest decrease in GPA. At Pearce and Webb, participants had the smallest decrease in GPA.

Table 13. Mean School-year Grade Point Average (GPA),
by TCCAP Participation Status and Campus

Campus and participation status		Mean grade point average
		2010–2011
Garcia (n = 775)	Core participant	3.09
	Participant	2.80
	Non-participant	2.94
Pearce (n = 529)	Core participant	3.09
	Participant	2.83
	Non-participant	2.74
Webb (n = 717)	Core participant	2.80
	Participant	2.79
	Non-participant	3.04
All TCCAP campuses		3.07

Source. TCCAP participant records for 2010–2011, AISD student records

Note. Mean school-year GPA was calculated only for students who participated in TCCAP academic programs. No students at Ann Richards attended academic programs.

Table 14. Percentage Increase in Mean School-year GPA (GPA) From Fall to Spring Semester,
by TCCAP Participation Status and Campus

Campus and participation status		Mean GPA for Fall 2010	Mean GPA for Spring 2011	GPA change	Percentage increase
Garcia (n = 775)	Core participant	3.21	3.13	-0.07	-2%
	Participant	3.12	2.80	-0.32	-10%
	Non-participant	3.12	2.97	-0.15	-5%
Pearce (n = 529)	Core participant	3.38	3.10	-0.27	-8%
	Participant	2.99	2.86	-0.13	-4%
	Non-participant	3.21	2.71	-0.50	-16%
Webb (n = 717)	Core participant	2.91	2.73	-0.18	-6%
	Participant	2.88	2.79	-0.08	-3%
	Non-participant	3.24	3.04	-0.19	-6%
All TCCAP campuses		3.27	3.08	-0.18	-6%

Source. TCCAP participant records for 2010–2011, AISD student records

AFTERSCHOOL PROGRAM SURVEY RESPONSES

During Spring 2011, a survey was conducted with students across all parts of the AISD Afterschool Program. Surveys were administered to program participants at 33 schools (13 elementary, 13 middle, and seven high schools). A total of 934 respondents provided information about their experiences. Of this sample, 134 students attended afterschool programs at the four TCCAP campuses: Ann Richards, Garcia, Pearce, and Webb. Overall, participants rated the programs positively. All students strongly agreed or agreed that they liked their programs (100%) and the majority responded that they would sign up again (98%). In addition, most of the students responded that they liked their afterschool program teachers (96%) and believed the things they did in the afterschool program were important (94%) (Table 18).

Table 15. TCCAP Afterschool Program Survey Respondent Demographics, 2010–2011

Demographic description		Number of respondents	Percentage
Gender	Female	53	49%
	Male	56	51%
Ethnicity	Native American	0	0%
	Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0%
	African American	37	33%
	Hispanic	68	61%
	White	3	3%
	Other	3	3%
Grade	6	47	42%
	7	45	40%
	8	20	18%
	9	1	1%

Source. Afterschool Program Survey 2010–2011

Table 16. Number of Days per Week Attending the Afterschool Program

Program attendance	Number of respondents	Percentage
One day per week	1	1%
Two days per week	15	14%
Three of more days per week	89	85%
Total	105	100%

Source. Afterschool Program Survey 2010–2011

Note. A total of 14 survey respondents did not answer this question and were categorized as missing data.

Table 17. Types of Afterschool Program Attended

Type of afterschool program	Number of respondents	Percentage
Mathematics class	5	4%
Science class	5	4%
Reading class	5	4%
Tutoring	15	12%
Homework Haven	25	20%
Arts	23	19%
Music/dance	15	12%
Theater	21	17%
Technology	32	26%
Community service program	5	4%
Leadership group	24	20%
Boys group	15	12%
Girls group	33	27%
Sports	59	48%
Cooking	17	14%
Job readiness/career prep	1	1%
College prep	2	2%
Outdoor education (e.g., scouting, fishing, gardening)	17	14%

Source. Afterschool Program Survey data 2010–2011.

Note. Students could participate in more than one type of program; therefore, percentages do not sum to 100%.

Table 18. Level of Agreement With Statements Regarding the Afterschool Program

Survey item	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. I like my afterschool classes.	47%	53%	0%	0%
2. I would sign up again for the afterschool program.	48%	50%	2%	0%
3. The afterschool program helps me feel better about myself.	49%	42%	9%	0%
4. The afterschool program helps me stay away from drugs and gangs.	50%	45%	5%	0%
5. I feel safe in my afterschool program.	49%	47%	3%	1%
6. The afterschool program keeps me from getting into trouble.	44%	49%	6%	1%
7. I come to school more because of the afterschool program.	48%	41%	9%	2%
8. The afterschool program helps me get better grades.	51%	41%	7%	1%
9. The afterschool program helps me behave better at school.	47%	42%	10%	1%
10. I get help with my homework in the afterschool program.	42%	53%	3%	2%
11. I usually finish my homework at the afterschool program.	43%	49%	7%	1%
12. I like my afterschool teachers	47%	49%	4%	0%
13. Last week, my afterschool program teacher said something good about my school work	50%	42%	6%	2%
14. The afterschool program helps me get along better with my friends.	46%	45%	9%	0%
15. The afterschool program helps me to talk to my teachers more.	43%	50%	6%	0%
16. The afterschool program helps me get along better with my family.	47%	42%	11%	0%
17. The afterschool program will help me graduate from high school.	46%	48%	5%	2%
18. The afterschool program helps me learn about jobs and careers.	41%	50%	6%	3%
19. The afterschool program gives me a chance to help others.	44%	51%	4%	1%
20. I like to help others during the afterschool program.	47%	49%	4%	0%
21. I make friends in the afterschool program.	50%	43%	6%	0%
22. The things I do in the afterschool program are important.	40%	54%	5%	1%
23. The afterschool program helps me learn about leadership.	47%	47%	6%	0%
24. The afterschool program teaches me to be a good role model.	48%	46%	5%	1%
25. At the afterschool program teachers make me feel my school work is important.	43%	53%	4%	0%
26. My afterschool program makes learning fun.	44%	51%	5%	0%
27. School is easier because I come to the afterschool program.	45%	45%	9%	1%
28. My afterschool program teachers make me feel my school work is important.	43%	52%	3%	2%

Source. Afterschool Program Survey data 2010–2011.