

NEW COMMUNITIES AFTER SCHOOL PROJECT ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT 2003-2004

AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM SITES

Clarks' Corner, Harrington

Knollwood, Claymont

September 1, 2004

The new Communities After School Program monitoring process is the responsibility of the Evaluation Team led by Co-Principal Investigators Donald G. Unger, Ph.D., of the Center for Disabilities Studies, and Leslie Cooksy, Ph.D., Director of the Center for Community Research and Service, both in the College of Human Services, Education and Public Policy at the University of Delaware. The support staff is comprised of Teresita Cuevas and Patricia A. Tressell, both Research Associates in the Center for Disabilities Studies, Shannon Howard, a Master's student in the UD School of Urban Affairs, and Tara Woolfolk, a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Individual and Family Studies.



**New Communities After School Program:
Summary Annual Monitoring Report Year 2003-04**

Table of Contents

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
PROGRAM SETTINGS	1
METHODOLOGY	2
RECRUITMENT/PARTICIPATION	3
PROGRAM COMPONENTS	3
PROGRAM ACTIVITIES	3
Homework help and other academic activities	3
Non academic and unstructured activities	4
Recreational/Cultural Activities	4
Tutoring Program	4
FAMILY INVOLVEMENT	4
PROGRAMS STAFF/TRAINING	6
PROGRAM DOCUMENTATION	6
COLLABORATING ORGANIZATIONS	6
AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM OBSERVATIONS	7
CHILD BEHAVIOR CHECKLIST FINDINGS	7
General Overview	7
7	
SITE PARTICIPANTS	10
FINDINGS OF THE ACHENBACH ASESMENT	10
NEW COMMUNITIES SUMMER PROGRAM	11
Clark's Corner Summer Day Camp	11
Knollwood Summer Day Camp	12

SUMMARY	13
Program Strengths	13
Program Recommendations	14
Documentation Recommendations	14
BIBLIOGRAPHY	15
APPENDIX A: After School Program Observation Instrument	16
APPENDIX B: Quick Sheets of the Coded Observation Instruments	24
APPENDIX C: Achenback System of Empirically Based Assessments	28

INTRODUCTION

After school programs have become part of the daily experience for a great number of children in most communities. After-school recreation programs are believed to help prevent some of the problems arising from the risks faced by youth (e.g., lack of home supervision during after-school hours, low family income, lack of positive adult role models and mentors, and lack of community opportunities) (NRPA, 1994; Posner & Vandell, 1994; Witt & Crompton, 1996). With the increasing number of working caregivers comes an increasing risk to children; the more potential they have for unsupervised time, the more vulnerable they tend to be to the possibility of engaging in high-risk behaviors. With this in mind, parents and policy makers are increasingly realizing the importance of providing a safe and engaging place in which children can spend time between the time when the school day ends and their time at home begins. At the same time, as the political pressure for academic accountability and school improvements grows, after school programs are seen as an important strategy for improving students' academic skills.

The purpose of this evaluation is to explore the performance and quality of the New Communities After School/Summer Programs, with a focus on their impact on both academic achievement and personal and social skills enhancement. The After School Program Evaluation Team has provided support to New Communities sites during this fiscal year assessing the effectiveness of the program by examining each component, documenting barriers to implementation, and developing recommendations to address them.

The New Communities After School Programs are funded through the United States Department of Agriculture, which allows the community to utilize the after school program's services at no charge.

PROGRAM SETTINGS

Delaware's New Communities programs take place in two communities: Clark's Corner and Knollwood. The After School/Summer site located in the Clark's Corner community center, operates out of the Delaware Public Housing Project office. The site is in an isolated rural area in Harrington, Kent County. There are 72 low-income families living in the housing project, which is surrounded by empty space and an elementary school. All of the children enrolled in the program are residents of the complex, which makes it convenient for them to walk to the program.

The Knollwood New Communities program is housed at the Brandywine Parent Information Center in the community of Knollwood, Claymont. Knollwood is made up of 140 single family and semi-detached houses placed in a circle which creates a closed community. The community was developed for and made up of steelworkers and their families in the early 1900s. After WWII, the community moved away from a home strictly for steelworkers and became open to the general public. Today, there are about 100 children in the community. The building that the center is using is owned by the Civic Association, leased by the Brandywine Parent Center, and used by the after school program.

METHODOLOGY

During fiscal year 2003-2004, the evaluation team initiated a three pronged approach to evaluate the New Communities After School/Summer programs. The team conducted interviews with program directors, performed program observations and completed document reviews collecting background material concerning the programs, the staff, and the participants. These activities were conducted through monthly visits at each program site. Observation reports were coded using a form developed in this evaluation. The theoretical rationale for the measures was based on National School-Age Care Alliance (NSACA) standards, (Roman, J 1998). The measure was organized into the content areas of Human Relationships; Indoor Environment; Activities; Health, Safety & Nutrition; Materials and Teaching Performance. Sixteen categories were included, with each addressing dimensions of quantity and appropriateness of the after school programs. The observation guide was developed under the supervision of Dr. Donald Unger. Please see appendix A for the observation instrument and appendix B for copies of the quick version of the coded observation instrument. In addition to observing the programs, data on each participating child was requested for analysis. Furthermore, the evaluation process included an examination and review of family engagement and support in the after school program (ASP). Lastly, the Achenbach System of Empirically Based Assessment (ASEBA) was administered to teachers, ASP staff, and parents for each child participating in the program in order to identify special needs of children.

RECRUITMENT/PARTICIPATION

The program sites mainly recruit participants by mailing or delivering flyers door to door to families of each community before the school year begins. The programs are designed to serve 20 to 25 students between the ages of 5 to 12. During the school year 2003-2004, Clark's Corner Program enrolled 24 children during the first four months of the school year. Out those 24 children 12 were females. A decrease in enrollment to 13 – 15 children was noted in the first three months following enrollment. The average number of days attended per child ranged from 7 to 11 days each month. The majority of the children served by the program were African American. At the end of the school year when the last data collection occurred, there were 10 African Americans, and 4 Latinos participating in the ASP.

During the fiscal year, Knollwood ASP maintained an enrollment of 23 children. The students were mostly Caucasians, with 5 Latino participants. The majority of students served were male, only 4 were female.

The grade levels from children at the different sites ranged from Kindergarten to 7th grade. Due to some inconsistencies in how the attendance form was completed the evaluation team was not able to report any data from Knollwood ASP attendance. There is a need for an attendance sheet with clear fields such as program operating dates, child name. A form is needed where the staff can consistently mark the days where the program was closed for reasons such as weather or school was closed for any other reason

PROGRAM COMPONENTS

The After School Programs were set up principally as homework help, but also incorporated elements of the 4H program which emphasized life skill development. Both programs also had a tutoring program focused on math and language arts.

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

Homework Help

The program's daily schedule from Monday to Thursday focused primarily on providing assistance with homework. The program structure was such that as children arrived they received a snack and then began homework activities with the assistance of the ASP staff. The average time spent working on homework activities ranged from 35 to 45

minutes. Additionally, ASP staff engaged the children in book reading, discussion and book reports.

Non-academic and unstructured activities

The program was designed to include a non academic focus with unstructured activities also. At the completion of the time allocated for homework activities, the children were given opportunities to choose a nonacademic activity such as doing crafts, playing with Legos and blocks, coloring, playing games, reading books, or helping to update the bulletin boards. Additionally, whenever the weather permitted, children were accompanied on the playground for free play with program staff.

Recreational/Cultural activities

The 4H Club that was on site offered a wide array of activities, which had a cultural, social and academic enrichment focus. The program goal was to give youth a variety of opportunities for positive youth development. The goal was accomplished through the following objectives: (1) Public presentations and demonstrations, (2) Community service such as “Clean Up Community Contest”; (3) County and state fair participation (e.g. three of the students in the program Clark’s Corner ASP entered a 4-H cooking contest at a county fair), and finally (4) Healthy Life style teachings including field trips, and presentations from guest speakers.

Tutoring Program

With the support of the Department of Education’s 21st Century Program, Clark’s Corner tutoring program had certified teachers who tutored each day for one hour during the school year. This has been a tremendous benefit to the Knollwood program since they only have 2 staff members. This program component is specifically designed to help prepare students for the DSTP. Program participants are tutored in groups or individually, and are referred to tutoring services by parents and teachers.

FAMILY INVOLVEMENT

Clark’s Corner ASP has very little family involvement. Parents are primarily involved in enrolling children and signing release and other program forms. Additionally, parents are required to sign a form if their child is sent home from the program due to behavioral issues. A meeting was conducted once to discuss the program needs and only five

parents participated. Parents who attended the meeting were the parents of the children with the highest attendance rates. These parents expressed concerns about the program as follows:

- Staff seemed to need more effective ways to address children’s challenging behaviors
- Despite receiving some help, children continue to come home with their homework done incorrectly
- Some parents do not seem to care about their children’s education
- Staff should increase use of rewards and encouragement to enable the children to excel in the program and at school.
- The program needs more ongoing communication with the schools.

Three of the parents seemed to be happy with the program. Some of their comments support their satisfaction with the program:

- “I like [the after school program] because it is good for the children, but I feel that parents need to be more involved.”
- “The kids are doing their homework and reading”
- “It’s a good program and I like it.”

During fiscal year 2003-2004, the Clark’s Corner ASP did not offer any activities to motivate the families to participate in any recreational or educational event with their children. According to the program director, in general, there is not much communication between the staff and the parents of the children participating in the program. In addition to the lack of activities that would encourage parent involvement, another reason for the limited communication may be that the children can walk to the program by themselves, so most parents are not even involved in dropping off and picking up the children. Finally, cultural competence may be a factor in the low family involvement; however, since the evaluation did not examine the cultural competence of the program staff, no clear conclusions can be drawn about the extent to which it is an issue.

Family involvement for the families participating in the Knollwood program included parents picking up and dropping off their children so that they can observe program events, attendance at a monthly family fun night which provided activities for parents and their children, and development of a biweekly newsletter by the ASP staff that was sent to parents in order to update them of what was going on in the program.

PROGRAM STAFF & TRAINING

The program staff at the New Communities Program sites have at least a bachelors degree and work on a part time basis. Program Directors and teachers also have at least a bachelors degree. Staffing at the Clark's Corner program site includes a program director, one teacher and one teacher's assistant. None of them are from the community or the surrounding areas. The Knollwood ASP consists of 3 staff members, two tutors and two volunteers. Of the three staff members involved with the program, two are very active members of the Knollwood community who reside in the community and whose children attend the program. Additionally, the ASP Director is the president of the Knollwood Civic Association.

The student staff ratio across sites at any given time was consistently less than 9 children to one staff member. Tutoring activities had much lower student:staff ratio. The typical size of the tutoring group at any given point range from 4 to 5 students.

PROGRAM DOCUMENTATION

The evaluation team requested documentation gathered by both programs about the participating children and their families in order to review the program monitoring process. Clark's Corner site submitted the children's attendance lists, behavior logs, and school information. Documentation from Knollwood included client data information, academic progress records, samples of children's school work, and attendance for children and families' participation. After reviewing the information collected, the evaluation team concluded that there were some inconsistencies in the way that documentation was collected making it impossible to draw conclusions at Clark's Corner about the quality of the student's school work and ASP enrollment. With respect to the Knollwood site, the evaluation team also had difficulties analyzing data about attendance records as a result of the method of data collection used. (See program recommendations on page 14).

COLLABORATING ORGANIZATIONS

Clark's Corner ASP did not collaborate much with other community organizations besides the housing project and the Girl Scouts organization. The ASP was a sub-grantee of the Lake Forest School District's 21st Century Community Learning Program, which supported tutoring for selected children. The Knollwood ASP director plans to develop

collaborative links with 2 schools at the Brandywine School District and with 6 other organizations in the area.

AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM OBSERVATIONS

The evaluation team conducted site visits each month, which lasted between 45 to 90 minutes. Site visit reports were coded using a measure organized into 7 content areas addressing quality and quantity suitability. The scale range used for scoring was 1 being very poor to 6 being very good. The average score for all observations was greater than 5 and lower than 6. (See appendix B for summaries of the results overall and broken out by site.) The weakest content area found in Knollwood was the content area of Indoor Environment. The facility is rather small for the amount of participating children and the different activities they engaged in; and lack of enforcing program rules often resulted in a less than ideal learning environment both academically and socially. Teaching Performance was determined to be the strongest content area in each observation conducted. Clark's Corner had the opposite pattern. Analysis of the measure used to determine program quality indicated that the Clark's Corner program's weakest content area was Teaching Performance and the strongest content area was Indoor Environment.

CHILD BEHAVIOR CHECKLIST FINDINGS

General Overview

The evaluation team and the After School program administrators agreed to administer the Achenbach System of Empirically Based Assessment (ASEBA) to the participating children. The Achenbach System has been normed from a national sample of children ages 4-18. In the New Communities ASP evaluation, teachers, program staff, and parents were asked to rate each participating child. Parents or surrogates provided information for 20 competence items and rated their child in 118 problem items using 0-1-2 scale for how true the item is of the child now or within the six the past month. Teachers and ASP staff provided ratings of children's academic performance, adaptive functioning, and 118 problem items.

Understanding the Results of the Achenbach System

The Achenbach System of Empirically Based Assessment provides efficient and economical means for obtaining information on children's functioning.

Ratings are based on comparison to the scores of the general population on which this measure was normed and validated. Possible ratings are limited to three categories: Okay, Borderline (recorded as “B’line”), and Clinical. The Okay category describes an individual with a healthy profile which includes high social (adaptive) competence scores and low problems scores. Clinical category indicates an individual with a deviant profile with low (adaptive) competence scores and high problem scores. Children identified within the borderline or clinical category may need professional support. As a result, school counseling or school psychologist can invest more time in gathering other important information not readily obtained with this assessment.

Internalizing Scale represents problems within the self. These problems include feelings of anxiety and depression, having somatic complaints without medical cause, and being withdrawn from social contacts. The Externalizing scale represents conflicts the children have with other people and their expectations for the children’s behavior. These behavioral problems include rule-breaking and aggressive behavior towards others. It is important to remember when viewing these columns that the internalizing and externalizing problem areas are not always mutually exclusive. There has been shown to be a positive correlation between these two problem areas. However it is still possible for children to score highly in one area and not the other.

Total Problems Scale represents comprised of the total sum of scores for each child based on all the problem areas both internalizing and externalizing. Total problem scores provide indices for the child's overall functioning based on the respondent's answers. The total problems scores can be used as a basis for comparing problems in different groups and for assessing change.

Critical Items identifies critical problems that may be overlooked in the Total Problems column. This scale represents items that have been rated by clinicians as being specific areas of concern and may require specialized attention.

The names of the scales are intended as descriptions of the problems they represent, and should not be constructed as diagnostic labels.

The “Adaptive Functioning” Scale includes the following Subscales:

1. *Academic Performance*
2. *Working Hard*

3. *Behaving*
4. *Learning*
5. *Happy*

The “Syndrome” Scale includes the following Subscales:

1. *Internalizing:*
 - a. *Anxious/Depressed*
 - b. *Withdrawn/Depressed*
 - c. *Somatic complaints*
2. *Social problems*
3. *Thought problems*
4. *Attention problems*
5. *Externalizing*
 - a. *Rule-breaking Behavior*
 - b. *Aggressive Behavior*

The DSM-Oriented Scale includes the following subscales:

1. *Affective Problems*
2. *Anxiety Problems*
3. *Somatic Problems*
4. *Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Problems*
5. *Oppositional Defiant Problems*
6. *Conduct Problems*

The result of the ASEBA can be supported or challenged by a specialist by obtaining other information such as reviewing records, observing the child, testing cognitive or emotional functioning, and interviewing the informants. The assessment does not provide “objective” measures of children’s problems. The rating scales involve perceptions of problems. These perceptions can vary from one informant to the other and can be influenced by a variety of factors. Disagreements can suggest important differences in a child’s behavior from one context to another, or differences among perceptions and judgments. On the other hand, agreements among multiple informants on syndrome scale scores indicate problem areas that need to be addressed.

The responses can lose reliability when:

- The informant evokes certain behaviors from the child.
- The child displays certain behavior only in the presence of one of the informant.
- The lack of contact with the child limits the informant knowledge of the child.
- The difference in value causes one informant to be either more or less tolerant of certain behaviors.
- The informant is prone to deny problems for reasons of social desirability.
- The informants own problems make the informant to become a poor informant

Site Participants

Children involved in the assessment were those that were participating in the program during the months of April and May. Ten children participated in ASEBA in Clark's Corner. Fifteen assessment forms were analyzed, which included 10 from ASP staff and five from parents. Teachers did not complete ASEBA forms. Knollwood had 23 children with completed ASEBA ratings. A total of fifty-one completed forms were analyzed with twenty-three completed by ASP staff, nineteen by parents, and three by teachers.

Findings of the Achenbach Assessment

Because of the reliability issues, we only consider the results for those children who were rated by more than one person. Of the 23 children in Knollwood, 19 (83%) had more than one rater. Eight children (42% of 19) were rated by two raters as having at least borderline problems in at least one of the areas measured by the Achenbach Measure. Overall children were most likely to be rated as borderline or clinical on the following scales: Externalizing Problems, Total Problems, Adaptive Functioning, Internalizing Problems, and Social Problems. Of the 10 children in Clark's Corner, 5 (50%) had more than one rater. Two of these five children were rated by both raters as having at least borderline problems in at least one of the areas measured by the Achenbach tool. Both children were rated as borderline or clinical on the Total Problem scale. No other common areas of concern were identified. For detailed results, see Appendix C.

NEW COMMUNITIES SUMMER PROGRAMS

Clark's Corner Summer Day Camp

The Clark's Corner Summer Day Camp program was in operation from June 14 to August 17, 2004 and offered a full day program with hours of Monday to Friday 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Twenty-six children between the ages of 5-12 from 15 different families participated in the program. Program participants included 4 Latino, 2 white, and 20 African American students. The student to staff ratio was 7 to 1. Recruitment consisted of delivering program flyers door to door, followed by a meeting with the program's social worker and families to explain program goals and objectives and distribute packages containing program enrollment information.

The staff was made up of two males and two females. Twenty of the participating children had at some point participated in the New Communities After School and /or Summer Programs. The program had a very hectic schedule. The students were always engaged and remained busy with activities in the center and outside of the center. The program coordinator seemed to carefully and diligently spend ample planning time on a weekly and daily basis to ensure that program participants were offered a wide variety of enrichment activities.

Some of the activities included field trips to Killens Pond, a Potato chip Factory, State Parks, Lewes Ferry to Cape May Zoo, bull riding, horseback riding, Philadelphia Zoo, Lake Forest Clubs, Blue Rock game, Crayola factory, 4H Camp in Harrington, Harrington Library etc. Also offered were lessons on swimming, golf, food safety, seed planting, natural resources etc. Activities also included a family barbecue. Community service project activities included designing and making bookmarks. Arts and craft, cooking, outdoor playground, and computers were part of the program daily schedule when the kids were at the center. The program served free breakfast and lunch.

During several site visits the evaluation team had the opportunity to talk informally with four parents and the Housing Project Manager. They seemed to be very happy with the program and aware of the activities that were taking place. For example, the Project Manager said, "They are doing wonderful things," as the children made a Flower Pot in Pen during the arts and crafts project. In response to the evaluator's question about their

satisfaction with the program, some parent comments were, “They have so many good field trips it is too bad that my child will be out the program because he will be 13, the program should have something for teenagers” and “My child is very happy in the program.”

Knollwood Summer Day Camp

The program had 2 staff and one volunteer. Flyer distribution was the primary means of advertising the program. The flyers were delivered door to door to community members. Ten families enrolled their children which totaled nineteen children. Seven of these children had never participated in any New Communities programs. Children ranged in age from ages 5-16. The enrolled group was composed of 7 Latino, 4 African-American, and 7 white. As a way of involving the families in the program, the staff planned a back to school picnic for the last week of August, and provided barbecue, and arts and craft activities for children and adults.

Some of the collaborating agencies during this period were:

- Saint Davis Church offering volunteers and Teachers for the Science Project
- Delaware Humane Society: Program “*Treat all living things humanely first-hand*”
- New Castle Police
- University of Delaware with the program “Nutrition Class week”
- Alliance for Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention–Program: Self Esteem Building once a week for six weeks
- Grand Opera House- Children Theater Program – 7 Presentations during the months of July and August
- Regal Movie Theater Family Festival [free movies on Tuesday and Wednesday]

Other program activities included a week at Townsend Hall in the 4H Clover Buds for 5 -8 year old children; a week at Newark Day Camp at UD campus for children ages 9-12 years old, arts and crafts, and computer games. Additionally, as part of the community service program component children brought an art project for each member of the senior citizen center. Field trips were organized to Killens Pond, Hershey Park, Washington Zoo, State Fair, Dover Air Force, Ice Skating, fishing, State Parks, and other similar places that offered social, cultural and academic enrichment.

SUMMARY

Program Strengths

The New Communities ASP plays a unique role in both communities. No other organization is providing similar services. The program is providing educational and recreational activities to two communities that differ in racial background and historical setting but they both are very poor and isolated.

The most basic elements necessary for the New Communities ASP to achieve its main goal were in place for the 2003-2004 school year. These elements are the following: 1) hiring and retaining and training staff, 2) establishing and maintaining a favorable emotional climate (especially in Knollwood site), 3) having a mix of younger and older students, 4) maintaining a low student-to-staff ratio, 5) maintaining continuity and complementarily with regular day school, 6) paying attention to safety and health issues, 7) providing a variety of activities, 8) providing age-appropriate activities and materials, 9) providing enough quality materials, and 10) involving families and using community-based organizations and facilities.

While the basic elements are in place, both programs have room for improvement. Specific recommendations are listed below. The recommendations refer to both schools, unless otherwise noted.

Program Recommendations

- Recruit program volunteers (Clark's Corner)
- Increase family communication and involvement (Clark's Corner)
- Include more recreational activities to make the ASP more attractive for children and parents (Clark's Corner)
- Increased communication with the schools and teachers of participant children

Documentation Recommendations

- Develop a more consistent method for collecting information for each child.
- Provide clearer and more accurate records of enrollment and exiting dates.
- Regarding the Behavior Log (Clark's Corner):
 - the program should record follow-up information about any interventions that transpired between the parents and staff;
 - there should be some characterization of the child behavior recorded on the attendance log; and
 - the logs should contain information on sanctions imposed, behavior and improvements observed.
- Collect information on child health and nutrition;
- Collect information on whether or not the child is receiving Special Education Services and, if so, include IEP objectives.
- Design an attendance sheet with clear fields such as program operating dates, and child's name (Knollwood)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Achecnback, T.M. & Rescorla, L. A. (2001). Manual for the ASEBA School–Age Forms & Profiles. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Research Center for Children, Youth, and Families.

National Recreation and Park Association. (1994). Beyond fun and games: Emerging roles of public recreation. Arlington, VA.: National Recreation and Park Association.

Posner, J. K., & Vandell, D. L. (1994). Low-income children's after-school care: Are there beneficial effects of after-school programs? Child Development,

Roman, J. (Eds.). (1998) The NSACA Standards for Quality School-Age Care. Boston: National School-Age Alliance.

Witt, P. A., & Crompton, J. L. (1996). Recreation programs that work for at-risk youth: The challenge of shaping the future. State College, PA: Venture Publishing.

APPENDIX A

***AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM EVALUATION
MEASURES for OBSERVATIONS***

AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM EVALUATION
MEASURES for OBSERVATIONS

Overview: Sixteen measures are included, each addressing dimensions of quantity and quality/appropriateness of the after school programs. Theoretical rationale for the measures is based on NSACA standards, which are organized into content areas of Human Relationships; Indoor Environment; Activities; Health, Safety & Nutrition; Materials and Teaching Performance.

Date of Observation: _____

Site & Program Name: _____

Time of Observation: _____ Length of Observation: _____

Name(s) of Observer(s): _____

of Staff Observed: _____ # of Children Observed: _____

List of Program Activities Observed:

- | | |
|----------|----------|
| 1. _____ | 2. _____ |
| 3. _____ | 3. _____ |
| 5. _____ | 6. _____ |
| 7. _____ | 8. _____ |

Additional Comments/Notes:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

Human Relationships:

1) Staff relate to children and youth.

N/A

a) QUANTITY

1	2	3	4	5	6
Virtually no interaction; hardly ever speak to children.		Some interactions; sometimes listen to them.		Often interact through talk or behavior.	

b) QUALITY & APPROPRIATENESS

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very negative; poor listening, interactions seldom indicate any respectful or positive reaction to needs of child.		Moderate respect and attention; some attempts to make children feel welcome and accepted when relating to them.		Very positive and engaged relations; treat them with respect and react positively according to individual needs.	

2) Staff responds to the individual needs of children and youth.

N/A

a) QUANTITY

1	2	3	4	5	6
Never responds to needs and requests of children.		Some interactions; sometimes react to them in regard to specific needs and requests.		Almost always responds to child's requests and needs.	

b) QUALITY & APPROPRIATENESS

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very inappropriate; responses indicate almost no relationship with the personal needs of the children.		Somewhat appropriate; occasionally relate to them in a way that acknowledges their personal temperament and needs. Sometimes provide support when child needs extra attention.		Very good fit between responses and needs of children; able to react to range of feelings, temperaments, and specific requests.	

3) Staff encourage children and youth to make choices and to become more responsible.

N/A

a) QUANTITY

1	2	3	4	5	6
Little or no opportunities to make choices.		Some opportunities to make choices; sometimes encourage children to take leadership roles.		Frequently allow children to have choices in what they do, how they do it, and with whom.	

b) QUALITY & APPROPRIATENESS

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very discouraging; never indicate appreciation for children's choices. May go to other extreme and overwhelm child with too many choices for their personal needs.		Moderate degree of encouragement; sometimes give children chances to choose and control their activities, sometimes do not seem to be able to react to children's desire to control their choices.		Very encouraging and responsive guidance; offer choices to control activities without overwhelming child or inaccurately assessing child's ability to lead.	

4) Staff interact with children and youth to help them learn. N/A

a) QUANTITY

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very low degree of interaction for learning; children are largely left on their own and are subject to one approach to learning only.		Some sharing of skills and resources; occasional conversations with them during lessons.		Often interact with children in learning opportunities.	

b) QUALITY & APPROPRIATENESS

1	2	3	4	5	6
Never encourage conversation to practice skills; either converse in a way that shuts down learning or effectively does it for the children instead of letting them use their skills.		Somewhat attentive to children's need for interaction; sometimes vary approach to learning according to child, sometimes do not share resources available with children who need them.		Very fitting interaction with children: conversations help facilitate learning and allow for children to solve problems for themselves when they are able.	

5) Children and youth generally interact with one another. N/A

a) QUANTITY

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very little opportunity for peer interaction.		Some occurrence of interactions.		Frequent interactions between children.	

b) QUALITY & APPROPRIATENESS

1	2	3	4	5	6
Negative interactions are the norm; children seem tense and atmosphere is either under- or over-controlled so that positive peer interactions are not facilitated.		Some room for positive and appropriate interaction between children; children are sometimes given a chance to work out conflicts for themselves and solve problems together.		Very positive interactions; children are able to relax and seem to respect one another and can usually cooperate successfully.	

Indoor Environment:

6) The program's indoor space meets the needs of children and youth. N/A

a) QUANTITY

1	2	3	4	5	6
There is not enough room for all program activities: areas are frequently overcrowded and resources are inaccessible to children.		Space is somewhat sufficient; sometimes there seems to be room to move around and arrange materials, but sometimes it seems too chaotic or crowded.		Indoor space is quite sufficient to meet the needs of the children: there is plenty of room for activities and to display relevant materials.	

b) QUALITY & APPROPRIATENESS

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very poor; indoor activities often interfere with each other, or space does not allow for all program activities; there is no indoor space for active play during bad weather, and the area is uncomfortable and inappropriately arranged.		Space is appropriate in some ways; sometimes shared space is maximized and things can go on at the same time without disruption. Other times the space restricts the children's activities or noise levels.		Very good; space allows maximum access to resources, it appears that all areas as useable and space allows for a range of activities.	

7) The indoor space allows children and youth to take initiative and explore their interests.

N/A

a) QUANTITY

1	2	3	4	5	6
Little or no room for unstructured play or exploration outside of planned activities.		Some room for children to "do their own thing"; some parts of area allow for exploration without disruption of others in shared space.		Plenty of room for varied activities; no areas being avoided by children, and there is room to arrange the materials to suit their needs.	

b) QUALITY & APPROPRIATENESS

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very poor; space is not comfortable and does not invite independent choice of activities. Children do not have access to resources available unless they are part of a planned activity.		Some opportunities to explore; some areas facilitate children's movement and provide easy access to materials, but some parts of space are not supportive of anything unplanned.		Extremely flexible and useful space; room for usage and storage of materials, and ability for children to manipulate resources without aid.	

8) The indoor space displays program rules and children's work. N/A

a) QUANTITY

1	2	3	4	5	6
Little or no displays of rules or children's works.		Some displays of rules and children's works.		Plenty of displays of program rules and children's works.	

b) QUALITY & APPROPRIATENESS

1	2	3	4	5	6
Space does not indicate attention to displays; rules for behavior are not posted, virtually no children's work is displayed, and there are no displays related to current class activities.		Some children's work is displayed, and there are some up-to-date bulletin boards, but not all of it is up to date or appears to be updated regularly.		Good use of display space; rules are clearly displayed, children's work is prominently displayed, and there are up to date, attractive bulletin boards.	

9) The program provides functional building facilities for children and youth. N/A

a) QUANTITY

1	2	3	4	5	6
Little or no areas with adequate facilities; broken or missing bathroom components, lights, temperature control.		Some suitable qualities to environment; may have some bathroom access or limited control of heat and light.		Adequate or excellent facilities; plenty of bathroom access, easily controlled heat and light sources.	

b) QUALITY & APPROPRIATENESS

1	2	3	4	5	6
Facilities are unclean and uncomfortable, with inadequate hand washing equipment.		Facility is somewhat healthy; some areas are clean and comfortable, and there may be limited access to hand washing areas.		Facility is healthy for children; area is clean, comfortable, and provides adequate and accessible supplies for hand washing.	

Activities:

10) Today's schedule is flexible and attentive to needs of all children and youth. N/A

a) QUANTITY

1	2	3	4	5	6
Little or no schedule of activities evident.		Some evidence of scheduled activities; at least part of schedule seems known.		Schedule is clear and evident to children	

b) QUALITY & APPROPRIATENESS

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very rigid schedule; does not allow for individual needs of children, nor for them to move through activities at their own pace.		Some opportunities for flexibility and attention to individual needs; some activities allow children individual room to set their own pace.		Many opportunities for flexibility and the addressing of individual needs; children can be as independent as they like without derailing the schedule for everyone.	

11) Children and youth can choose from a wide variety of activities

N/A

a) QUANTITY

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very few activities.		Some different activities.		Wide variety of activities.	

b) QUALITY & APPROPRIATENESS

1	2	3	4	5	6
There are no regular opportunities for choice; play is overly controlled or overly chaotic, and there is little to no variability.		Some range of activities available, children don't always get to choose (e.g., physical play, creative play, quiet time, etc. may be available but only by assignment).		Variety of quality choices available; children may often decide what they want to do.	

Safety, Health & Nutrition:

12) Children and youth are carefully supervised.

N/A

a) QUANTITY

1	2	3	4	5	6
Little or no supervision evident; staff is often unaware of location and activity of children.		Some supervision; staff are occasionally present during children's activities.		Staff are always present during children's activities.	

b) QUALITY & APPROPRIATENESS

1	2	3	4	5	6
Students are seldom supervised properly; may be unmonitored during potentially dangerous activity, supervision is not tailored to needs of child, and no one keeps track of comings and goings of children.		Students are somewhat supervised, but there are times when some of them are unaccounted for or receiving inappropriate supervision according to their ages, needs or abilities.		Students are well supervised; staff takes action according to needs of child and monitors potentially harmful situations very carefully.	

Materials:

13) There are materials to support program activities.

N/A

a) QUANTITY

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very few or no materials available to staff and children.		Some limited access to materials; may only have enough for some of the children or some of the activities.		Plenty of materials for program activities; enough for all children and activities.	

b) QUALITY & APPROPRIATENESS

1	2	3	4	5	6
Materials are in poor repair, incomplete, or missing; there are not enough to go around or they are not appropriate to today's program activities.		Materials are somewhat functional and available; there may be some broken things, or some times when there are not enough materials for all children to participate in an activity, or children have to wait to use them.		Materials are complete and in good working order; there are enough for the children in the program, and they are developmentally appropriate. There are varied materials for children with differing abilities and interests.	

Teaching Performance:

14) Staff guide the behavior of children and youth.

N/A

a) QUANTITY

1 2 3 4 5 6

No guidance evident.

Some guidance, but not consistent across all situations or children.

Adequate amount of consistent guidance.

b) QUALITY & APPROPRIATENESS

1 2 3 4 5 6

Extremely low or high behavioral limits set; either no rules or discipline, or total control without allowing children to resolve their own conflicts when possible.

Occasionally suitable guidance; some limits reasonable, but not necessarily all of them.

Guidance consistently appropriate, no harsh discipline; children are encouraged to work out their own conflicts, with staff intervention only if needed to work things out.

15) Staff/child ratios permit staff to meet the needs of children and youth.

N/A

a) QUANTITY

1 2 3 4 5 6

Ratios are insufficient; less than 1:15 for children 6 and older, and less than 1:12 for children under age 6.

Sometimes optimal ratios; other times inadequate ratios.

Staff ratios are optimal: between 1:10 to 1:15 for children age 6 and over, and between 1:8 and 1:12 for those under six.

b) QUALITY & APPROPRIATENESS

1 2 3 4 5 6

Inadequate staff for types and complexity of the group's activities.

Some children's needs are met; some group's have acceptable ratios, but some groups do not appear to have enough coverage for the activity they are doing.

Staff coverage varies according to activities and needs of children.

16) Staff works together to meet the needs of children and youth.

N/A

a) QUANTITY

1 2 3 4 5 6

Staff members work independently.

Staff works together at some times.

Staff works together most or all of the time; always appear to be a team.

b) QUALITY & APPROPRIATENESS

1 2 3 4 5 6

Staff does not appear to be cohesive or act professional and respectful with one another; they are poor role models of positive adult relationships.

Staff sometimes appears cooperative and communicative; at other times they may not keep interactions professional or check with one another to make sure all needs are met.

Staff works very well together; they are cooperative, respectful, communicative, and model positive verbal and non-verbal interaction.

Appendix B

QUICK SHEET FOR OBSERVATIONS

Summary of Combined Results

Summary of Knollwood Results (n=6 observations)

Summary of Clark's Corner (n=5 observations)

***After School Program Evaluation Measure Averages
for New Communities, N=11 Observations***

	* Quantity	* Quality & Appropriateness
Human Relationships:	5.73	5.65
1) Staff relate to children and youth.	5.73	5.45
2) Staff responds to the individual needs of children and youth.	5.55	5.73
3) Staff encourage children and youth to make choices and to become more responsible.	5.73	5.64
4) Staff interact with children and youth to help them learn.	5.73	5.64
5) Children and youth generally interact with one another.	6.00	5.78
Indoor Environment:	5.35	5.45
6) The program's indoor space meets the needs of children and youth.	5.40	5.40
7) The indoor space allows children and youth to take initiative and explore their interests.	5.40	5.60
8) The indoor space displays program rules and children's work.	5.00	5.20
9) The program provides functional building facilities for children and youth.	5.60	5.60
Activities:	5.18	5.14
10) Today's schedule is flexible and attentive to needs of all children and youth.	5.00	5.22
11) Children and youth can choose from a wide variety of activities	5.36	5.09
Safety, Health & Nutrition:		
12) Children and youth are carefully supervised.	6.00	5.64
Materials:		
13) There are materials to support program activities.	6.00	5.91
Teaching Performance:	5.76	5.85
14) Staff guide the behavior of children and youth.	5.82	5.91
15) Staff/child ratios permit staff to meet the needs of children and youth.	6.00	5.91
16) Staff works together to meet the needs of children and youth.	5.45	5.73
N/A Average: 3.25 Overall Averages:	5.67	5.63

* Scores range from 1=Very Poor to 6=Very Good

***After School Program Evaluation Measure Averages
for Clark's Corner, N=5 Observations***

	* Quantity	* Quality & Appropriateness
Human Relationships:	5.52	5.68
1) Staff relate to children and youth.	5.40	5.60
2) Staff responds to the individual needs of children and youth.	5.40	5.80
3) Staff encourage children and youth to make choices and to become more responsible.	5.40	5.80
4) Staff interact with children and youth to help them learn.	5.60	5.60
5) Children and youth generally interact with one another.	6.00	5.33
Indoor Environment:	5.88	5.88
6) The program's indoor space meets the needs of children and youth.	6.00	6.00
7) The indoor space allows children and youth to take initiative and explore their interests.	6.00	6.00
8) The indoor space displays program rules and children's work.	5.50	5.50
9) The program provides functional building facilities for children and youth.	6.00	6.00
Activities:	5.40	5.30
10) Today's schedule is flexible and attentive to needs of all children and youth.	5.00	5.40
11) Children and youth can choose from a wide variety of activities	5.80	5.20
Safety, Health & Nutrition:		
12) Children and youth are carefully supervised.	6.00	5.20
Materials:		
13) There are materials to support program activities.	6.00	5.80
Teaching Performance:	5.47	5.67
14) Staff guide the behavior of children and youth.	5.60	5.80
15) Staff/child ratios permit staff to meet the needs of children and youth.	6.00	5.80
16) Staff works together to meet the needs of children and youth.	4.80	5.40
N/A Average: 4.00 Overall Averages:	5.62	5.63

* Scores range from 1=Very Poor to 6=Very Good

***After School Program Evaluation Measure Averages
for Knollwood, Claymont, N=6 Observations***

	* Quantity	* Quality & Appropriateness
Human Relationships:	5.90	5.63
1) Staff relate to children and youth.	6.00	5.33
2) Staff responds to the individual needs of children and youth.	5.67	5.67
3) Staff encourage children and youth to make choices and to become more responsible.	6.00	5.50
4) Staff interact with children and youth to help them learn.	5.83	5.67
5) Children and youth generally interact with one another.	6.00	6.00
Indoor Environment:	5.00	5.17
6) The program's indoor space meets the needs of children and youth.	5.00	5.00
7) The indoor space allows children and youth to take initiative and explore their interests.	5.00	5.33
8) The indoor space displays program rules and children's work.	4.67	5.00
9) The program provides functional building facilities for children and youth.	5.33	5.33
Activities:	5.00	5.00
10) Today's schedule is flexible and attentive to needs of all children and youth.	5.00	5.00
11) Children and youth can choose from a wide variety of activities	5.00	5.00
Safety, Health & Nutrition:		
12) Children and youth are carefully supervised.	6.00	6.00
Materials:		
13) There are materials to support program activities.	6.00	6.00
Teaching Performance:	6.00	6.00
14) Staff guide the behavior of children and youth.	6.00	6.00
15) Staff/child ratios permit staff to meet the needs of children and youth.	6.00	6.00
16) Staff works together to meet the needs of children and youth.	6.00	6.00
N/A Average: 2.80 Overall Averages:	5.71	5.64

* Scores range from 1=Very Poor to 6=Very Good

Appendix C

ACHENBACH SYSTEM OF EMPIRICALLY BASED ASSESSMENTS

Detailed Results

Student	Score Category on Achenbach Measure of Child Behavior ¹																
	“Adaptive Functioning” Scale ²	“Internalizing, Externalizing, Total Problems & Critical Items” Scale				“Syndrome” Scale					“DSM-Oriented” Scales						
		Internalizing	Externalizing	Total Problems	Critical Items ³	Internalizing	Externalizing	Social Problems	Thought Problems	Attention Problems	Affective Problems	Anxiety Problems	Somatic Problems	Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Problems	Oppositional Defiant Problems	Conduct Problems	
1	Clinical-P ⁴ Clinical-S	B’line-P Okay-S	Okay-P Clinical-S	B’line-P Clinical-S	3-P 1-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Clinical-P Clinical-S	B’line-P B’line-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Clinical-S	Okay-P Clinical-S	
2	Clinical-S	B’line-S	Clinical-S	Clinical-S	1-S	Clinical-S	Clinical-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	B’line-S	B’line-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Clinical-S	Clinical-S	Clinical-S	
3	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Clinical-S	Okay-P B’line-S	0-P 1-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Clinical-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P B’line-S	Okay-P B’line-S	
4	Okay-P Okay-S	B’line-P Okay-S	Okay-P Clinical-S	B’line-P Clinical-S	3-P 3-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Clinical-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Clinical-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P B’line-S	Okay-P B’line-S	Okay-P Clinical-S	
5	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	0-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	
6	Okay-S	Okay-S	Clinical-S	Okay-S	0-S	Okay-S	Clinical-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	B’line-S	B’line-S	
7	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P B’line-S	Okay-P Okay-S	2-P 1-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	B’line-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	
8	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	0-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	
9	B’line-P Okay-S	Okay-P B’line-S	Okay-P Clinical-S	Okay-P Okay-S	3-P 0-S	MD ⁵ -P B’line-S	MD-P B’line-S	MD-P B’line-S	MD-P Okay-S	MD-P Okay-S	MD-P Okay-S	MD-P Okay-S	MD-P Okay-S	MD-P Okay-S	MD-P Okay-S	MD-P Okay-S	
10	Okay-S	Okay-S	Clinical-S	Clinical-S	2-S	Okay-S	Clinical-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Clinical-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Clinical-S	Okay-S	B’line-S	

¹ Information reported by parent and/or teacher. Shaded squares represent categories in which at least one rater scored the child’s behavior as “clinical.”

² Responses designated with a “P” indicate Parent Ratings; those designated with an “S” indicate Staff Ratings of the child’s behavior.

³ This scale reports the presence of any critical items worth noting, e.g., Cruelty to Animals, Drug Use, Sees Things, etc.

⁴ Raw scores and percentiles vary across subscales, as do the T-scores used here for uniformity of comparison. Each subscales has different numeric values for each category. However, the qualitative meaning is comparable across subscales, due to the fact that each score is judged in relation to the scores recorded for the general population sample of children, matched to the student according to age-range and gender.

⁵ Missing Data prevented reporting scores on this subscale.

For Demographic Description of Types of Children Served....

SITE: KNOLLWOOD AFTER SCHOOL/SUMMER PROGRAM

N=23

Student	Score Category on Achenbach Measure of Child Behavior ⁶																
	“Adaptive Functioning” Scale ⁷	“Internalizing, Externalizing, Total Problems & Critical Items” Scale				“Syndrome” Scale					“DSM-Oriented” Scales						
		Internalizing	Externalizing	Total Problems	Critical Items ⁸	Internalizing	Externalizing	Social Problems	Thought Problems	Attention Problems	Affective Problems	Anxiety Problems	Somatic Problems	Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Problems	Oppositional Defiant Problems	Conduct Problems	
1	B'line-P Clinical-S	B'line-P Okay-S	Clinical-P Okay-S	Clinical-P Clinical-S	1-P 0-S	B'line-P Okay-S	B'line-P Okay-S	Clinical-P B'line-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Clinical-P B'line-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P B'line-S	Clinical-P MD-P	Clinical-P Clinical-S	B'line-P Okay-S	Clinical-P Okay-S	
2	B'line-P Okay-S Clinical-T	Okay-P Okay-S Okay-T	B'line-P B'line-S B'line-T	Okay-P Okay-S Okay-T	1-P 1-S 1-T	Okay-P Okay-S Okay-T	B'line-P Okay-S Okay-T	Okay-P Okay-S Okay-T	Okay-P Okay-S Okay-T	Okay-P Okay-S Okay-T	Okay-P Okay-S Okay-T	Okay-P Okay-S Okay-T	Okay-P Okay-S MD ⁹ -T	Okay-P Okay-S Okay-T	B'line-P Okay-S Okay-T	Okay-P Okay-S Okay-T	
3	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	0-P 0-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	
4	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	0-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	
5	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	0-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	
6	B'line-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Clinical-P Clinical-S	Okay-P B'line-S	0-P 0-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Clinical-P Clinical-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Clinical-P Okay-S	Clinical-P B'line-S	
7	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P B'line-S	B'line-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	0-P 0-S	Okay-P Okay-S	B'line-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	
8	MD-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	0-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	
9	B'line-P MD-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	0-P 0-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	
10	Clinical-P MD-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	0-P 0-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	

⁶ Information reported by parent, ASP staff and/or teacher.

⁷ Responses designated with a “P” indicate Parent Ratings; those designated with an “S” indicate Staff Ratings of the child’s behavior.

⁸ This scale reports the presence of any critical items worth noting, e.g., Cruelty to Animals, Drug Use, Sees Things, etc.

⁹ Missing Data prevented reporting scores on this subscale.

KNOLLWOOD AFTER SCHOOL/SUMMER PROGRAM (CONTINUATION)

Student	Score Category on Achenbach Measure of Child Behavior																
	“Adaptive Functioning” Scale	“Internalizing, Externalizing, Total Problems & Critical Items” Scale				“Syndrome” Scale					“DSM-Oriented” Scales						
		Internalizing	Externalizing	Total Problems	Critical Items	Internalizing	Externalizing	Social Problems	Thought Problems	Attention Problems	Affective Problems	Anxiety Problems	Somatic Problems	Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Problems	Oppositional Defiant Problems	Conduct Problems	
11	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Clinical-P Okay-S	B'line-P Okay-S	1-P 1-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Clinical-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Clinical-P Okay-S	Clinical-P Okay-S	
12	B'line-P MD-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	0-P 0-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	
13	Clinical-P MD-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Clinical-P Okay-S	Clinical-P Okay-S	1-P 0-S	Okay-P Okay-S	B'line-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	B'line-P Okay-S	B'line-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	B'line-P Okay-S	B'line-P Okay-S	
14	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Clinical-P B'line-S	B'line-P Okay-S	0-P 1-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Clinical-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Clinical-P Okay-S	Clinical-P Okay-S	
15	Clinical-P MD-S	Okay-P Clinical-S	B'line-P Okay-S	Clinical-P B'line-S	1-P 0-S	Okay-P Clinical-S	B'line-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Clinical-P Okay-S	Clinical-P B'line-S	Okay-P B'line-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P MD-S	Clinical-P B'line-S	Okay-P Okay-S	B'line-P Okay-S	
16	Okay-P B'line-S B'line-T	Clinical-P Clinical-S Clinical-T	Clinical-S Okay-S Okay-T	Clinical-P B'line-S Clinical-T	4-P 0-S 0-T	Clinical-P B'line-S Clinical-T	Clinical-P Okay-S Okay-T	Clinical-P Okay-S Clinical-T	Clinical-P Clinical-S Okay-T	Clinical-P Okay-S Okay-T	Clinical-P B'line-S Clinical-T	Clinical-P Okay-S Clinical-T	Okay-P B'line-S B'line-T	Clinical-P Okay-S Okay-T	Okay-P Okay-S Okay-T	B'line-P Okay-S Okay-T	
17	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	0-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	Okay-S	
18	Clinical-P MD-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Clinical-P Okay-S	Clinical-P Okay-S	0-P 0-S	B'line-P Okay-S	Clinical-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	B'line-P MD-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Clinical-P Okay-S	Clinical-P Okay-S
19	Clinical-P Okay-S	Clinical-P B'line-S	Clinical-P Clinical-S	Clinical-P Clinical-S	0-P 1-S	B'line-P Okay-S	B'line-P Clinical-S	B'line-P Clinical-S	Clinical-P Okay-S	Okay-P B'line-S	B'line-P Okay-S	B'line-P B'line-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P B'line-S	Okay-P Clinical-P	B'line-P Clinical-S	
20	Okay-P Okay-S	B'line-P Clinical-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	0-P 0-S	Clinical-P Clinical-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	
21	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	B'line-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	0-P 0-S	B'line-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	B'line-P MD-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	
22	Clinical-P MD-S Clinical-T	Okay-P Okay-S Clinical-T	B'line-P Clinical-S Clinical-T	Okay-P Okay-S Clinical-T	0-P 1-S 2-T	Okay-P Okay-S Clinical-T	Okay-P Okay-S Clinical-T	Okay-P Okay-S Clinical-T	Okay-P Okay-S Clinical-T	Okay-P Okay-S Clinical-T	Okay-P Okay-S B'line-T	Okay-P Okay-S B'line-T	Okay-P MD-S Okay-T	Okay-P Okay-S Clinical-T	Okay-P Clinical-S Clinical-T	Okay-P Okay-S B'line-T	
23	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	0-P 0-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	Okay-P Okay-S	