

*Analysis of the After School Program Component of*  
**City Year Los Angeles's**  
**Whole School**  
**Whole Child Model**

Commissioned by  
City of Los Angeles

Prepared by  
City Year Los Angeles

# *Analysis of the After School Program Component of*

## **City Year Los Angeles's Whole School Whole Child Model**

**C**ity Year is an education-focused nonprofit organization that partners with public schools to help keep students in school and on track to graduate. Founded in Boston in 1989, City Year works in 15 cities across the United States and has international affiliates in London and Johannesburg, Africa. City Year corps members are 16- to 24-year-olds who commit to one year of full-time service in elementary or middle schools, or in non-personal school-based teams. City Year corps members provide a variety of services including literacy and math tutoring for targeted students, in-class support for teachers, and after-school programming that includes homework help, tutoring, and enrichment activities. City Year developed the Whole School, Whole Child Model to address the central factors affecting student academic success: attendance, behavior, and course performance.

For more information, visit [www.cityyear.org](http://www.cityyear.org). Operations are an integral part of City Year's mission.

This report focuses on the impact of the program on the academic and socio-emotional outcomes associated with students' participation in the program of its and its out-of-school support. Our analyses of the impact on student performance were guided by the following research questions:

- Do greater improvements to outcomes occur when a student received both in-school and after-school support?
- Do greater effects are for positive outcomes for students receiving after-school supports only or out-of-school supports?
- Do students identified as non-urban area earners show different effects of in-school or out-of-school support?

This brief includes a summary of the study, a description of the study's methodology and a brief explanation of the analyses conducted. It also describes the characteristics of students in the study. We partnered with the corps leaders who served in the study to present the findings for our analyses of the impact on students' test grades and test scores and its impact on students' state report card scores for the 2017-2018 school year.

## Key Findings

- Students who attended the program for more than 7 hours per week were more likely to increase their test grades in the 2017-2018 school year than students who did not.  $N = 1,000$ .  $p < .05$ . Students attending more than 7 hours of the program also scored significantly higher on the end-of-year state report card.  $N = 1,000$ .  $p < .05$ .
- Middle school students who participated in the program's in-school and after-school interventions were more likely to maintain or improve their test grade.  $N = 1,000$ .  $p < .05$ .
- Female students participating in any City Year program were more likely to maintain their test grades or improve their grades in the 2017-2018 school year than males.  $N = 1,000$ .  $p < .05$ . In addition, female students were more likely to improve or maintain their test grades.  $N = 1,000$ .  $p < .05$ .
- Students who received more than the median in-school tutoring hours in the 2017-2018 school year also attended the program more often.  $N = 1,000$ .  $p < .05$ . This effect was even larger for female middle school students who gained on average 10 points on the state report card.  $N = 1,000$ .  $p < .05$ . In addition, students who participated in the program for more than the median number of hours and received any in-school support also showed gains.  $N = 1,000$ .  $p < .05$ .
- Program participation was associated with positive outcomes for students classified as poor or non-poor. In addition, for program participants classified as poor, we found positive effects on test outcomes and on the state report card.  $N = 1,000$ .  $p < .05$ .

# Study Methodology

For our analyses we used data collected by: Y staff, Y corporates and Y partner organisations. These data include students' academic and social

### **Corps Member Characteristics**

The received data from City Year for the corps members who served at the sites included in our analyses for the 2019-2020 years. These data included corps members' race or ethnicity, gender, age, highest grade completed, and highest level of education attained.

### **Data Analysis**

We conducted separate analyses for each outcome at grades 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. We used test scores from the different forms of the assessment for each grade level. We used the same test scores for each grade level.

Therefore, the error variance in the test of an effect is reduced, the variance in student scores in the final analysis, but the error variance in student test



## ***Program Participation***

Students in City Year partner schools receive targeted support in the form of an adult role model during the school day in after-school programs or at other times. City Corps members play an important role in providing this support by working with teachers to differentiate instruction and working with students one-on-one in a tutoring capacity. Additionally, their presence as role models and their approach to coaching also provides students with socio-emotional support. The following section examines the characteristics of these Corps members and the results of their hours of specialized instruction that students received in 2013-14 and 2014-15.

**City Year**  
**Characteristics**

### Exhibit 3: Characteristics of CYLA corps members serving students in 2012-13 & 2013-14

| Corps member characteristics      | Percent of corps members |         |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|---------|
|                                   | 2012-13                  | 2013-14 |
| <b>Gender</b>                     | N= 78                    | N= 66   |
| Male                              | -                        | -       |
| Female                            | -                        | -       |
| <b>Race/Ethnicity</b>             | N= 70                    | N= 66   |
| Latino or Hispanic                | -                        | -       |
| White                             | -                        | -       |
| Black                             | -                        | -       |
| Asian                             | -                        | -       |
| Other                             | -                        | -       |
| <b>Highest level of education</b> | N= 78                    | N= 66   |
| Graduate degree                   | -                        | -       |
| Bachelor's degree                 | -                        | -       |
| Associate's degree                | -                        | -       |
| Some college                      | -                        | -       |
| High school graduate              | -                        | -       |
| Some high school                  | -                        | -       |

The chart below shows the distribution of corps members' highest level of education across the two study years. In 2012-13, more than a quarter of corps members were categorized as not at all proficient, while in 2013-14, no corps members received this designation and less than one percent were categorized as only proficient in pre-algebra or other mathematics. The vast majority of corps members were proficient in algebra. A subsequent analysis described later in this report explores whether corps members' level of proficiency in mathematics interacts with students' mathematics performance.







Anal

## Hours of Support

The number of hours of in-school support that a student received is similar for and that that is on a range of students received in-school and that support received on a range of hours of tutoring in - and and hours respectively in -. Students in after-school programs received a unique range of support. On a range of students in of years of study received more than the rest of the number of hours of support that an in-school support. It is important to note that the range of hours of support received is a range of years so the students received less than one hour of after-school support. The others received hundreds of hours. According to the median number of hours is as provided in that to provide an additional measure of central tendency.

### Exhibit 6: Change in Lexile scale score, fall to spring

| Type of support        | N | Mean Number of Hours | Median Number of Hours |
|------------------------|---|----------------------|------------------------|
| ELA in-school tutoring |   |                      |                        |
| 2013-14                |   |                      |                        |

Initial exploratory analyses of the number of hours of support by type of support and by school year suggest an association between the two variables. Differences in number of hours between the two elementary grades and in school are significant in each type of support category. Similarly, there are significant differences in hours of support by school year for in-school and after-school hours in - - p. However, not for all the differences between school groups are particularly noticeable in hours in of years as elementary school students on a range received more than hours of after-school support compared to close to and hours of after-school support among middle and high school students respectively.

## Exploratory Findings in Student Outcomes

Primary findings focus on five student outcomes: change in student assessments, change in student grades, change in student assessment grades, and change in student socio-economic index scores. Each subset of examined students' performance in beginning of year and end of year assessments and changes in student grades in the same time period. Grade analysis is limited to students in middle school and high school. The following section presents primary findings that establish the baseline level of student performance in each subset and changes in performance over the course of each study year.





Analysis of the A

Preliminary findings indicate that in 2019-2020, students significantly improved their quantitative score on the test from the beginning to end of year period. In 2020-2021, there was no significant difference between students' average beginning of year score and end of year score on the periodic assessment and this difference is not statistically significant. In addition, the results of these assessments by school year indicate the effect size in 2019-2020 indicates an important increase in scores.

Figure 1

There are no statistically significant differences between the beginning and end of year grades in either of the study years. The study used the same methodology as the previous studies.





## Impact Analyses and Findings

Our analyses of the City Year after school program in Los Angeles estimated the impact of students' participation in the program on five outcome areas: academic achievement, attendance, behavioral outcomes, social skills, and employment. We analyzed each outcome separately using a regression discontinuity design. The results show that students who participated in the program had higher academic achievement, better attendance, and improved social skills compared to students who did not participate. Additionally, students who participated in the program were more likely to be employed after graduation.

***RQ1. Do greater improvements to outcomes occur when a student received both in-school and after school support?***

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS (ELA) OUTCOMES.** We found positive



- ▶ Students included on the attendance and or a prior focus lists were es





► In addition to the effect of program participation on scores, we found some positive effects on program and program students

Program students who attended more than the median number of program hours scored on average 10 points higher on the spring test.  $N = 6$

Program students who attended the median number of program hours or more scored on average 10 points higher on the spring test.  $N = 6$

► The magnitude of gains on the test varied by subgroup. Elementary and middle school

Elementary school program students who participated in program for the median number of hours or more showed an average gain of 10 points on the test.  $N = 1$

Middle school program and program students who participated in program for the median number of hours or more showed average gains of respectively 10 points and 10 points on the test.  $N = 6$  and  $p$  respectively

### MATH OUTCOMES

► Program students who participated in program regardless of number of hours of support were 10% more likely to maintain or improve their math grades.  $N = 6$

► The average program and program students respectively were 10% more likely to maintain or improve their math grade compared to average students.  $N = 6$  and  $p$  respectively

► Regardless of types of support provided to the program students scored significantly lower on the spring test.  $N = 6$  -  $p$

### SKILLS REPORT CARD (SRC) OUTCOMES

► Program students receive any type of support from program. They significantly improved their SRC score in reading by an average of 10 points.  $N = 6$  -  $p$  Program students scored on average 10 points higher on their spring test.  $N = 6$

### ADDITIONAL FINDINGS

In nearly all analyses of the outcomes associated with the effect of in-school support and program we found that the base-line measure was as far from the target and far from the score is significantly and negatively associated with the final outcome. Mean program students who score higher in the beginning of the year on these measures are likely to show decreased gains on their final outcomes

We also included demographic variables to control for corporate and student characteristics. However, for an student gender none of these variables proved to have a significant effect on student outcomes

# Concluding Observations and Options for Additional Research





# **Appendix A: Variables and Statistical Models**

# Variables and Statistical Models

The use of multiple linear and logistic models to determine the effects of. The proportion in on the five outcome variables of interest. The grades at grades and is a indicator. The first year and the second year variables included in the final models are listed below in their explanations of how they were coded from the original data. We provided to the researchers the estimated coefficients and standard errors produced for the variables in the final prediction models are shown in subsequent exhibits accompanied by a short description of the models and analytic methods.

| Exhibit A1:<br>Summary of variables used in the analysis and variable coding |   |
|--|---|
| Variable label   | Description   |
| <b>Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI)</b>                                    | Students' grade in the reading score between fall and spring semester as the outcome variable for the test analyses.  |
| <b>Scholastic Math Inventory (SMI)</b>                                       | Students' grade in the math score between fall and spring semester as the outcome variable for the test analyses.   |
| <b>Periodic Assessment (ELA)</b>   | or - test analyses our outcome variable for test analyses as the grade in students' periodic assessment score between fall and spring.  |
| <b>Periodic Assessment (Math)</b>  | or - test analyses our outcome variable for test analyses as the grade in students' periodic assessment score between fall and spring.  |
| <b>Grades (ELA)</b>  | cross of years the used is indicator variable as the outcome for grade analyses. If a student's achievement level increased or maintained an or grade between the end of the first grade reading period and the end of the second year, the coded variable is 1. If the student's achievement level decreased or if the student's achievement level remained the same, the coded variable is 0.   |
| <b>Grades (Math)</b>   | the constructed is outcome variable for grades across of years applying the same process to students' math grades as is described for grades above.   |
| <b>Skills Report Card (SRC)</b>  | the calculated the grade in students' scores over the course of the year by subtracting the student's score of the first and last administration from the score of the final administration. We used the score of the final administration as the final administration is a coded variable used to help in the analyses students' performance data for the entire year. The SRC is a coded variable used to help in the analyses students' performance data for the entire year. The SRC is a coded variable used to help in the analyses students' performance data for the entire year. |



As a result of our decision to calculate the mean across a site, we conducted analyses to determine the internal consistency of the items. The results yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .84, indicating acceptable internal consistency.



**Exhibit A2:  
Multilevel mixed effects models predicting 2013-14 school year  
change in Scholastic Reading Inventory (ELA) assessment scores**



## Exhibit A3: Multilevel mixed effects models predicting 2013-14 school year change in Scholastic Mathematics Inventory (Math) assessment scores

| Variables  | Coefficient (SE) |
|--|------------------|
| Intercept $\beta$  | -                |
| Attended $\beta$ for or more hours each week and received to hours of afterschool tutoring in-school math hours within 5th to 7th percentiles $\gamma$           | -                |
| Attended $\beta$ for or more hours each week and received to hours of afterschool tutoring in-school math hours within 50th to 75th percentiles $\gamma$         | -                |
| Attended $\beta$ for or more hours each week and received more than hours of afterschool tutoring in-school math hours within 75th to 100th percentiles $\gamma$ | -                |
| $\beta$ students $\gamma$  | -                |
| $\beta$ students $\gamma$  | -                |
| Female students $\gamma$   | -                |
| Baseline math score $\gamma$   | -                |
| Students on the attendance roster $\gamma$   | -                |
| Students on the enrollment roster $\gamma$   | -                |
| Female corps leaders $\gamma$  | -                |
| 90-100% percent of corps leaders who took calculus $\gamma$  | -                |
| 90-100% percent of corps leaders or in if a student of the same race $\gamma$  | -                |
| Received to hours of afterschool tutoring in-school math hours within 5th to 7th percentiles $\gamma$  | -                |

Received to hours of afterschool tutoring in-school math hours within 5th to 7th percentiles  $\gamma$

**Exhibit A4:  
Logistic regression model predicting  
school year 2013**



A

## Exhibit A6: Multilevel mixed effects models predicting 2013-14 school year change in Skills Report Card scores

| Variables   | Coefficient<br>(SE) |
|---|---------------------|
| <b>Intercept, <math>\beta_{00}</math></b>                     |                     |
| attended ASP for more than the median hours = 80              |                     |
| received more than the median hours of all in-school tutoring |                     |
| ASP students  |                     |
| ASP students  |                     |
| female students   |                     |
| baseline score  |                     |
| students on the attendance roster                             |                     |
| students on the behavior roster                               |                     |
| baseline score  |                     |
| <b>Random effects</b>   |                     |
| random effect   |                     |
| $\sigma^2$  |                     |
| $N = 1000$  |                     |

indicates p = indicates p =  
indicates p = indicates p =

Exhibit reads: Students who attended ASP for more than the median number of hours scored 0.18 points higher (out of 5 points) on the SRC between fall and spring.



## Exhibit A8: Multilevel mixed effects models predicting 2012-13 school year change in Math periodic assessment scores

| Variables   | Coefficient<br>(SE) |
|---|---------------------|
| <b>Intercept, <math>\beta_{00}</math></b>   |                     |
| Attended 100% for or more hours per week and received 1-3 hours of at-home tutoring in-school math tutoring hours within 5th to 7th percentiles $\gamma$            | -                   |
| Attended 100% for or more hours per week and received 4-7 hours of at-home tutoring in-school math tutoring hours within 50th to 75th percentiles $\gamma$          | -                   |
| Attended 100% for or more hours per week and received more than 7 hours of at-home tutoring in-school math tutoring hours within 75th to 100th percentiles $\gamma$ | -                   |
| Female students $\gamma$  |                     |
| Female students $\gamma$  | -                   |
| Female students $\gamma$  |                     |
| Female students $\gamma$  | -                   |
| Baseline periodic assessment score $\gamma$   | -                   |
| Students on the attendance focus list $\gamma$  | -                   |
| Students on the behavior focus list $\gamma$  | -                   |
| Female corps leaders $\gamma$   | -                   |
| 100% female percent of corps leaders in the caucus $\gamma$   | -                   |
| 100% female percent of corps leaders or in the same race $\gamma$   | -                   |
| Received 1-3 hours of at-home tutoring in-school math tutoring hours within 5th to 7th percentiles $\gamma$   | -                   |
| Received 4-7 hours of at-home tutoring in-school math tutoring hours within 50th to 75th percentiles $\gamma$   | -                   |
| Received more than 7 hours of at-home tutoring in-school math tutoring hours within 75th to 100th percentiles $\gamma$  | -                   |
| Attended 100% for or more hours $M_{\text{an S}} \text{ hours} = 60 \gamma$   |                     |
| <b>Random effects</b>   |                     |
| 100% female effect $\gamma$   |                     |
| $\sigma^2$  |                     |
| $N$   |                     |

indicates p = Indicates p =  
indicates p = ar in a significance

Exhibit reads: Controlling for all other variables in the model and for the nesting of students in schools, students with higher fall baseline scores scored significantly lower, losing 0.42 points, on the spring administration of the math periodic assessment.



## Exhibit A9: Logistic regression model predicting school year 2012-13 change in ELA grade

| Independent variable  | Odds ratio<br>(SE) |
|---|--------------------|
| Intercept   | -                  |
| attended for 1-3 hours<br>attendance hours within 5th to 7th percentiles          | -                  |
| attended for 4-6 hours<br>attendance hours within 50th to 75th percentiles        | -                  |
| attended for 7 or more hours<br>attendance hours within 75th to 100th percentiles | -                  |
| received 1 or more hours of eLearning   | -                  |

## Exhibit A10: Logistic regression model predicting school year 2012-13 change in math grade

| Independent variable  | Odds ratio<br>(SE) |
|---|--------------------|
| Intercept   |                    |
| Attended 1 hour for - 3 hours<br>Attendance hours within 5th to 7th percentiles                   |                    |
| Attended 4-7 hours for - 3 hours<br>Attendance hours within 50th to 75th percentiles              |                    |
| Attended 8 or more hours for - 3 hours<br>Attendance hours within 75th to 100th percentiles       |                    |
| Received 1-3 hours of in-school at-tutoring<br>In-school hours in 5th to 7th percentiles          |                    |
| Received 4-7 hours of in-school at-tutoring<br>In-school hours in 50th to 75th percentiles        |                    |
| Received 8 or more hours of in-school at-tutoring<br>In-school hours in 75th to 100th percentiles |                    |
| RFEP students   |                    |
| RFEP students   |                    |
| RFEP students   |                    |
| ELA A students  |                    |
| Students on the attendance focus list   |                    |
| Students on the qualification focus list  |                    |
| 1st quarter at-grade  |                    |
| 90% or more percent of core courses or in the same race   |                    |
| 90% or more percent of core courses or too cautious   |                    |
| Pseudo R-squared  |                    |

indicates p = indicates p =  
indicates p = indicates p =

Exhibit reads: Students classified as RFEP students were 1.55 times more likely to improve or maintain their ELA grade during the 2012-13 school year. School fixed effects models only slightly improved model fit. Final model fits data significantly better than the empty model, p 0.001.



## Exhibit A11: Multilevel mixed effects models predicting 2012-13 school year change in Skills Report Card scores

**Variables**

**Coefficient**  
(

## **POLICY STUDIEST**