**Fidelity of Implementation of the
TASC ExpandED Model in 2011-12**

Beth Sinclair
Christina A. Russell
Jeanine Hildreth
Tiffany D. Miller
Pamela Stevens
Colleen McCann

January 2013

Executive Summary

The After-School Corporation (TASC) launched the ExpandED national demonstration in 2011 in five schools in New York City, three schools in New Orleans, Louisiana, and two schools in Baltimore, Maryland.[1] ExpandED is a whole-school reform model that seeks to increase the amount of learning time in the school day by bringing together schools and community partner organizations to work jointly to change instructional practices and expand learning opportunities for students. As a central element of the TASC model, the ExpandED School and community partner organization are expected to work together as a team to transform the school. The principal serves as the initiative leader, communicating the vision for change to the broader school community. In a school implementing the ExpandED model with a high degree of fidelity, staff of the school and community partner create a seamless school day, with minimal distinction between the learning opportunities led by school and community partner staff.

Fidelity of Implementation Rubric

TASC contracted with Policy Studies Associates (PSA) to conduct a five-year evaluation of the ExpandED model. This evaluation is built on two linked hypotheses. The first is that the ExpandED model is capable of transforming the in-school educational experiences of students. In schools in which ExpandED is implemented with fidelity to the model, it will expand, improve, and enrich students' learning opportunities to produce significant improvements in students' instructional experiences. The second hypothesis is that fidelity to the ExpandED model will result in learning gains for students. Findings from the first year of the evaluation (2011-12), focused on initial start-up and implementation, are summarized here.

TASC's ExpandED model is built on four core elements, listed in Exhibit A. As part of the evaluation, PSA, in collaboration with TASC, developed a rubric to assess the fidelity of schools' implementation of these core elements. The fidelity rubric is intended to be used for multiple purposes and by multiple stakeholders, including: (1) evaluators to examine the fidelity of implementation of the model across ExpandED Schools; (2) TASC and intermediary organizations as a coaching and monitoring tool for technical assistance efforts; and (3) ExpandED Schools as a self-assessment and program improvement tool. Because the fidelity rubric is intended to be shared with and used by multiple stakeholders, it can also serve as a tool for TASC to increase the transparency of its expectations for ExpandED Schools and community partners and to promote improved ExpandED implementation.

The rubric breaks the four TASC core elements for implementation into sub-elements, and operationalizes each of these sub-elements into concrete indicators. Over the five years of this evaluation, the rubric ratings will measure the progress of the schools in implementing the ExpandED model with fidelity. Rubric ratings, which are assigned following visits to each school, are based on high expectations for implementation of the ExpandED model. The rubric

---

[1] One additional school in Baltimore began implementing the ExpandED model in 2011-12 but did not continue in 2012-13. Another Baltimore school took its place in 2012-13 and will be included in the evaluation going forward.

is designed to hold ExpandED Schools accountable for achieving exemplary levels of fidelity to the ExpandED model. Especially in initial years of ExpandED implementation, PSA researchers expect to find some inconsistency in the fidelity of implementation across schools and across core elements. As implementation of the ExpandED model becomes more consistent and established within schools, more High and Excellent ratings are likely.

> **Excellent** (E) – Exemplary implementation; a model for other ExpandED Schools
> **High** (H) – School demonstrates consistent fidelity of ExpandED implementation
> **Medium** (M) – School demonstrates fidelity to the ExpandED model, but inconsistently
> **Low** (L) – Improvement needed; school implements the ExpandED model with limited
> fidelity
> **Unsatisfactory** (U) – Needs substantial work; school does not demonstrate fidelity to the
> ExpandED model

Findings from the First-Year Collection of Implementation Data

Based on interviews conducted with school and community partner staff and on observations in each ExpandED School in Spring 2012, PSA researchers assigned fidelity ratings for each element of the ExpandED model, as well as an overall fidelity rating (Exhibit A). Seven of the 10 schools were rated Medium or higher on their overall fidelity of implementation of ExpandED. However, certain elements of the model were more likely to be implemented at high levels of fidelity than others. For example, while shared responsibility for ExpandED between the school and community partner was rated High or Excellent for four of the 10 schools (core element 2a), no schools were rated High on family engagement in learning (core element 2b). As the ExpandED model becomes more rooted in schools in future years, higher levels of implementation fidelity can be expected. Highlights of promising approaches to implementation of each of the core elements are summarized below.

Core Element 1: More time for a balanced curriculum. The first core element of the TASC ExpandED model is a school day in which all students are engaged in expanded learning time and in which the added time includes rigorous academic and enrichment content. Eight of the 10 ExpandED Schools were rated Medium or High on their fidelity of implementation of this core element, and two were implementing the element with Low levels of fidelity.

In general, schools that had more experience experimenting with expanded learning approaches prior to the launch of the ExpandED initiative were best positioned to create school cultures consistent with the ExpandED model. Schools newest to the TASC expanded learning model struggled with involving all students in the school (or in designated grades within the school) in ExpandED, although many were working to increase ExpandED participation in future years. In the schools with more mature expanded learning approaches, supplementary learning opportunities had a stronger academic focus than in less mature ExpandED Schools and this focus was aligned with instruction the students received during the regular school day.

Exhibit A
Summary of ratings of implementation fidelity (N=10)

Core element:	Number of ExpandED Schools rated:				
	Excellent	**High**	**Medium**	**Low**	**Unsatis-factory**
Overall implementation fidelity rating	**0**	**2**	**5**	**2**	**1**
1: Balanced curriculum	0	2	6	2	0
1a: All students are engaged in expanded learning	2	1	3	4	0
1b: Students are exposed to rigorous, skill-based instruction	0	3	5	2	0
2: School-community partnership	0	3	4	2	1
2a: School and community partner organization share responsibility for implementation	2	2	3	2	1
2b: Family engagement in learning is encouraged and evident	0	0	4	5	1
3: Engaging instruction	0	3	4	3	0
3a: Instruction addresses the individual needs of students	0	2	5	3	0
3b: Instruction is data-driven	1	1	3	2	3
4: Integrated funding	0	0	3	3	4

Exhibit reads: None of the 10 ExpandED Schools were rated Excellent on overall fidelity of implementation of the TASC model. Two schools were rated High on fidelity of implementation, 5 Medium, 2 Low, and 1 Unsatisfactory.

Two ExpandED Schools were rated Excellent for engaging all students in expanded learning, due to their implementation of a model that targeted every student in the school. These two schools placed a high priority on communicating to parents that the school day lasted until 5:30 or 6:00 p.m., and administrators discouraged parents from picking their children up before the end of the day.

In schools receiving the highest ratings for exposing students to rigorous, skill-based instruction, academic and enrichment opportunities offered by community partners were well-aligned to the school-day curriculum. For example, in one school teaching artists from the community partner organization collaborated with the school-day teachers to develop and provide social studies enrichment activities based on the school-day curriculum. In another school, academic activities were led by the students' school-day teachers in an extended-day instructional period. Teachers were paired with community partner staff members for this period, and these teams delivered a combination of small-group instruction and group activities.

Core Element 2: School-community partnerships. All ExpandED Schools rely on community partner organizations to provide staffing and other resources to help expand the school day. The ExpandED model asks the school and community partner organization to work in tandem to provide students with an integrated, seamless school day. ExpandED Schools received mixed ratings for this core element, ranging from Unsatisfactory (one school) to High

(three schools). Higher-rated schools implemented approaches in which the school and community partner organization shared the responsibility for developing and delivering instruction, and took steps to engage parents in the expanded day.

In the schools rated the highest for implementing ExpandED with shared responsibility, the principal had taken specific steps in demonstrating commitment to ExpandED, and in encouraging collaboration between teachers and community partner staff. For example, the principal clearly communicated the ExpandED vision to the teaching staff, and in turn the teaching staff coached community partner staff in delivering effective programming.

Most schools experienced challenges in their efforts to engage families in expanded learning. In schools that were successful in this area, communication to parents about available resources and about the expanded learning day was clear and consistently delivered by both school-day and community partner staff.

Core Element 3: Engaging and personalized instruction. This core element is grounded in prior research on youth development and in TASC's experience that has highlighted the value of instruction that is data-driven and sufficiently differentiated to address the individual needs of students. Implementation of this core element was mixed. Three schools received a High rating and four received a Medium rating. The remaining three schools received a Low rating. In general, ExpandED Schools were more successful in delivering instruction that addressed the individual needs of students than they were in using data to drive instructional practices.

In schools rated most highly, school-day teachers and community partner staff worked together to identify student needs and to share responsibilities in delivering appropriate instructional supports. For example, one school fully integrated school-day teachers and community partner staff throughout the day. The community partner staff pulled students out of their classroom if they needed extra help or more challenging work. In schools that implemented data-driven instruction with high-fidelity, teachers' use of school-day data helped to determine which students should be pulled out to receive extra help from community partner staff, and what content to focus on during enrichment opportunities.

Core Element 4: Integrated funding model. The evaluation's purpose in assessing this core element is not to audit each school's funding stream against TASC's cost model and funding targets. Rather, PSA researchers are assessing the extent to which the school and community partner organization are working together to manage funds effectively and support efforts to sustain ExpandED in the school. Overall, this core element presented the greatest challenge for the 10 ExpandED Schools, with four rated Unsatisfactory and three rated Low. In schools rated most highly in this element, the school principal was actively engaged in fundraising to sustain the ExpandED model in the school, and the community partner was involved in school budgeting.

Lessons Learned

If TASC's ExpandED model becomes established in participating schools in the coming years, TASC expects that schools and community partners will: (1) create a seamless, expanded day for students, (2) align instruction between school-day teachers and community partner staff, and (3) increase ExpandED participation to all students in certain grades or all students in the school. TASC and intermediary organizations can play a key role in clarifying and prioritizing goals for increasing ExpandED participation and providing support to community partners and schools to improve the fidelity of ExpandED implementation.

Findings from the first year of the ExpandED evaluation consistently point to several conditions that may contribute to the capacity of ExpandED Schools to implement the model with fidelity. These conditions are described below. In particular, extending the ExpandED reform to all students in the school was a substantial challenge in all but two of the 10 study schools. In addition to the conditions described below, lack of funding, difficulty adjusting the school schedule, and issues related to student transportation were raised as significant implementation challenges.

Redefined relationship between school and community partner. In all schools, ExpandED built on existing relationships with community partner organizations. This approach had certain advantages because the school and community partner shared a history of working together to provide youth programming. However, retooling established relationships for the new ExpandED model was a challenge, and it was difficult to shift the perception of the community partner as a provider of traditional after-school services to a new role as partner in whole-school reform.

Where the ExpandED model was implemented with the highest fidelity, both the school and community partner organization saw ExpandED as a true school reform effort, shared a vision for the school, and had the organizational capacity to implement the vision in a balanced manner.

Strong principal leadership and vision. The principal of an ExpandED School plays an important role in making explicit the expectations for alignment and integration of instruction delivered by school-day teachers and community partner staff. A common theme in the schools that were implementing ExpandED with the greatest fidelity in 2011-12 was the important role of the principal in the reform effort. In these schools, the principal was a strong advocate for ExpandED and had taken concrete steps to make expanded learning an integral part of the school day. In contrast, in schools with lukewarm support from the principal, ExpandED operated more or less as an after-school program.

Commitment to a seamless school day. All ExpandED Schools understood the model's goal of integrating the work of the school and community partner organization to provide a seamless, expanded school day, but this vision was not the reality in most schools in the first year of ExpandED. Although two ExpandED Schools had made substantial progress in achieving seamlessness, the learning opportunities offered by the community partner were not yet fully established as part of the school culture in the other schools.

Encouraging parents to embrace an integrated, expanded school day was a challenge in nearly all schools. Many schools struggled to help parents accept expanded learning as a required part of the school day rather than as an optional resource for after-school activities. In the schools achieving the highest levels of implementation in this area, the principal, school staff, and community partner staff focused their efforts on direct communication with families to set the expectation for a longer school day.

The first year of the evaluation focused on initial start-up and implementation of the ExpandED model. In subsequent years, the focus of the evaluation will align with the anticipated scale-up of ExpandED. PSA will continue to assess implementation fidelity and will also examine more deeply the ways in which the ExpandED model contributes to a strong foundation for effective student learning in participating schools.

Contents

Overview of ExpandED and the Evaluation

The After-School Corporation (TASC) began developing its expanded learning time model in 2007 through its Expanded Learning Time/New York City (ELT/NYC) pilot initiative. During this three-year pilot, TASC recruited interested schools and community-based partner organizations in New York City and worked with them to design an approach in which students' learning time was expanded and enriched. This approach differed from the after-school programs that TASC had supported since 1998, with the ELT/NYC programs expected to "adopt academic engagement and success as the primary goal and therefore be more rigorous and serve many more students per school" (ELT/NYC Working Group, 2008).

TASC launched the ExpandED national demonstration in 2011, building on lessons learned through the ELT/NYC pilot. The ExpandED demonstration includes five schools in New York City, three schools in New Orleans, Louisiana, and two schools in Baltimore, Maryland.[1,2]

According to TASC informational materials and other TASC resources, the ExpandED model is designed as a whole-school reform with an overall goal of achieving at least 35 percent more learning time at an additional 10 percent of the normal cost of the school day. Based on experience with ELT/NYC and prior research on school-based learning time, the ExpandED model centers around four core elements addressing curriculum, staffing, instruction, and cost. TASC's President, Lucy Friedman, described the ideal ExpandED School in the 2011 TASC annual report as follows: "ExpandED Schools make no distinction between school and after-school. Instead, community partners join teachers and principals, parents and students in planning and executing a balanced learning day. Students get more personalized instruction and adult mentorship. They make choices to pursue their passions. They get the well-rounded education everyone wants for their children."

ExpandED Roles and Responsibilities

As a central element of the TASC model, the ExpandED School and community partner organization are expected to work together as a team to transform the school. The principal serves as the initiative leader, communicating the vision for change to the broader school community. In addition to the principal, ExpandED prescribes the following four roles in each school:

■ ***ExpandED instructional coordinator.*** The ExpandED instructional coordinator, typically a teacher or assistant principal in the school, serves as the day-to-day link between the school and the community partner organization. He/she works

---

[1] Three of the five ExpandED Schools in New York were part of the ELT/NYC pilot, starting their reform efforts in 2008. The other two New York ExpandED Schools started their reform efforts a year later in 2009, as TASC ELT/NYC affiliates.

[2] One additional school in Baltimore began the ExpandED initiative in 2011-12 but did not continue in 2012-13. Another school from this district took its place in 2012-13 and will be included in the evaluation going forward.

with the ExpandED director to identify content and themes for the ExpandED curriculum and is responsible for developing and implementing enrichment opportunities.

- ■ *ExpandED director.* The ExpandED director is employed by the community partner organization and works with the school principal and ExpandED instructional coordinator to integrate ExpandED into the overall school culture. He/she manages the budget and daily operations of the community partner in the school, planning and outreach, and community partner staff.

- ■ *School-day teachers.* School-day teachers provide academic instruction and, in some schools, also deliver other enrichment opportunities.

- ■ *Community partner staff.* Community partner staff, hired and supervised by the ExpandED director, deliver enrichments either in tandem with school staff or by themselves.

In a school that implements the ExpandED model with a high degree of fidelity, all the staff work together across all these roles to create a smooth, seamless day that has little distinction between instruction led by teachers and that led by community partners.

Intermediary organizations played a key role in supporting the implementation of the ExpandED model in each of the three participating cities, serving as the primary contact between TASC and participating schools. According to the model, the extent to which intermediary organizations are successful in supporting schools will significantly affect the overall success of the ExpandED initiative. TASC selected the intermediary organizations in New Orleans and Baltimore based on the organizations' history of effective data coordination, grant management, capacity-building, and policy change. In New York City, TASC serves as the intermediary organization for ExpandED. In each of these cities, important roles of the intermediary organizations included:

- ■ Selecting schools and community partner organizations

- ■ Distributing TASC funding to community partner organizations and schools

- ■ Working with schools to identify additional sources of funding

- ■ Providing professional development and other technical assistance designed to build the capacity of school teachers and community partner staff

Baseline Characteristics of ExpandED Schools

ExpandED Schools serve a racially diverse and economically disadvantaged group of students. These schools range from fairly small (200 students in grades K-5) to large (almost 900 students in that same grade span). In 2010-11, the average school attendance rate ranged from 90 percent to 96 percent. Half of the ExpandED Schools made adequate yearly progress (AYP) in reading and math, as defined by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The percent of students in the school

eligible for free/reduced price lunch ranged from 54 percent to 98 percent. Among the five New York schools, the percentage of students identified as limited English proficient students ranged from zero to 49 percent, a high rate relative to other schools in the city. Exhibit 1 shows the baseline characteristics of the ExpandED Schools in the study.

Exhibit 1
Characteristics of ExpandED Schools in school year 2010-11,
by city and by school

School characteristic:	ExpandED Schools in:									
	New York City					Baltimore		New Orleans		
Initial year with a TASC ELT model	2009	2008	2008	2008	2009	2011	2011	2011	2011	2011
Grades served	PK-8	K-5	PK-8	PK-5	PK-5	PK-5	PK-8	K-8	PK-8	PK-8
Total school enrollment	303	204	369	196	862	394	357	573	504	559
Average school attendance (percent)	94	94	90	92	96	95	93	*	N/A	95
Met AYP in:										
Reading	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N/A	N
Math	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N/A	N
Free/reduced priced lunch (percent)	93	54	97	98	84	85	90	93	N/A	*
Limited English proficient (percent)	49	0	14	8	25	*	*	*	N/A	*
Race/ethnicity (percent)										
African-American	2	92	30	57	0	98	99	95	98	99
Hispanic/Latino	95	7	65	40	25	0	0	2	1	1
White	0	0	4	1	35	1	1	1	1	0
Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	1	0	1	2	40	0	0	1	1	1
Other	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0

Notes: Percentages shown in this table may not add to 100 due to rounding.
      *Data not reported on the School Report Cards for these schools.

Exhibit reads: Three sites in New York City started the ELT/NYC initiative in 2008 and two started the initiative in 2009. During the 2010-11 school year, the enrollment in these five schools ranged from 196 to 862 students.

Sources: For the New York City and Baltimore City schools, data are from the state School Report Cards and Progress Reports for 2010-11. For the schools in New Orleans, the data for two schools were published in the 2010-11 School Report Cards and Progress Reports; for the third school the data reported are for 2011-12 because 2010-11 figures were unavailable.

Overview of the Evaluation

This report summarizes the first-year findings from a five-year evaluation of the ExpandED initiative, conducted by Policy Studies Associates (PSA). This study is built on two linked hypotheses. The first is that the ExpandED model, when fully implemented, is capable of

transforming the in-school educational experiences of students. In a school in which ExpandED is implemented with fidelity to the TASC model, it will expand, improve, and enrich students' learning opportunities to produce significant improvements in students' instructional experiences. The second hypothesis is that fidelity to the ExpandED model will result in learning gains for students.

Based on these two hypotheses, PSA's evaluation addresses the following research questions:

■　　　What actions do participating schools and community partners in the ExpandED initiative take to increase and enrich student learning time and to align instruction across the expanded school day?

■　　　To what extent do schools and community partner organizations implement the ExpandED model with fidelity to its four core principles?

■　　　How do students experience ExpandED, including their patterns of participation in the school's expanded learning time and the characteristics of their learning opportunities?

■　　　In what ways do students benefit from ExpandED?

■　　　How are variations in implementation fidelity to the ExpandED model reflected in student participation and learning patterns?

The first year of the evaluation addressed the first three research questions, focusing on initial start-up and implementation of ExpandED. In subsequent years, the focus of evaluation reports will align with the anticipated scale-up of ExpandED. PSA will continue to assess implementation fidelity and will also address the remaining research questions by looking more deeply into student experiences and results.

Exhibit 2 shows the data-collection activities planned for the study's five years.

Exhibit 2
Data collection activities for the evaluation of ExpandED, by year

Source	2011-12 (completed)	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Site visits	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Enrollment and participation data	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Student surveys		✓	✓		
School-day teacher survey				✓	
Community partner staff survey			✓		
Academic performance data					✓

PSA researchers visited each of the ExpandED Schools in spring 2012 and will continue to conduct annual visits in each of the remaining years of the study. During these visits, PSA

researchers interviewed the school principal, a small group of school teachers, the ExpandED instructional coordinator, the ExpandED director, and other staff members from the community partner organization. The interviews focused on scale-up of the ExpandED model and fidelity of implementation. Also during the visits, PSA researchers conducted observations to gain context and insight into the implementation and impact of expanded learning in each school. In the first year of the evaluation, PSA researchers also interviewed representatives from the intermediary organizations and from the school districts. Following the 2012 visits, the PSA site visitors completed a rubric for each of the ExpandED Schools measuring the fidelity of implementation in comparison to the ExpandED model. PSA researchers will collect similar data to complete a rubric for each school in each of the remaining study years to evaluate ExpandED implementation over the five-year period.

The fidelity of implementation rubric developed for this evaluation is designed to: (1) collect reliable and consistent information on ExpandED implementation and (2) generate detailed, actionable information on implementation that TASC can use to provide technical assistance to schools. Because the fidelity rubric is intended to be shared with and used by multiple stakeholders, it can also serve as a tool for TASC to increase the transparency of its expectations for ExpandED Schools and community partners and to promote improved ExpandED implementation.

The rubric breaks the four TASC core elements for implementation into sub-elements, and operationalizes each of these sub-elements into concrete indicators. As described below, PSA researchers rate the indicators, sub-elements, and core elements, and then assign an overall fidelity rating for each school. Over the five years of this evaluation, the rubric ratings will measure the progress of the schools in implementing the ExpandED model. Exhibit 3 shows the sub-elements for each of the four core elements and the number of indicators that make up each sub-element.

Exhibit 3
Fidelity of implementation rubric components

Core element	Sub-elements	Number of indicators
More Time for a Balanced Curriculum	All students are engaged in expanded learning	1
	Students are exposed to rigorous, skill-based instruction	5
School-Community Partnership	School and community partner share responsibility for implementation of ExpandED	7
	Family engagement in learning is encouraged and evident	2
Engaging and Personalized Instruction	Instruction addresses the individual needs of students	3
	Instruction is data-driven	3
Integrated Funding Model		3
Total		**24**

The rubric was designed to hold ExpandED Schools accountable for achieving exemplary levels of fidelity to the ExpandED model, meaning that, especially in early years of ExpandED implementation, PSA researchers expect to find some inconsistency in the fidelity of implementation across schools and across core elements. As implementation of the ExpandED model becomes more consistent and established within schools, more High and Excellent ratings are likely.

> **Excellent** (E) – Exemplary implementation; a model for other ExpandED Schools
> **High** (H) – School demonstrates consistent fidelity of ExpandED implementation
> **Medium** (M) – School demonstrates fidelity to the ExpandED model, but inconsistently
> **Low** (L) – Improvement needed; school implements the ExpandED model with limited fidelity
> **Unsatisfactory** (U) – Needs substantial work; school does not demonstrate fidelity to the ExpandED model

While the final rubric ratings describe ExpandED at the aggregate level, the rubric ratings at the indicator and sub-element levels offer information to help guide program improvement. The individual indicators that comprise each of the sub-elements are described in the discussion that follows. The complete rubric is included in the appendix.

Throughout this study, PSA researchers will interview many school leaders, teachers, and community partners. If quotations from these interviews are used in reporting for the study, the identities of schools, community partners, and individuals will be masked to ensure confidentiality. Similarly, rubric ratings and other school-level findings will be discussed in such a way that the identities of specific schools cannot be easily determined.

The remaining sections of this report describe the evaluation's assessment of the fidelity of implementation of the ExpandED model in 2011-12 and lessons learned from the first year of data collection.

Findings from the First-Year Collection
of Implementation Data

PSA researchers rated the fidelity of implementation of the TASC ExpandED model in each school (Exhibit 4). Seven of the 10 schools were rated Medium or higher on their overall fidelity of implementation of the ExpandED model. However, certain elements of the model were more likely to be implemented at high levels of fidelity than others. For example, while shared responsibility for ExpandED between the school and community partner was rated High or Excellent for four of the 10 schools (core element 2a), no schools were rated High on family engagement in learning (core element 2b). As anticipated, varying levels of experience with the model were also reflected in the ratings of implementation. As the ExpandED model becomes more rooted in schools in future years, higher levels of implementation fidelity can be expected.

This section presents the implementation findings for each of the four core elements of the ExpandED model in 2011-12, highlighting promising efforts and challenges, particularly in areas where many schools seem to be struggling with the same aspect of implementation.

Exhibit 4
Summary of ratings of implementation fidelity (N=10)

Core element:	Number of ExpandED Schools rated:				
	Excellent	**High**	**Medium**	**Low**	**Unsatis-factory**
Overall implementation fidelity rating	**0**	**2**	**5**	**2**	**1**
1: Balanced curriculum	0	2	6	2	0
1a: All students are engaged in expanded learning	2	1	3	4	0
1b: Students are exposed to rigorous, skill-based instruction	0	3	5	2	0
2: School-community partnership	0	3	4	2	1
2a: School and community partner organization share responsibility for implementation	2	2	3	2	1
2b: Family engagement in learning is encouraged and evident	0	0	4	5	1
3: Engaging instruction	0	3	4	3	0
3a: Instruction addresses the individual needs of students	0	2	5	3	0
3b: Instruction is data-driven	1	1	3	2	3
4: Integrated funding	0	0	3	3	4

Exhibit reads: None of the 10 ExpandED Schools were rated Excellent on overall fidelity of implementation of the TASC model. Two schools were rated High on fidelity of implementation, 5 Medium, 2 Low, and 1 Unsatisfactory.

Core Element 1: More Time for a Balanced Curriculum

The first core element of the TASC ExpandED model is a school day in which all students are engaged in expanded learning time and in which the added time includes rigorous academic and enrichment content. This core element comprises two sub-elements: (1a) all students are engaged in expanded learning and (1b) students are exposed to rigorous, skill-based, academic instruction and enrichment.

Eight of the 10 ExpandED Schools were rated Medium or High on their fidelity of implementation of this core element. Schools that implemented the TASC ELT/NYC model prior to the transition to ExpandED received the highest ratings. These schools had more experience experimenting with the approach that worked best in their context and were well positioned to start creating a school culture around the ExpandED model. In the schools with more mature expanded learning programs, learning opportunities had a strong academic focus that was aligned with instruction that the students received during the regular school day.

Sub-Element 1a: All students are engaged in ExpandED learning

PSA researchers assessed the level of implementation of whole-school ExpandED, the ultimate goal of the model. Although TASC's goal is for expanded learning to be part of the school experience for every student, a strategy adopted by some schools was to target specific grades for whole-grade implementation of ExpandED as an intermediate goal towards whole-school adoption. Enrollment and participation in expanded learning opportunities offered by the community partner is tracked each of the schools. In assigning the rubric ratings, schools enrolling all students in all grades in these opportunities received the highest ratings (Excellent, High), schools with whole-grade (but not whole-school) implementation were rated Medium, and open enrollment models received the lowest ratings (Low, Unsatisfactory).

Successful implementation of a whole-school model. Two ExpandED Schools received the highest possible rating (Excellent) due to their implementation of a model that targeted every student in the school. These two schools placed a high priority on communicating to parents that the school day lasted until 5:30 or 6:00 p.m., and administrators discouraged parents from picking their children up before the end of the day. In one of these schools there was no distinction between the "school day" and "after-school." Teachers and community partner staff worked alongside each other throughout the day, creating a seamless integration of school and services from the community partner.

The school rated High on this sub-element had opened a few years prior to the launch of ExpandED as a turnaround school with whole-school extended day as part of its model, as described by its principal:

> When I shared the school's vision with parents, [ExpandED] was a part of that mission. So right away parents knew that we were going to have 30 percent additional learning time after school and it was mandatory. It wasn't optional, it was mandatory.

This school communicated a consistent message that students were expected to stay until 6:00 p.m. through statements in enrollment materials and parent information meetings. Each year, the school worked with new families to help them understand the expanded day, and, as the principal said, "get our […] parents to buy into this vision."

In the four study schools that received a rubric rating of Low, ExpandED programming was open to students in all grades on a first-come, first-served basis, reflective of a more traditional after-school program. During the PSA site visits, the ExpandED directors in two of these schools described plans to increase the level of implementation for 2012-13 by targeting specific grades for whole-grade enrollment.

Challenges to whole-school implementation. Scheduling and parental perception of ExpandED as an after-school program were described by interviewees as challenges to whole-school implementation. The ExpandED director at one school elaborated:

> [There is] confusion where there's day school and there's after-school because we haven't figured out a way to do the schedule where it just is this one seamless day. So we're talking about playing around with some of the teacher schedules, some of the community educator schedules, so they can come in earlier.

Family expectations for the school day also presented significant challenges to ExpandED Schools. One school that attempted to engage all students in one grade in expanded learning noted that parents did not generally view the expanded part of the day as mandatory and therefore often picked their children up early or requested to have them sent home with the regularly departing school buses.

Participation in expanded learning. Given the whole-school implementation goal of the ExpandED model, the expectation is that, when ExpandED is fully implemented, all students in the school will enroll and participate in expanded learning every school day. PSA researchers used data collected by the community partner organization to examine enrollment and attendance patterns in the expanded learning opportunities offered by the community partner.[3] The analysis of number of days of attendance divided students into four categories—students who attended programming offered by the community partner for more than 135, 90, 45, and less than 45 days. Based on a school year of approximately 180 days, students who attended for more than 135 days attended these expanded learning opportunities for three-quarters of the possible days in an average school year.

The percent of the school population enrolled in learning opportunities offered through the community partner organization ranged from 38 percent to 100 percent. Two of the three schools with more than 85 percent of the students in the school enrolled also had the highest rates of participation, with more than 70 percent of these students attending more than 135 days during the 2011-12 school year, suggesting that these schools were closest to achieving full implementation of the whole-school model. In contrast, in school in which 81 percent of

---

[3] PSA analyzed enrollment and attendance data for students in all grades in the schools in the study. Students enrolled in activities offered by the community partner who attended for five or fewer days in the course of the 2011-12 school year were not considered enrolled and were excluded from analysis.

students enrolled in expanded learning opportunities offered by the community partner, the rate at which students attended was low: more than two-thirds of the enrolled students participated for fewer than 45 days over the course of the school year, indicating that regular participation in expanded learning time was not yet an expectation in those schools.[4] For 2012-13, PSA plans additional analysis of participation data. First, PSA researchers will broaden the participation analysis to determine if schools targeting specific grades for ExpandED are successfully enrolling students in those grades in learning opportunities offered by the community partner.

Sub-Element 1b: Students are exposed to rigorous, skill-based, academic instruction and enrichment

Across the 10 ExpandED Schools, three received a rating of High on their implementation of rigorous, skill-based instruction and enrichment, and five received a rating of Medium. The ratings for this sub-element are based on the following five indicators:

■ All learning opportunities are implemented with an intentional focus on helping students develop and build specific skills.

■ All learning opportunities have clear benchmarks for measuring success.

■ All academic learning opportunities explicitly align with the school's learning standards.

■ Students participate in both academic and non-academic learning opportunities. Academic enrichment extends beyond homework help. ***

■ Learning opportunities engage students in experiences in which they might not otherwise be able to participate.

In recognition of the critical role both academic and non-academic learning opportunities play in the ExpandED model, one of the indicators (marked with *** at the end of the description) carries additional weight in the ratings for this sub-element. A school receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory on this indicator receives a rating of Unsatisfactory for sub-element 1b as a whole, regardless of the ratings that the school received on the other sub-element 1b indicators.

The three schools receiving a rating of High on this sub-element had a clear structure in place for scheduling and planning lessons and enrichment activities that were well coordinated with the school-day curriculum. In the two schools that earned a rating of Low, challenges included inconsistent staff supervision and lesson planning, and a lack of enrichment opportunities with an academic focus.

Enriching activities and alignment with the school day. The schools receiving the highest ratings offered students rigorous academic and enrichment opportunities through instruction by community partners that was well-aligned to the school-day curriculum. In one

---

[4] A partial explanation of these low attendance figures lies in the fact that ExpandED had a late start in New Orleans in fall 2011. As a result, ExpandED was available to students in these schools for fewer days during the 2011-12 school year than it was for students in the other two ExpandED cities.

school that received a rating of High, teaching artists from the community partner organization collaborated with the school-day teachers to develop and provide social studies enrichment activities based on the school-day curriculum. For example, the school-day teacher and teaching artist worked together to create a unit that used shadow puppets to examine character development in a story that students were reading during the school day.

In another school that received a rating of High, academic activities were led by the students' school-day teachers in an extended-day instructional period. Teachers were paired with community partner staff members for this period, and these teams delivered a combination of small-group instruction and group activities. For the small-group instruction, the teacher divided the students into groups based on their educational needs in a subject area. The community partner staff worked with students who needed the least intensive instruction, while the teacher worked with the groups who were struggling the most with the subject. With this approach, community partner staff and teachers were able to review material or even cover new concepts, creating a more seamless school day. After this transitional period, community partner staff led enrichment activities, such as gym, clubs, Kidz Lit, and Kidz Math. The ExpandED director required community partner staff to submit weekly lesson plans, which she reviewed and returned with her feedback.

Barriers to activity planning and alignment. Two schools earned a rating of Low on this sub-element because of limited structures to ensure a cohesive and aligned plan for instruction and enrichment between the school-day staff and community partners.

In one of these two schools, there was little, if any, integration between the school and the community partner organization. Staff at the school described a system in which instruction led by the school and community partner organization functioned separately; school-day teachers led some literacy and math enrichments and reported to the ExpandED instructional coordinator, while community partner staff led arts enrichments and reported to one of two off-site supervisors within the community partner organization. This split system created structural barriers for joint planning and communication about the content and delivery of enrichments.

In the other school that received a rating of Low on this sub-element, the community partner offered project-based activities for students such as science, choir, band, and newspaper, but there were no efforts to align the enrichment activities with content taught by school-day teachers.

Core Element 2: School-Community Partnerships

All ExpandED Schools rely on community partner organizations to provide staffing and other additional resources to help expand the school day. The TASC ExpandED model asks the school and community partner organization to work in tandem to provide students an integrated, seamless school day. The rubric addresses this goal through two sub-elements: (2a) school and community partner organizations share responsibility for implementation of ExpandED, and (2b) family engagement in learning is encouraged and evident.

For core element 2 as a whole, ExpandED Schools received mixed ratings, ranging from Unsatisfactory to High. Higher-rated schools implemented a model in which the school and community partner organization shared responsibility for developing and delivering instruction and took steps to engage parents in the expanded day, while the school with the lowest rating did not engage in any joint planning and did not actively work to involve parents. Overall, schools received higher ratings for sub-element 2a (sharing responsibility) than they did for sub-element 2b (family engagement).

Sub-Element 2a: School and community partner organization share responsibility for implementation of ExpandED

In many ways, sub-element 2a is at the heart of ExpandED as a reform. Particularly for schools that have provided traditional after-school programming in the past, the vision for shared responsibility for implementation requires both the school and the community partner organization to redefine their relationship. The school principal must demonstrate a commitment to the expanded-learning reform through leadership and communication with both school and community partner staff. School-day and community partner staff need to work together to plan instruction. This sub-element includes seven indicators to assess how the school and the community partner organization are working together to achieve the goal of integrating ExpandED learning into the school day:

■ Schedule and staffing structures promote seamless integration of instruction by school staff and community partner staff.

■ The principal demonstrates commitment to the whole-school model for ExpandED. ***

■ The principal demonstrates commitment to ExpandED through support for joint design and implementation involving school and community partner staff. ***

■ Community partner staff are included in school leadership. ***

■ ExpandED is staffed by both teachers and community partner staff, using structures that build on the strengths of each group to teach students important academic and non-academic skills. Where appropriate, teachers and community partner staff co-teach.

■ Teachers and community partner staff participate in joint planning throughout the year to identify student needs and plan academic support and enrichment activities to meet those needs.

■ Teachers and community partner staff engage in formal and/or informal joint professional development.

In recognition of the critical roles that principal leadership and joint planning play in the ExpandED model, three of the indicators (marked with ***) carry additional weight in the ratings. A school receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory on any of these three indicators receives a rating of Unsatisfactory for sub-element 2a as a whole, regardless of the ratings that school received on the other sub-element 2a indicators.

12

Seven of the 10 schools received a rating of Medium or higher on this sub-element, while two schools received a Low rating and one school was rated Unsatisfactory. The schools receiving the highest ratings had established strong partnerships between the school and the community partner organization, guided by a principal with a strong commitment to the ExpandED model.

Principal leadership. While ExpandED implementation requires support from staff throughout the school, the principal sets the overall tone. In the schools receiving the highest ratings on this sub-element, the principal had taken specific steps in demonstrating commitment to ExpandED. These principals saw expanded learning as part of the overall vision for reform in their school and actively worked to incorporate it into the school culture. For example, in several of the schools that received high ratings, the principal appointed an ExpandED instructional coordinator who was either an assistant principal or senior teacher in the school. By assigning this role to a senior educator, the principal sent a message that partnership between the school and ExpandED was a high priority.

Creative scheduling for both school and community partner staff. A school that received an Excellent rating for this sub-element integrated teachers and community partner staff in such a way as to create a seamless school day for staff and students alike. Community partner staff worked in classrooms throughout the day, and all but two teachers worked into the traditional after-school hours. The ExpandED director in this school explained that implementing a model in which nearly all teachers work extended hours required both a commitment and creative scheduling from everyone involved.

> We look at our curriculum, what our goals are and our objectives, and we look to see who's available to be able to work. […] Most of the teachers have been here for such a long time and they've moved around and so they're all familiar with all of the grade levels. […] It's just an issue of scheduling time and ensuring that once you're here, we want the commitment that you're going to be here every day that you're supposed to work, and that you're ready, willing, and able to work and be able to fulfill the roles and objectives that we want to achieve.

The ExpandED director also explained the value of integrating community partner staff throughout the school day in order to form connections with students and teachers:

> It makes sense to be present during the course of the day if you are a community-based organization coming in and partnering. You get to see what's taking place. A lot of the energy and things that happen with our young people tend to take place around the lunch time. You can sit and get a wealth of information about what's going on at home [and about their interests.] […] It also allows us to build relationships with our teachers. We get to go into the classroom and […] observe or participate, it gives us a better sense of what's needed, areas that they're strong in and areas where they're extended. […] It also brings that cohesiveness. […] Because it's very difficult as a community-serving organization coming into a setting that's already been established.

Integrating community partner staff into professional development and school leadership. One school that received a rating of High focused on regular communication and joint professional development. The principal acted as a constant communicator of the ExpandED vision to the teaching staff, and in turn the teaching staff supported community partner staff in delivering programming. Although this was not a co-teaching arrangement, community partner staff and school-day teachers had regular meetings to discuss issues such as classroom assignments.

Teachers at this school also acted as trainers for community partner staff. According to the ExpandED director, several training sessions were held in which community partner staff learned from teachers about managing a classroom and other similar topics. In addition, community partner staff were invited to a faculty conference at which the ExpandED goals were outlined and discussed.

In some of the ExpandED Schools, ExpandED directors were members of school leadership and budget teams, forming close relationships with school administrators to ensure integration. One director described her efforts to become embedded in the school community so that the community partner was seen as an essential resource for the school:

> [I'm on] pretty much every team. […] And we're so involved together [that's it's at a level] where if the day school has an issue with a child and it's time for the parent to come in, [the principal] will call me around.

Barriers to a strong school-community partner relationship. As noted earlier, strong principal leadership is a critical first step in efforts to develop a working partnership between the school and the community partner organization. The result of lukewarm principal commitment was seen in one school where the ExpandED director did not have a designated space for an office in which to store materials and did not perceive that the principal was completely on board with the ExpandED model. There was little or no integration between the community partner staff and teaching staff, and the school never included community partner staff in professional development opportunities, school leadership teams, or staff meetings. The principal, while speaking positively of ExpandED, did not demonstrate substantial enthusiasm for it beyond its utility as a funding stream for after-school programming.

Sub-Element 2b: Family engagement in learning is encouraged and evident

For the ExpandED model to be successful in changing the learning environment of the school, parents must accept expanded learning time as an integral part of the school day, rather than as an after-school program. ExpandED seeks to cultivate a deeper level of parental involvement in students' learning by providing them with resources and encouraging them to see the value of an expanded day. The fidelity rubric uses the following two indicators to evaluate family engagement:

■ The ExpandED School engages families in students' learning and provides resources to help families support academic growth and youth development.

■   Families accept that expanded learning time is an integral part of the school day.

All schools experienced challenges in their efforts to engage families in expanded learning. The highest rating that any of the ExpandED Schools received on this sub-element was Medium (four schools). Of the six remaining schools, five received a rating of Low and one received a rating of Unsatisfactory.

The school as a community center. One school that had some success engaging parents reported that the school offered educational supports to parents throughout the week (including classes in ESL, nutrition, dance, and poetry). Many of these activities took place during the school day, and the ExpandED director was looking into opportunities for more parent activities in the afternoon and evening.

Ongoing efforts to cultivate parent buy-in to the ExpandED model. Three schools succeeded in their efforts to encourage parents and families to see expanded time as an integral part of the school day. All of these schools hosted mature ExpandED/ELT programs in which staff described their efforts to convince families to have their children stay for the extended school day as a process that took several years. One ExpandED director reported that for the first two years of expanded learning in the school parents often picked their children up at the end of the regular school day; but now most families in the school accept and accommodate the longer school day. The principal in one of these schools saw this as a parent education effort:

> It takes showing everybody the value. We did have an issue with parents picking the kids up throughout [the afternoon], but it's certainly died down a great deal because we have to explain to them that this is not babysitting. The day ends at 5:30 p.m., so when you take your child out early […], they're really missing something.

In these schools, starting on the first day of school, the principal, parent coordinator, and ExpandED director all delivered the same message, encouraging families new to the school to accept the initiative. Less effort was needed in this area with returning families, whose children attended the school for a year or more and had gradually come to accept the extended day. The ExpandED director in one of these schools referred to this campaign as "marketing and promoting this as an expanded learning school." These schools distributed materials at the start of the school year describing a seamless extended day (rather than a regular school day and a separate after-school).

Core Element 3: Engaging and Personalized Instruction

Core element 3—engaging and personalized instruction—is grounded in research on youth development and in TASC's experience that has highlighted the value of instruction that is data-driven and sufficiently differentiated to address the individual needs of students. Core element 3 is broken into two sub-elements for the fidelity rubric: (3a) instruction addresses the individual needs of students, and (3b) instruction is data-driven, in order to align instruction to students' learning needs.

Across all ExpandED Schools, implementation of this core element was mixed. Three schools received a rating of High, and four received a Medium rating. The remaining three schools received a Low rating. In general, ExpandED Schools received higher ratings on sub-element 3a than they did on sub-element 3b, indicating that incorporating data into the programming continues to be a challenge for the schools and community partner organizations.

Sub-Element 3a: Instruction addresses the individual needs of students

The rubric uses three indicators to examine the extent to which each ExpandED School addresses individual learning opportunities address individual student needs, both in terms of differentiated instruction and varied instructional approaches.

- ■ Students' individual needs and strengths are recognized in instruction delivered by both teachers and community partner staff. Instruction is differentiated to help all students advance to the next level, including both high- and low-performing students. ***

- ■ Learning experiences (both academic and non-academic) are experiential and inquiry-based.

- ■ Learning opportunities reflect student interests.

In recognition of the critical role that differentiated instruction plays in the ExpandED model, the first indicator (marked with *** above) carries additional weight in the ratings. An ExpandED School with a rating of Unsatisfactory on this indicator receives a rating of Unsatisfactory for sub-element 3a as a whole, regardless of the ratings that school received on the other sub-element 3a indicators.

Two of the 10 ExpandED Schools implementing this sub-element received a rating of High, and five schools received a Medium rating, meaning that these schools demonstrated fidelity to the model, but did so inconsistently. Three schools received a rating of Low on this sub-element.

Two schools that implemented this sub-element with a High rating did so through the meaningful integration of school-day teachers and community partner staff. For example, one school that received a High rating implemented the ExpandED model in a way that fully integrated school-day teachers and community partner staff. The community partner staff pulled students out of their classroom if they needed extra help or more challenging work. The school-day teachers and ExpandED director agreed that the community partner staff played a critical role in implementing instruction that addressed the needs of students:

> This is where [the community partner staff] really is critical. You have a group of kids who might be on different reading and math levels. . . . It's differentiated enough so that a young person who might be doing very well in math is not sitting there twiddling their thumbs. There are opportunities for them to have challenges in other areas, we'll use computers in the classroom, so that they can focus on some other kind of math task while we're working in the small group. [The community partner staff] comes in, and we'll do

16

either push out or pull in with a smaller group of kids who are on the same math or reading level to help them. So having them come in is so critical. *–ExpandED director*

And when my educational associate comes in, she tends to pull out the kids who would benefit from that extra academic help. We have a meditation hall upstairs and she has her five or six children that she pulls out, I would say at least three times a week, and she works with them with whatever we're working on in the class. *–School-day teacher*

In interviews, other teachers in this school reflected on the approach to differentiated instruction:

We do tons of group work; guided reading, guided math, just working in groups, and differentiating learning to each specific child. […] All of the classes are pretty much set up this way and everybody has the same needs within those groups. So that, when the teachers travel to the groups, we really know what we're focusing on. And it was a difficult transition for me at least in the beginning, but it's definitely something that makes you feel like, oh, I could have done this a lot sooner.

They're working in groups. We try to make it flow to the after-school as well. […] There's a reason why they're grouped together because they might be a lower tier group, so then I know that when we're in expanded learning, if I taught something during the day and I notice that one group didn't really grasp the concept, then I know in the after-school I can continue on. And maybe the higher level group I'll have them do something else. So now they're used to the groups during the day, so the afternoon would be seamless. So there's no, like, oh, where am I supposed to go? It's more like go to your group and then we'll just automatically go and start working right away.

Some schools faced challenges when implementing individualized instruction, including behavioral challenges or non-systematic implementation of differentiation.

Sub-Element 3b: Instruction is data-driven

The ExpandED model seeks to broaden the partnership between the school and community partner organization by encouraging data-sharing to learn more about individual student needs and also to make informed staffing and programming decisions. The following three indicators assess the fidelity of implementation in this area:

■ Community partner staff and school staff work together to review student needs and student progress.

■ ExpandED uses school-day data to inform decisions about programming.

■ ExpandED uses school-day data to inform decisions about staffing.

One ExpandED School received a rating of Excellent on this sub-element and another was rated as High. Of the remaining schools, three received a Medium rating, two were rated as Low, and three were rated as Unsatisfactory.

The school-day teacher as the data conduit. The school that implemented data-driven instruction with an Excellent rating was so seamless in its integration of staff that many community partner staff were in the classrooms with teachers throughout the day, and together they made data use part of staff members' daily routine. In fact, teachers' use of data simply carried over from the school day. The teachers used school-day data to determine which students should be pulled out to receive extra help from community partner staff. Teachers' knowledge of student data also helped them determine where to focus during enrichment opportunities. In interviews at this school, teachers said that the community partner staff, known as educational associates, had access to the same data that they did:

> My educational associate always knows when I have a test coming up… she knows which children will be struggling and which won't be. She'll work with those kids on those aspects where they are struggling. But she knows from the data that I share with her who the struggling readers are, and she'll have a small group and start reading with them. So I always share, I'm very open with the data.

Data-driven curriculum from the community partner organization. The school that was rated High used data to target high-priority students who scored at or below Basic levels on state tests and also used the community partner organization's data-driven curriculum for each grade. What set this ExpandED School apart from the others was that students were required to take pre- and post-tests, quizzes, and other periodic assessments to inform instructional support activities, and the resulting data were analyzed for both individual and group performance. For example, if fifth-graders were struggling with critical reading, teachers and community partners knew that they needed to target this skill in future lessons. In this school, the availability of student-level data helped staff organize students into small study groups based on academic need, and staff often reworked the study groups as new assessment results became available. The representative for the community partner organization described the way they used data:

> Oh, we definitely use data. We're a data-driven organization. We start with our pre-assessment results as well as the school's either benchmark or [state tests]. Usually by the time we start we're close to the first-quarter benchmark. We work with the school; we work with our lead teacher—who's also the instructional coach—to see what are the trends and what are we seeing during the day school. We do our own quarterly assessments. So we review that data as well with our teachers. And that data [are] also given to the day-school teachers. So we have the ability to say, "You know what, we may need to switch gears; we are focusing so much on this skill, but we see that skill B is something that we need to address at this time."

Challenges to successfully providing data-driven instruction. Across the schools that received Low ratings on this sub-element, two themes emerged: insufficient data-sharing between the school and community partner staff, and a lack of tools for using data to inform programming or instruction. In one case, the principal specifically stated that the school did not feel comfortable sharing data with community partner staff. However, this school and one other used the ExpandED instructional coordinator as a conduit to provide some data to help community partner staff make programming decisions.

Core Element 4: Integrated Funding Model

TASC prescribes cost and funding targets as part of its ExpandED funding model. The cost target is $1,600 or less per student, when ExpandED is implemented schoolwide, with an expectation that for that cost the school will expand the day for all students by at least 35 percent. Schools and community partner organizations are expected not only to contribute to the incremental costs of the expanded day (e.g., staff time, supplies and materials, fees for student trips) but also to leverage existing resources (e.g., facilities, security, student transportation, and some teacher time). The school contribution to incremental costs is expected to equal at least 10 percent of costs in the first year of ExpandED and at least 20 percent of costs in the second year. The community partner organization is expected to contribute at least 10 percent of costs in each year.[5] Schools were asked to identify potential sources of sustainable funding in their ExpandED proposals to TASC. They identified funds from federal initiatives (e.g., 21st Century Community Learning Centers, Supplemental Education Services, and Title I) as well as from city initiatives (e.g., Out of School Time programs in New York City and Baltimore).

The evaluation's purpose in assessing this core element is not to audit the funding stream in each school. Rather, for this study, PSA researchers are examining funding in broader terms, using the following three indicators to assess the extent to which the school and community partner organization are working together to manage funds effectively:

- ■　　School and community partner organization leaders coordinate budgets to allocate resources strategically (including public and private funds from education, youth development, health, childcare, and other sources) in order to create a seamless day.

- ■　　All partnerships in the school are strategically managed to promote an integrated school day.

- ■　　The school and community partner both support fundraising efforts for ExpandED. ***

The first two indicators assess the ways in which the school and community partner organization create a seamless expanded day by managing existing funds well. The last indicator assesses efforts by the school and community partner to support fundraising to sustain the model in future years. In recognition of the critical roles that joint funding and fundraising play in the ExpandED model, the last indicator (marked with *** above) carries additional weight. A school that receives a rating of Unsatisfactory on this indicator receives a rating of Unsatisfactory for the core element as a whole, regardless of the ratings that the school received on the other core element 4 indicators.

Overall, this core element presented the greatest challenge for the 10 ExpandED Schools, with four rated as Unsatisfactory and three rated as Low. In all four schools rated Unsatisfactory, interviewees reported that the school and community partner organization were not actively working to raise additional funds, and ratings on other indicators for these schools were also very low.

---

[5] TASC ExpandED Learning Time Schools, 2011-12 grant applications.

School leaders with strong fundraising skills. Two interviewees from the schools experiencing some success in developing a coordinated and sustainable funding model identified the principal as the key person in efforts to raise funds, but they both also noted that not all principals are skilled in this area. As the ExpandED director in one of these schools said, "The principals are not necessarily savvy in fundraising. We're fortunate that [our principal] is, but that's not always their background. So having a core person that's available to do those kinds of proposals and grants that make your school sound like this is the school that we need to put our money in [is important]."

Community partner involvement in school budgeting. In one school the community partner liaison sat on the school budget committee, a role she felt was very helpful in managing the ExpandED budget. Although the school and ExpandED budgets were developed separately, she felt it was important that she be involved in the school budgeting process:

> When it comes to the budgets, that's me, because I have to look at the larger picture. The principal will talk to me about that, and also going after new opportunities. So we went after 21st Century, and I worked with the principal on that application. I would be the one – how do we layer this on – basically putting the puzzle together.

Leveraging resources. In another of the higher-rated schools, the school leveraged existing resources by shifting the working hours of two staff members (the assistant principal/ExpandED instructional coordinator and the parent coordinator). These staff members both reported to work later than their colleagues, allowing them to stay at the school until 4:30 p.m., so that they could be part of the instruction occurring after the regular school day.

Establishing partnerships with local or national organizations. Finally, two schools worked with their community partners to establish partnerships with outside organizations that delivered additional resources to the school. One school partnered with an entertainment company that provided two teaching artists and materials to produce a musical. To receive this additional grant, the school had to agree to have the teaching artists come into the school once a week for an hour. The school also had to pledge to match resources and to teach and rehearse the musical numbers for at least 1.5 hours per week. The principal reported that ExpandED gave the school time in the schedule and arts resources (through the community partner) to make these pledges possible.

Barriers to raising additional funds. The broad challenge of raising funds to support ExpandED was an area of concern for principals and ExpandED directors in nearly all the study schools. Some respondents questioned the long-term sustainability of the ExpandED model, including this principal:

> You can't sustain it without the money. And so when that money's gone, then it's gone. So that word sustainability to me doesn't make a lot of sense, that we come in and give you this program and then you're expected to sustain it when we take the money away. It's just not realistic unless you're going to replace that money with some money from somewhere else. But money is what drives our ability to be able to provide all of these things. None of them is free.

The fundraising concerns centered on two main areas: the current uncertain financial climate and the fundraising ability of the school leader. While raising outside funds has always been a challenge for schools and other organizations, it is even more so in the current financial climate, and the few available funds are often awarded through short-term rather than multi-year grants. As the ExpandED director in one school said, "It is just a real issue. How are we going to fund this after the five years are over? And unless we have a serious upswing in the next year or so, I don't think it will happen. I'm not trying to be pessimistic here, I'm just trying to be realistic." The principal in the same school echoed this sentiment:

> We certainly don't want to rely on fundraising because that's not predictable. You need some kind of a source, [like] a donor that promises to be there for three years, then you can plan for who's going to take it over after that. But sustainability, the money has to come with that.

Intermediary staff reported playing a role in helping schools access additional sources of funding, noting that a school's level of commitment to funding and fundraising was indicative of the school's overall commitment to the ExpandED model.

Lessons Learned

As TASC's ExpandED model becomes established in participating schools in the coming years, TASC expects that schools and community partners will: (1) create a seamless expanded day for students, (2) ensure instructional alignment between school-day teachers and community partner staff, and (3) take the ExpandED model to scale with whole-grade implementation and, ultimately, whole-school implementation. TASC and intermediary organizations can play a key role in clarifying and prioritizing goals for taking the ExpandED model to scale and in providing targeted support to community partners and schools to strengthen ExpandED implementation.

Findings from the first year of the evaluation consistently point to several conditions that may contribute to the success of ExpandED Schools in implementing the model with fidelity. In particular, the goal of ExpandED to be a whole-school reform was a substantial challenge in all but two of the 10 study schools. In addition, lack of funding, difficulty reworking the school schedule, and issues related to student transportation were raised as significant implementation challenges faced by the schools.

Redefined Relationship Between School and Community Partner

ExpandED prescribes a strong partnership between the school and the community partner organization, and all study schools were working towards this goal. The PSA researchers did, however, identify two challenges that schools were trying to address in this area.

First, in all schools, ExpandED built on existing relationships with community partner organizations: in selecting schools for the initiative, intermediaries "went to longstanding partners that we had confidence in." This approach had certain advantages because the school and community partner had an established history of working together to provide youth programming. However, it presented challenges in retooling established relationships to support the new model, and it could be difficult to shift the perception of the community partner as a provider of traditional after-school services to a partner in whole-school reform. An intermediary representative said, "These schools had relationships of more than a year with these providers, and [they] had to understand that these relationships were going to change."

Second, a community partner that was previously successful in providing after-school youth development services did not necessarily have the capacity to play a lead role in a school-wide reform effort. One intermediary representative noted that both the schools and community partner organizations needed to see ExpandED as "a source for educational transformation." Another representative noted that both the school and community partner organization needed to share a vision for the school and also needed to have the organizational capacity to implement the vision in a balanced manner. These interviewees said that both the school and the community partner organization needed to look at the relationship as a true partnership in which both entities are actively involved, which contrasts with the autonomy with which schools and the community partner organizations have traditionally operated independently, fostering a sharp divide between school-day and after-school activities.

Strong Principal Leadership and Vision

The principal of an ExpandED School plays an important role in making explicit the expectations for alignment and integration of instruction delivered by school-day teachers and community partner staff. A common theme in the schools that implemented ExpandED with the greatest fidelity in 2011-12 was the strong role of the principal in the reform effort. In these schools, the principal was a persistent advocate for ExpandED and had taken concrete steps to make expanded learning an integral part of the school day. By contrast, in schools with lukewarm support from the principal, ExpandED operated more or less as a separate after-school program. The ExpandED Schools which had more previous experience with the TASC expanded learning time model struggled less with obtaining a high level of principal involvement than did those new to the ExpandED approach.

The intermediary organizations also saw the principal as key to the success of ExpandED. One intermediary organization representative said principals need to "take ownership of the initiative" and see it as an integral part of school reform and improvement plans. She also noted that this was a new role for principals who typically only sign agreements required for an after-school program to operate; the ExpandED model is "more structured" and has a "higher accountability and increased expectations." Similarly, a representative with another intermediary organization said that it was critical that the principal or some other person in the school devote time to the design and implementation of ExpandED. The intermediary organization plays an important role in not only securing the initial agreement of the principal but also sustaining that interest and engagement over the long term, especially when faced with potential leadership instability at the schools.

While all the school-system representatives interviewed for the study supported ExpandED, none played a strong role in implementation or advocacy for the initiative. One official, for example, described ExpandED as another after-school program approach rather than as a whole-school reform effort. This hands-off approach from the districts reinforces the need for the principals to provide the leadership and vision in order to fully implement the initiative in their schools.

Commitment to a Seamless School Day

All ExpandED Schools understood the model's goal of integrating the work of the school and community partner organization to provide a seamless expanded school day, but this vision was not the reality in most schools in the first year of ExpandED. Although two ExpandED Schools had made substantial progress in achieving seamlessness, the learning opportunities offered by the community partner were not yet fully established as part of the school culture in the other schools.

Much of the training and assistance offered to ExpandED Schools in the first year was directed toward working with community partner organizations and schools to break down the division between regular school day and after-school activities. A TASC representative commented that ExpandED school and community partner staff would ideally no longer use the terms *regular school day* and *after-school* in describing their collaboration. To help staff from

the schools and community partner organizations make this change, TASC staff provided training in scheduling, with a focus on looking at the day as spanning 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. and basing scheduling decisions on student needs.

Intermediary organization staff also worked with community partner organizations and school staff to fully integrate programming. One representative said that such integration was more likely if partner schools and the larger community viewed the ExpandED model as a viable educational improvement strategy. She said that principals tended to view after-school programming as valuable but not as a means of addressing achievement gaps in the student population. Another representative noted that helping schools and community partner organizations achieve a high level of integration was among the most critical areas of her work.

Finally, encouraging parents to embrace an integrated, expanded school day was a challenge in nearly all schools. Many schools struggled to help parents see expanded learning as a required part of the school day rather than as an optional resource for after-school activities. In the schools achieving the highest levels of implementation in this area, the principal, school staff, and community partner staff focused their efforts on direct communication with families to set the expectation for a longer school day.

Appendix:
Fidelity of Implementation Rubric

TASC ExpandED Schools
Fidelity of Implementation Rubric

Developed by Policy Studies Associates, Inc.

Guidelines for Using the Rubric

All ratings should be based on high expectations for implementation of the ExpandED model, regardless of a school's particular context. Use all available data, including document reviews, interviews, and observations to rate the fidelity of each ExpandED School in each of these areas.

Assign the ratings as follows:

Excellent ……… Exemplary; model for other ExpandED Schools
High …………… School demonstrates consistent fidelity of implementation of the ExpandED model
Medium ………. School demonstrates fidelity to the ExpandED model, but inconsistently
Low …………… Improvement needed; school implements the ExpandED model with limited fidelity
Unsatisfactory . Needs substantial work; school does not demonstrate fidelity to the ExpandED model

To select a rating, start by considering the MEDIUM rating. Determine whether MEDIUM reflects the consistency and clarity of ExpandED fidelity throughout the school. If a rating of MEDIUM is not accurate, move up or down to the next rating that more precisely reflects the fidelity level. Use the narrative sections to explain ratings and to highlight particularly effective approaches.

Throughout the rubric, *learning opportunities* refer to lessons, activities, or other programming throughout the ExpandED school. These opportunities may be led by school-day teachers or by community partner staff, and may occur at any point during the entire school day.

Contact Information

School name	
School address	
School principal	
Instructional coordinator	
School contact	Telephone: Email:
Community partner	
Community partner address	
Executive director	
ExpandED director	
Community partner contact	Telephone: Email:

Core Element 1: More Time for a Balanced Curriculum

In an excellent ExpandED school, expanded learning time is implemented throughout the whole school, and students engage in skill-based academic and enrichment opportunities throughout the day.

Core Element 1a: All students are engaged in expanded learning.

	Fidelity Rating				
Indicators	**E**	**H**	**M**	**L**	**U**
1. Whole-school implementation of expanded learning; all grades and all students. *Whole-school (all students) implementation is rated Excellent. Whole-grade implementation is rated Medium. An ExpandED school with open enrollment is automatically rated Low. All Excellent, High, and Medium ratings assume that a policy requiring regular participation in ExpandED is in place. An ExpandED school with ONLY a drop-in model is automatically rated Unsatisfactory.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Core Element 1b: Students are exposed to rigorous, skill-based, academic instruction and support, as well as enrichment and other youth development opportunities, which may include arts, physical activity, and community service.

	Fidelity Rating				
Indicators	**E**	**H**	**M**	**L**	**U**
1. All learning opportunities are implemented with an intentional focus on helping students develop and build specific skills. *Targeted skills are made explicit, and can include either academic or non-academic skills. If an activity occurs over several sessions, the connection from one session to the next is clear. Staff should be able to articulate the plan and objectives for each activity. An overall curriculum plan is written and shared, even if daily lesson plans are not on paper.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. All learning opportunities have clear benchmarks for measuring success. Benchmarks are communicated to students and staff.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. <u>All academic</u> learning opportunities explicitly align with the school's learning standards.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Students participate in both academic and non-academic learning opportunities. Academic enrichment extends beyond homework help.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ *
5. Learning opportunities engage students in experiences in which they might not otherwise be able to participate. *These may include arts, cultural, or other enrichment opportunities or experiences that students would otherwise not be exposed to.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Summary Rating for Core Element 1b

Excellent	**High**	**Medium**	**Low**	**Unsatisfactory**
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

*An unsatisfactory rating for this indicator is an automatic unsatisfactory rating for Core Element 1b

---

Core Element 1: More Time for a Balanced Curriculum (continued)

In an excellent ExpandED school, expanded learning time is implemented throughout the whole school, and students engage in skill-based academic and enrichment opportunities.

Comprehensive Rating for Core Element 1: More Time for a Balanced Curriculum

Excellent	High	Medium	Low	Unsatisfactory
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Narrative

Core Element 2: School-Community Partnership

In an excellent ExpandED school, the school and community partner share responsibility for the delivery of an integrated school day and for helping students achieve positive outcomes. Family engagement in learning is encouraged and evident.

Core Element 2a: School and community partner share responsibility for implementation of ExpandED.

Indicator	E	H	M	L	U
			Fidelity Rating		
1. Schedule and staffing structures promote seamless integration of instruction by school staff and community partner staff. *For example, co-teaching, aligned behavioral norms, complementary instructional approaches, and/or efficient transitions between activities and learning environments reinforce the perception of an integrated school day for both students.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. The principal <u>demonstrates commitment</u> to the whole-school model for ExpandED.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐*
3. The principal demonstrates commitment to ExpandED through support for joint design and implementation involving school staff and community partner staff.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐*
4. Community partner staff are included in school leadership. *Examples include contributing to the school leadership team or other planning committees. Inclusion in school leadership entails meaningful participation in decisions, not just invitations to meetings.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐*
5. ExpandED is staffed by both teachers and community partner staff, using structures that build on the strengths of each group to teach students important academic and non-academic skills. Where appropriate, teachers and community partner staff co-teach.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Teachers and community partner staff participate in <u>joint planning throughout the year</u> to identify student needs and plan academic support and enrichment activities to meet those needs.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Teachers and community partner staff engage in formal and/or informal joint professional development. *Teachers and community partner staff share knowledge and instructional approaches and learn from each other. This could include ongoing professional learning(such as staff meetings and peer mentoring), coaching, and joint participation in workshops.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Summary Rating for Core Element 2a

Excellent	High	Medium	Low	Unsatisfactory
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

*An unsatisfactory rating for this indicator is an automatic unsatisfactory rating for Core Element 2a

Core Element 2: School-Community Partnership (continued)

Core Element 2b: Family engagement in learning is encouraged and evident.

Indicators	Fidelity Rating				
	E	H	M	L	U
1. The ExpandED school engages families in students' learning and provides resources to help families support academic growth and youth development. *For example, school and community partner staff offer supports through a parent resource center or workshops on how navigating the school and helping children with homework. This item goes beyond solely inviting parents to attend events.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Families accept that expanded learning time is an integral part of the school day.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Summary Rating for Core Element 2b

Excellent	High	Medium	Low	Unsatisfactory
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comprehensive Rating for Core Element 2: School-Community Partnership

Excellent	High	Medium	Low	Unsatisfactory
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Narrative

Core Element 3: Engaging and Personalized Instruction

In an excellent ExpandED school, instruction is differentiated to address the individual needs of students and is data-driven.

Core Element 3a: Instruction addresses the individual needs of students.

Indicators	Fidelity Rating				
	E	**H**	**M**	**L**	**U**
1. Students' individual needs and strengths are recognized in instruction delivered by both teachers and community partner staff. Instruction is differentiated to help all students advance to the next level, including both high- and low-performing students. *Teachers and community partner staff differentiate instruction to focus on specific strengths and weaknesses of students.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐*
2. Learning experiences (both academic and non-academic) are experiential and inquiry-based.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Learning opportunities reflect student interests.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Summary Rating for Core Element 3a

Excellent	**High**	**Medium**	**Low**	**Unsatisfactory**
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

*An unsatisfactory rating for this indicator is an automatic unsatisfactory rating for Core Element 3a

---

Core Element 3b: Instruction is data-driven.

Indicators	Fidelity Rating				
	E	**H**	**M**	**L**	**U**
1. Community partner staff and school staff work together to review student needs (as indicated through student-level data) and student progress. *There is an explicit shared plan for data use. Ongoing use of data throughout the year (e.g., weekly or monthly) indicates a higher level of fidelity than using data only at the start of the semester or the start of the school year.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. School-data data are used to inform decisions about programming (e.g., instructional content, instructional methods, group assignments). *For example, student data drive decisions on student assignment to groups and adoption of content priorities in programming. Data may include metrics developed for ExpandED or other school data.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. School-day data are used to inform decisions about staffing (e.g., professional development needs, staff assignments). *For example, the school provides additional training in an area or re-assigns staff to address instructional needs identified in student data.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Summary Rating for Core Element 3b

Excellent	**High**	**Medium**	**Low**	**Unsatisfactory**
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Core Element 3: Engaging and Personalized Instruction (continued)

In an excellent ExpandED school, instruction is differentiated to address the individual needs of students and is data-driven.

Comprehensive Rating for Core Element 3: Engaging and Personalized Instruction				
Excellent	**High**	**Medium**	**Low**	**Unsatisfactory**
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Narrative

Core Element 4: Integrated Funding Model

In an excellent ExpandED school, funding streams are braided to support a school-wide expanded learning framework.

Indicators	Fidelity Rating				
	E	H	M	L	U
1. School and community partner leaders coordinate budgets to allocate resources strategically (including public and private funds from education, youth development, health, childcare, and other sources), in order to create a seamless expanded day. This includes integrated budget planning and/or joint discussions about resource allocation. The budget school and CBO budgets can be developed and managed separately. *This coordination includes allocations of funds for staff salaries, professional development, enrichment materials, and other resources to be used in instruction by both school and community partner staff.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. All partnerships in the school are strategically managed to promote an integrated school day. *All partnerships contribute to the ExpandED model; there are no separate activities or after-school programs offered by outside organizations that are distinct from the integrated school day.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. The school and community partner both support fundraising efforts for ExpandED. *Examples include identifying funding opportunities, contributing to grant-writing, hosting promotional visits, and advocating for ExpandED with potential funders and supporters. The school and community partner must both show initiative in this area to move the rating higher than U.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐*

Comprehensive Rating for Core Element 4: Integrated Funding Model

Excellent	High	Medium	Low	Unsatisfactory
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

*An unsatisfactory rating for this indicator is an automatic unsatisfactory rating for Core Element 4.

Narrative

TASC Compliance Indicators

TASC program staff will use available school data, interviews, and observations to determine the appropriate values for these indicators. Mark "Yes" if the school fulfills the compliance marker and "No" if the school does not meet the standard. Use the "Notes" column to explain the rating.

Indicators	Yes	No	Notes
1. All students are engaged for at least 1,600 hours during the school year (traditional school hours + expanded hours).	☐	☐	
2. Healthy snack and/or healthy supper is served to all students.	☐	☐	
3. The school meets all state standards for instructional time.	☐	☐	
4. There is an ExpandED director and an Instructional Coordinator.	☐	☐	
5. The ExpandED director and Instructional Coordinator meet the minimum requirements for their positions.	☐	☐	
6. The school adheres to TASC ExpandED plans for communication and data-sharing.	☐	☐	
7. Community partner staff and school-day staff jointly participate in 16 or more hours of professional development	☐	☐	
8. At least 25 percent of students' school day is spent in small groups (with a ratio of 10 students to 1 instructor or fewer).	☐	☐	
9. ExpandED operates at $1,600 or less per student (at scale). This covers the incremental cost and includes personnel, external partners, supplies, field trips, and related community partner expenses.	☐	☐	
10. The school and community partner both contribute funds and leverage resources (e.g., food, facilities, security, time) for ExpandED.	☐	☐	

<u>Overall</u> Rating of School Fidelity to the ExpandED Model

Excellent   Exemplary; model for other ExpandED Schools
High   School demonstrates consistent fidelity of implementation of the ExpandED model
Medium   School demonstrates fidelity to the ExpandED model, but inconsistently
Low   Improvement needed; school implements the ExpandED model with limited fidelity
Unsatisfactory Needs substantial work; school does not demonstrate fidelity to the ExpandED model

Note: Use the comprehensive ratings for each of the four core elements to determine the overall fidelity rating. PSA evaluators will exclude the TASC compliance indicators from consideration in the overall rating.

Excellent	High	Medium	Low	Unsatisfactory
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Explanation of Rating