

2020

A Formative Evaluation of an After-School Program for English II Students

Kandice Katrice Jernigan
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu.

Walden University

College of Education

This is to certify that the doctoral study by

Kandice Katrice Jernigan

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Glenn Penny, Committee Chairperson, Education Faculty

Dr. Mary Hallums, Committee Member, Education Faculty

Dr. Paul Englesberg, University Reviewer, Education Faculty

Chief Academic Officer and Provost

Sue Subocz, Ph.D.

Walden University

2020

Abstract

A Formative Evaluation of an After-School Program for English II Students

by

Kandice Katrice Jernigan

EdS, Walden University, 2011

MA, Mississippi Valley State University, 2005

BS, Delta State University, 2003

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Walden University

July 2020

Abstract

At a high school in a Southern U.S. state, district officials implemented an after-school program in 2018 to assist students with English language skills. However, the effectiveness of the program had not been evaluated. The study purpose was conducting an evaluation of this program with the conceptual framework of utilization-focused evaluation theory, which involves rigorous data collection with participation by the intended users and for their practical use. The research questions addressed whether the after-school program helped English II students' learning; whether administrators, parents, and students believed the program contributed to student success; and what strategies could be used to improve students' performance. A qualitative approach was used for data collection and analysis. A total of 21 stakeholders participated in interviews: 5 administrators, 8 parents, and 8 students. The data were coded for repeated topics and these condensed into themes. The results illustrate stakeholders' perspectives on the strengths and weaknesses of the program. The five themes were (a) that the program enhanced students' reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar skills; (b) that the condensed environment made it easier for teachers to target specific learning areas; (c) that students' confidence increased as the program progressed; (d) support for the inclusion of more technology and activities; and (e) support for student input in assignments and activities. A program evaluation report with recommendations for school officials' improvement of the after-school program was created for stakeholder presentation. Implementation of the recommendations may result in students' increased literacy skills, self-confidence, and motivation.

A Formative Evaluation of an After-School Program for English II Students

by

Kandice Katrice Jernigan

EdS, Walden University, 2011

MA, Mississippi Valley State University, 2005

BS, Delta State University, 2003

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Walden University

July 2020

Dedication

This project is dedicated to my deceased uncle, Willie (Bo) Smith. He was a very loving person who would go above and beyond for all family members. He was always courageous, trustworthy, and full of laughter. He always provided motivational and inspirational words throughout all situations. My uncle passed during my doctoral process, and I miss him dearly. When my doctoral class became challenging, I know he was the constant angel above who pushed me to continue my educational journey to success. I love my Uncle Bo Smith with all my heart. May he rest eternally with the good Lord above.

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I would like to thank God Almighty for allowing me to enter the doctoral process and reach my final destination. Believing in God, along with consistent prayer and faith, allowed me to complete such a challenging yet rewarding journey. Equally important, I would like to acknowledge my mother, father, sister, and two nieces. They have been my wholehearted support throughout this challenging process. At times, the process was very difficult and overwhelming, but my family members provided the encouragement to help me continue moving forward. I would like to thank them for making this process humorous; laughter was needed many days to get through the rough patches. Specifically, I would also like to extend special gratitude towards my mother. She believed in me when there seemed to be no hope at all. She always told me that I would finish this process and become Dr. Kandice Katrice Jernigan. My dream finally came true with her consistent support and motivational words. I love my family unconditionally and thank them for being my backbone throughout this tedious journey.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	v
Section 1: The Problem.....	1
The Local Problem.....	1
Definition of the Problem	2
Evidence of the Problem at the Local Level.....	3
Evidence of the Problem From the Professional Literature.....	4
Rationale	4
Definition of Terms.....	5
Significance of the Study	6
Research Questions	7
Review of the Literature	8
Saturation of Literature.....	9
Conceptual Framework.....	9
Review of the Broader Problem.....	11
English Difficulties and Strategies.....	12
Reading Strategies	13
Writing Strategies	14
Parental Involvement	15
Low Socioeconomic Status.....	16
Learning Disabilities	16
Differentiated Instructional Strategies	18

After-School Programs	19
Implications.....	19
Summary	20
Section 2: The Methodology.....	22
Introduction.....	22
Research Design and Approach	22
After-School Program Objectives.....	24
Participants.....	24
Data Collection	27
Data Collection Process	27
Participant Access	28
Role of the Researcher	29
Data Analysis	30
Limitations	31
Data Analysis Results	32
Participants' Demographics	31
Findings From the Interview Data	34
Codes Used to Generate Themes	34
Themes	37
Results Addressing the Research Questions	38
Research Question 1 and Theme 1.....	39
Research Question 2 and Themes 2 and 3	44

Research Question 3 and Themes 4 and 5	50
Discussion of Evidence of Quality	50
Discrepant Cases	50
Summary	55
Section 3: The Project	60
Introduction	60
Project Description and Goals	61
Rationale	61
Review of the Literature	62
Literature Search Strategy	62
Program Evaluation Definition	63
Types of Program Evaluations	64
Program Evaluation Process	65
Program Evaluation Report	66
Appropriateness of the Project Genre	68
Applicability of the UFE Framework	68
Theories and Research That Support the Project	70
Project Description	72
Potential Resources and Existing Support Barriers	77
Proposal for Implementation and Timetable	77
Responsibilities and Roles	79
Project Implications	79

Social Change Implications	79
Community Impact	80
Importance of the Project to Stakeholders	81
Section 4: Reflections and Conclusion	82
Introduction.....	82
Project Strengths and Limitations.....	83
Recommendations for Alternative Approaches	83
Scholarship, Project Development, and Leadership and Change	84
Scholarship.....	84
Project Development.....	86
Leadership and Change.....	87
Reflection on the Importance of the Work	89
Implications, Applications, and Directions for Future Research	90
Conclusion	92
References.....	97
Appendix A: Program Evaluation Report.....	124
Appendix B: Program Evaluation Presentation	159
Appendix C: Interview Questions.....	166

List of Tables

Table 1. Themes Mapped to Codes.....	35
Table 2. Recommendations Keyed to Themes	74
Table 3. Timetable	78
Table A1. Recommendations Keyed to Themes.....	151
Table A2. Timetable	154

Section 1: The Problem

The Local Problem

The target high school is located in a Southern U.S. city in a largely rural and predominantly poverty-based area. At the time of this study, the population of the high school numbered 310, consisting of 98% African American, 1% Caucasian, and 1% Hispanic students. Students consistently had trouble mastering components in the area of English II. This is a course in which English skills are taught for 10th-grade students. According to Breger (2017), an excessive number of students are economically challenged and perform inadequately on state-based assessments. At the high school, district officials created an after-school program to strengthen students' weaknesses in English II due to the students' inadequate performance on state-mandated examinations.

This mandatory after-school program was established in 2018 to enhance 10th-grade English II students' skills in reading comprehension, writing process, vocabulary building, and grammar to upgrade the students' achievement. The inclusion of this after-school program may increase the possibility that the school's racially diverse students will master English-based objectives and score successfully on the English II-based components of required examinations. In this study, I evaluated the after-school program. My focus was on students', parents', and administrators' perceptions of the after-school program's effects on student performance in English II.

Education is designed to enable individuals to understand what is socially valued in their lives (Elliott & Fourali, 2012). Mastery of English and the other high school subjects leads to graduation and college acceptance, followed by productive employment

(Cavendish, 2013; Hauser & Anderson, 2011). To date, according to school officials, the after-school program has not been evaluated for effectiveness. If the after-school program is evaluated and recommendations implemented, student performance may be increased in English II and students may score higher on required examinations. With higher scores, students may have greater opportunities to be accepted at colleges, obtain gainful employment, and become productive citizens of society.

Definition of the Problem

Frequent failure of English II students in reading, vocabulary, writing, and grammar created a problem at the high school under study. Research indicates that if students are not strong in literacy skills, they will most likely struggle in other significant courses. Students with inadequate literacy skills often lack necessary reading abilities and have difficulty interpreting and understanding advanced textual information, according to Wendt (2013). Literacy challenges can lead to students having problems understanding and be successful in a variety of necessary courses in high school and college (Terlitsky & Wilkins, 2015). Insufficient English skills can lead to poor examination scores, which may result in students failing school-level courses as well as being unable to graduate at the appropriate time. Many U.S. high schools have beginning students who have low reading performance in English (Fleischman & Heppen, 2009). At the high school under study, due to inadequate English II student performance, in 2018 district officials created an after-school program for all 55 students with inadequate English skills.

Evidence of the Problem at the Local Level

Students need sufficient skills to master English-based elements. High school students from a variety of backgrounds who have difficulties with literacy may not have the ability to align new information with current knowledge. They may not be able to understand significant knowledge included in course texts (McIntyre-McCullough, 2016). Although literacy is a critical component of education, many high school students in the United States have limited literacy abilities (Wendt, 2013).

At the local setting, 55 students were unable to perform adequately due to failing grades in the English course. To improve student performance, the district officials created an after-school program to assist students with scoring adequately in English II by targeting reading comprehension, writing process, vocabulary, and grammar. However, the effectiveness of the after-school program had not been evaluated. According to the school principal, determining whether the program has been effective in meeting its goals is a high priority for district and school officials. This is a high priority because of administrators' concerns about students' grades as they move toward graduation and the demands of state assessments.

After-school programs can play a vital role in students' academic performance (Gorard, Siddiqui, & See, 2015; Jones, 2018). Students' overall reading success is closely related to the effectiveness of the literacy program in which they are enrolled (Sheldon, Arbretton, Hopkins, & Grossman, 2010). For effective literacy programs, it is imperative that students receive services that target essential aspects of reading, such as recognizing terminology, enhancing language, understanding their personal thought processes, and

integrating knowledge necessary for understanding information (Harmon, Hedrick, Wood, & Vintinner, 2011). After-school programs with these aspects may benefit student performance in English II at the target high school, as such programs have with other students (Jones, 2018; Terlitsky & Wilkins, 2015).

Evidence of the Problem From the Professional Literature

Successful student mastery in the area of English is an issue of worldwide concern. Universally, secondary student literacy advancement is inadequate (Lai, Wilson, McNaughton, & Hsiao, 2014). Consistent struggles with English-based components lower possibilities for students to perform adequately on English-based assignments and successfully complete future courses. Reading comprehension is an essential competency needed for students to reach a high level of achievement in school; additionally, insufficient comprehension skills can have a detrimental effect on students' academic achievement (Watson, Gable, Gear, & Hughes, 2012). At the target high school, English II students continuously struggle with English-based problems.

Rationale

According to the principal at the high school, students are struggling in several English-based areas. Students' backgrounds include diversity factors, such as poverty, insufficient parental involvement, and learning disabilities, all of which hinder students' scoring adequately in English (see Almus & Dogan, 2016; Breger, 2017; Cetin & Taskin, 2016; Dudaite, 2016; Ko & Hughes, 2015). If students are not able to score adequately on English II elements, they will be unable to advance to the next grade level, adequately pass the General Education Development examination, and will be ineligible for

graduation. If they do not graduate, they will not be accepted into colleges and will likely not be able to obtain adequate career opportunities.

The purpose of this study was to assess the effectiveness of the target high school's after-school program by conducting a program evaluation. The findings of this evaluation may result in positive social change by informing the district administrators as to whether the program is effective in improving students' learning in English II and therefore whether the district should continue to invest time and resources in the program. The evaluation also includes recommendations on how the after-school program might be improved to enhance 10th-grade students' literacy capabilities.

The evaluation may also be useful to parents, students, and teachers. Findings from the evaluation may provide strategies that parents can use in assisting their children with English II homework. Students may become more aware of the strengths of the program and be able to chart their own progress and make suggestions for improvement. Additionally, the evaluation may help teachers to become informed of the after-school program's benefits and drawbacks so they may adapt their teaching strategies for greater effectiveness.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are used throughout this project:

Adolescence: The stage children go through in which they progress from childhood to maturity, with the purpose of developing social-emotional skills and effectiveness in performing tasks and public decision-making (Curtis, 2015).

After-school programs: Programs that take place following the scheduled school day and that involve engagement of students in activities designed to create a desire to learn and the use of information learned during the school day. The programs also offer tutorial help in various subjects (Bulanda & Mccrea, 2013).

Educational technology: Technological tools that aid students in acquiring knowledge and that enhance productivity (e.g., completion of assignments; Spector, Johnson, & Young, 2014).

English II: A course with reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar as key components. With guidance from teachers, students are expected to understand literacy components and properly respond to literary text. Another expected course outcome is that students develop vocabulary building skills and greater knowledge of grammar.

Program evaluation: An assessment of a program's subject matter, types of presentation, and effectiveness that is undertaken to make future beneficial decisions regarding it (Spaulding, 2014).

Significance of the Study

The significance of the problem can be seen in the results of the diverse students at the high school who continually score insufficiently on the reading comprehension, writing process, vocabulary, and grammar sections in English II. Inadequate English II student achievement results in low scores on state-mandated tests, which reflect on the high school as a whole and result in decreased graduation rates and students' lack of collegiate-based occupational opportunities. The high school administrators recognized the risks to students of low English proficiency and instituted the after-school program.

Failure to obtain a high school diploma is a serious problem in the United States (Hauser & Anderson, 2011). One reason is that a high school diploma is necessary for most students to be admitted to colleges and universities. As Applegate (2012) noted, the future of the U.S. economy and democracy depends greatly on the number of individuals in the country who possess a high-quality college degree. Evaluation of the target high school's after-school program may help school district officials to improve the program and better ensure student success in English II and throughout high school.

Research Questions

The research questions (RQs) provided the essential foundation for the entire research project. The questions for this program evaluation addressed how the program enhances students' English-based knowledge; the perceptions of students, parents, and administrators regarding the program; and possible strategies district leaders could use to address students' problems in the language arts skills of reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar. The findings from the evaluation may clarify strategic procedures that district leaders can put into place to help enhance student learning. The evaluation RQs were as follows:

- RQ1. How does the after-school program help to enhance English II racially diverse students' learning in regard to challenging aspects of English II?
- RQ2. What are the perceptions of students, parents and administrators regarding the contributions of the after-school program and the success of English II?
- RQ3. What possible strategies can be used to increase and improve English II students' overall performance?

Review of the Literature

I conducted the literature review search using the resources of the Walden University Library. All cited literature consists of peer-reviewed and evidence-based resources. I performed the search using databases such as Academic Search Complete, ERIC, and the ProQuest database Education Source, as well as books on relevant topics. Search terms related to English instructional strategies, teaching, and after-school programs were entered into the databases. These search terms included *after-school programs*, *English remedial programs*, *formative evaluation*, *planning evaluation*, *program evaluation*, *program evaluation report*, and *summative evaluation*. Possible search terms were first compiled and then individually entered into the databases. I also used Boolean search terms to locate significant information. I thoroughly reviewed the results from the online database searches for their relevance and appropriateness for inclusion in the study. I searched sources from 1995 to the present and located 170 sources. On close examination, I found that several were not pertinent to this study and used all the others until saturation was reached.

This review includes pertinent and contemporary literature regarding how an after-school program affects the performance of diverse students' performance in English literacy skills. The literature review addresses distinctive aspects, which include the conceptual framework of utilization-focused evaluation theory (Patton & Horton, 2009), English difficulties and strategies, and after-school programs. The major elements of the literature review provide the essential challenges students encounter regarding the language arts skills of reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar.

Saturation of Literature

Following the recommendations of Randolph (2009), I continued to collect and analyze sources until saturation was achieved. I examined references of the articles, decided what was important, read the content, and continuously repeated the procedures. When all searching was completed, I shared the information with a professional librarian to discover possible missing articles. According to Randolph (2009), the researcher can provide sources to knowledgeable individuals for guidance to determine if the information accessed is appropriate and balanced. The process was ended when saturation was complete and the professional approved the articles.

Conceptual Framework

The program evaluation was theory-driven in its implementation, following the recommendations of Mertens and Wilson (2012). As Leshem and Trafford (2007) noted, Conceptual frameworks also provide a scaffold within which strategies for the research design can be determined, and fieldwork can be undertaken. . . . the conceptual framework is a bridge between paradigms which explain the research issue and the practice of investigating that issue. (p. 99)

With this explanation in mind and to bridge the research issue and necessary fieldwork, I investigated several conceptual frameworks and chose the one most suited to this study.

I used utilization-focused evaluation (UFE) theory, a theory which calls for an evaluation to be planned based on a prearranged audience who will directly use the findings (Schwitzer, 1997), as the study conceptual framework. Therefore, the questions, evaluation standards and process, and information obtained should be compatible with

the needs of the prearranged users (Schwitzer, 1997). The primary proponent of UFE is Patton (2008, 2010, 2011, 2015). As “applied sociology” in which sociological principles are used to solve practical problems (Patton, 2015, p. 457), UTF is highly specific, concrete situational, personal, and interactional. Patton (2010) defined UFE as follows:

Utilization-focused evaluation is concerned with how real people in the real world apply evaluation findings and experience the evaluation process. Therefore, the *focus* in utilization-focused evaluation is on intended use by intended users. . . . In essence, utilization-focused evaluation is premised on the understanding that evaluation use is too important to be merely hoped for or assumed. Use must be planned for and facilitated (p. 137).

From this explanation, I determined that UFE was the most appropriate theoretical framework to use for this study.

In addition, in UFE the users take active roles in the evaluation process. The evaluator is not an unapproachable authority but helps the users to make their own judgments and decisions. After the evaluation is complete, the users are responsible for applying the findings and implementing the recommendations, often with the evaluator’s guidance (Patton, 2008, 2010).

UFE is widely recognized as a viable evaluation strategy and has been used in many fields. These include education in medicine (Afshar, Tabei, & Hosseinzade, 2018), Vassar, Wheeler, Davison, & Franklin, 2010), teacher evaluation (Noakes, 2009), conservation education (Flowers, 2010), and lay ministry education (English, MacDonald, & Connelly, 2006). Additionally, UFE has been used for a high school

hazing prevention program (Hakkola, Allan, & Kerschner, 2019), agricultural innovation (Patton & Horton, 2009), a family preservation program (Smith, 1995), tourism development (Briedenhann & Butts, 2005), and a youth training program (Ramirez, Kora, & Brodhead, 2017).

As Donaldson, Patton, Fetterman, and Scriven (2010) pointed out, the emphasis on UFE is the actual use of the evaluation to the targeted users. The authors noted that users should be “clearly identified primary intended users who have responsibility to apply evaluation findings and implement whatever recommendations emerge” (p. 18). The users are actively enlisted in the evaluation to address their priority, and as they are involved they become more invested in the evaluation and more likely to implement the recommendations of the evaluation.

For the current evaluation, the intended users were the board of directors, administrators, teachers, parents, and students involved in the after-school program. The evaluation was a formative one which addressed real events and the productivity of the program (Patton, 2010), highlighting the program’s strengths and weaknesses from the perspectives of administrators, parents, and students. The evaluation included recommendations for implementation of program improvement. However, implementation of the specific recommendations was the responsibility of the school administrators.

Review of the Broader Problem

The problem that led to this evaluation was that English II students were having difficulty mastering literacy-based components of their curriculum. A number of possible

factors contributed to the problem. Diversity barriers may have affected students' performance, such as lack of English skills, single-parent homes, or being raised by grandparents or foster parents (Cetin & Taskin, 2016; Dudaite, 2016). Insufficient parental involvement was another factor; parental involvement affects students' performance (Rol & Turhan, 2018).

In addition, many students at the school were of low socioeconomic status, and this background may have been a significant factor that affected their learning capabilities (Dudaite, 2016; Walsh & Theodorakakis, 2017). Because the parents often worked two jobs and cared for other siblings, the students could not gain the adults' necessary attention or at-home resources to enhance their learning and language arts skills. Finally, some of the students had learning disabilities, which can impede students' academic progress (Caruana, 2015; Ko & Hughest, 2015). All these barriers had to be addressed for students to reach higher levels of success in English II.

English Difficulties and Strategies

A number of areas in English are problematic for 10th-grade students in the language arts skills of reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar. Fluent reading is a significant skill for gaining knowledge and is essential throughout students' secondary schooling and collegiate experience (Cuevas, Irving, & Russell, 2014). Students with reading challenges have problems understanding, which makes it difficult for them to obtain the necessary information while reading texts and responding in examinations and essays (Vaughn et al., 2015).

Moreover, many students possess inadequate writing abilities. Classroom and homework writing techniques are used as strategies to form expressions and exchange information as well as generate ideas (Price, Jackson, Nippold, & Ward-Lonergan, 2015). Writing is a significant component used for acquiring knowledge and exchanging information with others (Santangelo, 2014). Students' vocabulary skills are essential to all subject areas and connected to academic performance (Beach, Sanchez, Flynn, & O'Connor, 2015). Knowledge of grammar is also essential for students' overall comprehension (Smith, 2011).

Reading Strategies

Students learn best through direct teaching methods, such as teachers reading aloud to students. Teachers' reading engages students and allows them to process information cognitively and in a meaningful manner (Fraher et al., 2019). Phonological awareness is strongly related to reading comprehension, meaningful communication, and reading abilities. Phonology instructional practices lead to reading improvement, and any lack of phonological components may negatively affect students' reading performance (Segers, Verhoeven, & Knoop-van, 2018). Additionally, students benefit from teachers' motivational techniques, such as assignments of interesting books, that encourage them to read at home and to visit libraries (Malloy et al., 2017).

Students need to be given multiple opportunities to read a variety of texts so that they become proficient readers (Roberts, Kim, Tandy, & Meyer, 2019). Intervention programs can also assist students with processing information, writing abilities, and verbal skills (Rouhani, Nafchi, & Ziaee, 2016). These programs target reading fluency

levels, assist struggling readers, and help students to build knowledge. With such intervention strategies, students' reading fluency and comprehension often improve (Vernon-Feagans, Bratsch-Hines, Varghese, Cutrer, & Garwood, 2018).

It is important that teachers on the secondary level gain knowledge of reading development procedures and effective reading instruction that improve students' reading abilities. Statistics have shown that improved reading capabilities contribute to the achievement of the nation's high school students (Ankrum, Genest, & Morewood, 2017). Furthermore, technological devices, such as smart boards, computers, and iPads, can be used to enhance students' reading comprehensions skills (Baron, 2017).

Literacy skills involve reading advancements that include the ability to draw conclusions, understand vocabulary while reading, and compile and discuss main ideas based on the subject matter of a document (Garwood, 2018). Research shows that literacy is a significant factor pertaining to student achievement, communication, and understanding of textual information (Mcgeown, Duncan, Griffiths, & Stothard, 2015). Additionally, literacy can be integrated into classroom instructional procedures through the use of technology. Approaches include interactive exercises, forums, and self-directed lessons (Bhojwani & Wilkie, 2018).

Writing Strategies

It is imperative that secondary students engage in complex writing activities (Jeffery & Wilcox, 2014). Writing is a significant element that allows students to communicate information and ideas (Price et al., 2015) and is required throughout students' education. Sieben (2017) suggested the following writing strategies for

students: use notes, inquire about information through discussions, respond to written information, and indicate main components of revised documents. Malpique, Ana Margarida, and Frison (2017) pointed out that distinctive and clear writing information is necessary in many ways for students to reach advanced levels.

Peer writing is another writing strategy. According to Loretto, DeMartino, and Godley (2016), secondary students' and teachers' interview responses indicated that students' analysis of peer writing was beneficial in helping all students improve their writing skills. Parental involvement also supports students in the writing process.

DeFauw (2017) suggested that parents and children write essays to one another based on the students' current book. Parental involvement can include parents requesting students to read passages aloud and then asking the students questions about the text, with the students writing down their responses (Camacho & Alves, 2017).

Parental Involvement

Parental involvement not only helps children write but also aids their involvement in school activities in other ways. Parents can regularly read to children, structure the home setting for educational purposes, and communicate about the significance of academic advancement (Mendez & Swick, 2018). Involvement of parents includes interacting with the educational system by attending parents' nights and conferring with teachers, helping their children to make choices in assignments, and offering their children assistance (Latunde & Clark-Louque, 2016). Parents should also make certain to receive information from teachers about notices of opportunities to participate in meetings and about the specifics of assignments (Rol & Turhan, 2018).

When parents demonstrate optimistic behavior about the educational system and reactions to it, their children reach adequate or better academic performance (Rice, 2017). Parental involvement also increases students' desires to learn (Rol & Turhan, 2018). Parents' exchange of information with their children and working with them toward a common goal are essential elements in efforts to enhance student achievement, attendance, and students' overall behavior (Titiz & Tokel, 2015). The involvement of parents in their children's education is a crucial element for students to reach academic success (Parker & Reid, 2017).

Low Socioeconomic Status

An impoverished lifestyle is a prevalent issue for students throughout the United States, and they may be faced with developmental delays (Walsh & Theodorakakis, 2017). Research shows that poverty affects students' overall academic performance (Chandler, 2014). Students who live in impoverished situations often perform poorly on reading and mathematics assignments and tests. Dudaite (2016) indicated that students' environmental conditions have a major effect on school performance outcomes. Bell, Hackett, and Hoffman (2016) observed that students who live in impoverished situations spend insufficient time completing educational tasks and are less likely to go to college than students from more affluent backgrounds.

Learning Disabilities

Scope. According to Christo and Ponzuric (2017), students gain knowledge using varied strategies and require multiple teaching methods. Learning disabilities involve neurological defects that hinder students' academic abilities related to reading, writing,

and mathematics (Kuder, 2017). Possible warning signs include delayed reading, writing, or mathematics skills (De La Paz & Butler, 2018). Graham, Collins, and Rigby-Wills (2017) indicated that student with learning disabilities may display struggles in writing. Students who possess learning disabilities may also have challenges fitting in with classmates and experience negative socialization issues, low self-confidence, and behavioral issues (Cavioni, Grazzani, & Ornaghi, 2017). These students often possess comprehensions problems, communication issues, and difficulties hearing, reading, spelling, and mathematics (Harðardóttir, Júlíusdóttir, & Guðmundsson, 2015).

According to Ko and Hughes (2015), students with learning disabilities experience increasingly severe challenges on the secondary level because of increased academic rigor. Learning disabled students may experience problems in many courses, with lower grades, higher course failures, and escalating lack of self-confidence. The difficulties may increase over time, with continued inadequate performance, repeating of grade levels, or prolonged absences from school (Billingsley, Thomas, & Webber, 2018).

Strategies to improve learning disabilities. A number of strategies have been developed to help learning disabled students. These students can be removed from the normal classroom setting to receive services from a special education instructor. Alternatively, the students may be kept in the normal setting while the instructor provides instructional services (Buckley & Mahdavi, 2018).

These students can be taught to use graphic organizers to increase their skills and help improve possible reading challenges (Singleton & Filce, 2015). Nagro, Hooks, Fraser, and Cornelius (2016) noted that when teachers use hand gestures, they help

students with learning disabilities to understand and be more focused during the instructional process. Caruana (2015) provided writing strategies for students with learning disabilities, which included technological components and communication as well as organizing information and supplies.

Botsas (2017) pointed out that the process of rehearsing or reexamining information is linked to students with inadequate performance levels. However, strategies to include additional details are connected to students' understanding more rigorous information. Other interventions can be incorporated into multiple areas of teaching, such as regulating self-behavior, repetitive instructions for comprehension, and tutoring (Cook & Rao, 2018).

Differentiated Instructional Strategies

The differentiated instructional process provides alternate techniques for students to understand information based on their specific needs (Dixon, Yssel, McConnell, & Hardin, 2014; Ismajli & Imami-Morina, 2018). According to Morgan (2014), the differentiated instructional process consists of identifying students' learning abilities and using various teaching strategies to meet their individual needs. Strategies include adjusting the curriculum, changing activities and tests, and using a variety of resources (Guay, Roy, & Valois, 2017). The differentiated instructional process not only accommodates to students' specific needs but also enhances student accountability and tutoring opportunities and allows flexible grouping of students by skill level (Morgan, 2014).

After-School Programs

After-school programs can play a vital role in students' academic performance. Reading remediation and intervention programs are put into place to assist students with severe reading issues to enhance their comprehension skills and increase their vocabulary (Vaughn et al., 2015). After-school programs can improve students' academic performance, increase participation, improve reading abilities, and lead to better interactions among students (Wieworka, 2017).

According to Votypka (2018), motivation to read should begin in the early grades. An after-school reading program for kindergarten to second grade students encourages them to engage in the reading process so that they may master reading and reach higher performance levels. Jeffes (2016) indicated that reading interventions are established to improve students' phonemic awareness and explore possible barriers that may hinder the students' learning process. After-school reading intervention programs can provide students with the necessary tools to improve their overall reading abilities (Bulanda & Mccrea, 2013; Davis & Fullerton, 2016; Wieworka, 2017).

Implications

The components of literacy greatly affect students' academic abilities, and good literacy skills are essential for students to reach academic success (Garwood, 2018; Terlitsky & Wilkins, 2015; Walker-Dalhouse & Risko, 2008). However, many students have low literacy skills (Wendt, 2013). Inadequate reading skills that are not addressed in earlier grades can affect students' performance throughout school, college, and their future occupations (Zaman & Asghar, 2019).

After-school programs are essential for building students' literacy and reading comprehension skills. Intervention-based programs provide methods that improve students' reading abilities. Research has shown that appropriate programs properly improve high school students' literacy skills and (Harmon et al., 2011). For students to advance in school, appropriate reading programs must be available and implemented effectively (Iwai, 2016; Lai et al., 2014).

At the school under study, many English II students had severe troubles with various aspects of literacy and reading comprehension. Although an after-school program for these students was implemented in the fall of 2018, since then the students' literacy had not improved in terms of English assignments and course grades. Consideration of the problem, the study design, conceptual framework of UFE, and literature review suggested that an evaluation of the English II after-school program would be appropriate to determine its strengths and weaknesses and provide recommendations for improvement. A program evaluation report could help the significant stakeholders identify the effectiveness of the after-school program and take steps to strengthen it. The report could also be published on the district website and sent in an e-mail announcement to all stakeholders. Summary presentations could also be made to individual stakeholder groups.

Summary

Many students have difficulties in mastering reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar. At the high school under study, English II students had low socioeconomic status, lack of parental involvement, and learning disabilities. These factors may have all

contributed to students' inability to perform adequately in English II. To address these barriers, an after-school program was established to target problematic areas of English. However, students' skills and grades did not improve.

Section 2 of this work focuses on the methodological approaches used in the evaluation. These include the research design, objective, RQs, participants, data collection, data analysis, and results. Section 3 consists of the presentation and summary of the project findings, and Section 4 reports reflections and conclusions.

Section 2: The Methodology

Introduction

In this section, I describe the techniques I used to conduct the formative program evaluation. In conducting the program evaluation, I drew from UFE theory (Patton, 2008, 2010) and used a qualitative approach to collect and analyze pertinent data relative to the evaluation. I interviewed administrators, parents, and students to explore the strengths and weaknesses of the English II after-school program intervention at the project site.

Research Design and Approach

I conducted the formative program evaluation to determine administrators', parents', and students' perceptions of factors regarding the effectiveness of an after-school program that district leaders created to increase students' English-based skills of reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar. The formative program evaluation design allowed all stakeholders to better comprehend the strong and weak aspects of the program and the district leaders to implement the evaluation recommendations (see Brady & Spencer, 2018). I used a qualitative approach and collected data from administrator, parent, and student participants by conducting interviews. Research indicates that the evaluation process emphasizes students' thoughts and increases their comprehension abilities, with a focus on the instructional process (Stefl-Mabry, 2018).

A formative program evaluation takes place during the implementation of a project and targets methods of improvement. I used the formative evaluation method because findings were needed for the duration of the program toward improvement. I chose not to use summative evaluations because they are based on the results of a

program after-school completion. Summative evaluations are used toward the end of a program and provide information as to whether the program was successful or unsuccessful (Cook, 2010).

The interviews with administrators, parents, and students captured significant and valuable information to help understand participants' opinions regarding the objectives of the evaluation (see Castillo-Montoya, 2016). Teachers were not included in the study to enhance the objectivity of the findings. Rather, I conducted the interviews with individuals who were not involved in the direct instructional delivery of the program, which decreased the possibility of biased information. Information was collected through interviews pertaining to how the after-school program helped enhance students' English II performance, challenging aspects of the English II components, and possible strategies to increase overall student performance. The qualitative design approach was intended to answer the following RQs:

- RQ1. How does the after-school program help to enhance English II racially diverse students' learning in regard to challenging aspects of English II?
- RQ2. What are the perceptions of administrators, parents, and students regarding the contributions of the after-school program and the success of English II?
- RQ3. What possible strategies can be used to increase and improve English II students' overall performance?

I concluded that a program evaluation was necessary to ensure the effectiveness and sustainability of the program by identifying strategies for improving student performance. An analysis of the program evaluation is provided along with an analysis of

strengths and weaknesses of the after-school program. Additionally, strategies are provided that can be used to improve the existing weaknesses.

After-School Program Objectives

The English II after-school tutorial program was geared towards improving diverse students' reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar skills. District leaders created the program to enhance students' English-based achievement, increase their graduation rates, and provide the students better opportunities to obtain significant occupations in their future lives. The program was offered during one school year from September to May, Monday through Thursday, from 4:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m., with two English II teachers providing instruction and exercises.

The after-school program was designed for teachers to present multiple learning strategies to students. These strategies included one-on-one instruction, group instruction and exercises, teachers' reading aloud, students reading aloud, writing exercises in a variety of topics, practice in use of vocabulary, and illustrations of grammatical constructions. Teachers introduced many assignments, such as essays, poetry study, and student portfolios, that met individual students' learning styles. The teachers also sometimes used technology to facilitate students' learning. Eight students participated in both individual and group-based instruction. All students attended the program regularly, with only a few absences.

Participants

I selected 21 participants by using purposive sampling. In purposive sampling, the researcher chooses participants who have characteristics that will align with the RQs

(Battaglia, 2008; Patton, 2014). This nonrandom sampling method was used to obtain a representation of the populations of administrators, parents, and students who had specific knowledge of and interest in the after-school program. Individuals were selected based on their personal association with English II. I placed invitation letters in administrators' mailboxes and mailed invitation letters to parents and students. The prospective participants had 1 week to respond, after which I sent a second invitation.

The criteria for administrators included having administrative credentials and being employed in the high school or district office. Administrators also had to be involved with teachers and students in the English II after-school program in the capacities of overseers and advisors, and had to have made classroom observations during the program. Four of the administrators who participated in the study worked in the high school, and one worked at the central office.

The criteria for parents consisted of being stakeholders in the community and having a child enrolled in the English-based after-school program. I chose one parent per child. Parents who accepted the invitation were selected based on whether their child was selected to participate in the evaluation. Parents not chosen were provided notification letters. The criteria for students to participate were having been enrolled in the after-school program and English II simultaneously. Not all 55 of the English II students were required to be enrolled in the after-school program. However, all English-based after-school participants had to have been enrolled in English II. Of the administrators, five accepted the invitation. Of the parents, I selected 12 parents to participate in the study and

sent them invitations, but four parents declined because of their schedules and lack of time. Of the students, all eight accepted the invitations and participated.

The final selection consisted of five administrators, eight parents, and eight students. The administrators included a principal, assistant principal, instructional coach, behavior specialist, and special education director. On acceptance, participants signed consent (administrators and parents) and assent (students) forms. Consent and assent forms were mailed to parents simultaneously. The interview sessions took place individually in a high school classroom.

Ethical protection of participants was an important component of the research procedures. The Walden University Institutional Review Board committee reviewed my proposal for this study and approved it. The approval number is 08-21-14-0173594. I received permission and a signed letter of cooperation from the local school district. Because qualitative research can include rich descriptions of participants, confidentiality elements are of great concern to qualitative researchers (Kaiser, 2009). I assured participants of confidentiality by assigning numbers only to each participant rather than using their names.

Ensuring that all participants were fully protected from harm was another ethical issue that I addressed. Human participant protection pertains primarily to specific standards, laws, and government-based requirements (McDonald & Cox, 2009). All administrators, parents, and students were provided with specific information regarding the evaluation to minimize feelings of discomfort. Furthermore, participants' thoughts and feelings were greatly respected throughout the research procedures.

During the interviews, I ensured privacy by removal of all direct identifiers such as names and social security numbers and coded the interview information with numbers only for participants. Their privacy was further protected because I stored all information on a computer with my private password. I kept all hard-copy information in a locked fireproof box, to which I alone have the key. All information will be expunged after 5 years.

Data Collection

Data collection is a strategic process in qualitative research. For this formative evaluation study, the qualitative data collection procedures were geared towards broad questioning techniques that allowed participants to share personal views (Creswell, 2012) on the effectiveness of the English II after-school and allowed me to collect multiple types of information. My goal was to increase the possibility that participants would share significant perceptions regarding the effect of the after-school program on English II-based performance. The interviews led to discovery of the underlying relationship between the students' English II performance and the after-school program.

Data Collection Process

The structured interviews consisted of 30-minute individual sessions that I conducted with the participating administrators, parents, and students. Each interview question was aligned with the essential elements of the RQs (see Appendix C). I gathered the interview data and analyzed the participants' responses to the interview questions. I also used a research log to provide a record of all components of the research process.

I scheduled the interviews at convenient and agreeable times and in a private, comfortable environment in a classroom at the high school after school hours. The interviews were recorded on a voice memo of an electronic device and downloaded into NVivo software, a program which assists in the collection, organization, and analysis of content from interview sessions. NVivo software allows a researcher to store data in one central location, and data are organized into folders, where accumulated data is also analyzed (Wiltshier, 2011).

I replayed the files repetitiously and transcribed them into typed documents, ensuring that all information that could threaten confidentiality was removed. In member checking (Simpson & Quigley, 2016), I sent participants the interview transcripts, giving them the opportunity to examine the transcripts to confirm the accurateness and completeness of their information.

Participant Access

To assure access to participants during the data collection process, I reminded the participants in person of their appointments 2 days before the actual interview sessions. I repeated that the interviews would take place in an environment of their preference at times that complied with their schedules (Creswell, 2012). Distinctive considerate approaches increase the likelihood of gaining access to participants and of participants keeping their appointments (Castillo-Montoya, 2016)..

I established a researcher-participant working relationship by setting boundaries between myself and the participants (Creswell, 2012). I clearly communicated the method of participation and expectations during the interviews and invited questions. At

the beginning of each interview, I informed the participants of the purpose of the evaluation, why they were chosen, and the research procedures. I also made sure to seek their permission for participation prior to the interviews, having previously contacting the district administration for permission, and assured participants they were under no obligation to participate. I assured them further that there would be no detrimental effects if they decided not to participate or withdrew at any time (Creswell, 2012).

Role of the Researcher

My professional role is a school improvement officer for the high school. This role includes conducting meetings, completing budget-related tasks, and conveying valuable information to school officials. My interactions with administrators take place within school-level and district meetings. My interactions with teachers take place through professional development gatherings and mentorship sessions.

My role as the researcher was totally separate from my professional role. The separation of my professional and researcher roles was specifically communicated to all participants, and my professional role and collaboration with participants were thoroughly explained. Specifically, I worked on the district level but had no power to fire or hire any administrators involved in the evaluation. I did not have power over the parents or teach their child. I did not teach the students in the after-school program. I did not have power to grant or withhold funds for the school, program, or individuals. To minimize bias, I made every effort to clarify my roles as administrator, colleague, and employee separate from my role as researcher.

Data Analysis

At the conclusion of the interview sessions, I organized the data and made adjustments, such as categorizing data by participants, to begin the analysis. I coded the data according to specific topics of information that I uncovered during the repetitive listening to the audio files and transcribing of the interviews. Particular themes emerged, and I gained an essential understanding of the themes.

I used the interpretive model, which involved acquiring an understanding of the components of the data analysis process. The interpretive model consists of a whole separated into various components and aspects reinforced by individuals' pragmatic understanding (Esfandiari, Riasati, Vaezian, & Rahimi, 2018). Using the model allowed me to make connections from the interviews between and among the participants' responses. Application of the model also involved discovering the successes and failures of the after-school program as well as gaining additional knowledge on the effectiveness and organization of the data.

As the study took place, I organized the steps in a logical, chronological order. In an effort to clarify the data, after I obtained the responses from participants, I combined and condensed the information in searches for meaning. In the data analysis, I placed emphasis on significant elements that connected with the issues of the study and the RQs. The data analysis process required making determinations and providing visual representations of main points (Creswell, 2012). The overall process involved gathering interview information, coding the data, examining the meanings, recognizing the themes, and assembling all information for coherent presentation.

Evidence of Quality

Member checking and the discrepant cases were used to determine evidence of quality. During the member checking process, I emailed participants the transcriptions of their interviews, a review of the study findings, and conclusions and requested their feedback and suggestions. After they responded, I took notes on their feedback and suggestions to determine if the findings reflected the participants' experiences and perceptions. The participants agreed that the information was accurate and added clarity to the findings.

A discrepant case analysis allowed me to discover data that did not support existing or emerging patterns. According to Creswell (2012), perspectives of participants may be contradictory to the primary findings and should be noted. These discrepant perspectives contribute to the validity of the study.

Limitations

Several limitations existed in this project evaluation. First, the study was limited to a small selection of administrators, parents, and students. This limitation decreased the amount of information that could be obtained. Second, the parent participants did not have as much access to the study as the administrators and students, which may have limited the information parents could provide. Third, teachers were not included in the study because I chose to enhance objectivity of the findings by including perspectives only of persons not involved in direct program delivery. It is possible that teachers would have contributed valuable information. Fourth, only interviews were used to collect data on the perspectives of administrators, parents, and students. A quantitative component

could have added further information about the program effectiveness. Additionally, I did not use instructional materials, classroom observations, student assessments, or student work in the evaluation. These components may also have shed additional light on the evaluation results and recommendations.

Data Analysis Results

In this section, I describe participants' demographics, coding information, codes used to create themes, and the themes generated in the study findings. Additionally, the RQ results are provided in relation to the themes that were generated during the project evaluation. Further, salient data, evidence of quality, summarized information, and the project delivery are also discussed in the following sections. The data provided answers to the RQs generated during the research process. The following RQs were addressed during the study:

- RQ1. How does the after-school program help to enhance English II racially diverse students' learning in regard to challenging aspects of English II?
- RQ2. What are the perceptions of administrators, parents, and students regarding the contributions of the after-school program and the success of English II?
- RQ3. What possible strategies can be used to increase and improve English II students' overall performance?

The formative program evaluation was conducted with a qualitative design. The data analysis process consisted of various procedures conducted repetitively to determine the perceptions of the three stakeholder groups, the administrators, parents, and students. I used NVivo software to collect, organize, and analyze content from the interview

sessions and established coding categories for the information obtained from interviews and for generation of themes.

The themes revealed the five key areas participants perceived most prevalent and important about the effectiveness of the after-school program. The themes that emerged were as follows: (a) enhancement was found in students' reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar skills; (b) the condensed environment made it easier for teachers to target specific learning areas; (c) students' confidence increased as the program progressed; (d) more technological and additional activities should be included in the program, and (e) students should have input regarding the programs' assignments and activities. These themes provided highly useful information pertaining to the strengths and weaknesses of the after-school program.

Participants' Demographics

This study took place in a rural area of a southern U.S. state at an economically-challenged high school. All participants were involved in the after-school program in various capacities. The demographic composition of the five administrators was as follows: 20% ($n = 1$) males and 80% ($n = 4$) females, and 100% ($n = 5$) African American. The years in administration ranged from 3 to 5 years.

For the parents, the demographic composition of the eight participants was as follows: 25% ($n = 2$) males and 75% ($n = 6$) females, and 100% African American. The highest level of education was college, and all worked full-time or part-time.

Two English II instructors taught the after-school program, and they had been teaching for either 15 or 18 years. The after-school program took place in a high school

classroom Monday through Thursday from 4:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. Eight students attended the program and all participated in the evaluation. The students were 25% ($n = 2$) boys, one 14 and one 15 years old; and 75% ($n = 6$) girls, two 14 and four 15 years old. All students and teachers were African American, and all students came from low socioeconomic homes.

The classroom was set up in four small group centers. This arrangement allowed the students to rotate among reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar centers and the teachers to offer individualized instruction. The centers contained many materials based on each child's learning ability.

Findings From the Interview Data

Data collection was based on 21 interviews, and the findings were the result of the program evaluation. To increase the level of accuracy, I recorded each interview by audiotape. After transcription, I sent all participants their transcripts for review of their information and asked them to check for any inaccuracies and add information as needed. Participants returned the transcripts with all necessary corrections. Then I developed codes for data analysis based on the interview material.

Codes Used to Generate Themes

I used the interview data I gathered as a basis for the coding process. I separated the interview data into groups and categorized the interview data by specific groups of words. After generating the codes from the interview questions and analyzing the data, I developed five specific themes. The themes revealed an increased understanding of the

participants' perspectives in relation to the research questions. Table 1 shows how the themes were mapped to the codes.

Table 1

Themes Mapped to Codes

Themes	Codes
1. Enhancement was found in reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar skills	Perform better on English assignments Speaking and writing improved Students' vocabulary increased Students have the ability to comprehend better
2. The condensed environment makes it easier for teachers to target specific learning areas	Students are able to write better essays Vocabulary and grammar increased Condensed size classroom makes it easier for students One-on-one instruction is beneficial One-on-one instruction was helpful Personalized instruction was beneficial Separation from other students is an advantage Small groups allowed students to focus on certain skills Small group settings regarding reading and writing increased students' ELA abilities (<i>table continues</i>) Smaller environments made learning more conducive

Themes	Codes
3. Students' confidence increased as the program took place	<p>Working one-on-one with teacher made learning process more feasible</p> <p>Boost students' confidence, self-esteem, character, and social skills</p> <p>Program builds students' confidence so that they are open to what is available</p>
4. More technological and additional activities should be included in the program	<p>Students felt more comfortable with skills</p> <p>Student gained confidence</p> <p>Students became more comfortable</p> <p>Students open up more about what they are learning</p> <p>Complete more projects and home assignments</p> <p>Include competitive assignments to improve student abilities</p> <p>Include more technological-based interactive activities</p> <p>More online activities</p> <p>Other activities and trips should be available</p> <p>Portion should be included for Enrichment (<i>table continues</i>)</p> <p>Use computer more during lessons</p> <p>Use smart board and online activities</p>

Themes	Codes
5. Students should have input regarding the program assignments and activities	<p data-bbox="870 417 1346 485">Gather input from students regarding activities</p> <p data-bbox="870 527 1346 594">Program is geared towards students who have the earnest desire and need</p> <p data-bbox="870 636 1281 703">Students should have a say in syllabus and hands-on activities</p> <p data-bbox="870 745 1287 812">The program must be filled with interest for students</p>

Themes

Five themes or recurring ideas were generated during the study. The themes were based on how the after-school program affected students' reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar skills. Once developed, the themes were used to frame answers to the RQs.

The five themes were:

- Enhancement was found in students' reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar skills.
- The condensed environment made it easier for teachers to target specific learning areas.
- Students' confidence increased as the program progressed.
- More technological and additional activities should be included in the program.
- Students should have input regarding the program assignments and activities.

The five themes were based on the participants' experiences regarding the effect of the after-school program on students' performance in reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar. Repetitive patterns in the interviews from data analysis indicated that participants were positively influenced by the after-school program. The patterns also indicated that adjustments needed to be made to further enhance the program. Three of the five themes indicated that the program positively affected participants:

- Students had increased performance in reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar capabilities..
- A smaller environment was created that was more conducive for teachers to address particular learning aspects.
- Students' confidence was increased.

On the other hand, two of the five themes showed that instructors needed to modify the program:

- Make additional use of technology in the pedagogy, as well as additional activities.
- Allow students to make decisions regarding the assignments and activities included in the program.

Results Addressing the Research Questions

The research questions asked how the after-school program helped to enhance students' learning in regard to challenging aspects of English II; what were the perceptions of administrators, parents, and students regarding the contributions of the after-school program and to their successes in English II; and what possible strategies

could have been used to increase and improve English II students' overall performance.

The themes will now be used to address the RQs guiding the study.

Research Question 1 and Theme 1

RQ 1 asked how the after-school program helped to enhance English II racially diverse students' learning in regard to challenging aspects of English II. Theme 1 addressed the first RQ. Overall, the participants indicated that students' capabilities improved regarding the language arts skills of reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar during the after-school program.

Theme 1: Language Arts Skill Enhancement. Theme 1 indicated that enhancement was found in students' reading, writing, vocabulary and grammar skills. Students were selected for the after-school tutorial based on their low English scores and classroom performance. Teachers targeted reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar using specific techniques based on the students' needs. The after-school sessions took place 4 days per week from September to May. Participants indicated that students improved regarding the language arts skills addressed in the program. The theme of students showing improvement in reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar emerged as most participants provided similar responses that students' performance improved in these areas during the after-school program.

Similarities were found across the groups of participants regarding students' advanced writing skills. For example, Student 1 indicated, "My writing skills have improved as a result of participating in the program." Parent 5 added, "My daughter is better able to write sentences and paragraphs." Parent 6 stated, "My daughter developed

better skills to write coherent essays.” Administrator 2 added, “I noticed students were writing more effective sentences and paragraphs.”

Similarly, Student 4 stated:

My writing skills improved greatly while writing essays. I am able to write a clear paragraph with a beginning, middle, and end. I now understand the components of a correct essay. My overall grades have improved on all writing activities, and I am able to complete writing assignments quicker.

In several specific areas participants in all three stakeholder groups held similar views regarding students’ improved reading skills. The initial similarity was that most participants believed students were able to better comprehend while reading. For instance, Student 2 indicated, “I am better able to understand while reading short stories.” Similarly, Parent 6 stated, “My child can comprehend information more accurately as he reads short stories and essays.”

Another view that members of all groups held similarly was that students’ skills advanced while engaging in the reading program. For example, Administrator 3 stated, “I detected enhancement in students’ reading skills while they were reading novels and books.” Additionally, Parent 5 noted, “Advancement was found in my child’s reading comprehension skills.” Moreover, participants were similar in their opinion that students’ reading skills improved during the program. Specifically, Administrator 5 said, “I noticed students had gained the ability to read more fluently.” Likewise, Parent 2 added, “My child has improved reading text more fluently and correctly.”

Moreover, most members of different stakeholder groups had similar perceptions that students gained advanced vocabulary skills, which led to improved reading skills. Specifically, Student 7 provided information that he was able to better use context clues because he had a better understanding of vocabulary. Similarly, Parent 8 indicated that her child's vocabulary skills had greatly improved after participating in the program.

Participants agreed that enhanced vocabulary resulted in improved reading, context clues, and communication. Student 1 explained:

My vocabulary skills are better when reading sentences, essays, and short stories. I am able to use context clues to better understand the meaning of the words and score higher on assignments and tests. I also use more advanced words while talking to my family and friends.

Likewise, Administrator 3 noted, "Students were able to better define vocabulary while reading various texts."

As the research analysis continued, another similarity emerged among the opinions of parents. Most parents believed that students in the program gained additional knowledge of reading, in analyzing sections of a story, and in understanding contextual information. For example, Parent 7 indicated:

My child's reading comprehension skills have enhanced regarding understanding short stories. She is able to break down sections of short stories and provide a much better explanation of events throughout the story. She is also able to make better use of context clues.

Similarly, Parent 4 stated, “My daughter is better able to interpret short stories, separate and determine the meaning of sections of the story, and recognize hints to better understand components of the story.”

Similarities were discovered across the groups regarding students’ improved grammar skills. Administrator 4 indicated, “Students’ grammar skills are better developed, and they are able to properly construct sentences.” Student 6 added, “My grammar skills have enhanced as I wrote sentences and essays.”

Furthermore, Parent 2 noted:

I noticed my child’s grammar is much more advanced as he writes paragraphs and other assignments. My child is able to write more coherent short stories and essays as well. I also notice that his spelling and punctuation are much better as he writes sentences and essays.

Additional similarities were discovered between the stakeholder groups during data analysis. An administrator, two parents, and two students observed that students’ writing skills improved as the program progressed. Two administrators, two parents, and a student all stated that they noticed improvement in students’ reading skills. Also, one administrator, one parents, and two students all reported that students’ vocabulary skills were enhanced. Additionally, one administrator, one parent, and one student noted progress in students’ grammatical abilities.

Variations also occurred between participants’ responses regarding Theme 1. All participants provided information regarding language arts skill enhancement; however, they had different perspectives. In the first variation, Parent 8 and Student 1 both noticed

an improvement in written communication. Parent 8 discussed her son's ability to communicate and write correctly, and Student 1 specifically discussed being able to write better essays.

Parent 8 stated:

My son's overall communication and writing skills had improved due to skills obtained during the after-school program. He communicates more clearly and is able to better explain information as needed. Additionally, he writes using the proper components while completing writing assignments.

Student 1 was more specific in his recognition of improvement:

The program helped me to write more effective essays and understand the proper parts of an essay. I am better able to write a clear beginning, middle, and end as well as develop a main idea related to the essay. I have made great improvement writing good essays.

The second variation was based on the responses of Parent 2 and Student 8, in which Parent 2 discussed vocabulary, grammar, and communication enhancement, and Student 8 focused on vocabulary enhancement alone. Parent 2 stated: "He is building his vocabulary and he is able to speak better than he actually was at first." Parent 2 added later in the interview, "Not only did my child's performance increase in vocabulary but also in the area of grammar."

Student 8 noted, "My overall vocabulary improved greatly. I am able to use a variety of words while writing sentences and short stories. I am also better able to draw conclusions while reading short texts and other reading materials."

The third variation emerged as Administrator 4 indicated a summary of the program and individual components. In this variation, the administrator singled out one-to-one instruction and student improvements. The variation was significant because, unlike the comments of others, this administrator specified the benefits of the individual student-teacher sessions and the resulting improved student literacy skills and assignments as well.

I really love that the program allows students to spend abundant time working individually with the teacher to improve reading, writing, and grammar skills to better complete assignments. I have noticed great improvement regarding students' reading, writing, grammar, and vocabulary skills. Additionally, students performed more accurately on English assignments.

Research Question 2 and Themes 2 and 3

RQ 2 asked what were the perceptions of administrators, parents, and students regarding the contributions of the after-school program and students' success of English II. Themes 2 and 3 are connected to RQ 2. Participants indicated that the condensed environment made it more feasible for teachers to assist students individually with significant skills. Participants also noticed an increase in students' overall levels of confidence.

Theme 2: Condensed Environment. Theme 2 revealed that the condensed environment made it easier for teachers to target specific learning. This environment enabled the teachers to adapt instruction to the needs of individual students. The learning environment consisted of a classroom with a teacher assisting eight or fewer students

within a session. The students then worked personally with the teacher and asked questions as needed. During the after-school sessions, no other students or individuals were present while the after-school sessions took place, which made it easier for teachers to specifically target students' needs.

The overall pattern of responses in Theme 2 was reflected by opinions of Administrator 1, Administrator 2, Administrator 3, Parent 2, Parent 4, Parent 6, and Student 6. All indicated that the program provided a smaller learning environment that allowed the teacher to target specific learning areas with individual students. For example, Administrator 2 stated, "The condensed size of the classroom makes it more feasible for students to obtain information. They are better able to understand and connect with the instruction as the learning process takes place. The teacher can target students' specific needs."

Administrator 3 observed:

I feel that students are allowed more personalized time with the teachers, and they can focus on weak areas. This process allows students to enhance their areas of need. Also, students can ask specific questions and other information from instruction that took place prior to after-school.

Parent 2 commented, "My child was able to complete assignments in a more feasible manner with less distractions. The teachers were able to focus on the students and ensure they were provided the necessary instruction."

Likewise, Parent 4 noted, "My child received personalized instruction that was

very beneficial throughout the program and helped to increase her overall English-based knowledge. The teacher is able to break down components and provide clear examples of information.”

Parent 6 communicated:

The separation from other students was a learning advantage which allowed students to remain focused and perform more effectively. My child was not interrupted by any disciplinary issues or other obstacles. She was able to grasp the information in a personalized setting.

Student 6 stated:

The way that teachers are able to really just focus, first of all, one-on-one, on the child’s significant needs due to the condensed size of the classroom is awesome. Students who may require additional support will be provided with the personalized time as needed.

Administrators, parents, and students all indicated that the learning environment was enhanced. Administrator 2 also noted that students had a personalized experience with the instructor, which made learning more meaningful. Additionally, Parent 7 noted that her child said that the one-on-one approach made the student more comfortable, and the child could learn better. Student 4 reported that he was able to ask individual questions and gain a better understanding of the material.

However, administrators as a group had different views from parents and students about the actions that should take place within the condensed environment. Specifically, a difference was found among the administrators, students, and parents. The administrators

stated that the lessons should be more rigorous. The students pointed out that additional lessons were needed during instruction; whereas parents indicated that students should spend more time with the teacher.

Theme 3: Enhancement in Students' Self-Confidence. Theme 3 suggested that students' confidence increased as the program progressed. The majority of opinions were positive. Many members of the stakeholder groups recognized that, as students engaged in the after-school program, they began to gain higher levels of self-confidence. Analysis of the data indicated that students reported higher self-esteem as well as social skills.

Some administrators reported that students' self-confidence increased.

Administrator 1 emphasized, "Students had a boost of confidence, self-esteem, character, and social skills which are skills need for future educational tasks and endeavors. These skills can be used in various educational areas as well as throughout lifelong endeavors."

Administrator 5 expressed a similar opinion:

The program builds students' confidence so that they open to what is available.

This allows the students to have a more open mind to what was going on in the program and reaching a level of success. Students' confidence can lead to various improvements across grade levels.

Most parents confirmed the views held by administrators. Parent 2 observed that her child's self-confidence increased with the skills she gained in reading and writing.

Parent 3 indicated, "I am very excited that my daughter has higher self-esteem and better grades in English." Parent 7 saw a marked change in her child and reported that she went from little self-confidence about the English skills "to the point where she would come

home and almost teach me what she has learned. That gave me a sense that she was on top of what was going on in school.” Similarly, Parent 5 noticed that her child’s scores increased and stated, “My child seems much more self-assured since participating in the after-school program. She has a higher level of self-confidence and is able to perform more efficiently.” Overall, the parents saw the after-school program as contributing greatly to their children’s self-confidence about English skills.

Similar to the views of administrators and parents, students expressed their increased confidence and the effect of the program on their English assignments. Students 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7 elaborated on how they became more comfortable with the English-related skills. Student 1 said, “My self-esteem increased as I began to perform better on my assignments.” Student 2 indicated, “I gained a better understanding of vocabulary and could better comprehend texts, and I am also better able to write clear sentences and essays with better terminology.”

Students 3 and 5 both stated that the program led to their increased confidence and performance. Specifically, Student 3 noted, “I felt more confident completing my English assignments.” Likewise, Student 5 observed, “My self-confidence boosted greatly as I understood the English components.” Additionally, Student 6 and Student 7 both indicated that they had increased confidence and English skills. Student 6 reported, “I gained better confidence and skills during the writing process, can write a coherent essay, and I am able to write a full essay with all necessary parts including develop a good main idea.” Similarly, Student 7 acknowledged his confidence with related activities: “I continued to gain courage to read aloud and complete more English-related

activities.” Thus, the students’ confidence led to their performing better on English assignments.

However, in contrast to the prevailing view of the positive effect of the program on students’ self-confidence, the majority of administrators, some parents, and some students expressed a diverging viewpoint—that the program did not increase students’ self-confidence. For example, Administrator 2 stated that the program should have led to students having more self-motivation: “Students’ confidence could have increased more during the program.” Similarly, Administrator 3 believed that the program did not affect students’ self-confidence sufficiently. He said, “The overall program did not have a major effect on students’ self-esteem.” And Administrator 4 offered the opinion that students’ self-confidence did not increase during the program. He indicated, “Students’ self-confidence was not affected by the components of the program.”

As with these administrators, four parents had reservations concerning the effect of the program on their children’s self-confidence. Initially, Parent 1 revealed that her child displayed a lack of confidence during the program. This parent stated, “I do believe the program was beneficial; however, it did not affect my daughter’s level of morale.” Similarly, Parent 2 admitted that the program was advantageous but, unfortunately, her child’s self-confidence did not increase. “The program provided great instructional components; however, no impact was made on my child’s self-confidence.”

Like the administrators and parents with the diverging view that the program did not increase the students’ self-confidence, a significant minority of students, three of the eight, believed that the program did not add to their self-confidence. Student 4 stated,

“My self-esteem levels were low as I struggled to complete the beginning after-school activities.” Student 7 indicated, “Challenges of the after-school program decreased my self-assurance.” Like Student 7, Student 8 added, “I feel that my confidence level did not increase due to the rigor of some assignments.”

These differences in viewpoint relating to students’ self-confidence may be surprising. However, some students may have believed they were too challenged and could not meet the adults’ expectations in contrast to the improvements of other students (De La Paz & Butler, 2018; Graham et al., 2017; Smith, 2011). Additionally, some students may have had learning disabilities that the teachers did not sufficiently address (Beach et al., 2015; Kuder, 2017; Roberts et al., 2019). Still other students may have felt their learning styles were not taken into account sufficiently (Billingsley et al., 2018; Dixon et al., 2014). Others may have had low motivation (Mcgeown et al., 2015). Finally, some students may have desired more face-to-face time with the teacher and more emotional support (Botsas, 2017; Ismajli & Imami-Morina, 2018; Perry, 2015).

Research Question 3 and Themes 4 and 5

RQ 3 asked what possible strategies could be used to increase and improve English II students’ overall performance. Themes 4 and 5 were closely connected to Question 3. Participants stated that more technology and additional activities would benefit the after-school program. Additionally, some participants suggested that allowing students to express their ideas regarding the needs of the program would be advantageous.

Theme 4: Additional Technology and Activities. Theme 4 indicated that more technological and additional activities should be included in the program. Administrators and parents suggested that tutorial and technological activities would be very beneficial. Specifically, Administrator 3, Administrator 4, Parent 3, and Parent 5 all pointed out that more assignments and activities would increase the productivity of the program.

One administrator stated that adding more information would be beneficial for enhancing student learning. Initially, Administrator 4 suggested, “Add more collaborative and varied assignments which would provide students with more opportunities to improve regarding English-based activities. The additional assignments could consist of various strategies to meet the needs of all available learners.”

Another administrator suggested including activities that presented students with a challenge. Administrator 3 explained, “Include competitive assignments to improve students’ abilities and allow students to have different alternatives and possibly increase students’ participation. The assignments could consist of technological and engaging games that spark the students’ interests.”

Similarly, a parent discussed the possibility of adding more collaborative and varied activities to the program. Specifically, Parent 3 stated, “The overall program could include more group-based, differentiated assignments. This process would provide students with even more opportunities to improve their overall performance. Students could also work together and gain a better understanding of the lessons.”

Students also expressed opinions that the program needed additional components, and the students were specific. The suggested components included additional

technology, more field trips, and supplementary activities. Two students, Students 7 and 8, emphasized the need for more electronic assignments, with use of the smartboard and technological activities to encourage creativity. Student 4 suggested more field trips. Student 5 discussed the need for hands-on activities, and Student 7 called for more interactive activities.

Further, in Theme 4, all groups offered specific suggestions about the use of additional technology usage and activities. Administrators, parents, and students all voiced the need for a range of additional technology. An administrator noted that various technological devices could be used to increase students' learning capabilities.

Administrator 5 stated, "Additional technology-based interactive activities are needed. Devices could include promethean boards, clickers, chrome books, and desktop computers. These devices can provide students with various digital methods to increase their learning abilities." Parents indicated a need for smartboards, more online activities, and electronic homework activities. Students recommended smartboards to help them remain focused and interactive activities to develop their creativity.

The suggestions for technology appeared similar among the groups. However, differences emerged across the groups in their specific recommendations about technology use and activities and computer usage. Administrators indicated that more technology assignments should be available. Parents suggested additional technological homework, and students pointed out that more computers and smartboards would be beneficial.

Theme 5: Student Input. Theme 5 revealed that students should have input

regarding the program assignments and activities. Several administrators and students provided statements that students should be allowed to express their opinions and be involved in the decision-making regarding the methods of instruction and assignments within the program.

Administrators concurred that students should be able to provide opinions regarding program assignments. Two administrators indicated that students should be have the opportunity to help determine what assignments should be included in the program. Administrator 1 stated, "Students should be allowed to select assignments pertaining to their interests." Similarly, Administrator 2 indicated, "Students need the opportunity to pick activities based on their preferences." Administrator 4 observed, "Since the activities are solely for student improvement, students should have an opportunity to voice their opinion regarding the activities that are included within the program." Additionally, Administrator 5 suggested that students should be asked to supply information for the program activities.

Several students agreed with the administrators and made suggestions for including student input. Student 1 recommended, "The after-school program committee should include students' ideas since students are the essential part of the program." Similarly, Student 3 asserted, "Opinions of students should be greatly recognized to make decisions for the after-school program." Likewise, Student 4 stated, "Students should be allowed to provide their opinion pertaining to assignments in the program so they will be included in the process." And Student 6 noted, "Students should be able to provide their perspectives regarding the components of the program." These students were fervent and

enthusiastic about the inclusion of student input. No parents contributed views on student input.

Discussion of Evidence of Quality

I used member checking and examination of discrepant cases to determine the credibility of research results. The member checking process involved exploration of the authenticity of information obtained from the study participants (Simpson & Quigley, 2016). After I transcribed the interviews, I sent them to participants to read, correct whatever they thought was necessary, and comment on my conclusions. I also gave participants the opportunity to evaluate the overall findings as well as provide feedback and suggestions. I also explored data that did not support existing patterns and that contradicted explanations that emerged during the study. In this exploration, I discovered three discrepant cases within the interview findings that helped to resolve inconsistent data.

Discrepant Cases

Although every participant's contribution was unique, data analysis revealed many similar perspectives. However, three discrepant cases were apparent. Out of the 21 participants in the study, only three individuals indicated discrepant information. An administrator stated there was improvement of students' scores on high-stakes tests following participation in the after-school program. A parent indicated that the program should have more instructors to properly execute the process. Also, a student said that the program should include community volunteers to help students make progress. The other participants focused on literacy skills, techniques, and environment. Although the

program was launched as a result of a concern about student performance, unlike these three participants, test scores, additional teacher assistance, and community help did not appear to be a major consideration for most other participants

Summary

The formative evaluation was focused on determining the effectiveness of an after-school program put in place to increase 10th-grade students' English skills. I used UFE theory (Patton, 2008, 2010) as the conceptual framework to inform the evaluation of the program. The UFE is a theory that is applied in real-world situations in which the evaluation and findings are focused on specific circumstances with specific users and require careful planning and facilitation. The evaluator and users collaborate in the evaluation, and the aim of UFE is to analyze the situation and render findings that promote strengths, decrease weaknesses, and enhance the situation—in the present case the after-school program (Patton, 2008, 2010, 2011; Schwitzer, 1997).

The evaluation focused on an after-school program to improve students' reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar skills. Three RQs were formulated, and an interview protocol was developed based on the RQs. 21 participants from three stakeholder groups with purposive sampling and interviewed five administrators, eight parents, and eight students in the program. Then I generated codes from the interviews, analyzed the data, and compiled the results.

From the data analysis of the participant interviews, I discovered five major themes. These themes constituted the major findings of the evaluation. The themes that emerged were the following: (a) enhancement was found in students' reading, writing,

vocabulary, and grammar skills; (b) the condensed environment made it easier for teachers to target specific learning areas; (c) students' confidence increased as the program progressed; (d) more technological and additional activities should be included in the program; and (e) students should have input regarding the program assignments and activities.

These themes indicated the strengths and drawbacks of the program. The first three themes showed strengths. Students improved in language arts skills. The small sizes of classes enabled teachers to target students' individual needs in one-on-one experiences. Students became more confident regarding English-related components during the program. The last two themes pinpointed potential weaknesses. More technology and related activities should be implemented, and students' views should be sought on the program assignments and activities.

The literature review sheds light on these themes, revealing pertinent factors that influence or hinder students' literacy-based performance. Tenth-grade English II students struggle in reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar, and lack of proficiency greatly affects their overall academic performance (Wendt, 2013). Other factors that impede student performance include poverty (Bell et al., 2016; Dudaite, 2016), degree of parental involvement in the students' learning (Cetin & Taskin, 2016); and students' learning disabilities (Kuder, 2017; Walsh & Theodorakakis, 2017).

The evaluation showed that students improved in reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar. According to But, Brown, and Smyth (2017), reading should be taught in all subject areas, and instructors should be knowledgeable of students' learning

capabilities and provide methods to help students enhance comprehension skills. One student (Student 7) commented that he gained confidence in reading aloud. Additionally, as in the after-school program, multiple assignments addressing variations in students' learning approaches and abilities can be beneficial (Dixon et al., 2014).

Students improved in their writing as well. Research shows that most students experience writing challenges when entering the collegiate world. The writing process allows to students to elicit internal thoughts and express their perceptions. Writing strategies, many of which were implemented in the program, include exchanging information through communication, revision of documents, parental collaboration during the process, and peer writing opportunities (De La Paz & Butler, 2018). Small-group classroom and individual exercises and self-monitoring skills combined with student/instructor feedback may lead to students' greatly improved writing skills (Sacher, 2016). All three stakeholder groups recognized students' improvements in writing.

After-school programs are beneficial for student learning improvement. Reading intervention programs are necessary to overcome students' critical reading challenges and help them reach higher levels of educational success (Auletto & Sableski, 2018). Enhancement programs not only improve educational outcomes but also relationships among students Pensiero and Green (2017). Davis and Fullerton (2016) indicated that after-school programs that use technology and involve student interaction, peer collaboration, attentiveness, and productivity enhance the learning and relationships of diverse high school students.

As the evaluation suggested, students should be included in making educational choices relative to their classroom activities (Cavendish, 2013). Students' participation in choosing activities can lead to many positives. These include their improved dispositions toward school, positive connections with teachers, successful academic outcomes, and recognition of the value of school (Tschannen-Moran, Bankole, Mitchell, & Moore, 2013).

In summary, the evaluation revealed that the after-school program for English II students was beneficial in addressing their deficiencies in language arts skills and that students benefited from the small learning environment and gained confidence in their skills. All three groups also made suggestions for improvement of the program, especially the increased use of technology and various learning activities and student input into the program curriculum.

The program evaluation of the English II after-school program was based on data gathered with the use of the UFE tailored specifically for this program with qualitative interviews, data analysis, conclusions, and recommendations. The UFE provided the framework for the RQs, interview protocol, and analysis in its emphasis on practical results of the program for the intended users for implementation (Patton, 2008, 2010). The participants were a purposive sample of the intended users—school administrators, parents, and students. In the evaluation, the five themes focused on the strength and weaknesses of the after-school program. Based on the weaknesses that emerged, the evaluation also provided recommendations to enhance the after-school program and ensure ongoing effectiveness for future English II after-school program.

Section 3 discusses the literature review, description and goals, rationale, and information of the program evaluation. The evaluation led to a program evaluation report (see Appendix A) outlining the problem and describing background information, purpose, RQs, conceptual framework, and the qualitative research design. The project report also included participant demographics, data collection, data analysis, and findings. The report will be in the form of several presentations for board members, administrators, educators, parents, students, and community members. The information to be delivered in the report can assist the stakeholders in determining the overall effectiveness of the after-school program and implementing the recommendations.

Section 4 contains an analysis of the strengths and limitations of the project, scholarship of the evaluation, recommendations of how to approach the problem differently, and a description of the development of the program evaluation. The section concludes with an evaluation of myself as scholar and project developer and the potential for social change as a result of this project. Finally, I explore implications of the project, as well as applications and directions for future research.

Section 3: The Project

Introduction

I will make three presentations and an oral presentation to stakeholders of the written program evaluation report. The purpose of the three presentations will be to inform stakeholders about the strengths and weaknesses of the after-school program and to help identify adjustments and suggest recommendations that may enhance future after-school programs. My evaluation was based on UFE, a theoretical framework in which the evaluation focuses on the real-world practical use of a program, course, model, or set of activities, and the participants are the intended users of the program (Patton, 2008, 2011). The evaluator and participants collaborate in assessing the strength and weaknesses of the program or other artifact, and recommendations are produced for improvement by the evaluator with participants' input (Patton, 2015). The written program evaluation report follows from the evaluation itself and includes the problem, background information, purpose, RQs, conceptual framework, research design, participants, data collection, data analysis, findings, and recommendations.

I will deliver this report to the three stakeholder groups, followed by oral presentations with PowerPoint illustrations (see Appendices A and B for the program evaluation and presentation, respectively). Copies of the report will be available for all stakeholders. First, I will present the reports at the central office to the school board and senior administrators at a school board meeting. Second, I will make a presentation at a regular local meeting of administrators and teachers at the high school in which the English II after-school program took place and was evaluated. Third, I will present the

report and oral presentation at an evening open house meeting to administrators, parents, students, and teachers. I have also made arrangements for the report to be published on the district website and links sent out in an e-mail announcement to stakeholders.

Project Description and Goals

The program evaluation report is a written document (see Appendix A), which contains the findings of the program evaluation, recommendations for future after-school programs, the time frame to complete necessary tasks, and a conclusion. The goal of the written report was to provide the stakeholders with significant information to improve future after-school programs and enhance student success in English II. I used UFE to implement the program evaluation so that the intended users, who were the administrators, parents, students, and teachers, would become aware of the present strengths and weaknesses and take steps to enhance the program (see Patton, 2008, 2010, 2011).

Rationale

I conducted the program evaluation because of the lack of information available to address the strengths and weaknesses of the after-school program. I used UFE as a guide in formulating the procedures for conducting the evaluation. In keeping with the major requirements of the UFE, I involved the intended users of the program evaluation so they had personal connections with the evaluation. I shared the findings with them for practical implementation (see Patton, 2011) through the written report and oral presentations. Involvement of the stakeholders in the evaluation promoted their trust in

and collaboration with me, their willingness to participate fully, and their “ownership” of the evaluation (see Patton & Horton, 2009, p. 1).

The written program evaluation report could help the stakeholders determine the effectiveness of the English II after-school program. Provision of results, conclusions, and recommendations may enhance the personal connection of the stakeholders with the evaluation and possibly lead to beneficial conversations among them regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the program. The data analysis may offer suggestions to ensure the program will be most efficient and effective. Providing a more efficient and effective program should allow students to enhance their skills and increase their academic performance.

Review of the Literature

Literature Search Strategy

To find pertinent articles for the literature review, I used various search tools available from Walden University Library. I used titles centering on project evaluations and interventions to obtain accurate and meaningful information. The databases used were Academic Search Complete, ERIC, and ProQuest database Education Source. The following specific keywords were used: *after-school programs*, *English remedial programs*, *formative evaluation*, *planning evaluation*, *program evaluation*, *program evaluation report*, and *summative evaluation*.

Saturation. The saturation process consisted of using the electronic databases to search for articles, determining the significance of the articles, exploring the references, and continuing the procedures until I reached saturation based on the recommendations of

Randolph (2009). I examined the references of the articles, decided what was important, read the references, and continuously repeated the procedures. When all searching was completed, I shared the information with a professional librarian to discover possible missing articles. I achieved saturation as sufficient sources were obtained for each category in the literature review.

Program Evaluation Definition

Program evaluation is defined as the methods and specific target, study, and delivery of findings for a continuing program (Van Koperen et al., 2016). The working definition of program evaluation provided a clear and precise understanding of the process for conducting the evaluation. Significantly, the program evaluation process involves collecting, analyzing, and using information to inform decision-making. Spaulding (2014) indicated that program evaluators analyze programs to detect their quality, reach conclusions, and make decisions for clarification and progress. Additionally, the program evaluation process enables program participants and overseers and other significant individuals to gain knowledge about the capability of the program and methods for improvement (Holden, Berger, Zingarelli, & Siegel, 2015). The evaluation procedures are significant for decoding and comprehending conclusions (Jong et al., 2018). Furthermore, program evaluations are compatible with meaningful specialized training sessions that provide teachers as well as administrators with important information (Shawer, 2013). Program evaluations consist of organized strategies to respond to inquiries regarding program usage and outcomes (Franklin & Blankenberger, 2016).

Essentially, a program evaluator seeks to find strategies to enhance the program and better the overall outcome. Franklin and Blankenberger (2016) stated that program evaluations consist of techniques to discuss and respond to concerns regarding the program and outcomes. Program evaluations contain data to inform conclusions as to whether the intended goal is being met; data can be provided to school officials to make necessary adjustments (Kantrovich, Hillison, & Duncan, 2017).

The specific program evaluation I used was a formative evaluation and was based on the UTE conceptual framework. In this framework, the intended users are the major contributors to the evaluation, they are involved in the evaluation, and their input is valued (Patton, 2010). In this program evaluation, the intended users were the school administrators, parents, and students. All of these groups may benefit from the evaluation, as well as the teachers who delivered the program.

Types of Program Evaluations

There are three major types of program evaluations: planning, formative, and summative. First, the planning evaluation takes place before the development of a program. The planning evaluation process consists of an organized method, series of actions, and results correlated to specific standards (Guyadeen & Seasons, 2016). Next, the formative evaluation is conducted during the actual delivery of a program, and data are gathered during this period. Adjustments are made as needed (Cotton, 2017). In the formative evaluation of the English II after-school program, I assessed the methods of delivery and observed students' academic performance on a recurring basis.

Lastly, the summative evaluation is the most common and normally takes place after the process, procedure, or program has taken place. The summative evaluation involves determining if students have reached the targeted goals (Young, Range, Hvidston, & Mette, 2015). Evaluations are used primarily during educational programs, and feedback is provided to inform decision-making for adjustments that may be necessary, during or following delivery of the programs (Cook, 2010).

Program Evaluation Process

The program evaluation process involves the examination of several components of a designated program to make adjustments or enhancements during the implementation phases of the program. An examination of the program evaluation plan can lead to awareness of procedures and methods used in the specific category (Sanzo, 2016). According to Law and Shek (2011), the program evaluation entails a process to determine if the program reached the desired result. The process may involve investigation of the worth of an entire program or part of a program (Kalu & Norman, 2018). With the results of an evaluation, individuals are better able to understand the components of a program, how it works, and the methods needed to improve the overall program. Moreover, in the program evaluation process, the evaluator addresses the reliability, attributes, and adjustments of the program as well as participant reactions (Morgan, Sibthorp, & Browne, 2016).

Additionally, significant leaders and individuals should be involved directly in the program (Franklin & Blankenberger, 2016). Furthermore, the program evaluation process can lead to the improvement of overall programs and to recommendations for

professional development opportunities for teachers and educational officials (Pratt & Martin, 2017; Shawer, 2013). In the English II after-school program evaluation, as the UTE directs (Patton, 2010), the leaders and other essential individuals were engaged for their perspectives and input about the program.

The program evaluation process takes place through a systematic, outlined series of events (Allen & Rimes, 2014). As the process takes place, as Thoma et al. (2017) observed, determinations can be made as to whether the process was successful and whether adjustments need to be made. In the program evaluation process, the evaluator makes diligent preparation and monitors the program to determine if the goal was reached; feedback is then provided for logical judgments. The process is used to enhance program achievement and provide information regarding upcoming programs (Natkin & Kolbe, 2016).

A program evaluation should indicate significant data about particular programs and evaluated for the overall effectiveness of the program. In education, the process involves a selection of individuals involved in the progression and enhancement of educational programs (Ahmady, Lakeh, Esmailpoor, Arab, & Yaghmaei, 2014). The major focus of evaluations may be knowledge enhancement, how the program is implemented, and how individuals are affected by the outcome of the program.

Program Evaluation Report

For the English II after-school program evaluation, the written report included all essential information about the program and how I conducted the evaluation. These

components included the problem, background information, purpose, RQs, review of literature, conceptual framework, qualitative research design and approach, participants, data collection, data analysis, and findings (see Appendix A). A program evaluation report is carefully written and structured to include whether the overall purpose was achieved and what strategies were used to answer essential questions (Jacob & Desautels, 2014).

A program evaluation report examines the specific design method and summarizes the validity of achieving a goal (Moreno, 2014). According to Uslu (2017), a program evaluation is viewed as an accumulation of information that is essential for determination of whether the desired target has been reached (Hollands, et al., 2016). Additionally, the report should be provided to stakeholders to inform decision-making for future programs (van Urk, Grant, & Bonell, 2016). The community is also a major stakeholder and affects the outcomes of the program evaluation (Little, 2014). The evaluation report contains procedures, routines, approaches, and tactics that can be used by other individuals in similar institutions or situations (Sanzo, 2016).

An evaluation report is an essential component of a complete program evaluation. The report should be delivered to stakeholders as a written document, and the findings should be used to improve the program in the institution of learning. The evaluator of a program evaluation report must also check all data for accuracy, distribute the report to audience members, share recommendations, respond to questions and problems, and discuss future alternatives regarding the report (Lishner & Puetz, 1986).

Appropriateness of the Project Genre

The problem I addressed with the current program evaluation was that 10th-grade English II students in the high school under study were performing inadequately in reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar. An after-school program had been implemented but never evaluated. A program evaluation report was perfectly suited to address this problem because it provided guidance to the school district on how to tailor the after-school program so that it would be most effective in addressing the students' challenges in reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar.

Applicability of the UFE Framework

The UFE framework was particularly appropriate to this program evaluation because the intended users needed to learn the strengths and drawbacks of the specific program toward enhancement and improvement (Patton, 2008, 2010, 2011). In the UFE framework, the emphasis is on the practicality of the report so that steps toward improvement are clear to the stakeholders. Moreover, for maximum benefit of the evaluation, the stakeholders must be directly involved and their views sought and given primary value. In the after-school program evaluation, I specifically involved the three important stakeholder groups—administrators, parents, and students—with individual interview questions that targeted their views (see Appendix C).

Program evaluation reports contain information based on the program and components that have effective results (Van Koperen et al., 2016). The program evaluation report contains information that confirms the goals and other major

components of the program (Jui-Long, Yu-Chang, & Rice, 2012). The current report provided findings from the participants which indicated their perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of the after-school program. Following the guidance of Moreno (2014), the program evaluation project provided data that were gathered and evaluated based on a specific program, with the results to be used to make future meaningful decisions.

Based on the recommendations of Gorard et al. (2015), the evaluation report should include information pertaining to the program's reliability, and participants' responses indicate whether the process is effective. Martaningsih (2018) indicated that program evaluation report outcomes can provide information regarding possible improvements and whether the intended target was reached. The information will be used to determine whether the purpose was made apparent and if the program fulfilled its goals. Program evaluation reports should include information that can help educational leaders develop approaches and objectives that can lead to a carefully outlined methodological series of steps for improvement (Allen & Rimes, 2014). From the current program evaluation report, I will use the information to recommend avenues and goals that can be developed by the stakeholders in a logical sequence of events.

Moreno (2014) indicated that program evaluation reports examine the specific design method and summarize the validity of achieving a goal. In the current evaluation report, I followed this advice. The report made explicit that the program evaluation reached the ultimate goal, which was to explore the strengths and weaknesses of the English II after-school program from the perspectives of involved stakeholders. The final

report should allow stakeholders to assess the worth of the overall program (Kalu & Norman, 2018).

Furthermore, Almus and Dogan (2016) stated that the program evaluation report should also contain information to help leaders determine if the program was beneficial as well as strategies to improve overall student performance. According to Chyung (2015), the program evaluation report includes improvements on performance outcomes and information for leaders to make future decisions. Based on the findings of this evaluation, the current report was the best deliverable component of the program evaluation project. This report provided the findings and recommendations to the participants and other stakeholders involved the program.

Theories and Research That Support the Project

The analysis of theory and the literature provide support for the content of this project. Wieworka (2017) asserted that after-school programs can be used to understand students' education from the practical experiences in the program. After-school programs are used to avoid negative end results, minimize potential risks, and enhance students' academic performance (Kremer, Maynard, Polanin, Vaughn, & Sarteschi, 2015).

Reading programs were created at the school under study to help students with inadequate reading, writing, comprehension, and vocabulary skills. Reading is an essential element for students to achieve progression and improvement in academic subjects (Lake & Holster, 2014). Hollands et al. (2016) described a reading evaluation program that involved assistance with students' phonemic awareness, fluency, and

understanding of textual information. An experimental intervention process of vocal articulation was shown to improve students' reading abilities (Hollands et al.).

After-school reading and language arts programs can enhance students' achievement, reading skills, achievement, and cooperation and increase their connections with other students. The literature suggests that a primary reading engagement program motivates students to participate in the reading process and increases their reading capabilities. Intervention programs provide strategies to improve students' fluency and reading abilities and lead to an ongoing process of gaining knowledge (Gorard et al., 2015). Reading interventions enhance students' reading capabilities and phonological awareness and detect hindrances that may impede the procedures. According to Abeberese, Kumler, and Linden (2014), a reading program provides age-level resources, specific time for reading, and various other activities. Intervention programs also help students with understanding ideas, communication in writing, and vocalizing information. Jacob, Armstrong, Bowden, and Pan (2016) indicated that reading intervention programs assist students with reading challenges, provide group-based activities, and increase their technological knowledge and application.

The current program evaluation report included findings from the participants' responses regarding students' performance and interactions in the after-school program. The evaluation revealed that students enhanced their literacy skills. Literacy is a prevalent component of the educational system as students' progress, and students need to comprehend information regarding each subject area (Iwai, 2016).

In the after-school program, the condensed environment allowed teachers to target specific skills. According to Baeten, Dochy, Struyven, Parmentier, and Vanderbruggen (2016), small educational settings promote a more immediate connection between the instructional process and student learning. In the program evaluation, the participants commented favorably on the personalized learning environment and noted that it increased student performance.

The evaluation revealed that additional activities should be included in the after-school program. These activities may include more reading and writing components, visual representations, and communication exercises (Bastug & Demirtas, 2016). Additionally, the evaluation also revealed that students should have input regarding assignments. Decision-making should be advantageous to student learning and educational outcomes (Mullen, 2017), and educators should be open to student input and decisions. The educational system should implement processes to assist students with making decisions (Meyer, 2018).

Project Description

The program evaluation report is provided in Appendix A. The report includes sections addressing the problem, background, purpose, RQs, conceptual framework, research design, participants, data collection, data analysis, results, conclusions and recommendations. The report will be presented to the district office for the improvement of the overall effectiveness of the after-school program. Three oral presentations will be provided to stakeholders to communicate the findings and recommendations. An oral presentation of the program evaluation report will be presented to the school board and

senior administrators at a school board meeting. Another presentation will be made to teachers and administrators at the school. An open house event meeting will take place with a presentation to administrators, parents, students, and teachers.

As part of the evaluation, I developed recommendations based on the themes revealed from participants' responses during the interview sessions. The recommendations are below:

- Use differentiated instructional procedures.
- Tailor instruction to students' learning needs.
- Employ strategies to enhance students' motivational levels.
- Include additional online assignments.
- Solicit students' participation in selecting group activities.

These recommendations related to the five themes revealed in the data analysis. The themes resulted from my application of UTE to the English II after-school program, based on participation from the three groups of intended users—the administrators, parents, and students—for their intended use. Following the principles of UTE, I formulated the RQs and interview protocol with the intended users in mind for what would help them most to know concerning the strengths and weaknesses of the program (Patton, 2010, 2011). In planning the personal interactions of the interviews, I solicited participants' input in terms of their experiences with the program and how they would use the information in the real-world after-school program (Patton, 2010).

According to UTE (Patton, 2008, 2010), I emphasized to the stakeholders that they would have active roles in the gathering of evaluation results, and their views would

be respected. I also made clear that I would supply recommendations and that the users had the responsibility of deciding whether and how to implement the recommendations (Patton, 2008, 2010). These recommendations stemmed from the themes, again for the practical use of the stakeholders.

The relationship between the themes and recommendations is shown in Table 2. Following the table, I discuss each theme and recommendation. The recommendations are supported by the literature.

Table 2

Recommendations Keyed to Themes

Themes	Recommendations
1. Enhancement was found in reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar skills	Use differentiated instructional Procedures
2. The condensed environment made it easier for teachers to target specific learning areas	Tailor instruction towards students' learning needs
3. Students' confidence increased as the program took place	Use strategies to enhance students' motivational levels
4. Additional technological and additional activities should be included in the program	Include additional online assignments
5. Students should have input regarding the program assignments and activities	Solicit students' participation in selection of group activities.

Differentiated instructional procedures would enhance student learning. Diverse learning practices dominate classrooms today, and teachers must enlarge and adapt their instruction as well as resources for specific subjects and students' learning styles (Valiandes & Neophytou, 2018). Differentiated instructional practices involve teachers' greater awareness of students' motives, skills, curiosity, and learning styles and preferences (Ismajli & Imami-Morina, 2018).

A condensed, one-to-one student environment promotes differentiated instructional procedures. In this environment, teachers can tailor their instruction toward individual students' learning needs. For example, teachers can use scaffolding, a method of interaction with students on highly individual levels to determine the students' specific needs (Rodgers, 2018). To expand students' understanding, in reading instruction teachers can use questions to elicit students' feelings, sense of identification, and knowledge about the passages read (Ankrum et al., 2017). Teachers are not the final authority but learning coaches, with students participating actively at their specific levels. With this perspective, students become more motivated, gain confidence in their self-pacing, and master the lessons with greater ease than in traditional lecture modes of learning (Altemueller & Lindquist, 2017).

The evaluation revealed that students' confidence increased during the program. To continue to help students with their self-confidence, teachers should use strategies that enhance students' motivational levels. These strategies can include assignments geared to students' interests, introduction to library research in their interests, field trips, and students writing about their increased self-confidence (Bahri & Corebima, 2015; Malloy

et al., 2017). With the use of differentiated strategies, students' learning outcomes can be positively influenced by greater motivation to learn and progressively increased self-confidence in their ability to learn (Bahri & Corebima, 2015).

One of the two drawbacks that emerged from the evaluation was the limited use of technology and other activities. Technology is increasingly used at all levels of education and occupations (Davis & Fullerton, 2016). With increased instruction in and use of technology, high school students may become better prepared for technological use throughout their educations (McKnight et al., 2016). A major use of technology recommended in the evaluation was online assignments. Students would learn to access the course website, perform research, and complete their assignments online, often sharing them with the teacher and other students online (Davis & Fullerton, 2016). Such assignments would be highly beneficial to the English II students in preparing them for later education and their careers.

The second drawback from the evaluation was that students did not have a say in the program assignments and activities. Students should be given the opportunity to voice their opinions regarding school-based elements (Perry, 2015). Participation allows students to use their cognitive and psychological skills while actively involved in educational tasks (Truyant, 2019).

Participants in the evaluation also recommended that students' views should be solicited in the selection of group activities. Student participation is important in the educational field and beyond; students should be able to engage in meaningful conversations with the adults who teach them (Wells, 2018). The relevant and productive

decisions students are encouraged to make in school impact their lifelong experiences (McHugh, Reedy, & Yehle, 2017).

Potential Resources and Existing Support Barriers

The program evaluation report (see Appendix A) includes recommendations of potential resources to assist with the presentations of the report as well as barriers that may hinder the presentations. Resources necessary will include handouts of the written report and a projector and pointer to display the accompanying PowerPoint (see Appendix B). Additional resources may be the securing of appropriate and large enough rooms for the presentations and refreshments for the open house for all stakeholders.

Barriers include scheduling of the presentation on the district's agenda and possibly my arranging a meeting with the superintendent to explain why my presentation should be included on the agenda. Conflicts with the time and rooms available to make the presentations may also present barriers. Additionally, at school board meetings, generally only 20 minutes are allotted for each individual presenting. This time constraint will make it difficult for me to give my full presentation.

Proposal for Implementation and Timetable

To illustrate how all the necessary steps will be organized, I created a timeline (see Table 3). These steps include offering the proposal for evaluation, gathering necessary resources, securing time to present the evaluation report, and delivering the presentation to all stakeholders. The calendar weeks are approximate and would be based on scheduling in the district agenda.

Table 3

Timetable

Timeline	Tasks
The fourth week of August 2020	Gather necessary resources for the program evaluation report
The first week of September 2020	Submission of the written report to the office of the superintendent
The second week of September 2020	Establish time frame to present oral report to administrators, parents, students, and teachers
The third week of September 2020	Deliver oral report to senior administrators at a school board meeting
The fourth week of September 2020	Deliver oral report to administrators and teachers at a regular local meeting
The first week of October 2020	Deliver oral report to administrators, parents, students, and teachers at an open house

The participants responded to the interview questions (see Appendix C) by providing specific information on how they assessed the effects of the after-school program on student performance. The questions were formulated according to UFE principles, with the intended users in mind and the goal of providing the most practical information for improvement in further implementation of the after-school program (Patton, 2015). My goals throughout was to involve the users on individual bases with in-

depth interviews and to create a report that would help them recognize the strengths and weaknesses of the program as the users from their own observations (Patton, 2010).

Responsibilities and Roles

My roles were first to write and share a written report (see Appendix A) and second to supplement the report with an oral presentation (see Appendix B). First, I will submit the written report to the office of the superintendent for approval. Following approval, and with appropriate scheduling, I will present the written and oral reports to the school board and senior administrators at a school board meeting; to administrators and teachers at the school; and to administrators, parents, students, and teachers at an open house event.

I will also provide copies of the report at all presentations for the stakeholders' understanding, note-taking, and future reference. Each of the three settings will have different audiences, and my aim will be informality to reduce possible anxiety. Following from the UTE guidelines for active engagement of the intended users (Patton, 2008), I will invite the district administrators, school board officials, and all other groups to ask questions, discuss the report, and actively engage in the process of understanding the evaluation toward implementation.

Project Implications

Social Change Implications

I created the program evaluation report to communicate the outcomes of a program evaluation conducted according to UFE principles. The evaluation assessed strengths and weaknesses of a literacy-based high school after-school program in

language arts skills. The evaluation report closely involved the intended users of the program and was based on their input, as UFE specifies (Patton, 2015).

The knowledge gained from the report can positively affect administrators, parents, students, and teachers, creating social change. Specifically, the social change outcomes could include adjustments to delivery of the after-school program in accordance with the recommendations (see Table 4). These changes may benefit students' behavior as well as their advancement in literacy skills, self-confidence, achievement, and graduation rates.

Community Impact

The evaluation report may lead to implementation by the stakeholders that would additionally empower students. Locally, implementation of the evaluation report may result in all students being able to participate in social learning activities, such as literacy forums, readings of their own written work, and other reading programs. The report will provide administrators and other school officials with effective methods to enhance and use the after-school program to improve students' literacy capabilities.

In the larger setting, the report may be useful in helping school officials as well as community members reach logical conclusions about the effectiveness of the program and implementation of instructional strategies to increase students' success. Stakeholders will understand the instructional procedures used to help students master more effectively reading, writing skills, vocabulary, and grammar. The results of the report could also help future English II students who attend the after-school program to enhance their language arts skills in preparation for success in later courses and higher education.

Importance of the Project to Stakeholders

The project was important to stakeholders because it provided recommendations to improve an after-school program to inform their future decision-making. The findings, recommendations, and conclusions may lead to effective results in academic achievement for students who struggle with English. Stakeholders may be greatly impacted by the positive outcomes of the project and recommendations for improvement.

Administrators may see that students' English skills improved and their scores on state-mandated assessments improved as well. As a result, the school report card grade could be improved (see Murray & Howe, 2017). Parents may see their children's greatly enhanced command of language arts skills and be motivated help them further in current and future homework and for higher education. Students may gain greater proficiency in language arts, feel increased satisfaction in their proficiency, understand the subject matter of other courses better, and increase their grades in all subjects.

Teachers may recognize that the after-school program has been effective and can become more effective with continued refined instructional strategies and implementation of the recommendations. The condensed environment and one-to-one mode of teaching may benefit the students considerably in terms of the teachers' customization to students' individual learning needs. Teachers may then continue to learn about their students and adapt instructional strategies to them. In sum, the project has much importance to the various stakeholders in terms of their concerns and responsibilities.

Section 4: Reflections and Conclusion

Introduction

The reflections and conclusions of the program evaluation project are included in this section. I created a program evaluation report to feature the program evaluation findings and recommendations. In this section, I consider the strengths and limitations of the project report. Additional subsections include my recommendations based on project findings and discussion of what I learned about scholarship, project development, leadership and social change. Furthermore, I reflect on the importance of the work and its implications and applications for future research. The section ends with a conclusion to the project study.

The essential goal of the project evaluation report was to provide administrators, including school board and district members; parents; and students with information to ensure the continued success of, and improvements to, an intervention program in remedial reading and writing skills. The recommendations, based on the participants' responses during the interview sessions, were the following:

- use differentiated instructional procedures,
- tailor instruction to students' learning needs,
- use strategies to enhance students' motivational levels,
- include additional online assignments, and
- solicit students' participation in selecting group activities.

Project Strengths and Limitations

This section provides the strengths and limitations of the project, the evaluation report. Regarding strengths, administrators, parents, and students learned of the improvements students had made in language arts from attendance at the after-school program. All groups also learned about students' struggles with literacy and possible strategies for improvement. Additionally, the report provided the school district with recommendations, suggestions, and improvements for the after-school program.

Several limitations are noted. The project was limited to only one school at one location and one grade level. Thus, generalizability of the findings to other high school remedial reading and writing programs may not be possible. In addition, I was able only to collect the available information and could not compare it to remedial language arts programs at other high schools. Another limitation was that only one qualitative method was used in the program evaluation, individual interviews with stakeholders. Other methods could have been used, such as observations, examination of teaching materials, and focus groups. Additionally, a mixed-method approach was not used. A quantitative component could have added to understanding of the stakeholders' viewpoints.

Recommendations for Alternative Approaches

Alternate approaches that may have worked with this program evaluation include curriculum planning and professional development training. Curriculum planning would involve a major focus, objectives, and consideration of the needs for students. Ziebell and Clarke (2018) stated that curriculum alignment is an effective component for enhancing students' academic performance. Additionally, resources and materials could be collected

and identified during the curriculum planning process. This process would ensure that the assignments were aligned and compatible with students' areas of need.

Another alternative approach would be to offer professional development training to the teachers. Instructors use methods of professional development that enhance students' performance (Pratt & Martin, 2017). The professional development process would include a purpose, goals, outcomes, and an audience. Professional development should be based on elements of best practices and the amount of time set aside for teachers to participate in the professional development activities. Teachers have noted that key components can change according to circumstances and educational demands (Martin, Polly, Mraz, & Algozzine, 2018). Nevertheless, the high school's offering of professional development seminars and workshops related to the strengths, limitations, and recommendations of the evaluation report could better prepare instructors to reach the needs of all students and improve the after-school program.

Scholarship, Project Development, and Leadership and Change

Scholarship

Throughout the process of conducting the evaluation and writing the program evaluation report, I discovered and developed different beliefs about myself as a scholar, practitioner, and project developer. As a scholar, I have come to understand and appreciate the necessity of collecting as much information as possible and from multiple perspectives. With this belief comes the knowledge that I must be critical and employ sound judgment about where I obtain the information by ensuring the educational research is relevant, scientifically based, and published in peer-reviewed journals. To

increase my success as an administrator, I must avoid educational information disseminated by those whose findings are not based on scientific research or by those who have alternative agendas not based on advancing the profession of education.

After completing this project, I found that my critical abilities have increased. I am now able to analyze articles to discover weaknesses in research designs and methods that may make the conclusions doubtful as well as possibly faulty logic of conclusions. Through critical analysis of the educational literature, I now question any conclusion that offers quick solutions to complicated educational problems.

I also recognize several valuable additions to my knowledge about problems and solutions in relation to English II. I gained abundant information about research and what it takes to properly evaluate a program. The project evaluation led to valuable outcomes, with themes revealed that district leaders can use to change and improve the program. Possible changes and improvements of the after-school program stem from the foundational level and professional educational practice. I used the knowledge I gleaned from the literature on how effective after-school programs function to evaluate the after-school program.

I created the program evaluation report from elements of the program evaluation. The findings in the program evaluation report provided a deeper understanding of program evaluations and program evaluation reports. Topics included the program evaluation definition and components, program evaluation process, successful programs, unsuccessful programs, benefits of programs, and program evaluation report information. I provided the school board and community with a specific, detailed, and organized

report, which included findings and recommendations from the program evaluation. I also wrote the project evaluation report in nontechnical language, and it should be easily understood by the school board, other stakeholders, and all community members.

Project Development

The project development began by my researching literature on successful and unsuccessful after-school programs remedial language arts programs, as well as possible theories on which to base the evaluation. I also realized I needed to ground the work in an applicable conceptual framework. Knowing that the after-school program was essential to English II students and the school, I saw the need for a theory that was based on high practicality and implementation by the intended users.

After researching several theories that could be applied to education, I decided on UFE as the most appropriate theory. The main premise of UFE is that it is practical for real-world situations (Patton, 2015) and that the results of the evaluation may be applied immediately as the users decide. I also realized that the full involvement of the intended users was an advantage because the theory calls for close participation of the users (Patton, 2015). These points made UFE ideal for this project.

Additionally, as a research practitioner and project developer, I have learned how to conduct research by recognizing and avoiding personal biases. I have endeavored to remain impartial when collecting, analyzing, and disseminating data and results. Further, I have become accustomed to delivering negative news (e.g., when I informed stakeholders of weaknesses in the after-school program).

As I delved deeper into the research and became more vested in the successful outcome of the program evaluation, I realized that, in alignment with UFE guidance, revealing weaknesses would be advantageous. Addressing weaknesses is the only way the after-school program will become successful and sustainable and increase student achievement. Furthermore, I learned that a program evaluation involves collecting, analyzing, and using information to answer significant questions based on the intended users' needs (Patton, 2008). The program evaluation helped administrators, parents, and students discover the limitations in the program to students' reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar mastery.

Finally, this process has made me more cognizant of the timeframe necessary to accomplish reliable and valid research that will lead to the awarding of my degree. Each time I created a timetable or set a goal for completing an aspect of my research, something unexpected would occur and interfere with these personal deadlines. The most time-consuming and challenging aspect was waiting for the IRB approval, which took several weeks longer than I had anticipated.

Additionally, the process of data transcription was tedious. Analyzing the qualitative data from the transcriptions was time-consuming and challenging. However, the repetitiveness and insights obtained allowed me to understand all data points and gave greater depth as well as meaning to the work I was able to complete.

Leadership and Change

I gained abundant scholarly knowledge as a result of completing this project and arrived at various insights. One of the first scholarly insights I gained was the need to use

current, peer-reviewed literature as the foundation for developing the problem regarding the evaluation. The literature had to be used as well for discussion of the strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations of the after-school program (Creswell, 2012).

Another insight that I gained during this project study was the need to immerse myself in the literature to gain a deeper understanding of the elements of a fully effective and successful after-school program and what improvements could be put into place to enhance less-than-successful after-school programs. The ability to immerse myself in the literature would not have been possible without my becoming familiar with the varied databases I used during the research portion of this project. Academic Research, ERIC, and ProQuest were especially useful resources throughout my research procedures.

I found it also important to read articles in the literature that were critical of after-school programs so as to include variety and different points of view in my research. The inclusion of different perspectives about the effectiveness of after-school programs provided greater focus so that I could identify the weaknesses in the after-school program and suggest adjustments for improvement of the program. Finally, the program evaluation report taught me the essential components of a program evaluation. Program evaluations involve a systematic approach with pragmatic documentation pertaining to performance (Mertens & Wilson, 2012). As I became more familiar with the process and how to present the information, I saw that the program evaluation helped administrators, parents, and students to understand the problem toward effective solutions.

The process of researching, collecting and analyzing data, as well as creating the report for this project study, allowed me to develop my personal leadership capabilities.

As a result of my research, I have now become viewed by members of the faculty and administration as an expert on the topic of after-school programs. I am excited about the prospect that the recommendations provided may be implemented. As a result, my research and report will help the after-school program to improve in the future and lead to increased student achievement.

Reflection on the Importance of the Work

In this study, I explored an after-school program for English II students that was developed to help them overcome their inadequate performance in language arts. Administrators, parents, and students provided perspectives on the benefits and limitations of the program and methods to improve student learning. The after-school program is an important component of the school's curriculum for helping the students master the essentials of language arts. Students' greater proficiency affects the school's scores on national assessments, school funding, students' performance on state examinations, and their success in their future education and careers (Polikoff, 2016).

The program evaluation provided all the necessary components to evaluate effectively whether the after-school program had a positive effect on students' literacy skills. Furthermore, the program evaluation report provided the findings, improvements, and drawbacks of the program. Following from these, the report also provided recommendations to inform the stakeholders' decision-making so they could make adjustments for improvement of the program as needed.

Implications, Applications, and Directions for Future Research

The implications and applications of the research in this project study offer a variety of insights regarding the effectiveness of the after-school program. The conceptual framework for this study was the UFE. This theory was particularly appropriate because it emphasizes and focuses on the intended uses for the intended users who will directly use the findings (Schwitzer, 1997). Per UFE, I engaged three groups of stakeholders actively in the evaluation process with the interview questions (see Appendix C) to gather their perspectives on various aspects of the success of the after-school program.

The evaluation was collaborative (see Patton, 2011); I gained the stakeholders' trust, and they were open in their views. I emphasized also that my role would not be as a judge but that, as Ramirez et al. (2017) noted in an evaluation of a youth training program using UFE, our work together was as "researchers/learners" (p. 19). Throughout, the emphasis was on utilization of the results by the users (see Patton, 2015). Involvement of the stakeholders increased their "ownership" of the evaluation (see Patton & Horton, 2009, p. 1). They felt invested in participating and recognized that their input and the findings would have great practical value for application to future implementation of the program.

The results of this study provided a clear picture of what aspects of the after-school program were implemented correctly and were effective in increasing student achievement. The results also highlighted the weaknesses of the after-school program for corrections that will need to be addressed. The results further provided research-based

information and recommendations for improvement of the current program so it may be continuously offered to English II students with inadequate language arts skills to help them increase their reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar knowledge and applications.

Continuation of research following from this project evaluation could consist of three possibilities for future research. First, I would suggest researching the effects that the after-school program has specifically on student learning within the classroom setting. Research would require interviews with students and teachers on the daily successes or failures of students' reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar skills in their classes. Second, I would analyze and evaluate the after-school program on a more consistent basis to ensure that all issues are addressed immediately. Evaluations could take place quarterly or biannually and the findings delivered to the stakeholders. I would also involve teachers directly in the evaluations.

Finally, future research could replicate this study with other high schools in other geographical areas as well as on the junior high school level. From such evaluations, implementation or enhancement could greatly improve students' levels of learning through after-school programs with differentiated activities. I would also add other research approaches for more complete pictures of the remedial programs. These approaches would include quantitative components, focus groups, and observations of classroom activities.

Conclusion

At the school under study, many students struggled in English II and had major troubles with reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar. The after-school program was created in response to the problem associated with the students' poor scores on state-mandated tests and poor grades in English. The program took place over the course of 9 months during one school year, from September to May for 4 days a week, with each session lasting 1.5 hours.

I was authorized by the school board to evaluate the program and used the UFE as the grounding for the formative evaluation. This conceptual framework was particularly suitable for the evaluation because of the importance of the after-school program to students' success in high school and beyond. In accordance with UFE, I enlisted the active involvement of the three groups of stakeholders—administrators, parents, and students—in a spirit of cooperation and trust to determine practical and usable findings for improvement of the after-school program.

Stakeholders were more likely to use the evaluation results with active involvement because they felt “ownership of the evaluation process and findings” (see Patton & Horton, 2009, p. 1). This involvement promoted their trust in me and the results in terms of the accuracy with which they viewed the evaluation (see Patton, 2011). Additionally, with a sense of ownership, I believed the stakeholders would be more committed to using the findings for greater improvement (see Ramirez et al., 2017).

The program evaluation elicited areas of strength and weakness, which are presented in the program evaluation report. Following data analysis of the stakeholders'

interviews, I extracted five themes, three strengths and two weaknesses. The strengths of the program included students' improvement in writing, reading, vocabulary, and grammar capabilities (Theme 1). Stakeholders recognized that the personalized, condensed learning environment of one-on-one instruction and small groups was highly beneficial to learning and meeting students' individual learning needs (Theme 2). However, parents commented that the students should spend more time with the teachers, and students also reported they needed additional time and instructional assistance. Administrators observed that the lessons should be more challenging.

Another strength that emerged was that students' self-confidence greatly increased as the program took place (Theme 3). Some students also reported greater confidence in their social skills. However, some students and administrators indicated that the program had no impact on the students' self-confidence.

The first limitation emerged as participants indicated that more technology and other activities should be added to the program (Theme 4). Administrators and parents recognized the need for students' greater familiarity with technology for later education and careers. Students suggested the use of many technological devices. Participants also suggested other activities, such as competitive exercises, group projects, and field trips.

The second limitation was that students should have input into the assignments (Theme 5). All participants recognized the importance of student involvement in the decisions about the methods of instruction and assignments. Participants agreed that student input on assignments should be based on their interests and preferences.

From these findings, I developed five recommendations for improvement in both the strengths and weaknesses of the program. Although much improvement was noted in students' reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar skills, differentiated instructional procedures could be used to meet students' needs further. The condensed environment was praised by all participants; however, instruction within the condensed environment could be more tailored to each student's learning needs. Students' self-confidence increased during the program. Nevertheless, some students did not believe their confidence increased. Therefore, additional strategies should be used to increase their motivational levels.

The information and recommendations provided in this program evaluation may help promote positive social change with improvements in the future after-school program as it continues to be offered in the high school. From the recommendations, administrators will be guided to decide on the next appropriate steps. These may include allocating increased funding for more teachers and students to participate in the after-school program, for additional technological devices to be used, and for field trips. Administrators may also arrange for teachers' professional development seminars and workshops with the focus on the after-school program and sponsor regular evaluations of the program for additional monitoring and improvement.

From the evaluation report and recommendations, parents may see their children's greatly enhanced command of language arts skills. In consultation with teachers, parents may then learn to help their children further in current and future homework assignments.

Parents may also be motivated themselves to become more involved in school activities and encourage their children to succeed in high school and in higher education.

Students will also benefit from the evaluation report. They will recognize that their literacy skills have increased, and consequently their self-confidence. They will then more likely increase their focus on improving even more and believe more in their abilities. With implementation of the recommendation for greater technological activities, the students will have the opportunity to expand their technological expertise for current classroom use and their later education. Students may then gain greater proficiency in language arts, feel greater satisfaction in their mastery, understand the subject matter of other courses better, and increase their grades in all subjects.

The evaluation report will be beneficial for teachers as well to help them improve their instructional processes, especially with regard to differentiated learning and one-on-one teaching strategies. Teachers will also more easily recognize students' self-confidence in their increased skills and help them further by researching and using motivational strategies to increase students' confidence. When teachers elicit and listen to students' input regarding their preferences in assignments and other activities, the teachers will benefit as well, making the assignments more interesting for the students. In these processes, teachers and students will build greater reciprocal trust and communication in the learning process.

The evaluation of the English II after-school program was intended to affect the program positively with emphasis on the usefulness of the findings for the stakeholders. Analysis of the interviews yielded five themes describing the program's strengths and

limitations, with recommendations to improve all. The after-school program was shown to greatly enhance students' literacy skills and self-confidence. Implementation of the recommendations should strengthen the program for future high school students' mastery of English II.

References

- Abeberese, A. B., Kumler, T. J., & Linden, L. L. (2014). Improving reading skills by encouraging children to read in school: A randomized evaluation of the Sa Aklat Sisikat reading program in the Philippines. *Journal of Human Resources, 49*(3), 612-633. doi:10.3368/jhr.49.3.611
- Afshar, L., Tabei, S. Z., & Hosseinzade, M. (2018). Evaluation of medical ethics doctoral program: A utilization-focused approach. *International Journal of Ethics Education, 3*(1), 89-99. doi:10.1007/s40889-018-0049-3
- Ahmady, S., Lakeh, M. A., Esmailpoor, S., Arab, M., & Yaghmaei, M. (2014). Educational program evaluation model, from the perspective of the new theories. *Research and Development in Medical Education, 3*(1), 5-8. doi:10.5681/rdme.2014.003
- Allen, J. M., & Rimes, J. (2014). A review of program evaluations in an Australian independent school: Participants' perspectives. *Australian Journal of Education, 58*(3), 262-277. doi:10.1177/0004944114542983
- Almus, K., & Dogan, B. (2016). A student of summer school enrichment program in high poverty urban public charter school. *Reading Improvement, 53*(1), 1-16. Retrieved from www.questia.com/library/journal/1G1-449837248/a-study-of-summer-school-enrichment-program-in-high-poverty
- Altemueller, L., & Lindquist, C. (2017). Flipped classroom instruction for inclusive learning. *British Journal of Special Education, 44*(3), 341-358. doi:10.1111/1467-8578.12177

- Ankrum, J., Genest, M., & Morewood, A. (2017). A description of contrasting discourse patterns used in differentiated reading instruction. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 31*(3), 313-323. doi:10.1080/02568543.2017.1319442
- Applegate, J. L. (2012). Graduating the 21st century student: Advising as if their lives (and our future) depended on it. *NACADA Journal, 32*(1), 5-11.
doi:10.12930/0271-9517-32.1
- Auletto, K. C., & Sableski, M.-K. (2018). Selecting a reading intervention program for struggling readers: A case study of an urban district. *International Journal of Educational Reform, 27*(3), 234-252. doi:10.1177/105678791802700301
- Baeten, M., Dochy, F., Struyven, K., Parmentier, E., & Vanderbruggen, A. (2016). Student-centered learning environments: An investigation into student teachers' instructional preferences and approaches to learning. *Learning Environments Research, 19*(1), 43-62. doi:10.1007/s10984-015-9190-5
- Bahri, A., & Corebima, A. D. (2015). The contribution of learning motivation and metacognitive skill on cognitive learning outcome of students within different learning strategies. *Journal of Baltic Science Education, 14*(4), 487-500.
Retrieved from http://www.scientiasocialis.lt/jbse/files/pdf/vol14/487-500.Bahri_JBSE_Vol.14_No.4.pdf
- Baron, N. S. (2017). Reading in a digital age. *Phi Delta Kappan, 99*(2), 15-20.
doi:10.1177/0031721717734184

- Bastug, M., & Demirtas, G. (2016). Child-centered reading intervention: See, talk, dictate, read, write. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 8(4), 601-616. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1109866.pdf>
- Battaglia, M. (2008). Purposive sample. In P. J. Lavrakas (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of survey research methods* (pp. 495-563). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Beach, K. D., Sanchez, V., Flynn, L. J., & O'Connor, R. E. (2015). Teaching academic vocabulary to adolescents with learning disabilities. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 48(1), 36-44. doi:10.1177/0040059915594783
- Bell, D. A., Hackett, C. D., & Hoffman, J. L. (2016). Student satisfaction and success in a low-income community college environment. *Journal of Applied Research in the Community College*, 23(1), 1-16. Retrieved from www.academia.edu/26202520/Student_Satisfaction_and_Success_in_a_Low-Income_Community_College_Environment
- Bhojwani, P., & Wilkie, C. (2018). *Power-up literacy: Technology and multimodality within the extended classroom*. Leichester, England: United Kingdom Literacy Association (Ideas in Practice). Retrieved from www.ukla.org
- Billingsley, G. M., Thomas, C. N., & Webber, J. A. (2018). Effects of student choice of instructional method on the learning outcomes of students with comorbid learning and emotional/behavioral disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 41(4), 213-226. doi:10.1177/0731948718768512
- Botsas, G. (2017). Differences in strategy use in the reading comprehension of narrative and science texts among students with and without learning disabilities. *Learning*

- Disabilities Contemporary Journal*, 15(1), 139-162. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1141985>
- Brady, S. R., & Spencer, M. S. (2018). Supporting and mentoring new social work instructors: A formative evaluation of the TEAM program. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 18(2), 24-38.
doi:10.14434/josotl.v18i2.22334
- Breger, L. (2017). Poverty and student achievement in Chicago public schools. *American Economist*, 62(2), 206-216. doi:10.1177/0569434516672759
- Briedenhann, J., & Butts, S. (2005). Utilization-focused evaluation. *Review of Policy Research*, 22(2), 221-243. doi:10.1111/j.1541-1338.2005.00131.x
- Buckley, M., & Mahdavi, J. N. (2018). Bringing children from the margins to the page: School counselors supporting students with learning disabilities. *Journal of School Counseling*, 16(23), 1-40. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1194637>
- Bulanda, J. J., & Mccrea, K. T. (2013). The promise of an accumulation of care: Disadvantaged African-American youths' perspectives about what makes an after-school program school program meaningful. *Child & Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 30(2), 95-118. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs10560-012-0281-1>
- But, J. C., Brown, P., & Smyth, D. S. (2017). Reading effectively across the disciplines

- (READ): A strategy to improve student success. *InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching*, 12, 30-50. Retrieved from <https://doaj.org/article/0cc5a6c150ed44d68a0b812cbee085cc>
- Camacho, A., & Alves, R. (2017). Fostering parental involvement in writing: Development and testing of the program Cultivating Writing. *Reading & Writing*, 30(2), 253-277. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11145-016-9672-6>
- Caruana, V. (2015). Accessing the common core standards for students with learning disabilities: Strategies for writing standards-based IEP goals. *Preventing School Failure*, 59(4), 237-243. doi:10.1080/1045988X.2014.924088
- Castillo-Montoya, M. (2016). Preparing for interview research: The interview protocol refinement framework. *Qualitative Report*, 21(5), 811-830. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2337&context=tqr>
- Cavendish, W. (2013). Student perceptions of school efforts to facilitate student involvement, school commitment, self-determination, and high school graduation. *Social Psychology of Education*, 16(2), 257-275. doi:10.1007/s11218-013-9212-z
- Cavioni, V., Grazzani, I., & Ornaghi, V. (2017). Social and emotional learning for children with learning disability: Implications for inclusion. *International Journal of Emotional Education*, 9(2), 100-109. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1162075>
- Cetin, S. K., & Taskin, P. (2016). Parent involvement in education in terms of their socio-economic status. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 66,

105-122. doi:10.14689/ejer.2016.66.6

- Chandler, R. (2014). Teachers' beliefs about poverty and the impact on learning disabilities identification in a poor, rural school district. *Rural Educator*, 35(3), 31-39. doi:10.35608/ruraled.v35i3.347
- Christo, C., & Ponzuric, J. (2017). CASP position paper: Specific learning disabilities and patterns of strengths and weaknesses. *Contemporary School Psychology*, 21(1), 7-9. doi:10.1007/s40688-016-0099-5
- Chyung, S. (2015). Foundational concepts for conducting program evaluations. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 27(4), 77-96. doi:10.1002/piq.21181
- Cook, D. A. (2010). Twelve tips for evaluating educational programs. *Medical Teacher*, 32(4), 296-301. doi:10.3109/01421590903480121
- Cook, S. C., & Rao, K. (2018). Systematically applying UDL to effective practices for students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 41(3), 179-191. doi:10.1177/0731948717749936
- Cotton, D. (2017). Teachers' use of formative assessment. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 83(3), 39-51. Retrieved from www.questia.com/library/journal/1P4-1929679929/teachers-use-of-formative-assessment
- Creswell, J. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

- Cuevas, J. A., Irving, M. A., & Russell, L. R. (2014). Applied cognition: Testing the effects of independent silent reading on secondary students' achievement and attribution. *Reading Psychology, 35*(2), 127-159. doi: 10.1080/02702711.2012.675419
- Curtis, A. C. (2015). Defining adolescence. *Journal of Adolescent and Family Health, 7*(2), 1-39. Retrieved from <https://scholar.utc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1035&context=jafh>
- Davis, K., & Fullerton, S. (2016). Connected learning in and after-school: Exploring technology's role in the learning experiences of diverse high school students. *Information Society, 32*(2), 98-116. doi:10.1080/01972243.2016.1130498
- DeFauw, D. (2017). Writing with parents in response to picture book read. *Alouds Reading Horizons, 56*(2), 22-41
Retrieved from http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/reading_horizons/vol56/iss2/3
- De La Paz, S., & Butler, C. (2018). Promoting motivated writers: Suggestions for teaching and conducting research with students with learning disabilities and struggling learners. *Learning Disabilities: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 23*(2), 56-69. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?q=source%3A%22learning+disabilities%3A+a+multidisciplinary+journal%22&id=EJ1189705>
- Dixon, F. A., Yssel, N., McConnell, J. M., & Hardin, T. (2014). Differentiated instruction, professional development, and teacher efficacy. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 37*(2), 111-127. doi:10.1177/0162353214529042

- Donaldson, S. I., Patton, M. Q., Fetterman, D., & Scriven, M. (2010). The 2009 Claremont Debates: The promise and pitfalls of utilization-focused and empowerment evaluation. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Evaluation*, 6(13), 15-57. doi:10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2016.10.005
- Dudaite, J. (2016). Impact of socio-economic home environment on student learning achievement. *Independent Journal of Management & Production*, 7(3), 854-871. Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007%2F978-3-319-56083-0_10
- Elliott, G., & Fourali, C. (2012). *Education and social change: Connecting local and global perspectives*. New York, NY: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Elmahdi, I., Al-Hattami, A., & Fawzi, H. (2018). Using technology for formative assessment to improve students' learning. *TOJET: The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 17(2), 182-188. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1176157.pdf>
- English, L., MacDonald, C., & Connelly, O. (2006). A utilization focused evaluation of a lay ministry education program: Issues and critiques. *Journal of Adult Theological Education*, 3(2), 129-146. doi:10.1558/jate.2006.3.2.129
- Esfandiari, M. R., Riasati, M. J., Vaezian, H., & Rahimi, F. (2018). A quantitative analysis of TOEFL iBT using an interpretive model of test validity. *Language Testing in Asia*, 8(1), 1-13. doi:10.1186/s40468-018-0062-7

- Fleischman, S., & Heppen, J. (2009). Improving low-performing high schools: Searching for evidence of promise. *The Future of Children, 19*(1), 105-33. Retrieved from <https://sde.ok.gov/sites/ok.gov.sde/files/ACE-AFTRemediation.pdf>
- Flowers, A. B. (2010). Blazing an evaluation pathway: Lessons learned from applying utilization-focused evaluation to a conservation education program. *Evaluation and Program Planning, 33*(2), 165-171. doi:10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2009.07.006
- Fraher, C., Jones, K., Caniglia, C., Crowell, G., Hastings, K., & Zumwalt, K. (2019). Effectiveness of direct instruction flashcards on sight word identification for a high school student with a specific learning disability. *Insights on Learning Disabilities, 16*(1), 37-44. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1218552.pdf>
- Franklin, D., & Blankenberger, B. (2016). Program evaluation of community college learning assistance centers: What do LAC directors think? *Community College Review, 44*(1), 3-25. doi:10.1177/0091552115609998
- Garwood, J. D. (2018). Literacy interventions for secondary students formally identified with emotional and behavioral disorders: Trends and gaps in the research. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 27*(1), 23-52. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs10864-017-9278-3>
- Gorard, S., Siddiqui, N., & See, B. H. (2015). An evaluation of the “Switch-on Reading” literacy catch-up programme. *British Educational Research Journal, 41*(4), 596–612. doi:10.1002/berj.3157
- Graham, S., Collins, A. A., & Rigby-Wills, H. (2017). Writing characteristics of students

- with learning disabilities and typically achieving peers. *Exceptional Children*, 83(2), 199-218. doi:10.1177/0014402916664070
- Guay, F., Roy, A., & Valois, P. (2017). Teacher structure as a predictor of students' perceived competence and autonomous motivation: The moderating role of differentiated instruction. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87(2), 224–240. doi:10.1111/bjep.12146
- Guyadeen, D., & Seasons, M. (2016) Plan evaluation: Challenges and directions for future research. *Planning Practice & Research*, 31(2), 215-228. doi:10.1080/02697459.2015.1081335
- Hakkola, L., Allan, E. J., & Kerschner, D. (2019). Applying utilization-focused evaluation to high school hazing prevention: A pilot intervention. *Evaluation and program planning*, 75, 61-68. doi:10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2019.05.005
- Harðardóttir, S., Júlíusdóttir, S., & Guðmundsson, H. S. (2015). Understanding resilience in learning difficulties: Unheard voices of secondary school students. *Child & Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 32(4), 351-358. doi:10.1007/s10560-014-0373-1
- Harmon, J. M., Hedrick, W. B., Wood, K. D., & Vintinner, J. (2011). An investigation of current secondary reading programs. *Literacy Research & Instruction*, 50(2), 105-119. doi:10.1080/1938871003611152
- Hauser, R. M., & Anderson, K. J. (2011). *High school dropout, graduation, and completion rate: Better data, better measures, better decisions*. Washington, DC: National Academic Press.

- Holden, L., Berger, W., Zingarelli, R., & Siegel, E. (2015). After-school program school program for urban youth: Evaluation of a health careers course in New York City high schools. *Information Services & Use, 35*(1-2), 141-60. doi:10.3233/ISU-150773
- Hollands, F. M., Kieffer, M. J., Shand, R., Pan, Y., Cheng, H., & Levin, H. M. (2016). Cost-effectiveness analysis of early reading programs: A demonstration with recommendations for future research. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 9*(1), 30-53. doi:10.1080/19345747.2015.1055639
- Ismajli, H., & Imami-Morina, I. (2018). Differentiated instruction: Understanding and applying interactive strategies to meet the needs of all the students. *International Journal of Instruction, 11*(3), 207-218. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1183415>
- Iwai, Y. (2016). The effect of explicit instruction on strategic reading in a literacy methods course. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 28*(1), 110-118. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1106323.pdf>
- Jacob, R., Armstrong, C., Bowden, A. B., & Pan, Y. (2016). Leveraging volunteers: An experimental evaluation of a tutoring program for struggling readers. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 9*(1), 67-92. doi:10.1080/19345747.2016.1138560
- Jacob, S., & Desautels, G. (2014). Assessing the quality of aboriginal program

- evaluations. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 29(1), 62-86. Retrieved from <https://evaluationcanada.ca/system/files/cjpe-entries/29-1-062.pdf>
- Jeffery, J. V., & Wilcox, K. (2014). "How do I do it if I don't like writing?": Adolescents' stances toward writing across disciplines. *Reading and Writing*, 27(6), 1095-1117. doi:10.1007/s11145-013-9493-9
- Jeffes, B. (2016). Raising the reading skills of secondary-age students with severe and persistent reading difficulties: Evaluation of the efficacy and implementation of a phonics-based intervention programme. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 32(1), 73-84. doi:10.1080/02667363.2015.1111198
- Jones, C. (2018). SPARK early literacy: Testing the impact of a family-school-community partnership literacy intervention. *School Community Journal*, 28(2), 247-264. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1201942.pdf>
- Jong, S. T., Brown, H. E., Croxson, C., Wilkinson, P., Corder, K. L., & van Sluijs, E. (2018). GoActive: A protocol for the mixed methods process evaluation of a school-based physical activity promotion programme for 13-14-year-old adolescents. *Trials*, 19(1), 3-11. doi:10.1186/s13063-018-2661-0
- Jui-Long, H., Yu-Chang, H., & Rice, K. (2012). Integrating data mining in program evaluation of K-12 online education. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 15(3), 27-41. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ992501>
- Kaiser, K. (2009). Protecting respondent confidentiality in qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 19(11), 1632-1641. doi:10.1177/1049732309350879

- Kalu, M. E., & Norman, K. E. (2018). Step by step process from logic model to case study method as an approach to educational programme evaluation. *Global Journal of Educational Research*, 17(2), 73-85. doi:10.4314/gjedr.v17i1.10
- Kantrovich, A. J., Hillison, J., & Duncan, D. (2017). A program evaluation as perceived by program graduates show program's validity. *NACTA Journal*, 61(4), 350-354. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43765646?seq=1>
- Ko, T., & Hughes, M. T. (2015). Reading comprehension instruction for adolescents with learning disabilities: A reality check. *Education Sciences*, 5(4), 413-439. doi:10.3390/educsci5040413
- Kremer, K. P., Maynard, B. R., Polanin, J. R., Vaughn, M. G., & Sarteschi, C. M. (2015). Effects of after-school programs with at-risk youth on attendance and externalizing behaviors: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 44(3), 616-636. doi:10.1007/s10964-014-0226-4
- Kuder, S. J. (2017). Vocabulary instruction for secondary students with reading disabilities: An updated research review. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 40(3), 155-164. doi:10.1177/0731948717690113
- Lai, M. K., Wilson, A., McNaughton, S., & Hsiao, S. (2014). Improving achievement in secondary schools: Impact of literacy project on reading comprehension and secondary school qualifications. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 49(3), 305-334. doi:10.1002/rrq.73
- Lake, J., & Holster, T. (2014). Developing autonomous self-regulated readers in an extensive reading program. *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal*, 5(4), 394-

403. Retrieved from http://sisaljournal.org/archives/dec14/lake_holster
- Latunde, Y., & Clark-Louque, A. (2016). Untapped resources: Black parent engagement that contributes to learning. *Journal of Negro Education, 85*(1), 72-81.
Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1215945>
- Law, B. M. F., & Shek, D. T. L. (2011). Process evaluation of a positive youth development program: Project P.A.T.H.S. *Research on Social Work Practice, 21*(5), 539-548. doi:10.1177/1049731511404436
- Lee, S., & Tsai, S. (2017) Reading and writing. *An Interdisciplinary Journal, 30*(4), 917-943. doi:10.1007/s11145-016-9697-x
- Leshem, S., & Trafford, V. (2007). Overlooking the conceptual framework. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 44*(1), 93-105.
doi:10.1080/14703290601081407
- Lishner, K., & Puetz, B. R. (1986). Program evaluation: As the program director sees it; as the evaluator sees it. *Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing, 17*(4), 125-130. doi:10.3928/0022-0124-19860701-07
- Little, P. (2014). Special issue: A practical guide to the science and practice of after-school programming. *New Directions for Your Development, 2014*(144), 1-132. Retrieved from
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/304658182_A_practical_guide_to_the_science_and_practice_of_afterschool_programming
- Loretto, A., DeMartino, S., & Godley, A. (2016). Secondary students' perceptions of peer

- review of writing. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 51(2), 134-161. Retrieved from <https://www.peerceptiv.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/Secondary-Students-Perceptions-of-Peer-Review-of-Writing.pdf>
- Malloy, J. A., Parsons, A. W., Marinak, B. A., Applegate, A. J., Applegate, M. D., Reutzel, D. R., . . . Gambrell, L. B. (2017). Assessing (and addressing!) motivation to read fiction and nonfiction. *Reading Teacher*, 71(3), 309-325. doi:10.1002/trtr.1633
- Malpique, A., Ana Margarida, V. V. S., & Frison, L. M. B. (2017). Self-regulated strategies for school writing tasks: A cross-cultural report. *Psychology of Language and Communication*, 21(1), 244-265. doi:10.1515/plc-2017-0012
- Martaningsih, S. T. (2018). Evaluation of career guidance program in vocational high school. *Global Conference on Teaching, Assessment, and Learning in Education*, 42, 1-8. doi:10.1051/shsconf/20184200093
- Martin, C., Polly, D., Mraz, M., & Algozzine, R. (2018). Teacher perspectives on literacy and mathematics professional development. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 27(1), 94-105. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1174901.pdf>
- McDonald, M., & Cox, S. (2009). Moving toward evidence-based human participant protection. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 7(1-2), 1-16. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs10805-009-9082-3>
- McGeown, S. P., Duncan, L. G., Griffiths, Y. M., & Stothard, S. E. (2015). Exploring the relationship between adolescent's reading skills, reading motivation and reading

- habits. *Reading and Writing*, 28(4), 545-569. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?q=reading&id=EJ1053454>
- McHugh, M., Reedy, P., & Yehle, A. K. (2017). Moving into action: Middle level learners as change agents: Robust learning happens when students have choice and voice in curriculum. *AMLE Magazine*, 5(3), 29-33. Retrieved from <https://www.amle.org/BrowsebyTopic/WhatsNew/WNDet/TabId/270/ArtMID/888/ArticleID/835/Moving-into-Action-Middle-Level-Learners-as-Change-Agents.aspx>
- McIntyre-McCullough, K. (2016). The issue of equity in the English language arts classroom. *English Journal*, 105(3), 94-97. Retrieved from <https://www.questia.com/library/journal/1P3-3926534381/the-issue-of-equity-in-the-english-language-arts-classroom>
- McKnight, K., O'Malley, K., Ruzic, R., Horsley, M. K., Franey, J. J., & Bassett, K. (2016). Teaching in a digital age: How educators use technology to improve student learning. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 48(3), 194-211. doi:10.1080/15391523.2016.1175856
- Mendez, J. L., & Swick, D. C. (2018). Guilford Parent Academy: A collaborative effort to engage parents in children's education. *Education & Treatment of Children*, 41(2), 249-268. doi:10.1353/etc.2018.0011
- Mertens, D. M., & Wilson, A. T. (2012). *Program evaluation theory and practice*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Meyer, H. (2018). Teachers' thoughts on student decision making during engineering

- design lessons. *Education Sciences*, 8(1), 1-11. doi:10.3390/educsci8010009
- Moreno, M. (2014). Program evaluation: A review of impact, method and emerging trends for music education. *Canadian Music Educator*, 55(3), 32-37. Retrieved from <https://openmusiclibrary.org/journal/canadian-music-educator/2014/55/>
- Morgan, C., Sibthorp, J., & Browne, L. P. (2016). Moving beyond outcomes: An applied example of implementation evaluation in a youth recreation program. *Journal of Park & Recreation Administration*, 34(4), 66-81. doi:10.18666/JPRA-2016-V34-I4-7290
- Morgan, H. (2014). Maximizing student success with differentiated learning. *Clearing House*, 87(1), 34-38. doi:10.1080/00098655.2013.832130
- Mullen, C. A. (2017). In students' best interest: What are teacher views of ethical learning and leading? *Curriculum & Teaching Dialogue*, 19(1/2), 89-103. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1247376>
- Murray, K., & Howe, K. R. (2017). Neglecting democracy in education policy: A-F school report card accountability systems. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 25(109), 1-31. doi:10.14507/epaa.25.3017
- Nagro, S. A., Hooks, S. D., Fraser, D. W., & Cornelius, K. E. (2016). Whole-group response strategies to promote student engagement in inclusive classrooms. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 48(5), 243-249. doi:10.1177/0040059918757947
- Natkin, L. W., & Kolbe, T. (2016). Enhancing sustainability curricula through faculty learning communities. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 17(4), 540-558. doi:10.1108/IJSHE-02-2015-0024

- Noakes, L. A. (2009). Adapting the utilization-focused approach for teacher evaluation. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Evaluation*, 6(11), 83-88. Retrieved from https://journals.sfu.ca/jmde/index.php/jmde_1/article/view/219/217
- Parker, L., & Reid, C. (2017). A case study of elementary school parents as agents for summer reading gain: Fostering a summer leap and holding steady. *School Community Journal*, 27(1), 307-327. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1146496.pdf>
- Patton, M. Q. (2008). *Utilization-focused evaluation* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Patton, M. Q. (2010). Utilization-focused evaluation for social services and social work. *Revista De Asistentia Sociala*, 9(4), 137-154. Retrieved from <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Utilization-Focused-Evaluation-for-Social-Services-Patton>
- Patton, M. Q. (2011). *Essentials of utilization-focused evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Patton, M. Q. (2014). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). The sociological roots of utilization-focused evaluation. *American Sociologist*, 46(4), 457-462. doi:10.1007/s12108-015-9275-8
- Patton, M. Q., & Horton, D. (2009). Utilization-focused evaluation for agricultural innovation. *ILAC Brief 22*, 1-6. Retrieved from www.betterevaluation.org/sites/default/files/ILAC_Brief22_Utilization_Focus_Evaluation.pdf

- Pensiero, N., & Green, F. (2017) Out-of-school-time study programmes: Do they work? *Oxford Review of Education*, 43(1), 127-147.
doi:10.1080/03054985.2016.1240673
- Perry, G. (2015). Are we listening to students? *Education Update*, 57(8), 1-4. Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/newsletters/education-update/aug15/vol57/num08/toc.aspx>
- Polikoff, M. S. (2016). Evaluating the instructional sensitivity of four states' student achievement tests. *Educational Assessment*, 21(2), 102-119.
doi:10.1080/10627197.2016.1166342
- Pratt, S. M., & Martin, A. M. (2017). Exploring effective professional development strategies for in-service teachers on guiding beginning readers to become more metacognitive in their oral reading. *Reading Horizons (Online)*, 56(3), 31-51.
Retrieved from https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3417&context=reading_horizons
- Price, J. R., Jackson, S. C., Nippold, M., & Ward-Lonergan, J. (2015). Procedures for obtaining and analyzing writing samples of school-age children and adolescents. *Language, Speech & Hearing Services in Schools*, 46(4), 277-293.
doi:10.1044/2015_LSHSS-14-0057
- Raman, A., Thannimalai, R., & Ismail, S. N. (2019). Principals' technology leadership

- and its effect on teachers' technology integration in 21st-century classrooms. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(4), 423-442. Retrieved from www.e-iji.net/dosyalar/iji_2019_4_28.pdf
- Ramirez, R., Kora, G., & Brodhead, D. (2017). Translating project achievements into strategic plans: A case study in utilization-focused evaluation. *Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation*, 13(28), 1-23. Retrieved from www.outcomemapping.ca/download/Ramirez%20et%20al,%202017.pdf
- Randolph, J. (2009). Practical assessment. *Research and Evaluation*, 14(13), 1-13. doi:10.4135/9781412950558.n433
- Rice, H. (2017). Parent perceptions of parent involvement with elementary-aged students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 22(1), 61-73. doi:10.18666/LDMJ-2017-V22-I1-7973
- Roberts, C. A., Kim, S., Tandy, J., & Meyer, N. (2019). Using content area literacy strategies during shared reading to increase comprehension of high school students with moderate intellectual disability on adapted science text. *Education & Training in Autism & Developmental Disabilities*, 54(2), 147-160. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1217433>
- Rodgers, A. (2018). Some assembly required: Scaffolding in the classroom. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 244, 1-6. doi:10.2991/ecpe-18.2018.1
- Rol, Y. C., & Turhan, M. (2018). The relationship between parental involvement to

- education of students and student's engagement to school. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 10(5), 260-281. doi:10.15345/iojes.2018.05.017
- Rouhani, Y., Nafchi, A. M., & Ziaee, S. M. (2016). Applying different interventions to teach writing to students with disabilities: A review study. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, 6(4), 733-741. doi:10.17507/tpls.0604.10
- Sacher, C. L. O. (2016). The writing crisis and how to address it through developmental writing classes. *Research & Teaching in Developmental Education*, 32(2), 46-61. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1101413>
- Santangelo, T. (2014). Why is writing so difficult for students with learning disabilities? Narrative review to inform the design of effective instruction. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal*, 12(1), 5-20. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1039858>
- Sanzo, K. (2016). An analysis of 2013 program evaluation proposals for the school leadership preparation program. *International Journal of Education Policy and Leadership*, 11(11), 1-16. Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/efl_fac_pubs/13/
- Schwitzer, A. M. (1997). Utilization-focused evaluation: Proposing a useful method of program evaluation for college counselors and student development professionals. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 30(1), 50-61. Retrieved from www.researchgate.net/deref/http%3A%2F%2Fdx.doi.org%2F10.1080%2F07481756.1997.12068917

- Segers, E., Verhoeven, L., & Knoop-van, C. (2018). How phonological awareness mediates the relation between working memory and word reading efficiency in children with dyslexia. *Dyslexia*, *24*(2), 156-169. doi:10.1002/dys.1583
- Shawer, S. F. (2013). Accreditation and standards-driven program evaluation: Implications for program quality assurance and stakeholder professional development. *Quality and Quantity*, *47*(5), 2883-2913. doi:10.1007/s11135-012-9696-1.
- Sheldon, J., Arbreton, A., Hopkins, L., & Grossman, J. B. (2010). Investing in success: Key strategies for building quality in after-school programs. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *45*(3-4), 394-404. doi:10.1007/s10464-010-9296-y
- Sieben, N. (2017). Building hopeful secondary school writers through effective feedback strategies. *English Journal*, *106*(6), 48-53. Retrieved from www.academia.edu/33985595/Building_Hopeful_Secondary_School_Writers_through_Effective_Feedback_Strategies
- Simpson, A., & Quigley, C. F. (2016). Member checking process with adolescent students: Not just reading a transcript. *Qualitative Report*, *21*(2), 377-392. Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/51087378.pdf>
- Singleton, S. M., & Filce, H. G. (2015). Graphic organizers for secondary students with learning disabilities. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, *48*(2), 110-117. doi:10.1177/0040059915605799
- Smith, A. (2011). Effective practice for adolescents with reading and literacy challenges.

- Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 54(5), 390-392. Retrieved from https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1207/s15548430jlr3402_4
- Smith, M. K. (1995). Utilization-focused evaluation of a family preservation program. *Families in Society*, 76(1), 11-19. doi:10.1177/104438949507600102
- Spaulding, D. T. (2014). *Research methods for the social sciences: Program evaluation in practice: Core concepts and examples for discussion and analysis*. Somerset, PA: Jossey-Bass.
- Spector, J., Johnson, T. T., & Young, P. (2014). An editorial on research and development in and with educational technology. *Educational Technology Research & Development*, 62(1), 1-12. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11423-014-9331-z>
- Spencer, S., Clegg, J., Lowe, H., & Stackhouse, J. (2017). Increasing adolescents' depth of understanding of cross-curriculum words: An intervention study. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 52(5), 652-668. doi:10.1111/1460-6984.12309
- Stefl-Mabry, J. (2018). Documenting evidence of practice: The power of formative assessment. *Knowledge Quest*, 46(3), 50-57. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1165040.pdf>
- Terlitsky, A. B., & Wilkins, J. (2015). Characteristics of family literacy programmes that improve child literacy, behaviour and parenting skills. *International Journal of Pedagogies & Learning*, 10(2), 121-138. doi:10.1080/22040552.2015.1113846
- Thoma, B., Gottlieb, M., Boysen-Osborn, M., King, A., Quinn, A., Sara, K., . . .

- Pineda, N. (2017). Curated collections for educators: Five key papers about program evaluation. *Cureus*, 9(5) 2-10. doi:10.7759/cureus.1224
- Titiz, H., & Tokel, A. (2015). Parents' expectations from teachers and school administrators regarding school-family cooperation development. *International Journal on New Trends in Education & Their Implications (IJONTE)*, 6(2), 172-186. Retrieved from http://ijonte.org/FileUpload/ks63207/File/15a._titiz.pdf
- Truyant (2019). Understanding student participation within a group learning. *South African Journal of Education*, 39(2), 1-8.
doi:10.15700/saje.v39n2a1629
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Bankole, R. A., Mitchell, R. M., & Moore, D. M. (2013). Student academic optimism: A confirmatory factor analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 51(2), 150-175.
doi:10.1108/09578231311304689
- Uslu, Ö. (2017). Evaluating the professional development program aimed technology integration at the era of curriculum change. *Kuram Ve Uygulamada Egitim Bilimleri [Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice]*, 17(6), 2031-2055. doi: 10.12738/estp.2017.6.0116
- Valiandes, S., & Neophytou, L. (2018). Teachers' professional development for differentiated instruction in mixed-ability classrooms: Investigating the impact of a development program on teachers' professional learning and on students' achievement. *Teacher Development*, 22(1), 123-138.
doi:10.1080/13664530.2017.1338196

- Van Koperen, T. M., Renders, C. M., Spierings, E. J. M., Hendriks, A., Westerman, M. J., Seidell, J. C., & Schuit, A. J. (2016). Recommendations and improvements for the evaluation of integrated community-wide interventions approaches. *Journal of Obesity*, 2016, 1-13. doi:10.1155/2016
- van Urk, F., Grant, S., & Bonell, C. (2016). Involving stakeholders in programme theory specification: Discussion of a systematic, consensus-based approach. *Evidence & Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice*, 12(4), 541-557. doi: 10.1332/174426415X14474260456850
- Vassar, M., Wheeler, D. L., Davison, M., & Franklin, J. (2010). Program evaluation in medical education: An overview of the utilization-focused approach. *Journal of Educational Evaluation for Health Professions*, 7(1), 1-3. doi: 10.3352/jeehp.2010.7.1
- Vaughn, S., Roberts, G., Schnakenberg, J. B., Fall, A., Vaughn, M. G., & Wexler, J. (2015). Improving reading comprehension for high school students with disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 82(1), 117-131. doi:10.1177/0014402915585478
- Vernon-Feagans, L., Bratsch-Hines, M., Varghese, C., Cutrer, E. A., & Garwood, J. D. (2018). Improving struggling readers' early literacy skills through a tier 2 professional development program for rural classroom teachers: The targeted reading intervention. *Elementary School Journal*, 118(4), 525-548. doi:10.1086/697491

- Votypka, J. (2018). PREP: Primary reading engagement program. *Reading Improvement, 55*(2), 47-53. Retrieved from www.projectinnovation.com/reading-improvement.html
- Walker-Dalhouse, D., & Risko, V. J. (2008). Learning from literacy successes in high-achieving urban schools. *Reading Teacher, 61*(5), 422-424.
doi:0.1598/RT.61.5.7
- Walsh, M. E., & Theodorakakis, M. D. (2017). The impact of economic inequality on children's development and achievement. *Religions, 8*(4), 1-13.
doi:10.3390/rel8040067
- Watson, S. R., Gable, R. A., Gear, S. B., & Hughes, K. C. (2012). Evidence-based strategies for improving the reading comprehension of secondary students: Implications for students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 27*(2), 79-89. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5826.2012.00353.x
- Webquests: A literacy/technology practice that fosters adolescents' curiosity. (2008). *Voices from the Middle, 16*(1), 48-49. Retrieved from <http://www.ncte.org/>
- Wells, D. M. (2018). Lifting student voice beyond the classroom: The Hester Hornbrook Academy playbook. *Connect: Supporting Student Participation, 2*(153), 10-11. Retrieved from <https://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=670537494704306;res=IE>
- LHSS

- Wendt, J. L. (2013). Combating the crisis in adolescent literacy: Exploring literacy in the secondary classroom. *American Secondary Education*, 41(2), 38-48.
Retrieved from <https://www.learntechlib.org/p/132499/>
- Wieworka, A. (2017). Student-centered: After-school program: Easy street to a well-rounded education. *Principal Leadership*, 17(9), 10-12. Retrieved from <https://web-a-ebSCOhost-com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/ehost/pdfviewer/>
- Wiltshier, F. (2011). Researching with NVivo. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 12(1), 1-8. Retrieved from www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1628/3146
- Young, S., Range, B. G., Hvidston, D., & Mette, I. M. (2015). Teacher evaluation reform: Principals' beliefs about newly adopted teacher evaluation systems. *Planning and Changing*, 46(1), 158-174. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1145477_007
- Zaman, S., & Asghar, S. (2019). Evaluation of teaching reading strategies used by early grade teachers. *Journal of Early Childhood Care and Education*, 3, 27-42.
Retrieved from <http://journal.aiou.edu.pk/journal1/index.php/jecce/article/view/599/71>
- Ziebell, N., & Clarke, D. (2018). Curriculum alignment: Performance types in the intended enacted, and assessed curriculum in primary mathematics and science classrooms. *Studia Paedagogica [Pedagogical Studies]*, 23(2), 175-203.
doi:10.5817/SP2018-2-10

Appendix A: Program Evaluation Report

A Report to the Board of Directors of a Program Evaluation of a Formative Evaluation of an After-School Program for English II Students

This program evaluation report provided significant information gathered from the program evaluation. The intended audience includes school board members, teachers, parents, and students. The report consists of the program evaluation, which includes the problem, background information, purpose, RQs, review of literature, conceptual qualitative research design and approach participants, data collection, data analysis, and findings.

Introduction

Successful student mastery in the area of English is a worldwide issue. Universally, secondary student literacy advancement is inadequate (Lai, Wilson, McNaughton, & Hsiao, 2014). Students' consistent struggles with English-based components lower their possibilities of performing adequately on English-based assignments and successfully completing future academic endeavors. Reading comprehension is an essential skill needed for students to reach a high level of achievement in school; additionally, insufficient comprehension skills can have a detrimental impact on students' academic achievements (Watson, Gable, Gear, & Hughes, 2012). English II students continuously struggle with English-based problems, and proper accommodations must be made to address the issues.

To help these students, the after-school remedial program was developed in reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar and evaluated. The evaluation and the

evaluation report were based on utilization-focused evaluation (UFE), a highly participatory approach to evaluation (Patton, 2008, 2011). In this approach, the evaluator solicits the detailed input of the stakeholders—in this case school administrators, parents, and the students themselves. Their perceptions of the program’s strengths and weaknesses are invited and respected. Following from these, recommendations are made to sustain and improve the program (Patton & Horton, 2009).

Problem

Literacy challenges can lead to students experiencing problems understanding and reaching success in a variety of necessary courses (Smith, 2011). If students are not strong in literacy skills, they will most likely struggle in other significant courses. Students with inadequate literacy skills often lack necessary reading abilities and have difficulty interpreting and understanding advanced textual information (Wendt, 2013). Insufficient English skills can lead to inadequate examination scores, which may result in students failing school-level courses as well as the inability to graduate at the appropriate time.

In many high schools, beginning students have low reading performance in English (Fleischman & Heppen, 2009). At the high school under study, due to inadequate English II student performance of 10th-grade students, an after-school program was created for all 55 students with inadequate English skills. Prior to this evaluation, the after-school program had not been evaluated, although it was implemented in 2018. The effectiveness of the after-school program was evaluated according to the principles of

utilization-focused evaluation (Patton, 2008) through the direct involvement of administrators, parents, and students.

Background Information

The evaluation was conducted in a high school located in a Southern United States city in a rural and predominantly poverty-based area. The population of the high school is 310 students, with 98% African American, 1% Caucasian, and 1% Hispanic students. Students consistently have trouble mastering components of English II. According to Walker-Dalhouse and Risko (2008), an excessive number of students, especially those who are economically challenged, perform inadequately on state-based assessments.

At the high school, students' inadequate performance led to the creation of an after-school program to strengthen students' weak English-based areas. This program was mandatory and was established to enhance the 10th-grade English II students' skills for greater achievement in reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar. The inclusion of this after-school program may increase the possibility of racially diverse students mastering English-based objectives and scoring successfully on the English II-based components. The focus of this evaluation report pertains to administrators', parents', and students' perceptions of the effectiveness of this after-school program on the students' performance in English II.

If the after-school program increases performance in English II, students will have greater opportunities to graduate from high school, attend college, obtain meaningful occupations, and become productive citizens of society. Education can help individuals

gain knowledge of what is socially significant in their lives (Elliott & Fourali, 2012). The students in the after-school program will have the ability to gain essential knowledge and become productive members of society by attending college as well as obtaining stable occupations.

Purpose

The purpose of the study was to implement a program evaluation created to assess the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of an after-school program. Implementation of this assessment will inform the district leaders on the effectiveness of the program in improving students' learning in English II and therefore whether to continue investing time and resources in the program. The evaluation report may result in positive social change by providing school officials with recommendations on how the after-school program might be improved to enhance students' literacy capabilities. Recommendations based on the evaluation are a major goal of UFE, and it is the stakeholders' responsibility to choose whether, when, and how to implement them (Patton, 2008, 2011).

Research Questions

The RQs provided the essential foundation for the research project. The questions for this program evaluation addressed how administrators, parents, and students perceived the program would enhance students' English-based knowledge and skills in reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar. The evaluation included possible strategies and recommendations that could further enhance the program to help improve student learning.

Review of Literature

The literature review search was conducted through the Walden University Library, and all information consisted of scholarly peer-reviewed and evidence-based resources. The search was conducted with search engines such as Academic Search Complete, ERIC, ProQuest, and books on pertinent topics. Search terms dealing with English strategies and challenges were entered into the databases.

A methodical search of the databases was used to obtain valid sources pertaining to after-school programs. Listings of possible search terms were first compiled and then individually entered into the databases. Boolean search terms were used to locate significant information. Additionally, timely peer-reviewed journals and books were thoroughly examined and reviewed from the databases.

The literature review addressed pertinent and contemporary literature regarding how an after-school program affects racially diverse students' performance in English II. The review addressed distinctive aspects of the evaluation. These included the conceptual framework of utilization-focused evaluation theory, English difficulties and strategies, and after-school programs. The key elements of the literature review highlighted the essential challenges students encounter in mastering vocabulary, reading, writing and grammar.

Conceptual Framework

The program evaluation process consists of assessing the validity and fulfillment of a program to reach conclusions for future implementation (Mertens & Wilson, 2012). The conceptual framework used was utilization-focused evaluation theory (UFE, Patton,

2011, 2015). In UFE, the evaluation must be planned based on prearranged stakeholders who will use the findings in real-world scenarios. The RQs, evaluation standards and process, and information obtained should be compatible with the concerns and issues of the prearranged users (Schwitzer, 1997).

In contrast to other theories, the UFE framework is based on factual and observational aspects (Patton, 2008). When this evaluation theory is applied to the after-school program, the end users will understand the learning outcomes and whether the program has addressed the problem. The users will learn the effects the program has on the improvement of students' literacy skills, addressing their low reading abilities and improving them.

Qualitative Research Design and Approach

A formative program evaluation takes place during the implementation of a project and targets methods of improvement (Brady & Spencer, 2018). Research indicates that the evaluation process emphasizes students, increases students' comprehension abilities, and focuses on the instructional process (Stefl-Mabry, 2018). The formative program evaluation was used to determine the perceptions of administrators, parents, and students on an after-school program that was created to increase students' English-based skills of reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar. Abundant data were collected through individual interview sessions.

Participants

The 21 participants were selected based on purposive sampling. In this sampling method, individuals with characteristics that align with the RQs were selected in a

nonrandom manner to acquire a representation of the population (Battaglia, 2008).

Administrators, parents, and students were selected based on their personal associations and experience with English II. Invitation letters to participate were placed in administrators' mailboxes, and parents and children received invitation letters via postal mail.

The criteria for administrators included having administrative credentials and being employed in the high school or district office. Administrators also had to be involved with teachers and students in the English II after-school program in the capacities of overseers and advisors, with classroom observations during the program. Four of the administrators worked in the high school and one worked at the central office.

The criteria for parents consisted of being stakeholders in the community and having a child enrolled in the English-based after-school program. One parent was chosen per child. Parents who accepted the invitation were selected based on whether their child was selected to participate in the evaluation. Parents not chosen were sent notification letters.

The criteria for students to participate were having been enrolled in the after-school program and English II simultaneously. All 55 of the English II students were not required to attend the after-school program. However, all English-based after-school participants had to have been enrolled in English II.

The final selection consisted of five administrators, eight parents, and eight students. The administrators included a principal, assistant principal, instructional coach, behavior specialist, and special education director. On acceptance, participants signed

consent (administrators and parents) and assent (students) forms. Consent and assent forms were mailed to parents simultaneously.

Data Collection

The 30-minute individual interviews were scheduled at convenient times and in a private, comfortable environment within a classroom at the high school after class hours. The interviews were recorded on a voice memo of an electronic device and downloaded into NVivo software, a program which collects, organizes, and analyzes content from interview sessions. NVivo software allows the researcher to store data in one central location, and data are organized into folders, where accumulated data are also analyzed (Wiltshier, 2011). I replayed the files repeatedly and transcribed them into typed documents, with all information that could threaten confidentiality removed. I also gave participants the opportunity to examine their interview transcripts to confirm accuracy and completeness of information.

Data Analysis

At the conclusion of the interview sessions, I clearly organized the data and made adjustments necessary to begin the analysis process. Then I coded the data according to specific topics of information that were generated during the analytic process. Particular themes emerged, and I gained an essential understanding of the themes.

For data analysis, I used the interpretive model, which focused on gaining an understanding of the language and meanings of the participants (Esfandiari, Riasati, Vaezian, & Rahimi, 2018). The model allowed me to make connections during the interview process among the participants' responses. Application of the model also

involved the discovery of successes and deficiencies of the program, as well as gaining additional knowledge regarding the effectiveness and organization of the data analysis.

As the study took place, I organized the steps in chronological order. In efforts to clarify the data, the responses of the participants to the after-school program, I combined and condensed the information for patterns of meaning. I organized the data according to significant elements that connected with the issues of the study and the RQs. The data analysis process involved making determinations and providing a visual representation of main points (Creswell, 2012). The overall process involved gathering interview information, coding the data, examining the meanings, recognizing the themes, and assembling all information for the report.

Findings From the Interview Data

Five administrators, eight parents, and eight students were interviewed, and all 21 participants were involved in the program: the administrators as overseers and advisors, the parents as adults whose children were in the program, and the students who were in the program and had done poorly on English II. All participants provided their personal perspectives on the effectiveness of the program. The themes that emerged from the findings are discussed below with appropriate verbatim passages from participants.

Theme 1: Language Arts Skill Enhancement. Theme 1 indicated that enhancement was found in students' reading, writing, vocabulary and grammar skills. Students were selected for the after-school tutorial based on their low English scores and classroom performance. Teachers targeted reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar

using specific techniques based on the students' needs. The after-school sessions took place 4 days per week from September to May.

Participants indicated that students improved regarding the language arts skills addressed in the program. The theme of students showing improvement in reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar emerged as most participants provided similar responses that students' performance improved in these areas during the after-school program.

Similarities were found across the groups of participants regarding students' advanced writing skills. For example, Student 1 indicated, "My writing skills have improved as a result of participating in the program.", Parent 5 added, "My daughter is better able to write sentences and paragraphs." Parent 6 stated, "My daughter developed better skills to write coherent essays." Administrator 2 added, "I noticed students were writing more effective sentences and paragraphs."

Similarly, Student 4 stated:

My writing skills improved greatly while writing essays. I am able to write a clear paragraph with a beginning, middle, and end. I now understand the components of a correct essay. My overall grades have improved on all writing activities, and I am able to complete writing assignments quicker.

In several specific areas, participants in all three stakeholder groups held similar views regarding students' improved reading skills. The initial similarity was that most participants believed students were able to better comprehend while reading. For instance, Student 2 indicated, "I am better able to understand while reading short stories."

Similarly, Parent 6 stated, “My child can comprehend information more accurately as he reads short stories and essays.”

Another view that members of all groups held similarly was that students’ skills advanced while engaging in the reading program. For example, Administrator 3 stated, “I detected enhancement in students’ reading skills while they were reading novels and books.” Additionally, Parent 5 noted, “Advancement was found in my child’s reading comprehension skills.” Moreover, participants were similar in their opinion that students’ reading skills improved during the program. Specifically, Administrator 5 said, “I noticed students had gained the ability to read more fluently.” Likewise, Parent 2 added, “My child has improved reading text more fluently and correctly.”

Moreover, most members of different stakeholder groups had similar perceptions that students gained advanced vocabulary skills, which led to improved reading skills. Specifically, Student 7 provided information that he was able to better use context clues because he had a better understanding of vocabulary. Similarly, Parent 8 indicated that her child’s vocabulary skills had greatly improved after participating in the program.

Participants agreed that enhanced vocabulary resulted in improved reading, context clues, and communication. Student 1 explained:

My vocabulary skills are better when reading sentences, essays, and short stories. I am able to use context clues to better understand the meaning of the words and score higher on assignments and tests. I also use more advanced words while talking to my family and friends.

Likewise, Administrator 3 noted, “Students were able to better define vocabulary while reading various texts.”

As the research analysis continued, another similarity emerged among the opinions of parents. Most parents believed that students in the program gained additional knowledge of reading, in analyzing sections of a story, and in understanding contextual information. For example, Parent 7 indicated:

My child’s reading comprehension skills have enhanced regarding understanding short stories. She is able to break down sections of short stories and provide a much better explanation of events throughout the story. She is also able to make better use of context clues.

Similarly, Parent 4 stated, “My daughter is better able to interpret short stories, separate and determine the meaning of sections of the story, and recognize hints to better understand components of the story.”

Similarities were discovered across the groups regarding students’ improved grammar skills. Administrator 4 indicated, “Students’ grammar skills are better developed and they are able to properly construct sentences.” Student 6 added, “My grammar skills have enhanced as I wrote sentences and essays.”

Furthermore, Parent 2 noted:

I noticed my child’s grammar is much more advanced as he writes paragraphs and other assignments. My child is able to write more coherent short stories and essays as well. I also notice that his spelling and punctuation are much better as he writes sentences and essays.

Additional similarities were discovered between the stakeholder groups during data analysis. An administrator, two parents, and two students observed that students' writing skills improved as the program progressed place. Two administrators, two parents, and a student all stated that they noticed improvement in students' reading skills. Also, one administrator, one parents, and two students all reported that students' vocabulary skills were enhanced. Additionally, one administrator, one parent, and one student all noted progress in students' grammatical abilities.

Variations also occurred between participants' responses regarding Theme 1. All participants provided information regarding language arts skill enhancement; however, they had different perspectives. In the first variation, Parent 8 and Student 1 both noticed an improvement in the area of written communication. Parent 8 discussed her son's ability to communicate and write correctly, and Student 1 specifically discussed being able to write better essays.

Parent 8 stated:

My son's overall communication and writing skills had improved due to skills obtained during the after-school program. He communicates more clearly and is able to better explain information as needed. Additionally, he writes using the proper components while completing writing assignments.

Student 1 was more specific in his recognition of improvement:

The program helped me to write more effective essays and understand the proper parts of an essay. I am better able to write a clear beginning, middle, and end as

well as develop a main idea related to the essay. I have made great improvement writing good essays.

The second variation was based on the responses of Parent 2 and Student 8, in which Parent 2 discussed vocabulary, grammar, and communication enhancement, and Student 8 focused on vocabulary enhancement alone. Parent 2 stated: “He is building his vocabulary and he is able to speak better than he actually was at first.” Parent 2 added later in the interview, “Not only did my child’s performance increase in vocabulary but also in the area of grammar.”

Student 8 noted, “My overall vocabulary improved greatly. I am able to use a variety of words while writing sentences and short stories. I am also better able to draw conclusions while reading short texts and other reading materials.”

The third variation emerged as Administrator 4 indicated a summary of the program and individual components. In this variation, the administrator singled out one-to-one instruction and student improvements. The variation was significant because, unlike the comments of others, this administrator specified the benefits of the individual student-teacher sessions and the resulting improved student literacy skills and work on assignments as well.

I really love that the program allows students to spend abundant time working individually with the teacher to improve reading, writing, and grammar skills to better complete assignments. I have noticed great improvement regarding students’ reading, writing, grammar, and vocabulary skills. Additionally, students performed more accurately on English assignments.

Theme 2: Condensed Environment. Theme 2 revealed that the condensed environment made it easier for teachers to target specific learning. This environment enabled the teachers to adapt instruction to the needs of individual students. The learning environment consisted of a classroom with a teacher assisting eight or fewer students within a session. The students then worked personally with the teacher and asked questions as needed. During the after-school sessions, no other students or individuals were present while the after-school sessions took place, which made it easier for teachers to specifically target students' needs.

The overall pattern of responses in Theme 2 was reflected by opinions of Administrator 1, Administrator 2, Administrator 3, Parent 2, Parent 4, Parent 6, and Student 6. All indicated that the program provided a smaller learning environment that allowed the teacher to target specific learning areas with individual students. For example, Administrator 2 stated, "The condensed size of the classroom makes it more feasible for students to obtain information. They are better able to understand and connect with the instruction as the learning process takes place. The teacher can target students' specific needs."

Administrator 3 observed:

I feel that students are allowed more personalized time with the teachers and they can focus on weak areas. This process allows students to enhance in their areas of need. Also, students can ask specific questions and other information from instruction that took place prior to after-school.

Parent 2 commented, “My child was able to complete assignments in a more feasible manner with less distractions. The teachers were able to focus on the students and ensure they were provided the necessary instruction.”

Likewise, Parent 4 noted, “My child received personalized instruction that was very beneficial throughout the program and helped to increase her overall English-based knowledge. The teacher is able to break down components and provide clear examples of information.”

Parent 6 communicated:

The separation from other students was a learning advantage which allowed students to remain focused and perform more effectively. My child was not interrupted by any disciplinary issues or other obstacles. She was able to grasp the information in a personalized setting.

Student 6 stated:

The way that teachers are able to really just focus, first of all, one-on-one, on the child’s significant needs due to the condensed size of the classroom is awesome. Students who may require additional support will be provided with the personalized time as needed.

Administrators, parents, and students all indicated that the learning environment was enhanced. Administrator 2 also noted that students had a personalized experience with the instructor, which made learning more meaningful. Additionally, Parent 7 noted that her child said that the one-on-one approach made the student more comfortable, and

the child could learn better. Student 4 reported that he was able to ask individual questions and gain a better understanding of the material.

However, administrators as a group had different views from parents and students about the actions that should take place within the condensed environment. Specifically, a difference was found among the administrators, students, and parents. The administrators stated that the lessons should be more rigorous. The students pointed out that additional lessons were needed during instruction. The parents indicated that students should spend more time with the teacher.

Theme 3: Enhancement in Students' Self-Confidence. Theme 3 suggested that students' confidence increased as the program progressed. The majority of opinions was positive. Many members of the stakeholder groups recognized that, as students engaged in the after-school program, they began to gain higher levels of self-confidence. Analysis of the data indicated that students reported higher self-esteem as well as social skills.

Some administrators reported that students' self-confidence increased:

Administrator 1 emphasized. "Students had a boost of confidence, self-esteem, character, and social skills which are skills need for future educational tasks and endeavors. These skills can be used in various educational areas as well as throughout lifelong endeavors."

Administrator 5 expressed a similar opinion:

The program builds students' confidence so that they open to what is available.

This allows the students to have a more open mind to what was going on in the program and reaching a level of success. Students' confidence can lead to various improvements across grade levels.

Most parents confirmed the views held by administrators. Parent 2 observed that her child's self-confidence increased with the skills she gained in reading and writing. Parent 3 indicated, "I am very excited that my daughter has higher self-esteem and better grades in English." Parent 7 saw a marked change in her child and reported that she went from little self-confidence about the English skills "to the point where she would come home and almost teach me what she has learned. That gave me a sense that she was on top of what was going on in school." Similarly, Parent 5 noticed that her child's scores increased and stated, "My child seems much more self-assured since participating in the after-school program. She has a higher level of self-confidence and is able to perform more efficiently." Overall, the parents saw the after-school program as contributing greatly to their children's self-confidence about English skills.

Similar to the views of administrators and parents, students expressed their increased confidence and the effect of the program on their English assignments. Students 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7 elaborated on how they became more comfortable with the English-related skills. Student 1 said, "My self-esteem increased as I began to perform better on my assignments." Student 2 indicated, "I gained a better understanding of vocabulary and could better comprehend texts, and I am also better able to write clear sentences and essays with better terminology."

Students 3 and 5 both stated that the program led to their increased confidence and performance. Specifically, Student 3 noted, "I felt more confident completing my English assignments." Likewise, Student 5 observed, "My self-confidence boosted greatly as I understood the English components." Additionally, Student 6 and Student 7

both indicated that they had increased confidence and English skills. Student 6 reported, “I gained better confidence and skills during the writing process, can write a coherent essay, and I am able to write a full essay with all necessary parts including develop a good main idea.” Similarly, Student 7 acknowledged his confidence with related activities, “I continued to gain courage to read aloud and complete more English-related activities.” Thus, the students’ confidence led to their performing better on English assignments.

However, in contrast to the prevailing view of the positive effect of the program on students’ self-confidence, the majority of administrators, some parents, and some students expressed a diverging viewpoint—that the program did not increase students’ self-confidence. For example, Administrator 2 stated that the program should have led to students having more self-motivation: “Students’ confidence could have increased more during the program.” Similarly, Administrator 3 believed that the program did not impact students’ self-confidence sufficiently. “The overall program did not have a major effect on students’ self-esteem.” And Administrator 4 offered the opinion that students’ self-confidence did not increase during the program. He indicated, “Student’s self-confidence was not affected by the components of the program.”

As with these administrators, four parents who had reservations concerning the effect of the program on their children’s self-confidence. Initially, Parent 1 revealed that her child displayed a lack of confidence during the program. This parent stated, “I do believe the program was beneficial; however, it did not affect my daughter’s level of morale.” Similarly, Parent 2 admitted that the program was advantageous but,

unfortunately, her child's self-confidence did not increase. "The program provided great instructional components; however, no impact was made on my child's self-confidence."

Like the administrators and parents with the diverging view that the program did not increase the students' self-confidence, a significant minority of students, three of the eight, believed that the program did not add to their self-confidence. Student 4 stated, "My self-esteem levels were low as I struggled to complete the beginning after-school activities." Student 7 indicated, "Challenges of the after-school program decreased my self-assurance." Like Student 7, Student 8 added, "I feel that my confidence level did not increase due to the rigor of some assignments."

These differences in viewpoint relating to students' self-confidence may be surprising. However, some students may have felt they were too challenged and could not meet the adults' expectations in contrast to the improvements of other students (De La Paz & Butler, 2018; Graham et al., 2017; Smith, 2011). Additionally, some students may have had learning disabilities that the teachers did not sufficiently address (Beach et al., 2015; Kuder, 2017; Roberts et al., 2019). Still other students may have felt their learning styles were not taken into account sufficiently (Billingsley et al., 2018; Dixon et al., 2014). Others may have had low motivation (Mcgeown et al., 2015). Finally, some students may have desired more face-to-face time with the teacher and more emotional support (Botsas, 2017; Ismajli & Imami-Morina, 2018; Perry, 2015).

Theme 4: Additional Technology and Activities. Theme 4 indicated that more technological and additional activities should be included in the program. Administrators and parents suggested that tutorial and technological activities would be very beneficial.

Specifically, Administrator 3, Administrator 4, Parent 3, and Parent 5 all pointed out that more assignments and activities would increase the productivity of the program.

One administrator stated that adding more information would be beneficial for enhancing student learning. Initially, Administrator 4 suggested, “Add more collaborative and varied assignments which would provide students with more opportunities to improve regarding English-based activities. The additional assignments could consist of various strategies to meet the needs of all available learners.”

Another administrator suggested including activities that presented students with a challenge. Administrator 3 explained, “Include competitive assignments to improve students’ abilities and allow students to have different alternatives and possibly increase students’ participation. The assignments could consist of technological and engaging games that spark the students’ interest.”

Similarly, a parent discussed the possibility of adding more collaborative and varied activities to the program. Specifically, Parent 3 stated, “The overall program could include more group-based, differentiated assignments. This process would provide students with even more opportunities to improve their overall performance. Students could also work together and gain a better understanding of the lessons.”

Students also expressed opinions that the program needed additional components, and the students were specific. The suggested components included additional technology, more field trips, and supplementary activities. Two students, Students 7 and 8, emphasized the need for more electronic assignments, with use of the smartboard and technological activities to encourage creativity. Student 4 suggested more field trips.

Student 5 discussed the need for hands-on activities, and Student 7 called for more interactive activities.

Further, in Theme 4, all groups offered specific suggestions about the use of additional technology usage and activities. Administrators, parents, and students all voiced the need for a range of additional technology. An administrator noted that various technological devices could be used to increase students' learning capabilities. For example, Administrator 5 stated, "Additional technology-based interactive activities are needed. Devices could include promethean boards, clickers, chrome books, and desk top computers. These devices can provide students with various digital methods to increase their learning abilities." Parents indicated a need for smartboards, more online activities, and electronic homework activities. Students recommended smartboards to help them remain focused and interactive activities to develop their creativity.

The suggestions for technology appeared similar among the groups. However, differences emerged across the groups in their specific recommendations about technology use and activities and computer usage. Administrators indicated that more technology assignments should be available. Parents suggested additional technological homework, and students pointed out that more computers and smartboards would be beneficial.

Theme 5: Student Input. Theme 5 revealed that students should have input regarding the program assignments and activities. Several administrators and students

provided statements that students should be allowed to express their opinions and be involved in the decision-making regarding the methods of instruction and assignments within the program.

Administrators concurred that students should be able to provide opinions regarding program assignments. Two administrators indicated that students should be have the opportunity to help determine what assignments should be included in the program. Administrator 1 stated, “Students should be allowed to select assignments pertaining to their interests.” Similarly, Administrator 2 indicated, “Students need the opportunity to pick activities based on their preferences.” Administrator 4 observed, “Since the activities are solely for student improvement, students should have an opportunity to voice their opinion regarding the activities that are included within the program.” Additionally, Administrator 5 suggested that students should be asked to supply information for the program activities.

Several students agreed with the administrators and made suggestions for including student input. Student 1 recommended, “The after-school program committee should include students’ ideas since students are the essential part of the program.” Student 3 asserted, “Opinions of students should be greatly recognized to make decisions for the after-school program.” Student 4 stated, “Students should be allowed to provide their opinion pertaining to assignments in the program so they will be included in the process.” And Student 6 noted, “Students should be able to provide their perspectives regarding the components of the program.” These students were fervent and enthusiastic about the inclusion of student input. No parents contributed views on student input.

In summary, the five themes are the following as revealed by the findings of the project evaluation:

1. Enhancement was found in students' reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar skills.
2. The condensed environment made it easier for teachers to target specific learning areas.
3. Students' confidence increased as the program progressed.
4. More technological and additional activities should be included in the program.
5. Students should have input regarding the program assignments and activities.

The program evaluation was based on the utilization-focused theory, in which the evaluation should be conducted according to the purposes of specific intended users (Patton, 2008, 2011). The English II after-school program had not been evaluated, and the stakeholders needed to know if it was effective. In addition, as UFE indicates, the program evaluation would reveal strengths and weaknesses of the program (Patton, 2015).

In the UFE, based on the evaluation, the evaluator makes recommendations to continue developing the strengths, correcting the deficiencies, and possibly expanding the program in the future (Ramirez et al., 2013). Patton (Donaldson et al., 2010) explained that the evaluator's task is to work "with clearly identified primary intended users who have responsibility to apply evaluation findings and implement whatever recommendations emerge" (p. 18). Moreover, the evaluator should be aware of "the

personal factor” (Patton & Horton, 2009, p. 1). When the stakeholders are specifically and actively involved in the evaluation, they will more likely use the results and direct the recommendations to those who can implement them (Patton & Horton, 2009).

My intent in conducting the program evaluation was to analyze the participants’ responses about the effectiveness of the English II after-school program for their perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of the program. From my analysis of the responses, I then desired to deliver the findings and clear and practical recommendations that followed to the board of directors. The board members would then have the responsibility whether to implement the recommendations (Patton, 2011).

Recommendations

From the data analysis of the findings and the themes that emerged, I developed five recommendations. The themes and corresponding recommendations are displayed in Table A1. Each recommendation is also described in more detail.

Recommendation 1. For Theme 1, the students’ enhancement of their language skills, I recommended that teachers use differentiated instructional procedures. I suggested that teachers should present assignments using multiple methods to honor and apply to the needs of students. Students should be exposed to different instructional procedures that could include student dyads, small groups, self-directed exercises, creative brainstorming, and use of technology.

Table A1

Recommendations Keyed to Themes

Themes	Recommendations
1. Enhancement was found in reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar skills	Use differentiated instructional Procedures
2. The condensed environment made it easier for teachers to target specific learning areas	Tailor instruction towards students' learning needs
3. Students' confidence increased as the program took place	Use strategies to enhance students' motivational levels
4. Additional technological and additional activities should be included in the program	Include additional online Assignments
5. Students should have input regarding the program assignments and activities	Solicit students' participation in selection of group activities.

Recommendation 2. For Theme 2, the beneficial nature of the condensed environment, I recommended that teachers tailor instruction more specifically towards students' individual learning needs. The instruction should be based on the students' learning abilities, with assignments created according to students' individual diagnostic assessment data and learning styles. The instruction should provide students with a fair opportunity to reach success in the assignments.

Recommendation 3. For Theme 3, students' increased confidence as the program continued, I recommended that teachers and parents use strategies to enhance students'

motivational levels. Strategies could include consistent praise by teachers and parents of the students' progress and videos to illustrate how individuals from low socioeconomic backgrounds became successful and made important contributions. Celebrations and awards could be arranged when students reach certain academic milestones, such as good scores on the state-mandated tests. In addition, class visits could be arranged with students who graduated from the high school and became successful in college and their careers.

Recommendation 4. For Theme 4, the addition of technological and other activities to the program, I recommended that teachers include additional online assignments. The program should include more smart boards, computers, and laptops to enhance the instructional process. If needed, students could be given instruction in technology from the teachers or media librarians. Homework assignments should also be presented in an electronic format, and students should be continuously introduced to and exposed to technological components.

Recommendation 5. For Theme 5, students' input regarding the program assignments and activities, I recommended that teachers solicit students' participation in the selection of group activities. Students should have the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process of assignments and activities for the after-school program. They should be encouraged to suggest activities compatible with their interests and to actively participate in how the assignments and activities would take place. The school board, other administrators, parents, and teachers could use these recommendations as a guide to enhance future after-school programs.

Timeline

The timeline includes information on how I would gather necessary resources and materials and deliver the program evaluation report. I established a time frame to present to all stakeholders. For each major stakeholder group, a separate meeting will be held. These groups are (a) senior administrators at a school board meeting; (b) administrators and teachers at a regular local meeting; and (c) administrators, parents, students, and teachers at an open house. I will provide an invitation and location to all possible participants and have copies of the report at all presentations for the stakeholders. Table A2 shows the timetable.

Table A2

Timetable

Timeline	Tasks
The fourth week of August 2020	Gather necessary resources for the program evaluation report
The first week of September 2020	Submission of the written report to the office of the superintendent
The second week of September 2020	Establish time frame to present oral report to administrators, parents, students, and teachers
The third week of September 2020	Deliver oral report to senior administrators at a school board meeting
The fourth week of September 2020	Deliver oral report to administrators and teachers at a regular local meeting
The first week of October 2020	Deliver oral report to administrators, parents, students, and teachers at an open house

Conclusion

The formative program evaluation of the English II after-school program was created to increase 10th-grade students' English-based skills of reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar. Spaulding (2014) indicated that program evaluations take place for analyzing programs to detect their quality, reach conclusions, and make decisions for clarification and progress. Additionally, the program evaluation process leads to program participants, overseers, and other significant individuals gaining

knowledge of the capabilities of the program and methods of enhancement (Holden et al., 2015).

The program evaluation for this study was based on data I gathered with the use of the UFE tailored specifically for this program with qualitative interviews, data analysis, conclusions, and recommendations. The UFE provided the framework for the RQs, interview protocol, and analysis. I found this conceptual theory particularly appropriate to the evaluation of the after-school program in the emphasis on delivery of practical results of the program and recommendations to the intended users for implementation (Patton, 2008, 2010).

According to the UFE, the evaluation should focus on a meaningful situation or program with which the intended users are concerned, and they should be intimately involved in the evaluation (Patton, 2011). The evaluator acts as facilitator rather than distanced authority. A major aspect to ensure the thoroughness and honesty of the evaluation responses is that, as UFE recommends, of “the personal factor” (Patton & Horton, 2009, p. 1). The evaluator solicits the input of the users, listens to them, and respects their views, taking them into account in the evaluation. With these collaborative relationships, the users welcome the reported strengths and deficiencies of the program and become open to the recommendations for maintenance and improvement that follow (Patton, 2008, 2011).

In the UFE framework, the intended users are the major contributors to the evaluation; they are involved in the evaluation, and their input is valued (Patton, 2010). The participants for this evaluation were a purposive sample of the intended users who

were involved in the program—school administrators, parents, and students. A total of 21 stakeholders participated: five administrators, eight parents, and eight students who were currently enrolled in the English II after-school program. In individual, private 30-minute interviews, the participants in these three groups provided their perceptions on the effectiveness of the after-school program.

Following data analysis of the interviews, I extracted five themes: three strengths and two weaknesses. The strengths of the program included students' improvement in writing, reading, vocabulary, and grammar capabilities (Theme 1). Stakeholders recognized that the personalized, condensed learning environment of one-on-one instruction and small groups was highly beneficial to learning and meeting students' individual learning needs (Theme 2). However, parents commented that the students should spend more time with the teachers, and students also reported they needed additional time and instructional assistance. Administrators observed that the lessons should be more challenging.

Another strength that emerged was that students' self-confidence greatly increased as the program took place (Theme 3). Some students also reported greater confidence in their social skills. However, some students and administrators indicated that the program had no impact on the students' self-confidence.

The first weakness emerged as participants indicated that more technology and other activities should be added to the program (Theme 4). Administrators and parents recognized the need for students' greater familiarity with technology for later education

and careers. Students suggested the use of many technological devices. Participants also suggested other activities, such as competitive exercises, group projects, and field trips.

The second weakness was that students should have input into the assignments (Theme 5). All participants recognized the importance of student involvement in the decisions about the methods of instruction and assignments. Participants agreed that student input on assignments should be based on their interests and preferences.

From these findings, and in accordance with UFE, I developed five recommendations for improvement in both the strengths and weaknesses of the program. Recommendations based on results of the program evaluation are an essential component of UFE (Patton & Horton, 2009). The intended users expect and have a right to expect recommendations based on the data and the evaluator's findings, and the recommendations must also be practical, usable, and focused on the real-world situation or program evaluated (Patton, 2008, 2015).

Thus, my recommendations followed from the results and the themes. Although much improvement was noted in students' reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar skills, differentiated instructional procedures could be used to meet students' needs further. The condensed environment was praised by all participants; however, instruction within the condensed environment could be more tailored to each student's learning needs. Students' self-confidence increased during the program. Nevertheless, some students did not believe their confidence increased. Therefore, additional strategies should be used to increase their motivational levels.

The information and recommendations provided in this program evaluation may help promote positive social change with improvements in the future after-school program as it continues to be offered in the high school. From the recommendations, administrators will be guided to decide on the next appropriate steps. These may include allocating increased funding for more teachers and students to participate in the after-school program, for additional technological devices to be used, and for field trips.

Administrators may see that students' English skills improved and their scores on state-mandated assessments improve as well. As a result, the school report card grade (Murray & Howe, 2017) could be improved and the school could be eligible for increased state funding. Administrators may also arrange for teachers' professional development seminars and workshops with the focus on the after-school program and sponsor regular evaluations of the program for additional monitoring and improvement.

From the evaluation report and recommendations, parents may see their children's greatly enhanced command of language arts skills. In consultation with teachers, parents may then learn to help their children further in current and future homework assignments. Parents may also be motivated themselves to become more involved in school activities and encourage their children to succeed in high school and in higher education.

Students will also benefit from the evaluation report. They will recognize that their literacy skills have increased, and consequently their self-confidence. They will then more likely increase their focus on improving even more and believe more in their abilities. With implementation of the recommendation for greater technological activities, the students will have the opportunity to expand their technological expertise for the

current classroom use and their later education. Students may then gain greater proficiency in language arts, feel greater satisfaction in their mastery, understand the subject matter of other courses better, and increase their grades in all subjects.

The evaluation report will be beneficial for teachers as well to help them improve their instructional processes, especially with regard to differentiated learning and one-on-one teaching strategies. Teachers will also more easily recognize students' self-confidence in their increased skills and help them further by researching and using motivational strategies to increase students' confidence. When teachers elicit and listen to students' input regarding their preferences in assignments and other activities, the teachers will benefit as well, making the assignments more interesting for the students. In these processes, teachers and students will build greater trust and communication in the learning process.

Teachers may recognize that the after-school program has been effective and can become more effective with continued instructional strategies and implementation of the recommendations. The condensed environment and one-to-one mode of teaching may benefit the students greatly in terms of the teachers' customization to their individual learning needs. Teachers may then continue to learn about their students' specific learning styles and adapt instructional strategies to them.

In the larger setting, this formative evaluation report may be useful in helping school officials as well as community members reach logical conclusions about the effectiveness of the program and implementation of instructional strategies to increase students' success. Stakeholders will understand the instructional procedures used to help

students more effectively master reading, writing skills, vocabulary, and grammar. The results of the report could also help future English II students to attend the after-school program to enhance their language arts skills in preparation for success in later courses.

The formative evaluation of the English II after-school program was intended to affect the program positively with emphasis on the UFE conceptual framework, which emphasizes the usefulness of the findings for the stakeholders (Patton, 2011). Analysis of the interviews yielded five themes describing the program's strengths and limitations, with recommendations to improve all. The after-school program was shown to greatly enhance students' literacy skills and self-confidence, with areas of improvement suggested in increased technological and other activities and students' input on assignments.

This project has much importance to the various stakeholders in terms of their concerns and responsibilities to the students and the school. The project's conclusions and recommendations are significant to all stakeholders because of the specific suggestions for improvement of the English II after-school program to inform future decision-making and enhancement of the program. Implementation of the recommendations should strengthen the after-school program for future high school students' mastery of English II toward their greater academic accomplishment in their ongoing education and success in their later careers.

Appendix B: Program Evaluation Presentation

A Report to the Board of Directors of a Program Evaluation of a Formative Evaluation of an After-

School Program for English II Students

Slide 1 – Introduction

Program Evaluation Report
a formative evaluation of an after-
school program for English II students

Presenter: Kandice K. Jernigan

Slide 2 – Problem

Problem

- A high school was located in Atlanta, Georgia within a rural and predominantly poverty-based area. In an effort to improve student performance, an after-school program was implemented to assist students with scoring adequately in English II by targeting areas, such as vocabulary, reading comprehension, writing process, and grammar. However, a problem for the school is that the effectiveness of the after-school program had not been evaluated.

Slide 3 – Background InformationBackground
Information

- Qualitative research
- Formative program evaluation
- Population of 55 English ii students
- Rural low socio-economic status
- The study involved researching 10th grade English ii students struggling in reading, writing, grammar, and vocabulary skills
- An after-school program was evaluated to determine whether students reading, writing, grammar, and vocabulary skills improved

Slide 4 – Purpose

Purpose

- The purpose of the study was to conduct a program evaluation to assess the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of an after-school program.

Slide 5 – Research QuestionsResearch
Questions

- How does the after-school program help to enhance English II diverse students' learning with regard to challenging aspects of English?
- What are the perceptions from students, parents and administrators, regarding the contributions of the after-school program and the success of English II?
- What possible strategies could be used to increase and improve English students' overall performance?

Slide 6 – Review of LiteratureReview of
Literature

- The literature review will address distinctive aspects, which include: the conceptual framework (constructivism), English difficulties and strategies, writing strategies, after-school program, poverty, parental involvement, and differentiated instruction. The key elements of the literature review provide the essential challenges students encounter regarding vocabulary, reading, writing and grammar.

Slide 7 – Conceptual Framework

Conceptual Framework

- The conceptual framework for this study was the utilization focused evaluation theory, a diligent method of collecting data for the intended user in effort to enhance evaluation services .

Slide 8 - Qualitative Research Design and Approach

Qualitative Research Design and Approach

- Conducted a program evaluation and a qualitative analysis was the research design used to collect data.

Slide 9 – Participants

Participants

- A total of 5 administrators, 8 parents, and 8 students participated in interviews to help explore the underlying phenomenon of the after-school program.

Slide 10 – Data Collection

Data collection

- The interviews were scheduled at convenient agreeable times and in a private, comfortable environment within a classroom at the high school after-school. The interviews were recorded on a voice memo of an electronic device and downloaded into NVivo software

Slide 11 – Data Analysis

Data analysis

- Data were clearly organized, and adjustments were made to begin the analysis process. The data was coded according to specific topics of information that generated during the process. Particular themes emerged, and an essential understanding of the themes was gained.

Slide 12 – Findings

Findings

- The findings of the evaluation of the after-school program included enhancement in literacy skills, more activities should be included, students should have input regarding assignments, the condensed environment allowed teachers to target specific skills, and students' confidence increased. The school board and community were provided with a report with findings and recommendations from the program evaluation.

Slide 13 - Recommendations

Recommendations

- Include additional online assignments
- Differentiated instructional programs
- Tailor instruction towards student's learning
- Solicit students' participation in selecting group activities

Slide 14– Timeline

Table 4

Timetable

Timeline	Tasks
The fourth week of August 2019	Gather necessary resources for the program evaluation report
The first week of September 2019	Submission of the written report to the office of the superintendent.
The second week of September 2019	Establish time frame to present oral report to parents, students, teachers, and administrators.
The third week of September 2019	Deliver oral report to senior administrators at a board meeting
The fourth week of September 2019	Deliver oral report to teachers and administrators at a regular local meeting
The first week of October 2019	Deliver oral report to parents, students, teachers, and administrators at an open house
The second week of October 2019	Collect, analyze, and share results of assessment

Appendix C: Interview Questions

Parent Interview Questions

1. What is your perception of the after-school program based on increasing your child's vocabulary, grammar, reading, and writing skills?
2. Based on your knowledge of the after-school program, have you noticed any enhancement in your child's performance? If so, what have you noticed?
3. What particular factors contribute to increasing your child's language-based skills in the after-school program?
4. What do you believe is the most significant factor in the after-school program that may promote increasing your child's vocabulary, grammar, reading, and writing skills?
5. What improvement or changes could be made to the after-school program?

Student Interview Questions

1. What are your feelings about the after-school program in regard to increasing your vocabulary, grammar, reading, and writing skills?
2. What type of activities/discussions help to increase your learning during the after-school program?
3. Share with me what you have learned during the after-school program.
4. What improvement or changes could be made to the after-school program?

Administrator Interview Questions

1. What is your perception of the after-school program based on impacting students' vocabulary, grammar, reading, and writing skills?
2. Based on your knowledge of the after-school program, have you noticed any enhancement in students' performance? If so, what have you noticed?
3. What should be done to address issues with reading, writing, grammar, and vocabulary?
4. What improvement or changes could be made to the after-school program?