

21st CCLC External Evaluation Guided Reflection Documentation

The 21st CCLC grantee's program administrator and certified external evaluator must complete this reflection tool as the official documentation of the 21st CCLC External Evaluation. The program administrator and local evaluator should meet twice to reflect on 1) the local context and 2) the data reports in relation to the Cohort 8 Goals and Objectives of the grant. Additional staff may be involved at the discretion of the program administrator and with the agreement of the external evaluator.

Instructions

The certified external evaluator should complete all sections of this report using the framework and charts provided (keep the document in the landscape position). There are eight sections of the Guided Reflection Documentation.

Part A: Additional Data Collection by the External Evaluator

1. Grantee/Evaluator Information
2. Program Overview
3. Local Context
4. Review of Progress on Previously Selected Objectives

Part B: Data Charts

5. Review of Data Reports

Part C: Narrative Responses

6. Status of Current Year's Objectives
7. Longitudinal Progress
8. 21st Century Community Learning Center Evaluation Summary (submitted in separate document template)

Sections 1-4 should be completed following the first face-to-face meeting (prior to 6/30/17) based on the external evaluators notes from the first meeting.

Sections 5-8 should be completed by the external evaluator once they have received the data (8/15/17) and before the second face-to-face meeting with the program director. Note: There are selected questions that should be completed following the second meeting, but for the most part, the Guided Reflection Documentation and Evaluation Summary should be completed prior to the second face-to-face meeting so that the program director can review the information prior to the meeting. This will allow the external evaluator and program director to focus on

responding to the specific questions identified for the second meeting and provide the program director an opportunity to clarify previously provided information and provide additional context/clarification as needed.

The Review of Data Reports chart should be completed as it is presented. The cells in the Review of Data Reports chart should expand as information is entered. Please do not adjust or delete unused chart columns.

The Guided Reflection Documentation and Evaluation Summary are due to DESE on 10/15/17. The external evaluator should submit the documentation to the grantee prior to 10/15/17. The grantee will then turn in the Guided Reflection Documentation to their DESE Supervisor.

Part A: Additional Data Collection by the External Evaluator

Grantee/Evaluator Information

21st CCLC Grantee: LINC - Hickman

Cohort #: 8

Year in the grant: 3

External Evaluator: Vicki Stein

Date of Local Context Meeting: June 8, 2017

Attendees at Local Context Meeting: Andrew Weisberg, Jason Ervin, Danisha Clarkson, Bryan Geddes

Sites Visited by External Evaluator: Johnson Elementary, Santa Fe Elementary, Smith Hale Middle School

Date of Status of Goals and Objectives Meeting: September 22, 2017

Attendees at Status of Goals and Objectives Meeting: Andrew Weisberg, Jason Ervin, Deanna Snider, Bryan Geddes

Program Overview

Name(s) of sites: Johnson Elementary, Santa Fe Elementary, Smith Hale Middle School

Please provide a 2-3 paragraph description of the program that includes at minimum the grades/ages served (Elementary, Middle, High School), how often the youth at each site meet, the types of activities provided, and approximate attendance and enrollments

Johnson and Santa Fe Elementary programs operate 6:30-7:30 AM Monday-Friday. Afternoon programs are 2:40-6:00 PM Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday. On Wednesday, district wide early release, they are open 1:40-6:00 PM. Smith Hale Middle School is only open afterschool 3:30-6:30 PM Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday. On Wednesday, they are open 2:30-6:30.

The elementary programs serve children first through sixth grade. The middle school has seventh and eighth grades. Elementary programs serve breakfast and dinner, while the middle school provides dinner.

Enrollment at Johnson was 164 with average attendance of 38 before school and 110 after school.

Santa FE enrolled 210 and had an average of 50 in the morning with 150 afternoons.

Smith Hale had 150 enrolled with average attendance of 80.

Elementary programs included basketball, Boy's Mentoring, Girl's Mentoring, Health and Nutrition, 4H Gardening, 4H Filmmaking, 4H WeDo, Photography, Robotics, Boy Scouts, Drill Team, Zoo Club, Violence Prevention, Spanish, Aerobics, Sewing Club, Chess Club, Computer Programming and Cooking Club.

Middle School program offerings included Chess, Drum Line, Dance, Sewing, Crafts, Sports, Robotics, Cooking, Photography, Art, Cooking and Dance.

Local Context

The Local Context section of the Guided Reflection document should be completed by the external evaluator following a face-to-face discussion that takes place before June 30th. All four items should be completed for each question. Please do not change the format used below.

- 1) Describe the issues (youth, staff, school, community) that have a positive or negative impact on the program's ability to successfully increase student achievement and sense of competence in the areas of reading/communication arts, mathematics, and science.

Youth:

One very positive factor is that there is an afterschool program that supports academics and that it is done in a fun way. Youth are interested in what the program brings in the STEM components of the activities. Staff have found that the more youth get into STEM, the more they like it. When they see others enjoying activities, they want to get involved.

One challenge is when some students are behind their classmates' grade level. Planned activity time may not be enough to help them understand, complete the activity, and learn the concept presented. Another major challenge for all age groups is the reading component. So many youth are not reading at grade level.

Parent schedules and plans can interfere with youth participation and learning during the program. Often parents pick up their child in the middle of an activity. They are on their way home and don't want to come back or there are other obligations at home. For the middle school program, staff deal with the stereotypical middle school concept that if you like science or math you are not cool.

Staff:

As much as possible, staff are given the opportunity to select activities and plan to their strengths. They can then improve their own knowledge in that area as they prepare their lesson plans. Staff enjoy the training opportunities and learning new information.

One challenge is a lack of staff and a lack of competent staff. Often their knowledge of math and science is sparse. Their creativity in planning is limited due to that lack of knowledge. Because of staff turnover, some don't know the 21 CCLC goals or what outcomes are expected to meet guidelines.

School:

As the programs have been in the schools several years, in some cases building staff have become more supportive of learning activities provided after school.

Smith Hale and Santa Fe are provided all the space in the building they need. Johnson has limited access and none for the computer lab. All programs feel there could be more communication to put together and plan a program with more connections to the school day. There is usually good communication on general topics, but principals are not always good at making connections for program staff with teachers. Some teachers do make the effort to reach out to program staff to help children struggling in their classrooms, but not all. Smith Hale felt they could be supportive of academics if they knew what they are teaching. The principal does share his goals, but they don't get specifics from classroom teachers.

Community:

At Santa Fe parents, generally support afterschool programs better than school events. By seeing families every day, the program staff is able to build those relationships.

All felt the Hickman Mills area is still working on getting more support in science and technology. Cerner has recently moved into the area, but that relationship has not yet been established with afterschool programs. They agreed they didn't feel a sense of community in most areas. Often businesses don't trust the clientele being served. Parents are only concerned about their own child, not all children in

the program or school. There is some church involvement and desire to volunteer, but they struggle with community involvement just as the programs do.

- 2) Describe the issues (youth, staff, school, community) that have a positive or negative impact on the program's ability to develop and maintain a quality program that includes a safe and supportive environment, positive interactions, and meaningful opportunities for engagement (this could include, but is not limited to staffing, continuous improvement, engaging instruction, family communication, and school alignment).

Youth:

During program times, youth are provided the opportunity to do new things and learn to make decisions, to decide what they want to learn. One strong positive is that the program is something consistent and regular in the lives of youth. Staff talk to their parents every day.

Johnson's site coordinator has good communication with the principal as to what goes on during the program.

Because of the lack of communication with the school day staff, behaviors can become a challenge as afterschool staff are left to try to diagnose the issues with a child.

It can be hard to keep youth involved in activities. Staff hear comments that everything they want to do is boring. It can be hard to find something youth want to do besides be on technology. Many feel technology has created a group of young people who don't know how to communicate face to face. Middle school students often have trouble working together. Character education has become a big issue. Some youth simply state they don't like people.

Staff:

Site coordinators report the same issues related to technology with some young staff members as with program participants. Not all understand what it means to actually work – to be on time, to dress professionally, to interact face to face and make eye contact. Some understand and some don't that they are role models for the youth. Youth see staff five days a week, sometimes more hours a week than school staff. They must understand this is a real job and they need to treat it as a real job.

Staff do have opportunities for training on how to do STEM activities. Coordinators felt if they are lucky to have a good team, they buy in to program goals and program activities. They are able to make their own connections with parents and school staff.

Some staff have reading challenges just like youth in the program.

School:

Smith Hale and Santa Fe report they get to use any room they need at any time which makes providing quality programs much easier. Johnson works with what they are allowed to use. All agreed program staff needs to build relationships with building staff in order to get their trust and then the use of shared space.

Community:

There is general consensus there is not enough community trust and support in their area.

- 3) Describe the issues (youth, staff, school, community) that have a positive or negative impact on the program's ability to enhance youth's college and career readiness skills and behaviors, including positive school behaviors, (attendance, program attendance, out of school suspensions), personal and social skills (communications, team work, accountability), and commitment to learning (initiative, study skills, homework completion).

Youth:

Johnson created Junior Jobs where youth had to apply and had the same instructions as regular employees. It was treated as an actual job. They were required to use professional language as they worked their job. Staff heard the youth using the same language with other youth in the program even when not "on duty." The experience helped them understand jobs they never thought about.

Often parents don't understand the importance of keeping youth in an organized program when they leave elementary school. Just comparing enrollment numbers at the of the elementary programs and the single district middle school shows the large percentage of youth not continuing in the program. Most are home alone. Staff feel they need to train the elementary youth to be responsible for when they are not going to be involved in a program.

The reason most middle school youth are in the program is because parents don't trust them alone or because their friends are in the program. Staff try to explain to youth about the program. What the expectations are, how that is going to help them in the future. There is a constant need to help them make the right choices to reinforce their future options depending on choices they make.

The programs prepare them for college and career readiness by the types of the activities in which they can be involved. Some are so involved in middle school programming, they want to come back to program if they have a dentist appointment during the school day. With a legitimate excuse, this is allowed even though the normal rule is that you must be in school to attend the program that day.

Staff:

At Smith Hale, they teach college and career readiness through the Character Counts, Modeling Manhood and Young Ladies Union programs. Youth learn how to fill out a resume, tie a tie and communicate with people you may not like.

These activities sometimes require asking some staff to do things new to them. Coordinators have to help staff understand what a job and career really involves, how to be professional, how to do a job. This job.

School:

The schools aren't sharing what they are doing to help youth in college and career readiness. Programs try to help youth understand that grades are important – regardless of your athletic ability.

There is a general feeling that the focus is on testing not necessarily on college and career readiness. Some school staff don't do enough to let youth know what is required to be a teacher or any other profession. Most teachers don't live in the neighborhood so don't connect with families who do.

Community:

Coordinators are frustrated that they can't even give youth a positive life lesson in community businesses. Several business workers have demonstrated very unprofessional behavior. Business owners usually don't live in the community so don't get involved.

Review of Progress on Previously Selected Objectives

- 1) How has the program used the previous years' External Evaluation to improve and refine the afterschool program? What specific areas (use objective numbers 1.1-3.5) did the program work on this year based on last year's data. How did the program try to make changes in that area? Please give specific examples.

Johnson –

1.6 – The goal was to have staff do more planning with students. However, there were challenges because staff might do well in executing plans, but they didn't understand the child development component and working with youth.

2.4 – Communication was not consistent with the principal. After attempts at holding regular meetings, both agreed regular email worked better due to busy schedules. Staff was encouraged to start building relationships with school staff on their own.

Santa Fe –

1.3 and 1.6 – The program needed to provide more STEM activities. They were able to get a coding class for students. They wanted to work on LEGO engineering, but there was no funding.

2.3 and 3.4 – The program needed to have more student led activities. They tried to get fifth and sixth graders added to Character Counts, math, art, etc. to be able get them involved in leadership roles. However, some students don't get to finish activities as parents pick them up early.

Smith Hale –

2.3 – The goal was to relate more to academic enrichment. The staff was given training on making connections and making lesson plans. They were given an extra thirty minutes a day to plan. The hardest component was to build reflection time into the activities. The challenge was that some students don't get to finish because parents pick them up early.

Part B: Data Charts

The following sections are to be completed by the external evaluator after receiving the data reports (8/15/17), but before meeting with the program director for the second face-to-face discussion. Please do not change the format of the charts.

Review of Data Reports

- 1) Using the data provided in the External Evaluator Site Summary Reports, mark the status of the sites for this year's data (Met or Not Met), list any sites that did not meet the objective, and list the relevant data for each site.

Objective	Status: Met or Not Met (at all sites)	If Not Met, which site(s)	Data (for all sites) or missing data comments
1.1 – Reading Grades	Met		J – 84.1% SF – 74.2% SH – 64.3%
1.2 – Math Grades	Met		J – 67.7% SF – 52.9% SH – 75%
1.3 – Science Grades	Met		J – 76.7% SF – 76.7% SH – 50.9%
1.4 – Reading Efficacy	Not Met	Smith Hale	J – 71.3% SF – 57.6% SH – 44.6%
1.5 – Math Efficacy	Not Met	Smith Hale	J – 86.1% SF – 76.7%

			SH – 44.6%
1.6 – Science Efficacy	Not Met	Santa Fe Smith Hale	J – 70.7% SF – 66.7% SH – 36.8%
2.1 – PQA	Met		J – 3.72 SF – 4.29 SH – 3.16
2.2 – Organizational Context	Met		J – 4.24, 4.10 SF – 3.78, 4.15 SH – 4.18, 3.87
2.3 – Instructional Context	Met		J – 4.16, 4.20 SF – 4.13, 3.99 SH – 3.43, 3.75
2.4 – External Relationships	Met		J – 3.56, 2.52 SF – 3.49, 2.91 SH – 4.02, 3.99
3.1 – School Day Attendance	FY17 - Not Applicable		
3.2 – Program Attendance	Met		J – 66.0% SF – 84.1% SH – 61.2%
3.3 – Behavior	FY17 - Not Applicable		
3.4 – Personal and Social Skills	Not Met	Smith Hale	J – 78.9% SF – 82.8% SH – 60.3%
3.5 – Commitment to Learning	Not Met	Smith Hale	J – 80.9% SF – 85.9% SH – 55.2%

2) Using the previous evaluation(s) and this year’s data, fill out the longitudinal chart. Mark items that were “Met” or “Not Met” (with M or N). List the sites that did not meet the objective with their data.

Objective	Year 1 – M/N	Sites Not Met	Year 2 – M/N	Sites Not Met	Year 3 – M/N	Sites Not Met	Year 4 – M/N	Sites Not Met	Year 5 – M/N	Sites Not Met	Comments
1.1 – Reading Grades	Met		Met		Met						
1.2 – Math Grades	Met		Not Met	Smith Hale	Met						
1.3 – Science Grades	Met		Met		Met						

1.4 – Reading Efficacy	Not Met	Johnson Santa Fe Smith Hale	Not Met	Smith Hale	Not Met	Smith Hale					
1.5 – Math Efficacy	Not Met	Smith Hale	Not Met	Smith Hale	Not Met	Smith Hale					
1.6 – Science Efficacy	Not Met	Smith Hale	Met		Not Met	Santa Fe Smith Hale					
2.1 – PQA	Not Met	Smith Hale	Met		Met						
2.2 – Organizational Context	Met		Met		Met						
2.3 – Instructional Context	Met		Met		Met						
2.4 – External Relationships	Not Met	Johnson	Not Met	Santa Fe Smith Hale	Met						
3.1 – School Day Attendance	FY15 - Not Applicable		FY16 - Not Applicable		FY17 - Not Applicable						
3.2 – Program Attendance	Met		Met		Met						
3.3 – Behavior	FY15 - Not Applicable		FY16 - Not Applicable		FY17 - Not Applicable						
3.4 – Personal and Social Skills	Not Met	Smith Hale	Met		Not Met	Smith Hale					
3.5 – Commitment to Learning	Not Met	Smith Hale	Not Met	Smith Hale	Not Met	Smith Hale					

Part C: Narrative Responses

The following sections are to be completed by the external evaluator based on the data above prior to meeting with the program director for the second face-to-face discussion.

Status of Current Year's Objectives

For each item below, the external evaluator should complete the first set of questions prior to the face-to-face meeting with the program director. The second set of questions can encourage discussion between the external evaluator and the program director. The external evaluator should complete those questions following the meeting.

- 1) Goal 1 – Grades (1.1-1.3) and Self-efficacy (1.4-1.6) – For each subject area (Reading, Math, and Science), what trends can be seen across all sites? In which subjects are youth succeeding? In which subjects do they need more assistance? How does the self-efficacy survey data fit/not fit with the grades data? Are there particular sites that do better/worse than others?

Reading

All three sites met the goal for 1.1, but Smith Hale was below the goal on 1.4. Efficacy for all sites was 10-20% below their grades. Johnson had 10-20% percent more youth than other two sites reaching the goal for reading.

Math

Smith Hale had the highest percentage youth meeting the grades goal of the three sites, but did not meet the efficacy goal. They were 30% lower than their grades percentage. The two elementary sites met both goals, but efficacy was 10-20% higher than grades percentages. Math had the highest efficacy for all sites of the three goal areas.

Science

All sites met the goal for 1.3, however Smith Hale was 50.9%. Only Johnson met the efficacy goal. Efficacy for all sites was 6%-15% below their grades percentages.

How does the local context fit this data? Why might some sites do better or worse than other sites in a particular subject? Why is the program succeeding or struggling in a particular subject area? (Answer based on the discussion at the second meeting.)

At Santa Fe, programming was not based on solely academic topics. They had the 4H science programs, but only some got to attend. Even the school didn't seem to emphasize science in all grades.

Smith Hale met the goal for all three subject's grades, but none in efficacy. You do well in the classes, but don't see the potential in their future so aren't interested.

Johnson did a big push on reading. Youth were involved in all activities and appeared to enjoy all.

- 2) Goal 2 – PQA (2.1) – What trends can be seen across all sites? What are the strengths of the program? What may need to be improved across all sites at the program? What concerns/areas for improvement can be seen for only certain sites?

Safe Environment and Supportive Environment are highest for all three sites. Engagement was lowest for Santa Fe. Interaction was lowest for Johnson and Stem Building Skills lowest for Smith Hale. All sites could work to improve Engagement, specifically Reflection and Planning.

How does the local context fit this data? Why might some sites do better or worse than other sites in a particular domain or scale? Why is the program succeeding or struggling in a particular domains or scales? (Answer based on the discussion at the second meeting.)

Santa Fe students weren't given the opportunity for planning as the program had to be in place before they arrived. STEM activities were done by 4H, but these are mostly geared to elementary students. Smith Hale youth often leave in the afternoon before the activity gets to the reflections and connections portions of the lesson. At Johnson, youth have jobs in the program to help build leadership skills.

- 3) Goal 2 – Leading Indicators – 2.2 Organizational Context (Staffing Model and Continuous Improvement) – What can be said about the Organizational Context based on the local context interview and survey data above? Are there site-specific issues in these areas? Are there management trends that surface?

All sites met both goals. Continuous Improvement was lowest of the two areas for Johnson and Smith Hale. Training on Weikart Planning with Data and Youth Work Methods were two of the lowest scores for all three sites.

In Staffing Model, all three sites were lowest in Staff come to the program with adequate training or experience. This indicates a need for more pre-training for staff at all sites.

Why is the program succeeding or struggling with staffing and continuous improvement? (Answer based on the discussion at the second meeting.)

Santa Fe has common goals with the school to support the students which led to this success.

Orientation training is still a challenge for all levels of the program.

4H was not as hands on in training staff. They only did lesson plans at the beginning of the year and with staff turnover, many never received the training.

- 4) Goal 2 – Leading Indicators – 2.3 Instructional Context (Academic Press and Engaging Instruction) – What can be said about the Instructional Context based on the local context interview and survey data above? Are there site-specific trends in these areas? Do the youth and staff seem in agreement about the Instructional Context?

The goal was met by all sites. Both elementary sites were above 4.13 on Academic Press with the middle school program at 3.43. Engaging instruction was strongest at Johnson (4.20). Johnson was slightly lower at 3.99 and Smith Hale at 3.75. Local context indicated all could benefit from more communication with classroom teachers in order to better support academics.

Growth and Mastery Skills were above the state average for all three programs. Instructional Quality were lowest for Johnson and Smith Hale. Santa Fe's lowest area was Youth Engagement and Belonging. Staff scores were slightly higher for the two elementary programs while the youth scores were slightly higher at the middle school. Additional training for staff how to best meet these goals would be beneficial.

Why is the program succeeding or struggling with academic press and engaging instruction? (Answer based on the discussion at the second meeting.)

At Santa Fe youth buy-in is growing. Students were learning about the new type of program and learning to enjoy the changes. Johnson wants to work on planning with the youth.

At Smith Hale, homework teachers want to pull youth from the program to help them with grades so youth don't consider those LINC times. The program started a tutoring session for math/algebra. Staff usually does lesson planning and works on lessons that have objectives. The program has great communication with school staff.

- 5) Goal 2 – Leading Indicators – 2.4 External Relationships (Family Communication and School Alignment) – What trends are seen in the External Relationships section based on the local context interview and survey data above? Consider the additional family and school district administrator data in the Results of the Afterschool Surveys Report to help convey the status of the External Relationships.

All programs were above the state average in Family Communication. All three had lower scores (but still above 3.0) for recruiting family members to participate in the program. This would be a good area for program improvement and to build relationships with families.

School Alignment is a challenge for both elementary programs as both scored below 3.0 due to lack of data being shared by the schools. However, both school administrator/principal surveys scored 3.0 and 4.0 on this item. Smith Hale was above the state average. During discussion for local context the elementary programs shared classroom teachers shared some information, but not all.

Why is the program succeeding or struggling with family communication and school alignment? (Answer based on the discussion at the second meeting.)

The programs have generally good communication with school staff.

Full time coordinators are present in the programs morning and afternoon to talk with parents and keep them informed about what is going on in the program.

Smith Hale had a strong site council that met each month and worked with the PTA.

- 6) Goal 3 – Program Attendance (3.2) – What are the program attendance trends across all sites? Are there particular sites that are doing well/struggling with program attendance? How does this fit with the local context? *(Note: Data is only provided for 3.2 – Program Attendance. You do not need to comment on the school day attendance and school day suspensions.)*

All three programs meet the goal scoring above 61%. Smith Hale Middle School was the lowest. Local context indicated middle school students sometimes are allowed to return to the program after leaving for medical appointments, etc.

What factors affect the program's attendance rates? Why might some sites do better or worse than other sites? Why is the program succeeding or struggling with the program attendance objective? (Answer based on the discussion at the second meeting.)

Families and youth appreciate the quality programs.

Johnson reports families pick up youth early so they don't really get to participate in many of the activities.

Smith Hale has learned attendance is higher on days when there are specific programs youth want to attend.

- 7) Goal 3 – Personal and Social Skills (3.4) – Across all sites, what are the trends on the youth surveys? Which areas might warrant more focus? Are there individual site differences? How does the local context fit this data?

Both elementary programs met the goal, however the middle school did not (60.3%). Local context indicated parents tended to have middle school students in the program because they could not trust them at home alone although some attend because friends are there. Some of the lower youth survey scores were on I like to work with others to solve problems and I work well with other kids.

Why is the program succeeding or struggling with the personal and social skills youth outcomes? (Answer based on the discussion at the second meeting.)

The programs at Santa Fe are designed to give youth the opportunity to build their social skills.

Johnson uses Character Counts and other social groups to help build those personal and social skills.

Smith Hale has classes that support social development and career options. The cover topics such as how to set goals and then how to complete those goals. That probably explains the higher scores in that area. The youth also do well working with others and respecting one another.

- 8) Goal 3 – Commitment to Learning (3.5) – Across all sites, what are the trends on the youth surveys? Which areas might warrant more focus? Are there individual site differences? How does the local context fit this data?

Both elementary programs scored over 80%, but the middle school was only 55.2%. The site average for completing homework while in the program was only 2.04. Local context indicated youth felt activities were boring as they wanted to be on their electronic devices.

Why is the program succeeding or struggling with the commitment to learning youth outcomes? (Answer based on the discussion at the second meeting.)

Santa Fe provides Character Counts and enrichment activities in addition to homework time and grade level work sheets.

Youth at Johnson don't want to do homework during program, but parents want them to do it in the program. A good connection with teachers helped staff support academics during the program.

Smith Hale gives youth the opportunity to do homework, but it is not mandatory. They can get tutoring if they wish. The program assists with getting youth to tutoring when it is offered by the school. A variety of programs are offered to youth and staff attempts to meet their interests. Youth have a choice of activities for selection. A survey is conducted at the first of the year to see what kinds of things they would like to do.

- 9) Additional Family, Staff, School Administrator, and Community Partner data – Does this data support the other data already reviewed? Are there specific concerns (at one site or across all sites) that the program should consider (e.g., families connected, staff supported, school administrators and community partners informed)?

All three Hickman Mills programs' survey data indicates strong family, staff, and school administrator support. Only Santa Fe had any community partner data which averaged 3.6. Both Johnson and Smith Hale are in fairly residential areas with little business near the schools. Surveys show there are good connections between the programs and families. While not all programs had use of the entire school building, they did have good relationships with the school staff. Regular communication with all partners is always a challenge for programs.

Longitudinal Progress

For each item below, the external evaluator should complete the first set of questions prior to the face-to-face meeting with the program director. The second set should be completed following the meeting with the program director.

1. What trends are noted across time related to the specific objectives (1.1-3.5)?

1.4-1.6 - Smith Hale has had the most challenges over time in all three efficacy areas.

Santa Fe has had efficacy low scores, but not over successive years.

2.4 - Over time all three programs have at one time struggled with External Relationships, but only one year each.

3.4 - Smith Hale did not meet the goal for the first and current year.

3.5 – Smith Hale did not meet the goal all three years.

If not previously discussed in the Status of Current Year's Objectives above, please discuss the local context or reasons why a particular objective may be not met for multiple years. (Answer based on the discussion at the second meeting.)

Santa Fe is trying to implement a new program and getting buy in for what they doing. There has been no consistency over several years Johnson's community support is getting better. Relationships with school staff are good.

Middle school youth say they don't like academics, but they do well in the subjects. There are not many businesses in the area that would help them see the value of the subjects. And the community is fairly closed. Families don't go out into the greater Kansas City area on a regular basis.

2. For the specific objective(s) that the program identified to work on during the past year (discussed in Review of Progress on Previously Selected Objectives in Part A above), what progress can be seen in the available data?

Johnson wanted to do more planning with students. The PQA average score of 3 for school-age planning indicates they are making progress in this area. They also wanted to improve communication with both the principal and teachers. Their score of 2.52 on school alignment indicates there is still work to be done in this area.

Santa Fe's goal was to add more STEM activities to help with science grades and efficacy. However, scores this year are below last year. 1.3- 81.8%/76.7% and 1.6- 73.8%/66.7%. Another goal was to have more student led activities. Data for this year shows Engaging instruction went from 4.27 last year to 3.99 this year while 3.4 was 87.1% last year and 82.8\$ this year. Still more work to be done in this area.

Smith Hale's goal was to make more relationships between program activities and academics being taught. Current scores for both areas of 2.3 indicate some drop from last year. 3.61/3.42 and 4.12/3.41. These are not significant drops, but more work must be done.

What factors contributed to or detracted from the progress? How does this fit with the local context? (Answer based on the discussion at the second meeting.)

Santa Fe's challenge is consistency. There are staffing issues for STEM and line staff don't have the knowledge or background to implement the activities.

Johnson did have more student involvement. However, they did not a great of support from the principal during the year.

Smith Hale's emphasis was on progress in academics and supporting the school day. There has been high turnover in administration and school staff in the last few years. There has been a lack of communication. The district also closed the building at the end of the school year. The program's focus has been on providing a safe environment for youth not on academics.

3. For the next year, which objective(s) might the program select for improvement? (Note: Action plans will be developed with the Afterschool Regional Educator.)

2.4 - Build relationships with regular communication with families, school administrators and community members. This can also help with families see the value in having middle school youth involved in the afterschool program.

Work with the schools for better connections on academic activities at all ages.

And early and continued training for all staff in the programs on how to achieve these goals.

The external evaluator should prepare an evaluation summary using the template provided. The 2-page document should summarize the information in the Guided Reflection Documentation about each of the three afterschool goals. The evaluation summary should be submitted in the template provided so that there is consistent presentation of the 21st CCLC funding and evaluation expectations.

Although the summary should be brief (expected to be 2 pages and not more than 3), this document represents the culmination of the evaluation and relies on the ability of the external evaluator to succinctly capture the status of the afterschool program.