

## **21<sup>st</sup> CCLC External Evaluation Guided Reflection Documentation**

The 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grantee's program administrator and certified external evaluator must complete this reflection tool as the official documentation of the 21<sup>st</sup> 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. 21<sup>st</sup> 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**

21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Grantee: LINC – Hickman Mills

Cohort #: 9

Year in the grant: 1

External Evaluator: Vicki Stein

Date of Local Context Meeting: June 9, 2017

Attendees at Local Context Meeting: Andrew Weisberg, Carl Wade, Joyce Kynard, Eric Hollins

Sites Visited by External Evaluator: Dobbs Elementary, Symington Elementary, Truman Elementary

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

Attendees at Status of Goals and Objectives Meeting: Andrew Weisberg, DeWayne Bright, Joyce Kynard, Jene Counts, Sara Duzzell

### **Program Overview**

Name(s) of sites: Dobbs Elementary, Symington Elementary, Truman Elementary

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

Dobbs and Symington provide programming Monday-Friday 6:30-7:45 AM. Truman's hours are 6:30-7:30 AM Monday-Friday. Afternoon hours for all three 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. All programs serve breakfast and dinner every day the program is open. These elementary programs enroll first-sixth grade.

Enrollment at Dobbs is 220 with average attendance in the morning 35-40, afternoon average attendance is 175. Truman had 163 enrolled. Morning attendance averaged 35 and afternoon was 122. Symington's enrollment was approximately 200 with morning attendance of 25 and afternoon average of 80.

Activities provided include chess, Zoo After School, Fitness, Good News Club, Crunch Don't Munch, Fitness 4 Ever, Sewing, Mad Science, Violence Prevention, 4H Robotics, Spanish and Youth Aerobics.

## 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 30<sup>th</sup>. 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:

Youth were introduced to Reading Rocket which got them involved in some positive activities related to reading.

Programs had a few mentors who came in to work with children after school.

When staff was able to share career opportunities related to STEM activities, it made youth aware of possible future options.

Staff had to deal with lots of behavior issues while trying to do STEM activities. This had a negative effect when dealing with vendors providing the STEM activity. Staff often didn't have the opportunity to focus on positive aspects of activities due to challenging behaviors. Sometimes staff expect youth to have a certain base of knowledge to participate, but many have not mastered that level. It was a challenge trying to get them to do structured homework activities. Youth felt they had done that during the school day.

### Staff:

Staff was able to go to some of the 4H training classes. They embraced the ideas and came back to teach those things as soon as they could. However, due to high turnover of staff, not everyone benefitted from that training.

Staff did get better near the end of the year at submitting lesson plans. But, it was hard to always follow the lesson plans and complete activities as planned.

School:

Symington is trying to work with teachers to get homework assignments to try to help youth. This is a goal for next year as well. Programs found they were more successful with the kindergarten-third grade than with fourth-sixth grade.

Teachers knew they could come to LINC if they needed to tutor a student even on non-tutoring day. Schools had a tutoring pull out program during the time prior to MAPs testing.

The principal at Dobbs was very supportive in all areas of the programing. Truman felt they knew the program and staff were there and the school staff could count on them to assist as needed. The relationships the program built with families was stronger than those teachers built since staff saw those families every day.

All felt there was still not enough communication between the school day staff and afterschool staff. The school doesn't fully understand the value LINC can bring.

Community:

There was no community involvement at Symington at this time. Dobbs had several churches that supported the program and students through the Back Snack program and by providing mentors for some students. They worked with the community and the school for Bingo for Books event.

- 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:

Symington tried to offer youth choices throughout the program. They had a junior staff program and allowed them to choose activities. They got their feedback as the program was revamped with the new site coordinator at midyear.

Dobbs tried not to have things so top down. However, it was difficult to organize when not everyone in a group went to the same activities. They will be working to improve that aspect next school year.

Parents were very supportive of youth and that ties into homework completion. Program staff made sure youth did work that was assigned. When youth reported they had no homework, staff checked with the teacher.

Staff:

High staff turnover is a problem for most programs. However, when some staff have stayed for three or four years, they provide a good foundation for the program. Youth felt safe and supported with that familiar staff. Families also had strong connections to these long-time staff members. One very popular lady at Dobbs was appreciated by parents because she recognized cars when families arrived and called for their child/ren before they even got in the building. The greeter at another building was one who had been there several years and really connected with families. One staff member at Dobbs was a former Parent Educator and provided good support for other staff members.

School:

The principal at Dobbs was very supportive. She helped with any space the program needed and helped build relations with other building staff members. When the new site coordinator arrived at Symington, he was able to build a good relationship with the school staff for events the program conducted. They partnered with LINC for events during the school day such as a MAP Rally before testing began. Truman started the year with adequate space for the program, but as the school year went on and enrollment during the school day grew, the program lost space because the school needed more classroom space.

Community:

One volunteer did a seminar at Dobbs for families on cleaning up their credit.

- 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:

Symington used the Character Counts program to help youth develop leadership skills. Different children led the pledges they were required to repeat daily. Dobbs only used Character Counts with a few grade levels, but after seeing positive results they will be expanding to all grades next year. Youth are allowed and encouraged to speak up and share their feelings in a positive way.

To provide opportunities to lead in junior staff, staff put all youth in positions of leadership, not just the “good” students. Programs found that the additional programs they were able to offer in the extra time on Wednesdays were popular with the youth.

Programs were able to talk to parents who became more supportive of the behavior programs after discussion and better understanding of what was being done in the program.

#### Staff:

Dobbs worked on emphasizing positive school behaviors and consistency on all grade level expectations. Some staff were college students or had other jobs and it was hard to find a time to have all staff meet together to learn what was needed. Symington staff lacked training at first, but after getting some basic training on managing behaviors, they were able to use it.

All reported it seemed there were fewer 4H trainings this year. Without staff having the premeasured kits to come back with and use, they were not always able to conduct the activities.

#### School:

At Symington, positive attendance during the school day was supported by events like bike giveaways and field trips. This also helped program attendance since youth had to attend school in order to attend the program.

The school placed pictures around the building of career opportunities and how they connect to STEM. Youth began associating jobs with STEM and those pictures in the school.

Teachers at Dobbs had a special week to highlight the college or university they attended. They did big displays on bulletin boards around the building about their school. This helped youth understand what could be ahead for them for college and as a career.

LINC helped with school attendance since they opened at 6:30 AM. Parents were able to drop off youth before going to work so children were in the building and on time for school.

#### Community:

Some youth at Dobbs had mentors from local churches. Churches also provided Turkey boxes at Thanksgiving and Christmas for families in the program which were much appreciated.

Symington had a few visits from the local Mid Continent Library branch and they now want to build a partnership with the program next year.

## 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.

Not Applicable – First year of grant cycle.

## 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		D – 81.2% S – 65.8% T – 57.6%
1.2 – Math Grades	Not Met	Symington	D – 72.3% S – 47.9% T – 68.2%
1.3 – Science Grades	Met		D – 81.8% S – 62.5% T – 64.9%
1.4 – Reading Efficacy	Met		D – 74.3% S – 55.4% T – 71.9%
1.5 – Math	Met		D – 86.1%

Efficacy			S – 82.8% T – 82.0%
1.6 – Science Efficacy	Not Met	Truman	D – 77.9% S – Missing data T – 61.0%
2.1 – PQA	Met		D – 4.07 S – 4.05 T – 3.34
2.2 – Organizational Context	Met		D – 3.47, 3.84 S – 4.05, 3.69 T – 3.46, 4.26
2.3 – Instructional Context	Met		D – 4.21, 3.99 S – 3.85, 3.65 T – 4.07, 4.05
2.4 – External Relationships	Not Met	Dobbs Symington Truman	D – 3.21, 2.14 S – 3.35, 1.74 T – 3.14, 2.05
3.1 – School Day Attendance	FY17 - Not Applicable		
3.2 – Program Attendance	Met		D – 71.9% S – 58.7% T – 57.4%
3.3 – Behavior	FY17 - Not Applicable		
3.4 – Personal and Social Skills	Met		D – 84.7% S – 82.8% T – 80.2%
3.5 – Commitment to Learning	Met		D – 89.0% S – 75.9% T – 77.8%

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										
1.2 – Math Grades	Not Met	Symington									
1.3 – Science	Met										



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

## **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 sites met the goal for 1.1, grades. Truman and Dobbs met 1.4, but Symington only had 55.4% on reading efficacy. Grades at Dobbs were 7% higher than efficacy, while Truman's efficacy was 14% higher than grades. Symington's grades were 10% higher than efficacy.

#### Math

Dobbs and Truman met the goal for 1.2, Symington missed the goal by 2.1%. All three sites met the efficacy goal with scores of 82.06% and higher. Efficacy was 14%-35% higher than grades for all three sites.

#### Science

All three sites met the goal for grades, 1.3. Only Dobbs met the goal for efficacy, their efficacy was 3.9% lower than their grades. Grades were 4% higher than efficacy at Dobbs. Data for efficacy was missing for Symington.

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.)

The programs had two partners to support math and science efficacy - Mad Science and 4H.

There was no formal reading program at Symington. Only 16% of student in the Symington building were on grade level. LINC brought in H3 Healthy Hip Hop in for the entire school. This was very popular with the students.

Dobbs program had staff reading to the students and the library brought books to the program that were changed out weekly.

Truman did DEAR during the year.

- 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?

Highest scores for Dobbs and Truman were for Safe Environments. Symington's highest was for Supporting Environment (only .03 higher than Safe Environment).

The lowest scores for all three sites were in Engagement, specifically in school-age choice. Truman and Dobbs also need to work on reflection on all activities. Symington and Truman were also low on school-age 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.)

Symington staff didn't have access to activity planning resources on site this probably impacted those activities.

They also had a coordinator change and this was the first year of 21 CCLC which created a further challenge from the norm especially in regards to choice and engagement.

Truman staff turnover and a new site coordinator made it hard to have a consistent staff with correct training to conduct activities as needed.

- 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?

Dobbs and Truman scored 3.47 and 3.46 on Staffing Model while Symington scored 4.05. On Continuous Improvement Symington was lowest at 3.65, with Dobbs at 3.99 and Truman at 4.05.

Local context indicates high staff turnover and the need for additional training is an issue for the programs. It is difficult to improve service to youth and families without basic knowledge of program goals and how to reach those goals. The programs do have the benefit of some longtime staff members who assist the newer staff members as they learn the program. However, more pre-training would definitely help.

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

Orientation training before the programs open and continuing throughout the year is definitely needed.

- 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?

Symington's scores were lowest on Academic Press at 3.85. Truman scored 4.07 and Dobbs 4.21. On Engaging Instruction Symington was also lowest with 3.65. Dobbs scored 3.99 and Truman 4.05.

In local context staff cited behavioral issues throughout the programs as challenging in providing strong academic support. Even some of the contracted providers struggled with presentations due to behaviors. Staff definitely need discipline training to assist in all areas of programming.

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

Behavior issues across the district are a challenge for all sites.

4H did lesson planning training for all sites, but only at the beginning of the year. With the amount of staff turnover, many never received this training.

At Symington, evidently expectations were different for school day and afterschool for many areas including behavior of the youth.

- 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.

None of the sites met the goal for 2.4. Symington was highest on Family Communication with 3.35, Truman had 3.14 and Dobbs 3.21. On School Alignment, Dobbs was highest with 2.14, Truman 2.05 and Symington 1.74.

For all three sites, the school administrator indicated by scores of 3.0 and 4.0 good connections between the program and the school day staff with sharing of information. However, the site coordinator with 1.0 and 2.0 indicated almost never having information shared. This confirms the local context that more communication is needed between the school day staff and the afterschool staff at all levels.

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

Symington and Truman had new site coordinators which required building trust and relationships with school staff. The emphasis was on the behavior of youth not their academic standing.

Program staff asked for teachers' homework packets, but did not always get them.

At Symington, teachers brought students to the cafeteria and didn't communicate with program staff as they had additional children to take to buses. There is more communication in the morning. Building staff are now aware this is a 21 CCLC site and the additional programs that are available for youth.

At Dobbs, the principal has a real appreciation and values LINC. He shares this importance with his staff on a regular basis. The program has all the space in the building they need.

- 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 sites met the goal with Dobbs highest at 71.9%, Truman and Symington were 57.4% and 58.7%. The strong connection with families described in local context could contribute to the high attendance rate. Any improvement due to the incentives used at Symington to improve attendance during the school day were not evident for afterschool attendance.

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.)

Enrollment numbers did not really reflect the active rosters at these sites. Many families enrolled children in case they needed the service, but the children rarely attended. Students who are no longer enrolled at that school were not dropped from the attendance roster.

- 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?

The goal was achieved by all three sites all scoring 80.2%-84.7%. Programs like Character Counts, Junior Staff and others where youth actively participate and learn to lead all contribute to these strong personal and social skills.

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

All programs did Character Counts and had other programs that supported social skills. Symington did have Junior Staff who worked in various areas of the program.

- 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?

Dobbs youth scored 89.0% on commitment to learning. Truman had 77.8% and Symington 75.9%. One of the lowest areas for Dobbs and Truman were older youth indicating they were good at staying focused on project that last more than one week – 3.73 and 3.91. Another lower area was working well with other kids – 3.68 for both.

The discipline issues described in local context could have an impact on the ability to work with other kids. Staff will need training to be able to support youth on long term projects.

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

The shift in coordinators changed the focus on academics during the year.

- 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)?

Data indicates there is strong support from families in the programs. One area programs could work toward is to personally invite families to participate or lead sessions.

As stated earlier, more needs to be done to communicate and build relationships with school personnel to help them be comfortable sharing student data with program staff. This could require releases or support from parents. Programs also need to do continual sharing of information with building staff whether by personally attending staff meetings, electronically or one on one. Until building staff understand the program is not just babysitting (as they may remember from their school days), but supporting academics using different methods than the school day. This also requires staff trained and exhibiting those skills in the building.

The few community partners who completed the survey indicated support for the program, but again communication is key to building those relationships. All the programs need to work to build more community partnerships throughout the area.

## **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)?

Not Applicable – First year of grant cycle.

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.)

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?

Not Applicable – First year of grant cycle.

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.)

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.)

Objective 2.4 – Family Communication and School Alignment were low across all three sites.

More training for staff to support them in how to support academics.

Objective 3.2 – Program staff need to remove names of youth who no longer attend the school or stop coming to the program. This will allow more accurate attendance in the future.

## **21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center Evaluation Summary**

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 21<sup>st</sup> 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.