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 – Kansas City
Cohort #: 8
Year in the grant: 3
External Evaluator: Vicki Stein

Date of Local Context Meeting: June 7, 2017
Attendees at Local Context Meeting: Andrew Weisberg, Brenda Newsome, Andrew Smith, Steve McClellan
Sites Visited by External Evaluator: African Centered College Preparatory Academy, Hartman, Melcher

Date of Status of Goals and Objectives Meeting: September 20, 2017
Attendees at Status of Goals and Objectives Meeting: Andrew Weisberg, Brenda Newsome, Jason Ervin

Program Overview

Name(s) of sites: African Centered College Preparatory Academy (ACCPA), Hartman Elementary, Melcher 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

All three sites serve youth kindergarten through sixth grade. Breakfast and dinner are served to all youth at all sites.

ACCPA is open 7:00-9:15 AM and 3:45-6:00 PM Monday-Friday. The enrollment is 187 with average attendance of 80-90 in the morning and 100-130 in the afternoon.
Hartman is open 7:00-8:30 AM and 2:50-6:00 PM. Their enrollment is 160 with approximately 60 attending in the morning and 130 after school.
Melcher is open 7:00-9:15 AM and 3:45-6:00 PM. They have 140 enrolled with 50 attending in the morning and 140 in the afternoon.

Activities at the sites include Zoo Club, Girls on the Run, Girl Scouts and Boy Scouts, Chess, Drill Team, Cheerleading, Good News, Kids in the Kitchen, 4H Graphic Design, 4H Robotics, Karate Club and Violence Prevent VIP.

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:
   At ACPPA, 4H Robotics has been very successful. The challenge has been finding LINC staff to work with the 4H worker to learn the activities to help sustain the program when the 4H worker is not present. The STEM activity has the children now liking science more. They are more knowledgeable when you talk to them about science.

   At Hartman, Robotics and Coding are popular with the youth. One of their favorite activities is making slime. Staff now provides time each Friday just to make slime. STEM programs had youth excited and ready to learn new things. The program had a good experience with Mad Science.

   For Melcher, the challenge has been finding what part of STEM activities actually stimulate the youth to want to participate. When choice is involved the youth get more involved. The garden at school was only of interest to the youth when staff were knowledgeable and able to get the youth excited about the topics related to gardening. Many did not know where we get potatoes or carrots.

Staff:
Staff development is critical for successful programs. More training would be helpful. Unless staff is educated it is difficult for them to get the youth excited about activities of any kind.

All programs felt communication at all levels of programming is important for many reasons. This includes staff to staff, school staff to program staff, staff to youth, staff to parents, etc.

ACPPA is able to do lots of on-site staff development. Their challenge is consistency of staff. With the amount of turnover, there is a constant need for training to help them learn all aspects of successful programming. Things as simple as helping them learn to ask learning questions can make a big difference in successful program activities.

School:
Hartman's 4H worker also works in the school during the day so speaks the same language, is familiar with school staff and knows the youth in that context.

Brenda Newsome at ACPPA is on the principal's Dream Team and meets once a month with leaders in the school. This allows her to learn more about academic goals and share what the program is doing to support those goals. They have a good relationship with the building teachers. They understand the goals of STEM in the program and are able to share what is happening during the school day.

Melcher's principal was hired at the same time the coordinator moved to the site. She was charged with raising test scores which were among the lowest in the district. By having STEM in the program, they are able to stimulate academics in all parts of the school day. The principal and school staff are supportive of the program.

Community:
Melcher had a jump start on community involvement since it sits in one of the neighborhoods of Historic East Neighborhoods Coalition (HENC). Calvin Wainright, LINC staff member assigned to HENC, was in the building nearly every day. He was able to help build community partnerships.

ACPPA has had a partnership with the Kansas City Zoo for several years. They come to the program once a week all year long. They are able to work with a different group each semester. In addition, the Southeast Library branch does robotics club once a week for those who are not in the 4H Robotics group. A local sorority does tutoring and pays for youth to attend local plays.
Hartman had a partnership with the Kansas City Zoo for one semester when they came two times a week to work with youth. A high school group does Project Read with kindergarten and first graders. Waldo Readers also read with kindergarten and first graders

focusing on STEM. Volunteers from Country Club Christian Church have assisted in several ways including cleaning up the area around the school and creating an outside area dedicated to a special person.

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:
All sites agreed one of their biggest issues was conflict resolution on all levels – staff-staff, staff-youth, youth-youth. They would like to have staff training to help them and then they can model for youth in the program. As many of the staff are very young, some sixth graders consider them peers creating problems with discipline and leadership.

Staff:
There was general agreement of a need for more training for staff in all areas of programming. With the amount of staff turnover, continual training is essential for the success of the staff member and the work they do in the program. Hopefully with better, earlier training there would be less turnover.

School:
Hartman is challenged by lack of consistent space for programming. The library is not always available for their use. Most of the building teachers are cooperative to assist with programming locations. When the school and program had the influx of students from Satchel Paige Elementary when it closed at the end of the 2015-2016 school year, it created a need for additional programing space to handle the additional youth who now attend.

Both ACPPA and Melcher report strong support in all areas of programming by school staff.

Community:
ACPPA has strong support from the community around the school. Having this community involvement helps with program quality. Since the library has been involved in the program, parents now take youth to the local library for their Saturday robotics program.

Hartman and Melcher report the support from local churches has been very helpful. They find that some families are now going to the churches for events and activities held there.

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:
Hartman does a lot of reading with youth. There is a heavy focus on reading throughout the program. Their attendance is strong. Activities that support personal and social skills include Scouts, Boys to Men, and Sister Girls United.

ACPPA has a group for second graders called Umoja that focuses on social skills. They also have Boys to Men and Sister Girls United.

Melcher uses the church volunteers and male mentors for the boys. All youth have a strong push for improving academics with this new principal.

Staff:
Hartman reported after completing required training for the program, two staff members went back to school to complete their education.

All agree good staff attendance is critical. Staff needs to be there every day in order to effectively work with youth.

Melcher has had high staff turnover. Two or three of the staff members have degrees or are working on completing their degrees and are seeking out college and career readiness opportunities for themselves which is being shared with youth in the program.

School:
At ACPPA, the school is working in partnership to provide needed materials. They have donated books for the reading program. For behavior issues, staff works with both the school and parents to resolve problems.

Melcher reported sometimes everyone takes for granted that everyone in the building is all one entity. However, there are definitely separate groups within the building. This means good communication and sharing perspectives of all are important for success.

Hartman has good support in the building. If they have an issue, they could communicate with the teacher or principal to help work it out.

Community:
ACPPA feels the fact that families are taking youth to the library for robotics is a strong positive connection.

By having the garden on site at Melcher, the learning process has been supported since there are also community gardens in the area.

Hartman has almost always had positive community support. They sponsor a Career Day when community members come in to talk to youth about their jobs. This included a president of Commerce Bank to talk about money.

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.

Hartman – 1.1 & 1.4 – They keep crates of books in several areas of the building and on carts ready for DEAR twice a day, every day. Everyone reads.

ACCPA – 2.3 – When the school has staff development, the program has staff development and sets goals for the quarter. They keep training staff on site and when staff go to outside training they are responsible to come back and train other staff who were not able to attend. When staff attended training where they were able to see data from evaluations, it had an impact on them in their work.

Melcher – 2.4 – The program has set up team leadership to start doing more to develop staff.

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		ACP – Missing Data H – 69.7% M – 73.3%
1.2 – Math Grades	Met		ACP – 100% H – 70.7% M – 71.6%
1.3 – Science Grades	Met		ACP – Missing Data H – 69.7% M – 60.0%
1.4 – Reading Efficacy	Met		ACP – 83.8% H – 79.8% M – 67.7%
1.5 – Math Efficacy	Met		ACP – 92.6% H – 71.3% M – 81.1%
1.6 – Science Efficacy	Not Met	Hartman	ACP – 76.3% H – 68.6% M – 75.3%
2.1 – PQA	Not Met	Melcher	ACP – 4.33 H – 3.86 M – 2.70
2.2 – Organizational Context	Not Met	Melcher	ACP – 4.04, 4.62 H – 3.86, 4.04 M – 2.85, 2.23
2.3 – Instructional Context	Met		ACP – 4.68, 4.53 H – 4.16, 4.23 M – 4.00, 3.19
2.4 – External Relationships	Met		ACP – 4.18, 4.06 H – 4.22, 3.75 M – 4.16, 3.67
3.1 – School Day Attendance	FY17 - Not Applicable		
3.2 – Program Attendance	Not Met	Melcher	ACP – 69.3% H – 55.3% M – 48.6%
3.3 – Behavior	FY17 - Not Applicable		
3.4 – Personal	Met		ACP – 96.3%

and Social Skills			H – 79.8% M – 79.8%
3.5 – Commitment to Learning	Met		ACP – 97.1% H – 80.9% M – 82.3%

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		Met		Met						
1.3 – Science Grades	Met		Met		Met						
1.4 – Reading Efficacy	Met		Met		Met						
1.5 – Math Efficacy	Met		Met		Met						
1.6 – Science Efficacy	No Data Paige		Not Met	Paige	Not Met	Hartman					
2.1 – PQA	No Data Melcher or Paige		Met		Not Met	Melcher					
2.2 – Organizational Context	Met		Met		Not Met	Melcher					
2.3 – Instructional Context	Met		Met		Met						
2.4 – External Relationships	No Data Melcher		Not Met	Melcher Paige	Met						
3.1 – School Day Attendance	FY15 - Not Applicable		FY16 - Not Applicable		FY17 - Not Applicable						
3.2 – Program Attendance	Met		Met		Not Met	Melcher					
3.3 – Behavior	FY15 - Not Applicable		FY16 - Not Applicable		FY17 - Not Applicable						
3.4 – Personal	Met		Met		Met						

and Social Skills											
3.5 – Commitment to Learning	Met		Met		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
Efficacy was strong at both ACP and Hartman. Melcher only missed the goal by 2.3%. Data was missing for ACP, but the other two scored over 69% on 1.1. Efficacy and grade percentages were very close for Melcher. For Hartman, efficacy was approximately 10% higher. Grades data was missing for ACP, but their efficacy was the highest of the three sites.

Math
Math grades are the highest percentage for all three sites and math efficacy was highest for ACP and Melcher. Hartman's efficacy and grades percentages are within .6%. Melcher's efficacy is approximately 10% higher than the grades. ACP's grades are approximately 7% higher than efficacy.

Science

Hartman and Melcher met the goal for 1.3, but data was missing for ACP. Melcher and ACP met the efficacy goal, but Hartman missed by 1.4%. Melcher's efficacy is approximately 15% higher than grades. Grades and efficacy for Hartman are almost the same. Grades data is missing for ACP.

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.)

Additional books are needed to be able to have book clubs which support both reading grades and efficacy. The youth have had the same books for several years at ACP. The programs have used donations of books from various sources, but not enough of each one for books clubs. Hartman reports it is a struggle to help youth learn the importance of reading due in part to lack of support by families.

ACP is helping staff learn to use the learning questions in all activities, even table games, to support mathematics. All were reminded, youth must test into ACP so have stronger academics than the average school student in the district.

All programs can select from the same offerings by 4H. One of the challenges is having staff work with 4H. Programs do not usually have enough staff to work with the 4H staff to learn the activities and then continue the experience with youth after that session. In addition, program staff are not trained on STEM activities which can affect efficacy. And the 4H programs are not consistent at all sites depending on the staff presenting the activity.

Hartman and Melcher have had transitions in leadership in their programs, and communication with school day staff must be developed over time with each transition.

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?

All programs scored high in Safe Environment, 4.24 or above. Only ACP scored higher in Extended Observation, 5.0. Lowest for all sites was Engagement. Melcher scored 1.0 on Engagement. Hartman and ACP scored 3.0 and above in all areas. At Melcher only Safe Environment and Interaction were above 3.0.

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.)

Melcher had high staff turnover. Training is still an issue for all programs.
Directors think programs are licensed too high. The space is not available in the locations they are provided in the schools. They suggest perhaps limiting the enrollment number per grade.
It can be difficult to hire college students who need a job today when background checks sometimes took a month or longer.

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?

Melcher did not meet the goal. Job Satisfaction was just above 2.5 at Melcher and Continuous Quality Improvement was only 1.88. This is likely due to high staff turnover shared in local context. ACP scored above 4.0 in both areas. Hartman's lowest item was new staff orientation. Horizontal Communication was strong at all three sites.

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

Most staff care about the youth and want to make a difference. Introductory and continuing training are needed for all staff.
ACP meets with staff every time classroom teachers meet and gives rewards for various staff events.
The impact of the high staff turnover at Melcher was obvious from the data.

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?

All sites met the goal with scores 4.0 and above for all except Melcher's Engaging Instruction, 3.19. This can also be connected to high staff turnover and the need for training for new staff. The highest area for all three sites was Academic Planning Scale with 4.0 and higher. ACP reported they do a lot of on-site training. This is reflected in their high scores in these areas.

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

4H did some lesson planning training which was well received by staff and directors. Staff are given 30 minutes a day planning time. Teachers share which youth are having problems and in what areas. Sites did well because staff are encouraged to teach to their interests.

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 sites met the goal and scored above 4.0 on Family Communication. Melcher, 3.67, and Hartman, 3.75, were slightly lower due Melcher's Student Data Scale, 3.33 and Hartman's School Day Content Scale, 3.51. Melcher had a score of 2.69 on the staff version of Strengthening Families. However, the parent version had a site average of 4.63. This could be due to staff turnover and new staff not knowing what is provided to families. The site coordinator version was 3.25. Hartman staff and families had identical scores of 4.06 which were slightly higher than the site coordinator's score. All three scores for ACP were very close around 4.30.

School Alignment was good for all three sites. Local context indicates good relationships with school staff at all levels to help support this goal.

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

All programs make an effort to get to know families. Directors report a good greeter helps as well. Families appreciate the programs and the services provided. They appreciate the free service, but are not always good at volunteering in the program. It makes a big difference when the site coordinator has been at the school for several years.

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.*)

Only Melcher did not meet the goal scoring 48.6%. Hartman met the goal at 55.3%. ACP scored 69.3%. Possibly the high staff turnover reported in local context could impact attendance at Melcher as staff may not be adequately trained in providing engaging activities and on developing positive relationships with youth.

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.)

There was general concern by directors as to the accuracy of numbers reported on the 3.2. Sites consistently have at least 80-90% attendance.

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?

All sites met the goal with 79.8% and higher. All sites scored 4.09 and above on the youth surveys of Personal and Social Skills. Local context shared all programs offer a variety of activities to support these areas.

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

Staff and coordinators know everyone's names and try to help them feel good about themselves. Youth like the programs. They have choice.

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?

All sites met the goal with scores of 80.9%-97.1%. Youth survey scores were 4.14-4.72. Lowest areas on ACP and Melcher were getting homework done during the program. Hartman's lowest was for paying attention in class. However, all these low scores were above 3.71. Quality programming that supports academics in fun ways as reported in local context can help youth in these areas. Mentors and strong staff can also be beneficial.

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

At ACP, homework doesn't start until 5:30 and parents often pick up before that time. Staff does work with children if the school or parents indicate they are not getting it done.

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)?

Melcher did not have any school administrator data. Hartman did not have any community partner data. Data that is available from others indicate a generally positive and supportive atmosphere for the three programs. Each has their own challenges, but with good training for staff and lower staff turnover, they can meet their goals.

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)?

    ACP has met all goals every year. The program staff work well with school personnel to help support students and families.
    External relationships have been a challenge for Melcher and Paige in the past, but this year both Melcher and Hartman (replacement for Paige after that school closed) met this goal.
    Melcher did not meet four goals this year they had met in the past. This could be attributed to high staff turnover. Hartman met all goals except 1.6, which was not met by Paige the previous year.

    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.)

    Staffing issues contributed to low science efficacy at Paige and then Hartman.

Families did not support the interest in science and there was not much science education during the school day.

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?

   Hartman's focus was on reading by providing books all over the building for DEAR. Students met both 1.1 and 1.4 goals.
   ACP focused on staff development. Their success is evident in meeting all goals and from responses by staff, families and school personnel.
   Melcher also focused on staff development through team leadership. However, any success they may have had was not reflected in goals as they did not meet four goals.

   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.)

   Staff turnover likely impacted any success Melcher might have had with the additional training. Melcher will need to focus on the same areas, specifically planning and reflection.

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.)

   2.2 – Staff development both before staff work with youth and continuing throughout the year could benefit all areas of the program. With better prepared staff, they will be more engaged with youth and families so attendance should improve. They should also be more likely to be involved with school staff which will help youth in academic areas.

21st 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 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.