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 #: 9
Year in the grant: 1
External Evaluator: Vicki Stein

Date of Local Context Meeting: June 13, 2017
Attendees at Local Context Meeting: Andrew Weisberg, Matthew Uppman, Danielle Small, Roosevelt Dickerson
Sites Visited by External Evaluator: Garfield Elementary, Gladstone Elementary, Whittier Elementary

Date of Status of Goals and Objectives Meeting: September 20, 2017
Attendees at Status of Goals and Objectives Meeting: Andrew Weisberg, Matthew Uppman, Danielle Small, Roosevelt Dickerson

Program Overview

Name(s) of sites: Garfield Elementary, Gladstone Elementary, Whittier 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

Programs at all three elementary buildings are open 7:00-8:30 AM. Garfield and Whittier are open 3:00-6:00 PM. Gladstone's afternoon program times are 3:10-6:00. Youth in all three programs are provided breakfast and supper.

Enrollment at Garfield was 173 with average daily attendance of 40 in the morning and 160 in the afternoon.
Gladstone enrolled 325 with average attendance of 160 in the morning and 310 in the afternoon.
Whittier's enrollment was 210. Their morning attendance averaged 40 with afternoon averaging 160.

Programs offered at the programs included Chess, Mad Science, Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, 4H Clover Kids, 4H WeDo Robotics, Garden Club, Robotics for all grade levels, Sewing Club, Health and Fitness for 6th grade, Arts and Crafts, Homework Helper, Air Plane Club, Electronics, Building, and Sports.

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:
   Site Coordinators generally agreed Mad Science was not there enough for each grade level for it to be a true learning activity, but was usually good entertainment. At Gladstone, first grade would have the program in September, but not again until January. Program staff didn't have any input into planning this activity.

   Gladstone provided a reading program for 4th-6th grade before supper each day using a popular reading cart. 4H did a variety of popular STEM Robotics, gardening and math. The 4H staff member was very popular with youth and staff in the building.

   Garfield reported their read aloud after supper was very popular. They did feel youth could be very close minded about new activities they did not understand. When presented with math activities, they shared they did math during the day. Discipline issues could also impact staff attempting to provide program activities.

Whittier staff was challenged in providing consistent learning activities by how many of the youth were in and out of the program, some several times during the year. Some attended one or two days a week inconsistently.
Youth could tell when staff didn't particularly care for the activity they were sharing and then they didn't want to participate.
Because of STEM restrictions, the program did not do any reading this year, but focused on math.
4H was popular since the youth got to do Robotics and fun science activity.

Staff:
Site Coordinators expressed frustration there was no knowledge of what the expectations were for 21 CCLC and the STEM program until the start of school. They didn't know what they needed to do, what was required. They felt if they had had a meeting earlier that would have helped them to learn expectations and would have been easier to move forward. Programs had already been planned and staff hired before they found out they were 21 CCLC and STEM.

Some staff at Garfield were accustomed to doing Arts and Crafts with youth. When they were told they had to do STEM, they felt they weren't able to do it. But after training and coaching they got into it and were more comfortable. Staff felt they did not always provide a good learning activity for youth. Staff was comfortable teaching what they knew, but this year they had to do STEM. They were ready for the program under the old plans, but now had to do STEM which they didn't know.

Whittier's staff had to be pushed hard to do STEM activities and then lost many of those staff members. The current staff is trying, but most don't have the skill level to teach STEM.

Gladstone staff was simply overwhelmed by the number of youth who attended. They didn't have enough staff to work with the number attending until January. However, youth kept enrolling and as a result, the program was short staffed again.

School:
Gladstone reported a great relationship with both the principal and teachers in the building. Teachers would come to the LINC office to compliment staff on what an excellent job they had done in helping their students with math during Homework Help. They also appreciated the 4H worker who was able to work during the school day assisting with math activities.

Garfield also felt they had a great relationship with the school. When staff was told this was now a STEM site, the school staff were very supportive. However, they didn't support evening activities such as Family Math Night or Lights On. Program staff would also like to build a more cohesive relationship between the school day and after school curriculum.

Whittier felt they had more buy in from building teachers when they learned of the STEM focus since before they were just considered babysitters. More communication with the school staff also helped. Youth in the Photography Club took pictures of STEM activities during program time and program staff was able to share these with parents and building staff. This knowledge of actual program activity helped raise positive awareness among school personnel.

Community:
Gladstone's partnership with Harvesters was beneficial on many levels. They provided food for the Nutritional Cooking Class. After youth completed the program, their families received about 100 pounds of food. In total the program was able to give away over 150,000 pounds of food to school families through this program. A local food pantry also contributed food.
Community members, even some local teens, came for Lights On. Former program participants came back to help other youth in the program

Whittier was concerned they may have pushed some parents away because they didn't want to come back at night for STEM activity since they were more accustomed to social activity and soccer games. They didn't want to attend "science" activities.
They did work with several local churches in the community, the wrestling league, Boy and Girl Scouts, the Community Assistance Council and Harvesters.

Garfield partnered with Nelson Atkins Museum. Their staff was able to tie lessons with STEM on lights and engineering.
Back Snack was a weekly program, but youth soon became bored because it was the same food every week.
Boy and Girl Scouts tried to get more youth engaged in activities.
Mad Science taught aerospace engineering for eight weeks to the same group of youth in a popular program.
Parents weren't interested in coming to Math or Science Nights. They would come to movie or dance nights.
A local grocery store donated items to help with STEM activities.

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:
Whittier didn't feel like their program was student centered this year. They would want to do soccer, but the budget didn't allow the purchase of soccer balls. Comic Books had been a popular club in the past and staff was able to stretch the STEM concepts to allow it to fit 21 CCLC requirements

At Garfield youth in the program were outspoken about their support at the school. They were willing and able to speak up if they felt unsafe or concerned about whatever was happening.
At first, they didn't understand STEM and didn't like it. However, once they got into it they were okay, but still wanted to do other things.

Gladstone felt they had too many youth and not enough staff. Then to throw in STEM as a new concept just created a mess. Once they made STEM part of Homework Help, it became easier to get their buy in by getting them involved. Not all staff understood that while generally most girls are willing to sit and participate in activities for longer periods of time, boys need to move more often. The program was able to create math activities using a punching a bag.

Staff:
It was hard for Site Coordinators to feel like they had support from most at central office because of the way the grant was written to support STEM only. They weren't given rational examples of what could be done. They didn't feel supported in making this change. As a result of these changes and limited support, it was difficult to provide a safe and supportive environment for youth in the programs.

Whittier had to push staff outside their comfort zone because they were accustomed to doing "fill in the box" lesson plans. Now they had to create plans to meet the new requirements. Training helped, but often staff needed more basic training to understand the new concepts.

Garfield used online resources to assist staff in planning activities. It was difficult to teach staff to use learning questions during activities and to understand why they were teaching this activity. Staff did talk to classroom teachers on how best to help youth who were struggling.

At Gladstone, most of the staff had some college or were currently students. One teacher had been a teacher in Iraq. These staff members had come to the program with the idea of doing STEM type activities even before it was introduced to the staff. One teacher specialized in math and worked after school in Homework Help. Their 4H worker did many positive activities with the youth. He also assisted during the school day to teach robotics and other STEM activities.

School:
Garfield felt when the school staff were told they were now a STEM site, they were more supportive of the program. She used email to keep school staff updated on was what happening in the program. However, there still was not much support for evening activities and STEM activities. However, staff would stay for block parties and picnics.

Gladstone had good support from school staff for their Math Night and then was asked for program staff support for the school Math Night.

The Site Coordinator was able to make the 4H staff member available during the school day for assistance with STEM activities.

When Whittier's Site Coordinator shared the new emphasis in the program, the school day staff was more likely to share space and ideas. Use of classroom space was a major improvement over space in the halls.

Community:
Garfield wants to work on more parent support as a STEM site. Other community partners were supportive of STEM and incorporated the concept into their lesson plans.

Gladstone's partnership with Harvesters and other neighborhood groups has benefited families in the community.
Their strong relationships with the community has provided them support in many areas of programing.

Partners at Whittier like that they were doing STEM and most knew how they could support these activities since it was a known quantity.

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:
Gladstone wanted the sewing class to be more than just pillows and brought in a local fashion designer to teach youth to prepare for Project Runway. They were able to purchase sewing machines, locking cabinets and rolling carts for the program. One young lady, recently from Cuba, was able to sew two dresses. She was featured on a local TV morning show and shared all the STEM things she had learned – measuring and how to engineer the dress, etc. It took all the staff knowledge of technology to fix the machines.

Garfield focused on simple things. They had Career Readiness for 6th graders focusing on what they wanted to do when they grew up. It has become harder to get speakers to come in for the program, so they used technology to do online research. The challenge was that many students were part time on irregular schedules, in and out the program and the school.

Whittier felt they didn't get to focus on the youth because of the new focus and challenges. Many youth didn't come on a regular basis since they were not always enjoying the program this year.

Staff:
Staff at Whittier didn't feel they were able to build strong relationships with youth for many of the reasons listed above.
Staff were more committed because they had reason to be. They wanted to attend the training, wanted to attend work because they then wanted to be the one teaching that activity to their group.

Garfield tried to help staff understand what was causing challenging behaviors in order to help youth. They tried to focus on getting staff to talk with youth. They wished they had been able to focus more on attendance during the school day to be able to reach out to families to learn about what was causing absences.

Gladstone staff developed the ability to "read" children and work with them when there were issues before the behavior became challenging. This ability allowed staff to connect with a child and then assist a father get custody of a child in a troubling situation. This ability also contributed to the number of youth in the program because they liked to be with staff. And the staff was able to work as team.

School:
Garfield felt the lack of consistent discipline during the school impacted behaviors during the program. If youth were allowed to do things during the day, they felt they could do them during the program. The Site Coordinator did relate to the principal what the after school program had learned about challenging situations. They did keep up to date on attendance during the school day.

The Site Coordinator's relationship with the principal at Gladstone was so strong, he was invited to meeting with parents and students who were in the program to deal with behavior issues. She even gave him her cell phone to use if it was needed when she was not in the building. They both made a strong effort to stay in touch.

For Whittier, this year, if it happened during the school day, program staff knew about it. The school now identified youth as "our" kids, not those LINC kids. Program staff was willing to work together with school staff to help youth. They even assisted on field trips because they knew the students unlike parent and community volunteers who were willing to help, but didn't know the youth.

Community:
Whittier didn't invite the community much because they were doing STEM activities. As a result, they didn't have as a good a relationship with the community this year.

Gladstone felt the Sewing Class crossed all the lines. The mother of the successful girl was very supportive in all parts of the Fashion Show. Community members supported the Fashion Show by making donations.

Garfield did work together with the community through email and face to face meetings on how to better the program. Youth invited staff on outings and to their special events in the community. Youth were especially pleased when the Site Coordinator attended the events.

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		Gar – 71.1% Glad – 81.4% Whit – 91.2%
1.2 – Math	Met		Gar – 70.4%

Grades			Glad – 82.4% Whit – 81.5%
1.3 – Science Grades	Met		Gar – 76.7% Glad – 79.0% Whit – 70.9%
1.4 – Reading Efficacy	Not Met	Gladstone	Gar – 65.9% Glad – 95.7% Whit – 75.4%
1.5 – Math Efficacy	Met		Gar – 75.9% Glad – 87.8% Whit – 73.1%
1.6 – Science Efficacy	Not Met Missing	Garfield Gladstone	Gar – 50% Glad – Missing Whit – 76.0%
2.1 – PQA	Met		Gar – 3.46 Glad – 4.13 Whit – 3.85
2.2 – Organizational Context	Met		Gar – 3.69, 4.04 Glad – 3.48, 4.04 Whit – 2.95, 4.05
2.3 – Instructional Context	Met		Gar – 4.11, 4.07 Glad – 4.06, 3.79 Whit – 4.25, 4.08
2.4 – External Relationships	Not Met	Gladstone	Gar – 3.51, 2.60 Glad – 3.48, 2.35 Whit – 4.38, 2.31
3.1 – School Day Attendance	FY17 - Not Applicable		
3.2 – Program Attendance	Met		Gar – 72.8% Glad – 91.2% Whit – 72.5%
3.3 – Behavior	FY17 - Not Applicable		
3.4 – Personal and Social Skills	Met		Gar – 72.8% Glad – 92.3% Whit – 79.3%
3.5 – Commitment to Learning	Met		Gar – 76.1% Glad – 89.3% Whit – 80.7%

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	Met										
1.3 – Science Grades	Met										
1.4 – Reading Efficacy	Not Met	Gladstone									
1.5 – Math Efficacy	Met										
1.6 – Science Efficacy	Not Met Missing	Garfield Gladstone									
2.1 – PQA	Met										
2.2 – Organizational Context	Met										
2.3 – Instructional Context	Met										
2.4 – External Relationships	Not Met	Gladstone									
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 three sites met the goal for 1.1. However, Garfield did not meet the goal on 1.4. Efficacy was higher than grades at Gladstone, while both Garfield and Whittier had lower efficacy. Garfield's scores were lowest in both areas.

   Math
   The goal was met by all sites for both grades and efficacy. Again, Garfield was lowest on grades, only scoring 70.4%. Gladstone was highest in both areas. For all three sites, grades and efficacy were within with 7%.

   Science
   Grades goal was met by all three sites, but Whittier scored 70.9%. Only Whittier is shown to have met the goal for efficacy. Garfield only scored 50%. Gladstone's data was missing.

   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.)

   Garfield and Gladstone have many students who are ELL. They barely speak English and can't read or write it. Many families at the three schools are moving all the time so youth have little consistency. Staff are looking for ways to make activities fun to engage youth more. During the day, Whittier youth move between different teachers for math, reading, and science similar to middle school. This works for some students, but not all.

Efficacy was low at Whittier in part because they didn't do reading in the program as they had done in the past, only science.
Gladstone wasn't able to really start STEM until November. But wound up doing more science than they do with during the school day.
Their 4H staffer has been great and even works with the school teachers during the day.

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 was scored highest for Garfield and Whittier. Gladstone's score was highest for Safe Environment of the three sites, but was down slightly due to a "3" on Nutritious food and drink. Their highest was a "5" on Extended Observation.
School Age Planning was lowest or second lowest for all three sites. Also low were School-Age Planning (Garfield and Whittier), Choice (Gladstone) and Reflection (all three sites).
Interaction was the lowest section (2.79) at Garfield.

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.)

Whittier had poor food service and that person left the district at the end of the year. Planning and reflection is so difficult because youth are in and out every day.
Garfield really pushes providing a safe environment. Some weeks would be good, but then back to bare minimum.
Gladstone had too many children and not enough staff so it was hard to plan with all those issues.
Space is an issue for all sites. Enrollment in the schools kept growing and the schools need more space for classrooms which cuts bac on space available for the programs.

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?

While all sites met the goal, there were definitely concerns in this area. Whittier indicated a need for more staff to come to the program with adequate training and for training to continue and then for them to stay with the program. Gladstone indicated a need for more staff.

In local context, there were comments in regard to late notice these were to be sites with STEM focus. They didn't feel they had adequate time to prepare staff for this change to be effective. Even with these challenges, the job satisfaction scale was 3.63 and above for all three sites.

Continuous Improvement scores for all three were above 4.0.

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

Staffing issues are always a challenge for all three programs. However, they continue to train staff and work with what they have. Some have staff who have been there for several years and they do provide a good core for the program.

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 Academic Press scores were above 4.06 with the lowest scores in homework completion at Garfield and Whittier. Gladstone's lowest scores were in academic planning. Garfield and Whittier scored 4.07 and 4.08 on Engaging Instruction. Gladstone's was 3.79.

Gladstone and Whittier's staff and youth scores were within .2 in Engaging Instruction. Garfield's were within .4.

In local context staff expressed concerns about the late information about the STEM focus and felt that had a negative impact on program staff and youth. However, scores on these sections all met the goal.

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

Parents at Garfield want youth to do homework at home, but teachers say they don't turn in homework. Staff find it hard to meet everyone's expectations.
Whittier was surprised the homework scores were low because youth couldn't go to clubs until they completed their homework.

At Garfield, everyone was learning late about the STEM program so it took a while to get that part of the program up and running.

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.

Garfield and Whittier both met the goal, but Gladstone did not. All scored 4.38 and above in family communication on the parent surveys. Low areas for all were School Alignment/student data scales scoring 1 and 2 by Site Coordinators. Local context indicated during the school year, as relationships were built with school staff around the new STEM focus, there was more cooperation in working with youth in the school. School Administrator survey data was consistent with that from program staff regarding sharing of grades, etc. Overall, Garfield's administrator rated the lowest with 2.78, Whittier's two administrators scored 3.31 and Gladstone was 3.65.

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

Garfield reports it is sometimes hard to work with the principal. They work more with the parent liaison.
None of the programs receive information about individual students' academics, but teachers will respond will respond to concerns about specific students even while asking why they need to know that information.
Teachers do ask program staff to address the behavioral issues with parents.

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 programs met the attendance goal with Garfield and Whittier at 72.8% and 72.5%. Gladstone was 91.2%. In local context staff shared youth were outspoken about how they felt in the program.

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.)

The three programs report youth like the programs, but parents sometimes want youth to come home right after school so they won't have to come back to get them. This is especially true if it raining or cold weather.
Gladstone's enrollment and attendance continue to grow because youth enjoy the program.

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 Gladstone the highest at 92.3%. Youth surveys were all averaged 4.13 and above. Areas staff might consider for focus would be working with other kids, and setting goals. The younger students who completed the surveys at Gladstone did not respond to these items. Local context indicated discipline could be a challenge with some youth. And this could influence the idea of working with others.

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 of all three schools were surprised at the high scores considering some of the behaviors they see in their programs.

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?

The goal was met by all three programs with Gladstone highest at 89.3%. Lowest scores for Whittier (3.54) and Garfield (3.36) were getting homework done during the program. Gladstone had no data as these were younger students. Staff reported during local context youth could be disinterested, but became more involved once they learned more about the STEM activities.

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

Youth know the programs and the school are their safe places and they want to be there. All staff were surprised at the lower scores on getting homework completed.

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)?

According to Community Partner surveys, all programs need to work on getting more information out to the community about what they are doing. Even some of the school administrator data indicates there could be more regular communication. Even families can be asked to participate and contribute on a regular basis.

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.)

2.2 – Train staff before they start working with youth and then continue training on their specific responsibilities within the program. This would include discipline training for all.
2.4 – Better communication with all school staff on all levels of the program.
2.4 – More dissemination of information about the programs throughout the community, not just their community partners.

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.