

21st CCLC External Evaluation **Guided Reflection Documentation** **(Boys and Girls Clubs of Greater St. Louis and Hazelwood)**

The 21st CCLC grantee's administrator listed in the grant and certified external evaluator must complete this reflection tool as the official documentation of the 21st CCLC External Evaluation. The program director, site coordinators, and other key staff should meet twice with the external evaluator to reflect on 1) the local context and 2) the data reports in relation to the Goals and Objectives of the grant and the evaluator's written responses. The external evaluator will submit the document to the program director. The grant administrator is responsible for submitting the document in its entirety to DESE by the deadline.

Cover Sheet Instructions

The grant administrator must sign this first page of the Guided Reflection and e-mail it to DESE by the deadline. The full Guided Reflection Document (including this page and the Evaluation Summary) should also be submitted by the grant administrator to DESE via e-mail.

21st CCLC Grantee Name: BGC Greater St. Louis

Cohort #: **10** Year in the grant: **5**

External Evaluator Name: **Natalie Bolton**

Name of Program Director participating in evaluation meetings: **Roxanne Crawford**

List each site included in this evaluation and the name of the site representative that attended each meeting:

	Date of first meeting: June 8, 2022	Date of second meeting: January 11, 2023
Site 1: Hazelwood BGC	Attendee: Keisha Caruthers Roxanne Crawford	Attendee: Roxanne Crawford
Site 2: Southeast Middle	Attendee: Keisha Caruthers Roxanne Crawford	Attendee: Roxanne Crawford
Site 3: East High	Attendee: Keisha Caruthers Roxanne Crawford	Attendee: Roxanne Crawford

To be completed by the 21st CCLC Program Administrator:

☐ I have read the summary provided by the external evaluator regarding our progress on the previous year's identified objective in Part A, Section 4 and Part C, Section 7, Question 2. For the previous school year, our program selected the following objective(s) to work on:

☐ 1.1 ☐ 1.2 ☐ 1.3
☐ 2.1 ☐ 2.2 ☐ 2.3 ☐ 2.4
☐ 3.1 ☐ 3.2 ☐ 3.3

☐ I have read the evaluators recommendation(s) for this year in Part C, Section 7, Question 3. Based on this evaluation, the external evaluator has recommended that our program work on:

☐ 1.1 ☐ 3.1 ☐ 2.2 ☐ 1.3 ☐ 3.3 ☐ 2.4
☐ 2.1 ☐ 1.2 ☐ 3.2 ☐ 2.3

☒ I have read the evaluation and recommendations contained in the Guided Reflection Document.

Roxanne Crawford
 Program Director Signature

Roxanne Crawford
 Printed Name

1/17/2023
 Date

ongoing quality improvement process that includes the point-of-service experience of youth, school day linkages, offering a broad array of activities, and family engagement opportunities.

Progress related to goal 2 continues at all sites since the start of the grant. All criteria were scored as Satisfactory or above at all sites with the exception of 2.4.C, **Family Strengthening Families Scale**. All sites scored **Less than Satisfactory** (61.5%). The goal was at least 70% of family members indicate a positive response on the Strengthening Families scale. The Strengthening Families (Family version) 9 survey item results showed that all item sites scored 3.0 or higher on every item. East High outperformed the comparative mean on each item as well. Programming efforts to address individual student needs has been a successful endeavor for student participants under the constraints of operating the program during Covid-19. Intentional communication and efforts are in place to get feedback from administration and staff at all sites related to programming and student needs. Tracking student communication and progress and communicating program schedules and content were beneficial based on the data. Minor targeted efforts related to survey responses can be made in the following areas noted within Section 6 Goal 2 for any questions at sites that fell below 3.0 indicating disagreement or not true.

Goal 3: Youth Outcomes

Afterschool program also offer non-academic benefits that support the student's development of life readiness skills including positive school behaviors (e.g., regular attendance), personal and social skills (e.g., time management, team work, critical thinking), and commitment to learning (e.g., initiative, homework completion, study skills).

Indicator 3.1a was targeted to work on related to program attendance at all sites. Restrictions related to Covid continued to impact all sites related to program attendance. Those students enrolled in the program at all levels truly want to be in attendance and benefit from the programming. Efforts were made to combine programming efforts and to move programming locations to increase attendance for the middle and high school. Increases in attendance did occur. The lack of feeder schools also impacted attendance. The program staff continued to be innovative and creative but their efforts do not fully show in the attendance data. School Day Attendance (DESE Data) and School Day Discipline data were not reported and are recommended to target and monitor next year since one year of data is missing.

For more information, contact Roxanne Crawford at 314-953-7795 or 636-675-9570 or roxanne@bgcstl.org.

Part A: Additional Data Collection by the External Evaluator

Section 1 – Grantee/Evaluator Information

21st CCLC Grantee Name: BGC Greater St. Louis

Cohort #: **10** Year in the grant: **5**

External Evaluator Name: **Natalie Bolton**

Name of Program Director participating in evaluation meetings: **Roxanne Crawford**

List each site included in this evaluation and the name of the site representative that attended each meeting:

	Date of first meeting: June 8, 2022	Date of second meeting: January 11, 2023	Site Visit? (Y/N)
Site 1: Hazelwood BGC	Attendee: Keisha Caruthers Roxanne Crawford	Attendee: Roxanne Crawford	N

Site 2: Southeast Middle	Attendee: Keisha Caruthers Roxanne Crawford	Attendee: Roxanne Crawford	N
Site 3: East High	Attendee: Keisha Caruthers Roxanne Crawford	Attendee: Roxanne Crawford	N

Section 2 – Program Overview

Please provide a 2-3 paragraph description of the program that includes at a 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. Please note whether the youth attending the program usually have homework. Describe the staffing of the program and sites, including the number of paid staff, volunteers, and administrative structure.

The Hazelwood School District program serves K – 12 students across three school sites (Hazelwood BGC, Southeast Middle School, and East High) that feed into one another. Based on the 2021- 2022 KCC 5+ days attendance data, there are 30 participants from Southeast Middle School, eight from East High School, and 24 from Hazelwood BGC, which serves students in grades K-5. Programming was offered onsite at East High School and Southeast Middle school until mid-Spring 2022. At that time, programming moved to the Teen Center of Excellence. The prior sites offered limited programming space and needed a new learning environment. A transportation plan was written and approved. Program participation also increased. Collaborative efforts were made across sites to increase program participation. Summer 2022 programming will also be held at the Teen Center of Excellence. Hazelwood BGC enrollment numbers have remained modest since Covid changes. Bus drivers for the district have been a challenge and leads to the increased wait time for students at bus stops. An Early Risers program was attempted to recruit from program early but never materialized. Programming offered during the Summer of 2022 did show increased enrollment. Feeder schools did occur during 2021-2022.

The administrative structure remained the same across all sites, with the exception of the loss of a program manager. There were two full-time specialists. All other staff were part-time. No team members were reassigned, and the Director continued to lead program efforts across sites.

During year five of the grant, similar content and activities from years one through four were provided at all sites. Programming included all key Boys and Girls Clubs programming related to academics, good character and citizenship, and healthy lifestyle (programming targeted for just teens is not offered at the elementary site). Specific programming included: Passport to Manhood (promotes and teaches responsibility through highly interactive small-group sessions, with an emphasis on positive behavior and personal growth); Triple Play's Health Habits (designed to incorporate healthy living and active learning in every part of the Club experience, Healthy Habits emphasizes good nutrition, regular physical activity and improving overall well-being); Smart Girls (promotes health, fitness, prevention, education, self-esteem and good decision-making to enable girls to develop their full potential); Smart Moves (prevention and education program addresses drug, alcohol and tobacco use and premature sexual activity through discussion with staff and peer leaders); Power Hour (daily after-school homework help with an emphasis on youth becoming self-directed learners); Project Learn (reinforces school lessons by combining tutoring, school and parental involvement, education games and activities, and academic incentives); tutoring (one-on-one attention in communication arts, history, math, and science, with special attention on reading skills); and Reading Room (a quiet space dedicated to reading alone or in groups. Small libraries provide age-appropriate reading material on a variety of subjects.). Homework is typical and supported at sites (some with tutors), and programming Power Hour

and Stride Academy are aligned with MO Learning standards. If a student does not have homework or finish homework early, they participate in engaging academic activities. Tracking sheets are used to document reaching out to families for after-school programming.

Section 3 – 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) **Goal 1 – Academic** 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: Participation in programming efforts was limited due to site changes and a lack of feeder schools. The same content was emphasized in the past years for students that did participate in elementary through high school. Collaboration between the academic support day program with learning coaches supported students' learning needs. Programming included all key Boys and Girls Clubs programming related to academics, good character and citizenship, and healthy lifestyle (programming targeted for just teens is not offered at the elementary site). Specific programming included: Passport to Manhood (promotes and teaches responsibility through highly interactive small-group sessions, with an emphasis on positive behavior and personal growth); Triple Play's Health Habits (designed to incorporate healthy living and active learning in every part of the Club experience, Healthy Habits emphasizes good nutrition, regular physical activity and improving overall well-being); Smart Girls (promotes health, fitness, prevention, education, self-esteem and good decision-making to enable girls to develop their full potential); Smart Moves (prevention and education program addresses drug, alcohol and tobacco use and premature sexual activity through discussion with staff and peer leaders); Power Hour (daily after-school homework help with an emphasis on youth becoming self-directed learners); Project Learn (reinforces school lessons by combining tutoring, school and parental involvement, education games and activities, and academic incentives); tutoring (one-on-one attention in communication arts, history, math, and science, with special attention on reading skills); and Reading Room (a quiet space dedicated to reading alone or in groups. Small libraries provide age-appropriate reading material on a variety of subjects.). Homework is typical and supported at sites (some with tutors), and programming Power Hour and Stride Academy are aligned with MO Learning standards. If a student does not have homework or finish homework early, they participate in engaging academic activities. Tracking sheets are used to document reaching out to families for after-school programming.

Staff: Staff used tracking sheets to document reaching out to families for afterschool programming; staff was in communication with students weekly, targeting students that responded. Programming efforts at the middle and high school moved during the Spring of 2022 to the Teen Center of Excellence to centralize resources and provide an improved learning environment. All programming planning was done with outcomes in mind. Staff communicated via emails and phone calls to keep in touch with participants and their families. A social worker also continued to support students' academic needs. Used Zoom to support training with staff for trauma-informed instruction. Five mental health days were also provided to staff.

School: MAP and EOC testing occurred spring of 2022, and programming staff served as proctors. The summer school was held at all sites due to low academic participation and performance during the school year. Due to a lack of space, on-site programming was challenging for middle and high

school. The Teen Center of Excellence was used to provide programming and allowed a merging of resources.

Community: Collaborated with the St. Louis Internship Partnership for SAT and ACT support. Attendance was not mandatory to participate. Collaborated with the Teen Center of Excellence to provide programming to middle and high school students.

- 2) **Goal 2 – Program Quality** 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 observed program quality (PQA, surveys), school day alignment (consistency of curriculum, communication with school-day staff, alignment with standards), broad array of activities (academic strategies based on individual student needs, SEL, variety, choice), and family engagement (family and child academic enrichment opportunities, educational development for adult family members of students served).

Youth: Continue to work on programming to have consistent structure at all sites also used emails and phone calls. Due to Covid-19 and school on-site closures in the prior year, participation at all sites was minimal compared to prior years. High school students continued to have ACT/SAT support with the St. Louis Internship Partnership. The Club also assisted in sharing scholarship information and financial resources with students and parents/families.

Staff: See context for staff and academics. Staff worked relentlessly to recruit students and made pivots to programming on a daily basis to try to address needs. Continued to work on strategies with staff to work with students’ social and emotional needs to support academics at all sites. A social worker also contributed to addressing SEL needs with students as programming content was pivoted. COCA was also a partner in providing arts-related opportunities to students. All curriculum planning was done with outcomes in mind.

School: See context for school and academics. The principal of Southeast Middle School continues to be a challenge to work related to operating the program. Space is a big issue but was resolved by moving to the Teen Center of Excellence and having the high school join. The high school principal and Larimore principal received awards related to collaboration efforts by the BGCSTL. These efforts also showed with programming efforts at both sites. Staff collaborated with teachers via some surveys but mostly communicated via email.

Community: Engaging with the community continues to be a focus especially working with the community on program awareness and supporting students and their families. Continued efforts to immerse parents in community events (i.e., extra efforts including email, phone correspondence, and home visits). Additionally, partnering with community agencies (Seeds of Substance, Black Nursing Associates, Urban League, and Care STL) to provide food and distribute information related to Covid-19 and vaccines. Families were not allowed on sites, but carpool lines were utilized to distribute programming materials, positive action resources, and food. Overall, staff was limited on how they could collaborate with parents due to district Covid-19 protocols.

- 3) **Goal 3 – Youth Outcomes** Describe the issues (youth, staff, school, community) that have a positive or negative impact on the program’s ability to enhance youth’s life readiness skills and behaviors, including positive school behaviors (attendance, program attendance, out of school suspensions), personal and social skills (communications, teamwork, accountability), and commitment to learning (initiative, study skills, homework completion).

Youth: Program participation and attendance continue to be affected after the height of Covid-19, especially at the elementary school, compared to prior years. Middle and high school sites still had limited participation but enrollment did increase in the Spring of 2022. Discipline issues were an issue at the high school but improved with the move to the Teen Center of Excellence. Support for student's development of college and career readiness skills for high school students still occurred. For all students, personal and social skills (e.g., time management, teamwork, critical thinking) and commitment to learning (e.g., initiative, homework completion, study skills) all continued to be emphasized throughout programming efforts.

Staff: Staff assisted with the transportation efforts related to relocating the middle and high school to the Teen Center of Excellence. The move to the Center also assisted with recruitment and retention efforts. The staff continue to have open dialogue, regularly with members to discuss ways to advocate for themselves and overcome academic challenges successfully. The staff has also continued to connect with member teachers to discuss the program and behavior of members. All data is then used to develop lessons with a focus on better ways to manage and work through stressful occurrences. Staff also introduced the Club during carpool lines to increase participation for the next school year.

School: See context for school and academics. Continue to work on strategies with staff to work with students on participation and social and emotional needs to support academics at all sites.

Community: The St. Louis Internship Partnership was an asset in working with students related to scholarship opportunities and essay writing support for college applications. There is still a focus on helping parents learn about resources, how to work with the school and club, and educating on program experiences. The Club provides resources (food) and helps involve parents if youth are not participating in the program.

Section 4 – Review of Progress on Previously Selected Objectives

1) Which item(s) was selected from last year's External Evaluation to be worked on this year?

<input type="checkbox"/> 1.1	<input type="checkbox"/> 1.2	<input type="checkbox"/> 1.3	
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2.2	<input type="checkbox"/> 2.3	<input type="checkbox"/> 2.4
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.1	<input type="checkbox"/> 3.2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3.3	

2) How has the program used the previous years' External Evaluation to improve and refine the afterschool program? What changes did the program try to make in order to make progress on the selected objective(s)? Please give specific examples.

Indicator 3.1a was targeted to work on related to program attendance at all sites. Restrictions related to Covid continued to impact all sites related to program attendance. Those students enrolled in the program at all levels truly want to be in attendance and benefit from the programming. Efforts were made to combine programming efforts and to move programming locations to increase attendance for the middle and high school. Increases in attendance did occur. The lack of feeder schools also impacted attendance. The program staff continued to be innovative and creative but their efforts do not fully show in the attendance data.

Part B: Data Charts

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

Section 5 – Review of Data Reports

- 1) Using the data provided in the External Evaluator Grantee Summary Report, if the overall grantee score is Less than Satisfactory, indicate which sites contributed to the low score.

Objective	If overall grantee score (Goals 1 & 3) or individual site score (Goal 2) is Less than Satisfactory, list which site(s) contributed to the low score?	Using last year's External Evaluation Report, please comment on whether these sites had previously scored "Less than Satisfactory".
1.1 – Reading		
1.2 – Math		
1.3 – Science		
2.1 – Observed Program Quality		
2.2 – School Day Linkages		
2.3 – Broad Array		
2.4 – Family Engagement		
3.1 – Program Attendance	Less than Satisfactory- all sites	Program Attendance Rubric (3.1)- Across all sites, scores were More than Satisfactory or Above
3.2 – Personal and Social Skills		
3.3 – Commitment to Learning		

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.

Section 6 – Status of 2021-22 Objectives

For each item below, the external evaluator should complete the first set of questions prior to the second face-to-face meeting with the program team. The purpose of the second set of questions (in italics) is to contextualize the relevant data. The second set of questions should be completed following the second meeting with the director.

- 1) **Goal 1 – Student Achievement and Sense of Competence Rubrics (1.1-1.3)** – 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 and test score data? Are there particular sites that do better/worse than others? How does the local context fit this data?

Reading: Three measures were used to report student achievement and competence in reading/communications arts. Overall, for all sites, the grantee scored **Satisfactory or above**.

For criteria A, **Grades – all 30+**, all sites scored **Advanced 82.5%** (64.7% Southeast Middle, 94.4% Hazelwood BGC, and 100% East High). The goal was for at least 70% of youth to maintain or increase their reading/language arts grades.

For criteria B, **Grades-students with pre-grade in the “need” category**, all sites scored **Less than Satisfactory 40%** (N/A Southeast Middle, 50% Hazelwood BGC, and 100% East High). The goal was that at least 50% of students identified as “need” increase their grades.

For criteria C, **MAP** data was not available from DESE for the 2021-22 school year.

For criteria D, **EOC** data was not available from DESE for the 2021-22 school year.

For criteria E, **Efficacy**, all sites scored **Satisfactory 79.6% or a mean score of 3.89** (4.11 mean Southeast Middle, 3.67 mean Hazelwood BGC, and 3.88 mean East High). Data shared used average Likert score data on four questions related to reading efficacy. All sites' mean scores were at or above a 3.0 on a 5.0 scale, indicating true almost half the time to almost always true. The comparative overall mean was 4.01. Southeast Middle exceeded the comparative mean, while Hazelwood BGC and East High were slightly lower. The goal was for at least 70% of youth per site will report a medium to a high level of efficacy as measured by items on the Youth Survey.

Math: Three measures were used to report student achievement and competence in math. Overall, for all sites, the grantee scored **Satisfactory or above**.

For criteria A, **Grades – all 30+**, the mean score was **Advanced 74.4%** (66.7% Southeast Middle, 76.5% Hazelwood BGC, and 100% East High). The goal was for at least 70% of youth to maintain or increase their grade in math.

For criteria B, **Grades-students with pre-grade in the “need” category**, the mean score was **Less than Satisfactory 42.9%** (60% Southeast Middle, 0% Hazelwood BGC, and 0% East High). The goal was that at least 50% of students identified as “need” increase their grades.

For criteria C, **MAP** data was not available from DESE for the 2021-22 school year.

For criteria D, **EOC** data was not available from DESE for the 2021-22 school year.

For criteria E, **Efficacy**, the mean score was **More than Satisfactory 81.5% or a mean score of 4.19** (4.07 mean Southeast Middle, 4.57 mean Hazelwood BGC, and 3.94 mean East High). Data shared used average Likert score data on four questions related to math efficacy. All sites' mean scores were at or above a 3.0 on a 5.0 scale, indicating true almost half of the time to almost always true. The comparative overall mean was 4.15. Southeast Middle exceeded this comparative mean, while Hazelwood BGC and East High were slightly lower. The goal was for at least 80% of youth per site will report a medium to a high level of efficacy as measured by items on the Youth Survey.

Science: Three measures were used to report student achievement and competence in science. Overall, for all sites, the grantee scored **Satisfactory or above**.

For criteria A, **Grades – all 30+**, the mean score was **Advanced 85.7%** (69.2% Southeast Middle, 94.1% Hazelwood BGC, and 100% East High). The goal was for at least 70% of youth to maintain or increase their grade in science.

For criteria B, **Grades-students with pre-grade in the “need” category**, the mean score was **Less than Satisfactory 38.5%** (42.9% Southeast Middle, 66.7% Hazelwood BGC, and 0% East High). The goal was that at least 50% of students identified as “need” increase their grades.

For criteria C, **MAP** data was not available from DESE for the 2020-21 school year.

For criteria D, **EOC** data was not available from DESE for the 2020-21 school year.

For criteria E, **Efficacy**, the mean score was **Satisfactory 72.7% or a mean score of 4.17** (3.78 mean Southeast Middle, 4.09 mean Hazelwood BGC, and 4.50 mean East High). Data shared used average Likert score data on four questions related to science efficacy. All sites' mean scores were above 3.0 on a 5.0 scale, indicating true almost half the time to almost always true. The comparative overall mean was 4.14. East High exceeded this mean, while Southeast Middle and Hazelwood BGC were slightly lower. The goal was for at least 70% of youth per site will report a medium to a high level of efficacy as measured by items on the Youth Survey.

Why is the program succeeding or struggling in a particular subject area? Why might some sites do better or worse than other sites in a particular domain or scale? (Answer based on the discussion at the second meeting.)

All goal 1 criteria were satisfactory or above across all content areas with the exception of Grades-students with pre-grade in the “need” category. Reading 1.1 For criteria B, Grades-students with pre-grade in the “need” category, all sites scored Less than Satisfactory 40% (N/A Southeast Middle, 50% Hazelwood BGC, and 100% East High). The goal was that at least 50% of students identified as “need” increase their grades. Mathematics 1.2 For criteria B, Grades-students with pre-grade in the “need” category, the mean score was Less than Satisfactory 42.9% (60% Southeast Middle, 0% Hazelwood BGC, and 0% East High). The goal was that at least 50% of students identified as “need” increase their grades. Science 1.3 For criteria B, Grades-students with pre-grade in the “need” category, the mean score was Less than Satisfactory 38.5% (42.9% Southeast Middle, 66.7% Hazelwood BGC, and 0% East High). The goal was that at least 50% of students identified as “need” increase their grades. MAP and EOC data were not collected for any content area, so other academic records aligned with their content should continue to be monitored.

Literacy and STEM programming efforts were reinforced. The St. Louis Internship Partnership provided SAT and ACT support at the high school level to assist with college entrance examinations. Attendance was not mandatory to participate. To support efficacy in math and science, Friday fun days, Zoo trips, scavenger hunts, science, reading, and collaborative group work were all planned and integrated into programming when possible.

2) **Goal 2 – Program Quality Rubric (2.1) – This includes PQA, Youth Program Quality Scale, Staff Program Quality Scale, and Family Program Quality Scale.**

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? How does the local context fit this data?

Across all sites, scores were **Satisfactory or Above** related to program quality. Four measures were used related to this criterion.

For criteria A, **Program Quality Assessment**, two sites scored **Satisfactory** (3.86 East High & 3.57 Southeast Middle), and one site scored **Advanced** (4.41 Hazelwood BGC). The goal was 4.4 or above on the Program Quality Scale for Hazelwood BGC and 2.9 or above on the PQA tool OR if less than 2.9, at least 50% of site staff attend an extra YWM training for East High and Southeast Middle.

For criteria B, **Staff Program Quality scale**, one site scored **More than Satisfactory** (4.16 Hazelwood BGC), and two sites scored **Advanced** (4.55 East High and 4.52 Southeast Middle). The goal was 4.0 or above on the Program Quality Scale for Hazelwood BGC and 4.5 or above on the Program Quality Scale for East High and Southeast Middle.

For criteria C, **Youth Program Quality scale**, one site scored **Advanced** (93.8% Hazelwood BGC), one site scored **Satisfactory** (75.7% Southeast Middle), and one site scored **More than Satisfactory** (80% East High). The goal was at least 90% for Hazelwood, at least 80% for East High, and at least 70% for Southeast Middle youth, indicating a positive response on the Program Quality scale.

For criteria D, **Family Program Quality scale**, two sites scored **Advanced** (100% East High and 90% Hazelwood BGC), and one site scored **More than Satisfactory** (81.3% Southeast Middle). The goal was at least 90% of family members indicating a positive response on the Program Quality scale for East High and Hazelwood BGC and at least 80% for Southeast Middle.

3) **Goal 2 – School Day Alignment Rubric (2.2)** – *This includes Coordination of Academic Support, State Standards, School Day Admin Scale, and Staff School Day Linkages Scale.*

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? How does the local context fit this data?

Across all sites, scores were **Satisfactory or Above** related to program quality. Four measures were used related to this criterion.

For criteria A, **Coordination of Academic Support-Consistency of Curriculum and Content**, Hazelwood BGC scored **Advanced** (document review), Southeast Middle scored **More than Satisfactory** (document review), and East High scored **Satisfactory** (document review). The goal for each school was to have documentation of the implementation of the agreed-upon plan.

For criteria B, **Documenting State Standards**, all sites scored **Advanced** (document review). Lesson plans for all academic enrichment activities (math, reading, and science) include the full description of the state standards OR lesson plans for all activities (except homework help, tutoring, snack, and free time) including the minimum coding of state standards.

For criteria C, **School Day Administrator Surveys**, one site scored **More than Satisfactory** (3.44 Hazelwood BGC), one site scored **Advanced** (3.89 East High), and Southeast Middle was **Not Applicable**. The goal for

Hazelwood was an average score of at least 3.4 on the Administrator Survey, and the goal for East High was an average score of at least 3.7 on the Administrator Survey.

For criteria D, **Staff/Coordinator School Day Linkages Scale**, all sites scored **More than satisfactory** (4.23 Southeast, 4.36 East High, and 4.08 Hazelwood BGC). The goal of all sites was to have an average score of at least 4.0 on the School Day Linkages scale.

4) **Goal 2 – Broad Array Rubric (2.3)** – *This includes Academic Strategies, SEL, Lesson Planning, Schedules, and Choice.*

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? How does the local context fit this data?

Across all sites, scores were **Satisfactory or Above** related to program quality. Five measures were used related to this criterion.

For criteria A, **Academic Strategies Based on Student Needs**, two sites scored **Advanced** (Southeast Middle and Hazelwood) (document review), and one site scored **Satisfactory** (East High)(Document review). The goal of East High was to have documentation that at least one intentional academic strategy based on student academic needs has been implemented. The goal of Hazelwood BGC was to have data to document the impact of at least two academic strategies based on students' academic needs. The goal of Southeast Middle was to have Data to document the impact of at least two academic strategies based on students' academic needs.

For criteria B, **Social and Emotional Learning Activities**, one site scored **Satisfactory** (East High) (document review), and two sites scored **More than Satisfactory** (Southeast Middle & Hazelwood BGC) (document review). The goal for East High and Southeast Middle was to have documentation that at least two SEL activities (individual, small group, or whole group) were implemented. The goal of Hazelwood BGC was to have documentation of at least three SEL activities OR a summary of the site's approach to supporting SEL that includes at least two of the following: topics covered, frequency of SEL activities, the rationale for selection.

For criteria C, **Lesson Plans**, all sites scored **Satisfactory** (East High, Hazelwood BGC, and Southeast) (document review). All sites had a goal for all academic support activities to have lesson plans with objectives, procedures, materials, etc.

For criteria D, **Weekly Schedule-Exposure to a Variety of Topics**, all sites scored **Advanced** (East High, Southeast Middle, and Hazelwood BGC) (document review). All sites had a goal to have a weekly schedule that includes academic support and at least four of the following areas: health/recreation/ fitness, fine and performing arts, college and career readiness, social and emotional learning, service learning, and life skills education.

For criteria E, **Daily Schedule-Variety of Activities Each Day**, two sites scored **Advanced** (East High and Southeast Middle) (document review), and one site scored **Satisfactory** (Hazelwood BGC) (document review). The goal for East High and Southeast Middle was to have a daily schedule that has at least three activities per day for each age group (excluding snacks/meal). The goal for Hazelwood BGC was to have a daily schedule with at least two activities per day for each age group (excluding snacks/meal).

For criteria F, **Choice of Activities**, two sites scored **Advanced** (East High & Southeast Middle) (document review), and one site scored **Satisfactory** (Hazelwood BGC) (document review). The goal for East High and Southeast Middle was for the youth to have daily opportunities to choose from the site's broad array of enrichment activities (health/ recreation/fitness, fine and performing arts, college and career readiness, social and emotional learning, STEM, life skills education, service learning, etc.). The goal for Hazelwood BGC was to have a daily or weekly schedule that allows youth the opportunity to choose at least one activity throughout the week. (Note: Evidence that youth "select" a class/group/club to sign up for at least quarterly can be accepted for "choice" at the satisfactory level.)

5) **Goal 2 – Family Engagement Rubric (2.4) – This includes Family & Child Academic Enrichment, Educational Development for Adult Family Members, Family and Staff Strengthening Families Scales.**

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? How does the local context fit this data?

Across all sites, scores were **Satisfactory or Above** related to program quality. Two measures were used related to this criterion.

For criteria A, **Family and Child Academic Enrichment Opportunities**, all sites scored **More than Satisfactory** (document review). The goal for each school was to have documentation of two family engagement opportunities with participating families in attendance.

For criteria B, **Educational Development for Adult Family Members of Students Served**, all sites scored **More than Satisfactory** (document review). The goal for each school was to have documentation that the educational development opportunity for families of students served with attendance was planned based on additional needs assessment/survey within the current year.

For criteria C, **Family Strengthening Families Scale**, all sites scored **Less than Satisfactory** (61.5%). The goal was at least 70% of family members indicate a positive response on the Strengthening Families scale.

For criteria D, **Afterschool Staff Strengthening Families Scale**, all sites scored **More than Satisfactory** (83.3%). The goal was at least 80% of staff indicate a positive response on the Strengthening Families scale.

*The Program Quality Scale (Afterschool Staff version) contained 52 items. The majority of the items fell above 4.0 (true about three-fourths of the time) and were within the range (@ .25) of the comparative value. One item of concern includes, "Our program provides public recognition of community volunteers, organizations, and businesses that contribute to the afterschool program" at Hazelwood BGC (2.50 and only score below 3).

*The Program Quality Scale (Youth version) contained 18 items. A majority of the item mean scores were 4.0 or higher (true about three-fourths of the time). Southeast Middle scored 2.62 on the “I get to help pick the activities at the program.”

*The Family Program Quality Scale contained 20 items. A majority of the item mean scores were 4.0 or higher (true about three-fourths of the time). The question, “An adult in our family has been personally recruited to participate in and/or lead sessions at the afterschool program.” is an item of concern because both Southeast Middle (2.44) and Hazelwood (2.20) scored below 3 indicating disagreement.

*The School Administrator/Principal Survey had 17 of 18 items scoring at 3.0 or higher, with the exception of one item, “Some professional development activities are coordinated between the school district/school day and afterschool program,” scored 2.00 from Hazelwood BGC. Southeast Middle did not have any data for this survey.

*The School Day Linkages (Staff) scale results showed that all sites scored 3.50 or higher on every item.

*The Strengthening Families (Family version) 9 survey item results showed that all item sites scored 3.0 or higher on every item. East High outperformed the comparative mean on each item as well.

*The Strengthening Families (staff/coordinator version) scale contained 13 items. All sites scored above 3.0 on every item except the question, “Family activities provide time for families to work with their child (e.g., doing crafts together, cooperative games),” on which East High scored 2.5.

Why is the program succeeding or struggling in a particular rubric item? Why might some sites do better or worse than other sites in a particular rubric item? (Answer based on the discussion at the second meeting.)

Progress related to goal 2 continues at all sites since the start of the grant. All criteria were scored as Satisfactory or above at all sites with the exception of 2.4.C, **Family Strengthening Families Scale**. All sites scored **Less than Satisfactory** (61.5%). The goal was at least 70% of family members indicate a positive response on the Strengthening Families scale. The Strengthening Families (Family version) 9 survey item results showed that all item sites scored 3.0 or higher on every item. East High outperformed the comparative mean on each item as well. Programming efforts to address individual student needs has been a successful endeavor for student participants under the constraints of operating the program during Covid-19. Intentional communication and efforts are in place to get feedback from administration and staff at all sites related to programming and student needs. Tracking student communication and progress and communicating program schedules and content were beneficial based on the data. Minor targeted efforts related to survey responses can be made in the following areas noted above in Section 6 Goal 2 for any questions at sites that fell below 3.0 indicating disagreement or not true.

6) **Goal 3 – Program Attendance Rubric (3.1)** – *This includes Proposed vs. Actual Attendance and grade level attendance benchmarks.*

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? How does the local context fit this data?

Across all sites, scores were **Satisfactory or Above** related to program quality. Seven measures were used related to this criterion.

For criteria A, **Proposed vs. Actual Attendance**, all sites scored **Less than Satisfactory** (35.8%). The goal was actual 30+ day attendance at least 80% of proposed attendance.

For criteria B, **Elementary- 30+ days**, all sites scored **Advanced** (75.0%). The goal was at least 70% of youth attend 30+ days.

For criteria C, **Elementary stretch- 60+ days**, all sites scored **Satisfactory** (50.0%). The goal was at least 50% of youth attend 60+ days.

For criteria D, **Middle School/Junior High- 30+ days**, all sites scored **Advanced** (66.7%). The goal was at least 60% of youth attend 30+ days.

For criteria E, **Middle School/Junior High stretch- 45+ days**, all sites scored **More than Satisfactory** (63.3%). The goal was at least 60% of youth attend 45+ days.

For criteria F, **High School- 30+ days**, all sites scored **Advanced** (62.5%). The goal was at least 50% of youth attend 30+ days.

For criteria G, **High School stretch- 30+ days**, all sites scored **More than Satisfactory** (62.5%). The goal was at least 60% of youth attend 30+ days.

7) **Goal 3 – Positive School Behaviors – Personal and Social Skills Rubric (3.2)** *This includes the Personal and Social Skills Scale and School Day Discipline.*

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? How does the local context fit this data?

Across all sites, **Satisfactory or Above** scores were related to program quality. Two measures were used related to this criterion.

For criteria A, **Personal and Social Skills scale**, all sites scored **Advanced** (91.1%). The goal was at least 90% of youth indicate a medium to a high level of personal and social skills on the Youth Survey OR the site level SEL plan includes personal and social skills, a lesson plan specific to personal and social skills, and data to document impact.

For criteria B, **School Day Discipline (DESE Data)**, data was not available from DESE for the 2021-22 school year.

8) **Goal 3 – Positive School Behaviors – Commitment to Learning (3.3)** *This includes the Commitment to Learning Scale and School Day Attendance.*

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? How does the local context fit this data?

Across all sites, scores were **Satisfactory or Above** related to program quality. Two measures were used related to this criterion.

For criteria A, **Commitment to Learning scale**, all sites scored **Advanced** (94.5%). The goal was at least 90% of youth indicate a medium to a high level of commitment to learning on the Youth Survey OR the site level SEL plan includes a commitment to learning, lesson plan, and data to document impact.

For criteria B, **School Day Attendance (DESE Data)**, data was not available from DESE for the 2021-22 school year.

Indicator 3.1a was targeted to work on related to program attendance at all sites. Restrictions related to Covid continued to impact all sites related to program attendance. Those students enrolled in the program at all levels truly want to be in attendance and benefit from the programming. Efforts were made to combine programming efforts and to move programming locations to increase attendance for the middle and high school. Increases in attendance did occur. The lack of feeder schools also impacted attendance. The program staff continued to be innovative and creative but their efforts do not fully show in the attendance data. School Day Attendance (DESE Data) and School Day Discipline data were not reported and are recommended to target and monitor next year since one year of data is missing.

Section 7 – Longitudinal Progress

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

Please use this document and the previous Guided Reflection documents to look at trends over time.

1. What trends are noted across time related to the three goals?

- a. Goal 1 – Student Achievement and Sense of Competence:

2021- 2022: All goal 1 criteria were satisfactory or above across all content areas with the exception of Grades-students with pre-grade in the “need” category. Reading 1.1 For criteria B, Grades-students with pre-grade in the “need” category, all sites scored Less than Satisfactory 40% (N/A Southeast Middle, 50% Hazelwood BGC, and 100% East High). The goal was that at least 50% of students identified as “need” increase their grades. Mathematics 1.2 For criteria B, Grades-students with pre-grade in the “need” category, the mean score was Less than Satisfactory 42.9% (60% Southeast Middle, 0% Hazelwood BGC, and 0% East High). The goal was that at least 50% of students identified as “need” increase their grades. Science 1.3 For criteria B, Grades-students with pre-grade in the “need” category, the mean score was Less than Satisfactory 38.5% (42.9% Southeast Middle, 66.7% Hazelwood BGC, and 0% East High). The goal was that at least 50% of students identified as “need” increase their grades. MAP and EOC data were not collected for any content area, so other academic records aligned with their content should continue to be monitored. Literacy and STEM programming efforts were reinforced. The St. Louis Internship Partnership provided SAT and ACT support at the high school level to assist with college entrance examinations. Attendance was not mandatory to participate. To support efficacy in math and science, Friday fun days, Zoo trips, scavenger hunts, science, reading, and collaborative group work were all planned and integrated into programming when possible.

2020-2021: Programming, virtual and kits, were designed with outcomes in mind aligned with student needs. Literacy and STEM programming efforts were reinforced. The St. Louis Internship Partnership provided SAT and ACT support at the high school level to assist with college entrance examinations. Attendance was not mandatory to participate. To support efficacy in math and science, Friday fun days, Zoo trips, scavenger hunts, science, reading, and collaborative group work were all planned and integrated into self-directed kits when possible. Schedules of virtual learning showed STEM and Power Hour. MAP and EOC data were not collected for any content area, so should other academic records aligned with their content should continue to be monitored. Although data is based on a small number of students, all other academic and efficacy data in all categories were reported as More than Satisfactory or Advanced. Program efforts used to support these students were successful.

2019-2020: Programming funds multiple tutors that are site-based. The elementary reading program has struggled because more members need tutoring. Efforts have been made to recruit high school/college volunteers to assist with this need. site-based tutors and students have numerous indoor and outdoor academic activities and age-appropriate academic programming (ex. Power Hour and Stride Academy). Most middle school students are reading at a level at least two grades below the grade in which they are currently placed and/or have an IEP. To help bridge the gap, staff placed strong attention on reading/ELA in our tutoring and STRIDE sessions. In middle school, reading sessions are conducted. These sessions consist of members being placed in small groups or individually, and each member gets to read a book that interests them most. At the high school level, to assist with EOC exams, teaching staff provided study guides for EOC tests, and after-school staff assisted with preparedness for exams. To support efficiency in math and science, partners are invited to support the program by hosting after school programs and summer programs that emphasize math and science activities. High School members do not have a tutor but have communicated with daytime staff to provide additional support by way of the existing tutor program. Members perform a weekly grade check to identify specific non-satisfactory subject grades. Management has communicated with families and teaching staff regarding the need and enrollment of members in tutoring to support better academic progress in subjects of science, math, and in preparation for EOC. The guidance counselor at the high school continues to provide academic support and college preparation assistance (SAT/ACT) to students regarding college applications. All sites have stressed STEM content and efficacy and provide at least one weekly STEM lesson.

2018-2019: Emphasis has been placed on science and science efficacy over the past two years. Focus for the future should find a balance or integration with science, mathematics, and reading programming. Contextual data reported alignment with these areas to work on by the use of tutoring (one-on-one attention in communication arts, history, math, and science, with special attention on reading skills); and Reading Room (a quiet space dedicated to reading alone or in groups. Small libraries provide age-appropriate reading material on a variety of subjects). Attention has also been placed on STEM and should continue.

b. Goal 2 – Program Quality:

2021- 2022: Progress related to goal 2 continues at all sites since the start of the grant. All criteria were scored as Satisfactory or above at all sites with the exception of 2.4.C, **Family Strengthening Families Scale**. All sites scored **Less than Satisfactory** (61.5%). The goal was at least 70% of family members indicate a positive response on the Strengthening Families scale. The Strengthening Families (Family version) 9 survey item results showed that all item sites scored 3.0 or higher on every item. East High outperformed the comparative mean on each item as well. Programming efforts to address individual student needs has been a successful endeavor for student participants under the constraints of operating the program during Covid-19.

Intentional communication and efforts are in place to get feedback from administration and staff at all sites related to programming and student needs. Tracking student communication and progress and communicating program schedules and content were beneficial based on the data. Minor targeted efforts related to survey responses can be made in the following areas noted within Section 6 Goal 2 for any questions at sites that fell below 3.0 indicating disagreement or not true.

2020-2021: Progress has been made on goal 2 since last year at all sites. All criteria were scored as Satisfactory or above at all sites with the exception of 2.1 criteria D, **Staff/Coordinator School Day Linkages Scale**, one site scored **Less than Satisfactory** (3.38 East High). A goal of 3.5 was set for East High to score on the **Staff/Coordinator School Day Linkages Scale**. Programming efforts to address individual student needs through self-directed kits was a successful endeavor for student participants under the constraints of operating the program during Covid-19. Intentional communication and efforts are in place to get feedback from administration and staff at all sites related to programming and student needs. Tracking student communication and progress and communicating program schedules and content were beneficial based on the data. Minor targeted efforts related to survey responses can be made in the following areas noted in the report or summary related to goal 2.

2019-2020: Due to Covid-19, many measures were not scored, and recommendations should be a focus for next year to continue monitoring for program improvement. Continue to work on programming to have consistent structure at all sites. During year three, at middle school and high school, there continues to be an improvement in youth participation. The elementary school has a seasoned staff, and is still very consistent in his/her work effort, efficacy, and implementation of programming efforts. Staff turnover at middle school continued in year three. There are attempts by staff to make academic activities game based and use high-engagement activities at the middle school due to the low achievement levels of middle school students. Entrepreneurial endeavors were also a focus to promote high-engagement academic activities (i.e., tabletop shirt makers) for students. Working with staff to promote a more engaging environment with programming. The elementary school collaborates well with the Club staff in implementing programming efforts. The elementary school is still very consistent in his/her work effort, efficacy, and implementation of programming efforts. Middle school and High school leadership are supportive of the Club and continue to help increase enrollment. Intentional communication and efforts are in place to get feedback from administration and staff at all sites related to programming and student needs. Working with staff to promote a more engaging environment with programming. At the high school, schedules are posted weekly, and announcements are made to members daily on the school intercom system as well as during program hours. These announcements are visible in the program space to let members know of upcoming events as well as request their input on program activities.

2018- 2019: Continue to work on programming to have consistent structure at all sites. During year two, at middle school and high school, there has been an improvement in youth participation. The collection of administrator survey data is critical to have perspective included within site evaluation and should be a priority. Efforts should be made to make survey administrator(s) are aware of the survey's purpose, data collection window, and reminders sent to complete the survey. High school students continued to have ACT support from the school guidance counselor. Events continue to take place where students and parents/families can attend and learn about various programming (i.e., career launch diplomas to degrees) and academic portfolio. Attendance at these events continues to increase. The Club also continues to assist in sharing scholarship information and financial resources with students and parents/families. Rising freshmen attend high school summer club in which the focus was on study skills and organization. The same transition process occurs with 5th grade students transitioning to 6th grade. Additionally, weekly and daily schedules should be reviewed and enhanced at East High School. Reviewing documents from Grannemann

and Southeast Middle School may be beneficial for East High School, and/or schedules may be diverse weekly or daily, so submitting the best schedules reflective of weekly and daily activities.

c. Goal 3 – Youth Outcomes:

2021- 2022: **Indicator 3.1a** was targeted to work on related to program attendance at all sites. Restrictions related to Covid continued to impact all sites related to program attendance. Those students enrolled in the program at all levels truly want to be in attendance and benefit from the programming. Efforts were made to combine programming efforts and to move programming locations to increase attendance for the middle and high school. Increases in attendance did occur. The lack of feeder schools also impacted attendance. The program staff continued to be innovative and creative but their efforts do not fully show in the attendance data. School Day Attendance (DESE Data) and School Day Discipline data were not reported and are recommended to target and monitor next year since one year of data is missing.

2020-2021: Collaborate with school and community partners to focus on recruitment and retention efforts. Attendance had been improved or maintained over the past years compared to prior reports. Covid-19 and The closure of schools and on-site programming had a great impact related to program attendance. All attendance criteria for all sites were noted as Less than Satisfactory. Staff did try multiple ways to increase attendance during remote learning and when students had an opportunity to be at on-site programming. East Middle School also did not allow the program to return onsite, which played a role in recruiting and retaining participants. Partnering with community agencies did contribute to success in recruitment and retention efforts. Data showed that students who participated in the program with all of the pivots in place did show success with all programming efforts. School Day Attendance and School Day Discipline data were not reported and are recommended to target and monitor next year since one year of data is missing.

2018-2020: Efforts across sites since year one related to attendance, positive school behaviors (personal and social skills), and positive school behaviors (commitment to learning) have positively impacted grant outcomes. Contextual data reported that efforts were made during year one to improve attendance (ADA data clearly articulated how to collect now based on a misunderstanding of how data was collected last year; Have a full-time youth development officer who has a main responsibility for making sure attendance checked and monitored; Membership secretary also alerts parents if attendance has dropped) and grant results show the efforts positively contributed to grant outcomes.

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.)

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, Section 4 above), what progress can be seen in the available data?

Indicator 3.1a was targeted to work on related to program attendance at all sites. Restrictions related to Covid continued to impact all sites related to program attendance. Those students enrolled in the program at all levels truly want to be in attendance and benefit from the programming. Efforts were made to combine programming efforts and to move programming locations to increase attendance for the middle and high school. Increases in attendance did occur. The lack of feeder schools also impacted attendance. The

program staff continued to be innovative and creative but their efforts do not fully show in the attendance data. School Day Attendance (DESE Data) and School Day Discipline data were not reported and are recommended to target and monitor next year since one year of data is missing.

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 objectives do you recommend the program focus on for improvement? The evaluator should recommend 2-3 objectives if there are multiple areas that should be worked on simultaneously or if there are multiple sites that do not have the same recommended objectives.

When selecting recommendations, prioritize objectives that are marked as “Less than Satisfactory” on the data chart (Part B). If there are no items that are “Less than Satisfactory” at the objective level, please recommend objectives that have individual rubric items that are “Less than Satisfactory”. If all items are “Satisfactory or Above”, please select an item based off of your discussion with the program director.

- a. Select the objective number(s) that you are recommending:

☐ 1.1 ☐ 1.2 ☐ 1.3
☐ 2.1 ☐ 2.2 ☐ 2.3 ☐ 2.4
☒ 3.1 ☐ 3.2 ☐ 3.3

- b. For each site, indicate the objective number applicable to that site.

	Objective(s) for Improvement
Site 1: Hazelwood BGC	3.1
Site 2: Southeast Middle School	3.1
Site 3: East High School	3.1
Site 4:	
Site 5:	
Site 6:	

- c. After selecting the objective number(s), provide a rationale for each recommendation based on the data presented earlier. (Note: Action plans will be developed with the Afterschool Regional Educator so this response should be a standalone explanation of why you are recommending this item that the ARE can read to gain a quick but thorough understanding of the need, local context, and rationale for selection.)

Collaborate with school and community partners to focus on recruitment and retention efforts. Prior to Covid 19, attendance had improved since the start of the grant. All attendance criteria for all sites were noted as Less than Satisfactory for the second year. Those students enrolled in the program at all levels truly want to be in attendance and benefit from the programming. Efforts were made to combine programming efforts and to move programming locations to increase attendance for the middle and high school. Increases

in attendance did occur. Partnering with community agencies did contribute to success in recruitment and retention efforts. The lack of feeder schools also impacted attendance. The program staff continued to be innovative and creative but their efforts do not fully show in the attendance data. School Day Attendance (DESE Data) and School Day Discipline data were not reported and are recommended to target and monitor next year since one year of data is missing.

Section 8 – 21st Century Community Learning Center Evaluation Summary

The external evaluator should prepare an evaluation summary using the template provided at the beginning of the document. The evaluation summary should be a summary of 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 two pages and not more than three), 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.