

**21<sup>st</sup> CCLC External Evaluation**  
**Guided Reflection Documentation**  
**(Boys and Girls Clubs of Greater St. Louis and**  
**Riverview Gardens Highland Elementary)**

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

21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Grantee Name: Mission St. Louis

Cohort #: 12 Year in the grant: 1

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: 5/13/22	Date of second meeting: 1/17/23
Site 1: Highland Elementary	Attendee: Keisha Caruthers Roxanne Crawford	Attendee: Roxanne Crawford

**To be completed by the 21<sup>st</sup> 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

## Guided Reflection Instructions

The certified external evaluator should complete all sections of this report using the framework and charts provided. There are eight sections of the Guided Reflection Documentation.

### Evaluation Summary

Instructions are in Part C, Section 8, but for ease of review, the Evaluation Summary has been moved to the front of the document. Grantees may use the evaluation summary as their public document, rather than posting or distributing the entire Guided Reflection Document.

### Part A: Additional Data Collection by the External Evaluator

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

### Part B: Data Charts

5. Review of Data Reports

### Part C: Narrative Responses

6. Status of Current Year's Objectives
7. Longitudinal Progress
8. 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center Evaluation Summary

Sections 1-4 should be completed following the first face-to-face meeting (prior to 6/30/22) based on the external evaluators notes from the first meeting.

Sections 6-8 should be completed by the external evaluator once they have received the data and before the second face-to-face meeting with the program director. Note: There are selected questions in Sections 6-8 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 provide the program director an opportunity to clarify previously provided information and provide additional context/clarification as needed and allow the conversations at the second face-to-face meeting to focus on responding to the additional reflection questions.

The Guided Reflection Documentation and Evaluation Summary are due to DESE by the deadline. The external evaluator should submit the documentation to the grantee. The grant administrator must sign the Cover Page of the Guided Reflection and e-mail it to DESE. The full Guided Reflection Document (including the Cover Page and the Evaluation Summary) should also be submitted by the grant administrator to DESE via e-mail.



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

### (BGC Greater St. Louis Riverview Gardens Highland Elementary – Complete summary after Guided Reflection Section 8)

Afterschool programs are an evidence-based strategy for helping students meet challenging academic standards, improve attendance and graduation rates, and develop college and career readiness skills and behaviors. The federally funded 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) program provides competitive grant funding to districts to implement before- and after-school and summer enrichment programs that support and enhance student outcomes. (Riverview Gardens Highland Elementary) received a 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grant in (2021). The afterschool program operates (1 SITE) in (1 ELEMENTARY) serving (43 STUDENTS).

Each year, 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grantees undergo an external evaluation process that reviews their progress related to three broad afterschool goals: 1) academic improvement and efficacy, 2) program quality, and 3) youth outcomes. During the 2021-22 school year, each site recorded attendance and grades data, received a Program Quality Assessment (PQA) observation, and completed a series of afterschool surveys with responses from (22) youth, (12) families, (8) program staff, and (1) school administrator. A certified external evaluator met with the program administrator to review data and complete a Guided Reflection Document. Results from the annual external evaluation ensure grant compliance and influence continuous quality improvement efforts including modifying the program curricula and enrichment activities and planning professional development for staff.

#### Goal 1: Academic Achievement and Efficacy

Afterschool programs provide a full range of academic support including homework help, tutoring, academic enrichment, and comprehensive integrated units directly tied to the state standards. They provide activities that complement rather than replicate the school day.

Programming was designed with outcomes in mind aligned with student needs. Literacy and STEM programming efforts were reinforced. To support efficacy in math and science, Friday fun days, Zoo trips, scavenger hunts, science, reading, collaborative group work were all planned and integrated when possible. Schedules reflected initial time for STEM and Power Hour. Map data in all content areas were not included with the report data so should continue to review and monitor the results of that data with other academic data. Although data is based on a small number of students, grade data for all academic categories (criteria A) were reported as Advanced 100%. Related to science: For criteria B, **Grades-students with pre-grade in the “need” category**, the site scored **Less than Satisfactory 80.0%**. The goal was less than 50% of students identified as “need” increase their grade. For criteria E, **Efficacy**, the site scored **Less than Satisfactory 68.2%**. The goal was Less than 70% of youth per site will report a medium to high level of efficacy as measured by items on the Youth Survey. Future programming efforts should target these students for both science content and efficacy.

#### Goal 2: Program Quality

Research shows that high quality afterschool programs help close the achievement gap and reduce the likelihood of youth participating in risk-taking behaviors. The 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grant recipients participate in an 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.

All criteria were scored as Satisfactory or above for the site with the exception criteria C, **Family Strengthening Families Scale**, the site scored **Less than Satisfactory (41.7%)**. The goal was less than

70% of family members indicate a positive response on the Strengthening Families scale. Programming efforts to address individual student needs was a successful endeavor for student participants under the constraints of operating the program during Covid-19 restrictions/transitions. Intentional communication and efforts are in place to get feedback from administration and staff related to programming and student needs. Tracking student communication and progress and communicating program schedules and content was beneficial based on the data. Minor targeted efforts related to survey responses can be made in the following areas noted above with an \* that fell below a 3.0 indicating do not agree or not true (\*See end of Section 6, Goal 2).

### 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).

2021-2022: **Indicator 3.1a** is targeted to work on **Proposed vs. Actual Attendance**, the site scored **Less than Satisfactory** (36.5%). The goal was actual 30+ day attendance is at least 80% of proposed attendance. Additionally 3.1c is also targeted to work on, **Elementary stretch- 60+ days**, the site scored **Less than Satisfactory** (28.6%). The goal was at least 50% of youth attend 60+ days. Restrictions related to Covid continued to impact the site related to program attendance. Those students enrolled in the program at all grade levels truly want to be in attendance and benefit from the programming. Increases in attendance did occur over the year. 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](mailto:roxanne@bgcstl.org).

## **Part A: Additional Data Collection by the External Evaluator**

### **Section 1 – Grantee/Evaluator Information**

21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Grantee Name: BGC Greater St. Louis

Cohort #: 12      Year in the grant: 1      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: 5/13/22	Date of second meeting: 1/17/23	Site Visit? (Y/N)
Site 1:	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 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 Riverview Gardens Highland Elementary continues to serve youth ages 6 – 11 in grades Kindergarten up to 5<sup>th</sup> grade. Although a new grant, prior 21st Century grant evidence shows that enrollment is modest compared to prior years due to transitions from Covid. ESSER III funds were submitted but delayed in received which contributed to lower participation with a delay to implementing programming. Additionally, no feeder schools are contributing to attendance like in the past. Feeder schools will begin to participate summer 2022. Have a staff to student ratio of 1:16 that needs to be maintained. Administrative structure remains the same and program director is the same.

During year one of the grant, similar content and activities from prior grant experience were provided at the site. Programming efforts address student needs. Communication efforts include emails and phone calls to keep in touch with participants and their families. Programming includes all key Boys and Girls Clubs programming related to academic success, healthy lifestyle, leadership and character development, and music and arts programming. Specific programming includes: 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. A small library provides age-appropriate reading material on a variety of subjects.). Homework is typical and Power Hour and Stride Academy (aligned with MO Learning standards) support time for homework completion. If a student does not have homework or finishes early, he/she may participate in engaging academic activities.

The afterschool program operates one site at Highland Elementary within the Riverview Gardens school district serving 43 students (Missouri Afterschool External Evaluator Grantee Summary Report 2021-2022 Kids Care Center 5+ days attendance).

### **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 30<sup>th</sup>. 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: During year one of the grant, similar content and activities from prior grant experience were provided at the site. Programming efforts address student needs. Communication efforts include emails and phone calls to keep in touch with participants and their families. Programming includes all key Boys and Girls Clubs programming related to academic success, healthy lifestyle, leadership and character development, and music and arts programming. Specific programming includes: 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. A small library provides age-appropriate reading material on a variety of subjects.). Homework is typical and Power Hour and Stride Academy (aligned with MO Learning standards) support time for homework completion. Have asked for hotspots from district and get some support. Firewalls have been a barrier at times. Cleaning and keeping technology up to par at Riverview Gardens has been an issue but troubleshoot. If a student does not have homework or finishes early, he/she may participate in engaging academic activities.

Staff: Staff used tracking sheets to document reaching out to families for afterschool programming, Programming efforts address multiple needs (academic and social) of students. Emails and phone calls are utilized to keep in touch with participants and their families. Staff are familiar and trained on all key Boys and Girls Clubs programming related to academics, and good character and citizenship. A social worker also supports programming efforts. Schedules reflect time specifically for STEM and Power Hour. All program planning was completed with outcomes in mind.

School: MAP occurred spring of 2022 and programming staff served as proctors.

Community: Collaboration with stakeholders outside of the school were very limited due to policies of not allowing external agencies in the building. Community were shared and enhanced when possible.

- 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 the site. Communication efforts supported academic programming with use of emails and phone calls. Compared to prior years from prior 21st Century grant, participation at all sites was minimal.

Staff: See context for staff and academics. ESSER III funds were submitted but delayed in received which contributed to lower participation with a delay to implementing programming. Additionally,

no feeder schools are contributing to attendance like in the past. Feeder schools will begin to participate summer 2022. Have a staff to student ratio of 1:16 that needs to be maintained. Administrative structure remains the same and program director is the same.

Continued to work on strategies with staff to work with student's social and emotional needs to support academics at site. A social worker also contributed to addressing SEL needs with students. All curriculum planning was done with outcomes in mind.

School: See context for school and academics. When meeting with school administrator, did take laptops so administrator so surveys could be completed. Principal has transitioned to new site.

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 with community events (i.e., extra efforts as far as email and phone correspondence)/Additionally partnered with community agencies (Seeds of Substance, Black Nursing Associates, Urban League, CARE STL) to provide food and distribute information related to Covid-19 and vaccines.

- 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, team work, 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, compared to prior years. For all students, personal and social skills (e.g., time management, team work, critical thinking), and commitment to learning (e.g., initiative, homework completion, study skills) all continued to be emphasized throughout programming efforts.

Staff: Staff continue to have open dialogue, regularly, with members to discuss ways to successfully advocate for themselves and overcome academic challenges. Staff also continue to connect with member teachers to discuss 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.

School: See context for school and academics. Continue to work on strategies with staff to work with student's on participation and social and emotional needs to support academics at site. Staff also introduced the Club during carpool lines to increase participation for the next school year.

Community: 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> x_ 1.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x_ 1.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x_ 1.3	
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2.2	<input type="checkbox"/> 2.3	<input type="checkbox"/> 2.4
<input 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.

#### **Areas for Improvement within Goal 1 prior year:**

MAP data was not included in the report data for any content area so site should monitor MAP data along with other academic records aligned with assessed content areas. Although data is based on a small number of students, grade data for all academic categories were reported as Advanced 100%. Program efforts used to support these students were successful. For all academic categories reported, Grades-students with pre-grade in the "need" category scored Less than Satisfactory. Because all student's grades were in the Advanced category, data may not have been able to report in this area.

Restrictions related to Covid continued to impact site related to program attendance. Those students enrolled in the program truly want to be in attendance and benefit from the programming. The delayed start and lack of feeder schools impacted program attendance. However, staff are trained in programming content and high-quality Boys and Girls Clubs programming is used aligned with academic needs (content and efficacy).

#### **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		
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, the grantee scored **satisfactory or above**.

For criteria A, **Grades – all 30+**, site scored **Advanced 85.7%**. The goal was at least 70% of youth maintain or increase their grade in reading/language arts.

For criteria B, **Grades-students with pre-grade in the “need” category**, the site scored **Advanced 75.0%**. The goal was at least 70% of students identified as “need” to increase their grade.

For criteria C, **MAP** data was not available from DESE for the 2021-21 school year.

For criteria D, **EOC** data was not available from DESE for the 2021-21 school year.

For criteria E, **Efficacy**, the site scored **More than Satisfactory 86.4%**. The goal was at least 80% of youth per site will report a medium to 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, the grantee scored **satisfactory or above**.

For criteria A, **Grades – all 30+**, site scored **Advanced 75.0%**. The goal was at least 70% of youth maintain or increase their grade in math.

For criteria B, **Grades-students with pre-grade in the “need” category**, the site scored **Advanced 100.0%**. The goal was at least 70% of students identified as “need” to increase their grade.

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 site scored **Satisfactory 77.3%**. The goal was least 70% of youth per site will report a medium to 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, the grantee scored **satisfactory or above**.

For criteria A, **Grades – all 30+**, the site scored **Advanced 100.00%**. The goal was at least 70% of youth maintain or increase their grade in science.

For criteria B, **Grades-students with pre-grade in the “need” category**, the site scored **Less than Satisfactory 80.0%**. The goal was less than 50% of students identified as “need” increase their grade.

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 site scored **Less than Satisfactory 68.2%**. The goal was Less than 70% of youth per site will report a medium to high level of efficacy as measured by items on the Youth Survey.

Programming was designed with outcomes in mind aligned with student needs. Literacy and STEM programming efforts were reinforced. To support efficacy in math and science, Friday fun days, Zoo trips, scavenger hunts, science, reading, collaborative group work were all planned and integrated when possible. Schedules reflected initial time for STEM and Power Hour. Map data in all content areas were not included with the report data so should continue to review and monitor the results of that data with other academic data. Although data is based on a small number of students, grade data for all academic categories (criteria A) were reported as Advanced 100%. Related to science: For criteria B, **Grades-students with pre-grade in the “need” category**, the site scored **Less than Satisfactory 80.0%**. The goal was less than 50% of students identified as “need” increase their grade. For criteria E, **Efficacy**, the site scored **Less than Satisfactory 68.2%**. The goal was Less than 70% of youth per site will report a medium to high level of efficacy as measured by items on the Youth Survey. Future programming efforts should target these students for both science content and efficacy.

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?

Site scores were **Satisfactory or Above** related to program quality. Four measures were used related to this criterion.

For criteria A, **Program Quality Assessment**, the site scored **More than Satisfactory (4.06)**. The goal was 3.9 or above on the PQA tool.

For criteria B, **Staff Program Quality scale**, the site scored **More than Satisfactory (4.40)**. The goal was 3.9 on PQA tool.

For criteria C, **Youth Program Quality scale**, the site scored **More than Satisfactory** (81.8%). The goal was at least 80% of youth indicate a positive response on the Program Quality scale.

For criteria D, **Family Program Quality scale**, the site scored **Advanced** (91.7%). The goal was at least 90% of family members indicating a positive response on the Program Quality scale.

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?

Site scores were **Satisfactory or Above** related to program quality. Two measures were used related to this criterion.

For criteria A, **Coordination of Academic Support-Consistency of Curriculum and Content**, the site scored **More than Satisfactory** (document review). The goal for this site was to have documentation that the written plan is agreed upon by both parties.

For criteria B, **Documenting State Standards**, the site scored **Advanced** (document review). The goal was that 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) include the minimum coding of state standards.

For criteria C, **School Day Administrator Surveys**, the site scored **Advanced** (3.78). The goal for the site was an average score of at least 3.7 on the Administrator Survey.

For criteria D, **Staff/Coordinator School Day Linkages Scale**, the site scored **More than Satisfactory** (4.00). The goal was 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?

Site 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**, the site scored **Satisfactory** (document review). The goal is to have documentation of at least one intentional, academic strategy based on student academic needs has been implemented.



For criteria B, **Social and Emotional Learning Activities**, the site scored **Satisfactory** (document review). The goal of the site was to have documentation that at least two SEL activities (individual, small group, or whole group) were implemented.

For criteria C, **Lesson Plans**, the site scored **Satisfactory** (document review). Evidence that lesson plans are created in advance with at least some detail (such as objectives, procedures, materials, etc.) for at least some activities each week.

For criteria D, **Weekly Schedule-Exposure to a Variety of Topics**, the site scored **Advanced** (document review). The goal was weekly schedule includes academic support and at least three of the following additional areas: health/ recreation/fitness, fine or 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**, the site scored **Advanced** (document review). The goal for the site is that the daily schedule has at least three activities per day for each age group (excluding snack/meal).

For criteria F, **Choice of Activities**, the site scored **Satisfactory** (document review). Daily or weekly schedule 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?

Site scores were **Satisfactory or Above** related to program quality. Four measures were used related to this criterion.

For criteria A, **Family and Child Academic Enrichment Opportunities**, the site scored **More than Satisfactory** (document review). The goal of the site was to have documentation of one family engagement opportunity with participating families in attendance.

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

For criteria C, **Family Strengthening Families Scale**, the site scored **Less than Satisfactory** (41.7%). The goal was less than 70% of family members indicate a positive response on the Strengthening Families scale.

For criteria D, **Afterschool Staff Strengthening Families Scale**, the site scored **Advanced** 88.9%). At least 90% of staff indicate a positive response on the Strengthening Families scale.

\* The Program Quality (Afterschool Staff version) survey item results showed no concerns with any of the survey items.

\* The Program Quality Scale (Youth version) survey item results showed no concerns with any of the survey items.

\* The Program Quality (Family version) item results showed concern with three items: 1) "On at least a monthly basis an adult in our family receives information at home or attends a meeting about the afterschool program" (site mean score 2.58 vs. comparative value 3.89); 2) "Each semester an adult in our family talk on the phone or meets in person with afterschool staff to receive detailed information about my child's progress in the program" (site mean score 2.42 vs. comparative value 3.78); and 3) "An adult in our family has been personally recruited to participate in and/or lead sessions at the afterschool program" (site mean score 1.75 vs. comparative value 2.84)

\* The School Administrator/Principal Survey item results showed concern with only one item. The mean score for, "Some professional development activities are coordinated between the school district/school day and afterschool program" (site mean score 2.00 vs. comparative value 3.05).

\*The School Day Linkages (Staff) survey item results showed no concerns with any of the survey items.

\*The Strengthening Families (Parent version) overall mean for the site was 3.49 and the comparative value was 4.03. Of the seven items, only two items had mean scores greater than the comparative value. Items lower than the comparative value included: 1) (2.75 mean vs 3.63) The afterschool program offers needed services to adult family members (GED, ELL, technology, family literacy, career/job training; 2) (3.58 mean vs 4.11) The afterschool program provides information about activities for us to attend outside of the program (e.g., fun, fairs, libraries); 3) (2.75 mean vs 3.91) The afterschool program provides either opportunities for parents to learn new skills or provides information about other community programs in the area that provide skill development; 4) (3.83 mean vs. 4.09) The afterschool program links with other service providers in order to bring services on site, ease the referral process, share information about resources, and identity and fill gaps; and 5) (2.50 mean vs 3.91) The afterschool program provides parents with opportunities for personal growth or leadership development.

\*The Strengthening Families (staff/coordinator version) survey item results showed no concerns with any of the survey items.

All criteria were scored as Satisfactory or above for the site with the exception criteria C, **Family Strengthening Families Scale**, the site scored **Less than Satisfactory** (41.7%). The goal was less than 70% of family members indicate a positive response on the Strengthening Families scale. Programming efforts to address individual student needs was a successful endeavor for student participants under the constraints of operating the program during Covid-19 restrictions/transitions. Intentional communication and efforts are in place to get feedback from administration and staff related to programming and student needs. Tracking student communication and progress and communicating program schedules and content was beneficial based on the data. Minor targeted efforts related to survey responses can be made in the following areas noted above with an \* that fell below a 3.0 indicating do not agree or not true (\*See end of Section 6, Goal 2).



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?

Site scores were **Satisfactory or above** related to program quality. Five measures were used related to this criterion.

For criteria A, **Proposed vs. Actual Attendance**, the site scored **Less than Satisfactory** (36.5%). The goal was actual 30+ day attendance is at least 80% of proposed attendance.

For criteria B, **Elementary- 30+ days** the site scored **Advanced** (71.4%). The goal was at least 70% of youth attend 30+ days.

For criteria C, **Elementary stretch- 60+ days**, the site scored **Less than Satisfactory** (28.6%). The goal was at least 50% of youth attend 60+ days.

For criteria D, **Middle School/Junior High- 30+ days**, the site scored **Advanced**. The goal was at least 60% of youth attend 30+ days.

For criteria E, **Middle School/Junior High stretch- 45+ days**, the site scored **Advanced**. The goal was at least 70% of youth attend 30+ days.

For criteria F, **High School- 30+ days**, the site scored **N/A** (no students in this age group).

For criteria G, **High School stretch- 30+ days**, the site scored **N/A** (no students in this age group).

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?

Site scores were **Satisfactory or above** related to program quality. Two measures were used related to this criterion.

For criteria A, **Personal and Social Skills scale**, the site scored **More than Satisfactory**. The goal was at least 80% 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 AND documentation of a lesson plan specific to personal and social skills.

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?

Site scores were **Satisfactory or above** related to program quality. Two measures were used related to this criterion.

For criteria A, **Commitment to Learning scale**, the site scored **More than Satisfactory**. The goal was at least 80% of youth indicate a medium to a high level of commitment to learning on the Youth Survey OR the site-level SEL plans, including a commitment to learning and documentation of at least one Commitment to Learning lesson plan (in addition to the two SEL lesson plans provided in 2.2.B)

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

*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.)*

**Indicator 3.1a** is targeted to work on **Proposed vs. Actual Attendance**, the site scored **Less than Satisfactory** (36.5%). The goal was actual 30+ day attendance is at least 80% of proposed attendance. Additionally, 3.1c is also targeted to work on, **Elementary stretch- 60+ days**, the site scored **Less than Satisfactory** (28.6%). The goal was at least 50% of youth attend 60+ days. Restrictions related to Covid continued to impact the site related to program attendance. Those students enrolled in the program at all grade levels truly want to be in attendance and benefit from the programming. Increases in attendance did occur over the year. 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: Programming was designed with outcomes in mind aligned with student needs. Literacy and STEM programming efforts were reinforced. To support efficacy in math and science, Friday fun days, Zoo trips, scavenger hunts, science, reading, collaborative group work were all planned and integrated when possible. Schedules reflected initial time for STEM and Power Hour. Map data in all content areas were not included with the report data so should continue to review and monitor the results of that data with other academic data. Although data is based on a small number of students, grade data for all academic categories (criteria A) were reported as Advanced 100%. Related to science: For criteria B, **Grades-students with pre-grade in the "need" category**, the site scored **Less than Satisfactory 80.0%**. The goal was less than 50% of students identified as "need" increase their grade. For criteria E, **Efficacy**, the site scored **Less than Satisfactory 68.2%**. The goal was Less than 70% of youth per site will report a medium to high level of efficacy as measured by items on the Youth Survey. Future programming efforts should target these students for both science content and efficacy.

b. Goal 2 – Program Quality:

2021 - 2022: All criteria were scored as Satisfactory or above for the site with the exception criteria C, **Family Strengthening Families Scale**, the site scored **Less than Satisfactory (41.7%)**. The goal was less than 70% of family members indicate a positive response on the Strengthening Families scale. Programming efforts to address individual student needs was a successful endeavor for student participants under the constraints of operating the program during Covid-19 restrictions/transitions. Intentional communication and efforts are in place to get feedback from administration and staff related to programming and student needs. Tracking student communication and progress and communicating program schedules and content was beneficial based on the data. Minor targeted efforts related to survey responses can be made in the following areas noted above with an \* that fell below a 3.0 indicating do not agree or not true (\*See end of Section 6, Goal 2).

c. Goal 3 – Youth Outcomes:

2021-2022: **Indicator 3.1a** is targeted to work on **Proposed vs. Actual Attendance**, the site scored **Less than Satisfactory (36.5%)**. The goal was actual 30+ day attendance is at least 80% of proposed attendance. Additionally, 3.1c is also targeted to work on, **Elementary stretch- 60+ days**, the site scored **Less than Satisfactory (28.6%)**. The goal was at least 50% of youth attend 60+ days. Restrictions related to Covid continued to impact the site related to program attendance. Those students enrolled in the program at all grade levels truly want to be in attendance and benefit from the programming. Increases in attendance did occur over the year. 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.

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?

MAP data was not included in the report data for any content area so site should monitor MAP data along with other academic records aligned with assessed content areas. Although data is based on a small number of students, grade data for all academic categories were reported as Advanced 100%. Program efforts used to support these students were successful. For all academic categories reported, Grades-students with pre-

grade in the “need” category scored Less than Satisfactory. Because all student's grades were in the Advanced category, data may not have been able to report in this area.

Restrictions related to Covid continued to impact site related to program attendance. Those students enrolled in the program truly want to be in attendance and benefit from the programming. The delayed start and lack of feeder schools impacted program attendance. However, staff are trained in programming content and high-quality Boys and Girls Clubs programming is used aligned with academic needs (content and efficacy). Map data continued to not be reported this year but all grade criteria (criteria A) were advanced for all content areas.

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: Highland Elementary	1.3, 2.4, 3.1
Site 2:	
Site 3:	
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.)

Goal 1: Related to science: For criteria B, **Grades-students with pre-grade in the “need” category**, the site scored **Less than Satisfactory 80.0%**. The goal was less than 50% of students identified as “need” increase



their grade. For criteria E, **Efficacy**, the site scored **Less than Satisfactory 68.2%**. The goal was Less than 70% of youth per site will report a medium to high level of efficacy as measured by items on the Youth Survey. Future programming efforts should target these students for both science content and efficacy.

Goal 2: 2.4, criteria C, **Family Strengthening Families Scale**, the site scored **Less than Satisfactory (41.7%)**. The goal was less than 70% of family members indicate a positive response on the Strengthening Families scale. \*The Strengthening Families (Parent version) overall mean for the site was 3.49 and the comparative value was 4.03. Of the seven items, only two items had mean scores greater than the comparative value. Items lower than the comparative value included: 1) (2.75 mean vs 3.63) The afterschool program offers needed services to adult family members (GED, ELL, technology, family literacy, career/job training; 2) (3.58 mean vs 4.11) The afterschool program provides information about activities for us to attend outside of the program (e.g., fun, fairs, libraries); 3) (2.75 mean vs 3.91) The afterschool program provides either opportunities for parents to learn new skills or provides information about other community programs in the area that provide skill development; 4) (3.83 mean vs. 4.09) The afterschool program links with other service providers in order to bring services on site, ease the referral process, share information about resources, and identity and fill gaps; and 5) (2.50 mean vs 3.91) The afterschool program provides parents with opportunities for personal growth or leadership development. All items listed above should be considered for improving programming effectiveness.

Goal 3: **Indicator 3.1a** is targeted to work on **Proposed vs. Actual Attendance**, the site scored **Less than Satisfactory (36.5%)**. The goal was actual 30+ day attendance is at least 80% of proposed attendance. Additionally, 3.1c is also targeted to work on, **Elementary stretch- 60+ days**, the site scored **Less than Satisfactory (28.6%)**. The goal was at least 50% of youth attend 60+ days. Restrictions related to Covid continued to impact the site related to program attendance. Those students enrolled in the program at all grade levels truly want to be in attendance and benefit from the programming. Increases in attendance did occur over the year. 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 – 21<sup>st</sup> 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 21<sup>st</sup> 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.