

21st CCLC External Evaluation Guided Reflection Documentation West St. Francois County

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 10/15/19.

Cover Sheet Instructions

The grant administrator must sign this first page of the Guided Reflection and e-mail it to DESE by 10/15/19. The full Guided Reflection Document (including this page and the Evaluation Summary) should also be submitted by the grant administrator to DESE by 10/15/19 via e-mail.

21st CCLC Grantee Name:

Cohort #: 10 Year in the grant: 2

External Evaluator Name: Marla Swindell

Name of Program Director participating in evaluation meetings: Lisa Puller

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

	Date of first meeting: May 22, 2019	Date of second meeting: April 9, 2020
Site 1: West St. Francois County Elementary	Attendee: Lisa Puller	Attendee: Lisa Puller
Site 2: West St. Francois County Middle School	Attendee: Lisa Puller	Attendee: Lisa Puller
Site 3: West St. Francois County High School	Attendee: Lisa Puller	Attendee: Lisa Puller
Site 4: Rocky Creek	Attendee: Lisa Puller	Attendee: Lisa Puller
Site 5:	Attendee:	Attendee:
Site 6:	Attendee:	Attendee:

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 1.4 1.5 1.6
 2.1 2.2 2.3 2.4
 3.1 3.2 3.3 3.4 3.5

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 1.2 1.3
 2.1 2.2 2.3 2.4
 3.1 3.2 3.3

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

Program Director Signature

Printed Name

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. 21st Century Community Learning Center Evaluation Summary

Sections 1-4 should be completed following the first face-to-face meeting (prior to 6/30/19) 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 (8/15/19) 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 on 10/15/19. The external evaluator should submit the documentation to the grantee prior to 10/15/19. The grant administrator must sign the Cover Page of the Guided Reflection and e-mail it to DESE by 10/15/19. The full Guided Reflection Document (including the Cover Page and the Evaluation Summary) should also be submitted by the grant administrator to DESE by 10/15/19 via e-mail.

21st Century Community Learning Center Evaluation Summary

West St. Francois County

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. West St. Francois County received a 21st CCLC grant in 2017. The afterschool program operates four in one elementary, one middle, and one high school and one off campus facility for boys, serving 792 students.

Each year, 21st 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 2018-19 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 (613) youth, (90) families, (55) program staff, (4) school administrators. 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.

This program continues to be a program of which to be proud. The four sites not only offer complete homework assistance and tutoring program with certified staff to address their needs, but an extensive offering in enrichment activities for participants of all ages. All academic offerings are aligned to Missouri State Standards and are approved through the program director. The enrichment activities are extensions of the regular school day, as well. Examples include art clubs, athletic clubs, robotics, STEM, 4-H, as well as activities targeted for specific age groups. Middle school students have a Drone Club, Chess Club, and Life skills class. High school offers STEM, Running Club, Drama Club, and Weightlifting/Conditioning. High school students can also get credit recovery, ACT prep, and participate in Random Acts of Kindness throughout the community. At the Rocky Creek site, students not only receive small group tutoring, but can receive training in Martial Arts and learn life skills, which better prepares them after leaving school.

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 21st 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.

The program continues to be strong in this area. Survey results from students, staff, family, and administrators prove that the program is a great asset for students in this district. To address some of the areas of concern from the past, the program offered professional development, Trauma Informed Child, to the elementary staff. A social worker is on staff to assist with students as needed. Also, monthly family nights at the elementary were offered. Middle school students hosted Career Town, and Rocky Creek hosted

Brag Night. Tech Night was presented at the middle and high school level. These are just a few examples of the efforts put forth by staff to improve involvement in an already quality program.

Goal 3: Youth Outcomes

Afterschool program also offer non-academic benefits that support the student’s development of college and career 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).

The program continues to improve on areas of academics and efficacy which is a direct link to college and career readiness. Homework completion is expected in the afterschool program, which prepares all students for studies/work after school age. Attendance improved during the 2018/2019 school year, as those goals were met at each site. Teamwork and critical thinking is evidence through a host of enrichment activities provided for all age groups, such as robotics and STEM. The 4-H clubs also provide several opportunities for these students that they might not otherwise experience. This is a good partnership or this area. Life skills and leadership skills are emphasized in a variety of clubs that are offered at each level. Community projects are also an excellent opportunity for students to learn the importance of the community and giving back.

For more information, contact Lisa Puller at 573-562-7558 or lpuller@wcr4.org

Part A: Additional Data Collection by the External Evaluator

Section 1 – Grantee/Evaluator Information

21st CCLC Grantee Name:

Cohort #: 10 Year in the grant: 2 Name of External Evaluator: Marla Swindell

Name of Program Director participating in evaluation meetings: Lisa Puller

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

	Date of first meeting: May 22, 2019	Date of second meeting: April 9, 2020	Site Visit? (Y/N)
Site 1: SFC Elementary	Lisa Puller	Lisa Puller	Y/N
Site 2: SFC Middle School	Lisa Puller	Lisa Puller	N/N
Site 3: SFC High School	Lisa Puller	Lisa Puller	N/N
Site 4: Rocky Creek	Lisa Puller	Lisa Puller	N/N
Site 5:			
Site 6:			

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.

West County After School Program serves students in grade Pre-K through tenth grade and students in grades first through 12th at Rocky Creek Youth Ranch. There is one district coordinator, 4 site coordinators, and the superintendent and school board are highly engaged in the program. At the elementary site (grades PreK through 5), the middle school site (grades 6-8) and the high school (grades 9-10) program runs before and after school five days per week. At Rocky Creek Youth Ranch, the facility is open 4 or 5 days per week depending on staff availability and student interest. At the elementary site, there are 429 students enrolled in the program, of which 248 attended 30+ days.

Homework assistance is offered in the morning and the afternoon three times per week. A paid staff of 40 with 2 volunteers oversee and instruct not only homework assistance but activities such as: Preschool Fun, social skills, Makerspace, Technology, Fitness, Creative Play, Honor Choir, Instrumental Group, Art Club, Girls Club, Positive Attitude Leaders, Running Club, Synergy, 4-H. At the middle school site, there are 269 enrolled, with 96 attending 30+ days. Homework assistance is available, as well as tutoring from 21 paid staff members and on volunteer. Students can receive homework assistance in the library and computer lab for tutoring. Activities include: Creative Arts, Chess Club, Culture Club, Health, Running Club, STEM Sports, Drone Club, Academic Team, WCTV, Robotics, Percussion Club, and Life skills.

Homework assistance is available in the library each morning, as well as tutoring, Credit Recovery and ACT prep at the high school site. There 25 paid staff members. Three hundred ten are enrolled, and 91 have attended 30+ days. Enrichment activities that are provided include: Creative Arts, Running Club, STEM Sports, Academic Team, WCTV, Robotics, Fitness Club, Venturing Club, Drama, Random Acts of Kindness, and Weightlifting/condition. At the Rocky Creek Youth Ranch, there is no homework. Attendance averages 30 students attending 30+ days, with 57 enrolled. There are six paid staff members. Activities include tutoring, Health, Art, Life skills, Martial Arts.

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: Afterschool participants can attend the program before and after school, as well as during the summers and receive assistance in homework and tutoring in areas of need in three subject areas, math, reading, and science. Other activities provided are based on student interest and are cross curricular that have shown to have a positive impact on student achievement. The regular school day staff are the after school staff so that they are familiar with students and their individual needs. Academic and enrichment classes are offered at all four sites. All four sites provide a wide variety of

enrichment to enhance student life. Classes also offer social and emotional support as the area has a substantial negative impact on students. Approximately ten per cent of all students at each grade level qualify as homeless, and the local shelter in the community will not accept children. This, of course has a negative effect on student growth. Another negative factor is on of transit families. This is especially a problem at Rocky Creek.

Staff: For the most part, the after school staff is the same as the regular school day staff, which provides additional stability for the program. Staff members are well aware of student needs, and are able to address them readily in the after school program. This improves the overall learning environment. All staff members receive professional development that is provided but the district each year. Staff members have received training in Methods Training, technology, Seven Habits of Happy Kids, Effective Teenagers, and Trauma Informed Learning. There has been little staff turn over with the exception of Rocky Creek Ranch where turnover was an issue in the beginning. There have been a few new staff added at the elementary level. It was noted that additional staff is added as needed throughout the year to continue to provide solid instruction and supervision for participants. Substitutes in the program are trained and prepared to cover when needed. They are required to job shadow before they are allowed to work in the program. A negative that was sited was the fact that some staff experience burn out as the program continues.

School: District administration and the school board are very supportive of the program, as they realize the need for such to improve students' lives in the district. The district assists in mentoring programs and professional development training. Board members are actively involved in program events which help promote the importance of academic achievement for their students. Title One funds are also used to supplement the needs of the after school program, as well as some district funds. Students and staff are able to use all facilities and resources that available during the regular school day, including technology.

Community: The community is a low economic area. Three local prisons in the area lend to the heavy transit population due to incarcerated parents. The area is the third largest in the state in meth related seizures and other related side effect. The area is also known for opium and heroin use, but even with these obstacles, the after school program is widely supported throughout the community. Community partners such as Young Faith in Christ Mentoring provide resources to students in need free of charge with local daycares.

- 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: Interest in the program remains high in the offerings of the program. Students in the three sites that are part of the district campus feel safe in their environment and are well of their surroundings. These sites have cameras that are monitored by staff and a buzzer system for entry. Parents must sign in and out each day at each location. Rocky Creek has onsite supervision 24 hours per day. It has been a concentrated effort in the program to improve student /staff interaction, which in turn improves the program overall. Students are exposed to a variety of enrichment opportunities that they might not otherwise get to experience. Interest surveys from students are utilized to create activities of high interest to keep student involved.

Staff: Communication between staff is continuous. They attend weekly grade level meetings in the elementary, middle and high school, which as departmental meetings, as well as faculty meetings. Administrators, Special Ed Director, and Technology coordinators sometime attend these meetings. This is a time for student outcomes and curriculum to be discussed. A successful program is the objective, and therefore, all aspects of student growth are the concentration. Rock Creek staff members meet on site. Since professional development is shared and includes after school staff members, the program benefits from the overall improvement of instruction and curriculum alignment. Trauma Informed Child was an example of professional development provided this year. Staff members are also trained in CPR. Parents are contacted personally by staff when special circumstances arise. The school web site is used to post announcements for parents and students of the program. Text alerts are used by staff members to keep parents informed on student progress and possible discipline issues. Rocky Creek has a case worker that is connected to the district.

School: The program director presents annually to the board of education on the progress of the program. Evaluations are discussed at advisory council meetings, which consists of school personnel, as well as after school personnel. Weekly administration meetings are held and the after school program agenda is discussed as needed. Family nights are held monthly on the elementary campus. Other family oriented events include: Screenagers at all three district locations, Tech night at the middle and high school, Career Town at the middle school, and Brag Night at Rocky Creek.

Community: The program provides social media information so that all members of the community can be aware of the program activities that are provided. Surveys and Advisory Council meetings are used to obtain input from community members, and the input is important and considered when creating program o outcomes. Communication efforts continue to be positive. The program is constantly creating ways to educate parents and community members on the curriculum and STEM education. However, low attendance hinders the adult component of the program. 4-H and the State Bank actively participate in family nights, and the program continues to strive to improve the adult component even with the challenges of which they are faced.

- 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 college and career readiness skills and behaviors, including positive school behaviors, (attendance, program attendance, out of school suspensions), personal and social skills (communications, team work, accountability), and commitment to learning (initiative, study skills, homework completion).

Youth: At the elementary site, all activities are STEM based which lead to career readiness and problem solving. Careers are discussed in relationship to lessons that are offered, sometimes in reflection pieces. Students can request clubs and the program staff accommodates whenever feasible. The district is a PBS school, and the behavioral guidelines overflow into the after school program. Students are well aware of expectations and follow the guidelines throughout the program. It was sited that behavior had, in fact ,improved during the school day, as well as the after school program hours. Attendance in the summer program is rewarded with field trips, which enhances the over attendance in the program, as well as the regular school day. At the high school site, youth are provided with a wide range of activities that better prepare them for college/career readiness. ACT training, Credit Recovery, and work related skills training are provided throughout the year. Rocky Creek Youth activities are focused on students becoming college and career ready, while learning self reliance and personal skills that assist in their independence.

Staff: Staff members are trained in PBS and all behavioral issues are addressed through the program. Attendance incentives are provided by staff to encourage student attendance, and high expectations of the regular school day staff are utilized in the after school staff, as well. Staff members are required to include STEM components in daily lessons and hands-on activities that encourage student engagement. Through these types of activities, teamwork, communication skills, and a sense of personal pride improve. Staff is well aware of homework assignments and projects that are due since they are familiar with all students. Students are encouraged by staff to complete assignments in a timely manner and assist students in organizing their assignments.

School: Building administration at each site, as well as the supervisor at Rocky Creek are firmly committed to the after school program and is most supportive of the program. District facilities and technology are available to the program at any time Having access to all technology assists students in preparation for college and career readiness.

Community: Community partners provide assistance that promotes college and career readiness, positive school behaviors social skills, and commitment to learning. Young Faith in Christ and the local 4-H Clubs are examples of those assisting in the program. One of the goals of the program is service learning, which increases awareness in community service and social leadership in a community where that is needed.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.5
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2.2	<input type="checkbox"/> 2.3	<input type="checkbox"/> 2.4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.6
<input type="checkbox"/> 3.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3.3	<input type="checkbox"/> 3.4	<input type="checkbox"/> 3.5

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.

To address the objectives 1.4,1.5,1.6 in students efficacy scores in reading, math, and science, the program implemented increased social emotional learning activities with additional guidance in the program’s existing activities. Staff encouraged and monitored more closely students’ self-confidence levels, and this had a positive effect on student outcomes.

Pursuant to indicator 3.2, the program addressed the need of the students after survey results were analyzed and created more offerings that students had requested as to increase interest, which promoted better attendance. The social worker and building counselors also provided incentives to students to encourage better attendance.

The following sections are to be completed by the external evaluator after receiving the data reports (8/15/19), 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 "Not Met" in similar areas.
1.1 – Reading		1.4 Not Met: Elementary, Middle, High, Rocky Creek
1.2 – Math		1.5 Not Met: Middle, High, Rocky Creek
1.3 – Science		1.6 Not Met: Middle, High
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		Not Met: Elementary, Middle, High, Rocky Creek
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 2018-19 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 Overall, the program saw great improvement in this academic area. Rocky Creek received the highest percentage in maintaining or improving reading grades with a percentage of 79.3%, where 29 at risk students attend. The lowest percentage received in “increasing and maintaining “ was the elementary site, with 166 students attending and a percentage of 71.1%. All four sites showed solid improvement in this area. According to last year’s data, non of the four sites met, mostly due to efficacy indicators. For those students who were identified in “need” and 30+ days attendance, the high school received the lowest percentage of increase with 40%, which identified 5 students. Rocky Creek received the highest with 77.8%, which identified 9 students. These nine students were more than one third of the students who attend the program. Thirty four students who had attended the program 30+ days scored proficient or advanced on EOCs. At the middle school site 72 students attending 30+ days scored proficient or above on MAP, an 51.2% scored proficient or above at the elementary level, which only included third through 5 grade of the total number of students in the program at this age level.

The highest efficacy score (4.29) was received by Rocky Creek, and the lowest received by the middle school site (3.67) showed improvement over last year’s data. The lowest score received in efficacy was at the middle school site in the area of “I am interested in reading/language arts,” which was 3.34.

The scores received parallel the efforts put forth by the program director and staff. Their work was focused on improving efficacy scores throughout the year.

Math Overall the program excelled in the area of math, received Advanced in three of the five areas. Efficacy received the lowest score, but still was Satisfactory. Increases in grades for those attending 30+days were impressive. Over 70% of youth attending saw an increase in reading grades at all four sites. Rocky Creek improved with a 76.7% increase , which was the highest. The high school and middle school sites received the lowest at 79.5 and 70.3, respectively. Rocky Creed received the lowest score as far as improved grades with identified “need” with a percentage of 20.2%, a total of 5 students. The highest percentage for identified students in “need” was at the high school site. Those six students saw a 83.3% increase in grades. Of the students in grades 3-5 who took MAP, 65.9% received a score of proficient or above, which was the highest percentage received in the program. The middle school received the lowest percentage of proficient or above on MAP with at percentage of 52.1%. There was no data posted for Rocky Creek in this area. Last year data showed that the middle school, high school, and Rocky Creek did not meet. This year those scores improved and were met. Rocky Creek received the highest score of 4.08. Middle and high school received the lowest of 3.84. This was slightly below the comparative scores, but it was still an improvement for the program.

Science Efficacy received the lowest score of Satisfactory in this area of science. With those attending 30+ days and those identified as in “need, scores well above the 70%, with “Advanced” outcomes. The high school site received the lowest score with 55.7% of the students improving or maintaining grades. The middle school received the highest, 91.9% Seventy four students at the middle school improved grades, which is a strong positive for the program. There were two identified students in “need” at the high school level, and one of those students improved. At the elementary and middle school level, 100% of students attending 30+ days improved grades. There were no MAP or EOC scores for data. Overall efficacy scores do not necessarily compare to grades/achievement. However, all sites met with an overall score of 3.95. Rocky Creek received the highest score of 4.48, and the middle school was the lowest with 3.82. Last year, the middle school and high school did not meet this objective.

The program met this goal. Students continued to improve in areas of academics at all sites. This was partly due to the staff, administration, and Advisory Council developing ways to assist students, not only in grade

improvement but to aid students in realization of self confidence which increases self efficacy scores. Student and parent voice was considered in depth which the program also felt contributed to the success of the program.

- 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?

Of the four sites, only in two areas, Youth Program Quality, did the program received Less than Satisfactory. At the elementary level 68.3% was received with 70% being the goal, and a 53.1% at the middle school site. All other indicators were Satisfactory and above. The high school received “Advanced” on Family Program Quality scale. Rocky Creek also received Advanced on the Youth Program Quality scale. At all four sites, Staff Program Quality was More than Satisfactory. The only slight concern from this overall indicator was at the middle school site, Youth Program Quality scale. When reviewing the survey results at the middle school site, *working in small groups and I get to help pick activities* received lowest scores in comparison to all other outcomes. The Family Program Quality Scale were all high scores, with the exception of recruitment of adults/family in the program to lead. The program received an average score of 2.39. Rocky Creek has no scores in this area due to lack of participants with legal guardians.

The program saw continued improvement successfully meeting this objective. Increased small group instruction was felt to be a contributing factor at the middle school site, as this type of instruction contributed to more engaging and differentiated learning. Staff, administration, and the Advisory Council continually sought ways to improve and address the needs of youth and family members of the program. Survey results are reviewed and discussed to constantly improve the program.

- 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?

All four sites received well above Satisfactory in this area. Rocky Creek, overall, had the lowest of the scores with two Satisfactory scores in *documenting state standards and school day linkage*. The elementary site received on Satisfactory in *documenting state standards*, as well. When observing data from surveys, the lowest scores were from the middle and high school sites in *increased parental involvement and professional development activities coordinated between the school day staff/afterschool staff*. These were all 3.0. Rocky Creek had 3.00 in six areas, and one area falling below that, “coordinate the activity content of afterschool sessions with students’ homework, 2.58. Overall, there were no concerns.

The regular school day staff is also the afterschool staff, therefore, those administering instruction are very familiar with state standards and assure that all activities are aligned. Staff meetings are a time to discuss this objective, and adjustments are made accordingly. The program is constantly monitored by the program director and school day administration, and flexibility is key as they make necessary adjustments throughout the program.

- 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?

There were no concerns with this objective. All indicators were Satisfactory or above at all four sites. There were, in fact, eleven areas of the four sites that receive a score of “Advanced.”

Social and emotional learning has been an emphasis of the program recently, as it employs a social worker. School counselors are also on staff to assist when needed. Lesson plans are reviewed by the program director, and they are aligned and used effectively. Student and parent voice are considered when creating enrichment activities for the participants in the program. And the staff, administration, and Advisory Council monitor the program, and adjustments are made throughout the year.

- 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?

The program received composite score of Satisfactory on two of the areas, and an Advanced on one. Less than Satisfactory (60%) was received in *Afterschool Staff Strengthening Families*. With that statement, one must be aware that participant at the Rocky Creek site are basically there due to high needs/at-risk situations. Therefore, those scores do not project a true outcome of the program.

The program was successful in this area. Rocky Creek students do not have guardians/parents, so there are not scores received from families at this site. The other sites did very well. The program offers support through a variety of ways throughout the school year for not only its youth, but families, as well.

- 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?

The overall objective received More the Satisfactory , 95.4%. The elementary site received Advanced with 30+ days attendance. Middle and high school sites received Satisfactory. All four sites were above 80% as far as proposed/actual attendance. The elementary and Rocky Creek sites exceeded projections with 100.8% and 103.3% respectfully. The high school received the lowest percentage. There were 85 proposed students attending 30+ days, and only 68 met that goal. But with the age of the students at this site, this was still a solid outcome.

Success in this area was attributed to the on staff social worker who contacts students who have been absent and their parents and makes home visits when necessary. This has provided additional support to the program. Students receive interest surveys throughout the year so that the program can provide engaging and high interest activities, which improves daily attendance.

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?

There were no concerns in this area. In Personal and Social Skills results were More than Satisfactory and School Day Discipline was Advanced. The middle school site scored the lowest, 79.7%, on the Personal and Social Scale. The high school site received the highest, 88.3%. Overall, Rocky Creek scored lowest, 4.11, in the survey results. The district rate of you with NO building or out of school suspensions was 86.7%. The lowest rate, 78.4%, was received by the middle school site.

The program remains successful in this area, as there is a need for it in so many ways. The staff also recognizes the need and is always seeking new ideas and activities for their students, who might not otherwise get the chances that are provided through the program. New administration at the middle school is providing some new ideas that are to be projected in the program, and this should further strengthen the program in the years to come.

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?

There were no concerns with this objective. *Commitment to learning scale* received More than Satisfactory, 87.9%, and the *School Day Attendance* received Advanced, 71.7%. The middle school site received the lowest indicator points, 4.13. All four sites were within a few tenths of the comparative value throughout the state programs. The district rate of daily attendance was 95.2%.

All sites are continuously seeking ways to improve attendance. Incentives have been initiated, and more will be introduced in the program in the coming year. This seems to improve the overall attitude of those youth enrolled in the program.

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 2017-18 Guided Reflection document 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:

The program at all four sites worked hard on improving student outcomes: grades, state testing, as well as efficacy. All three areas of Reading, Math, and Science were Satisfactory and above, which was an improvement from last year, when efficacy was not meeting the state standard number indicators. From previous year, none of the sites “met” in all three subject areas concerning efficacy. The elementary site “met” in efficacy in math and science only. So, there was definite improvement made during the 2018/2019 school year.

b. Goal 2 – Program Quality:

This goal had no concerns. The program continues to be a solid program that addresses youth needs, and it progresses at a steady pace. PQA scale scores remain high. It is obvious that there is a concerted effort to address each and every one of these indicators throughout the program

c. Goal 3 – Youth Outcomes:

Personal and Social Skills had been a target indicator for this year’s cycle. During this cycle, the program achieved More than Satisfactory and Advanced. Proposed and Actual Attendance “met” with high percentages: all over 80%. The program continues to improve in this area.

Contributing factors that have improved the program have been a dedicated staff, administration, and Advisory Council who consistently monitor the program and the needs of all students. The area is very high poverty level with many students who never get the chance to participate in some of the activities that are provided through the program. Student and parent voice are strongly considered when preparing enrichment activities and schedules. With the addition of a social worker on staff, there has been improved attendance

and more social emotional learning for students. Regular school day counselors for middle and high school have been solid assets to the program, as well, as they provide additional support when needed. Staff also participated in professional development in Trauma Informed Learning which was most beneficial.

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?

Efficacy in all three areas were identified, 1.4,1.5,1.6. All three of those indicator saw an improvement and received Satisfactory and above. Indicator 3.2 was also identified, and it also received higher indicator scores with the lowest average score being 4.08 at the middle school.

The program saw an approximate overall 10 point percentage increase in all three areas, (reading, math, science). So this demonstrates a positive trend for the program. As students gain confidence in their abilities, this will continue to improve. The grade and state assessment have met, but students were not realizing the connection, but it seems this is changing. Indicator 3.2, attendance made great gains. All sites improved at a minimum of 10 percentage points.

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: Elementary	2.4
Site 2: Middle School	2.4
Site 3: High School	2.4
Site 4: Rocky Creek	2.4
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.)

All program goals were met so there is not a concerning goal of which to choose, however, after discussion with program director, it was decided to emphasize goal 2.4 at all sites next year. Less the Satisfactory was received on Afterschool Staff Strengthening Families, and the program was ready to focus on this particular part of the program. With the addition of the social worker and new administration, it was deemed that this would be an appropriate objective on which to concentrate to improve the program.

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.

Consulting Agreement for Afterschool External Evaluation Services

This agreement is entered into between

West St. Francois County (21st CCLC Grantee) and
Marla Swindell (certified external evaluator).

Background information:

1. In order to ensure that DESE is able to have consistent data about grantees, the goals and objectives, data collection, data analysis, and reflection process have been standardized. The new Guided Reflection process includes responsibilities for both the program administrator and the certified external evaluator (see below).
2. All 21st CCLC grantees have the same goals and objectives related to 1) academic achievement and efficacy, 2) program effectiveness, and 3) college and career readiness.
3. Grantees will work *cooperatively* with a trained/certified external evaluator to complete the required Guided Reflection process. The process includes collecting and using consistent data, *jointly reviewing* program and site data, and *jointly completing* required documents that guide the program administrator and external evaluator through an evaluation reflection process. The program administrator's knowledge of the program operation, local context, strengths of staff members, and student dynamics will inform the discussion. The external evaluator's training on the data and prior evaluation skills/experience will be instrumental in making the most of the process, including analyzing the data in relation to the local programs' unique context. *Together* the program administrator and external evaluator will discuss the data and questions included on the guided reflection document. *Note: The external evaluator is responsible for all written responses. The program administrator should not need to provide any additional data or respond in writing to the questions in the Guided Reflection document.*

Responsibilities:

1. Program Administrator
 - a. The program administrator agrees to meet at least twice with the external evaluator. One meeting is to take place before June 30, 2019 to discuss the Local Context and Review of Progress on Selected Goals and Objectives portions of the Guided Reflection document. The second meeting is to take place between August 15, 2019 and October 10, 2019 to discuss the Data and Reports, Status of Goals and Objectives, and Longitudinal Progress portions of the Guided Reflection document.

- b. The program administrator should schedule the meetings at a time when the site coordinators are able to participate.
- c. The program administrator will notify DESE and MASN of the name of the evaluator selected to complete the Guided Reflection process. The program administrator acknowledges that the external evaluator will receive a copy of the data reports associated with the Guided Reflection process from MASN on 8/15/19.
- d. The program administrator will receive the final Guided Reflection from the external evaluator by (no later than 10/14/19). The program administrator is responsible for submitting the Guided Reflection document to DESE by 10/15/19.

2. Certified External Evaluator

- a. The external evaluator agrees to meet at least twice with the program administrator. One meeting is to take place before June 30, 2019 to discuss the Local Context and Review of Progress on Selected Goals and Objectives portions of the Guided Reflection document. The second meeting is to take place between August 15, 2019 and (no later than 10/10/19) to discuss the Data and Reports, Status of Goals and Objectives, and Longitudinal Progress portions of the Guided Reflection document.
- b. The external evaluator will lead the discussions at the two meetings and document the meetings in the Guided Reflection document.
- c. The external evaluator will submit a copy of the Local Context and Review of Progress on Selected Goals and Objectives sections of the Guided Reflection document to the program administrator by (choose a date around 6/30/19 since that is the deadline for the first meeting).
- d. The external evaluator will review the site specific data reports, looking for trends and considering the local context, and complete all remaining sections of the Guided Reflection document prior to the second meeting. Note: The Status of Current Year's Goals and Objectives and Longitudinal Progress sections have "reflection questions" that will be completed by the External Evaluator following the second meeting. These questions are noted with the comment "(Answer based on the discussion at the second meeting.)".
- e. The external evaluator will prepare and submit the final Guided Reflection report to the program administrator by (no later than 10/14/19). It is the responsibility of the program administrator to submit the final Guided Reflection document to DESE by 10/15/19.

Compensation:

1. The consistent rate that grantees are allowed to pay for this Guided Reflection process is a base rate of \$2,200 for the grantee with one site and \$400 per additional site after the first site.
2. This agreement includes the following grant sites:
West St. Francois County Elementary
West St. Francois County Middle School
West St. Francois County High School
Rocky Creek Youth

3. The total compensation for the Guided Reflection process is \$3400.00.

Maria Dussell

Consultant Signature

5-22-2019

Date

Program Administrator

Date