21st CCLC Outside Evaluation
Guided Reflection Documentation

The 21st CCLC grantee's program administrator and certified local evaluator must complete this reflection tool as the official documentation of the 21st CCLC Outside Evaluation. The program administrator and local evaluator should meet twice to reflect on 1) the local context and 2) the data reports in relation to the Cohort 8 Goals and Objectives of the grant. Additional staff may be involved at the discretion of the program administrator and with the agreement of the local evaluator.

Instructions

The local evaluator should complete all sections of this report using the framework and charts provided.
The Review of Data Reports chart should be completed as it is presented. The cells in the Review of Data Reports chart should expand as information is entered.

The Guided Reflection Documentation is due to DESE on 10/15/16. The local evaluator should submit the documentation to the grantee prior to 10/15/16. The grantee will then turn in the Guided Reflection Documentation to their DESE Supervisor.

Grantee/Evaluator Information

21st CCLC Grantee: Local Investment Commission (LINC) – Kansas City School District – African Centered Prep K-6, George Melcher K-5, Satchel Paige K-6
Cohort # 8
Year in the grant: 2
External Evaluator: Vicki Stein

Date of Local Context Meeting: May 26, 2016
Attendees at Local Context Meeting: Andrew Weisberg, Brenda Newsome, Paul Lichtenauer. Jason Ervin submitted information later.

Date of Status of Goals and Objectives Meeting: September 19, 2016
Attendees at Status of Goals and Objectives Meeting:

Program Overview

Name(s) of sites:
      African Centered Prep Elementary (ACCPA)
      George Melcher Elementary
      Satchel Paige Elementary

Please provide a 2-3 paragraph description of the program that includes at minimum the grades/ages served (Elementary, Middle, High School), how often the youth at each site meet, the types of activities provided, and approximate attendance and enrollments

ACCPA serves students in grades kindergarten through sixth grade. Their enrollment is 147 with afternoon average daily attendance of 100-110. The program is open ==xx-xx AM, and xx-xx PM.==
Activities offered include robotics, Science Afterschool, Math Mania, African Scientists, Boy Scouts, African Drumming, dance, choir and a variety of other clubs. Thirteen families graduated from Families and Schools Together (FAST).

The program at Melcher includes youth kindergarten through sixth grade ==xx-xx AM, and xx-xx PM==. They have approximately 125 enrolled with average daily attendance of 90. Their activities include robotics, chess, Boy Scouts, a variety of science activities, and basketball. The director at Melcher has only been in the program for a short time so is still working through many issues.

Paige elementary is a kindergarten through sixth grade school in the Kansas City school district. The program times are 7:00-8:30 AM and 4:00-6:00 PM. They have a variety of programs for the student participation such as Girl Scouts, Boys Scouts, good news club, robotics, Clover Kids, football, basketball and young builders club. There are approximately 120 students enrolled and an average daily attendance of about 85 students. This school is closing at the end of the 2015-2016 school year.

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.

1) Describe the issues (youth, staff, school, community) that have a positive or negative impact on the program's ability to successfully increase student achievement and sense of competence in the areas of reading/communication arts, mathematics, and science.

<u>Youth:</u>
At ACCPA there was very positive response to everything that was implemented in the program. One challenge for youth was when the leader of the Boys to Men Club left and various staff members covered for the remainder of the year. As a result, the young men lost interest and many stopped attending.

Melcher staff deals with daily fights at all age levels. One opinion is the youth have a lack of coping skills which leads to minimal gains in many areas. When you are fighting, you are not learning what is being offered in the program (or in school).

The director at Paige feels the students benefit from the majority of activities offered due to the ability of staff to get the students to understand the importance of specific programs and by giving youth ownership and more leadership in most activities.

<u>Staff:</u>
4-H training has really helped with staff development and training in science and math at ACCPA.

Melcher's staff becomes frustrated with youth behaviors and this impacts their ability to provide the planned program. For part of the year, the past director was covering two program sites which created an added challenge for the program and staff.

Staff turnover at Paige has been a major concern and understandably so with the limited hours for the to work. But on the other hand, regular staff actually bought into what we were trying to accomplish; teaching students the importance of respecting themselves, being accountable for their actions and most of all respecting others and treating people the way they want to be treated.

<u>School:</u>
There is a good partnership with the school at ACCPA. If the program needs anything, the school is willing to help.

The aesthetics have improved at Melcher and they are trying to make some positive impact on the experience of the youth in the building.

The only major issue with the school environment at Paige was getting school staff to become as willing and cooperative as LINC staff were to make sure the students became successful in the classroom as well as in the community. We tended to have some support, but much more was needed.

Community:
The Kansas City Zoo has really really helped the program and the school. Jackson County Community LINK has assisted in many areas including providing free math and science programs.

Melcher does not have much community input or involvement at this time.

Paige has great community partners that come in and offer great programs for the students. The main focus is violence prevention, accountability and self esteem. They have stepped up and given the program what was needed for positive development of the students.

2) Describe the issues (youth, staff, school, community) that have a positive or negative impact on the program's ability to develop and maintain a quality program that includes a safe and supportive environment, positive interactions, and meaningful opportunities for engagement (this could include, but is not limited to staffing, continuous improvement, engaging instruction, family communication, and school alignment).

Youth:
Youth at ACCPA really liked the activities that were provided. There was good attendance and participation.

At Melcher the youth are coping with both program and community issues which impacts all areas of learning.

Program development and quality programming at Paige is fine, they just find themselves running into limited funding, time constraints and getting parents to truly understand that students must be in the program to benefit from the programs we offer on a weekly basis.

Staff:
When ACCPA staff returned from training, they did a good job of sharing what they had learned with other staff members who had not been able to attend.

Staff at Melcher that stayed were able to work around most of the challenges. They did good lesson planning, but were not always able to follow through due to behavioral issues.

Staff turnover at Paige is a problem due to individuals needing more hours and benefits. These factors don't allow the program to keep the good staff members because better opportunities are available to them.

School:
ACCPA has developed an excellent relationship with all aspects of the school. After the FAST graduation, families much more involved in the school.

Melcher has a lack of space in the building which made the groups too large for effective programming. The school depended on the program to be the communication arm with parents for them. This communication was a positive and/or a negative for the relationships with families.

The director at Paige feels some school staff do their jobs for a paycheck and not for the fight reasons. The program feels the lack of genuine love for the student in the community and school is a major issue.

Community:
As listed above, ACCPA has excellent community support from several groups including the Kansas City Zoo.

Melcher is still working on community involvement.

The director at Paige feels the community has lost faith in the school district which diminishes most support in the schools. They seem to support LINC programs, but it has been a challenge for community members to support the school as a whole.

3) Describe the issues (youth, staff, school, community) that have a positive or negative impact on the program's ability to enhance youth's college and career readiness skills and behaviors, including positive school behaviors, (attendance, program attendance, out of school suspensions), personal and social skills (communications, team work, accountability), and commitment to learning (initiative, study skills, homework completion).

Youth:
The activities provided at ACCPA make the children want to attend. One mother reported her son didn't want to go to school, but wanted to come to LINC for Robotics. The daily evening meal provided during the program is important for many youth. Any youth suspended from school are not allowed to attend program.

The behavior issues at Melcher make it very difficult to get commitments to learning. The program does try to work on personal and social skills, however with issues in the community it is hard to see results within the program.

The majority of programs at Paige are based on mental and physical developmental level of the youth. The focus in classroom activities and sports was to make students accountable in the classroom, in the program as well as the community.

Staff:
ACCPA has a fantastic team. They are willing to work together to solve issues. They feel staff trainings have helped in many areas.

Melcher has some staff with rough edges, but they are working to improve. It is too soon to see the result of staff training.

Paige encourages the young staff to actually pursue higher education. This is another factor in the high turnover in staff.

School:
The Parent Liaison of the school is a good partner with the program. They were able to work together on several projects.

The lack of program space at Melcher is a major impact on the program. If they were able to have smaller groups, some of the behavior issues would not be as challenging.

Paige

Community:
Many community groups have helped with many activities for both youth and families at ACCPA throughout the year.

Melcher has not been able to develop any community partners, but is looking at some possibilities for the next school year.

Paige

Review of Progress on Selected Goals and Objectives

1) How has the program used the previous years' External Evaluation to improve and refine the afterschool program? What specific areas (use objective numbers 1.1-3.5) did the program work on this year based on last year's data. How did the program try to make changes in that area? Please give specific examples.

Review of Data Reports

The Review of Data section of the Guided Reflection document should be completed by the local evaluator following the release of the data reports and prior to the face-to-face Status of Goals and Objectives discussion.

1) Using the data provided, mark the status of this year's goals and objectives and make comments to contextualize the responses.

Objective	Status: Met or Not Met (at all sites)	If Not Met, which site(s)	Data (for all sites) or missing data comments
1.1 – Reading Grades	Met		ACCPA 62.1% Melcher 75.0% Paige 73.5%
1.2 – Math Grades	Met		ACCPA 56.1% Melcher 60.6% Paige 70.2%
1.3 – Science Grades	Met		ACCPA 55.8% Melcher 67.7% Paige 70.8%
1.4 – Reading Efficacy	Met		ACCPA 83.5% Melcher 79.2% Paige 75.0%
1.5 – Math Efficacy	Met		ACCPA 89.8% Melcher 84.9% Paige 88.1%
1.6 – Science Efficacy	Not Met	Paige	ACCPA 78.9% Melcher 76.0% Paige 65.0%
2.1 – PQA	Met		ACCPA 4.35 Melcher 3.46 Paige 7.3

2.2 – Organizational Context	Met		Staffing Model
			  ACCPA 4.32
			  Melcher 3.49
			  Paige 3.77
			Continuous Improvement
			  ACCPA 4.78
			  Melcher 3.39
			  Paige 4.24

2.3 – Instructional Context	Met		Academic Press
			  ACCPA 4.26
			  Melcher 4.60
			  Paige 4.06
			Engaging Instruction
			  ACCPA 4.42
			  Melcher 3.96
			  Paige 4.17

2.4 – External Relationships	Not Met	Melcher
		Paige
			Family Communications
			  ACCPA 3.99
			  Melcher 3.93
			  Paige 3.69
			School Alignment
			  ACCPA 3.88
			  Melcher 2.33
			  Paige 2.57

3.1 – School Day Attendance	FY16 - Not Applicable		
3.2 – Program Attendance	Met		ACCPA 90.6% Melcher 67.4% Paige 84.3%
3.3 – Behavior	FY16 - Not Applicable		
3.4 – Personal and Social Skills	Met		ACCPA 92.9% Melcher 83.0% Paige 88.2%
3.5 – Commitment to Learning	Met		ACCPA 96.9% Melcher 86.5% Paige 92.8%

2) Using the previous evaluation(s) and this year's data, fill out the longitudinal chart. Mark items that were "Met" or "Not Met" (with M or N). List the sites that did not meet the objective.

Objective	Year 1 –	Sites Not Met	Year 2 –	Sites Not Met	Year 3	Sites Not Met	Year 4	Sites Not Met	Year 5	Sites Not Met	Comments

	M/N		M/N		– M/N		– M/N		– M/N		
1.1 – Reading Grades	Met		Met								
1.2 – Math Grades	Met		Met								
1.3 – Science Grades	Met		Met								
1.4 – Reading Efficacy	Met		Met								
1.5 – Math Efficacy	Met		Met								
1.6 – Science Efficacy	No Data Paige		Not Met	Paige							
2.1 – PQA	No Data Melcher or Paige		Met								
2.2 – Organizational Context	Met		Met								
2.3 – Instructional Context	Met		Met								
2.4 – External Relationships	No Data Melcher		Not Met	Melcher Paige							
3.1 – School Day Attendance	FY15 - Not Applicable		FY16 - Not Applicable								
3.2 – Program Attendance	Met		Met								
3.3 – Behavior	FY15 - Not Applicable		FY16 - Not Applicable								
3.4 – Personal and Social Skills	Met		Met								
3.5 – Commitment to Learning	Met		Met								

Status of This Year's Goals and Objectives

The Status of Goals and Objectives section of the Guided Reflection document should be completed by the local evaluator following a face-to-face discussion with the grantee.

1) Goal 1 – Grades (1.1-1.3) and Self-efficacy (1.4-1.6) – What trends can be seen across all sites? In which subjects are youth succeeding? In which subjects do they need more assistance? How does the self-efficacy survey data fit/not fit with the grades data? Are there particular sites that do better/worse than others? How does the local context fit this data?

2) Goal 2 – PQA (2.1) – What trends can be seen across all sites? What are the strengths of the program? What may need to be improved across all sites at the program? What concerns/areas for improvement can be seen for only certain sites? How does the local context fit this data?

3) Goal 2 – Leading Indicators (2.2-2.4)

   Organizational Context (Staffing Model and Continuous Improvement) – What does the survey data say across all sites related to the Organizational Context? Are there management trends that surface?

   Instructional Context (Academic Press and Engaging Instruction) – Looking at the responses for the Instructional Context, does this match the perception of the program staff? Are there site specific issues?

External Relationships (Family Communication and School Alignment) – What trends are seen in the External Relationships section? How does the survey data in the External Relationships section relate to the local context outlined above?

4) Goal 3 – Attendance (3.1-3.2) and Behavior (3.3) – What are the attendance trends across all sites? Are there particular sites that are doing well/struggling with attendance and school behaviors (out-of-school suspensions)? What factors impact the attendance and suspension rates?   (*Note: Data is only provided for 3.2 – Program Attendance. You may still discuss the program's impression of school day attendance and school day suspensions, but are not required to do so.*)

5) Goal 3 – Personal and Social Skills (3.4) and Commitment to Learning (3.5) – Across all sites, what are the trends on the youth surveys? Which areas might warrant more focus? Are there individual site differences? How does the local context fit this data?

6) Additional Family, Staff, School Administrator, and Community Partner data – Does this data support the other data already reviewed? Are there specific concerns (at one site or across all sites) that the program should consider (e.g., families connected, staff supported, school administrators and community partners informed)?

Longitudinal Progress

1. What trends are noted across time related to the specific objectives (1.1-3.5)?

2. For the specific objective(s) that the program identified to work on during the past year, what progress can be seen in the available data? What factors contributed to or detracted from the progress? How does this fit with the local context?

3. For the next year, which objective(s) might the program select for improvement? (Note: Action plans will be developed with the Afterschool Regional Educator.)