21st CCLC External Evaluator Training

Terri Foulkes and Jason Patrie, Missouri AfterSchool Network
Wayne Mayfield, PhD, Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis
Today’s Agenda

• MASN Overview
• Quality Framework
• Statewide and Local Evaluation
  — Evaluation Design (MASN/OSEDA/DESE)
  — Data Collection (MASN/Grantees)
  — Data Report Generation (OSEDA/Weikart)
  — Review of Data (Local Evaluator)
  — Guided Reflection (Local Evaluator/Grantees)
• Summary of Local Evaluator Responsibilities
MASN builds systems across the state that improve, support, and sustain high quality afterschool programs.

MASN is one of 40+ Statewide Afterschool Networks (SANs) funded by the Mott Foundation.
Goal 1
Foster *partnerships* at the local, state, and national level to support afterschool professionals and programs

Goal 2
Develop *public support* and garner resources to advance and sustain afterschool programs

Goal 3
Ensure *quality* by providing supports to afterschool programs that are necessary to meet and exceed the Missouri Quality Standards
Our Work

• MASN Steering Committee

- Funding & Sustainability
- Professional Development
- Public Policy
- Quality
- STEM

• Funded Projects

- MOARC
- KCC
- Coordinate Evaluation Process
- MOSAC2
- PDI
- Champions Development
Evaluation Work

• MASN is coordinating the new Statewide and Local Evaluation
  – Sub contracting with Weikart Center and OSEDA for survey development, data analysis, and report writing
  – Providing training/certification of external evaluators
Quality Framework

Develop relationships to support programs to make data driven decisions about improving program quality.
Afterschool Logic Model

Training
Coaching
Self-assessment

AS Staff Skills
AS Program Structure

Afterschool Program Quality

Youth Outcomes

College and Career Readiness /Success
Weikart Center for Youth Program Quality
Youth Program Quality Improvement (YPQI)
Technical Assistance and Training

- Training
- Resources
- Coaching Visits
- Action Plan
- Surveys
- PQA
- KCC

Plan → Assess → Improve
Assess – KCC, Surveys, PQAs

- Youth Survey
- Family Survey
- Coordinator/Director Survey
- Site Staff Survey
- School Administrator Survey
- Community Partner Survey
Plan – TA Visits & APWD

• Grantee Level Action Plans
  – Coaching visits

• Site Level Action Plans
  – Advanced Planning with Data or Mini Planning with Data
  – Coaching visits
Improve – Coaching, Training, and Resources

- Coaching visits (discussions, observations, feedback)
- Methods Trainings
- Summits
- Webinars
- Statewide Conferences
## 21st CCLC Technical Assistance Timeline

### 21st CCLC Technical Assistance and Evaluation Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Program Visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Program Visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Site Visit (site level action plan - Years 1, 2, 3, 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Site Visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program level check-ins between visits via phone, off-site meetings, email, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program level action plan created during 1st Program Visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Planning with Data (site level action plan - Years 1, 2, 3, 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Work Methods Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Trainings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOSAC2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Statewide Summit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAACOE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- Program level
- Site level
- Both Program and Site Level
External Evaluation and Statewide Evaluation

Parallel evaluations - Consistent goals/objectives, same data, similar analysis
Coordinated Evaluation

• Local external evaluation parallels statewide evaluation
  – Same data and framework for all grantees
• Same data used for quality improvement efforts and evaluation efforts
Ensuring Consistency

• New model
  – Same goals, objectives, and data as Statewide Evaluation

• Outside Evaluators
  – Must attend a training to become “certified”
  – All paid the same rate, receive the same data, and submit the same report
Steps In the 21st CCLC Local/External Evaluation Process

- Evaluation Design
  • MASN
  • OSEDA
  • DESE

- Data Collection
  • MASN
  • Grantees

- Data Report Generation
  • OSEDA
  • Weikart

- Review of Data
  • Local Evaluator

- Local Context and Guided Reflection
  • Local Evaluator
  • Grantees
Local Evaluation Fee

- $2000 per grantee, includes one site, $200 per additional site
  - Consulting with Local/External Evaluator for:
    - Local Context (report Part 1)
    - Review of Data
    - Guided Reflection (report Part 2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why</th>
<th>Assess</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Improve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site</strong></td>
<td>Point of service improvement,</td>
<td>PWD, TA Visits, Site Goals</td>
<td>YW Methods, Trainings, Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase youth/staff engagement,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same data used for all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>levels,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program/Grantee</strong></td>
<td>Program effectiveness, External</td>
<td>Guided Reflection, TA Visits,</td>
<td>Training, Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Grantee Goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program effectiveness, External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple sources of data:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PQA’s, KCC, Surveys, Core Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System</strong></td>
<td>Statewide effectiveness, Potential</td>
<td>MASN Contract Quality</td>
<td>Designing new training and new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>funding opportunities, Statewide</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>coaching resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same data used for all levels,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PQA’s, KCC, Surveys, Core Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation Design

- MASN
- OSEDA
- DESE

- MASN
- Grantees

- OSEDA
- Weikart

- Local Evaluator

- Local Evaluator
- Grantees
Goals

• Goal 1: Support or increase **student achievement and sense of competence** in the areas of reading/communication arts, mathematics, and science.

• Goal 2: Develop and maintain a **quality program** that includes a safe and supportive environment, positive interactions, and meaningful opportunities for engagement.

• Goal 3: Enhance youth’s **college and career readiness skills and behaviors**, including positive school behaviors, personal and social skills, and commitment to learning.
Goal 1: Support or increase student achievement and sense of competence in the areas of reading/communication arts, mathematics, and science.

- Objective 1.1: At least 50% of youth per site will maintain and/or increase their grades in reading/communication arts during the school year as measured by pre-/post-grades entered into Kids Care Center.

- Objective 1.2: At least 50% of youth per site will maintain and/or increase their grades in math during the school year as measured by pre-/post-grades entered into Kids Care Center.

- Objective 1.3: At least 50% of youth per site will maintain and/or increase their grades in science during the school year as measured by pre-/post-grades entered into Kids Care Center.

- Objective 1.4: At least 70% of youth per site will report a medium to high level of reading efficacy as measured by items on the Leading Indicators Youth Survey (average score of 3.5 or higher).

- Objective 1.5: At least 70% of youth per site will report a medium to high level of math efficacy as measured by items on the Leading Indicators Youth Survey (average score of 3.5 or higher).

- Objective 1.6: At least 70% of youth per site will report a medium to high level of interest and engagement in STEM as measured by questions from the Common Instrument Science Survey (total score of 3.0 or higher).
Goal 2: Develop and maintain a quality program that includes a safe and supportive environment, positive interactions, and meaningful opportunities for engagement.

- **Objective 2.1:** All sites will score at least an average 2.9 on the Program Quality Assessment tool.

- **Objective 2.2:** All sites will score at least an average 3.0 on the Organizational Context Leading Indicators of Staffing Model and Continuous Improvement.

- **Objective 2.3:** All sites will score at least an average 3.0 on the Instructional Context Leading Indicators of Academic Press and Engaging Instruction.

- **Objective 2.4:** All sites will score at least an average 3.0 on the External Relationships Leading Indicators of Family Communication and School Alignment.
Goal 3: Enhance youth’s college and career readiness skills and behaviors, including positive school behaviors, personal and social skills, and commitment to learning.

- **Objective 3.1:** At least 50% of youth per site will meet or exceed the school district’s average rate of school-day attendance.

- **Objective 3.2:** At least 50% of total youth enrolled in the afterschool program per site will have at least 60 days of attendance in the afterschool program.

- **Objective 3.3:** At least 50% of youth per site will have no in-building or out-of-school suspensions.

- **Objective 3.4:** At least 70% of youth per site will indicate a medium to high level of personal and social skills as measured by the youth outcomes survey and teacher surveys (average score of 3.5 or higher).

- **Objective 3.5:** At least 70% of youth per site will indicate a medium to high level of commitment to learning as measured by the youth outcomes survey and teacher surveys (average score of 3.5 or higher).
Data Collection

- Evaluation Design
  - MASN
  - OSEDA
  - DESE

- Data Collection
  - MASN
  - Grantees

- Data Report Generation
  - OSEDA
  - Weikart

- Review of Data
  - Local Evaluator

- Local Context and Guided Reflection
  - Local Evaluator
  - Grantees
Data Sources used for the Statewide Evaluation

- Program Quality Assessments (PQAs)
- Surveys
- Kids Care Center (KCC) Data
- DESE Core Data (FY17?)
Surveys

- Survey links sent in February to grant contact
  - One per site – coded with Org ID so it is important to make sure to use the correct links
- Paper survey available for parents and youth
- Spanish versions of parent and youth
- Youth survey requires a student identifier and “opt out” consent
- Weekly e-mail with number of completed surveys
As part of an annual evaluation process, we are asking district administrators and school principals to give us their opinions about the afterschool program. Your input is very valuable and will help in making decisions about how to improve afterschool for our students. This survey is confidential and anonymous so your responses cannot be linked back to you. Please answer the questions as honestly as you can. Again, thank you for completing this survey!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Applicable (NA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The afterschool program is effectively coordinated with school day learning (i.e., afterschool program has a direct correlation/link to the school day curriculum).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school shares grades, test scores, or student progress information with the afterschool program to coordinate supports for students in the afterschool program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afterschool staff members receive support from school administrators/teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afterschool staff members are invited to district or school meetings to coordinate efforts to support students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The afterschool program keeps us well informed of its activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The afterschool program provides opportunities for school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kids Care Center (KCC)

- Statewide database used to collect youth enrollment and activity participation
- KCC training and technical assistance
- Data used for Statewide and Local Evaluation
  - KCC ID used for the surveys
- Data is entered into federal system for reporting
KCC Variables

- Afterschool attendance
- Grades
Program Quality Assessments (PQA)

- Developed by the Weikart Center for Youth Program Quality
  - School Age Program Quality Assessment (SAPQA) Walk-Through Method
  - Youth Program Quality Assessment (YPQA), with STEM Add-on
- On-site assessment by trained, reliable external assessors
Program Quality Assessments

- Four domains
  - Multiple scales in a domain
  - Multiple items in a scale
Data Report Generation

- Evaluation Design
  - MASN
  - OSEDA
  - DESE

- Data Collection
  - MASN
  - Grantees

- Data Report Generation
  - OSEDA
  - Weikart

- Review of Data
  - Local Evaluator

- Local Context and Guided Reflection
  - Local Evaluator
  - Grantees
Four Reports Provided

- Site Summary (1.1-1.3, 3.2)
- College and Career Readiness (1.4-1.6, 3.4-3.5)
- PQA (2.1)
- Leading Indicators (2.2-2.4)
Review of Data

- Evaluation Design
  - MASN
  - OSEDA
  - DESE

- Data Collection
  - MASN
  - Grantees

- Data Report Generation
  - OSEDA
  - Weikart

- Review of Data
  - Local Evaluator

- Local Context and Guided Reflection
  - Local Evaluator
  - Grantees
Local Evaluator Responsibilities

• **Before 6/30**
  – Meet with grantee to discuss local context
  – Complete Local Context section of Guided Reflection document

• **8/15-10/15**
  – Review reports, complete Review of Data Reports section of Guided Reflection document
  – Meet with grantee to review reports and discuss status on goals and objectives
  – Complete Status on Goals and Objectives section of Guided Reflection document
Local Context and Guided Reflection

- Evaluation Design
  - MASN
  - OSEDA
  - DESE
- Data Collection
  - MASN
  - Grantees
- Data Report Generation
  - OSEDA
  - Weikart
- Review of Data
  - Local Evaluator
- Local Context and Guided Reflection
  - Local Evaluator
  - Grantees
Cohort 8 - Apples to Apples

Data

- Kids Care Center
- PQAs
- School Surveys
- Youth Surveys
- Parent Surveys
- Staff Surveys
- Partner Surveys

Reports

- Summary Report
- College and Career Readiness
- Leading Indicators
- PQA Feedback

Product

- Guided Reflection Document
Audience

- DESE – Extended Learning
- Superintendents/School Boards

- High level analysis – Data should stay in Review of Data Reports
Meeting #1 – Local Context

• Meet with Program Director prior to 6/30
• Discuss local context
• Review key areas from previous year
Guided Reflection Document
Program Overview

• Names of sites

• 2-3 paragraphs about the program
  – Elementary, Middle, High
  – Description of how often the programs meet
  – Approximate attendance and enrollments
Guided Reflection Document

Local Context

- By Goals:
  - Academic
  - Program Quality
  - College and Career Readiness
- Break down by each type
  - Youth
  - Staff
  - School
  - Community
- Some positive and negative impacts
- May be strong in one area and not another
Data Available for Review

- Data reports will be e-mailed 8/15
- Review data prior to second meeting with the Program Director
- Start with the Site Summary Report
- Additional reports provide supporting data
Guided Reflection Document

Review of Data Reports

• One chart for ALL sites
• Fill out all Status for all (Met and Not Met)
• If not met, list all sites not meeting
• Comments:
  – For all (even if met)
    • Site A 97.3%, Site B 85.2%, Site C 45.9%
  – Missing data
• New multi-year chart
Guided Reflection Document

Previous Years’ Data Chart

- Record Met/Not Met and specific sites for previous years
- Add comments capturing trends
Meeting #2 – Review of Goals and Objectives

- Meet with Program Director prior to 10/1
- Discuss data and trends
- Review Longitudinal Progress
Guided Reflection Document

Status of Goals and Objectives

• Use the supporting data reports
• Refer back to local context
• Do not need to restate the data in the Status of Goals and Objectives chart
• Remember the audience – focus on themes, trends, and connections rather than restating the data – summarize for them
• “consistent across sites”, “higher/lower than state average”, “fits with local context”
Guided Reflection Document
Longitudinal Progress

• Discuss trends across time
• Focus on specific objective(s) selected by program to work on from year to year
• Discuss/recommend possible objective(s) to improve on in upcoming year
  — NOTE: The ARE will work with the grantee to develop action plans.
Summary of Local Evaluator Responsibilities
Local Evaluation Timeline

- January – External Evaluator training
- February – Certified Evaluator list available
- March–May – Grantees select and contract with Certified Evaluators
- By June 30 – External Evaluator and Program Administration meet to discuss local context
- August 15 – Data available to External Evaluator and Program Administrator
- August 26 (10:00 a.m.) – External Evaluator Refresher Call
- Prior to October 1 – External Evaluator and Program Administrator meet to discuss status of goals and objectives
- Prior to October 15 – External Evaluator completes Guided Reflection document
- October 15 – Guided Reflection document due to DESE
Key Points

• Schedule and prepare for meetings
• Lead discussions during meetings
• Type up Guided Reflection Documentation following meetings
• Thoughtful review of data reports in preparation for Status of Goals and Objectives meeting
## Comprehensive Data Collection and Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why</th>
<th>Assess</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Improve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site</strong></td>
<td>Point of service improvement, Increase youth/staff engagement, interactions</td>
<td>Same data used for all levels, PQA’s, KCC, Surveys, Core Data</td>
<td>PWD, TA Visits, Site Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program/Grantee</strong></td>
<td>Program effectiveness, External Evaluation</td>
<td>Guided Reflection, TA Visits, Grantee Goals</td>
<td>Training, Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System</strong></td>
<td>Statewide effectiveness, Potential funding opportunities, Statewide Evaluation</td>
<td>MASN Contract Quality Committee</td>
<td>Designing new training and new coaching resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>