



DAVID P. WEIKART
CENTER FOR YOUTH
PROGRAM QUALITY

Oklahoma 21st Century Community Learning Centers Statewide Evaluation – Interim Report

2013-2014 Annual Report
Report to the Oklahoma State Department of Education

February 2015

Oklahoma 21st Century Community Learning Centers Statewide Evaluation Report: 2013-2014 Annual Report

Prepared by
Samantha Sniegowski, Anna Gersh, Charles Smith, & Angelina Garner
The David P. Weikart Center for Youth Program Quality
A Division of the Forum for Youth Investment

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	4
Purpose and Components of the Evaluation	5
Summary of Findings.....	7
Major Findings	7
Detailed findings for quality improvement planning:.....	8
Evaluation Methodology.....	10
Measures, Data Collection Procedures, and Sample Characteristics	10
Grantee Director/Site Coordinator Survey & Sample	11
Afterschool Teacher/Youth Worker Survey	12
Youth Survey.....	13
Parent Survey	14
Program Quality Assessment.....	16
Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS)	17
Findings/Results	19
Leading Indicator 1.1 – Staffing Model.....	21
Leading Indicator 1.2 – Continuous Improvement.....	22
Leading Indicator 1.2 – Continuous Improvement continued.....	23
Leading Indicator 1.3 – Youth Governance	24
Leading Indicator 1.4 – Enrollment Policy	25
Leading Indicator 2.1 – Academic Press	27
Leading Indicator 2.2 – Engaging Instruction	28
Leading Indicator 2.2 – Engaging Instruction continued	29
Indicator 3.1 – System Norms	31
Indicator 3.2 – Family Engagement.....	32
Indicator 3.3 – School Alignment	33
Indicator 3.4 – Community Resources.....	35
Indicator 4.1 – Socioemotional Development	37
Indicator 4.2 – Academic Efficacy.....	38
Indicator 4.2 – Academic Efficacy continued.....	40
Indicator 5.1 – Family Satisfaction	42
Indicator 5.1 – Family Satisfaction continued	43
Recommendations	44
References	48
Appendix A: Technical Detail on Reliability of Measures	49
Appendix B: Profiles of High- and Low-Performing Sites.....	51

Introduction

In 2002, the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) was reauthorized and the responsibility for distributing federal funding regarding 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) was shifted to each state. These dollars are intended to fund afterschool programs that are located in high poverty areas or in low-achieving schools. Grants are awarded to applicants whose main are to increase academic achievement, provide additional enrichment activities, and provide literacy and educational services for the parents of youth who attend the afterschool programs (United States Department of Education, 2011).

Both the State Education Agency (SEA) and grantees must comply with specific evaluation and accountability policies and reporting structures. SEAs must provide comprehensive annual evaluations of their 21st CCLC programs, reporting on the performance measures listed in their applications to the United States Department of Education. These reports must be made available for public consumption.

In order to aide in the evaluation process, grantees are required to submit data annually using the Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS), an online portal that houses information from all 21st CCLC grantees across the United States.

Since 2002, the Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) has utilized federal dollars to fund afterschool programming in a wide variety of school districts and community organizations. To date, OSDE has awarded approximately 175 grantees serving approximately 12,000 youth per year (Oklahoma State Department of Education, 2014).

During the 2013-2014 program year, nine new grantees were awarded bringing the total number of grantees receiving funding to 60. These 60 grantees, representing 86 different sites/centers would split the approximately \$11.6 million that was delegated to OSDE by the federal government.

In fulfillment of the federal requirement for an annual evaluation, and because OSDE does not require that grantees hire local evaluators, OSDE sought an evaluation design that prioritized usefulness to grantee-level stakeholders. Therefore, in the fall of 2010, the Oklahoma State Department of Education enlisted the David P. Weikart Center for Youth Program Quality at the Forum for Youth Investment (hereafter “evaluation contractor”) to provide a statewide evaluation of the Oklahoma 21st CCLC program.

Note on Interim Status:

The closing of PPICS in October 2014, before that year’s reading and math proficiency data became available resulted in an extended delay in the availability of that information as well as certain program operations data, also typically entered by grantees into the PPICS system. This report is released in the interim, with an expectation of completion following the release of the new federal data collection system, slated for late fall, 2015. Due to this delay, several analyses are missing from this report including:

- a. Academic proficiency data: summary outcomes
- b. Operations data: distribution of academic programming
- c. Grantee program characteristics
- d. Regular attendee academic achievement

These missing data are noted where they would normally appear in the report.

Purpose and Components of the Evaluation

The evaluation design includes two overarching components – Program Evaluation and Program Quality Improvement. Program Evaluation includes 1) support in the collection and submission of federally required data through the Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS), 2) collection of statewide Leading Indicator data at multiple levels from multiple sources, and 3) preparation of grantee-level Leading Indicator reports allowing for grantee-level comparisons to statewide norms. Table 1 presents a complete timeline of the services and supports surrounding the Program Evaluation component.

Table 1 - 2013-2014 Program Quality Improvement & Evaluation Components Timeline

Date/Time	Activities
October 8, 2013	OSDE Grantee Orientation Kickoff
November 1, 2013	Live Youth PQA Basics/Plus Training: Online training also available
November – December, 2013	Site Self Assessment Teams conduct program self assessment and receive external assessment (year one and year three grantees)
November 2013	Youth Work Methods Summits
November 13 & 15, 2014	Self Assessment Check-in webinars
January 21-24, 2014	PPICS Webinars: Grantee Profile & Data Management Spreadsheet
January 30 & 31	Live Planning with Data Workshops
January 31, 2014	Due Date: Grantee Profile Updated/Completed in PPICS
February 21, 2014	Due Date: All PQA data due in Scores Reporter
February, 2014	Improvement Planning Webinars
February 21, 2014	Due Date: Program Improvement Plans due in Scores Reporter
March 28, 2014	Improvement Stage Webinars
April 21-May 2, 2014	Surveys Administered
April, 2014	PPICS Annual Performance Report (APR) Opens
May 7 & 9, 2014	PPICS Webinars: APR & Data Management Spreadsheet
May 31, 2014	Due Date: Operations, feeder schools, and partners data due in PPICS
May 31, 2014	End of program year – last day of data collection for the 2013-2014 program year
June 1, 2014	Beginning of 2013-2014 program year
June 30, 2014	Due Date: Attendance, Staffing, and Activities data due
June 30, 2014	Due Date: State Assessment Data due
September, 2013	Leading Indicator Reports Created
Fall-Winter, 2014/15	Statewide Evaluation Report


The program quality improvement process (see Figure 1) is aimed at embedding a culture of continuous improvement through a cycle of assessment, planning, and implementation¹. Typically, clients are asked to select a site team to conduct program self assessments using the Youth Program Quality Assessment (Youth PQA) (Smith & Hohmann, 2005). Once data is collected, clients then review their data to identify strengths and areas for improvement. A program improvement plan is then created based on these areas, which includes detailed information about the timeline for the goals, parties responsible, resources and supports necessary, and a description of what success looks like. Throughout the program year, clients implement the steps necessary to achieve these goals.

The program quality improvement process used in the Oklahoma CCLC network was adapted from the Weikart Center’s evidence-based continuous improvement model and includes 1) support in the understanding and interpretation of the Leading Indicator reports, 2) support in the creation and implementation of Program

¹ The Youth Program Quality Intervention (YPQI) is a data-driven continuous improvement model for afterschool systems. A cluster-randomized trial of the YPQI demonstrated a cascade of positive effects beginning with the provision of standards, training, and technical assistance, flowing through managers and staff implementation of continuous improvement practices, and resulting in effects on staff instructional practices. For more information, and to read the full report, please visit www.cypq.org/ypqi.

Improvement Plans based on the data in the Leading Indicator reports and 3) intensive technical assistance (management coaching) for select sites.

Figure 1



Summary of Findings

During the 2013-2014 program year, Oklahoma 21st CCLC grantees 86 sites representing 60 grantees successfully completed requirements for both components of the statewide evaluation: Program Evaluation and Program Quality Improvement. There are four core elements of the YPQI process: program assessment (self or external); data-driven improvement planning; professional development aligned with program improvement goals; and continuous feedback loops on instructional practice between managers and staff. This year, 94% of sites submitted program assessments using the Youth or School-Age PQA, 88% of sites submitted program improvement plans based upon data from PQA and/or Leading Indicator reports, 78% of staff reported professional development participation unrelated to Weikart Center training (43% reported participation in Weikart Center trainings), and 86% of staff reported that their manager engages them in continuous feedback dialogue on at least a monthly basis.

The findings described in this report indicate that grantees are doing well in several areas, and continue to do well in the same areas from year to year. In this section we present three major findings and then a number of more detailed findings divided into program strengths and areas for improvement.

Major Findings

- ❖ Grantees implemented a fourth year of data collection activities as well as intensive training and technical assistance to improve the quality of Oklahoma afterschool programs. Aside from the required submission of data to the federal government through PPICS, grantees also completed program self assessments, submitted program improvement plans, submitted a number of evaluation surveys, and participated in various staff development trainings (including a Planning with Data training that utilized both PQA data and site-level Leading Indicator reports). Grantees in their second and third year also contracted with external assessors to come into their program to observe using the Youth or School-Age PQA. A select number of grantees also received intensive coaching services.
- ❖ Based on an analysis of sites' scores on 22 Leading Indicator scales, the Collaboration scale suggested a high degree of collaborative work among sites. Twenty-eight sites were identified in the high quartile (high quartile mean = 5.00) and 37% of sites were identified in the low quartile (low quartile mean = 3.61). Sites also indicated a high level of communication with families with 25% of sites identified within the high quartile (mean = 4.71) and 23% identified within the low quartile (mean = 3.81). Two areas of potential improvement are Community Engagement with 27% of sites identified within the low quartile (mean = 1.61) and Youth Governance with 29% of sites in the low quartile (mean = 1.91). Access also indicated a particularly low bottom quartile mean (mean = 1.00), however because the items in the Access scale refer to the process of intentionally restricting or otherwise limiting program registration to certain groups of students, its low score may not necessarily indicate low quality, but rather open access to programs for all students. This scale should be considered in the context of both the Academic Targeting indicator and the mission of the program of interest.
- ❖ Similar to last year, two primary indicators of program outcomes related to academic proficiency and numbers of students served were:
 - Academic proficiency data outcome: To be completed following release of federal data collection system
 - On average, programs served slightly more students than anticipated during the 2013-2014 program year. Grantees are required to provide a grantee profile in PPICS and submit the number of youth they anticipate serving during the program year. This number was compared with the actual number of students served based on attendance records submitted at the end of the program year by each grantee. This indicates that grantees may be generating more interest in their programs.

Detailed findings for quality improvement planning:

Program Strengths

- ❖ According to youth, Oklahoma 21st CCLC programs continue to provide spaces where they feel they can be efficacious, develop good work habits, develop positive relationships, build upon and master skills, and complete their homework while being supported in doing so. Students appear to be more interested in the science and technology subjects than in reading or math.

Table 38 – Youth-Reported Interest* in Academic Subject Areas by Grade and Gender

	Reading		Math		Science		Technology	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
4 th Grade	47.7% (n=406)	52.8% (n=397)	60.9% (n=412)	60.2% (n=397)	64.8% (n=410)	65.8% (n=395)	69.6% (n=412)	61.0% (n=398)
5 th Grade	44.3% (n=266)	43.7% (n=322)	60.5% (n=269)	60.9% (n=197)	66.9% (n=263)	60.9% (n=323)	71.1% (n=267)	61.6% (n=321)
6 th Grade	37.2% (n=223)	38.0% (n=205)	53.5% (n=226)	43.6% (n=90)	57.1% (n=224)	56.1% (n=203)	64.7% (n=227)	55.8% (n=206)
7 th Grade	40.6% (n=155)	40.6% (n=133)	35.8% (n=156)	42.5% (n=57)	51.2% (n=156)	48.5% (n=134)	60.7% (n=158)	54.0% (n=135)
8 th Grade	38.0% (n=92)	48.0% (n=75)	40.8% (n=93)	33.7% (n=74)	42.8% (n=91)	40.5% (n=74)	56.9% (n=93)	46.6% (n=75)
9 th Grade	35.0% (n=20)	46.1% (n=26)	30.0% (n=20)	34.6% (n=26)	42.1% (n=19)	46.1% (n=26)	36.8% (n=19)	33.3% (n=27)
10 th Grade	50.0% (n=14)	38.8% (n=18)	46.6% (n=15)	27.7% (n=18)	60.0% (n=15)	41.1% (n=17)	53.3% (n=15)	27.7% (n=18)
11 th Grade	11.0% (n=9)	33.3% (n=10)	44.4% (n=9)	30.0% (n=10)	30.0% (n=9)	33.3% (n=10)	26.3% (n=9)	00.0% (n=10)
12 th Grade	25.0% (n=4)	80.0% (n=10)	40.0% (n=5)	50.0% (n=10)	60.0% (n=5)	50.0% (n=10)	66.6% (n=5)	60.0% (n=10)

*Proportion responding “Almost always true” for interest in subject area.

- ❖ Most parents of the youth in the afterschool programs appear to be satisfied with the services that the 21st CCLC programs provide in terms of the program’s convenience, the reliability of the program to provide a safe space for youth, and the program’s ability to contribute to their child’s success in school. Parents also report that communication with the afterschool program is fairly regular.
- ❖ Staff in the afterschool programs report that they are able to provide opportunities for growth and mastery for students, specifically by exposing them to new experiences. Staff also appear to be satisfied with their jobs, know the goals and priorities of their programs, and are able to talk to their peers and supervisors.
- ❖ According to grantee directors and site coordinators, they are familiar with the standards of quality for the 21st CCLC program, they collaborate across sites and share a common definition of quality, they are aware of the learning that is happening for their students during the school day, and they have students who participate in community service or service learning as well as start their own projects and initiatives.

Improvement Areas

- ❖ Grantee directors and site coordinators report that they rarely prioritize making programs accessible to certain groups of students or target students who are academically at-risk. Also, grantee directors and site coordinators are likely to review achievement test scores annually, but are less likely to review student progress reports. While reviewing achievement test scores can describe how students are doing from year to year, identifying progress (or lack thereof) that is being made *during* the program year may be more beneficial to students.
- ❖ While grantee directors and staff report that they know what academic content their students will be focusing on during the school day, they are less likely to report involvement and facilitation of effective communication between school day stakeholders, parents, and themselves. This communication is important to ensure that all of the supports that surround the youth in the program are operating with a unified goal in mind.
- ❖ Grantee directors and site coordinators report that middle school and high school age youth are not involved in decisions for hiring or how the organization's budget is spent. Further, youth are not: regularly offered opportunities to begin their own projects, initiatives, and enterprises; involved in selecting the content and purposes of the activities and the sessions; and able to contribute to the design, appearance, and aesthetics of the physical space.
- ❖ An important part of building new skills and intrinsic motivation in youth is involving them in engaging activities that grow increasingly complex over time. Staff report that group projects offered in the afterschool program typically do not take over five sessions to complete.

Evaluation Methodology

Measures, Data Collection Procedures, and Sample Characteristics

Much of the summary data and evaluative comparisons presented in this report are organized around a Leading Indicators framework developed by the evaluation contractor to serve several key purposes:

- To improve cost effectiveness of investments in evaluation by reorienting evaluation purposes to include grantee/site-level continuous improvement as a primary goal while maintaining system-wide summative conclusions as an important but secondary goal.
- To support continuous improvement decisions by:
 - Collecting data which is focused on specific best practices at multiple levels - system, organization, point of service – in order to simultaneously empower actors at all levels and roles to improve performance;
 - Collecting child level data which is proximal to the point-of-service setting where instruction is delivered in order to more effectively inform site-level actors about actionable beliefs and skills that children both bring to and develop in the program.
- To improve our ability to differentiate between high and low quality programs by including information from multiple measures in a single profile of grantee/site performance, thereby reducing the threat of erroneous decision-making due to error in any single measure.

The Leading Indicator framework came from the *Youth Program Quality Intervention Study* (Smith et al., 2012) and was first executed in the state of Michigan's 21st CCLC programs beginning in 2008. In the Oklahoma evaluation, Leading Indicator reports were produced for each grantee, comparing grantee performance with normative performance across all grantees in the state. This report provides a summative profile of performance for the statewide system, across all sites and grantees.

The thirteen leading Indicators described on pages 20-43 of this report are constructed as composites from 29 scale scores drawn from survey administered to program staff, students and parents and observational measures of program quality. Scale scores are designed to identify best practices that impact quality and effectiveness of afterschool programs, according to theory, research and the experience of Weikart Center staff. The 13 leading indicator composite scores are constructed as means across each of the unweighted scales in that domain (Smith et al., 2012). These composite scores are most appropriately used for exploratory purposes, guiding grantee/site staff toward further examination of scale and item level scores. The Leading Indicators are arranged in alignment with five primary contexts that characterize afterschool programming: Organizational, Instructional, External Relationships, Youth Skills, and Family Satisfaction.

The reliability and validity of the leading indicators are described in a report to the Oklahoma Department of Education and is based on research methods for composing scores from multiple criteria (Bobko, Roth, & Buster, 2007; Fralix & Raju, 1982; Smith et al., 2012). Appendix A provides descriptive information and reliability evidence for the Oklahoma 2013-2014 sample. In general, the 29 scales demonstrate acceptable levels of internal consistency (items within scales) and fairly high levels of inter-rater agreement (persons within program sites).

The next section describes each of the Leading Indicator measures and additional sources of information used in this report as well as the procedures for data collection, and sample characteristics.

Grantee Director/Site Coordinator Survey & Sample

In many 21st CCLC systems across the United States, a grantee oversees multiple sites (or locations where programming is offered). Each of these is managed by a site coordinator who is responsible for the daily operations of programming and staff supervision. The grantee director typically operates at a higher level of management, communicating accountability policies to site coordinators. However, in Oklahoma's 21st CCLC system, there are many grantees who offer programming at only one site and in which the grantee director is also the site coordinator. Therefore, this survey was directed primarily at grantee directors although site coordinators who were not also grantee directors were surveyed where appropriate.

The Grantee Director/Site Coordinator survey consisted of 44 items addressing perceptions of various practices and organizational characteristics that fell under the Organizational and External Relationships Contexts. These questions focused on issues such as staff capacity to carry out the work, job satisfaction, what role youth have in governing the program, enrollment for students with academic risk factors, accountability and collaboration norms, connections to the school day, and community engagement with the afterschool program.

The Grantee Director/Site Coordinator survey was administered March 3-14, 2014. Surveys were constructed within Qualtrics, an online survey program, and a link to the survey was posted on the Oklahoma 21st CCLC project page of the evaluation contractor's website, with e-mail reminders sent to non-respondents roughly halfway through the data collection period. Information at the beginning of the survey clarified the purpose of the surveys – this year, no confidentiality assurances were made.

A total of 121 grantee directors and site coordinators responded to the online survey, representing 100% of the 86 Oklahoma 21st CCLC sites. Table 2 below displays characteristics of grantee directors and site coordinators. The majority of respondents had a Master's degree, were white females, and 80% were certified teachers. The average number of hours worked per week was 17.8 and grantee directors and site coordinators worked for approximately 10.7 months out of the year.

Table 2 – Grantee Director/Site Coordinator Survey Respondent Characteristics

Characteristics	N=121
Average years of experience at site in any capacity	4.96
Average years of experience at site as Site Coordinator	3.42
Education Level	
Less than high school diploma/GED	0%
GED/High School diploma	2%
Some college, no degree	4%
Associate's Degree	5%
Bachelor's Degree	18%
Graduate program but no degree yet	4%
Master's Degree	63%
Doctorate	2%
Other professional degree after BA	1%
Teaching Certification	80%
Average months worked per year	10.70
Average hours worked per week	17.74
Gender	20% male
Race	
White	84%
African American	2%
Native American	24%
Hispanic	2%
Arab American	0%
Asian	0%
Other Race	0%

Afterschool Teacher/Youth Worker Survey

The Afterschool Teacher/Youth worker survey consisted of 42 different questions and was directed at the staff within each site/center who were directly responsible for providing programming to children and youth. These staff were in direct contact with children and youth on a day-to-day basis. This survey asked questions regarding job satisfaction, involvement in continuous quality improvement efforts, communication with peers and with the grantee directors/site coordinators, the extent that academic activities are planned into their afterschool offerings, the growth and mastery skills of the children and youth in their programs, and connections to the school day.

The Afterschool Teacher/Youth Worker survey was also administered in the first two weeks of March, 2014 via Qualtrics, an online survey program. Surveys were constructed within Qualtrics, an online survey program, and a link to the survey was posted on the Oklahoma 21st CCLC project page of the evaluation contractor's website, with e-mail reminders sent to non-respondents roughly halfway through the data collection period. Information at the beginning of the survey clarified the purpose of the surveys – this year, no confidentiality assurances were made.

A total of 756 afterschool teachers and youth workers responded to the online survey, representing responses from 100% of Oklahoma 21st CCLC grantees. Table 3 highlights the characteristics of the afterschool teachers and youth workers that interact with youth on a daily basis. The average number of years worked at the site was three and a half years and the majority of staff had either a Bachelors' or Master's degree. Approximately 69% of staff were certified school-day teachers and white females. The majority of staff worked 8.5 months out of the year and approximately 8.3 hours per week.

Table 3 – Afterschool Teacher/Youth Worker Survey Respondent Characteristics

Characteristics	N=756
Average years of experience at site	3.30
Education Level	
Less than high school diploma/GED	5%
GED/High School diploma	9%
Some college, no degree	11%
Associate’s Degree	4%
Bachelor’s Degree	44%
Graduate program but no degree yet	6%
Master’s Degree	22%
Doctorate	0%
Other professional degree after BA	1%
Teaching Certification	71%
Average months worked per year	8.50
Average hours worked per week	8.34
Gender	14% male
Race	
White	80%
African American	4%
Native American	20%
Hispanic	3%
Arab American	0%
Asian	1%
Other Race	1%

Youth Survey

The youth survey consisted of 40 different questions and was administered to youth in grades fourth through twelfth who attended the afterschool programs. Surveys were directed only at this age group because the survey method was not developmentally appropriate for children in third grade or lower. Youth were asked to report on social and emotional competencies, their homework completion in the afterschool program, the extent to which they felt engaged in and belonged in the program, work habits, and their self-efficacy regarding academic content areas such as English/reading, math, science, and technology. These measures were adapted from the California Outcomes Project (Vandell, 2012) and are being used with permission.

In an effort to reduce paper consumption, youth surveys were administered online via the online survey software Qualtrics *unless* a site specifically requested paper surveys. If paper surveys were requested, one hundred youth surveys were mailed to each site/center along with instructions for administering the surveys to youth. Each survey (online and paper) contained instructions for completing the survey as well as confidentiality assurances for youth. Online surveys were automatically saved to the system. Once paper surveys were completed, the grantee director then mailed them back to the evaluation contractor in the self-addressed postage-paid envelopes that were included in the survey materials package. Reminders were sent at the halfway point during data collection and continued until the data collection period ended.

A total of 2,464 youth in fourth through twelfth grade completed a survey, representing responses from 97 of Oklahoma 21st CCLC sites. Table 4 presents demographic information for the youth in this sample. The average age of youth in the 21st CCLC programs was 11.7 years old and the average grade in school was sixth grade. Fifty percent of youth were male, while 58% reported white as their race, 35% reported they were Native American, 14% reported Hispanic, 9% reported African American, 7% reported “other”, and 1% reported being Asian.

Table 4 – Youth Survey Respondent Characteristics

Characteristics	N=2,464
Average Age	11.70
Average Grade	5.78
Gender	50% male
Race (check all that apply)	
White	58%
Native American	35%
African American	9%
Hispanic	14%
Arab American	0%
Asian	1%
Other Race	7%

Parent Survey

The parent survey consisted of 24 different questions, and was directed at the parents/guardians of *all* children and youth attending the afterschool programs, regardless of their age. The parent survey asked questions about their communication with the afterschool program, the academic efficacy of their child(ren), the confidence and convenience of the services provided at the afterschool program, and the connection that they have with the school itself. New this year, the parent survey also asked parents a series of questions about their interest in fee-based afterschool services.

Parent surveys were also administered online via the online survey software Qualtrics *unless* a site specifically requested paper surveys. If paper surveys were requested, one hundred parent surveys were mailed to each site/center along with instructions for administering the surveys to youth. Each survey (online and paper) contained instructions for completing the survey as well as confidentiality assurances for parents. Online surveys were automatically saved to the system. One hundred confidentiality envelopes were also enclosed for parents to put their completed paper surveys in before returning them to the grantee director. Once paper surveys were completed, the grantee director then mailed them back to the evaluation contractor in the self-addressed postage-paid envelopes that were included in the survey materials package. Reminders were sent at the halfway point during data collection and continued until the data collection period ended.

A total of 2,752 parents completed a survey, representing responses from 99% of Oklahoma 21st CCLC sites. Table 5 displays information for the parent sample from 2013-2014 program year data collection. The majority of parents ranged between 26 and 44 years old, had a four year degree or less, and had a household income of less than \$50,000 per year. Twenty percent of respondents were male, while 60% reported white as their race, 25% reported Native American, 14% reported Hispanic, 7% reported African American, 1% reported Asian, and 1% reported “other.”

Table 5 – Parent Survey Respondent Characteristics

Characteristics	N=2,752
Average Age	
25 or less years old	6%
26-30 years old	17%
31-35 years old	26%
36-40 years old	21%
41-44years old	14%
46-50 years old	6%
51-55 years old	3%
56-60 years old	3%
61-65 years old	2%
66 or more years old	2%
Education	
Less than high school diploma/GED	11%
GED/High School diploma	31%
Some college, no degree	26%
Associate's Degree	11%
Bachelor's Degree	14%
Graduate program but no degree yet	1%
Master's Degree	5%
Doctorate	1%
Other professional degree after BA	0%
Race (check all that apply)	
White	60%
African American	7%
Native American	25%
Hispanic	14%
Arab American	0%
Asian	1%
Other Race	1%
Gender	20% male
Income	
Less than \$10,000	7%
\$10,000 to \$19,999	17%
\$20,000 to \$29,999	18%
\$30,000 to \$39,999	17%
\$40,000 to \$49,999	10%
\$50,000 to \$59,999	7%
\$60,000 to \$69,999	6%
\$70,000 to \$79,999	5%
\$80,000 to \$89,999	4%
\$90,000 to \$100,000	4%
More than \$100,000	5%
If federal funding for this afterschool program stopped, would you be willing to pay a fee for afterschool services?	52%
If federal funding for this afterschool program stopped, would you be able to pay a fee for afterschool services?	44%

Program Quality Assessment

The *Youth Program Quality Assessment* (Youth PQA) and the *School-Age Program Quality Assessment* (School-Age PQA) are observation-based measures which were used to conduct program self assessments as a critical piece of the Program Quality Improvement component, but also provided very useful data within the Instructional Context of the Leading Indicators. Raters using the PQA use observational notes to score rubrics describing the extent to which specific staff practices are happening within each program session.

The Youth PQA is composed of 60 different items comprising 18 different scales, which fall into four domains: Safe Environment, Supportive Environment, Interaction, and Engagement. The Youth PQA is currently being used in over 80 afterschool networks across the United States and evidence from multiple replication samples suggests that data produced by the Youth PQA has characteristics of both precision (reliability) and meaningfulness (validity) (Smith et al., 2012; Smith & Hohmann, 2005).

The School-Age PQA is composed of 68 different items comprising 20 different scales, which fall under the same four domains from the Youth PQA: Safe Environment, Supportive Environment, Interaction, and Engagement. The School-Age PQA assesses staff instructional practices that are developmentally appropriate for younger children. Evidence of reliability and validity for the School-Age PQA is available from the Weikart Center.

Program quality *self* assessments were conducted with each grantee. The program self assessment method includes the selection of a site team that observe each other's practice using the developmentally appropriate PQA assessment tool (Youth PQA or School-Age PQA). Once the site team has a chance to observe each other's practice, a scoring meeting is scheduled in which staff discuss their observations and come to a consensus on the score for each item on the PQA.

Program quality *external* assessments were also conducted for a subset of these grantees (those in the second year of their grant). Grantees who received program quality external assessment contracted with independent raters to come in and observe their programs. Raters received endorsement through the completion of a rigorous reliability training process in which they are required to pass an examination by reaching 80% perfect agreement with the Weikart Center's gold standard scores on the PQA.

Between October 2012 and January 2013, a total of 44 self assessments with the Youth PQA and 103 self assessments with the School-Age PQA were conducted, representing 94% of all sites. Also between October and January, a total of eight external assessments using the Youth PQA and 21 external assessments using the School-Age PQA were conducted, representing 100% of all second-year grantees.

Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS)

The information extracted from PPICS and included in this report represents recruitment and retention information, program attendance information, student progress on academic achievement, and community partnerships.

The evaluation contractor provided technical assistance to grantees needing to fulfill data submission requirements via the online PPICS system. Grantees were asked to submit or update their grantee profile and their operations, activities, partners, and feeder school information under the annual performance report in PPICS, with assistance from evaluation contractor staff. Conversely, the evaluation contractor submitted the staffing, attendance, and impact category for regular attendees (state assessment cross year) in PPICS for all grantees.

In order to complete the attendance, staffing, and state assessment modules for grantees, the evaluation contractor asked all grantees to keep track of their data using an Excel spreadsheet created by the evaluation contractor. Grantees were asked to update these files on a monthly basis and then submit to the evaluation contractor once the program year had ended.

Table 6 highlights key program characteristics of the grantees in this sample. During the 2013-2014 program year, there were 60 different grantees across the state of Oklahoma representing 86 different sites (i.e., spaces where afterschool programming was in operation). These 60 grantees across Oklahoma served a diverse population and have their own unique characteristics, including the content of the afterschool activities offered, operations, community partners, program enrollment, etc. Almost three quarters of sites offered programming during both the summer and the school year and the average number of active community partners was approximately six per grant.

Operations data: distribution of programming time around academic content; To be completed following release of federal data collection system

According to grantees at the beginning of the program, the average anticipated enrollment was 142 students, while the actual number of students served was 172. It is also important to note that 23% of grantees are serving 75% or less of their original anticipated number of students served, as indicated in their Grantee Profile. The average number of students who attended less than 30 days was 66 compared to the average of 107 students who attended 30 days or more (regular attendees).

Table 6 – Oklahoma 21st CCLC Grantee Program Characteristics

Program Characteristics	N=86
Operations: To be completed following release of federal data collection system	
Number of sites/centers operating during the school year only	*
Number of sites/centers operating during both the summer and school year	*
Partners	
Average Number of Community Partners	6
Time on Academics	
Average number of activity hours spent on academics during the school year	13.2
Average number of activity hours spent on academics during the summer	13.5
Recruitment and Retention	
Ratio of anticipated to actual students served	142:172
Ratio of students attending 30 or more days to students attend 30 days or less	107:66

Table 7 – Oklahoma 21st CCLC Regular Attendee Academic Achievement*

To be completed following release of federal data collection system

Academic Achievement	
Reading Proficiency	
30-59 days	
Percent increase OR stayed in the Advanced or Proficient levels in reading proficiency level	*
Percent increase to Advanced or Proficient from Unsatisfactory or Limited Knowledge in reading proficiency level	*

60-89 days	
Percent increase OR stayed in the Advanced or Proficient levels in reading proficiency level	*
Percent increase to Advanced or Proficient from Unsatisfactory or Limited Knowledge in reading proficiency level	*
90+ days	
Percent increase OR stayed in the Advanced or Proficient levels in reading proficiency level	*
Percent increase to Advanced or Proficient from Unsatisfactory or Limited Knowledge in reading proficiency level	*
Math Proficiency	
30-59 days	
Percent increase OR stayed in the Advanced or Proficient levels in math proficiency level (30-59 days)	*
Percent increase to Advanced or Proficient from Unsatisfactory or Limited Knowledge in math proficiency level	*
60-89 days	
Percent increase OR stayed in the Advanced or Proficient levels in math proficiency level (60-89 days)	*
Percent increase to Advanced or Proficient from Unsatisfactory or Limited Knowledge in math proficiency level	*
90+ days	
Percent increase OR stayed in the Advanced or Proficient levels in math proficiency level (90+ days)	*
Percent increase to Advanced or Proficient from Unsatisfactory or Limited Knowledge in math proficiency level	*

*For regular attendees that had both pre- and post- test data.

Table 7 highlights academic achievement data for students who had test score data available for both the 2012-2013 and the 2013-2014 program years. Data is presented for both reading and math and are disaggregated by the number of days of attendance. This information includes students who made a “jump up” from the previous year’s proficiency level OR those students who remained in the Advanced or Proficient categories from one year to the next. ** To be completed following release of federal data collection system

Findings/Results

The following section presents findings from the 2013-2014 Oklahoma 21st CCLC Statewide Evaluation conducted by the evaluation contractor. The 2013-2014 program year marks the third year the evaluation contractor has used the leading indicators framework to collect, analyze, and present data aligned with specific best practices at multiple levels of each grantee. As such, 2013-2014 program data is presented alongside 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013 program data.

The inclusion of 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013 program data is provided to support comparisons across years, with a number of critical caveats:

- In most cases, this data cannot be used to represent changes in the behavior of specific individuals. Because we do not collect identifying information for any specific individual, year-to-year comparisons only represent changes in the average scores for groups of individuals (within sites) that almost certainly differ across years.
- Aggregating across scale scores to create the indicator composites may obscure actual patterns of change on scales (i.e., the composite indicator may go up a little because two component scales went up a lot but a third went down even more).
- We lack a yardstick for how much change is substantively important.


The inclusion of multi-year data is aimed at driving deeper and more critical thinking, investigation, and question-raising to support lower stakes decision making about program improvement.

All summaries of data tables and figures described below are predicated upon 2013-2014 program year data only. Data representations for the 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and the 2012-2013 program years are solely meant for reference and examination purposes.

Organizational Context

Four Leading Indicators were included under the organizational context: Staffing Model, Continuous Improvement, Youth Governance, and Enrollment Policy. These four indicators reflect organizational level policies and practices and scores are presented in Figure 2.

Figure 2 –Organizational Context Leading Indicators



Staffing Model assesses the degree to which grantee directors and site coordinators feel their staff members are prepared for their jobs, their own ability to offer supports and resources to their staff, and the extent to which people feel like they enjoy their jobs. Overall, it appears that grantee directors and site coordinators feel their staff members are generally prepared to lead afterschool activities and respondents are relatively satisfied with their job most of the time.

Continuous Improvement measures the extent to which staff members participate in professional development opportunities and activities that are meant to increase the quality of the services they provide. It also measures how well staff members communicate with their peers and supervisors regarding program quality. On average, staff are engaged in some form of professional development opportunities and exhibit effective communication.

Youth Governance scores lower than Staffing Model and Continuous Improvement, which is an indication that opportunities for youth to participate in important decision-making roles are not as frequent in Oklahoma 21st CCLC program sites. It is important to note that questions related to this Leading Indicator were only asked of grantees who serve middle school and high school age youth and questions ask respondents to report *about* middle school and high school age youth.

Enrollment Policy is comparable with the Youth Governance Leading Indicator within organizational context. The Enrollment Policy Leading Indicator represents intentional efforts to target low-income at-risk youth, a primary purpose of the 21st CCLC funding stream. While this indicator suggest gradual and consistent improvement since 2010, given its central importance to the 21stCCLC mission this area should remain a target for improvement. Also worth noting, further iterations of the grantee director/site coordinator survey may warrant revision or further specification on the intent of these questions.

Leading Indicator 1.1 – Staffing Model

This Leading Indicator is meant to capture the degree to which staff are prepared for their position and have the necessary supports and resources to do their job effectively. Also, this Leading Indicator captures an overall sense of job satisfaction.

Figure 3 – Leading Indicator 1.1 Staffing Model: Scale Scores




Table 8 – Capacity Scale Detailed Scores

<i>PROMPT: Please rate the extent to which the following statements are true for staff in your program (1=Almost never true of staff, 3=True for about half of staff, 5=Almost always true of staff).</i>	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2012-2013 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
Capacity	4.16	4.15	4.19	4.15
Staff come to the program with adequate training or experience	4.04	4.29	4.14	4.08
Staff stay at our program for a long time	4.44	4.29	4.42	4.46
We have enough staff and/or student-to-staff ratios are good	4.39	4.56	4.49	4.43
New staff get an adequate orientation	4.17	4.00	3.99	3.89
Staff have enough time to attend meetings or do planning	3.54	3.50	3.74	3.69
Staff are designing and delivering activities consistent with program goals and objectives for students	4.36	4.27	4.35	4.32

Data Source: Grantee Director/Site Coordinator Survey

Table 9 – Job Satisfaction Scale Detailed Scores

<i>PROMPT: Please rate the extent to which the following statements are true for you (1=Almost never true, 3=True about half of the time, 5=Almost always true).</i>	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2012-2013 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
Job Satisfaction	4.15	4.25	4.45	4.26
In most ways, this job is close to my ideal	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.14
The condition of my current job is excellent	4.22	4.37	4.37	4.38
I am satisfied with this job	4.36	4.35	4.29	4.45
If I could change my career so far, I would not change anything	4.02	4.11	4.17	4.09

Data Source: Grantee Director/Site Coordinator Survey & Afterschool Teacher/Youth Worker Survey

Key Points:

- Grantee directors and site coordinators report that they have enough staff and the student-to-staff ratios are good, but may also feel that staff do not have enough time to attend meetings or do planning.
- Respondents report an overall sense of job satisfaction.

Leading Indicator 1.2 – Continuous Improvement

This Leading Indicator is meant to capture the degree to which staff communicate with their peers and their supervisors as well as their participation in efforts to continuously improve their delivery of high quality instruction.

Figure 4 – Leading Indicator 1.2 Continuous Improvement: Scale Scores




Table 10 – Continuous Quality Improvement Scale Detailed Scores

	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2012-2013 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
Continuous Quality Improvement	3.56	3.29	3.28	3.05
<i>Please select one response for each statement (1=No, 3=One or the other, 5=Both).</i>				
Are you currently using the Youth Program Quality Assessment (YPQA) from High/Scope as a quality assessment tool and/or any other quality assessment tool that employs observation and written evidence to produce quality ratings at your site?	2.51	2.56	2.58	2.62
<i>In the past year or so at your program, how often have you: (1=Never, 3=Once, 5=Two or more times).</i>				
Observed staff sessions with youth to assess quality?	3.42	3.13	3.23	3.11
Collected written anecdotal evidence on program quality?	3.46	2.76	2.70	2.46
Conducted program planning using quality assessment data?	3.48	3.02	3.03	2.82
<i>How much training have you had on the following during the past year? (1=None, 3=One day or less, 5=Two days or more)</i>				
Developmental Assets training	3.58	3.64	3.63	2.77
Advancing Youth Development training	3.63	3.66	3.59	2.70
Bringing Yourself to Work training	3.33	2.42	2.22	2.33
Youth Work Methods or Youth PQA training	3.36	2.25	2.28	2.20
Other training re positive youth development	3.61	3.38	3.31	3.09
<i>Please select the response that most nearly represents how often the following practices occur in your program (1=Never, 3=Every few months, 5=At least weekly).</i>				
My supervisor gives me helpful feedback about how I work with youth	3.76	3.88	3.96	3.94
My supervisor is visible during the offerings that I lead or co-lead	4.14	4.14	4.21	4.19
My supervisor knows what I am trying to accomplish with youth	4.33	4.38	4.47	4.43

Data Source: Afterschool Teacher/Youth Worker Survey

Leading Indicator 1.2 – Continuous Improvement continued

Table 11 – Horizontal Communication Scale Detailed Scores

<i>PROMPT: Please select the response that most nearly represents how often the following practices occur in your program (1=Never, 3=Every few months, 5=At least weekly).</i>	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2012-2013 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
Horizontal Communication	3.37	3.52	3.54	3.57
I co-plan with another member of staff	3.65	3.86	3.83	3.82
I discuss teaching problems or practices with another staff member	4.15	4.20	4.19	4.28
A co-worker observes my session and offers feedback about my performance	3.07	3.23	3.25	3.32
I work on plans for program policies or activities with other staff	3.24	3.43	3.44	3.54
I observe a co-worker's session and provide feedback about their performance	2.73	2.86	2.98	2.90

Data Source: Afterschool Teacher/Youth Worker Survey

Table 12 – Vertical Communication Scale Detailed Scores

<i>PROMPT: Please select the response that most nearly represents how often the following practices occur in your program (1=Never, 3=Every few months, 5=At least weekly).</i>	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2012-2013 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
Vertical Communication	3.85	3.95	3.96	3.95
My supervisor challenges me to innovate and try new ideas	3.65	3.78	3.78	3.83
My supervisor makes sure that program goals and priorities are clear to me	4.06	4.11	4.15	4.08

Data Source: Afterschool Teacher/Youth Worker Survey

Key Points:

- Staff report average use of the Youth PQA assessment tool and/or other quality assessment tools, mainly using one or the “other,” but not more than one. Staff also report that they experience overall good communication with their supervisors and that supervisors are present and available during program hours and know the goals of their staff.

Table 13 - YPQI Fidelity – Proportion of Sites Completing Fidelity Elements

	Assess PQA	Other assessment tool	Plan Program Improvement Planning	Weikart Center professional development	Improve Other professional development	Supervisor feedback to staff
Proportion of sites completing (survey)	60%	18%	57%	41%	77%	87% (Every few months or more)
Proportion of sites completing (Scores Reporter)	86%	Not available	92%	Not available	Not available	Not available

- Staff report that they discuss teaching problems or practices with other staff members, but are less likely to have had experience observing their peers and providing feedback about their performance.
- Staff report they know the goals and priorities of the program and are sometimes able to be innovative in their work.

Leading Indicator 1.3 – Youth Governance

This Leading Indicator is meant to capture the degree to which middle school and high school age youth are intentionally included in the operations of their own afterschool program.

Figure 5 – Leading Indicator 1.3 Youth Governance: Scale Scores




Table 14 – Youth Role in Governance Scale Detailed Scores

<i>PROMPT: Please indicate the proportion of MIDDLE AND HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS for which the following goal statements are true (1=Almost none, 3=About half, 5=Almost all).</i>	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2012-2013 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
Youth Role in Governance	2.18	2.55	2.48	2.69
Youth have opportunities to begin their own projects, initiatives, and enterprises	3.01	3.48	3.38	3.71
Youth are involved in selecting the content or purposes of activities and sessions	2.90	3.36	3.27	3.55
Youth contribute to the design, appearance, and aesthetics of the physical space	2.43	2.79	2.76	2.88
Youth are involved in hiring new staff	1.21	1.36	1.37	1.55
Youth are involved in deciding how the organization's budget is spent	1.37	1.74	1.68	1.75

Data Source: Grantee Director/Site Coordinator Survey

Key Points:

- Grantee directors and site coordinators report that on average, a little more than half of youth have opportunities to start their own projects, initiatives, or enterprises, but fewer are likely to have had opportunities to be involved in the hiring of new staff or deciding how the organization's budget is spent.

Leading Indicator 1.4 – Enrollment Policy

This Leading Indicator is meant to capture the degree to which the 21st CCLC programs in Oklahoma are prioritizing enrollment for certain populations as well as targeting youth who are academically at-risk.

Figure 6 – Leading Indicator 1.4 Enrollment Policy: Scale Scores




Table 15 – Access Scale Detailed Scores

<i>PROMPT: Please rate the extent to which the following statements are true for program sessions at your site (1=Almost never true, 3= True for about half of sessions, 5=Almost always true).</i>	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2012-2013 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
Access	1.58	1.97	2.13	2.14
Program sessions have enrollment priority for certain groups of students	1.75	2.38	2.79	2.68
Program sessions are restricted so only certain groups of students can participate	1.42	1.55	1.52	1.59

Data Source: Grantee Director/Site Coordinator Survey

Table 16 – Targeting Academic Risk Scale Detailed Scores

<i>PROMPT: Please indicate the proportion of students for which the following statements are true (1=Almost none, 3=About half, 5=Almost all).</i>	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2012-2013 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
Targeting Academic Risk	2.18	2.79	2.89	3.13
Students were targeted for participation in our program because they scored below "proficient" on local or state assessments	2.36	3.08	3.16	3.47
Students were targeted for participation because they did not receive a passing grade during a preceding grading period	2.07	2.91	2.93	3.29
Students were referred to the program by a teacher for additional assistance in reading, mathematics or science	2.71	3.19	3.44	3.56
Students were targeted for participation because of the student's status as an English Language Learner (ELL)	1.53	1.97	2.01	2.21

Data Source: Grantee Director/Site Coordinator Survey


Key Points:

- Grantee directors and site coordinators report that they rarely prioritize making their programs accessible to certain groups of students. They also report that about half of their students are referred to the program by a teacher for assistance in readings, mathematics, and science.

Instructional Context

Two Leading Indicators were included under the Instructional Context: Academic Press and Engaging Instruction. These two indicators reflect instructional level practices and scores are presented in Figure 7.

Figure 7 –Instructional Context Leading Indicators



Academic press refers to the extent to which academic content and homework completion are major priorities in the afterschool programs offered. Overall, it appears that Oklahoma 21st CCLC grantees put a relatively large emphasis on making sure that academic content areas are covered during programming and that youth have the opportunity to complete their homework during program hours.

Engaging instruction refers to the extent that high quality instructional practices are happening on a daily basis, that youth are feeling engaged in the program and that they belong, and that staff are offering opportunities for youth to build on and master new skills. Oklahoma grantees appear to be offering these opportunities on a fairly regular basis.

Leading Indicator 2.1 – Academic Press

This Leading Indicator is meant to capture the extent to which academic content and homework completion are major components of afterschool programming.

Figure 8 – Leading Indicator 2.1 Academic Press: Scale Scores




Table 17 – Academic Planning Scale Detailed Scores

<i>PROMPT: When you lead sessions focused on reading, mathematics, and science, how true are the following statements? (1=Never true, 3=True about half of the time, 5=Always true)</i>	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2012-2013 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
Academic Planning	3.94	4.04	4.05	4.03
The session is planned in advance and written out in a lesson plan format	3.47	3.61	3.75	3.71
The session is targeted at specific learning goals for the individual student, or for a school curriculum target or for a specific state standard	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.16
The session builds upon steps taken in a prior activity or session	4.02	4.13	4.05	4.07
The session is based on recent feedback from students about where they need support	3.89	3.95	3.97	4.00
The session combines academic content with the expressed interests of students	4.12	4.25	4.24	4.18

Data Source: Afterschool Teacher/Youth Worker Survey

Table 18 – Homework Completion Scale Detailed Scores

<i>PROMPT: When you think about your experience in this afterschool program, how true are the following statement for you? (1=Almost never true, 3=True about half of the time, 5=Almost always true)</i>	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2012-2013 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
Homework Completion	4.13	4.06	3.82	3.79
I get my homework done when I come to the afterschool program	4.17	4.14	3.85	3.79
The staff here understand my homework and can help me when I get stuck	4.32	4.22	3.99	3.97
I learn things in the afterschool program that help me in school	3.90	3.82	3.64	3.62

Data Source: Youth Survey

Key Points:

- Staff report that activities are targeted at specific learning goals for their students a majority of the time and they incorporate the interests of students into the program.
- Youth report that they are able to complete their homework at the afterschool program and that staff are available to help them with it.

Leading Indicator 2.2 – Engaging Instruction

This Leading Indicator is meant to capture the processes and practices in which staff members engage that are consistent with high quality instruction and the extent to which youth feel like they belong and are engaged in the program.

Figure 9 – Leading Indicator 2.2 Engaging Instruction: Scale Scores




Table 19 – Youth Engagement and Belonging Scale Detailed Scores

<i>PROMPT: When you think about your experience in this afterschool program, how true are the following statement for you? (1=Almost never true, 3=True about half of the time, 5=Almost always true)</i>	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2012-2013 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
Youth Engagement and Belonging	3.86	3.85	3.59	3.50
I am interested in what we do	3.90	3.92	3.53	3.44
The activities are important to me	3.75	3.76	3.47	3.35
I try to do things I have never done before	3.81	3.84	3.57	3.46
I am challenged in a good way	3.91	3.87	3.61	3.48
I am using my skills	4.17	4.16	3.82	3.83
I really have to concentrate to complete the activities	3.56	3.56	3.36	3.32
I feel like I belong at this program	3.93	3.89	3.72	3.62
I feel like I matter at this program	3.87	3.80	3.67	3.54

Data Source: Youth Survey

Table 20 – Growth and Mastery Skills Scale Detailed Scores

<i>PROMPT: Please indicate the proportion of students in your program for which the following goal statements are true (1=Almost none, 3=About half, 5=Almost all).</i>	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2012-2013 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
Growth and Mastery Skills	3.52	3.67	3.68	3.63
We will expose students to experiences which are new for them	3.83	3.92	3.98	3.89
Students will have responsibilities and privileges that increase over time	3.81	3.91	3.93	3.85
Students will work on group projects that take more than five sessions to complete	2.80	2.95	2.94	2.92
All participating children and youth will be acknowledged for achievements, contributions and responsibilities	3.96	4.14	4.09	4.04
At least once during a semester students will participate in sequence of sessions where task complexity increases to build explicit skills	3.03	3.27	3.27	3.24
Students will identify a skill/activity/pursuit that the feel they are uniquely good at	3.69	3.78	3.85	3.80

Data Source: Afterschool Teacher/Youth Worker Survey

Leading Indicator 2.2 – Engaging Instruction continued

Table 21 – Instructional Quality Scale Detailed Scores

	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2012-2013 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
Instructional Quality	4.00	3.96	4.04	3.86
Supportive Environment	4.26	4.28	4.32	4.19
Interaction	4.11	4.05	4.13	3.96
Engagement	3.62	3.56	3.66	3.42

Data Source: Youth PQA & School-Age PQA


Key Points:

- Youth report that they are often using their skills in the afterschool program and that they belong and matter at the program.
- Staff report that they frequently expose students to new experiences and that students will be acknowledged for their achievements and contributions, but report that group projects will not take more than five sessions to complete.
- Program self assessment scores indicate that key instructional practices are being delivered during the afterschool programs.

External Relationships

Four Leading Indicators were included under the External Relationships Context: System Norms, Family Engagement, School Alignment, and Community Resources. These four indicators reflect the policies and practices that facilitate communication and collaboration between the afterschool program and external parties. Scores for the four Leading Indicators are presented in Figure 10.

Figure 10 –External Relationships Leading Indicators



The System Norms Leading Indicator represents the extent to which the afterschool program holds itself accountable for providing high quality services as well as being able to collaborate with other programs in their network. Overall, grantees appear to hold themselves accountable and collaborate well with others.

Family Engagement measures the extent to which the afterschool program is connected and communicating effectively with the family members of the youth they serve. Grantees in the Oklahoma 21st CCLC network appear to have only average level of communication with family members.

School Alignment measures the extent to which the afterschool program connects the youths' school day in terms of how well it supplements the learning happening in school and the communication with school-day staff about what youth are working on. Grantees in Oklahoma report having slightly higher than average communication and alignment with the school-day.

The Community Resources Leading Indicator measures the extent to which available partners in the community are being involved in the afterschool program. Overall, it appears that the utilization of community resources is happening about fifty percent of the time.

Indicator 3.1 – System Norms

This Leading Indicator is meant to capture the extent to which grantee directors and site coordinators hold themselves, their program, and their staff accountable for delivering high quality services, as well as the ability to work with others in the 21st CCLC network.

Figure 11– Leading Indicator 3.1 System Norms: Scale Scores




Table 22 – Accountability Scale Detailed Scores

<i>PROMPT: How true are the following statements regarding accountability for quality services? (1=Almost never true, 3=True about half of the time, 5=Almost always true)</i>	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2012-2013 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
Accountability	4.17	4.39	4.44	4.39
Our program is held accountable for the quality, including point of service quality (i.e., relationships, instruction)	4.37	4.53	4.48	4.57
Our program is routinely monitored by higher level administrators	3.69	4.14	4.25	4.14
In our program all staff are familiar with standards of quality	4.46	4.48	4.58	4.47

Data Source: Grantee Director/Site Coordinator Survey

Table 23 – Collaboration Scale Detailed Scores

<i>PROMPT: How true are the following statements regarding collaboration? (1=Almost never true, 3=True about half of the time, 5=Almost always true)</i>	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2012-2013 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
Collaboration	4.04	4.21	4.32	4.33
Collaboration across sites is strongly encouraged by network administrators	3.78	4.01	4.23	4.26
Site supervisors in our network share a similar definition of high quality services	4.29	4.40	4.43	4.40

Data Source: Grantee Director/Site Coordinator Survey

Key Points:

- Grantee directors and site coordinators report that they are familiar with and accountable for standards of quality as well as monitored by higher level administrators.
- Grantee directors and site coordinators report that they collaborate across sites and share a similar definition of quality.

Indicator 3.2 – Family Engagement

This Leading Indicator is meant to capture the degree to which staff members communicate with the families of youth.

Figure 12 – Leading Indicator 3.2 Family Engagement: Scale Scores




Table 24 – Communication Scale Detailed Scores

PROMPT: For the past school year, how true are the following statements for you? (1=Almost never true, 3=True about half of the time, 5=Almost always true)	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2012-2013 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
Communication	2.91	3.10	2.98	2.99
On at least a monthly basis an adult in our family receives information at home or attends a meeting about the afterschool program	3.35	3.57	3.39	3.37
Each semester an adult in our family talk on the phone or meets in person with afterschool staff to receive detailed information my child's progress in the program	3.12	3.36	3.18	3.27
An adult in our family has been personally recruited to participate in and/or lead sessions at the afterschool program	2.25	2.35	2.36	2.33

Data Source: Parent Survey

Key Points:

- Parents report that they receive information about the program a little above fifty percent of the time. While parents report that they have some regular contact with program staff, they are less likely to be asked to participate in the afterschool program in some way.

Indicator 3.3 – School Alignment

This Leading Indicator is meant to capture the degree to which staff members utilize information provided by schools to inform their activity programming.

Figure 13 – Leading Indicator 3.3 School Alignment: Scale Scores




Table 25 – Student Data Scale Detailed Scores

<i>PROMPT: Please indicate the proportion of students in your program for which the following statements are true (1=Almost none, 3=About half, 5=Almost all).</i>	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2012-2013 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
Student Data	4.06	4.14	4.20	4.06
Each year we review achievement test scores and or grades from the previous year OR have online access to grades	4.59	4.65	4.67	4.51
We receive student progress reports from school-day teachers during the current year	3.51	3.74	3.77	3.61
We review diagnostic data from the current school year for individual students	4.05	4.02	4.20	4.06

Data Source: Grantee Director/Site Coordinator Survey

Table 26 – School Day Content Scale Detailed Scores

<i>PROMPT: When you lead academic sessions or coordinate academic learning in the afterschool program, indicate the proportion of students for which the following statements are true (1=Almost none, 3=About half, 5=Almost all).</i>	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2012-2013 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
School Day Content	3.61	3.63	3.74	3.61
I know what academic content my afterschool students will be focusing on during the school day on a week-to-week basis	4.16	4.29	4.26	4.17
I coordinate the activity content of afterschool sessions with students' homework	3.85	3.91	4.04	3.82
I help manage formal 3-way communication that uses the afterschool program to link students' parents with school-day staff and information	3.31	3.33	3.51	3.34
I participate in meetings for afterschool and school day staff where linkages between the school day and afterschool are discussed and/or where academic progress of individual students are discussed	3.51	3.51	3.67	3.61
I participate in parent-teacher conferences to provide information about how individual students are faring in the afterschool program	3.20	3.09	3.19	3.13

Data Source: Grantee Director/Site Coordinator Survey & Afterschool Teacher/Youth Worker Survey

Key Points:

- Grantee directors and site coordinators report that they review achievement test scores on a yearly basis, but are less likely to review student progress reports.
- Grantee directors and site coordinators report they know what academic content their students are covering during the school day, but are less likely to manage the communication between themselves, school-day teachers, and parents and participate in parent-teacher conferences.

Indicator 3.4 – Community Resources

This Leading Indicator is meant to capture the degree to which community partners are engaged to more fully support youth.

Figure 14 – Leading Indicator 3.4 Community Resources: Scale Scores




Table 27 – Community Engagement Scale Detailed Scores

<i>PROMPT: Please indicate the proportion of students for which the following statements regarding community engagement are true (1=Almost none, 3=About half, 5=Almost all).</i>	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2012-2013 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
Community Engagement	2.60	2.92	3.03	2.88
Our students participate in community service, service learning or civic participation projects that extend over multiple sessions	3.42	3.56	3.63	3.38
Our students experience afterschool sessions and/or field trips LED BY OR PROVIDED BY local businesses, community groups and youth serving organizations who are not paid service vendors	2.67	2.99	3.12	3.07
Our students experience afterschool sessions led or supported by PAST AFTERSCHOOL STUDENTS who are paid staff or volunteers	1.73	2.19	2.36	2.19
Our students help to provide public recognition of community volunteers, organizations and businesses that contribute to the afterschool program	2.51	2.96	3.02	2.86

Data Source: Grantee Director/Site Coordinator Survey

Key Points:

- Grantee directors and site coordinators report that their students are likely to participate in community service or service learning projects, but are less likely to have afterschool session led by past afterschool students who return as paid staff or volunteers.

Youth Characteristics

Two Leading Indicators were included under the Youth Characteristics Context: Socioemotional Development and Academic Efficacy. These two indicators reflect the characteristics of the youth who attend the afterschool programs and are reported by the youth themselves or their parents. Scores for the two Leading Indicators are presented in Figure 15.

Figure 15 –Student Characteristics Leading Indicators



The Socioemotional Development Leading Indicator measures the extent to which youth feel they are competent and able to work with others. Overall, the youth in this sample report that they feel relatively competent socially and emotionally.

Academic Efficacy measures the extent to which youth feel they are good at different academic content areas. Youth report high levels of academic efficacy overall, as do their parents.

Indicator 4.1 – Socioemotional Development

This Leading Indicator captures the degree to which staff are providing atmosphere in which youth feel that they are socially and emotionally competent.

Figure 16 – Leading Indicator 4.1 Socioemotional Development: Scale Scores




Table 28 – Social & Emotional Competencies Scale Detailed Scores

PROMPT: For the past school year, how true are the following statements for you? (1=Almost never true, 3=True about half of the time, 5=Almost always true)	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2012-2013 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
Social & Emotional Competencies	3.93	3.94	4.04	3.99
I work well with other kids	3.97	3.97	4.11	4.08
I can make friends with other kids	4.20	4.22	4.33	4.27
I can talk with people I don't know	3.53	3.54	3.67	3.49
I can tell other kids that they are doing something I don't like	3.69	3.68	3.76	3.70
I can tell a funny story to a group of friends	3.92	3.96	4.09	4.08
I can stay friends with other kids	4.25	4.27	4.35	4.34
I can tell other kids what I think, even if they disagree with me	3.95	3.95	4.01	4.00

Data Source: Youth Survey

Key Points:

- Youth report that they are able to make AND stay friends with other kids, but are less able to talk with people they do not know or let other students know that they are doing something they don't like.

Indicator 4.2 – Academic Efficacy

This Leading Indicator is meant to capture the degree to which the program environment allows youth to develop good work habits and feel efficacious in a variety of content areas.

Figure 17 – Leading Indicator 4.2 Academic Efficacy: Scale Scores




Table 29 – Work Habits Scale Detailed Scores

<i>PROMPT: For the past school year, how true are the following statements for you? (1=Almost never true, 3=True about half of the time, 5=Almost always true)</i>	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
Work Habits	4.04	4.04	4.15	4.12
I follow the rules in my classroom	4.15	4.14	4.28	4.28
I work well by myself	4.04	4.03	4.09	4.01
I am careful and neat with my work	3.91	3.93	4.07	4.02
I make good use of my time at school	4.07	4.05	4.19	4.18
I finish my work on time	4.01	4.01	4.08	4.02
I keep track of my things at school	4.09	4.10	4.19	4.22

Data Source: Youth Survey

Table 30 – Reading/English Efficacy Scale Detailed Scores

<i>PROMPT: For the past school year, how true are the following statements for you? (1=Almost never true, 3=True about half of the time, 5=Almost always true)</i>	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
Reading/English Efficacy	3.92	3.92	4.03	4.01
I am interested in reading/English	3.58	3.58	3.75	3.73
I am good at reading/English	3.91	3.94	4.01	4.01
I expect to do well in reading/English this year	4.24	4.23	4.28	4.26
I would be good at learning something new in reading/English	3.98	3.95	4.12	4.04

Data Source: Youth Survey

Table 31 – Math Efficacy Scale Detailed Scores

<i>PROMPT: For the past school year, how true are the following statements for you? (1=Almost never true, 3=True about half of the time, 5=Almost always true)</i>	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
Math Efficacy	4.00	3.93	4.05	4.11
I am interested in math	3.84	3.73	3.91	3.96
I am good at math	3.92	3.86	3.95	4.02
I expect to do well in math this year	4.26	4.20	4.30	4.34
I would be good at learning something new in math	4.00	3.99	4.08	4.15

Data Source: Youth Survey

Table 32 – Science Efficacy Scale Detailed Scores

<i>PROMPT: For the past school year, how true are the following statements for you? (1=Almost never true, 3=True about half of the time, 5=Almost always true)</i>	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
Science Efficacy	4.10	4.11	4.22	4.22
I am interested in science	4.10	4.07	4.20	4.23
I would be good at learning something new in science	4.11	4.16	4.24	4.21

Data Source: Youth Survey

Table 33 – Technology Efficacy Scale Detailed Scores

<i>PROMPT: For the past school year, how true are the following statements for you? (1=Almost never true, 3=True about half of the time, 5=Almost always true)</i>	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
Technology Efficacy	4.17	4.17	4.24	4.25
I am interested in technology (computers, robotics, internet design)	4.25	4.24	4.24	4.29
I would be good at learning something new in technology	4.10	4.10	4.23	4.20

Data Source: Youth Survey

Indicator 4.2 – Academic Efficacy continued

Table 34 – Academic Efficacy Scale Detailed Scores

<i>PROMPT: For the past school year, how true are the following statements for your child? (1=Almost never true, 3=True about half of the time, 5=Almost always true)</i>	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
Academic Efficacy	3.97	4.07	4.04	3.96
As a result of participating in the afterschool program this year my child has developed better work habits	4.01	4.12	4.08	4.00
As a result of participating in the afterschool program this year my child has developed more confidence in math	3.96	4.03	4.02	3.95
As a result of participating in the afterschool program this year my child has developed more confidence in reading/English	4.03	4.13	4.06	3.98
As a result of participating in the afterschool program this year my child has developed more confidence in science and/or technology	3.87	4.00	3.98	3.92

Data Source: Parent Survey


Key Points:

- Youth report they have good work habits.
- Youth report they feel more efficacious in science and technology than in reading and math, although most expect they will be successful in reading and math classes. Youth report they have the least amount of interest in reading/English.
- Parents report that the afterschool program has helped their child(ren) develop better work habits as well as confidence in Reading/English.

Family Satisfaction

One Leading Indicator was included under the Family Satisfaction Context: Family Satisfaction. This indicator reflects the parent perception of the afterschool programs offered in the Oklahoma 21st CCLC network. The score for the Leading Indicator is presented in Figure 18.

Figure 18 –Family Satisfaction Leading Indicators



Family Satisfaction measures the extent to which the parents or guardians of the youth who attend the afterschool program feel that trustworthy, reliable, and affordable services are offered and that they believe the afterschool program is connected to the regular school day. Overall, family satisfaction with the afterschool programs in the Oklahoma 21st CCLC network is high.

Indicator 5.1 – Family Satisfaction

This Leading Indicator is meant to capture the degree to which the programming offered by staff is considered reliable and convenient by parents and is well connected to the youths’ school day.

Figure 19 – Leading Indicator 5.1 Family Satisfaction: Scale Scores




Table 35 – Confidence in Care Scale Detailed Scores

PROMPT: For the past school year, how true are the following statements for you? (1=Almost never true, 3=True about half of the time, 5=Almost always true)	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
Confidence in Care	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.61
I don't worry about my child when at the afterschool program	4.65	4.61	4.61	4.56
The afterschool program is reliable and I count on them to provide the afterschool care I need	4.72	4.74	4.72	4.65
My child is having a positive experience in the afterschool program	4.65	4.71	4.68	4.63

Data Source: Parent Survey

Table 36 – Convenience in Care Scale Detailed Scores

PROMPT: For the past school year, how true are the following statements for you? (1=Almost never true, 3=True about half of the time, 5=Almost always true)	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
Convenience of Care	4.65	4.64	4.67	4.62
The afterschool program is convenient because it is close to home or has effective and trustworthy transportation	4.63	4.63	4.70	4.60
The afterschool program is cost effective for our family	4.67	4.67	4.64	4.64

Data Source: Parent Survey

Indicator 5.1 – Family Satisfaction continued

Table 37 – Family-School Connection Scale Detailed Scores

<i>PROMPT: For the past school year, how true are the following statements for you? (1=Almost never true, 3=True about half of the time, 5=Almost always true)</i>	2010-2011 OK Aggregate (N=75)	2011-2012 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=107)	2013-2014 OK Aggregate (N=86)
Family-School Connection	4.30	4.41	4.35	4.25
The afterschool program is helping my child to be more successful in school	4.52	4.60	4.54	4.42
Afterschool staff are well informed about my child's learning successes and challenges in school	4.29	4.45	4.38	4.30
The afterschool program has helped our family get to know the school and school day teachers better	4.09	4.18	4.14	4.04

Data Source: Parent Survey

Key Findings:

- Parents report that they do not worry about their child(ren) when at the afterschool program and that they believe their child(ren) are having a positive experience.
- Parents report that the either the location of the program or the transportation is convenient and reliable, as well as cost-effective.
- Parents report that the afterschool program has been beneficial to their child(ren)'s learning in school, that they are well informed, and that they feel like they know the school-day teachers better.

Recommendations

The recommendations below provide guidance for improvements, in some cases with action steps for both OSDE and grantee directors. These recommendations have been developed in an iterative sequence over four years, reflecting trends in the data, and other learnings that have emerged over time. Some recommendations are cast over multiple years and have appeared in multiple annual reports.

1. **Are 21st CCLC Programs effectively targeting at-risk children? Are they qualified to serve children with multiple risk factors? Are intentional efforts being made to make sure the students who would benefit from programming are the ones enrolled in the program?**

21st CCLC grants are directed to serve at-risk populations but students with some risk factors may be underserved without specific guidance for targeting.

- **Recommendation:** Clarifications of grantee qualifications, along with modifications to how applications are reviewed and scored may reveal risk areas which are under-represented due to the grant selection process. Clarification in the guidance documents could help grantees navigate grant requirements and improve targeting. Additional action steps include:
 - *Identify barriers* to targeting students who are academically at-risk and would benefit from 21st CCLC services.
 - *Identify exemplary programs* where special or supplemental services or specialized curricula are available for specific types of risk, including multiple risk factors.
 - *Provide a one-page guidance document* for targeting populations with multiple risk factors.
 - *Improve focus of evaluation survey items* to better identify programs that are either not targeting or do not have a targeted service model available for academically at-risk students.

2. **An important pathway to skill development is involving students in engaging activities that sequentially grow more complex over time (Durlak & Weissberg, 2007; Marzano, 1998), e.g., project-based learning and skills training.**

The state lead may want to guide grantees to implement programming that takes multiple sessions to complete, requires skill development, and has a larger goal or end product. STEM or art content delivered with a project based curricula and explicit skill goals are ideal examples of high quality 21st CCLC programming.

- **Recommendations:** Update the guidance to suggest how grantees can provide more project-based and skill-focused activities (curricula), including the importance of staff lesson planning time to successful project-based and skill-focused learning. Update the grant application and scoring rubrics to seek out applicants that include staff planning time in their budget submissions. Additional action steps include:
 - *Encourage the use of lesson planning* for afterschool sessions. For example, map learning themes over time (e.g., sessions, weeks) with learning objectives that build over sessions, potentially integrating community resources.
 - *Grantee directors encourage multi-session lesson planning* by having site coordinators schedule time with site staff.

3. **Frequent review of student progress may better identify student support needs throughout the year.**

When schools share student academic progress with afterschool staff, the information can be used to create a complementary learning environment to support developmental outcomes for students (Catalano, Haggerty, Oesterle, Fleming, & Hawkins, 2004; Weiss, Little, Bouffard, Deschenes, & Malone, 2009).

- **Recommendations:** Update guidance on coordination with school-day personnel and access to student data, including guidance on how and when to review this data. Additional action steps include:
 - *Encourage staff to request access to online grading systems and/or a regular reporting schedule with a school representative* (e.g., school social worker, lead teacher, guidance counselor, etc.) who can provide data access and supports.

- *Offer shared professional development experiences and family engagement events between school and afterschool staff, including parent-teacher conferences.*
- *Encourage sites to establish a school liaison whose role is to communicate with school staff, maintain working relationships, and assure that students' school-day goals are a priority afterschool.*

4. **To what extent are grantees including site coordinators and program staff in the Youth Program Quality Intervention (YPQI) cycle?**

The YPQI improvement cycle produces substantially greater improvements in the quality of instruction when the manager and staff participate in four activities: 1) program quality assessment, 2) data-driven improvement planning, 3) training aligned with quality assessment domains and 4) instructional coaching by a supervisor (Smith et al., 2012).

- **Recommendations:** Create an inventory of training participation for each grantee over the last four years to assure that untrained staff are given access to the training. Keep this list available and up to date. Additional action steps include:
 - *Provide guidance on who should participate in training for the YPQI.* Exposing all staff to some direct training in YPQI will support fidelity to the YPQI. Returning grantees should deepen the YPQI by sending new or untrained staff and expecting these participants to bring what they learn back to their program team.
 - *Provide guidance on how to revisit the program improvement plan and relevant domains of the Program Quality Assessment.* Encourage staff to reflect on progress in areas targeted for improvement. This practice supports high fidelity to the YPQI.

5. **Providing young people with chances to make decisions about their activities and how they carry them out can improve motivation and buy-in.**

Fostering youth voice involves finding ways for young people to actively participate in shaping the decisions that affect their lives (Kirshner, 2003; Mitra, 2004), while supporting young people's autonomy requires that adults help youth develop and realize their own goals, interests, and values (Assor, Kaplan, & Roth, 2002; Connell & Wellborn, 1991).

- **Recommendations:** For middle and high school programs, ensure the involvement of youth in program governance by providing explicit guidance and scoring rubrics in the application highlighting the need for a plan to include youth in program governance. Additional action steps include:
 - *Make professional development on youth voice and governance available to staff.*
 - *Encourage staff to involve youth in program assessment and improvement planning to provide experience with both ownership and accountability.*
 - *Use monitoring visits to create opportunities for youth governance, including reflection with students and other program partners.*

6. **Identify grantee mentors for evaluation requirements and external communication.**

Identify mentors to assist new or struggling grantee directors with evaluation requirements (e.g., collecting data for PPICS, administering evaluation surveys in line with protocols) and effective communication with external partners (e.g., parents, school day staff).

- **Recommendations:** Request self-nomination of grantee leaders that have expertise in evaluation requirements and external communication and include these mentors on state-wide network and e-learning (webinars or conference calls) opportunities. This could take the form of a monthly conference call, hosted by OSDE with standing agenda items, and rotating professional development topics. Additional action steps include:
 - *Survey grantees about methods they employ for high response rates on their surveys, particularly parent surveys.*
 - *Host a webinar where mentors can share guidance with grantees who struggle to enter their data and/or get high survey response rates.*

- **Note:** With suspension of the PPICS data collection system in 2014, this recommendation has been partly put on hold until the new system is released.

7. Ask grantees to offer more STEM activities within their programs and provide them with resources and support for their staff to be effective facilitators of STEM activities.

The National Research Council recommends that out-of-school time programs should be designed with specific learning goals in mind (e.g. the strands of science learning) should: Be interactive; provide multiple ways for learners to engage with concepts, practices, and phenomena within the setting; facilitate science learning across multiple settings; prompt and support participants to interpret their learning experiences in light of relevant prior knowledge, experiences, and interest; and support and encourage learners to extend their learning over time (Committee on Learning Science in Informal Environments, 2009). In other words, to have a high quality learning environment infused with science content.

8. Consider a revision of statewide goals and objectives.

Objectives are necessary to measure progress on a goal and should include clarity around what is needed in order to measure the goal (such as specific data) and achievement benchmarks.

- **Note on Progress to Date:** In the 2013-14 application, the statewide goals and objectives were shared along with expectations for measures of progress. The following four performance goals were adopted:

Goal 1: Improve both academic and non-academic outcomes for regularly attending participants.

Objective 1.1: Participants in the program will demonstrate increased performance on State Assessment Proficiency Tests in reading and mathematics.

Objective 1.2: Participants in the program will report higher levels of social and emotional competency, increased skills in work habits, and in academic efficacy.

Goal 2: Promote a physically and emotionally safe place to attend and continual instruction to promote healthy bodies, minds, and habits.

Objective 2.1: Grantees will consistently offer high-quality instructional programming, regardless of content, as measured by the Youth PQA or School-Age PQA.

Objective 2.2: Grantees will provide high-quality activities in the core academic areas such as reading and literacy, mathematics, and science.

Objective 2.3: Grantees will provide high-quality activities in enrichment areas such as nutrition and health, art, music, and technology.

Goal 3: Provide opportunities for parents and students to learn and connect with their community together.

Objective 3.1: Grantees will establish and maintain partnerships and collaborative relationships within the community to enhance participants' access to a variety of opportunities.

Objective 3.2: Grantees will establish collaborative relationships that offer opportunities for literacy and related educational activities to the families of participating students.

Objective 3.3: Grantees will maintain a high satisfaction rate among families served by the program.

Goal 4: Build organizational capacity to deliver high-quality programming to all participants attending 21st CCLC programming.

Objective 4.1: Grantees will identify students characterized as "at-risk" and actively recruit those students to attend 21st CCLC programming.

Objective 4.2: Grantees will engage in the Youth Program Quality Intervention (YPQI) as a part of a program quality improvement process.

Objective 4.3: Grantees will facilitate opportunities for communication between and among center coordinators and direct staff working in the 21st CCLC programs.

Objective 4.4: Grantees will maintain a high job satisfaction rate among grantee directors, center coordinators, and direct staff.

9. **Conduct visits to sites that are not progressing out of the low-scoring profile for the Leading Indicators performance measures.** Identify barriers to change, resources needed, and plans for improvement.

- **Note on Progress to Date:** Based on this recommendation in 2012-13, OSDE chartered additional analyses to examine the frequency with which program performance scores improved over time. Each site received a normative score on each Leading Indicator composite score using data from the baseline year of collection (2010-2011). We then examined data from the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 program years to determine the proportion of sites that were above the normative baseline on each of the 13 Leading Indicator Composites. For six identified sites, the “no change” on more than half of the indicators is associated with baseline being above 3.5, a relatively high performance in the baseline year. A coaching support system is in place to support first year grantees, but OSDE also hired an additional staff member to target sites who were beyond year one and still needed support.

10. **Annually, establish an area of focus for a performance goal that is consistent across all grantees.**

During the improvement phase of the continuous improvement process, sites are asked to select three goals for their improvement plans. Having one goal area that is common across all grantees could allow for a network-wide professional development focus.

- **Recommendation:** Work with grantee directors to develop a network-wide goal focus area based on federal education goals and 21st CCLC grantee guidance. Examples of such goal areas include: school improvement, family engagement, youth leadership, community service, or STEM. It is important to still allow flexibility and autonomy among grantees and sites to define their individual performance targets and action steps, but a common goal focus could be an opportunity for OSDE to offer targeted professional development. Additional action steps include:
 - *Review program quality and leading indicator data to find trends across grantees* that could signal focus areas.
 - *Survey grantees or hold focus groups* to gather input on possible focus areas.

References

- Assor, A., Kaplan, H., & Roth, G. (2002). Choice is good, but relevance is excellent: Autonomy-enhancing and suppressing teacher behaviours predicting students' engagement in school work. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 72*, 261-278.
- Bliese, P. D. (2000). Within-Group Agreement, Non-Independence, and Reliability: Implications for Data Aggregation and Analysis. In K. J. Klein & S. W. Kozlowski (Eds.), *Multilevel Theory, Research, and Methods in Organizations: Foundations, Extensions, and New Directions* (1 ed., pp. 349-381): Jossey-Bass.
- Bobko, P., Roth, P. L., & Buster, M. A. (2007). The usefulness of unit weights in creating composite scores: A literature review, application to content validity, and meta-analysis. *Organizational Research Methods, 10*(4), 689-709.
- Catalano, R. F., Haggerty, K. P., Oesterle, S., Fleming, C. B., & Hawkins, J. D. (2004). The Importance of Bonding to School for Healthy Development: Findings from the Social Development Research Group. *Journal of School Health, 74*(7), 252-261.
- Committee on Learning Science in Informal Environments, P. B., Bruce Lewenstein, Andrew W. Shouse, Michael A. Feder (2009). *Learning Science in Informal Environments: People, Places, and Pursuits*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Connell, J. P., & Wellborn, J. G. (1991). Competence, autonomy and relatedness: A motivational analysis of self-system processes. In M. R. Gunar & L. A. Sroufe (Eds.), *Self Processes and Development* (pp. 43-77). Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Durlak, J. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2007). *The impact of after-school programs that promote personal and social skills*. Chicago, IL: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL).
- Fralicx, R. D., & Raju, N. S. (1982). A comparison of five methods for combining multiple criteria into a single composite. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 42*, 823-827.
- Kirshner, B. (2003). *The social formation of youth voice*.
- Marzano, R. J. (1998). *A theory-based meta-analysis of research on instruction*. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Mitra, D. L. (2004). The significance of students: Can increasing student voice in schools lead to gains in youth development. *Teachers college record, 106*(4), 651-688.
- Oklahoma State Department of Education. (2014). 21st Century Community Learning Centers Award Recipients. Retrieved from <http://ok.gov/sde/21st-century-community-learning-centers-award-recipients>
- Smith, C., Akiva, T., Sugar, S., Lo, Y. J., Frank, K. A., Peck, S. C., & Cortina, K. S. (2012). *Continuous quality improvement in afterschool settings: Impact findings from the Youth Program Quality Intervention study*. Ypsilanti, MI: David P. Weikart Center for Youth Program Quality at the Forum for Youth Investment.
- Smith, C., & Hohmann, C. (2005). *Full findings from the Youth PQA validation study*. Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Educational Research Foundation.
- Vandell, D. L. (2012). *California Afterschool Outcome Measures Project: Field Test Of The Online Toolbox Final Report To California Department Of Education*. Irvine, CA: University of California, Irvine.
- Weiss, H., Little, P., Bouffard, S. M., Deschenes, S. N., & Malone, H. J. (2009). Strengthen What Happens outside School to Improve What Happens inside. *Phi Delta Kappan, 90*(8), 592-596. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno=EJ836639>

Appendix A: Technical Detail on Reliability of Measures

The leading indicator framework is comprised of multiple, nested levels of measurement: five domains, 13 Leading Indicators, 29 scales and 190 items. Table A1 provides descriptive information for the 29 scales including the number of items that comprise each scale, the source of the items, the scale mean, standard deviation and skew which describes the shape of the distribution of site scores for each scale. In general, scales with skew coefficients between +/- 2 are considered in the acceptable range. Table A1 also provides reliability information for the 29 scales. Internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha or α) is an item level intra-class correlation that describes the degree to which the items that make up a scale are more highly correlated within each respondent than across respondents and $\alpha \geq .7$ is typically seen as the acceptable range.

Two additional intra-class correlations (ICC (1) and ICC (2)) are provided in the final two columns of Table A1 and these coefficients describe the reliability of multiple staff and youth reports from the same program site in terms of the degree of agreement between respondents within the same program site. In general, higher levels of agreement among respondents in the same program site are required to meaningfully interpret an average score for multiple respondents in the same program site. ICC (1) can be understood as the reliability of a rating from a single respondent and the proportion of scale score variance explained by differences between sites. ICC (2) describes the reliability of the scale mean for each site by taking into account the number of additional raters included in the mean scale score (Bliese, 2000). In general, ICCs (1) and (2) indicate that there is relatively high agreement within program sites and that program site means can be meaningfully interpreted.

ICCs (1) and (2) were calculated using variance estimates from one-way ANOVA with random effects model for the data with each scale as the dependent variable and the site ID as the factor. The formulas for each are provided in Figure A1 where MSB is the scale score variance accounted for between sites, MSW is the scale score variance accounted for within sites and K is the average number of staff, youth or parents contributing to the mean scale score for that site.

Figure A1. Calculating Formulas for Intraclass Coefficients

$$ICC(1) = \frac{MSB-MSW}{MSB+[(k-1)*MSW]}$$

$$ICC(2) = \frac{k(ICC(1))}{1+(k-1)ICC(1)}$$

Table A1. Descriptive and Reliability Information for 29 Leading Indicator Scale Scores

	Number of Items	Source*	Mean	SD	Skew	Cronbach's Alpha	ICC (1)	ICC (2)
1.1 - Staffing Model								
Capacity	6	SC	4.15	.55	-.75	.76	*	*
Job Satisfaction	4	SC,S	4.26	.41	-.44	.89	0.13	0.54
1.2 - Continuous Improvement								
Continuous Quality Improvement	12	S	3.19	.52	.74	.88	0.21	0.68
Horizontal Communication	5	S	3.57	.62	.02	.89	0.22	0.69
Vertical Communication	2	S	3.95	.53	-.33	.90	1.37	0.57
1.3 - Youth Governance								
Youth Role in Governance	5	SC	2.69	.83	.75	.84	*	*
1.4 - Enrollment Policy								
Access	2	SC	2.14	1.03	.81	.58	*	*
Targeting Academic Risk	4	SC	3.13	.97	.24	.86	*	*
2.1 - Academic Press								
Academic Planning	5	S	4.03	.52	-.77	.91	0.14	0.56
Homework Completion	3	Y	3.79	.44	-.61	.77	0.08	0.74
2.2 - Engaging Instruction								
Youth Engagement & Belonging	8	Y	3.50	.39	-.01	.90	0.13	0.82
Growth & Mastery Skills	6	S	3.63	.55	-.22	.92	0.18	0.64
Instructional Quality	3	PQA	3.86	.79	-1.60	.89	*	*
3.1 - System Norms								
Accountability	3	SC	4.39	.50	-.40	.63	*	*
Collaboration	2	SC	4.33	.67	-.95	.73	*	*
3.2 - Family Engagement								
Communication	3	P	2.99	.76	-.24	.89	0.21	0.88
3.3 - School Alignment								
Student Data	3	SC	4.06	.96	-.93	.79	*	*
School Day Content	5	SC,S	3.61	.72	-.34	.89	0.15	0.59
3.4 - Community Engagement								
Community Engagement	4	SC	2.88	1.03	.17	.82	*	*
4.1 - Socio-Emotional Development								
Social & Emotional Competencies	7	Y	3.99	.31	-.25	.86	0.05	0.64
4.2 - Academic Efficacy								
Work Habits	6	Y	4.12	.27	-.65	.87	0.06	0.67
Reading/English Efficacy	4	Y	4.01	.34	-.54	.89	0.05	0.65
Math Efficacy	4	Y	4.11	.30	-.69	.90	0.06	0.68
Science Efficacy	2	Y	4.22	.37	-.56	.96	0.06	0.67
Technology Efficacy	2	Y	4.25	.32	-.46	.83	0.03	0.55
Academic Efficacy (parent)	4	P	3.96	.59	-3.79	.98	0.07	0.69
5.1 - Family Satisfaction								
Confidence in Care	3	P	4.61	.55	-7.06	.97	0.07	0.69
Convenience of Care	2	P	4.62	.61	-5.73	.89	0.13	0.81
Family-School Connection	3	P	4.25	.58	-4.75	.95	0.10	0.76

*SC=Site coordinator survey; S=Staff survey; Y=Youth survey; P=Parent survey.

Appendix B: Profiles of High- and Low-Performing Sites

In this appendix we examine the prevalence of “low performance” defined as assignment to the low quartile on one or more of 22 leading indicator scale scores. The seven student outcome scales were excluded from this analysis. As a first step we examined the difference between group means score for the highest and lowest quartile groups on each scale. We also conducted a statistical significance test of the difference using an independent subjects T-test. Table B1 describes the results of these analyses including p-values indicating the statistical significance of the difference. There appear to be statistically significant differences for all scales that had low and high quartile data.

Table B1 – Comparison of Group Means for High and Low Quartiles

	# Sites in High Quartile	High Quartile Mean	# Sites in Low Quartile	Low Quartile Mean	Mean Difference	P value
Capacity	21	4.76	21	3.38	1.38	.000
Job Satisfaction	23	4.64	21	3.62	1.04	.000
Continuous Improvement	24	3.84	20	2.38	1.48	.000
Horizontal Communication	21	4.37	21	2.80	1.57	.000
Vertical Communication	22	4.58	21	3.24	1.35	.000
Youth Governance	15	3.96	25	1.91	2.06	.000
Access	21	3.51	23	1.00	2.50	.000
Targeting	21	4.44	27	2.07	2.37	.000
Academic Planning	17	4.66	20	3.32	1.34	.000
Youth Engagement & Belonging	21	3.99	21	3.02	.96	.000
Growth & Mastery Skills	20	4.29	21	2.87	1.42	.000
Instructional Quality	20	4.67	19	2.93	1.73	.000
Accountability	21	5.00	24	3.77	1.22	.000
Collaboration	28	5.00	32	3.61	1.38	.000
Communication	21	3.97	20	2.20	1.77	.000
Student Data	25	5.00	20	2.63	2.36	.000
School Day Content	22	4.50	21	2.69	1.82	.000
Community Engagement	18	4.31	23	1.61	2.69	.000
Academic Efficacy - Parent Report	21	4.48	20	3.49	.98	.000
Confidence in Care	24	4.88	20	4.50	.55	.000
Convenience of Care	21	4.96	20	4.23	.72	.000
Family-School Connection	22	4.71	20	3.81	.90	.000

As a next step in describing the prevalence of lower performing sites, we created a risk index. For each scale we created a risk variable where 1= membership in the lowest quartile and 0= membership in one of the higher quartiles. We then summed across the 22 possible risk variables to create the risk index ranging between 0 and 22. Figure B1 illustrates the prevalence of low performance across sites. Risk Index Scores range from zero to 16, meaning that some sites had zero scales for which their scores were in the lowest quartile (out of 22), while some sites had as many as 16 scales.

Figure B1 – Risk Index Score by Number of Sites

