



Michigan 21st Century Community Learning Centers 2023 Leading Indicators Report - Wayne State University

— Site Range ● Grantee Average ■ State Average

Instructional Context



Management Context



For complete reference, see **Leading Indicators Report Interpretation Guide**.

To ensure representation and confidentiality, insufficient data are not displayed at the site level but included in the calculation of grantee and state averages.

Indicator	MI	G	CenterLineH	ClintondaleH	ConnerCreek	DenbyH	EastEnglishVi	FitzgeraldH	FrontierIntIA	KingH	MedicineCo	PershingH	PontiacAcade	SouthLakeH	SouthfieldArt	UniversityH	WarrenMottH	WarrenWood	WaterfordKe	WaterfordM				
Number of youth (Summer 2022-Spring 2023)	17429	2337	188	118	101	52	78	215	119	187	63	94	28	113	168	157	97	163	137	84				
Number of youth with available school outcome information (Summer 2022-Spring 2023)	8888	1091	124	86	65			168	88				6	83	4	105	83	65	101	38				
Number of weeks in the summer meeting 30 average daily attendance ^{EZ} (Goal = at least 30 weeks for the whole year, including at least 3 weeks in the summer)	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Number of weeks in the school year meeting 30 average daily attendance ^{EZ} (Goal = at least 30 weeks for the whole year, including at least 3 weeks in the summer)	12	21	31	32	31	28	23	27	12	33	32	28	0	14	21	34	8	34	1	0				

Indicator	MI	G	CenterlineH	ClintondaleH	ConnerCreek	DenbyH	EastEnglishVi	FitzgeraldH	FrontierIntIA	KingH	MedicineCo	PersinghH	PontiacAcade	SouthLakeH	SouthfieldArt	UniversityH	WarrenMott	WarrenWood	WaterfordKe	WaterfordM				
1.1 Enrollment and Continuous Participation	74%	49%	19%	45%	47%	100%	0%	46%	40%	50%	0%	50%	61%	51%	75%	81%	46%	51%	46%	75%				
1.1.1 Academically disadvantaged youth are served ^{EZ,O}	83%	42%	56%	35%	41%			39%	20%				83%	53%	25%	43%	39%	54%	39%	26%				
1.1.2 Enrollment policy is in place ^{SC} [100% = Yes / 0% = No]	95%	80%	0%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%	100%	100%				
1.1.3 Attendance policy is in place ^{SC} [100% = Yes / 0% = No]	44%	25%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%	100%				
1.2 Academic Content	60%	56%	38%	75%	55%	67%	47%	55%	48%	54%	64%	58%	55%	50%	51%	78%	48%	50%	49%	55%				
1.2.1 Youth participate in academic enrichment activities ^{EZ}	59%	30%	23%	19%	33%	69%	59%	11%	30%	47%	10%	12%	23%	45%	17%	51%	34%	17%	3%	33%				
1.2.2 Youth participate in schoolwork-focused activities ^{EZ}	57%	63%	11%	84%	85%	92%	41%	82%	32%	55%	97%	80%	65%	63%	60%	90%	55%	59%	40%	39%				
1.2.3 Academically disadvantaged youth participate in schoolwork-focused activities ^{EZ,O}	56%	64%	9%	93%	73%			89%	0%				80%	48%	0%	100%	61%	57%	60%	50%				

G: Grantee, EZ: EZReports, O: Outcomes, PD: Project Director Surveys, SC: Site Coordinator Surveys, ST: Staff Survey, Y: Youth Surveys.

Minimum case for reporting. Staff survey = 3, youth survey = 15. Insufficient data will be left blank.

Indicator	MI	G	CenterlineH	ClintondaleH	ConnerCreek	DenbyH	EastEnglishVi	FitzgeraldH	FrontierIntIA	KingH	MedicineCo	PershingH	PontiacAcade	SouthLakeH	SouthfieldArt	UniversityH	WarrenMott	WarrenWood	WaterfordKe	WaterfordM				
1.2.4 The academic growth of the youth is a top priority ST	64%	56%	75%		50%													67%	100%					
1.2.5 Program administrator connects to school-day content ^{SC}	72%	73%	60%	100%	67%	40%	40%	80%	80%	80%	50%	60%	60%	60%	100%	100%	75%	100%	60%	80%				
1.2.6 Staff connect to school-day content ST	48%	52%	47%	78%	20%	67%		11%	100%	33%	100%	78%	44%	33%	78%	50%	14%	4%	33%	72%				
1.3 Enrichment Content	38%	26%	52%	13%	25%	31%	34%	12%	14%	40%	29%	48%	10%	22%	25%	39%	26%	31%	16%	26%				
1.3.1 Youth participate in arts activities ^{EZ}	29%	14%	52%	5%	1%	6%		0%	0%	0%	0%	65%	4%	1%	6%	38%	23%	13%	4%	12%				
1.3.2 Youth participate in physical activities ^{EZ}	31%	11%		1%	16%	43%	1%	0%	32%				12%	0%		1%		1%	22%	44%				
1.3.3 Youth participate in youth development activities ^{EZ}	63%	63%	71%	38%	60%	76%	92%	41%	22%	80%	87%	78%	23%	67%	67%	70%	50%	78%	23%	28%				
1.3.4 Youth participate in field trip or special event activities ^{EZ}	31%	18%	34%	7%	24%	0%	8%	6%	4%	39%	0%	0%	0%	19%	1%	47%	4%	33%	16%	20%				
1.4 Instructional Quality	82%	89%	87%	92%	81%	92%	91%	93%	89%	93%	97%	88%		95%	91%	100%		77%	81%	87%				
1.4.1 Staff report of high-quality sessions ST	82%	85%	83%		92%													58%	88%					

Indicator	MI	G	CenterlineH	ClintondaleH	ConnerCreek	DenbyH	EastEnglishVi	FitzgeraldH	FrontierIntIA	KingH	MedicineCo	PershingH	PontiacAcade	SouthLakeH	SouthfieldArt	UniversityH	WarrenMott	WarrenWood	WaterfordKe	WaterfordM				
1.4.2 Youth report of program satisfaction ^Y	83%	94%	94%	98%	94%	97%	93%	95%	93%	92%	99%	87%		96%	89%	100%		92%	92%	81%				
1.4.3 Staff report of providing youth with leadership opportunities ST	81%	80%	77%		61%													33%	58%					
1.4.4 Youth report of collaboration experience ^Y	82%	92%	87%	92%	93%	90%	94%	95%	85%	95%	97%	93%		93%	94%	100%		89%	79%	82%				
1.4.5 Staff report of providing youth with meaningful interaction and engagement opportunities ST	87%	86%	80%		57%													62%	93%					
1.4.6 Youth report of having adult support ^Y	86%	92%	90%	89%	89%	90%	90%	87%	91%	90%	100%	82%		97%	92%	100%		90%	92%	88%				
1.4.7 Youth report of developing growth mindsets ^Y	89%	97%	95%	99%	99%	98%	98%	99%	94%	97%	98%	93%		99%	93%	99%		96%	93%	96%				
1.4.8 Youth report of quality peer interaction ^Y	82%	91%	93%	85%	89%	87%	81%	93%	91%	90%	95%	86%		96%	88%	99%		88%	82%	86%				

Indicator	MI	G	CenterlineH	ClintondaleH	ConnerCreek	DenbyH	EastEnglishVi	FitzgeraldH	FrontierIntIA	KingH	MedicineCo	PershingH	PontiacAcade	SouthLakeH	SouthfieldArt	UniversityH	WarrenMott	WarrenWood	WaterfordKe	WaterfordM				
1.4.9 Staff report of creating opportunities for youth decision-making and governance ST	70%	83%	90%		44%													61%	67%					
1.4.10 Youth report of opportunities for youth voice ^Y	75%	91%	86%	95%	84%	95%	83%	93%	85%	92%	95%	88%		92%	93%	100%		91%	80%	91%				
1.4.11 Youth report of program benefits around social-emotional learning ^Y	81%	90%	83%	85%	91%	87%	98%	89%	83%	92%	98%	87%		93%	90%	100%		88%	69%	83%				
2.1 Stability	68%	66%	50%	50%	50%	100%	75%	50%	100%	50%	100%	50%	0%	25%	50%	50%	25%	100%	50%	25%				
2.1.1 Seasoned Project Director ^{EZ}	81%	100%																						
2.1.2 Seasoned Site Coordinator ^{SC} [100% = Yes / 0% = No]	61%	65%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%				
2.1.3 Staff retention rate is at least 75% ^{SC}	36%	40%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%	0%	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%				
2.1.4 Program or the host school did not relocate or face challenges ^{SC} [100% = Yes / 0% = No]	90%	80%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%			

Indicator	MI	G	CenterlineH	ClintondaleH	ConnerCreek	DenbyH	EastEnglishVi	FitzgeraldH	FrontierIntIA	KingH	MedicineCo	PershingH	PontiacAcade	SouthLakeH	SouthfieldArt	UniversityH	WarrenMott	WarrenWood	WaterfordKe	WaterfordM				
2.1.5 School administration did not change ^{SC} [100% = Yes / 0% = No]	72%	45%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%	100%				
2.2 Grantee Management	71%	45%																						
2.2.1 Project Director supports Site Coordinators ^{SC}	69%	40%																						
2.2.2 Effective meetings are held by Project Director ^{SC}	75%	50%																						
2.2.3 Site coordinators have high job satisfaction ^{SC}	67%	45%																						
2.3 Site Management	84%	88%	83%	94%	88%	94%	96%	93%	93%	93%	93%	84%		95%	89%	96%		77%	91%	90%				
2.3.1 Site Coordinator supports staff ST	85%	80%	64%		93%													80%	70%					
2.3.2 Effective meetings are held by Site Coordinator ST	90%	91%	94%		92%													67%	100%					
2.3.3 Staff have high job satisfaction ST	83%	84%	80%		67%													67%	100%					
2.3.4 Youth report effective program management ^Y	79%	92%	86%	94%	94%	94%	95%	96%	89%	94%	89%	78%		93%	91%	97%		85%	94%	91%				

G: Grantee, EZ: EZReports, O: Outcomes, PD: Project Director Surveys, SC: Site Coordinator Surveys, ST: Staff Survey, Y: Youth Surveys.
 Minimum case for reporting. Staff survey = 3, youth survey = 15. Insufficient data will be left blank.

Indicator	MI	G	CenterlineH	ClintondaleH	ConnerCreek	DenbyH	EastEnglishVi	FitzgeraldH	FrontierIntIA	KingH	MedicineCo	PershingH	PontiacAcade	SouthLakeH	SouthfieldArt	UniversityH	WarrenMott	WarrenWood	WaterfordKe	WaterfordM				
2.3.5 Youth do not have negative peer experience ^Y	82%	93%	89%	95%	94%	94%	96%	90%	97%	93%	96%	91%		97%	87%	96%		85%	92%	89%				
2.4 Staff Qualification	54%	70%	67%		50%													51%	61%					
2.4.1 Staff have at least one professional qualification ST	42%	63%	40%		50%													60%	60%					
2.4.2 Staff are experienced working with youth ST	62%	83%	100%		50%													75%	60%					
2.4.3 Staff are familiar with state and other standards ST	57%	64%	60%		50%													17%	63%					
2.5 Professional Development	70%	65%	59%		50%													53%	65%					
2.5.1 Strong orientation for new staff ST	84%	80%	65%		67%													67%	83%					
2.5.2 Staff frequently participate in trainings ST	55%	50%	52%		33%													40%	47%					
2.6 School Connection	56%	63%	58%	72%	49%	48%	54%	98%	96%	98%	75%	59%	100%	98%	99%	63%	33%	60%	21%	95%				
2.6.1 Host school invests in the program ^{SC} [100% = Yes / 0% = No]	63%	53%	0%	100%	50%	0%	50%	100%	100%	100%	0%	50%	100%	100%	100%	50%	0%	0%	0%	100%				

Indicator	MI	G	CenterlineH	ClintondaleH	ConnerCreek	DenbyH	EastEnglishVi	FitzgeraldH	FrontierIntLA	KingH	MedicineCo	PershingH	PontiacAcade	SouthLakeH	SouthfieldArt	UniversityH	WarrenMott	WarrenWood	WaterfordKe	WaterfordM				
2.6.2 Policy for connecting with the school-day administrators is in place ^{SC} [100% = Yes / 0% = No]	43%	55%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%				
2.6.3 Site coordinator meets with school administrator regularly ^{SC} [100% = Yes / 0% = No]	74%	90%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%				
2.6.4 Staff use school records for activity planning ST	19%	30%	20%		0%													17%	25%					
2.6.5 Youth report of program strengthening school connection ^Y	79%	88%	68%	86%	93%	92%	67%	90%	83%	91%	100%	87%		91%	94%	100%		85%	78%	79%				
2.7 Family Communication	43%	32%	8%	0%	28%	17%	17%	17%	0%	83%	0%	50%	17%	50%	83%	17%	17%	31%	13%	67%				
2.7.1 Staff frequently communicate with parents ST	42%	36%	17%		56%													11%	10%					
2.7.2 Site Coordinator frequently communicates with parents ^{SC} [100% = Yes / 0% = No]	45%	28%	0%	0%	0%	17%	17%	17%	0%	83%	0%	50%	17%	50%	83%	17%	17%	50%	17%	67%				

G: Grantee, EZ: EZReports, O: Outcomes, PD: Project Director Surveys, SC: Site Coordinator Surveys, ST: Staff Survey, Y: Youth Surveys.

Minimum case for reporting. Staff survey = 3, youth survey = 15. Insufficient data will be left blank.

Indicator	MI	G	CenterLineH	ClintondaleH	ConnerCreek	DenbyH	EastEnglishVi	FitzgeraldH	FrontierIntIA	KingH	MedicineCo	PershingH	PontiacAcade	SouthLakeH	SouthfieldArt	UniversityH	WarrenMott	WarrenWood	WaterfordKe	WaterfordM				
2.8 Continuous Improvement and Evaluation	52%	59%	33%	22%	63%		50%	89%	100%	100%				80%	100%		100%	8%	25%	88%				
2.8.1 Staff participating in data-driven continuous quality improvement process with other staff ST	42%	45%	38%		64%													25%	31%					
2.8.2 Staff participate in training for program assessment ST	25%	33%	40%		25%													0%	20%					
2.8.3 Local Evaluator is involved ^{Grantee-PD, Site-SC}	85%	100%	20%	22%	100%		50%	89%	100%	100%				80%	100%		100%	0%						88%