

Michigan 21st Century Community Learning Centers

2018-2019 Grantee DATA TABLES

Wayne State University

Michigan State University

State Evaluation Team

November, 2019



University Outreach
and Engagement

INTRODUCTION

This report follows the format of the **Leading Indicators Report (LIR)**, which was originally developed in 2010 with a joint effort between Michigan Department of Education (MDE), the Technical Assistance and Coaching Support System (TACSS) team at David P. Weikart Center for Youth Program Quality and the State Evaluation Team at Michigan State University (MSU). In 2019, a series of stakeholder meetings were held with participants from the original partners, select Project Directors and local data specialists. The goal of the meetings was to ensure the report reflects the most current policies and high-quality practices for the Out-of-School Time programs. The Indicators are organized under the two contexts in the current version:

Instructional Contexts

- 1.1 Enrollment and Continuous Participation
- 1.2 Academic Content
- 1.3 Enrichment Content
- 1.4 Connections to School Day
- 1.5 Instructional Quality

Management Context

- 2.1 Stability
- 2.2 Grantee Management
- 2.3 Site Program Management
- 2.4 Professional Development
- 2.5 Staff Qualifications
- 2.6 Continuous Improvement and Evaluation
- 2.7 School Connection
- 2.8 Stakeholder Involvement
- 2.9 Family Communication

For detailed information on how each Indicator is calculated, read the **Leading Indicators Report Interpretation Guide**. This Data Table provides additional information on the indicators to further support your quality improvement efforts. It also includes a third section on Youth Outcomes to help demonstrate the impact of your program.

Data source. The sources and data used in this Data Table include:

- EZReports (for participants' characteristics, attendance, and activity offering)
- School outcome records (for school grades)
- Site Coordinator survey (for Site Coordinator's report on program policy and procedures)
- Staff survey (for staff's perception of program quality, policy and work climate)
- Teacher survey (for changes in classroom behavior and homework completion)
- Youth Program Quality Assessment/YPQA scores (for staff's self-assessment on practices around safe environment, supportive environment, interaction, and engagement)
- Youth survey (for changes in youth developmental assets and program satisfaction)

Comparisons to the state. Most tables in this report compare data from this grantee to data from other grantees across the state. Each of these tables indicates whether the data for your grantee is "Very high", "High", "Average", "Low", or "Very low" compared to others. To determine these cutoffs, we used the Standard Deviation (SD), which is a measure of how far a score is from the average score. Assuming scores are "normally distributed", which will form a bell shape as displayed in Figure A. In this report, an "Average" means the score is within the 0.5 SD from the average (mean), a "High" or "Low" means the score is between 0.5 to 1 SD from the average, and "Very high" or "Very Low" means the score is more than 1 SD away from the average.




Figure A. How to Interpret Your Score

Understand Your Score. Based on the same assumption of the normal distribution, “Very high” means the score is between 84th and 100th percentiles, “High” means the score is between 69th and 83th percentiles, “Average” means the score is between 31st and 68th percentiles, “Low” means the score is between 16th and 30th percentiles and “Very low” is between zero and 15th percentiles. You might see a score being considered as “Average” even though the number is much higher or lower than the state average. That means, in practice, there is a wide range of scores in the state and therefore it might not be a meaningful difference. On the other hand, you might see your scores being very close to the state average but are noted as “Low” or “High.” In that case, most of the programs would have similar scores close to the state average, and therefore slight differences in scoring might mean very different things. You will need to use your best judgment to decide how comparisons to the state average might be meaningful to you.

Important Note. For the Site Data Table, state comparison data is based on the youth or sites from similar grade levels. However, for the Grantee Data Table, the state comparison is based on all youth in the 21st CCLC programs because most 21st CCLC grantees serve a wide range of grade levels and therefore there is a lack of grantees serving only high-school, middle-school, or elementary-school aged youth to be used for comparison.

Data Included in the report. To ensure the data represent your program and protect confidentiality, we only include scores when enough people provided answers to questions. We set the reporting threshold as follows:

- Youth and teacher surveys: at least 15 respondents must have turned in the survey
- Staff survey: at least 3 respondents must have turned in the survey

Data that do not meet the threshold will be identified as “**Insufficient data**” and excluded from the report.

Table of Contents

1	INSTRUCTIONAL CONTEXT	10
1.1	LEADING INDICATOR: Enrollment and Continuous Participation	10
1.1.1	All Youth	10
1.1.2	Low-Achieving Youth	12
1.1.3	Enrollment policy is in place	14
1.1.4	Attendance policy is in place.....	14
1.2	LEADING INDICATOR: Academic Content	15
1.2.1	Youth participate in academic enrichment activities	15
1.2.2	Academically disadvantaged youth participate in remedial education	16
1.2.3	The academic growth of the youth is a top priority.....	16
1.2.4	Program administrator connects to school-day content.....	17
1.2.5	Staff connect to school-day content	18
1.3	LEADING INDICATOR: Enrichment Content	19
1.3.1	Activity Participation.....	19
1.4	LEADING INDICATOR: Instructional Quality.....	20
1.4.1	Staff report of high-quality sessions	21
1.4.2	Youth report of high-quality experience	21
1.4.3	Staff report of providing youth with leadership opportunities.....	23
1.4.4	Youth report of opportunities for leadership and teamwork.....	23
1.4.5	Staff report of providing youth with meaningful interaction and engagement opportunities.....	24
1.4.6	Youth report of having adult support.....	25
1.4.7	Youth report of opportunities for mastery.....	25
1.4.8	Youth report of quality peer interaction	26
1.4.9	Staff report of creating opportunities for youth decision-making and governance.....	26
1.4.10	Youth report of opportunities for decision-making and governance	27
1.4.11	Youth report of opportunities for increasing health awareness	27
1.4.12	Youth report of program benefits around social-emotional learning	28
1.4.13	Youth Program Quality Assessment (YPQA) Scores	29
2	MANAGEMENT CONTEXT	30
2.1	LEADING INDICATOR: Stability.....	30
2.1.1	Seasoned Project Director.....	30
2.1.2	Seasoned Site Coordinator	30
2.1.3	Staff retention rate is at least 75% [Data to be available In 2020]	31
2.1.4	Program or the host school did not relocate or face challenge	31
2.1.5	School administration did not change.....	31
2.2	LEADING INDICATOR: Grantee Management	32
2.2.1	Project Director supports Site Coordinators	32
2.2.2	Effective meetings are held by Project Director	33
2.2.3	Site coordinators have high job satisfaction	33

2.3	LEADING INDICATOR: Site Management	34
2.3.1	Site Coordinator supports staff	34
2.3.2	Effective meetings are held by Site Coordinator.....	35
2.3.3	Staff have high job satisfaction.....	35
2.3.4	Youth report effective program management	35
2.3.5	Youth do not have negative peer experience	36
2.4	LEADING INDICATOR: Staff Qualifications	36
2.4.1	Staff have at least one professional qualification	36
2.4.2	Staff are experienced working with youth	37
2.4.3	Staff are familiar with state and other standards.....	37
2.5	LEADING INDICATOR: Professional Development.....	38
2.5.1	Strong orientation for new staff	38
2.5.2	Staff frequently participate in trainings.....	38
2.6	LEADING INDICATOR: School Connection	39
2.6.1	Host school invests in the program	39
2.6.2	Policy for connecting with the school-day administrators is in place.....	39
2.6.3	Site coordinator meets with school administrator regularly.....	40
2.6.4	Staff use school records for activity planning.....	40
2.6.5	Youth report of program strengthening school connection	40
2.7	LEADING INDICATOR: Family Communication	41
2.7.1	Staff frequently communicate with parents	41
2.7.2	Site Coordinator frequently communicates with parents	42
2.8	LEADING INDICATOR: Continuous Improvement and Evaluation	42
2.8.1	Staff participate in data-driven continuous quality improvement process with other staff	43
2.8.2	Staff participate in training for program assessment.....	44
2.8.3	Local Evaluator is involved	45
3	YOUTH OUTCOMES.....	46
3.1	Improvement in Grades	46
3.1.1	All Regular Attendees.....	46
3.1.2	Regular attendees with Room for Improvement	46
3.1.3	Regular attendees Compared to Non-Regular attendees	47
3.2	Teacher Ratings	48
3.2.1	Overall changes	48
3.2.2	Specific Improvements	48

List of Tables

Table 1. Enrollment/Continuous Participation for All Youth	11
Table 2. Enrollment/Continuous Participation Compared to Other Sites	11
Table 3. Enrollment/Continuous Participation of Academically At-Risk Youth	12
Table 4. Enrollment/Continuous Participation of Academically At-risk youth Compared to Other Sites ..	13
Table 5. Enrollment Policy Is in Place	14
Table 6. Attendance Policy Is in Place	14
Table 7. Academic Activity Participation: Percent of Youth Who Participated in Each Type	15
Table 8. Homework Help/Tutoring Activities for Academically At-risk youth: Percent of Academically At-risk youth Who Participated	16
Table 9. Program Priority: Percent of Staff Identified Each Area as the First or Second Top Priority for the Program	16
Table 10. Program Administrator Connects to School-Day Content	17
Table 11. Connections to the School Day: Percent of Staff Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed	18
Table 12. Enrichment Activity Participation: Percent of Youth Who Participated in Each Type of Activity	19
Table 13. Activities Were Intentionally Planned: Percent of Staff Reported Frequently or Always	21
Table 14. Youth Report of High-Quality Experience: Percent of Youth Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed ..	21
Table 15. Providing Youth with Leadership Opportunities: Percent of Staff Reported Agreed or Strongly Agreed	23
Table 16. Opportunities for Leadership and Teamwork: Percent of Youth Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed	23
Table 17. Practices for Engagement: Percent of Staff Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed	24
Table 18. Adult Support: Percent of Youth Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed	25
Table 19. Opportunities for Mastery: Percent of Youth Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed	25
Table 20. Peer Interaction: Percent of Youth Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed	26
Table 21. Creating Opportunities for Youth Decision-Making and Governance: Percent of Staff Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed	26
Table 22. Opportunities for Decision-Making and Governance: Percent of Youth Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed	27
Table 23. Opportunities for Increasing Health Awareness: Percent of Youth Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed	27
Table 24. Program Helped with Social-emotional Learning: Percent of Youth Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed	28
Table 25. Staff Self-Assessment on Practices: YPQA Scores	29
Table 26. Seasoned Project Director: Your Program 100% = Yes / 0% = No	30
Table 27. Seasoned Site Coordinator	30
Table 28. Sites or the Host Schools Did Not Relocate or Face Budget Cuts	31
Table 29. Sites Have Same School Administration	31
Table 30. Project Director Supports Site Coordinators	32
Table 31. Effective Site Coordinator Meetings	33

Grantee Data Tables for Wayne State University.

Table 32. Site Coordinator Have High Job Satisfaction33

Table 33. Site Coordinator Supports Staff: Percent of Staff Reported Practice Occurring at Least Once a Month
.....34

Table 34. Staff Report Effective Staff Meetings35

Table 35. Staff Job Satisfaction: Percent of Staff Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed35

Table 36. Effective Program Management: Percent of Youth Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed35

Table 37. The Absence of Negative Peer Experience: Percent of Youth Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed 36

Table 38. Professional Qualification: Percent of Staff with the Qualification36

Table 39. Staff Education: Percent of Staff with at Least 3-Year Experience.....37

Table 40. Staff Familiar with State and Other Standards: Percent of Staff Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed37

Table 41. New Staff Training: Percent of Staff Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed.....38

Table 42. Ongoing Professional Development: Percent of Staff Reported Attending Trainings at Least Twice in
Past Year38

Table 43. Sites Have Host School Investing in the Program.....39

Table 44. Policy for Connecting with the School-day Administrators.....39

Table 45. Meets with School Administrator Regularly: Percent of Site Coordinator Who Reported at Least
Monthly.....40

Table 46. Use School Records for Activity Planning: Percent of Staff Who Reported Regularly40

Table 47. Strengthening School Connection: Percent of Youth Reported Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed40

Table 48. Parent Communication: Percent of Staff Reported at Least Once a Month41

Table 49. Site Coordinator Communicates with Parents at Least Once a Month42

Table 50. Data-Driven Quality Improvement Process: Percent of Staff Reported Practice Occurring at Least
Once a Month43

Table 51. Participation in Training for Program Assessment: Percent of Staff Reported Participating in Each
Activity44

Table 52. Local Evaluator’s Involvement.....45

Table 53. Improvement in Grades among Regular Attendees: Percent of All Regular Attendees Who Improved
.....46

Table 54. Improvement in Grades among Regular Attendees with Room for Improvement: Percent of Regular
Attendees with Room for Improvement.....46

Table 55. Changes in ELA/Reading Grades: Percent of Regular vs. Non-Regular Attendees with Room for
Improvement47

Table 56. Changes in Math Grades: Percent of Regular vs. Non-Regular Attendees with Room for
Improvement47

Table 57. Teacher Ratings on Overall School Performance: Percent of Regular Attendees Who Improved48

Table 58. Teacher Ratings on Specific School Activities: Percent of Regular Attendees Who Improved ...48

Data Available

EZREPORTS DATA

EZReports Data Available		
<i>Youth characteristic</i>	<i>Number of youth with data</i>	<i>% of youth with data</i>
Number of youth attendees	2004	Not applicable
Grade	2004	100%
Sex	2004	100%
Race	2004	100%

SURVEY DATA

Survey Data Available		
<i>Survey</i>	<i>Number of individuals with data</i>	<i>% of youth with data</i>
Youth survey	929	87%
Teacher survey	633	81%
Staff survey	46	Not applicable

Note: The number of individuals with data includes those who completed a major part of the survey.

SCHOOL OUTCOMES

Grade Data Available to Show Change		
<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Number of youth with data</i>	<i>% of youth with data</i>
ELA/reading grades	1489	86%
Math grades	1446	84%

Note: In your program, a total of **1610** youth had at least 1 grade record submitted to the state evaluation. The table above shows the number of youth with at least two marking periods of ELA/reading and/or math records to allow the calculation of grade change over the reporting period.

1 INSTRUCTIONAL CONTEXT

1.1 LEADING INDICATOR: ENROLLMENT AND CONTINUOUS PARTICIPATION

Indicator Description: Program serves and successfully retains academically disadvantaged youth.

- ① 1.1.1 Percent of youth who attend 30 days
- ① 1.1.2 Percent of youth who attend 60 days
- ① 1.1.3 Percent of youth who attend 90 days
- ① 1.1.4 Percent of academically disadvantaged youth are served
- ① 1.1.5 Percent of academically disadvantaged youth who attend 30 days
- ① 1.1.6 Percent of academically disadvantaged youth who attend 60 days
- ① 1.1.7 Percent of academically disadvantaged youth who attend 90 days
- ① 1.1.8 Enrollment policy is in place
- ① 1.1.9 Attendance policy is in place

Since this grantee started receiving 21st CCLC funding, it has served **5622** unique youth.

1.1.1 ALL YOUTH

1.1.1.1 PAST TWO YEARS

The following table gives the numbers for total enrollment at this grantee and its average site daily attendance for the past two years based on the data entered into EZReports. It also provides information on the percent of youth who attended regularly for each year.

Table 1. Enrollment/Continuous Participation for All Youth		
<i>Attendance measure</i>	<i>2017-2018</i>	<i>2018-2019</i>
Enrollment (attended at least once)		
All year	1445	2001
Summer	253	266
School year	1263	1808
Continuous participation		
Percent retained at least 30 days (regulars)	39%	42%
Percent retained at least 60 days	18%	16%
Percent retained at least 90 days	5%	5%
Average daily attendance per site		
Summer	5	5
School year	22	24

Note. From EZReports.

1.1.1.2 COMPARED TO OTHER GRANTEES

The following table reports enrollment, average attendance and continuous participation at this grantee compared to other grantees.

Table 2. Enrollment/Continuous Participation Compared to Other Sites			
<i>Attendance measure</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Enrollment (attended at least once)			
All year	2001	598	Very high
Summer	266	237	Average
School year	1808	452	Very high
Continuous participation			
Percent retained at least 30 days (regulars)	42%	55%	Low
Percent retained at least 60 days	16%	37%	Very low
Percent retained at least 90 days	5%	25%	Very low
Average daily attendance per site			
Summer	5	25	Very low
School year	24	27	Average

Note. From EZReports.

1.1.2 LOW-ACHIEVING YOUTH

1.1.2.1 PAST TWO YEARS

This section describes the extent to which this grantee enrolled and retained academically low-achieving youth. The table below shows the percent of youth enrolled and the percent of youth who attended regularly that were low achieving in ELA/reading or math. It also gives the percent of academically low-achieving youth who attended this grantee regularly for each year. During the 2018-2019 school year, **77%** of the total **1610** youth (N=**1243**) whose school outcome information was available were identified as academically at risk.

Table 3. Enrollment/Continuous Participation of Academically At-Risk Youth		
<i>Attendance measure</i>	<i>2017-2018</i>	<i>2018-2019</i>
Enrollment (attended at least once)		
All year	874	1243
Summer	49	36
School year	874	1243
Continuous participation		
Percent retained at least 30 days (regulars)	46%	48%
Percent retained at least 60 days	22%	18%
Percent retained at least 90 days	7%	7%
Average daily attendance per site		
Summer	2	1
School year	16	18

Note. Because school outcome data were not collected from youth who only attended the summer program, the summer attendance presented here might not best reflect your at-risk population during that period. From EZReports and school outcomes data: Academically at-risk youth are defined as youth whose Fall reading or math grades were less than 2.5, which is equivalent to B-/C+ on a Letter Grade system or 75~79 out of 100 score.

1.1.2.2 COMPARED TO OTHER GRANTEES

The following table reports enrollment and continuous participation of academically at-risk youth at this grantee compared to other grantee.

Table 4. Enrollment/Continuous Participation of Academically At-risk youth Compared to Other Sites			
<i>Attendance measure</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Enrollment (attended at least once)			
All year	1243	253	Very high
Summer	36	55	Average
School year	1243	253	Very high
Continuous participation			
Percent retained at least 30 days (regulars)	48%	74%	Very low
Percent retained at least 60 days	18%	48%	Very low
Percent retained at least 90 days	7%	31%	Very low
Average daily attendance per site			
Summer	1	5	Very low
School year	18	16	Average

Note. Because school outcome data were not collected from youth who only attended the summer program, the summer attendance presented here might not best reflect your at-risk population during that period. From EZReports and school outcomes data: Academically at-risk youth are defined as youth whose Fall reading or math grades were less than 2.5, which is equivalent to B-/C+ on a Letter Grade system or 75~79 out of 100 score.

1.1.3 ENROLLMENT POLICY IS IN PLACE

The following table reports the percent of your sites having a formal policy on enrollment, giving priorities to participants with at least one condition: chronic absenteeism, academically low performing, behavioral issues, special education, economic disadvantage, English as Second Language, homelessness or prior program participants.

Table 5. Enrollment Policy Is in Place				
<i>Enrollment policy</i>	<i>% of your sites give priority to..</i>	<i>% of sites gives priority to (Statewide)</i>	<i>% of your sites have easy access to this data</i>	<i>% of sites has easy access to this data (Statewide)</i>
Chronically absent students (Missing 10% of school)	39%	40%	88%	76%
Academically low performing students identified by the school day staff	67%	89%	88%	88%
Students who have behavioral issues identified by the school day staff	44%	59%	75%	80%
Family request due to academic issues	56%	79%	75%	80%
Family request due to behavioral issues	44%	47%	69%	69%
Special education students	39%	50%	63%	72%
Free/reduced price meal students	53%	61%	82%	78%
English as Second Language (ESL) students	39%	52%	81%	73%
Students experiencing homelessness	56%	82%	88%	93%
Prior program participants	44%	65%	50%	56%

Note. From Site Coordinator Survey: N = 19.

1.1.4 ATTENDANCE POLICY IS IN PLACE

The following table reports the percent of your sites having a formal policy on attendance, indicating specific attendance requirements.

Table 6. Attendance Policy Is in Place			
<i>Attendance policy</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Specific attendance requirements.	56%	56%	Average

Note. From Site Coordinator Survey: N = 19.

1.2 LEADING INDICATOR: ACADEMIC CONTENT

Indicator Description: Program demonstrates that academics are a high priority.

- ① 1.2.1 Youth participate in academic enrichment activities
- ① 1.2.2 Academically disadvantaged youth participate in remedial education
- ① 1.2.3 The academic growth of the youth is a top priority
- ① 1.2.4 Program administrator connects to school-day content
- ① 1.2.5 Staff connect to school-day content

1.2.1 YOUTH PARTICIPATE IN ACADEMIC ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES

The table below lists the percent of youth who attended the program for at least 10 days **and** participated in each type of academic activity for at least 10 days.

<i>Type of academic activity</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Homework help (support for homework completion)	44%	64%	Low
Tutoring (remedial instruction for 1-3 students per adult)	16%	34%	Low
Credit recovery		39%	Insufficient data/session not offered
Academic lessons focused on specific subjects	43%	80%	Very low
Academic enrichment activities focused on embedded learning	42%	65%	Very low
Did not participate in any academic activities	5%	1%	Very high

Note. Activities are categorized by MSU based on the session name, description, and objectives listed in EZReports. Youth are counted as having participated in an activity if they attended the type of activity for at least 10 days. From EZReports: N = 1473.

1.2.2 ACADEMICALLY DISADVANTAGED YOUTH PARTICIPATE IN REMEDIAL EDUCATION

The table below lists the percent of academically at-risk youth who attended the program for at least 10 days **and** participated in the combination of homework help, tutoring, and/or credit recovery sessions for at least 10 days.

Table 8. Homework Help/Tutoring Activities for Academically At-risk youth: Percent of Academically At-risk youth Who Participated			
<i>Type of academic activity</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Homework help/tutoring/credit recovery	46%	80%	Very low

Note. Activities are categorized by MSU based on the session name, description, and objectives listed in EZReports. Youth are counted as having participated in an activity if they attended the type of activity for at least 10 days. Academically at-risk youth are defined as youth whose fall reading or math grades were less than 2.5, which is equivalent to B-/C+ on a Letter Grade system or 75~79 out of 100 score. From EZReports: N = 917.

1.2.3 THE ACADEMIC GROWTH OF THE YOUTH IS A TOP PRIORITY

The table below provides information on what staff in this program see as the top two priorities. This information gives you a sense of whether the priorities of the staff are aligned with what administrators consider to be the program’s priorities. Staff ranked the following priorities from most to least important and here we report the percent of staff ranking the following priorities below as first or second.

Table 9. Program Priority: Percent of Staff Identified Each Area as the First or Second Top Priority for the Program			
<i>Program Area</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Improve the academic achievement of all youth	56%	49%	Average
Enable the lowest-performing students to achieve grade-level proficiency	19%	24%	Average
Provide opportunities for youth to learn STEM or other academic subjects in a fun way	40%	11%	Very high
Help youth keep up with homework	7%	15%	Low
Engage youth in fun leisure activities otherwise unavailable to them (i.e., arts, music, fitness, sports, etc.)	14%	13%	Average
Keep youth in a safe environment that allows them to relax, play, and socialize	37%	53%	Very low
Improve the social and emotional development of youth	28%	34%	Average

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 3 staff. From staff survey: N= 46.

1.2.4 PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR CONNECTS TO SCHOOL-DAY CONTENT

The table below provides information on how Site Coordinators at this grantee connecting school-day content with the out-of-school time program to support what school-day teachers are working toward.

Table 10. Program Administrator Connects to School-Day Content			
<i>Survey item</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Someone has a specific responsibility to attend teacher staff meetings at least monthly and report back to the program.	67%	45%	High
Someone communicates regularly with school-day staff about individual students' academic progress and needs.	100%	90%	High
Program has access to review students' grades for each marking period and standardized test scores throughout the year (not only for end-of-year reporting).	95%	74%	High
School-day curricula were used as part of the program's academic activities.	71%	81%	Average
The objectives for program activities are intentionally influenced by grade-level content standards (or learning objectives).	95%	89%	Average

Note. From Site Coordinator Survey: N = 19.

1.2.5 STAFF CONNECT TO SCHOOL-DAY CONTENT

The table below provides information on how staff report connecting school-day content with the out-of-school time program to support what school-day teachers are working toward.

Table 11. Connections to the School Day: Percent of Staff Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed			
<i>Survey item</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
On a week-to-week basis, I know what academic content will be covered during the school day with the students I work with in the out-of-school time program.	61%	63%	Average
I coordinate the content of the afterschool activities I provide with my students' school day work.	52%	56%	Average
I know who to contact at my students' day-time school if I have a question about their progress or status.	79%	80%	Average
The activities I provide in the out-of-school time program are tied to specific learning goals that are related to the school-day curriculum.	58%	64%	Average
I use student assessment data to provide different types of instruction to students attending my out-of-school time activities based on their achievement level.	56%	51%	Average
I help manage a 3-way communication system that links parents, program, and day-time school information.	56%	42%	High
I participate in regular joint staff meetings for out-of-school time and day-time school staff where steps to ensure linkages between the school day and out-of-school time are discussed.	51%	39%	High
I meet regularly with school-day staff not working in the out-of-school time program to review the academic progress of individual students.	49%	40%	High
I participate in parent-teacher conferences to provide information about how individual students are doing (NOTE: If you are a school-day teacher, please answer this question in relation to a student you do not have in your school-day classroom).	52%	28%	Very high

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 3 staff. From staff survey: N = 46.

1.3 LEADING INDICATOR: ENRICHMENT CONTENT

Indicator Description: *The program has a comprehensive set of activities that facilitate achievement and development in which most youth participate.*

- ① 1.3.1 Youth participate in arts activities
- ① 1.3.2 Youth participate in physical activities
- ① 1.3.3 Youth participate in youth development activities
- ① 1.3.4 Youth participate in STEM science activities
- ① 1.3.5 Youth participate in STEM technology activities
- ① 1.3.6 Youth participate in STEM engineering activities
- ① 1.3.7 Youth participate in STEM math activities
- ① 1.3.8 Youth participate in field trip or special event activities

1.3.1 ACTIVITY PARTICIPATION

The table below lists the percent of youth who attended the program for at least 10 days **and** participated in each type of enrichment activities for at least 10 days.

Table 12. Enrichment Activity Participation: Percent of Youth Who Participated in Each Type of Activity			
<i>Type of activity</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Arts	4%	46%	Very low
Sports		44%	Insufficient data/session not offered
Youth development	66%	65%	Average
STEM - Science	17%	31%	Low
STEM - Technology	7%	15%	Low
STEM - Engineering	25%	22%	Average
STEM – Math	3%	30%	Very low
Field trip	0%	6%	Low

Note. Activities are categorized by MSU based on the session name, description, and objectives listed in EZReports. Youth are counted as having participated in an activity if they attended the type of activity for at least 10 days. From EZReports: N = 1473.

1.4 LEADING INDICATOR: INSTRUCTIONAL QUALITY

Indicator Description: Program has structures and resources that ensure alignment between school-day and out-of-school time learning.

- ① 1.4.1 Staff report of high-quality sessions
 - ① 1.4.2 Youth report of high-quality experience
 - ① 1.4.3 Staff report of providing youth with leadership opportunities
 - ① 1.4.4 Youth report of opportunities for leadership and teamwork
 - ① 1.4.5 Staff report of providing youth with meaningful interaction and engagement opportunities
 - ① 1.4.6 Youth report of having adult support
 - ① 1.4.7 Youth report of opportunities for mastery
 - ① 1.4.8 Youth report of quality peer interaction
 - ① 1.4.9 Staff report of creating opportunities for youth decision-making and governance
 - ① 1.4.10 Youth report of opportunities for decision-making and governance
 - ① 1.4.11 Youth report of opportunities for increasing health awareness
 - ① 1.4.12 Youth report of program benefits around social-emotional learning
 - 1.4.13 Youth program quality assessment (YPQA) scores: Safe environment, supportive environment, interaction and engagement (Not included in the Leading Indicators Report)
-

1.4.1 STAFF REPORT OF HIGH-QUALITY SESSIONS

The table below provides information on how staff plan activities using intentional strategies.

Table 13. Activities Were Intentionally Planned: Percent of Staff Reported Frequently or Always			
<i>Survey item: Activities were...</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Well-planned in advance	98%	88%	Very high
Based on written plans for the session, assignments, and projects	91%	82%	High
Tied to specific learning goals	98%	84%	High
Meant to build upon skills cultivated in a prior activity or lesson	91%	77%	High
Explicitly designed to promote skill-building and mastery in relation to one or more state standard	91%	74%	Very high
Explicitly meant to address students' social-emotional developmental needs (e.g., cognitive, social, emotional, civic, physical, etc.)	75%	72%	Average
Structured to respond to youth feedback on what the content or format of the activity should be	86%	78%	High
Informed by the expressed interests, preferences, and/or satisfaction of the participating youth	86%	82%	Average

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 3 staff. From staff survey: N = 46.

1.4.2 YOUTH REPORT OF HIGH-QUALITY EXPERIENCE

The table below shows youth report “agree” or “strongly agree” on having high-quality program experiences.

Table 14. Youth Report of High-Quality Experience: Percent of Youth Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed			
<i>Survey item: At this program...</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
I get to do things I like to do here.	93%	82%	Very high
I do things that I don't get to do anywhere else.	77%	64%	High
I learn new skills that help me in life.	94%	83%	High
I learn about different careers and colleges.	96%	69%	Very high

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 15 youth. From youth survey: N = 929.

Grantee Data Tables for Wayne State University.

1.4.3 STAFF REPORT OF PROVIDING YOUTH WITH LEADERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES

This table shows staff perceptions of the degree to which staff use practices that provide opportunities for youth to take on leadership roles. These are often difficult practices for staff to learn to do consistently and well.

Table 15. Providing Youth with Leadership Opportunities: Percent of Staff Reported Agreed or Strongly Agreed			
<i>Survey item</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Staff listen to youth more than talk at them.	90%	83%	High
Staff actively and continuously consult and involve youth.	95%	93%	Average
Staff facilitate youth to lead activities.	93%	84%	High
Staff have youth help or mentor other youth in completing a project or task.	95%	90%	Average
Staff provide opportunities for the work, achievements, or accomplishments of youth to be publicly recognized.	93%	86%	High
Staff have youth make formal presentations to the larger group of students.	81%	66%	High

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 3 staff. From staff survey: N = 46.

1.4.4 YOUTH REPORT OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR LEADERSHIP AND TEAMWORK

The table below lists the percent of youth at this grantee and statewide who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with statements about opportunities to build leadership skills.

Table 16. Opportunities for Leadership and Teamwork: Percent of Youth Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed			
<i>Survey item: At this program...</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
I have opportunities to be a leader.	96%	83%	Very high
I get to work in teams.	97%	90%	High
We reflect on activities.	95%	84%	Very high

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 15 youth. From youth survey: N = 929.

1.4.5 STAFF REPORT OF PROVIDING YOUTH WITH MEANINGFUL INTERACTION AND ENGAGEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

This table shows staff perceptions of the degree to which staff use practices that provide opportunities for high levels of engagement within activities.

Table 17. Practices for Engagement: Percent of Staff Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed			
<i>Survey item</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Staff include time in activities for youth to reflect on their experiences (e.g., formal journal writing, conversational feedback).	91%	87%	Average
Staff are effective at providing youth with meaningful choices during activities.	95%	92%	Average
Staff provide structured and planned activities explicitly designed to help youth get to know each other.	93%	91%	Average
Staff are effective at providing youth with opportunities to set goals and make plans within the program.	95%	85%	High
Staff ask for and listen to student opinions about the way things should work in the program.	95%	89%	High
Staff have youth work collaboratively with other youth in small groups.	100%	92%	Very high
Staff have youth work on group projects that take more than one day to complete.	88%	83%	High

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 3 staff. From staff survey: N = 46.

1.4.6 YOUTH REPORT OF HAVING ADULT SUPPORT

The table below lists the percent of youth at this grantee and statewide who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with the following statements about having adult support at this program.

Table 18. Adult Support: Percent of Youth Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed			
<i>Survey item</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Adults care about me.	98%	95%	High
Adults listen to both sides when there is a disagreement.	88%	83%	High
I can tell the adults about my problems.	86%	81%	High
Adults allow others to be mean to me*.	91%	90%	Average

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 15 youth. From youth survey: N = 929. *Scores were reverse coded so the higher the better.

1.4.7 YOUTH REPORT OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR MASTERY

The table below lists the percent of youth at this grantee and statewide who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with the following statements about their skill-building and mastery experiences at the program.

Table 19. Opportunities for Mastery: Percent of Youth Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed			
<i>Survey item</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
I'm encouraged to be the best I can be.	96%	90%	High
Asking questions is welcomed.	98%	93%	High
It's ok to make mistakes.	97%	92%	High
Adults ask me about my goals.	95%	79%	Very high

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 15 youth. From youth survey: N = 929.

1.4.8 YOUTH REPORT OF QUALITY PEER INTERACTION

The table below lists the percent of youth at this grantee and statewide who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with the following statements about peer support.

Table 20. Peer Interaction: Percent of Youth Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed			
<i>Survey Item</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
I work with my peers to solve problems.	91%	82%	High
I can ask my peers for help.	92%	87%	High
We tell each other when we do a good job.	89%	79%	High

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 15 youth. From youth survey: N = 929.

1.4.9 STAFF REPORT OF CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH DECISION-MAKING AND GOVERNANCE

This table shows staff perceptions of the degree to which staff use practices that provide youth with opportunities for choice, governance, and decision-making. Staff were asked to rate each item on a scale of 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree), with an additional option for “I am not sure” that would be represented as missing data from the calculation below.

Table 21. Creating Opportunities for Youth Decision-Making and Governance: Percent of Staff Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed			
<i>Survey Item: At this program...</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Youth are able to take responsibility for their own program.	85%	71%	High
Youth can set goals for what they want to accomplish in the program.	93%	80%	High
Youth help make plans for what activities are offered at the program.	93%	82%	High
Youth make choices about WHAT content is covered in program offerings.	88%	69%	Very high
Youth make choices about HOW content is covered in program offerings.	80%	60%	Very high
Youth help create rules and guidelines for the program.	83%	75%	High

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 3 staff. From staff survey: N = 46.

1.4.10 YOUTH REPORT OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR DECISION-MAKING AND GOVERNANCE

The table below lists the percent of youth at this grantee and statewide who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with the following statements about the program’s opportunities for choice, decision-making, and governance.

Table 22. Opportunities for Decision-Making and Governance: Percent of Youth Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed			
<i>Survey item</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
I am asked what kinds of activities I like.	94%	81%	Very high
I get to choose my activities.	86%	70%	High
I get to help plan activities, projects or events.	84%	67%	Very high
I am asked to make decisions about this program.	82%	64%	Very high

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 15 youth. From youth survey: N = 929.

1.4.11 YOUTH REPORT OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR INCREASING HEALTH AWARENESS

The table below shows the percent of youth who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that the program helped them build a healthier life.

Table 23. Opportunities for Increasing Health Awareness: Percent of Youth Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed			
<i>Survey item</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
I learn how to be physically active to improve my health.	87%	84%	Average
I learn how to make healthy choices here.	93%	84%	High

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 15 youth. From youth survey: N = 929.

1.4.12 YOUTH REPORT OF PROGRAM BENEFITS AROUND SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL LEARNING

Youth were asked to rate the extent to which the program promoted their social-emotional learning. The table below shows the percent of youth who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” the program helped them with social-emotional learning.

Table 24. Program Helped with Social-emotional Learning: Percent of Youth Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed			
<i>Survey item</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Managing my emotions	81%	72%	High
Understanding how other people feel	87%	79%	High
Working together	97%	89%	High
Being responsible for my actions	97%	91%	High
Trying new things	97%	90%	High
Not giving up	95%	86%	High
Helping others	95%	89%	High
Solving problems	96%	88%	Very high
Standing up for what is right	94%	88%	High
Making my school or community better	93%	84%	High
Making and keeping friends	91%	87%	High

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 15 youth. From youth survey: N = 929.

1.4.13 YOUTH PROGRAM QUALITY ASSESSMENT (YPQA) SCORES

The table below tells you the Youth Program Quality Assessment (YPQA) self-assessment scores on Safe environment, Supportive Environment, Interaction and Engagement. Descriptions of the scales are listed below:

- **Safe environment:** Emotional Safety, Healthy Environment, Emergency Preparedness, Accommodating Environment, Nourishment.
- **Supportive Environment:** Warm Welcome, Session Flow, Active Engagement, Skill-Building, Encouragement, Reframing Conflict.
- **Interaction:** Youth have opportunities to develop a sense of belonging, participate in small groups, act as group facilitators/mentors, and manage feels and conflicts appropriately.
- **Engagement:** Youth have opportunities to set goals/make plans, reflect on activities and learning, and make choices.

Table 25. Staff Self-Assessment on Practices: YPQA Scores			
<i>YPQA scale</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Safe environment	4.26	4.58	Very low
Supportive environment	4.39	4.16	High
Interaction	4.10	3.98	Average
Engagement	3.95	3.55	High

Note. Scores can range from 1 to 5. From Youth Program Quality Assessment, self-assessment: N = 19.

2 MANAGEMENT CONTEXT

2.1 LEADING INDICATOR: STABILITY

Indicator Description: Program has consistent management, staffing, and school structure.

- ① 2.1.1 Seasoned Project Director
- ① 2.1.2 Seasoned Site Coordinator
- ① 2.1.3 Staff retention rate is at least 75% [Data to be available in 2020]
- ① 2.1.4 Program or the host school did not relocate or face challenge
- ① 2.1.5 School administration did not change

2.1.1 SEASONED PROJECT DIRECTOR

The table below indicates whether the Project Director is the same from last year and stays for the entire program year.

Table 26. Seasoned Project Director: Your Program 100% = Yes / 0% = No			
<i>Survey Item</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
The Project Director is the same from last year and stays for the entire program year	100%	79%	Not applicable

Note. From Project Director Survey.

2.1.2 SEASONED SITE COORDINATOR

The table below indicates the percent of your Site Coordinators being the same from last year and staying for the entire program year.

Table 27. Seasoned Site Coordinator			
<i>Survey Item</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
The Site Coordinator is the same from last year and stays for the entire program year	37%	47%	Average

Note. Data are From Site Coordinator Survey; N = 19.

2.1.3 STAFF RETENTION RATE IS AT LEAST 75% [DATA TO BE AVAILABLE IN 2020]

2.1.4 PROGRAM OR THE HOST SCHOOL DID NOT RELOCATE OR FACE CHALLENGE

The table below reports the percent of the program remained on the same site. Host school was not reorganized or faced with budget cuts that affect the program

Table 28. Sites or the Host Schools Did Not Relocate or Face Budget Cuts			
<i>Survey Item</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Program remained on the same site. Host school was not reorganized or faced with budget cuts that affect the program.	100%	93%	Average

Note. From Site Coordinator Survey: N = 19.

2.1.5 SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION DID NOT CHANGE

The table below reports the percent of the superintendent or the school-day administration did not change since last year.

Table 29. Sites Have Same School Administration			
<i>Survey Item</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
The superintendent or the school-day administration did not change since last year.	53%	78%	Very low

Note. From Site Coordinator Survey: N = 19.

2.2 LEADING INDICATOR: GRANTEE MANAGEMENT

Indicator Description: Overall program management is guided by standards, has effective supervision, and is collaborative internally and externally.

- ① 2.2.1 Project Director supports Site Coordinators
- ① 2.2.2 Effective meetings are held by Project Director
- ① 2.2.3 Site coordinators have high job satisfaction

2.2.1 PROJECT DIRECTOR SUPPORTS SITE COORDINATORS

The table below shows the percent of Site Coordinators who received the kind of supports from the Project Director.

Table 30. Project Director Supports Site Coordinators			
<i>Survey item: My project director...</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Challenges me to innovate and try new ideas.	95%	82%	High
Make sure that program goals and priorities are clear to me.	89%	81%	Average
Provides me with opportunities to collaborate with other site coordinators or co-plan with my team.	95%	86%	Average
Visits my site regularly.	26%	55%	Low
Is available during the program hours.	89%	87%	Average
Gives me useful feedback about how I work with my staff.	74%	74%	Average

Note. From Site Coordinator Survey: N = 19.

2.2.2 EFFECTIVE MEETINGS ARE HELD BY PROJECT DIRECTOR

The table below shows the percent of Site Coordinators who reported that the meetings with the Project Director were effective.

Table 31. Effective Site Coordinator Meetings			
<i>Survey item: At this program, meetings are...</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Well Organized.	95%	87%	Average
Open to input.	95%	86%	Average
Open to disagreement.	84%	79%	Average
Participants achieving agreement when necessary.	89%	84%	Average

Note. From Site Coordinator Survey: N = 19.

2.2.3 SITE COORDINATORS HAVE HIGH JOB SATISFACTION

The table below shows the percent of Site Coordinators who had high job satisfaction.

Table 32. Site Coordinator Have High Job Satisfaction			
<i>Survey item</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
I am satisfied with my job at this after-school program.	89%	80%	High

Note. From Site Coordinator Survey: N = 19.

2.3 LEADING INDICATOR: SITE MANAGEMENT

Indicator Description: *Site management is guided by standards, has effective supervision, and is collaborative.*

- ① 2.3.1 Site Coordinator supports staff
- ① 2.3.2 Effective meetings are held by Site Coordinator
- ① 2.3.3 Staff have high job satisfaction
- ① 2.3.4 Youth report effective program management
- ① 2.3.5 Youth do not have negative peer experience

2.3.1 SITE COORDINATOR SUPPORTS STAFF

The table below lists the percent of staff at this grantee and statewide who reported that they received the following supports from their supervisor at least once a month.

Table 33. Site Coordinator Supports Staff: Percent of Staff Reported Practice Occurring at Least Once a Month			
<i>Survey item: My supervisor...</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Reviews my activity plans.	95%	84%	High
Make sure that program goals and priorities are clear to you.	91%	83%	High
Give you positive feedback.	95%	89%	High
Be visible during activities.	91%	91%	Average
Gives you useful feedback about how you work with youth.	91%	87%	Average

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 3 staff. From staff survey: N = 46.

2.3.2 EFFECTIVE MEETINGS ARE HELD BY SITE COORDINATOR

The table below lists the percent of staff at this grantee and statewide who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” about the following aspects of effective staff meetings. Research has shown that effective staff meetings are a key way to communicate program priorities, coach staff, and build staff voice and ideas into the program. They are a key predictor of whether staff put the goals of the program into practice.

Table 34. Staff Report Effective Staff Meetings			
<i>Survey item: At this program, meetings are...</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Well organized.	94%	88%	High
Open to input from staff.	97%	96%	Average
Open to disagreement from staff.	89%	86%	Average
Able to achieve agreement from all participants when necessary.	94%	94%	Average

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 3 staff. From staff survey: N = 46

2.3.3 STAFF HAVE HIGH JOB SATISFACTION

The table below lists the percent of staff at this grantee and statewide who agreed or strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their current job in the after-school program.

Table 35. Staff Job Satisfaction: Percent of Staff Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed			
<i>Survey item</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
I am satisfied with this job at this out-of-school time program.	86%	82%	Average

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 3 staff. From staff survey: N = 46

2.3.4 YOUTH REPORT EFFECTIVE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

The table below lists the percent of youth at this grantee and statewide who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with the following statements about program management problems.

Table 36. Effective Program Management: Percent of Youth Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed			
<i>Survey item: At this program...</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Adults are organized.	94%	90%	High
Adults yell a lot*.	84%	72%	Very high
I usually don't know the plan for the day*.	82%	64%	Very high
We have to wait around a lot*.	90%	77%	Very high

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 15 youth. From youth survey: N = 929. *Scores were reverse coded so the higher the better.

2.3.5 YOUTH DO NOT HAVE NEGATIVE PEER EXPERIENCE

The table below lists the percent of youth at this grantee and statewide who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with the following statements about negative peer interactions. **Note: Data are reverse coded and high scores are good.**

Table 37. The Absence of Negative Peer Experience: Percent of Youth Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed			
<i>At this program...</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
My peers make fun of me*.	84%	79%	High
I feel pressured by my peers to do things I don't want to do*.	92%	82%	Very high
I feel left out*.	93%	85%	Very high
I don't feel like I can be myself here*.	92%	82%	Very high

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 15 youth. From youth survey: N = 929. *Scores were reverse coded so the higher the better.

2.4 LEADING INDICATOR: STAFF QUALIFICATIONS

Indicator Description: Staff are educated, experienced, and have sufficient professional development.

- ① 2.4.1 Staff have at least one professional qualification
- ① 2.4.2 Staff are experienced working with youth
- ① 2.4.3 Staff are familiar with state and other standards

2.4.1 STAFF HAVE AT LEAST ONE PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATION

The table below reports the percent of staff who reported having Staff report having the following qualifications.

Table 38. Professional Qualification: Percent of Staff with the Qualification			
<i>Staff credentials</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
At least an Associate Degree in child-related field [Data to be available in 2020]			
MiSAYD [Data to be available in 2020]			
Teaching certificate	17%	17%	Average
Social worker	4%	2%	Average
At least 60 semester hours with 12 semester hours in a child-related field [Data to be available in 2020]			

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 3 staff. From staff survey: N = 46.

2.4.2 STAFF ARE EXPERIENCED WORKING WITH YOUTH

The table below reports the percent of staff who reported having at least three years of working with youth.

Table 39. Staff Education: Percent of Staff with at Least 3-Year Experience			
<i>Staff years of experience</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
At least 3-year experience working with youth	63%	70%	Average

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 3 staff. From staff survey: N = 46.

2.4.3 STAFF ARE FAMILIAR WITH STATE AND OTHER STANDARDS

The table below reports the percent of staff who were familiar with standards for out-of-school time programs.

Table 40. Staff Familiar with State and Other Standards: Percent of Staff Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed			
<i>Survey item</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
I would be able to describe the main points of the Michigan state standards for out-of-school time programs to someone else.	70%	57%	High
I would be able to describe the main points of at least one other written standard that applies to out-of-school time or youth development work (for example, National After School Association, American Camping Association) to someone else.	73%	52%	Very high
I would be able to describe the specific objectives for this program, as written in the proposal that this program's organization submitted to MDE, to someone else.	72%	63%	High
I refer to the state standards or other written standards when identifying what this program should be doing with youth.	73%	60%	High

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 3 staff. From staff survey: N = 46.

2.5 LEADING INDICATOR: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Indicator Description: *Staff receive professional development upon hiring and on an ongoing basis in youth development and activity content.*

- ① 2.5.1 Strong orientation for new staff
- ① 2.5.2 Staff frequently participate in trainings

2.5.1 STRONG ORIENTATION FOR NEW STAFF

The table below reports the percent of staff who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that they received various forms of new staff training when they began working at the program.

Table 41. New Staff Training: Percent of Staff Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed			
<i>Survey item: When beginning working at this program, staff were...</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Offered a “beginner seminar” or pre-service orientation about how to work with youth.	70%	66%	Average
Given shared planning time with a staff member who had been here longer.	87%	71%	Very high
Informed about how staff at this program are expected to work with youth.	89%	89%	Average
Mentored by more experienced staff.	82%	71%	High
Informed about what this program is trying to accomplish with youth.	96%	90%	Very high
In daily communication with my supervisor about how things were going.	93%	85%	Very high

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 3 staff. From staff survey: N = 46.

2.5.2 STAFF FREQUENTLY PARTICIPATE IN TRAININGS

The table below reports the percent of staff who report participating in training or professional development at least twice in past year.

Table 42. Ongoing Professional Development: Percent of Staff Reported Attending Trainings at Least Twice in Past Year			
<i>Survey item: In the past year, have you participated in trainings related to:</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
STEM	64%	40%	Very high
SEL	67%	61%	Average
Leadership	60%	46%	High
Risk Prevention	47%	33%	High
Other	51%	45%	Average

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 3 staff. From staff survey: N = 46.

2.6 LEADING INDICATOR: SCHOOL CONNECTION

Indicator Description: Program has a strong tie with the host school's administration and activities.

- ① 2.6.1 Host school invests in the program
- ① 2.6.2 Policy for connecting with the school-day administrators is in place
- ① 2.6.3 Site Coordinator meets with school administrator regularly
- ① 2.6.4 Staff use school records for activity planning
- ① 2.6.5 Youth report of program strengthening school connection

2.6.1 HOST SCHOOL INVESTS IN THE PROGRAM

The table below shows the percent of Site Coordinators reporting that school principals and teachers are invested or highly invested in program.

Table 43. Sites Have Host School Investing in the Program			
<i>Survey Item: How invested was(were) your school...</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Principal	84%	70%	High
Teachers	63%	60%	Average

Note. From Site Coordinator Survey: N = 19.

2.6.2 POLICY FOR CONNECTING WITH THE SCHOOL-DAY ADMINISTRATORS IS IN PLACE

The table below shows the percent of your Site Coordinators reporting sites having established formal policies and procedures to follow for connecting with the school-day administrators.

Table 44. Policy for Connecting with the School-day Administrators			
<i>Survey Item</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Having a formal policy for connecting with the school-day administrators	47%	44%	Average

Note. From Site Coordinator Survey: N = 19.

2.6.3 SITE COORDINATOR MEETS WITH SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR REGULARLY

The table below shows the percent of Site Coordinators meeting with the school-day administrators at least monthly.

Table 45. Meets with School Administrator Regularly: Percent of Site Coordinator Who Reported at Least Monthly			
<i>Survey Item</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Site Coordinator reports meeting with school-day administrators at least monthly	89%	85%	Average

Note. From Site Coordinator Survey: N = 19.

2.6.4 STAFF USE SCHOOL RECORDS FOR ACTIVITY PLANNING

The table below shows the staff report using the following school records regularly for activity planning.

Table 46. Use School Records for Activity Planning: Percent of Staff Who Reported Regularly			
<i>Survey Item</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Students' academic plans	23%	24%	Average
Students' standardized test scores	18%	11%	High
Students' grades	48%	30%	High
Input from students' school-day teachers	39%	33%	Average

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 3 staff. From staff survey: N = 46.

2.6.5 YOUTH REPORT OF PROGRAM STRENGTHENING SCHOOL CONNECTION

Youth were asked to rate to the extent to which the program helped them do better at school.

Table 47. Strengthening School Connection: Percent of Youth Reported Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed			
<i>At this program...</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
The activities here help me do better at school.	93%	82%	Very high
I learn school subjects in fun ways at this program.	93%	84%	High
I can use the things I do here during my school day.	91%	81%	High
I don't get help on my school work here*.	88%	85%	Average

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 15 youth. From youth survey: N = 929. *Scores were reverse coded so the higher the better.

2.7 LEADING INDICATOR: FAMILY COMMUNICATION

Indicator Description: Family members are informed about their child and opportunities for involvement.

- ① 2.7.1 Staff frequently communicate with parents
- ① 2.7.2 Site Coordinator frequently communicates with parents

2.7.1 STAFF FREQUENTLY COMMUNICATE WITH PARENTS

The table below lists the percent of staff at this grantee and statewide who communicated with parents at least once a month.

Table 48. Parent Communication: Percent of Staff Reported at Least Once a Month			
<i>Survey item: How often do staff...</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Send materials about program offerings home to parents	63%	66%	Average
Send information home about how the student is progressing in the program	42%	42%	Average
Hold events or meetings to which parents are invited	30%	36%	Average
Have conversations with parents over the phone	49%	58%	Low
Meet with a student's parents to talk about the student's progress	30%	40%	Low
Ask for input from parents on what and how activities should be provided	30%	32%	Average

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 3 staff. From staff survey: N = 46.

2.7.2 SITE COORDINATOR FREQUENTLY COMMUNICATES WITH PARENTS

The table below lists the percent of Site Coordinators at this grantee and statewide who communicated with parents at least once per year.

Table 49. Site Coordinator Communicates with Parents at Least Once a Month			
<i>Survey item: At least monthly, the Site Coordinator...</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Send materials about program offerings home to parents	37%	68%	Low
Send information home about how the student is progressing in the program	21%	31%	Average
Hold events or meetings to which parents are invited	21%	30%	Average
Have conversations with parents over the phone	74%	77%	Average
Meet with a student’s parents to talk about the student’s progress	26%	45%	Low
Ask for input from parents on what and how activities should be provided	26%	26%	Average

Note. From Site Coordinator Survey: N = 19.

2.8 LEADING INDICATOR: CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT AND EVALUATION

Indicator Description: *Staff and Local Evaluator are actively involved in the evaluation process for program improvement.*

- ① 2.8.1 Staff participate in data-driven continuous quality improvement process with other staff
- ① 2.8.2 Staff participate in training for program assessment
- ① 2.8.3 Local Evaluator is involved

2.8.1 STAFF PARTICIPATE IN DATA-DRIVEN CONTINUOUS QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROCESS WITH OTHER STAFF

The table below lists the percent of staff at this grantee and statewide who reported that they used the following processes with other staff as part of a data-driven quality improvement process at least once a month.

Table 50. Data-Driven Quality Improvement Process: Percent of Staff Reported Practice Occurring at Least Once a Month			
<i>Survey item: How frequently do you do the following with other staff working in the out-of-school time program?</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Review and interpret evaluation data.	59%	33%	Very high
Conduct program planning based on a review of data.	59%	35%	Very high
Use evaluation data to set program improvement goals.	59%	34%	Very high
Discuss progress on meeting program improvement goals.	70%	48%	Very high
Observe other afterschool staff delivering programming in order to provide feedback on their practice.	64%	31%	Very high
Get observed by other afterschool staff while I deliver programming in order to get feedback on my practice.	64%	31%	Very high
Conduct program planning in order to meet specific learning goals in coordinated ways across multiple activities.	68%	53%	High
Share ideas on how to make programming more engaging for participating students.	77%	75%	Average
Follow-up about individual students.	75%	76%	Average
Receive feedback from school-day teachers and/or administrators on how the program could better support student learning needs.	48%	46%	Average
Discuss current research-based instructional practices.	64%	39%	Very high
Work with or see presentations from the local evaluator for this program.	39%	29%	High

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 3 staff. From staff survey: N = 46.

2.8.2 STAFF PARTICIPATE IN TRAINING FOR PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

The table below lists the percent of staff at this grantee and statewide who reported that they participated in the continuous quality improvement.

Table 51. Participation in Training for Program Assessment: Percent of Staff Reported Participating in Each Activity			
<i>Survey item: I participated in our continuous quality improvement process in the following ways:</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
I attended a formal PQA Basics training through the Weikart Center (online or live).	48%	27%	Very high
I received training on how to do self-assessment from my organization.	59%	36%	Very high
I used the PQA to observe another staff member.	41%	29%	High
I was observed by another staff member using the PQA.	48%	47%	Average
I participated in a consensus PQA scoring meeting.	26%	27%	Average
I reviewed and discussed our Leading Indicators Report.	28%	24%	Average
I reviewed and discussed our PQA scores.	41%	35%	Average
I co-developed program improvement plans with my supervisor.	46%	35%	High
I participated in follow-up discussions or progress meetings related to our goals.	70%	62%	Average

Note. Data are presented only if available for at least 3 staff. From staff survey: N = 46.

2.8.3 LOCAL EVALUATOR IS INVOLVED

The table below lists the percent of Site Coordinators report “some” or “a lot” on Local Evaluator’s involvement in the following areas.

Table 52. Local Evaluator’s Involvement			
<i>Survey item: The Local Evaluator...</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Analyzed and reported on the state evaluation data provided by MSU	100%	97%	Average
Interpreted reports provided by MSU	100%	97%	Average
Collected additional feedback (e.g., surveys, interviews, focus groups)	100%	97%	Average
Obtained School Outcomes information to submit to MSU	88%	91%	Average
Helped us meet the grant reporting requirements	89%	97%	Very low
Participated in the YPQA process	78%	89%	Average
Worked with us on program improvement	82%	92%	Low
Worked with us on funding and stability	83%	79%	Average
Used data to create professional development plans	100%	79%	High
Visited our sites	50%	74%	Low

Note. From Site Coordinator Survey: N = 19.

3 YOUTH OUTCOMES

Youth outcomes are *not* part of the Leading Indicators, which focus on program components that are likely to characterize a high-quality program. The assumption is that they result from a high-quality program. They are presented in this report to let you see whether Your grantee is meeting the goals you have set for youth outcomes and federal targets.

3.1 IMPROVEMENT IN GRADES

3.1.1 ALL REGULAR ATTENDEES

The table below shows the percent of ALL **regular attendees** (as defined as youth participants who attended **at least 30 days**) who improved at least one-half grade in ELA/reading or math grades from fall to spring for Your grantee and statewide.

Table 53. Improvement in Grades among Regular Attendees: Percent of All Regular Attendees Who Improved			
<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
ELA/reading grades	35%	34%	Average
Math grades	30%	35%	Average

Note. Data only include regular attendees. From school outcomes data: ELA/reading N = 753, math N = 722.

3.1.2 REGULAR ATTENDEES WITH ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT

The table below shows the percent of regular attendees with room for improvement and improved at least one-half grade in ELA/reading or math grades fall to spring for Your grantee and statewide.

Table 54. Improvement in Grades among Regular Attendees with Room for Improvement: Percent of Regular Attendees with Room for Improvement			
<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Reading/English grades	48%	44%	Average
Math grades	36%	44%	Low

Note. Data only include regular attendees whose ELA/reading or math grades in the fall or average GPA were below 3.0. From school outcomes data: ELA/reading N = 509, math N = 547.

3.1.3 REGULAR ATTENDEES COMPARED TO NON-REGULAR ATTENDEES

The table below shows improvement in grades for ALL regular attendees compared to youth who attended less than 30 days (non-regulars). **This includes only youth who had room for change.** If your program might have had an impact on reading and math grades, these results would be seen below:

- More regular attendees should have improved than non-regular attendees.
- Fewer regular attendees should show no change or a decline than non-regular attendees

Table 55. Changes in ELA/Reading Grades: Percent of Regular vs. Non-Regular Attendees with Room for Improvement			
<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Regular attendees</i>	<i>Non-regular attendees</i>	<i>Regular compared to non-regular attendees</i>
Improved	48%	42%	Average
No change	26%	29%	Average
Declined	26%	29%	Average

Note. Data include all youth with at least two marking periods of ELA/Reading grades. From school outcomes data: regulars N = 509, non-regulars N = 528.

Table 56. Changes in Math Grades: Percent of Regular vs. Non-Regular Attendees with Room for Improvement			
<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Regular attendees</i>	<i>Non-regular attendees</i>	<i>Regular compared to non-regular attendees</i>
Improved	36%	39%	Average
No change	26%	32%	Average
Declined	38%	29%	High

Note. Data include all youth with at least two marking periods of math grades. From school outcomes data: regulars N = 547, non-regulars N = 566.

3.2 TEACHER RATINGS

3.2.1 OVERALL CHANGES

The table below shows the percent of regular attendees whose teachers said the student improved at school.

Table 57. Teacher Ratings on Overall School Performance: Percent of Regular Attendees Who Improved			
<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Teacher ratings on behavior	66%	75%	Very low
Teacher ratings on homework and classroom participation	66%	73%	Low

Note. Data only include **regular attendees whose teachers indicated there was a need for improvement.** From teacher survey: N = 633.

3.2.2 SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS

The table below shows the percent of regular attendees whose teachers said they had any improvement in the following types of activities while at school.

Table 58. Teacher Ratings on Specific School Activities: Percent of Regular Attendees Who Improved			
<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Your grantee</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Your grantee compared to state</i>
Turning in homework on time	60%	62%	Average
Completing homework to your satisfaction	60%	64%	Average
Participating in class	58%	66%	Low
Volunteering	49%	51%	Average
Attending class regularly	45%	47%	Average
Being attentive in class	53%	59%	Low
Behaving well in class	52%	55%	Average
Academic performance	58%	69%	Very low
Coming to school motivated to learn	51%	59%	Low
Getting along well with other students	50%	56%	Low

Note. Data only include **regular attendees whose teachers indicated there was a need for improvement.** From teacher survey: N = 633.