# Michigan 21st Century Community Learning Centers

---

# 2015-2016 GRANTEE DATA TABLES

## Wayne State University



Michigan 21st Century Community Learning Centers
State Evaluation Team

November, 2016

Wayne State University.

# INTRODUCTION

**What are the data sources for this report?** The 2015-2016 Data Tables include information that MSU obtained from several sources about your program as a whole. MSU gives you data from:

- EZReports (student characteristics, attendance, activities, staff, vendors/partners)

- School records that you submitted (grades, tests)

- Parent and student surveys from the state evaluation (changes in youth developmental assets, outcomes, program satisfaction)

- Teacher survey data collected as part of state and federal requirements (changes in classroom behavior)

- Staff survey data (beliefs about quality, perceptions of the working climate)

- Youth Program Quality Assessment (YPQA) (staff practices around interaction and engagement)

**Comparisons to the state.** Most tables in this report compare data from this grantee to data 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 the data for the state. To determine these cutoffs, we used standard deviations. A standard deviation (SD) is a measure of how far a score is from the average score. For example, scores for most grantees will fall between 1 SD above and 1 SD below the average score. This means that a score more than 1 SD from the average score is quite different from how most of the other grantees are scoring.

- **"High"** means that this grantee scored **higher than two-thirds (67%)** of the grantees across the state

- **"Very high"** means that this grantee scored **higher than 84%** of grantees across the state

- **"Low"** means that this grantee scored **lower than two-thirds (67%)** of grantees across the state

- **"Very low"** means that this grantee **scored lower than 84%** of grantees across the state

**Interpretation notes.** 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 grantees 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 data might be meaningful to you. **Please note that for site data tables, state comparison data is for those students or sites serving the same grades served by your site. However, for the grantee data tables, the state comparison is for all students in the 21st CCLC program. This is because a grantee may be serving various grade levels.**

**Data Included in the report.** To ensure the data represent your program and also protect confidentiality, we only include scores when enough people provided answers to questions. We set the reporting threshold as follows:
- Parent, student and teacher surveys: at least 15 respondents must have completed the question

- Staff survey: at least 3 respondents must have completed the question

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

Wayne State University.

## LEADING INDICATORS ⓘ

This report is organized around a set of leading indicators and has been developed for Michigan 21st CCLC programs. These indicators, which are presented within three domains, represent characteristics that contribute to high-quality programs. Here are the Leading Indicators and a brief description of each:

### *Domain 1: Instructional Context*

- **Enrollment and Continuous Participation:** Program serves and successfully retains high-risk students.

- **Academic Content:** Program demonstrates that academics are a high priority.

- **Enrichment Content:** Program has a comprehensive set of activities that facilitate achievement and development in which most students participate.

- **Connection to School Day:** Program has structures and resources that ensure alignment between school-day and after-school learning.

- **Instructional Quality:** Program has high levels of point-of-service engagement and interaction during activities.

### *Domain 2: Organizational Context*

- **Stability:** Program has consistent management, staffing, and school structure.

- **Grantee Program Management:** Overall program management is guided by standards, has effective supervision, and is collaborative internally and externally.

- **Site Program Management:** Site management is guided by standards, has effective supervision, and is collaborative.

- **Professional Development:** Staff receive professional development upon hiring and on an ongoing basis in youth development and activity content.

- **Staff Qualifications:** Staff are educated, experienced, and knowledgeable about quality standards for youth programs.

- **Continuous Improvement and Evaluation:** Processes and quality infrastructure are in place for data-driven program improvement and evaluation

### *Domain 3: Positive Relationships*

- **Relationships:** Relationships among staff and participants are supportive and warm.

- **Climate:** Program environment is safe and welcoming.

- **Community Partnerships:** Program has relationships with community partners that contribute to sustainability and quality.

- **Family Communication:** Family members are informed about their child and about opportunities for involvement.

All Leading Indicators have specific measures that are represented by data from the 21st CCLC evaluation. Some are not displayed in order to maintain the confidentiality that was promised in the supervisor survey. Data in this report that are part of the leading indicators are marked by ⓘ.

Wayne State University.

# Table of Contents

Wayne State University.

Wayne State University.

# List of Tables

Wayne State University.

Wayne State University.

# Data Available

## EZREPORTS DATA

| Table 1. EZReports Data Available | | |
|---|---|---|
| *Student characteristic* | *Number of students with data* | *% of students with data* |
| Number of students attending | 1090 | Not applicable |
| Grade | 1090 | 100% |
| Sex | 1090 | 100% |
| Race | 1090 | 100% |

## SURVEY DATA

| Table 2. Survey Data Available | | |
|---|---|---|
| *Survey* | *Number of individuals with data* | *% of students with data* |
| Student survey | 382 | 79% |
| Parent survey | 260 | 58% |
| Teacher survey | 292 | 80% |
| Staff survey | 46 | Not applicable |

*Note:* The number of individuals with data includes those who completed at least part of the survey. The number here may meet the threshold for reporting data; however, the grantee may not have met the minimum requirement of survey responses for **each** question in the survey, which will result in "insufficient data" for those questions.

## SCHOOL OUTCOMES

| Table 3. Grade Data Available | | |
|---|---|---|
| *Outcome* | *Number of students with data* | *% of students with data* |
| Reading grades | 820 | 77% |
| Math grades | 787 | 74% |

*Note:* Grade data are presented for students who have grades reported for at least two marking periods of reading and/or math.

Wayne State University.

# Domain 1. Instructional Context

## 1.1. LEADING INDICATOR: ENROLLMENT AND CONTINUOUS PARTICIPATION

***Indicator Description: Program serves and successfully retains high-risk students.***

This section presents data on the specific measures related to the indicator as well as other relevant data to help you identify reasons for your enrollment/continuous participation rates. The specific measures included in the indicator *Enrollment and Continuous Participation* are:

ⓘ  1.1.1  % of students served who are academically at risk (Descriptions above Table 6,Table 7)

ⓘ  1.1.2  % of students retained at least 30 days in the program year (Table 4, Table 5)

ⓘ  1.1.3  % of academically at-risk students retained at least 30 days in the program year (Table 6, Table 7)

ⓘ  1.1.4  % of academically at-risk students retained at least 60 days in the program year (Table 6, Table 7)

ⓘ  1.1.5  % of academically at-risk students retained at least 90 days in the program year (Table 6, Table 7)

Reasons for enrollment (Table 8)

Since this grantee started receiving 21st CCLC funding, it has served **2289** unique students.

---

### 1.1.A. ALL STUDENTS

#### 1.1.A.1. Past Two Years

The following table reports the number of students enrolled and the average daily attendance at this grantee for the past two years based on the data entered into EZReports. It also reports the percent of students who attended regularly for each year.

| Table 4. Enrollment/Continuous Participation for All Students | | |
|---|---|---|
| *Attendance measure* | *2014-2015* | *2015-2016* |
| Enrollment (attended at least once) | | |
| All year | 1178 | 1090 |
| Summer | 203 | 174 |
| School year | 1017 | 985 |
| Average site daily attendance | | |
| Summer | 5 | 5 |
| School year | 14 | 14 |
| Continuous Participation | | |
| Percent retained at least 30 days (regulars) ⓘ | 34% | 35% |
| Percent retained at least 60 days | 14% | 18% |
| Percent retained at least 90 days | 6% | 8% |

*Note.* From EZReports.

Wayne State University.

## 1.1.A.2. Compared to the State

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

| Table 5. Enrollment/Continuous Participation Compared to the State | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Attendance measure* | *Your Grantee* | *Statewide* | *Grantee compared to state* |
| Enrollment (attended at least once) | | | |
| All year | 1090 | 442 | Very high |
| Summer | 174 | 200 | Average |
| School year | 985 | 368 | Very high |
| Average site daily attendance | | | |
| Summer | 5 | 23 | Very low |
| School year | 14 | 32 | Very low |
| Continuous Participation | | | |
| Percent retained at least 30 days (regulars) ⓘ | 35% | 57% | Very low |
| Percent retained at least 60 days | 18% | 43% | Very low |
| Percent retained at least 90 days | 8% | 30% | Very low |

*Note.* From EZReports.

## 1.1.B. LOW-ACHIEVING STUDENTS

## 1.1.B.1. Past Two Years

This section describes the extent to which this grantee enrolled and retained low-achieving students. The table below shows the percent of students enrolled and the percent of students who attended regularly who were low-achieving in reading and math. It also gives the percent of low-achieving students who attended this grantee regularly for each year. During the 2015-2016 school year, **75%** of the total **910** students (N=**669**) whose school outcome information was available were identified as academically at risk (ⓘ).

| Table 6. Enrollment/Continuous Participation of Academically At-Risk Students | | |
|---|---|---|
| *Attendance measure* | *2014-2015* | *2015-2016* |
| Enrollment (attended at least once) | | |
| All year | 724 | 669 |
| Summer | 23 | 54 |
| School year | 724 | 657 |
| Average site daily attendance | | |
| Summer | 1 | 2 |
| School year | 11 | 10 |
| Continuous Participation | | |
| Percent retained at least 30 days (regulars) ⓘ | 36% | 40% |
| Percent retained at least 60 days ⓘ | 14% | 18% |
| Percent retained at least 90 days ⓘ | 7% | 8% |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 at-risk students based on school outcome data submission for the grantee. Because school outcome data were not collected from students 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 students are defined as students 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.

Wayne State University.

## 1.1.B.2. Compared to the State

The following table reports enrollment and continuous participation of academically at-risk students at this grantee compared to the state.

| Table 7. Enrollment/Continuous Participation of Academically At-Risk Students Compared to the State | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Attendance measure* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Enrollment (attended at least once) | | | |
| All year | 669 | 226 | Very high |
| Summer | 54 | 57 | Average |
| School year | 657 | 218 | Very high |
| Average site daily attendance | | | |
| Summer | 2 | 7 | Low |
| School year | 10 | 18 | Low |
| Continuous Participation | | | |
| Percent retained at least 30 days (regulars) ⓘ | 40% | 78% | Very low |
| Percent retained at least 60 days ⓘ | 18% | 60% | Very low |
| Percent  retained at least 90 days ⓘ | 8% | 40% | Very low |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 at-risk students based on school outcome data submission for the grantee. Because school outcome data were not collected from students who only attended the summer program, the summer attendance presented here might not best reflect your at-risk population during that period. Academically at-risk students are defined as students 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 and school outcomes data.

## 1.1.C. REASONS FOR ENROLLMENT

This section presents reasons for enrollment based on responses from the parent and student surveys.

### 1.1.C.1. Parents

The table below lists the percent of parents who thought the following statements were very important reasons for them to enroll their children in the program.

| Table 8. Reasons for Enrollment: Percent of Parents Reported "Very Important" | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Reason for enrollment* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| It is a safe place for my child after school. | 90% | 93% | Low |
| It will help my child stay out of trouble. | 82% | 81% | Average |
| It provides dependable after-school care. | 74% | 80% | Low |
| It provides affordable after-school care. | 77% | 75% | Average |
| School staff suggested that my child enroll. | 60% | 56% | Average |
| I hope it will help my child do better in school. | 86% | 87% | Average |
| My child has a disability or learning problem that this program can help. | 49% | 49% | Average |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 parent respondents. From parent survey. N = 260.

### 1.1.C.2. Students

The table below lists the percent of students according to whom they reported wanted them to come to this program.

| Table 9. Voluntary Participation: Percent of Students Reported Whose Decision for Them to Attend the Program | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Who decided* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| My parents want me to come. | 16% | 29% | Low |
| My teachers, counselor or principal want me to come. | 9% | 5% | Very high |
| I want to come. | 74% | 66% | High |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 students. From student survey. N = 382.

Wayne State University.

## 1.2. LEADING INDICATOR: ACADEMIC CONTENT

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

This section presents data on the specific measures related to the indicator as well as other relevant data. The specific measures included in the indicator *Academic Content* are:

- ⓘ 1.2.1 Academic activity participation (Table 10)
- ⓘ 1.2.2 Homework help/tutoring participation for academically at-risk students (Table 11)
- ⓘ 1.2.3 Academic enrichment participation (Table 10)
- ⓘ 1.2.4 Activities informed by grade-level content standards (from ARF survey, not presented here)
- ⓘ 1.2.5 Student reports of academic support quality (Table 12)
- ⓘ 1.2.6 Academics is identified by staff as a top priority (Table 13)
- ⓘ 1.2.7 Supervisor connection to school-day content (Table 14)
- ⓘ 1.2.8 Staff connection to school-day content (Table 15)

## 1.2.A. ACADEMIC ACTIVITY PARTICIPATION

The table below lists the percent of students who participated in each type of academic activity for this grantee and across the state out of students who attended the program for at least 10 days.

| Table 10. Academic Activity Participation: Percent of Students Who Participated in Each Type | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Type of academic activity* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Homework help (support for homework completion) ⓘ | 70% | 61% | Average |
| Tutoring (remedial instruction for 1-3 students per adult) ⓘ | 39% | 7% | Very high |
| Academic lessons focused on specific subjects ⓘ | 83% | 85% | Average |
| Credit recovery ⓘ | 0% | 2% | Average |
| Academic enrichment focused on embedded learning ⓘ | 63% | 61% | Average |
| Did not participate in any academic activities | 3% | 2% | Average |

*Note.* Activities are categorized by MSU based on the session name, description, and objectives listed in EZReports. Students are counted as having participated in an activity if they attended the program for at least 10 days and attended that type of activity for at least 10 days. From EZReports. N = 713.

Wayne State University.

## 1.2.B. HOMEWORK HELP/TUTORING FOR ACADEMICALLY AT-RISK STUDENTS

The table below lists the percent of academically at-risk students who attended the program for at least 10 days and participated in homework help or tutoring sessions for at least 10 days combined for this grantee and for students across the state out of academically at-risk students.

| Table 11. Homework Help/Tutoring Activities for Academically At-Risk Students: Percent of Academically At-Risk Students Who Participated | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Type of academic activity | Your grantee | Statewide | Your grantee compared to state |
| Homework help/tutoring ⓘ | 85% | 78% | Average |

*Note.* Activities are categorized by MSU based on the activity name, description, and objectives listed in EZReports. Students are counted as having participated in an activity if they attended the program for at least 10 days and attended that type of activity for at least 10 days. Academically at-risk students are defined as students 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 = 640.

## 1.2.C. STUDENT FEEDBACK ON ACADEMIC SUPPORT

The table below lists the percent of students at this grantee and statewide who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the following statements about academic support in the program.

| Table 12. Academic Support: Percent of Students Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Survey item | Your grantee | Statewide | Your grantee compared to state |
| This program helps me understand what we are doing in class. ⓘ | 85% | 80% | High |
| At this program, I learn school subjects in fun ways. ⓘ | 85% | 81% | High |
| The school work I do matches the school work we do in regular class. ⓘ | 72% | 69% | Average |
| This program helps me get my homework done. ⓘ | 91% | 90% | Average |
| My grades have gotten better because of this program. ⓘ | 82% | 76% | High |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 students. From student survey. N = 382.

## 1.2.D. STAFF PRIORITIES

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 people ranking the following priorities below as first or second.

| Table 13. Program Priority: Percent of Staff Identified Each Area as the First or Second Top Priority for the Program | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Program Area | Your grantee | Statewide | Your grantee compared to state |
| Improve the academic achievement of youth ⓘ | 60% | 57% | Average |
| Enable the lowest-performing students to achieve grade-level proficiency ⓘ | 36% | 32% | Average |
| Provide opportunities for youth to learn STEM or other academic subjects in a fun way | 36% | 13% | Very high |
| Help youth keep up with homework ⓘ | 2% | 14% | Very low |

Wayne State University.

| Table 13. Program Priority: Percent of Staff Identified Each Area as the First or Second Top Priority for the Program | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Engage youth in fun leisure activities otherwise unavailable to them (i.e., arts, music, fitness, sports, etc.) | 4% | 13% | Average |
| Keep youth in a safe environment that allows them to relax, play, and socialize | 38% | 35% | Average |
| Improve the social and emotional development of youth | 20% | 28% | Low |

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

## 1.2.E. SUPERVISOR CONNECTION TO SCHOOL-DAY CONTENT

The table below provides information on how supervisors report connecting school-day content with the after-school program to support what school-day teachers are working toward. The percent of supervisors who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the statement is reported for your grantee and for the state.

| Table 14. Connections to the School Day: Percent of Supervisors Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Survey item* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| On a week-to-week basis, we know what academic content will be covered during the school day with the students we work with in the after-school program. ⓘ | 38% | 65% | Very low |
| We coordinate the content of the afterschool activities we provide with our students' school day work. ⓘ | 53% | 71% | Low |
| The activities we provide in the after-school program are tied to specific learning goals that are related to the school-day curriculum. ⓘ | 82% | 76% | Average |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 3 supervisors. From supervisor survey. N = 17.

## 1.2.F. STAFF CONNECTION TO SCHOOL-DAY CONTENT

The table below provides information on how staff report connecting school-day content with the after-school program to support what school-day teachers are working toward. The percent of staff who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the statement is reported for your grantee and for the state.

| Table 15. Connections to the School Day: Percent of Staff Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Survey item* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| 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 after-school program. ⓘ | 51% | 63% | Low |
| I coordinate the content of the afterschool activities I provide with my students' school day work. ⓘ | 49% | 59% | Low |
| The activities I provide in the after-school program are tied to specific learning goals that are related to the school-day curriculum. ⓘ | 66% | 67% | Average |

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

Wayne State University.

## 1.3. LEADING INDICATOR: ENRICHMENT CONTENT

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

This section presents data on the specific measures related to the indicator as well as other relevant data. The specific measures included in the indicator *Enrichment Content* are:

ⓘ  1.3.1  Arts participation (Table 16)

ⓘ  1.3.2  Youth development participation (Table 16)

ⓘ  1.3.3  Technology participation (Table 16)

ⓘ  1.3.4  Activity variety (Table 17)

### 1.3.A. ENRICHMENT ACTIVITY PARTICIPATION

The table below lists the percent of students (attending the program for at least 10 days) who participated in each type of activity (for at least 10 days) for this grantee and for students across the state.

| Table 16. Enrichment Activity Participation: Percent of Students Who Participated in Each Type of Activity | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Type of activity* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Arts ⓘ | 20% | 49% | Very low |
| Health/nutrition | 0% | 6% | Low |
| Recreation (social events, games, free play, etc) | 12% | 62% | Very low |
| Youth development (character education, conflict resolution, life skills, resistance skills, etc) ⓘ | 50% | 60% | Average |
| Sports | 0% | 56% | Very low |
| Technology  ⓘ | 7% | 14% | Average |
| STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Math) | 69% | 76% | Average |

*Note.* Activities are categorized by MSU based on the activity name, description, and objectives listed in EZReports. Students are counted as having participated in an activity if they attended the program for at least 10 days and attended that type of activity for at least 10 days. From EZReports. N = 713.

### 1.3.B. ACTIVITY VARIETY

Programming that includes a variety of activities is considered best practice for most youth programs. The percent of different activity offered by this grantee is presented below. There were 7 possible activity types considered including *art, health/nutrition, sports, technology, youth development, recreation,* and *special events.*

| Table 17. Offering on Activity Variety: Percent of Activities Types Program Offered | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Percent of activity types offered ⓘ | 88% | 82% | Average |

*Note.* Activities are categorized by MSU based on the activity name, description, and objectives listed in EZReports. From EZReports.

Wayne State University.

## 1.4. LEADING INDICATOR: CONNECTION TO SCHOOL DAY

***Indicator Description: Program has structures and resources that ensure alignment between school-day and after-school learning.***

This section presents data on some of the measures of this indicator. It includes data on staffing patterns for academic activities and student perceptions of academic support. The specific measures included in the indicator *Connection to School Day* are:

ⓘ 1.4.1 Formal policies for connecting with school day (from ARF survey, not presented here)

ⓘ 1.4.2 Supervisor communication with school (Table 18)

ⓘ 1.4.3 Staff communication with school (Table 19)

ⓘ 1.4.4 School investment in program (from ARF survey, not presented here)

ⓘ 1.4.5 Student assessment data used in planning (Table 20, Table 21, Table 22, Table 23)

   Staffing for academic activities (Table 24)

---

## 1.4.A. SUPERVISOR COMMUNICATION WITH SCHOOL

The table below shows the percent of supervisors who report using the following communication strategies to bridge academic programming between the after-school program and school-day instruction.

| Table 18. Supervisor Communication with School: Percent of Supervisors Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Survey item* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| We know who to contact at our students' day-time school if we have a question about their progress or status. ⓘ | 100% | 97% | Average |
| I participate in regular joint staff meetings for after-school and day-time school staff where steps to discuss linkages between the school day and after-school are discussed. ⓘ | 65% | 57% | Average |
| We meet regularly with school-day staff not working in the after-school program to review the academic progress of individual students. ⓘ | 53% | 64% | Average |
| We 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 student you do not have in your school-day classroom). ⓘ | 81% | 57% | High |
| I help manage a 3-way communication system that links parents, program, and day-time school information. ⓘ | 47% | 66% | Low |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 3 supervisors. From supervisor survey. N =17.

Wayne State University.

## 1.4.B. STAFF COMMUNICATION WITH SCHOOL

The table below shows the percent of staff who report using the following communication strategies to bridge academic programming between the after-school program and school-day instruction.

| Table 19.  Staff Communication with School: Percent of Staff Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Survey item* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| I know who to contact at my students' day-time school if I have a question about their progress or status. ⓘ | 83% | 80% | Average |
| I participate in regular joint staff meetings for after-school and day-time school staff where steps to ensure linkages between the school day and after-school are discussed. ⓘ | 51% | 41% | High |
| I meet regularly with school-day staff not working in the after-school program to review the academic progress of individual students. ⓘ | 39% | 44% | Average |
| 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). ⓘ | 46% | 30% | High |

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

## 1.4.C. STUDENT ASSESSMENT DATA USED IN PLANNING

The table below shows the percentage of staff who plan for activities using students' academic data. The percent of staff who report using each data source regularly is reported for your grantee and for the state.

| Table 20. Using Academic Data for Activity Planning: Percent of Staff Reported "Use Regularly" | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Survey item* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Individual students' academic plans  ⓘ | 40% | 22% | Very high |
| Individual students' standardized test scores ⓘ | 23% | 14% | High |
| Individual students' grades ⓘ | 53% | 31% | Very high |
| Input from individual students' school-day teachers. | 33% | 37% | Average |

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

The table below provides information on how staff report connecting school-day content with the after-school program to support what school-day teachers are working toward. The percent of staff who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the statement is reported for your grantee and for the state.

| Table 21. Differentiated Instruction Based on Student Assessment Data: Percent of Staff Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Survey item* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| I use student assessment data to provide different types of instruction to students attending my after-school activities based on their achievement level. ⓘ | 51% | 53% | Average |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 3 staff. From staff survey. N = 41.

Wayne State University.

The table below provides information on how supervisors report connecting school-day with the after-school program to support what school-day teachers are working toward. The percent of supervisors who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the statement is reported for your grantee and for the state.

| Table 22. Differentiated Instruction Based on Student Assessment Data: Percent of Supervisors Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Survey item* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| We use student assessment data to provide different types of instruction to students attending my after-school activities based on their achievement level. ⓘ | *65%* | *67%* | *Average* |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 3 supervisors. From supervisor survey. N = 17.

The table below provides information on the percent of staff who report planning for activities using intentional strategies that take into account student preferences. The percent of staff who reported "frequently" or "always" to the statement is reported for your grantee and for the state.

| Table 23. Considering Student Preferences for Activity Planning: Percent of Staff Reported Frequently or Always | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Survey item* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Well-planned in advance | 96% | 89% | High |
| Based on written plans for the session, assignments, and projects | 96% | 84% | High |
| Tied to specific learning goals | 96% | 85% | Very high |
| Meant to build upon skills cultivated in a prior activity or lesson | 91% | 81% | 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 a specific developmental domain (e.g., cognitive, social, emotional, civic, physical, etc.) | 73% | 68% | Average |
| Structured to respond to youth feedback on what the content or format of the activity should be | 91% | 74% | High |
| Informed by the expressed interests, preferences, and/or satisfaction of the participating youth | 84% | 80% | Average |

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

## 1.4.D. STAFFING FOR ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES

The following table shows the percent of each type of academic activity led by school-day or retired teachers for this grantee and statewide.

| Table 24. Staffing for Academic Activities: Percent of Academic Activities Led by School-Day or Retired Teachers | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Type of academic activity* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| All academic activities | 16% | 29% | Average |
| Homework help (support for homework completion) | 10% | 31% | Low |
| Tutoring (remedial instruction for 1-3 students per adult) | 24% | 39% | Average |
| Credit recovery | | 57% | Session not offered or students not attended |
| Academic lessons focused on specific subjects | 11% | 30% | Low |
| Academic enrichment activities focused on embedded learning | 14% | 24% | Average |
| STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Math) | 13% | 26% | Average |

Note. All academic activities N = 651, homework help N = 178, tutoring N = 152, credit recovery N = 0, academic lessons focused on specific subjects N = 33, academic enrichment activities focused on embedded learning N = 288, STEM N = 467. From EZReports.

Wayne State University.

## 1.5. LEADING INDICATOR: INSTRUCTIONAL QUALITY

***Indicator Description: Program has high levels of point-of-service engagement and interaction during activities***

This section presents data on the specific measures related to the indicator as well as other relevant data. The specific measures included in the indicator *Instructional Quality* are:

ⓘ  1.5.1  Self-assessed observation of instructional quality (YPQA) (Table 25)

ⓘ  1.5.2  Student-reported opportunities for interaction (Table 26)

ⓘ  1.5.2  Student-reported opportunities for engagement (Table 27)

ⓘ  1.5.4  Student-reported opportunities for governance, decision-making, and choice (Table 28)

ⓘ  1.5.5  Student-reported program mastery focus (Table 29)

ⓘ  1.5.6  Staff-reported interaction practices (Table 30)

ⓘ  1.5.7  Staff-reported engagement practices (Table 31)

### 1.5.A. YOUTH PROGRAM QUALITY ASSESSMENT (YPQA) SCORES: INTERACTION AND ENGAGEMENT

The table below tells you the Youth Program Quality Assessment (YPQA) self-assessment scores for Interaction and Engagement for your program compared to the state. To identify specific items to work on, refer to your YPQA reports. A score of at least 4 is desired. It should be noted that for the self-assessments, different sites may have different perceptions of what is necessary to get a certain score. Descriptions of the scales are listed below:

- **Interaction:** Students have opportunities to develop a sense of belonging, participate in small groups, act as group facilitators/mentors, and manage feels and conflicts appropriately.

- **Engagement:** Students have opportunities to set goals/make plans, reflect on activities and learning, and make choices.

| Table 25. Self-Assessment on Interaction and Engagement: YPQA Scores | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| YPQA scale | Your grantee | Statewide | Your grantee compared to state |
| Interaction (self-assessment) ⓘ | 4.3 | 4.0 | High |
| Engagement (self-assessment) ⓘ | 4.5 | 3.5 | Very high |

*Note.* Scores can range from 1 to 5. From Youth Program Quality Assessment, self-assessment N = 15**.**

### 1.5.B. STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF PROGRAM QUALITY

Students in 4th- to 12th-grade reported about a variety of areas of program quality. The indicator includes student reports of engagement and interaction. However, student reports in other areas are provided here as well for your review for potential program improvement.

Wayne State University.

### 1.5.B.1. Interaction

The table below lists the percent of 4th- to 12th-grade students at this grantee and statewide who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with statements about opportunities for interaction in the program.

| Table 26. Opportunities for Interaction: Percent of Students Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Survey item: At this program…* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| I get to work in small groups of just a few kids. ⓘ | 95% | 81% | Very high |
| Kids and staff set goals for what should happen. ⓘ | 92% | 80% | Very high |
| Kids and staff have group discussions about what we learned. ⓘ | 88% | 75% | Very high |
| I get to teach or coach other kids. ⓘ | 69% | 55% | Very high |
| I have opportunities to be a leader. ⓘ | 88% | 76% | Very high |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 students. From student survey. N = 382.

### 1.5.B.2. Engagement

The table below lists the percent of 4th- to 12th-grade students at this grantee and statewide who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with statements about their engagement in the program.

| Table 27. Opportunities for Engagement:  Percent of Students Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Survey item: At this program…* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| The activities challenge me to learn new skills. ⓘ | 92% | 81% | Very high |
| The activities we do really make me think. ⓘ | 93% | 78% | Very high |
| I do things that I don't get to do anywhere else. ⓘ | 80% | 69% | Very high |
| I get to do things I like to do. ⓘ | 94% | 81% | Very high |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 students. From student survey. N = 382.

### 1.5.B.3. Opportunities for Choice, Decision-Making, and Governance

The table below lists the percent of 4th- to 12th-grade students 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 28. Opportunities for Choice, Decision-Making, and Governance: Percent of Students Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Survey item: At this program…* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| I get to decide how to complete some projects or activities. ⓘ | 80% | 70% | High |
| I get to choose my activities. ⓘ | 89% | 64% | Very high |
| I help decide what kinds of activities are offered. ⓘ | 75% | 64% | High |
| My opinions matter when decisions are made about the program. ⓘ | 86% | 70% | Very high |
| I have participated in a youth advisory committee. ⓘ | 52% | 51% | Average |
| I am involved in important decisions about this program. ⓘ | 73% | 60% | Very high |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 students. From student survey. N = 382.

Wayne State University.

### 1.5.B.4. Skill-Building and Mastery Orientation

The table below lists the percent of 4th- to 12th-grade students at this grantee and statewide who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the following statements about the program's orientation toward skill-building and mastery.

| Table 29. Opportunities for Skill-Building and Mastery Orientation: Percent of Students Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Survey item: At this program…* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| It's important that we really understand the activities that we do. ⓘ | 95% | 88% | Very high |
| Trying hard is very important. ⓘ | 94% | 89% | High |
| Learning new ideas and concepts is very important. ⓘ | 94% | 88% | Very high |
| How much you improve is really important. ⓘ | 93% | 88% | High |
| Staff notice when I have done something well. ⓘ | 95% | 85% | Very high |
| It's ok to make mistakes as long as you're learning. ⓘ | 96% | 91% | Very high |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 students. From student survey. N = 382.

## 1.5.C. STAFF BELIEFS ABOUT IMPORTANT PRACTICES

The next tables present staff perceptions about practices for working with youth to improve both achievement and social development. 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. These data may provide suggestions for professional development depending on the goals of your program.

### 1.5.C.1. Staff Beliefs about Interaction

This table shows staff perceptions of the degree to which staff use practices that provide opportunities for high levels of interaction within activities. These are often difficult practices for staff to learn to do consistently and well.

| Table 30. Practices for Interaction: Percent of Staff Reported Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Survey item* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Staff listen to youth more than talk at them. ⓘ | 88% | 80% | High |
| Staff actively and continuously consult and involve youth. ⓘ | 95% | 92% | Average |
| Staff facilitate youth to lead activities. ⓘ | 81% | 83% | Average |
| Staff have youth help or mentor other youth in completing a project or task. ⓘ | 93% | 88% | High |
| Staff provide opportunities for the work, achievements, or accomplishments of youth to be publicly recognized. ⓘ | 90% | 87% | Average |
| Staff have youth make formal presentations to the larger group of students. ⓘ | 93% | 69% | Very high |

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

Wayne State University.

### 1.5.C.2. Staff Beliefs about Engagement Practices

This table shows staff perceptions of the degree to which staff use practices that provide opportunities for high levels of engagement within activities. These are often difficult practices for staff to learn to do consistently and well.

| Table 31. Practices for Engagement: Percent of Staff Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Survey item* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Staff include time in activities for youth to reflect on their experiences (e.g., formal journal writing, conversational feedback). ⓘ | 95% | 83% | High |
| Staff are effective at providing youth with meaningful choices during activities. ⓘ | 98% | 92% | Very high |
| Staff provide structured and planned activities explicitly designed to help youth get to know each other. ⓘ | 88% | 89% | Average |
| Staff are effective at providing youth with opportunities to set goals and make plans within the program. ⓘ | 98% | 82% | Very high |
| Staff ask for and listen to student opinions about the way things should work in the program. ⓘ | 98% | 88% | High |
| Staff have youth work collaboratively with other youth in small groups. ⓘ | 98% | 92% | High |
| Staff have youth work on group projects that take more than one day to complete. ⓘ | 95% | 86% | High |

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

### 1.5.C.3. Staff Beliefs about Youth Choice, Decision-Making, and Governance

This table shows staff perceptions of the degree to which staff use practices that provide students 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. These items range from letting students choose activities to partnering with students to determine the overall policies of the program.

| Table 32. Practices for Creating Opportunities for Choice, Decision-Making, and Governance: Percent of Staff Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Practice* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Youth are able to take responsibility for their own program. | 86% | 71% | High |
| Youth can set goals for what they want to accomplish in the program. | 91% | 78% | Very high |
| Youth help make plans for what activities are offered at the program. | 83% | 77% | Average |
| Youth make choices about WHAT content is covered in program offerings. | 78% | 60% | High |
| Youth make choices about  HOW content is covered in program offerings. | 73% | 54% | High |
| Youth help create rules and guidelines for the program. | 86% | 68% | Very high |

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

Wayne State University.

# Domain 2. Organizational Context

## 2.1. LEADING INDICATOR: STABILITY

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

**Data for this indicator are reported on the ARF survey, not in the Data Tables.** For your information, the specific measures of the indicator *Stability* are:

- ⓘ 2.1.1 Program director has not changed since last ARF

- ⓘ 2.1.2 Site Coordinator has not changed since last ARF

- ⓘ 2.1.3 At least 75% of regular staff were retained since last ARF

- ⓘ 2.1.4 School has not changed or reorganized since last ARF

- ⓘ 2.1.5 School principal has not changed since last ARF

## 2.2. LEADING INDICATOR: GRANTEE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

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

Because data about grantee program management come from site coordinator and program director surveys and can be identified, they are kept confidential. For your information, the specific measures of the indicator *Grantee Program Management* are:

- ⓘ 2.2.1 Supervisor-reported effective staff meetings (Table 33)

- ⓘ 2.2.2 Program Director refers to standards when designing the program (not reported here).

- ⓘ 2.2.3 Program Director is familiar with the objectives outlined in the grant (not reported here).

- ⓘ 2.2.4 Network of sites within this grantee is viewed as quality-focused, collaborative, a learning community (Table 34)

- ⓘ 2.2.5 Site Coordinators have high job satisfaction (Table 35)

## 2.2.A. SUPERVISOR-REPORTED EFFECTIVE STAFF MEETINGS

The table below lists the percent of supervisors at this grantee and statewide who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the following descriptions about staff meetings at this grantee. 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 33. Effective Staff Meetings: Percent of Supervisors Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Survey item* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Well organized. ⓘ | 94% | 86% | Average |
| Open to input from staff. ⓘ | 100% | 92% | High |
| Open to disagreement from staff. ⓘ | 94% | 88% | Average |
| Able to achieve agreement from all participants when necessary. ⓘ | 94% | 88% | Average |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 3 supervisors. From supervisor survey. N = 17.

Wayne State University.

## 2.2.B. NETWORK OF SITES WITHIN THIS GRANTEE

The table below lists the percent of supervisors at this grantee and statewide who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the following statements.

| Table 34. Quality of Networks within Grantee: Percent of Supervisors Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Survey item* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| In our network, lead administrators make sure that all staff are familiar with standards of quality. ⓘ | 100% | 91% | High |
| Our site is routinely monitored by higher-level administrators. ⓘ | 100% | 85% | High |
| Site coordinators in our network are adequately trained and prepared to manage their sites. ⓘ | 88% | 89% | Average |
| Sites in our network are held accountable for the quality of their services. ⓘ | 88% | 93% | Average |
| Staff who provide youth activities in our network are adequately trained and prepared to work with our youth. ⓘ | 100% | 87% | High |
| Everyone in our network is working together toward common goals. ⓘ | 100% | 93% | High |
| Collaboration across sites in our network is strongly encouraged by program administrators. ⓘ | 94% | 89% | Average |
| Within this network, most site coordinators share the same vision about the central mission of the program. ⓘ | 94% | 91% | Average |
| Supervisors in our network use a formal process to observe their staff and provide feedback about the quality of the program as a whole. ⓘ | 94% | 87% | Average |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 3 supervisors. From supervisor survey. N = 17.

## 2.2.C. SITE COORDINATOR JOB SATISFACTION

The table below lists the percent of supervisors at this grantee and statewide who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the following statement.

| Table 35. Site Coordinator Job Satisfaction: Percent of Site Coordinators Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Survey item* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| I am satisfied with this job at this after-school program. ⓘ | 73% | 79% | Average |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 3 site coordinators. From supervisor survey. N = 15.

Wayne State University.

## 2.3. LEADING INDICATOR: SITE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

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

This section presents data on some of the specific measures related to the indicator as well as other relevant data. Some of these measures are more appropriately dealt with at the grantee level, while others are site-level issues. The specific measures included in the indicator Site Program Management that are within the purview of grantee-level management are:

ⓘ 2.3.1  Supervisors provide effective support to staff (Table 36)

ⓘ 2.3.2  Staff-reported effective staff meetings (Table 37)

ⓘ 2.3.3  Supervisors refer to standards when designing the program (Table 38)

ⓘ 2.3.4  Supervisors are familiar with the objectives outlined in the grant (Table 39)

ⓘ 2.3.5  Staff have high job satisfaction (Table 40)

### 2.3.A. EFFECTIVE SUPERVISOR SUPPORT

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 per month.

| Table 36. Supervisor Supports for Working with Youth: Percent of Staff Reported at Least Once Per Month | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Survey item: My supervisor…* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Reviews my activity plans. ⓘ | 90% | 82% | High |
| Is visible during the activities. ⓘ | 93% | 92% | Average |
| Makes sure that program goals and priorities are clear to me. ⓘ | 86% | 82% | Average |
| Gives me positive feedback. ⓘ | 93% | 89% | Average |
| Gives me useful feedback about how I work with youth. ⓘ | 88% | 85% | Average |

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

### 2.3.B. STAFF-REPORTED EFFECTIVE STAFF MEETINGS

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 37. Effective Staff Meetings: Percent of Staff Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Survey item* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Well organized. ⓘ | 95% | 90% | Average |
| Open to input from staff. ⓘ | 95% | 95% | Average |
| Open to disagreement from staff. ⓘ | 90% | 85% | High |
| Able to achieve agreement from all participants when necessary. ⓘ | 100% | 93% | High |

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

Wayne State University.

## 2.3.C. SUPERVISOR FAMILIAR WITH STANDARDS

The table below reports the percent of supervisors who are familiar with these standards for after-school programs.

| Table 38. Supervisor Familiar with Standards: Percent of Supervisors Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Survey item | Your grantee | Statewide | Your grantee compared to state |
| I would be able to describe the main points of the Michigan state standards for after-school programs to someone else. ⓘ | 100% | 83% | High |
| I would be able to describe the main points of at least one other written standard that applies to after-school or youth development work (for example, National After School Association, American Camping Association) to someone else. ⓘ | 94% | 78% | High |
| I refer to the state standards or other written standards when identifying what this program should be doing with youth. ⓘ | 100% | 88% | High |

Note. Data are presented if available for at least 3 supervisors. From supervisor survey. N = 17.

## 2.3.D. SUPERVISOR FAMILIAR WITH OBJECTIVES OUTLINED IN THE GRANT

The table below reports the percent of supervisors who are familiar with the program's objectives as written in their proposal to MDE.

| Table 39. Supervisor Familiar with Objectives: Percent of Supervisors Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Survey item | Your grantee | Statewide | Your grantee compared to state |
| 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. ⓘ | 100% | 87% | High |

Note. Data are presented if available for at least 3 supervisors. From supervisor survey. N = 17.

## 2.3.E. 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 40. Staff Job Satisfaction: Percent of Staff Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Survey item | Your grantee | Statewide | Your grantee compared to state |
| I am satisfied with this job at this after-school program. ⓘ | 78% | 83% | Low |

Note. Data are presented if available for at least 3 staff. From staff survey. N = 45.

Wayne State University.

## 2.4. LEADING INDICATOR: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

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

This section presents data on some of the specific measures related to the indicator as well as other relevant data. Some of these measures are more appropriately dealt with at the grantee level, while others are site-level issues. The specific measures included in the indicator Professional Development that are within the purview of grantee-level management are:

ⓘ 2.4.1 Strong orientation to program for staff (Table 41)

ⓘ 2.4.2 Strong orientation to program for vendor (Table 42)

ⓘ 2.4.3 Ongoing professional development about how to work with youth (new)

ⓘ 2.4.4 Ongoing professional development in content areas for program director (new)

ⓘ 2.4.5 Supervisors and staff discuss current research-based instructional practices (2.4.2)

## 2.4.A. NEW STAFF ORIENTATION AND TRAINING

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 Regular Staff Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *When you began working at this program, were you:* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Informed about how staff at this program are expected to work with youth. ⓘ | 85% | 89% | Low |
| Informed about what this program is trying to accomplish with youth. ⓘ | 87% | 90% | Average |
| Mentored by more experienced staff. ⓘ | 63% | 68% | Average |
| Offered a "beginners seminar" or pre-service orientation about how to work with youth. ⓘ | 70% | 60% | Average |
| Given shared planning time with a staff member who had been here longer. ⓘ | 67% | 66% | Average |
| In daily communication with your supervisor at THIS program about how things were going. ⓘ | 85% | 84% | Average |

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

Wayne State University.

## 2.4.B. NEW VENDOR ORIENTATION AND TRAINING

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

| Table 42. New Vendor Training: Percent of Vendor Staff Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *When you began working at this program, were you:* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Informed about how staff at this program are expected to work with youth. ⓘ | | 71% | Insufficient data |
| Informed about what this program is trying to accomplish with youth. ⓘ | | 81% | Insufficient data |
| Mentored by more experienced staff. ⓘ | | 52% | Insufficient data |
| Offered a "beginners seminar" or pre-service orientation about how to work with youth. ⓘ | | 51% | Insufficient data |
| Given shared planning time with a staff member who had been here longer. ⓘ | | 53% | Insufficient data |
| In daily communication with your supervisor at THIS program about how things were going. ⓘ | | 69% | Insufficient data |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 3 vendor staff. From staff survey. N = 0.

## 2.4.C. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ABOUT HOW TO WORK WITH YOUTH

The table below reports the percent of staff who report participating in training or professional development on how to work with youth at least twice in past year. *Starting 2016, questions were specific around social-emotional learning, youth leadership and risk prevention trainings.

| Table 43. Ongoing Professional Development about How to Work with Youth: Percent of Staff Reported Training at Least Twice in Past Year | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *In the past year, have you participated in:* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Social-emotional learning (i.e, emotional management, empathy, teamwork, responsibility, initiative, problem-solving). ⓘ | 50% | 50% | Average |
| Youth leadership (i.e., youth advisory council, team-building). ⓘ | 51% | 41% | Average |
| Risk prevention (i.e., drug/alcohol prevention, anti-bully event). ⓘ | 36% | 30% | Average |

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

## 2.4.D. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN CONTENT AREAS

The table below reports the percent of staff who report participating in various professional development opportunities related to content areas at least twice in past year. *Starting 2016, questions were specific around STEM or other subjects.

| Table 44. Ongoing Professional Development in Content Areas: Percent of Staff Reported Training at Least Twice in Past Year | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *In the past year, have you participated in:* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| STEM (i.e., Science, Technology, Engineering, Math). ⓘ | 58% | 37% | Very high |
| Other subjects (i.e., arts, literacy). ⓘ | 33% | 42% | Average |

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

Wayne State University.

## 2.4.E. EVIDENCE-BASED LEARNING

The table below lists the percent of supervisors and staff at this grantee and statewide who reported that they discussed research-based instructional practices at least once per month.

| Table 45. Discussions around Research-Based Instructional Practices: Percent of Supervisors and Staff Reported Having Discussions at Least Once Per Month | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *How often do you do the following?* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Discuss current research-based instructional practices. ⓘ | 32% | 37% | Average |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 3 supervisors and staff combined. From staff and supervisor surveys. N = 72.

The table below lists the percent of staff at this grantee and statewide who reported that they used a specific curriculum around the various themes.

| Table 46. Use of curriculum: Percent of Staff Reported Using a Specific Curriculum around Each Theme | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *When working with youth, do you use a specific curriculum around…* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Social-emotional learning (i.e, emotional management, empathy, teamwork, responsibility, initiative, problem-solving). | 71% | 48% | Very high |
| Youth leadership (i.e., youth advisory council, team-building). | 67% | 43% | Very high |
| Risk prevention (i.e., drug/alcohol prevention, anti-bully event). | 40% | 29% | High |
| STEM (i.e., Science, Technology, Engineering, Math). | 91% | 48% | Very high |

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

The table below lists the percent of staff at this grantee and statewide who reported that they participated in the continuous quality improvement process led by the Weikart Center TACSS initiative (Technical Assistance and Coaching Supports Services).

| Table 47. Participation in Weikart Center TACSS activities: Percent of Staff Reported Participating in Each Activity | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *I participated in our continuous quality improvement process in the following ways:* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| I attended a formal PQA Basics training through the Weikart Center (online or live). | 52% | 24% | Very high |
| I received training on how to do self-assessment from my organization. | 59% | 37% | Very high |
| I used the PQA to observe another staff member. | 46% | 30% | High |
| I was observed by another staff member using the PQA. | 52% | 47% | Average |
| I participated in a consensus PQA scoring meeting. | 48% | 28% | High |
| I reviewed and discussed our Leading Indicators Report. | 46% | 28% | Very high |
| I reviewed and discussed our PQA scores. | 57% | 38% | High |
| I co-developed program improvement plans with my supervisor. | 43% | 37% | Average |
| I participated in follow-up discussions or progress meetings related to our goals. | 65% | 58% | Average |

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

Wayne State University.

## 2.5. LEADING INDICATOR: STAFF QUALIFICATIONS

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

The specific measures of the indicator *Staff Qualifications* are:

ⓘ  2.5.1   Bachelor's degrees or higher (Table 48)

ⓘ  2.5.2   A minimum of 3-year experience working with youth (Table 49)

ⓘ  2.5.3   Familiarity with state standards or other standards for working with youth (Table 50)

ⓘ  2.5.4   Teaching Certificate (Table 51)

### 2.5.A. STAFF EDUCATION

The table below reports the percent of staff who reported having a bachelor's degree or higher.

| Table 48. Staff Education: Percent of Staff with Bachelor's Degrees or Higher | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Bachelor's degree or higher ⓘ | 74% | 56% | High |

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

### 2.5.B. STAFF EXPERIENCE

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

| Table 49. Staff Experience: Percent of Staff with at Least 3-Year Experience | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *How often do you do the following?* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| At least 3-year experience working with youth. ⓘ | 85% | 77% | Average |

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

Wayne State University.

## 2.5.C. STAFF FAMILIARITY WITH PROGRAM STANDARDS

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

| Table 50. Staff Familiar with Standards: Percent of Staff Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Survey item* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| I would be able to describe the main points of the Michigan state standards for after-school programs to someone else. ⓘ | 67% | 55% | High |
| I would be able to describe the main points of at least one other written standard that applies to after-school or youth development work (for example, National After School Association, American Camping Association) to someone else. ⓘ | 58% | 49% | 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. | 76% | 62% | High |

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

## 2.5.D. TEACHING CERTIFICATE

| Table 51. Teaching Certificate: Percent of Staff with a Teaching Certificate | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Staff with teaching certificate who run activities. ⓘ | 24% | 32% | Average |

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

Wayne State University.

## 2.6. LEADING INDICATOR: CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT AND EVALUATION

***Indicator Description: Processes and quality infrastructure are in place for data-driven program improvement and evaluation***

This section presents data on some of the measures related to the indicator. The specific measures for the indicator *Continuous Improvement and Evaluation* are:

ⓘ  2.6.1  Data-driven continuous quality improvement process – staff (Table 52)

ⓘ  2.6.2  Data-driven continuous quality improvement process – supervisors (Table 53)

ⓘ  2.6.3  Local evaluator involvement (from ARF survey, not presented here)

ⓘ  2.6.4  Self-assessment and improvement plan completed (data submission record; not reported here)

### 2.6.A. DATA-DRIVEN CONTINUOUS QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROCESS – STAFF

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

| Table 52. Data-Driven Quality Improvement Process: Percent of Staff Reported Practice Occurring at Least Once Per Month | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *How frequently do you do the following with other staff working in the after-school program?* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Get observed by other afterschool staff while I deliver programming in order to get feedback on my practice. ⓘ | 43% | 32% | High |
| Observe other afterschool staff delivering programming in order to provide feedback on their practice. ⓘ | 43% | 27% | Very high |
| Review and interpret evaluation data. ⓘ | 31% | 29% | Average |
| Conduct program planning based on a review of data. ⓘ | 41% | 33% | Average |
| Use evaluation data to set program improvement goals. ⓘ | 36% | 32% | Average |
| Discuss progress on meeting program improvement goals. ⓘ | 48% | 45% | Average |
| Conduct program planning in order to meet specific learning goals in coordinated ways across multiple activities. ⓘ | 59% | 47% | High |
| Share ideas on how to make programming more engaging for participating students. ⓘ | 71% | 67% | Average |
| Work with or see presentations from the local evaluator for this program. ⓘ | 31% | 27% | Average |

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

### 2.6.B. DATA-DRIVEN CONTINUOUS QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROCESS – SUPERVISORS

The table below lists the percent of supervisors at this grantee and statewide who reported they often or always use the following processes with their staff as part of a data-driven quality improvement process.

| Table 53. Supervision of Staff Practice: Percent of Supervisors Reported Practice Occurring at Least Once Per Month | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *How frequently you do the following things for each staff?* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Review their activity plans. ⓘ | 100% | 84% | High |
| Make sure that program goals and priorities are clear to them. ⓘ | 88% | 81% | Average |
| Give them positive feedback. ⓘ | 100% | 97% | Average |
| Be visible during their activities. ⓘ | 94% | 96% | Average |
| Gives them useful feedback about how they work with youth. ⓘ | 100% | 96% | Average |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 3 supervisors. From supervisor survey. N = 17.

Wayne State University.

# Domain 3. Positive Relationships

## 3.1. LEADING INDICATOR: RELATIONSHIPS

***Indicator Description: Relationships among staff and participants are supportive and warm.***

The specific measures of the indicator *Relationships* are:

ⓘ  3.1.1  Student report of supportive relationships with staff (Table 54)

ⓘ  3.1.2  Student report of supportive relationships with program peers (Table 55)

ⓘ  3.1.3  Parent report of student relationships with staff (Table 56)

---

## 3.1.A. STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF SUPPORTIVE RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF

The table below lists the percent of 4th- to 12th-grade students at this grantee and statewide who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the following statements about program staff.

| Table 54. Adult Support: Percent of Students Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Survey item: At this program…* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Staff care about me.  ⓘ | 98% | 95% | High |
| I trust the staff.  ⓘ | 95% | 90% | High |
| I can tell the staff in this program about my problems.  ⓘ | 86% | 78% | High |
| If a kid at this program is being mean to me, I know that staff will help me.  ⓘ | 93% | 88% | High |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 students. From student survey. N = 382.

## 3.1.B. STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF SUPPORTIVE RELATIONSHIPS WITH PEERS

The table below lists the percent of 4th- to 12th-grade students at this grantee and statewide who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the following statements about peer support.

| Table 55. Peer Support: Percent of Students Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *At this program…* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Kids make sure that other kids follow the rules.  ⓘ | 72% | 63% | High |
| Kids tell each other when they do a good job.  ⓘ | 75% | 67% | High |
| Kids work together to solve problems.  ⓘ | 90% | 72% | Very high |
| Kids help me when I'm having a hard time.  ⓘ | 83% | 71% | Very high |
| I trust the kids.  ⓘ | 74% | 61% | High |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 students. From student survey. N = 382.

Wayne State University.

## 3.1.C. PARENT PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF

The table below lists the percent of parents at this grantee and statewide who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the following statements about staff relationship with their children

| Table 56. Positive Relationships between Students and Staff: Percent of Parents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Survey item* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| At least one staff in this program has a strong relationship with my child. ⓘ | 93% | 94% | Average |
| Staff in this program give my child individual attention. ⓘ | 95% | 94% | Average |
| Staff at this program do a good job of preventing bullying. ⓘ | 98% | 95% | High |
| Staff in this program know how to work with a child like mine. ⓘ | 97% | 96% | Average |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 parents. From parent survey. N = 260.

Wayne State University.

## 3.2. LEADING INDICATOR: CLIMATE

***Indicator Description: Program environment is safe and welcoming.***

The specific measures for the indicator *Climate* are:

- ⓘ 3.2.1 Program self-assessment of safe environment (Table 57)
- ⓘ 3.2.2 Parent report of welcoming environment (Table 58)
- ⓘ 3.2.3 Minimal bullying (Table 59)
- ⓘ 3.2.4 Students report few program management problems (Table 60)
- 3.2.5 Students report satisfaction with the program (Table 61)
- 3.2.6 Parents rating of the program (Table 62)

### 3.2.A. YOUTH PROGRAM QUALITY ASSESSMENT (YPQA) SCORES: SAFE ENVIRONMENT

The table below tells you the Youth Program Quality Assessment (YPQA) scores for Safe Environment for your grantee compared to the state. To identify specific items to work on, refer to your YPQA reports. A score of at least 4 is desired. It should be noted that for the self-assessments, different grantees may have different perceptions of what is necessary to get a certain score. Descriptions of the scales are listed below:

| Table 57. Self-Assessment on Safe Environment: YPQA Scores | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *YPQA scale* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Safe environment (self-assessment) ⓘ | 4.5 | 4.6 | Average |

*Note.* Scores can range from 1 to 5. From Youth Program Quality Assessment, self-assessment N = 15**.**

### 3.2.B. PARENT REPORT OF WELCOMING ENVIRONMENT

The table below lists the percent of parents at this grantee and statewide who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the following statements about the environment created by the staff and the program.

| Table 58. Welcoming Environment: Percent of Parents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Survey item* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| I feel my child is safe in this program. ⓘ | 99% | 99% | Average |
| When I go to the program, staff are doing things with the kids. ⓘ | 93% | 97% | Very low |
| When I go to the program, staff greet me. ⓘ | 95% | 97% | Very low |
| When I get to the program, staff are hanging out with other staff instead of being with the kids.(reversed, the higher the better ⓘ | 81% | 76% | Average |
| Staff treat me in a positive way. ⓘ | 95% | 98% | Very low |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 parents. From parent survey. N = 260.

Wayne State University.

### 3.2.C. MINIMAL BULLYING

The table below lists the percent of 4<sup>th</sup>- to 12<sup>th</sup>-grade students at this grantee and statewide who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the following statements about bullying. ***Note: Low scores are good.***

| **Table 59. Bullying: Percent of Students Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *At this program…* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| At this program, other kids make fun of me for things I do. ⓘ | 10% | 25% | Very low |
| At this program, I feel left out. ⓘ | 6% | 15% | Very low |
| I feel pressured by other kids to do things I don't want to do. | 7% | 21% | Very low |
| I feel like I don't belong. | 6% | 16% | Very low |
| There are cliques (groups of kids who stick together and leave other kids out). | 18% | 39% | Very low |
| Kids at this program have made inappropriate sexual comments, jokes, or gestures. | 14% | 34% | Very low |
| I was discriminated against because of my gender, race, ethnicity, disability, or sexual orientation. | 4% | 13% | Very low |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 students. From student survey. N = 382.

### 3.2.D. STUDENTS REPORT FEW PROGRAM MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS

The table below lists the percent of 4<sup>th</sup>- to 12<sup>th</sup>-grade students at this grantee and statewide who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the following statements about program management problems. ***Note: Low scores are good.***

| **Table 60. Program Management Problems: Percent of Students Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *At this program…* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Staff punish kids without finding out what really happened. ⓘ | 20% | 29% | Low |
| Things get out of control. ⓘ | 9% | 34% | Very low |
| Kids have to wait around a lot. ⓘ | 9% | 27% | Very low |
| Staff yell a lot. ⓘ | 13% | 31% | Very low |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 students. From student survey. N = 382.

Wayne State University.

## 3.2.E. PROGRAM SATISFACTION

The table below lists the percent of 4th- to 12th-grade students at this grantee and statewide who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the following statements about the program. This table is not part of the leading indicators, but is available for program improvement purposes.

| Table 61. Program Satisfaction: Percent of Students Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Survey item* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| At this program, I feel safe. | 94% | 88% | High |
| I miss being at this program when I don't come. | 76% | 72% | Average |
| I have fun when I'm at this program. | 94% | 88% | High |
| I really like coming to this program. | 94% | 85% | Very high |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 students. From student survey. N = 382.

## 3.2.F. PARENT RATING ON THE PROGRAM

The table below lists the percent of parents at this grantee and statewide who gave their child's program a grade of A, B, C, D or F. This table is not part of the leading indicators, but is available for program improvement purposes.

| Table 62. Parent Rating on the Program: Percent of Parents by Grade They Gave Program | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Grade* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| A    Excellent | 63% | 65% | Average |
| B    Good | 29% | 29% | Average |
| C    Fair | 7% | 5% | Average |
| D /F    Unsatisfactory or F Failing | 1% | 0% | Average |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 parents. From parent survey. N = 260.

Wayne State University.

## 3.3. LEADING INDICATOR: COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS

*Indicator Description: Program has relationships with community partners that contribute to sustainability and quality.*

ⓘ  3.3.1  Co-funded student opportunities (from ARF survey, not presented here)

ⓘ  3.3.2  Advisory committee represents multiple stakeholder groups (from ARF survey, not presented here)

ⓘ  3.3.3  In-kind contributions (from ARF survey, not presented here)

---

## 3.4. LEADING INDICATOR: FAMILY COMMUNICATION

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

The specific measures for the indicator *Family Communication* are:

ⓘ  3.4.1  Staff report of program communication with parents (Table 63, Table 64)

ⓘ  3.4.2  Parent report of program communication with parents (Table 65Table 64)

Family engagement opportunities (Table 66)

---

### 3.4.A. STAFF REPORT OF PROGRAM COMMUNICATION WITH PARENTS

The table below lists the percent of staff at this grantee and statewide who communicate with parents at least three to five times per year.

| Table 63. Parent Communication Frequency: Percent of Staff Reported At Least 3 to 5 Times Per Year | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *How often do you or other staff…* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Send materials about program offerings home to parents.  ⓘ | 67% | 80% | Low |
| Send information home about how the student is progressing in the program.  ⓘ | 54% | 57% | Average |
| Hold events or meetings to which parents are invited.  ⓘ | 52% | 62% | Average |
| Have conversations with parents over the phone.  ⓘ | 68% | 71% | Average |
| Meet with a student's parents to talk about the student's progress.  ⓘ | 57% | 61% | Average |
| Ask for input from parents on what and how activities should be provided.  ⓘ | 33% | 49% | Low |

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

Wayne State University.

The table below lists the percent of staff at this grantee and statewide who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the following statements.

| Table 64. Parent Communication Efforts: Percent of Staff Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Survey item | Your grantee | Statewide | Your grantee compared to state |
| I keep parents informed about how their child is doing in the after-school program. | 73% | 74% | Average |
| We offer family events at this program. | 73% | 86% | Low |
| When parents arrive at the program I greet them. | 93% | 92% | Average |
| I inform parents family events they can go to. | 61% | 78% | Very low |
| I treat parents in a positive way. | 93% | 98% | Very low |
| When we send an email or flyer to the parents, we make sure it is easy for them to read or understand. | 83% | 94% | Very low |
| When parents have a question, concern, or comment about the program, I or somebody else gets back to them right away. | 95% | 97% | Average |
| I ask parents about their child's progress or activities at home or school. | 70% | 74% | Average |

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

## 3.4.B. PARENT REPORT OF PROGRAM COMMUNICATION WITH PARENTS

The table below lists the percent of parents at this grantee and statewide who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the following statements about the program's communication and family involvement opportunities.

| Table 65. Parent Communication with Staff: Percent of Parents Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Survey item | Your grantee | Statewide | Your grantee compared to state |
| The program informs me about family events that I can go to. ⓘ | 81% | 93% | Very low |
| Staff keep me informed about how my child is doing. ⓘ | 85% | 90% | Very low |
| I attend family events at this program. ⓘ | 64% | 78% | Very low |
| When I receive an email or flyer from the program, it is easy for me to read or understand. | 90% | 96% | Very low |
| If I have a question, concern, or comment about the program, somebody get back to me right away. | 93% | 96% | Very low |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 parents. From parent survey. N= 260.

## 3.4.C. FAMILY ENGAGEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

The table below lists the percent of parents at this grantee and statewide who reported they would take advantage of the following opportunities if offered.

| Table 66. Family Engagement Opportunities: Percent of Parents Who Would Take Advantage If Opportunities Offered | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Survey item | Your grantee | Statewide | Your grantee compared to state |
| Transportation to or from the program | 75% | 70% | Average |
| Networking opportunities with other families | 61% | 54% | High |
| Adult education classes | 49% | 42% | High |
| Workshops on building positive family relationship | 63% | 65% | Average |
| Workshops to help my child to be successful at school | 77% | 81% | Average |
| To be part of the program advisory board | 41% | 36% | High |
| Providing information on community resources available | 64% | 64% | Average |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 parents. From parent survey. N= 260.

Wayne State University.

# Domain 4. STUDENT OUTCOMES

Student 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 positive student outcomes *result* from a high-quality program. Data on student outcomes are presented here to let you see whether your grantee is meeting the goals you have set for student outcomes and where the program stands in regard to federal targets. Please note that federal targets have not been updated for a number of years. For that reason, we include the target areas (e.g., improvement in grades), but no specific target numbers.

## 4.1. IMPROVEMENT IN GRADES

### 4.1.A. ALL REGULAR STUDENTS (FEDERAL TARGET)

The table below shows the percent of ALL students who attended at least 30 days who improved at least one-half grade in reading or math grades from fall to spring for your grantee and statewide.

| Table 67. Improvement in Grades among Regular Students: Percent of All Regular Students Who Improved | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Outcome | Your grantee | Statewide | Your grantee compared to state |
| Reading/English grades | 28% | 32% | Low |
| Math grades | 30% | 37% | Low |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 regular students (attended at least 30 days). From school outcomes data. Reading N = 325, math N = 310.

### 4.1.B. REGULAR STUDENTS WITH ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT

The table below shows the percent of students who attended at least 30 days who had room for improvement and improved at least one-half grade in reading or math grades fall to spring for your grantee and statewide.

| Table 68. Improvement in Grades among Regular Students with Room for Improvement: Percent of Regular Students with Room for Improvement Who Improved | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Outcome | Your grantee | Statewide | Your grantee compared to state |
| Reading/English grades | 39% | 42% | Average |
| Math grades | 38% | 45% | Low |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 regular students (attended at least 30 days) who had fall grades of below 3.0. From school outcomes data. Reading N = 220, math N = 234.

Wayne State University.

## 4.1.C. REGULAR STUDENTS COMPARED TO NON-REGULAR STUDENTS

The table below shows improvement in grades for students who attended at least 30 days (regulars) compared to students who attended less than 30 days (non-regulars). **This includes only students 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 students should have improved than non-regular students.

- Fewer regular students should show no change or a decline than non-regular students

| **Table 69. Changes in Reading Grades: Percent of Regular vs. Non-Regular Students with Room for Improvement** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Outcome* | *Regular students* | *Non-regular students* | *Regular compared to non-regular students* |
| Improved | 39% | 36% | Average |
| No change | 28% | 32% | Average |
| Declined | 33% | 32% | Average |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 students  who had fall grades of below 3.0 in each group. From school outcomes data. Regulars N = 220, non-regulars N = 353.

| **Table 70.  Changes in Math Grades: Percent of Regular vs. Non-Regular Students With Room for Improvement** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Outcome* | *Regular students* | *Non-regular students* | *Regular compared to non-regular students* |
| Improved | 38% | 39% | Average |
| No change | 25% | 29% | Average |
| Declined | 37% | 32% | High |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 students who had fall grades of below 3.0 in each group. From school outcomes data. Regulars N = 234, non-regulars N = 349.

Wayne State University.

## 4.2. TEACHER RATINGS

### 4.2.A. FEDERAL TARGETS

The table below shows the percent of regularly attending students whose teachers said students had improved at school.

| Table 71. Teacher Ratings on Overall School Performance: Percent of Regular Students Who Improved | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Outcome | Your grantee | Statewide | Your grantee compared to state |
| Teacher ratings, behavior | 73% | 74% | Average |
| Teacher ratings, homework and classroom participation | 72% | 73% | Average |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 regular students (attended at least 30 days) who initially had room for improvement. From teacher survey. N = 292.

### 4.2.B. SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS

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

| Table 72. Teacher Ratings on Specific School Activities: Percent of Regular Students Who Improved | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Outcome | Your grantee | Statewide | Your grantee compared to state |
| Turning in homework on time. | 61% | 63% | Average |
| Completing homework to your satisfaction. | 66% | 65% | Average |
| Participating in class. | 64% | 65% | Average |
| Volunteering. | 46% | 50% | Average |
| Attending class regularly. | 43% | 47% | Average |
| Being attentive in class. | 58% | 57% | Average |
| Behaving well in class. | 58% | 54% | Average |
| Academic performance. | 65% | 68% | Average |
| Coming to school motivated to learn. | 57% | 58% | Average |
| Getting along well with other students. | 51% | 55% | Average |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 regular students (attended at least 30 days) who initially had room for improvement. From teacher survey. N = 292.

Wayne State University.

## 4.3. PARTICIPANT PERCEPTIONS OF PROGRAM IMPACT

### 4.3.A. STUDENT PERCEPTIONS

#### 4.3.A.1. Program helps with academic and non-academic areas

Students were asked to rate how the program helped them improve in various areas. The ratings were from "Not at all" to "I was already great at this." The table below shows the percent of  students who perceived the program helped them improve "some" or "a lot" in the targeted academic and non-academic areas. Your grantee may not offer activities that would be expected to make a difference in all of these areas. In that case, improvement would be expected to be low in those areas.

| Outcome | Your grantee | Statewide | Your grantee compared to state |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Table 73. Program Helped with Academic and Non-Academic Areas: Percent of Students Reported the Program Helped Some or a Lot** | | | |
| **ACADEMIC AREAS** | | | |
| Reading, English, language arts, writing. | 75% | 69% | High |
| Math. | 70% | 69% | Average |
| Science/technology | 77% | 65% | Very high |
| Other school subjects (science, social studies). | 67% | 63% | Average |
| **NON-ACADEMIC AREAS** | | | |
| Sports, athletic, physical activities. | 51% | 68% | Very low |
| Working with computers/internet | 71% | 66% | Average |
| Creative skills, like art, music, dance, drama. | 66% | 67% | Average |
| Staying away from drugs and alcohol. | 73% | 70% | Average |
| Making and keeping friends. | 76% | 72% | Average |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 students who initially had room for improvement. From student survey. N = 382.

#### 4.3.A.2. Program helps with school commitment

Students were asked to rate to what extent the program changed their feelings about school. The ratings were from "Not at all" to "I already did this a lot." The table below shows the percent of students who believed the program helped change their perception of school commitment "some" or "a lot".

| Outcome | Your grantee | Statewide | Your grantee compared to state |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Table 74. Program Helped with School Commitment: Percent of Students Reported the Program Helped Some or a Lot** | | | |
| Care more about getting good grades. | 80% | 77% | Average |
| Think that success in school would help you have a good life when you grow up. | 86% | 81% | High |
| Look forward to coming to school more because of this program. | 73% | 71% | Average |
| Because of this program, I have more interest in going to college. | 85% | 74% | Very high |
| Because of this program, I think that doing well in school is important for having a successful career. | 87% | 82% | High |

Note. Data are presented if available for at least 15 students. From student survey. N = 382.

Wayne State University.

### 4.3.A.3. Program helps with healthy eating

Students were asked to rate to what extent the program helped them with getting healthy food or learning about nutrition. The table below shows the percent of students who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that the program helped them in the area of health and nutrition.

| Table 75. Program Helped with Healthy Eating: Percent of Students Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| At this program… | Your grantee | Statewide | Your grantee compared to state |
| I eat fruits and vegetables at this program. | 67% | 69% | Average |
| This program teaches me what healthy foods are. | 67% | 68% | Average |
| This program teaches me how to read nutrition facts on food packages. | 59% | 54% | Average |
| This program teaches me that what I eat matters for my health. | 70% | 70% | Average |
| I get to learn how to make healthy food at this program. | 60% | 65% | Average |
| I drink water every day at this program | 71% | 73% | Average |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 students. From student survey. N = 382.

### 4.3.A.4. Program helps with increasing physical activity

Students were asked to rate to what extent the program helped them become physically active. The table below shows the percent of students who "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that the program helped them with physical activity.

| Table 76. Program Helped with Physical Activities: Percent of Students Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| At this program… | Your grantee | Statewide | Your grantee compared to state |
| The physical activities at this program are interesting and fun. | 81% | 85% | Low |
| I get to do physical activities at this program that I wouldn't get to do otherwise. | 64% | 69% | Average |
| This program teaches me how to be physically active to improve my health. | 71% | 76% | Low |
| I don't get to do enough physical activity at this program, reversed (the higher the better) | 47% | 62% | Very low |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 students. From student survey. N = 382.

### 4.3.A.5. Program helps with building prosocial skills

Students were asked to rate to what extent the program allowed them to build prosocial skills. The table below shows the percent of students who rated that the program allowed "some" or "a lot" of those types of experiences.

| Table 77. Program Helped with Prosocial Skills: Percent of Students Reported the Program Helped Some or a Lot | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| At this program… | Your grantee | Statewide | Your grantee compared to state |
| Learned about helping others. | 84% | 74% | Very high |
| I was able to change my school or community for the better. | 57% | 56% | Average |
| Learned to stand up for something I believed was morally right. | 74% | 69% | High |
| We discussed morals and values. | 70% | 60% | High |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 students. From student survey. N = 382.

Wayne State University.

### 4.3.A.6. Program helps with building teamwork

Students were asked to rate to what extent the program helped them build teamwork. The table below shows the percent of students who rated that the program allowed "some" or "a lot" of those types of experiences.

| Table 78. Program Helped with Teamwork: Percent of Students Reported the Program Helped Some or a Lot | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *At this program…* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Learned that working together requires some compromising. | 83% | 73% | Very high |
| Became better at sharing responsibility. | 81% | 72% | Very high |
| Learned to be patient with other group members. | 81% | 81% | High |
| Learned how my emotions and attitude affect others in the group. | 77% | 69% | High |
| Learned that it is not necessary to like people in order to work with them. | 78% | 68% | Very high |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 students. From student survey. N = 382.

### 4.3.A.7. Program helps with developing leadership skills

Students were asked to rate to what extent the program allowed them to build leadership skills. The table below shows the percent of students who rated that the program allowed "some" or "a lot" of those types of experiences.

| Table 79. Program Helped with Leadership: Percent of Students Reported the Program Helped Some or a Lot | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *At this program…* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Learned about the challenges of being a leader. | 73% | 68% | High |
| Others in this program counted on me. | 65% | 63% | Average |
| Had an opportunity to be in charge of a group of peers. | 62% | 57% | High |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 students. From student survey. N = 382.

### 4.3.A.8. Program helps with social emotional learning

Students were asked to rate to what extent the program promoted their social-emotional learning. The table below shows the percent of students who rated that the program allowed "some" or "a lot" of those types of experiences.

| Table 80. Program Helped with Social-emotional Learning: Percent of Students Reported the Program Helped Some or a Lot | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *At this program…* | *Your grantee* | *Statewide* | *Your grantee compared to state* |
| Learned about controlling my temper. | 61% | 54% | High |
| Became better at dealing with fear and anxiety. | 62% | 54% | High |
| Became better at handling stress. | 66% | 56% | Very high |
| Learned that my emotions affect how I perform. | 74% | 65% | High |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 students. From student survey. N = 382.

Wayne State University.

## 4.3.B. PARENT PERCEPTIONS OF PROGRAM IMPACT

Parents were asked to rate how the program helped their child improve in various areas. The ratings were from "Not at all" to "My child was already great at this." The table below shows the percent of parents who perceived the program helped their child improve "some" or "a lot" in the targeted academic and non-academic areas. Your program may not offer activities that would be expected to make a difference in all of these areas. In that case, improvement would be expected to be low.

| Table 81. Parent Perceptions of Program Impact: Percent of Parents Reporting Some or a Lot of Student Improvement | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Outcome | Your grantee | Statewide | Your grantee compared to state |
| **ACADEMIC AREAS** | | | |
| Reading, English, language arts, writing. | 82% | 90% | Very low |
| Math. | 82% | 88% | Very low |
| Science/technology. | 86% | 85% | Average |
| Other school subjects (science, social studies). | 74% | 83% | Very low |
| **HELP WITH SCHOOL PERFORMANCE** | | | |
| Get better grades. | 91% | 91% | Average |
| Complete homework. | 87% | 91% | Low |
| **ACADEMIC ENGAGEMENT** | | | |
| Because of this program, my child cares more about getting good grades. | 88% | 89% | Average |
| Because of this program, my child thinks that success in school will help them have a good life when they grow up. | 87% | 90% | Low |
| My child looks forward to coming to school more because of this program. | 86% | 89% | Low |
| Because of this program, my child is more interested in going to college. | 89% | 81% | High |
| Because of this program, my child thinks that doing well in school is important for having a successful career. | 94% | 88% | High |
| **NON-ACADEMIC AREAS** | | | |
| Sports, athletic, physical activities. | 46% | 83% | Very low |
| Working with computers/internet | 78% | 83% | Low |
| Creative skills, like art, music, dance, drama. | 72% | 86% | Very low |
| Staying away from drugs and alcohol. | 85% | 85% | Average |
| Making and keeping friends. | 84% | 91% | Very low |

*Note.* Data are presented if available for at least 15 parents whose child initially had room for improvement. From parent survey. N = 260.