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MEETING NORMS

01 ENGAGE!
Actively engage with us and one another. When you feel comfortable, keep your camera on.

02 LISTEN!
Actively listen to and respect each others’ experiences and shares.

03 SHARE!
Interact and share using the Zoom platform (i.e., unmute, reactions, chatbox).
Afterschool for Children and Teens Now (ACT Now) is a statewide coalition that works to ensure there are high-quality, affordable afterschool/OST programs available for youth across the state of Illinois.

Advocacy  
Connecting Stakeholders  
Professional Development  
Technical Assistance
FACILITATORS

NIKKI GILLANI
she/her
Afterschool Resources & Support Specialist (School Partnerships)

EMILY SHAYMAN
PhD, MSW, PEL73
she/her
School Social Worker
Assistant Professor of Social Work
Director, Lewis U Community Schools Consortium
Faculty Advisor, Office of Community Engaged Learning
Evaluator, 21st Century Community Learning Centers
Lewis University
eshayman@lewisu.edu
PURPOSE

Alert and inform school districts of the opportunities available to expand afterschool using COVID relief funding.

Network and share best practices or opportunities to collaborate in the youth development field.
SERIES GOALS

01. ESTABLISH A BASELINE
   Understand the current state of afterschool in Illinois

02. LEARN HOW TO LEVERAGE RESOURCES
   Utilize available community partners and funding to expand afterschool

03. CREATE SUSTAINABLE OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH
   Prepare for programming post ARP funding
SEVEN SESSIONS OVERVIEW

AUGUST 31, 2022
The Scope of Afterschool in Illinois

SEPT. 22, 2022
Designing Programming with a Needs Assessment and Asset Mapping

OCT. 25, 2022
Connecting With Community Partners

NOV. 30, 2022
Sustainability Planning for After ESSER Funding

JAN. 17, 2023
Curricula and Activities

FEB. 23, 2023
Program Assessment
School districts must spend $20\%$ of ARP funds on learning loss
- Afterschool is an allowable use!

ISBE’s projects through ESSER II & III:
- High impact tutoring; community schools; bridge programs; assessment

ISBE granted funding to EBF districts for learning loss, summer enrichment, and afterschool
## ESSER Funds Summary - State of IL – LEA (90%) – As of 9/28/22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>$ Allocated</th>
<th>$ Expended</th>
<th>$ Unexpended</th>
<th>% Expended</th>
<th>Obligation By</th>
<th>Liquidation By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESSER I</td>
<td>$ 512,520,496</td>
<td>$ 504,400,321</td>
<td>$ 8,120,175</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>9/30/2022</td>
<td>1/28/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSER II</td>
<td>$ 2,025,724,402</td>
<td>$ 1,583,690,907</td>
<td>$ 442,033,495</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>9/30/2023</td>
<td>1/28/2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSER III*</td>
<td>$ 4,856,233,714</td>
<td>$ 944,910,483</td>
<td>$ 3,911,323,231</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>9/30/2024</td>
<td>1/28/2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 7,394,478,612</td>
<td>$ 3,033,001,711</td>
<td>$ 4,361,476,901</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Sustainability Timeline & Template**

**Before**
- Planning meeting, research, and goal setting

**Summer 2021**
- Conduct focused conversations about delving down.
- Discontinue services that are least impactful.

**Ongoing**
- Spend, monitor, amend, and ask questions

**Winter of 2021, 2022, & 2023**
- Conduct focused conversations about delving down.
- Discontinue services that are least impactful.
- Investigate ROI, analyze data, find funding sources to continue what is working

**Final Year**
- Fall 2024
Plan your Activities

1. Organizing Centers
   - What units of study are worthy of time and energy?

2. Choose your Standards
   - What needs do your students have that you can address in OST?

3. Identify your Outcomes
   - How will you know if your program has been a success?

4. Plan your Activities
   - How can you use Project Based Learning to meet your goals?
Today’s Agenda

What is assessment and evaluation?
- Big-picture thinking
- FAQs

How to do program assessment & evaluation
- Putting your pieces together
- Group discussion
Why do we need a **systematic process**?

- To avoid everyday errors in personal observations, like:
  - Selective or inaccurate observation
  - Overgeneralization
  - Illogical Reasoning
  - Resistance to change
  - Adherence to authority

- And - So that we can fit our observations into broader streams of thinking.

Assessment & Evaluation: Becoming an Investigator, a Researcher

“Research is a **systematic process** where we attempt to separate fact from fiction”
### Types of RESEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exploratory</th>
<th>Explanatory</th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
<th>Mixed-Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting a foothold, learning how to ask questions.</td>
<td>Explaining causes and effects, testing observations or theories</td>
<td>Use of numbers to examine trends, correlations, patterns, etc.</td>
<td>Use of words, observations; about depth of understanding</td>
<td>Combining both approaches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EVALUATION

- Seeing whether what we are doing is working.
Questions come from the researcher
Meant to be generalizable across settings
Role of researcher is unbiased, separate
Confidentiality (IRB) - anonymity is (usually) possible

Research

Questions come from the program and/or its stakeholders
Meant to be used by and for the program (staff, participants, etc.)
Role confusing with unclear boundaries; role conflicts
Confidentiality (FERPA, HIPAA, etc.) - You know your students!

Evaluation

Research seeks to prove. Evaluation seeks to IMPROVE.
WHY we do evaluations

- To **ensure intentionality** - that we are implementing the program intentionally
- So that we **(better) understand, gain insight** about…
  - **Inputs** (resources)
  - **Outputs** (products)
  - **Processes** (what services, activities, interventions look like, & how they happen)
  - **Goals** (changes over time)
  - **Outcomes** (attainment, performance levels)
- To **build capacity** - Increase funding, enhance skills, strengthen accountability, etc.
Consider using a Logic Model to answer the question: "Does the logic of this program actually work?"
F_{(and-less-F)}AQs
What should be in the evaluation?

Think about the Who, What, When, & Where... leading to the Why.

Culturally Responsive Evaluation

“We suggest that cultural competence in evaluation is not a function of a static set of prescribed steps, but is achieved via ongoing reflection, correction, and adaptation”

(Botcheva, Shih & Huffman, 2009).
What should be in the evaluation?

Think about the Who, What, When, & Where... leading to the Why.

Who
- Student demographics: Gender, Grade-level/Age, Race/Ethnicity, Language, Family Income, IEP/Disability, Address, etc.
- Leadership team (administrators, staff, families and students, etc.)

What
- Breadth and scope of activities of services: What CAN vs. CANNOT occur? What DOES vs. DOES NOT occur? Internal and/or external services? Academics? Social emotional learning? Recreation? Field trips?
- Professional development/training
- Food, other resources

When
- Program hours, days, consistency, schedule/routine, time of year, etc.

Where
- Where is the program? (How many locations? Consistency? Accessibility? Transportation? etc.)
How often do I evaluate the program?

There is no ‘one’ answer to this question...

- What are the requirements?
- What are the questions you are wanting to answer?
- What are the resources available?
- How useful is the process?

and think about...

Formative vs. Summative Evaluation
Process vs. Outcomes Evaluation
Who should do the evaluation?

Think about the benefits & limitations of implementing an internal vs. external evaluation.

Internal Evaluation
Implemented in-house, by staff/stakeholders of the program.

**Benefits:** “Insider knowledge”, flexibility, free(?), Voice, And more

**Limitations:** Bias, Required resources (time, capacity), Increases role confusion, And more

External Evaluation
Implemented by person(s) outside of/distinct from the program.

**Benefits:** Experts, Outside/Neutral*, perspective, Support & partnership, And more

**Limitations:** Still requires in-house collaboration/coordination, Cost, Cultural relevance, And more
Let’s talk about **Stakeholders**.

**Stakeholder** = A person invested and/or impacted by the program.

“**Who helps to plan the evaluation?”**

...is different than...

“**Whose voice is [in] the evaluation?”**
What are the most common reasons for challenging evaluations?

**Ineffective evaluations could occur when...**

- The plan for the evaluation is not culturally relevant.
- Program goals are not agreed on and/or they are not realistic.
- Information needs are not well defined (i.e., no understanding of the inputs, outputs, process goals).
- Evaluation data are not practically or feasibly obtainable.
- Intended users are not willing or able to use the evaluation info.

There are times when it could be challenging (or impossible?!?) to obtain effective information from an evaluation.
Other questions?

DOING evaluation!
First things first...

**WHAT are the questions you are seeking to answer?**

➔ What do you want (or need) to know about your PROCESS (inputs, activities, outputs)?
➔ What do you want (or need) to know about your OUTCOMES (lasting change)?

Write your evaluation questions in the chat...

Think about...
- What are your community’s strengths & needs?
- What growth do you expect and/or hope to see?
- What outcomes are you seeking?
- What services are you offering?
- WHY are you performing this assessment?
Second things next...

HOW will you answer those questions?

➔ What data do you ALREADY have?
➔ What data could you EASILY have?

Write your ideas in the chat...
Types of DATA (i.e., info.)

Data you ALREADY have

- Program attendance
- Daily plans (lesson plans)
- Contracts with community partners
- Calendars (program dates, field trips, meetings, activities, etc.)
- School-day attendance*
- Assessment data*

Data you EASILY have

- Observations (make them systematic)
- Recordings (qualitative data)
- Student work (copy, scan documents)
- Newsletters, emails, communications
- Community, family, staff feedback (bin, mailbox, email, etc.)
- Professional development evaluations
Types of DATA (i.e., info.)

Data you COULD have

- Survey responses (family surveys, student surveys, teacher surveys, staff surveys, etc.)
- Focus group
- Standardized/Normed vs Informal Rating Scale
- and more…

IMPORTANT! All data should be PRACTICAL and obtainable in FEASIBLE ways!!!
Let’s DO some evaluation!
Imagine you are at the end of your first year of programming. Try to answer the questions / respond to the prompts posed in the document.

As you attempt to enter information, consider:
- What data would you need to collect throughout the year in order to best complete this document? And, how can you feasibly/practically do so?
- Which questions are important for your organization’s program (and which are not)?
- What may be necessary to revise/modify in order to ensure that your evaluation report is culturally responsive and relevant?
How did it go?

LET’S REVIEW AN EXAMPLE EVALUATION.
Implementation was modified/changed due to impacts of COVID-19, and the necessary adjustments to programming within the district. The following table demonstrates the proposed evaluation design in comparison to the implemented evaluation design:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals &amp; Objective</th>
<th>Evaluation Design Proposed</th>
<th>Evaluation Design Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 1, Objective A:</strong> Participants will demonstrate increased levels of academic proficiency on IAR Math and ELA assessments. Measurable outcome: Students taking the IAR will score a 4 or 5 on Math and ELA. Among students scoring lower, 10% will increase scores from the 2020 assessment.</td>
<td>Scores from IAR Math and ELA assessments will be gathered to determine students’ academic achievement. After two years of these measures are available and thereafter, measures will be compared year to year.</td>
<td>Scores from IAR Math and ELA assessments will be gathered to determine students’ academic achievement. Of students scoring 1, 2, 3, their scores were analyzed by percentage of students who increased scores from 2019 to 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 2, Objective A:</strong> Participants will demonstrate increased school attendance. Measurable outcome: Attendees</td>
<td>In-school attendance rates during the school-year program will be retrieved from InfiniteCampus. Individual student report cards will be collected and submitted to the evaluation team as needed. Program staff will maintain attendance records for program participation, and submit these records to the evaluation team.</td>
<td>The evaluation of this objective remains generally the same. Attendance rates pre- and post-program enrollment were obtained, and 21st CCLC program staff maintained rigorous attendance records during the program, and submitted these records to the evaluation team. Analysis, however, required attention to the...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CCCLC and colleagues, teachers, student support personnel and administrators, knowing the 21st CCLC team was finding that schools were misunderstanding the program goals and rationale, the Program Director urged all Program Coordinators to present at staff meetings, talk with their school’s administrators and meet with colleagues to discuss best practices for 21st CCLC and seek buy-in from school staff. Program Coordinators expressed that while they found it difficult to initially receive the buy-in they aimed to see, they believed that these efforts did increase recruitment and retention in the long-run. Additionally, the Program Director met with all school principals throughout the year to ensure strong connection and integration of 21st CCLC programming within the school during school hours.

**COVID-19 Flexibility:** In order to ensure access to programming, site coordinators remained flexible in their recruitment and retention strategies due to the COVID-19 pandemic. While protocol required specific steps and actions, site coordinators maintained that in order to reach the students who most needed this program’s support and opportunities, they needed to be more flexible than originally planned. Therefore, most sites maintained lax attendance policies, aiming to be inclusive of any and all participation rather than enforce required consistency.

**Figure 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21CCCLC Student Recruitment Formula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review students enrolled in the previous year. Of those students:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review all students in your school who qualify for free/reduced lunch:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review all students who are absent from school more than 7% of the time:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check with school administrators, non-homecoming teachers, social worker, psychologist, ELL coordinator, and Learning Environment Coordinator. Ask for student referrals based on (lack of) social interactions, (lack of) school engagement, (need for) staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. DEG Academic Year Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Unduplicated Enrollment</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>Total Unduplicated Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) # of students attending ≤ 30 days (Note: 15 hrs is approx. 5 days; 16-45 hrs is approx. 6-15 days; 46-90 hrs is approx. 16-30 days)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) # of students attending &lt;15 hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) # of students attending 16-45 hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) # of students attending 46-90 hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) # of students attending 30-59 days</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) # of students attending 91-180 hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) # of students attending 60-89 days</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) # of students attending 181-270 hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) # of students attending 90+ days</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) # of students attending 271+ hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. DEG Average Daily Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEG Elementary School</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Average Daily Attendance (ADA)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>27.84</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA for Afterschool Program</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA for Summer Program</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>15.89</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEG enrollment and attendance analysis discussion:**

With 47 total students participating in 2021 and 97 students participating in 2022, enrollment at DEG shows growth between its first and second year of programming. The first full year of programming allowed for more hours of participation per student as well. Summer trends, while not as stark, also show growth between summer 2021 and summer 2022 programs. Average daily attendance at DEG shows growth in number of student participants on a daily basis between the two years of programming (2021 to 2022), and also shows that programming during the academic year (after school) has thus far been larger in size on a daily basis than summer programming. Program leaders may want to support summer recruitment efforts in different and/or more intentional ways during the academic year programming to increase summer enrollment and consistent participation. Additionally, ADA (during the academic year) equals just 38.14% of total enrollment numbers, which could be another area of improvement in subsequent years.
V. Overall Summary and Recommendations

The quantitative and qualitative data collected for this program evaluation shows immense progress for these schools during 2021-2022. Overall, the five sites in this program demonstrate numerous successes to note, along with some areas for growth.

Strengths, Improvements, and Successes during FY 2021-2022

Successfully completing a full year of programming, which as of July 2022, also comprehensively includes two summer program sessions, one full session, and two spring sessions.

Navigating the implementation of five school-based program sites during the height of the Covid-19 pandemic, which some experts claim to be the most intense, difficult years of educational/school-based programming in recent history.

Providing programming for 391 students during the 2021-2022 academic year and 233 students during the Summer 2022 program. This is an increase from 230 students during the 2020-2021 academic year, and 128 students during Summer 2021.

Implementing 11 family engagement events with 21st CCLC funding, which served families from all five 21st CCLC school sites.

Averaging, across the five sites, over 22 weeks of programming during the academic year sessions, and almost four weeks of programming during the Summer 2022 session.

Finding innovative ways to recruit and retain staff members from both within and external to the school district, including an array of professionals including, but not limited to: classroom teachers, special education teachers, librarians, paraprofessionals, school mental health practitioners (counselors, social workers, psychologists), Family and Community Liaisons, administrative assistants, school nurses, and more. The diverse professional experiences and expertise allows for students and families to find numerous types of support and services via relationships formed in 21st CCLC. The partnerships bring external community partners to the school sites allowing for stronger connections between families and their surrounding communities.

Organizing and participating in the National Community Schools and Family Engagement Conference, which allowed 21st CCLC and other relevant employees to discover new approaches and strategies to engage their students and school community.

Meeting Objective One, as more than 10% of Cohort 4 students scoring a 1, 2, or 3 on both the 2019 and 2020 TAKS ELA and math assessments increased their score in 2022 as compared to their score in 2019. Increasing attendance rates for students who had previously been experiencing chronic absences (of the 99 students who had been experiencing chronic absenteeism (below 90% attendance) prior to participation in 21st CCLC, 74.7% increased their rate of attendance after enrollment in the program.

Areas for Improvement and Related Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area(s) for Improvement</th>
<th>Relevant recommendation(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program sites, while enrolling adequate numbers of student participants, had significantly lower rates of average daily attendance (ADA). For example, AMS enrolled 107 students but had an average of 30 students attending daily (average ADA = 28.04% of total enrollment). NMD enrolled 84 students but had an average of 25 students attending daily (average ADA = 26.9% of total enrollment). DSG enrolled 97 students but had an average of 37 students attending daily (average ADA = 38.14% of total enrollment). LNT enrolled 116 students but had an average of 40 students attending daily (average ADA = 34.48% of total enrollment). JAS enrolled 95 students but had an average of 16 students attending daily (average ADA = 16.84% of total enrollment).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The measurable outcome about “School Belonging” for Objective 2 (that all 21st CCLC participants rate 3, 4, or 5 about school belonging on the Panorama Social Emotional Assessment) was not met. Cohort 4 results showed the 14.7% of participants rated a 1 (not at all) or 2 (a little) |

The Panorama Social Emotional Assessment showed that there was a slight decrease in the average score for social awareness from Fall 2021 to Spring 2022, though this was not a statistically significant difference. Across “emotional regulation” questions, an average of 32.3% of students showed a decrease in “emotional regulation” scores from Fall 2021 to Spring 2022. However, an average of 35.04% showed an increase in “emotional regulation” scores, and 32.4% showed no change in score from Fall 2021 to Spring 2022. (See Progress Toward Objectives, Objective 3; page XX).

With Covid-related influences (restrictions, school closures, etc.) it is recommended that the Director and all program leaders develop a plan for addressing the...
Questions?
Concerns?
Thoughts?
Ideas?
Resources

- STEM Guidebook
- ANCAL
- Mizzen by Mott App
- ISBE Standards Page
- ISBE Title Grants Page
- Ensuring High Quality Curriculum by Angela Di Michele Lalor
Fill this out by 12:30pm today to be entered into a raffle for a $10 Target gift card!
VIRTUAL MULTI-STATE STEM CONFERENCE

March 14-15

Register Here!
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