Evaluation of the 2021–2022 Nita M. Lowey 21st Century Community Learning Centers

Arizona Department of Education Data Governance February 10, 2023



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Nita M. Lowey 21st Century Community Learning Center (21st CCLC) program is administered by the Arizona Department of Education (ADE). This evaluation project is needed to meet the federal requirements of the 21st CCLC legislation, Title IV Part B of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act*, as amended by the *Every Student Succeeds Act*, 20 U.S.C. § 6301 (2015).

This evaluation is a mixed mode analysis of the 21st CCLC program sites in Arizona. The evaluation includes an impact analysis of the effect of program participation on standardized mathematics and English language arts test scores and school-day attendance rates. The evaluation also includes a qualitative analysis of the site evaluation and customer service forms. The next aspect of the evaluation analyzes the effect of additional points given to applicants at rural sites. This evaluation also provides recommendations for future iterations of the 21st CCLC program in Arizona.

The impact evaluation first analyzes the extent to which participation in 21st CCLC programming affects student performance on standardized tests in mathematics and English language arts (ELA) and on school day attendance rates. Results of the analysis of program participation on mathematics assessment scores suggest that program participants in grades four and five had scores that were approximately 5 to 7 points higher than non-participants in the same grades. Additional analyses demonstrate that increased time in 21st CCLC programming equates to higher test scores in mathematics among students in grades four and five. The program had a positive effect on the ELA scores of students in grade four only. Specifically, program participants in grade four had ELA scores that were approximately 3.3 points higher than non-participants in grade four.

The difference between the school day attendance rates of program participants and nonparticipants ranged from 1.5 percentage points for students in grade four to 2.7 percentage points for students in grade eight. Further, results indicate that higher levels of program participation are also associated with higher attendance rates. Specifically, the attendance rates increase by .01 percent for each hour a student spends participating in program activities.

The results of the qualitative analysis found that approximately two-thirds of subgrantee sites reported meeting their family engagement goals. ADE program staff should investigate why one-third of subgrantee sites did not meet their goals. ADE program staff should also utilize site visits during future cycles to evaluate the implementation of family engagement activities offered by subgrantees. The next facet of this evaluation investigated potential opportunities for technical assistance (TA) and professional development (PD). The biggest needs for future TA activities as identified by subgrantee sites were ways to (1) increase student engagement; and (2) improve surveys, data collection, and data use. Additionally, several sites suggested

incorporating additional youth development in programming, as well as ways of enhancing and fostering community partnerships.

Starting in academic year 2021–22 (i.e., cycle 17), the application scoring process for new 21st CCLC subgrantees awarded two points to sites located in towns and four points to sites located in rural areas.¹ When comparing the demographic makeup to cycle 16, the results of this analysis show that awarding additional points to town and rural schools in cycle 17 increased the proportions of English language learners and students eligible for free or reduced-price lunches. However, the rural points also lowered the proportions of students who identify as American Indian or Alaska Native, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, and White. Additionally, cycle 17 also had a lower proportion of special education students compared to cycle 16.

Although results of this evaluation demonstrate some promising effects of participating in the 21st CCLC program, the benefits of participation on state assessment scores were limited to students in grades 4 and 5. Program staff should involve mathematics and English language arts subject matter experts to investigate ways to incorporate professional development for delivering lessons and tutoring to older students, most notably students in grades 6 through 8.

Program staff at ADE should investigate how to standardize data collection to improve continuous monitoring activities and evaluations with minimal impact on staff at subgrantee sites. This may be accomplished by using data collection applications, such as Google Forms, Survey Monkey, or another third-party application.

ADE program staff should also consider developing standardized pre- and post-test surveys for students and parents. This will ensure that all subgrantee sites are consistently gathering the same data from program participants and their parents, regardless of which subgrantee site they attend. Pre- and post-test surveys may help sites determine the course of program activities while providing consistent data for continuous monitoring and evaluation purposes.

¹ Site locale data provided by the US Department of Education's 2021–22 Common Core of Data (CCD) <u>https://nces.ed.gov/programs/edge/Geographic/SchoolLocations</u> retrieved on 11/30/22.

CONTENTS

FIGURES	iii
TABLES	iv
21 st CCLC Sites in Arizona	.v
INTRODUCTION	.1
21 st CCLC in Arizona	1
Grant Application and Award	1
Evaluation Context	2
ADE Program Staff	2
Continuous improvement	2
	_
PROGRAM EVALUATION	.4
Program Participants	4
Indicators Goals and Measures	5
Research Questions	5
IMPACT ANALYSIS	.7
Area of Common Support	8
Inverse Probability Weights	8
Covariate Balance	8
Analytic Sample	9
Research Question 1	.11
Mathematics Scores	.11
Mathematics Assessment Results by Participation Dosage	.12
English Language Arts Scores	.12
English Language Arts Assessment Results by Participation Dosage	.13
Research Question 2	.14
Attendance Rates	.14
Attendance Rates by Participation Dosage	.14
Impact Evaluation Summary	.15
QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS	16
Qualitativa Mathada	16
Qualitative Methods	10
CHART Coole	10
Subarantaa Salf Evaluations	17
Subgranice Sen-Evaluations Stratagias for Improvement	17
Research Augestion A	12
Qualitative Analysis Summary	19

RURAL PRIORITY POINTS	20
Research Question 5	20
Conclusions	21
REFERENCES	20
APPENDICES	21
Appendix A. Area of Common Support	22
Appendix B. Balance Tables	25
Appendix C. Site Evaluation Report Template, 2021-2022 Program Year	28
Appendix D. FY22 Customer Satisfaction Survey	43

FIGURES

Figure 1. Continuous Improvement Plan	3
Figure 2. Risk Levels	3
Figure 3. Student Characteristics Program Participants vs. All Arizona Students	4
Figure 4. Evaluation Indicators, Goals, and Measures	5
Figure 5. Student- and School-Level Propensity Score Model Covariates	7

TABLES

Table 1. Number of Program Participants and Non-Participants, by Grade and Total	10
Table 2. Unweighted Assessment Scores for Program Participants and Non-Participants, by Grade	.10
Table 3. Weighted Mathematics Assessment Scores, by Grade	11
Table 4. Weighted Mathematics Dosage, by Grade	12
Table 5. Weighted Assessment Scores for English Language Arts, by Grade	.13
Table 6. Weighted ELA Dosage, by Grade	13
Table 7. Weighted Attendance Rates, by Grade	14
Table 8. Weighted Attendance Dosage by Grade	14
Table 9. Change in Average Student Characteristics at Cycle 16 and Cycle 17 Sites, by Rural Status	.20



21st CCLC Sites in Arizona

Visit What is the 21st CCLC Grant Program for an in-depth review of Arizona's subgrantees.²

² Please see <u>https://www.azed.gov/21stcclc/whatis21stcclc</u> and select "Which Arizona schools' students are currently participating in the 21st CCLC program?" from the dropdown menu.

INTRODUCTION

The Nita M. Lowey 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) grant supports out-ofschool time programs through funding from the U.S. Department of Education.³ The goal of the 21st CCLC grant in Arizona is to boost student success in five key areas (i.e., student academic achievement, student behavioral change, family engagement, program quality, and student access). This evaluation is required by the Nita M. Lowey 21st CCLC legislation, Title IV Part B of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* as amended by the *Every Student Succeeds Act*, 20 U.S.C. § 6301 (2015).

21st CCLC in Arizona

Arizona's 21st CCLC subgrantees serve elementary and secondary students who attend highpoverty and low-performing schools, and its purpose is to improve academic achievement in mathematics and English language arts (ELA) among 21st CCLC program participants. Additional services, programs, and activities are also provided to students and their families that complement regular academic programs and encourage the academic success of students. The Arizona Department of Education (ADE) supports subgrantees through ongoing professional development (PD) opportunities, technical assistance (TA), and compliance monitoring throughout the course of each five-year award. In turn, subgrantees offer academic enrichment activities to students and family engagement activities to students and their adult family members.

Grant Application and Award

Subgrantees are selected through a competitive application process that adheres to federal and state statutes, regulations, and assurances. Eligible sites must have not less than 40 percent economically-disadvantaged students in the total school population, and a significant number of students who are in need of academic improvement regardless of the school's letter grade. Applicants are also judged on how well their proposed program goals and objectives are aligned to the goals and objectives their school and school improvement plans. Subgrantees are awarded funds for five years and must submit a budget request for approval. The dollar amount of the disbursement remains the same for the first three years of the grant cycle, with reductions in the fourth and fifth years to encourage Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to sustain the program and to develop strategies and partnerships over the five years of funding and beyond.

³ For more information, see https: <u>https://oese.ed.gov/offices/office-of-formula-grants/school-support-and-accountability/21st-century-community-learning-centers/performance-21st-century-community-learning-centers/</u> accessed February 27, 2023.

The most recent round of subgrantees, referred to as grant *cycle 17*, began offering program activities in the summer of 2021 and ended in the Spring of 2022.⁴

Evaluation Context

The results of 21st CCLC program in academic year 2021–22 (AY22) should be viewed considering the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic and changes to program data collection processes resulting from federal changes in the GPRA measures. In the context of this evaluation, the COVID–19 pandemic resulted in gaps in the data from academic year 2020–21 (AY21). Second, AY22 was the first year of implementation for new data collection systems on the federal and state side related to the federal change in the GPRA measures. Therefore, this evaluation will serve as a starting point to build upon, strengthen, and refine data collection practices for future evaluations of Arizona's 21st CCLC subgrantees.

ADE Program Staff

Nine 21st CCLC Education Program Specialists, one director, one administrative assistant, and one data analyst staff the 21st CCLC administrative program at the ADE. The 21st CCLC Program Specialists are each assigned to a geographic region of the state and are dedicated to supporting and monitoring the same grantees throughout the five-year funding cycle. This allows the specialist and subgrantee staff the chance to collaborate and establish ongoing professional relationships which, in turn, lays the foundation for effective compliance monitoring, technical assistance, and professional development.

Continuous improvement

Figure 1 describes the continuous improvement plan that covers all five years of the grant. ADE monitors all subgrantees by conducting site visits to identify TA and PD opportunities during the first two years of the grant.

⁴ Some sites began programming at the start of the Fall semester of AY22.

Figure 1. Continuous Improvement Plan

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Implementation	Continuation			
Technical Assistance and Professional Learning to support Strategic Implementation	Technical Assistance and Professional Learning to Support Continuous Improvement			
Site Visits I	Site Visits Monitoring Targeted Monitoring Visits as Needed			
Desktop Monitoring through Programmatic and Fiscal Reports				
	End of each Year – Substantial Compliance Status Notification			

All subgrantees are required to complete a self-assessment form at least once a year as part of a required annual site-level evaluation. Program specialists use this form to identify subgrantees for onsite monitoring and additional TA each year according to the ADE 21st CCLC Risk Model. Program Specialists complete a compliance assessment at the end of each year for each center which generates a score that places each center into a risk tier (Figure 2). Additional TA, professional development, and/or monitoring are implemented based on the risk tier.

Figure 2. Risk Levels

I. No Apparent Risk
II. Low Risk/ Warning
III. Moderate Risk/ Out of Compliance
IV. High Risk/Out of Compliance

PROGRAM EVALUATION

This evaluation is designed to determine the effect of the 21st CCLC program on student participants. The first component of the evaluation is an analysis of the effect of program participation on statewide assessment scores and school day attendance rates. The analysis also investigates how varying levels of affect assessment scores and school day attendance rates among program participants. The second component is a qualitative analysis to determine the nature of family engagement activities across the sites and to determine if themes exist to identify opportunities for PD and TA activities. The third component is an investigative analysis of the addition of points for town and rural subgrantees to examine the effect of rural schools on the demographic makeup of the program participants in Arizona.

Program Participants

More than 55,000 students participated in 21st CCLC program between Summer 2021 and Spring 2022. Figure 3 displays the average characteristics of the program participants compared to all students in Arizona's public schools. When compared to all students in Arizona, the percentage of program participants was larger in three categories, including Hispanic students (22.6%), English Language Learners (9.0%), and students who were eligible for the free or reduced-price lunch program (FRPL; 27.5%).



Figure 3. Student Characteristics of 21st CCLC Program Participants vs. All Arizona Students

NOTE: The percentage of Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, and migrant students are redacted because they represent less than 2% of the student population.

Indicators, Goals, and Measures

This evaluation uses data collected by each program site to evaluate individual sites and conduct compliance monitoring, among other logistic requirements. To supplement these data, this evaluation also uses state assessment, school day attendance, and student demographic data which are collected and stored by ADE. Finally, the evaluation also uses data from the U.S. Department of Education's *Common Core of Data* (CCD). Figure 4 describes the indicators, goals, and measures used to evaluate the program.

Indicators	Student Academic Achievement	Student Behavioral Change	Family Engagement	Program Quality	Student Access
Goals	To determine the effect of participation academic achievement	To determine the effect of participation on student behaviors	To determine the nature of family engagement in program subgrantees	To determine where the program can focus technical assistance efforts for subgrantees	To explore the effect of priority points on the demographic makeup of program participants
Measures	State Standardized Test Scores	School Day Attendance Rates	Family Engagement SMART Goal	Site Evaluation Form and Customer Satisfaction Survey	Student Population Characteristics

Figure 4. Evaluation Indicators, Goals, and Measures

Research Questions

The purpose of this evaluation is to determine the effect of program participation on academic achievement and drive continuous improvement efforts. To do this, the evaluation focuses on five research questions developed by ADE.

- What was the effect of the 21st CCLC program on academic achievement as measured by standardized tests in mathematics and English language arts? Did the scores on these tests vary by program dosage, or the amount of time a students took part in program activities?
- 2. What was the effect of the 21st CCLC program on school day attendance rates? Did school day attendance rates vary by the amount of time students took part in program activities?

- 3. Did sites successfully implement the family engagement component?
- 4. In which areas should ADE 21st CCLC program staff focus technical assistance efforts for subgrantees?
- 5. What was the effect of adding rural priority points during the cycle 17 application phase?

IMPACT ANALYSIS

Although random assignment is generally considered the gold standard of program evaluation, randomization may be unnecessary or even unethical in a school setting. Such is the case for the 21st CCLC program, where students are not randomly selected to participate. An evaluation will likely suffer from selection bias if it fails to consider how student characteristics affect program participation (Austin, 2011).

To address the selection bias, the impact analysis employs a quasi-experimental analysis that uses propensity scores to create comparable groups of program participants and nonparticipants. The first step of this analysis uses regression models to estimate the probability of each student to participate in the 21st CCLC program, regardless of their actual participation status. These probabilities of participation are commonly referred to as propensity scores.

Logistic regression models used student- and school-level characteristics to predict program participation and estimate the propensity scores for grades four through eight.⁵ Figure 2 lists the student- and school-level variables used in the propensity score models to predict program participation. The equation for the propensity score models is

$$Y_1 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{stu} + \beta_2 X_{sch} + \varepsilon$$

where y is program participation, X_{stu} is the set of student characteristics, X_{sch} represents the set of school characteristics, and ε represents all other characteristics not included in the model. Figure 5 lists the student- and school-level covariates included in the propensity score models.

Student Characteristics	School Characteristics
Sex	Letter Grade Rating
Race/Ethnicity	Grant Cycle
Eligible for Free/Reduced Lunch	Urban, Suburban, Town, Rural Status
Military Family	Charter School
English Language Learner*	School Student Population Size
Special Education Status**	
Homeless Status**	
Foster Status**	
Math Assessment score in AY21	
ELA Assessment score in AY21	

Figure 5. Student- and School-Level Propensity Score Model Covariates

* Only grades 7 and 8

** Only grade 8

⁵ No prior assessment data exists for students in grade 3 because Arizona does not test second grade students using the AASA.

Area of Common Support

The area of common support specifies a range of propensity scores that are common to both program participants and non-participants. For example, if the range of propensity scores is 0.097 to 0.843 among program participants and 0.087 to 0.766 among non-participants, the area of common support would include all students whose propensity scores fall between 0.097 (the higher of the two minimum values) and 0.766 (the lower of the two maximum values). After estimating the propensity scores, we removed cases that fell outside the area of common support, by grade level. <u>Appendix A</u> includes graphs that provide a visual display of the area of common support for each grade four through eight.

Inverse Probability Weights

Next, we used the propensity scores to create inverse probability of treatment weights (IPTWs). As discussed in the following section, when applied to statistical models, IPTWs adjust the characteristics of the comparison group (i.e., non-participants) to appear similar to those of the intervention group (i.e., program participants) across the variables included in the models. The equation to calculate the IPTWs is

$$\omega(W \mid X) = W + (1 - W) \frac{p}{1 - p}$$

where $\omega(W \mid X)$ represents the IPTW for a treatment assignment (*W*) given a set of covariates (*X*), and p represents the propensity score. When the treatment assignment has a value of one, which indicates a 21st CCLC program participant, the IPTW also equals one. When the treatment assignment is zero, which indicates non-participants, the equation reduces to

$$\omega(W|X) = \frac{p}{1-p}$$

which calculates a statistical weight equal to the probability of participating in the program divided by the probability of not participating in the program.

Covariate Balance

Generally, when random selection determines membership in an intervention group or comparison group, the characteristics of intervention group (i.e., program participants) will be very similar to the characteristics of the comparison group (i.e., non-participants). If 40 percent of a student population was eligible for the free or reduced-price lunch program, then we would expect approximately 40 percent of the intervention group and 40 percent of the comparison group to also be eligible for free or reduced-price lunch program and the two groups would be *equivalent at baseline*.

When applied to the characteristics used to predict the propensity scores, the IPTWs adjust the non-participant student data so participants and non-participants are equivalent at baseline. In other words, participants and non-participants appear as if they had been selected to participate at random. This effect of IPTWs is true assuming the propensity score models correctly included all characteristics that predict participation. However, even when propensity score models do not include all covariates, the IPTWs will reduce selection bias (D'Agostino, 1998).

To determine the extent to which the IPTWs correct selection bias, we first compared the characteristics of program participants and non-participants after applying the weights. When the standardized difference between the two means is less than .25, standard deviations are considered balanced. We used the following equation to estimate covariate balance:

$$d = \frac{\bar{m}_1 - \bar{m}_0}{\sqrt{\frac{s_1^2 + s_0^2}{2}}}$$

where *d* is the standardized difference, or *bias*, which is the difference between the studentlevel covariate means for program participants (\overline{m}_1) and non-participants (\overline{m}_0) divided by the square root of the sum of participant and non-participant standard deviations ($s_1^2 + s_0^2$) divided by two (Guo & Fraser, 2015). <u>Appendix B</u> includes tables that describe the covariate balance by grade for students in grades four through eight. The results show that the IPTW successfully balanced program participants and non-participants at baseline.

After determining baseline equivalence, the IPTWs were then applied to the regression models that predict student outcomes by grade. The outcome models included the same student-level characteristics, but the school-level characteristics (i.e., school letter grades, program cycle, locale, charter school status, and student enrollment) were replaced with school dummy variables.

Analytic Sample

The analytic sample includes a total of 22,448 students at 175 subgrantee schools. This accounts for students in grades four through eight who

- 1. received mathematics and ELA scores for Arizona's Academic Standards Assessment (AASA) in AY21 and AY22;
- 2. attended a subgrantee school that received a letter grade of A, B, C, or D in AY22; and
- 3. participated in the program for at least 30 hours during the school year.

The comparison group included the remainder of students who attended subgrantee schools but did not participate in the program. It is important to note that this evaluation does not include students from schools without a 21st CCLC program. The sample for the impact analysis includes a total of 22,448 students including 9,046 program participants and 13,402 non-

participants. Table 1 displays the number of program participants and non-participants by grade and total included in the impact analysis.

	Program	Non-	
Grade	Participants	participants	Total
4	2,307	2,294	4,601
5	2,298	2,825	5,123
6	1,253	2,442	3,695
7	1,193	2,157	3,350
8	1,995	3,684	5,679
Total	9,046	13,402	22,448

Table 1. Number of Program Participants and Non-Participants, by Grade and Total

Arizona requires all students in grade 3 through 8 to participate in Arizona's Academic Standards Assessment (AASA) in mathematics and ELA at the end of the academic year; therefore, we used these assessments to measure of academic outcomes. Students in grade three are excluded from this analysis because these students do not have assessment data for the prior year. Table 2 displays the average unweighted scores in statewide mathematics and English language arts tests for program participants and non-participants.

Table 2. Unweighted Assessment Scores for Program Participants and Non-Participants, by Grade

	Mathematics		EL	Α
	Non-			Non-
	Participants	participants	Participants	participants
Grade 4	3530.6	3495.7	2507.9	2490.2
Grade 5	3557.8	3510.7	2513.6	2489.7
Grade 6	3583.2	3560.9	2526.9	2515.8
Grade 7	3603.4	3570.1	2537.6	2520.5
Grade 8	3634.4	3601.9	2545.5	2528.6

Research Question 1

What was the effect of the 21st CCLC program on academic achievement as measured by standardized tests in mathematics and English language arts? Did the scores on these tests vary by program dosage, or the amount of time a student participated in the 21st CCLC program?

Across all grades, program participants averaged 44.8 points higher on the mathematics assessment and 22.9 points higher on the ELA assessment than their non-participant counterparts. The unweighted assessment scores in table 3 provide an idea about how the scores differ between program participants and non-participants before applying the IPTWs, which means the program participants and non-participants are not equivalent at baseline. Therefore, the observed differences in mathematics and ELA scores between program participants should not be attributed to participation in the 21st CCLC program.

Mathematics Scores

Table 3 presents the difference between program participants and non-participants on the mathematics assessment by grade level, weighted by IPTWs.

Standard				
	Estimate	Error	t	p
Grade 4	4.77	2.01	2.37	.0193
Grade 5	6.79	2.73	2.49	.0141
Grade 6	-0.86	1.82	-0.47	.6394
Grade 7	6.76	4.69	1.44	.1536
Grade 8	15.43	10.42	1.48	.1426

Table 3. Weighted Mathematics Assessment Scores, by Grade

NOTE: Estimate is statistically significant when p < .05

Mathematics scores were higher for program participants than non-participants in grades four and five. Participants in grade four scored almost five points higher than non-participants (p = .0193), while students in grade five scored almost seven points higher than non-participants (p = .0141). The mathematics scores for program participants in grades six, seven, and eight were not significantly different from the mathematics scores for non-participants.

Mathematics Assessment Results by Participation Dosage

The mathematics dosage analysis investigated the how the amount of time taking part in program activities during AY22 affected scores on the mathematics assessment. The number of hours of program participation was reported by subgrantee staff in half hour increments. Table 4 shows the results of the mathematics dosage analysis.

	Estimate	Error	t	р
Grade 4	0.03	0.015	2.039	.0434
Grade 5	0.04	0.015	2.900	.0044
Grade 6	-0.03	0.023	-1.235	.2200
Grade 7	0.04	0.027	1.471	.1455
Grade 8	0.07	0.071	1.054	.2951

Table 4. Weighted Mathematics Dosage, by Grade

NOTE: Estimates are statistically significant when p < .05

In grades four and five, the amount of program participation had a positive effect on mathematics assessment scores. Notably, each additional hour of participation resulted in an increase of approximately .03 points (p = .0434) for students in grade four and approximately .04 points for students in grade five (p = .0044). In other words, 100 hours program participation would equate to an increase of approximately 3 points on the mathematics assessment for students in grade four and approximately 4 points for students in grade five. Similar to the results of mathematics scores presented in table 3, the amount of time participating in program activities did not affect scores on the mathematics assessment for students in grades six, seven, and eight.

English Language Arts Scores

Table 5 presents the difference between program participants and non-participants on the ELA assessment by grade level, weighted by IPTWs. Results of the effect of program participation on ELA assessment scores demonstrate no significant differences between the scores of program participants and non-participants.

Standard				
	Estimate	Error	t	р
Grade 4	1.76	1.17	1.51	.1342
Grade 5	1.41	1.41	1.00	.3194
Grade 6	-1.25	1.10	-1.14	.2593
Grade 7	2.48	2.75	0.90	.3700
Grade 8	7.93	5.68	1.40	.1664

Table 5. Weighted Assessment Scores for English Language Arts, by Grade

NOTE: Estimates are statistically significant when p < .05

English Language Arts Assessment Results by Participation Dosage

The ELA dosage analysis investigated how the amount of time participating in 21st CCLC program activities affected scores on the ELA assessment. Table 6 shows the results of the ELA dosage analysis.

Standard						
	Estimate	Error	t	р		
Grade 4	3.31	1.616	2.050	.0404		
Grade 5	1.37	1.638	0.838	.4023		
Grade 6	-2.52	2.263	-1.114	.2654		
Grade 7	1.90	2.319	0.818	.4135		
Grade 8	5.47	6.310	0.866	.3863		

Table 6. Weighted ELA Dosage, by Grade

NOTE: Estimates are statistically significant when p < .05

The amount of program participation had a positive effect on ELA assessment scores for program participants in grade four only. The amount of time participating in program activities did not have a significant effect on ELA scores for students in grades five through eight.

Research Question 2

What was the effect of the 21st CCLC program on school day attendance rates? Did school day attendance rates vary by the amount of time students participated in the 21st CCLC program?

Attendance Rates

We examined the effect that program participation has on school-day attendance. After applying the IPTWs, we found that program participants in grades four through eight demonstrated higher school-day attendance rates than non-participants, ranging from 1.53 percentage points for students in grade four to 2.67 percentage points for students in grade eight, see table 7.

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
Standard					
	Estimate	Error	t	р	
Grade 4	1.53	0.308	4.974	.0000	
Grade 5	1.60	0.253	6.333	.0000	
Grade 6	2.01	0.326	6.161	.0000	
Grade 7	1.62	0.391	4.141	.0001	
Grade 8	2.67	0.500	5.339	.0000	

Table 7. Weighted Attendance Rates, by Grade

NOTE: Estimates are statistically significant when p < .05

Attendance Rates by Participation Dosage

The analysis of the effect of varying levels of participation shows that for each hour of program participation was related to an increase of 1 one-hundredth of a percentage point for students in grades four and five. Students in grades six, seven, and eight showed an increase of 2 one-hundredths of a percentage point. Although these estimates appear small, consider that a student would need to accumulate one hundred hours participating in program activities in order to increase their school-day attendance rate by one percentage point (see table 8).

Table 8.	Weighted	Attendance	Dosage	by Grade
----------	----------	------------	--------	----------

		Standard		
	Estimate	Error	t	р
Grade 4	0.01	0.002	5.569	.0000
Grade 5	0.01	0.003	5.520	.0000
Grade 6	0.02	0.003	4.879	.0000
Grade 7	0.02	0.003	4.725	.0000
Grade 8	0.02	0.003	5.266	.0000

NOTE: Estimates are statistically significant when p < .05

Impact Evaluation Summary

The 21st CCLC program in Arizona demonstrated a positive impact on some program participants, most notably in the mathematics assessment scores of students in grades 4 and 5. The impact of the program on mathematics assessment scores of students in other grades, as well as impact on ELA achievement for all students, is unclear and should be investigated further with the assistance of mathematics and ELA subject matter experts.

One highlight of the impact analysis is the effect that program participation has on attendance rates. Specifically, program participants demonstrated attendance rates of approximately 1 to 2 percentage points higher than non-participants overall. This effect is more pronounced for students who spend more time participating in program activities throughout the year. As mentioned earlier, although there is a small increase in attendance rates per hour of program participation, we see attendance rates increasing as the amount of time participating in program activities also increases.

QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

Qualitative Methods

The qualitative analysis of cycle 17 sites used a modified record abstraction approach to determine whether subgrantees met the goals for family engagement activities that were set prior to offering program activities. Analysts also reviewed site evaluation forms for each cycle 17 site to determine the family engagement goals and the level of participation in family engagement activities. We then used the same approach to determine opportunities for professional development (PD) and technical assistance (TA).

Research Question 3

Did cycle 17 sites successfully implement the family engagement component?

SMART Goals

One of the components of the 21st CCLC grant in Arizona required that subgrantees provide the families of program participants with opportunities for *active and meaningful engagement in the student's education*. At the beginning of each new grant cycle, subgrantees are asked to create a SMART⁶ goal that describes the site's target goal for including adult family members in family engagement activities. The subgrantees' SMART goals were approved by 21st CCLC program staff at ADE. Although all goals were approved by ADE, there was some variation among the goals about defining and measuring success in the family engagement component. Two examples of family engagement SMART goals among cycle 17 sites include:

By June 1st of each year of the project 30 families of (program participants) will attend at least two of the family engagement activities as measured by attendance sheets or family survey.

During each of the five years of the grant, at least one adult family member of 75% of the (program participants) will attend at least 2 family engagement events, as verified by sign-in rosters.

As part of the cycle 17 competition, applicants were given instructions to ensure that their family engagement objectives were related to the process of their family engagement practices and not their outcomes. As grants moved through the competition phases, ADE reviewed objectives before final approval to ensure they were SMART and met requirements.

⁶ A SMART goal is one that is Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-Bound

Subgrantee Self-Evaluations

At the end of each program year, subgrantees are required to fill out a Site Evaluation report which indicated if each subgrantee met their family engagement SMART goal at the end of AY22. We used the Site Evaluation report to determine how well cycle 17 subgrantees met their family engagement goal in AY22.

Among the cycle 17 subgrantees, approximately two-thirds reported meeting their family engagement goal by the end of AY22. The cycle 17 subgrantees that reported not meeting their family engagement SMART goals provided a range of reasons, including, but not limited to, (1) the ongoing effects of COVID-19; (2) difficulties with transportation to family engagement activities; and (3) finding teachers willing to come to and lead family engagement activities.

Strategies for Improvement

Regardless of whether subgrantees met their family engagement SMART goals, all subgrantees were asked to provide strategies for improving their family engagement activities. The responses provided by 21st CCLC sites varied based on the needs of the individual sites. One theme among the improvement strategies specified increasing the accessibility of family engagement activities by including more in-person and hybrid activities. Other strategies for improvement included creating a pre- and post-program family engagement survey and ensuring regular and consistent communication between 21st CCLC site staff and the parents of program participants. Some sites noted that they would continue their current processes in future program years. Although each of these subgrantees reported meeting the family engagement goals they set at the beginning of AY22, simply *maintaining current operations* is not a strategy for program *improvement*, but rather a strategy for *maintaining the status quo*.

Research Question 4

The fourth research question asked *In which areas should ADE 21st CCLC program staff focus TA and PD efforts for subgrantees?*

We used the Site Evaluation report (see <u>Appendix C</u>) to determine the need for TA and PD activities. Based on an analysis of these forms, the two biggest needs for future TA and PD activities should focus on ways to increase student engagement; and improve surveys, data collection, and data use. Additionally, sites demonstrated a desire to incorporate youth development in programming, and ways to enhance fostering community partnerships.

Almost half of the cycle 17 sites (43.7%) mentioned increasing or improving student engagement, but the ways of increasing engagement differed among sites. Sites indicated that they would increase student engagement by involving students in the process of determining program activities, with one site stating that "we would like to see students have more say in programming and development of programming, especially at the older grade levels." Another site suggested increasing engagement by providing incentives to students stated that "improving incentive offerings to support this engagement from students is also an area we hope will help us going forward" and another site indicated that they could "encourage and provide consistent PBIS (Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports) incentives for students" in future years.

Thirty-eight percent of sites indicated that they need to improve (1) pre- and post-program surveys, (2) data collection, and (3) their use of the data to drive continuous improvement. TA and PD opportunities in this area should focus on developing meaningful and useful surveys, improving survey response rates, and understanding data and how it can be used to make programmatic changes.

Approximately 15 percent of cycle 17 sites indicated a need for TA and PD opportunities around incorporating the principles of additional youth development into student programming, while 13 percent of sites indicated a need to help develop and maintain community partnerships.

To investigate how ADE staff could better serve subgrantees, we also used the Customer Satisfaction Survey that was administered to staff at each site (see <u>Appendix D</u>). The survey asked, "if you could identify one thing that ADE's 21st CCLC team could do to increase your satisfaction with our service, what would it be?" More than one third of subgrantees identified training opportunities (35.9%), while another third identified funding (32.3%) to increase satisfaction with the service provided by ADE staff. Additionally, sites also noted that changes in collaboration (13.8%), support (9.6%), and communication (8.4%) would increase customer satisfaction.

Qualitative Analysis Summary

We used a modified record abstraction to determine if subgrantees met their family engagement goals and avenues for future professional development and technical assistance opportunities. Recommendations for improving the implementation analyses in future evaluations relate primarily to how subgrantees provide site-specific data to ADE staff. Any enhancements should be designed to maximize the usefulness of the data as it relates to future evaluations while minimizing any negative impact on the program operations.

Given that the goals for family engagement activities vary from site to site, it is difficult to evaluate the overall success in meeting the goals across the state. ADE staff should investigate ways to standardize both site goals and how each site evaluates whether they met the goal. Hypothetically, subgrantees could start with the same initial goal of including at least 75 percent of parents in family engagement activities. Individual sites could work with 21st CCLC staff at ADE if they need to alter the family engagement goal based on the unique needs of the site and the families at the site. In this hypothetical example, any site that needs to deviate from the original goal would also need to participate in TA opportunities to increase family participation and ultimately meet the original goal of 75 percent family engagement attendance. It is important to note that if ADE were to implement a standard goal for subgrantees, individual sites would still determine the nature of their family engagement activities.

RURAL PRIORITY POINTS

Research Question 5

The fifth research question asked *What was the effect of adding rural priority points during the cycle 17 application phase*?

The most recent round of subgrantees, referred to as grant cycle 17, began offering program activities during AY22. During application phase of cycle 17, sites in the rural areas of Arizona were awarded two and four additional points to increase the coverage of 21st CCLC grant awards across the state. We investigated the effect of increasing the number of rural subgrantees. Table 9 presents the percentage of students in several demographic categories for rural sites, non-rural sites, and all funded sites in cycle 17.

Table 9. Change in Average Student Characteristics at Cycle 16 and Cycle 17 Sites, by Rural Status

	Cycle 16	Cycle17	Change
Female	48.2	48.7	~
Race/Ethnicity			
American Indian/Alaska Native	2.8	2.7	≈
Asian	‡	‡	\checkmark
Black/African American	7.2	6.1	\checkmark
Hispanic/Latino	70.1	69.4	\checkmark
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	‡	‡	\uparrow
White	2.7	2.3	\checkmark
Two or More	15.3	17.8	\uparrow
English Language Learners	15.7	17.7	\uparrow
Homeless	‡	‡	≈
Free/Reduce Lunch	58.7	61.7	\uparrow
Special Education	16.1	14.0	\checkmark
Migrant	‡	‡	\uparrow
Foster	‡	‡	≈
Standardized ELA Score	2530.0	2529.5	\checkmark
Standardized Mathematics Score	3600.7	3599.5	\checkmark

‡ Estimate redacted because it is lower than 2%

The results of this analysis show that awarding additional points to rural schools in cycle 17 increased the proportions of English language learners and students eligible for free or reducedprice lunches. However, the rural points also lowered the proportions of students who identify as American Indian or Alaska Native, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, and White. Additionally, cycle 17 also had a lower proportion of special education students compared to cycle 16.

Conclusions

This report documents the results of the evaluation of the Nita M. Lowey 21st CCLC grant program in Arizona. Although the results show that the program has a positive effect on the academic achievement of younger students (i.e., students in grade four and 5), results also suggest that the program has a positive effect on school day students in all grades.

The evaluation of the 21st CCLC program during FY22 represents a starting point for future evaluations. While this evaluation utilized data collected from sites, the ways in which sites collect data about students and their participation in the program should be augmented to systematically collect consistent and reliable data without adding undue burden at the sites. Standardizing data collection processes across subgrantee sites will strengthen future evaluations of the 21st CCLC program in Arizona.

REFERENCES

- Austin, P. C. (2011). An introduction to propensity score methods for reducing the effects of confounding in observational studies. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *46*(3), 399–424.
- D'Agostino, R. B. (1998). Tutorial in biostatistics propensity score methods for bias reduction in the comparison of a treatment to a non-randomized control group. *Statistics in Medicine, 17*, 2265–2281.
- Guo, S., & Fraser, M. W. (2015). *Propensity score analysis: Statistical methods and applications. Advanced quantitative techniques in the social sciences series* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Performance. Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2022, December 7). Retrieved from https://oese.ed.gov/offices/office-of-formula-grants/school-support-and-accountability/21st-century-community-learning-centers/performance-21st-century-community-learning-centers/

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Area of Common Support



Figure A1. Common support for students in grade four

Figure A2. Common support for students in grade five





Figure A3. Common support for students in grade 6

Figure A4. Common support for students in grade 7





Figure A5. Common support for students in grade 8

Return to section

Appendix B. Balance Tables

		Non-	
	Participants	participants	Bias
Female	55.1	54.3	1.7
Race/Ethnicity			
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.3	2.3	0.1
Asian	‡	+	0.1
Black or African American	5.4	5.3	0.3
Hispanic or Latino	70.6	70.0	1.2
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	‡	‡	0.6
Two or More	2.6	2.5	1.1
White	17.6	18.5	-2.3
Eligible for FRLP	69.0	68.4	1.1
Military	‡	+	1.1
Migrant	‡	‡	1.7
Prior Assessment			
English Language Arst	2480.0	2481.3	-2.2
Mathematics	3486.0	3487.3	-1.2

Table B1. Weighted covariate balance for participants and non-participants in grade four

‡ Estimate redacted because it is lower than 2%

		Non-	
	Participants	participants	Bias
Female	55.0	55.7	-1.3
Race/Ethnicity			
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.6	2.5	0.5
Asian	‡	‡	-2.1
Black or African American	5.9	6.1	-0.7
Hispanic or Latino	71.2	70.7	1.3
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	‡	‡	1.2
Two or More	2.6	2.5	0.6
White	15.8	16.1	-0.9
Eligible for FRLP	70.1	69.8	0.7
Military	‡	‡	-2.0
Migrant	2.7	2.6	0.4
Prior Assessment			
English Language Arts	2498.4	2498.6	-0.2
Mathematics	3510.9	3511.2	-0.2

Table B2. Weighted covariate balance for participants and non-participants in grade five

‡ Estimate redacted because it is lower than 2%

		Non-	
	Participants	participants	Bias
Female	50.2	50.6	-0.9
Race/Ethnicity ¹			
American Indian or Alaska Native	+	+	0.7
Asian	+	‡	-1.0
Black or African American	5.2	5.2	-0.2
Hispanic or Latino	75.0	74.6	0.9
Two or More	2.0	2.0	-0.4
White	15.6	15.9	-0.8
Eligible for FRLP	68.6	67.7	1.7
Military	+	‡	-1.7
Migrant	3.3	3.1	1.2
Prior Assessment			
English Language Arst	2513.1	2513.7	-0.8
Mathematics	3543.4	3544.0	-0.4

Table B3. Weighted covariate balance for participants and non-participants in grade 6

‡ Estimate redacted because it is lower than 2%

		Non-	
	Participants	participants	Bias
Female	49.3	49.7	-0.8
Race/Ethnicity			
American Indian or Alaska Native	+	+	0.5
Asian	+	+	-1.9
Black or African American	8.0	8.0	0.0
Hispanic or Latino	71.7	71.1	1.2
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	+	‡	-0.5
Two or More	2.5	2.7	-0.9
White	14.1	14.3	-0.5
Eligible for FRLP	64.6	64.9	-0.5
Military	+	‡	2.5
Migrant	2.4	2.3	0.9
English Language Learner	+	‡	-0.6
Prior Assessment			
English Language Arst	2521.7	2521.7	0.0
Mathematics	3573.5	3573.2	0.2

Table B4. Weighted covariate balance for participants and non-participants in grade 7

‡ Estimate redacted because it is lower than 2%

		Non-	
	Participants	participants	Bias
Female	50.3	49.7	1.3
Race/Ethnicity			
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.3	2.0	1.9
Asian	+	+	0.7
Black or African American	6.6	6.4	0.9
Hispanic or Latino	67.5	67.3	0.4
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	+	+	-1.8
Two or More	2.3	2.2	0.4
White	19.7	20.4	-1.7
Special Education	11.5	12.1	-1.9
Eligible for FRLP	63.3	62.1	2.6
Military	‡	‡	-0.5
Migrant	+	+	0.5
English Language Learner	9.7	9.2	1.9
Homeless	‡	‡	-0.7
Foster	‡	‡	1.2
Prior Assessment			
English Language Arst	2530.0	2529.5	0.5
Mathematics	3600.7	3599.5	0.6

Table B5. Weighted covariate balance for participants and non-participants in grade 8

‡ Estimate redacted because it is lower than 2%

Return to section

Appendix C. Site Evaluation Report Template, 2021-2022 Program Year

Return to section



21st Century Community Learning Centers

Annual Site Evaluation Report

See *Required Reporting Due Dates* for exact date at this link: http://www.azed.gov/21stcclc/required-reporting/



Report Sections:

- **Compliance Worksheet**
- **Objectives Worksheet**
- **Continuous Improvement Worksheets**

The 21st Century Community Learning Centers afterschool program is funded by a federal grant from the U.S. Department of Education and administered by the Arizona Department of Education. For more information visit: <u>http://www.azed.gov/21stcclc/</u>





Guidance for completing and submitting this report can be found on the 21st CCLC website at <u>http://www.azed.gov/21stcclc/required-reporting/</u> under the Site Evaluation Blue ribbon drop down. Please contact your assigned 21st CCLC program specialist if you have other questions or need technical assistance.

Site Information				
District/Organization Name:				
Site Name:				
Cycle:	Year:			
Name of Person Responsible for filling out report:				
Phone:	Email:			

21st CCLC Program Self-Assessment Compliance Worksheet

Directions: Select "Yes" if the site met the requirement during the program year and "No" if the site did not meet the requirement. If you select "No" on any item of the Compliance Worksheet, please indicate the reason(s) in the comments section.

For requirements with additional narrative requested (in blue), add appropriate answers to the comments section.

1. Direct Student Services

Requirement	Compliant	Comments
a. Program services are provided for the number of hours and	Yes	
days per week proposed in original approved application.	🗌 No	
b. Student services are provided for the number of days and to the	Yes	
projected number of regular student attendees as proposed in the	🗌 No	
application funding formula.		
c. Classes/Services provided support academic objectives for	Yes	
students.	No No	
d. Classes/Services provided support youth development	Yes	
objectives for students.	🗌 No	
e. Services are being provided for the target population identified	Yes	
in the application.	No No	

2. Direct Family Services

<u> </u>		
Requirement	Compliant	Comments
a. Ongoing family engagement services are provided as proposed	Yes	
in the original application.	No	
b. The family engagement activities offered support academic	Yes	Narrative required:
achievement of 21st CCLC students.	No	
Family Engagement services are intended to involve adult family		
members of 21st CCLC student participants in ongoing activities		
that will have an impact on their children's academic success.		
Provide 1-2 paragraphs describing your site's family engagement		
services/activities.		

3. Alignment to the School Day			
Requirement	Compliant	Comments	
a. Student data is used to make decisions regarding program	Yes		
implementation.	No		
b. Regular communication occurs between 21st CCLC staff,	Yes	Narrative required:	
school administrators, and regular school day staff to access and	No		
enhance individual student academic progress.			
Describe communication between the 21st CCLC program staff and			
the school day classroom teachers. Include how this			
communication met the needs of students targeted in your original			
application during the PROGRAM YEAR.			

4. Safe and Healthy Learning Environment			
Requirement	Compliant	Comments	
	Yes		
a. A 21st CCLC Safety Plan is developed and implemented.	No		
	Yes		
b. Services are provided in a safe and secure location.	No No		
c. If services are provided in a location other than the school, the	Yes/NA		
location will be at least as available and accessible to the students	No No		
to be served as if the program were located in the school.			
d. Procedures for the safe transportation of students between	Yes	Narrative required:	
school, 21st CCLC site, and home have been established.	🗌 🗋 No		
What safety procedures have been established for tracking students			
during the program and for the safe transportation of students?			
e. Afterschool snacks and summer meals are provided.	Yes	Narrative required:	
What is the site's procedure for providing afterschool snacks and	🗌 No		
summer meals for 21 st CCLC students?			

5. Equity and Access		
Requirement	Compliant	Comments
a. Students with disabilities have been identified and are being	Yes	
served.	No	

6. Evaluation		
Requirement	Compliant	Comments
a. Data needed to ensure compliance with all requirements are	Yes	Narrative required:
collected, compiled, and reviewed on a regular basis.	No	
During the PROGRAM YEAR, describe what type of evaluation		
activities occurred to strengthen the program. Include how staff		
improved and strengthened the individual student's out-of-school		
time instruction based on data gathered throughout the year.		
h Data mandad to many una magness toward manhing amount	Vag	1) Nometing apprind:
b. Data needed to measure progress toward reaching grant		1) Narrative required:
program objectives are conected, complied, analyzed, and		
1) During the PPOGPAM VEAP describe how evaluation results		
were communicated to all stakeholders and community members. If		
evaluations results were not communicated to community members.		
and stakeholders, provide an explanation.		
····· ································		
2) Identify the lead person(s) for the 21 st CCLC evaluation process		2) Narrative required:
by name and job title. Include any qualifications and		
responsibilities this person(s) had to lead the evaluation process.		
(An external evaluator is not required, however should be listed		
here if one is used.)		

7. Dissemination		
Requirement	Compliant	Comments
a. Methods and strategies to disseminate and share information	Yes	
about the program, outcomes, and accomplishments to parents,	No No	
staff, students, community members, and other stakeholders are		
being implemented.		

8. Sustainability			
Requirement	Compliant	Comments	
a. At least one active partnership has been established with an	Yes	Narrative required:	
organization that is not the fiscal agent/LEA/school itself.	No		
Identify external partners who supported the 21st CCLC program			
during the program year and how each partner contributed to meet			
the program's needs and objectives. If no external partners were			
used, provide an explanation as to why and how the site will			
identify and use external partners in the next program year.		NT / 1	
b. At least one other federal, state, or local program is leveraged	Yes	Narrative required:	
to ensure the most effective use of public resources.			
Describe how 21st CCLC grant activities collaborated with other			
tederal, state or local community programs in the PROGRAM			
YEAR.	Vag	Normative required:	
c. The site is actively building additional resources in support of		Narrative required.	
anligting new newtrang, and/on newtraning			
emisting new partners, and/or partnering			
with alternatively funded programs.			
Outline what steps the site took this current year to determine			
which elements of the program would be the most critical to			
continue AND to ensure that these components will continue to			
and/or ends			

9. Fiscal Record Keeping Compliant Comments Requirement Yes a. Expenditure reports that follow cost principals and ADE No Guidelines are kept, organized, and available on request. b. Pre-approved purchase orders and receipts that coincide with Yes approved budgets are tracked, organized, and available on No request. Yes c. Payroll records showing positions approved in approved No budget are kept, organized, and available on request.

d. Time and effort reports are completed, kept, organized, and available upon request.	Yes No	
e. Capital expenditures are in accordance with approved budgets	Yes	
and fixed assets are tracked appropriately.	No	

10. Required Training			
Requirement	Compliant	Comments	
a. (NEW)21st CCLC district director, the principal, and site	Yes/NA		
coordinators new to grant leadership participated in the Grant	🗌 No		
Leadership Orientation (GLO) training to understand grant			
requirements and regulations.			
b. (NEW and CONTINUING) Principal and site coordinator(s)	Yes		
attended 21st CCLC annual conference to support the success and	🗌 No	Principal attended (name of PD) on (date):	
best practices of the 21st CCLC program. Any exceptions to this		Coordinator attended (name of PD) on (date):	
requirement must be approved in writing by ADE 21st CCLC			
program specialist assigned to the grantee.		Narrative required:	
Explain in 1-2 paragraphs how your school's 21 st CCLC program			
was impacted/enhanced by the professional development attended.			

Program Management (Adequacy of Resources) Questions		
Requirement	Comments	
During the PROGRAM YEAR, describe the fiscal management of this grant at BOTH the district and site level.	Narrative required:	
During the PROGRAM YEAR, describe the involvement of school administration (principal) in managing the grant at this site.	Narrative required:	
During the PROGRAM YEAR, describe how staff was recruited and retained in the 21st CCLC program.	Narrative required:	

21st CCLC Program SMART Outcome Objectives Worksheet

The Objectives Worksheet is designed to collect information regarding progress made toward meeting SMART outcome objectives. From your own approved 21st CCLC grant application, please report on **all** academic, youth development and family engagement SMART outcome objectives from your approved application or Specialist approved revisions. Report all information requested on the Objectives Worksheet for each objective.

Area	SMART Outcome Objective	Data Source	Data Findings	Objective Met
	1.1			Yes
	12			
	1.2			
Academics				
	1.3 (if applicable)			Yes
	2.1			Ves
Youth Development				

	2.2 (if applicable)		Yes No
Family Engagement	3.1		Yes

21st CCLC Program Continuous Improvement Worksheet A Continuous Improvement Worksheet must be completed for each SMART outcome objective listed in the Objectives Worksheet (see page 7). Academic Achievement Outcome Objective 1: _____ Findings¹: Strengths **Opportunities** Weaknesses **Threats** What helped our successes with the What hurt our success with the What might help accomplish the What might hinder our efforts to Objective? Objective? Objective in the future? accomplish the Objective in the future? Strategies for Improvement. What do we plan to do differently in the future?

¹ Findings: Was the Objective met? Summary or conclusion reached after completion and examination of the compliance and objectives Worksheets or any other relevant resources that have been identified.

21st CCLC Program Continuous Improvement Worksheet A Continuous Improvement Worksheet must be completed for each SMART outcome objective listed in the Objectives Worksheet (see page 7). Academic Achievement Outcome Objective 2: _____ Findings²: Strengths **Opportunities** Weaknesses **Threats** What helped our successes with the What hurt our success with the What might help accomplish the What might hinder our efforts to Objective? Objective? Objective in the future? accomplish the Objective in the future? Strategies for Improvement. What do we plan to do differently in the future?

² Findings: Was the Objective met? Summary or conclusion reached after completion and examination of the compliance and objectives Worksheets or any other relevant resources that have been identified.

21st CCLC Program Continuous Improvement Worksheet A Continuous Improvement Worksheet must be completed for each SMART outcome objective listed in the Objectives Worksheet (see page 7). Academic Achievement Outcome Objective 3 (if applicable): Findings³: Strengths **Opportunities** Weaknesses **Threats** What helped our successes with the What hurt our success with the What might help accomplish the What might hinder our efforts to Objective? Objective? Objective in the future? accomplish the Objective in the future? Strategies for Improvement. What do we plan to do differently in the future?

³ **Findings:** Was the Objective met? Summary or conclusion reached after completion and examination of the compliance and objectives Worksheets or any other relevant resources that have been identified.

21st CCLC Program Continuous Improvement Worksheet			
A Continuous Improvement Worksheet	must be completed for each SMART	outcome objective listed in the Obje	ctives Worksheet <i>(see page 7)</i> .
Youth Development Outcome Objective 1:			
Findings ⁴ :			
Strengths What helped our successes with the Objective?	Weaknesses What hurt our success with the Objective?	Opportunities What might help accomplish the Objective in the future?	Threats What might hinder our efforts to accomplish the Objective in the future?
Strategies for Improvement. What do we plan to do differently in the future?			

⁴ **Findings:** Was the Objective met? Summary or conclusion reached after completion and examination of the compliance and objectives Worksheets or any other relevant resources that have been identified.

21st CCLC Program Continuous Improvement Worksheet

A Continuous Improvement Worksheet must be completed for each SMART outcome objective listed in the Objectives Worksheet (see page 7).

Youth Development Outcome Objective 2 (if applicable): _____

Findings⁵:

Strengths What helped our successes with the Objective?	Weaknesses What hurt our success with the Objective?	Opportunities What might help accomplish the Objective in the future?	Threats What might hinder our efforts to accomplish the Objective in the future?
Stra	ategies for Improvement. What do we	plan to do differently in the future?	

⁵ **Findings:** Was the Objective met? Summary or conclusion reached after completion and examination of the compliance and objectives Worksheets or any other relevant resources that have been identified.

21st CCLC Program Continuous Improvement Worksheet

A Continuous Improvement Worksheet must be completed for each SMART outcome objective listed in the Objectives Worksheet (see page 7).

Family Engagement Objective: _____

Findings⁶: _____

Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
What helped our successes with the	What hurt our success with the	What might help accomplish the	What might hinder our efforts to
Objective?	Objective?	Objective in the future?	accomplish the Objective in the future?
Strategies for Improvement. What do we plan to do differently in the future?			

⁶ **Findings:** Was the Objective met? Summary or conclusion reached after completion and examination of the compliance and objectives Worksheets or any other relevant resources that have been identified.

Appendix D. FY22 Customer Satisfaction Survey

Return to section





Arizona Department of Education (ADE) 21st CCLC Customer Satisfaction Survey 2022

It is the mission of the Arizona Department of Education (ADE)'s 21st CCLC team to serve Arizona's education community and actively engage parents to ensure every student has access to an excellent education.

In order to evaluate whether the ADE 21st CCLC team is achieving this goal of service excellence, we need your feedback. Your participation in the survey is critical and your unique, unfiltered perspective is important to us. The feedback provided in these annual customer surveys is valuable in helping us identify objectives to improve our services to you, our stakeholders.

Your responses will remain completely anonymous and will be grouped with responses from other stakeholders in the field. There is no ability to identify a specific individual's responses, so we encourage your honest and candid feedback as you participate. We strongly encourage you to complete the survey immediately. It should take you approximately 5-6 minutes to complete.

Please complete the survey no later than 5:00 PM on Friday, May 13. Thank you for all you do to contribute to the success of your students and families.

1. The ADE 21st CCLC team delivers information in a timely manner.

○ Strongly agree

◯ Agree

○ Neither agree nor disagree

◯ Disagree

○ Strongly disagree

2. Communication from ADE 21st CCLC completely and effectively covers the scope of the topic addressed.

◯ Strongly agree

◯ Agree

O Neither agree nor disagree

○ Disagree

○ Strongly disagree

3. ADE 21st CCLC staff work in collaborative manner with district/school/site program leaders.

◯ Strongly agree

◯ Agree

- O Neither agree nor disagree
- ◯ Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- 4. ADE 21st CCLC staff consistently display a high level of content knowledge.
 - ◯ Strongly agree

◯ Agree

- O Neither agree nor disagree
- ◯ Disagree
- Strongly disagree

5. ADE 21st CCLC's technical assistance and monitoring feedback helps us understand our legal requirements.

◯ Strongly agree

◯ Agree

O Neither agree nor disagree

◯ Disagree

○ Strongly disagree

6. Materials/ data provided by ADE 21st CCLC are characterized by a high level of accuracy.

◯ Strongly agree

◯ Agree

- O Neither agree nor disagree
- ◯ Disagree
- Strongly disagree

7. Overall satisfaction:

- Very satisfied
- ◯ Satisfied
- \bigcirc Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- \bigcirc Dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied
- 8. Please choose your type of educational institution:
 - \bigcirc District

◯ Charter

9. Please choose th	e location that best desc	ribes your program:
○ Rural: Town, Rur Tribal Controllec	al, Rural-Remote, and/or I	O Urban: City or Suburb
10. What grade leve	ls does your program ser	ve?
PreK	🗌 4th	🗌 9th
К	🗌 5th	🗌 10th
🗌 1st	🗌 6th	🗌 11th
2nd	🗌 7th	🗌 12th
3rd	🗌 8th	
🗌 Other (please sp	ecify)	
11. If you could iden satisfaction with ou	tify one thing that ADE's r service, what would it b	21st CCLC team could to do increase your be?
		\bigcirc Collaboration
Communication		
Other (please specify))	
12. Please describe the collaboration that wou	e type(s) of training, supp uld be most helpful to yo	port, communication, funding, or u. What does it look like?
13. In the text box belo	ow, please feel free to add	d any additional comments.







Arizona Department of Education (ADE) 21st CCLC Customer Satisfaction Survey 2022

Bonus Questions

The questions in this section are optional but we'd appreciate it if you took a few minutes to answer them.

Summer Learning

There is national interest in learning and other loss for students due to the pandemic. Summer presents a rich opportunity to address these losses. In Arizona, we've offered continued professional development and discussion in order to encourage evidenced based practice in summer learning.

In this section, we will ask how have you changed your summer learning practices to reflect the key elements of evidence based practice in your preparation for Summer 2022 programs.

14. Key Element 1: Start Planning Early- Please check all of the components of this element that you utilized for your Summer 2022 program.

Started cross-department planning by January

Made key programmatic decisions, such as targeted student population and program duration, upfront

] Met regularly and plan for both academics and enrichment activities

Engaged in a continuous improvement process

15. Key Element 2: Structure Program for Sufficient Academic Time on Task- Please check all of the components of this element that you utilized for your Summer 2022 program.
Scheduled academic instruction for three to four hours per day
Scheduled the program to span five to six weeks
Provided teachers with strategies for maximizing instructional time
Will ensure smooth site operations from Day 1
16. Key Element 3: Use Effective Student Recruitment Practices- Please check all of the components of this element that you utilized for your Summer 2022 program.
Developed clear and timely recruitment materials that explain program requirements and features
Personalized recruitment of students and their families
Will follow up with enrollees before the program starts
17. Key Element 4: Hire Effective Instructional Staff- Please check all of the components
of this element that you utilized for your Summer 2022 program.
of this element that you utilized for your Summer 2022 program. Developed rigorous processes to recruit and hire effective, certified teachers with grade-level and content experience for academic classes
of this element that you utilized for your Summer 2022 program. Developed rigorous processes to recruit and hire effective, certified teachers with grade- level and content experience for academic classes For enrichment classes, hired instructors with strong content expertise
 of this element that you utilized for your Summer 2022 program. Developed rigorous processes to recruit and hire effective, certified teachers with grade-level and content experience for academic classes For enrichment classes, hired instructors with strong content expertise Trained enrichment instructors in behavior management strategies
 of this element that you utilized for your Summer 2022 program. Developed rigorous processes to recruit and hire effective, certified teachers with grade-level and content experience for academic classes For enrichment classes, hired instructors with strong content expertise Trained enrichment instructors in behavior management strategies 18. Key Element 5: Provide High-Quality Academic Instruction- Please check all of the components of this element that you utilized for your Summer 2022 program.
 of this element that you utilized for your Summer 2022 program. Developed rigorous processes to recruit and hire effective, certified teachers with grade-level and content experience for academic classes For enrichment classes, hired instructors with strong content expertise Trained enrichment instructors in behavior management strategies 18. Key Element 5: Provide High-Quality Academic Instruction- Please check all of the components of this element that you utilized for your Summer 2022 program. Selected curricula that are aligned to school-year standards and students' needs
 of this element that you utilized for your Summer 2022 program. Developed rigorous processes to recruit and hire effective, certified teachers with grade-level and content experience for academic classes For enrichment classes, hired instructors with strong content expertise Trained enrichment instructors in behavior management strategies 18. Key Element 5: Provide High-Quality Academic Instruction- Please check all of the components of this element that you utilized for your Summer 2022 program. Selected curricula that are aligned to school-year standards and students' needs Will instruct in small classes or groups
of this element that you utilized for your Summer 2022 program. Developed rigorous processes to recruit and hire effective, certified teachers with grade- level and content experience for academic classes For enrichment classes, hired instructors with strong content expertise Trained enrichment instructors in behavior management strategies 18. Key Element 5: Provide High-Quality Academic Instruction- Please check all of the components of this element that you utilized for your Summer 2022 program. Selected curricula that are aligned to school-year standards and students' needs Will instruct in small classes or groups Will provide support to students with special needs
of this element that you utilized for your Summer 2022 program. Developed rigorous processes to recruit and hire effective, certified teachers with grade- level and content experience for academic classes For enrichment classes, hired instructors with strong content expertise Trained enrichment instructors in behavior management strategies 8. Key Element 5: Provide High-Quality Academic Instruction- Please check all of the components of this element that you utilized for your Summer 2022 program. Selected curricula that are aligned to school-year standards and students' needs Will instruct in small classes or groups Gave teachers sufficient training and ongoing support

19. Key Element 6: Foster a Positive Summer Site Climate- Please check all of the components of this element that you utilized for your Summer 2022 program.
Trained all staff on the importance of positive adult engagement with students throughout the day — not only in classes
Developed a clear, positive message about the summer site culture and ask staff to consistently convey it to students
If resources allow, considered hiring staff to support positive student behavior
20. Key Element 7: Maximize Attendance- Please check all of the components of this element that you utilized for your Summer 2022 program.
Established firm enrollment deadlines and keep electronic student records
Established a clear attendance policy and track student-level attendance data
Will provide free meals and transportation
If resources permit, will provide field trips, enrichment activities and other incentives to attendees
21. Key Element 8: Strive for Cost Efficiencies- Please check all of the components of this element that you utilized for your Summer 2022 program.
Capitalized on existing district experts and systems
Hired staff based on projected daily attendance, not on the initial number of enrollees
Connected summer and school-year curricula
Partnered with community-based organizations to provide enrichment activities
22. We welcome any additional comments on the planning and implementation of 2022 summer learning at your site.

The key elements of evidenced based summer learning can be found <u>here</u> as a document from RAND.