

21st Century Community Learning Center Evaluation Summary

(Emmanuel Family & Child Development Center (EFCDC) – Complete summary after Guided Reflection Section 8)

Afterschool programs are an evidence-based strategy for helping students meet challenging academic standards, improve attendance and graduation rates, and develop college and career readiness skills and behaviors. The federally funded 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) program provides competitive grant funding to districts to implement before- and after-school and summer enrichment programs that support and enhance student outcomes. Emmanuel Family & Child Development Center (EFCDC) received a 21st CCLC grant in 2021-22.¹ The afterschool program operates one K-8 program on-site at EFCDC serving 15-25 students.

Each year, 21st CCLC grantees undergo an external evaluation process that reviews their progress related to three broad afterschool goals: 1) academic improvement and efficacy, 2) program quality, and 3) youth outcomes. During the 2021-22 school year, each site recorded attendance and grades data, received a Program Quality Assessment (PQA) observation, and completed a series of afterschool surveys with responses from 6 youth and 2 program staff. (No responses were received from families or school administrators). A certified external evaluator met with the program administrator to review data and complete a Guided Reflection Document. Results from the annual external evaluation ensure grant compliance and influence continuous quality improvement efforts including modifying the program curricula and enrichment activities and planning professional development for staff.

Goal 1: Academic Achievement and Efficacy

Afterschool programs provide a full range of academic support including homework help, tutoring, academic enrichment, and comprehensive integrated units directly tied to the state standards. They provide activities that complement rather than replicate the school day.

The Emmanuel afterschool program supports academic achievement and efficacy for students from five charter schools in a lower socio-economic area of Kansas City. In 2021-22, the program included homework help, recreational and academic activities, and a healthy snack. Students engaged in a variety of academic achievement, social and emotional learning, reading and STEM literacy activities. Afterschool leaders were well-prepared and credentialed to lead a high-quality program. In year one, the program satisfactorily met goal one objectives in the area of **Math (1.2)**, **Reading and Communication Arts (1.1)** and **Science (1.3)** were less than satisfactory. Youth survey respondents perceived they worked hard, got better, and were capable of learning new things in reading and science, though efficacy scores overall were below state average. These results fit with the local context description (No year one grades or MAP test scores were available for review.) Staff describe student attitudes as generally positive with an excitement and a desire to learn, especially hands-on activities. Cooking classes and financial literacy were two program highlights of year one.

Goal 2: Program Quality

Research shows that high quality afterschool programs help close the achievement gap and reduce the likelihood of youth participating in risk-taking behaviors. The 21st CCLC grant recipients participate in an

¹ <https://dese.mo.gov/media/pdf/21st-cclc-grant-recipients-cohort-12>

ongoing quality improvement process that includes the point-of-service experience of youth, school day linkages, offering a broad array of activities, and family engagement opportunities.

The Emmanuel afterschool program had strong **Observed Program Quality (Goal 2.1)** in 2021-22. The program earned more than satisfactory marks on the PQA, staff survey, and youth survey. Emmanuel program quality was positively influenced by frontline staff were hired with specialized skills to strengthen the program. **School Day Alignment (Goal 2.2)** was satisfactorily met, with Documenting State Standards receiving an advanced rating. (No school administrator surveys were available for review). **Broad Array (2.3)** was a noted strength of the program which more than met the satisfactory rating. Partnerships with preparatory academies created opportunities to amplify learning afterschool. Evidence of school day alignment and broad array of activities were noted in a range of offerings. Lesson Plans and Daily Schedule both earned an advanced rating, while SEL Activities and Weekly Schedule were both more than satisfactory. **Family Engagement (2.4)** was also satisfactory or above, with Family & Child Academic Enrichment Opportunities rated more than satisfactory. Afterschool Staff Strengthening Families however received a less than satisfactory rating. Turnover of school personnel and afterschool staff, including a vacant school outreach coordinator/liaison position, presented challenges in year one.

Goal 3: Youth Outcomes

Afterschool programs also offer non-academic benefits that support the student's development of life readiness skills including positive school behaviors (e.g., regular attendance), personal and social skills (e.g., time management, teamwork, critical thinking), and commitment to learning (e.g., initiative, homework completion, study skills).

The Emmanuel program met the goal for **Program Attendance (3.1)**, with elementary, middle school, and high school students attending at least 30 days, receiving more than satisfactory and/or advanced ratings. Stretch goals for attendance were less than satisfactory for elementary and middle school. The program came up short of the proposed vs. actual attendance goal. Staff acknowledge first year engagement with schools and students takes time and requires staff consistency on both ends. **Personal and Social Skills (3.2)** and **Commitment to Learning (3.3)** were both very strong and received advanced ratings. The program was attentive to helping students see college as attainable and know their options. Community partners were eager to give kids access to enrichment and resources beyond school. A project-based focus supported personal and social skill development through teamwork over individual work. Students living in stressful environments and experiencing various forms of trauma presented challenges to youth outcomes. Emmanuel aimed to take a holistic approach and to create a culture of belonging for all youth in the program. Students were provided regular access to a counselor. Staff received trauma training to better support positive youth outcomes.

For more information, contact Melody Morgan at 816-921-3164 or morganmelody01@gmail.com.

Part A: Additional Data Collection by the External Evaluator

Section 1 – Grantee/Evaluator Information

21st CCLC Grantee Name: **Emmanuel Family & Child Development Center (EFDCDC)**

Cohort #: **12** Year in the grant: **2** External Evaluator Name: **Steven Hennes**

Name of Program Director participating in evaluation meetings: **Alex Taylor**

List each site included in this evaluation and the name of the site representative that attended each meeting:

	Date of first meeting:	Date of second meeting:	Site Visit? (Y/N)
Site 1: Emmanuel Family & Child Development Center	September 28, 2022 – Alex Taylor, Melody Morgan, Janel Fields, Deborah Mann	February 28, 2023 – Melody Morgan, Janel Fields, Deborah Mann	Yes
Site 2:			
Site 3:			
Site 4:			
Site 5:			
Site 6:			

Section 2 – Program Overview

Please provide a 2-3 paragraph description of the program that includes at minimum the grades/ages served (Elementary, Middle, High School), how often the youth at each site meet, the types of activities provided, and approximate attendance and enrollments. Please note whether the youth attending the program usually have homework. Describe the staffing of the program and sites, including the number of paid staff, volunteers, and administrative structure.

The Emmanuel Family & Child Development Center² runs one centrally located afterschool site in Kansas City, Missouri. The program serves K-8 students and takes place on-site at EFDCDC. The newly constructed facility opened in May 2020 in Kansas City’s third district (Blue Hills) at the corner of Prospect Avenue and MLK Jr. Blvd. In addition to afterschool, the facility co-houses Emmanuel’s infant-toddler, preschool, and parent education programs, family emergency services, and health services through the Swope Health KidsCare clinic.

Afterschool program enrollment is 40 students with average daily attendance of 15-25 students. The site operates Monday through Friday before school from 6 to 9 a.m. and after school from 3 to 6 p.m. Homework help is an integral part of the program. Students are also engaged in a variety of academic enrichment, social and emotional learning, reading and STEM literacy activities. Emmanuel is a fee-based school age program with an annual registration fee, before and/or afterschool rates, and weekly transportation options. The daily program includes homework help, recreational and academic activities, and a healthy snack (as well as breakfast before school and dinner for afterschool participants). Other activities include a variety of

² <http://www.emmanuelchildcare.org/>

Emmanuel-based curriculum programs, such as cooking, financial literacy, entrepreneurship, and hand-on STEM activities.

Program staffing includes a school age program director, school outreach coordinator/liaison, four youth development specialists, and two teachers. These staff positions are funded 100% by 21st CCLC funds. The liaison, specialists, and teachers are supervised by the program director. The director of development is acting as primary program contact for the 21st CCLC grant. The assistant director/education coordinator works closely with the program director, school age care staff, and schools on curriculum and planning. These staff members report to the Emmanuel founder/executive director of 36 years.

Staff members are seasoned non-profit and youth development professionals who are overseeing the grant, program administration, staff recruitment, and partnerships with schools and community. Attrition of staff during the 2021-22 school year left several positions vacant. A new school age program director started in March 2022 (but transitioned out December 2022). The director of development joined the staff in August 2022. At the first meeting, vacancies included the school outreach coordinator/liaison, youth development specialists, and teacher positions. Recruitment and screening of applicants were underway. By the second meeting, six new staff had been hired: a new program director to start March 2023, a school outreach coordinator/liaison, youth development specialists, and teachers.

Section 3 – Local Context

The Local Context section of the Guided Reflection document should be completed by the external evaluator following a face-to-face discussion that takes place before June 30th. All four items should be completed for each question. Please do not change the format used below.

- 1) **Goal 1 – Academic** Describe the issues (youth, staff, school, community) that have a positive or negative impact on the program’s ability to successfully increase student achievement and sense of competence in the areas of reading/communication arts, mathematics, and science.

Youth:

Positive influences on academics include student excitement and desire to learn, especially involving hands-on activities. Staff observe student attitudes toward learning are generally positive. Students want to be there but often do not come to the program with homework. They want to be on target in school and to improve. Some want homework but do not have it. Students say they do not do a lot of science in school and want hands-on activities afterschool. The Emmanuel site sets up STEM activity baskets for students to pick up in the homework room. Lab coats and goggles are tangibles that students say make them feel like real scientists. Program partnerships with the Prairie Fire Museum, for example, provide off-site opportunities as well, including complimentary busing and free access during the summer. Cooking activities like making cookies and tacos emphasize math using recipes and calculations. The Compass KC program teaches financial literacy, budgeting, and entrepreneurship as a math emphasis. Staff indicate plans to focus more on reading and to bring in a speech therapist (for pronunciation and other speech challenges that impact reading competency). The program will receive additional data on student reading progress midway through the school year.

Negative influences on academics include family stress, instability, and childhood trauma affecting how students perform in school. The observed transience of families is a barrier. Many students come from single parent homes, and kids are having to assume parental roles and supervising younger siblings. Students may be in between housing situations, live in a homeless shelter, or have a family member in jail. Caregiving adults may not always be present in the lives of students. Parents

are tired and stressed. Unemployment has taken a toll. Parents may not always know how to help students with homework as schools change the way some subjects are taught. Assessments indicate most kids served by the afterschool program have had at least one adverse childhood experience. If childhood trauma is not ongoing, it has already occurred, and students are trying to process it. Emmanuel feeds kids a meal every day, 3:00-6:00 p.m., and before school, 6:00-9:00 a.m. Some students come just before school, but typically attend both before and after school. The program also offers group counseling to all students in 3rd grade or higher every week for 4 weeks. Parental involvement in the program is a challenge and becomes harder for students beyond third grade. If an issue with a child is not immediate or negative, parents often are not as attentive.

Staff:

Positive influences on academics include a smaller program size of 15-25 students which has allowed staff to work more one-on-one with students on STEM activities. Staff are better able to assess where kids are developmentally. Emmanuel helps staff learn how to build relationships with kids, as many of the students served have trust issues with adults. Emmanuel's approach is project-based learning to keep student hands busy, not to emulate what goes on in school (cooking classes are popular with the students; "let's make slime!").

Staff shortages and attrition were a challenge in 2021-22. Systems are in place to support recruitment and hiring, and Emmanuel is particular about who they hire. A lot of staffing comes from relationships the program has built and from people referring others. As of the first visit, recruitment of open positions was underway with staff reaching out to schools and universities and six interviews to occur that week. By the day of the second visit, six hires had been made.

School:

The program serves students from 5 schools situated in a lower socio-economic area -- Genesis School, Hogan Preparatory Academy, KC Girls Preparatory Academy, Hope Leadership Academy, and University Academy. Students' experience reflect that these are charter schools which each have a target or theme. University Academy partners with the University of Missouri and has a college prep focus. Genesis focuses on literacy and brings a literacy lab to the Emmanuel program and hosts a literacy night. The other schools tend to focus on STEM curriculum.

The Kansas City Public School System has struggled, and more than half of all K-12 students attend one of 20 charter schools in the district.³ Staff indicate students in high school are doing math at the 3rd or 4th grade level. Recent data from MARC indicate starting kindergarten reading levels are lower than desirable. School class sizes are large. It is difficult for one teacher to focus on the students who are higher achieving. Students are probably not being challenged in classroom reading as they should. Schools are working to tackle social-emotional learning, character, and social skills. Staff perceptions are that behavioral and disciplinary problems in schools limit offering more hands-on learning, such as in STEM labs.

Community:

Emmanuel operates from a holistic mission seeking to provide out-of-school programs, parent education, emergency services, and health care housed together under one roof. The afterschool program predominantly serves children and youth of lower socio-economic status. The center

³ <https://www.kcur.org/education/2021-11-29/for-the-first-time-more-k-12-students-are-attending-charters-than-kansas-city-public-schools>

website estimates 91% of enrolled families live below the poverty level, and 15% of children are homeless or near homeless. Many live in women's or homeless shelters or transitional housing programs.

- 2) **Goal 2 – Program Quality** Describe the issues (youth, staff, school, community) that have a positive or negative impact on the program's ability to develop and maintain a quality program that includes observed program quality (PQA, surveys), school day alignment (consistency of curriculum, communication with school day staff, alignment with standards), broad array of activities (academic strategies based on individual student needs, SEL, variety, choice), and family engagement (family and child academic enrichment opportunities, educational development for adult family members of students served).

Youth:

Positive influences on quality include observed student engagement, attention to standards alignment, and a wide range of enrichment activities. Emmanuel 6th and 7th graders experienced summer programming during 2021-22, including a financial literacy and STEM program. The program director notes students were initially unable to finish pre/post-test questions but finished them in under 5 minutes at the end of the program, demonstrating engagement in learning. The curriculum coordinator constantly looks at standards to ensure activities align. Linkages between homework help and extended programming activities are intentional. Programs from partners like COMBAT (Community Backed Anti-Crime Tax) contribute to a broad array of activities. This complementary funding source provides educational awareness on substance abuse along with a focus on social-emotional learning. Activities are becoming more youth led. Students are involved in more of the planning, although staff acknowledge the program could do more in this area. Overall, staff feel students are socially, academically, and mentally in a good spot.

Negative influences include the challenges in getting parents to routinely come out to support programming. They do come out for larger events, such as the end-of-year program which staff indicate was packed and standing-room only. The KC Compass entrepreneurship program held an end-of-camp celebration and gave kids financial incentives for completing the program (\$100 and a suitcase to the top 3 business ideas). Surveys are difficult to get completed from school administrators and parents, in part due to changes in administrators at partner schools.

Staff:

Strengths that bolster program quality include the new center, which consolidated previous operations from three locations into one. Bright spaces and natural lighting have opened up new programming possibilities and created a "transformational" physical environment that is more conducive to learning. According to the executive director, it also enhances the program's ability to attract certified teachers to come work in the modern facility. High-speed internet supports interactive learning like Osmo.

Challenges include the lack of a school liaison staff member, which have limited connections with partner schools. Staff also recognize youth development specialists could use more PQA training in areas of interaction, engagement, classroom setup, and managing challenging behaviors. Parent and family engagement is an ongoing dilemma. It is harder to realize attendance at one-night events and in between the start and finish of extended programs. Emmanuel is aiming to partner with Genesis School on parent nights and parent/teacher conferences already on the schedule, as a strategy to go where parents already are and offer afterschool resources.

School:

Positive issues include partnerships with the preparatory academies which create opportunities to amplify learning afterschool. For example, the Genesis School's focus on literacy and reading has carried over into Emmanuel's work with students outside of school. There is an upcoming literacy night, where students will read books to youngers, and resources will be available for parents. The program director has interacted with schools since coming on board in the spring and this will transition to the school liaison staff when hired. Emmanuel afterschool leaders are well-prepped and credentialed to lead the program, with master's degrees and years of combined experience in classroom teaching, staff supervision, college admissions and advising, and educational curriculum and leadership. One teacher on staff currently has a degree in math. Emmanuel purposefully hires teachers who are not from the prep academies to enhance the afterschool experience and avoid any conflicts of interest between the school day and the afterschool program.

Negative issues include the challenges of getting schools to complete the afterschool surveys. Emmanuel staff indicate partner schools are experiencing shortages in staff. According to staff, one school sustained complete turnover, and the full counseling staff left. As a result, Emmanuel staff are re-introducing themselves and the afterschool program to schools to rebuild awareness, buy-in, and commitment.

Community:

After 36 years, Emmanuel has enormous support in the Kansas City community, as evidenced by the \$9.6 million construction of the new facility. The center has not yet reached full operating capacity due to residual concerns over COVID-19. Added benefits of the center to the community have included fiber-optic internet cable installation accessible to all neighborhood residents, and additional Head Start revenue and child slots due to expanded and dedicated programming space.

- 3) **Goal 3 – Youth Outcomes** Describe the issues (youth, staff, school, community) that have a positive or negative impact on the program's ability to enhance youth's life readiness skills and behaviors, including positive school behaviors, (attendance, program attendance, out of school suspensions), personal and social skills (communications, teamwork, accountability), and commitment to learning (initiative, study skills, homework completion).

Youth:

Along with issues described above, strengths related to youth outcomes include program efforts to expand postsecondary pathways and career options for students. Trade school was mentioned as a promising route for raising student awareness of options and opportunities. One Emmanuel student recently expressed interest to a staff member in pursuing a cybersecurity career. Many students served by the program are not sure if college is attainable. There is a lack of awareness, and they are not seeing a lot of it at home. They need to have it introduced to them, and to know what their options are. For this reason, along with Emmanuel's college career club curriculum for students, college visits are being planned for this year.

Another challenge to attaining youth outcomes is stress and compromised mental well-being of students. When they come, the program is a refuge, and they have peace of mind, but have to go back to do battle in their lives outside the program. This can create some behaviors staff do not want to see. Kids must attend school to attend the Emmanuel program, and a couple of students have struggled with managing behavior and suspensions. The organization strives to create a culture of belonging for all youth. The therapist starts each session with a story and hands-on activity, talking

about how students can better esteem themselves and others. The cook and the bus driver greet each child by name, showing them their value.

Staff:

To facilitate positive school behaviors, staff have adopted an open-arms approach toward students. All Emmanuel staff are going through Trauma Smart training (Crittenton Children’s Center), which was paused during COVID, but is starting again. The goal is to support positive behaviors with a growth mindset to help kids better understand, empathize, change approaches, and problem solve.

The project-based focus emphasizes personal and social skills through teamwork over individual work. Group counseling sessions build life skills, including the soft skills with which kids struggle. Social skills are modeled to students and parents by staff. Staff aim to create an emotionally safe space, pull a student aside, teach little techniques they can use, and make it different than what they experience outside the program environment. Emmanuel provides a physical space/environment that is set for learning, offers activities that are ready-to-go, and communicates messages that are affirming. As an extra touch, students can display their artwork on site for a sense of ownership and pride.

In terms of family support, staff note how parenting has changed. The shift in parenting attitudes toward education and careers can stifle student motivation. Parents do not seem to be challenging kids as much to pursue college. YouTube is seen as a “career” and how one can be successful without having to do the work.

School:

Schools create an environment that supports student success. Classrooms are vibrant. Signs are everywhere (“readers are leaders”), and students see positive messages daily. Technology was identified as a two-edged sword, with both positive and negative influences on youth outcomes. The program strives to make good use of student technology fluency. Intentionality is key. Some students in the afterschool program have a smartphone, but not all. In many interactions, technology has become a substitute supervisor of students and is replacing the dynamic of family interaction critical to many life skills.

Community:

The new EFCDC facility was built in a high-need area of Kansas City which has been classified as a “childcare desert” where current providers are unable to offer adequate coverage for families. The opening of the 28,000 square-foot center the year prior to COVID-19 allowed Emmanuel to pivot to provide critical services for youth and families during the pandemic.⁴ In Kansas City, there is widespread recognition of built-in inequities across systems. Staff indicate community partners have been eager to give kids access to enrichment opportunities and resources beyond school. In tangible, everyday ways, this includes things like free Zoo access, swimming pool discounts, and donated theatre costumes.

⁴ <https://iff.org/transformational-new-facility-unlocks-potential-for-early-childhood-learners-in-kansas-city/>

Section 4 – Review of Progress on Previously Selected Objectives

1) Which item(s) was selected from last year’s External Evaluation to be worked on this year?

1.1 1.2 1.3
 2.1 2.2 2.3 2.4
 3.1 3.2 3.3

2) How has the program used the previous years’ External Evaluation to improve and refine the afterschool program? What changes did the program try to make in order to make progress on the selected objective(s)? Please give specific examples.

N/A – first year evaluation

Part B: Data Charts

The following sections are to be completed by the external evaluator after receiving the data reports (8/15/22), but before meeting with the program director for the second face-to-face discussion. Please do not change the format of the charts.

Section 5 – Review of Data Reports

1) Using the data provided in the External Evaluator Grantee Summary Report, if the overall grantee score is Less than Satisfactory, indicate which sites contributed to the low score.

Objective	If overall grantee score (Goals 1 & 3) or individual site score (Goal 2) is Less than Satisfactory, list which site(s) contributed to the low score?	Using last year’s External Evaluation Report, please comment on whether these sites had previously scored “Less than Satisfactory”.
1.1 – Reading	Emmanuel	Less Than Satisfactory
1.2 – Math		
1.3 – Science	Emmanuel	Less Than Satisfactory
2.1 – Observed Program Quality		
2.2 – School Day Linkages		
2.3 – Broad Array		
2.4 – Family Engagement		
3.1 – Program Attendance		
3.2 – Personal and Social Skills		
3.3 – Commitment to Learning		

Part C: Narrative Responses

The following sections are to be completed by the external evaluator based on the data above prior to meeting with the program director for the second face-to-face discussion.

Section 6 – Status of 2021-22 Objectives

For each item below, the external evaluator should complete the first set of questions prior to the second face-to-face meeting with the program team. The purpose of the second set of questions (in italics) is to contextualize the relevant data. The second set of questions should be completed following the second meeting with the director.

- 1) **Goal 1 – Student Achievement and Sense of Competence Rubrics (1.1-1.3)** – For each subject area (Reading, Math, and Science), what trends can be seen across all sites? In which subjects are youth succeeding? In which subjects do they need more assistance? How does the self-efficacy survey data fit/not fit with the grades and test score data? Are there particular sites that do better/worse than others? How does the local context fit this data?

Goal 1 criteria were partially met in 2021-22 (1 of 3 objectives). The math objective was satisfactory or above while reading/communication arts and science objectives were less than satisfactory.

Limited survey data are available to analyze or summarize first-year performance of the project (N=6 students, 2 staff, 0 family, and 0 school administrators). All (100%) student respondents were Black/African American (3 male, 3 female students). Half of the survey respondents (50%) were K-2 students.

According to Kids Care Center data, students in grades 3-5 made up over half (53%) of total students in regular attendance (N=26 total). Female students (54%) made up a slightly greater proportion of program attendees than male students (46%). All students served were Black/African American. No survey data were available from family or staff for summary.

Reading

- First-year student efficacy scores in reading (66.7%) were slightly lower than the minimum satisfactory criteria for this objective (70% of students reporting medium or high efficacy at reading).
- No reading grades or test score data were available to review for 2021-22 school year.
- Overall reading efficacy item results indicate lower average scores (3.75) than the comparative value (4.01). Emmanuel student respondents are interested in reading/language arts (4.00) and believe they would be good at learning something new in reading (4.00), but believe they are good at reading to a lesser extent than other students (3.67 compared to 4.01 average).
- The local context influences reading progress, given parent stress levels, family instability, and student trauma. Recent MARC data indicate kindergarten reading levels are lower than desirable.
- Students could benefit from more assistance in reading confidence, reinforcement, and challenge. Staff indicate plans to focus more on reading and to bring in a speech therapist. Newer data on reading progress from the 2022-2023 school year can inform approaches for next year. Partnering with the Genesis School's focus on literacy and reading demonstrate the program is proactively working to improve reading.

Math

- First-year student efficacy scores in math (83.3%) were higher than the minimum criteria for this objective (80% or more youth reporting medium or high efficacy at math).
- No math grades or test scores were available to review for 2021-22 school year.
- Emmanuel respondents have slightly lower average math efficacy scores (3.92) than students in other programs (4.15). Emmanuel student respondents said they work hard and are getting better at math (4.33) and believe they would be good at learning something new in math (4.00) but show less interest (3.83) and less belief they are good at math (4.00) than their peers.
- The local context shapes student performance in math. According to staff, area high school student skills in math are often still at the 3rd and 4th grade level.
- The Emmanuel program is making math fun and relatable through cooking activities, financial literacy, entrepreneurship, and hands-on STEM activities. One teacher on staff has a degree in math, bringing subject expertise in planning activities and supporting students. The smaller program size of 15-25 students has allowed staff to work with students more one-on-one on STEM activities. Activities that grow confidence and reinforce math skills will continue to benefit students.

Science

- First-year student efficacy scores in science (33.3%) were lower than the minimum criteria for this objective (70% or more youth reporting medium or high efficacy at science).
- No science grades or test scores were available to review for 2021-22 school year.
- Emmanuel respondents have lower average science efficacy scores (3.54) than students in other programs (4.14). Students were less interested in science than their afterschool peers (3.33 compared to 4.16). However, student scores were nearly equal to other programs in working hard and getting better at science (4.00 compared to 4.12), as well as believing they would be good at learning new things in science (4.00 compared to 4.06).
- The local context influences student performance in STEM. A number of charter schools that partner with the program have a STEM curriculum focus. However, according to staff, students say they do not do a lot of science in school and want hands-on activities afterschool.
- The program is working to boost student interest in and experience with STEM through hands-on activities and field trips. Along with Emmanuel's college career club curriculum for students, college visits are being planned for this year. Activities that provide further exposure to STEM concepts and careers will benefit students.

Why is the program succeeding or struggling in a particular rubric item? Why might some sites do better or worse than other sites in a particular rubric item? (Answer based on the discussion at the second meeting.)

The program has added staff with backgrounds in areas that can impact reading and science. Moreover, the program is becoming more intentional about adding literacy components to before-school programming and to other activities such as art. Staff considered one teacher last year may have had limited success with students on numerous STEM experiences because the teacher did not have adequate time to build relationships so lacked connection with students that would have made learning experiences more impactful. The program continues to prioritize student relationships as the gateway to impact learning over time.

2) **Goal 2 – Program Quality Rubric (2.1)** – *This includes PQA, Youth Program Quality Scale, Staff Program Quality Scale, and Family Program Quality Scale.*

What trends can be seen across all sites? What are the strengths of the program? What may need to be improved across all sites at the program? What concerns/areas for improvement can be seen for only certain sites? How does the local context fit this data?

Goal 2 criteria for program quality were met, with all three objectives satisfactory or above. Emmanuel was more than satisfactory on program quality assessments of staff, youth, and overall.

- The program scored more than satisfactory on Goal 2, Objective 1 for program quality. Emmanuel was more than satisfactory on staff, youth, and overall assessments of program quality.
- Emmanuel was overall close to the program average on program quality (3.96 compared to 4.05). The program was stronger in three out of four areas (engagement, supportive environment, and safe environment) than the program average. Engagement most exceeded the average program (3.75 to 3.27 average).
- Staff survey results (N=2) were strong on supportive environment, staff support, staffing, management, and cultural practices scales, all ranging from 4.07-4.25, though each score was still shy of program averages. The broad array of activities score was lowest at 3.71, compared to 3.88 other programs.
- On single items, Emmanuel staff said the program helps youth feel valued; offers sessions that build upon prior activities; and provide SEL activities for youth (all scored 5.00). By contrast, staff rated the program lower on youth voice in activity selection, staff retention and longevity, and keeping the community well-informed about the program (all scored 3.0).
- On youth survey results (N=6), students feel like they matter (4.67) and are treated fairly by staff (4.67). They do fun (4.50) and interesting activities (4.50), feel like they belong (4.33) and feel safe afterschool (4.33). Youth least associate the program with working in small groups on projects (3.17) and doing activities important to them (3.33).
- No family program quality data were available for review.
- Interactions was one area where the program could improve (2.67 compared to 3.79 average).

Why is the program succeeding or struggling in a particular rubric item? Why might some sites do better or worse than other sites in a particular rubric item? (Answer based on the discussion at the second meeting.)

Results on Goal 2 objective 1 were not surprising to staff, given the program’s emphasis on building a safe and supportive environment for all youth. Staff indicate that involving youth in activity selection is improving. Greater involvement of students in choice of activities could further raise the relevance level. Staff had a question about the grade levels of students answering the survey item related to “doing activities important to them.” (Survey respondents included three K-2 students, one in grades 3-5, and two in grades 6-8).

3) **Goal 2 – School Day Alignment Rubric (2.2)** – *This includes Coordination of Academic Support, State Standards, School Day Admin Scale, and Staff School Day Linkages Scale.*

What trends can be seen across all sites? What are the strengths of the program? What may need to be improved across all sites at the program? What concerns/areas for improvement can be seen for only certain sites? How does the local context fit this data?

- The program scored more than satisfactory on Goal 2, Objective 2 for school day alignment. Emmanuel was rated as advanced on documenting state standards, satisfactory on coordination of

academic support, and satisfactory on staff/coordinator school day linkages (score of 3.87 exceeded average score of 3.5 on linkages scale)

- On staff survey results (N=2), respondents agreed program sessions link to specific learning goals, targets, or standards (5.0). Staff see importance of integrating academic content and workplace skills into the program, offering academic enrichment that complements the school day, and keeping schools informed on afterschool activities (all 4.5). Communication between afterschool staff and school day teachers was rated infrequent (2.0). Coordinated professional development activities between schools and afterschool program, and program staff knowing focus of school day academics each week could be areas for improvement (3.0).
- No school administrator survey data were available to review.

Why is the program succeeding or struggling in a particular rubric item? Why might some sites do better or worse than other sites in a particular rubric item? (Answer based on the discussion at the second meeting.)

Staff expected results on school day alignment to be strong, as the education coordinator works diligently to ensure linkages between program activities and standards and classrooms. Infrequent communication with school day teachers last year was partly due to a vacant school liaison position, but with that person in place, bridges are being built between the afterschool program and classrooms.

4) **Goal 2 – Broad Array Rubric (2.3)** – *This includes Academic Strategies, SEL, Lesson Planning, Schedules, and Choice.*

What trends can be seen across all sites? What are the strengths of the program? What may need to be improved across all sites at the program? What concerns/areas for improvement can be seen for only certain sites? How does the local context fit this data?

- The program scored satisfactory or above on Goal 2, Objective 3 for broad array of activities. Emmanuel was rated as advanced on lesson plans and daily schedule/variety of activities. Two areas were also rated more than satisfactory including social and emotional learning and weekly schedule/exposure to variety of topics. Academic strategies based on student needs and choice of activities were both rated satisfactory.

Why is the program succeeding or struggling in a particular rubric item? Why might some sites do better or worse than other sites in a particular rubric item? (Answer based on the discussion at the second meeting.)

Evidence of a broad array of activities is noted in a range of offerings, including cooking, scouting, coding, painting, sewing, arts, IXL curriculum, and a college career club. Group counseling sessions build life skills, including the soft skills with which kids tend to struggle.

5) **Goal 2 – Family Engagement Rubric (2.4)** – *This includes Family & Child Academic Enrichment, Educational Development for Adult Family Members, Family and Staff Strengthening Families Scales.*

What trends can be seen across all sites? What are the strengths of the program? What may need to be improved across all sites at the program? What concerns/areas for improvement can be seen for only certain sites? How does the local context fit this data?

- The program scored satisfactory or above on Goal 2, Objective 4 for family engagement. Emmanuel was rated as more than satisfactory on family and child academic enrichment opportunities and satisfactory on educational development for adult family members of students. Results on the

afterschool staff strengthening families scale (50%) were less than satisfactory, compared to the 70% positive response criteria for this scale.

- On staff survey results (N=2), respondents rated the program overall on strengthening families at 3.57, compared to the 4.15 program average. Staff were most confident that the program offers activities that promote parental involvement (4.50), while least confident on program parent decision input (2.0). Getting to know parents, offering parenting information, and providing opportunities for families to engage in student learning, do family activities together, and develop a sense of community were areas for improvement (all 3.0).
- No family member survey data were available for review.

Why is the program succeeding or struggling in a particular rubric item? Why might some sites do better or worse than other sites in a particular rubric item? (Answer based on the discussion at the second meeting.)

The absence of a school outreach coordinator/liaison last year factored into Objective 2.4 results, as this person's responsibilities largely include relations with families as well as schools. Progress is expected in this area as the position is now filled, and the program is partnering with schools on parent events already on the schedule.

6) **Goal 3 – Program Attendance Rubric (3.1)** – *This includes Proposed vs. Actual Attendance and grade level attendance benchmarks.*

What trends can be seen across all sites? What are the strengths of the program? What may need to be improved across all sites at the program? What concerns/areas for improvement can be seen for only certain sites? How does the local context fit this data?

Goal 3 criteria for youth outcomes were met, with three objectives satisfactory or above. Emmanuel was satisfactory on program attendance and advanced on both personal and social skills and commitment to learning.

- The program scored satisfactory or above on Goal 3, Objective 1 for program attendance. Results on this objective were mixed. The program was rated as advanced for middle school/junior high 30+ days and high school 30+ days. Elementary 30+ days attendance was rated as more than satisfactory. Elementary stretch 60+ days, middle school/junior high stretch 45+ days, and proposed vs. actual attendance were all less than satisfactory.
- The program met 27% of its attendance goal of 95 youth with 30+ days program attendance.
- Areas for improvement include moving elementary and middle school attendance beyond the 45+ and 60+ days criteria.

Why is the program succeeding or struggling in a particular rubric item? Why might some sites do better or worse than other sites in a particular rubric item? (Answer based on the discussion at the second meeting.)

Program attendance for 2021-22 reflects the program's first year of engagement with schools and students, which staff recognize takes time. This year staff are offering students more out-of-school time experiences, such as field trips, to build excitement and interest in activities that periodically get them "out of the building." Students who are happy with new experiences and spread it by word of mouth to others will support attendance. The morning before-school program also provides a relaxed and calm atmosphere for students to begin the school day and is a connecting point to attendance afterschool.

7) **Goal 3 – Positive School Behaviors – Personal and Social Skills Rubric (3.2)** *This includes the Personal and Social Skills Scale and School Day Discipline.*

What trends can be seen across all sites? What are the strengths of the program? What may need to be improved across all sites at the program? What concerns/areas for improvement can be seen for only certain sites? How does the local context fit this data?

- The program scored advanced on Goal 3, Objective 2 for personal and social skills. All youth survey respondents (100%) scored 3.5 or higher on the personal and social skills scale, above the 90% minimum threshold.
- Youth survey results (N=6) overall averaged 3.92, compared to the 4.56 average of other programs. On individual items, respondents scored highest on working well with others, following rules, knowing who to go to for help, and disagreeing without an argument (all 4.33). Respondents scored lowest on goalsetting for themselves (2.67).

Why is the program succeeding or struggling in a particular rubric item? Why might some sites do better or worse than other sites in a particular rubric item? (Answer based on the discussion at the second meeting.)

Staff view results for Objectives 3.2 and 3.3 as “pride points” for the program, especially after COVID and all of the challenges associated with students and school connectedness. Students learning personal and social skills through the program also applies to other areas of their lives and helps them to avoid risky behaviors. A former Emmanuel student has come back to work with the program in college as a student teacher, largely because of the relationship with the program founder/director and is an inspiration to current staff and youth that “education is a choice.”

8) **Goal 3 – Positive School Behaviors – Commitment to Learning (3.3)** *This includes the Commitment to Learning Scale and School Day Attendance.*

What trends can be seen across all sites? What are the strengths of the program? What may need to be improved across all sites at the program? What concerns/areas for improvement can be seen for only certain sites? How does the local context fit this data?

- The program scored advanced on Goal 3, Objective 3 for commitment to learning. All youth respondents (100%) scored 3.5 or higher on commitment to learning scale, compared to the 90% threshold.
- Youth survey results (N=6) overall averaged 4.01, compared to the 4.40 average of other programs. On individual items, respondents scored highest on wanting to do well in school and liking to learn new things (both 4.50), as well as knowing doing well in school will help them as adults and being responsible for how much they learn in school (both 4.33).
- The lowest rated items on the scale were knowing how to prepare for tests and believing they could do well even on difficult tests (both 3.33).

Why is the program succeeding or struggling in a particular rubric item? Why might some sites do better or worse than other sites in a particular rubric item? (Answer based on the discussion at the second meeting.)

See comments under Objective 3.2

Section 7 – Longitudinal Progress

For each item below, the external evaluator should complete the first set of questions prior to the second face-to-face meeting with the program director. The second set of questions in italics should be completed following the second meeting with the program director.

Please use this document and the previous Guided Reflection documents to look at trends over time.

1. What trends are noted across time related to the three goals?

- a. Goal 1 – Student Achievement and Sense of Competence:
- b. Goal 2 – Program Quality:
- c. Goal 3 – Youth Outcomes:

N/A – first year of evaluation

2. For the specific objective(s) that the program identified to work on during the past year (discussed in Review of Progress on Previously Selected Objectives in Part A, Section 4 above), what progress can be seen in the available data?

N/A – first year of evaluation

3. For the next year, which objectives do you recommend the program focus on for improvement? The evaluator should recommend 2-3 objectives if there are multiple areas that should be worked on simultaneously or if there are multiple sites that do not have the same recommended objectives.

When selecting recommendations, prioritize objectives that are marked as “Less than Satisfactory” on the data chart (Part B). If there are no items that are “Less than Satisfactory” at the objective level, please recommend objectives that have individual rubric items that are “Less than Satisfactory”. If all items are “Satisfactory or Above”, please select an item based off of your discussion with the program director.

a. Select the objective number(s) that you are recommending:

- | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1.2 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.3 | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2.1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2.2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2.3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2.4 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3.1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3.2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3.3 | |

b. For each site, indicate the objective number applicable to that site.

	Objective(s) for Improvement
Site 1: Emmanuel	1.1 and 1.3
Site 2:	
Site 3:	
Site 4:	
Site 5:	
Site 6:	

- c. After selecting the objective number(s), provide a rationale for each recommendation based on the data presented earlier. (Note: Action plans will be developed with the Afterschool Regional Educator so this response should be a standalone explanation of why you are recommending this item that the ARE can read to gain a quick, but thorough, understanding of the need, local context, and rationale for selection.)

From a review of the available data, Objectives 1.1 and 1.3 are recommended for the program to focus on for improvement in year two. Since limited survey data were available to review for year one, survey completion by students, staff, family, and school administrators should be a high priority for year two. This can provide a fuller and more representative look at the program next year and increase staff confidence in planning where to focus on the future.

For Objective 1.1, student reading efficacy scores were slightly lower than the satisfactory criteria in year one. Average reading efficacy scores were lower than state performance average for afterschool programs. The program cites evidence that Kansas City area kindergartners are lagging behind in reading, and reading is fundamental to every area of academic success. Emmanuel students say they are interested in reading and up to be challenged in this area. Students could benefit from more assistance in reading confidence, reinforcement, and challenge. Staff indicate plans to focus more on reading and to bring in a speech therapist to address underlying issues. Partnering with the Genesis School to bring greater program-wide focus on literacy and reading may be one strategy. Incorporating literacy and reading into other subject areas (such as art) and introducing reading as a strategy to help students cope and heal from trauma may be others.

For Objective 1.3, student science efficacy scores were less than half of the satisfactory criteria in year one. Emmanuel students were less interested in science than their peers, and average science efficacy scores were less than students in other afterschool programs. However, students were comparable to others in their self-perceptions of working hard, getting better, and their abilities to learn new things in science. Students have expressed interest to staff in STEM-related careers (like cybersecurity) but may need the program's help in connecting their interests as involving STEM. The program has ripe opportunity to extend a STEM learning focus through partnerships with charter schools that share this focus but are unable to offer hands-on experiential learning. Field trips and guest speakers (including former Emmanuel students who have gone on in STEM career pathways) may be strategies to enliven student interest and learning in year two and beyond.

Year one results also point to areas for continuous improvement, especially as key staff positions are filled:

- Expand youth voice in activity selection and ask youth for input on relevance of activities to their lives.
- Improve communication with school day teachers on school day academics and professional development.
- Build relationships with parents, offer opportunities for families to engage and do family activities together, and keep the community well-informed about program offerings and impacts.
- Help younger students with goalsetting and provide support for test preparation and confident test-taking.

Collectively, these areas could further strengthen and position Emmanuel as a high-quality afterschool program among Missouri 21st Century Community Learning Center grantees.