

21st CCLC Michigan

Overview of Program and State Evaluation Technical Supplement

Heng-Chieh Wu
Laurie A. Van Egeren
Laura Bates

MICHIGAN STATE
UNIVERSITY

Advancing Knowledge.
Transforming Lives.

21st CCLC Michigan

Overview of Program and State Evaluation Technical Supplement

Heng-Chieh Wu
Research Assistant

Laurie A. Van Egeren
Director, Community Evaluation and Research
Center

Laura Bates
Editor

Community Evaluation and Research Center
University Outreach & Engagement
Michigan State University

**MICHIGAN STATE
UNIVERSITY**



University Outreach
& Engagement
Michigan State University
East Lansing

MARCH 2007

- Copies of this report are available on line from:

- **University Outreach & Engagement**

- Michigan State University

- Kellogg Center, Garden Level

- East Lansing, Michigan 48824

- Phone: (517) 353-8977

- Fax: (517) 432-9541

- E-mail: outreach@msu.edu

- Web: <http://outreach.msu.edu/cerc/21stcclc.asp>

- © 2007 Michigan State University. All rights reserved

- Series: 21st CCLC Michigan Evaluation Briefs

- The views expressed are solely those of the authors.

- For more information about this report, contact Laurie

- Van Egeren at the above address or phone number, or

- email: vanegere@msu.edu.

- **Graphic Design**

- Adina Huda

- **Funding**

- This report was supported in part by a contract with

- the Michigan Department of Education and University

- Outreach & Engagement, Michigan State University.

- Michigan State University is an affirmative-action,

- equal-opportunity employer.

Contents

Introduction.....	5
Michigan 21 st CCLC Evaluation Methods	6
EZreports Database	6
Procedure for EZreports Data Collection.....	6
Program Improvement Surveys.....	7
Student Program Improvement Survey	7
Procedure for Student Survey Administration	9
Student Survey Return Rates	10
Parent Program Improvement Survey	11
Procedure for Parent Survey Administration	11
Parent Survey Return Rates	12
Staff Survey	12
Procedure for Staff Survey Administration.....	13
Teacher Survey	14
Procedures for Teacher Survey Administration	14
Teacher Survey Return Rates	15
School Outcome Data	15
Youth Program Quality Assessment (YPOA)	15
Annual Report Form (ARF)	16
Data Analysis for the Overview Brief	17
Number of Sites	17
Number of Students	17
Operation Hours.....	17
Cost per student	18

Tables

Table 1. Scale Information for Student Program Improvement Survey (K-3 rd grade)	7
Table 2. Scale Information for Student Program Improvement Survey (4th-12 th grade).....	8
Table 3. Scale Information for Parent Survey Scales.....	11
Table 4. Scale Information for Staff Survey Scales	13
Table 5. Scale Information for Teacher Survey Items.....	14

Introduction

The state evaluation of 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program (21st CCLC) is designed to assess the success of Michigan grantees in improving student academic and youth development outcomes, as well as to identify program characteristics that are associated with successful programs. The state evaluation is intended to answer the following evaluation questions:

- Is Michigan meeting federal performance targets for student outcomes?
- How does the Michigan 21st CCLC compare with national performance?
- Is the program more successful with some groups of students than with others?
- What are the characteristics of more successful programs that might contribute to their success?
- What would make the programs even better?

This technical supplement provides an overview of all measures and procedures used in the state evaluation of the Michigan 21st CCLC Program. It also details the analyses included in *21st Century Community Learning Centers Research Brief: Overview of Program and State Evaluation for Michigan* (available at outreach.msu.edu/cerc/21stcclc.asp).

Questions about this report or the methods used can be directed to Laurie A. Van Egeren, Principal Investigator, vanegere@msu.edu.

Michigan 21st CCLC Evaluation Methods

This section details the measures used in the Michigan evaluation of 21st CCLC programs since its initiation in 2003.

EZREPORTS DATABASE

EZreports (Thomas Kelly Software Associates) is a web-based data tracking system used by all Michigan 21st CCLC grantees except one. The system allows program staff and evaluators to enter, manage, monitor, and report data for their after-school programs. The single grantee who does not use EZreports had a relatively comparable system in place and regularly provides the data to the state evaluators.

Data from EZreports that are included in the data analyses include:

- **Student demographics.** This includes each student's gender, ethnicity, grade, age, and parental education and marital status.
- **Student program attendance.** This includes each student's program attendance on a specific date for each session and activity.
- **Activity and session information.** This includes activity and session names, timing, session dates, grade levels targeted, staffing level, the staff and providers who delivered the activity, and activity categories as identified by site staff.
- **Staff information.** For each staff person, this includes date of birth, gender, ethnicity, staff type (e.g., Center administrators/coordinators, school-day teacher, youth development workers, parents, etc.), whether the staff is paid or volunteer, highest education level, years working in after-school programs, and years working in the youth development field.
- **Provider information.** This includes each provider's organization name, type (e.g., School district, community-based organization, for-profit entity, library, museum, etc.), and the value of subcontract and in-kind contributions.

Procedure for EZreports Data Collection

The 21st CCLC State-wide evaluation team provides on-site training on an ongoing basis to program directors, site coordinators and regular staff to train them to enter data into EZreports and generate reports for their administrative use. All data are downloaded on a weekly basis and cleaned at the end of the school year by the evaluation team for monitoring and analysis purposes. Cleaned data from EZreports are returned to each grantee and local evaluator as EXCEL and/or SPSS files for their own analysis purposes.

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT SURVEYS

Survey instruments for the present year can be obtained at outreach.msu.edu/cerc/21cclc.asp. Survey instruments for past years can be obtained by contacting the principal investigator.

Student Program Improvement Survey

The student program improvement surveys were developed by the evaluation team based on a review of the literature and with input from site staff and local evaluators. The purpose of the surveys are to assess student perceptions of program quality and the extent to which they have benefited. They have been revised slightly each year since 2004. Two versions are available, each designed for different grade levels: (a) kindergarten through 3rd grade (K-3), and (b) 4th-12th grade (4-12). Both surveys were first written in English and then translated into Spanish and Arabic for students whose primary language is not English.

Survey for K-3rd grade. The K-3 survey had 14 items rated on the extent to which each statement is true for the student on a three-point scale of "not much," "sometimes/some," and "a lot." The scale items were accompanied by frowning, neutral, or smiling faces to assist beginning readers. Scale information is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Scale Information for Student Program Improvement Survey (K-3rd Grade)

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Items</i>	<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i>	<i>N of Items</i>
Peer Support	Kids help each other out	.60	3
	Kids help staff plan what they will do here		
	Kids make sure other kids follow the rules		
Overall Enjoyment	I feel safe here	.58	3
	Activities here are fun		
	I like to come to this program		
Staff Support	If a kid is mean to me, staff will help me	.46	2
	Staff here care about me		
Help Learn	Read better	.72	5
	Do math better		
	Do computers		
	Do art, music or dancing		
	Do sports or games		

Note: Maximum N=1,829.

Survey for 4th-12th grade. The survey for 4th - 12th grade students had 79 items rated on a series of 4-point scales. Each series of questions had one of the following rating scales: 1) "Not very good," "Okay," "Pretty good," "Very good;" 2) "Hardly ever," "Every once in a while," "Sometimes," "A lot of time;" 3) "Not at all," "A little," "Some," "A lot;" and 4) "Not at all true," "A little true," "Somewhat true," "Very true." The scale information for the 4-12 survey is shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Scale Information for the 2005-06 Student Program Improvement Survey (4th -12th Grade)

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Items</i>	<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i>	<i>N of Items</i>
Youth voice	Staff and kids decide together how to do the activities	.81	7
	Staff and kids decide the rules together		
	Kids get to choose their activities		
	All kids get a chance to be a leader		
	Kids get the chance to do a lot of different things		
	Kids and staff set goals for what should happen		
	Kids and staff talk about what kids learned		
Peer support	Kids treat each other with respect	.82	6
	Kids work together to solve problems		
	Kids make sure that other kids follow the rules		
	Kids treat staff with respect		
	Kids help each other out		
	Kids tell each other when they do a good job		
Staff support	Staff care about me	.82	5
	Staff treat kids with respect		
	Staff try to be fair		
	Staff help kids understand homework and school subjects		
	Staff make activities interesting and fun		
Academic support	Helps me understand what we are doing in class—recoded	.79	4
	Helps me stay caught up with my homework—recoded		
	Matches the things we do in class—recoded		
	Helps me learn school subjects in interesting ways—recoded		
Program satisfaction	I would tell other kids to come to this program for fun activities	.63	4
	I look forward to coming to this program		
	I get bored at this program—reversed		
	I would tell other kids to come to this program for help with school work		
Negative interaction	Staff get mad when you make a mistake	.67	3

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Items</i>	<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i>	<i>N of Items</i>
	Staff don't care what I think		
	Staff punish kids without even knowing what really happened		
Lack of challenge	The activities are too easy Is too easy	.53	2
Academic improvement (single scores)	Reading, English or Language arts Math Other school subjects (science, social studies)	.84	3
Non-academic improvement (single scores)	Eating healthy food Feeling good about yourself Playing sports Helping my community or school Getting exercise Getting along with other kids Staying away from drugs and alcohol Working with computers Being a leader	.93	9
Academic improvement (change scores)	Change in Reading, English, Language arts Math Other school subjects (science, social studies)	.61	3
Non-academic improvement (change scores)	Staying away from drugs and alcohol Eating healthy food Feeling good about yourself Playing sports Getting along with other kids Working with computers Being a leader	.79	9

Note: Maximum N=3,280.

Procedure for Student Survey Administration

Each year, site coordinators identified a "testing week" about a month prior to the end of the programs, which can occur between March and June. Using student attendance obtained from the EZreports system, students who attended at least once during the three months previous to the testing week were identified. For each identified student, surveys were developed with a cover page indicating the student's school name, grade level, and full name, as well as instructions and information on confidentiality and voluntary participation. Each survey also included a bar code that contained the grantee ID, site ID, and student ID. This bar code protects the confidentiality of the information from staff and other students while allowing the evaluation team to link the data with other information.¹ The evaluation team sent the surveys to the sites, where the site coordinator distributed the surveys to the targeted students to be

¹ The only exception to this procedure was made for a district in which school policy allowed only anonymous surveys. The bar code for this grantee contained only grantee and site IDs.

completed during an activity period, usually one assigned to academic work. Program staff could assist students by reading the questions, and were required to do so for the K-3 survey. Students were instructed to tear off the cover sheet with the identifying information, complete the survey, and place the now-confidential survey in a box or envelope. The completed surveys were then sent to the evaluation team, where the data was scanned and cleaned.

Student Survey Return Rates

In 2005-06, 14,534 surveys were sent to student participants at 181 sites. Among all students to whom surveys were sent, 9,785 students showed at least one day of attendance in the programs within the two-month period after the survey was sent. Because students would not receive surveys unless they were in the program, the actual survey return rate was calculated based on students who had received surveys and attended the program during the survey period. Overall, 5,248 surveys were returned for a survey response rate of 54%². For more detailed information on the survey return rate for each of the survey versions, please see the paragraphs below.

Return rate for K-3 surveys. In 2005-06, 4,327 program improvement surveys were sent to 101 sites for student participants in the K-3rd grades. Among these survey recipients, 3,259 students attended at least one day during the survey administration period. A total of 1,897 surveys were returned from 86 sites, with an overall return rate of 58% from students; 85% of sites that received surveys returned them. Among sites that returned surveys, return rates ranged from 4% to 100%. The average return rate among sites that returned any surveys was 67%, with a median return rate of 67% (*SD* = 25%).

Return rate for 4-12 surveys. In 2005-06, 10,207 program improvement surveys were sent to 177 sites that served 4th-12th graders. Among these survey recipients, 6,526 students attended at least one day during the survey administration period. A total of 3,351 surveys were returned from 150 sites for an overall return rate of 51% from students; 85% of sites that received surveys returned them. Among sites that returned surveys, return rates ranged from 3% to 100%. The average return rate among sites that returned any surveys was 60%, with a median rate of 60% (*SD* = 28%).

² Surveys from one grantee were not included in calculations of the response rate because they had copied surveys on site and thus it was not possible to determine how many surveys had been distributed. This grantee returned 63 student program improvement surveys (32 K-3 surveys and 31 4-12 surveys).

Parent Program Improvement Survey

The parent program improvement survey was developed to assess parent satisfaction with the programs in which their children participated. In 2005-06, the survey had 7 items rated on a 3-point scale of "Not important," "Kind of important," "Very important" and 16 items rated on a 4-point scale of "Strongly disagree," "Disagree," "Agree," "Strongly agree." The survey was first written in English and then translated into Spanish and Arabic for parents whose primary language is not English. Information on parent survey scales is shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Scale Information for the 2005-06 Parent Survey

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Theme</i>	<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i>	<i>N of Items</i>
Enroll for Academic Reasons	School staff suggested that my child enroll	.66	3
	I hope it will help my child do better in school		
	My child has special needs that are met by this program		
Enroll for the Need of Child Care	It is a safe place for my child after school	.72	3
	It provides dependable after school care		
	It provides affordable after school care		
Parent Perception of Program	Has good equipment and facilities	.46	2
	Is doing what I hoped it would for my child		
	Spends the right amount of time on academics		
	Spends the right amount of time on recreation		
Parent Perception of Learning	Has many interesting activities for my child to participate in	.91	5
	Do better in school		
	Learn about new things		
	Develop new skills		
	Make new friends and get along with other kids		
Parent Perception of Staff	Learn ways to handle his/her feelings	.86	3
	Give my child individual attention		
	Respect me and my opinions		
	Know how to work with kids		

Note: Maximum $N=2,559$.

Procedure for Parent Survey Administration

Each year, site coordinators identified a "testing week" that was scheduled for about a month prior to the end of the programs, which can occur between March and June. Using student attendance obtained from the EZreports system, students who attended at least once during the three months previous to the testing week were identified. For each identified student, surveys were produced that included a cover page with the student's school name, grade level and "To the parents or guardian of" and the student's full name. Each survey also included a

bar code that contained the student's grantee ID, site ID, and student ID, as well as information on confidentiality and voluntary participation. This bar code protects the confidentiality of the information from staff and other individuals while allowing the evaluation team to link the data with other information³. The research team sent the surveys to the sites, where the site coordinator distributed the surveys to the targeted parents. Sites determined the best way to distribute surveys to parents; some requested that parents complete the survey when picking up their students, some asked students to take it home and return it, and some incorporated it into parent nights or family activities. Parents were instructed to tear off the cover sheet with the identifying information, complete the survey, and place the now-confidential survey in a box or envelope. The completed surveys were then sent to the evaluation team, where the data was scanned and cleaned.

Parent Survey Return Rates

Overall, 14,533 surveys were sent to parent participants across 181 different sites. Among all students to whom surveys were sent, 9,721 students showed at least one day of attendance in the programs during the survey administration period. Because parents were only asked to complete surveys if their child was currently in the program, the actual survey return rate was calculated based on parents who had been sent surveys and had children who had attended the program during the survey period. Overall, 2,610 surveys were returned from 148 sites, with an overall return rate of 27% from parents; 82% of sites that received surveys returned them. Among sites who returned any surveys, return rates ranged from 1% to 100%, with an average rate of 33% ($SD = 25\%$).

STAFF SURVEY

In 2005-06, a staff survey developed by High/Scope Educational Research Foundation⁴ to assess perceptions of youth program workers and administrators was administered to a subset of sites. This survey was developed to assess perceptions of climate, job satisfaction, beliefs about quality, and practices from staff who had direct contact providing activities to students. In 2005-06, in partnership with High/Scope, the survey was pilot-tested with staff from sites who volunteered to have their staff participate. Sixty-five out of 187 sites agreed to participate. In 2006-07, all sites will be required to participate in completing a revised version of the staff survey. In addition, a supervisor survey developed by High/Scope will be administered to supervisors who have direct contact with students.

The 2005-06 staff survey contained 104 items. Results from reliability tests yielded high reliability on the 16 sub-scales derived by High/Scope using 58 questions. The 16 sub-scales were further grouped into eight themes. Staff survey themes and subscales are shown in Table 4.

³The only exception to this procedure was made for one school district in which school policy allowed only anonymous surveys. The bar code for this grantee contained only grantee and site IDs.

⁴ The staff and supervisor surveys can be obtained by contacting Charles Smith at High/Scope Educational Research Foundation at csmith@highscope.org.

Table 4. Scale Information for the 2005-06 Staff Survey

<i>Theme</i>	<i>Subscale</i>	<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i>	<i>N of Items</i>
Belief	ADULT CONTROL	.71	6
	EMPHASIS ON RELATIONSHIPS	.74	3
	SHARED CONTROL	.68	5
	ADULT MODELING	.58	2
Practice	MEANINGFUL LEARNING EXPERIENCE	.78	5
	AUTONOMY(YOUTH LEADERSHIP/CHOICE)	.80	5
	INPUT/ACTIVITY BY YOUTH AT ADMIN. LEVEL	.80	3
Climate	SUPPORTIVE STAFF	.87	4
	STAFF INPUT	.81	3
Self-Efficacy	SELF-EFFICACY/SUCCESS WITH YOUTH	.86	5
Supervisor	SUPERVISOR EMPHASIS ON SHARED CONTROL/ACTIVE LEARNING	.95	8
	SUPERVISOR SUPPORT FULL SCALE	.90	2
Job Control	STAFF SHARED CONTROL-POS LEVEL	.77	3
	STAFF SHARED CONTROL-ORG LEVEL	.70	4
Relation with Other Staff	STAFF COLLABORATION relations scale	.83	6
Skepticism toward Evaluation	STAFF SKEPTICISM	.66	3

Note: Maximum *N*= 141.

Procedure for Staff Survey Administration

All but one grantee chose to receive the survey online; that grantee requested a paper version of the survey. After staff e-mail addresses were collected from the sites, an e-mail notice was sent to each staff informing them of the upcoming survey. In June 2006, a link was sent to each staff e-mail account for those who were taking the electronic survey. A total of 283 online survey links were sent. In addition, the program director of the grantee who requested paper surveys received 250 surveys for distribution to staff. Staff who received the paper survey were asked to mail the survey directly back to the evaluation team in an envelope provided by the evaluation team. A follow-up e-mail reminder was sent one month later to all online survey participants in order to maximize the return rate. The online access to the survey was closed on August 5th, allowing a two-month period for survey completion. A total of 141 surveys (86 online and 55 paper versions) were returned, with an average total return rate of 24%. The average return rate for online surveys was 29% across 47 sites (a 72% site-level response rate). Among sites that returned online surveys, the overall return rates ranged from 10% to 100%, with a median of 33% ($SD = 26\%$). The average return rate for paper survey in general was 22% although calculation of return rates for each site could not be executed due to the method of survey distribution. Data were cleaned and returned to the sites for program improvement purposes unless fewer than five respondents from a site returned the survey. This was done to maintain confidentiality of respondents.

TEACHER SURVEY

The teacher survey was developed by Learning Point Associates and is a required component of the federal evaluation of 21st CCLC. It was designed to collect information regarding changes in individual student classroom behavior.

Teachers of students who attended the program regularly were asked to complete a one-page survey giving their ratings of changes in student classroom behavior and performance. "Regular" students were defined by the federal evaluators as those who attended 30 days or more in a year (defined as a school year and the summer prior to that school year). Because students had to be identified for teacher surveys by March or April in order to allow time for printing and distribution, teacher surveys were produced for all students who had attended 20 days or more in the programs from the time school began until the time when surveys were printed.

Teachers rated 10 items on a 7- point scale ranging from 1 (significant decline) to 7 (significant improvement). Teachers could also indicate for each item that the student did not need to improve that behavior. Information on teacher survey items is shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Item Information for the 2005-06 Teacher Survey

<i>Item</i>	<i>Did not need to improve</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. Turning in homework on time.	21%	5.09	1.50
2. Completing homework to your satisfaction.	19%	5.15	1.47
3. Participating in class.	20%	5.29	1.35
4. Volunteering (e.g., for extra credit or more responsibilities).	19%	5.04	1.30
5. Attending class regularly.	38%	4.92	1.50
6. Being attentive in class.	21%	5.00	1.46
7. Behaving well in class.	24%	4.89	1.54
8. Academic performance.	15%	5.22	1.42
9. Coming to school motivated to learn.	20%	5.07	1.45
10. Getting along well with other students.	26%	5.01	1.49

Note: Maximum $N=4,722$.

Procedures for Teacher Survey Administration

Site coordinators or program directors chose either a paper version or an online version of the surveys based on discussions with the teachers about which mode would be preferable. For online surveys, the evaluation team provided the site staff with a list of eligible students, and the staff identified one teacher, preferably a reading/English/language arts or math teacher, for each student and provided the research team with their email addresses. Teachers received a direct link to the online surveys for the students for whom they were asked to complete surveys. In past years, a popular online survey provider was used to conduct the survey; as of 2007, the survey will be distributed using an online system developed by MSU's Biomedical Research and Information Center (BRIC).

For the paper surveys, a cover page that indicated the site name, school name, and the student's full name, as well as confidentiality and voluntary participation, was stapled to the survey. The actual survey page included a bar code that indicated the grantee id, site id and student ID. This bar code protects the confidentiality of the information while allowing the state evaluation team to link the survey to other data⁵. The research team sent the surveys to the sites, where the site coordinator distributed the surveys to the identified teachers and coordinated the collection of the completed surveys. Teachers were instructed to tear off the cover sheet with the identifying information, complete the survey, and place the now-confidential survey in a box or envelope. The completed surveys were then sent to the evaluation team, where the data is scanned and cleaned.

Teacher Survey Return Rates

In 2005-06, 11,358 surveys were sent to school teachers across 182 different sites. Among them, 23 sites received teacher surveys online per their request and 159 sites received the paper version of the survey. A total of 4,898 surveys were returned from 134 sites for an overall return rate of 44% from students; 74% of sites that received surveys returned them. The average survey return rate for the online survey was 31%. The average survey return rate for paper survey was 45%. Among sites that returned surveys, the overall return rates ranged from 4% to 100%, with a median of 61% (SD = 28%).

SCHOOL OUTCOME DATA

The submission of school outcome data is a requirement of 21st CCLC grants for reporting school records of any students who attended at least one time from the beginning of summer semester to the end of the school year. Three options were available for site staff to submit students school outcome records: 1) Entering school records directly into an Excel template provided by the evaluation team; 2) Generating a file from the school/district system that contains students' school records; or 3) Using linking files provided by the evaluation team to link with students' school records and then remove all identifying information to make school records anonymous upon return.

The requested fields for the student's school records include: The four marking periods of reading grades, the four marking periods of math grades, MEAP reading score, MEAP math score, the percentiles of standardized test score, the number of days the student was suspended, the number of days the student was expelled, the number of days the school was in session, the number of days the student was absent from school (or attending school), and the students' eligibility for free or reduced lunch, LEP/ESL (limited English proficiency/English as a second language) status and special education.

YOUTH PROGRAM QUALITY ASSESSMENT (YPQA)

The Youth Program Quality Assessment (PQA) is a validated instrument designed to evaluate the quality of youth programs and identify staff training needs. Developed by High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, the YPQA represents widely shared ideas about how programs can best promote youth development and learning. It consists of standards for best

⁵The only exception to this procedure was made for one school district in which school policy allowed only anonymous surveys. The bar code for this grantee contained only grantee and site IDs.

practices that can be scored by outside raters or program staff. Information is gathered through observation and interviews. It provides information on seven domains: safe environment, supportive environment, interaction, engagement, youth-centered policies and practices, high expectations for youth and staff, and access.⁶ A three-year validation study has established the reliability and validity of the instrument.⁷ As part of the Michigan Quality Improvement System⁸, each site conducts a self-assessment process using the YPOA. In addition, YPOA observations made by trained outside observers are gathered for a subset of sites participating in High/Scope's study of quality improvement funded by the W.T. Grant Foundation.

ANNUAL REPORT FORM (ARF)

The Annual Report Form (ARF) is a web-based reporting form developed by the state evaluation team as a mechanism for grantees to report to the Michigan Department of Education on their annual progress. A unique feature of the ARF is that the state evaluation team provides individual grantees with grantee-level and site-level data summarized from their EZreports, survey, and YPOA data about implementation, participant characteristics and outcomes to aid them in assessing their program's progress, accomplishments, and areas in need of improvement.

The ARF has two parts: 1) a grantee-level report is completed by the program director, and 2) site-level reports for each program site are completed by site coordinators or other administrators working with the site coordinators. The grantee-level report covers factors that are not likely to change across sites including: overall program objectives, management structures, student governance policies, staff development and training, recruitment and attendance policies, partnerships, and links to school and community. It also includes a information on student outcomes for the program as a whole. The site-level report covers factors likely to vary from site to site including: facilities, staffing, activities, service utilization, relationships to the school, service partnerships and student outcomes. In each area, sites are provided with descriptive tables and charts that summarize information from program data, surveys and school records to assist them in assessing their progress. Administrators are asked to comment on and interpret the data presented in the report and to provide additional information about their program management. Data is analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively.

⁶ High/Scope Educational Research Foundation. *The Participatory Learning Approach: Transforming Youth Programs & Youth*. Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Educational Research Foundation. www.highscope.org

⁷ Details of the validation study can be found at www.youth.highscope.org.

⁸ Wilson-Ahlstrom, A., & Yohalem, N., with Pittman, K. (2007, March). *Building quality improvement systems: Lessons from three emerging efforts in the youth-serving sector*. The Forum for Youth Investment. www.forumforyouthinvestment.org.

Data Analysis for the Overview Brief

This section provides details of the analyses presented in *21st Century Community Learning Centers Research Brief: Overview of Program and State Evaluation for Michigan* (available at outreach.msu.edu/cerc/21cclc.asp). All the following analyses are from page 2 of the Overview Brief. The text to which the analysis refers is italicized.

Number of Sites

In 2005-2006, these grantees offered programming at 186 sites, including schools and community centers. The majority of the grantees were local school districts (16). Other awardees were charter academies (6), community- or faith-based organizations (7), regional/intermediate school districts (2), and universities (1).

In 2005-06, 186 sites operated. However, one grantee who was funded for three sites actually operated programs at four sites. This was because one of their sites funded for K-5 students operated the K-1 program in one building and the 2-5 program in another building. To track these sites individually in EZreports, this necessitated creating two sites for data purposes. Thus, data analyses at the site level are conducted using 187 sites, while administratively, there were 186 sites.

Number of Students

From January 2003 to the end of the 2005-2006 school year, 48,870 students were served in Michigan 21st CCLC programs.

This is the total unduplicated number of students who attended at least once from January 2003 to June 30, 2006 according to data entered into EZreports.

Operation Hours

Grantees can offer programming before or after school, on weekends, and during the summer. All Michigan sites offer activities after school. In 2005-2006 many sites offered additional programming:

- *16% offered before-school activities*
- *17% offered weekend activities*
- *78% offered summer programs (this will be a requirement for programs funded in 2007)*

The percentages of schools offering before-school, weekend, and summer programs were calculated based on the proportion of schools offering at least one activity before-school, weekend, and during the summer divided by the total number of schools. Data were retrieved from EZreports ($N=187$).

In program year 2005-2006, grantees offered an average of 13.5 hours of programming per week. A typical site was open 3.7 days per week for about 3 hours a day, with an average daily attendance of 35 students.

The average number of hours operating per week is the mean of weekly operation hours during the school year reported by site staff in the EZreports ($N=187$).

The average number of days operating per week is based on students' attendance records. Sites that have at least one student attending in the program were considered in operation for the day. The average number of days operating per week is the mean of weekly operating days during the school year for each site calculated from EZreports (N=187).

The average daily attendance per site is the mean of total students attending in an operating day for each site during the school year calculated from EZreports (N=187).

Cost per student

Overall, the yearly cost per student enrolled was \$978.

Cost per student is a basic calculation of the grant award for 2005-06 divided by the number of students served. It does not include the in-kind contributions of partners, which can be substantial.