

Michigan 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) Leading Indicator Interpretation Guide for 2012-13

October 2013

DOMAIN 1. INSTRUCTIONAL CONTEXT

Indicator	Measures	Grantee Level Definition	Site Level Definition	Source	Data Table # (G: Grantee S: Site)	Weight
1.1 Enrollment and Retention Program serves and successfully retains high-risk students.	1.1.1 % served who are academically at risk	Estimated % served across grantee who are academically at risk (based on returned school outcome data; at risk defined as reading or math grade less than 2.5 or MEAP reading or math not proficient)	Estimated % served by site who are academically at risk (based on returned school outcome data; at risk defined as reading or math grade less than 2.5 or MEAP reading or math not proficient)	2012-13 School Outcomes; 2012-13 EZ	G:7 S:7	1
	1.1.2 % students retained 30 days	% all students across grantee retained 30 days	% all students in site retained 30 days	2012-13 EZ	G:6 S:6	1
	1.1.3 % academically at-risk students retained 30 days	% academically at-risk students across grantee retained 30 days	% academically at-risk students in site retained 30 days	2012-13 EZ; 2012-13 School Outcomes	G:7 S:7	2
	1.1.4 % academically at-risk students retained 60 days	% academically at-risk students across grantee retained 60 days	% academically at-risk in site retained 60 days			3
	1.1.5 % academically at-	% academically at-risk students across grantee	% academically at-risk students in site			3

Van Egeren, L. A., Wu, H-C., & Smith, C. (2013). *Michigan 21st Century Community Learning Centers leading indicator interpretation guide for 2012-13*. Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

Indicator	Measures	Grantee Level Definition	Site Level Definition	Source	Data Table # (G: Grantee S: Site)	Weight
	risk students retained 90 days	retained 90 days	retained 90 days			
1.2 Academic Content Program demonstrates that academics are a high priority.	1.2.1 Academic activity participation	% of students across grantee attending at least 10 days participating in any form of academics at least 10 days	% of students at site attending at least 10 days participating in any form of academics at least 10 days	2012-13 EZ	G:11 & 12 S:11 & 12	1.5
	1.2.2 Homework help/tutoring participation for academically at-risk students	% of academically at-risk students across grantee attending at least 10 days participating in homework help and/or tutoring at least 10 days	% of academically at-risk students at site attending at least 10 days participating in homework help and/or tutoring at least 10 days			1.5
	1.2.3 Academic enrichment participation	% of students across grantee attending at least 10 days participating in academic enrichment at least 10 days	% of students at site attending at least 10 days participating in academic enrichment at least 10 days			1.5
	1.2.4 Activities informed by grade-level content standards	% of sites indicating that activities are informed by grade-level content standards (or Learning Objectives)	Sites activities are informed by grade-level content standards (or Learning Objectives)	2012-13 Site ARF, Q59	--	1
	1.2.5 Student reports of academic support quality	% of students across grantee reporting at least 3 on 4-point scale (agreeing). <i>Minimum N = 15.</i>	% of students at site reporting at least 3 on 4-point scale (agreeing). <i>Minimum N</i>	2012-13 Youth Survey: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This program helps me understand what we are doing in class At this program, I learn school subjects in fun ways 	G:13 S:13	1.5

Van Egeren, L. A., Wu, H-C., & Smith, C. (2013). *Michigan 21st Century Community Learning Centers leading indicator interpretation guide for 2012-13*. Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

Indicator	Measures	Grantee Level Definition	Site Level Definition	Source	Data Table # (G: Grantee S: Site)	Weight
			= 15.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school work I do matches the school work we do in regular class • This program helps me get my homework done • My grades have gotten better because of this program 		
	1.2.6 Academics is top priority	PD indicates that at least one of the following (improving academic achievement of all youth; enabling lowest-performing students to achieve grade-level proficiency; helping youth keep up with homework) is priority 1 or 2. <i>PD consents to display.</i>	% of staff and SCs at site indicating that at least one of the following (improving academic achievement of all youth; enabling lowest-performing students to achieve grade-level proficiency; helping youth keep up with homework) is priority 1 or 2. <i>Minimum N = 3 or SC consents to display</i>	2012-13 Staff/ Supervisor Survey	G:14 S:14	.5
	1.2.7 Supervisor connection to school-day content	% of PD across grantee reporting at least 4 on 5-point scale (agreeing). <i>PD consents to display.</i>	SC reports at least 4 on 5-point scale (agreeing). <i>Minimum N = 3 or SC consents to display.</i>	2012-13 Supervisor Survey: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On a week-to-week basis, I know what academic content will be covered during the school day with the students I work with in the after-school program • I coordinate the content of the afterschool activities I provide with my students school day work • The activities I provide in the after-school program are tied to specific learning goals that are related to the school-day curriculum 	G:15	1

Indicator	Measures	Grantee Level Definition	Site Level Definition	Source	Data Table # (G: Grantee S: Site)	Weight
	1.2.8 Staff connection to school-day content	% of staff across grantee reporting at least 4 on 5-point scale (agreeing). <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	% of staff at site reporting at least 4 on 5-point scale (agreeing). <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	2012-13 Staff Survey: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On a week-to-week basis, I know what academic content will be covered during the school day with the students I work with in the after-school program I coordinate the content of afterschool activities I provide with my students school day work The activities I provide in the after-school program are tied to specific learning goals that are related to the school-day curriculum 	G:16 S:15	1.5
1.3 Enrichment Content Program has comprehensive set of activities that facilitate achievement and development in which most students participate.	1.3.1 Arts participation	% of students across grantee attending at least 10 days who participated in arts at least 10 days	% of students at site attending at least 10 days who participated in arts at least 10 days	2012-13 EZ	G:17 S:16	2
	1.3.2 Youth development participation	% of students across grantee attending at least 10 days who participated in youth development at least 10 days	% of students at site attending at least 10 days who participated in youth development at least 10 days			3
	1.3.3 Technology participation	% of students across grantee attending at least 10 days who participated in technology at least 10 days	% of students at site attending at least 10 days who participated in technology at least 10 days			2
	1.3.4 Activity variety	% of 7 activity types offered by a site averaged across all sites:(1) art, (2) health/nutrition, (3) sports, (4) technology, (5) youth development, (6) recreation	% of 7 activity types offered by: (1) art, (2) health/nutrition, (3) sports, (4) technology, (5) youth development, (6) recreation [games,		G:18 S:17	3

Van Egeren, L. A., Wu, H-C., & Smith, C. (2013). *Michigan 21st Century Community Learning Centers leading indicator interpretation guide for 2012-13*. Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

Indicator	Measures	Grantee Level Definition	Site Level Definition	Source	Data Table # (G: Grantee S: Site)	Weight
		[games, social activities, camp and fun days, not including free play], (7) special events or field trips. (1) to (6) do not include special events/field trips.	social activities, camp and fun days, not including free play], (7) special events or field trips. (1) to (6) do not include special events/field trips.			
<p>1.4 Connection to School Day Program has structures and resources that ensure alignment between school day and after-school learning.</p>	1.4.1 Formal policies for connecting with school day	% of policy items on grantee ARF.	% of policy items on site ARF.	<p>2012-13 Grantee/Site ARF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the after-school program have written policies and procedures about connecting with school-day teachers to support students’ academic learning? • Did someone from the after-school program have a specific responsibility to attend teacher staff meetings at least monthly and report back to the after-school program? • Did Site Coordinator responsibilities include communicating regularly with school-day staff about student needs? • Did after-school staff use WRITTEN progress reports to correspond with school-day teachers about individual students’ academic progress and needs? (credit given if “Yes, for all students” OR “Yes, for academically at-risk students only.” 	ARF	2
	1.4.2 Supervisor communication with school	% of PDs across grantee reporting at least 4 on 5-point scale (agreeing). <i>PD consents to display.</i>	SC reports at least 4 on 5-point scale (agreeing). <i>Minimum N = 3 or SC consents to display.</i>	<p>2012-13 Supervisor Survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We know who to contact at our students’ day-time school if we have a question about their progress or status. • I help manage a 3-way communication system that links parents, program, and day-time school 	G:19	2.5

Indicator	Measures	Grantee Level Definition	Site Level Definition	Source	Data Table # (G: Grantee S: Site)	Weight
				information. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I participate in regular joint staff meetings for after-school and day-time school staff where steps to discuss linkages between the school day and after-school are discussed. • We meet regularly with school-day staff not working in the after-school program to review the academic progress of individual students. • We participate in parent-teacher conferences to provide information about individual students are doing (NOTE: If you are a school-day teacher, please answer this question in relation to students you do not have in your school-day classroom) 		
	1.4.3 Staff communication with school	% of staff across grantee reporting at least 4 on 5-point scale (agreeing). <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	% of site staff reporting at least 4 on 5-point scale (agreeing). See Scale Items (5).	2012-13 Staff Survey: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I know who to contact at our students' day-time school if I have a question about their progress or status. • I participate in regular joint staff meetings for after-school and day-time school staff where steps to discuss linkages between the school day and after-school are discussed. • I meet regularly with school-day staff not working in the after-school program to review the academic progress of individual students. • I participate in parent-teacher conferences to provide information about individual students are doing (NOTE: If you are a school-day teacher, please answer this question in relation to students you do not have in your school-day classroom) 	G: 20 S: 18	2

Indicator	Measures	Grantee Level Definition	Site Level Definition	Source	Data Table # (G: Grantee S: Site)	Weight																														
	1.4.4 School investment in program	% of sites reporting that the principal and teachers are invested in program	Site reports that the principal and teachers are invested in program.	2012-13 Site ARF		1.5																														
	1.4.5 Student assessment data used in planning	% of staff and supervisors across grantee reporting at least 4 on 5-point scale (agreeing). <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	% of site staff and supervisor reporting at least 4 on 5-point scale (agreeing). <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	2012-13 Staff/ Supervisor Survey: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We (SC)/I (staff) use student assessment data to provide different types of instruction to students attending our after-school activities based on their achievement level. Extent to which the following are used <i>regularly</i>: Individual students' academic plans OR individual students' standardized test scores OR individual students' grades. 	G: 21 & 22 S: 19 & 20	2																														
1.5 Instructional Quality Program has high levels of point-of-service engagement and interaction during activities.	1.5.1 Self-assessed observation of instructional quality	Average of site scores converted to 1 pt scale.	Site score converted to 1 pt scale.	2012-13 YPQA Self Assessment: <table border="1" style="margin-left: 20px;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Items</th> <th>School-Age</th> <th>Youth</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Staff warm and respectful</td> <td>SA.WW2</td> <td>WW2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Positive staff body language</td> <td>SA.WW3</td> <td>WW3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Inclusive relationships</td> <td>SA.Be2</td> <td>Be2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Youth identify with program</td> <td>SA.Be3</td> <td>Be3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Opportunities for youth to get to know each other</td> <td>SA.Be1</td> <td>Be1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Youth engage with materials or ideas</td> <td>SA.AE1</td> <td>AE1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Balance concrete and abstract</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>AE3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Staff encourages youth to try skills</td> <td>SA.SB2</td> <td>SB2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Staff engages with children in</td> <td>SA.AI1</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Items	School-Age	Youth	Staff warm and respectful	SA.WW2	WW2	Positive staff body language	SA.WW3	WW3	Inclusive relationships	SA.Be2	Be2	Youth identify with program	SA.Be3	Be3	Opportunities for youth to get to know each other	SA.Be1	Be1	Youth engage with materials or ideas	SA.AE1	AE1	Balance concrete and abstract	N/A	AE3	Staff encourages youth to try skills	SA.SB2	SB2	Staff engages with children in	SA.AI1	N/A	G: 26 S: 23	1
Items	School-Age	Youth																																		
Staff warm and respectful	SA.WW2	WW2																																		
Positive staff body language	SA.WW3	WW3																																		
Inclusive relationships	SA.Be2	Be2																																		
Youth identify with program	SA.Be3	Be3																																		
Opportunities for youth to get to know each other	SA.Be1	Be1																																		
Youth engage with materials or ideas	SA.AE1	AE1																																		
Balance concrete and abstract	N/A	AE3																																		
Staff encourages youth to try skills	SA.SB2	SB2																																		
Staff engages with children in	SA.AI1	N/A																																		

Indicator	Measures	Grantee Level Definition	Site Level Definition	Source			Data Table # (G: Grantee S: Site)	Weight
				positive ways	SA.AI2 SA.AI3 SA.AI4			
				Staff is actively involved with youth	N/A	Ec3		
				Staff asks open-ended questions	SA.Ec2	Ec2		
				Opportunities to collaborate and work cooperatively with others.	N/A	Co1 Co2 Co3		
				Structured small group activities	SA.Be.4	N/A		
				Opportunities to make authentic choices	SA.Ch1	N/A		
				Opportunities to make open-ended choices	SA.Ch2	N/A		
				Opportunities to make content choices	N/A	Y.Ch1		
				Opportunities to make process choices	N/A	Y.Ch2		
				Opportunities to make plans	SA.Pn1	N/A		
				Multiple planning strategies used	SA.Pn1	N/A		
				Opportunities to make plans	N/A	Pn1		
				Multiple planning strategies used	N/A	Pn2		
				Intentional reflection	SA.Rf1	Rf1		

Indicator	Measures	Grantee Level Definition	Site Level Definition	Source			Data Table # (G: Grantee S: Site)	Weight
				Multiple reflection strategies Structured opportunities to present to the group	SA.Rf2 N/A	Rf2 Y.Rf4		
	1.5.2 Student-reported opportunities for interaction	% of students across grantee reporting at least 3 on 4-point scale (agreeing). <i>Minimum N = 15.</i>	% of students at site reporting at least 3 on 4-point scale (agreeing). <i>Minimum N = 15.</i>	2012-13 Youth Survey: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At this program, I have opportunities to be a leader • I get to work in small groups of just a few kids • At this program, kids and staff have group discussions about what we learned • At this program, I get to teach or coach other kids • At this program, kids and staff set goals for what should happen 			G:28 S:25	2
	1.5.3 Student-reported opportunities for engagement	% of students across grantee reporting at least 3 on 4-point scale (agreeing). <i>Minimum N = 15.</i>	% of students at site reporting at least 3 on 4-point scale (agreeing). <i>Minimum N = 15.</i>	2012-13 Youth Survey: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The activities challenge me to learn new skills • The activities we do really make me think • At this program, I do things that I don't get to do anywhere else • At this program, I get to do things I like to do 			G:27 S:24	2
	1.5.4 Student report of opportunities for governance, decision-making, and choice	% of students across grantee reporting at least 3 on 4-point scale (agreeing). <i>Minimum N = 15.</i>	% of students at site reporting at least 3 on 4-point scale (agreeing). <i>Minimum N = 15.</i>	2012-13 Youth Survey: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At this program, I get to decide how to complete some projects or activities • At this program, I get to choose my activities • I help decide what kinds of activities are offered • I have participated in a youth advisory committee • I am involved in important decisions about this program • My opinions matter when decisions are made about this program 			G:29 S:26	2
	1.5.5 Student	% of students across	% of students at site	2012-13 Youth Survey:			G: 30	2

Van Egeren, L. A., Wu, H-C., & Smith, C. (2013). *Michigan 21st Century Community Learning Centers leading indicator interpretation guide for 2012-13*. Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

Indicator	Measures	Grantee Level Definition	Site Level Definition	Source	Data Table # (G: Grantee S: Site)	Weight
	report of program mastery focus	grantee reporting at least 3 on 4-point scale (agreeing). <i>Minimum N = 15.</i>	reporting at least 3 on 4-point scale (agreeing). <i>Minimum N = 15.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At this program, it's important that we really understand the activities that we do • How much you improve is really important • Staff notice when I have done something well • At this program, trying hard is very important • Learning new ideas and concepts is very important • It's ok to make mistakes as long as you're learning 	S:27	
	1.5.6 Staff-reported interaction practices	% of staff across grantee reporting at least 3.5 on 4-point scale (strongly agree). <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	% of staff at site reporting at least 3.5 on 4-point scale (strongly agree). <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	<p>2012-13 Staff Survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff listen to youth more than talk at them • Staff actively and continuously consult and involve youth • Staff facilitate youth to lead activities • Staff have youth help or mentor other youth in completing a project or task • Staff provide opportunities for the work, achievements, or accomplishments of youth to be publicly recognized • Staff have youth make formal presentations to the larger group of students 	G:32 S:29	.5
	1.5.7 Staff-reported engagement practices	% of staff across grantee reporting at least 3.5 on 4-point scale (strongly agree). <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	% of staff at site reporting at least 3.5 on 4-point scale (strongly agree). <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	<p>2012-13 Staff Survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff include time in activities for youth to reflect on their experiences (e.g., formal journal writing, conversational feedback) • Staff are effective at providing youth with meaningful choices during activities • Staff provide structured and planned activities explicitly designed to help youth get to know each other • Staff are effective at providing youth with opportunities to set goals and make plans within 	G:31 S:28	.5

Van Egeren, L. A., Wu, H-C., & Smith, C. (2013). *Michigan 21st Century Community Learning Centers leading indicator interpretation guide for 2012-13*. Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

Indicator	Measures	Grantee Level Definition	Site Level Definition	Source	Data Table # (G: Grantee S: Site)	Weight
				the program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff ask for and listen to student opinions about the way things should work in the program • Staff have youth work collaboratively with other youth in small groups • Staff have youth work on group projects that take more than one day to complete 		

DOMAIN2. ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

Indicator	Measures	Grantee Level Definition	Site Level Definition	Source	Data Table # (G: Grantee S: Site)	Weight (grantee /site)
2.1 Stability Program has consistent management, staffing, and school structure.	2.1.1 Same Program Director from previous year	Program Director has not changed since prior ARF	<i>Not applicable; grant level</i>	2012-13 Grantee ARF	ARF	2.67/0
	2.1.2 Same Site Coordinators from previous year	% sites across grantee where Site Coordinators have not changed since prior ARF	Site Coordinator is same since last year	2012-13 Site ARF		2.67/3.5
	2.1.3 Staff retention	% of sites across grantee with more than 75% of regular staff (not volunteers or vendors) retained since last ARF	Site retained at least 75% of regular staff (not volunteers or vendors) since last year			2.66/3.5
	2.1.4 School did not change or reorganize	% of sites across grantee where school did not change or reorganize since prior ARF	School did not change or reorganize since prior ARF			1/1.5
	2.1.5 Principal did not change	% of sites across grantee where principal did not change since prior ARF	Principal did not change since prior ARF			1/1.5
2.2 Grantee Program Management Overall program management is guided by standards, has effective	2.2.1 Effective staff meetings	% site coordinators' (SCs, not PDs, PD/SCs, or Lead Partner Agencies) across grantee agreeing that grantee-level staff meetings are effective => 4 (1-5 scale). <i>Minimum N to report = 3 or SC consents to display.</i>	<i>Not applicable; grant level</i>	2012-13 Supervisor Survey: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff meetings at this site are open to disagreement from staff Staff meetings at this site are well organized Staff meetings at this site are open to input from staff Staff meetings at this site are able to achieve agreement from all participants when necessary 	G: 34	2.5

Van Egeren, L. A., Wu, H-C., & Smith, C. (2013). *Michigan 21st Century Community Learning Centers leading indicator interpretation guide for 2012-13*. Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

Indicator	Measures	Grantee Level Definition	Site Level Definition	Source	Data Table # (G: Grantee S: Site)	Weight (grantee /site)
supervision, and is collaborative internally and externally.						
	2.2.2 Program Director refers to standards when designing the program	% program director (PD, PD/SC, Lead Partner Agency) reports knowledge or use of standards (state or other youth standards) =>4 (on 1-5 scale). <i>PD consents to display.</i>	<i>Not applicable; grant level</i>	2012-13 Supervisor Survey (PD): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would be able to describe the main points of the Michigan state standards for after-school programs to someone else. I would be able to describe the main points of at least one other written standard that applies to after-school or youth development work (for example, National After School Association, American Camping Association) to someone else. I refer to the state standards or other written standards when identifying what this program should be doing with youth. 	--	1.5
	2.2.3 Program Director is familiar with the objectives outlined in their grant	% program director (PD, PD/SC, Lead Partner Agency) reports awareness of objectives for this program as submitted on proposal to MDE = 5 (on 1-5 scale). <i>PD consents to display.</i>	<i>Not applicable; grant level</i>	2012-13 Supervisor Survey (PD)	--	1.5
	2.2.4 The network of sites within this grantee is	% of all PD and SC's (PD, SC, PD/SC, Lead Partner Agencies) agreeing on high network quality => 4 (1-5)	<i>Not applicable; grant level</i>	2012-13 Supervisor Survey (PD, SC): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In our network, lead administrators make sure that all staff are familiar with standards of quality. Our site is routinely monitored by higher-level 	G:35	2

Van Egeren, L. A., Wu, H-C., & Smith, C. (2013). *Michigan 21st Century Community Learning Centers leading indicator interpretation guide for 2012-13*. Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

Indicator	Measures	Grantee Level Definition	Site Level Definition	Source	Data Table # (G: Grantee S: Site)	Weight (grantee /site)
	viewed as quality-focused, collaborative, a learning community	scale). <i>Minimum N to report = 3 or consent to display.</i>		<p>administrators.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site coordinators in our network are adequately trained and prepared to manage their sites. • Sites in our network are held accountable for the quality of their services. • Staff who provide youth activities in our network are adequately trained and prepared to work with our youth. • Everyone in our network is working together toward common goals. • Collaboration across sites in our network is strongly encouraged by program administrators. • Within this network, most site coordinators share the same vision about the central mission of the program. • Supervisors in our network use a formal process to observe their staff and provide feedback about the quality of the program as a whole. 		
	2.2.5 Site Coordinators have high job satisfaction	% SCs agreeing => 4 (1-5 scale). <i>Minimum N = 3 or SC consent to report.</i>	<i>Not applicable; grant level</i>	2012-13 Supervisor Survey (SC)	G:36	2.5
2.3 Site Program Management Site management is guided by standards, has effective supervision, and is collaborative.	2.3.1 Site Coordinators provide effective support to staff	% staff across grantee agreeing that there is quality supervisor support => 4 (1-5 scale). Does not include high school students, volunteers, or administrators. <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	% staff at site agreeing that there is quality supervisor support => 4 (1-5 scale). Does not include high school students, volunteers, or administrators. <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	<p>2012-13 Staff Survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review your activity plans • Make sure that program goals and priorities are clear to you • Give you positive feedback • Be visible during activities • Gives you useful feedback about how you work with youth 	G:37 S:31	3
	2.3.2 Effective	% staff across grantee	% staff at site agreeing	2012-13 Staff Survey:	G:38	2

Van Egeren, L. A., Wu, H-C., & Smith, C. (2013). *Michigan 21st Century Community Learning Centers leading indicator interpretation guide for 2012-13*. Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

Indicator	Measures	Grantee Level Definition	Site Level Definition	Source	Data Table # (G: Grantee S: Site)	Weight (grantee /site)
	staff meetings	agreeing that site staff meetings are effective => 4 (1-5 scale). Does not include high school students, volunteers, or administrators. <i>Minimum N= 3.</i>	that staff meetings are effective => 4 (1-5 scale). Does not include high school students, volunteers, or administrators. <i>Minimum N= 3.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open to disagreement from staff • Well organized • Open to input from staff • Able to achieve agreement from all participants when necessary 	S:32	
	2.3.3 Site Coordinators refer to standards when designing the program	% SCs across grantee reporting knowledge or use of standards (state or other youth standards) =>4 (on 1-5 scale). <i>Minimum N = 3 or consent to display.</i>	SC reports knowledge or use of standards (state or other youth standards) =>4 (on 1-5 scale). <i>Requires consent to display.</i>	<p>2012-13 Supervisor Survey (SC).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would be able to describe the main points of the Michigan state standards for after-school programs to someone else. • I would be able to describe the main points of at least one other written standard that applies to after-school or youth development work (for example, National After School Association, American Camping Association) to someone else. • I refer to the state standards or other written standards when identifying what this program should be doing with youth. 	G:39	1.5
	2.3.4 Site Coordinators are familiar with the objectives outlined in their grant	% SCs across grantee reporting awareness of objectives for this program as submitted on proposal to MDE = 5 (on 1-5 scale). <i>Minimum N = 3 or consent to display.</i>	SC reports awareness of objectives for this program as submitted on proposal to MDE = 5 (on 1-5 scale). <i>Requires consent to display.</i>	2012-13 Supervisor survey (SC)	G:40	1.5
	2.3.5 Staff have high job satisfaction	% staff across grantee agreeing => 4 (1-5 scale). Does not include high school students, volunteers, or administrators.	% staff at site agreeing => 4 (1-5 scale). Does not include high school students, volunteers, or administrators.	2012-13 Staff Survey	G:41 S:33	2

Van Egeren, L. A., Wu, H-C., & Smith, C. (2013). *Michigan 21st Century Community Learning Centers leading indicator interpretation guide for 2012-13*. Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

Indicator	Measures	Grantee Level Definition	Site Level Definition	Source	Data Table # (G: Grantee S: Site)	Weight (grantee /site)
		<i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	<i>Minimum N = 3.</i>			
2.4 Professional Development Staff receive professional development upon hiring and on an ongoing basis in youth development and activity content.	2.4.1 Strong orientation to program - staff	% staff across grantee agreeing they received orientation and mentoring in first months at program =>4 (1-5 scale). Does not include high school students, volunteers, administrators, or vendors. <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	% staff at site agreeing they received orientation and mentoring in first months at program =>4 (1-5 scale). Does not include high school students, volunteers, administrators, or vendors. <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	2012-13 Staff Survey: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff are offered a “beginner’s seminar” or pre-service orientation about how to work with youth. Staff given shared planning time with a staff member who had been here longer OR mentored by more experienced staff (4 or 5 on at least one of these). Staff are informed about how staff at this program are expected to work with youth OR about what this program is trying to accomplish with youth (4 or 5 on at least one of these). Staff are in daily communication with supervisors about how things are going. 	G:42 S:34	2/2.5 if no vendors
	2.4.2 Strong orientation to program - vendors	% vendor staff across grantee agreeing they received orientation and mentoring in first months at program =>4 (1-5 scale). <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	% vendor staff at site agreeing they received orientation and mentoring in first months at program =>4 (1-5 scale). <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	2012-13 Staff Survey: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I was offered a “beginner’s seminar” or pre-service orientation about how to work with youth. I was informed about how staff at this program are expected to work with youth OR I was informed about what this program is trying to accomplish with youth (4 or 5 on at least one of these). I was in daily communication with my supervisor about how things were going. 	G:43 S:35	2/0 if no vendors
	2.4.3 Ongoing professional development about how to work with youth	% staff across grantee agreeing that they participated in professional development about how to work with youth at least twice in past year. Does not include high school	% staff at site agreeing that they participated in professional development about how to work with youth at least twice in past year. Does not	2012-13 Staff Survey	S:36	2/2.5 if no vendors

Van Egeren, L. A., Wu, H-C., & Smith, C. (2013). *Michigan 21st Century Community Learning Centers leading indicator interpretation guide for 2012-13*. Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

Indicator	Measures	Grantee Level Definition	Site Level Definition	Source	Data Table # (G: Grantee S: Site)	Weight (grantee /site)
		students, volunteers, or administrators. <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	include high school students, volunteers, or administrators. <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>			
	2.4.4 Ongoing professional development in content areas	% staff across grantee agreeing that they participated in professional development related to content of activities they lead at least twice in past year. Does not include high school students, volunteers, or administrators. <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	% staff at site agreeing that they participated in professional development related to content they lead at least twice in past year. Does not include high school students, volunteers, or administrators. <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	2012-13 Staff Survey	S:37	2/2.5 if no vendors
	2.4.5 Discuss current research-based instructional practices	% staff/supervisors across grantee agreeing that they discuss current research-based instructional practices at least once a month. Does not include high school students or volunteers. <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	% staff/supervisors at site agreeing that they discuss current research-based instructional practices. Does not include high school students or volunteers. <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	2012-13 Staff/ Supervisor Survey	G:44 S:38	2/2.5 if no vendors
2.5 Staff Qualifications Staff are educated, experienced, and knowledgeable about quality	2.5.1 Bachelor's degrees or higher	% staff (all) across grantee with at least a B.A/B.S. <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	% staff (all) at site with at least a B.A/B.S. <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	2012-13 Staff Survey	G:45 S:39	3
	2.5.2 Experience working with youth	% staff (all) across grantee with at least 3 years experience working with youth. <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	% staff (all) at site with at least 3 years experience working with youth. <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>		G:46 S:40	3

Van Egeren, L. A., Wu, H-C., & Smith, C. (2013). *Michigan 21st Century Community Learning Centers leading indicator interpretation guide for 2012-13*. Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

Indicator	Measures	Grantee Level Definition	Site Level Definition	Source	Data Table # (G: Grantee S: Site)	Weight (grantee /site)
standards for youth programs.			= 3.			
	2.5.3 Familiarity with state and other standards	% staff (not including high school students, volunteers, or administrators) across grantee reporting knowledge of standards (state or other youth standards) =1 (on 0/1 scale). <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	% staff (not including high school students, volunteers, or administrators) at site reporting knowledge of standards (state or other youth standards) =1 (on 0/1 scale). <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	2012-13 Staff Survey: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would be able to describe the main points of the Michigan state standards for after-school programs to someone else. I would be able to describe the main points of at least one other written standard that applies to after-school or youth development work (for example, National After School Association, American Camping Association) to someone else. 	G:47 S:41	2
	2.5.4 Teaching certificate	% staff (all) across grantee reporting that they have a teaching certificate. <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	% staff (all) at site reporting that they have a teaching certificate. <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	2012-13 Staff Survey	G:48 S:42	2
2.6 Continuous improvement and evaluation Processes and quality infrastructure are in place for data-driven program improvement and evaluation.	2.6.1 Data-driven continuous quality improvement process - staff	% staff (not high school students, volunteers, or administrators) across grantee =>4 (on 1-5 scale). <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	% staff (not high school students, volunteers, or administrators) at site =>4 (on 1-5 scale). <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	2012-13 Staff Survey: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct program planning based on a review of data Use evaluation data to set program improvement goals Discuss progress on meeting program improvement goals Observe other afterschool staff delivering programming in order to provide feedback on their practice Get observed by other afterschool staff while I deliver programming in order to get feedback on my practice Conduct program planning in order to meet specific learning goals in coordinated ways across multiple activities Share ideas on how to make programming more 	G:49 S:43	3.5/4

Van Egeren, L. A., Wu, H-C., & Smith, C. (2013). *Michigan 21st Century Community Learning Centers leading indicator interpretation guide for 2012-13*. Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

Indicator	Measures	Grantee Level Definition	Site Level Definition	Source	Data Table # (G: Grantee S: Site)	Weight (grantee /site)
				engaging for participating students • Work with or see presentations from the local evaluator for this program.		
	2.6.2 Data-driven continuous quality improvement process - supervisors	% supervisors across grantee reporting =>4 (on 1-5 scale). <i>Minimum N = 3 or consent to display.</i>	SC reports =>4 (on 1-5 scale). <i>Requires consent to display.</i>	2012-13 Supervisor Survey: • Review staff's activity plans • Make sure that program goals and priorities are clear to staff • Give staff positive feedback • Be visible during staff's activities • Give staff useful feedback about how they work with youth	G:50	1.5/2
	2.6.3 Local evaluator involvement	% items on Grantee ARF Local Evaluator section rated => 2 – “did some of this” (1-3 scale).	<i>Not applicable; grant level</i>	2012-13 Grantee ARF: • Analyzed and reported on the data collected for the state evaluation and given back to us by MSU • Collected additional information (e.g., surveys, interviews, or focus groups) • Helped us interpret the data in the Annual Report Form Data Tables • Got school outcomes information to submit to the state • Helped us meet state and federal reporting requirements • Facilitated our YPQA process • Worked with us on program improvement • Worked with us on funding and sustainability	ARF	1.5/0
	2.6.4 Self-assessment and improvement plan	% sites with complete self-assessment (YPQA) and improvement plan submitted.	Site completed self-assessment (YPQA) and submitted improvement plan	2012-13 YPQA and Improvement Plan	YPQA	3.5/4

Indicator	Measures	Grantee Level Definition	Site Level Definition	Source	Data Table # (G: Grantee S: Site)	Weight (grantee /site)
			submitted.			

DOMAIN 3. POSITIVE RELATIONSHIPS

Indicator	Measures	Grantee Level Definition	Site Level Definition	Source	Data Table # (G: Grantee S: Site)	Weight
3.1 Relationships Relationships among staff and participants are supportive and warm.	3.1.1 Student report of supportive relationships with staff	% students across grantee reporting at least 3 on 4-point scale. <i>Minimum N = 15.</i>	% students at site reporting at least 3 on 4-point scale. <i>Minimum N = 15.</i>	2012-13 Youth Survey: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff care about me • I trust the staff • I can tell the staff in this program about my problems • If a kid is being mean to me, staff will help me 	G:51 S:44	4
	3.1.2 Student report of supportive relationships with program peers	% students across grantee reporting at least 3 on 4-point scale. <i>Minimum N = 15.</i>	% students at site reporting at least 3 on 4-point scale. <i>Minimum N = 15.</i>	2012-13 Youth Survey: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kids make sure that other kids follow the rules • Kids tell each other when they do a good job • Kids work together to solve problems • Kids help me when I'm having a hard time • I trust the kids 	G:52 S:45	4
	3.1.3 Parent report of student relationships with staff	% parents across grantee reporting at least 3 on 4-point scale. <i>Minimum N = 15.</i>	% parents at site reporting at least 3 on 4-point scale. <i>Minimum N = 15.</i>	2012-13 Parent Survey: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff in this program give my child individual attention • At least one staff in this program has a strong relationship with my child • Staff in this program know how to work with a child like mine • Staff at this program do a good job of preventing bullying 	G:53 S:46	2

Van Egeren, L. A., Wu, H-C., & Smith, C. (2013). *Michigan 21st Century Community Learning Centers leading indicator interpretation guide for 2012-13*. Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

Indicator	Measures	Grantee Level Definition	Site Level Definition	Source	Data Table # (G: Grantee S: Site)	Weight
3.2 Climate Program environment is safe and welcoming.	3.2.1 Safe environment	% sites receiving score at least 4 on 5-point scale on YPQA Safe Environment (self assessment).	sites receiving score at least 4 on 5-point scale on YPQA Safe Environment (self assessment).	2012-13 YPQA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Psychological and emotional safety is promoted The physical environment is safe and free of health hazards Appropriate emergency procedures and supplies are present Program space and furniture accommodate the activities offered Healthy food and drinks are provided 	G:54 S:47	2
	3.2.2 Parent report of welcoming environment	% parents across grantee reporting => 3 (1-4 scale). <i>Minimum N = 15.</i>	% parents at site reporting => 3 (1-4 scale). <i>Minimum N = 15.</i>	2012-13 Parent Survey: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When I go to the program, staff are doing things with the kids Staff at this program do a good job of preventing bullying I feel my child is safe at this program When I get to the program, staff greet me Staff treat me in a positive way 	G:55 S:48	2
	3.2.3 Minimal bullying	% students across grantee reporting <2 (1-4 scale). <i>Minimum N = 15.</i>	% students at site reporting <2 (1-4 scale). <i>Minimum N = 15.</i>	2012-13 Youth Survey: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At this program, I feel left out. At this program, other kids make fun of me for things I do 	G:56 S:49	3
	3.2.4 Minimal student perceptions of program management problems	% students across grantee reporting <2 (1-4 scale). <i>Minimum N = 15.</i>	% students at site reporting <2 (1-4 scale). <i>Minimum N = 15.</i>	2012-13 Youth Survey: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At this program, staff punish kids without finding out what really happened At this program, things get out of control At this program, kids have to wait around a lot At this program, staff yell a lot 	G:57 S:50	3
3.3 Community Partnerships	3.3.1 Co-funded student opportunities	Developed co-funded student opportunities	<i>Not applicable. Grantee level.</i>	2012-13 Grantee ARF	ARF	4

Indicator	Measures	Grantee Level Definition	Site Level Definition	Source	Data Table # (G: Grantee S: Site)	Weight
Program has relationships with community partners that contribute to sustainability and quality.	3.3.2 Advisory committee represents multiple stakeholder groups	Advisory committee exists; % of the following 8 stakeholder groups on committee: (1) both project director and site coordinator; (2) parents; (3) program providers/vendors; (4) School district superintendent, ISD or school district staff, principal, host school staff not in 21st CCLC program, school board rep; (5) community agency staff; (6) local government; (7) business; (8) faith-based.	<i>Not applicable. Grantee level.</i>	2012-13 Grantee ARF	ARF	4
	3.3.3 In-kind contributions	Generated in-kind contribution	<i>Not applicable. Grantee level.</i>	2012-13 Grantee ARF	ARF	2
3.4 Family Communication Family members are informed about child and opportunities for involvement.	3.4.1 Staff report of communication with parents	% staff and supervisors across grantee reporting => 3 – “About three to five times a year” (1-5 scale). <i>Minimum N = 3 or consents to display.</i>	% staff and supervisors across grantee reporting => 3 – “About three to five times a year” (1-5 scale). <i>Minimum N = 3.</i>	2012-13 Staff/ Supervisor Survey: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Send materials about program offerings home to parents. • Send information home about how the student is progressing in the program. • Hold events or meetings to which parents are invited. • Have conversations with parents over the phone. • Meet with a student’s parents to talk about the student’s progress. • Ask for input from parents on what and how activities should be provided. 	G:60 S:53	5

Indicator	Measures	Grantee Level Definition	Site Level Definition	Source	Data Table # (G: Grantee S: Site)	Weight
	3.4.2 Parent report of communication with parents	% parents across grantee reporting at least 3 on 4-point scale. <i>Minimum N = 15.</i>	% parents at site reporting at least 3 on 4-point scale. <i>Minimum N = 15.</i>	2012-13 Parent Survey: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff keep me informed about how my child is doing. • This program informs me about family events I can go to. • I attend family events at this program. 	G:61 S:54	5