



**CITY OF SEATTLE, HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT**  
***FUNDED OUT-OF-SCHOOL TRAINING***  
***PROGRAM EVALUATION***

*Prepared for*

*City of Seattle, Human Services Department*

*June 2002*

---

*Prepared by*

*Organizational Research Services  
1932 First Avenue, Suite 408  
Seattle, Washington 98101*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## **Executive Summary**

Introduction.....	1
Key Findings.....	2
Evaluation Issues and Recommendations.....	2

## **Report**

Introduction.....	4
Overall Evaluation Philosophy .....	5
Program Participant and Staff Interviews .....	6
Methods.....	6
Findings.....	7
Development of Outcome-based Evaluation System .....	10
SOW Training Evaluation.....	15
Methods.....	15
Overall Discussion .....	16
Interview Findings .....	17

## **Appendices**

- APPENDIX A: Program Interview Summaries
- APPENDIX B: Program Evaluation Plans
- APPENDIX C: Program Tools
- APPENDIX D: SOW Interview Guide

# **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

## ***FUNDED OST PROGRAM EVALUATION***

# INTRODUCTION

Over the past year Organizational Research Services (ORS), in collaboration with the Cross-Cultural Health Care Program (CCHCP), has managed the design of the evaluation of the seven out-of-school time (OST) programs funded by the City of Seattle Families and Education Levy. This process involved working with the City of Seattle Human Service Department (the City) staff and representatives from the participating programs to gather information about the program impact on youth and families, and the selection of appropriate outcomes and indicators to measure this impact in the future.

In this project the research team conducted a set of interviews with program staff, participants, and parents intended to gather information about the impacts of the out-of-school time programs. Working with the City of Seattle Human Services staff, we developed an “outcome matrix” that included a range of standard outcomes related to changes in Academic Achievement and Social Skills. This matrix will serve as the framework for the ongoing self-evaluation of program activities. We further conducted a set of interviews with the program staff to assess the impact of the on-site training offered by the City through School’s Out Washington (SOW). The intent of this component of the project was to evaluate the ways that programs benefited from this outside training.

## KEY FINDINGS

- ♦ Using the data collected via interviews and discussions with the Human Services staff, we were able to develop an “outcomes matrix”(see Table 1, page ) that represents the types of outcomes that out-of-school programs would use to evaluate their impact on the youth they serve. The core set of nine standard outcomes fall under two different domains: Academic Achievement and Social Skills.
- ♦ The ORS and CCHCP staff worked with the programs in the selection of appropriate outcomes and indicators for future evaluation. We further assisted the programs in the development of evaluation tools that will enable the program and City to better report the accomplishments of these out-of-school time programs.
- ♦ The program interviews clearly showed that parents and youth are not the most accurate and reliable sources of information about the proposed outcomes. Given that, most of the programs have created evaluation tools that gather information about Academic Achievement and Social Skills outcomes from either teachers or the program staff. The evaluation tools are included in APPENDIX C of the report.
- ♦ In sum, the Human Services staff now has a more reliable and insightful system for collecting and reporting information about program impact to the Levy and to other interested parties.

## EVALUATION ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- ♦ Enhance programs’ capacities to evaluate their impact – as a result of this project the seven OST programs have a better sense of the outcome evaluation process, and have some evaluation tools that will allow them to gather data for funders and for informing about their program impact. The fact is, though, that this process is quite new to them and the staff will face continuing challenges in collecting data, managing the data, analyzing the data and accurately reporting their findings to the City. We recommend the City institute some mechanism for on-going training or assistance for the programs so that they can continue to self-evaluate in an efficient and accurate manner.
- ♦ Enhance program’s abilities to serve youth and parents – the SOW evaluation and interviews with staff, youth and parents clearly showed that the programs face many challenges including staff turnover, lack of resources, and working with volunteers. The Human Services staff should continue to make training resources available to the programs, and try to work collectively with the programs in helping to identify resources that will allow the programs to better address the academic and social skills needs of the youth who participate.
- ♦ Assist programs in communicating what they do to parents – the analyses suggested that many parents are grateful for the presence of the program, but may not know what

occurs in the program, or how the program activities and content may impact their children or themselves. This is most clearly shown by the fact that parents are not a reliable source of information about changes experienced by the youth. Some of the difficulty lies in logistical challenges or barriers (i.e., language difficulties, parents being far from the program site). The City should work with the programs to continue to encourage parent involvement and to provide mechanisms for informing parents about the program functions, intentions and goals.

- ♦ *Make clear to the programs how this new evaluation approach fits with the City of Seattle performance commitment system* – to this point the City has utilized a performance commitment system whereby agencies are paid based on the accomplishment of a number of indicators achieved. Our analysis raises two concerns with the indicators used in the past a) they probably don't provide the most insight on program impact, and b) they were collected from less reliable sources of data – youth and the parents. In the past it was easier for the programs to “meet their numbers” on such indicators. As we have moved to a more accurate and reflective evaluation framework, the programs are now measuring more insightful, yet more challenging outcomes (i.e., improved academic skills). The concern is whether non-achievement of such outcomes will be perceived as non-performance, thus adversely affecting the program's ability to get paid for services. This is a concern that the City needs to address in structuring the contracts with the OST programs.

**REPORT**

---

***FUNDED OST PROGRAM EVALUATION***

# INTRODUCTION

Over the past year Organizational Research Services (ORS), in collaboration with the Cross-Cultural Health Care Program (CCHCP), has managed the design of the evaluation of the seven out-of-school time programs funded by the City of Seattle Families and Education Levy. This process involved working with the City of Seattle Human Service Department staff and representatives from the participating programs to gather information about the program impact on youth and families, and the selection of appropriate outcomes and indicators to measure this impact in the future. In particular, the steps in this process included:

- ♦ Collecting information about the impact of programs through interviews conducted with staff, participating youth, and parents at each of the seven program sites.
- ♦ Conceptualizing and developing a set of standard outcomes and indicators based on insights from the data gathered from the staff and youth, and through feedback from the Human Services and Levy representatives.
- ♦ Assisting the programs in the selection of appropriate outcomes and indicators, and in the development of easy-to-use and insightful evaluation tools.
- ♦ Collecting primary interview data from program staff to assess the impact of the School's Out Washington (SOW) training on program activities.

This report provides a summary of the information gathered from staff and participants at the program sites, and a description of the process of developing an outcome-based evaluation framework to be used by the Human Services Department in the future. The first section of this report describes the overall approach and philosophy underlying the evaluation and the development of an ongoing evaluation system.

The second section summarizes the staff and youth interviews, and provides a sense of how this data served as the starting point for the discussion about program outcomes and indicators. The third section of the report describes the process whereby ORS, the Human Services staff, and funded programs worked together in the development and selection of outcomes, indicators, and evaluation tools. In this section we will present the new outcome-based evaluation framework, describe some of the evaluation tools the programs will start to use in the future, and discuss the implications of this system in terms of assessing the impact of the Families and Education Levy. The fourth section of the report summarizes the evaluation of the impact of the SOW training. This includes a complete summary of the interviews conducted with the program staff, and some discussion of implications of these findings.

# OVERALL EVALUATION PHILOSOPHY

At the outset of this project, the project team included three staff of the City of Seattle Human Services Department, two cross-cultural community researchers of the Cross Cultural Health Care Program, and two ORS researchers. The project team intended to design an evaluation framework and set of evaluation tools to help the out-of-school time programs assess their impact on those they serve. The underlying philosophy that supports such an approach is based on the following premises:

- ♦ It is critical to measure program success based on what they intend to do and actually do
- ♦ It is critical to recognize the different challenges and approaches across programs
- ♦ It is critical to discover a short and finite list of key measurable outcomes
- ♦ It is critical for the programs to become systematically self-reflective in order to devise better solutions for the children and parents, and
- ♦ Self-evaluation is far more cost-effective than external evaluation.

As a strategy we used a “grounded” approach to start to identify outcome domains, indicators, and measures; by “grounded,” we mean knowledge drawn from the real-life work of the participants. We did this by interviewing program participants, reflecting back to them their stated objectives and measures of positive change, and working with the program staff to construct tools reflecting these elements.

This mode of engagement produces an emergent evolutionary empowerment process, so it is has only just begun. As the program participants engage in self-evaluation and see the limitations of their first products and the benefits of better products, they will become more sophisticated. They will discover that it works for them, not only in reporting to external bodies, but to revise internal plans and practices.

This approach is superior to external formalistic evaluation approaches that do not reflect what programs are actually trying to do; it is important to measure the impact of what people are actually trying to do rather than what they assumed to be doing or holding them to standards they do not embrace. The key here is to let the programs establish their standards, then try to achieve them. This will produce more reliable and valid information and more staff member attachment to evaluation itself. In the future, the programs may still need external helpers to move forward, perhaps City staff, but more likely other collegial programs conversant with logic models and self-evaluation.

# PROGRAM PARTICIPANT AND STAFF INTERVIEWS

## METHODS

The starting point of the process of designing the outcome evaluation framework was the completion of a set of interviews with the staff, participants and parents at each of the seven out-of-school time programs. We conducted face-to-face and telephone interviews with program providers, students, and family members; we provided honoraria to participating parents and relied on interpreters where appropriate.

We used brief, structured, open-ended interview guides to elicit their perspectives. The guides were different for program staff, students, and parents. We spoke to all key program staff and representative numbers of parents and students; the availability of both parents and students was more problematic in some programs than in others for a variety of reasons that could not be totally overcome.

From **program staff**, we asked for:

- ♦ An overview of all activities in the program.
- ♦ Types and schedule of activities: group vs. individual, homework assistance, arts, field trips, cultural, etc.
- ♦ Program demographics: gender, age, class size, staff size, staff-student ratio, how long children are in the program.
- ♦ What they expect the children to get out of the program.
- ♦ What tells them that the program is successful for the children?
- ♦ What sorts of changes do they look for to show that they have benefited? When? Where? How? How much?
- ♦ How did they know these changes actually occurred?
- ♦ What do they expect parents to get out of the program?
- ♦ What tells them that the program is successful for the parents?
- ♦ What specific changes do they look for to show that they have benefited? When? Where? How? How much?
- ♦ How do they know these changes actually occurred?
- ♦ How are they currently evaluating the program?

From **children**, we asked:

- ♦ Tell me what you do everyday here at the program.
- ♦ Do you like coming here?
- ♦ What do you like about being here? Why?
- ♦ What don't you like about being here? Why?
- ♦ What would you do if you weren't coming to this program?

From **parents**, we asked:

- ♦ and/or benefited How has your child changed as a result of the program?
- ♦ How have you changed from the program?
- ♦ What does sending your child to the program allow you to do differently?
- ♦ What does your child do when s/he's not attending the program?
- ♦ Would you be interested in receiving program assistance with your involvement with the schools? In what ways?

Interviews were conducted on-site at the programs, during the course of the normal program hours; children were interviewed in school. Parents were interviewed at home, at school functions, and by telephone. Only hand-written notes were taken and the names of the respondents were not recorded.

## FINDINGS

Each of these programs has been tailored to meet the specific needs of the recipient families; as a consequence, their representations of what they intend to do reflect different cultural, ethnic, linguistic, and many situational factors. However, at their core, the programs are remarkably similar in that what they *actually* do with the bulk of their efforts is in advance of clear parental interests, namely, *the provision of a safe and supportive environment in which the children will receive homework support, other academic tutoring, and mentoring in social and behavioral norms and skills in order for them to succeed in school and in the future.*

These interests appear critical to these parents who, for various reasons (e.g., recent immigrancy, lack of English language skills, unfamiliarity with specific subject areas and tools in the American curriculum, difficult employment schedules, lack of stable housing, lack of ability to communicate with the schools), find themselves unable to provide these needed supports. Given these similar and essentially concrete interests and pursuits, it was found possible to construct acceptable outcome domains, indicators, measures, and methods across these different programs. Some of the outcome domains that emerge, in part, from the content of the interviews include

- ♦ Academic/School Achievement or Performance
- ♦ Readiness to Learn in school and program settings
- ♦ Social, communication or expression skills
- ♦ Demonstration of appropriate ways of interacting with others in school and program settings
- ♦ Understanding and expression of appropriate cultural behaviors and norms.

After listening carefully to what respondents told us about desired program outcomes and benefits, we concluded that, while it would be useful for program staff to systematically inquire in the future among the children and parents about how their programs were perceived and/or could function better, neither children nor their parents would be reliable and efficient sources of information on common beneficial outcomes.

For example, when children spoke of what they liked about the programs, their comments centered mostly on a few general areas: **homework** (completion of homework, staff assistance), **social environment** (time with friends, treatment by staff), and **general interest in program activities**. When children spoke of those things that they didn't like about the programs (which also factor into their definition of program success), their feedback was related primarily to issues around lack of access to resources (e.g., books, vans, computers, sports equipment, games, space) which was, for the most part, resolvable by funding, rather than changes in program quality that could be instituted by staff.

Other sources of dissatisfaction revolved primarily around those things that children generally tend to be unhappy with, e.g.:

- ♦ I wish could spend more time here.
- ♦ The tutor makes us do hard thing repeatedly (i.e. having difficulty with homework).
- ♦ I want longer time to play.
- ♦ I wish we could have a party.
- ♦ I wish I could horse around.
- ♦ I don't like to do work.
- ♦ There is too much noise, people yelling and screaming.

Overwhelmingly, when children were asked where they would be/what they would be doing if they were not coming to the after-school program, their responses involved sitting at home and watching television, playing Nintendo, playing, talking on the phone, and hanging out at the mall, rather than group activities and homework.

When parents were asked about program benefits, the responses focused primarily on school performance, safety, and parent surrogacy:

- ♦ Better study habits and improved grades.
- ♦ They finish their homework every day.
- ♦ They're more knowledgeable about world events.
- ♦ They have a safe place to come, so I don't have to worry. There are activities for my kids.

- ♦ Takes care of my headache, because I also have a 2-year-old son, I can take care of him.
- ♦ Because he's here, I can work longer. I don't have to worry where he'll be.
- ♦ When I get home, I don't have to worry about helping him with homework.
- ♦ The program helps me because my wife and I can't teach our children (language barrier).
- ♦ Without the program, I wouldn't be able to work, or would have to work shorter hours.
- ♦ For two hours, I don't worry where the kids are; they're in a safe place.
- ♦ If no program, I wouldn't know what to do with the kids, there's no one to help. I can't focus on the kids' homework at home, because after we get home I have to focus on dinner, and then, when dinner's done, it's already bedtime. Their homework used to get lost, but now they're more organized in doing it, and turning it in.
- ♦ The problem was, I used to send him home with the key. But he wouldn't stay at home. When I came home from work, he wouldn't be there, and I had to go house-to-house looking for him. There's been a big change since then; the program has been lots of help. I'm calmer at work, less preoccupied.

APPENDIX A provides a set of summaries of the interviews conducted across each of the seven sites. For each program we provide insight on the program demographics, staff/participant perceptions of success, assessments of parent involvement, assessments of involvement in the schools, and thoughts on current and future evaluation methods and approaches.

# DEVELOPMENT OF OUTCOME-BASED EVALUATION SYSTEM

The research staff was initially brought in by the Human Services Department to complete an evaluation of the seven funded OST programs. It was clear, though, from the onset that beyond collecting information from the program staff and participants, it was necessary to work with the Human Services Department and the funded programs in the development of a system for continued evaluation of the program. Historically, the funded programs were asked to provide indicator data to inform two of the Families and Education Levy Goals:

- ◇ Engage children and youth in safe and constructive out-of-school time activities
  - ◆ Number of children served
  - ◆ Number of days of service
  - ◆ Number of children who feel that the activities are personally satisfying
- ◇ Ensure that children are ready to learn and do well in school
  - ◆ Number of parents who report that their child's learning readiness has been supported by enrollment in the OST programs.

One of our first tasks was to assess the usefulness of the existing evaluation system. While we found that it was true that programs were collecting some information to provide data about the indicators noted above, it was also evident that in many instances the evaluation tools were not appropriate for collecting necessary information, the data collection was sporadic and sometimes unwieldy, and most importantly, the indicators were not providing insight to the programs on their impact. A primary concern was that the stated Levy indicators were not providing useful and insight information about the true impact of the programs. In particular:

- ◇ The indicators *number of children served* and *days of service* are actually outputs (i.e., how much of an activity a program engages in over a time period). In an evaluation framework we are actually more interested in outcomes (i.e., what changes for those youth who participate in these activities). Thus, the question is how did the youth change (i.e., know more, act different, communicate more, etc.) as a result of participating in an OST program.
- ◇ To that end, the question is whether collecting information from the children about their "satisfaction" with the program, or from parents about their perceptions of the child's readiness, is providing enough insight about the true impact of the OST programs. The interviews summarized in Section 2 of the report clearly showed that a) programs are hoping to see changes in academic achievement/educational performance and in the demonstration of social skills, and b) it is questionable whether youth or parents are the most reliable sources of information about program outcomes.

At this point, drawing on the interviews with the staff and youth and our collaborative discussions with the Human Service Department, we constructed an “outcome matrix” for the continued evaluation. The intent was to develop a framework that was:

- ♦ **Standardized:** a common set of outcomes under two particular domains – Academic Achievement and Social Skills – that agencies could choose from.
- ♦ **Flexible:** a system whereby a program could choose a number of outcomes that best fit their activities, and could specify, with the assistance of the ORS staff, their own program specific indicators. Moreover, programs have the flexibility to develop appropriate tools that collect information from youth, parents, their own staff, or teachers.
- ♦ **Easy-to-Use:** a system where there are specified, common definitions for outcomes and examples of indicators for programs less familiar with the process.
- ♦ **Cost-Effective:** a system where programs with some assistance could develop appropriate evaluation tools, collect and analyze their own data, thus limiting the need for costly external evaluation services.

The process of developing this matrix was remarkably smooth, due to the goodwill and interest of the entire project team and the program staff. The researchers engaged the City staff in meetings to discuss the relative merits for each revision of the outcomes matrix. Because the research team and the City team were both small (seven persons involved throughout the process) and collaborative, it was possible to debate and refine, over several weeks, various iterations of the matrix, challenging each item and making its definition and measure increasingly more specific.

The final “outcomes matrix” is presented in TABLE 1 on the following page.

**TABLE 1: OUT-OF-SCHOOL TIME PROGRAM OUTCOMES MATRIX**

	<b>Comments or Explanation (if necessary!)</b>	<b>Example Indicators</b>
<b>Domain A: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT (STANDARD OUTCOME)</b>		
A1: <b>Increased/maintained completion of homework</b>	<i>Can be measured in school and/or program setting</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Days per week fully complete homework</li> </ul>
A2: <b>Improved/maintained academic achievement</b>	<i>Achievement defined in terms of performance in academic setting</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ GPA</li> <li>▪ Test Scores</li> <li>▪ Report Card Letter Grades</li> </ul>
A3: <b>Improved/maintained specific academic skills</b>	<i>“Academic” skills related to particular areas such as speaking, writing, reading comprehension, etc.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Writing skills assessment scores</li> <li>▪ Able to present material to class in a clear manner</li> </ul>
A4: <b>Increased/maintained focus on task</b>	<i>Can be measured in school and/or program setting</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Completion of task/activity within specified time</li> </ul>
A5: <b>Increased/maintained demonstration of a positive approach to new educational experiences</b>	<i>“A positive approach to new educational experiences” is an accepted definition of readiness to learn that seems to fit best with what the programs are hoping to accomplish</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Opens book bag and ready to go</li> <li>▪ Asks questions about “academic issues”</li> <li>▪ Spends more time preparing for school work</li> </ul>
<b>Domain B: SOCIAL SKILLS (STANDARD OUTCOME)</b>		
<b>B1: Increase/maintain initiation of communication with others</b>	<i>“Others” could include other youth in program or staff</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Starts conversations with others</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Willing to speak with individuals they don’t know</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Communicates with staff for issues unrelated to homework and school</b></li> </ul>
<b>B2: Increased/maintained positive interaction with other youth</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Shares more with others</li> <li>▪ Fewer fights/negative episodes</li> <li>▪ Cooperation on joint activities</li> </ul>
<b>B3: Increased/maintained positive interaction with adults</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Helps/assists adults more</li> <li>▪ Able to receive assistance from adults</li> </ul>
<b>B4: Increased/maintained demonstration of conflict resolution skills</b>	<i>“Demonstration” implies looking for use of particular behaviors</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Observed use of learned conflict resolution methods</li> <li>▪ Uses non-violent approaches to solve problems with others</li> </ul>
<b>Domain C: CULTURE</b>		
Increased ability to read/write in native language		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Language skills assessment</li> </ul>
Increase in culturally appropriate behavior around adults as defined by program	<i>As expected the definition of culturally appropriate behavior will be specific to each program</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Demonstrates type of respect</li> <li>▪ Use specific mannerisms</li> </ul>
<b>Domain D: FAMILY SUPPORT</b>		
Increase in parent use of other services provided by agency		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Use of following other services (X, Y, Z)</b></li> </ul>
Increase in frequency of parent-initiated contact with program staff		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ # contacts per month with staff members</li> </ul>

There are five outcomes in the Academic Achievement domain and four outcomes in the Social Skills domain. We realize that “Social Skills” is a rather broad term, but for these purposes it best captures the range of different outcomes that programs may want to measure. The programs are also given the opportunity to specify outcomes under other domains including Culture and Family Support. While some examples of each are provided, the programs do have the flexibility, in consultation with the Human Services Department staff, to choose program specific measures. The following comments provide greater clarification about the proposed outcomes:

- ♦ The outcome “Improved/Maintained Academic Achievement” refers to measures of performance in an academic setting. This suggests that the information should come from either “official” data such as grades or test scores, or through the perceptions of individuals in those settings, typically classroom teachers
- ♦ The outcome “Improved/Maintained Specific Academic Skills” focuses on the demonstration of skills in particular areas including writing, reading, comprehension, or math. It is distinct from the previous outcome in that a program could use measures such as a writing test, math assessment or perceptions of reading ability to evaluate the outcome.
- ♦ The outcome “Increased Demonstration of a Positive Approach to New Educational Experiences” refers to one of the theoretical definitions of *readiness to learn*. The staff and youth interviews suggested that this definition seems to best fit what the programs were doing and what they were observing in terms of impact in their setting.
- ♦ It was important to establish two different outcomes related to “Positive Interaction.” The interviews suggested that programs vary in terms of trying to enhance a youth’s ability to interact with adults and other youth. In either instance, since the focus was on the demonstration of a behavior, it makes sense for the program to gather information about the outcome and associated indicators based on staff or outside observer perceptions.
- ♦ The outcome “Increased Demonstration of Conflict Resolution Skills” has been reserved for programs that engage in specific activities focusing on conflict resolution. This outcome focuses on explicit changes that may result from such an activity. If a program does not utilize specific conflict resolution strategies, but does try to affect the nature of youth interactions, we recommended they choose “Increased Positive Interaction with Youth.”

In our discussions with the OST programs it was evident that one of the main challenges of the evaluation in the past was in collecting useful and complete information from youth and parents. A primary concern that emerged in these discussions and though the initial interviews is that in many ways youth and parents are not the most reliable sources of data on the specified outcomes. Quite often the parents are too far removed from the program and from the school setting to be able to report on academic achievements, and further are not present in enough situations where the children are demonstrating particular social skills. Moreover, the interviews showed that parents and youth have fairly diffuse goals and some difficulty articulating their interests for a

variety of reasons, not the least included age or difficulties with the English language. These findings suggested that perhaps school teachers or the program staff might be more reliable “informants” about the changes demonstrated by the youth.

While many of the programs were gathering some information about the youth they work with from teachers, in most instances this data was not being collected systemically for use in an evaluation. Usually the program staff communicated with teachers to get a better sense of what they might work on with particular students. The fact, though, that the staff has had ongoing dialogue with the teachers thus opens up the possibility of utilizing teacher perceptions as sources of data on the indicators. In our conversations with the programs, most believed that teachers might be most reliable “informant” on the youth’s academic achievements and their demonstration of social skills *outside the program setting*.

Yet, for many programs there is an interest in evaluating the demonstration of social skills *inside the program setting* as well. Since the program staff and volunteers are a consistent presence in the setting, and by nature are observing the youth in the setting, we felt that creating an evaluation tool that is completed by program staff or volunteers in a systematic manner would provide additional insights on the social skills outcomes. Likewise, it might offer any interesting contrast of the outcomes demonstrated in the program setting vs. a school setting.

The full set of evaluation tools is included in APPENDIX C. An objective of our work with the programs was to create evaluation tools that were comprehensive, yet easy to use and interpret. A secondary objective was to develop tools that were similar across programs so that there might be some consistency in the evaluation approaches across the programs, and so that program may be able learn from each other’s experiences. We were fortunate enough to create a set of observational surveys that met the needs of the program and were fairly similar across programs.

We have also included the evaluation plans for each of the programs in APPENDIX C. Most of the programs, with the exception of the Seattle Emergency Housing Services, intend to collect information via staff or school surveys about all youth in their population at multiple time points

# SOW TRAINING EVALUATION

## METHODS

The intent of the interview study was to evaluate the impact of the on-site training program provided by the City of Seattle and SOW to reveal if the training component has better prepared OST providers to help children succeed in school. The ORS research staff conducted a total of 6 interviews with key program staff. The interviews were approximately 45 minutes in length, and a structured interview guide was used, with questions addressing the following topic areas (please see APPENDIX D for complete interview guide):

- ◆ General description of work with trainer
- ◆ Strengths of work with trainer
- ◆ Training methods/techniques that work and don't work
- ◆ Amount of training hours
- ◆ Particular issues/topics worked on with trainer
- ◆ Ways in which program has changed and/or benefited from the training
- ◆ Program changes not attributable to training
- ◆ Challenges encountered in terms of delivering program services
- ◆ Challenges encountered in terms of pressure from parents, school or community
- ◆ Challenges encountered in terms of staff turnover
- ◆ Whether or not training funds should be used for other strategies
- ◆ Whether or not program services have been affected by the new co-pay policy.

This report summarizes the interviews with key program staff and provides the city and SOW with insights on the impact of the training. The summary also provides the city and SOW with a better sense of how to develop future support services that can prepare OST providers to help children succeed.

## OVERALL DISCUSSION

Overall, the data collected through the interviews can help inform directions for the on-site training program to fit the program's goals and improvement efforts, as well as communicate areas of success. The data suggests that the training has a positive impact on most participants, particularly for those who have fewer years of experience than others. When we probed the respondents about the potential impact of a new co-policy that requires the programs to pay a fee for a certain number of SOW training hours, we found that a) most were unaware of this new co-pay policy and b) the majority of respondents presumed that the new co-pay policy would most likely affect utilization of training hours due to funding constraints.

The most interesting findings, however, were revealed when we found some discordance in comparing the challenges faced in delivering program services to the particular topics/issues worked on by the trainer. For example, one respondent reported that its staff received training on how to include special needs kids into their program. However, the program's small space was reported as being their biggest challenge. Another respondent reported that their program asked for training on behavior management rather than on how to retain volunteers as that was reported as their most significant challenge in delivering program services. Therefore, there is some evidence that program staff members may be unaware of all training opportunities the trainer can provide to their program, or perhaps may not be communicating all their needs to those who might be of some assistance

Given the findings of this study the Human Services Department staff might consider the following suggestions as you proceed in providing SOW training services to the funded programs:

- ♦ Consider revising co-pay policy to decrease financial impact on programs and increase use of training hours
- ♦ Increase communication with program staff coordinators with regards to new policies that may impact program delivery
- ♦ Increase communication between trainer and program coordinator and staff to increase awareness of training opportunities.

# INTERVIEW FINDINGS

## Description of Work With Trainers

The majority of respondents reported that the training they receive is based on individual program needs. Some of these needs are discovered by the trainer when talking with the program coordinator and/or staff or by observation:

*“She’ll check-in with me every month or so to see how we’re doing and to see if we need any trainings”*

*“She’ll come to our site and observe our program to see if there is anything she can suggest for improvements. It’s good to get someone else’s feedback in case I don’t see something that needs to be changed”*

## Strengths of Working Relationship With Trainer

Respondents further reported that developing a positive and supportive relationship with their trainer helps build a strong working relationship:

*“We have developed a very positive and supportive relationship with her because she is so positive and supportive of us and the program”*

*“She’s very interactive with the staff and really appreciates the work that we do. That’s really important because it establishes trust and we feel supported”*

One result of building a positive and supportive relationship with their trainer is that respondents report that their level of confidence has increased:

*“She motivates, empowers and supports me to believe that ‘I can do this’! I take this feeling of confidence and talk to the Board of Directors about certain issues like the budget”*

*“The volunteers that stay have told me that they feel more confident working with the kids after they receive the training”*

*“She provides me with information so that I can gain more knowledge about other resources. She helps me with building my skills and as a result, I feel more confident with my abilities to work with the kids and staff”*

## **Training Methods**

The respondents felt that the SOW trainers used a variety of methods that worked well in the setting. Some of these methods include listening to staff members' ideas, observing the program and one-on-one consulting with program coordinator. The respondents had no explicit comments about which methods or techniques did not work as well:

*“By observing the way our program is set up and how it works, she pinpoints what the program needs and then helps us work on that challenge”*

*“She listens to what we have to say and incorporates that into the training or any suggestions for program changes”*

## **Training Hours**

While the majority of respondents reported that the amount of time allotted for training purposes was sufficient, they did report that additional training hours would be beneficial. Many felt that these hours could be spent on training new staff, individualized staff training and parent training:

*“I would give each staff person five hours of individual training for whatever issues they need individual help with”*

*“I would like to provide training for parents to learn Problem Solving methods, to learn to have more positive interactions with their kids and to learn how to be more involved with their children's lives”*

## **Particular Issues/Topics Trainer Worked on With Programs**

Respondents reported that they worked on a variety of issues/topics with the trainer such as behavior management and working with special needs kids:

*“We had a training on behavior management because we have some kids here that need special attention. She connected me with resources and training to tackle this issue”*

*“We had a training on how to include special needs kids into programs that don't usually have special needs kids. We learned that we needed to change the way our room was set up because he couldn't access a lot of the games and activities and didn't feel included”*

## **Program Changes or Benefits From Training**

Respondents reported that their program, in general, has changed and/or benefited from the training. Some of these changes or benefits include increased communication among staff, increase in problem solving skills, enhanced room structure and increased knowledge of community resources:

*“We have increased our communication with other resources, communities and organizations”*

*“We had little structure...our trainer came here and suggested that we set up different centers such as art, play and science centers to slow the kids down and to get them focused on special tasks”*

*“We have the ability to plan activities better, especially with our special needs kids”*

Respondents further reported that staff has increased their knowledge and skills with regards to a wide range of topics such as appropriate lesson planning, behavior management and cultural relevance:

*“Some people don’t understand that culture and race are different and that there are all kinds of culture. The staff is trained to understand the difference and how this relates to why some of our kids come to our program”*

*“The staff has learned about developmental standards and milestones so that they can plan their lessons more appropriately”*

*“The staff have more knowledge about how to work with difficult and angry kids – kids that have serious behavior issues as a result of the world that they live in”*

## **Challenges Encountered Delivering Program Services**

All of the respondents reported that they encounter challenges delivering program services. Some of these challenges include volunteer turnover and language barriers:

*“It’s a challenge to deliver services to people who English is not their first language”*

*“Our volunteers change every quarter because they’re students. So we have to train new volunteers every three months”*

Other challenges include the perceptions of the pressure from parents and the community placed on the program:

*“We need to have a certain amount of kids here to keep our funds from the city coming. Sometimes those numbers go up and sometimes they go down because of the nature of homelessness. So we get some pressure from the city to keep the numbers up”*

*“The parents want us to focus only on homework. Most of the parents don’t speak English, so they can’t help their kids with their homework. So they want to make sure that it’s getting done here”*

## **Using Training Funds For Other Strategies**

The majority of respondents reported that they would not exchange their on-site training for other strategies:

*“The training and support we receive from the trainer is invaluable. It’s crucial to have an outside evaluator/observer look at our program to help us identify our strengths and weaknesses so that we can improve our program”*

*“The amount of money is too little to put elsewhere. It’s not worth the trouble”*

*“The training and trainer is beneficial to our program. She is supportive of what we do and we would miss the support. It helps us and the program going”*

Only one respondent stated that they would rather use the money for other strategies:

*“Since I have been doing this for a long time, I don’t really need the training. I would rather use the money for supplies such as books, pencils, paper and crayons.”*

## **Co-pay Policy**

The co-pay instituted this year requires the programs to pay 20% of the total cost of the 30 hours of the SOW training allocated to each of the programs. The City was interested whether the new co-pay policy has affected the utilization of all the training hours within the program. The most interesting finding is that most of the respondents reported that they were unaware of this new policy. This may be because the program staff are not as involved in the day to day management of the program budget. Yet when informed about the policy, most of the respondents stated that the new policy would most likely affect their utilization of their allotted training hours:

*“I would think that it would affect our ability to keep the trainer since our funds are so tight as it is. I can’t imagine that we have extra funds to pay for the training”*

*“Although I don’t know what our budget is, I can only assume that if we have to pay more money for the training that we won’t be able to work with her as frequently as we would like to”*

The remaining respondents reported that the program would work with this new policy because the training is imperative to their program:

*“It will be worth the money to get professional training to help support the program and staff”*

*“We just have to be creative with the small amount of funds we receive in order to keep the training. It’s worth the challenge because the training is crucial for our staff and volunteers to learn how to effectively work with the kids”*

## **Additional Comments**

*“This was a good process for me because it helped me put things in order. I get so busy that I forget to stop and think about all the great things we’re doing here!”*

*“I’m just really thankful for all of the training we have received. It really helps us work better with the kids”*

*“Our trainer has been amazingly supportive to the program and me. Her support has helped me realize that my goals for the program will more than likely be attained as long as we work as a team”*

**APPENDIX A – PROGRAM INTERVIEW  
SUMMARIES**

---

***FUNDED OST PROGRAM EVALUATION***

Each of the programs has depicted its ambitions, programs, staffing, service populations, and recipient surveys well, in their initial funding proposals and subsequent annual reports. In the future, these self-depictions and the results of self-evaluation should combine to draw more clear views of the efforts invested and the outcomes achieved by these programs.

Here, we share some insights garnered from our interviews with staff, parents, and children.

## **Atlantic Street Center**

### **Program description**

The program, primarily academic, provides participants with one-to-one and small group services designed to each child's needs, responds to the individual requests and needs of participants and families, modifies its services as needed, and focuses on providing customized assistance with completing homework assignments. It provides 1:1 matches between students and the volunteer tutors, focused on individual needs in reading and homework. The children are learning communication skills in that situation because of the back-and-forth dialogue with an adult.

Once they have finished these tasks, they engage in educational games, also 1:1 with the tutors. Program language notes the need also to support relationship-building with families, nurture positive parent-child relationships, and increase self-assurance and positive self-esteem.

### **Demographics**

There are approximately 35 African American, African, Caucasian and South-East Asian students, all 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> graders. Many are special education and or English as a Second Language students.

### **Thoughts on success**

Program staff note that, even though the program can enhance academic performance, they would prefer that it not be the sole indicator of success. "If you rely only on the GPA based on what they're doing in tutoring, it may not be a true indicator on whether the child is succeeding." Staff want the children to see that education is fun as well as the means to an end, that they are doing it for a reason, and that they can find the connection among learning, career, and family.

The staff see that enhanced skills in the academic area are needed for enhanced self-esteem. They also see that the modeling of positive adult behavior, having a positive relationship with an adult, is valuable for both the child and the adults in the community. "When they have a tutor they can depend on, I notice how focused they become over a period of time."

### **Parent involvement**

There is limited involvement with parents because the children are bussed from the far south end to the far north end. The program does have family dinners which are more social events – “They're four times a year and we really try to get the families”. The events focus on cultural themes. “You can't get real in-depth, but you can get a sense of how things are going.”

### **Feedback from parents**

In order to get this feedback, given the limited contact with parents, the program has someone call all the parents and ask a few questions. The program has discovered that sending a form home with the child does not work. Program staff would like to ask more questions about the program than simply “is the program helpful?” to get more detail about how parents think the program may be helping their children. Staff suggest that parents are generally unaware of what services their children are receiving. “They know their children stay late Tuesdays and Thursdays, but I am not sure what they know beyond that.”

### **Feedback from children**

The staff feel that, even though the children do not stay with the program long, due to their changing housing situations, in general the children tend to like it. Once the children's tutors are consistent and there is some attachment, they stop looking around to see who else they wish they were with.

### **Thoughts on Evaluation**

Given the complexity of the lives of these children, the staff would like to know more about what is impacting each child's learning. They would like to know about the relative size and use of structured and unstructured time, do they know how to make friends easily, are they secure with themselves, do they ask questions in class, are they able to communicate with adults, and can they deal with authority?

Staff would like to be able to capture that information in a brief, non-intrusive way. “Finding a tool that works for parents and kids, but that is non-intrusive, not asking for their thumbprint, but that can get us information that we need to gear the program to what the children need.” Staff also want to be able to incorporate the developmental assets model into program evaluation.

Now, the program relies almost entirely on teacher feedback and the academic performance numbers. In the future, staff would like to do more student assessments and then build their resources to be able to meet the findings of that assessment.

## **El Centro de la Raza**

### **Program Description**

This program has three relatively equivalent and distinct goals -- assisting children and youth in academic achievement, nonviolence training, and community involvement. The program staff first help them with their homework, then move on to physical development activities, art projects, computer class, poetry, manipulative games, language development activity, story time, and music time. The program includes 20 minutes reading every day. The program also focuses considerably on bilingual education – to capture and retain the culture and the language. The staff also advocate for the families by calling caseworkers, to ensure they have subsidization for program involvement. The children get involved in ethnic/cultural community meetings around the city. “Community involvement is very important because, without being involved in the community, they don't know what is happening.”

### **Demographics**

There are 21 students, ages 5-12, from Spanish-speaking families.

### **Thoughts on success**

Staff view a successful program as one that is truly bilingual program and where children feel good about who they are and about their culture.

### **Indicators of success**

Premised on cultural and community understanding and pride, this program uses indicators such as “knowledge of what's happening in society and in the world, understanding how decisions on school council are made. Right after we go somewhere, they present on what they've learned.” They also look at changing personal performance (“if they have difficulties in writing and then we see they wrote a poem”) and self-esteem. Program staff also use attendance as an indicator, because the children come to program not because they have to but because they like it.

### **Relationship with Schools**

At start of school year, the program staff make contact with all the teachers in the schools, “We personally introduce ourselves so we can have a connection with them. Right after we talk to them we give them a survey, usually they send them back very quickly. The teacher will tell us what are, specifically, the weakness of the students.”

### **Feedback from parents**

The staff suggest that the parents are pleased that “I can go and speak my first language and they will listen to me.” They suggest that the biggest barrier for parents is that they have barriers in going to work -- where do they leave their children; that is why the staff help with subsidy is so important. They also like the parenting classes, because there are many single parents. Staff report parents saying, “I like it here, because I feel like it's part of my family.” At parent meetings, they achieve 100% participation.

### **Feedback from children**

Staff members say the children like the food, “because they're Latino, and the cook here and all the food and ingredients are traditional. They love to speak with somebody that speaks Spanish.”

## **Refugee Women’s Alliance**

### **Program Description**

This program provides services at Mt Baker from 5-7p.m. on Mondays and Wednesdays and at the Rainier Valley Cultural Center from 6-8p.m. on Tuesdays and Thursdays. The program has diverse goals and activities, split between academic enhancement and cultural activities. The program helps students with homework, with writing activities (journaling, fairy tales, cultural stories), and reading aloud. It also create opportunities for children come in traditional clothes and with symbolic objects, to engage in parent and youth seminars, and to provide support for middle and high school girls.

During a normal day, the first hour is reserved for helping students with their homework. This is followed by a break time with snacks, then other activities.

### **Demographics**

Serving youth from 5-12 years of age, the program at Mt. Baker Apartments sees mostly Cambodian children. At Rainier Valley, there is a mix of Vietnamese, Chinese, Cambodian, and Ethiopian children.

### **Thoughts on Success**

The program staff aim to help children with homework, helping them understand what to do, with the goal of enhanced academic achievement and problem-solving skills. Secondly, they aim to teach Cambodian traditions, “the way we sit, the way we respect adults, the way we talk to adults,” as well as the love to read and write. They feel responsible to the parents “who send children to us with big expectations about homework assistance.”

### **Indicators of success**

The staff currently rely on a number of indicators – child attendance, parental feedback on child behavior towards their parents, school performance, and child behavior in the program. “The sign of success is that children keep coming back, parents are still bringing children back.”

### **Parent involvement**

There are parent seminars and open house at the beginning of each quarter.

### **Relationship with schools**

The program staff work closely with schools to let them know about the program and that it accepts referrals. They also send an inquiry letter regarding evaluations quarterly to every child's teacher.

### **Feedback from Parents**

Parents talk mostly about the cultural activities. “They like that, they see that their children are coming home, asking them for help with the literature, and then ask ‘Is it right to sit like this?’”

Most of the parents also mention that the program has helped them to help their children with the homework. “Their focus is on homework because they don't understand the importance of the other things (e.g., emotional and problem-solving skills building, socializing better with other children), but if we show it to them, what we're trying to do in our program, they totally agree.”

### **Thoughts on evaluation**

In addition to school performance evaluations, the staff conduct home visits. But the staff would like to see more, not just numbers, but quality. They would like to have tools to assess what changes the program has made, the difference for the child, the issues they used to have, and what positive changes are happening in the lives of the children and their parents. They would also like to work more with the schools in the academic area.

## **Seattle Emergency Housing Services**

### **Program Description**

This is an unusual program because its recipients are homeless and, therefore, geographically and educationally transitional. The students often remain enrolled for only 6-8 weeks. The curriculum is focused on recreation, academic performance, and therapy. It operates 3 hours a day, 5 days a week. The day begins with a snack, and then proceeds with homework based on 1:1 tutoring help. This is supplemented by arts and crafts, culturally relevant activities through art and expression, and conflict resolution and anger management with mental health counselors every Friday. There is swimming once a week, a family fieldtrip once a month. The program also provides Nintendo, sensory activities, a computer lab, Internet network, and guest speakers.

### **Demographics**

The program serves between 20 and 36 children a day depending on family sizes in the shelter. They vary in age from 5-18 years. The persons and mix changes frequently depending on who is staying at the shelter. Generally, the children are African American, Somali, Hispanic, and children of mixed race or ethnicity.

### **Indicators of success**

Given the short time the children are in the program, it would be difficult to rely on longer-term indicators such as changes in academic performance. The program focuses more on attaching children to the tasks before them, giving them continuity in their transitional period, and instilling work habits. Program staff talk about indicators such as “increasing their self-esteem, making them more motivated to go to school, teaching

them communication skills to help them be productive citizens. They walk in, they open their backpack, they open up their book, and they're ready to go. That's letting you know that they're feeling more confident about their abilities here.”

“Success can be a very small thing that you see, when our children have something to look forward to in coming to our program, that's a success. When they want to come down and talk to our staff about what went on in their day and my staff listens to what's going on, that's success. Giving them the sense of belonging to something. A success is ultimately connecting 220 children to external resources, mental health services, nurse practitioners, community centers, and other services that they wouldn't otherwise be connected to. If they come continually when they're at the shelter, if they laugh a lot, they're smiling, they tell you they like it here. Also, learning to speak more English for those who are ESL. And adapting to diversity.”

### **Indicators of success for parents**

“They're more in tune with what's going on with their child, understanding that their children are still young and their minds are still forming. We try to improve the relationships children have with their parents through family activities. We stress to both parents and children that staying a family unit is essential to the success of the household. I want the parents to know that their children are safe and trust that we'll help them with tutoring and homework. We provide a safe place for the children so that parents can do other things, like look for housing.”

### **Relationship with schools**

The program has a volunteer who is the tutoring program coordinator. She communicates with all the designated homeless public schools and communicates with them if the program has one of their students. The schools let the program know how the child is doing in school and attendance. One school is currently helping the program devise an assessment tool that can work with all the children. The assessment happens in the afterschool program, and the information is documented and sent back to the public schools.

### **Children feedback**

Staff suggest that the children like the atmosphere, just being there -- the counseling sessions, movies, snacks, and they love swimming, that's their ultimate.

### **Thoughts about evaluation**

While the staff acknowledge the funders' need for numbers, the program staff are driven by what they can accomplish in such a brief time and with children in such transition. “Our staff know that they are achieving those successes that you can't necessarily get on a piece of paper or through a survey. We're not here to correct all the issues that are going on with our families, we're just trying to build upon their needs, so that when they move on from there, they have something to build upon.”

# **Chinese Information Service Center**

## **Program Description**

The core of the CISC program is academic tutoring. Four days a week, the children arrive and first do their homework, with volunteers helping if they have questions. Then they read on their own or sit with someone to practice reading. There are activity stations to supplement the homework. There are other literacy activities, as well. All of the children have computer classes every week and some have ESL classes. The program is bilingual. There are also directed math games, group team-building activities, some culturally relevant activities (e.g., Chinese poems using Chinese characters, calligraphy, storytelling and skits in Chinese), and social life skills addressing such topics as the school system and how to take classes, substance abuse, dating, dating violence, how to make friends, and communication with parents. Friday is a choice day.

## **Demographics**

The program attracts many newly-arrive immigrants, with very limited English skills. As a consequence, the children, ages 7-12, need much help with their homework and reading. Most of the children are Chinese, most from China and a few from Vietnam. Some of the children are from the Bilingual Orientation Center. About 80% of this year's children were returnees from last year.

## **Thoughts on success**

Given the recency of the families' immigration to the United States, the program focuses on helping the children to adjust to this country. Adjustment is defined as motivating them and helping them with school so they feel more confident about it, both academically and socially. They focus on literacy. "Once they pick up the language, they'll know what to do with the homework and, if they're socially well-adjusted, they will start making friends and will talk to the teachers (at school) instead of worrying about making mistakes. The more they want to talk and socialize with other people, their language will get better, and they will excel." The program also intends to support the children and their parents to maintain their ethnic identity, to bridge the gap between children and parents, so that parents know how to help the children and children are willing to be helped by the parents.

## **Indicators of success**

Given the focus on literacy and social adjustment, the program staff currently look to such indicators as communication skills, the children becoming more verbal and asking more questions during class in school. From a social development perspective, they look at whether school teachers report the children being more confident and more willing to participate in class. From the perspective of parent and child acceptance, they look to whether the children are willing to come to the program and past program participants coming back to help as volunteers.

### **Parent Involvement**

At end of each quarter, the program has a family night and, without fail, all parents come, a sign that they appreciate the program, not just for the supervision and education, but also for the cultural activities. During the family night, there are parenting sessions so that the staff can have discussions with parents on different topics, and also talk about how they can help their children. The program has parenting classes – six sessions – throughout the year.

### **Relationship with Schools**

Every year at start of year, the program staff send out a letter to introduce themselves to the schools. 80% of the letters are responded to with feedback. The staff also go to parent-teacher conferences for the elementary school students. If a child has problems at the program, the staff call the teachers to confer.

### **Feedback from parents**

The staff suggest that the parents like their children to come to the program because it is bilingual. Bilingualism enables the parents to know what is going on and its importance, whereas, if their children go to a regular school program, they cannot communicate with staff. There is much connection between the community and staff, resulting in the children returning every year.

### **Thoughts on evaluation**

Staff express some doubt that the current evaluation tools reflect the entire picture, resulting in staff desire for help in developing a more comprehensive tool. Part of the problem is that there are significant differences among what different parents want and need for their children, resulting in more individualized or personalized target outcomes. For example, they suggest, in preserving their ethnic identity and language, some of the parents want their children to learn English and fit into the American society; but, staff suggest, research has shown that children who are bilingual and bicultural will adjust better in the long run. The children themselves do not see the value in maintaining their ethnic identity.

The staff desire tools to assess how well these children are adjusting into the school system and into this new society (particularly older children who immigrated more recently, what kind of impact the program has on the way they interact with their friends, their parents, or how willing they are to go to school, and how much the program has helped the parents by sending their children to the program, by their understanding of the school system, and by their willingness to be involved with the child's learning.

## **YMCA of Greater Seattle**

### **Program Description**

The program is housed at the Thurgood Marshall Elementary School. Staff meet the children at the school and bring them to the program space. After the children put their belongings away and attendance is taken, the staff conduct a “community meeting” so that staff can address what is going to happen for that day and the children can express how their day was going so far. Then, they launch into some song, where children can express themselves and have fun. Then the students are directed to homework, followed by a snack time and games. They are then directed to their Y Club Activities (divided by age group (1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> grade, 3<sup>rd</sup>/4<sup>th</sup> grade, and 5<sup>th</sup>/6<sup>th</sup> grade) including physical activity, arts and crafts, and so on. Its activities are centered around literacy, computer activities, creative arts, community service learning, and recreation. The program teaches core values: Honesty, Responsibility, Respect, Caring, Faith and Fun.

### **Demographics**

The program serves between 30-35 children, aged 6-13 years. Friday is a “fun day.” Most of the children are African-American, a couple are Filipino, some are of mixed racial and ethnic background, and some are White. All the parents and children are English speaking. All the children, with the exception of graduated 6<sup>th</sup> graders, returned to the program.

### **Indicators of success**

The staff suggest that their most important outcome is in the child’s self-esteem, based on accomplishment, such as finishing assigned homework, turning a hard day around, doing a project, sitting down, listening, not lashing out, or having a fit. Each child has his/her own goals. Success is seen in many different and individualized ways – the children having fun and learn something, volunteering when they're done with the program, helping out at a site, and “remembering what we did for them.” Thus, there is no one measure of success.

### **Indicators of success for parents**

The staff want the parents to be owners and partners in the process of helping to raise their children, to see how they can utilize the program’s role in their child's life. “We're don't want to raise their children, we want to help so they can spend the quality time with their children. Ten years from now, I want them to remember us.”

### **Parent involvement**

Staff seek parental feedback on what they want for their children. They want the parents to be a part of the center not just for their children, but for themselves as well. Parent meetings are opportunities for them to be involved in the program. Parent involvement is currently at its highest point; at the first family informational meetings, all 32 families showed up. Parents are always volunteering to help out with the youth campaign, be on the parent action committee, bring food when there are potlucks, and help chaperone on field trips.

### **Relationship with school**

Many teachers come to the program during the day; it is where they have their art classes. The staff report that working with the school principal has been great, "he's really supported us and involved us in the school." The staff at the school communicates with the program about how the children's days are going; the program staff are in the school assisting and monitoring during the day.

### **Feedback from parents**

The majority of the parents want their children to be safe and have fun; many express that when their children are enjoying where they are, they feel comfortable, and the children feel comfortable. "The staff really cares about the children, took care of my children...it's more than just a place I'm dropping off my children, you guys really took the time and really cared for them." Many have also said it has changed their lives, the meaningful things the children are bringing home, that they're sharing with their parents. Parents have said they've tried to get mentors or big brothers and they can't find anybody (male role model)...the program staff are filling that gap of the day, uncle, or grandfather.

### **Feedback from children**

Staff report that the children love coming to the program. They note that, with the relationship staff develop with the parents, the parents see the staff more closely than they see the teachers and the children see the staff more as an uncle or an aunt. "When you walk in the school and children that aren't even in the program know your name and say 'Hi,' that's a huge thing. How do they know your name if you don't even interact with them every day?"

### **Thoughts on evaluation**

The program has satisfactory systems in place that can measure how well a child does in school by looking at his/her grades and how they can and do improve over time.

What is missing are comparable systems to measure change in the social and behavioral aspects of their lives. Program staff would like the means to measure if and how the program helps children being able to socialize in the long run, to change how they view or perceive things, build their self-esteem, to talk and work with other people, to be a team member and an active leader, to have the willpower to learn, to retain the values taught to them, the things that children can take with them into adulthood. "If children feel like failures, if they're having to take care of themselves, you can't expect the children to be leaders. Measure that." In essence, they challenge the ability of evaluation, internal or external, to measure the non-academic "intangibles", such as change in behaviors, the sense of relief in the parents that their children are safe and receiving the academic supports they require, the fact that the children are not merely being baby-sat in front of a television, that "they're in an environment that's loving, caring, and just like home."

Staff would like to see evaluation customized to the activities and to each site. Otherwise, they suggest, total standardization will limit them. “If it's standardized, I'll feel like I can't go out of the box, I have to gear everything to this format to make it work. If it's customized, I can expand, come up with new ideas of how to do things.”

Staff, while recognizing the value of evaluation based on responses from parents and children, also suggest the need to poll the staff as well.

## **Lao Community Center**

### **Program Description**

The primary work of the Center's program is around academics. Program staff will provide time and support for the children to complete their homework; then the staff, relying on an individual activity sheet, will guide them in academic areas in which they need practice. After homework, they will read or do diary entries. Students are provided with computers. Students are picked up at school and dropped off at home; snacks are provided at the end of the day's activities. There are some activities that involve the parents, especially during the summer. There are performances (with sword dances, cultural dances) twice a year, for the children to learn and to perform for the parents.

### **Demographics**

This year, the program served a total of 31 children, ranging in age from 5-14 years. It serves different Laotian ethnic groups including Khmu, Mien, Hmong and mainland Laos, as well as a couple of Vietnamese and Chinese children. While some of the children speak English poorly, the program is delivered primarily in English. The English skills of the parents are also pretty poor. Some of the same children return year after year.

### **Thoughts on Success**

Program staff would like to see the students receive better grades and improve in every academic area, not just in one or two. They also want the students to learn to be respectful of each other, learning how to deal with other people in any kind of situation. Staff want to help instill in students some lessons about communication skills.

### **Current Indicators of Success**

The staff members assess student progress by relying on and comparing current to past report cards and teachers' progress reports. They also talk directly to the teachers. Other, less structured indicators include whether older students come back to help tutor the younger children and/or if they recommend their younger brothers or sisters to come to the program. In terms of behavioral changes, they look for students overcoming initial shyness, communicating with other children, making friends, becoming more comfortable, and asking other children to help them. Staff members also see most of the children in their family/home environment and talk to counselors, to find out if they are having behavioral problems, how behavior has improved or worsened, if they are getting in trouble at school or having a problem with tardiness.

### **Parent involvement**

Staff report that the parents are very involved. Staff are in "constant" contact with all the parents, talking to all the parents regarding behavioral issues, so that they have a source of help in managing the children while they are in program.

### **Relationship with Schools**

The program has had at least 11 years of experience with the schools, so that staff view that relationship as good. Staff know almost all the schools, teachers, and counselors. The teachers communicate with the program staff about what children are having trouble, particularly because the program is the liaison between the parents and the schools; the program communicates with the teachers and helps relay the message to the parents. Even though the schools mail progress reports home, the parents will bring it to the program, asking: "Can you tell us what is going on here? What does 'A' mean? What does 'B' mean?"

### **Feedback from Parents**

Staff report that parents are grateful for the program, that, without it, parents would not know where the children would go. Most of the parents want see improvement in grades. They don't want their children to be "into anything else" after school. They trust that the staff will provide the students with structure and instill values and respect for adults and culture. Parents would like to see more individual staff and volunteer assistance for their child, as they see its direct relationship to academic performance.

### **Feedback from Children**

Staff report that the children are glad that the program provides a place for the children to "hang out," picks them up and drops them off, providing help in the form of someone who can help them with their homework, and providing supplies they don't have at home – for example, crayons, or a computer to type a report or do a project. Students do not like the number of program rules.

**APPENDIX B – PROGRAM EVALUATION  
PLANS**

---

***FUNDED OST PROGRAM EVALUATION***

# LAO COMMUNITY CENTER

## PROGRAM EVALUATION PLAN

Outcomes	Indicators	Data Collection Method	Data Collection Schedule	Sample
(A2) Improved or Maintained academic achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ GPA</li> <li>▪ Test Scores</li> <li>▪ Report Card Letter Grades</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quarterly assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in Program</li> </ul>
(A3) Improved or Maintained specific academic skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improvement in English skills</li> <li>▪ Improvement in Reading Skills</li> <li>▪ Improvement in Math skills</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quarterly assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in Program</li> </ul>
(B1) Increased or Maintained initiation of communication with teachers and others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Starts conversations with teachers and others</li> <li>▪ Communicates with teachers for issues unrelated to homework and school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quarterly assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in Program</li> </ul>
(B2) Increased or Maintained positive interaction with youth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Shares with others</li> <li>▪ Fewer fights/negative episodes</li> <li>▪ Cooperation on joint activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quarterly assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in Program</li> </ul>

## ReWA

### PROGRAM EVALUATION PLAN

Outcomes	Indicators	Data Collection Method	Data Collection Schedule	Sample
(A2) Increased or Maintained academic achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Finishes assignments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quarterly assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in Program</li> </ul>
(A3) Improved or Maintained specific academic skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improvement in Writing Skills</li> <li>▪ Improvement in Reading Skills</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quarterly assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in Program</li> </ul>
(B1) Increased or Maintained initiation of communication with others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Communicates with teacher for issues related to homework and school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quarterly assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in Program</li> </ul>
(B4) Increased or Maintained demonstration of conflict resolution skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Student more likely to talk instead of fight when solving a problem</li> <li>▪ Student is less aggressive with teacher and others</li> <li>▪ Student demonstrates leadership in trying to resolve conflicts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quarterly assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in Program</li> </ul>
(C2) Increase or Maintain culturally appropriate behavior around adults as defined by program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Use specific mannerisms taught by program (provide specific examples)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Staff observation tool (will not report to SOW)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quarterly assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in Program</li> </ul>

# YMCA

## PROGRAM EVALUATION PLAN

Outcomes	Indicators	Data Collection Method	Data Collection Schedule	Sample
(A1) Increased or Maintained completion of homework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Assessment of level of improvement in homework completion at school and program setting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher/staff assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quarterly assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in program</li> </ul>
(A2) Improved or Maintained academic achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ GPA/ Test Scores from school setting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quarterly assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in program</li> </ul>
(B2) Increased or Maintained positive interaction with youth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Fewer fights in school and program setting</li> <li>▪ Greater cooperation with other youth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher/staff assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quarterly assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All youth in program</li> </ul>
(B4) Increased or Maintained demonstration of conflict resolution skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Youth more likely to talk instead of fight when solving a problem</li> <li>▪ Youth is less aggressive with teacher, program staff and others</li> <li>▪ Youth demonstrates leadership in trying to resolve conflicts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher/staff assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quarterly assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in program</li> </ul>
(D2) Increased or Maintained demonstration in frequency of parent-initiated contact with program staff (optional – will not report data to City)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Parents more likely to make contact with staff members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Current YMCA feedback survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quarterly assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All parents who have youth in program</li> </ul>

## ATLANTIC STREET CENTER – After School Program

### PROGRAM EVALUATION PLAN

Outcomes	Indicators	Data Collection Method	Data Collection Schedule	Sample
(A1) Increased or Maintained completion of homework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Assessment of level of improvement in homework completion in school setting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quarterly assessment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in Program</li> </ul>
(A3) Improved or Maintained specific academic skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improvement in English skills</li> <li>▪ Improvement in Reading Skills</li> <li>▪ Improvement in Math skills</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quarterly assessment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in Program</li> </ul>
(B1) Increase in initiation of communication with others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ More willing to start conversations with others</li> <li>▪ Talks with those they don't know well</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher assessment survey</li> <li>▪ ASC Staff/Volunteer Assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quarterly (both surveys)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in Program</li> </ul>
(B2) Increased positive interaction with youth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Fewer fights or discipline referrals</li> <li>▪ Greater cooperation with other youth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher assessment survey</li> <li>▪ ASC Staff/Volunteer Assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quarterly (both surveys)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in Program</li> </ul>

## ATLANTIC STREET CENTER – Summer Academy

### PROGRAM EVALUATION PLAN

Outcomes	Indicators	Data Collection Method	Data Collection Schedule	Sample
(A1) Increased or Maintained completion of homework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Assessment of level of improvement in homework completion in school setting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ End of 2<sup>nd</sup> week and end of 5<sup>th</sup> week</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in Program</li> </ul>
(A3) Improved or Maintained specific academic skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improvement in English skills</li> <li>▪ Improvement in Reading Skills</li> <li>▪ Improvement in Math skills</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher referral form</li> <li>▪ “Skills” test</li> <li>▪ Teacher assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ End of school year and end of summer school year</li> <li>▪ PRE/POST</li> <li>▪ End of 2<sup>nd</sup> week and end of 5<sup>th</sup> week</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in Program</li> </ul>
(B1) Increase in initiation of communication with others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ More willing to start conversations with others</li> <li>▪ Talks with those they don’t know well</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher assessment survey</li> <li>▪ ASC Staff/Volunteer Assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ End of 2<sup>nd</sup> week and end of 5<sup>th</sup> week</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in Program</li> </ul>
(B4) Increased or Maintained demonstration of conflict resolution skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Youth more likely to talk instead of fight when solving a problem</li> <li>▪ Youth is less aggressive with teacher and others</li> <li>▪ Youth demonstrates leadership in trying to resolve conflicts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher assessment survey</li> <li>▪ ASC Staff/Volunteer Assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ End of 2<sup>nd</sup> week and end of 5<sup>th</sup> week</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in Program</li> </ul>
(B2) Increased or Maintained positive interaction with youth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Fewer fights or discipline referrals</li> <li>▪ Greater cooperation with other youth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher assessment survey</li> <li>▪ ASC Staff/Volunteer Assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ End of 2<sup>nd</sup> week and end of 5<sup>th</sup> week</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in Program</li> </ul>

## CHINESE INFORMATION SERVICE CENTER – After School Program

### PROGRAM EVALUATION PLAN

Outcomes	Indicators	Data Collection Method	Data Collection Schedule	Sample
(A1) Increased or Maintained completion of homework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Assessment of level of improvement in homework completion in school setting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quarterly assessment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in Program</li> </ul>
(A3) Improved or Maintained specific academic skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improvement in English skills</li> <li>▪ Improvement in Reading Skills</li> <li>▪ Improvement in Math skills</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quarterly assessment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in Program</li> </ul>
(B1) Increase in initiation of communication with others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Starts conversations with others</li> <li>▪ Participates in discussions</li> <li>▪ Communicates with others during participation in activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher assessment survey</li> <li>▪ CISC Staff assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher Assessment – quarterly</li> <li>▪ Staff assessment survey - quarterly</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in Program</li> </ul>
(B2) Increased positive interaction with youth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Working as a team</li> <li>▪ Less arguing</li> <li>▪ Less teasing</li> <li>▪ Helping each other</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher assessment survey</li> <li>▪ CISC Staff assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher Assessment – quarterly</li> <li>▪ Staff assessment survey - quarterly</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in Program</li> </ul>

# ELCENTRO DE LA RAZA

## PROGRAM EVALUATION PLAN

<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Data Collection Method</b>	<b>Data Collection Schedule</b>	<b>Sample</b>
(A1) Increased or Maintained completion of homework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Assessment of level of improvement in homework completion at program setting</li> <li>▪ Assessment of level of improvement in homework completion in school setting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher assessment survey</li> <li>▪ EL CENTRO staff assessment survey (IDP tool)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quarterly assessments – both surveys</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in Program</li> </ul>
(A2) Improved or Maintained specific academic skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improvement in English skills</li> <li>▪ Improvement in Reading Skills</li> <li>▪ Improvement in Math skills</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher assessment survey</li> <li>▪ EL CENTRO staff assessment survey (IDP tool)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quarterly assessments – both surveys</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in Program</li> </ul>
(B4) Increased or Maintained demonstration of conflict resolution skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Youth more likely to talk instead of fight when solving a problem</li> <li>▪ Youth is less aggressive with teacher and others</li> <li>▪ Youth demonstrates leadership in trying to resolve conflicts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher assessment survey</li> <li>▪ EL CENTRO staff assessment survey (IDP tool)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quarterly assessments – both surveys</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in Program</li> </ul>
(B2) Increased or Maintained positive interaction with youth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Fewer fights</li> <li>▪ Greater cooperation with other youth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher assessment survey</li> <li>▪ EL CENTRO staff assessment survey (IDP tool)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quarterly assessments – both surveys</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in Program</li> </ul>
Improved Spanish vocabulary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Use of more Spanish words and phrases</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ EL CENTRO staff assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Twice – late January and end of school year</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in Program</li> </ul>
Increased pride in the Spanish language	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Willing to use language with friends</li> <li>▪ Willing to use language with family</li> <li>▪ Willing to use language at school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ After-School program children's survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ ???</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All Youth in Program</li> </ul>

## SEATTLE EMERGENCY HOUSING – After School Program

### PROGRAM EVALUATION PLAN

Outcomes	Indicators	Data Collection Method	Data Collection Schedule	Sample
(A1) Increased or Maintained completion of homework (for program we interpret as “motivated to complete homework”)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Brings homework to program to work on with tutor</li> <li>▪ Brings in appropriate materials to work on homework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ SEHS Staff assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Baseline at second week of participation in program and follow-up during fourth week of participation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Random 25% of program participants (every 4<sup>th</sup> participant in the program ~ 50-60 youth per year)</li> </ul>
(A6) Increased demonstration of a positive approach to new educational experiences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Consistent attendance at the after-school program (I’m not a big fan of this one!)</li> <li>▪ Greater participation in the rewards game/system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ SEHS Staff assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Baseline at second week of participation in program and follow-up during fourth week of participation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Random 25% of program participants (every 4<sup>th</sup> participant in the program ~ 50-60 youth per year)</li> </ul>
(B2) Increased positive interaction with youth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sit and listen while others are talking</li> <li>▪ Playing together without arguing</li> <li>▪ Positive behavior while on field trips</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ SEHS Staff assessment survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Baseline at second week of participation in program and follow-up during fourth week of participation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Random 25% of program participants (every 4<sup>th</sup> participant in the program ~ 50-60 youth per year)</li> </ul>
(B3) Increased positive interaction with adults	<p>Interaction with STAFF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Listens/pays attention to staff</li> <li>▪ Talks to staff about what is happening in their lives</li> <li>▪ Asks for or looks forward to more 1 on 1 attention from staff</li> </ul> <p>Interaction with PARENTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Talks with parents what about what is going on in program and school</li> <li>▪ Enjoys talking with parents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ SEHS Staff assessment survey</li> <li>▪ Youth interview</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Baseline at second week of participation in program and follow-up during fourth week of participation</li> <li>▪ Interview during 4<sup>th</sup> week of participation in program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Random 25% of program participants (every 4<sup>th</sup> participant in the program ~ 50-60 youth per year)</li> </ul>

**APPENDIX C – PROGRAM EVALUATION TOOLS**  

---

***FUNDED OST TIME PROGRAM EVALUATION***



**LAO COMMUNITY CENTER AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM**

**TEACHER SURVEY**

STUDENT INFORMATION	
Date:	School:
Student's Name:	Grade:
Teacher's Name:	Subject:

**Please assess the student in the following categories by marking the appropriate box:**

	CURRENT ASSESSMENT			
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
<b>GPA/Test Scores</b>				
<b>Positive Interaction With Other Youth</b> <i>(see examples below)</i>				
<b>Positive Communication</b> <i>(see examples below)</i>				
<b>Writing skills</b>				
<b>Reading skills</b>				

***Positive Interaction Skills include:***

1. Shares more with others
2. Fewer fights/negative episodes
3. Cooperation on joint activities

***Positive Communication Skill includes:***

1. Starts conversations with teachers and others
2. Communicates with teachers and others for issues unrelated to homework or school

COMMENTS:

---



---



---



---



---



---

*If you have any questions please call Linda Chulaparn at (206) 328-2644*

**Thank you!!**

**ReWA AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM  
TEACHER SURVEY**

<b>STUDENT INFORMATION</b>	
Date:	School:
Student's Name:	Grade:
Teacher's Name:	Subject:

**Please assess the student in the following categories by marking the appropriate box:**

	<b>CURRENT ASSESSMENT</b>			
	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>
<b>Finishes assignments</b>				
<b>Conflict resolution skills</b> <i>(see examples below)</i>				
<b>Positive Interactions</b> <i>(see examples below)</i>				
<b>Writing skills</b>				
<b>Reading skills</b>				

***Conflict Resolution Skills include:***

1. Student talks instead of fighting when solving a problem or conflict
2. Student is less aggressive with the teacher and others
3. Student demonstrates leadership skills in resolving conflicts

***Positive Interaction includes:***

1. Reduced number of fights/discipline referrals
2. Level of cooperation with others

**COMMENTS:**

---



---



---



---



---



---



---

**THANK YOU!**

**YMCA AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM**

**TEACHER/STAFF SURVEY**

<b>Date:</b>
<b>Student's Name:</b>
<b>Teacher's (Staff) Name:</b>

*Please assess the student by marking the appropriate box:*

	IMPROVEMENT			AGE LEVEL ASSESSMENT		
	Not Improving	Improving	Improving Dramatically	Below standard Level	At standard level	Exceeding standard level
<b>Finishes assignments</b>						
<b>GPA/Test Scores</b>						
<b>Conflict resolution skills</b> <i>(see examples below)</i>						
<b>Positive Interactions</b> <i>(see examples below)</i>						
<b>Writing skills</b>						
<b>Reading skills</b>						
<b>Math skills</b>						

***Conflict Resolution Skills include:***

1. Student talks instead of fighting when solving a problem or conflict
2. Student is less aggressive with the teacher, staff and others
3. Student demonstrates leadership skills in resolving conflicts

***Positive Interaction includes:***

1. Reduced number of fights/discipline referrals
2. Greater cooperation with others

***Communication Skills include:***

1. Student willing to start conversations with others
2. Student talks with those they don't know well

**COMMENTS:**

---



---



---



---



---

**THANK YOU!**

# ATLANTIC STREET CENTER AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM

<b>Date:</b>
<b>Student's Name:</b>
<b>Teacher's (Staff) Name:</b>

*Please assess the student by marking the appropriate box:*

	CURRENT ASSESSMENT			
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
<b>Finishes assignments</b>				
<b>Class Attendance</b>				
<b>Conflict resolution skills</b> <i>(see examples below)</i>				
<b>Positive Interactions</b> <i>(see examples below)</i>				
<b>Communication Skills</b> <i>(see examples below)</i>				
<b>Writing skills</b>				
<b>Reading skills</b>				
<b>Math skills</b>				

***Conflict Resolution Skills include:***

1. Student talks instead of fighting when solving a problem or conflict
2. Student is less aggressive with the teacher and others
3. Student demonstrates leadership skills in resolving conflicts

***Positive Interaction includes:***

1. Reduced number of fights/discipline referrals
2. Level of cooperation with others

***Communication Skills include:***

1. Student willing to start conversations with others
2. Student talks with those they don't know well

COMMENTS:

---



---



---



---



---



---



---

# CHINESE INFORMATION SERVICE CENTER AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM

<b>Date:</b>
<b>Student's Name:</b>
<b>Staff Member:</b>

*Please assess the student's progress in the last quarter by marking the appropriate box:*

	<b>CURRENT ASSESSMENT</b>			
	PROFICIENT	IMPROVED	Maintained	Needs Improvement
<b>Finishes Assignments</b>				
<b>Class Attendance</b>				
<b>Positive Interactions</b> <i>(see examples below)</i>				
<b>Communication Skills</b> <i>(see examples below)</i>				
<b>Writing (or English) skills</b>				
<b>Reading skills</b>				
<b>Math skills</b>				

**Communication Skills include:**

1. Student willing to start conversations with others
2. Student communicates during program discussions
3. Students communicate with other during participation in program activities

**Positive Interaction includes:**

1. Student works with others as part of a team
2. Student does not argue with other youth
3. Student doesn't tease other youth
4. Student is willing to help other youth

**Writing (or English) Skills:** Writing conventions, able to organize written thoughts.

**Reading Skills:** Fluency, comprehension, reading for pleasure.

**Math Skills:** Understand instructions, understand and apply math concepts, able to problem solve by asking appropriate questions.

**COMMENTS:**

---



---



---



---



---



---



---

# CHINESE INFORMATION SERVICE CENTER AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM

<b>Date:</b>
<b>Student's Name:</b>
<b>Teacher's Name:</b>

*Please assess the student's progress in the last quarter by marking the appropriate box:*

	<b>CURRENT ASSESSMENT</b>			
	PROFICIENT	IMPROVED	Maintained	Needs Improvement
<b>Finishes Assignments</b>				
<b>Class Attendance</b>				
<b>Positive Interactions</b> <i>(see examples below)</i>				
<b>Communication Skills</b> <i>(see examples below)</i>				
<b>Writing (or English) skills</b>				
<b>Reading skills</b>				
<b>Math skills</b>				

**Communication Skills include:**

1. Student willing to start conversations with others
2. Student communicates during classroom discussions
3. Students communicate with other during participation in activities

**Positive Interaction includes:**

1. Student works with others as part of a team
2. Student does not argue with other youth
3. Student doesn't tease other youth
4. Student is willing to help other youth

**Writing (or English) Skills:** Writing conventions, able to organize written thoughts.

**Reading Skills:** Fluency, comprehension, reading for pleasure.

**Math Skills:** Understand instructions, understand and apply math concepts, able to problem solve by asking appropriate questions.

**COMMENTS:**

---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



**EL CENTRO DE LA RAZA AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM**

<b>Date:</b>
<b>Student's Name:</b>
<b>Teacher's Name:</b>

**Please assess the student in BOTH of the following categories by marking the appropriate box:**

*If you have any questions please call Silvia Blanco at (206) 329-8961*

	IMPROVEMENT (last quarter)			AGE LEVEL ASSESSMENT		
	Not Improving	Improving	Improving Dramatically	Below Age Level	At age level	Exceeding Age level
<b>Finishes assignments</b>						
<b>Class Attendance</b>						
<b>Conflict resolution skills</b> <i>(see examples below)</i>						
<b>Positive Interactions</b> <i>(see examples below)</i>						
<b>Writing skills</b>						
<b>Reading skills</b>						
<b>Math skills</b>						

***Conflict Resolution Skills include:***

1. Student talks instead of fighting when solving a problem or conflict
2. Student is less aggressive with the teacher and others
3. Student demonstrates leadership skills in resolving conflicts

***Positive Interaction includes:***

1. Reduced number of fights/discipline referrals
2. Level of cooperation with others

**COMMENTS:**

---



---



---



---



---

**EL CENTRO DE LA RAZA AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM**

**STAFF ASSESSMENT AND INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Student's Name:</b>	<b>Student Age:</b>
<b>El Centro Staff Member:</b>	<b>Teacher:</b>

**Please assess the student's improvement in the last quarter by marking the appropriate box:**

	<b>IMPROVEMENT (last quarter)</b>			<b>Individual Development Plan Comments</b>
	<b>Not Improving</b>	<b>Improving</b>	<b>Improving Dramatically</b>	
<b>Finishes assignments/homework</b>				
<b>Conflict resolution skills</b> ( <i>see examples below</i> )				
<b>Positive Interactions</b> ( <i>see examples below</i> )				
<b>Writing skills</b>				
<b>Reading skills</b>				
<b>Math skills</b>				
<b>Use of Spanish words or phrases</b>				
<b>Social and Emotional Development</b>				
<b>Personal and Family Needs</b>				

***Conflict Resolution Skills include:***

1. Student talks instead of fighting when solving a problem or conflict
2. Student is less aggressive with the teacher and others
3. Student demonstrates leadership skills in resolving conflicts

***Positive Interaction includes:***

1. Reduced number of fights/discipline referrals
2. Level of cooperation with others

**COMMENTS:**

## SEATTLE EMERGENCY HOUSING AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM

<b>Date:</b>
<b>Student's Name:</b>
<b>Staff Member:</b>
<b># Weeks Student has been in Program:</b>

*Please assess the student's current progress by marking the appropriate box:*

	CURRENT ASSESSMENT			
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Homework Completion (see examples below)				
Attendance at Program				
Participation in Program Rewards System				
Positive Interactions with Youth (see examples below)				
Positive Interactions with Staff (see examples below)				

Homework Completion includes:	Positive Interaction with Youth includes:	Positive Interaction with Staff
1. Student brings homework to work on with tutor	1. Student sits and listens while others are talking	1. Student listens and pays attention to staff
2. Student brings in appropriate materials to work on homework (i.e., books, calculators, etc.)	2. Student plays with others without arguing	2. Student talks to staff about what is happening in their lives
	3. Student demonstrates positive behavior on field trips	3. Student asks for or looks forward to more one-on-one attention from staff members

COMMENTS:

**APPENDIX D – SOW INTERVIEW GUIDE**  

---

***FUNDED OST TIME PROGRAM EVALUATION***

Thank you for taking the time to meet with me. The purpose of this interview is to gather insights and observations from key staff members with regards to the on-site training that you have received from the City of Seattle and School's Out Washington. There are no right or wrong answers, the purpose is to gather information on what works and what doesn't work so that the City and SOW can strengthen the training program. Please know that all information is strictly confidential and will be reported in a way that prevents any identification of people or programs participating in the survey. Names will not be attached to particular responses when we summarize the final report.

***The first few questions ask you to think about the work that you have done with your trainer***

1. Can you describe your work with the trainer? What happens/has happened during the training session?

What are the strengths of your work with the trainer?

2. What training methods/techniques work best? What methods/techniques don't work?
3. Are more training hours needed? Why or why not? How often does the trainer come to your site? Is it enough time?
4. Were there particular issues/topics that you worked on? If so, can you tell me more about that?

***The next couple of questions ask about what, if any, changes have occurred in your program as a result of the training***

5. In what ways has your program changed and/or benefited from the training? For example:

In general, what, if any, changes have you noticed in individual staff's knowledge?

What, if any, changes have there been in staff knowledge/skills with regards to specific topics?

What, if any, changes have you noticed in staff's awareness and/or understanding of quality standards?

What, if any, changes have you made in your program's structure (e.g. such as the way you approach your budget, or your board of directors)?

What, if any, changes have you made with regards to how your program uses volunteers?

What, if any, changes have been made with regards to how your program works with school system

6. Are there any changes that are not connected or attributable to training?

**Next I'd like to talk about any program challenges that you and your staff have faced**

7. What, if any, challenges have you encountered in terms of delivering program services?

Has there been any pressure from parents, the community, school, etc.? If so, please describe.

8. Has there been an increase or decrease in staff turnover? Why or why not? Has this been a challenge? Why or why not?

***We're almost done...Now I'd like ask for your opinion with regards to funds used for on-site training***

9. As you may know, the City of Seattle spends a certain amount of money to provide on-site training. Would you rather use these funds for other strategies?
10. Has the new co-pay policy affected the utilization of all the training hours within the program? If so, how and in what capacity?
11. Those are all of the questions that I have for you. Was there anything that we should have discussed that you would like to add?

**Thank you for your time!!!**

