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Overview

1. Developing the Redwood City Community School Evaluation
2. Analysis findings
3. Using the data
4. Activity: Tying Data to Your Logic Model
RWC Evaluation Background

• Third year of working with RCSD and RWC 2020 following a previous evaluator
• Links data from programs to school outcome and survey data
• Looks at program participation patterns and relationships between participation and student outcomes
The Evaluation Process

- Meet annually to decide jointly on the research questions and analyses
- Discuss and revise annual reports
- “Data talks” with community school coordinators and other presentations
## RWC School Logic Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INPUTS</th>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>DELIVERABLES</th>
<th>SHORT-TERM OUTCOMES</th>
<th>LONG-TERM OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS Coordinator</td>
<td>Family Engagement - Education</td>
<td>Supported and connected families</td>
<td>Children are ready to learn</td>
<td>Students succeed academically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Engagement Specialist</td>
<td>Family Engagement - Leadership - Volunteerism</td>
<td>Comprehensive learning supports</td>
<td>Students are actively involved in learning and their community</td>
<td>Students and families are healthier - socially - physically - emotionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding/Resources</td>
<td>Family Engagement - Mental Health/Social Services Support</td>
<td>Integrated service delivery (physical, emotional, social)</td>
<td>Students receive supports according to their needs</td>
<td>Students receive supports according to their needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Partners</td>
<td>Family Engagement - Extended Learning Opportunities</td>
<td>High Quality programs</td>
<td>Students receive supports according to their needs</td>
<td>Students receive supports according to their needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Family Engagement - Social/Emotional Learning</td>
<td>Partner Integration into the school day</td>
<td>Students receive supports according to their needs</td>
<td>Students receive supports according to their needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration Structure</td>
<td>Family Engagement - Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students receive supports according to their needs</td>
<td>Students receive supports according to their needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School /partners collaborative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students receive supports according to their needs</td>
<td>Students receive supports according to their needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Children are ready to learn**

- High Quality programs
- Partner Integration into the school day

**Students succeed academically**

- Students are actively involved in learning and their community
- Students receive supports according to their needs
- Families are connected with the schools
- Schools are supportive of youth and families
- Communities are desirable places to live
The Case of Redwood City

Family Engagement 30%

- Parent Leadership 8%
  - School Site Council
  - PTO/PTA
  - Coaching
- Parent Education 9%
  - ESL Classes
  - Computer Classes
- Parent Volunteers 24%
  - Outreach
  - Dialogues
  - Volunteer Activities

Extended Learning 48%

- After School Programs 46%
- Youth Leadership 15%

Support 39%

- Counseling 20%
  - Individual Counseling
  - Group Counseling
  - Case Management
- Family Assistance 26%
  - Bus Passes
  - Uniform Help
  - Holiday Gift Cards

- After School Programs
- Intercesssion Programs
- Conflict Managers
- FLY Legal Education
Linking Data to Measure Success: The Youth Data Archive

Youth Data Archive allowed us to link community school program participation to outcomes:

• School district data – student characteristics, academic test scores, school attendance, discipline
• Survey data on student motivation
2009-10 Findings:
Participation increased over time

Community School Program Participation Rates, 2007-08 to 2009-10

- **Family Engagement**
  - 2007-08 (n=2,982): 22%
  - 2008-09 (n=3,068): 26%
  - 2009-10 (n=2,960): 30%

- **Extended Learning**
  - 2007-08 (n=2,982): 38%
  - 2008-09 (n=3,068): 39%
  - 2009-10 (n=2,960): 48%

- **Support**
  - 2007-08 (n=2,982): 7%
  - 2008-09 (n=3,068): 25%
  - 2009-10 (n=2,960): 39%

- **Any Participation**
  - 2007-08 (n=2,982): 51%
  - 2008-09 (n=3,068): 66%
  - 2009-10 (n=2,960): 72%
2009-10 Findings: Participation Linked to Care

Likelihood of High Sense of Care by Program Participation, 2009-10

- Support: Participants 35%, Non-Participants 28%
- Family Engagement: Participants 42%, Non-Participants 27%
- Extended Learning: Participants 30%, Non-Participants 26%
- Support and Extended Learning: Participants 35%, Non-Participants 28%
- Family Engagement and Extended Learning: Participants 47%, Non-Participants 27%
- Support and Family Engagement: Participants 43%, Non-Participants 27%
- All Three: Participants 46%, Non-Participants 28%
2009-10 Findings: Participation linked to CST Math

CST Math Percentiles for Family Engagement Participants and Non-Participants, 2006-07 to 2009-10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Family Engagement</th>
<th>No Family Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2009-10 Findings: Family engagement linked to CELDT

Overall CELDT Percentiles for Family Engagement Participants and Non-Participants, 2006-07 to 2009-10
Implications: Using the Data

• Understanding what works and areas for improvement

• Building capacity to utilize data and improve data collection

• Communicating the work to outside audiences to bolster support for community schools
Questions?
## RWC School Logic Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INPUTS</th>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>DELIVERABLES</th>
<th>SHORT-TERM OUTCOMES</th>
<th>LONG-TERM OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS Coordinator</td>
<td>Family Engagement - Education - Leadership - Volunteerism</td>
<td>Supported and connected families</td>
<td>Children are ready to learn</td>
<td>Students succeed academically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Engagement Specialist</td>
<td>Extended Learning Opportunities</td>
<td>Comprehensive learning supports</td>
<td>Students are actively involved in learning and their community</td>
<td>Students and families are healthier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding/Resources</td>
<td>Mental Health/Social Services Support</td>
<td>Integrated service delivery (physical, emotional, social)</td>
<td>Students receive supports according to their needs</td>
<td>- socially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Partners</td>
<td>Social/Emotional Learning</td>
<td>High Quality programs</td>
<td>Families are connected with the schools</td>
<td>- physically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Partner Integration into the school day</td>
<td></td>
<td>- emotionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration Structure</td>
<td>School /partners collaborative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schools are supportive of youth and families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communities are desirable places to live</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Using Data to Answer Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Data Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many students are receiving services?</td>
<td>Service participation records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What combinations of services do students receive?</td>
<td>Program participation data linked across programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the characteristics of students who receive and don’t receive services?</td>
<td>Service participation records linked to student demographic information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What effects do community school programs have on student outcomes?</td>
<td>Program participation data linked to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic data (test scores, grades)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• School attendance data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Health data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What practices at community school programs are linked to improved outcomes?</td>
<td>Program observations/interviews linked to program attendance and outcome data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity:
Tying Data to Your Logic Model

Please take out your logic model and “Gap Analysis” (with domains).

On your worksheet:

1. Place your logic model outcomes in the corresponding domains on your worksheet. Are there domains for which there are no outcomes?
2. Identify an indicator (piece of evidence) that you could use to measure progress for each outcome.
3. For each indicator, identify a data source – who collects those data? In what form are they collected? Do you have access to them?
Next Steps:
Taking Evaluation Back to Your Site

- Confirm data availability at your site and look at existing data with your team to identify gaps – before the end of the year
- Talk with community-based partner providers to establish data sharing agreements - summer
- Choose indicators with your team to track for the next school year (use indicators identified on the worksheet) – late summer
- Determine intervals at which partners transfer data
- Begin collecting data – fall