

**SECTION G-E: SITE-BASED INDICATORS OF PROGRAM QUALITY**

**SITE-BASED INDICATORS OF PROGRAM QUALITY**

*Program evaluations are performed in the Idaho 21st CCLC Management System and are rated according to the following scale:*

- Program Indicator**  
**1 = Planning Needed**  
**2 = Beginning**  
**3 = Emerging**  
**4 = Nearing Completion**  
**5 = Operational**

The matrix presented to the left will be expanded so that each component of criteria is explained in detail.

<b>Program Leadership and Management</b>	
<i>The program administrator maintains a vision and practice of improving achievement for children and adults, and ensures that this vision is reflected in daily program practice.</i>	
<b>Program Indicators</b>	
1.1.	The program has an administrator who articulates a vision of academic achievement for the program participants and provides leadership and direction for the local Idaho 21st CCLC program and supporting community.
1.2.	The program administrator employs management strategies that ensure the program operates smoothly and achieves its goals including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teaming that involves partners, collaborators, staff, and parents</li> <li>• Regularly monitoring management and accountability system that allows measurement of program effectiveness and outcomes</li> <li>• Fiscal management and accountability</li> <li>• Developing and implementing a plan of sustainability beyond the grant’s end</li> <li>• Ensuring that all paperwork, reports, and necessary documentation is completed accurately and filed in a timely manner.</li> </ul>
1.3.	The program administrator manages budget resources on behalf of the partnership, including preparing an annual realistic budget, approving expenditures (and ensuring records are kept for both cash and matching resources and expenditures), monitoring the budget status monthly, and filing the necessary reports for continued funding.
1.4.	Program administrators actively recruit and hire staff with strong credentials and experience in academic achievement and related fields.
1.5.	Leadership and management pay special attention to creating safe and healthy environments where children can learn and thrive.

**Program Planning, Organization, Operation, and Evaluation**

*Programs have an ongoing planning process that is responsive to community and participant needs, includes collaboration, and is based on demographic needs.*

**Program Indicators**

- 2.1. The program has a written mission, goals, and objectives focused on improving academic achievement and is updated and reported annually as to the progress attained.
- 2.2. The staff, parents, and collaborative partners participate in a quarterly review to determine the program’s effectiveness in meeting the needs of children and families.
- 2.3. The program designs activities to strengthen partnerships between parents and schools by encouraging participation in a variety of activities including attending parent-teacher conferences, volunteering, governance, and home activities.
- 2.4. The program is designed to promote personal and social behavior and encourage participation in activities for enjoyment, challenge, self-expression, and communication.
- 2.5. The program schedule is well defined, published, and meets expectations according to the needs assessment.

**Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment**

*Programs provide focused, intensive, age appropriate instruction that assists participants to increase achievement and obtain the knowledge and skills necessary for academic success, employment, self-sufficiency, recreation, and/or effective parenting.*

**Program Indicators**

- 3.1 The program includes developmentally appropriate academic content supporting classroom instruction and is linked to the Idaho Performance Standards for K-12.
- 3.2 Assessments are used and regularly reviewed and learning goals are established for each child in relation to individual academic needs and objectives.
- 3.3 Programs are designed to meet the needs of students who are most at risk of academic and social failure.

## **Communication and Community**

*Comprehensive programs have an organized, systematic approach for engaging the local 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC with the school, home, and community.*

### **Program Indicators**

- |     |   |
|-----|---|
| 4.1 | The program staff has knowledge of the social and cultural contexts in which participants live and respects the values and traditions of culturally diverse families.   |
| 4.2 | The program has a plan to transport participants as needed.   |
| 4.3 | The program administrator establishes and maintains a system of internal and external communication to ensure that staff, including staff of collaborating agencies, and families are aware of program events, pertinent academic achievement news, and support services, and to ensure visibility in the community to build support for the program. |
| 4.4 | Communication and collaboration with the traditional school day program are implemented and engaged in regularly.   |
|     | Community opinion and satisfaction is solicited and considered in program development and improvement.  |

## **Professional Development**

*Programs provide an ongoing professional development and training process to improve teacher and program effectiveness and quality.*

### **Program Indicators**

- |      |   |
|------|---|
| 5.1. | The program creates and executes a local staff development plan that addresses identified training needs guided by program improvement. |
| 5.2. | The program makes available to opportunities for parents to extend their own learning and professional growth.                          |
| 5.3. | The teachers and paraprofessionals (instructional assistants) have or are working toward appropriate certification.                     |

Evidence or documentation may be required for each item in the program quality review, but will be limited to the items included in this document and verifications of student academic achievement success data. You may wish to include evidence with your periodic reviews that will justify the score you submit, labeling them according to the corresponding elements of program quality. For example, documents supporting 5.3 would include copies of appropriate certificates and staff development plans, each one labeled and saved as "53a, 53b, 53c, etc.". All evidence and/or documentation would be placed in a single file folder labeled as "Evidence & Documentation for Review xx-xx-xxxx(date)", and emailed to the state coordinator or evaluator.

# Bibliography

*The following resources were reviewed and included with the development of the program evaluation criteria above.*

U.S. Department of Education (2002) *When Schools Stay Open Late: Executive Summary*. U.S. Department of Education

NCREL (2002). *Beyond the Bell™ Second Edition: A Toolkit for Creating Effective After School Programs*. NCREL

Aker, Valerie, Aldersebaes, Inge, Tomlin, Michael E. (2001) *Indicators of Program Quality*, Idaho Department of Education, Even Start Program

Pane, N., Mulligan, I., Ginsburg, A., Lauland, G., (1999). *A Guide to Continuous Improvement Management (CIM)*. US Department of Education

Calfee, C. S., Wittwer, F., & Meredith, M. (1998). *Building a full service school. A step-by-step guide*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Center on Families, Communities, Schools, and Children's Learning. (1995). *Removing barriers to learning: Factors that affect participation and dropout in parent interventions* [Report No. 27]. Baltimore, MD: Center on Families, Communities, Schools, and Children's Learning, Johns Hopkins University.

Charles Stewart Mott Foundation. (June, 1998). *Making after school count--communities and schools working together to create quality after-school programs*. Flint, MI: Author.

Davies, D., Burch, P., & Johnson, V. (1992). *A portrait of schools reaching out: Report of a survey of practices and policies of family-community-school collaboration* [Report No. 1]. Boston, MA: Center on Families, Communities, Schools, and Children's Learning. Institute for Responsive Education.

Decker, L. E., Gregg, G., & Decker, V. A. (1993). *Teachers manual for parent and community involvement*. Boca Raton, FL: Florida Atlantic University, College of Education.

Epstein, J. L., Coates, L., Salinas, K., Sanders, M. G., & Simon B. S. (1997). *School, family, and community partnerships: Your handbook for action*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Fashola, O. S. (1998). *Review of extended-day and after-school programs and their effectiveness* [Report No. 24]. Washington, DC: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk (CRESPAR), Howard University.

Kunesh, L., & Farley, J. (1993). *Policy briefs: Integrating community services for young children and their families*. Oak Brook, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory.

Melaville, A., with Blank, M. J. (1991). *What it takes: Structuring interagency partnerships to connect children and families with comprehensive services*. Washington, DC: Education and Human Services Consortium.

Melaville, A., Blank, M., & Asayesh, G. (1993). *Together we can: A guide for crafting a profamily system of education and human services*. Pittsburgh, PA: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U. S. Department of Education.

Shartrand, A. M., Weiss, H., Kreider, H. M., & Lopez, M. E. (1997). *New skills for new schools: Preparing teachers in family involvement*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project, Harvard Graduate School of Education.