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Session agenda

• Welcome and overview
• Introduction to the Chicago Public Schools Initiative and Evaluation
• Implementation findings
• Impact findings
• Poster walk
• Closing
Session goals

- Learn how a mixed method approach to evaluation can contribute to a deeper understanding of CS initiatives.
- Understand how close collaboration of evaluators and district staff can support continuous improvement.
- Learn about promising practices in implementation of CS initiatives.
Get to know your neighbor

Turn and Talk

• Introduce yourself with name, role, and organization
• Share one thing you find inspiring about the work you do
Chicago Public Schools Snapshot: Three Community School Initiative Models

Nita M. Lowey 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) and Full Service Community Schools

- District-managed
- 97 schools
- $145K per school

CPS selects schools based on Grant Requirements and Community Need

Nita M. Lowey 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CSIx)

- External Agency-managed
- 127 schools
- $129K per school

External Agency selects schools based on ISBE Grant Requirements and School Relationship

Sustainable Community Schools (SCS)

- Partnership with the Chicago Teachers Union
- 20 schools
- $500K per school

Schools selected on broad range of metrics (i.e. Community Hardship Index, Demographics) and Geographic Diversity
Implementation evaluation

Goals

1. Identify the primary drivers of high quality implementation of the CPS CSI model.

2. Identify successful strategies and potential challenges to implementation.

3. Provide assessments of how the CPS CSI model is associated with improvements or gains in student learning and growth.
What does it mean to have a mixed methods approach?

- Support for continuous improvement
  - Qualitative research
  - Quantitative research
  - Gathering feedback and adjusting
What does it mean to have a mixed methods approach?

Goals

1. Identify the primary drivers of high quality implementation of the CPS CSI model.
2. Identify successful strategies and potential challenges to implementation.

   - Interviews and focus groups with
   - Observations
   - Extant data

Support for continuous improvement

Gathering feedback and adjusting
What does it mean to have a mixed methods approach?

- **Interviews and focus groups with**
  - Principals
  - Resource Coordinators
  - Parents
  - Students
  - Program leaders
  - Lead partner agencies
  - District Coordinators
  - Advisory board members

- **Observations**
  - Programming using validated tools
  - Ethnographic observations

- **Extant data**
  - Required reports for program planning and quality
  - Continuous Quality Improvement Reports
What does it mean to have a mixed methods approach?

Goals:

3. Monitor school progress on a series of indicators related to program participation and youth outcomes

4. Provide assessments of how the CPS CSI model is associated with improvements or gains in student learning and growth.
What does it mean to have a mixed methods approach?

- **Key performance indicators**
  - School student population enrolled in CSI programming and services
  - Student reaching thresholds of CSI participation associated with positive effects
  - Retention of students in CSI programming
  - Characteristics of students enrolled in programming
  - Student improvement in academic, behavioral, and perceptions of school climate outcomes

- **Effectiveness analyses**
  - Reliance on quasi-experimental designs with comparison groups
What does it mean to have a mixed methods approach?

Goals:

• Evaluation Advisory Group
  • Provide feedback on the direction of evaluations

• Stakeholder Advisory Group
  • Provide feedback on the direction and utility of evaluations

• Evaluation Coordination meetings
  • Coordinate, manage, and direct daily evaluation activities
Elbow share: What does your district do?

Turn to the person next to you and quickly share (5 minutes) which approaches you use in your initiative or site(s) to:

• Collect and assess qualitative data
• Collect and assess quantitative data
• Ensure you are meeting the needs of stakeholders in evaluation activities
• Share findings and ensure their use
Qualitative data: What have we learned?

- Interviews and focus groups with
- Observations
- Extant data
Core structures of implementation

- Communication Structures
- Creating Community
- Shared Decision Making
- Monitoring
- Needs Assessment

Shared Vision
Shared Vision

- Communication Structures
- Shared Decision Making
- Needs Assessment
- Monitoring
- Creating Community

Shared Vision
Shared vision is the driver of implementation

The vision for implementation:

• Defines the goals for impact or change in students, families and the school.

• Creates a focus for programing

• Can place emphasis on the importance of data to drive decisions (which data and how frequently)

• Can set expectations for communicating with benefiting and supporting stakeholders.
Shared vision is the driver of implementation

Key components to shared vision

• **Principal** understands CS and motivates stakeholders to have buy-in

• **Resource Coordinator** understands, shares, and helps to drive vision

• **Communication** of vision and goals to school staff, parents, and community members

• **Vision aligns with district’s understanding of CS** and incorporates community context
We talk about it on a regular basis. It's posted around the school. **It is a living, breathing document.** We revamped our vision this year as a school. We got all stakeholders involved in that process. I didn't write it on my own. I literally sat down and said “Hey what do we want in five years to see as a part of our school... what do we want to see happen?”, and we did it over the summer. **It's a part of the conversation. It's a part of my teachers conversations...It is a part of our culture and climate** and they know it's out of love and concern really for their growth. Everyone is well versed in it. It's almost to the point where if you're not, it's just because you're not cognate or wanting to be cognate about what we're discussing as a school. – CSI School principal
Categories of vision

- Increasing family engagement with school
- Developing connection to the local community
- Fostering students’ connection to school
- Improving students’ academic and/or socio-emotional skills
- Providing a welcoming environment
- Supporting the whole child

Evaluation of one cohort from 2018 to 2020.

Primary categories (not always mutually exclusive):
- Warm and welcoming environment
- Increasing student connection to school
- Improving academic or socio-emotional learning
- Increasing family engagement (new as of 2019 cohorts)
- Developing connection to the community

Evaluation of one new cohort and a sub-set of cohorts from previous grant years in 2021.
**Categories of vision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increasing family engagement with school</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing connection to the local community</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering students’ connection to school</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving students’ academic and/or socio-emotional skills</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a welcoming environment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation of one cohort from 2018 to 2020.**

**Important take-aways and noticing's:**

- Schools newer to implementation less frequently reported a whole-child focus and more frequently focused on skills and a welcoming environment.
- The more time spent in implementation the greater the focus on whole-child or wrap around supports.
- Post-COVID shift to focusing on increasing community connection to school and providing a warm and welcoming environment.

---

**Evaluation of one new cohort and a sub-set of cohorts from previous grant years in 2021.**
Shared decision making:

- Fundamental to the community school model.
- Inclusive of all stakeholders including students, parents, partner agencies, and community groups.
- Must allow for authentic opportunities to provide input.
- Can be challenging to establish.

Our team looked at decision-making structures and found three basic types of structures:

- Shared among a group of stakeholders (RC, administration, and advisory groups)
- RC and administration works together
- RC tasked with decision making alone

Evaluation of one cohort from 2018 to 2020.
# Decision making progression

Evaluation of one cohort from 2018 to 2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RC alone</th>
<th>Admin alone</th>
<th>RC/Admin</th>
<th>RC/Admin/Advisory Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lacking data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC/Admin</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC Alone</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subsample**
- 2019-20:
  - RC alone: 13%
  - Admin alone: 13%
  - RC/Admin: 50%
  - RC/Admin/Advisory Committee: 25%

**New cohort**
- 2019-20:
  - RC alone: 14%
  - Admin alone: 86%

Percentage of schools in which respondents reported the type of decision-making structure.

Evaluation of one new cohort and a sub-set of cohorts from previous grant years in 2021.
Decision making progression

**Important take aways:**

- As schools progressed in implementation, decision making shifted to shared or partially shared models.

- Communication structures had a role to play in school’s ability to implement shared decision making.

- In most schools, regardless of time of implementation, the Resource Coordinator and administration held a majority of the decision making power.
Communication continuum

Communication to those who support and those who benefit from the CSI:

- Supports engagement and enrollment in programing and services.
- Supports structures for shared decision-making (e.g. agendas, meeting notes, informal check ins).
- Plays an important role in informing stakeholders and developing buy in to vision and goals.
Communication continuum

Less Developed
- Largely unplanned/informal
- Limited in scope or frequency
- Usually only internal, formal communication

Moderately Developed
- Some planned, regular communication
- Frequent, intentional communication with few stakeholders
- Some formal and informal communications
- Inconsistent outreach to parents

Well Developed
- Planned, frequent communication to supporting and benefiting stakeholders
- Intentional engagement with all stakeholder groups
- Formal and informal, consistent communication
- Multiple methods of communication
Evaluation of one cohort from 2018 to 2020.

**Important take aways:**

- As schools progressed in implementation most schools made progress in **developing communication structures** and **diversifying** the means of communication.
- **Staff turn-over** impacted progress in communication and outreach.
Chicago Public Schools Community Schools Initiative

Reflections from a district-run initiative with Autumn Berg.

• What did these findings mean to you in your role in the district?

• How have you and your team helped schools to act on or better understand how to apply these findings?
What does the quantitative research tell us?

A distinction can be made between effects associated with CSI participants versus school-level effects

• What effect did participation in CSI programming for 120 hours or more during two consecutive school years have on a series of school-related outcomes compared to similar students enrolled in CSI schools not participating in programming?

• What effect did receipt of CSI funding have on student outcomes relative to similar schools not receiving CSI funding?
Analyses Based on CSI Participation

• Approximately **50%** of school populations involved in CSI programming (pre-pandemic in 24 schools)

• Attended CSI programming for 120 hours or more during this period (treatment group)
  – **60%** of youth attending CSI at any level in both school years
  – **44%** of youth attending CSI at any level in either school year

• Students in the treatment groups attended an average of **327 hours** of CSI programming over two school years
Treatment Population

- Largely consistent with school populations and the overall population of students served in CSI
  - Gender
  - Eligibility for free and reduced priced lunches
  - English learner status
- More apt to be Hispanic, enrolled in Grades K to 3, and less apt to have an IEP
- More apt to perform better on school outcomes at baseline
Analyses Based on CSI Participation – Positive Effects

**Academic Achievement**
- Annual GPA – 0.12 to 0.26 grade points higher
- MAP Reading – 0.11 standard deviations
- MAP Mathematics – 0.20 standard deviations

**School Day Attendance**
- Grades K–3 – 1.22 percentage point increases in % of days
- Grades 4–8 – 0.87 percentage point increase in the % of days attended

**Disciplinary Incidents**
- Grades K–3 – 0.34 fewer incidents
- Grades 4–8 – 0.95 fewer incidents

**School Climate**
- Grades 6–8 – Positive effects on scores related to psychological sense of school membership
- Grades 9–12 – Positive effects on scores related to psychological sense of school membership and academic engagement
Digging Deeper

• Some schools more heavily represented in the treatment population
  – Extended day programming focused on academics
  – Common vision that is shared and communicated about effectively
  – Principal smooths way for service integration, sets tone for interaction with families, and creates trust
  – Data is used to identify needs and coordinate opportunities and supports
  – Information sharing and coordination activities are prevalent
Analyses Based on Whole School Change

- Two different analyses
  - Subsample of 14 higher implementing schools funded by 21st CCLC
  - 20 schools funded through the Sustainable Community Schools grant program
- Use of a comparative interrupted time series (CITS) design, with comparison schools not receiving the CSI funding in question
Analyses Based on Whole School Change – 21st CCLC

Positive effects only found in relation to school climate and in schools where afterschool programming experiences supported key motivation and engagement constructs

Motivation and Engagement Constructs

- Engagement
- Relevance
- Challenge
- Positive Affect
- Absence of Negative Affect
- Learned/got better at something

Positive Effects Related to School Climate

- Peer Support for Academic Work scores
- Student-Teacher Trust scores
- Academic Engagement scores
- Emotional Health scores
- Knowledge of Human and Social Resources in the Community scores
- Rigorous Study Habits scores
- Psychological Sense of School Membership scores
Role of Key Developmental Experiences in CSI Programming

Experiencing Program Engagement
- Growth in positive mindsets
- Growth in interpersonal skills

Positive Emotions
- Growth in interpersonal skills
- Developing new friendships

Opportunities for Agency / Positive Peer Interactions
- Growth in positive mindsets
- Growth in Interpersonal skills
- Improved self-esteem
- Improved self-concept and confidence

Skill Building Experiences
- Growth in positive mindsets
- Growth in Interpersonal skills
- Improved self-esteem
- Improved self-concept and confidence
Analyses Based on Whole School Change – SCS

• SCS Pillars
  – Culturally relevant curricula
  – Emphasis on high quality teaching
  – Wrap around services and supports
  – Restorative justice practices
  – Authentic parent and community engagement
• Implementation impacted by both the Covid-19 pandemic and a teacher’s strike
Analyses Based on Whole School Change – SCS

Total Participation Hours in After-School and Summer Programming (All Programs) – SCS Schools Versus Comparison Schools

Note. Source: After-school and summer participation data entered into Cityspan from 20 SCS schools and 117 non-SCS schools. SCS = Sustainable Community Schools.
Analyses Based on Whole School Change – SCS

• Positive effects associated with being enrolled in an SCS school were related to school-day attendance-related outcomes:
  – High school students chronically absent 14% to 15% less often
  – Elementary students chronically absent 6% to 8% less often (limited to English learners)

• Students in SCS schools who received an Out-of-School Suspension served a fewer number of suspension days
Quantitative Analysis Challenges

• Challenges in scaling implementation from students involved in specific learning supports and opportunities to whole school change

• Difficulty in assessing how CSI is having an effect on school-day instruction specifically

• Limited school bandwidth for supplemental assessment and measurement strategies
Chicago Public Schools Community Schools Initiative

Reflections from a district-run initiative with Autumn Berg.

• What did these findings mean to you in your role in the district?
• How have you and your team helped schools to act on or better understand how to apply these findings?
Making research actionable

As part of the support work for the evaluation researchers and practitioners from CPS collaborate to:

• Revise the needs assessment and quality improvement plan process

• Host workshops for practitioners to learn about research findings and apply them to their work

• Create a dissemination plan for the research that identifies diverse audiences and means for communicating findings
Poster walk

Use the post it notes on the table to share your thoughts on the highlighted finds and respond to the prompts at the bottom.
Questions?
THANK YOU!

Questions? Reach out to us!

Neil Naftzger
Nnaftzger@air.org
Or
Dominique Bradley
dbradley@air.org
What does it mean to have a mixed methods approach?

- **Evaluation Advisory Group**
  - Meets bi-annually (at minimum)
  - Stakeholders with different roles in the implementation and support of CSI
  - **Provide feedback on the direction of evaluations**
- **Stakeholder Advisory Group**
  - Meets as needed
  - Incorporates voices from the community that are pertinent to topics
  - **Provide feedback on the direction and utility of evaluations**
- **Evaluation Coordination meetings**
  - Weekly
  - Primary evaluation and CPS team members
  - **Coordinate, manage, and direct daily evaluation activities**