

**Illinois After-school Partnership
Outcomes Work Group
Compiled Minutes from 2004 Meetings**

January 14, 2004

Members in Attendance: Michele Smith, Independent Consultant, Sonia Kennedy, CDHS, Angela Farnham, CPRD, Avis Jenkins, HOPE World Wide, April Langworthy, OCAP, Lestine Byars, CIESS, Theresa Adams, SSPC, David Zverow, Metropolitan Family Services, Kristin Allen, BGC-Springfield, Carole Franke, I-KAN/Teen Reach, Debbie Bretag, ICVP

Welcome and Introductions

In the absence of J. Becker Mouhcine, D. Bretag welcomed everyone and asked those in attendance to introduce themselves and the organization they represent. D. Bretag asked K. Allen to assist with facilitating the meeting.

Chicago Coalition For Community Schools Report

Members of the Chicago Coalition for Community Schools Evaluation team joined the meeting to learn about what our workgroup is doing and to share the work of their group in this area.

Review of Progress to Date

K. Allen provided a review of the work of the committee to date. K. Allen stated that the committee outlined their scope of work in its initial meetings and that, while inclusion of outcomes for programs, staff, parents and the community was discussed, it was determined that the initial goal would be to develop a menu of outcomes from which providers could choose. It was also recognized that such a menu of outcomes would allow programs to adopt those most appropriate for their target populations, communities and the providers' capacity. Finally, K. Allen stated that outcomes have been gathered from a wide variety of providers and funding organizations, including the Illinois Dept. of Human Services and the Illinois State Board of Education. The committee has organized outcomes into the 5 core areas identified in the Task Force report, and has been working through each area to consolidate each list by examining the statements for similarities and whether they meet the definition. In doing this, the committee has also begun using an additional framework of knowledge, skills, behaviors and attitudes to further classify outcomes.

2004 Goals/Workplan

Discussion of this item was postponed until the next meeting.

Determining Common Themes in Remaining Outcome Areas

The group discussed the next outcome area: Cultural and Artistic Enrichment. The attached chart reflects that discussion. During discussion, the committee recognized that some of the outcomes could logically be listed in several or all core areas, such as the outcome, "increased school engagement". It was agreed that these would be listed during the discussion in the Cultural and Artistic Enrichment area, but it was also suggested that outcomes for all areas be examined to determine if they were specific to one core area, or if they could be listed at a higher level, as they applied to all 5 core areas. It was also noted that use of terms across all areas should be consistent.

Next Steps

Distribute CDC website resource information to work group.

**Illinois After-school Partnership
Outcomes Work Group
Compiled Minutes from 2004 Meetings
CULTURAL AND ARTISTIC ACHIEVEMENT OUTCOMES CHART**

DRAFT

1. Increased engagement in school activities and participation in areas such as arts, technology, sports, etc. (UW/HFRP-R) (Behavior) (Consistent with Academic Outcomes)
2. Youth demonstrate increased community involvement (UW/HFRP-R) (Behavior) (levels of community involvement were discussed; civic responsibility was one level and included such things as voting, etc. , while it was noted that community involvement was broader and included many other types of activities).
3. Increased time spent in artistic endeavors (S&S-R – the committee determined that time spent is the most accurate measure/indicator of “interest” in the arts; DYMCA – noting that “sensitivity to the arts” can be measured through time spent) (Behavior)
4. Development of new artistic skills (S&S-R; CAPE – as the committee equated development of new artistic skills to the ability to “convey information through diverse art forms” and to “use technology to represent their learning”, i.e. new knowledge and skills) (Skill)
5. Youth have an increased understanding and respect for their own cultural identity and for the cultures of others (BGC; HFRP-R) (the following were seen as stages in a youth’s development of cultural knowledge, skills and behavior)
 - a. Increased awareness and/or knowledge of their own cultural identity (BGC) (Knowledge)
 - b. Increased awareness and/or knowledge of other cultures (DYMCA; HFRP-R) (Knowledge)
 - c. Youth demonstrate tolerance for differences among people (BGC; DYMCA – if equate tolerance with appreciation) (Skill/Behavior)
 - d. Youth work collaboratively with others from diverse backgrounds (CAPE; BGC) (Behavior)

The committee decided that the ability to organize space and time effectively (CAPE goal) would best be represented in an outcome related to increased time management skills and it was noted that this goal is stated in several other core areas.

**Illinois After-school Partnership
Outcomes Work Group
Compiled Minutes from 2004 Meetings**

April 15, 2004

Members in Attendance: Adam Alonso, *Action for Children /Illinois MOST*; Kristin Allen, *Springfield Boys & Girls Club*; Audrey Brown, *Illinois School-Age Child Care Network*; Sonia Kennedy, *Chicago Department of Human Services*; Rachel Klein, *After School Matters*; Heather Barton-Villagrana, *Evaluation Research Institute/ICVP*; JoAnn Carpenter, *YWCA Lake County*

Staff in Attendance: Jennifer Becker-Mouhcine, Sarah Rothschild (Workgroup Assistant), Genevieve Lopez (Outreach Assistant)

Review of Progress to Date: Following the 5 Core Program Elements that have been identified by the Partnership in the Task Force Report, the Outcomes Workgroup has been analyzing outcomes and performance indicators for each Core Outcome that were collected from about 17 programs and research institutes. In previous meetings, the Workgroup discussed the areas of: Academic Enrichment Opportunities, Social-Emotional and Life Skills Building Opportunities and Enrichment, and Cultural and Artistic Enrichment. The Workgroup is carefully scrutinizing the objectives and performance indicators and therefore the project is slightly behind the estimated timeframe. After the Workgroup goes through each of the Core Outcomes, it will revisit each one to narrow down the number of objectives and performance indicators.

Determining Common Themes in Healthy Lifestyle Promotion Outcome: In looking at the list of examples under this category, the Outcomes Workgroup decided to break it down into 6 categories, each with two sub-categories in order to clearly identify three important outcome types: knowledge, attitude, and behavior. A chart of these categories and outcomes is attached below.

Next Steps:

Jennifer will research sample outcomes relating to nutrition and obesity prevention. The Outcomes Workgroup will look at the last of the 6 Core Elements, Opportunities to Develop Positive Relationships.

Next Meeting: May 13, 2004, 2 –4 pm, at ICVP.

**Illinois After-school Partnership
Outcomes Work Group
Compiled Minutes from 2004 Meetings**

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION ONLY:
HEALTHY LIFESTYLE OUTCOMES

Category	Sex Education
Knowledge	Youth will increase knowledge of safe sex and safe sexual choices, harmful effects of early sexual activity and pregnancy.
Attitude	Students are able to anticipate consequences and make positive decisions regarding their own behavior. <i>(NOTE: the group thought that in several areas, this captured a general outcome around attitude that didn't bring in judgment. It shows up in several areas, and upon review of all of the outcomes, the group will determine where it should ultimately be placed.)</i>
Behavior	Decreased initiation /and or level of sexual activity
Behavior	Decrease in initiation of and/or subsequent risky sexual behavior.
Behavior	Decreased pregnancy rates

Category	Fitness/Being Active
Knowledge	Youth will increase knowledge of physical growth and healthy development.
Attitude	Students are able to anticipate consequences and make positive decisions regarding their own behavior.
Behavior	Youth will increase physical fitness
Behavior	Youth will increase participation in physical fitness activities.
Behavior	Youth will increase athletic skills <i>(Note: the idea of gaining skills was discussed as being important for a variety of areas, and whether or not skills belongs here or in another category, the group determined that attaining specific skills connected to program focus should be noted explicitly somehow)</i>

Category	Substance Abuse Prevention
Knowledge	Youth will have increased knowledge of the harmful effects of substance use and abuse.
Attitude	Students are able to anticipate consequences and make positive decisions regarding their own behavior.
Behavior	Decreased initiation of and/or use of ATOD by youth.

Category	Personal Safety
Knowledge	Youth will have increased knowledge of protecting personal safety (ranging from appropriate "touching" to safe dating practices, etc.)
Attitude	Students are able to anticipate consequences and make positive decisions regarding their own behavior.
Behavior	Youth will demonstrate personal safety skills

Category	Health Care
Knowledge	Youth have increased knowledge of how to access health care services.

Category	Nutrition
(this category was discussed as needed more research to see if sample outcomes exist)	

**Illinois After-school Partnership
Outcomes Work Group
Compiled Minutes from 2004 Meetings**

May 13, 2004

Members in Attendance: Tom Finley, *IL Alliance of Boys & Girls Clubs*; Rebecca George, *Youth Network Council*; Kristin Allen, *Springfield Boys & Girls Club*; Angela Farnham, *CPRD*; Heather Barton-Villagrana, *Evaluation Research Institute/ICVP*; Loomis Mayfield, *After-School Alliance*

Staff: Jennifer Becker-Mouhcine, *IL After-School Partnership/ICVP*; Sarah Rothschild, *IL After-School Partnership/Americorps*

Co-Chair: The Leadership Team has invited Kristin Allen to become a co-chair for the Outcomes Work Group. There is still another co-chair slot available, and the Leadership Team will be working to identify candidates. You can contact Jennifer with questions about this.

Review of Progress to Date: In the last meeting, the group worked on the Healthy Lifestyles Promotion section and categorized the outcomes for sex education, fitness/being active, substance abuse prevention, and personal safety into a rubric of *knowledge, attitude, and behavior*. The remaining component of this category is nutrition, and since there was a lack of example outcomes in this area to work from, Jennifer did research on nutrition outcomes for this meeting. The group will review those outcomes today, and move on to the final outcome category of Opportunities to Develop Positive Relationships.

Determining Common Themes in Remaining Outcomes Areas:

The group reviewed the new examples of outcomes added to the Healthy Lifestyles section.

The group discussed whether or not the Healthy Lifestyles Promotion section should include personal hygiene. The public health department has a personal hygiene workshop for youth, and it was decided that this is an important component, but it should perhaps remain as a stand-alone outcome and the group will look at it later during the second round of analysis for all of the outcomes.

Category	Nutrition
Knowledge	Understanding the food guide pyramid and the food groups
Attitude	<i>(NOTE: the group thought that the behavior component captured attitude)</i>
Behavior	Make healthy food choices

Opportunities to Develop Positive Relationships

The group decided that since the social emotional/life skills area covers internal outcomes and is more *skill*-focused, that this component should be more outward and *relationship*-focused. Two evidence-based models that can be used to reach the outcomes in this component are “Iowa Strengthening Families” and the “40 Developmental Assets” from the Search Institute.

The group spent some time discussing the name of this area, since as it is listed “Opportunities to Develop Positive Relationship” it leads to program related outcomes, and since the group is currently looking at the outcomes for youth, rather than what programs are providing, we decided to change the name to “Developing Positive Relationships” to reduce confusion.

The following outcomes resulted from the conversation.

Developing Positive Relationships

Type	Outcomes
Behavior	➤ Youth are able to develop and sustain positive relationships with adults

**Illinois After-school Partnership
Outcomes Work Group
Compiled Minutes from 2004 Meetings**

Behavior	➤ Youth are able to develop and sustain positive relationships with peers
Attitude	➤ Youth have a healthy sense of belonging and connectedness to their community and others.
Behavior	➤ Youth are able to effectively and meaningfully contribute to the group process
Knowledge	➤ Youth increase knowledge and access to supports needed for civic engagement

Notes:

- The group discussed the possible need to add something about the ability to be independent to the social/emotional section, which seems to be missing
- Perhaps peer relationships belong in social emotional (much overlap between this section and “social” part of other section)

In the course of the discussion, the question was raised as to whether we were trying to make sure ALL outcomes used by programs were in our final list, or if we were going to be selecting certain outcomes. The group at this point is trying to make sure that the major outcomes are in this first list, but eventually priorities will be set and some of the outcomes may not be on the final list of common outcomes selected by the Partnership. The work group could keep our documents with all of the outcomes we arrived at for providers use, but the intensive work to determine measurement, pathways and supports needed to reach outcomes will only be done for those chosen as the priority common outcomes, which will still be a menu for providers to choose from based on their program offerings, community needs, etc.

Full Partnership Meeting (Monday, June 14, 1pm at the Thompson Center):

The next Full Partnership meeting is going to be focused on the topic “Addressing Quality in After-school”, which relates closely to the work we are doing in our workgroup.

The majority of the meeting will be a presentation/discussion led by The National Institute for Out-of-School Time (NIOST). They have experience in several areas relating to quality, including standards, worker competencies, and a current research project (MARS) that is studying how certain program components lead to outcomes. This study incorporates afterschool programs from a wide variety of sectors. They are going to present on their work in these areas, as well as lay out some of the context and importance of this work, and try to give Illinois some key questions to consider as we move forward in our work.

A part of this meeting should be used to update the group on our work, so attendees can see how our work fits in to the goals around quality. In addition, a small group from the Outcomes workgroup and staff will have the chance to have a smaller meeting over lunch to discuss some of our challenges in more specific terms to see what advice they may have for us.

The workgroup needs to determine what and how we would like to present to the full group, and what we could raise in a small discussion with NIOST.

At last December’s Full Partnership Meeting, the Outcomes Workgroup presented the framework for our outcomes work and discussed the process being employed to collect and define agreed upon outcomes for the five core areas for out-of-school time programs that came out of the Task Force Report. The actual outcomes were not presented, rather the group discussed considerations the group has made in the collection of outcomes and the capacity building tools and supports that will need to go hand in hand with our work.

The group decided to use our next meeting to decide exactly what to present, and how to frame our work, and to decide the key questions for consultation with NIOST.

Next Meeting: Thursday, June 3rd, 1 – 2:30pm at ICVP.

**Illinois After-school Partnership
Outcomes Work Group
Compiled Minutes from 2004 Meetings**

June 3rd, 2004

Attendees: Kristin Allen, Springfield Boys and Girls Club, Heather Barton-Villagrana, ICVP-ERI, David Zverow, Metropolitan Family Services, Colleen Jones, Metropolitan Family Services, Mindy Lanum, ICVP-ERI, Angela Adan Farnham, CPRD

Staff: Jennifer Becker Mouhcine, Sarah Rothschild

Discussion: What Framework/Organization to Use in Moving Forward Toward Product Goals

The group spent most of its time discussing challenges and questions faced in moving forward with our work. We have reached the point where the overarching question is about how our product is to be implemented, what are final product should look like and how it should be used. In discussing this overall question, the following issue areas were raised and discussed.

Defining What Types Of Programs Fall Under “Out-Of-School-Time” For The Purposes Of Outcomes

The group discussed the fact that when deciding what the final product and tools look like and how they are rolled out, that the Partnership should decide how we are defining afterschool, so we are clear about what programs our outcomes would be relevant to. The work group started with a very broad definition of out-of-school-time, and has now reached a point where some clearer definition is needed.

Three things the group thought could be included in the definition were:

- On-going program with significant duration (not just a couple of weeks, or isolated event, but youth are involved over a period of time)
- Intentionality of programming and reaching outcomes
- Reaching outcomes in at least one (or two) of the five core areas

Examples to Consider:

- One example discussed was a jewelry program, which may only be focused in one area, but if done well, the program could be designed to reach outcomes in a whole range of areas (positive relationships, problems solving, math skills, team work,etc.)
- Another example to consider is sports leagues, organized around a single focus, youth could reach a range of outcomes, but the goal of the sports leagues may or may not be youth outcomes.

Questions:

- Does the Partnership want to limit its scope to comprehensive, multi-focus programs or should the definition be broad enough to include a quality single focus program?
- What should the definition say about frequency? (one or two days a week program vs. four or five days)

Making Decisions About A Smaller Set Of Outcomes In Each Area

Members of the work group were uncomfortable making decisions about which of the long list of outcomes should be priority outcomes for programs. Some felt that deciding upon outcomes really should be made at the community level based on their particular needs and program activities and

**Illinois After-school Partnership
Outcomes Work Group
Compiled Minutes from 2004 Meetings**

offerings. They felt that if choices about priority outcomes were to be made at the statewide level, that they could be decided by the state co-chairs for the programs in their pervue.

The group thought that while they didn't want to necessarily make decisions about priority outcomes, they could help provide some information to help providers do so by identifying outcomes in several contexts. For example, the group thought the tool/product developed could show the priority outcomes for main funding sources if programs wanted to consider aligning their program activities with those. Outcomes could also be noted as those most commonly cited in the source documents. We could gather input from providers about their priorities and note those. Outcomes could be noted for their importance in national or state research efforts. The final product could show various subsets of the larger list.

How Are Outcomes Implemented?

The group talked about designing some type of tier system to help determine what kind of expectations around outcomes may be appropriate for different types of programs. Tiers could consider:

- Comprehensiveness of focus
- Typology (what the program's content areas are)
- Frequency/dosage?
- Some matrix of varying combinations?

Questions:

- Does the Partnership roll them out as recommendations or as a tool/guide/resource to move programs toward outcomes based planning and evaluation?
- Do the state agencies agree on and roll out a subset of the list as common outcomes for their programs with some requirements around their implementation?
- Regardless of who rolls them out, are they guides, goals to shoot for, or do they include required outcomes to be working toward? Are they minimum outcome requirements or maximum?
- Are there some required specific outcomes for all programs, are requirements based on choosing a required number from menu (i.e. have an outcome in at least 1 of these areas, 2 of the areas?)

Sequencing Of Outcomes

The group determined that while ordering the outcomes we have by knowledge, attitude, and behavior was useful as a framework for narrowing down the original list, and could be helpful when considering measurement tools, that they are not necessarily appropriate for any sequencing of outcomes. In other words, outcomes are not reached in any particular order of knowledge, attitude, behavior etc., or show any clear indicators that one is a stepping-stone to another.

The group also talked about the difficulty of identifying any particular outcome on the list as necessarily short term or long term. The order or when youth reach outcomes can vary so much from individual to individual since human development is very often not linear, and programs may have varying goals based on populations served, the way programming is offered, etc.

Clarity About The Domain Of The Outcomes Identified

**Illinois After-school Partnership
Outcomes Work Group
Compiled Minutes from 2004 Meetings**

The group decided that it was important to note on our documents that we are currently looking at youth outcomes only, so as these become public, it is clear that these don't include program, community or family outcomes.

Developing Tools/Resources For Providers

The group talked about its role in developing the supports that providers need to be able to do a program plan, select proper outcomes based on their needs and program activities, and develop a system to measure, collect, and analyze their data. The group talked about developing goals statements in each of the 5 outcome areas to discuss the importance of that particular area. This could be developed from the information in the Task Force Report, and would help providers understand each core area's focus. The group also discussed creating a general program or logic model, using some outcomes in each area, to help programs understand how they could use that model regardless of which outcomes they select. These samples could include measurement tools, indicators, possible process indicators, etc. to try to map out the steps toward reaching those outcomes. Another option would be to provide sample/recommended measures and indicators for each outcome listed to work toward consistency by providing resources in a usable guide/compendium and encourage its use.

Next Steps

Overall, the work group determined that several questions needed to be considered by the Leadership Team in order to know how best to move forward. The group could work on goal statements and logic models, but gaining clarity on why we are doing this work and the specific expectations are for the product we are developing is important.

The lunch meeting with NIOST will focus on some of these questions, and will hopefully give us some insight. A next meeting will be set after the Full Partnership meeting and after the Leadership Team has a chance to consider the questions posed. In the meantime, Jennifer will write up the notes from this meeting and outline possible frameworks for moving forward.

**Illinois After-school Partnership
Outcomes Work Group
Compiled Minutes from 2004 Meetings**

November Planning Notes

Proposed Outcomes Agenda and Direction

The Outcomes work group and the Leadership Team have been discussing the appropriate next steps for the Outcomes work group to take, as well as the best way to continue to move towards consistency in outcomes measurement in the field. The work group raised questions as to the definition of programs that the eventual common outcomes would apply to, as well as where the decision about which outcomes are priorities or recommend (or required) should be made. Based on these discussions, there seems to be some agreement that a menu of outcomes along with tools and resources for measurement, outcomes selection etc. would be a useful resource for the field at large, and that the best place to start in deciding upon a smaller list of common outcomes and measures would be between Teen REACH and 21st Century, and eventually expanding that to include other public funding sources, and eventually other sectors. An initial meeting between program staff is being planned.

While the public agencies work toward consistency on their outcomes, the work group can continue to look at what tools can be developed or compiled to help programs think about outcomes measurement, how to select appropriate outcomes based on their needs and activities, sample logic models, etc. and can inform the Partnership on what resources are needed for programs to be effective in evaluation.

Next Steps

Outcomes Chart: The outcomes chart can be given a final review by the work group, and then passed on to the Leadership Team, and specifically to the Teen REACH and 21st Century staff for their meetings, along with any recommendations the group may want to add. This chart can be the basis for a future resource for the field, as well. Eventually, this chart could be our comprehensive outcomes menu, including recommended indicators, and information on which activities/program practices are likely to lead to which outcomes, as well as including the common outcomes being agreed upon by public agencies. However, in order to be a sound resource, we would need to ensure that the links between program practices and outcomes are valid and that indicators are valid as well. There may be an opportunity to work with NIOST and their MARS research study that is undertaking some of this research, and determining where else this research or opportunities for it may exist (i.e. Teen REACH benchmarks)

Developing Resources for Providers: Regardless of decisions about which outcomes are required or recommended, we know providers could use resources now around developing logic models, selecting appropriate outcomes, conducting program evaluations, and information on available resources. The work group could determine existing resources and/or develop needed tools, and compile these resources and get them out to providers. Some of this work has been started by the Capacity Building work group (such as an initial pilot questionnaire to find out providers capacity to do evaluation) and could be taken up by members of this work group. This information would help determine what providers feel they need, and we could create resources in response to their needs.

**Illinois After-school Partnership
Outcomes Work Group
Compiled Minutes from 2004 Meetings**

Original product goals and steps planned July 2003 with noted progress/recommendations in each area.

Consistent Outcome Measures Across Programs Are Developed	
<p>Define what an O-S-T program is (who is impacted by measures), possibly considering tiers of programs due to concern of possible exclusion of groups not meeting a definition</p> <p>Gather and define O-S-T program types (whose outcomes are being measured)</p>	<p>The group decided to start as inclusively as possible, and left the definition question open. When this question was raised again when considering who the common outcomes would apply to, the group determined that the Leadership Team could help provide some direction as to the definition of programs for the purpose of outcomes measurement. The Leadership Team also discussed the definitions question, but found it difficult to determine a concrete definition in the abstract.</p>
<p>Identify demographics of kids served (Needs of kids)</p> <p>Identify/Define program components</p>	<p>Again, the range in these areas is great, and the group decided to be inclusive of all kids and components in its work. This information may need to be identified by individual programs who then have a resource to guide them in how to select outcomes based on their needs and components.</p>
<p>Define what Outcomes are</p>	<p>Determined we would focus first on Youth Outcomes, and used the United Way definition: Benefits or changes for participants during or after program activities</p>
<p>Gather/Understand full array of Current Outcomes</p>	<p>Gathered outcomes from major afterschool programs, research, and funding requirements</p>
<p>With list of outcomes in hand, look at common themes</p>	<p>Outcomes listed in five program element areas from Report</p>
<p>Build consensus on common outcomes across stakeholder groups</p>	<p>OWG narrowed down the list of outcomes to the chart we have today. Similar outcomes were reworded, condensed, etc., and categories discussed. Once the group reached the point developing "recommended common outcomes", the group felt that it was too hard to make decisions about priority common outcomes in the absence of how they link to program activities, community needs, etc. and that for required common outcomes to be determined, they need to be decided by the funders requiring and didn't feel comfortable in making those decisions. Leadership Team understood this dilemma, and suggested that reaching a decision on common outcomes and measure can start with Teen REACH and 21st Century, and build to other public programs, etc., but that the OWG could continue to work on tools and resources and a menu for all programs to use.</p>
<p>Ensure outcomes are consistent with 4 goals for programs in the Task Force Report: programs that in a positive and safe environment provide the opportunity: to participate in rewarding activities; to improve their academic performance; to develop positive relationships with peers and adults; to gain self-confidence.</p>	
<p>Make recommendations to funders to amend current required outcomes based on research and Educate</p>	<p>We can discuss how the outcomes list we've created can be helpful to the state agencies while they work toward</p>

**Illinois After-school Partnership
Outcomes Work Group
Compiled Minutes from 2004 Meetings**

fundes and providers about the importance of <u>each</u> of the goals & related outcomes	consistency
Plan for use of outcome data in advocacy efforts to prove O-S-T effectiveness	
Supports For Providers To Achieving Outcomes Are Developed	
Create a list of technical support needed to achieve the recommendations for outcomes	
Develop guide of examples of different methods to reach outcomes	
Describe a process for a program to engage in an outcomes assessment, and how this works at local/state level	
Assessment Of Costs Of Reaching Outcome Measures (Factored Into Financing Plan)	
Identify tools or data sources needed for assessing various outcomes and Determine Costs involved	