THE EQUITY CENTER SUMMER PROGRAM

Developmental Program Evaluation

THE EQUITY CENTER AT UVA
617 W MAIN STREET
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA

PREPARED BY DR. SHERICA D. JONES-LEWIS, DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY RESEARCH, THE EQUITY CENTER AT UVA
This report attempts to describe the impact of the Equity Center at UVA’s Summer Program. We want to acknowledge commendable work done by our community partners and by the staff members of Albemarle County. We also want to thank the parents, guardians and other caring adults who entrusted us with their students.

We thank the following organizations from the Charlottesville community who answered the call to serve the community this summer.

100 Black Men of Central Virginia
Black Women of Central Virginia
Conscious Capitalist Group
Fundamental Factory
Integrity Mentoring
Project Pipeline
Wildrock
Wright Counseling Group

We extend special thank you to the administrators of Jackson P. Burley Middle School, Kasaundra Blount and Rusty Carlock; the administrators of Jack Jouett Middle School, Ashby Johnson and Christie Isaiah, and the administrative team at Walton Middle School, Josh Walton, and Tireese Lewis.

We also want to thank Natalie Capps, the talent development teacher at Walton Middle School and Equity Center Summer Program coordinator for all her time and energy. Programming would not have been possible without her vision and execution.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
## CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TABLES + FIGURES</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACRONYMS</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACKGROUND</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODOLOGY</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPARISON OF KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS TO SUCCESS CRITERIA</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY FINDINGS</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPORT STRUCTURE</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENDED AUDIENCE</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM PURPOSES AND GOALS</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDING MODEL</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMER PROGRAM EVALUATION</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATION DESIGN</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATION STUDY QUESTIONS</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODOLOGY</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATA LIMITATIONS</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATION FINDINGS</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY FINDINGS</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION: A BASIC NEED</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENROLLMENT: A PROCESS FOR BETTER PROJECTIONS</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMING: A DIFFERENT WAY OF WORKING WITH COMMUNITY PARTNERS</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX A: END OF WEEK SURVEY</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX B: WALKTHROUGH FORM</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX C: STUDENT FEEDBACK FORM</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDNOTES</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURES + TABLES

Figure 1: Programmatic activities accomplished
Figure 2: Walkthrough Form - The focus is (physical, social/emotional or curricular)
Figure 3: Are students actively engaged?
Figure 4: Are they doing something with the information presented to them or creating more information?
Figure 5: Student perception of summer program
Figure 6: Student survey - Likert “How much do you look forward to attending the program?”
Figure 7: Student survey “Do you feel comfortable talking to program staff?”
Figure 8: ECHOS improvement for program leaders
Figure 9: Is the learning space physically and emotionally safe?
Table 1: Staff needed to serve students at a 1:12 ratio, with program coordinator.
Table 2: Evaluation questions and success criteria
Table 3: Descriptive statistics for level of engagement
Table 4: Portrait of an ACPS Learner Alignment

ACRONYMS

100 BMOCV 100 Black Men of Central Virginia
BIPOC Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color
BWCV Black Women of Central Virginia
ACPS Albemarle County Public Schools
UVA University of Virginia
TOR Terms of Reference
REM Rapid Evaluation Methods
RFP Request for Proposal
VDOE Virginia Department of Education
STEM Science, Technology, Engineering and Math
STEAM Science, Technology, Engineering, Art and Math
COVID Coronavirus Disease
ECHO Extension for Community Healthcare Outcomes
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND
The UVA Democracy Initiative Center for the Redress of Inequity through Community-Engaged Scholarship (aka the Equity Center) was officially launched in October of 2019. The Equity Center grew out of many years of community advocacy for social justice in the Charlottesville/Albemarle region. The center was born of the tireless work of many in the community who worked hard to call on the University of Virginia to redress racial and socio-economic injustice.

The mission of The Equity Center is to “tangibly redress racial and economic inequity in university communities by advancing a transformative approach to the fundamental research mission, which will, in turn, reform institutional values, pedagogy, and operations.” The local steering committee, faculty, staff, and wider community envision a university that proactively serves the local community by drawing upon the rich research resources that the community has to offer and equipping its students to lead in building a more just society.

In conjunction with Albemarle County Public Schools and a host of community partners, The Equity Center was able to offer after school enrichment opportunities to middle school aged students, during the summer of 2021. This opportunity arose due to a request for summer programming for students set forth by Albemarle County Public Schools.

OBJECTIVE
This report is intended to assist Albemarle County Public Schools decision makers in developing programs that help students meet with success. The information in this report can be used to inform equitable learning recovery during the 2021-2022 school year and beyond.

This evaluation is developmental in nature. Meant to be neither formative or summative, the purpose of Developmental Evaluation centers around the development of a program or set of programs that meets the needs of students in the local community. Whereas formative and summative evaluation often center around the improvement of an existing program or set of programs, developmental evaluation looks to grow the knowledge base necessary for program development.

METHODOLOGY
The mixed-methods approach required the collection and examination of both quantitative and qualitative data. Brief descriptions of data collection tools, instruments, processes, and parties responsible (in part or in whole) for ensuring that the data were regularly collected are provided below.

DOCUMENT REVIEW
According to the Center for Disease Control (2018), document review is a way of collecting and analyzing data by reviewing new and existing documents. The documents may be internal or external to the organization, hard copy or electronic. The use of document review is best employed to gather background information, determine if program implementation reflects programmatic plans and when information is needed for the development of other data collection tools. Document review is also useful when evidence is needed to answer certain types of evaluation questions.

OBSERVATIONS/ WALKTHROUGHS
To conduct observations of programming, an observation form was created and shared with the three potential observers. The form served as a checklist to help the observers focus and maintain consistency. The use of a standardized form also allows for comparison across groups and within groups. The observations focused on whether students were engaged, and how that engagement was occurring as well as the level of physical and emotional safety of the room/space.

SURVEYS
Both quantitative and qualitative data on The Equity Center Program were collected via surveys administered to grantees to students, interns, and community organizers. In this manner, we were able to glean information about program implementation with a focus on what could be omitted, added, or changed in the future.

To select data focused on answering each of the evaluation questions in a clear concise manner, the following evaluation question and success criteria chart was created by the evaluation group.
To what degree were planned program activities accomplished?

80% of program activities accomplished on a daily, weekly, and monthly (program-long) basis.

Were program leaders able to maintain an elevated level of engagement throughout the Equity Center’s Summer Program?

Average program participation is greater than or equal to 80% of students report being engaged in program activities greater than or equal to 80% of the time.

To what degree did community program leaders improve their social-emotional and mental health knowledge due to Project ECHO (Extension for Community Healthcare Outcomes)?

Program leaders bring one or more topics to the ECHOs team. There is qualitative evidence of application of lessons learned during one of more ECHOs session.

To what extent were students in the target demographic able to access programming (Black, Latinx, low-wealth, and/or potential first-generation college students)?

80% of students enrolled in the Equity Center Summer Program are part of one or more identified target groups.

How did external factors influence program delivery?

N/A. Positive and negative programmatic impacts will be highlighted to glean understanding.

A mean score of 4.88 on a 6-point scale is equivalent to 81%, which exceeds the success criteria of 80%. Additionally, 74% walkthroughs showed that the group activities were curricular in nature. Therefore, it is determined that the threshold of accomplishing 80% of program activities was met. Qualitative evidence of this came during the Expo at the end of the program where 100% of groups were able to display what students learned.

While weeks 1 and 2 saw program participation of greater than 80%, this was not the case in weeks 3 and 4. With that said, students who attended were happy with programming, and connected to adults (93%). Students who attended were actively engaged (doing something with the data presented to them) 68.4% of the time, and 15.8% of the time some students were actively engaged, and some were passively engaged.
82% of students enrolled in The Equity Center Summer Program were students of color, and 17% of students identified as White. However, students who attended summer programming regularly were students of color. This may have been due to the small number of White program leaders. >90% of students in attendance each week identified as either Black, Hispanic-Latino, or Mixed-Race.

According to document review and end of program surveys, major programmatic impacts were related to the following elements: cost, composition of community partner groups, and day-to-day factors.

### KEY EVALUATION QUESTION #4
To what extent were students in the target demographic able to access programming (Black, Latinx, low-wealth, and/or potential first-generation college students)?

80% of students enrolled in Equity Center Summer Program are part of one or more identified target groups.

### SUCCESS CRITERIA
80% of students enrolled in Equity Center Summer Program are part of one or more identified target groups.

82% of students enrolled in The Equity Center Summer Program were students of color, and 17% of students identified as White. However, students who attended summer programming regularly were students of color. This may have been due to the small number of White program leaders. >90% of students in attendance each week identified as either Black, Hispanic-Latino, or Mixed-Race.

### KEY EVALUATION QUESTION #5
To what degree did community program leaders improve their social-emotional and mental health knowledge due to Project ECHO (Extension for Community Healthcare Outcomes)?

There is qualitative evidence of the application of lessons learned during one of more ECHO sessions. There is qualitative evidence of application of lessons learned during one of more ECHO sessions. Physically and emotionally safe learning environments resulted because leaders were knowledgeable on social-emotional and mental health topics. Additional evidence of practice can be found in final survey responses.

### SUCCESS CRITERIA
Program leaders bring one or more topics to the ECHOs team. There is qualitative evidence of application of lessons learned during one of more ECHOs session.

According to document review and end of program surveys, major programmatic impacts were related to the following elements: cost, composition of community partner groups, and day-to-day factors.

### Key Evaluation Question #3
To what extent were students actively engaged?

If you attended ECHOs meetings, did you see improvement in your social-emotional and/or mental health knowledge?

### Success Criteria
How did external factors influence program delivery?
RECOMMENDATIONS

TIMING: A DIFFERENT WAY OF WORKING WITH COMMUNITY PARTNERS

The process from requesting to provide summer programming for Albemarle County Public Schools students, to award was a long one. The process began in April and was not finalized until just before programming began in July; this necessitated some changes in programmatic objectives. The bulleted list below illustrates the way the Equity Center attempted to align the Virginia Department of Education’s Career Clusters, with community groups delivering programming. The list further illustrates the way for students to actualize interests in these career clusters far beyond the summer by highlighting the existing Albemarle County High School Academy and potential college majors.

TIMELINE

To the greatest extent possible, provide ample time for the writing and submission of future RFPs and ensure that notification and release of funding is consistent with program objectives.

VILLAGE MENTALITY

To the greatest extent possible continue to partner with small, BIPOC community organizations when the target group of students to be served is reflective of their composition.

EXPOSURE

Continue to provide programming that exposes students to a myriad of experiences related to college and career readiness.

WHOLE CHILD

Continue to focus on the education of the whole child to include both physical and social-emotional wellness.

KEY FINDINGS

TRANSPORTATION: A BASIC NEED

The Equity Center worked to be responsive to the needs of working families throughout the Summer Program. While some parents, guardians, and other caring adults were able to provide transportation for their students, this was not possible for others. The lack of transportation services presented a large problem and required significant changes over time. Equity Center Executive Director, Ben Allen initially spent upwards of 20 hours using GIS to plot student locations, creating clusters, and finally creating a final transportation plan for implementation by Ambassador Limousine. The Equity Center staff then worked to call all families to let them know when and where students would be dropped off in the afternoon. This effort took no less than 12 additional hours but did allow for a personal connection in terms of programming.

Once transportation routes were established, daily routes were adjusted according to student attendance by week and eventually by day. The number of vehicles used to transport students shrank from four to two due to enrollment and access to parent/guardian transport. This required additional time from both Dr. Allen and Ms. Capps to ensure that transportation home occurred smoothly.

ENROLLMENT: A PROCESS FOR BETTER PROJECTIONS

The number of students that the Equity Center Summer Program was able to serve was capped at 100. However, enrollment never reached these numbers. While the number of individual students enrolled was in the 70s, the number of students present per week and per day fluctuated well below the target number. Equity Center Summer Program staffing levels remained steady to account for enrollment projections. The number of organizations providing direct services for summer programming also changed from the time the RFP was submitted to the time that programming was executed. This was due, in large part, to the reality of enrollment projections and lack of transportation.

It is also important to note that the submission for summer programming submitted by the Equity Center requested the use of Burley Middle School as a central location and to offer the program to all middle school students. However, since there was initially a lack of transportation from the other schools the program served mostly Burley Middle School Students with a moderate level of participation from students at Jack Jouett Middle School and Walton Middle School. To problem solve around this, students from Jack Jouett Middle School and Walton Middle School were transported to Burley Middle School using the Albemarle Limousine Service, which also picked up students from Monticello High School (the site of Walton Middle School summer school). Even with students from two other middle schools, enrollment numbers in both summer school and therefore The Equity Center Summer Program, were far below projections. In the future, a different process for enrollment might be more effective.
INTRODUCTION

The SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19/Coronavirus Disease 2019) pandemic caused many students across the United State and around the world to suffer interrupted learning. While many public-school districts in the United States provided online or hybrid learning during the latter part of the 2019 school year, and into the 2020-2021 academic year, this disruption is likely to have a substantial impact on learners. The switch to virtual instruction left many parents, guardians, and other caring adults to try and manage at-home learning while adjusting to other parts of their lives. With the start of the 2021-2022 school year, the need to forecast learning loss is increasingly necessary each day. While some researchers are focused on measuring and assessing the learning loss that has occurred, others are working to proactively manage the situation. This work is being done based on the data that school districts have at their disposal. These data include work completion, attendance rates and more.

Congress passed COVID-19 relief funding for Local Education Associations (LEAs) under the “Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief Fund (ESSER Fund). While this funding was given at the state level, states were required to disperse no less than 90% of their total awards to LEAs. This money was to be allocated and spent with attention to the following: Need Allocations for State Education Associations (SEAs) and LEAs were calculated based on the number of students in each location who qualified for federal, Title 1 service. Spending Category Each state submitted a plan to the Department of Education outlining how it planned to spend its funding. No money was allocated until plans were submitted and approved.

REPORT STRUCTURE

The report begins with a background that explains why the summer programming took place and requirements as dictated by the funding source. It then moves into a brief description of the overall methodology of the evaluation, before moving into evaluation results and finally recommendations. Findings are presented within the context of key evaluation questions with an emphasis on the evidence drawn from multiple data sources. The conclusion section presents some recommendations and provides the framework necessary to make additional recommendations in the future.

INTENDED AUDIENCE

The Equity Center works to tangibly redress inequities. We continue to learn, grow, and contribute to the advancement of best practices within our approach in programming, access, and educational equity. Therefore, from the beginning Equity Center leadership planned to conduct a full program evaluation to discern what was and what was not beneficial to students during summer programming. This report seeks to address questions that can help to guide the community towards the development of a community-school partnership model that infuses mentorship, project-based learning, social-emotional education, and wellness efforts. The intended audience for this report includes:

ALBEMARLE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL
- Parents/Guardians/Other Caring Adults
- Superintendent and Superintendent’s Cabinet Members
- School Based Leadership: School Administrators and Instructional Coaches
- Guidance Counselors

COMMUNITY AT LARGE
Institutes of Higher Education
- Piedmont Virginia Community College
- University of Virginia and others

Community Organizations
- 100 Black Men of Central Virginia
- Black Women of Central Virginia
- Conscious Capitalist Group
- Fundamental Factory
- Integrity Mentoring
- Project Pipeline
- Wildrock
- Wright Counseling Group

This report is intended to assist Albemarle County Public Schools decision makers in developing programs that help students meet with success. The information in this report can be used to inform equitable learning recovery during the 2021-2022 school year and beyond.

This evaluation is developmental in nature. Meant to be neither formative or summative, the purpose of Developmental Evaluation centers around the development of a program or set of programs that meets the needs of students in the local community. Whereas formative and summative evaluation often center around the improvement of an existing program or set of programs, while developmental evaluation looks to grow the knowledge base necessary for program development.
PROGRAM PURPOSES + GOALS

The Equity Center is a new center at the University of Virginia, officially launched in October 2019. The Equity Center grew out of many years of community advocacy for social justice in the Charlottesville/Albemarle region. The center was born of the tireless work of many in the community who worked hard to call on the University of Virginia to redress racial and socio-economic injustice.

The mission of The Equity Center is to “tangibly redress racial and economic inequity in university communities by advancing a transformative approach to the fundamental research mission, which will, in turn, reform institutional values, pedagogy, and operations”. The local steering committee, faculty, staff, and wider community envision a university that proactively serves the local community by drawing upon the rich research resources that the community has to offer and equipping its students to lead in building a more just society.

In conjunction with Albemarle County Public Schools and a host of community partners, The Equity Center was able to offer after summer school enrichment opportunities to middle school aged students, during the summer of 2021. This opportunity arose due to a request for summer programming for students set forth by Albemarle County Public Schools.

The mission of Albemarle County Public Schools is to “establish a community of learners and learning, through relationships, relevance and rigor, one student at a time.” By recognizing the power of relationships, Albemarle County Public Schools has positioned itself to make great strides in reaching every student. The Equity Center shares this belief and envisions the summer pathways program as a vehicle for creating and maintaining strong, community relationships that benefit students.

The local steering committee, staff and faculty of The Equity Center recognize that the notion of establishing a community of learners and learning may not have always envisioned the school community as part of the community at large. However, it should be clear that the Charlottesville/Albemarle community has much to offer and much to learn from Albemarle County Public Schools students. Therefore, The Equity Center sought to work from a student-centered, assets-based approach to create a model for success. This model infused student choice and agency in a manner that aligns with future ACPS academy plans as well as the Virginia Department of Education career clusters. Exposure to these pathways aligns with the Albemarle County Public Schools’ vision: “all learners believe in their power to embrace learning, to excel, and own their own future.” It is important to note that there is significant alignment between ACPS’s core values and those of the Equity Center.

ALBEMARLE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS CORE VALUES

EQUITY
We will provide every student with the level of support necessary to thrive.

EXCELLENCE
We will provide mitigate barriers and provide opportunities for every student to be academically successful.

THE EQUITY CENTER CORE VALUES

AUTHENTIC PARTNERSHIP
Our approach to community-engaged theory and practice means we are committed to authentic, honest, and transparent community collaboration.

SHARED POWER
We will intentionally and equitably share our power as researchers by studying issues that address community priorities, openly sharing data and results with our community partners, and helping to translate our research into tangible actions that reduce economic and racial inequity.

EQUITY
We are committed to the production of knowledge that advances social justice, by joining community research partners, and ensuring fair and equitable treatment of community experts.

JUSTICE
Our work will contribute to the fair distribution of equal, basic rights to all members of society.

BENEFICIAL
We will conduct research that tangibly benefits communities, both methodologically and in implementation.

FAMILY AND COMMUNITY
We will engage with and share the responsibility for student success with families and community partners.

WELLNESS
We will support the physical and emotional health of our students and staff.

ACTION
Our research will go beyond the creation and discovery of new knowledge, but we will also work to directly employ our learning to implement interventions that reduce inequity.

MUTUALITY
We will form meaningful partnerships with low-income, Black, Latinx, indigenous, and immigrant community residents of all ages to create opportunities for two-way knowledge transfer and co-learning that will lead to more effective, equitable, and enduring solutions to problems impacting these communities.

YOUTH
We will make training and equipping young people a major focus of the Equity Center’s work, because young people are at the center of many of the inequities present in our communities, from educational opportunity gaps to interactions with the justice system, to health, poverty, housing, and hunger.

FUNDING MODEL

In response to the Summer Programming for Students Proposal released by Albemarle County, The Equity Center proposed the pricing schedule below. The schedule attempted to account for enrollments ranging from 84 to 108 students per week. The Equity Center then contracted with local, community knowledge keepers and experts, the technical experience and expertise of the Equity Center staff as educators, grant administrators, grant managers, and community partners (within the Charlottesville community at large, K-12 education spaces, and University of Virginia faculty and department relationships) to keep expenses related to planning and programming low. Due to these deeply rooted community resources, The Equity Center was able to provide meaningful, enriching opportunities for a considerable number of students at a rate of under $102 per student per day.

COSTS FOR IMPLEMENTATION PER STUDENT INCLUDED, BUT WERE NOT LIMITED TO:

- Staffing for an on-site coordinator who served as the main coordinator/contact for parents, contractors, school administrators and facilitators
- Extended time for programming that exceeded the minimum requirement of 4pm
- Provision for additional mentoring/tutoring support for students
- Contracting external BIPOC and women-owned and led organizations and partners to provide contextualized career programming clusters that responded to the interests of youth
- Social-emotional health training and technical assistance provided by the University of Virginia using the Enhancing Community Health Outcomes program
- Provision for locally sourced, healthy snacks
- The cost of a post-program evaluation

In alignment with the Equity Center’s vision and mission, there is always a high priority on equity and redress in contract and purchasing as well as on the amplification of BIPOC and women owned small businesses, non-profit community-based organizations, and individuals. The Equity Center was able to secure funding from Albemarle County Public Schools to assist BIPOC, minority, and women owned community partners, in achieving proposed program objectives and delivering high-quality, community-based services that were reflective and representative of the students and Charlottesville/Albemarle community.

To deliver summer programming during the Equity Center Summer Program. The Equity Center considered the constraints of COVID relief funding at the federal level, as well as the request as stated by Albemarle County. This led to the funding structure that considered program size, capacity for serving students and space requirements.

Student to Adult Ratio: Student to adult ratio must be at least 1:12

The number of full-time staff was determined by enrollment. To include a program coordinator as well as a program leader for 12 students. The number of staff members necessary for implementation at anticipated levels of student attendance was calculated by taking the number of students, dividing by 12, and adding one, where any remainder facilitated an additional staff member. The way the number of staff members were set to scale is illustrated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73-84</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-96</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-108</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Equity Center Summer Program anticipated serving between 84 and 108 students per week of programming. Funding and staffing levels were set accordingly.
The Equity Center outlined the following expenses in our original proposal:

- Contracts with local community knowledge keepers and experts, the technical experience and expertise of the Equity Center staff as educators, grant administrators, grant managers, and community partners (within the Charlottesville community at large, k-12 education spaces, and University of Virginia faculty and department relationships) to keep expenses related to planning and programming low

- Staffing for an on-site coordinator who will serve as the main coordinator/contact for parents, contractors, school administrators and facilitators

- Extended time for programming that exceed the minimum requirement of 4pm

- Providing additional mentoring/tutoring support for students

- Contracting external BIPOC and women-owned and led organizations and partners to provide contextualized career programming clusters that respond to the interests of youth

- Social-emotional health training and technical assistance provided by the University of Virginia using the Enhancing Community Health Outcomes program

- Providing locally sourced, healthy snacks

- Conducting a post-program evaluation to determine the success, outcomes, best practices, area of improvement and lessons learned that will be shared with partners, school officials and administrators

As summarized on the previous page and in Appendix D, the Equity Center was able to meet and exceed the proposed spending outcomes and budget for this project. The Equity Center prioritized local contractors and suppliers to keep dollars and spending within the local economy, over 70% of all expenses (direct and indirect) went to local community partners and community partner programming. All contracted community partners were women or BIPOC led small non-profits with less than two paid full-time staff members employed. The Equity Center was able to register 19 new women owned and BIPOC small business, organizations, and individuals into the UVA procurement system. The average community partner had a contract of $6,900, with an additional $17,124 in in-kind support (project management, transportation, supplies, student wages). In total, each group received an average amount of $24,024 in services (direct and indirect) from this award.

The Equity Center employed thirteen students who represented the continuum of mentoring from middle school to UVA. These students were able to have hands-on experience as mentors and leaders for others in their community. Student mentors were compensated at an average rate of $15-18 dollars per hour in exchange for their expertise.

One of our largest unforeseen expenses was the provision of round-trip transportation for students in and around the Charlottesville community (19.55% of community partner spending). Providing transportation was an essential cost that enabled more students to participate fully and completely in the programming provided but required that we re-allocate a portion of Equity Center staffing back into community programming, resulting in 9% of funds used for Equity Center staffing who provided coordination, project management, logistics and evaluation for the project.

The Equity Center has the opportunity to further contribute to back into the local economy by continuing to source local program supplies and materials, which accounted for 7.5% of community partner spending. Due to time constraints in the contract period, we relied heavily on business that could provide expedited shipping and processing. Future programming will include a larger percentage of supplies and materials being sourced from local businesses.
SUMMER PROGRAM EVALUATION

EVALUATION DESIGN

A mixed-methods approach of quantitative and qualitative data collection was used to examine outcomes and processes as part of the evaluation. This evaluation considers many aspects of programming including program activities, challenges, outputs, and changes. These data are used to monitor the current process to make any necessary amendments, omissions, or changes for future iterations of the program and other programming within the same sphere.

EVALUATION STUDY QUESTIONS

Key evaluation questions relevant to The Equity Center Summer Program were developed to assist with the focus of the evaluation on the development process. Five key evaluation questions were examined as part of the evaluation:

1. To what degree were planned program activities accomplished?
2. Were program leaders able to maintain an elevated level of engagement throughout The Equity Center Summer Program?
3. To what degree did community program leaders improve their social-emotional and mental health knowledge due to Project ECHO (Extension for Community Healthcare Outcomes)?
4. To what extent were students in the target demographic able to access programming (Black, Latinx, low-wealth, and/or potential first-generation college students)?
5. How did external factors influence program delivery?

METHODOLOGY

The mixed-methods approach required the collection and examination of both quantitative and qualitative data. Brief descriptions of data collection tools, instruments, processes, and parties responsible (in part or in whole) for ensuring that the data were regularly collected are provided below.

DOCUMENT REVIEW

According to the Center for Disease Control (2018), document review is a way of collecting and analyzing data by reviewing new and existing documents. The documents may be internal or external to the organization, hard copy or electronic. The use of document review is best employed to gather background information, determine if program implementation reflects programmatic plans and when information is needed for the development of other data collection tools. Document review is also useful when evidence is needed to answer certain types of evaluation questions.

Before, during and after the document review process care was taken to understand how documents would be reviewed. As this is an internal evaluation, some documents were created for future use in the evaluation process. All documents were compiled as part of the evaluation plan, and where necessary scrubbed for identifying information to maintain confidentiality.

The documents reviewed included:

1. List of Students with No Media Permissions
2. Monthly and Weekly Calendars and Individual Supplier Plans
3. Attendance (Burley Middle School and Equity Center Summer Program)
4. Scrubbed Attendee Lists
5. Budget
6. Transportation Plans

OBSERVATIONS/WALKTHROUGHS

To conduct observations of programming, an observation form was created and shared with the three potential observers. The form served as a checklist to help the observers focus and maintain consistency. The use of a standardized form also allows for comparison across groups and within groups. The observations focused on whether students were engaged, and how that engagement was occurring as well as the level of physical and emotional safety of the room/pace.

SURVEYS

Both quantitative and qualitative data on The Equity Center Program were collected via surveys administered by grantees to students, interns, and community organizers. In this manner, we were able to glean information about program implementation with a focus on what could be omitted, added, or changed in the future.

To select data focused on answering each of the evaluation questions in a clear concise manner, the following evaluation question and success criteria chart was created by the evaluation group. (See Table 2, p. 25)
DATA LIMITATIONS

DOCUMENT REVIEW

According to the Center for Disease Control: Evaluation Brief related to document review includes the presence of extraneous information, access to applicable, organized data, document bias, and time. Data collected using document review are limited in the following ways:

Information was unavailable
Since evaluation methods were planned before program implementation, many of the documents needed for review were designed with data collection in mind. However, there was still some data that could not be accessed by the reviewer.

Bias
Bias can impact document review because of the inherent desire of some to control the flow of data. This sometimes leads to the documentation of more favorable outcomes and the omission and/or deletion of those that are less favorable. The result can be data that are incomplete or inaccurate.

Time
It is time consuming to narrow the documents that will be reviewed and to review each document; many of which have copious amounts of data.

OBSERVATIONS

Limitations related to observations: As with any observation, the data collected using observations during this study were limited due to the following:

Hawthorne Effect
Student participants and adult community partners may act differently due to the presence of the observer. The observers were in and out of the learning spaces, even when not doing formal observations to mitigate this effect. However, there is no way to ensure that this did not occur.

Observer Impact
Whether fatigue or emotional distress comes into play, it is always important to note that observations are done through the lens of the observer. An observation form was used to assist the observers in conducting observations in a consistent manner. Additionally, initial group observations were conducted to establish consistent standards.

Disruptions and distractions
Conducting consistent evaluations where disruptions and distractions do not create outlier data takes time and patience.

Time
Longer observations are better than brief time snippets. However, that was not possible during the evaluation period.

QUESTIONAIRES

Questionnaires can be fixed response, open response, or a combination of the two. The following are limitations of questionnaires as a source of data:

Fixed Response: Lack of Detail
Fixed response questionnaires often lack detail because questionnaire respondents do not have the opportunity to elaborate upon answer choices.

Open Response: Time Consuming
Because respondents can elaborate upon choices and are often encouraged to collect a great deal of data, however these data can be time consuming to distil and analyze.

Open Response: Bias
Because responses often must be communicated in writing variance can occur based on the educational attainment of the respondents.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

To what degree were planned program activities accomplished?
80% of program activities accomplished on a daily, weekly, and monthly (program-long) basis

Were program leaders able to maintain an elevated level of engagement throughout the Equity Center Summer Program?
Average program participation is greater than or equal to 80%. Students report being engaged in program activities greater than or equal to 80% of the time

To what degree did community program leaders improve their social-emotional and mental health knowledge due to Project ECHO (Extension for Community Healthcare Outcomes)?
Program leaders bring one or more topics to the ECHOs program. There is qualitative evidence of application of lessons learned during one of more ECHOs sessions.

To what extent were students in the target demographic able to access programming (Black, Latinx, low-wealth, and/or potential first-generation college students)?
80% of students enrolled in Equity Center Summer Program are part of one or more identified target groups.

How did external factors influence program delivery?
Positive and negative programmatic impacts will be highlighted to glean understanding.

DATA LIMITATIONS SPECIFIC TO THE EQUITY CENTER SUMMER PROGRAM

Evidence Collection
Due to limits regarding the capacity of program leaders, participation in evidence collection was limited throughout the data collection process. Program leaders were tasked with teaching, guiding, and caring for groups of students, and at times this meant that they were unable to follow through with set data collection procedures. This impacted survey response rates for students as well.

Physical and Digital Access
The Equity Center Summer Program included many off-site experiences when students were not in or around the building walkthroughs could not be conducted.

Further, some documents and other information that would have proved useful for the evaluation were not able to be shared with the program evaluators due to issues surrounding both privacy and transparency. This means that the data herein, while robust in some areas, is lacking in others.
EVALUATION FINDINGS

This portion of the report focuses on addressing each key evaluation question using the data sources previously identified. For each key evaluation question there is stating of the question, a positioning of the question as adjacent to the goals of the Albemarle County Public School System, as set forth in the request for summer programming, and a mixture of qualitative and quantitative evidence.

FINDINGS FOR KEY EVALUATION QUESTION #1

QUESTION STATEMENT
To what degree were planned program activities accomplished?

FRAMING OF THE QUESTION
This evaluation question is supported by adherence to the guiding principle of The Whole Child. “We will support the whole child in our learning recovery work. While academic progress is a significant concern, learning recovery efforts will be most successful if they are personalized and coordinated to meet the academic as well as the social-emotional and wellness needs of all students.”

DATA
To gather quantitative data related to question #1 program leaders were asked the following question:

Rate yourself: To what degree have you, and the other leaders of your program been able to maintain a high level of engagement this week?

Descriptive Statistics for the question above can be found in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINIMUM</th>
<th>MAXIMUM</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>STD DEVIATION</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Descriptive statistics for level of engagement.

In support of the self-reported data from the End of Program survey, given to the program leaders, Figure 1 is from the Walkthrough Form. It shows that during 74% of walkthroughs program activity was curricular in nature, as opposed to physical and/or social emotional. This illustrated that it was the curricular, programmatic tasks that leaders were most often focused on in class.

Figure 1: Programmatic activities accomplished
80% of program activities accomplished on a daily, weekly, and monthly (program long) basis. A mean score of 4.88 on a 6-point scale is equivalent to 81% which exceeds the success criteria of 80%. Additionally, 74% walkthroughs showed that the group activities were curricular in nature. Therefore, it is determined that the threshold of accomplishing 80% of program activities was met. Qualitative evidence of this came during the Expo at the end of the program where 100% of groups were able to display what students learned.

**SUCCESS CRITERIA**

80% of program activities accomplished on a daily, weekly, and monthly (program long) basis.

**FINDINGS FOR KEY EVALUATION QUESTION #2**

**QUESTION STATEMENT**

Were program leaders able to maintain an elevated level of engagement throughout the Equity Center Summer Program?

**FRAMING OF THE QUESTION**

Key Evaluation Question #2 really seeks to address the guiding principle related to relationships. The request for summer programming stated the following:

We will build productive relationships to achieve our shared goals. Collaborative relationships with students, families, and community partners will be a foundation for developing innovative and transformational learning opportunities.

**DATA**

The Equity Center recognized that engagement in the process to provide summer programming for students, represented a commitment to building productive relationships and harnessing the capacity to knit together different stakeholders around a common vision, mission, and values. The Equity Center Summer Program met a need for students and families and was supported by like-minded community partners who were able to build meaningful relationships with students.
Walkthrough data shows that students were actively engaged (doing something with the data presented to them) 68.4% of the time, and 15.8% of the time some students were actively engaged, and some were passively engaged.

**STUDENTS PERCEPTION OF THE SUMMER PROGRAM**

50% of student survey respondents reported that they were participating in the summer program of their own volition, while a little over one-fifth of respondents said that participation was dictated by a parent. One interesting component was that some students felt like they were chosen to participate, while another fifth reported that the decision was one that they made as a family.

100% of students answered favorably (between 3 and 5) on a 5-point Likert scale.
WHAT STUDENTS ENJOYED MOST ABOUT THE SUMMER PROGRAM

When looking at what students liked most about the program, the top two open responses were fun and field trips. Student quotes when asked what they tell other students about the summer program included:

"The teachers are nice and care about you and your feelings, and we do fun things."
"It was overall pretty cool, engaging, and interesting."
"It’s a fun program and you’ll experience a lot."

When asked what they would like to change, more than half respondents said they would not change anything, but others wanted:

- “more field trips”
- less “equity propaganda”
- “a different room”
- “more sports”
- “no bugs”

There were mixed results when examining whether program leaders were able to maintain an elevated level of engagement throughout The Equity Center at UVA’s Summer Program. While weeks 1 and 2 saw program participation of greater than 80%, this was not the case in weeks 3 and 4. With that said, students who attended were actively engaged (doing something with the data presented to them) 68.4% of the time, and 15.8% of the time some students were actively engaged, and some were passively engaged, and connected to adults (93%).

SUCCESS CRITERIA

Average program participation is greater than or equal to 80%. Student’s engaged in program activities greater than or equal to 80% of the time.

While weeks 1 and 2 saw program participation of greater than 80%, this was not the case in weeks 3 and 4. With that said, students who attended were happy with programming, and connected to adults (93%). Students who attended were actively engaged (doing something with the data presented to them) 68.4% of the time, and 15.8% of the time some students were actively engaged, and some were passively engaged.

FINDINGS FOR KEY EVALUATION QUESTION #3

QUESTION STATEMENT

To what degree did community program leaders improve their social-emotional and mental health knowledge due to Project ECHO (Extension for Community Healthcare Outcomes)?

FRAMING OF THE QUESTION

As outlined in their request for summer programming, Albemarle County stated that it was seeking to educate the “whole child”:

Support the whole child in our learning recovery work. While academic progress is a significant concern, learning recovery efforts will be most successful if they are personalized and coordinated to meet the academic as well as the social-emotional and wellness needs of all students. To achieve the aforementioned outcomes, The Equity Center partnered with the leadership of the Virginia Partnership for School Mental Health (VPSMH) to provide training and support to program staff related to assessing and supporting student social-emotional and mental wellness. During the summer program, VPSMH offered a tele-mentoring experience called Enhancing Community Health Outcomes (ECHOs) wherein program staff met virtually for one hour per week to share lessons learned and challenges related to supporting student mental health. The ECHOs meetings were led by university and community experts in mental health, summer programming, and equity. Because the ECHOs meetings allowed staff to consult with their peers as well as leaders in the field, it provided an opportunity for programs to share knowledge and collaborate to support student mental health.
Qualitatively program leaders reported that the ECHOs program had a positive influence on program delivery. Some responses to this end, included:

“Hearing approaches from educators from both the elementary and middle school level as well as counselors created a broader bank of resources to draw from when addressing student behavior.”

(The) “presentation on ASF and sharing of ideas of positive reinforcement were directly helpful to building positive behaviors and skill sets in class.”

“Our program was influenced positively by learning about a reward system for kids with ASD (Autism Spectrum Disorder).”

It is important to note that ECHOs meetings occurred on Tuesday mornings, so not all program leaders were able to attend. Topics for the ECHOs meetings were initially chosen by the ECHOs team and then topic suggestions were taken from participants. This led to ECHOs programming that was immediately useful for summer program leaders. Quantitative results were assessed at the end of the program.

When asked if they attended ECHOs during the week 12 out of 25 respondents said yes. Of those 12, 100% indicated that ECHOs had improved their social-emotional and mental health knowledge. Just one respondent cited little improvement.

Another way that the impact of the ECHOs program was assessed was through the implementation of the knowledge and skills gleaned from sessions. Evidence of the can be seen when assessing the level of physical and emotional safety in the classroom as well as in the ways in which program leaders were able to identify issues and solutions. See Figure 9 below. Additionally, impact can be gleaned from responses like, “Hearing approaches from educators from both the elementary and middle school level as well as counselors created a broader bank of resources to draw from when addressing student behavior.”

Figure 8: If you attended ECHOs meetings, did you see improvement in your social-emotional and/or mental health knowledge?

Figure 9: “To what extent is the learning space physically and emotionally safe?”

SUCCESS CRITERIA

Program leaders bring one or more topics to the ECHOs team. There is qualitative evidence of application of lessons learned during one of more ECHOs session.

Program leaders brought the topic of autism spectrum disorder to the group, and they were able to learn more about how to work with students identified with this disability. This is evident in their practice, as physically and emotionally safe learning environments results. Additionally, evidence of practice can be found in final survey responses.
FINDINGS FOR KEY EVALUATION QUESTION #4

QUESTION STATEMENT
To what extent were students in the target demographic (Black, Latinx, low-wealth, and/or potential first-generation college students) able to access programming?

FRAMING OF THE QUESTION
This question really speaks to of the guiding principles, present in the RFP. They are Equity and Portrait of an ACPS Learner.

Equity
We will maintain an equity lens to evaluate all learning recovery efforts. Recognizing that the coronavirus has had disproportionately detrimental effects on our most vulnerable student and family populations, our ACPS equity mission and commitment to anti-racism must be the primary factors used to determine how we develop, implement, and monitor recovery programs.

DATA
This data combines students enrolled in Weeks 1-4 with repetition for students who with repeated enrollment. It is also important to note that the race/ethnicity data reported above does not include all races and/or ethnicities and does not purport to do so. The only data included was the data provided to Equity Center Staff as listed in the student information systems.

According to document review, demographic data for students enrolled in the Equity Center Summer Program was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data values in this table have been rounded to whole numbers.

The students who registered for the summer program and the students who attended were different. We know that 100% of participants from Jack Jouett Middle School were students of color (Black, Multi-Racial, and Hispanic/Latino), while 75% of students from Walton Middle School were students of color (this includes one, White student-intern). Demographic data from the students at Jackson P. Burley Middle School varied by week, however during weeks 1-4 greater than 90% of students attending were students of color.

Qualitatively, when asked about the demographic makeup of the summer program participants. Students responded that they saw a lot of students who looked like them. This was the case for students who identified as Black and Hispanic/Latino, but not the case for students who identified as White. Demographic data above was reflective of the students who attended The Equity Center Summer Program with one exception. White students attended at a rate less than 20%. This may have been due to the low level of program leaders who identified as White.

SUCCESS CRITERIA
80% of students enrolled in Equity Center Summer programming are part of one or more identified target groups.

82% of students enrolled in The Equity Center Summer Program were students of color, and 17% of students identified as White. However, students who attended summer programming regularly were students of color. This may have been due to the small number of White program leaders. >90% of students in attendance each week identified as either Black, Hispanic-Latino, or Mixed-Race.
FINDINGS FOR KEY EVALUATION QUESTION #5

QUESTION STATEMENT

How did external factors influence program delivery?

FRAMING OF THE QUESTION

In alignment with the Equity Center vision and mission, we prioritized equity and redress in our contract and purchasing to amplify BIPOC and women owned small businesses, non-profit community-based organizations, and individuals. The Equity Center’s summer program centered on the recognition of our BIPOC and women owned community partners. They were integral in completing the proposed program objectives and delivering high-quality, community-based services that are reflective and representative of the students and Charlottesville community.

This question also aligns with ACPS’s learning recovery principle which states:

Committed to creating innovative opportunities so that all students can own their learning. The systems and strategies designed to achieve learning recovery will align with the strategic priorities of the division and move all students towards our Portrait of an ACPS Learner.19

The alignment of this plan with the Portrait of an ACPS learner as well as the VDOE career clusters is clearly defined Table 4 below. The Equity Center Summer Program also aligned collegiate majors, and where appropriate existing high school academies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VDOE CLUSTER</th>
<th>COMMUNITY PARTNER GROUP</th>
<th>ACPS HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMY</th>
<th>COLLEGE MAJORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Management &amp; Administration</td>
<td>Conscious Capital 100 Black Women of Central Virginia</td>
<td>None (currently)</td>
<td>Commerce, Accounting, Advertising, Business, Administration, Economics, Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>Fundamental Factory</td>
<td>Math Engineering and Science Academy (MESA)</td>
<td>Engineering, Mathematics, Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Food, and Natural Resources</td>
<td>Wildrock</td>
<td>Environmental Sciences Academy</td>
<td>Environmental Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture and Design</td>
<td>Project Pipeline</td>
<td>Math Engineering and Science Academy (MESA)</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Portrait of an ACPS Learner Alignment

In alignment with the Equity Center vision and mission, we prioritized equity and redress in our contract and purchasing to amplify BIPOC and women owned small businesses, non-profit community-based organizations, and individuals. The Equity Center’s summer program centered on the recognition of our BIPOC and women owned community partners. They were integral in completing the proposed program objectives and delivering high-quality, community-based services that are reflective and representative of the students and Charlottesville community.

DATA

According to document review and end of program surveys, major programmatic impacts were related to: cost, composition of community partner groups, and day-to-day factors.

Cost

The Equity Center proposed an average per student cost of $102 per day. This amount was to be used for the following:

- Staffing for an on-site coordinator who served as the main coordinator/contact for parents, contractors, school administrators and facilitators
- Extended time for programming that exceeds the minimum requirement of 4pm
- Providing additional mentoring/tutoring support for students
- Contracting external BIPOC and women-owned and led organizations and partners to provide contextualized career programming clusters that respond to the interests of youth
- Social-emotional health training and technical assistance provided by the University of Virginia using the Enhancing Community Health Outcomes program
- Providing locally sourced, healthy snacks
- Conducting a post-program evaluation to determine the success, outcomes, best practices, area of improvement and lessons learned that will be shared with partners, school officials and administrators

Composition of Community Partner Groups

In alignment with the Equity Center vision and mission, equity and redress were prioritized in contract and purchasing and to amplify BIPOC and women owned small businesses, non-profit community-based organizations, and individuals. The Equity Centers centered recognition of our BIPOC and women owned community partners, and as highlighted throughout this proposal, will be integral to complete the proposed program objectives and deliver high-quality, community-based services that are reflective and representative of the students and Charlottesville community.

Day to Day Factors

These included internal program factors such as the ECHOs program (please see Key Evaluation Question #4), the Circle of Power and Respect as well as external factors such as walking distances, motivation, and number of students served.

- Circle of Power and Respect

Results surrounding the impact of the Circle of Power and Respect were mixed. These are some responses.

"Our group was positively influenced by the outline for the Circle of Power and Respect. It helped us to hit all the key points."

"Distraction and feeling awkward with the Circle of Power and Respect--none of them really wants to sit down and listen much at this time of the day, so we have gravitated to some other intros instead of direct socioemotional convos."
SUCCESS CRITERIA

According to document review and end of program surveys, major programmatic impacts were related to the following elements: cost, composition of community partner groups, and day-to-day factors.

• Other factors influencing program delivery

“The walking distance to certain activities certainly affected group morale. However, we were able to keep the kids motivated with treats and distracting games that we played during the walking. Although the factor was negative, we were still able to overcome it.”

“The number of kids at the meeting, which was not that many, led us to change our delivery. As counselors we managed a more one-on-one approach that was positive and helped us bond with the kids.”
KEY FINDINGS

TRANSPORTATION: A BASIC NEED

The Equity Center worked to the responsive needs of working families throughout the summer program. While some parents, guardians, and other caring adults were able to provide transportation for their students, this was not possible for others. The lack of transportation services presented a large problem and required significant changes over time. Equity Center Executive Director, Ben Allen initially spent upwards of 20 hours using GIS to plot student locations, creating clusters, and finally creating a final transportation plan for implementation by Ambassador Limousine. The Equity Center staff then worked to call all families to let them know when and where students would be dropped off in the afternoon. This effort took no less than 12 additional hours but did allow for a personal connection in terms of programming.

Once transportation routes were established, daily routes were adjusted according to student attendance by week and eventually by day. The number of vehicles used to transport students shrunk from 4-2, due to enrollment and access to parent/guardian transport. This required additional time from both Dr. Allen and Ms. Capps to ensure that transportation home occurred smoothly.

ENROLLMENT: A PROCESS FOR BETTER PROJECTIONS

The number of students that the Equity Center Summer Program was able to serve was capped at 100. However, enrollment never reached these numbers. While the number of individual students enrolled was in the 70s, the number of students present per week and per day fluctuated well below the target number. Equity Center Summer Program staffing levels remained steady to account for enrollment projections. The number of organizations providing direct services for summer programming also changed from the time the RFP was submitted to the time that programming was executed. This was due, in large part, to the reality of enrollment projections and lack of transportation.

It is also important to note that the submission for summer programming submitted by the Equity Center requested the use of Burley Middle School as a central location and to offer the program to all middle school students. However, since there was initially a lack of transportation from the other schools the program served mostly Burley Middle School Students with a moderate level of participation from students at Jack Jouett Middle School and Walton Middle School. To problem solve around this, students from Jack Jouett Middle School and Walton Middle School were transported to Burley Middle School using the Albemarle Limousine Service, which also picked up students from Monticello High School (the site of Walton Middle School summer school).

Even with students from two other middle schools, enrollment numbers in both summer school and therefore The Equity Center Summer Program, were far below projections. In the future, a different process for enrollment might be more effective.
The process from requesting summer programming for Albemarle County Public Schools students, to award was a long one. The process began in April and was not finalized until just before programming began in July; this necessitated some changes in programmatic objectives. While institutional alignment between the Equity Center and Albemarle County Public Schools remained strong, additional timing would have allowed for the intentional planning necessary to provide deeper connections between students and subject areas. The bulleted list below illustrates the way The Equity Center attempted to align the Virginia Department of Education’s Career Clusters, with community groups delivering programming. The list further illustrates the way for students to actualize interests in these career clusters far beyond the summer by highlighting the existing Albemarle County High School Academy and potential college majors.

Specifically, the Equity Center Community Partnership Program partnership included:

**Career School Pipelines**
Students were introduced to University of Virginia academic paths such as Architecture, Education, Business, and Engineering. This led to interactions with student and faculty mentors and tutors that exposed students to many career possibilities that align with Albemarle County Public Schools (ACPS) Academies and with the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) Career Clusters.

**Placed-Based Education**
Place-based education allowed educators to help students shift their attention to and be familiarized with their locality, both natural and social, allowing them to understand the local and social histories that have made up their place.

**Passion-Based Exploratory Learning**
Led by community organizations, individual student’s interests were fostered by UVA faculty and undergraduate mentors during summer programming. This will include experiences at the Piedmont Virginia Community College and the University of Virginia such as campus tours, place-based learning to include the Memorial to Enslaved Laborers, Morven Farm and field trips to STEM labs and the Medical School.

**Social-Emotional Development**
Students were afforded consistent access to mentors, tutors, enrichment experiences, and other school-community mental health supports that build on youth strengths and further develop social, emotional, and psychological competencies necessary for success in school.

**Village Mentality**
At the core of the programming is the intersection between students, school staff, UVA partners, and community leaders. Crucial to program success is the ability to leverage and foster these critical relationships to provide whole child support for each participant.

**TIMING: A DIFFERENT WAY OF WORKING WITH COMMUNITY PARTNERS**

To the greatest extent possible, provide ample time for the writing and submission of future RFPs and ensure that notification and release of funding is consistent with program objectives.

**Village Mentality**
To the greatest extend possible continue to partner with small, BIPOC community organizations when the target group of students to be served is reflective of their composition.

**Exposure**
Continue to provide programming that exposes students to a myriad of experiences related to college and career readiness.

**Whole Child**
Continue to focus on the education of the whole child to include both physical and social-emotional wellness.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Timeline**
To the greatest extent possible, provide ample time for the writing and submission of future RFPs and ensure that notification and release of funding is consistent with program objectives.

**Village Mentality**
To the greatest extend possible continue to partner with small, BIPOC community organizations when the target group of students to be served is reflective of their composition.

**Exposure**
Continue to provide programming that exposes students to a myriad of experiences related to college and career readiness.

**Whole Child**
Continue to focus on the education of the whole child to include both physical and social-emotional wellness.
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### APPENDIX A

**EQUITY CENTER SUMMER PROGRAM END OF WEEK SURVEY**  
August 1st, 2021, 8:27 pm MDT

Q1 - To what degree were planned program activities accomplished?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>MINIMUM</th>
<th>MAXIMUM</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>STD DEVIATION</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what degree were planned program activities accomplished?</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>ANSWER</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0% NOT AT ALL</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>100% ACCOMPLISHED</td>
<td>41.18%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>80% ACCOMPLISHED</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>60% ACCOMPLISHED</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40% ACCOMPLISHED</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20% ACCOMPLISHED</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2 - Rate yourself: To what degree have you, and the other leaders of your program been able to maintain a high level of engagement this week?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>MINIMUM</th>
<th>MAXIMUM</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>STD DEVIATION</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate yourself: To what degree have you, and the other leaders of your program been able to maintain a high level of engagement this week?</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>ANSWER</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I attended part of the meeting</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3 - Did you attend the ECHO meeting this week?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>MINIMUM</th>
<th>MAXIMUM</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>STD DEVIATION</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did you attend the ECHO meeting this week?</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>ANSWER</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I attended part of the meeting</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4 - To what degree did the ECHO meeting improve your social-emotional and mental health knowledge?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>MINIMUM</th>
<th>MAXIMUM</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>STD DEVIATION</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what degree did the ECHO meeting improve your social-emotional and mental health knowledge?</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q3 - What factors influenced your program delivery this week? Explain whether those influences were positive or negative and why.

"Presentation on ASD and sharing of ideas for positive reinforcement were directly helpful to behaviors and skillsets in class."

"Our program was influence in positive by learning about a reward system for kids with ASD."

"The walking distance to certain activities certainly affected group morale. However, we were able to keep the kids motivated with treats and distracting games that we played during the walking. Although the factor was negative, we were still able to overcome it."

"The amount of kids at the meeting, which was not that many, led us to change our delivery. As counselors we managed a more one on one approach that was positive and helped us bond with the kids."

"Distraction and feeling awkward with the circle of power and respect–none of them really want to sit down and listen much at this time of the day, so we've gravitated to some other intro instead of direct socioemotional convos."

"Hearing approaches from educators from both the elementary and middle school level as well as counselors created a broader bank of resources to draw from when addressing student behavior."

"We have not begun the program yet. Our first meeting occurred before the students arrived. Having an intro about how to navigate feelings of anxiety and how to help students de-escalate was useful as a preventative tool."

"The outline for the Circle of Power and Respect points"
APPENDIX B

EQUITY CENTER WALKTHROUGH FORM
By Sherica Jones-Lewis

1. Instructor/s ____________________________________________

2. Class (mark only one oval)
   - Art
   - Black Women of CVA
   - Fundamental Factory
   - Project Pipeline
   - Robotics
   - Wildrock

3. How many students are present? ________

4. Are students actively engaged? (mark only one oval)
   - Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 Yes, highly

5. Are they doing something with the information presented to them or creating more information? (mark only one oval)
   - Yes  No  Some are active and others passive

6. Is the learning space physically and emotionally safe? (mark only one oval)
   - Teacher 1 2 3 4 5 Student

7. Explain the rating above. ____________________________________________

8. The focus is
   - Physical
   - Social/Emotional
   - Curricular
   - Other

9. Comments and questions ____________________________________________

10. Person conducting walk-through (mark only one oval)
    - Dr. Sherica D. Jones-Lewis
    - Dr. E Ben Allen
    - Ms. Natalie Capps
    - Other
APPENDIX C

EQUITY CENTER SUMMER PROGRAM STUDENT FEEDBACK FORM


* Required

1. Your Grade (mark only one oval)
   - Rising 6th
   - Rising 7th
   - Rising 8th
   - Rising 9th
   - Other

2. What pronouns do you prefer?
   - She/her
   - He/him
   - They/them
   - I prefer not to say
   - Other

3. Program/s (check all that apply)
   - Art
   - Black Women of Central Virginia
   - Fundamental Factory
   - Project Pipeline
   - Robotics
   - Wildrock

4. Do you think it is important to have a program like this here in your community? (mark only one oval)
   - Yes
   - No
   - Maybe

5. Why did you join/start participating in the program? (mark only one oval)
   - Parent/guardian told me to
   - I chose to
   - My family decided it was best
   - Other

6. How much do you look forward to attending the program? (mark only one oval)
   - No, never
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5
   - Yes, always

7. Do you feel comfortable talking to program staff? (mark only one oval)
   - Yes, all of them
   - Yes, most of them
   - No, mostly not
   - Not at all

8. Do you feel there is someone available in the program to help when you need it?* (mark only one oval)
   - Yes
   - No
   - Sometimes

9. During the program you may have connected with an adult, please list that person (or people) below.*
   ___________________________________________________________________________________

10. What would you tell others about the program who do not participate?* _______________

11. What would you be doing after school if you weren't coming to the program? __________

12. What do you like best about the Equity Center Summer Program?* ____________________

13. What are some things that you would like to see changed?* ___________________________

14. Is there anything else that we should know?* _______________________________________

15. Email (THIS IS NOT REQUIRED) _________________________________________________

Thank you for filling out this short survey! We know that they can be a pain, so thank you so much!
APPENDIX D
EQUITY CENTER ACPS SUMMER FUNDING REPORT

Total Award Allocations: Community, UVA, and EC

- Direct Community Programming (70.29%)
- University Overhead (20.63%)
- Equity Center Coordination (9.09%)

Total Additional Support (inkind and shared resources) on top of direct contracts: $17,124

Breakdown of Community Partner Spending

- Contracted Community Partners (45.52%)
- Transportation (19.55%)
- Student Mentors (17.11%)
- Social/Emotional Developmental Training (10.41%)
- Program Supplies (7.42%)

Value of shared and inkind services for each community partner

- Supplies/Materials: $1,807
- Office Coordination: $1,000
- Equity Center Staff Coordination: $1,367
- Training and Development: $7,934
- Stipends/Wages: $6,900
- Transportation: $4,646

Average contract payment to community partner: $6,900

New community partners registered as suppliers within UVA: 19

Student mentors from middle school (2), high school (1), and University (10) employed: 13
ENDNOTES


