Year 2 (2018-2019) 21CCLC Annual Evaluation Report

Purpose of this Document

This Year 2 Annual Evaluation Report (AER) Template and Guide for evaluators of local 21st CCLC programs was developed at the request of the **State Program Coordinator.**

It is recognized, as stated in the Evaluation Manual, that "Evaluation first and foremost should be useful to the program managers at all levels of the system…" and that "The Annual Report's primary function is to present findings on the degree to which…objectives were met." The Evaluation Manual further specifies that the AER should report on the study methodology, findings, and recommendations and conclusions.

While these represent the report's "primary" functions, they do not reflect its only purpose. The AER also serves – along with other data sources – to inform NYSED Project Managers, Resource Center support specialists, and the Statewide Evaluator about program performance and accomplishments, which help guide the monitoring review and technical assistance processes. Indeed, many of the components of this report are directly aligned with NYSED policies and program expectations that are the focus of the monitoring visits that all programs receive. These alignments are highlighted throughout this template with references to **required indicators and evidence** in the revised Site Monitoring Visit Report ("SMV Report").[1] Because NYSED and the Resource Centers review a program's AERs before each visit, information provided in this report that aligns with those indicators can be used to fulfill the documentation requirements of these visits.

Additional purposes of this report include helping to inform NYSED and the State Evaluator about trends across sub-grantees, which help to guide NYSED's policy decisions, as well as its mandated reporting to the U.S. Department of Education. In short, the AER supports program improvement at both the state and local levels, and contributes to evidence that the federal government needs to make funding decisions.

[1] Retrieved from http://www.p12.nysed.gov/sss/documents/21C%20Onsite%20Monitoring%20Report%202017-19.doc.

For all of these reasons, the information requested herein should be of interest to all stakeholders, and is consistent with that required by the **Evaluation Manual** [1] per the **Request for Proposals** for local program funding,[2] as well as **State monitoring guidelines**.[3]

The purpose of this report guide and template is to clearly identify, and to organize within a consistent structure, the information that is necessary for each of the above stakeholders. The template has been designed with the varying needs of these different stakeholders in mind. It is designed to strike a compromise between the brevity and accessibility that program managers require, and the depth of detail that state and federal stakeholders require. Summaries or graphics that would be useful to program staff can always be included within or appended at the end of each section.

Please contact the State Evaluation Team at Measurement Incorporated with any questions. Thank you for your cooperation.

New York State 21st CCLC State Evaluation Team

Jonathan Tunik, Project Director
Lily Corrigan, Project Associate
Nora Phelan, Project Assistant
Dr. Nina Gottlieb, Senior Research Consultant
21CEval@measinc.com | 1-800-330-1420 x203

[1] "New York State's 21st Century Community Learning Centers Evaluation Manual." Retrieved from: http://www.p12.nysed.gov/sss/21stCCLC/NYSEvaluationManual.pdf
[2] Retrieved from http://www.p12.nysed.gov/funding/2017-2022-21st-cclc/2017-2022-21st-cclc-grant-application.pdf.
[3] As outlined in New York State's revised 21st CCLC "Site Visit Monitoring Report," cited above.

Table of Contents

I. Project Information

Program Name	
Project Number	0187-19- __ __ __ __
Name of Lead Agency	
Name of Program Director	
Name(s) of Participating Site(s) and grade level(s) served at each site	Site 1: ______________________ Grade(s) Served: ______________ Site 2: ______________________ Grade(s) Served: ______________ Site 3: ______________________ Grade(s) Served: ______________ Site 4: ______________________ Grade(s) Served: ______________ Site 5: ______________________ Grade(s) Served: ______________ Site 6: ______________________ Grade(s) Served: ______________ Site 7: ______________________ Grade(s) Served: ______________ Site 8: ______________________ Grade(s) Served: ______________ Site 9: ______________________ Grade(s) Served: ______________ Site 10: ______________________ Grade(s) Served: ______________
Evaluator Name and Company	
Evaluator Phone and Email	

II. Evaluation Plan & Year 2 Results

- Use the tables below to identify your program objectives, performance indicators (PIs) of success, evaluation and measurement plan, and results of y analysis for Year 2.
- Add rows, and copy and paste the sections provided below, as many times as needed in order to accommodate all of your program's objectives and
- **Note**: This table is derived from the Template of Goals & Objectives submitted with the grant. If the activities and measurability of the PIs indicate a plan, then this completed table may be used by grantees as evidence to support compliance with SMV Indicator E-3(a): "Adherence to the Program's aligns with the ***Template for Goals and Objectives*** as it appears in proposal and/or *NYSED-approved* program modifications".
- If you have an existing table that includes some of the information below, you may copy and paste it at the end of this section or attach as an appenc *appended table(s)* by writing "See Appendix X" or "See table below" in the appropriate columns, and *completing all additional columns* that require in original table(s).

Objective 1: 21st CCLCs will offer a range of high-quality educational, developmental, and recreational services for students and their families.

Sub-Objective 1.1: Core educational services. 100% of Centers will offer high quality services in core academic areas, e.g., reading and literacy, mathematics, and science.

Program Objective 1.1-1 (specify):

Performance Indicator(s) (PI) of success	**Target Population(s)**[1]	**PI Meets SMART Criteria?**[2] **(Y/N)**	**Activity(ies) to support this program objective**[3]	**PI Measures** data collection instruments & methods[4] (Indicate title if published)	**Describe the analysis conducted, including specific results that directly address the PI.** Include any longitudinal assessments conducted beyond one program year.	**Response Rate**[5] (if applicable):	**Was this PI Met (Yes, No, Partial**[6]**, Data Pending, Not Measured)**
						# in Pop: ___ # w data: ___	
						# in Pop: ___ # w data: ___	

[1] Students, parents, staff; grade levels, sub-groups [e.g. special education], specific activity participants, etc. as applicable.
[2] "SMART" = **Specific:** targets a specific area of improvement; **Measurable:** has a defined target that can be assessed (can include qualitative assessment); **Achievable:** realistic given baseline conditions and State Evaluator to assess]; **Relevant:** aligned to program mission, program activities, school day academics, GPRA indicators, etc.; **Time-bound:** specifies when the goal will be achieved [most will be annual].
[3] List activity titles, or attach a list (in any format) as an appendix, and reference here.
[4] E.g. surveys, observations, interviews, focus groups, report cards, attendance rosters, behavior/disciplinary records, state assessments, other skills assessments, etc.
[5] **Response rate** is defined as the number of respondents for whom data/information was obtained, divided by the total number in the target population.
[6] A designation of "Partial" can only be used to indicate that a Performance Indicator (PI) was met in at least one site, but not at all sites.

Sub-Objective 1.2: **Enrichment and support activities.** 100% of Centers will offer enrichment and youth development activities such as nutrition and health, art, music, technology and recre							
Program Objective 1.2-1 (specify):							
Performance Indicator(s) (PI) of success	**Target Population(s)**[1]	**PI Meets SMART Criteria?**[2] **(Y/N)**	**Activity(ies) to support this program objective**[3]	**PI Measures** data collection instruments & methods[4] (Indicate title if published)	**Describe the analysis conducted, including specific results that directly address the PI.** Include any longitudinal assessments conducted beyond one program year.	**Response Rate**[5] (if applicable):	**Was this PI Met (Yes, No, Partial**[6]**, Data Pending, Not Measured)**
						# in Pop: ___ # w data: ___	
						# in Pop: ___ # w data: ___	

Sub-Objective 1.3: Community Involvement. 100% of Centers will establish and maintain partnerships within the community that continue to increase levels of community collaboration in p							
Program Objective 1.3-1 (specify):							
Performance Indicator(s) (PI) of success	**Target Population(s)**[1]	**PI Meets SMART Criteria?**[2] **(Y/N)**	**Activity(ies) to support this program objective**[3]	**PI Measures** data collection instruments & methods[4] (Indicate title if published)	**Describe the analysis conducted, including specific results that directly address the PI.** Include any longitudinal assessments conducted beyond one program year.	**Response Rate**[5] (if applicable):	**Was this PI Met (Yes, No, Partial**[6]**, Data Pending, Not Measured)**
						# in Pop: ___ # w data: ___	
						# in Pop: ___ # w data: ___	

[1] Students, parents, staff; grade levels, sub-groups [e.g. special education], specific activity participants, etc. as applicable.
[2] "SMART" = **Specific:** targets a specific area of improvement; **Measurable:** has a defined target that can be assessed (can include qualitative assessment); **Achievable:** realistic given baseline conditions and State Evaluator to assess]; **Relevant:** aligned to program mission, program activities, school day academics, GPRA indicators, etc.; **Time-bound:** specifies when the goal will be achieved [most will be annual].
[3] List activity titles, or attach a list (in any format) as an appendix, and reference here.
[4] E.g. surveys, observations, interviews, focus groups, report cards, attendance rosters, behavior/disciplinary records, state assessments, other skills assessments, etc.
[5] **Response rate** is defined as the number of respondents for whom data/information was obtained, divided by the total number in the target population.
[6] A designation of "Partial" can only be used to indicate that a Performance Indicator (PI) was met in at least one site, but not at all sites.
[7] Note that this table might serve as a supplemental source of evidence documenting activities to engage and communicate with families, helping support grantees' compliance with Indicators in SMV Section G

Sub-Objective 1.4: Services to parents and other adult community members. 100% of Centers will offer services to parents of participating children.[1]

Program Objective 1.4-1 (specify):

Performance Indicator(s) (PI) of success	**Target Population(s)**[2]	**PI Meets SMART Criteria?**[3] **(Y/N)**	**Activity(ies) to support this program objective**[4]	**PI Measures** data collection instruments & methods[5] (Indicate title if published)	**Describe the analysis conducted, including specific results that directly address the PI.** Include any longitudinal assessments conducted beyond one program year.	**Response Rate**[6] (if applicable):	**Was this PI Met (Yes, No, Partial**[7]**, Data Pending, Not Measured)**
						# in Pop: ___ # w data: ___	
						# in Pop: ___ # w data: ___	

Sub-Objective 1.5: Extended hours. More than 75% of Centers will offer services at least 15 hours a week on average and provide services when school is not in session, such as during th

Program Objective 1.5-1 (specify):

Performance Indicator(s) (PI) of success	**Target Population(s)**[2]	**PI Meets SMART Criteria?**[3] **(Y/N)**	**Activity(ies) to support this program objective**[4]	**PI Measures** data collection instruments & methods[5] (Indicate title if published)	**Describe the analysis conducted, including specific results that directly address the PI.** Include any longitudinal assessments conducted beyond one program year.	**Response Rate**[6] (if applicable):	**Was this PI Met (Yes, No, Partial**[7]**, Data Pending, Not Measured)**
						# in Pop: ___ # w data: ___	
						# in Pop: ___ # w data: ___	

[1] Note that this table might serve as a supplemental source of evidence documenting “Adult Learning Opportunities” helping to support grantees’ compliance with SMV Indicator G-8(d).
[2] Students, parents, staff; grade levels, sub-groups [e.g. special education], specific activity participants, etc. as applicable.
[3] "SMART" = **Specific:** targets a specific area of improvement; **Measurable:** has a defined target that can be assessed (can include qualitative assessment); **Achievable:** realistic given baseline conditions and State Evaluator to assess]; **Relevant:** aligned to program mission, program activities, school day academics, GPRA indicators, etc.; **Time-bound:** specifies when the goal will be achieved [most will be annual].
[4] List activity titles, or attach a list (in any format) as an appendix, and reference here.
[5] E.g. surveys, observations, interviews, focus groups, report cards, attendance rosters, behavior/disciplinary records, state assessments, other skills assessments, etc.
[6] **Response rate** is defined as the number of respondents for whom data/information was obtained, divided by the total number in the target population.
[7] A designation of “Partial” can only be used to indicate that a Performance Indicator (PI) was met in at least one site, but not at all sites.

Objective 2: Participants of 21st CCLC Programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.

Sub-Objective 2.1: Achievement. Students regularly participating in the program will show continuous improvement in achievement through measures such as test scores, grades and/or tea

Program Objective 2.1-1 (specify):

Performance Indicator(s) (PI) of success	**Target Population(s)**[1]	**PI Meets SMART Criteria?**[2] **(Y/N)**	**Activity(ies) to support this program objective**[3]	**PI Measures** data collection instruments & methods[4] (Indicate title if published)	**Describe the analysis conducted, including specific results that directly address the PI.** Include any longitudinal assessments conducted beyond one program year.	**Response Rate**[5] (if applicable):	**Was this PI Met (Yes, No, Partial,[6] Data Pending, Not Measured)**
						# in Pop: ___ # w data: ___	
						# in Pop: ___ # w data: ___	

Sub-Objective 2.2: Behavior. Regular attendees in the program will show continuous improvements on measures such as school attendance, classroom performance and decreased discipli

Program Objective 2.2-1 (specify):

Performance Indicator(s) (PI) of success	**Target Population(s)**[1]	**PI Meets SMART Criteria?**[2] **(Y/N)**	**Activity(ies) to support this program objective**[3]	**PI Measures** data collection instruments & methods[4] (Indicate title if published)	**Describe the analysis conducted, including specific results that directly address the PI.** Include any longitudinal assessments conducted beyond one program year.	**Response Rate**[5] (if applicable):	**Was this PI Met (Yes, No, Partial[6], Data Pending, Not Measured)**
						# in Pop: ___ # w data: ___	
						# in Pop: ___ # w data: ___	

[1] Students, parents, staff; grade levels, sub-groups [e.g. special education], specific activity participants, etc. as applicable.
[2] "SMART" = **Specific:** targets a specific area of improvement; **Measurable:** has a defined target that can be assessed (can include qualitative assessment); **Achievable:** realistic given baseline conditions and State Evaluator to assess]; **Relevant:** aligned to program mission, program activities, school day academics, GPRA indicators, etc.; **Time-bound:** specifies when the goal will be achieved [most will be annual].
[3] List activity titles, or attach a list (in any format) as an appendix, and reference here.
[4] E.g. surveys, observations, interviews, focus groups, report cards, attendance rosters, behavior/disciplinary records, state assessments, other skills assessments, etc.
[5] **Response rate** is defined as the number of respondents for whom data/information was obtained, divided by the total number in the target population.
[6] A designation of "Partial" can only be used to indicate that a Performance Indicator (PI) was met in at least one site, but not at all sites.

(Optional): Additional comments on evaluation plan and Year 2 PI results. Include a discussion of any particular strengths or limitations of above assessments, and describe any efforts to minimize limitations

III. Observation Results

In this section you are asked to provide data and findings from each of the two required annual evaluator visits per site, as specified in the Evaluation Manual. The specified purposes of these visits include:

First visit: to observe program implementation fidelity
Second visit: to conduct point of service quality reviews.

- First visit: Append observation protocol results.[1] Alternatively, you can paste on this page any summaries of findings on **fidelity to program design** from the first required visit.

Please specify approximate date(s) of *first* round of Year 2 observations (MM/YY): ________________________________

Results:

[1] Copies of completed site observation protocols and/or other site visit summaries should be provided to program managers as a source of required supporting evidence to meet compliance for SMV Indicator H-1(c), "evidence of two site visits per site."

- Second visit: Append observation protocol results,[1] or paste on this page, any summaries of findings on **point of service quality review observations** from the second observation conducted as part of the program evaluation.

Please specify approximate date(s) of *second* round of Year 2 observations (MM/YY): ___________________________________

- Observation protocol used for point of service observations:[2]
  - ❒ Out of School Time (OST) Protocol
  - ❒ Modified Out of School Time (OST) Protocol
  - ❒ Other observation protocol (attach sample in Appendix, or if published, indicate name): ______________________________________

Results:

[1] Copies of completed site observation protocols and/or other site visit summaries should be provided to program managers as a source of required supporting evidence to meet compliance for SMV Indicator H-1(c), "evidence of two site visits per site."

[2] Note: As specified in SMV Indicator D-3, grantees are also required to conduct program activity implementation reviews, using a form consistent with the research-based OST observation instrument. Evidence of the activities specified in Indicator D-3 [see D-3(a) and (b)] can be strengthened if the evaluator and grantee collaborate on learning from the findings of these similar point-of-service observations and grantee quality reviews.

IV. Logic Model (LM)

- This should represent the most up-to-date version, highlighting any modifications since the program began[1]. A simplified example of a program logic model template is provided below. For a more in depth description of the components included in a logic model, refer to the Evaluation Manual, Appendix 4: *The Logic Model Process Deconstructed* (p.8).
- The Logic Model should do more than simply list inputs, activities, outputs, etc.; it should depict how these components relate to each other (*e.g.,* which activities are supported by each particular input; which outcomes are expected to result from a particular activity; etc.).
- Short-term and long-term outcomes should align with described project goals.

Inputs	Activities (reference Section I)	Outputs	Short-term Outcomes	Long Term Outcomes/ Impacts
• *Resources* • *Staff* • *Facilities* • *Equipment* • *Funds*	• *Services for students* • *Services for family/ community members*	• *Number of students who received services* • *Number of family members who received services* • *Hours of activity provided*	• *Participating students increased targeted skills, knowledge, behavior, attitudes* • *Family members increased targeted skills, knowledge, attitudes*	• *Participating students: increased school attendance improved GPA/ exam scores decreased behavior incident reports*

COPY AND PASTE YOUR LOGIC MODEL HERE, using the above template as a guide.

- Use the space below to summarize any aspects of the LM that have changed since the prior program year,[2] or are still under development, and if so, why.

Comments:

[1] Note: the up-to-date/annually reviewed logic model is a piece of required documentation that all programs must be prepared to present in order to achieve full compliance for SMV Indicator H-2. (See SMV Indicator H-2(b).)

[2] Note that annual reviews of the logic model are required, as per SMV Indicator H-2(b).

V. Engagement & Communication

- Use the table below to describe the ongoing efforts you/ your team undertook (processes used and products created) to communicate formative and summative findings to program stakeholders.[1] Add additional rows as needed.

Type of communication	If this communication type was used, give a brief description	How often	**Which stakeholders received this communication or were included in this communication activity?** (program director, site director, community school director, front line staff, principal, evaluator, CBO partners, community members, parents, students, etc.)
Annual Evaluation Reports			
Interim Evaluation Reports			
Memos/Weekly or Monthly reports			
Advisory Group Meetings			
Other Meetings			
Email/phone			
Other (specify): ______________			

[1] Ongoing communication is a joint responsibility of the program manager and local evaluator in order for the grantee to meet full compliance. Required evidence of these activities is specified in SMV Indicator H-3(b) and (c). In addition, communication of evaluation findings to multiple stakeholders is required, as specified in SMV Indicator H-7.

- In the box below, describe any strategies used to help ensure that evaluation findings were used to inform program improvement.

(*Required*) To your knowledge, were evaluation findings and recommendations used for program improvement?[1] (Y/N) ____ If YES, describe how.

[1] Data driven program improvement is a joint responsibility of the program manager and local evaluator in order for the grantee to meet full compliance. Required evidence of how "formative and summative evaluation findings are [being] used to inform continuous program improvement" is specified in SMV Indicator H-5(b).

VI. Conclusions & Recommendations

Program's successes and lessons learned based on your evaluation findings from Year 2.[1] (Include results of implementation of recommendations from Year 1, as applicable):

Key recommendations from Year 2 (including any relevant to other OST programs):[2]

[1] Note: as specified in SMV Indicator H-7, grantees are required to communicate evaluation findings to families and community stakeholders. Evidence of implementation of the activities specified in Indicator H-7(a) and (b) can be strengthened if the evaluator can help provide the grantee with a summary of sharable findings, such as reported in this summary.

[2] Note: As specified in SMV Indicator H-5(a), local evaluators are required to provide grantees with "Annual Evaluation Reports (AERs) that include actionable recommendations linked to key, implementation and impact evaluation findings."

VII. Appendices

Required:

- Copies of any *locally developed* measurement tools/assessments (surveys, observation tools, etc.)
- Full, tabulated results of any quantitative assessment tools (surveys,[1] observation protocols, skills assessments, etc.)

Optional:

- Sample of memo or weekly/monthly report used to share ongoing evaluation results/data with program[2]
- Any additional narrative, analysis, graphics or other information that did not fit into any section in this report that you would like to include

[1] Note: As specified in SMV Indicator H-4(a), local evaluators and program administrators are jointly responsible for administering annual surveys to student participants, and grantees are required to maintain documented evidence of this activity.
[2] Note: As specified in SMV Indicator H-3(b), local evaluators and program administrators are jointly responsible for maintaining ongoing communication with each other, and grantees are required to maintain documented evidence of this activity.