

Addendum to New York State's 21st Century Community Learning Centers Evaluation Manual Updated January 23, 2020

Joint Responsibilities Between Local Evaluator and Program Administration

These responsibilities, and required or recommended supporting documents to be used to demonstrate the program's compliance with these responsibilities, are spelled out in the most recent Site Monitoring Visit Report Template (posted on the NYS 21st CCLC website at <http://www.nys21cclc.org/program-resources/forms/>).

- Evaluability is established and maintained through active collaboration between program manager(s) and the local evaluator. The logic model is reviewed at least annually and updated as needed.
- Ongoing communication with local program evaluator(s) is maintained including attendance and participation in the Advisory group (also called an Advisory Council, Advisory Board, etc.)
- Students' satisfaction and perception of program impact is formally assessed at least once annually for all participants at each program site. (See *Requirements for Student Surveys*, below.)

State-specific APR reporting requirements

- One day of participation is defined as three hours. An activity lasting more than three hours is counted proportionally as more than one day, while an activity lasting less than three hours is counted as a fraction of a day.
- A "family member" can include any adult who plays an important role in the child's life. That person does not need to be in the same household.
- NYS programs do not use feeder schools; every school is either a partner school to the CBO sub-grantee or there is an LEA sub-grantee program site.
- Collaboration includes joint planning and decision making.
- NYSED's definition of a "partner" may be a CBO partnering with an LEA sub-grantee or an LEA partnering with a CBO sub-grantee. A "partner," as distinguished from a "vendor," is an entity that collaborates with the sub-grantee in program planning and decision-making. A vendor is an entity that enters into a contract with the sub-grantee to provide goods and/or services but is not a primary collaborator.
- NYS currently uses the State English Language Arts (ELA) and Math exams as the measure of student achievement for all sub-grantees. In addition, for sub-grantees not located in New York City, NYS also uses report card grades as an additional measure of student achievement.

Requirements for Annual Evaluation Reports (AERs)

As of Year 2 (Program Year 2018-2019), all AERs are required to comply with the format, as well as the content, specified in the “Year 2 Annual Evaluation Report Template - Year 2” that was circulated on June 19, 2019 and posted on the NYS 21st CCLC website (<http://www.nys21cclc.org/program-resources/professional-development-materials/evaluation-materials/>). A slightly modified version of this template will be circulated in advance of the Year 3 reports.

Requirements for Student Surveys

NYSED has decided that the Short-term Student Outcomes Survey (SSOS) is no longer required for any sub-grantees, and the State will no longer collect a sample of these surveys from selected sites. However, because students are the primary beneficiaries of 21st CCLC program services, NYSED has determined that evaluators are still required to administer either the SSOS or another student survey of their choice to inform local program evaluations, including objectives for social-emotional learning. Such surveys can also be useful for cross-validating or supplementing federal outcome indicators, as an opportunity to provide students with “meaningful involvement in program planning and design,” as specified in the RFP, and for informing continuous program improvement, consistent with the QSA process. Quality standards for alternate surveys, discussed under *Requirements for all major data collection instruments*, below, must be adhered to.

Exceptions

In the case of populations (notably early childhood grades) for which age- and content-appropriate surveys are not realistic, for the 2017-18 program year, it is highly recommended that input from these participants be obtained through other means, such as observations and/or focus group interviews.

Beginning in the 2018-19 program year, data collection on these populations through one of the above methods will become a requirement.

Requirements for Program Observations

As described in the evaluation manual, the second annual required site visit per program site is for the purpose of assessing ‘point of service’ quality of program activities. It is strongly recommended that the research-based OST (Out of School Time) Observation Instrument, cited in the manual, be used for this purpose. If there is a compelling need to use a different instrument – for example, if the grantee already has an established observation process that would make implementation of the OST redundant – an alternative observation protocol may be used. Observations must use a structured observation protocol, and quality standards for alternate observation protocols, discussed under *Requirements for all major data collection instruments*, below, must be adhered to.

Requirements for all major data collection instruments that are locally-selected or locally-developed

While no specific psychometric criteria are currently established for selection or creation of alternate surveys or observation protocols, careful consideration should be given to the AEA evaluation principles reproduced in the Evaluation Manual, including but not limited to: adherence to high technical standards, exploration of the shortcomings and strengths of the instruments, respect for differences

among participants, and consideration of the possibility of producing misleading conclusions. It is recommended that published, validated instruments be used wherever possible if an appropriate instrument can be identified. In choosing or creating instruments, local evaluators should assume responsibility for ensuring the technical quality of the instrument, but should confer with program staff to ensure that the instrument is appropriate to use with the target population, and that it has face validity for assessing their local objectives.

Evaluators will be required to submit sample questions from, or attach copies of any alternate instruments they use in an appendix of the Annual Evaluation Report. In the body of the report, they will be required to make a case for the appropriateness and consistency with AEA principles of any key instruments that were locally selected or developed, and to comment on how useful the instruments proved to be in informing program improvement and local evaluation objectives.

Modifications to the Evaluability Process

In response to suggestions from the field, NYSED had re-examined expectations for the Evaluability Process and submission of the Evaluability Checklist. A new requirement for the July/August Advisory meeting agenda is the reassessment of the program logic model, and the adoption of any revisions agreed upon by all stakeholders. This annual logic model updating is now required in lieu of the annual submission of the Evaluability Checklist, which is now only required in the first year of the five year funding cycle.

New Federal Vendor for APR Data

The 21APR system, managed by the Tactile Group, has replaced the Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS) as the system that collects APR program data from sub-grantees for reporting to the U.S. Department of Education.

Data for Addressing GPRA Indicators on Student Achievement

NYSED currently requires reporting of ELA and Math assessment scores to assess student achievement outcomes. In addition, NYSED currently requires reporting of report card grades for sub-grantees not located in New York City. Due to barriers experienced in obtaining report card grades in NYC, NYSED is no longer able to require NYC sub-grantees to report this data.

Reporting Student Attendance

Annual reporting of student program attendance, a requirement stated in the original RFP for program sub-grantees, is primarily the responsibility of program administration, but is often supported by the local evaluator, depending on the sub-grantee's evaluation contract. Attendance must be reported annually on the student attendance roster, which is distributed by MI each year in early to mid-June, to be completed by July 15. Instructions for accessing and completing the most recent roster (for program Year 2) was provided in a joint memorandum from Elizabeth Whipple and the State Evaluation Team circulated on June 11, 2019. A slightly modified roster, with improvements recommended by an advisory group of evaluators and program administrators, will be provided for Year 3 attendance records. These rosters are used to determine whether programs are meeting their attendance targets (as described in the RFP), and beginning in Year 2, will be used to support the assessment of statewide program objectives. For this reasons, also beginning in Year 2, student ID codes must be provided for all students who have an official district or state ID. Nevertheless, to protect privacy, students for whom district regulations regarding parental consent have not been met will not be included in the analyses.