



NYS 21st CCLC Updates and Clarifications for Year 3 Annual Evaluation Reports – February 11, 2020

This document will serve as a reminder to sub-grantees and evaluators of the anticipated minor changes and clarifications that the New York State Education Department and the Statewide Evaluator, Measurement Incorporated, are providing for the Year 3 Annual Evaluation Reports (AERs). These changes are implemented in response to conversations at the November 2019 Evaluators' Networking meeting in Albany, as well as reviews of the Year 2 AERs. Most of these changes were previously described in an email from MI sent to all program directors and evaluators on January 22, 2020. Additions to that email are highlighted below.

Changes and clarifications to the AER template will include, but may not be limited to, the following:

Overall Level of detail:

Results can be reported primarily at the consortium level; however, if there is a lot of variation in results among sites, or if there are one or more "outlier" sites that do not fit the consortium level summary, these variations should be reported. In addition, if different assessments are used at different sites, please label the assessments to reflect this.

Evaluation Design:

As discussed at previous Evaluators' Network meetings, goals and Performance Indicators (PIs) can (and should) be modified, with a program modification approval from NYSED, if the original goals do not meet "SMART" criteria.¹ If any goals, objectives or indicators have been modified since the previous AER, they should be labeled as such on the Table for Goals and Objectives in the Evaluation Plan (Section II).

Make sure that assessments of whether PIs were met are aligned with how the PI is defined. (For example, if the PI specifies improvement, it is not sufficient to report only on end-of-year performance.)

Any PIs from the prior year that could not be reported in that year's AER due to pending data must now be reported in a new subsection that will be added to the Table for Goals and Objectives.

Previously, evaluators were asked in an optional section to report any limitations of the evaluation design and describe if and how they were addressed. This discussion, if applicable, will now be required.

Logic Models:

There was concern that the sample logic model that was included in past AER guides/templates was too basic and did not provide the best exemplar. A better exemplar showing the details of a complete logic model will be included for Year 3.

¹ S=specific; M=measurable; A=achievable (realistic); R=relevant; T=time-bound.





Engagement and Communication:

On the evaluators' recommendation, this section will be removed, and has now been added to the program directors' mid-year reports instead.²

Conclusions and Recommendations:

This section should include:

- a summary of the status of the implementation of recommendations from the previous year;
- the perceived impacts of implementing recommendations from the previous year, if applicable;
- conclusions and recommendations based on the current year's evaluation findings; and
- conclusions and recommendations based on findings from prior year evaluation activities that could not previously be addressed due to pending data, if applicable (see above).

Appendices:

The Year 2 instructions stated that, "Full, tabulated results of any quantitative assessment tools" must be included in the appendices. This is especially important in relation to assessments that were used to determine achievement of objectives.

For those who may be concerned that such data-heavy appendices would be overwhelming to their client, the optional *Comments* sections can be used to provide a narrative summary, graphics, etc. as desired to better address their client's needs.

² A separate email containing important information about the Mid-Year Reports, including a link to the form that will be used to complete the reports, was sent by EMSC to all Program Directors on February 6, 2020. The Mid-year Report is due March 31, 2020.