

**Evaluability Checklist**

**Required Information** of the Program Leader & Local Evaluator completing this process:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Lead Agency | Name |
| Project Number (subgrantee ID) | 018-7-23-XXXX |
| Program Director/Manager | Name |
| Local Evaluator & Company | Name, Company |

**Instructions for Completion** & **Submission**:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **🞎** | Read the purpose, process guidance, and submission details on page 2. |
| **🞎** | Follow the guidance by reviewing each item in the three-stage process, determining the mutual agreement, and co-signing the final page. |
| **🞎** | Save the completed, signed document as:  Agency Name-Evaluability Checklist |
| **🞎** | Email the doc as a PDF to the NYSED Program Office  Address: EMSC21STCCLC@nysed.gov  Subject Line specifying **one** of the following three determinations:  0187-23-XXXX.Agency Name.Evaluability Checklist.**COMPLETED**  0187-23-XXXX.Agency Name.Evaluability Checklist.**IN PROGRESS-NO TA**  0187-23-XXXX.Agency Name.Evaluability Checklist.**IN PROGRESS-YES TA** |

**Evaluability Checklist**

For **Program Leaders, Program Management Teams (PMTs)**

and **Local Evaluators**

**Purpose of Evaluability for Year 1**

This checklist outlines the required, three-stage evaluability process, identifying items to review that can help organize and guide the collaborative efforts of Local Evaluators and Program Leaders. It is a process informed by NYS Local Evalautors**1** intended to support the establishment of effective practices for high quality 21CCLC evaluation, as described in the grant. Program Leaders and Evaluators can develop their own plan and activities to prepare for an effective evaluation, while **including** these evaluability items within their process.

**Process Guidance**

Program Leaders and the Local Evaluator can progress through this process at any time during the first 4-5 months and decide how they want to engage in it as partners/collaborators. Partners are invited to review each item on the list together and come to agreement about whether that item is **complete/present** (**Done**), or still **in progress** (**Not Yet**). If an item is not done yet, partners are advised to focus attention on that evaluability item and work to complete it before December 31, which is midway through the program year. There are boxes provided at the bottom of each Stage; these can be used to capture important notes or action steps related to any items that are still in progress.

**Agreement about Status of Completion** & **Submission Requirements**

By **December 31**, Program Leaders and the Evaluator are required to agree on the status of their progress. The Checklist needs to be signed at the bottom, on page 6, by both the Program Director and the Local Evaluator to show there was mutual agreement about the level of evaluability. They will then select either 🗹 The process has been **Fully Completed**, or 🗹 The process is still **In Progress**. If the Process is still in progress – meaning one or multiple items have not been completed by December 31 – they can either make a request for Technical Assistance (see, below), or commit to completing the items in a timely way that will allow the evaluation to proceed. Programs are instructed to save the signed, up-to-date record of the Evaluability Checklist, and submit it to the NYSED Program Office.

**Technical Assistance Request**

**Completion of items on the Evaluability Checklist is NOT used as an assessment of grant compliance**. This co-created record indicates where each program is within the evaluability process, and whether a program may require additional support. Programs that submit the Evaluability Checklist with items that are still in progress AND mark the box requesting Technical Assistance will be reviewed by the Program Office and matched with a state-level TA provider. Assistance will be provided by a member of the regional Resource Center, in consultation with the Statewide Evaluator.

**1** The **Network of Local Evaluators serving Round 7 NYS 21CCLC programs** contributed key insights to this guidance, describing the useful practices that support effective partnership for participatory, formative & summative evaluation. They highlighted the value of collaborative design & planning, continuous communication, and establishing practical, coordinated data collection systems with program leaders early in the grant cycle.

**Stage 1. Collaborative Planning**

The Local Evaluator and Program Leaders meet to review program goals, to create or revise the program logic model/theory of change, and to arrive at a mutual agreement about how the evaluation will proceed.

**Recommendation from the NYS 21CCLC Program Office**. Leaders are encouraged to consider engaging Advisory Board members in the Collaborative Planning process outlined in Stage 1. A possible way to do this would be to (a) create a discussion item on the agenda for the next/initial Board meeting, (b) share relevant materials to review in advance, and (c) invite members to ask questions and offer input on any of the products requiring mutual agreement between the Program and the Local Evaluator.

Useful items to have available: Grant Proposal, drafted Logic Model/Theory of Action, drafted Year 1 Program Implementation Plan, Local Program Evaluation Framework & Timeline, 21CCLC Program Timeline for Year 1, Advisory Board guidance memo.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Evaluability Item | **DONE** | **NOT YET** |
| **1** | **SMART Performance Indicators** are present and mutually agreed upon  The program’s overarching goals and objectives, listed in the Template of Goals and Objectives, are clear and make it possible to develop Performance Indicators. These Indicators meet **SMART criteria**:   * Specific - focused and discrete so it can be isolated for measurement. * Measurable - evidence is reliably available & practical to gather. * Attainable – can be reasonably accomplished within the scheduled timeframe. * Relevant – aligns with long-term goals AND clearly reflects the program’s mission and values shared by stakeholders. * Time-bound – has a clear start point and end point. | **⭘** | **⭘** |
|  |
| **2** | **Model/Map accurately describing Program Logic** is present and mutually agreed upon  Reviewing the Core Program Services described in the grant proposal. These are the foundational services designed to meet the participant & community needs identified in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment.   * Program Activities for students, families and adult learners defined in the Year 1 Program Implementation Plan directly align with these core services. * These activities can be linked through clear, connective/causal pathways to the outcomes, or Performance Indicators, they are intended to change. * This program logic is mapped and displayed in a visual representation as either a Logic Model or Theory of Change. * Mechanisms are in place to record any changes that occur to the designed program logic over the course of Year 1 implementation. This information will be used to update the models/maps ahead of the start of Year 2. | **⭘** | **⭘** |
|  |
| **3** | **Evaluation Plan** is present and mutually agreed upon   * Evaluation Plan measures Performance Indicators using valid & reliable methods. * Evaluation Plan aligns with the Program Logic Model/Theory of Change. * Evaluation Plan aligns with the required activities and deliverables listed on the Local Program Evaluation Framework and Timeline. * Evaluation Plan includes a Data Collection Schedule and set of procedures that Program Leaders agree to, and will help facilitate, as needed. | **⭘** | **⭘** |
|  |
| **4** | **Communication Plan** is present and mutually agreed upon  This is a set of clearly defined expectations/agreements outlining the bidirectional (flowing both ways) communication channels/modes available for active, ongoing contact and information exchange throughout the year. It can be integrated into the Evaluation Plan, contract of services, or it can exist as a stand-alone document.  Core components of a strong Communication Plan include:   * Multiple, identified Points of Contact - people designated to send and receive messages relevant to the ongoing evaluation. This way, if contact points change, there are other people to connect with and continuity in communication can be maintained. * Protocols and protections for securely sharing sensitive information. | **⭘** | **⭘** |
|  |
| **5** | **Advisory Board** has been established in ways that adhere to NYSED’s requirements and recommendations  These recommendations & requirements are described in the grant and further clarified in the NYSED 21CCLC Advisory Board Memo. | **⭘** | **⭘** |
|  |

*Notes/Action Steps about items in progress*.

**Stage 2. First Site Visit: Readiness Review** & **Walkthrough**

The Local Evaluator and Program Leaders schedule the **First Site Visit** to review installation activities and check readiness factors. Evaluators can observe early program implementation efforts, if possible. This is a **collaborative, interactive experience** where information is exchanged, questions are explored, and shared learning occurs.

Useful items to have available: Grant Proposal, Logic Model/Theory of Action, Year 1 Program Implementation Plan, Local Program Evaluation Framework & Timeline, 21CCLC Program Timeline for Year 1, Advisory Board guidance memo, Activity/Lesson Plan, and an observational walkthrough tool.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Evaluability Item | **DONE** | **NOT YET** |
| **1** | **Program Activities are ready to be implemented** as designed   * Operational Plans, Timelines & Site-level logistics are complete and available. * Program Handbook and Safety Procedures are complete and available. * Staff have been hired and are prepared to deliver service. * Education Liaison has been selected, prepared to perform in their role, and provided a clear set of operating procedures/practices. * Partnering Agencies have been prepared and have a clear plan detailing how they will contribute their services. | **⭘** | **⭘** |
|  |
| **2** | **Data Collection & Information Management mechanisms/practices** have been installed   * Data Manager is prepared to carry out their role, with clear procedures detailing how, when, and where to collect, enter and store program data for statewide reporting, internal monitoring, and local evaluation. * Staff are informed and prepared to contribute to key information gathering and reporting processes. * Parental permissions have been requested and obtained to allow for the gathering and reporting of student-level data. | **⭘** | **⭘** |
|  |

*Notes/Action Steps about items in progress*.

**Stage 3. Formative Findings Report**

Following the Visit, Program Leaders and Evaluators will engage in a rapid cycle feedback process, wherein the Evaluator communicates a summary of salient findings and actionable recommendations within 1-2 weeks after the visit. Program Leaders receive and review with their Program Management Teams, clarify/inquire into the findings, as needed, and incorporate key takeaways into program improvement.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Evaluability Item | **DONE** | **NOT YET** |
| **1** | Local Evaluator’s **Findings Report** has been delivered to the program | **⭘** | **⭘** |
| **2** | Program received report recommendations and **integrated them into continuous improvement plans** | **⭘** | **⭘** |

*Notes/Action Steps about items in progress*.

**Review of Checklist** & **Agreement about Status of Completion**

After completing this Evaluability Process together, we agree with the following assessment:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **🞎** | The Process is **Fully Completed**. Each item on the checklist is DONE. Therefore, the program meets the requisite criteria for evaluability. |
| **🞎** | The Process is still **In Progress**. At least one item on the checklist has yet to be completed. Therefore, the program meets some, but not all, of the requisite criteria for evaluability. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **🞎** | **Technical Assistance from a state-level provider is requested** to support the program in completion of remaining evaluability items. |
| **🞎** | **Technical Assistance from a state-level provider is NOT requested.** The program leadership feels confident they can complete the remaining evaluability items. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| Program Director’s Signature | Date |
|  |  |
| Local Program Evaluator’s Signature | Date |