PURPOSE

All 21st CCLC programs are required to conduct an annual local independent evaluation of the program’s effectiveness and submit an annual evaluation report to the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). The purpose of the evaluation is to support continuous program improvement at the local level. The evaluation should measure progress in meeting the program goals and objectives, and progress in meeting the state and federal performance indicators, including progress in increasing student achievement and behavior that supports student success for at risk students.

This year, OSPI has revised the guidelines for the local evaluation reports with the assistance of American Institutes for Research (AIR) and the David P. Weikart Center for Youth Program Quality (Weikart Center). These revisions rely heavily upon information gathered from both project directors and local evaluators. These revisions presented here include the complete spectrum of intended changes; however OSPI is aware and respectful that the timing of these changes is somewhat less than ideal. As such, each change will include information on whether it is required or optional for the current program year. It is encouraged that optional changes be made during the current program year to the extent possible.

The local evaluation report guidelines are designed to provide a uniform framework for reporting the annual findings of the 21st CCLC projects. The intent of the guidelines is to increase the ease with which they can be read, and increase the interpretability of the reports, particularly by program managers. These guidelines are not standardized and not meant to be overly prescriptive. Flexibility is purposefully built into the guidelines so that projects can maintain responsive local evaluations that serve the needs of local projects.

The purpose of the revisions is to provide additional guidance around the structure of the report, while offering more flexibility to collect, analyze and report data that are most meaningful to the project and its stakeholders.

THEORY OF CHANGE

While federal policies and requirements are focused primarily on academic-related outcomes, which are indeed very important, OSPI understands that there may be more intermediary outcomes that are more directly influenced by participation in 21st CCLC programming. OSPI has prescribed to the following theory of change (Figure 1) as a way of thinking about how 21st CCLC program in Washington can have an impact on the students who attend those programs and is aligned with statewide evaluation goals and objectives.

*Figure 1*

Theory of Student Change Related to 21st CCLC Program Participation
However, this theory of change also offers more flexibility in how projects might think about the components of their local evaluation. The short-term outcomes box is more closely associated with the types of data currently collected as a part of both statewide and local evaluation efforts (MSP scores, teacher surveys, grades, attendance, etc.). Other areas in this theory of change may all be points of interest that projects may want to consider for their local evaluations.

GUIDELINES

PROCESS

The following guidelines deal with how the evaluations process, at minimum, should be conducted every year.

- Evaluators should meet with project directors prior to the program year to review the projects goals and objectives, review the logic model or theory of change (or develop one), review any drafts of last year’s evaluation report, and to set up the evaluation design for the upcoming program year.
  - This may include a discussion of any issues outside of the stated goals and objectives that the project director or evaluator thinks is important to examine.
  - Evaluators and project directors should visit the statewide leading indicators report to determine if there is any area of interest that would require further investigation during the upcoming program year.

- Evaluators should check in with project director at least twice a semester to discuss any issues or concerns, or anything new and interesting that may affect the evaluation. Regular check-in calls could also serve as a tool to flag any important adjustments that need to be made midway through the evaluation process.

- Evaluators should provide a draft of the local evaluation report to the project directors for review, allowing a chance to discuss any questions or concerns, as well as talk about recommendations for the upcoming year. Once the final report is submitted, evaluators should schedule a follow-up conversation to confirm all data collection plans and goals for the next program year. Evaluators might also schedule an on-site meeting with the project director and site staff to discuss the findings from the report and create an action/improvement plan for the next program year.

REPORT CONTENT

It is important that the report contains information on both implementation evaluation and outcome evaluation. The following are guidelines on the content of the report.

- Program Background/Context (required) – here it is important to set the stage for the purpose of the program using any relevant information that community stakeholders would find necessary to understand the findings in the rest of the report. This should generally cover why the program is important for the community and any substantial changes from the past year.
  - This could include a brief description of the community, including information about the demographics, and target population, and relevant community, school, and student characteristics (recommended).
  - It could also include a brief description of the day-to-day operation of the program and any events or special circumstances that will help to understand and interpret the findings. Examples include a change in superintendent, a new partner agency, significant job losses that year in the community, or changes to 21st CCLC staff (recommended).

- Presentation of Program Goals and Objectives (required) – explicitly describe the goals and objectives. These should be aligned with the goals and objectives as stated in the original grant application.
  - If goals and objectives have changed slightly over the course of the five-year grant period, describe those changes and the reason behind them (recommended).
  - This is also an opportunity to define any goals and objectives that were not originally part of the grant application. Consider diving deeper into what is important to stakeholders in the community, or examining an area from the Leading Indicators report produced from the statewide evaluation that you would like to know more about (recommended).
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• Theory of Change and/or Logic Model (required) – this should be the guiding framework for the evaluation and sets the tone of the report. How do the program goals and objectives fit inside the theory of change/logic model?

• Data Collection Methodology (required) – This section should describe the type of data collected (e.g., State Student Achievement Assessment Results, classroom based assessment results, grades, or parent interviews), how the data was collected, and the number (sample) involved.
  o For example, if State Student Achievement Assessment Results were used, one might obtain information on whether or not a student met standard by subject from the district or state database for those students participating a certain number of days in the program. Or, if parents were interviewed, parents may have participated in a brief interview conducted by volunteer staff, and a total of 40 parents were interviewed. These are examples only, meant to convey a range of possibilities for this section.
  o Note: Programs are encouraged to employ additional methods, such as querying parents, staff, and faculty, or conducting quality assessments of the program (recommended).

• Program Implementation Findings (required) – The extent to which the project is meeting its intended purposes should be described in detail. Is the program being implemented in a way that is true to the proposed criteria defined in the original grant application? If there have been adjustments to these criteria over the life cycle of the grant, how is the program faring?
  o Examples may include the extent to which the program is reaching its intended target population and the level of quality of the activities and services provided.
  o If the project participates in the YPQI process, fidelity to the components of the YPQI process (program assessment, data-driven planning, coaching/feedback loops, and professional development) should be mentioned here (required if a participant in YPQI).

• Program Impact Findings (required) – Impact findings should be related to the program goals and objectives and have been articulated in the project’s theory of change/logic model. This data may include student achievement scores on the MSP or grades, student behavior, attendance, grade promotion, social and emotional competency, parent involvement, parent satisfaction, program quality (including Youth PQA), etc.
  o An important note to remember is that we are trying to measure the program’s impact on these measures, not just simply present this information in a series of tables and graphs. How do we need to tweak our evaluation design to measure the program’s impact? (recommended)

• Discussion (required) – In this section, discuss the findings in light of the background/context information, detail whether or not goals and objectives of the program are being met, and describe progress in meeting student achievement/behavior outcomes. Summarize the program strengths and challenges.

• Recommendations (required) – The report should make specific recommendations for improvements in program quality and participant performance based on the evaluation findings. It should provide detailed recommendations for how the results of the local evaluation should be used for program improvement at the site and district or regional level.
  o Food for Thought: What recommendations would you make to next year’s evaluation questions and design based on this year’s report?

**REPORT FORMAT**

The narrative should be in 11 or 12 point font, and limited in length to no more than 20 pages. Projects with more than 5 centers may use a few more pages. Appendices may be included to add additional information. The report should also focus on the following criteria:

• Clarity of Presentation – Report should be organized; materials presented clearly, data collection procedures explained, recommendations aligned with the findings, and tables easy to follow.
  o One recommendation is that the report be organized by finding rather than by data source.
- Comprehensiveness of Content – Report should provide details on data collection processes, expand upon findings, and findings should be consistent with what was proposed.
- Relevance of Content to Goals and Objectives – Program findings contained in the report should be related to the program goals and objectives and should be defined by SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Timely) criteria.
- Rigor of Program Evidence – Report should contain information on how the evaluation design provided rigorous evidence of program implementation and outcomes, using reliable and valid measures, and using findings from multiple data sources. We must be very careful about drawing conclusions about the impact of the program on various outcome measures. We must be certain that our evaluation is rigorous enough to measure impact. A transparent discussion of rigor of program evidence is encouraged.

SAMPLE FRAMEWORK

Bullets are placed in each section to designate features each project may wish to address. Asterisks indicate required elements. Bullets not marked with an asterisk are examples of what could be included and do not necessarily appear in the guidelines above. Local evaluators may choose to include any combination of, but are not limited to, these bullets to tell the story of the program.

I. Background/Context*
   - Community Description
   - Project Vision
   - Mission
   - Characteristics of Population Served
   - Goals*
   - Objectives*
   - Theory of Change/Logic Model*

II. Project Description
   - Partnerships
   - Operations
   - Annual Schedule
   - Intensity and duration of services
   - Staffing
   - Activities
   - Feeder Schools

III. Data Collection Methodology*
   - Recruitment
   - Attendance/Retention of Students
   - Grades
   - Student Achievement Data
   - Observations of Student Behavior and Attitudes
   - Survey Data (students, parents, teachers, staff, directors, others)
   - Focus Groups (students, parents, teachers, staff, directors, others)
   - Program Quality Assessment

IV. Program Implementation Findings*
   - Recruitment of Target Population
   - Fidelity to Program Implementation (operations, activities, etc.)
   - Barriers to Program Implementation
   - Program Quality Assessment

V. Program Outcome Findings*
   - Attendance/Retention
   - Grades
   - Students At-Risk
   - Student Achievement Data*
   - Observations of Student Behavior and Attitudes
   - Survey Data (students, parents, teachers, staff, directors, others)
   - Focus Groups (students, parents, teachers, staff, directors, others)
   - Program Quality

VI. Discussion*
   - Progress in Meeting Goals and Objectives of Proposed Project*
   - Progress in Meeting Student and Program Performance Indicators*
   - Program Strengths
   - Program Challenges
   - Needs for Improvement

VII. Recommendations*
   - Recommendations For Improving Program Design and Quality
   - Recommendations for Improving Participant Outcomes (Recruitment, Attendance/Retention, Student Achievement and Behavior)
   - Recommendations for Using Evaluation Results for Program Improvement, Sustainability, Informing Partners and Staff.
   - Recommendations for next year’s evaluation questions and design.
NEXT STEPS

Preliminary Results: Preliminary results and recommendations due to 21st CCLC Program Director for review and discussion, as well as inclusion in Advanced Planning with Data Training.

Report Due: November 1, 2014

Questions: Contact Debra Williams-Appleton 360-725-6049 or Debra.appleton@k12.wa.us

Mail Hardcopy To: Debra Williams-Appleton, Program Supervisor
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Old Capitol Building PO Box 47200
Olympia, WA 98504-7200