



New York  
21st Century Community Learning Centers  
SOARING BEYOND EXPECTATIONS



# Statewide Evaluation Networking Meeting –

## Evaluators Track Session I: Evaluability

Tuesday, January 9, 2018; 10:30 a.m. – Noon

Jonathan Tunik, Project Director  
Bernadette DeVito, Project Assistant

## Session Objectives:

- (1) Highlights of best practices and challenges** for program evaluability established in the literature
- (2) Brief overview** of the Evaluation Readiness Process outlined in the Evaluation Manual – explore alignment with literature
- (3) Summary of perceived benefits and concerns** surrounding the process, expressed by local evaluators
- (4) Discussion** to move towards a consensus on local evaluators' perspectives on what is working, and how the process might be improved
- (5) Suggestions for other topics** for the Network to explore.

# Best Practices in Assessing Program Evaluability

## Requirements for evaluability

- formal, sound program design or model
- adequate resources (funding, staff, equipment, space)
- program is implemented as designed
- serves intended target population
- able to provide data needed for evaluation

# Best Practices in Assessing Program Evaluability

## Assessing evaluability

- Involve all stakeholders (Participatory Evaluation)
- Independent/third-party perspectives strengthen utility
- Obtain consensus on indicators of success
- Establish a clear purpose and consensus on how results will be used
- Review all program components (documents, case files, staff interviews)

## Develop a logic model

- Focus on the most critical activities and components
- Use and evolve throughout life of program
- Document assumptions

# Benefits and Challenges of Assessing Program Evaluability

## Challenges

- Time commitment
- Unrepresentative or uncooperative teams
- Stakeholders may have different implicit assumptions, different concepts of the model and ToC.

## Benefits of a logic model (short list)

- Evaluation not possible without a program model.
- L.M. supports participatory evaluation
- L.M. and ToC help communication with supporters

# Overview of Evaluability Process in NYS

## **(1) Define the program:**

- meet with advisory group, identify program theory, develop logic model, revise as program evolves.
- Review alignment among: program objectives, indicators, grant requirements, evaluation activities

## Checklist:

- Representative advisory group, meet on schedule
- Consensus on program theory
- Program objectives aligned with theory
- Identification of effective measures of objectives
- Scheduling/notification of evaluation activities
- Sharing program implementation expectations

# Overview of Evaluability Process in NYS

## **(2) Program observations:**

- Review program documents, policies and activities early in program year
- Verify adherence to proposal, availability of timeline and policy handbook, receipt of parent consents

### Checklist:

- Implemented as designed
- Timeline of activities
- Policy handbook
- Procedure for recording data for evaluation
- Obtaining parental consents for evaluation

# Summary of Perceptions from NYC Session

## Concerns

- Checklist format feels like compliance report\*
- Reported to SED; feels like monitoring\*
- Some questioning whether some administrative responsibilities are relevant to program improvement – should be RCs' responsibility, not evaluator's

## Benefits

- Importance of readiness indicators for formative support/implementation evaluation
- Program theory necessary for measuring fidelity
- Use to guide advisory meeting focus
- Not punitive – **intended to identify supports**



## **Local Evaluators' Perspectives on Evaluability and the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Process**

- What is working?
- What challenges have you encountered? How were they/might they be overcome? How can the process be improved?
- What additional supports can the Resource Centers and/or State Evaluator provide to support this process and promote evaluation readiness?

**Closing  
Questions & Comments**

**Other Concerns or  
Topics of Interest for Future  
Networking Sessions?**

# References

(will be posted on [nys21cclc.org](http://nys21cclc.org))

AEM Education Services. (January 2016). Logic Model Toolkit: Quick Reference Guide & Annotated Logic Model Template. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oese/oss/technicalassistance/easnaemlogicmodeltoolkit12016.pdf>

Innovation Network. (2010). Logic Model Workbook. Retrieved from [http://www.pointk.org/client\\_docs/File/logic\\_model\\_workbook.pdf](http://www.pointk.org/client_docs/File/logic_model_workbook.pdf)

Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center. (2003). Evaluability Assessment: Examining the Readiness of a Program for Evaluation (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Washington, D.C.) Retrieved from <http://www.jrsa.org/pubs/juv-justice/evaluability-assessment.pdf>

Kekahio, W., Lawton, B., Cicchinelli, L., & Brandon, P. (2014). Logic models: A tool for effective program planning, collaboration and monitoring. Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED544779.pdf>

# References (continued)

Kellogg Foundation. (January 2004). Logic Model Development Guide: Using Logic Models to Bring Together Planning, Evaluation and Action. Retrieved from <https://www.wkkf.org/resource-directory/resource/2006/02/wk-kellogg-foundation-logic-model-development-guide>

Methods Lab. (2015). Evaluability assessment for impact evaluation. Retrieved from <http://www.betterevaluation.org/sites/default/files/Evaluability%20assessment%20for%20impact%20evaluation.pdf>

Organizational Research Services. (2004). Theory of Change: A Practical Tool for Action, Results and Learning. AE Casey Foundation. Retrieved from <http://www.aecf.org/resources/theory-of-change/>

Trevisan, M.S., & Huang, Y.M. (October 2003). Evaluability Assessment: A Primer. Retrieved from <http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=8&n=20>

# NYS 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Statewide Evaluation



Evaluation & School Improvement Services Division

[www.mi-schoolservices.com](http://www.mi-schoolservices.com)

Lead Evaluators:

**Jonathan Tunik**, Senior Research Associate (MI), Project Director

**Lily Corrigan**, Research Associate (MI), Project Associate

Evaluation Team:

**Dr. Thomas J. Kelsh**, Vice President (MI), Principal Investigator

**Jacob Feinberg and Bernadette DeVito**, Project Assistants

*Please contact us with any questions, ideas or information requests:*

**[21CEval@measinc.com](mailto:21CEval@measinc.com)**

**[1-800-330-1420 x203](tel:1-800-330-1420)**