New York State Department of Education

21st Century Community Learning Center Program, Round 8

Annual Evaluation Report

2022-2023

MI MEASUREMENT INCORPORATED

Executive Summary

In fall 2022, the New York State Education Department began its 8th round of funding for the 21st Century Community Learning Center (21st CCLC) initiative. This initiative, funded by the United States Department of Education, supports community learning center programs that provide expanded academic learning enrichment opportunities to help students who attend low-performing schools meet state academic standards. The centers also offer a broad array of additional services, including service learning, nutrition and health education, drug and violence prevention programs, counseling programs, arts, music, physical fitness and wellness programs, technology education programs, financial literacy programs, environmental literacy programs, mathematics, science, career and technical programs, internship or apprenticeship programs, youth development, and family literacy.

NYSED's 8th cohort includes 152 sub-grantee programs, of which 75 are located in the New York City metro areas and its surrounding boroughs and 77 are located across the rest of the state. These include grants awarded to Community Based Organizations (CBOs) as well as Local Education Agencies (46 and 29, respectively in NYC; and 35 and 42, respectively in the rest of the state). Among these 152 programs, 17 received their grant awards through a secondary "Round 8A" funding cycle and did not begin programming until year two, while 58 CBOs awarded during the original funding cycle experienced delays in contract approval during year one, but also began programming by mid-year, or by year two. Currently, these 152 grants are collectively serving approximately 50,000 students in grades pre-kindergarten through 12.

Measurement Incorporated (MI) was awarded a 5-year contract from NYSED to conduct an external evaluation of the state's 21st CCLC initiative. The purposes of the evaluation are to assess the implementation and outcomes of the program and to guide NYSED's efforts to direct and improve its administration of the program; aid local grantees; and improve program quality and outcomes for participating students. Specifically, the evaluation has six objectives:

- Evaluate NYSED's achievement of statewide objectives related to statewide improvements in participating students' academic performance and behavior.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of the 21st CCLC Technical Assistance Resource Centers.
- Evaluate the performance of 21st CCLC programs.
- Support and review the quality of local evaluation efforts.
- Provide guidance to NYSED on accessing and managing required data for GPRA reporting.
- Provide support and engagement opportunities for local evaluators.

This report provides a summary of activities performed by MI to address the six objectives during year one of Round 8 (October 1, 2022 – September 30, 2023). It includes links to key deliverables that were submitted to NYSED throughout the year.

Objective 1. Evaluate NYSED's achievement of statewide objectives related to statewide improvements in participating students' academic performance and behavior.

MI was contracted to conduct a comprehensive study investigating the impact of the 21st CCLC programs on student academic achievement and other school-related outcomes, such as attendance, school incidents, and graduation rates. MI proposed a quasi-experimental design using a matched comparison group that included students who did not participate in a 21st CCLC program. The study would include data from the 21st CCLC reporting system, EZReports, and other state-level data systems (primarily including the Student Information Repository System, the Public Reports Portal, and School Report Cards).

In year one, MI and the State Coordinator agreed to temporarily suspend the study. This decision was made in response to the declining trends in academic performance reported across the state resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic.[1] It was agreed that these trends were a credible threat to the study and could result in misattributing negative outcomes to the 21st CCLC program.

In lieu of a comprehensive study on academic achievement, MI received approval to conduct a two-year pilot study of social emotional learning initiatives. This focus resulted from broad consensus in the field, especially in the long shadow of the COVID-19 pandemic, that providing a scaffold to develop social-emotional learning (SEL) is essential to ensure students' academic success. MI reached out to sub-grantees and their evaluators to (a) solicit participation in an advisory group to collaborate on the study design and (b) identify programs that include activities explicitly designed to support SEL that would be interested in participating in the pilot study.

MI's outreach resulted in a strong advisory group of evaluators, many with expertise in social emotional learning, and most of whom had programs that expressed an interest in participating in the study. The advisory group consisted of nine local evaluators, MI's Senior Field Researcher, and one of MI's project co-leads for the State Evaluation. The group met seven times throughout the reporting period, with the large majority attending each meeting. Through this collaboration, the advisory group identified a plan for the study which was presented to the State Coordinator in a memo dated April 20, 2023.

The year one focus of the study was to obtain a better understanding of how programs conceptualize the SEL interventions, and how well these interventions align with broadly accepted definitions of SEL concepts for positive youth development, skills, and competencies. Data were collected using the Activity Focus Categories in EZReports and an optional survey that was administered to all Program Managers. The survey included items asking Program Managers to describe their program's initiatives, or plans for initiatives (for those that experienced a late start), for developing students' social-emotional learning. Respondents were asked to describe their initiatives in terms of the extent to which they fit into broadly recognized

---

[1] https://www.osc.ny.gov/reports/nations-report-card-underscores-new-yorks-need-academic-recovery

categories of effective SEL programming, and the methods through which these strategies are implemented.

The survey was administered in June 2023. [Survey responses](#) represented a total of 41% of the original 135 Round 8 programs, with the strongest representation from Rest of State. Responses represented a good balance between new 21st CCLC providers and those with prior experience. There was also a good balance among programs serving elementary, middle and high school grades, although high school grades were somewhat less represented.

Data on programs' descriptions of their activities was extracted from the Activity Focus Categories section of EZReports for all 229 sites at 101 programs that submitted data.[2]

A report summarizing the analyses on Phase I is near completion.

Phase 2 of the study, pending approval from NYSED leadership and discussion with the NYSED SEL Coordinator (already completed), and with the pilot study advisory group, is planned to include spring surveys of program service providers regarding their perceptions of what they are expected to provide, as well as the degree to which they feel adequately supported to do so; and of participating students regarding their perceptions of how much guidance they receive for developing their SEL skills, of the program "climate" (vis a vis "positive youth development" conditions) and of the extent to which they feel their competencies have improved.

---

[2] Many of the Round 8 programs that experienced delays in contract approval had not entered these records for year one.

Objective 2. Evaluate the Effectiveness of the 21st CCLC Technical Assistance Resource Centers

MI was contracted to evaluate the effectiveness of the two 21st CCLC Technical Assistance Resource Centers (TARCs), one located in New York City that serves all 21st CCLCs in the City's five boroughs, and one located in Binghamton to serve all 21st CCLCs outside of New York City, in the Rest of State (RoS). This section provides a summary of related evaluation activities including (1) observations and survey feedback on professional development conferences and webinar events provided by the TARCs, (2) feedback from sub grantees via an annual Program Staff Survey, and (3) interviews with TARC staff.

At the beginning of year 1 of the contract, MI developed a survey designed to solicit feedback from the State Coordinator and each TARC staff member, in order to identify and implement improvements to the TARC evaluation. The survey asked respondents to rate the usefulness of the evaluation activities performed in Round 7 and to identify areas for consideration for revision. Survey responses were used to form the agenda for a debriefing meeting during which several suggestions emerged for improving the evaluation process. Specifically, it was agreed that the Program Manager Survey could be streamlined by omitting redundancy from other sources and providing clarified phrasing. Additionally, several questions were added about new RC initiatives that included family engagement resources, the Program Implementation Guide, and the information gathering and process for Quality Self-Assessment (QSA) reviews. New survey questions were also added about the usefulness of various components of EZReports support from Thomas Kelly Software Associates (TKSA).

Observations and participant surveys for conferences/webinars

Observation protocols and post conference and workshop surveys were updated to align them with the workshop session "Best Practices" document that MI developed during Round 7 (see "Recommended Practices for Conference Presenters" on the Resource Centers' website at https://www.nys21cclc.org/evaluation). The revised instruments were used to assess a fall webinar focused on using the Quality Self-Assessment tool, the fall 2022 Kick-off Conference, the spring statewide conference, and the two regional fall 2023 conferences. Summaries of observations and survey results were provided to the State Coordinator shortly after each session.

Table 1 lists the fall and spring professional development events that were observed and includes links to the summary of findings that were submitted to the State Coordinator.

Table 1. Conferences and Workshops Included in the Year 1 Evaluation[3]

Date	Title	Link to summary
October 12, 2022	Quality Self-Assessment Tool Workshop	- QSA Workshop Survey Results - QSA Workshop Survey Observation
October 19, 2022	Fall Kick-off Conference[4]	- Conference Observation
March 24, 2023	Spring Statewide Conference	- Conference Survey Results - Conference Workshop Observations
September 29, 2023	Rest of State Fall Conference	- Conference Survey Results - Conference Workshop Observations

Program Staff Survey

An end of year staff survey was sent to all key sub-grantee staff in June 2023, including program leaders, Data Managers, Site Coordinators, and Fiscal Coordinators. Surveys were returned by a total of 256 respondents; but because of inconsistencies in how respondents' roles were identified on the TARCs' contact lists *vs.* survey responses, it is unclear how many programs are represented by these responses, nor how many responses were received for each role. Based on responses for which contact list and survey response data were consistent, however, returned surveys represented at least the following:

- At least 50% of programs were represented by Program Manager responses
- Responses from Data Managers represented at least 59% of programs. However, some of these responses were from Program Managers who also act as Data Managers. To avoid double counting the same respondents, these cases will be included with the results for Program Managers.
- Responses from Site Coordinators represented at least 27% of programs. As for Data Managers, however, respondents who were identified as both a Program Manager and a Site Coordinator will be included with the results for Program Managers.

A detailed memorandum was sent to the SEA Coordinator and all TARC staff on July 19, 2023, explaining these discrepancies, and making recommendations for how they might be resolved, and how to disaggregate the survey data. An analysis of survey results from Rest of State respondents was submitted upon request to the RoS TARC in October 2023; full analyses for all respondents are underway, focusing only on responses from verified Program Leaders, per agreement with NYSED.

TARC staff Interviews

Focus group interviews were conducted with TARC staff via video conference in July and August 2023. In order to ensure that all respondents felt that they were able to speak freely,

---

[3] The September 2023 RoS conference is included here because MI's evaluation contract term does not coincide with the Resource Centers' and sub-grantees' contract terms.

[4] Survey results for the fall 2022 kick-off conference were not reported because response rates fell well below the 50% that MI and NYSED had established as the minimum to consider the data meaningful.

where possible, the interviews were conducted by MI's semi-independent Senior Field Researcher whenever possible, or by the State Evaluation Co-Lead when necessary.

All interviews were conducted using the same semi-structured [interview protocol](), which covered the following major topics:

- Internal and State-level communications and collaboration (amongst all TARC staff, with NYSED, and with the State Evaluator);
- The success of the Site Monitoring Visit (SMV) process (including selection and identification of sites; pre-visit preparations; the on-site process; and follow up); and,
- Dealing with internal staff transitions and turnover.

Focus groups were conducted separately for each TARC, with all Resource Specialists and the Data Specialist present wherever possible; but the TARC Director was included in the focus group only if all members (including the Director) independently agreed. By request of all members, the Director was included in the RoS Resource Center focus group, but one staff member who had a scheduling conflict was interviewed separately. For the NYC Resource Center, because a consensus was not reached, separate interviews were scheduled for the staff (Resource and Data Specialists) and the Director; however, the NYC TARC Director–who had left her position towards the end of year one–was unable to participate in an interview. While there were also several other interview participants who have since left their positions, participation did represent almost all of the staff from both Resource Centers who had been in place through most of year one.

Because of the well-established atmosphere of collaboration and trust between MI and State-level staff that has been developed over the years, neither the Senior Field Researcher nor the Evaluation Co-Lead perceived any hesitation among participants to speak openly at these interviews.

A summary of findings from these focus groups is currently underway.

Objective 3. Evaluate the Performance of 21ˢᵗ CCLC Programs

MI was contracted to evaluate ten sub-grantee programs, annually, for the purposes of exploring implementation fidelity and quality, and identifying program strengths and areas in need of additional support or guidance from the State. This section provides a summary of related evaluation activities including (a) case studies of the ten programs, and (b) review of the mid year reports.

Case Studies

In quarter one, the MI evaluation team that included our WMBE subcontractor began work on the Exploratory Case Studies, by preparing to select 10 programs with which to conduct site visits, document reviews, and interviews with program leaders and staff. The team designed communications and instruments aligned with the focus areas for the case study. Completed documents related to this deliverable can be found on the Resource Centers' website at www.nys21cclc.org/forms.

In quarter two, the team ramped up work on the Exploratory Case Studies, preparing a list of 10 prospective programs to participate. A purposeful sample selection process was utilized, incorporating intel from SED and the Resource Centers, alongside variables/characteristics to provide richness and representativeness. The MI team scheduled the site visits, document reviews, and interviews with program leaders and staff. Additionally, the team developed communications and instruments for the visit.

The ten Program Site Visits were conducted between April 28ᵗʰ – May 31, 2023. Program Directors, Site Coordinators and Local Evaluators were invited to participate in interviews. Three substitutions were made to the original, prospective sample list and replaced with programs with similar characteristics. These programs were replaced because in some cases, programming had already ended, and in one case the program director was out on leave. (The updated list of programs has been sent to the Program Coordinator in a memo dated 7.20.2023 and posted in the state's Sharepoint folder).

The Case Study report was submitted for review on September 15, 2023. NYSED subsequently approved the report and released it to the public. It was distributed via the statewide stakeholders listserv and posted on the Resource Center website: NYS 21CCLC Program Case Study Report, Round 8 Year 1. A brief overview of the report was presented at the regional conferences in the fall. The product was designed to be accessible for a broad audience of 21C stakeholders, and included an invitation at the conclusion for readers to submit feedback, suggestions, and considerations for continuing discussion. This strategy is part of a larger mission advanced by the state level team (the SED Program Office and subcontractors) to increase engagement among local program leaders, evaluators, and other partners by creating more opportunities to cultivate a shared collective identity, and an active community of practice.

Mid-Year Report

In year one, SED team members and MI collaborated to review the previous version of the Mid-Year Report (MYR) and modify and/or add items based on desired focus and informational needs.

The Program Directors' Mid-Year Report was co-developed by SED and MI (artifacts from that collaboration can be located on the NYSED Sharepoint drive, HERE). The MYR was administered by SED in February as an online form using SurveyMonkey. Responses were collected from all subgrantee program directors, and SED made the raw results available to internal state level team members for use, as needed. MI performed a full descriptive analysis of this data in the summer, and produced two summary featuring purposefully selected items:

(1) **Professional Learning-Program Leaders Input**. This flash findings report was produced in July upon request from the Resource Center leaders, who wanted to study these results to inform their fall conference planning process.

(2) **NYS 21CCLC Programs' Use of Supports, Round 8 Year 1**. This report was produced in November; it synthesized information from the MYR, a small sample of Annual Evaluation Reports (AERs), and an analysis of grant budget information from figures provided by SED. (See Deliverable 4).

Objective 4. Support and Review the Quality of Local Evaluation and Continuous Improvement Efforts

MI was contracted to be a resource to local program evaluators and programs to support continuous improvement efforts and improve the quality and consistency of local program evaluation throughout the state. To this end, in year one MI developed and collaborated with NYSED and TARC members to develop tools and guides to enhance stakeholders' engagement with evaluation services, to facilitate data and information management, and strengthen continuous improvement mechanisms. Published tools, guides and resources were distributed to stakeholders and located on the Resource Centers' website (Resources/Forms & Guides, Resources/Evaluation). They included

➢ Guidance tools to assist local evaluators & program-level users: Evaluability Checklist, Advisory Board Memo, Sample Advisory Board Terms of Reference & Meeting Agenda, Year 1 Program Timeline, Updated Local Evaluation Framework & Timeline, Evaluation Planning Tips Doc.

➢ Program Directors' Quick Guide to Program Evaluation

➢ Program Data Manager's Guide that was accompanied by a Data Manager's webinar to guide program leaders and DMs in the procedures related to Teacher Surveys and APR completion

➢ Annual Evaluation Template. Revised tool to assist local evaluators in organizing and presenting information about their evaluation designs and about their program's progress.

➢ NYS Evaluation & Continuous Improvement Strategies & Action Planner

➢ Draft Data Manager's Guide/Manual. MI contributed to the co-creation of this updated and expanded version of the original Data Manager Guide.

➢ 8A Evaluation guidance and expectations for programs with reduced budgets/ scaled down scope of work.

➢ Updated Program Modification Request Facts Sheet and the Memo notifying subgrantees about the discontinuation of applying for Program Modification Requests to add ELT. Provided draft language for NYSED's announcement to programs.

MI developed and launched an online Resource Library for the Local Evaluators' Network so users can access up-to-date guidance and practical tools. Throughout the year, MI curated submitted materials and created new content for the Resource Library, including a Sample Findings Brief, Communication Plan, and Evaluation Plan.

MI also helped the state prepare a memo to disseminate three, interrelated Year 1 products that synthesized relevant findings and highlighted effective policies and practices. See copy, below.

> "Good morning 21st CCLC subgrantees and supporting stakeholders,
>
> NYSED is excited to provide you with some interesting and valuable documents produced by our very competent statewide evaluation team. I am confident you will find them relevant to your work. I truly hope you set aside some time to read, digest and perhaps use in whatever ways might be useful for you. They each contain different types of information, are drawn from different sources, and have different functions depending

on the user/reader. But each one offers some valuable insights into how the state's 21C grant is designed and how programs are operating. We encourage our network of 21C stakeholders to review them, reflect on the information, and to reach out with questions. As you can read on the last page of the Brief, there is a constellation of supports available in this grant. And those providers, be they the TA Resource Centers, evaluators, NYSED, or the statewide evaluator (MI) – are ready to listen and respond.

Contents recommended for review:

- **Year 1 Case Study Report**. This is one of MI's annual reports commissioned by the state. A sample of programs from across the state were visited, leaders and evaluators were interviewed, and findings were organized into this summary. It describes some of the creative ways 21CCLC subgrantees are designing programming and managing complex challenges to deliver services to their students and families. Please read up on what other colleagues in this leadership network are doing, what they're experiencing. See if anything resonates. Our team at SED and MI want to design the annual studies of implementation with a *pro*spective bend, looking ahead at areas/issues that matter most to programs. Reach out to the team at MI – Jody and Lil, emails at the end of the report – to share your feedback or suggest topic ideas.

- **NYS 21CCLC Programs' Use of Supports**. This Brief is a snapshot of information gathered from items in the Mid-Year Report collected from program directors. It also includes information from a sample study of Annual Evaluation Report (AER) submissions from local evaluators. It highlights how programs have invested in local evaluation, how program directors report valuing the services. It also presents leaders' interest in more peer networking and professional learning community (PLC) opportunities, which the TARCS and Change Impact are working to address – look for an invitation about joining Community Cohorts coming soon!

- **Program Director's Quick Guide to Program Evaluation**. This is a revamped guidance document linked in the Program Director's Manual. NYSED and the Resource Center team thought it would be useful to update this guidance and make it a checklist outlining the local evaluation components program leaders need to know about. It aligns with the *Local Evaluation Framework & Timeline*, the RFP, and the other requirements from the state. Note: these and additional materials are on the Resource Center website and MI's Evaluation Network Resource Library."

Lastly, MI helped design and co-facilitate with NYSED a workgroup dedicated to studying, reflecting on practice, and norming the Site Monitoring Visit processes. Members include SED Program and Fiscal specialists, leaders and specialists from both regional TARCs, and other TA-providing partners subcontracting with the state. Commencing in September, 2023, the workgroup convened 4 times in Quarter 4 of the contract cycle (9/5, 9/21, 10/5, and 10/24). MI helped co-create team protocols, process norms, information collecting activities, and agendas. MI conducted an exploratory needs-sensing survey of state level stakeholders (N=10), and produced a summary report, SMV Process-Reflection Survey Results, featuring key findings; this was, then, presented and discussed at the workgroup team meeting. MI designed draft workflows, communication tools, and policy guidance for team members to contribute to. All meeting materials and draft products are located in NYSED's internal SMV Norming folder.

Objective 5. Provide guidance to NYSED on Accessing Required Data for APR Reporting

MI was contracted to provide guidance and assistance to NYSED staff on APR data management and collection using NYSED's contracted statewide data collection and reporting system, EZReports. This section provides a summary of related evaluation activities including (a) supporting the definition, identification, collection, and upload of program and student data; (b) supporting EZreport training needs; (c) supporting the clarification of Data Manager and Data Specialist roles; and (d) supporting administration and analysis of the teacher survey.

Supporting the definition, identification, collection, and upload of program and student data

MI supported the State Coordinator to help ensure that all student data needed from the SIRS office was included in the data request in the formats needed for APRs, as well as for Statewide analyses. Because some district and school administrators have been reticent about sharing student data, upon MI's recommendation, the State Coordinator developed a letter with MI's input in order to clarify to District Superintendents what kinds of data they are contractually obligated to share with program staff.

Subsequently, NYSED obtained student level data from its SIRS department, which provides these student records based on their NYSSIS ID codes, as documented by program staff. MI developed a process for matching program records to SIRS records to ensure that both sources are pointing to the same student. This process was continuously refined and improved during Round 8, and the validation process will be implemented with help from the NYSED Data Specialist as soon as the records are received from SIRS.

While the use of these State records ensures consistency for APR reporting and Statewide analyses, it has also resulted in considerable confusion among sub-grantees and local evaluators, because New York State laws governing data security prohibit NYSED from sharing the data with entities (other than MI and TKSA) that do not have a direct contract with the State. To help local program staff and evaluators navigate these complexities, MI drafted a document clarifying the requirements for sub-grantees for obtaining, uploading and archiving student records needed for their own purposes. These requirements were also explained to attending Program Managers and Evaluators at a Data Management panel presentation during the September 2023 fall conference, at which one of MI's project Co-Leads served as one of the expert panelists.

MI also supported sub-grantees and TARC staff in converting last spring's report card data into GPA scores using the GPA Calculators developed during Round 7, which were updated for Round 8; and then supported cleaning the derived GPA data and uploading it into EZReports. For NYC GPA records, which are calculated globally by the City's Research and Policy Support Group (RPSG), MI worked hand in hand with the NYC TARC director and a consultant from RPSG to ensure that the GPA conversion specifications used were consistent with the rest of the State. To support TARC staff in uploading the final GPA scores–a process which requires adherence to very precise details–MI works with TARC and NYSED staff to continually update a printed guide to cleaning GPA results files (first developed by MI in fall 2022) every time a new upload error is encountered.

Supporting EZReports training needs

In fall 2022, MI and the Resource Centers collaborated to develop a survey of sub-grantee program staff and local evaluators to determine what kinds of refresher or follow-up training they needed to use EZReports. Results were shared with the TKSA trainer, who incorporated these requests into fall training sessions. MI maintained communications with local programs throughout the year to assess changes in their needs at different phases of their projects. As needs for clarifications and training on EZReports are identified, they are communicated to the Resource Centers and/or to TKSA staff as appropriate.

MI met with the SEA Coordinator and the TKSA Vice President to discuss possible customizations in cases where users felt that the program could better support their needs. Once estimates for these customizations are obtained from TKSA, MI discusses and recommends priorities to NYSED, on an ongoing basis as needed.

In order to communicate with all stakeholders about training needs, and to provide additional support on use of the system, MI staff participates in all training activities focused on use of EZReports, including those provided by TKSA and Resource Center staff.

Defining and supporting new sub-grantees' Data Manager roles and RCs' Data Specialist roles

Upon MI's recommendation, the Data Manager and RC Data Specialist roles were established through the Round 8 sub-grantee and Resource Center RFPs, respectively. However, the expectations for these staff established in the RFPs were not sufficiently concrete to ensure consistency across programs; therefore, MI worked closely with NYSED and the Resource Centers throughout the year, while also soliciting input from Local Evaluators, to help develop role definitions that support effective data management, while ensuring that the roles are consistent with these groups' contracts.

Specifically, MI played a central role in collaboration with the NYSED Data Specialist to develop a summary of Resource Center Data Specialist roles,[5] and facilitated training sessions for RCs' and NYSED's Data Specialists on how to review EZReports and other program data to identify trends in quality control challenges. Before working to orient TARC Data Specialists to methods that can be used to efficiently validate large amounts of data, MI provided a detailed preliminary status summary[6] so that the Resource Centers had a clear baseline before beginning their own quality control.

MI also updated a printed guide–first developed in December 2022–to techniques for validating various types of data in EZReports; a separate guide for using NYSED's public "SEDREF" database to verify Principal and Superintendent names, and school and district names and BEDS codes; and drafted a timeline of recommended data quality control procedures. MI has also provided formal training as well as ongoing technical support to help Data Specialists implement these techniques. The possibility of sharing these Data Verification Guidelines with local Data Managers—once their role definitions are circulated—is being considered.

---

[5] To date, this summary has not been finalized, as the NYSED and TARC Data Specialists have turned their focus towards defining the Data Manager roles.

[6] Because it contains Personally Identifiable Information about students, this summary cannot be linked to this document.

To support clarification of the Data Manager role, MI continues to work closely with the NYSED and TARC Data Specialists on the development of a [Data Managers' Handbook](#), which has been circulated to subgrantees and local evaluators for comment. With an outline that reflects the [Data Manager's Guide](#), this handbook presents a much more granular description of purposes, definitions, and resources needed to support the DM's contractual responsibilities as defined by the SEA Coordinator, as well as other discretionary responsibilities that might be identified by the Program Manager. As stated in the Handbook, it's purpose is to "give Data Managers, Local Evaluators, Program Directors, and other relevant staff the information and tools they need to address sufficiently the data management and quality control efforts that are essential for successful 21st Century Community Learning Center (21st CCLC) grants."

Supporting administration and analysis of the Teacher Survey

MI collaborated with TARC and NYSED staff on all aspects of preparing for and implementing this survey, which was administered in May 2023. This work included supporting reconciliation of contact lists; updating the timeline for actions from all key players (NYSED, RC, MI, and Program Managers); identifying actions specific to Data Managers and Data Specialists; and reviewing and updating all supporting documentation (including NYSED letters to PMs and Principals, templates for sub-grantees to send to Principals and Teachers, guidelines for identifying classroom teachers, administering the survey, and following up with non-respondents.) All sub-grantees have access to their program's teacher survey results through EZReports; MI's analysis of Statewide survey trends is underway.

Objective 6. Provide Support & Engagement Opportunities for Local Evaluators

MI was contracted to plan and facilitate two network meetings annually for local program evaluators, one location that was accessible to New York City evaluators and one centralized location for evaluators in ROS. Additionally, MI was available to provide technical assistance evaluators and collaborate with Resource Center partners on local evaluation matters.

The MI team convened the first meeting, dubbed the Evaluators' Network, in a 90-minute virtual setting on November 30th, 2022. In preparation for the meeting, MI issued multiple communications to build awareness and interest and sent invitations to all local evaluators. The agenda included the Evaluability Process, Participatory Evaluation Approaches, the Data Manager Role and SEDL Measurement. The meeting presentation slides are available HERE. The meeting was attended by 44 evaluators.The majority were serving at least one Rest of State (RoS) client, some were serving NYC clients, and some were serving clients in both regions. Two colleagues presented short, 15-minute segments: the first about using Participatory Evaluation as a tool to support equity and engagement, and the second about how to design effective Data Management practices as an external evaluator partnering with programs. A follow-up survey was sent to all local evaluators to gather additional insights from absent members or those with more to contribute. MI produced & distributed the Evaluators' Network Update brief summarizing meeting notes and survey contributions.

The spring Evaluators' Network meeting was held in-person at the Statewide Spring Conference in Troy on March 24, 2023. An estimated 40 members, including a few non-evaluator guests, attended. Members collaborated in breakout groups to discuss common, relevant issues and then were brought together to share insights and offer suggestions for future Network offerings. Meeting materials and slides are located HERE. Similar to the fall meeting, MI distributed a follow-up survey to gather additional insights from absent members or those with more to contribute. MI produced an **Evaluators' Network Update** brief that summarized meeting notes and survey contributions.

Throughout the year, the MI team provided TA support through correspondence, phone calls, and virtual meetings. Support was distributed between both local evaluators, and program leaders – either directly, or indirectly by way of the Resource Centers who would relay queries from the field. Topics ranged from finding technical fixes to navigating more complex, adaptive challenges. Examples included, 8A scope of work conditions, AER Template use, instrumentation and methodology, documentation required for SMVs, replacing evaluators, subgrantee responsiveness and lack of internal capacity, and other issues. MI averaged an estimated 6 unique TA requests per month over the course of the year. A sample of these communications is available HERE.