

# Annual Evaluation Report (AER) TEMPLATE

*for NYS 21CCLC Local Evaluators*

## Purpose of the AER Template

The [Annual Evaluation Report \(AER\) Template](#) was developed at the request of the State Program Coordinator to create a **uniform method** to collect and organize information about local evaluations for New York State subgrantee programs. It is intended to function, both, (1) as a protocol for submitting end-of-year evaluation information in a way that allows for **systematic review** by members of the state-level leadership team, and (2) as guidance for program evaluators to inventory their data collection measures and reporting activities, and check alignment with NYS 21CCLC evaluation requirements and performance metrics.

The New York State Education Dept. (NYSED) is committed to maintaining and supporting **high-quality local evaluation** that helps to drive continuous improvement and raise the effectiveness of statewide 21CCLC programming. The review of AERs offers key insights into a program's measurability, the research methodologies used by the evaluator, and a snapshot of findings about implementation progress and success indicators.

## Quick Facts about AERs

- ▶ **Due Date** | AERs are submitted to the NYSED Program Office by [September 30](#). (See [SMV Indicator H-1a](#))
- ▶ **Utilization** | AERs serve as a multi-purpose reference document used by NYSED and state-level partners; as such, the template is designed to collect information in areas that serve those groups' needs. Program-level stakeholders are not the primary audience for this report, yet programs are required to receive the AER from their evaluators and keep it for their records. Evaluators can provide a customized report, tailored to meet the needs of their clients and program-level stakeholders by adapting and or expanding the information from the AER. Reports designed for clients are not submitted to NYSED; they are useful for clients to utilize to communicate progress to community stakeholders (See [SMV Indicator H-6](#)), as well as for continuous program improvement.
- ▶ **Value** | AERs are reviewed by NYSED and the Resource Centers before each subgrantee Site Monitoring Visit (SMV) or Technical Assistance (TA) visit to [enrich the team's understanding](#) of the program. AERs are studied by the Statewide Evaluator to [identify patterns](#), trends, effective design strategies, and areas for further inquiry. A collection of highlights and aggregated summaries from AERs will be included in presentations to federal level monitors and the network of SEA Coordinators, as needed, to [demonstrate qualities of local evaluation](#) across the state.
- ▶ **Alignment** | Components of the template are directly aligned with NYSED policies and program expectations that are the focus of [Site Monitoring Visits \(SMVs\)](#). These alignments are [highlighted](#) throughout this template with references to required indicators and evidence in the [SMV Tool](#).

## Contents & Instructions

	Section Heading	Pages	Instructions for Completion
I	<b>Project Info</b>	3	Enter info into the fields on the table. *Save your draft as you work; see submission instructions, below.
II	<b>Site Visit Findings</b>	4 - 9	Enter info into the tables; provide a brief narrative summary of visits 1 & 2.
III	<b>Conclusion &amp; Recommendations</b>	10	Provide a written summary in the box provided. *Prepare Required Supporting Docs.
IV	<b>Collaboration &amp; Utilization</b>	11	Provide a written summary in the box provided. *Prepare Optional Supporting Doc.
V	<b>Logic Model/TOC</b>	12	Insert/embed a <i>clear</i> picture of the model or attach as a separate document/PDF.
VI	<b>Evaluation Plan &amp; EOY Results Tables</b>	13	Download the accompanying excel workbook. Review the GUIDE, defining the category headings; the OUTLINE, showing the organization and order of the sheets; and an EXAMPLE of table 1, Core Ed Services.

### Instructions for Submitting the AER & Supporting Docs

- 1** **Name the Word Doc File.** Once you begin editing/inputting info into this Microsoft Word document Template, Save As: “**AER-[RoS/NYC]-[Last four digits of Project ID]-Submission Year**” | Example: “**AER-NYC-0123-2024**” | This unique tag will be used by the State to check that each project’s AER has been received by 9/30/24 and locate the AER, the accompanying Eval Plan & Results Tables (Section VI), and required supporting docs (listed on p.10) into the correct program file folder. Send as an MS Word or PDF file.
- 2** **Name the Excel File.** Once you start editing/inputting info into the accompanying AER Eval Plan & Results Tables excel workbook, Save As: “**AER-[RoS/NYC]-[Last four digits of Project ID]-Submission Year-Tables**” | Example: “**AER-RoS-4567-2024-Tables**”
- 3** **Name the Required Supporting Documents.** Save As: “**AER-[RoS/NYC]-[Last four digits of Project ID]-[Type of item]**” | Example: “**AER-RoS-4567-Survey**” | Supporting Docs include blank copies of any instruments used for data collection (see p.10) and *may* include a PDF of the Logic Model or Theory of Change Model if it is not embedded into page 12 of this AER document.
- 4** **Send an Email with All Attachments to [EMSC21STCCLC@nysed.gov](mailto:EMSC21STCCLC@nysed.gov).** It will be received and processed by the NYSED Program Office. The state-level partners – Measurement Incorporated (MI) team and the Regional RCs – will be notified about submissions and be able to commence their review. AERs for the 2022-23 program year are due to NYSED by 9/30/24.
- 5** **Send an Email with all Attachments to your client/program director** by 9/30/24 so they can review, if they wish, and add to their files. Use the **amber color-coded notes** throughout the AER Template to inform clients about which compliance indicators these items relate to.

## Section I

## PROJECT INFORMATION

Program	<b>Full, Unabbreviated Name</b>		
Project #	0187-23-	<input type="text" value="8017"/>	<i>Insert last four digits</i>
Lead Agency	<b>Full, Unabbreviated Name</b>		
Program Director	<b>First &amp; Last Name, Title</b>		
#	Name of Participating Site(s) @ Locality (town or city name)		Grade level(s) served at each site
1	Little Flower UFSD, Wading River, New York		3 - 12
2	Name, Town/City		<b>Grade Min - Max</b>
3	Name, Town/City		<b>Grade Min - Max</b>
4	Name, Town/City		<b>Grade Min - Max</b>
5	Name, Town/City		<b>Grade Min - Max</b>
6	Name, Town/City		<b>Grade Min - Max</b>
7	Name, Town/City		<b>Grade Min - Max</b>
8	Name, Town/City		<b>Grade Min - Max</b>
9	Name, Town/City		<b>Grade Min - Max</b>
10	Name, Town/City		<b>Grade Min - Max</b>
11	Name, Town/City		<b>Grade Min - Max</b>
12	Name, Town/City		<b>Grade Min - Max</b>
13	Name, Town/City		<b>Grade Min - Max</b>
14	Name, Town/City		<b>Grade Min - Max</b>
15	Name, Town/City		<b>Grade Min - Max</b>
Program-wide Target Student Enrollment	<input type="text" value="110"/>		Actual Enrollment at/above 15 hours <input type="text" value="108"/>
Evaluator	Margareth Lafontant, PhD		Developmental Systems, Inc.
Contact Info	917-364-3735		drmlafontant@gmail.com

## Section II

## Site Visit Findings

*In this section you are asked to provide summary findings from each of the two required annual evaluator site visits. Please include a discussion of any observations you may have conducted. To assist our review and learn about your process, please attach observation/interview protocols you used, if applicable. N.B.: All items/artifacts submitted to NYSED as part of the AER are for state-level review purposes only; they will **not** be shared or used outside of the review process without explicit consent from, both, the evaluator and client program director. \*Client assist: Evidence of completion of site visits is required for compliance with **SMV Indicator H-1**.*

### 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.

This visit functions to demonstrate the value of the dialogue between partners: the evaluator and the program leaders. Evaluators use a protocol to review the program's anchoring and operational documentation: i.e., verify alignment between the grant proposal (including the Table for Goals and Objectives), logic model, calendar & schedule of activities/offerings, program timeline, program handbook, parental consent forms, and procedures for entering/documenting data. This visit should also serve to identify any obstacles to implementation.

## 1a. First Site Visit | Procedure

Date(s)	Site# (use p.3 list)	Program activities observed	Methods Used across all sites
00/00/202X	1	Athletics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation using protocol*
00/00/202X	1	Calm / SEL	<input type="checkbox"/> Interview(s) using protocol*
00/00/202X	1	Drama	<input type="checkbox"/> Document review using protocol*
00/00/202X	# from list	Title of activity	<input type="checkbox"/> Insert description of Other Method
00/00/202X	# from list	Title of activity	<input type="checkbox"/> Insert description of Other Method
00/00/202X	# from list	Title of activity	
00/00/202X	# from list	Title of activity	

\* Please submit a blank copy of each data collection instrument (see Required Supporting Documents, p.10)

## 1b. First Site Visit | Summary of Findings

Briefly summarize the salient findings you gathered from your observation(s) & interview(s). What did you see, hear, and learn about installation and initial implementation?

As demonstrated in the previous academic year, the school environment was highly positive. All areas of the building and grounds were clean, well kept, and organized. Youngsters transitioned seamlessly from activity to activity and were actively engaged in each of the sessions observed. It was obvious that the afterschool program was benefitting from the strengths of the day program, i.e., teachers were already familiar with the students, setting was well-organized, and the ample resources of the school enhanced the overall functioning of the afterschool program. A sampling of the highly engaging activities observed in each of the sessions observed are briefly described below.

*Athletics Club (5 participants)*- took place in the gym. The coach modeled the drills and had students perform: warm up exercises, dribbling around cones with dominant hand vs. non-dominant hand, and shooting a basketball correctly. He also provided ample scaffolding, via verbal instructions, as students attempted to perform each of the targeted skills. Toward the end of the session, students were allowed to scrimmage.

*SEL Club (5 participants)* - the teacher effectively utilized with visual aids to support conversation on self-management goals. The students engaged in collaborative discussions via an "Emotion Circle" exercise; taking turns sharing a recent situation where they struggled with self-management, while others offered supportive feedback and suggestions. They also participated in hands-on exercises such as "Emotion Thermometer" where they created personalized charts to visually track their emotional states to help them recognize patterns and triggers.

*Drama Club (12 participants)*- students engaged enthusiastically in reading and acting out their respective parts in an unusual rendition of Little Red Riding Hood tale. In addition to promoting literacy skills, it was clear that that social skills (via collaborative performance) were also being effectively promoted, in addition to boosting students' self-confidence through public speaking. We also observed that through thoughtful questioning and prompting from the teacher, these character portrayals also encouraged empathy and emotional understanding.

## 1c. First Site Visit | Delivery & Receipt of Report

Briefly describe the **delivery** of the findings report. *What form did your report take? How did you present it?*

Briefly describe the **receipt** of the report, and, if known, the use of the information. *How was it received? Was it shared with program staff and other stakeholders? What actions did program leaders take as a result of the information?*

*\*Client & State leadership team assist: Evidence of collaboration between the evaluator and program, and the use of evaluation findings for continuous improvement, help satisfy requirements in **SMV Section H**. This information also helps the state-level team understand more about the effective ways an evaluator presents formative findings, as well as the program leader's utilization of the feedback.*

Please enter your summary, here

After visiting the 3 activities mentioned, evaluators immediately met with the Program Director, Dr. Dean, who also serves as the Superintendent of the district. We shared our positive thoughts about the activities we observed and asked about plans to increase overall offerings and attendance. Dr. Dean provided *key details on how he and his staff have begun to operationalize suggestions offered by both the Evaluator and Project 3C's Advisory Committee*. He went on to explain that these plans would soon take better shape in the subsequent quarters of the program, as a bit more time was needed from the start of the school year to fully implement.

Indeed, throughout the 23/24 academic year, the program took a consistent and multi-pronged approach to increase overall program attendance. First, overall number and variety of offerings dramatically increased in subsequent quarters and activities offered were primarily based on preferences expressed by students (*as per preference data collected by the Evaluator from student surveys and focus groups*). There were more than twice as many afterschool offerings in quarters 2, 3, and 4. Additionally, strategies and progress in meeting attendance goals continued to be discussed at each of the four (4) Advisory Committee meetings and included offering afterschool and weekend activities in the cottages on campus where students reside. Furthermore, later on in the 23/24 academic year, Dr. Dean was also able to secure permission from NYSED to include special STEM and SEL "Extended Learning Time" (ELT) activities.

**Second Site Visit: Point of Service Quality Review**

The second of the two annual visits is focused on assessing fidelity at full implementation. Observations are conducted at each program site for selected activities, attending to activity/lesson content and structure, environment/context, levels of participation, and staff’s use of effective engagement and instructional strategies. Additional items of interest include the quality of interpersonal relationships, program personnel’s use of inclusion and restorative practices, preparedness of staff delivering the lesson, support for staff from site leader(s), and the degree to which activities/lessons activate critical thinking, collaboration, and promote skill development. Evaluators are required to use an observation walkthrough tool; it may be inspired by the NYSED-approved Out of School Time (OST) tool, or another validated, reliable observation instrument.

*\*Client assist: As specified in **SMV Indicator D-2**, grantees are also required to conduct **program activity implementation reviews (PAIR)** two times a year. Alignment between the Evaluator’s observational measure and the program’s internal observational measure is not required, yet it could be useful for program leaders and evaluators to share an understanding about the look-fors/indicators of service quality to be able to combine findings and complement improvement efforts.*

**2a. Second Site Visit | Procedure**

Date(s)	Site# (use p.3 list)	Program activities observed	Methods Used across all sites
00/00/202X	1	Children’s Museum at Little Flower	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation using protocol*
00/00/202X	1	Chess Club	<input type="checkbox"/> Interview(s) using protocol*
00/00/202X	1	Weightlifting	<input type="checkbox"/> Document review using protocol*
00/00/202X	# from list	Title of activity	<input type="checkbox"/> Insert description of Other Method
00/00/202X	# from list	Title of activity	<input type="checkbox"/> Insert description of Other Method
00/00/202X	# from list	Title of activity	
00/00/202X	# from list	Title of activity	
00/00/202X	# from list	Title of activity	
00/00/202X	# from list	Title of activity	

*\* Please submit a blank copy of each data collection instrument (see Required Supporting Documents, p.10)*

## 2b. Second Site Visit | Summary of Findings

Briefly summarize the salient **findings** you gathered from your observation & interview(s). What did you see, hear, and learn about implementation and progress toward outcomes? Was there evidence of improvement in the areas recommended in the previous evaluation report?

Please enter your summary, here

There were a variety of activities being offered the afternoon of our visit. Of the seven (7) or eight (8) being offered, Evaluators visited three (3). One classroom was implementing activities and strategies from the program's partnership with the Long Island Children's Museum. Evaluators also visited the Chess Club and a Weightlifting session.

*Children's Museum at Little Flower (22 participants)*- Students were provided with a variety of materials to invent a robot, machine, or anything to their liking. The students demonstrated enthusiasm and creativity in their invention ideas (e.g., a robot that can make anything, a flying car, an oven that can make any dish). The use of readily available resources promoted adaptability and real-world problem-solving skills, while the creative aspect encouraged self-expression. The teachers actively engaged the students in conversation, promoting deeper thinking and planning.

*Chess Club- (6 participants)*- The children in the Chess Club were paired with other students of like ability. The teacher walked around from pair to pair to ask or answer questions about the game. It was truly impressive to see how engrossed the students were and how quickly they took up another game as soon as the last one was completed.

*Weightlifting (7 participants)*- The instructor focused on the use of the barbell. This included proper form and how to spot a partner with this piece of equipment. Before handling the equipment, the instructor had students do pretend lifting. That latter was key to safely teaching proper form. Students took turns using the barbells and spotting each other. It was interesting to see the high levels of attention they put into observing one another.

## 2c. Second Site Visit | Delivery & Receipt of Report

Briefly describe the **delivery** of the findings report. *What form did your report take? How did you present it?*

Briefly describe the **receipt** of the report, and, *if known*, the use of the information. *How was it received? Was it shared with program staff and other stakeholders? What actions did program leaders take as a result of the information?*

*\*Client & State leadership team assist: Evidence of collaboration between the evaluator and program, and the use of evaluation findings for continuous improvement, help satisfy requirements in **SMV Section H**. This information also helps the state-level team understand more about the effective ways an evaluator presents findings, as well as the program leader's utilization of the feedback.*

We met with Dr. Dean after our observations of the activities. We were excited to share our excellent ratings for the Children's Museum class and we were also pleased to see the variety of activities being offered that afternoon, which included: e-Sports, Fun and Games, and SEL activity, Photography, and Walking. We also commented on the marked increase in the number of participating students that day in comparison to our first visit in October.

After discussing the visit that day, we began planning an agenda for the next Advisory committee meeting. It would be the last meeting for the school 23 / 24year. We agreed that the survey data and related focus group information that Evaluators collected from the teachers and students on key areas of the NYSAN would be presented and results would help in the planning for the 24/25 school year.

## Conclusions & Recommendations

*Synthesizing all the data from site visits, surveys, interviews, and other sources, please summarize the program's **successes, struggles/lessons learned, and recommendations** to integrate into next year's program implementation plan.*

*\*Client assist: Evidence of reporting is required for compliance with **SMV Indicator H-1**.*

Please enter your summary, here

Project 3C is an exceptional 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program in Suffolk County, serving residential students (grades 3 – 12) with emotional and learning disabilities. Of the 2 objectives that Project 3C was not able to fully realize this year, these only missed the mark by very slim margins. For example, the program achieved 94% of its targeted program participation objective, as opposed to the full 100%. This is a substantial improvement from the 65% participation rate last year! The program also made significant progress in developing the parental involvement component. This has understandably been the most challenging aspect of the program, given that students live on campus and the overwhelming majority of the families live 30 miles away or more. However, Project 3C's close collaboration with representatives from the Little Flower Residential facility and Advisory Committee has allowed them to collect key information this past year that will serve as a bedrock to effectively engage parents in Year 3.

Survey and focus group interviews with teachers and students have consistently revealed very positive ratings in all areas of the NYSAN that have been administered. These include: Environment and Climate, Relationships, Programming and Activities, in addition to Youth Participation and Engagement. Other areas not previously surveyed will be targeted for the 24/25 school year.

The administration from Project 3C is highly organized and proactive in partnering with all major stakeholders to continually develop and improve the program. Advisory Committee meetings are held on schedule, without an exception. In between Advisory meetings, the administration initiates and maintains close contact with Advisory members, the Evaluator, formal partners, and collaborators.

We look forward to continue working closely with Project 3C to further support their already exceptional program!

### **Required Supporting Documents (please attach)**

- ▶ **Data Collection Instruments.** Please attach a blank copy of a survey, observation tool, and interview protocol utilized this past year – only if you did not previously submit the instruments in the Year 1 AER.

*N.B.: All items/artifacts submitted to NYSED as part of the AER are for state-level review purposes only; they will **not** be shared or used outside of the review process without explicit consent from, both, the evaluator and client program director.*

*\*The AER collects a sample of the instruments evaluators used to conduct their study activities. However, programs/clients are required to keep evidence of survey results capturing students' satisfaction with programming and their perceptions of program impact (SMV Indicator H-4).*

Section IV

## Collaboration & Utilization

*Briefly describe the collaboration strategies you and program partners engaged in this year. What worked well? How much was evaluation (your participatory study practices, your information sharing) applied to support program functioning,\* if at all? If you could envision any **improvements/enhancements** to the communication, collaboration, and utilization of evaluation findings & services – what would those be? How would those improvements bring even greater benefit to your client?*

Please enter your summary, here:

We have found that the most effective collaboration strategy is to listen with intent and with sincere respect for clients' concerns and the deep funds of knowledge they possess about their settings and the population they serve. Yes, this approach does help to build trust and reciprocity. However, this approach also widens and deepens knowledge about the client, the community and its various stakeholders. In so doing, it also leads to the enhanced provision of services from Evaluator to the client / community.

We presented at all four (4) Advisory Committee meetings. About half of the time, it was to report on data collected via survey or focus groups. It could also be to provide an overview of major findings in the overall evaluation of the program. At times it was also to ask questions on how best we can meet a challenging objective. At all times, even when we reported on data, we made an effort to frame our talks as inquiries as opposed to spitting out data and predetermined recommendations. Our presentations and overall stance were to present in a way that showed appreciation for and encouraged input from all stakeholders.

We also touched base in between Advisory Committee meetings, which usually was on at least a monthly basis. This was primarily done by contacting the Director of the program to provide reminders of upcoming deadlines and how we could best support each other in meeting the latter.

### **Optional Supporting Documents (please attach)**

- ▶ **Sample Communication Artifact** featuring formative, data-based recommendations. Please share a memo, brief, correspondence, abridged record from a meeting, etc., in which you provided your client with applicable, improvement-focused recommendations this past year.

*\*This information helps the state-level team understand more about the effective processes evaluators used to engage with their program partners/clients. Please provide your client with this communication because evidence of collaboration between the evaluator and program, and the use of evaluation findings for continuous improvement, helps satisfy program compliance requirements in **SMV Section H**.*

Section V

## Logic Model (LM) and/or Theory of Change Model (ToC)

Please provide your most up-to-date logic model and/or theory of change model. Consult the Logic Model Guidance document if you are still constructing your model and would like to review the standard components and basic scaffold. *\*This illustration helps the state-level team see how the evaluator used client input to visually organize program activities and map those across change pathways to targeted outcomes.*

**INSERT HERE or ATTACH SEPARATELY**



## Section VI

## Evaluation Plan &amp; End-of-Year Results Tables

Download the companion excel workbook, **AER Eval Plan & Results Tables**. Review the first two sheets with guidance and the overview of the seven tables. Input into the tables the information for the program's **local objectives** (as listed in the Template for Goals and Objectives), **performance indicators**, **how they were measured**, and **what the year-end results were**. See below for an example of table 1, Core Ed services – one of the five implementation-related 21CCLC program objectives.

**EXAMPLE****OBJECTIVE 1**

Program  
Implementation

21st CCLCs will offer a range of high-quality educational, developmental, and recreational services for students and their families.

**Sub-Objective 1.1**

**Core Educational Services.** 100% of Centers will offer high quality services in **core academic areas**, e.g., reading and literacy, mathematics, and science.

Local Program  
Objective

*All sites provide ELA and STEM activities at schedules allowing students to participate in at least 15 hours of programming.*

Annual Evaluation Report (AER) Template

(A) Performance Indicator(s) (PI) of success	(B) Target Participants whose data will be gathered	(C) PI Measures data collection instruments & methods	(D) Analysis performed <i>Brief description</i>	(E) Sample Studied % of participants data was collected from <i>(if applicable)</i>	(F) Was PI Met? Yes/ Partially/ No/ Data pending	(G) Results in same metrics as PI <i>(if Partially or Data Pending briefly explain)</i>
ELA enrichment programming offered 3 hours/day, 3 days/week for 30 weeks, annually	Program Sites A and B	<input type="checkbox"/> Program schedules <input type="checkbox"/> Observation w/ protocol	<input type="checkbox"/> Review of operating dates, days, and hours <input type="checkbox"/> Observations verify enrichment programming	NA	Partially	Site A offered ELA activities for 3 hrs/day x 3 days/wk. for 30 weeks. Site B had staffing limitations and offered ELA for 2 hrs/day x 2 days/wk. for 25 weeks.
100% of participating ENL/MLL students receive integrated ENL supports	Students designated as ENL/MLL at the beginning of the academic year	<input type="checkbox"/> Site visit observations; review of evidence of Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) in lesson plans	<input type="checkbox"/> Reviewed notes from observations of ENL/MLL afterschool classrooms to check for observational evidence of SIOP used in instruction <input type="checkbox"/> Reviewed lesson plans for ENL/MLL afterschool classes for evidence of SIOP methodologies	100% <input type="checkbox"/> 30 ENL/MLL students in 2 afterschool classrooms were observed; weekly lesson plans were reviewed	Yes	100% of the ENL/MLL students in the program received integrated SIOP ENL supports
50 students will participate in a STEM class for at least 30 hours each year	All 21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC program participants	<input type="checkbox"/> EZ Reports session attendance records	<input type="checkbox"/> Descriptive statistics analysis of EZ Reports data	100%	No	35 students participated in 30 or more hours of STEM classes