

New Evaluation Reporting Requirements for Indiana's 21st CCLC Programs

Mindy Hightower King, Ph.D.

Indiana University



**Indiana
Department of Education**

Glenda Ritz, NBCT

Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction

First, some background:

- Programs submit vastly different local evaluation reports to IDOE each year.
- Some reports include only minimal primary data collection and analysis.
- Program directors are often uncertain as to the types of data collection and analysis that evaluators can provide.
- It is often very difficult for IDOE to determine how programs are doing, based on their local evaluation report.

Where do these new guidelines come from?

- Evaluation advisory committee, established in the summer of 2014
- Discussed issues related to streamlining evaluation requirements and building a framework to ensure more useful evaluation efforts across the state
- Guidelines proposed by the committee, reviewed by IDOE and IAN, are now being shared statewide
- Guidelines apply to all Cohort 6 & 7 local evaluation reports submitted at the end of the 2014-2015 program year

Resources available:

- *Indiana 21st CCLC Evaluation Guidelines: 2014-2015*
(Word document that includes all templates presented during the webinar and a summary of the evaluation report requirements; available electronically, and will be distributed by IDOE to all Program Directors and Evaluators of Record following this webinar)
- **This Power Point Slide deck**
(Will be distributed by IDOE to all Program Directors and Evaluators of Record following this webinar)
- **Mindy Hightower King, Indiana University,**
minking@indiana.edu

Overview of Today's Topics:

- Guidelines for Local Reports
- Reporting STPMs
- ISTEP+ and Acuity Data

Site-Level Executive Summary:

(Template provided - recommended length of 2 pages;
limited to 3 pages maximum)

1. Total number of students attending 60+ days (or 30+ days) for middle and high schools - compared to the targeted number of students for this site.
2. Summarized results of all performance measures that include academic data (ISTEP+, local assessments, grades, credits earned, etc.).
3. Two or three bullet points describing the program site's main successes during the year; 2-3 bullet points describing how programming at this site will be strengthened during the upcoming year.

Grantee Logo [optional]	21 st CCLC Program Name - Site Name (Cohort X, Year X)			
	2014-2015 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY			
Students Served by the Program Site During Grant Cycle				
Attendance Category	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Attendance Target	50	--	--	--
Less than 30 days	12	--	--	--
30-60 days	9	--	--	--
60 or more days	42	--	--	--
Total	63	--	--	--
2014-2015 Progress Toward Academic Performance Measures				
Result	Performance Measure and Annual Target			
75%	70% of regularly attending students in grades 3-6 will pass the ELA portion of the 2015 ISTEP+ Assessment.			
15%	Fall to spring proficiency rates on DIBELS for regularly attending students in grade K-2 will increase by 10%.			
82%	75% of regularly attending students in grades 3-6 will demonstrate at least 75% mastery on ELA section of Acuity C in spring 2015.			
68%	70% of students will maintain a grade of "B" or better, or improve their ELA grade from fall 2014 to spring 2015.			
75%	70% of regularly attending students in grades 3-6 will pass the math portion of the 2015 ISTEP+ Assessment.			
15%	Fall to spring proficiency rates on DIBELS Math for regularly attending students in grade K-2 will increase by 10%.			
82%	75% of regularly attending students in grades 3-6 will demonstrate at least 75% mastery on math section of Acuity C in spring 2015.			
68%	70% of students will maintain a grade of "B" or better, or improve their math grade from fall 2014 to spring 2015.			
2014-2015 Program Site Successes				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Brief description of success. ➤ Brief description of success. ➤ Brief description of success. 				
Areas to be Strengthened in 2015-2016				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Area to be strengthened. ➤ Area to be strengthened. ➤ Area to be strengthened. 				

Elementary School Executive Summary Template

← Attendance targets and data

← Summarized results of all performance measures that include academic data

← Two or three bullet points describing the program site's main successes during the year and areas to strengthen.

Report(s)

The following information must be included in multiple site-level reports or one overall report that includes site-level data:

1. Students Served by the Program
2. Progress Towards ALL Performance Measures
(with detailed reporting of Short-Term Performance Measures)
3. Formative Feedback
4. Comparisons of Performance Across Multiple Years (Years 2, 3, and 4 only)

1. Students Served by the Program

For each program site, include:

- The number and percent of students served less than 30 days, 30-59, and 60+ days (for elementary schools)
- The number and percent of students served less than 30 days and 30+ days (for middle and high schools)
- Document how the program's actual attendance numbers compare to projected attendance numbers included in your grant application
- Include participant demographics (ages, race/ethnicity, free/reduced lunch numbers, etc.)

2. Progress Towards Performance Measures

For each program site, include:

- Progress made toward each performance measure included in the grant application. If changes to these performance measures have been made and approved by IDOE, please be sure to include revised performance measures.
- ***Quantitative data*** to demonstrate progress towards the targets set in each performance measure.
- Data on progress towards the program's *Short-term Performance Measures* (STPMs), must be reported using the required STPM table (next slides). This information can also be reported in an appendix in the report.

Elementary and Middle School STPM Table

Short-term Performance Measures: Math (Program Name, Site Name)

Spring proficiency rates on the Math portion of Acuity will increase from fall proficiency rates by 3%.

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Total Number of “Frequent” or “Regular” Participants in Relevant Grade Levels	Total Number of Participants in Column A with Assessment Data in Both Fall and Spring	Percent with Complete Data	Fall		Spring		Percent Change	Met Target
			Number of Students Passing	Percent of Students Passing	Number of Students Passing	Percent of Students Passing		
110	100	90.9%	60	60.0%	67	67.0%	+ 7.0%	Yes

High School STPM Table: Progress Measures

Short-term Performance Measures: Progress (Program Name, Site Name)

75% of regular program participants in high school who are enrolled in a math course during the school year will earn a minimum of 1 credit per semester in math.

A	B	C	D	E	F
Total Number of Regular Participants Eligible for Measure	Total Number of Regular Participants for whom Relevant Data are Available	Percent with Complete Data	Number of Regular Participants who Met the Stated Criteria	Percent of Regular Participants who Met the Stated Criteria	Met Target
110	100	90.9%	60	60.0%	Yes

High School STPM Table: Graduation Measures

Short-term Performance Measures: Graduation (Program Name, Site Name)

53% of regular program participants (on a diploma track) in their fourth year of high school will graduate from high school by October 1st of the following school year.

A	B	C	D	E	F
Total Number of Regular Participants Eligible for Measure	Total Number of Regular Participants for whom Necessary Data are Available	Percent with Complete Data	Number of Regular Participants who Met the Stated Criteria	Percent of Regular Participants who Met the Stated Criteria	Met Target
110	100	90.9%	60	60.0%	Yes

3. Formative Feedback

For each program site, include:

- Information on the strengths and weaknesses of each program site. These data may be compiled through site visits, stakeholder interviews, or focus groups. Most importantly, this is information compiled by the local evaluator.
- Ideally, formative feedback will be aligned with the Indiana Afterschool Standards and serve to complement the IN-QPSA self-assessment process.
- The strengths and weaknesses of each program site should be easy to locate and included in summary format in the report.

4. Comparison of Performance Across Years

(Years 2, 3, and 4 only)

For each program site, include:

- Comparisons of yearly performance (e.g., program attendance, test scores, performance measures, grades, student behavior) across all four years of the grant in order to demonstrate growth.
- Longitudinal analyses that consider “multiple-year attendees” (those who attend 60+ or 30+ for 2 or more years) are recommended, but not required.

2014-2015 Assessment Changes Affecting 21st CCLC Data Collection and Reporting

- **ISTEP+ Data** - Will be available later than in years past; these data are still federally required and must be put into EZReports within 10 days of availability.
- **Acuity** - Changes in the Predictive Assessments in 2014-2015 will yield Assessments A, B, and C non-comparable.
 - Programs are not required to report changes in proficiency rates from fall to spring, but only report results for Assessment C.
 - Performance measures and targets should be re-written to accommodate these changes.
 - These performance measures should not be compared across years.

Examples of Appropriate Acuity Performance Measures

- **75% of regularly attending 21st CCLC participants in grades 3-6 will score at or above 50% on the math portion of Assessment C of Acuity in Spring 2015.**
- **75% of regularly attending 21st CCLC participants in grades 3-6 will score at or above 75% on the ELA portion of Assessment C of Acuity in Spring 2015.**

NOTE: Setting the targets for these performance measures may be challenging, but data from Assessments A and B should be available for reference. These data should be used to inform program staff on areas of student need.

Elementary and Middle School STPM Table: Revised for Reporting 2014-2015 Acuity Data

Short-term Performance Measures: Math (Program Name, Site Name)

Spring proficiency rates on the Math portion of Acuity will increase from fall proficiency rates by 3%.

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Total Number of “Frequent” or “Regular” Participants in Relevant Grade Levels	Total Number of Participants in Column A with ...data from Acuity Assessment C	Percent with Complete Data	Fall		Spring		Leave this cell empty	Met Target
			Leave this cell empty	Leave this cell empty	Number of students at predicted level	Percent of students at predicted level		
110	100	90.9%	60	60.0%	67	67.0%	+ 7.0%	Yes

Evaluation Reporting Requirements for Indiana's 21st CCLC Programs

Mindy Hightower King, Ph.D.

Indiana University



**Indiana
Department of Education**

Glenda Ritz, NBCT

Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction