Exploring How Programs are **Participating in** *and* **Using** NYS 21C Evaluation

INTRODUCTION & PURPOSE

The requirement for local evaluation is a key component of New York State's 2IC Program; one that differentiates it from other states' 2IC programs, and from other youth- and community-focused grants. NYSED has issued policies and guidance intended to help evaluators establish a cooperative partnership wherein and programs participatory, utilization-focused evaluation services can be integrated effectively. MI has gathered evidence from surveys, interviews, and AERs that suggests there are many examples of productive evaluatorprogram partnerships across the state, and that program communities are experiencing multiple benefits from this collaboration. There are also a number of programs with the potential to develop a more aligned and impactful role for evaluation within their organizations. In all scenarios. 2IC stakeholders have expressed an interest in learning more about how to leverage local evaluation effectively as a resource. MI continues to dialogue with different stakeholder groups to discover what this could look like and how to facilitate more of it. statewide.

NYSED and state-level partners want to understand more about how local evaluators and program leaders are engaging with each other and optimizing their partnership. Today, we will be exploring...

How have **Program Directors** <u>indicated they use</u> <u>external evaluation</u>? How can we learn more about the needs of this pivotal group of "evaluation users"?

How are different stakeholder groups participating in the study? How are they involved or contributing, and how are findings shared with them?

How do evaluators present findings and recommendations in ways that <u>satisfy the different</u> <u>needs of these groups</u>?

EVALUATION NETWORK MEETING Friday, Sept. 13th | 10:15 AM

Measurement Inc.

Program Directors' Year 2 Mid-Year Report (MYR) Survey

NYSED asked Program Directors how much they were using evaluation to engage in **key grant activities**. Some items were specific 2IC local evaluation requirements; some were not.

Review & Reflect

Skim through the Reference Doc, pp.1-3

- (a) <u>MYR Results: PDs' Use of Eval</u>
- (b) MYR Results: PDs' Use of AER
- (c) <u>Policy doc excerpts & Evaluator</u> <u>Survey Responses: Use of EOY Eval</u>

Consider the following questions: (feel free to make notes on the docs)

What resonates? How do these results compare with your experiences and fit with your expectations, statewide?

What do you wonder about? What new questions/curiosities arise?

5 mins

GENERATING DIALOGUE

Chat with a Group of Three-Four. Share your experiences & ideas.

(I) What did you observe about the information that interested you? How do your experiences as a program/site/activity leader or evaluator, compare or contrast? What information was absent?

(2) <u>Program leaders</u>: What activities or types of support provided by your evaluator have been **most important**? <u>Evaluators</u>: When and how have you been **most involved** with supporting program leaders and stakeholders?

(3) <u>All</u>: Where might there be **additional opportunities** to integrate evaluation into the program? What benefits would that bring?

15 mins



Convene & Share Out with the Whole Group Discuss:

- How has evaluation been used to benefit your program/your client's program so far?
- What are some opportunities partners see to optimize evaluation this year? What would you start, stop, or continue doing?
- How can NYSED & MI learn more from program leaders about their evaluation needs? How can program leaders learn more about how to utilize their evaluations?

GATHERING INPUT

EVALUATION

NETWORK MFFTING

Jot down your thoughts on the draft Stakeholder Matrix on page 3. Work independently, then discuss within your group.

Consider the following questions:

(I) How do Program Directors translate and disseminate evaluation information to their stakeholders?

(2) How do evaluators and directors partner together to identify the information and specify the design of report forms based on different stakeholder needs and requests?

20 mins







Participation in & Utilization of Evaluation

Exploring different types and levels of stakeholder engagement in 21C evaluation.

DIRECTIONS. Please fill in the empty spaces in the table, below, to the best of your knowledge and experience. We will be including additional voices and consulting additional sources to integrate with your contributions. This information will help us create the working draft for a Stakeholder Engagement Matrix. For the Participation and Informational Needs columns, select the approximate LEVEL of frequency/importance using the scale High=(3), Medium=(2), Low=(1), None=(0), Not Applicable=NA.

Please select your role in 2IC: | Evaluator 🗖 | Program Director/Manager 🗖 | Site Coordinator/Leader 🗖 | Activity Leader 🗖 |

Other 🗖 🔄

| Stakeholder Group | Participation / Involven in the Evaluation | nent | Informational Needs from the Evaluation | | Deliverable Form & Opportunity |
|--|---|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|--|
| Who needs to be engaged in the study as a participant and recipient of evaluation findings? | In what ways are they engaged as contributors, participants, and/or facilitators of the data collection process?* What is the LEVEL of frequency? | L E V E L | What content might they need in order to make decisions and support program improvement? What is the LEVEL of importance of the information? | L E V E L | In what form(s) and when might the information be most accessible and usable for them?* |
| Program Director | | | | | |
| Program Activity Leaders/Staff | | | | | |
| Executive Director | | | | | |
| School Principal | | | | | |
| Family/Guardian | | | | | |
| Student/Youth Participants | | | | | |
| Other: | | | | | |

*Keep in mind, NYSED policy and guidance states that program leaders and evaluators are collaborating partners in the evaluation. Planning, designing, integrating learning, and helping communicate and disseminate information are considered shared responsibilities (See the SMV Tool, the Evaluability Checklist, and other resources located on the TARC & NYSED Program websites).





Additional Space for Notes

| Stakeholder Group | Participation / Involvement in the Evaluation | Informational Needs from the Evaluation | Deliverable Form & Opportunity |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|
| Program Director | | | |
| Program Activity Leaders/Staff | | | |
| Executive Director | | | |
| School Principal | | | |
| Family/ Guardian | | | |
| Student/Youth Participants | | | |

Thank you for sharing with us.