

2024-25

## Annual Evaluation Report (AER) Template for NYS 21CCLC Local Evaluators

### 1. Project Information

Program Name	The Business Training Institute Inc. (BTI) 21st CCLC Program at Utica City School District (UCSD)		Project Number 0187-25-	8115
Lead Agency	The Business Training Institute Inc.			
Program Director Name	Dr. Patricia Laino	email	<a href="mailto:lainoleo@aol.com">lainoleo@aol.com</a>	phone (315) 733-9848
	Tracy Herman, A&O		<a href="mailto:tracy@aoevaluation.com">tracy@aoevaluation.com</a>	(585) 645-3461 (Tracy)
Evaluator Name & Company	Cynthia O'Connor, A&O	email	<a href="mailto:cynthia@aoevaluation.com">cynthia@aoevaluation.com</a>	phone (315) 427-5747 (Cynthia)
Data Manager Name	Jeff Badgley	email	<a href="mailto:jbadgley.21stcentury@gmail.com">jbadgley.21stcentury@gmail.com</a>	phone (315) 733-9848

Site #	Name of Participating Site(s) and Location (town/city)	Grade Level(s) Served at Each Site	Program Start Date for Students	Target Student Enrollment	Actual Student Enrolled with 15+ Hours by June 30
1	Donovan Middle School (Utica)	7–8	Summer: 8/5/24 After school: 10/21/24	150	75
2	Kennedy Middle School (Utica)	7–8	Summer: 7/8/24 After school: 10/21/24	75	130
3	Proctor High School (Utica)	9–12	Summer: 7/1/24 After school: 9/9/24	250	469
TOTAL Target and Actual Enrollment →				475	674 (Source: Afterschool 21)

Describe any important changes that your project experienced during the 2024-25 program year (e.g., location, major staffing changes, etc.).

There were no major changes to the program locations and staffing to report for the 2024–25 program year. However, Utica City School District got a new superintendent and two of the program sites had mid-year changes of building administrators.

## 2. Site Visits

### 2a. First Site Visit - Readiness Review & Walkthrough

The Local Evaluator and Program Leaders schedule the first site visit to review startup activities and procedures. During this collaborative visit, evaluators may observe early program implementation efforts if possible. Evaluators use a protocol to verify alignment across the program's grant proposal, the logic model, and the program implementation. This visit should serve to identify any obstacles to implementation.

Site # (from page 2)	Visit Date(s)*	Activities Observed (List Activity Titles that Match with AS21 Activity Titles if Possible)	Total N Students Observed
1	11/19/24	After-school academics and enrichment (detailed list provided in site visit summary).	47
2	11/20/24	After-school academics and enrichment (detailed list provided in site visit summary).	8
3	11/20/24	After-school academics and enrichment (detailed list provided in site visit summary).	79

#### Findings & Recommendations Shared with (select all that apply)

- ☒ Project Director      ☒ Advisory Committee      ☒ Site Coordinators  
☐ Other – Describe below

#### How were site visit findings shared? (select all that apply)

- ☒ Meeting (in person or virtual)      ☒ Email      ☐ Newsletter  
☒ Other – Describe below

#### Brief Summary of Findings and Recommendations OR upload your site visit reports

Briefly summarize the findings and recommendations for each site for your first site visit(s) or upload your site visit report(s).

*\*If the first site visit was not conducted, please explain the reason(s) it was not conducted.*

- ☒ Select if site visit report(s) are being uploaded separately.

2b. Second Site Visit – Point of Service Quality Review

The purpose of the second site visit is to focus on assessing fidelity at full implementation.

Site # (from page 2)	Visit Date(s)*	Activities Observed (List Activity Titles that Match with AS21 Activity Titles if Possible)	Total N Students Observed
1	4/3/25	After-school academics and enrichment (detailed list provided in site visit summary).	29
2	3/25/25	After-school academics and enrichment (detailed list provided in site visit summary).	56
3	3/25/25	After-school academics and enrichment (detailed list provided in site visit summary).	20

Findings & Recommendations Shared with (select all that apply)

- ☒ Project Director
- ☒ Advisory Committee
- ☒ Site Coordinators
- ☐ Other – Describe below

How were site visit findings shared? (select all that apply)

- ☒ Meeting (in person or virtual)
- ☒ Email
- ☐ Newsletter
- ☐ Other – Describe below

To what extent were recommendations from the first site visit implemented?

- ☐ 1  
Not at all
- ☐ 2
- ☐ 3
- ☐ 4
- ☒ 5  
To a Great Extent

Comment:

The evaluator provided site-specific and program-wide recommendations through verbal debriefs and a written summary shared with program leadership and during an advisory board meeting. Implementation challenges and recommended solutions were included in these summaries.

Because different activities and instructors were observed in the fall and spring, instructor-specific recommendations identified during the fall visits could not be reassessed during the spring observations. However, fall 2024 average OST tool ratings across the four domains were very strong (6.1 or higher on a 7-point scale), leaving limited opportunity for measurable improvement in the spring.

Throughout the year, the BTI grant manager, data manager, and site coordinator(s) demonstrated a consistent commitment to program quality by actively seeking feedback and implementing recommendations for ongoing improvement.

Summary of Findings and Actionable Recommendations

Briefly summarize the findings and recommendations from your second site visit(s) or upload your site visit report(s).

*\*If the second site visit was not conducted, please explain the reason(s) it was not conducted.*

- ☒ Select if site visit report(s) are being uploaded separately.

### 3. Advisory Committee

21CCLC programs are required to hold quarterly Advisory Committee meetings that allow stakeholders to have meaningful involvement in program planning and decision-making. Issues addressed at Advisory Committee meetings should include effectiveness of program features, student development, and other aspects of program evaluation.

Which best describes this program's Advisory Committee(s)?

☒ One Advisory Committee for all sites combined
 ☐ One Advisory Committee per site

☐ A different configuration – explain:

#### Advisory Committee Configuration & Meeting Dates

On the table below, enter

- the number of people who represented each role and attended at least 2 program Advisory Committee(s) and
- the Advisory Committee meeting dates.

If your program convenes one Advisory Committee for all sites combined, complete row 1 only.

Site # (from page 2)	1. Representation on the Advisory Committee - enter number								2. Meeting Dates			
	Program Director or Manager	Other Lead Agency Representative	School Administrators or Staff	Partners	Families	Evaluator	Students	Other Role -Describe and Enter Number <i>Example: Town Supervisor 1</i>	1*	2*	3*	4
1	1	1	7	0	0	1	0	Community Members - 3	9/26/24	12/16/24	4/29/25	6/17/25

\*Provide an explanation if fewer than four Advisory Board meetings convened.

Provide a brief description of your program's Advisory Committee(s) and how it has meaningful involvement in program design planning and assessment.

What recommendations and resources did they provide?

- The BTI advisory committee had a comprehensive roster, with a variety of stakeholders representing the three program locations. Representatives from each school attended each quarterly meeting and parents and students attended one meeting.
- Advisory meetings were guided by an agenda of program planning and assessment items including general program updates, successes, challenges, solutions, and evaluation findings (e.g., observations, focus groups, surveys, mid-year and annual evaluation reports).
- Advisory board recommendations guided key areas of program planning, including:
  - Revising the program calendar for Year 4
  - Revising the student sign-in sheet

- o Developing a “Q&A” document for staff and students in response to questions/suggestions provided in annual surveys
- o Coordinating new staff orientations
- o Planning family engagement events

## 4. Conclusions & Recommendations

Provide site-specific information where appropriate.

On the table below, briefly summarize the surveys and focus groups that were conducted as part of this year's evaluation. Insert additional rows as needed.

Survey or Focus Group?	Description of Participants (e.g., students, family members, etc.)	N Invited	N Responded or Included	Briefly Describe Any Important Findings
Focus group	Program staff	10	9	See attached staff focus group summary.
Surveys	Students	475	298	See attached student survey summary.
Surveys	Parents	200 out of 550 called for a phone survey	187	See attached parent survey summary.
Surveys	Program staff	55	42	See attached staff survey summary.

If you engaged in data collection or evaluation activities that were not included in your program's plan but were especially helpful or meaningful, please describe them here.

All data collection and evaluation activities outlined in the evaluation contract were carried out as planned. A&O also provided ongoing technical assistance, supporting areas such as the transition from EZReports, NYSED reporting, and program planning based on evaluation findings.

In addition to required NYS data collection activities (e.g., surveys, document review, data analysis, and observations), A&O offered an annual staff focus group, which included staff from each site and the BTI data manager. A&O also developed summary reports and visual presentations to support advisory board meetings and a wider dissemination of findings.

To what extent is each site implementing its program as intended?

Site # (from page 2)	Not at All	1	2	3	4	To a Great Extent	5	Comment
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

**Describe this project's successes, including those successes tied to Performance Indicators.**

### **Implementation**

Many of the same **performance indicators for implementation** were achieved this grant year as in the previous year, including professional development offerings, QSA action planning, STEM programming, career and college programming, use of community partners, and family engagement.

- **Student participation:** The program served 674 students for 15 or more hours, far exceeding its funding target of 475 students.<sup>1</sup> The program schedule allowed for summer and after-school participation, along with weekends for select activities (e.g., community service work, robotics competition, drama club practices).
- **Implementation fidelity:** Fall and spring observations demonstrated overall **fidelity to the BTI's NYSED-approved plan** and federal grant requirements. Additionally, BTI and Utica City School District (UCSD) staff met grant expectations by using an approved lesson plan template, completing the QSA twice per year, and convening quarterly advisory board meetings with a variety of stakeholders represented.
- **Instructional quality:** Evaluators observed **high-quality instruction**, with UCSD staff involvement in programming. Many staff received OST ratings of 6 or 7 (on a 7-point scale), exceeding the benchmark rating of 5 (*evident or implicit*) for student and staff performance. Sample lesson plans were also of high quality. Activity choices were age-appropriate and offered students meaningful opportunities to develop financial literacy, strengthen technological skills, and enhance their preparedness for post-secondary education and future careers.
- **Site coordinators:** In Year 3, BTI transitioned site coordinator responsibilities to non-administrative school staff. The organization hired new site coordinators (i.e., school staff) and provided them with an updated position description. These new coordinators adhered to their newly defined responsibilities according to evaluator observations and available documentation. This strategic shift proved beneficial, particularly as two program sites experienced mid-year changes in building administration.
- **After-school snack:** In Year 3, all sites consistently served an after-school snack to all after-school program participants as soon as the school day ended.

### **Stakeholder feedback was positive**

- Survey, focus group, and advisory board feedback indicated that participants, parents, and staff consistently reported **positive impressions of the program and clear benefits for students**. Stakeholders highlighted several program strengths including student access to activities and skill-building opportunities not otherwise available to them, the variety of program offerings, a safe and supportive after-school environment, snack distribution, opportunities for socialization with peers outside the regular school day, small group settings, and increases in student creativity and confidence.

### **Use of evaluation findings**

- Program evaluation findings were consistently used by the BTI program leaders and site coordinators to inform planning and drive improvements.

---

<sup>1</sup> Source: Afterschool 21 aggregation, provided by NYSED in October 2025

## Program challenges

- **Limited access to shared schedules:** Program schedules were not maintained on a shared electronic platform, preventing multiple stakeholders (e.g., site coordinators, BTI program leads, building administrators, the evaluator) from having real-time access. As a result, schedules had to be individually requested from each site coordinator to confirm current activities, dates and times, staff assignments, and class locations. This lack of centralized access also limited the visibility of schedule changes during the year. At times, discrepancies were noted between site coordinator schedules and those maintained by BTI.
- **Staffing and student-to-staff ratios:** Several observed classes were staffed with a second adult when the student-to-staff ratio did not warrant it (i.e., exceeding the 15-to-1 ratio). While an additional adult can enhance relationship-building with students, this could lead to over-spending if attendance per class is not carefully and regularly monitored.
- **Inconsistent attendance data across systems:** Participant attendance records varied between EZReports/Afterschool 21 (maintained by the BTI data manager and aggregated by Pathwise) and the district's analysis of participant attendance and student outcome data. The EZReports/Afterschool 21 records indicated a higher number of students meeting the 15 and 30-hour thresholds. As a result, the student outcome data reported for 21st CCLC Program Objective 2 analysis (i.e., academic performance and behavior) under-represented the number of students who attended the program for 30 or more hours. The Excel AER clarifies the percentage of students represented in the outcome analysis.
- **Limited access to student information:** Staff reported challenges in effectively serving program participants without access to protected student information (e.g., IEPs, disabilities, academic performance, behavioral issues) due to the district's confidentiality restrictions.



## Recommendations

- **Implement agreed-upon program improvements:** During the April 2025 advisory board meeting, program staff and coordinators agreed to implement the following actions for Year 4:
  - Store program schedules on a shared drive accessible to school district staff, BTI staff, and the external evaluator to ensure real-time access and consistency
  - Monitor student attendance in classes with more than one staff member and reduce staffing when not warranted by enrollment, as a cost-control measure
- **Align attendance data across systems:** Ensure that student attendance records are consistent between Afterschool 21 and the district's SchoolTool system to improve the accuracy of data used in the Objective 2 analysis.
- **Strengthen communication between program and school staff:** Encourage program activity leaders to regularly communicate with the education liaison (i.e., the building administrator) and classroom teachers to understand student academic needs, disabilities, and personal circumstances that could influence behavior or emotional well-being during program time.
- **Refine and expand program offerings based on feedback:** Continue to adapt programming in response to survey and focus group feedback and needs assessment findings. Potential strategies include:
  - Increasing the number of program days offered annually (e.g., starting the program earlier in the school year)
  - Revising the program schedule to address attendance barriers such as offering high-interest clubs more than once per week
  - Rotating club options throughout the year (e.g., introducing new activities mid-year)
  - Expanding enrichment opportunities to reflect evolving student interests
  - Increasing community organization involvement in grant-supported activities

## 5. *Logic Model and/or Theory of Change Model*

Insert or attach separately your most up-to-date logic model and/or theory of change model.

☒ Select if the logic model/theory of change model has been updated from the program's accepted application.

← Year of most recent version if updated

☒ Select if the logic model/theory of change model is being uploaded separately.

## ***6. Evaluation Plan & End-of-Year Results Tables***

Please see the accompanying Annual Evaluation Report Evaluation Plan & Results Tables in Excel.