



# 2018-19 North Carolina 21st CCLC Program State-Level Progress Monitoring Report

---

## Cohort 12 and 13 Grantees

### **Submitted by:**

Bryan C. Hutchins, Ph.D.  
Wendy McColskey, Ph.D.  
Melissa Williams, M.A.  
Kathleen Mooney, M.A.

SERVE Center at UNCG  
Dixon Building  
5900 Summit Avenue  
Browns Summit, NC 27214  
(800) 755-3277

### **Submitted to:**

Susan Brigman  
Interim Assistant Director, Federal Program  
Monitoring and Support  
NCDPI

**March 2020**

## Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Goal 1: Projected Numbers of Students Are Enrolled .....	3
Objective 1.1: The Majority (Over 50%) of Grantees Enroll At Least 75% of their Projected Number of Students.....	4
Objective 1.2: The Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served Statewide are from Low-Income Schools .....	5
Objective 1.3: The Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served Statewide are in Need of Academic Support .....	5
Goal 2: Enrolled Students Meet Definition of “Regular” Attendance.....	6
Objective 2.1: Statewide Percentage of Students Attending 30 Days or More is At Least 70% (80% in Elementary, 60% in Middle School, and 40% in High School).....	7
Objective 2.2: Statewide Percentage of Centers with an Average Attendance of 30 Days or More Will Not Fall Below 87%.....	7
Goal 3: Programs Will Offer Services in Core Academic Areas and in Enrichment .....	8
Objective 3.1: More than 85% of Centers Offer Services in At Least One Core Academic Area ....	8
Objective 3.2: More than 85% of Centers Offer Enrichment Support Activities.....	9
Goal 4: “Regular” Attendees Will Demonstrate Educational and Social Benefits and Exhibit Positive Behavioral Changes .....	10
<b>A. State Achievement Test Results</b> .....	10
Objective 4.1: The Statewide Percentage of “Regular” Attendees (Grades 4-8), With Two Years of State Test Data, Who Improve from “Non-Proficient” (Levels I, II or III) To “Proficient” (Levels IV or V) Will Be At Least 11%.....	11
Objective 4.2: “Regular” Attendees (Grades 4-8) With Two Years of State Test Data Will Demonstrate Year-to-Year Change On State Tests in Reading and Math at Least as Great or Greater Than the State Population Year-to-Year Change .....	12
<b>B. Classroom Teacher Survey on “Regular” Attendees’ Improvement at End of Year</b> .....	14
Objective 4.3: The Majority (Over 50%) of Classroom Teachers Responding to a Teacher Survey Will Rate 21st CCLC “Regular” Attendees’ Classroom Performance and Behavior as Improved. 14	
Summary .....	15
Appendix A: Proposed and Actual Enrollment by Grantee 2018-19.....	18
Appendix B: Attendance Data Reported by Center/Grantee 2018-19.....	21

# 2018-19 North Carolina 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Program State-Level Progress Monitoring Report: Cohort 12 And 13 Grantees

## Introduction

---

Since 2002, the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) has operated a federally-funded competitive grant award program to fund 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) to provide after-school services. The intent of this federal funding is for grantees to provide after-school (and before school, weekend, or summer) academic enrichment opportunities for children attending high-poverty and low-performing schools as a means to help them meet local and state academic standards.

Each group of awarded grants (grantees) is called a cohort. NCDPI funded the first cohort of 16 grantees in 2002. Cohorts 2-8 (2003-2009) averaged 20 grantees per cohort. In July 2010, the State Board approved funds for the largest cohort to date (89 Cohort 9 grantees, for a total award of \$24,982,787). In July 2013, the State Board approved funds for 52 Cohort 10 grantees totaling \$17,925,136. The following year, funds were approved for 68 Cohort 11 grantees totaling \$22,323,666.

In 2017, 45 Cohort 12 grantees received funding totaling \$14,917,238.<sup>1</sup> Then in 2018, 49 Cohort 13 grantees received funding totaling \$15,771,977. This report summarizes data from the two cohorts of grantees operating programs in 2018-19 (i.e., Cohort 12, with 45 grantees in their second year of funding, and Cohort 13, with 49 grantees in their first year of funding).

The purpose of this report is to provide descriptive information to inform NCDPI's monitoring of the performance of the grantees and participating students, statewide. The report is organized by NCDPI's goals and objectives for the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program, which incorporate required federal 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC objectives and performance measures.<sup>2</sup> The NCDPI goals and objectives for the program are:

- **Goal 1:** Projected numbers of students are enrolled.
  - **Objective 1.1:** The majority (over 50%) of grantees enroll at least 75% of their projected number of students.
  - **Objective 1.2:** The majority (over 50%) of students served statewide are from low-income schools.
  - **Objective 1.3:** The majority (over 50%) of students served statewide are in need of academic support.

---

<sup>1</sup> During the May 2017 State Board Meeting it was recommended that the Allotment Policy Manual be revised to offer three-year 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grants to approved organizations; thus, Cohort 12 was the first cohort to receive a three-year grant (as opposed to previous cohorts that had four-year grant funding cycles with reduced funding in the final year).

<sup>2</sup> <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/21stcclc/performance.html>



- **Goal 2:** Enrolled students meet the definition of “regular” attendance.
  - **Objective 2.1:** Statewide percentage of students attending 30 days or more is at least 70% (80% in elementary, 60% in middle school, and 40% in high school).
  - **Objective 2.2:** Statewide percentage of centers with an average attendance of 30 days or more will not fall below 87%.
- **Goal 3:** Programs will offer services in core academic areas and in enrichment.
  - **Objective 3.1:** More than 85% of centers offer services in at least one core academic area.
  - **Objective 3.2:** More than 85% of centers offer enrichment support activities.
- **Goal 4:** “Regular” attendees will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.
  - **Objective 4.1:** The statewide percentage of “regular” attendees (Grades 4-8), with two years of state test data, who improve from “non-proficient” (levels I, II or III) to “proficient” (levels iv or v) will be at least 11%.
  - **Objective 4.2:** “Regular” attendees (Grades 4-8) with two years of state test data will demonstrate year-to-year change on state tests in reading and math at least as great or greater than the state population year-to-year change.
  - **Objective 4.3:** The majority (over 50%) of classroom teachers responding to a Teacher Survey will rate 21<sup>st</sup> cclc “regular” attendees’ classroom performance and behavior as improved.

**Goal 1** focuses on the extent to which grantees, statewide, enroll the students for whom the program is intended. **Goal 2** addresses the extent to which enrolled students, statewide, are “regularly” attending the after-school programming provided by the grantees. “Regular” attendees are defined by the federal program requirements as those students who attend 30 days or more during the course of the school year. Data related to Goals 1 and 2 come from 21DC (the state database for this program). Grantees are required to report daily attendance for all students participating in the program through the 21DC system. NCDPI provided student-level attendance data from 21DC to SERVE Center for this report.

**Goals 3 and 4** reflect the wording of the federal 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program-established performance objectives and indicators required by states with 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs as part of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA). Goal 3 relates to ensuring funded programs provide the required academic and enrichment activities to students. Data related to Goal 3 come from 21DC. Grantees are required to report, through the 21DC system, which academic and enrichment activities centers provide and how often these activities are provided. NCDPI provided center-level activity data from 21DC to SERVE Center for this report.

Goal 4 focuses on the outcomes desired for those students who participate on a “regular” basis (at least 30 days for the school year). Under Goal 4, two sources of data on the progress of participating students were obtained and analyzed. The first source was state test score results for participating Grades 4-8 students who attended at least 30 days for the 2018-19 school year and who had two years of state test results on End-of-Grade (EOG) tests in reading or math. Student-level assessment data for this report were provided by NCDPI. The second source of data were



Teacher Surveys. The surveys are distributed by grantees to classroom teachers of program participants in order to collect data regarding changes to the classroom performance and/or behavior of 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC “regular” attendees over the course of the school year. The grantees enter teachers’ ratings of “regular” attendees into 21DC. NCDPI provided student-level teacher ratings to SERVE Center for this report. More information about the Teacher Survey is provided in the discussion of Objective 4.3.

Below, we provide data on the extent to which the state objectives for the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program were met for 2018-19 for the four goals.

## Goal 1: Projected Numbers of Students Are Enrolled

As context for this goal, Table 1 describes the number of grantees and centers, statewide, for 2017-18 and 2018-19 and the average number of students served per grantee. Because the first year of operation for Cohort 13 was 2018-19, no data are reported for Cohort 13 in 2017-18. During the 2018-19 school year, there were a total of 94<sup>3</sup> grantees operating 206 centers (average of 2 centers per grantee). Statewide, the 94 grantees reported 14,912 participating students, with an average of 159 students served per grantee.

**Table 1.** 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC 2017-18 and 2018-19 Grantees, Centers, and Participating Students

	Cohort 12 2017-18	Cohort 12 2018-19	Cohort 13 2017-18	Cohort 13 2018-19	Both Cohorts 2017-18	Both Cohorts 2018-19
<b>Grantees</b>						
Number of grantees	45	45	N/A	49	N/A	<b>94</b>
Number of participating students	8,693	8,578	N/A	6,355	N/A	<b>14,912*</b>
Average number of students served by grantees	194	191	N/A	130	N/A	<b>159</b>
<b>Centers</b>						
Number of centers	117	119	N/A	87	N/A	<b>206</b>
Number of centers per grantee (range)	1-8	1-8	N/A	1-6	N/A	<b>1-8</b>
Average number of centers per grantee	3	3	N/A	2	N/A	<b>2</b>

Note. Includes all students, regardless of days of attendance.

\* 21 students were reported as participating in *both* Cohort 12 and Cohort 13 centers.

As can be seen in the far righthand column of Table 2, for 2018-19, of the 14,912 enrolled, 69% were elementary-level students (with 24% from middle schools and 7% from high schools). Approximately half of the students enrolled in 2018-19 were African American, 23% were White, and 17% were Hispanic.

<sup>3</sup> Eleven grantees operated both Cohort 12 and 13 centers. Five of these grantees operated 10 centers that were reported as being funded by both Cohorts 12 and 13. In the event that a grantee operated both Cohort 12 and 13 centers, data for these grantees were analyzed and reported separately by cohort.



**Table 2.** 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Participating Students in 2017-18 and 2018-19

	Cohort 12 2017-18	Cohort 12 2018-19	Cohort 13 2017-18	Cohort 13 2018-19	Both Cohorts 2017-18	Both Cohorts 2018-19
Number of centers	117	119	N/A	87	N/A	<b>206</b>
Average # of students served per center	75	72	N/A	73	N/A	<b>73</b>
Number of participating students	8,693	8,578	N/A	6,355	N/A	<b>14,912*</b>
<b>By School Level</b>						
% Elementary School	57%	66%	N/A	74%	N/A	<b>69%</b>
% Middle School	29%	26%	N/A	21%	N/A	<b>24%</b>
% High School	14%	9%	N/A	5%	N/A	<b>7%</b>
<b>By Ethnicity</b>						
% African American	45%	46%	N/A	58%	N/A	<b>51%</b>
% White	27%	27%	N/A	16%	N/A	<b>23%</b>
% Hispanic	16%	16%	N/A	18%	N/A	<b>17%</b>
% Other	12%	10%	N/A	7%	N/A	<b>9%</b>

\* 21 students were reported as participating in *both* Cohort 12 and Cohort 13 centers.

### *Objective 1.1: The Majority (Over 50%) of Grantees Enroll At Least 75% of their Projected Number of Students*

Applicants seeking a 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grant were required to estimate the number of students their program would enroll. Thus, grantee performance can be reviewed by examining the percent of grantees who reported enrolling their projected number of participants. The number of students enrolled per grantee was calculated using student-level 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grantee-reported data provided by NCDPI. The reported number of students proposed to be served by Cohort 12 and 13 grantees ranged from 50 to 520, while the number of students who were reported as enrolled in 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs in 2018-19 ranged from 40 to 561.

To describe the extent of enrollment by grantee, the enrollment projections of grantees were classified as “met” if the number of students who were enrolled was at least 75% of their projected enrollment. See Appendix A for the reported enrollment percentages by grantee.

#### **✓ Objective 1.1—Met**

For 2018-19, this objective was met. Approximately 98% of Cohort 12 grantees and 90% of Cohort 13 grantees reported serving at least 75% of their proposed number of students in 2018-19, with a total across both cohorts of 94%. The objective was exceeded in that almost all (94%) grantees enrolled at least 75% of their projected number of students.

In exploring variations across types of organizations, Table 3 shows that, across organization types, the percentage of grantees with at least 75% of projected enrollment was similarly high, 90% or above.

**Table 3.** Number of Grantees that Enrolled At Least 75% of Projected Students by Organization Type

Organization Type	Both Cohorts 2018-19	
	# of Grantees	#% of grantees that enrolled ≥75% of projected students
Charter School (CS)	8	8 (100%)



Organization Type	Both Cohorts 2018-19	
	# of Grantees	#% of grantees that enrolled ≥75% of projected students
Community-Based Organization (CBO)	42	38 (90%)
Faith-Based Organization (FBO)	7	7 (100%)
School District (SD)	27	26 (96%)
Other	10	9 (90%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>88 (94%)</b>

*Objective 1.2: The Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served Statewide are from Low-Income Schools*

One focus of the federal 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC funding is on supporting students from high-poverty schools. Table 4 indicates that 86% of students who attended Cohort 12 and Cohort 13 centers in 2018-19 attended schools that qualified for Title I funding.<sup>4</sup> Elementary school participants in 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs were overwhelmingly from Title I schools (99%), while 72% of middle school participants and 51% of high school participants were from Title I schools.

**Table 4.** 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Participating Students from Title I Schools in 2018-19

	Cohort 12	Cohort 13	Both Cohorts
Average # of students from Title I schools served per center	62	68	<b>65</b>
Average % of students from Title I schools served per center	82%	93%	<b>86%</b>
Number of participating Title I students	7,415	5,949	<b>13,364</b>
<b>By School Level</b>			
% Elementary School	98%	100%	<b>99%</b>
% Middle School	65%	83%	<b>72%</b>
% High School	54%	44%	<b>51%</b>
<b>By Ethnicity</b>			
% African American	88%	93%	<b>91%</b>
% White	81%	88%	<b>83%</b>
% Hispanic	85%	97%	<b>91%</b>
% Other	90%	94%	<b>92%</b>

**✓ Objective 1.2—Met**

This objective was met for 2018-19. Overall, an average of 86% of students per center came from schools that qualified for Title I funding (65 students on average per center coming from Title I schools).

*Objective 1.3: The Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served Statewide are in Need of Academic Support*

Given the focus of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program on students from low-performing schools, it is germane to examine the extent to which students (Grades 4-8) entering the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program for any given year scored “non-proficient” on the previous year’s state tests in reading or math. That is, are over 50% of the students served entering the program at the beginning of the year in academic need, as judged by their performance on the prior year’s state tests?

<sup>4</sup> Title I schools were identified using 2018-19 eligibility data from NCDPI (see <https://files.nc.gov/dpi/documents/program-monitoring/data/essr-data-as-of-2-12-19.xlsx>). School was identified as Title I if “School Served” variable = “Y”.





State EOG test results for 2017-18 (prior year for this report) are reported using the following five proficiency levels:<sup>5</sup>

- Level I: Students have limited command of knowledge and skills
- Level II: Students have partial command of the knowledge and skills
- Level III: Students have sufficient command of the knowledge and skills
- Level IV: Students have solid command of the knowledge and skills
- Level V: Students have superior command of the knowledge and skills

This scale, adopted by the North Carolina State Board of Education in 2013, is meant to convey the degree to which a student is prepared to proceed to the next grade level. Table 5 shows that, for Cohort 12, based on the total number of students in Grades 4 to 8 (with prior year test scores who were served in 2017-18), 74% entered the school year “non-proficient” in reading and 67% entered “non-proficient” in math. For students served in 2018-19, 74% of Cohort 12 and 78% of Cohort 13 students in Grades 4 to 8 were “non-proficient” in reading at the beginning of the school year, while 68% of Cohort 12 and 73% of Cohort 13 students were “non-proficient” in math.

**Table 5.** Percent of 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Students (Grades 4-8) “Non-Proficient” in Reading or Math EOG Tests in 2017 for 2017-18 School Year and in 2018 for 2018-19 School Year

	Reading		Math	
	Cohort 12	Cohort 13	Cohort 12	Cohort 13
% “non-proficient” at end of 2017 (prior to being served in 2017-18 school year)	74%	N/A	67%	N/A-
% “non-proficient” at end of 2018 (prior to being served in 2018-19 school year)	74%	78%	68%	73%

Note. *N* sizes varied by cohort and subject.

**✓ Objective 1.3—Met**

This objective was met in 2018-19. For participating Cohort 12 and 13 students in Grades 4 to 8 with prior year test scores, the majority (over 50%), in this case 68% to 78%, were in need of academic support, as judged by their lack of proficiency on state tests in reading or math at program entry.

## Goal 2: Enrolled Students Meet Definition of “Regular” Attendance

Program attendance is a critical aspect in determining program success. That is, if participating students do not participate “regularly,” they will be less likely to realize any significant benefits, academic or otherwise. “Regular” attendance is defined by federal guidelines as attending the program for a minimum of 30 days. “Regular” attendance is measured here in the following two ways: (Objective 2.1) the percentage of students who participated “regularly” overall and by school level (elementary, middle, high) and (Objective 2.2) the percentage of centers, statewide, with an average attendance of 30 days or more (“regular” attendance). For both objectives, the target percentages were set based on statewide baseline data reported on students participating in 2014-15.

<sup>5</sup> For the purposes of this report, “non-proficient” is defined as those students who fall within proficiency Level I, Level II, and Level III.





**Objective 2.1: Statewide Percentage of Students Attending 30 Days or More is At Least 70% (80% in Elementary, 60% in Middle School, and 40% in High School)**

As Table 6 shows, statewide, 71% (for Cohort 12 and Cohort 13 combined) of enrolled students were reported by grantees as attending for 30 days or more in 2018-19, while 29% of students were reported as attending fewer than 30 days. The percentage of students who were “regular” attendees was highest at the elementary level (77%) and decreased in middle school (63%) and high school (38%), when other after-school activities may be more likely to interfere with program attendance.

**Table 6.** Cohort 12 and 13 Center Attendance in 2017-18 and 2018-19

	Cohort 12 2017-18	Cohort 12 2018-19	Cohort 13 2017-18	Cohort 13 2018-19	Both Cohorts 2017-18	Both Cohorts 2018-19
<b>Students</b>						
% of “regular” attendees (30 days or more)	63%	72%	N/A	69%	N/A	<b>71%</b>
% 30-89 days	37%	37%	N/A	48%	N/A	42%
% 90 days or more	26%	35%	N/A	21%	N/A	29%
% of “non-regular” attendees	37%	28%	N/A	31%	N/A	<b>29%</b>
<b>School-Level</b>						
% of ES “regular” attendees	77%	83%	N/A	71%	N/A	<b>77%</b>
% of MS “regular” attendees	55%	59%	N/A	69%	N/A	<b>63%</b>
% of HS “regular” attendees	20%	36%	N/A	43%	N/A	<b>38%</b>

Note. “Regular” attendees = ≥30 days; “Non-regular” attendees < 30 days

**✓ Objective 2.1—Partially Met**

Overall, this objective was met in 2018-19. Seventy-one percent (71%) of participants attended 30 days or more (were “regular” attendees). The objective was also met for middle school students as the percentage of middle school students attending 30 days or more was 63%. However, the objective was not met for elementary and high school students as the percentage of students attending 30 days or more was 77% (not 80%) among elementary students and 38% (not 40%) among high school students.

**Objective 2.2: Statewide Percentage of Centers with an Average Attendance of 30 Days or More Will Not Fall Below 87%**

Another way of examining attendance data is based on the percentage of centers, statewide, with average attendance that is high versus low (according to the federal standard, low attendance is defined as fewer than 30 days). In 2018-19, 87% of 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC centers, statewide, had average attendance at or above the federally-defined 30-day minimum for a “regular” attendee, and 13% had average attendance below the 30-day minimum. Results for this objective are described below, by Cohort. See Appendix B for a list by center/grantee of average attendance and percentage of “regular” attendees.



**Table 7.** Cohort 12 and 13 Percentage of Centers with Average Attendance Meeting and Not Meeting “Regular” Attendee Definition

	Cohort 12 2017-18	Cohort 12 2018-19	Cohort 13 2017-18	Cohort 13 2018-19	Both Cohorts 2017-18	Both Cohorts 2018-19
% of centers statewide with average attendance of 30 days or more	84%	<b>87%</b>	N/A	<b>87%</b>	N/A	87%
% of centers statewide with average attendance fewer than 30 days	16%	<b>13%</b>	N/A	<b>13%</b>	N/A	13%

**✓ Objective 2.2—Met**

Cohort 12 and 13 met this objective in 2018-19. Eighty-seven percent (87%) of centers within each cohort reported average attendance rates of 30 days or more, while 13% of centers within each cohort reported fewer than 30 days attendance, on average.

### Goal 3: Programs Will Offer Services in Core Academic Areas and in Enrichment

In order to meet the federal requirements for this program, grantees are expected to offer services that emphasize core academic areas, such as reading or STEM. In addition, grantees are expected to offer services that emphasize enrichment areas (e.g., character education, youth leadership or drug and violence prevention), which complement academic program services.

*Objective 3.1: More than 85% of Centers Offer Services in At Least One Core Academic Area*

In their reporting to NCDPI, grantees indicated how often they emphasized specific academic areas in terms of “high” to “low” frequency. Across all centers operating in 2018-19 (119 in Cohort 12 and 87 in Cohort 13), 96% reported a “high frequency” of activity in Literacy, Homework Help, or Tutoring (Note: Data analyzed are not shown in Table 8).

Table 8 shows that Homework Help was reported as the most frequently offered academic activity by centers for both Cohort 12 (95%) and Cohort 13 (84%), followed by Literacy (77%) and STEM (77%) for Cohort 12 and STEM (78%) and Tutoring (69%) for Cohort 13.

**Table 8.** Cohort 12 and 13 Center-Reported Frequency of Core Academic Activities

Academic Activities	Cohort 12 (119 Centers)		Cohort 13 (87 Centers)	
	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	Low Frequency (3 Times per Month– Once per Term) to None	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	Low Frequency (3 Times per Month – Once per Term) to None
English Language Learners Support	20%	80%	5%	95%
Homework Help	95%	5%	84%	16%
Literacy	77%	23%	55%	45%
STEM	77%	22%	78%	22%
Tutoring	64%	36%	69%	31%



✓ **Objective 3.1—Met**

This objective was met in 2018-19. Over 85% of Cohort 12 and Cohort 13 centers reported that they frequently provided activities in Literacy, Homework Help, or Tutoring.

*Objective 3.2: More than 85% of Centers Offer Enrichment Support Activities*

Grantees also reported to NCDPI on the frequency that specific enrichment areas were offered for the past year. Table 9 provides the frequency of activity availability by cohort. Across both cohorts (note: not shown in Table 9) approximately 80% of all centers reported emphasizing physical activity at least once a week (i.e., high frequency). Across both cohorts, 53% of all centers reported emphasizing Arts and Music activities with high frequency. In addition, 32% of all centers reported emphasizing Youth Leadership activities with high frequency.

**Table 9.** Cohort 12 and 13 Center-Reported Frequency of Specific Enrichment Activities

Type of Activity	Cohort 12 (119 Centers)		Cohort 13 (87 Centers)	
	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	Low Frequency (3 Times per Month – Once per Term) to None	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	Low Frequency (3 Times per Month – Once per Term) to None
<b>Character Education</b>				
Counseling Programs	9%	91%	14%	86%
Drug Prevention	2%	98%	3%	97%
Truancy Prevention	0%	100%	2%	98%
Violence Prevention	6%	94%	14%	86%
Youth Leadership	30%	70%	35%	65%
<b>Enrichment</b>				
Arts & Music	56%	44%	49%	51%
Community / Service Learning	3%	97%	5%	95%
Entrepreneurship	5%	95%	3%	97%
Mentoring	19%	81%	14%	86%
Physical Activity	85%	15%	79%	21%

In terms of the number of centers providing at least one character education or enrichment activity (note: not shown in Table 9), 38% of Cohort 12 centers and 51% of Cohort 13 centers reported a high frequency of at least one *character education* activity, while 89% of Cohort 12 centers and 83% of Cohort 13 centers indicated a high frequency of at least one *enrichment* activity. In total, 89% of centers (92% of Cohort 12 and 85% of Cohort 13) reported a high frequency of at least one character education or enrichment activity.

✓ **Objective 3.2—Met**

This objective was met by both cohorts. Eighty-nine percent (89%) of Cohort 12 and 13 centers reported a high frequency of at least one character education or enrichment activity.



## Goal 4: “Regular” Attendees Will Demonstrate Educational and Social Benefits and Exhibit Positive Behavioral Changes

---

The federal guidance includes the expectation that “regular” attendees in 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs should demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes. That is, the expectation of the grant program is that participating students will benefit academically, and in other ways, by participating in this program. Data used to address Goal 4 included (a) state achievement test results in reading and math at Grades 4-8 and (b) classroom Teacher Surveys of individual participating students’ improvement in classroom performance and behavior as collected by grantees at the end of the year.

In terms of state achievement test results, it should be noted that in 2017 the State Board of Education approved revisions to the North Carolina Standard Course of Study (NCSCOS) in reading and math. The revised NCSCOS in reading and math were implemented in 2018-19. Relatedly, the State Board of Education called for the revision of assessments in these content areas to align with the new NCSCOS. As a result, the new math assessment was implemented in 2018-19 and the new reading assessment was implemented in 2019-20 for students in Grades 4-8. Because assessment data for this report come from 2017-18 and 2018-19, students in this report sample took the same reading assessments across the two years. However, over this two-year period, there were transitions from the previous math assessment (2017-18) to the new math assessment (2018-19). Because of this transition to a new assessment in math for the current reporting year (and a transition to a new reading assessment in 2019-20 that will impact next year’s evaluation report), we have adjusted our reporting methodology to take into consideration this period of transition. In the next section we describe how this transition in assessments impacts current reporting.

### *A. State Achievement Test Results*

Regarding state achievement test data, two indicators of educational benefits of the program are presented below, both based on state achievement test results in reading and math in Grades 4-8, but examined using different methods:

- *Indicator 1: Change in “Regular” Attendees’ Status from “Non-Proficient” to “Proficient.”* We examined the percentage of “regular” attendees (30 days or more) whose achievement test scores improved from “below proficient” to “proficient” or above on reading or math state assessments.
- *Indicator 2: Average Year-to-Year Change in Participants’ Test Scores:* We examined standardized year-to-year change scores for “regular” attendees in Grades 4-8 as compared to the state population year-to-year change.

The results of these two different approaches to examining participants’ reading and math EOG test score changes from the end of the 2017-18 school year to the end of 2018-19 school year are described below. Changes to the state assessments in math (and future changes to the reading



assessment) require a revision to Objective 4.1 from previous reporting years. We begin by reviewing the original Objective 4.1 followed by a discussion of the need to revise this objective.

***Objective 4.1: The Statewide Percentage of “Regular” Attendees (Grades 4-8) With Two Years of State Test Data, Who Improve from “Non-Proficient” (Levels I, II or III) to “Proficient” (Levels IV or V) Will Be At Least 11%<sup>6</sup>***

As defined by the North Carolina College and Career Readiness (CCR) Standards, if a reading EOG score is categorized as Level IV proficiency or above, then the student is considered “proficient.” To examine participating students’ changes in proficiency status, we requested, from NCDPI, two years of state test results in reading and math for all students enrolled in 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs in 2018-19. In previous years, we used a threshold of 11% of students moving from “non-proficient” to “proficient” as a benchmark for meeting Objective 4.1. However, this baseline was established using assessment data from 2013-14 and 2014-15. Neither year was a transition year for state assessments. Given that the math assessment changed in the time period covered by this report, it is necessary to establish a new baseline in the future when two years of the new assessment data are available. As such, for Objective 4.1 we will report the percentage of “regular” attendees who improve from “non-proficient” to “proficient” and we will compare these students to the statewide average, but we will not render a determination as to whether Objective 4.1 was met.

As shown in Tables 10 and 11, we first calculated the number of students whose scores indicated they were “non-proficient” at the end of the 2017-18 academic year (“Level I, II, or III in 2018”) categorized by level of attendance (< 30 days “non-regular” attendees / ≥ 30 days “regular” attendees). Next, we show the number of these “non-proficient” students in 2018 who scored “Level IV or V in 2019.” Then we calculated the percent of those students who scored “non-proficient” in 2018 who subsequently scored “proficient” at the end of 2019. (Of the 10,630 students reported as “regularly” attending, there were 5,289 in Grades 4-8 who had two years of state test scores in reading and 5,230 in math.)

Table 10 shows that, on the **reading EOG** assessment, for all students statewide (not just those attending 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs), 15% of students who were “non-proficient” at the end of academic year 2017-18 moved to “proficient” status at the end of academic year 2018-19. For “regular” attendees in Cohorts 12 and 13, the comparable percentage moving from “non-proficient” to “proficient” in reading was 10% and for those students who did not attend “regularly,” the percentage was 9%.

Table 11 shows that, on the **math EOG** assessment, for all students statewide (not just those attending 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs), 8% of students who were “non-proficient” in 2018 moved to “proficient” status in 2019. For “regular” attendees in Cohorts 12 and 13, the comparable percentage moving from “non-proficient” to “proficient” in math was 7% and for “non-regular” attendees, the percentage moving from “non-proficient” to “proficient” was 5%.

---

<sup>6</sup> Note: The 11% threshold for Objective 4.1 was based on the 2014-15 baseline.



**Table 10.** Percentage of “Non-Proficient” Students Who Become “Proficient” in 2019—READING EOG

Grade in 2018	Grade in 2019	All Students (Statewide)			21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC “Non-Regular” Attendees			21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC “Regular” Attendees		
		Level I, II, or III in 2018	Level IV or V in 2019	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.	Level I, II, or III in 2018	Level IV or V in 2019	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.	Level I, II, or III in 2018	Level IV or V in 2019	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.
03	04	62,662	9,385	15%	377	42	11%	1,251	106	9%
04	05	63,149	8,174	13%	416	24	6%	1,199	91	8%
05	06	67,824	15,180	22%	391	50	13%	772	127	17%
06	07	55,514	7,877	14%	296	20	7%	475	51	11%
07	08	53,890	5,801	11%	206	15	7%	324	35	11%
All Grades 4-8		303,039	46,417	<b>15%</b>	1,686	151	<b>9%</b>	4,021	410	<b>10%</b>

**Table 11.** Percentage of “Non-Proficient” Students Who Become “Proficient” in 2019—MATH EOG

Grade in 2017	Grade in 2018	All Students (Statewide)			21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC “Non-Regular” Attendees			21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC “Regular” Attendees		
		Level I, II, or III in 2018	Level IV or V in 2019	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.	Level I, II, or III in 2018	Level IV or V in 2019	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.	Level I, II, or III in 2018	Level IV or V in 2019	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.
03	04	53,752	3,770	7%	330	16	5%	1,069	52	5%
04	05	57,132	4,844	8%	389	17	4%	1,124	75	7%
05	06	53,699	3,853	7%	343	10	3%	644	51	8%
06	07	61,654	7,348	12%	302	18	6%	470	47	10%
07	08	60,302	4,359	7%	230	12	5%	312	21	7%
All Grades 4-8		286,539	24,174	<b>8%</b>	1,594	73	<b>5%</b>	3,619	246	<b>7%</b>

**✓ Objective 4.1—Not Reported for This Year**

Given the transition to new state assessments in math, we did not report this year on this objective of having at least 11% of “regular” attendees (in Grades 4-8 with two years of state test results) improving from “non-proficient” to “proficient.” Instead, we provide the information in Tables 10 and 11 but without drawing conclusions for Objective 4.1 from these data. The tables show that “regular” attendees were slightly more likely to have improved from “non-proficient” to “proficient” compared to “non-regular” attendees in both reading and math. However, “regular” attendees in both reading and math had a slightly lower percentage of students moving from “non-proficient” to “proficient” than the state average (i.e., “All Students (Statewide)” column).

**Objective 4.2: “Regular” Attendees (Grades 4-8) With Two Years of State Test Data Will Demonstrate Year-to-Year Change On State Tests in Reading and Math At Least as Great or Greater Than the State Population Year-to-Year Change**

The following table shows the results of a second method of describing the state test score changes experienced by Grade 4-8 participants from 2018 to 2019. These analyses describe the year-to-year change in test scores for the students served in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program relative to the year-to-year change in the overall state population. That is, the average change in





standardized scores<sup>7</sup> was calculated for “regular” attendees, and that average change was compared to the average 2018 to 2019 change for all students in the state at the respective grade levels. To meet this objective, “regular” attendees would show average improvement in state test scores at the same rate or greater than the state average year-to-year change.

The results of the change score analyses, the difference in students’ standardized scores from one year to the next (2018 to 2019), are presented below.

Table 12 describes the year-to-year change on state EOG reading and math tests for Cohorts 12 and 13 students in Grades 4-8.

- Where the average change in “regular” attendees’ scores were significantly greater than the statewide average change scores the change has been labeled “**Above.**”
- Similarly, where “regular” attendees did not show an average change in scores as great as students across the state, the change has been labeled “**Below.**”
- Finally, where there was no measurable difference between the “regular” attendees and the statewide student population as a whole, the change was labeled “**Same.**”

Unlike Objective 4.1, Objective 4.2 is not impacted by the transition to the new math assessment because, for Objective 4.2, students’ scale scores are not directly compared across years. Instead, each Cohort 12 and Cohort 13 “regular” attendee’s scale score is converted to a standardized score within each year to indicate how each student’s score compares to the state average in a given year. For example, if a 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC “regular” attendee had a standardized score of 0 in 2017-18 and a +0.5 in 2018-19, this increase would indicate that in 2017-18 this student’s score was the same as the state average, but in 2018-19 this student’s score was above average compared to all other students in the state (0.5 standard deviations above the average). Because all students were equally impacted by the change in the state assessments, it is still possible to meaningfully report “regular” attendees’ standing compared to the state average even if the test itself changed from one year to the next.

**Table 12.** Year-to-Year Change in Reading and Math EOG Scores for “Regular” Attendees in Cohorts 12 and 13 Compared to State Average by Grade

Grade Level	Reading	Math
Grade 4	Above (+0.03)	Same
Grade 5	Same	Above (+0.04)
Grade 6	Same	Same

<sup>7</sup> Different EOG assessments were used across grades, and the resulting EOG scores are not on a comparable scale. In order to make valid comparisons among scores from one year to the next, the assessments must be placed on a common, standardized scale. Standardization is achieved through a two-step process. First, scores for a given test are centered about the state mean for the grade in question by subtracting the state mean from each score on the EOG. Second, the centered scores are divided by the state standard deviation for the test in question. This results in a standardized score that is interpreted as the number of standard deviations that the original score lies from the state mean for that assessment. A standardized score of 1.5 indicates that the student’s score was 1.5 standard deviations above the state mean for that assessment, while a standardized score of 0 indicates that the student’s score was equivalent to the state mean. Change relative to the state mean was measured using a paired-sample *t*-test with a threshold of  $p \leq 0.05$ .



Grade Level	Reading	Math
Grade 7	Same	Same
Grade 8	Same	Above (+0.43) <sup>8</sup>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Same</b>	<b>Above (+0.05)</b>

✓ **Objective 4.2—Met**

This objective was met in Reading. On the **Reading EOG**, the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC “regular” attendees across grade levels (“Total” row) **improved their scores from year-to-year at the same rate as students across the state**. Disaggregated along grade levels, fourth-grade students improved their scores in reading at a slightly greater rate than students statewide.

This objective was also met in Math. On the **Math EOG**, the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC “regular” attendees across grade levels (“Total” row) **improved their scores from year-to-year at a rate slightly greater than students across the state**. Disaggregated by grade levels, Grade 5 and Grade 8 “regular” attendees improved their scores in math at a rate greater than students statewide.

*B. Classroom Teacher Survey on “Regular” Attendees’ Improvement at End of Year*

In addition to state test results, another indicator of program participation impact is reflected in data collected from classroom teachers (i.e., Teacher Surveys of improvements in “regular” attendees’ classroom performance and behavior over the course of the school year). On their website, NCDPI makes available a Teacher Survey for grantees to use.<sup>9</sup> Grantees are instructed to distribute the Teacher Survey to a classroom teacher of each participating “regular” attendee.<sup>10</sup> It is the responsibility of the grantee to enter completed Teacher Survey responses for individual students into the 21DC system<sup>11</sup> as well as indicate whether or not the Teacher Survey is returned.<sup>12</sup> For each Teacher Survey that is completed and returned on a “regular attendee,” grantees must indicate, in 21DC, whether the student had a “reported improvement in homework completion and classroom participation” (response options being Yes or No) and/or a “reported improvement in student behavior” (response options being Yes or No).

**Objective 4.3: The Majority (Over 50%) of Classroom Teachers Responding to a Teacher Survey Will Rate 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC “Regular” Attendees’ Classroom Performance and Behavior as Improved**

Table 13 presents the response rates, by grade level, for the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Teacher Survey as reported by grantees who distributed these surveys. These response rates reflect completed surveys for students who were “regular” attendees in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC after-school programs in

<sup>8</sup> This finding should be interpreted with caution. Some 8<sup>th</sup> grade students take the Math I EOC assessment instead of the 8<sup>th</sup> grade math EOG assessment. This positive improvement for “regular” program students relative to the state average may be the result of differential patterns of EOG math assessment taking among “regular” program students compared to all students across the state. It should be noted that the overall “Total” finding held when 8<sup>th</sup> grade students were excluded from the analysis.

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.dpi.nc.gov/districts-schools/federal-program-monitoring/21st-century-community-learning-centers#data-collection-&-reporting>

<sup>10</sup> If elementary students, the survey goes to their regular teacher. If middle or high school, the survey goes to only one teacher in the areas in which the student is receiving academic assistance. The choice of teacher is determined by the grantee request to the school and school compliance with the request. Thus, no student will have more than one survey reported.

<sup>11</sup> Grantees enter Teacher Survey distribution data at the individual student level in 21DC (Prompt: Teacher Survey distributed; Response options: Yes or No).

<sup>12</sup> Grantees enter returned Teacher Survey status in 21DC at the individual student level (Prompt: Teacher Survey returned; Response options: Yes or No).



2018-19. Grantees reported, via their data entry into 21DC, that 10,653 Teacher Surveys were distributed and that 7,868 were returned for a response rate of 74%. However, the number of regular attendees was 10,630, and the number of students with completed surveys was 7,868 so the percent of regular attendees without survey information was 26%.

**Table 13.** Teacher Survey Response Rates in 2018-19 by Grade (for “Regular” Attendees)

Grade Level	Both Cohorts		
	Teacher Surveys Distributed	Teacher Surveys Returned	Response Rate
Elementary	8,013	5,776	72%
Middle	2,228	1,719	77%
High	412	373	91%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10,653</b>	<b>7,868</b>	<b>74%</b>

Around 57% of the Cohort 12 and 13 grantees reported a response rate from teachers in 2018-19 of 70% to 100%. Similarly, in 2017-18, 68% of the Cohort 11 and 12 grantees reported response rates in this range.

Table 14 shows the results of the Teacher Surveys as entered into 21DC by grantees. Grantees were only asked to indicate in the 21DC database whether the Teacher Survey for the “regular” attendee indicated “improvement” or not<sup>13</sup>.

**Table 14.** Teacher Survey Ratings of Student Improvement (“Regular” Attendees)

Grade Level	Both Cohorts 2018-19		
	Responses	Percentage of Regular Attendees with Completed Surveys Reported to Have Improved Homework Completion and Class Participation	Percentage of Regular Attendees with Completed Surveys Reported to Have Improved Student Behavior
Elementary	5,776	86%	74%
Middle	1,719	90%	78%
High	373	88%	84%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7,868</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>75%</b>

**✓ Objective 4.3—Met**

This objective was met in 2018-19. Over 50% of “regular” attendees across Cohorts 12 and 13 with returned Teacher Surveys were reported by grantees to have improved in the following two areas: (1) homework completion and class participation and (2) student behavior.

## Summary

As the summary table below shows, statewide grantee performance in 2018-19 “met” eight of nine state objectives, as indicated by the status column. One of the nine objectives was “partially met” (Objective 2.1 on attendance in the after school program). (Note: Appendix A provides

<sup>13</sup> In order to align Teacher Survey data with the 21DC response options, it is understood that grantees had to interpret and categorize teacher responses. For example, if a student was reported to have “moderate improvement” in completing homework and a “slight decline” in class participation, it would be at the discretion of the grantee to determine if the student would receive a “Yes” indicating improvement or not.



grantee level data on enrollment and Appendix B provides center/grantee level data on attendance so that differences across grantees can be examined in these areas.)

**Table 15.** Summary of 2018-19 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Progress Monitoring Findings

Goals/Objectives	2018-19 Status	Summary of Findings
<b>Goal 1: Projected Numbers of Students Are Enrolled</b>		
Objective 1.1: The <b>Majority (Over 50%) of Grantees</b> Enroll At Least 75% of their Projected Number of Students	<b>Met</b>	Approximately <b>98%</b> of Cohort 12 grantees and <b>90%</b> of Cohort 13 grantees served at least 75% of their proposed number of students, in 2018-19, with a total across both cohorts of <b>94%</b> (which represents the majority, greater than 50%).
Objective 1.2: The <b>Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served</b> Statewide are from Low-Income Schools	<b>Met</b>	An average of <b>86%</b> of students per center came from schools that qualified for Title I funding (65 students on average per center coming from Title I schools).
Objective 1.3: The <b>Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served</b> Statewide are in Need of Academic Support	<b>Met</b>	For participating Cohort 12 and Cohort 13 students in Grades 4 to 8 with prior year test scores, <b>68% to 78%</b> were in need of academic support, as judged by their lack of proficiency on state tests in reading or math at program entry.
<b>Goal 2: Enrolled Students Meet Definition of “Regular” Attendance</b>		
Objective 2.1: Statewide Percentage of Students Attending 30 Days or More is <b>At Least 70%</b> (80% in Elementary, 60% in Middle School, and 40% in High School)	<b>Partially Met</b> (Met overall and for middle but not elementary or high school students)	Overall <b>71%</b> of participants attended 30 days or more (i.e., were “regular” attendees). The percentage of students attending 30 days or more was <b>77%</b> (not 80%) among elementary students, <b>63%</b> among middle school students, and <b>38%</b> (not 40%) among high school students.
Objective 2.2: Statewide Percentage of Centers with an Average Attendance of 30 Days or More <b>Will Not Fall Below 87%</b>	<b>Met</b>	A total of <b>87%</b> of centers within each cohort reported average attendance rates of 30 days or more, while 13% of centers within each cohort reported fewer than 30 days attendance, on average.
<b>Goal 3: Programs Will Offer Services in Core Academic Areas and in Enrichment</b>		
Objective 3.1: <b>More than 85%</b> of Centers Offer Services in At Least One Core Academic Area	<b>Met</b>	<b>Over 85%</b> of Cohort 12 and Cohort 13 centers reported that they frequently provided activities in Literacy, Homework Help, <b>or</b> Tutoring.
Objective 3.2: <b>More than 85%</b> of Centers Offer Enrichment Support Activities	<b>Met</b>	Across Cohort 12 and 13 centers, <b>89%</b> reported a high frequency of at least one character education <b>or</b> enrichment activity.
<b>Goal 4: “Regular” Attendees Will Demonstrate Educational and Social Benefits and Exhibit Positive Behavioral Changes</b>		
Objective 4.1: The Statewide Percentage of “Regular” Attendees (Grades 4-8), With Two Years of State Test Data, Who Improve from “Non-Proficient” (Levels I, II or III) to “Proficient” (Levels IV or V) <b>Will Be At Least 11%</b> .	<b>Not Reported</b>	<b>Reading EOG:</b> For “regular” attendees, <b>10%</b> moved from “non-proficient” in 2018 to “proficient” in 2019.  <b>Math EOG:</b> For “regular” attendees, <b>7%</b> moved from “non-proficient” in 2018 to “proficient” in 2019.



Goals/Objectives	2018-19 Status	Summary of Findings
Objective 4.2: “Regular” Attendees (Grades 4-8) With Two Years of State Test Data Will Demonstrate Year-to-Year Change On State Tests in Reading and Math at Least As <b>Great Or Greater Than The State Population</b> Year-to-Year Change.	<b>Met</b>	<p>On the <b>Reading EOG</b>, “regular” attendees across Grades 4-8 improved their scores from year-to-year at the <b>same rate</b> as students across the state.</p> <p>On the <b>Math EOG</b>, the “regular” attendees across Grades 4-8 improved their scores from year-to-year at a rate <b>slightly greater</b> than students across the state.</p>
Objective 4.3: The Majority ( <b>Over 50%</b> ) of Classroom Teachers Responding to a Teacher Survey Will Rate 21st CCLC “Regular” Attendees’ Classroom Performance and Behavior as Improved	<b>Met</b>	<b>Over 50%</b> of “regular” attendees across Cohorts 12 and 13 with returned Teacher Surveys were reported to have made improvement in the following two areas: homework completion and class participation, and student behavior.

DRAFT



## Appendix A: Proposed and Actual Enrollment by Grantee 2018-19

*Note. "Enrolled" is defined as any student the grantee enters into 21DC as having attended one day or greater.*

<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Grantee</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Difference</b>	<b>% of Proposed</b>
12	A Step Ahead Learning Center	50	52	+2	104%
12	Above and Beyond Academic Learning Center	200	227	+27	114%
12	Above and Beyond Students	200	233	+33	116%
12	Black Child Development Institute of Greensboro, Inc.	50	53	+3	106%
12	Boys & Girls Club of Cabarrus County	160	160	0	100%
12	Boys and Girls Clubs of the Piedmont	150	224	+74	149%
12	Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools	200	192	-8	96%
12	Cherokee County Schools	270	332	+62	123%
12	Children's Village Academy	120	146	+26	122%
12	CIS of Brunswick County	120	131	+11	109%
12	Cleveland County Schools	200	229	+29	114%
12	Communities In Schools of Cape Fear	180	193	+13	107%
12	Communities In Schools of Durham	160	186	+26	116%
12	Cornerstone Family Worship Center	180	228	+48	127%
12	Fayetteville State University	200	201	+1	100%
12	Gaston County Local Government	150	150	0	100%
12	Heart Works	150	168	+18	112%
12	Helping Others Love Themselves (HOLT), Incorporated	60	55	-5	92%
12	Kinetic Minds	120	130	+10	108%
12	Maggies Outreach Community Economic Development Center	50	40	-10	80%
12	Maiden Rosenwald Community Development Corporation	132	253	+121	192%
12	Mount Airy City Schools	246	220	-26	89%
12	New Life Christian Center	100	78	-22	78%
12	NRMPS/Boys and Girls Clubs of the Tar River	210	239	+29	114%
12	Onslow County Partnership for Children	90	73	-17	81%
12	Operation Xcel	110	136	+26	124%
12	ourBRIDGE	50	64	+14	128%
12	Partners In Ministry	100	177	+77	177%
12	Pender County Schools	120	148	+28	123%
12	Prodigal Son Foundation (Sugar Creek Learning Center)	75	83	+8	111%
12	Public Schools of Robeson County	200	487	+287	244%
12	Robeson County Parks & Recreation Dept.	200	561	+361	280%
12	Rutherford County Schools	150	173	+23	115%
12	Saints Provision CDC	150	121	-29	81%
12	St. John Community Development Corp., Inc.	200	226	+26	113%
12	Student U	150	135	-15	90%
12	Swain County Schools	520	441	-79	85%
12	The Excel Community Association of Alamance	120	130	+10	108%
12	TRAC Academy	130	98	-32	75%
12	TRAC Educational Services Group	125	95	-30	76%





12	WAMY Community Action, Inc. - Avery Youth Opportunities 21st CCLC	225	225	0	100%
12	Williams YMCA of Avery County	110	153	+43	139%
12	WINGS for kids	144	106	-38	74%
12	Yancey County Schools	370	373	+3	101%
12	YMCA of Western North Carolina	280	477	+197	170%
13	A Touch of God's Presence	80	85	+5	106%
13	Above and Beyond Students	175	204	+29	117%
13	Alluvium Inc.	110	71	-39	65%
13	Antioch Developing Positive Attributes Program	125	94	-31	75%
13	Black Child Development Institute of Greensboro, Inc.	75	58	-17	77%
13	Boys & Girls Club of Cabarrus County	150	165	+15	110%
13	Boys & Girls Clubs of North Central North Carolina	100	244	+144	244%
13	Brame Academy	100	87	-13	87%
13	Brame Institute	100	109	+9	109%
13	Caring and Sharing Inc.	100	129	+29	129%
13	Children's Village Academy	120	120	0	100%
13	Christian Provision Ministries	150	121	-29	81%
13	Communities In Schools of Cape Fear	250	219	-31	88%
13	Dream Center Academy	80	66	-14	82%
13	Engage Empower Excel Learning Center	100	229	+129	229%
13	Gaston County Local Government	150	150	0	100%
13	Graham County Schools	115	151	+36	131%
13	Granville County Schools	100	147	+47	147%
13	Hyde County Schools	200	215	+15	108%
13	Innovative Learning, Inc.	60	58	-2	97%
13	Integrity Unlimited CDC	60	62	+2	103%
13	Kairos Church Ministries	125	117	-8	94%
13	Kinetic Minds Inspire LLC	120	95	-25	79%
13	Montgomery County Schools	255	328	+73	129%
13	New Life Faith Center	75	76	+1	101%
13	New Salem Missionary Baptist Church	65	49	-16	75%
13	North East Baptist Church	150	119	-31	79%
13	Operation Xcel	120	134	+14	112%
13	ourBRIDGE	100	117	+17	117%
13	Partners In Ministry	100	106	+6	106%
13	Partnership For a Drug-Free NC	150	219	+69	146%
13	Paul L Dunbar Group	80	82	+2	102%
13	Possessing the Keys of the Kingdom, Inc.	75	61	-14	81%
13	Quality Education Academy	75	77	+2	103%
13	Robeson County Parks & Recreation Dept.	200	280	+80	140%
13	SIPNAYAN Math Center and Afterschool Program LLC	100	91	-9	91%
13	Southeast Raleigh Community Learning Center, Inc.	125	93	-32	74%
13	Stanly County Schools	250	226	-24	90%
13	The 21st Century Village Community Learning Center, Inc.	180	90	-90	50%
13	The Bridge Downeast	120	75	-45	62%
13	The Dream Center of Randolph County	80	71	-9	89%



13	The Family Institute for Health & Human Services dba Project Cares	160	231	+71	144%
13	The Greater Enrichment Program	200	250	+50	125%
13	The Power of U, Inc	100	100	0	100%
13	Torchlight Academy	75	86	+11	115%
13	Whiteville City Schools	100	148	+48	148%
13	WINGS for kids	144	131	-13	91%
13	Winston Salem / Forsyth County Schools	200	61	-139	30%
13	YMCA of Northwest North Carolina	80	78	-2	98%

DRAFT



## Appendix B: Attendance Data Reported by Center/Grantee 2018-19

Cohort	Grantee: Center	Mean Days Attended	Percent Regular Attendees
12	A Step Ahead Learning Center: A Step Ahead Learning Center Inc	93	100%
12	Above and Beyond Academic Learning Center: Bruns Academy 1183	51	64%
12	Above and Beyond Academic Learning Center: Oakdale Elementary	66	81%
12	Above and Beyond Academic Learning Center: Southside Homes	81	87%
12	Above and Beyond Students: Seigle Point Community	93	95%
12	Above and Beyond Students: Tuckaseegee Elementary	104	97%
12	Above and Beyond Students: Westerly Hills Academy	107	86%
12	Black Child Development Institute of Greensboro, Inc.: Windsor Recreation Center	108	96%
12	Boys & Girls Club of Cabarrus County: Boys & Girls Club of Cabarrus County	119	96%
12	Boys and Girls Clubs of the Piedmont: Excelling in the 21st Century	107	92%
12	Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools: Druid Hills Academy	152	100%
12	Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools: JH Gunn	162	100%
12	Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools: Renaissance West STEAM Academy	160	100%
12	Cherokee County Schools: Andrews Elementary School	83	91%
12	Cherokee County Schools: Andrews Middle School	55	65%
12	Cherokee County Schools: Hiwassee Dam Elementary School	64	86%
12	Cherokee County Schools: Martins Creek Elementary / Middle School	60	74%
12	Cherokee County Schools: Murphy Elementary School	74	81%
12	Cherokee County Schools: Murphy Middle School	48	68%
12	Cherokee County Schools: Peachtree Elementary School	84	91%
12	Cherokee County Schools: Ranger Elementary / Middle School	52	62%
12	Children's Village Academy: Children's Village Academy	90	95%
12	CIS of Brunswick County: Supply Elementary School	82	82%
12	Cleveland County Schools: James Love Elementary School	48	73%
12	Cleveland County Schools: Marion Elementary School	44	61%
12	Cleveland County Schools: Shelby High School	36	55%
12	Cleveland County Schools: Shelby Intermediate School	49	75%
12	Cleveland County Schools: Shelby Middle School	66	88%
12	Communities In Schools of Cape Fear: Burgaw Middle School	49	100%
12	Communities In Schools of Cape Fear: Cape Fear Middle School	67	87%
12	Communities In Schools of Cape Fear: Heide Trask High School	36	63%
12	Communities In Schools of Cape Fear: Pender High School	39	81%
12	Communities In Schools of Cape Fear: Penderlea	56	87%
12	Communities In Schools of Cape Fear: West Pender Middle	40	70%
12	Communities In Schools of Durham: E K Powe	102	88%
12	Communities In Schools of Durham: Eno Valley	87	96%
12	Communities In Schools of Durham: Merrick Moore	93	90%
12	Cornerstone Family Worship Center: Chocowinity Middle School	47	59%
12	Cornerstone Family Worship Center: John Small Elementary School	68	81%
12	Cornerstone Family Worship Center: PS Jones Middle School	104	94%
12	Fayetteville State University: Douglas Byrd High School	9	9%
12	Fayetteville State University: Douglas Byrd Middle School	20	27%
12	Gaston County Local Government: A.S.P.I.R.E. - Pleasant Ridge Elementary	80	79%



12	Heart Works: Heartworks	115	90%
12	Helping Others Love Themselves (HOLT), Incorporated: Henderson Grove Missionary Baptist Church	55	60%
12	Kinetic Minds: Kinetic Minds	59	86%
12	Maggies Outreach Community Economic Development Center: Road To Success 21st Century Afterschool Progra	33	44%
12	Maggies Outreach Community Economic Development Center: Road To Success Youth Enrichment Center	27	45%
12	Maiden Rosenwald Community Development Corporation: After Hours	15	14%
12	Maiden Rosenwald Community Development Corporation: Faith Center	72	86%
12	Maiden Rosenwald Community Development Corporation: Grandview Middle School	43	67%
12	Maiden Rosenwald Community Development Corporation: Northview Middle School	44	74%
12	Mount Airy City Schools: B.H. Tharrington Primary School	37	39%
12	Mount Airy City Schools: Jones Intermediate School	39	48%
12	Mount Airy City Schools: Mt. Airy Middle School	32	42%
12	New Life Christian Center: HOPE VALLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	103	91%
12	New Life Christian Center: New Life SPA Site	1	NA%
12	NRMPS/Boys and Girls Clubs of the Tar River: Bailey Elementary School	74	88%
12	NRMPS/Boys and Girls Clubs of the Tar River: Cedar Grove Elementary School	73	88%
12	NRMPS/Boys and Girls Clubs of the Tar River: Middlesex Elementary School	63	73%
12	NRMPS/Boys and Girls Clubs of the Tar River: Southern Nash Middle School	54	71%
12	NRMPS/Boys and Girls Clubs of the Tar River: Spring Hope Elementary School	54	74%
12	Onslow County Partnership for Children: LEAD	119	97%
12	Operation Xcel: High Point	45	51%
12	Operation Xcel: Jackson Middle School	28	32%
12	Operation Xcel: Stokesdale	124	98%
12	ourBRIDGE: our BRIDGE for KIDS	52	58%
12	Partners In Ministry: Partners In Ministry	47	61%
12	Pender County Schools: Burgaw Elementary School	74	89%
12	Pender County Schools: Cape Fear Elementary School	78	89%
12	Pender County Schools: Malpass Corner Elementary School	62	62%
12	Pender County Schools: Rocky Point Elementary School	92	94%
12	Prodigal Son Foundation (Sugar Creek Learning Center): Prodigal Son Foundation	53	75%
12	Public Schools of Robeson County: Fairmont High School	20	29%
12	Public Schools of Robeson County: Parkton Elementary School	46	81%
12	Public Schools of Robeson County: Red Springs Middle	26	42%
12	Robeson County Parks & Recreation Dept.: Littlefield Middle School	34	46%
12	Robeson County Parks & Recreation Dept.: Pembroke Middle School	25	47%
12	Robeson County Parks & Recreation Dept.: Townsend Middle School	70	81%
12	Robeson County Parks & Recreation Dept.: WH Knuckles Elementary School	54	76%
12	Rutherford County Schools: Forest City-Dunbar Elementary Young Scholars	79	95%
12	Saints Provision CDC: Saints Provision CDC	73	92%
12	St. John Community Development Corp., Inc.: J & J Children's Corner	112	87%
12	St. John Community Development Corp., Inc.: Save A Youth SAY Center	70	70%



12	Student U: Student U	49	78%
12	Swain County Schools: Swain East Elementary	119	93%
12	Swain County Schools: Swain High School	40	57%
12	Swain County Schools: Swain Middle School	81	81%
12	Swain County Schools: Swain West Elementary	109	89%
12	The Excel Community Association of Alamance: Excel Community Association Of Alamance	29	41%
12	TRAC Academy: Images of Hope Intermediate	78	80%
12	TRAC Academy: Images of Hope Primary	62	73%
12	TRAC Educational Services Group: Porject Promise	57	78%
12	WAMY Community Action, Inc. - Avery Youth Opportunities 21st CCLC: Avery Middle School	27	33%
12	WAMY Community Action, Inc. - Avery Youth Opportunities 21st CCLC: Banner Elk Elementary	94	90%
12	WAMY Community Action, Inc. - Avery Youth Opportunities 21st CCLC: Cranberry Middle School	45	54%
12	WAMY Community Action, Inc. - Avery Youth Opportunities 21st CCLC: Crossnore Elementary School	105	98%
12	WAMY Community Action, Inc. - Avery Youth Opportunities 21st CCLC: Freedom Trail Elementary	76	80%
12	WAMY Community Action, Inc. - Avery Youth Opportunities 21st CCLC: Newland Elementary School	113	100%
12	WAMY Community Action, Inc. - Avery Youth Opportunities 21st CCLC: Riverside Elementary School	79	89%
12	Williams YMCA of Avery County: Blackburn Facility	81	84%
12	Williams YMCA of Avery County: Chapman Center	66	67%
12	Williams YMCA of Avery County: Williams YMCA of Avery County	84	75%
12	WINGS for kids: Bruns Academy 1259	56	58%
12	Yancey County Schools: Bald Creek Elementary	79	86%
12	Yancey County Schools: Burnsville Elementary	82	97%
12	Yancey County Schools: Cane River Middle	46	69%
12	Yancey County Schools: Clearmont Elementary	81	100%
12	Yancey County Schools: East Yancey Middle	70	89%
12	Yancey County Schools: Micaville Elementary	87	99%
12	Yancey County Schools: South Toe Elementary	82	94%
12	YMCA of Western North Carolina: Cane Creek Middle Horizon Program	28	38%
12	YMCA of Western North Carolina: Enka Intermediate Horizon Program	46	66%
12	YMCA of Western North Carolina: Enka Middle Horizon Program	27	36%
12	YMCA of Western North Carolina: Erwin Middle School Horizon Program	29	38%
12	YMCA of Western North Carolina: North Buncombe Middle Horizon Program	21	27%
12	YMCA of Western North Carolina: Owen Middle Horizon Program	36	49%
12	YMCA of Western North Carolina: Reynolds Middle School Horizon Program	38	54%
12	YMCA of Western North Carolina: Valley Springs Middle Horizon Program	29	47%
13	A Touch of God's Presence: A Touch of God's Presence Shining Star	69	92%
13	Above and Beyond Students: Allenbrook Elementary	69	78%
13	Above and Beyond Students: Ranson Middle	60	69%
13	Alluvium Inc.: S.U.C.C.E.E.D. After School Program	41	59%
13	Antioch Developing Positive Attributes Program: Antioch Developing Positive Attributes Program	51	55%



13	Black Child Development Institute of Greensboro, Inc.: Peeler Recreation Center	71	78%
13	Boys & Girls Club of Cabarrus County: Boys & Girls Club of Cabarrus County	64	69%
13	Boys & Girls Clubs of North Central North Carolina: Everetts STEM Elementary School	55	67%
13	Boys & Girls Clubs of North Central North Carolina: Inborden Elementary STEAM Academy	55	62%
13	Brame Academy: Brame Academy	57	80%
13	Brame Institute: Brame Institute of Education	50	65%
13	Caring and Sharing Inc.: Bladen Lakes Primary School	30	49%
13	Caring and Sharing Inc.: Caring and Sharing, Inc.	52	72%
13	Caring and Sharing Inc.: Plainview Primary School	30	65%
13	Children's Village Academy: Children's Village Academy	87	99%
13	Christian Provision Ministries: Christian Provision Ministries	57	76%
13	Communities In Schools of Cape Fear: Burgaw Middle School	51	100%
13	Communities In Schools of Cape Fear: Cape Fear Middle School	63	84%
13	Communities In Schools of Cape Fear: Heide Trask High School	39	100%
13	Communities In Schools of Cape Fear: Pender High School	35	74%
13	Communities In Schools of Cape Fear: Penderlea	62	95%
13	Communities In Schools of Cape Fear: West Pender Middle	44	66%
13	Dream Center Academy: Dream Center Academy	88	91%
13	Engage Empower Excel Learning Center: Engage Empower Excel 21st CCLC	21	31%
13	Gaston County Local Government: A.S.P.I.R.E. - H.H. Beam Elementary	62	73%
13	Graham County Schools: Robbinsville Elementary School	30	35%
13	Graham County Schools: Robbinsville Middle School	15	18%
13	Graham County Schools: Stecoah Valley Center	42	64%
13	Granville County Schools: Creedmoor Elementary School	77	81%
13	Granville County Schools: West Oxford Elementary School	54	65%
13	Hyde County Schools: Mattamuskeet Early College High School	27	43%
13	Hyde County Schools: Mattamuskeet Elementary	46	72%
13	Hyde County Schools: Ocracoke School	41	62%
13	Innovative Learning, Inc.: Innovative Learning, INC.	69	76%
13	Integrity Unlimited CDC: Integrity Unlimited CDC	121	98%
13	Kairos Church Ministries: KCM 21st CCLC	39	55%
13	Kinetic Minds Inspire LLC: Dillard Academy Charter School	14	20%
13	Montgomery County Schools: Candor Elementary School	28	50%
13	Montgomery County Schools: Green Ridge Elementary School	44	62%
13	Montgomery County Schools: Mount Gilead Elementary School	56	81%
13	Montgomery County Schools: Page Street Elementary School	54	84%
13	Montgomery County Schools: Star Elementary School	42	62%
13	New Life Faith Center: New Life Faith Center	32	46%
13	New Salem Missionary Baptist Church: New Salem Missionary Baptist Church	90	94%
13	North East Baptist Church: Eastway Elementary School	66	85%
13	North East Baptist Church: Fayetteville Street Elementary School	64	92%
13	North East Baptist Church: Spring Valley Elementary School	70	94%
13	Operation Xcel: Eastern Guilford Middle School	36	49%
13	Operation Xcel: Next Generation Academy	68	77%
13	ourBRIDGE: our BRIDGE for KIDS	80	79%
13	Partners In Ministry: Partners In Ministry	42	59%





13	Partnership For a Drug-Free NC: Germanton Elementary School	73	88%
13	Partnership For a Drug-Free NC: London Elementary School	92	100%
13	Partnership For a Drug-Free NC: Nancy Reynolds Elementary School	56	72%
13	Partnership For a Drug-Free NC: Pine Hall Elementary School	85	94%
13	Partnership For a Drug-Free NC: Pinnacle Elementary School	74	80%
13	Partnership For a Drug-Free NC: Sandy Ridge Elementary School	65	79%
13	Paul L Dunbar Group: Essie Mae Kiser Foxx Charter School	60	82%
13	Paul L Dunbar Group: Hurley Elementry	32	59%
13	Possessing the Keys of the Kingdom, Inc.: Possessing the Keys Academy	28	41%
13	Quality Education Academy: Quality Education Academy	66	86%
13	Robeson County Parks & Recreation Dept.: Piney Grove Elementary School	27	54%
13	Robeson County Parks & Recreation Dept.: Southside Ashpole Elementary School	28	47%
13	SIPNAYAN Math Center and Afterschool Program LLC: Sallie B. Howard School	99	91%
13	Southeast Raleigh Community Learning Center, Inc.: State Street Community Church	56	55%
13	Southeast Raleigh Community Learning Center, Inc.: Wanda's Little Hands Educational Center	58	70%
13	Stanly County Schools: Badin	36	57%
13	Stanly County Schools: Norwood	36	52%
13	Stanly County Schools: Stanfield	24	27%
13	Stanly County Schools: YMCA Pavilion	36	63%
13	The 21st Century Village Community Learning Center, Inc.: The 21st Century Village Community Learning Ce	22	33%
13	The Bridge Downeast: The Bridge Downeast (Afterschool)	56	72%
13	The Dream Center of Randolph County: The Dream Center of Randolph County	98	100%
13	The Family Institute for Health & Human Services dba Project Cares: COULWOOD STEM ACADEMY	51	89%
13	The Family Institute for Health & Human Services dba Project Cares: HIDDEN VALLEY ELEMENTARY	70	99%
13	The Family Institute for Health & Human Services dba Project Cares: PROJECT C.A.R.E.S. CENTER	70	92%
13	The Family Institute for Health & Human Services dba Project Cares: WEST CHARLOTTE HIGH SCHOOL	56	100%
13	The Greater Enrichment Program: Hidden Valley Elementary	100	81%
13	The Greater Enrichment Program: Movement Charter School	122	95%
13	The Power of U, Inc: The Power of U	57	71%
13	Torchlight Academy: Torchlight Academy	104	86%
13	Whiteville City Schools: Central Middle School	38	60%
13	Whiteville City Schools: Edgewood Elementary	60	78%
13	WINGS for kids: WINGS for Kids at Thomasboro	84	89%
13	Winston Salem / Forsyth County Schools: Forest Park Elementary School	47	74%
13	YMCA of Northwest North Carolina: Access Academy North Middle School	40	60%
13	YMCA of Northwest North Carolina: Access Academy North Wilkesboro Elementary	47	64%

