

**North Carolina 21st Century
Community Learning Center Program**

October 2015

Survey and Other Descriptive Data:
Cohort 10 and 11 (2014-15)

*Prepared for the North Carolina Department of
Public Instruction by SERVE Center at UNCG*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Highlights and Implications	1
Attendance.....	1
Data Management	1
Issues with Student Attendance	1
Enrollment, Programming, Challenges, and Benefits	2
Enrollment	2
Programming	2
Challenges.....	3
Benefits to Students	3
Full Report.....	4
Introduction	4
Federal funding for 21st Century Community Learning Centers	4
Grantees and Centers	4
Number of Centers	5
Number of Feeder Schools	6
Methodology	6
1. Program Director Attendance Survey	6
2. Site Coordinator Survey on Center Programs and Challenges	7
3. Feeder School Contact Survey on Satisfaction and Challenges.....	7
Results	7
1. Program Director Attendance Survey	7
Attendance Reporting Processes	8
Use of Attendance Data.....	9
Reasons for Low and High Student Attendance.....	10
Processes for Year-End Reporting of Attendance	13
2. Site Coordinator Survey on Center Programs and Challenges	15
Enrollment	15
Programming	17
Potential Issues or Challenges	18
Benefits to Students.....	20
3. Feeder School Contact Survey on Satisfaction and Challenges.....	22
Satisfaction and Perceived Quality.....	23
Collaboration with the 21st CCLC	25
Positive Outcomes Noticed	25
Concerns or Suggestions	27
Appendix A: Program Director Attendance Survey.....	29
Appendix B: Site Coordinator Survey	34
Appendix C: Feeder School Contact Survey	44

HIGHLIGHTS AND IMPLICATIONS

The 21st CCLC program is a federal grant program administered by the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI), with grantees (local education agencies, community-based, faith-based, or other organizations) operating a specified number of centers during out-of-school time hours. In 2014-15, NCDPI contracted with SERVE Center at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro (SERVE) to conduct a statewide evaluation of the centers funded and students served. As part of the evaluation, three surveys were administered in the spring of 2015 to all grantees (Program Directors, Site Coordinators, and feeder school contacts). Key findings from these survey results, along with implications for the kinds of additional support from NCDPI that might be valuable to 21st CCLC grantees, are presented below.

Attendance

Data Management

Program Directors were asked the extent to which data management of student attendance is a challenge for their program. Only 7% indicated it was a “major challenge,” 29% indicated it was “somewhat of a challenge,” 33% indicated a “minor challenge,” 32% indicated “not a challenge.” When given the opportunity to provide suggestions to NCDPI on how they can help 21st CCLC grantees improve attendance reporting, 43 suggestions were provided. The most common suggestions from these 43 were for NCDPI to provide more guidance with reporting systems and/or templates.

- *If there was an option to use a template that would total the student's attended days for the month, and YTD, that would be helpful.*
- *Make sure [NCDPI] is consistent with expectations for reporting. I have spoken with several Cohort 10 Programs who don't seem to go to the lengths that we do to report our attendance. I feel there should be one required format designed for every program funded to follow.*
- *[Have] a standard tracking system we can use. Even if it cost money; I would prefer to have [something] NCDPI endorses to do attendance.*
- *Have an online reporting database that is entered into a system every week or month in order to keep up-to-date information on attendance.*
- *Implement a standard, easy to use, reporting system for all programs that would provide daily totals.*

Thus, there are some grantees, perhaps a minority, who might benefit from more support and direction from NCDPI on how to collect and manage student attendance and other data. In particular, some indicated an interest in more information on the software others were using or suggestions for reporting templates from NCDPI.

Issues with Student Attendance

Program Directors of Cohort 10 and 11 grants were asked the extent to which low attendance is a problem for their centers: 32% indicated it was “not a problem,” 47% indicated it was a “minor

problem,” and 20% indicated it was “somewhat of a problem.” They were asked if they were considering or planning to implement any new policies or strategies to try to improve center attendance rates and 48% indicated “Yes.” For the respondents to this question (n=42), the most frequently mentioned strategies were (1) increasing parent engagement, (2) instituting new and/or better enforcing existing attendance policy, (3) providing more incentives, and (4) offering new or restructured programming.

Even though only a minority (n=42) of Program Directors reporting currently trying new strategies to improve student attendance, there may be interest in a venue (e.g., webinar) hosted by NCDPI to discuss some of these strategies such as enhanced parent engagement and new or better attendance policies with others (what others are doing/have learned, etc.).

Enrollment, Programming, Challenges, and Benefits

Enrollment

Regarding enrollment, 61% of Site Coordinators responding reported serving their projected maximum number of students in 2014-15. Further, 45% indicated having a waiting list for the program. The most commonly cited reasons for the waiting list were related to limitations in space or funding/staffing, given the demand. On the flip side (lower enrollment relative to capacity), 39% of respondents reported they did *not* serve students at their maximum capacity, the reasons for which varied (e.g., low parent and/or student interest, transportation, conflicting student schedules, having a small pool of students to draw from, and issues related to the start date of programming).

When asked what percentage of their students served scored below proficient on state tests in 2014, the responses from Site Coordinators ranged from a low of 5% to a high of 100%. Thirty-two indicated a percentage of students between 26% and 50% scoring below proficient on Reading/Language Arts state tests, while 53 indicated 51% or higher of their students served scoring below proficient on Reading/Language Arts state tests.

NCDPI might identify those programs serving significantly fewer students than anticipated (less than projected enrollment) and those programs with relatively small percentages of students scoring below proficient on state tests and use monitoring visits to better understand their feeder school contexts.

Programming

In terms of types of programming beyond the regular after-school program provided, 12% of the Site Coordinators offered “before school” programming and 16% offered “Saturday sessions” whereas “summer/intersession programming” was offered by 84%. Some centers offered “mini-programs” during the school year (programs for particular purposes that may not last all year long). When asked if they offered “mini-programs that had different expectations in terms of how long or how often students would attend”, 30% indicated “Yes.” An example of such a short duration program is an EOG test preparation program.

In terms of the percentage of students with various attendance expectations, 95% of the Site Coordinators indicated that “most participating students enrolled with the intent of attending daily,” 24% indicated “we had some students who enrolled with the intent that they may only

come once or twice per week;” and 10% indicated that “we had some students who enrolled for particular programs of shorter duration such as a semester or month.”

All Site Coordinators responding indicated offering at least 2 hours per week of: “homework help,” “an academic activity in which reading instruction or practice takes place (not tutoring),” and “an academic activity in which mathematics instruction or practice takes place (not tutoring).” Across respondents, “homework help” had the highest number of average hours per week of the activities listed.

To the extent that some programs offer “mini-programs,” there may be implications for attendance reporting and the classification of “regular attendees” for the state system as these students may not attend for 30 days. Perhaps attendance on students in “mini-programs” could be reported separately from the regular, year-long student participation.

Challenges

Overall, across the three surveys, no significant challenges to program implementation were identified. For example, the majority of Site Coordinator respondents indicated that the potential issues listed in the survey were either no challenge at all or only a minor challenge for their centers. A small subset (1%-18%) of respondents identified a few issues on the list provided as a major challenge. Of those, the issue rated most challenging was “Families are not involved in monitoring the academic or behavior progress their children make at the center,” followed closely by “We cannot find volunteers with time and expertise to support academic activities at our center.”

Of those Site Coordinators who described challenges in an open-ended follow-up question, issues cited were related to staffing (e.g., limited numbers, special qualifications, etc.), family involvement/buy-in, and communication with the feeder schools. These were also challenges mentioned by feeder school contacts. Of the relatively small subset of feeder school respondents who provided suggestions for improvement, the most frequently mentioned issues were (1) improving communication between the feeder school and the 21st CCLC program and (2) issues related to program staffing for the centers.

Parent involvement/buy-in, staffing overall and use of volunteers, and communications between the centers and their feeder schools are areas for which NCDPI might provide some additional professional development or opportunities for sharing among grantees.

Benefits to Students

Across all Site Coordinators responding to a question about the benefits of the program, the most frequently mentioned themes were (1) academic support, (2) opportunity for social/emotional development, (3) access to a safe after school environment with caring and supportive staff, and (4) availability of resources not otherwise available. The first three themes were also mentioned by the feeder school contacts responding (n=37) who also expressed a high level of satisfaction with the services of their particular center. Thus, there seems to be agreement between the providers and the limited number of feeder school contacts that responded to the survey about the potential benefits of the program for students.

FULL REPORT

Introduction

The 21st CCLC program is a federal grant program administered by NCDPI, with grantees (local education agencies, community-based, faith-based, or other organizations) operating a specified number of centers during out-of-school time hours (at least 15 hours per week). NCDPI awarded grants to eleven cohorts of grantees since 2002. In the 2014-15 school year, there were 116 grantees operating programs with these federal funds. There were 49 grantees in Cohort 10 who received their awards in 2013 and 67 grantees in Cohort 11 who received their awards in 2014. Grantees receive funding for four years, so during the 2014-15 school year, Cohort 10 grantees were in their second year and Cohort 11 grantees were in their first year.

This report describes the findings from survey data collected from the grantees and others on their 2014-15 operations.

Federal Funding for 21st Century Community Learning Centers

The NCDPI 21st CCLC awards, using federal funding authorized under Title IV, Part B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, provide before and after school, weekend, and summer school academic enrichment opportunities for children attending low-performing schools to help them meet local and state academic standards in such subjects as reading, mathematics, and science. Awards can be made to school districts, non-profit or for-profit organizations, faith-based organizations, or others to operate centers. A “grantee” is the entity serving as the fiduciary agent for a given 21st CCLC grant. A “center” is considered to be the physical location where grant-funded services and activities are provided to participating students and adults.¹ (As a result of a successful ESEA waiver application, effective in 2012-13, centers in North Carolina may offer services on a limited basis to extend the regular school day.) Programs may provide additional activities for youth development, drug and violence prevention, art, music, technology, character education, counseling, and recreation to enhance academic programming. The program also supports a component for family literacy and community outreach. Grantees can request funds for up to \$400,000 per year for four years. Program guidelines define eligible students as those primarily attending low-income schools.

Grantees and Centers

In the 2014-15 school year, Cohorts 10 and 11 consisted of a total of 49 and 67 “grantees,” respectively.² According to the most recent Annual Performance Report (APR) in North Carolina’s Consolidated Federal Data Collection (CFDC) database, a total of 42% of Cohort 10³ and 25% of Cohort 11 were school-based organizations (including one charter school grantee and three colleges or universities in Cohort 10).

¹ Grantee and center definitions: <http://ppics.learningpt.org/ppicsnet/public/supportDefinitions.aspx>

² School year 2014-15 marks the second year of program implementation for Cohort 10. Please note that the data presented in this report represent Cohort 10 and 11 2014-15 information. No survey data were collected on Cohort 10, in school year 2013-14 (year 1).

³ Data from one Cohort 10 site were not available at the time of reporting. Thus, all Cohort 10 descriptive data in this section are based on a total of 48 reporting sites rather than 49 funded sites.

As shown in Table 1, roughly 60% of Cohort 10 and 75% of Cohort 11 grantees were non-school-based organizations—including community-based organizations (Cohort 10: 42% and Cohort 11: 51%), faith-based organizations (Cohort 10: 6% and Cohort 11: 12%), various nationally affiliated nonprofit agencies (Cohort 10: 10% and Cohort 11: 1%), for-profit entities (Cohort 11 only: 9%), and other unit of city or county government (Cohort 11 only: 1%).

Table 1: Type of Grantee

Grantee Type	Number of Grantees	
	<i>Cohort 10</i>	<i>Cohort 11</i>
School District (SD)	16	17
Charter School (CS)	1	0
Colleges or Universities (COU)	3	0
Community-Based Organization (CBO)	20	34
Faith-Based Organization (FBO)	3	8
Nationally Affiliated Nonprofit Agency—Boys & Girls Club (CLUB)	2	0
Nationally Affiliated Nonprofit Agency—YMCA/YWCA (Y)	3	0
Nationally Affiliated Nonprofit Agency (NANPA)	0	1
For-Profit Entity (FPC)	0	6
Other Unit of City or County Government (UG)	0	1
Missing Data	1	0

Number of Centers

Cohort 10 and Cohort 11 grantees managed from one to eight “centers” (i.e., the physical location where grant-funded services and activities are provided to participating students). Over half of Cohort 10 and Cohort 11 grantees managed between one and three centers (70% and 76%, respectively) while a small percentage of grantees managed over five centers (Cohort 10: 8% and Cohort 11: 10%).

Table 2: Number of Centers by Grantee

Grantee Type	Number of Grantees	
	<i>Cohort 10</i>	<i>Cohort 11</i>
One Center	16	33
Two Centers	9	12
Three Centers	9	6
Four Centers	5	8
Five Centers	5	1
Six Centers	0	5
Seven Centers	2	1
Eight Centers	2	1
Missing Data	1	0

Number of Feeder Schools

Cohort 10 grantees reported serving students from 1 to 31 “feeder schools” (i.e., any public or private school that provides students to the 21st CCLC). Cohort 11 grantees reported serving students from 1 to 30 “feeder schools.”

Table 3: Number of Feeder Schools by Grantee

Grantee Type	Number of Grantees	
	Cohort 10	Cohort 11
1 to 3 feeder schools	16	23
4 to 6 feeder schools	14	21
7 to 9 feeder schools	6	6
10 to 19 feeder schools	8	11
20 or more feeder schools	4	6
Missing Data	1	0

Methodology

SERVE Center at the University of North Carolina administered the following online surveys in the spring of 2015.

1. Attendance survey completed by grantee Program Directors on attendance reporting processes and student attendance challenges.
2. Programs and challenges survey completed by Site Coordinators (or Program Directors where applicable⁴).
3. Satisfaction and challenges survey completed by feeder school contacts provided by grantees.

1. Program Director Attendance Survey

SERVE developed the Program Director Attendance Survey with the intent to (a) develop a better understanding of how 21st CCLC programs collect, organize, and use attendance data on participating students; (b) identify any challenges faced in accurately reporting attendance data; and (c) solicit recommendations regarding ways in which NCDPI can help 21st CCLC grantees improve attendance and/or reporting in the future.

An on-line survey link was sent to all Cohort 10 and 11 Program Directors on March 20, 2015 via a memo from NCDPI’s Federal Programs Monitoring and Support Division. A total of 100 Program Directors responded to the survey.⁵ The overall response rate was 86% (78% for Cohort 10 and 93% for Cohort 11).

⁴ If a program had only one center and the Program Director was responsible for the Site Coordinator duties, then the Program Director was asked to complete the survey.

⁵ While 100 Program Directors responded to the survey, all results are presented based on item-specific response rates. Not all 100 Program Directors answered each survey item.

2. Site Coordinator Survey on Center Programs and Challenges

SERVE developed the Site Coordinator Survey to explore how 21st CCLC centers vary in terms of the students targeted, programming, staffing, ways of working with feeder schools, challenges, and other implementation dimensions.

An on-line survey link was sent to all Program Directors on June 11, 2014 with instructions to forward the information to their Site Coordinator(s)⁶. According to the most recent Annual Performance Report (APR) in North Carolina's Consolidated Federal Data Collection (CFDC) database, there were a total of 293 21st CCLC centers active across the state during the 2014-15 school year. Of those 293 sites, a total of 115 responded to the survey⁷—thus, the overall response rate was 39%. However, the low response rates compared to the overall number of centers may reflect the likelihood that Program Directors (one per grantee) completed the survey rather than Site Coordinators.

3. Feeder School Contact Survey on Satisfaction and Challenges

SERVE developed the Feeder School Contact Survey to describe the perceptions of feeder school principals and/or feeder school center contacts as regards the quality and utility of services provided to students in their school.

In order to identify the most appropriate people to answer this satisfaction survey at the feeder school level, NCDPI requested that all Cohort 10 and 11 Program Directors submit the names of the schools their centers served, their feeder school contact, and an email address for the identified contact person. With this information, on June 9, 2014 SERVE sent the on-line survey link to 409 feeder school contacts (out of 876 feeder schools⁸ reported in the 2014-15 CFDC database). A total of 23% of the feeder school contacts responded to the survey⁹.

Results

The results for each of the three surveys are summarized below.

1. Program Director Attendance Survey

As described above, the Program Director Attendance Survey was administered to all Program Directors, and yielded a response rate of 86%. In terms of the Cohort 10 and Cohort 11 Program Directors who completed the survey (n=38 and n=62, respectively), 53% operated more than one center and 48% operated one center. They reported serving from 60 to over 500 students in their

⁶ If a program had only one center and the Program Director was responsible for the Site Coordinator duties, then the Program Director was asked to complete the survey.

⁷ While 115 Site Coordinators responded to the survey, all results are presented based on item-specific response rates. Not all 115 Site Coordinators answered each survey item.

⁸ The actual number may be slightly smaller since in some cases different centers serve the same school.

⁹ The 96 survey feeder school responses were then sorted on whether the respondent indicated their position was funded by the grant. This was done in order to alleviate potential conflict of interest in terms of reporting perceptions of grant program quality etc. from respondents who were funded by the grant program itself. Thus, results are presented in this report based on a total of 63 responses from school contacts.

after school centers; thus, the attendance data collection process may have differed across centers depending on the number of sites and students served.

Of the 100 Program Directors responding, 29% reported having funding other than 21st CCLC to support their centers and 71% reported no other funding.

Attendance Reporting Processes

About half of the Program Directors (50%) reported that Site Coordinators were responsible for gathering the daily student attendance while 32% reported that teachers/tutors were responsible. In terms of methods of recording data, 59% indicated that the attendance data were collected on paper initially and then entered electronically (i.e., into a database), whereas 32% recorded daily attendance data on paper only.

When asked to describe their attendance taking processes, the general protocol was similar among respondents: (1) attendance was taken daily, upon arrival at the after school program, (2) daily attendance data were recorded and stored by program staff, and (3) attendance data were summarized at pre-determined intervals and submitted to the Program Director.

However, responses suggest differences in details such as who took the attendance (e.g., student sign-in versus staff member roll call), whether it was on paper or electronically (e.g., paper only versus attendance recorded on paper and then subsequently entered into an electronic format), how often it was summarized (e.g., weekly versus monthly), whether it was organized by activity or general program attendance, whether it was checked for accuracy, etc. Sample descriptions of attendance-taking processes included:

- *Students sign-in when they enter the classroom after school. At the end of the day, attendance sheets are taken up by the site-coordinator or designated teacher. Attendance is then entered into a database that tracks student attendance totals for the year. Completed sign-in sheets are kept in a notebook for further review. Monthly attendance records are maintained on the computer and hard copies are printed and placed in a separate notebook.*
- *Attendance is taken by bus monitor, turned in, and compared with Site Coordinator roster daily. Daily attendance rosters are inputted into a database that will provide the total number of days a student attended the program by first and last names and school.*
- *...Tutors have attendance sheets with students' names, and each present student is checked off the list as they come in.*
- *Attendance is taken at 2:40 p.m. and then again by each teacher as they meet with students. The individual teachers then give the data to the Lead Teacher and the Lead Teacher stores the data in a notebook.*
- *Every day the attendance is collected on paper when the student arrives. At the conclusion of the week the data is inputted into a tracking system that tracks the students' attendance. The Program Coordinator is able to look up the information on the attendance. At the conclusion of each week, the Site Coordinators submit a weekly report with the total number for that week to the 21st Century Program Coordinator.*

- *Students sign in. Teachers/tutors are responsible for ensuring that students sign in. Site coordinator (Lead Tutor) enters attendance into a spreadsheet. Spreadsheet is shared monthly with Program Director...*
- *Attendance is taken electronically when children initially enter the door. Attendance is also taken at activities by tutors and then when they receive snack. All paper copies are given to the membership coordinator who double checks attendance and enters activities into a software system that tallies attendance.*
- *Attendance is taken when students arrive. It is also taken at the beginning of tutoring and enrichments and then parents sign the child out at the end of the day. At the end of the week attendance (paper copy) is turned in and then entered electronically and is stored on an all-agency home drive.*

In terms of any challenges to collecting accurate attendance data on participating students, over half (53%) of the responding Program Directors reported no challenges whatsoever. Of the remaining respondents, the most frequently cited challenge to accurate attendance data collection was students arriving late or leaving the programming early. A few respondents mentioned students forgetting to sign in upon arrival and issues related to limited staffing/funds.

- *There are times that a child is in the office or with another teacher...and is not present when attendance is taken but goes to [after school programming] late.*
- *Students who may not attend the complete program day. Site Coordinators have to double check for students who arrive later due to family issues, medical issues, etc.*
- *If students leave early, we've already marked them present, but they aren't receiving the benefit of the program that day.*
- *...early checkouts are a challenge our center face daily. Early checkouts interfere with contact hours with each child.*
- *Some students forget to sign in daily.*
- *The challenge is the [limited] funds that can be spent on administrative staff to focus on attendance.*
- *The only thing that would help is money to be able to afford a good database system...*
- *Begin overwhelmed with children that [staff] have to watch and take attendance at the same time.*

When asked how often data on student attendance at the center level were summarized and reviewed by staff, about half indicated weekly (49%) and 41% indicated monthly. In terms of ease of accessing the data on each student, 71% responded with a "Yes," data on each student could be quickly/easily summarized across students. The remainder indicated "Somewhat" (22%) or "No" (7%).

Use of Attendance Data

In responding to a question about three types of use of their student attendance data, 92% of Program Directors indicated keeping it "for the Program Director to use in reporting to the State" and 97% indicated using it "so that staff members can talk to students or parents as needed to explore reasons for inconsistent attendance." A smaller percentage, though still a majority,

indicated using the data “to identify/adjust program activities that don’t seem to be working” (65%).

In order to use attendance data effectively, it must be entered, stored, and summarized using some kind of tracking system. We asked the Program Directors to describe their systems used in managing the data. The majority of respondents reported using an electronic mechanism for tracking such as desktop database software (e.g., Microsoft Excel, Access) or other web-based data management system (e.g. Power School, CIS Data Management), while others reported using hard copy notebooks (paper copies) to track attendance or a combination of the two (electronic and hard copies). The table below presents a summary of the frequency with which various tracking mechanisms were mentioned by name more than once. (n=88, however, please note that some respondents either did not specify a tracking system by name and/or some respondents mentioned more than one tracking mechanism within a single response.)

Table 4: Summary of Attendance Tracking Systems by Name

<i>Tracking Systems</i>	<i>Frequency</i>
Excel/Access	42
Notebooks/Binders/Hard Copy (Paper) Files	21
Power School	10
CIS Data Management	6
Google Docs	3
Vision Member Tracking System	2
NFocus	2

We asked Program Directors the extent to which data management is a challenge for their program. Only 7% indicated it was a “major challenge,” 29% indicated it was “somewhat of a challenge,” 33% indicated “only a minor challenge,” 32% indicated “not a challenge.”

Reasons for Low and High Student Attendance

Program Directors were asked the extent to which low attendance is a problem for their centers: 32% indicated it was “not a problem,” 47% indicated it was a “minor problem,” and 20% indicated it was “somewhat of a problem.”

They were also asked an open-ended question about the most common reasons students attend less than twice per week. The most frequently cited reasons included: conflict with other activities/commitments scheduled at the same time as after school programming, illness/doctor appointments, family related scheduling conflicts, and lack of transportation. The reasons they listed are presented in the table below, in order of frequency. (n=91, however, please note that some respondents either did not specify a reason and/or some respondents mentioned more than one reason within a single response.)

Table 5: Summary of Attendance Tracking Systems by Name

<i>Reasons Specified</i>	Frequency
Conflict with other activities/commitments (e.g., work sports, music, church, etc.)	53
Illness/Doctor appointments	26
Family related (e.g., vacation, family emergencies, family issues/troubles etc.)	15
Lack of transportation	10
Absence from school/suspension/other behavior-related absence	6
Student choice (e.g., needed a break, felt grades improved enough, etc.)	5
N/A	4
Lack of parent support	3
Length of bus ride	2

In addition, Program Directors were asked about the strategies they used to ensure consistently high rates of attendance in their after school programming. The most frequently described strategies involved offering engaging/exciting programming that students like, parental involvement/communication, provision of a positive environment with caring and quality staff, and the availability of transportation. The table below presents a summary of the frequency with which various strategies were mentioned by name more than once. (n=94, however, please note that many respondents indicated more than one strategy within a single response.)

Table 6: Strategies to Ensure Consistent Rates of Attendance

<i>Strategies Specified</i>	Frequency
Engaging/exciting programming (e.g., interactive enrichment activities, activity based learning, etc.)	33
Opportunity for parental involvement/frequent communication (e.g., family night, Parent Advisory Council, letters and phone correspondence, etc.)	32
Positive environment with caring, supportive, qualified staff	20
Rewards/incentives	11
Offer transportation	10
Academic support (e.g., homework assistance)	9
Snacks	7
STEM activities	4
Frequent communication with daytime school staff (e.g., teachers)	4
Free programming	3

Finally, they were asked if they were considering or planning to implement any new policies or strategies to try to improve center attendance rates and 48% indicated “Yes.” Across all respondents to this question (n=42), the most frequently emerging themes centered on (1) increasing parent engagement, (2) instituting new and/or better enforcing existing attendance policy, (3) providing more incentives, and (4) offering new or restructured programming which are described below.

(1) Increasing parent engagement: respondents described various strategies for increasing communication and opportunities for parent/family involvement in after school activities. Commonly cited examples included: more contact with parents to make them aware of attendance policies, alerting parents when attendance issues arise, and offering parents and families opportunities to engage with programming.

- *Implement a monthly newsletter to parents reminding them of the [importance] of daily attendance.*
- *We are considering implementing an automatic phone call system that will give an automated call to the home phone number on file for any students that misses more than 3 days consecutively. This small change will allow staff to better use their work time while ensuring parents are notified about absence issues. We believe that this strategy will equip parents to best address home or family issues that may be impacting their student's attendance and participation levels.*
- *...We are planning more communication on our websites and more communications with our parents to make 21st CCLC more well-known and supported by families.*
- *[Provide] more timely feedback to parents using technology...hold more parent meetings and activities geared toward parents.*
- *We will implement a parent workshop on employment skills development and schedule more parent nights.*

(2) Instituting new and/or better enforcing existing attendance policy: respondents also reported plans to revisit existing attendance policies and revise/make more stringent if necessary. In some cases, this strategy also included mention of ensuring parents have a clearer understanding of attendance expectations.

- *Possibly lowering the number of consecutive days attendees can miss before being released from the program. If a student is suspended from school, they may be permanently released from the program.*
- *We have discussed an attendance policy that not only outlines 3 days/week, but a certain number of weeks that they must attend.*
- *Stricter enforcement of our policy for 4 day per week attendance for at least 1 1/2 hours per day.*
- *One new policy is to have parents and students to sign an agreement committing to a minimum of two days a week.*
- *The new policy will require parents to pick-up their child at a set time giving tutors sufficient time to work with the child. After a new parent orientation parents will sign an agreement stating they understand the policy. Students will have to meet weekly attendance requirements in order to remain eligible for the services of the program.*

(3) Providing more incentives: several respondents also commented that they were considering offering incentives as a strategy for increasing attendance. Students' receipt of these rewards would be contingent on previously determined attendance goals (e.g., minimum number of days/week, etc.).

- *...Perfect attendance rewards, Consecutive days rewards. Ice-cream parties for weekly perfect attendance...*
- *To improve center attendance rates we plan to tie attendance to activities and positive behavior interventions.*
- *Weekly rewards—we will be contacting local vendors to offer incentives to our students for attendance benchmarks.*
- *Make participation in certain activities dependent on good attendance.*

(4) Offering new or restructured programming: respondents described plans to update current programming and/or train staff in, and offer, new types programming to better attract participants and increase attendance.

- *[We will offer] more mini programs to address needs of specific demographics.*
- *[Provide staff training] on STEM activities from...the UNC Morehead Planetarium and Science Center ...we believe that the students would love the inquiry based strategies.*
- *We [will shift to an] 8 week project driven learning model where we work on a large project for an extended period of time instead of small projects regularly.*
- *We will use more STEM activities on a daily basis.*
- *More hands-on activities and cultural fieldtrips.*

Processes for Year-End Reporting of Attendance

At the end of each year, centers must report to NCDPI on how many days students attended their programs. When Program Directors were asked to describe their processes for calculating attendance and determining the percent of students who were “regular attendees,” the protocol was similar among the majority of respondents: (1) number of days a student attended are “tallied,” (2) percent attendance for each student is calculated by dividing the number of days student attended by the total number of days of programming offered, and (3) the number of days attended and/or the percent attendance are compared to a pre-determined benchmark for what is considered “regular attendance.”

Variations in responses were more in terms of specific details such as the kind of software/tracking system used (e.g., Excel was most commonly cited, however, Power School and Google Docs were also mentioned). Sample descriptions of these processes include:

- *Our attendance log is done in Excel and it automatically adds up the days each student has attended; from that we determined how many students attended 30 days and how many attended less than 30 days.*
- *An Excel spreadsheet shows every month the program operates along with summer (counted as a total figure with daily attendance evidence to back it up) and calculates the student's cumulative attendance in a separate column. We then print the spreadsheets out and by hand count the total number of 30+ day regular attendees, usually circling their cumulative attendance in red and marking the number of 30+ and 30- at the top of each spreadsheet page.*
- *Attendance for students is kept on an Excel Spread sheet. The Program Director tally's the monthly total number of days students sign-in from the weekly attendance*

records. At the end of each month a Year- to- Date total number of days attended are recorded. From this Excel spread sheet the percent of students who attend 30 days or more or students who attend less than 30 are calculated.

- *Our Google doc electronic automatically calculates the total number of days each student attends the program. It is then very easy to calculate the percentage of students who attended 30 days or more in the program just by doing the math.*
- *Our spreadsheets maintained in Google track the number days attended by all attendees. The tally indicates the number of students who met the 30-day threshold.*
- *Power School is used to calculate the total number of days each student attends the program at the end of the year and determine the percent of regular attendees.*
- *Students' attendance is kept so there is no guesswork involved; two days or more is counted as regular attendance on a 4-day week of programming.*
- *We run a report in the member tracking system from the beginning of the school year to the end. We consider regular attendance for children who average 3 or more visits a week.*
- *Students are expected to attend 80% (4 out of 5 days each week).*

The Program Directors reported that for 2014-15, from 30% to 100% of their enrollees attended at least 30 days. The average percentage of students reported as attending at least 30 days was 78%.

When given the opportunity to provide suggestions to NCDPI on how they can help 21st CCLC grantees improve attendance reporting, the majority (51%) gave no suggestions. However, 43 suggestions were provided. The most common suggestion centered on a call for standardized reporting systems and/or templates that could be used by all grantees.

- *If there was an option to use a template that would total the student's attended days for the month, and YTD, that would be helpful.*
- *Make sure [NCDPI] is consistent with expectations for reporting. I have spoken with several Cohort 10 Programs who don't seem to go to the lengths that we do to report our attendance. I feel there should be one required format designed for every program funded to follow.*
- *I would like to see them have either a standard template or purchase a reporting program such as Cayen.*
- *Provide an online system that we can capture all of the information we need and that will summarize the data needed for reporting.*
- *[Have] a standard tracking system we can use. Even if it cost money; I would prefer to have [something] NCDPI endorses to do attendance.*
- *Have an online reporting database that is entered into a system every week or month in order to keep up-to-date information on attendance.*
- *Implement a standard, easy to use, reporting system for all programs that would provide daily totals.*

Other specific suggestions, though mentioned by only a few respondents, were related to providing information on best practices, increasing access to Power School, and requesting that NCDPI help to facilitate parent engagement and understanding of the program.

- *Informally let grantees know of any best practices [NCDPI] may have observed during your monitoring process and share them with all the grantees.*
- *Link us directly to Power School. Although this may not help directly with attendance it will help with all other facets of monitoring and reporting.*
- *I would recommend that NCDPI coordinate a state-wide regional meeting for parents. It is important for parents to understand the guidelines and policies of the 21st Century [Program]. [Sometimes] it is best if they hear it from those that are in charge.*

2. Site Coordinator Survey on Center Programs and Challenges

As described in the Methodology section, this survey was sent to all Program Directors with instructions to forward the information on to their Site Coordinator(s); however, if a program had only one center, and the Program Director was responsible for the Site Coordinator duties, then the Program Director was asked to complete the survey. A total of 115 responded to the survey (out of 293 sites); thus, the overall response rate was approximately 39%.

In terms of experience levels of program providers, 44% of respondents indicated that their center was in operation and providing after school services prior to receiving 21st CCLC funding. Thus, the majority of respondents (over 50%) were operating centers which were newly established with 21st CCLC funds. A majority (66%) of respondents reported being located at a school facility.

Enrollment

Regarding enrollment, 61% reported serving their projected maximum number of students in 2014-15. Further, 45% indicated having a waiting list for the program. Of those who indicated a waiting list, the number of students on the list ranged from 2 to 200 with most numbers between 5 and 20. When asked to provide an explanation for the need to have a waiting list, the most commonly cited reasons were related to limitations in space or funding/staffing, given the demand.

- *Student population in need of after school enrichment was high; we did our best to accommodate all students interested in the program.*
- *[The] school is one of the larger schools we serve... We limit the number of students served so we are able to provide exceptional programs for the students and are not spread too thin.*
- *We had more students at certain grade levels that wanted to participate than we could serve.*
- *Our center has a limited number of space that we fill... This is to ensure we are achieving our goals of both safety and academic enrichment.*
- *We could not [accommodate] all the students with the funding that we [were] working with at this time... We need more staff and a larger location.*

On the flip side (lower enrollment relative to capacity), 39% of respondents reported they did *not* serve students at their maximum capacity, the reasons for which varied. For example, explanations included: low parent and/or student interest, transportation, conflicting schedules

(e.g., other after school activities), having a small pool of students to draw from, and issues related to the start date of programming:

- *Lack of students' interest and parents' lack of enrolling them or wanting them to attend the after school program.*
- *[Parents] stated they had concerns regarding their children walking alone to the center due to significant crime activity in the neighborhood.*
- *Small school size meant that our pool to pull students from was smaller.*
- *The program started during the middle of the academic year, not at the beginning, and parents indicated they were not informed of the program's existence.*

In terms of grade levels, 70% or more of respondents indicated serving students in grades 3, 4, and 5. From 51% to 64% served grades K, 1, and 2. Less than 20% of respondents indicated serving high school students (n=112 but please note that multiple grade levels could be served by centers.)

Table 7: Grade Level Served

<i>Grade</i>	<i>Response</i>	<i>Percent</i>
K	57	51%
1	68	61%
2	72	64%
3	84	75%
4	83	74%
5	82	73%
6	68	61%
7	46	41%
8	42	38%
9	21	19%
10	17	15%
11	13	12%
12	11	10%

When asked what percentage of their students scored below proficiency on state tests in 2014, the responses (n=91) ranged from a low of 5% to a high of 100%. Thirty-two indicated a percentage between 26% and 50% scoring below proficiency on Reading/Language Arts state tests, while 21 indicated between 51% and 75%, 21 indicated between 76% and 100%, and 11 indicated between 0% and 25%.

Table 8: Percent of Students Served Reported as Scoring Below Proficiency on State Tests in Reading/Language Arts

<i>Students Scoring Below Proficiency</i>	Frequency
0-25% Below Proficiency	11
26-50%	32
51-75%	21
76-100%	21
Unknown/NA (non-testing grade)	6

Programming

In terms of types of programming beyond the regular after-school program, 12% offered “before school” programming and 16% offered “Saturday sessions” whereas “summer/intersession programming” was offered by 84%. Some centers offered “mini-programs” during the school year (programs for particular purposes that may not last all year long). When asked if they offered “mini-programs that had different expectations in terms of how long or how often students would attend, 30% indicated “Yes.” An example of such a short duration program is an EOG test preparation program.

In terms of percent of students with various attendance expectations, 95% of respondents indicated that “most participating students enrolled with the intent of attending daily;” 24% indicated “we had some students who enrolled with the intent that they may only come once or twice per week;” and 10% indicated that “we had some students who enrolled for particular programs of shorter duration such as a semester or month.”

Respondents were also asked about the amount of time participating students spent per week on various support and or/enrichment activities. The question read: “How many hours per week did your 21st CCLC after school center provide students the following support/activities?” Table 9 shows the distribution of responses regarding hour per week (“Not offered” [1] to “More than 6 hours per week” [5]), as well as the mean and standard deviation for each item.

All respondents indicated offering at least 2 hours per week of “homework help,” “an academic activity in which reading instruction or practice takes place (not tutoring) ,” and “an academic activity in which mathematics instruction or practice takes place (not tutoring) .” Across respondents, “homework help” had the highest number of average hours per week of the activities listed.

Table 9: Average Hours Per Week Support/Activities Offered

Item	>6 (5)	5-6 (4)	2-4 (3)	1-2 (2)	NO (1)	Mean	Std Dev	Tot Resp
a. Homework help	14	34	43	10	0	3.5	0.86	101
b. Tutoring (one-to-one or peer)	9	20	45	21	4	3.1	0.97	99

Item	>6 (5)	5-6 (4)	2-4 (3)	1-2 (2)	NO (1)	Mean	Std Dev	Tot Resp
c. An academic activity in which reading instruction or practice takes place (not tutoring)	8	20	52	22	0	3.1	0.84	102
d. An academic activity in which mathematics instruction or practice takes place (not tutoring)	7	17	57	21	0	3.1	0.80	102
e. An arts or recreation enrichment activity (e.g., sports, outdoor games, crafts, theater, music)	3	11	44	41	3	2.7	0.82	102
f. A science activity, project, or science-related field trip (e.g., to a local science museum)	3	13	39	30	17	2.6	1.01	102
g. A public service or other supplemental activity (e.g., mentoring, counseling, drug and violence prevention, healthy habits)	1	4	22	59	16	2.2	0.77	102

Note: >6 = More than 6 hours per week; 5-1 = 5-6 hours per week; 2-4 = 2-4 hours per week; 1-2 = No more than 2 hours per week; NO = Not offered

In terms of how they assessed student progress, 82% of respondents indicated that they “regularly assess students’ academic growth in reading/language arts and math as part of its program activities.” Half of the respondents indicated they used a “supplemental instructional software program to assess students’ academic growth in reading and/or math.” When asked to name the supplemental software used to assess students’ academic growth, a variety of names were provided (e.g., i-Ready, Triumph Online: Coach Readiness, mClass, MobyMax, Math Media, MindPlay, IXL, GRADE/GMADE, Dibels, Success Maker, Study Island, Sumdog, Compass Learning, Achieve 3000, Catchup Math, Reading A to Z, Waterford, etc.).

Potential Issues or Challenges

Regarding potential issues or challenges faced by their 21st CCLC program, respondents were provided a list of issues and challenges that may apply to their center and were asked to indicate whether it was “Not a challenge for my center” (1), “A minor challenge for my center” (2), or “A major challenge for my center” (3). Table 10 shows the distribution of responses as well as the mean and standard deviation for each item.

The majority of respondents indicated that the potential issues presented were either no challenge at all or only a minor challenge for their centers. A small subset (1%-18%) of respondents identified the issues presented as a major challenge. Of those, the issue rated most challenging was “Families are not involved in monitoring the academic or behavior progress their children

make at the center,” followed closely by “We cannot find volunteers with time and expertise to support academic activities at our center.”

Table 10: Potential Issues or Challenges for the 21st CCLC Program

Item	Major (3)	Minor (2)	None (1)	Mean	Std Dev	Tot Resp
a. The feeder school would like our program to be more academically focused than it currently is.	6	13	80	1.3	0.56	99
b. The space available for center programs is inadequate, inappropriate, or unsafe.	7	17	76	1.3	0.60	100
c. We cannot find staff with expertise in teaching the academic subjects we offer.	9	27	64	1.5	0.66	100
d. We cannot find volunteers with time and expertise to support academic activities at our center.	17	31	52	1.7	0.76	100
e. We cannot afford to offer competitive salaries to staff who are qualified to provide supplementary academic instruction at our center.	13	14	72	1.4	0.71	99
f. We cannot afford to offer potential staff enough hours of paid employment.	8	25	67	1.4	0.64	100
g. Staff do not have the skills to help English-language learners with their academic development.	1	18	81	1.2	0.43	100
h. There are limited professional development opportunities for staff.	7	20	72	1.3	0.61	99
i. We have inadequate instructional materials or programming ideas.	3	15	81	1.2	0.48	99
j. We receive insufficient information from the feeder school about how to help our center participants with the school day curriculum.	8	20	71	1.3	0.63	99
k. Many of our students do not attend the center regularly enough to make academic improvements.	7	36	57	1.5	0.63	100
l. Some students are not interested in coming to the program.	11	41	48	1.6	0.68	100
m. Students drop out of the after school program because they lose interest in doing academic work after school.	11	39	50	1.6	0.68	100
n. Families are not involved in monitoring the academic or behavior progress their children make at the center.	18	46	36	1.8	0.72	100

Item	Major (3)	Minor (2)	None (1)	Mean	Std Dev	Tot Resp
o. There is too much competition for students' time from other activities, such as jobs or sports.	14	36	50	1.6	0.72	100

Note: Major = A major challenge for my center; Minor = A minor challenge for my center; None = Not a challenge for my center

When asked to further describe any major challenges experienced by their 21st CCLC after school center, almost half (49%) of the respondents had no additional issues to report. Of those who described challenges over and above those mentioned elsewhere in the survey, issues cited were related to staffing (e.g., limited numbers, special qualifications, etc.), family involvement/buy-in, and communication with the feeder schools. For example:

- *Our only big challenge is finding and keeping staff to offer more slots for students to be able to attend the program.*
- *The only major challenge my site has is maintaining and getting staff to be able to serve more students in the program due to the 1:18 ratio.*
- *The major challenge is finding long-term staff who can manage student behaviors after school.*
- *Staff not being able to communicate with parents of ESL learners.*
- *We would have liked to have had more participation from parents, especially in Parenting Sessions.*
- *Parents allowing students to make the decision about whether they enroll or attend the after school program and also the lack of parental support in after school program meetings.*
- *It is a challenge to get timely information from school day teachers as to a student's needs. We only hear from them when there is a complaint.*
- *The lines of communications are not open with some of our feeder schools.*

Benefits to Students

Respondents were asked an open-ended question about 21st CCLC program benefits. The question read “What is the most important benefit the students get from attending your 21st CCLC after school center?” Across all respondents to this question (n=91), the most frequently emerging themes centered on (1) academic support, (2) opportunity for social/emotional development, (3) access to a safe after school environment with caring and supportive staff, and (4) availability of resources not otherwise available.

(1) Academic support: the majority of respondents described various aspects of academic support (e.g., homework assistance, help with comprehension of concepts taught during the school day, etc.) as one of the most important benefits afforded to students participating in their 21st CCLC program.

- *The most important benefit the students get from attending is that they know they will receive help with their schoolwork.*

- *The most important benefit our students receive is getting help with their homework. Most of them have really struggled with their homework, and many parents are not equipped to give their children the help they need to complete their homework correctly.*
- *The most important benefit for students attending the program was to receive homework assistance and tutoring to help understand the material they are learning in the classroom and to expand on their knowledge of the content area.*
- *Students received supplemental instruction through "fun" activities. Most students appreciated assistance with homework as well as the opportunity to read in a quiet setting.*
- *Students are given the opportunity to have skills reinforced from their classrooms. Students are taught material through a different approach, which many have more success with.*
- *Assistance and comprehension with the homework they are provided from school and the additional work we offer to further their grasp of the material and their grade level learning objectives, in addition to EOG (End of Grade) testing preparation.*

(2) Opportunity for social/emotional development: respondents also emphasized benefits students receive in terms of social/emotional growth; specifically mentioning increased opportunity for socialization and “life skills” enrichment. Many described a noticeable boost in students’ confidence and self-esteem as a result of participation in their programming.

- *[Students] receive help in both tutoring and homework that helps with their academics but they also get socialization with other children and feel part of a group.*
- *Students learn about health and nutrition, and we want to promote the development of each child socially. We try to instill good values into the children along with role-playing and discussing when they make good choices and when they make bad choices. We encourage respect and try to handle discipline in a way that will cause them to think about their behaviors before they act.*
- *[Students] enhance their life skills and growth in all developmental areas.*
- *I have found that students gain an incredible sense of self-worth and confidence from our programming. We are able to provide the method, practice and possible remediation needed for students to feel like they are prepared. Students have an understanding that hard work and persistence pay off.*
- *We observed growth in students' self-esteem and belief in their academic ability. We also observed improvement in the students' self-confidence and their ability to communicate effectively with both children and adult. A sense of community was established among those involved in the program.*

(3) Access to a safe after school environment with caring and supportive staff: several respondents also commented that the program provided a safe environment for students to go after school; that it provided shelter, security, and caring/supportive adult supervision and mentorship.

- *Staying off the streets, having a safe and fun place to go after school.*

- *We have many benefits, but students come to a fun, safe place after school with a caring staff who promotes the importance of education relative to their lives as adults. They get their homework completed and also get to engage with encouraging staff who care about the students and their overall needs.*
- *They are showed love and support. It is a safe place for many of our students!*
- *In addition to academic progress, students have a safe environment where they are able to build positive relationships with adults and peers.*
- *Shelter, food, security and education. Most of all a safe haven for the children.*
- *Students get that one-on-one attention needed to be successful in the academic arena [while interacting] with positive, caring role models.*

(4) Availability of resources not otherwise available: another benefit described was related to access to resources and experiences students get to use and/or take part in after school.

Examples ranged from healthy snacks, to specialized materials, to field trips.

- *The students are able to be engaged in extracurricular activities that they wouldn't get if they just went home. Students get an extra healthy snack later in the day for those that don't have much at home.*
- *Due to the location of the center there is a lack of resources available to the students. However, through the field trips the students have become more exposed to things that they would not normal see.*
- *[Access to] STEM activities.*
- *Students can receive...access to an array of enriching social, cultural, and athletic activities that they would not get by going straight home after school.*
- *Many of our students were happy to have a place to do homework; they found supportive teachers, computer access as well as textbook access (most are not allowed to take them home).*
- *Learning SEL and being the first group of kids to experience WINGS for Kids. We saw a difference in many of our students throughout the year.*
- *The students received...healthy snacks and a place to grow academically outside of their normal school day. The students participate in academic enrichment field trips to enhance their learning experience.*

3. Feeder School Contact Survey on Satisfaction and Challenges

As described in the Methodology section, 21st CCLCs during the 2014-15 school year (comprised of Cohorts 10 and 11), served over 800 feeder schools. The 21st CCLC Feeder School Perception Survey 2015 was sent to 409 individuals previously identified via NCDPI as the Feeder Schools' principal and/or most appropriate contact at the Feeder School level. Only a small sample of the targeted Feeder School population responded to the survey (n=96; 23% response rate). These 96 survey responses were then sorted on whether the respondent indicated their position was funded by the grant. This was done in order to alleviate potential conflict of interest in terms of reporting perceptions about the quality of the program's services from respondents who were funded by the grant program itself. Thus, results are presented based on a total of 63 responses from school contacts: 38 principals, 5 assistant principals, 8 teachers, 4 counselors, and 8 others.

About half were from elementary schools and a quarter from middle schools with the remainder from high schools, K-8, or other. A little over half of respondents indicated that the 21st CCLC program was offered at their school facility. (Note: the other half may not have direct contact with the program given it is not located at the school facility).

Although the sample is small and may not be representative of the larger population of schools served by 21st CCLC programs, the results are provided below.

Satisfaction and Perceived Quality

Respondents were asked to provide ratings on their level of satisfaction with the services students received from the after school program, as well as their perceived value and quality of those after school services. Their responses are shown in Tables 11-13.

Regarding **satisfaction**, the survey asked: “Overall how would you rate your satisfaction with the services provided to students from your school attending the 21st CCLC after school program?” Responses are shown in Table 11 (n=55). A majority (72%) indicated being either “very satisfied” or “satisfied.” Around a quarter of respondents were either “somewhat satisfied” or “neutral” in their perceptions. Only one respondent indicated dissatisfaction.

Table 11: Satisfaction with Services Provided to Students from Respondents’ School Attending the After School Program

Answer	Response	%
Very satisfied	26	47%
Satisfied	14	25%
Somewhat satisfied	10	18%
Neutral	4	7%
Somewhat dissatisfied	0	0%
Dissatisfied	1	2%
Very dissatisfied	0	0%

Respondents were also asked about perceived **quality and impact** of the 21st CCLC after school services. Table 12 shows the distribution of responses along a five-point Likert-type rating scale (“Strongly Disagree” [1] to “Strongly Agree” [5]), as well as the mean and standard deviation for each item. Across all items, the mean response value was 4.2 with relatively small standard deviations, suggesting that, on the whole, respondents agreed with the survey statements regarding program quality and impact. That is, the majority of respondents indicated that they either “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” that the after school program seemed to have high quality programming (79%), high quality staff (80%), and that students who attended the program benefitted from participation (87%).

Table 12: Overall Quality and Impact of 21st CCLC After School Program Services

Item	SA (5)	A (4)	N (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	Mean	Std Dev	Tot Resp
After school program seems to have high quality programming	23	18	8	2	1	4.1	0.96	52
After school program seems to have high quality staff	24	17	8	1	1	4.2	0.92	51
Students attending after school program seem to benefit from participation	26	20	6	0	1	4.3	0.83	53

Perceived value of the 21st CCLC after school services was also rated by respondents. Table 13 shows the distribution of responses along a five-point Likert-type rating scale (“Strongly Disagree” [1] to “Strongly Agree” [5]), as well as the mean and standard deviation for each item. As with perceived quality and impact of the program, the average extent to which respondents agreed with statements regarding program value was high, with an overall mean of 4.3 with small standard deviations across all items. As with the previous items, most respondents were positive (82%-95%) and indicated that they either “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” with all items pertaining to program value.

Table 13: Value of 21st CCLC After School Program Services

Item	SA (5)	A (4)	N (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	Mean	Std Dev	Tot Resp
Provides a valuable service to our students	31	22	2	1	0	4.5	0.66	56
Provides our students with needed academic support outside of the regular school day	26	22	6	0	1	4.3	0.81	55
Provides our students with the help they need with homework	26	23	6	0	0	4.4	0.68	55
Provides our students with valuable support for social and behavioral development	25	19	9	0	0	4.3	0.75	53
Provides help with engaging the families of our students	21	21	7	2	0	4.2	0.83	51

Note: SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; N = Neither Agree nor Disagree; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree

To summarize, results indicate that, across the various ratings presented above (i.e., overall satisfaction and program quality, impact, and value), there is relative consistency in that the majority of respondents had positive perceptions about the 21st CCLC services, with a small number (anywhere from 3 to 11 of the approximately 56 respondents) who were neutral or negative.

Collaboration with the 21st CCLC

Five survey items on the Feeder School Contact Survey asked respondents to indicate their level of agreement with statements regarding the quality and extent of communication and collaboration between school staff and 21st CCLC program staff. Table 14 shows the distribution of responses along a five-point, Likert-type rating scale (“Strongly Disagree” [1] to “Strongly Agree” [5]), as well as the mean and standard deviation for each item. The average extent to which respondents agreed with statements regarding collaboration was 4.0 with small standard deviations across all items. That is, the majority of respondents indicated positive perceptions (69%-84%) across all collaboration survey items. A group of approximately 15 respondents (roughly 30% or less) were less positive (responded with “neutral”, “disagree”, or “strongly disagree”).

Table 14: Collaboration with 21st CCLC

Item	SA (5)	A (4)	N (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	Mean	Std Dev	Tot Resp
I work with the 21 st CCLC staff to connect their programming to content taught in the school	15	19	6	7	2	3.8	1.16	49
School staff and 21 st CCLC program staff systematically share information to support student homework completion or other academic needs	22	17	2	10	2	3.9	1.25	53
I have good communication with the 21 st CCLC program staff about their programming	23	19	5	6	3	4.0	1.20	56
I view the 21 st CCLC after school program as an extension of our school programming, not as a program offered by an outside agency or staff with no knowledge of what is happening during the day	24	15	10	4	2	4.0	1.12	55
I communicate successfully, as needed, with the 21 st CCLC program staff about students from our school attending their program	23	23	2	5	2	4.1	1.08	55

Note: SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; N = Neither Agree nor Disagree; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree

Positive Outcomes Noticed

In addition to the Likert-type questions, respondents were presented with an open-ended question regarding positive outcomes observed as a result of students’ participation in the program. The question read “What, if any, positive benefits or outcomes have you noticed as a result of student

participation in the 21st CCLC after school program?” Across all respondents to this question (n=37), the most frequently emerging themes centered on (1) social/emotional improvement, (2) academic improvement, and (3) provision of a safe environment.

(1) Social/emotional improvement: respondents described an improvement in students’ social and emotional wellbeing upon participation in the 21st CCLC program. Commonly cited examples include more positive attitudes/desire to succeed overall, increased self-confidence, and improved behavior.

- *Students loved the program. They were given a [well-rounded] experience that grew their confidence as people. They felt better about themselves and they learned how to get along with each other...*
- *[Participating] students seem to have more self-confidence and greater self-image...[they] ‘want’ to be successful in all areas of their life and seem to know what it takes to be successful and reach their goals.*
- *Our students in the 21st Century program have outperformed students who did not receive these services. The students participate more in class and have a stronger desire to succeed.*
- *I’ve...seen the behavior of the students change to a much more positive one.*
- *Students’ behavior is improving, thereby, improving their academics.*
- *...student behavior is more positive and there is a more positive attitude toward school.*

(2) Academic improvement: respondents also identified the academic assistance provided by the after school program as one of the primary benefits to participation, with some specifically stating that they and/or participating students’ teachers have observed an increase academic achievement in the classroom.

- *Teachers [have noticed] an improvement in the regular school day from tutoring in the after school program.*
- *I have seen the students that participate in this program improve in their reading and math...*
- *Many teachers have stated that the program has helped students make up missed credits and improve grades on...class tests.*
- *Students in [the] program have improved their grades, reading fluency, and completion of homework.*
- *Many students who were in the...21st CCLC [program] pass the 3rd grade EOG assessment. Also, students who participated in our program increased their scores on their...report card.*

(3) Provision of a safe environment: several respondents also commented that the program provided a safe place for students to go when the regular school day was over; a positive benefit in that many students may not have had another place to go with access to adult supervision. This safe environment also had the benefits of offering a number of choices and structured activities/programming.

- *It gives [students] something to do after school, which is good for us because we are a very rural county.*

- *Students have a safe location after school to continue their education with adult supervision.*
- *The students benefit from our Drug and Alcohol Awareness lessons...*
- *...gives students a positive environment for after school hours...*
- *Students are happy to have the after school program because it gives them something to do and they encourage their peers to attend also.*

Concerns or Suggestions

Respondents were also asked an open-ended question about any concerns and/or suggestions for program improvement. The question read “Do you have any concerns or suggestions for how you would improve the 21st CCLC after school program?” Across all respondents to this question (n=36) almost half (47%) expressed that they did not have any concerns or suggestions to improve the program, with one particularly emphatic endorsement: “...it was the BEST program EVER.” Alternatively, of the relatively small subset of respondents who expressed concern and/or who provided suggestions for improvement, the most frequently emerging themes were related to (1) improving communication with the 21st CCLC program and (2) issues related to program staffing.

(1) Improving communication with the 21st CCLC program: eight respondents (22%) indicated concern around levels of communication, primarily between the school/classroom and the 21st CCLC program staff. In particular, there was a call for more frequent communication between the two parties throughout the school year.

- *In my position the only time we are contacted is at the end of the school year for test results, grades, and teacher input on how the students’ homework was during the year. To my knowledge, teachers are not contacted through the year...*
- *Communication with the program was a struggle this year. When students were suspended from the program we were not notified until the student mentioned it at dismissal which [caused] transportation issues/concerns.*
- *Better communication with school staff on students’ areas of weakness to help improve reading and math levels. Work to make [school] staff a part of our vision and communicate with them better to make sure children are held accountable.*
- *The center needs to be in communication with the child’s teacher to better understand the academic needs of the students.*

(2) Program staffing: six respondents (17%) had comments regarding the qualifications of 21st CCLC program staff, the need for increased numbers of staff, and improved staff training (particularly around behavior issues).

- *Hiring professionals that are qualified and have the skills and desire to serve high risk students in a safe environment is needed. The staff does not always know how to handle situations or behavior of the students which takes away from the program. Students are disruptive and rowdy at times and the discipline needs attention. The staff needs additional training (all the staff) to ensure they know how to work best with the students.*

- *Making sure that all staff are in place before starting the program would be beneficial.*
- *...there should be more small group tutoring in the core areas of reading and math, however, to do this means that there will have to be those willing to help.*
- *Supervision appears to be lacking at times, as there have been issues that occurred and they were relegated to school based administrators to deal with.*
- *More training and staff development/professional development in dealing with discipline issues in a top-notch and professional manner with the students.*

APPENDIX A: PROGRAM DIRECTOR ATTENDANCE SURVEY

Thanks for taking this survey. The intent of the survey is to: a) develop a better understanding of how 21st CCLC programs collect, organize, and use attendance data of participating students; b) identify the various challenges faced in accurately reporting attendance data; and c) solicit recommendations regarding ways in which NCDPI can help 21st CCLC grantees improve attendance and/or reporting in the future. (Note: The focus of this survey is on students' 21st CCLC program attendance and not on students' school attendance.)

Section I: Background information about your 21st CCLC program

1. Your grantee name:
(select from dropdown list provided)
2. Is your organization a...?
 - ☐ School district
 - ☐ Community-based organization
 - ☐ Nationally affiliated non-profit agency
 - ☐ Faith-based organization
 - ☐ For-profit entity
 - ☐ Charter school
 - ☐ Unit of city/county government
 - ☐ Other: Explain _____
3. How many years has your organization operated an afterschool program (regardless of funding type)?
 - ☐ 1-2 years
 - ☐ 2-5 years
 - ☐ 5-10 years
 - ☐ 10-15 years
 - ☐ More than 15 years
4. Indicate your 21st CCLC cohort status. (check all that apply)
 - ☐ Cohort 10
 - ☐ Cohort 11
 - ☐ Don't know
5. Indicate the school level(s) served by your 21st CCLC program. (check all that apply)
 - ☐ Elementary
 - ☐ Middle
 - ☐ High

6. Did your program operate more than one 21st CCLC-funded center this year?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Answer If Did your program operate more than one 21st CCLC-funded center this year? Yes Is Selected
How many 21st CCLC-funded centers did your program operate this year?

7. How many students did your program serve this year with 21st CCLC funding?

8. Do you have funding other than 21st CCLC to support your center(s) operation?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Answer If Do you have funding other than 21st CCLC to support your center(s) operation? Yes Is Selected
What percent of your total funding is comprised of 21st CCLC funds? (use the slider bar below to indicate %)

Section II: Your attendance record keeping processes

9. Does someone at the center level collect data on which students attend each day?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Do you have multiple "mini-programs" ...

Answer If Does someone at the center level collect data daily on which students attend each day? Yes Is Selected

Who is responsible for gathering the daily student attendance (e.g., who takes roll, makes sure students sign in, etc.)?

- ☐ Site Coordinator
- ☐ Teachers/Tutors
- ☐ Administrative Staff Member
- ☐ Other: _____

Answer If Does someone at the center level collect data daily on which students attend each day? No Is Selected

Why does your program NOT collect data regarding which students attend each day?

10. How is the daily individual student attendance data recorded at the center level?

- ☐ On paper
- ☐ Online/electronically
- ☐ On paper initially, then entered electronically (i.e., into a database)
- ☐ Other: Explain _____

11. Please list the steps used in recording data daily on individual student attendance (e.g., when is attendance taken, where do the data go next, where are the data stored, etc.).

Answer If Did your program operate more than one center this year? Yes Is Selected

Since your program operates multiple centers, how are the daily attendance data from the centers submitted to the Program Director?

12. Do you have any "mini-programs" that have different expectations in terms of how long students will attend or how often they will attend (e.g., credit recovery, athlete tutoring, EOG test preparation)?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

Answer If Do you have multiple "mini-programs" that have different expectations in terms of attendance? Yes Is Selected

Please list the names/types of "mini programs" offered and the timeframe they are offered.

13. As a Program Director, do you see a need for improving the efficiency/accuracy of your attendance data collection processes?

- ☐ Yes
☐ Somewhat
☐ No

Answer If As a Program Director, do you need help in improving the accuracy/usefulness of your attendance data collection efforts? No Is Not Selected

What kind of help would you like to receive in terms of your attendance data collection efforts?

14. In terms of collecting accurate attendance data on participating students, what challenges do center-level staff face?

Section III: Your use of attendance data

15. How do you use center attendance data? (check all the apply)

- ☐ We keep the attendance data on file mostly for the Program Director to use in reporting to the state.
☐ The Site Coordinator/Center Director tracks individual student attendance so that staff members can talk to students or parents as needed to explore reasons for inconsistent attendance.
☐ We use data on attendance to identify/adjust program activities that don't seem to be working.
☐ Other (specify): _____

16. How often are data on student attendance at the center level summarized and reviewed by staff?

- ☐ Weekly
☐ Monthly
☐ End of quarter/semester
☐ End of year
☐ Never

17. In your program, do you review/discuss attendance data to help reflect on the level of student engagement in your activities?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

18. Does your program have a procedure or policy for flagging low attendance and following up with students or parents?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not sure

Answer If Does your program have a procedure or policy for flagging low attendance and following up with st... Yes Is Selected

Please explain your procedure/policy for flagging low attendance and following up with students or parents.

19. When needed, how do you communicate with students and their parents about attendance?

20. Does your program maintain information/data on each participating student (e.g., contact information, demographics, center attendance, school attendance, achievement, grades, etc.) in a way that can be quickly/easily summarized across participating students?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Somewhat
- ☐ No

Answer If Does your program maintain information/data on each participating student (e.g., contact informat... No Is Not Selected

Describe your program's system for entering, storing, and summarizing your data (e.g., types of data entered, software used).

21. To what extent is data management a challenge for your program?

- ☐ Major challenge
- ☐ Somewhat of a challenge
- ☐ Only a minor challenge
- ☐ Not a challenge

Answer If To what extent is data management a challenge for your program? Not a problem for our program Is Not Selected

Explain in what ways data management is a challenge for your program.

Section IV: Attendance levels

22. Please describe your process for calculating the total number of days each student attends the program at the end of the year and determining the percent who were regular attendees.

23. (Use the slider bar below to indicate %) For the 2014-15 school year, what percent of total participating students...

_____ have attended at least 30 days.

_____ have attended at least two times per week.

24. What are the most common reasons your students attend less than twice a week?

25. To what extent is low attendance a problem for any of your centers?

- ☐ Major problem
- ☐ Somewhat of a problem
- ☐ Minor problem
- ☐ Not a problem

Answer If To what extent is low attendance a problem for any of your centers? Major problem Is Selected And To what extent is low attendance a problem for any of your centers? Somewhat of a problem Is Selected

Explain, why low attendance is a problem for your center(s).

26. What is the most effective thing your program currently does to ensure consistently high rates of student attendance?

27. Are you considering or planning to implement any new policies or strategies to try to improve center attendance rates?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Answer If Are you considering or do you have any strategies in place to try to improve attendance? Yes Is Selected

Explain the new policies or strategies you are considering in order to improve center attendance rates.

28. What recommendations/suggestions do you have for NCDPI on how they can help 21st CCLC grantees improve attendance reporting?

29. What recommendations/suggestions do you have for NCDPI on how they can help 21st CCLC grantees improve student attendance?

APPENDIX B: SITE COORDINATOR SURVEY ON CENTER PROGRAMS AND CHALLENGES

SERVE Center is collecting data from all 21st CCLC after school centers in order to describe the students served, programming provided, staffing, challenges, and other implementation dimensions. This survey should take approximately 20 minutes to complete. If you have any questions about the survey or experience any technical issues, please contact Kathleen Mooney at SERVE Center (336-315-7401 or kmooney@serve.org).

1. Which 21st CCLC grantee provides funding/guidance for your after school center?
(select from dropdown list provided)
2. What is the name of your 21st CCLC after school center?

Section 1: Experience and Logistics of Your 21st CCLC After School Center

3. Was your center in operation and providing after school services prior to receiving 21st CCLC funding?
☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Don't know
4. How many years has your center operated an after school program (regardless of funding type)?
☐ 1-2 years
☐ 3-5 years
☐ 6-10 years
☐ 11-15 years
☐ More than 15 years
☐ Don't know
5. Overall, how many years has your center operated a 21st CCLC-funded after school program?
☐ 1-2 years
☐ 3-5 years
☐ 6-10 years
☐ 11-15 years
☐ More than 15 years
☐ Don't know
6. Is your 21st CCLC after school center located at a school?
☐ Yes
☐ No

Answer If Is your 21st CCLC center located at a school? Yes Is Selected

What is the name of the school where your 21st CCLC after school center is located?

Answer If Is your 21st CCLC center located at a school? No Is Selected

Describe the type of facility in which your 21st CCLC after school center is located (e.g., church building, government facility, etc.).

7. Are there any challenges/limitations to effectively serving students in your current after school center's facility?
- ☐ No challenges
 - ☐ Yes, minor challenges
 - ☐ Yes, major challenges

Answer If Are there any challenges/limitations in serving students in the facility you are in? No challenges Is Not Selected

Explain the challenges/limitations your 21st CCLC after school center faces due to its current facilities.

8. Is transportation from the participating students' schools to your 21st CCLC after school center provided?
- ☐ Yes, students are provided transportation
 - ☐ No, students/families are responsible for providing transportation
 - ☐ Other _____

Section 2: Students and Schools Served by Your 21st CCLC After School Center

9. On average, how many students did your 21st CCLC after school center serve this school year?
10. On average, did your 21st CCLC after school center serve its maximum number of students this school year?
- ☐ Yes
 - ☐ No

Answer If On average, did you serve the maximum number of students at your center this school year? No Is Selected

Explain why your 21st CCLC after school center did not serve the maximum number of students this school year.

11. Did your center ever have a waiting list this year for the 21st CCLC after school program?
- ☐ Yes
 - ☐ No

Answer If Did your site have a waiting list this year for the after school program? Yes Is Selected

On average, how many students were on your center's waiting list?

Answer If Did your center have a waiting list this year for the after school program? Yes Is Selected

Explain why your 21st CCLC after school center had to have a waiting list (e.g., limited space, staff, curricular materials, etc.).

12. What were the grade levels of the students that attended your 21st CCLC after school center this year?

- ☐ K
- ☐ 1
- ☐ 2
- ☐ 3
- ☐ 4
- ☐ 5
- ☐ 6
- ☐ 7
- ☐ 8
- ☐ 9
- ☐ 10
- ☐ 11
- ☐ 12

13. At your 21st CCLC after school center, roughly what percent of students served by the program scored below proficiency (i.e., Level I or II) on state tests in 2014?

% below proficiency in reading/language arts:

% below proficiency in math:

14. How many schools did your 21st CCLC after school center serve this school year? (Note: In other words, a count of the various schools your students attended during the regular school day.)

15. List the schools your 21st CCLC after school center served this year (and provide each school's % Free/Reduced Lunch rate). Example: East Elementary (75% FRL) West Elementary (90% FRL) North Elementary (80% FRL) South Elementary (70% FRL)

Section 3: Programming Provided by Your 21st CCLC After School Center

16. Did your center offer a "before school" program through 21st CCLC this school year?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

17. Did your center offer Saturday sessions through 21st CCLC this school year?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

18. Did your center offer services to students during the school day through 21st CCLC this year?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

19. Does your center offer summer/intersession programs through 21st CCLC funding?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

20. Did your 21st CCLC after school attendees enroll with the intent of coming almost daily throughout the school year? (check all that apply)

- ☐ Most participating students enrolled with the intent of attending daily.
- ☐ We had some students who enrolled with the intent that they may only come once or twice per week.
- ☐ We had some students who enrolled for particular programs of shorter duration (semester or month).
- ☐ Other _____

21. Did your 21st CCLC after school center offer "mini-programs" that had different expectations in terms of how long or how often students would attend (e.g., credit recovery, athlete tutoring, EOG test preparation, etc.)?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Answer If Did your 21st CCLC after school center offer "mini-programs" that had different expectations in t... Yes Is Selected

What types of "mini-programs" did your center provide this year? (check all that apply)

- ☐ ESL activities for ESL population
- ☐ Limited duration state test preparation for certain students (30 days or less)
- ☐ Ongoing enrichment activities for a particular school activity or interest group offered for less than a school year or less than daily (e.g., debate club, Lego league, etc.)
- ☐ Other _____
- ☐ Other _____
- ☐ Other _____

22. In general, how many hours per week did your center provide 21st CCLC-funded programming/activities this year? Example: My after school program operated 5 days a week for 3 hours a day (15 hours) and provided Saturday Sessions for 2 hours most weeks. Thus, on average, my center operated approximately 17 hours per week.

23. On average, how many hours per week did your 21st CCLC after school center provide students the following support/activities? (Choose one response per row for items a-g) Examples: Homework help at my center is provided for one hour daily, thus I would select "5-6 hours per week". Science

enrichment activities are offered for 3 hours every other Friday, thus I would select "no more than 2 hours per week".

	Not offered (1)	No more than 2 hours per week (2)	2-4 hours per week (3)	5-6 hours per week (4)	More than 6 hours per week (5)
a. Homework help	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. Tutoring (one-to-one or peer	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. An academic activity in which reading instruction or practice takes place (not tutoring)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. An academic activity in which mathematics instruction or practice takes place (not tutoring)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. An arts or recreation enrichment activity (e.g., sports, outdoor games, crafts, theater, music)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. A science activity, project, or science-related field trip (e.g., to a local science museum)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. A public service or other supplemental activity (e.g., mentoring, counseling, drug and violence prevention, healthy habits)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

24. **Goals of Programming Offered:** In terms of the 21st CCLC after school services your center offered this year, to what extent was each of the following a programmatic goal? (Chose one response per row for items a-j)

	Not a goal for us (1)	Minor goal for us (2)	Major goal for us (3)
a. Provide a safe out of school environment for students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. Help students improve their academic performance (e.g., grades, test scores)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. Help students develop socially or behaviorally	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. Provide opportunities for enrichment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. Provide recreational activities for students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. Provide hands-on activities that supplement school content, learning and engaging students in learning different ways	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. Help parents and/or other adults with literacy or other skills (e.g., parenting)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h. Help connect students to their community through service or other special projects	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i. Provide at-risk students an "extra-push" doing homework and academic school work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
j. Provide students with positive adult guidance and/or mentors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section 4: Data Access and Data Use by Your 21st CCLC After School Center

25. How did your 21st CCLC after school center staff use its attendance data? (check all that apply)

- ☐ We kept the attendance data on file for the grant director or evaluator to use.
- ☐ We reviewed individual student attendance to be able to follow up as needed when student attendance dropped off.
- ☐ We used data on attendance to adjust program offerings.
- ☐ Other (specify) _____

26. What happened when a student's attendance at your 21st CCLC center dropped off? (check all that apply)

- ☐ A staff member spoke to the student about an absence after each absence.
- ☐ A staff member spoke to the student about an absence after a certain number of absences.
- ☐ A staff member checked with the school about attendance.
- ☐ A staff member checked with the student's parents or caregivers.
- ☐ Other (specify) _____

27. What information is available to you/your center from your 21st CCLC Program Director or school/district officials on student performance? (check all that apply)
- ☐ State assessment test results for the individual students at your center
 - ☐ Students' grades for each grading period
 - ☐ Individual information from school-administered diagnostic or quarterly tests
 - ☐ Individual information for center administered assessments
 - ☐ Information from students' classroom teachers on behavior issues or homework completion
 - ☐ We do not have or receive any data or information on student performance
28. Did your 21st CCLC after school center regularly assess students' academic growth in reading/language arts as part of its program activities this year?
- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
29. Did your 21st CCLC after school center regularly assess students' academic growth in math as part of its program activities this year?
- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
30. Did your 21st CCLC after school center use a supplemental instructional software program to assess students' academic growth in reading and/or math?
- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Answer If Did your 21st CCLC after school center use a supplemental instructional software program to assess students' academic growth in reading and/or math? Yes Is Selected

What are the names of the supplemental software programs your center used to assess students' academic growth?

31. What kind of feedback did students receive about the progress they made or their accomplishments at your 21st CCLC after school center? (check all that apply)
- ☐ Verbal feedback from center staff on work assigned by the school
 - ☐ Written feedback from center staff on work assigned by the school
 - ☐ Verbal feedback from center staff on work they assign at the center
 - ☐ Written feedback from center staff on work they assign at the center
 - ☐ Verbal feedback from center staff on student behavior
 - ☐ Written feedback from center staff on student behavior
 - ☐ Rewards, certificates, or awards for program accomplishments
32. **Reading Support Activities:** Academic support in reading refers to structured activities designed to build students' literacy skills. Academic support activities may include scheduled time for independent student reading, writing, and literacy enrichment activities but NOT homework assistance. Note: Depending upon the age groups and needs of students you serve, some of these

reading tasks may not be appropriate for your students. In such cases, please indicate “not applicable”.

How often do your students do the following reading activities at your 21st CCLC after school center? (Choose one in each row.)

	Never or almost never (1)	Several times a month (2)	A few times each week (3)	Every day (4)	Not applicable (5)
Read aloud	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Talk with peers about what they have read	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Write about something	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Practice reading comprehension test questions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Read books students have chosen themselves	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Use reading in real-world situations (e.g., technical manuals, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Do a group activity or project on something they have read	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Use supplemental reading programs on the computer	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Help students understand new words	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Talk or write about something interesting they have read	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

33. **Mathematics Support Activities:** Academic support in mathematics refers to structured activities dedicated to increasing students' mathematics skills. Academic support activities may include applied enrichment, skill building, mathematics games, and scheduled time for tutoring, but NOT homework assistance. Note: Depending upon the age groups and needs of students you serve, some of these math tasks may not be appropriate for your students. In such cases, please indicate "not applicable".

How often do your students do the following math activities at your 21st CCLC after school center?
(Choose one in each row.)

	Never or almost never (1)	Several times a month (2)	A few times each week (3)	Every day (4)	Not applicable (5)
Practice test questions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Make charts, tables, or graphs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Solve problems from math textbooks or other sources in a group	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Learn about the relevance of math to real-world situations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Use computers to practice or learn math	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Write mathematical questions to solve a problem	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Practice basic math facts (e.g., addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Talk about any problems or confusions they have in math	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section 5: Staffing of Your 21st CCLC After School Center

34. How many staff members were supported by 21st CCLC funding at your center this year?
full-time staff members:
part-time staff members:
35. How many staff members at your 21st CCLC after school center were certified teachers this year?
36. On average, what was your 21st CCLC after school center's staff-to-student ratio this year?
37. Do you believe your staff-to-student ratio this year was effective for your type of programming?
(check all that apply)
- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No, we would like to have more staff but we don't have the funding.
- ☐ No, we would like to have more staff but have trouble finding and keeping staff.
- ☐ No, other (please explain) _____

Section 6: Challenges Experienced by Your 21st CCLC After School Center

38. Below is a list of potential issues or challenges that may currently apply for your center. Please indicate the extent to which each identified challenge applies to your center. (Choose one response in each row for items a-j)

	Not a challenge for my center (1)	A minor challenge for my center (2)	A major challenge for my center (3)
a. The feeder school would like our program to be more academically focused than it currently is.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. The space available for center programs is inadequate, inappropriate, or unsafe.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. We cannot find staff with expertise in teaching the academic subjects we offer.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. We cannot find volunteers with time and expertise to support academic activities at our center.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. We cannot afford to offer competitive salaries to staff who are qualified to provide supplementary academic instruction at our center	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. We cannot afford to offer potential staff enough hours of paid employment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. Staff do not have the skills to help English-language learners with their academic development.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h. There are limited professional development opportunities for staff.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i. We have inadequate instructional materials or programming ideas.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
j. We receive insufficient information from the feeder school about how to help our center participants with the school day curriculum.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
k. Many of our students do not attend the center regularly enough to make academic improvements.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
l. Some students are not interested in coming to the program.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
m. Students drop out of the after school program because they lose interest in doing academic work after school.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
n. Families are not involved in monitoring the academic or behavior progress their children make at the center.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
o. There is too much competition for students' time from other activities, such as jobs or sports.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

39. Please describe any major challenges, not mentioned above, that your 21st CCLC after school center experiences?

40. What is the most important benefit the students get from attending your 21st CCLC after school center?

APPENDIX C: FEEDER SCHOOL CONTACT SURVEY ON SATISFACTION AND CHALLENGES

You were sent this survey because you have been identified as the key contact in a school with students who were served this year by a 21st Century Community Learning Center (CCLC) after school program. NCDPI is interested in the perceptions of the identified school contacts across the state regarding after school services provided by the 21st CCLC programs. Please complete this survey by June 19, 2015. The survey should take approximately 5 minutes to complete. Thank you for your input.

1. Name of your school:
2. What is your role in the school?
 - ☐ Principal
 - ☐ Assistant Principal
 - ☐ School Counselor
 - ☐ Teacher
 - ☐ Other _____
3. Type of school:
 - ☐ Elementary
 - ☐ Middle
 - ☐ High
 - ☐ K-8
 - ☐ Other _____
4. Calendar:
 - ☐ Traditional calendar
 - ☐ Year-round calendar
 - ☐ Other _____
5. Is your school a charter school?
 - ☐ Yes
 - ☐ No
6. Is your current position either fully or partially supported with 21st CCLC funds?
 - ☐ Yes
 - ☐ No
7. Our records indicate that students from your school were served by a 21st CCLC after school program run by [Program Name auto-fill]. Is this correct?
 - ☐ Yes, that is correct.
 - ☐ Students from my school were served by a 21st CCLC after school program; however, not by the agency/organization listed above.
 - ☐ I am not sure; however, another staff member at my school may know.
 - ☐ As far as I know, there were no students from my school that were served by a 21st CCLC after school program this year.

If No. No students from my sch... Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey

Answer If Our records indicate that students from your school were served by a 21st CCLC funded program run by... Is this correct? Yes, that is correct. Is Selected

Approximately, how many students in your school are/were enrolled in the 21st CCLC after school program run by [Program Name auto-fill] this year?

Please enter the estimated number here. (If you don't know, enter "?")

Answer If Our records indicate that students from your school were served by a 21st CCLC funded program run by... Is this correct? Students from my school were served by a 21st CCLC after school program; however, not by the agency/organization listed above. Is Selected

What is the name of the agency/organization that provided your students 21st CCLC after school services this year?

Answer If What is the name of the agency/organization that provided your students 21st CCLC funded after school services this year? Text Response Is Not Empty

Approximately, how many students in your school are/were enrolled in the 21st CCLC after school program this year?

Please enter the estimated number here. (If you don't know, enter "?")

Answer If Our records indicate that students from your school were served by a 21st CCLC funded program run by... Is this correct? Don't know Is Selected

Please provide the name and email of a contact at your school that you think could provide us with more detailed information regarding your students' experiences/attendance at the 21st CCLC after school program run by [Program Name auto-fill].

First Name

Last Name

Job Title

Email Address

If First Name Is Not Empty, Then Skip To End of Survey

8. Is the 21st CCLC after school program offered at your school facility?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Answer If Is the 21st CCLC after school program offered at your school facility? Yes Is Selected

Does the 21st CCLC program appropriately use classroom, gym/cafeteria, media center, computer labs, and outdoor spaces at your school?

☐ Yes

☐ No (Please explain) _____

☐ Don't know (Please explain) _____

Answer If Is the 21st CCLC after school program offered at your school facility? No Is Selected

Have you seen the 21st CCLC facility that serves your school's students?

☐ Yes

☐ No

The following questions should be answered based on your knowledge of the 21st CCLC after school program that serves your school (e.g., either onsite at a school facility or offsite at a local community/faith-based facility). Directions: Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements (a-m).

9. **Value of 21st CCLC after school program services:** The 21st CCLC after school program that serves my school...

	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Don't know/Not Applicable (0)
a. ...provides a valuable service to our students.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. ...provides our students with needed academic support outside of the regular school day.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. ...provides our students with the help they need with homework.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. ...provides our students with valuable support for social and behavioral development.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. ...provides help with engaging the families of our students.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Collaboration with 21st CCLC:

	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Don't know/Not Applicable (0)
f. I work with the 21st CCLC staff to connect their programming to content taught in the school (e.g., aligns with Standard Course of Study, offers extensions of an activity or concept taught during the day, offers remediation on areas students need help in).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. I view the 21st CCLC after school program as an extension of our school programming, not as a program offered by an outside agency or staff with no knowledge of what is happening during the day.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h. I communicate successfully, as needed, with the 21st CCLC program staff about students from our school attending their program.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i. I have good communication with 21st CCLC program staff about their programming (e.g., who from our school is attending, any attendance problems, or other things of importance that I should know).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
j. School staff and 21st CCLC program staff systematically share information to support student homework completion or other academic needs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Overall quality and impact of 21st CCLC after school program services:

	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Don't know/Not Applicable (0)
k. The 21st CCLC after school program serving our school seems to have high quality programming.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
l. The 21st CCLC after school program serving our school seems to have high quality staff.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
m. Students who attend the 21st CCLC after school program serving our school seem to benefit from participation.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

10. Overall, how would you rate your satisfaction with the services provided to students from your school attending the 21st CCLC after school program?

- ☐ Very Satisfied (1)
- ☐ Satisfied (2)
- ☐ Somewhat Satisfied (3)
- ☐ Neutral (4)
- ☐ Somewhat Dissatisfied (5)
- ☐ Dissatisfied (6)
- ☐ Very Dissatisfied (7)

11. What, if any, positive benefits or outcomes have you noticed as a result of student participation in the 21st CCLC after school program?

12. Do you have any concerns or suggestions for how you would improve the 21st CCLC after school program?