![SERVE Center logo]

21st Century Community Learning Centers Competitive Summer Mini-Grant Program

2023 Final Report

Table of Contents

21st Century Community Learning Centers Competitive Summer Mini-Grant Program: 2023 Final Report

I. 21st CCLC Summer Mini-Grant Overview and Grants Awarded

21st CCLC Summer Mini-Grant Overview

In 2023, the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) awarded $5,977,997 from their U.S. Department of Education Title IV, Part B allocation to fund the Competitive Summer Mini-Grant Program. According to the Request for Proposal (RFP), the 21st Century Community Learning Center (CCLC) Competitive Summer Mini-Grant Program for summer 2023 was designed to improve students' access to innovative learning strategies in order to achieve grade-level proficiency.

The larger 21st CCLC Program that provides competitive awards for after-school programs is authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015. The U.S. Department of Education (USED) awards formula grants to NCDPI, which in turn makes competitive grants available to eligible entities. The intent of this federal funding is for grantees to provide after-school (and before-school, weekend, or summer) academic enrichment opportunities for children attending high-poverty and low-performing schools as a means to help them meet local and state academic standards. NCDPI has operated the federally-funded 21st CCLC Program since 2002.

More specifically, in terms of the 21st CCLC Competitive Summer Mini-Grant Program (referred to as the 21st CCLC SMG Program in this report), the 2023 RPF provided absolute priority consideration to applications that proposed to primarily serve students who attended schools eligible for Title I, Part A school-wide programs.

Furthermore, competitive priority for the summer mini-grants was given to applications

- demonstrating models that propose all schools to be served are identified as Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) Schools and/or Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) Schools (up to 2 points);
- intending to serve economically distressed counties (up to 2 points);[1]
- extending program hours (i.e., before 9:00 a.m., after 5:00 p.m., and/or Fridays/Saturdays/Sundays), (up to 4 points);
- proposing to run a summer program site in a county that hast not hosted a 21st CCLC program site in the last three grant cycles (up to 2 points); and
- that did not have current 21st CCLC funding (up to 5 points).

In terms of required subgrantee reporting, the RFP for the 2023 21st CCLC SMG Program indicated subgrantees were required to report both

---

[1] Based on the 2022 County Tier Designations (https://www.commerce.nc.gov/media/3441/open)

- implementation data (i.e., number of students served, frequency/duration of services students received, eligibility of participants, and other measures as determined by the NCDPI) and
- outcome data on key performance measures (e.g., program attendance rates, academic outcomes, behavioral outcomes).

NCDPI contracted with the SERVE Center at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro (SERVE Center) to provide support in the form of: (a) assisting with the internal grant application review process and (b) collecting implementation and outcome data from subgrantees. This report was developed by SERVE Center under a contract with NCDPI as a means of presenting a cross-subgrantee overview of 21st CCLC SMG programming implemented during summer 2023.

Grants Awarded

In January 2023, two virtual technical assistance webinars were conducted for potential applicants (i.e., 1/4/23 and 1/5/23). The NCDPI Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plan[2] (CCIP system) was activated to allow for 21st CCLC SMG applications to be submitted starting January 9, 2023, with the final deadline for application submission being noon on February 8, 2023.

To determine the level of funding eligibility, NCDPI utilized the Wallace Out-of-School Time Cost Calculator[3] to develop suggested ranges. The funding ranges indicated in the RFP included:

- 50-75 students; 4-6 weeks; 20-29 hours per week; $50,000 - $125,000
- 50-75 students; 4-6 weeks; 30-40+ hours per week; up to $175,000
- 76-100 students; 4-6 weeks; 20-29 hours per week; $75,000 - $150,000
- 76-100 students; 4-6 weeks; 30-40+ hours per week; up to $200,000
- 101+ students; 4-6 weeks; 20-29 hours per week; $100,000 - $200,000
- 101+ students; 4-6 weeks; 30-40+ hours per week; up to $300,000

A total of 47 applications were submitted (uploaded in the CCIP system) and were eligible for the Level I and Level II review process.

As part of the Level I review process:

- Reviewers (selected by SERVE Center based on their experience and knowledge) used an application rubric to guide scoring.
- Each application received three reviews (resulting in three individual scores that were averaged for a total Level I score).

---

[2] The Comprehensive, Continuous Improvement Plan (CCIP) is a web-based planning and grants management tool, and it connects district goals for improvement to budgeted activities. CCIP is used by local education agencies (LEAs), charter schools and non-LEAs to apply for federal and state funds.

[3] https://www.wallacefoundation.org/cost-of-quality/pages/default.aspx

- There was a maximum possible application score of 90 points.[4]

As part of the Level II review process:

- Priority points were applied for applications that met priority considerations (i.e., with a maximum of 15 points).
- Technical deductions were applied for applications with incomplete documentation (i.e., one point for each incomplete required document).

As indicated on page 6 of the RFP, "After regional awardees are identified, additional organizations may be recommended for the award based on total application score and ranking, without regional consideration." After at least two top rank-scored applications by SBE region were identified, the NCDPI Office of Federal Programs determined that additional funds were available to recommend additional eligible applications in six of the regions. (Note. The Northwest region did not have additional applications to recommend for funding.)

Using the results from the Level I and Level II review process, the Office of Federal Programs Senior Director at NCDPI presented the scoring results to the State Board of Education (SBE) for approval. The SBE approved the awards to subgrantees in May 2023. Of the 47 applications that underwent the Level I and Level II review process, a total of 32 were recommended for funding. (Note: One subgrantee recommended for funding declined the award; thus, a total of 31 subgrantees implemented programming in 2023.)

The subgrantees that received awards represented seven of the eight regions across the state.[5] Recommended applications included a minimum of two (2) to a maximum of seven (7) awards per region—Northeast (5), Southeast (4), North Central (7), Sandhills (4), Piedmont Triad (2), Southwest (7), and Western (3) regions. The initial combined amount approved to award to the subgrantees was $5,977,997.56 to serve a total of 26 counties, with awards ranging from $75,561 to $300,000.00. Figure 1 shows the geographic distribution of the funded subgrantees.

Table 1. 21st CCLC Summer Mini-Grant Awards by Region (2023)

Organization	County Served	Region Served[a]	Funds Awarded
Boys & Girls Clubs of the Coastal Plain	Lenoir & Beaufort	1	$101,000.00
Northeast Academy of Aerospace & AdvTech	Pasquotank	1	$150,000.00
Gates County Schools	Gates	1	$299,999.00
Boys & Girls Clubs of the Albemarle	Pasquotank	1	$80,492.00
Weldon City Schools	Halifax	1	$200,000.00
Boys & Girls Clubs of Wayne County	Wayne	2	$192,374.00
Children's Village Academy	Lenoir	2	$299,000.00
Diversity Nurtures Achievements Community	Duplin	2	$75,561.00
Brunswick County Schools	Vance and Warren	2	$139,331.00
Insight Human Services, Inc.	Stokes	3	$150,000.00
Wilson Youth United, Inc. dba the SPOT	Wilson	3	$180,000.00
YMCA of the Triangle Area	Wake & Orange	3	$300,000.00

---

[4] The quality-band ranges for the 2023 21st CCLC SMG Program grant competition were: Excellent (90-76), Strong (75-61), Average (60-47), Weak (46-36), and Unacceptable (35 or below).

[5] Note: No applications were received from the Northwest region.

Organization	County Served	Region Served[a]	Funds Awarded
Reeves Community Center (RCC) Foundation	Surry	3	$175,000.00
Integrity Unlimited CDC	Wilson	3	$125,149.00
St. John Community Development Corp., Inc.	Wilson	3	$200,000.00
Boys & Girls Clubs of North Central North Carolina	Granville, Franklin, Halifax, & Vance	3	$300,000.00
Communities In Schools of Robeson County	Robeson	4	$150,000.00
Robeson County Parks & Recreation Dept.	Robeson	4	$300,000.00
Caring and Sharing Inc.	Bladen	4	$141,489.00
My Meta Re-Entry Services, Inc.	Scotland	4	$136,200.00
Winston Salem / Forsyth County Schools	Forsyth	5	$299,999.00
YMCA of Northwest North Carolina	Wilkes	5	$114,550.00
Empowerment Academy	Mecklenburg	6	$175,000.00
Freedom School Partners	Mecklenburg	6	$298,803.00
MeckEd	Mecklenburg	6	$173,811.00
Prodigal Son Foundation (Sugar Creek Learning)	Mecklenburg	6	$86,700.00
Movement Charter School	Mecklenburg	6	$200,000.00
Just Us Kids Enrichment	Stanly	6	$136,610.00
Stanly County Schools	Stanly	6	$168,692.00
The Cindy Platt Boys & Girls Club of Transylvania	Transylvania	8	$239,615.00
Boys and Girls Club of the Plateau (BGCP)	Jackson	8	$283,947.56
YMCA of Western North Carolina [b]	Buncombe	8	$104,675.00
		Total	$5,977,997.56

[a] Region 1=Northeast, Region 2=Southeast, Region 3=North Central, Region 4=Sandhills, Region 5=Piedmont-Triad, Region 6=Southwest, Region 7=Northwest, and Region 8=Western

[b] YMCA of Western North Carolina declined the funds and did not implement SMG programming in 2023

Figure 1. 21st CCLC Summer Mini-Grant Awards (2023) Across North Carolina

Note. The colored dots on the state map represent the fiscal agent location and number of subgrantees awarded per zip code (i.e., yellow= one subgrantee; orange=two subgrantees; and red=3 subgrantees).

Data Sources for the Final Report

SERVE Center used subgrantee-level implementation and outcomes data as the primary source for this 2023 21st CCLC SMG Program Final Report. More specifically, SERVE Center developed and administered an online reporting system that collected data regarding: (a) participant attendance, (b) academic and enrichment services, (c) programmatic outcomes, and (d) grantee perceptions/reflections of program implementation and administration.

All subgrantees were required to submit their implementation and outcomes data electronically, via a Qualtrics-based survey link, on or before August 30, 2023. To provide technical assistance and guidance to subgrantees regarding the online reporting process and expectations, SERVE Center held virtual office hours on August 2, 2023.

The next three sections of this report—Subgrantee Implementation (Section II), Subgrantee Outcomes (Section III), and Technical Assistance Suggestions (Section IV)—provide an overview of the information submitted by the 31 awarded subgrantees regarding their summer 2023 programming.

II. Subgrantee Implementation

Overview of Summer Subgrantee Sites

According to the 2023 21st CCLC SMG Program RFP, subgrantees were required to submit an end-of-grant implementation and outcome report regarding their summer programming. An end-of-grant report was submitted by all 31 subgrantees.

The reports provided detail about the subgrantees' scope of operations as well as the total number of sites that operated. As shown in Table 2, overall, the subgrantees operated a total of 59 sites. Fourteen out of the 31 subgrantees (45%) operated just one site, while the 17 remaining subgrantees operated multiple sites (ranging from two to four sites).

Subgrantees operated summer mini-grant programs at locations such as schools, community-based centers, and/or both types of sites. Sixteen of the 31 subgrantees operated community-based centers, 13 subgrantees operated at school-based sites, and two subgrantees provided programming at a combination of both types of locations.

Students Reported as Served by 21st CCLC SMG-Funded Programs

As part of the implementation reporting process, subgrantees reported data on students served via 21st CCLC SMG programming. Table 2 shows the number of students served at the subgrantee level. The highest number served by a subgrantee was 377 students (across three sites), and the lowest number served was 40 students (across two sites). The average number served across the 59 sites was 66 students. Furthermore, subgrantees reported 15,512 operational hours serving a total of 3,867 students (ranging from kindergarten to grade 12) using their 21st CCLC SMG funding.

Table 2. Overview of 21st CCLC SMG Subgrantee Program Information

Subgrantee	# Sites	Site Types[a]	Avg. Days/ Week Sites Operated	Grades Served	Avg. # of Students/ Site	Total Students Served	Total Hours of Services Offered[b]
Boys & Girls Clubs of the Albemarle	1	1 CB	4	K – 8	75	75	320
Boys & Girls Clubs of North Central North Carolina	4	4 CB	5	2 – 8	49.5	198	1,860
Boys & Girls Clubs of the Coastal Plain	2	2 CB	5	K – 8	97.5	195	800
Boys & Girls Clubs of Wayne County	3	3 CB	5	1 – 8	57.3	172	1,386
Boys and Girls Club of the Plateau (BGCP)	1	1 CB	5	1 – 12	259	259	441
Brunswick County Schools	2	2 SB	4	K – 12	36	72	312
Caring and Sharing Inc.	1	1 CB	4	K – 8	45	45	288
Children's Village Academy	3	3 SB	5	K – 8	40	120	644
Communities In Schools of Robeson County	1	1 SB	5	5 – 8	42	42	176
Diversity Nurtures Achievements Community	1	1 CB	6	K – 12	46	46	340
Empowerment Academy	1	1 CB	5	K – 5	79	79	490
Freedom School Partners	4	3 SB 1 CB	5	K – 8	55.3	221	728
Gates County Schools	3	3 SB	5	1 – 5	48.3	145	414
Insight Human Services, Inc.	1	1 SB		K – 5	121	121	174
Integrity Unlimited CDC	1	1 CB	5	K – 8	63	63	255
Just Us Kids Enrichment	2	2 CB		K – 5	20	40	40
MeckEd	2	1 CB 1 SB	5	6 – 8	20.5	41	350
Movement Charter School	1	1 SB	5	1 – 8	124	124	230
My Meta Re-Entry Services, Inc.	2	2 CB	4.5	K – 11	27	54	189
Northeast Academy of Aerospace & AdvTech	1	1 SB	5	5 – 11	123	123	100
Prodigal Son Foundation (Sugar Creek Learning)	1	1 SB	4	K – 8	75	75	225
Reeves Community Center (RCC) Foundation	1	1 CB	6	6 – 9	63	63	260
Robeson County Parks & Recreation Dept.	2	2 SB	6	6 – 12	69	138	460
St. John Community Development Corp., Inc.	1	1 CB	5	K – 5	55	55	280
Stanly County Schools	2	2 CB	5	5 – 8	27.5	55	392
The Cindy Platt Boys & Girls Club of Transylvania	2	2 CB	5	1 – 12	161	322	740
Weldon City Schools	3	3 SB	4	1 – 12	56.7	170	900
Wilson Youth United, Inc. dba the SPOT	1	1 CB	5	K – 6	153	153	330
Winston Salem / Forsyth County Schools	4	4 SB	5	K – 8	21.5	86	700

Subgrantee	# Sites	Site Types[a]	Avg. Days/ Week Sites Operated	Grades Served	Avg. # of Students/ Site	Total Students Served	Total Hours of Services Offered[b]
YMCA of Northwest North Carolina	2	2 SB	5	1 – 8	69	138	1,078
YMCA of the Triangle Area	3	3 SB	5	K – 6	125.7	377	611
Totals	59 sites	28 CB 31 SB	Avg. 4.9 days per week	K – 12	Avg. 66 students per site	3,867 students served	15,512 hours

[a] CB=Community-based, SB=School-based
[b] The number of hours of services offered was calculated by multiplying the average hours per day that a program ran at each site by the number of days operated. For this reason, the numbers are approximate.

Staffing

As part of the implementation reporting process, subgrantees provided data on summer staffing supported by the 21st CCLC SMG Program. As seen in Table 3, subgrantees reported a total of 658 paid staff members across the 59 sites, with an average of 21 staff members employed per subgrantee. In addition to paid staff, a total of 136 volunteers were utilized to support summer programming.

Table 3. Overview of 21st CCLC SMG Subgrantee Program Numbers

Subgrantee	#Paid Staff-All Sites	#Volunteer Staff	Staffing Challenge Level
Boys & Girls Clubs of the Albemarle	17	0	None
Boys & Girls Clubs of North Central North Carolina	28	4	Moderate
Boys & Girls Clubs of the Coastal Plain	--	0	Moderate
Boys & Girls Clubs of Wayne County	14	3	None
Boys and Girls Club of the Plateau (BGCP)	31	10	Moderate
Brunswick County Schools	11	1	Moderate
Caring and Sharing Inc.	15	5	None
Children's Village Academy	32	9	None
Communities In Schools of Robeson County	9	2	None
Diversity Nurtures Achievements Community	14	5	None
Empowerment Academy	9	3	None
Freedom School Partners	37	29	Moderate
Gates County Schools	22	0	Moderate
Insight Human Services, Inc.	27	0	None
Integrity Unlimited CDC	8	3	Moderate
Just Us Kids Enrichment	9	0	--
MeckEd	12	15	None
Movement Charter School	11	0	Moderate
My Meta Re-Entry Services, Inc.	18	4	Minimal
Northeast Academy of Aerospace & AdvTech	23	0	Moderate
Prodigal Son Foundation (Sugar Creek Learning)	24	6	Moderate
Reeves Community Center (RCC) Foundation	7	0	None
Robeson County Parks & Recreation Dept.	29	0	None

Subgrantee	#Paid Staff-All Sites	#Volunteer Staff	Staffing Challenge Level
St. John Community Development Corp., Inc.	18	0	None
Stanly County Schools	9	1	None
The Cindy Platt Boys & Girls Club of Transylvania	40	2	Moderate
Weldon City Schools	43	0	Moderate
Wilson Youth United, Inc. dba the SPOT	28	18	None
Winston Salem / Forsyth County Schools	16	16	Moderate
YMCA of Northwest North Carolina	20	0	None
YMCA of the Triangle Area	77	0	None
Totals	**658**	**136**	**--**

For each site, subgrantees were asked to rate the extent to which staffing was a challenge. A total of 28 of 59 sites (47%) reported staffing was "not at all" a challenge, 38 sites reported staffing was "moderately" challenging, and one site reported it was "extremely" challenging. The primary staffing issues conveyed by subgrantees included (a) recruiting experienced, high-quality staff and (b) retaining consistent staff for the duration of the summer program. Subgrantees provided the following descriptions of the challenges they faced.

Difficulties Hiring High-Quality Staff for Summer Programming:

- *There was competition for staff from within the District as well as from external organizations that were hiring certified teachers.*
- *Candidates were selected for [two] positions but they were unable to assume the positions. Due to timing, the positions were not filled.*
- *Unfortunately, the organization did experience some challenges in staffing positions starting with grades 6-8. The individual needed to be competent in core areas of the curriculum as well as skills to engage students in enrichment activities. After several interviews, the position was filled and the individual started to work the first week.*
- *Some staff members did not meet the expectations of the program and after additional training they had to be terminated.*
- *Since the COVID-19 pandemic began, recruiting and retaining both afterschool and summer staff has been more challenging than pre-pandemic. Although we were considered fully-staffed by our standards this summer, we could have utilized additional staff or staff working more hours.*
- *Our most pressing post-pandemic challenge is hiring the seasonal staff necessary to serve scholars. Labor shortages are a significant economic factor for businesses across the country and [our organization] has felt these effects. Because major local employers are facing employment challenges, they have expanded their reach and increased their benefits for college-aged interns, making it more difficult for [our organization] and other non-profits in a very competitive environment.*
- *Teachers need to be highly paid in order to be willing to work.*

Difficulties with Consistent Staffing Throughout Summer:

- *Due to our district-wide early calendar, it was difficult ensuring consistent employment of staff members throughout the summer.*

- *Summer vacationing of employees presented a slight challenge; however, with advanced notice and utilizing our volunteers to assist with instructions, we could provide the proper instruction in the teacher's absence.*
- *We began the summer fully staffed. As we continued the program, we experienced staff fatigue and began to have more frequent staff call outs. We had to adjust our staffing plan to ensure consistent high-quality programming.*
- *Staffing challenges were present in that school staff were experiencing fatigue and needed a break from the day-to-day operations of the normal school year.*
- *Filling the office assistant position created some difficulty. The position was eventually filled with two individuals over the course of the program with the program director and site coordinator providing assistance as needed. The first (office assistant) individual left for a more secure (permanent) position.*

Types of Programming

As shown in Table 4, a total of 23 (74%) subgrantees served elementary students, 18 (58%) served middle grades students, and six (19%) served high school students. The majority of subgrantees served multiple school levels; more specifically, six subgrantees served a combination of elementary and middle school students, two subgrantees served middle and high school students, and four subgrantees served students that spanned elementary, middle, and high school. Some subgrantees chose to offer their 21st CCLC SMG services to a more targeted group of students. For example, 12 subgrantees focused only on elementary school students, and six only on middle school students.

Table 4. 21st CCLC SMG Subgrantees School Level of Students Served

Subgrantee	School Level of Students Served		
	Elem	*Middle*	*High*
Boys & Girls Clubs of the Albemarle		✓	
Boys & Girls Clubs of North Central North Carolina	✓	✓	
Boys & Girls Clubs of the Coastal Plain	✓	✓	
Boys & Girls Clubs of Wayne County	✓		
Boys and Girls Club of the Plateau (BGCP)	✓		
Brunswick County Schools	✓	✓	✓
Caring and Sharing Inc.	✓		
Children's Village Academy	✓	✓	
Communities In Schools of Robeson County		✓	
Diversity Nurtures Achievements Community	✓		
Empowerment Academy	✓		
Freedom School Partners	✓		
Gates County Schools	✓		
Insight Human Services, Inc.	✓		
Integrity Unlimited CDC	✓	✓	✓
Just Us Kids Enrichment	✓		
MeckEd		✓	
Movement Charter School	✓		
My Meta Re-Entry Services, Inc.	✓	✓	✓
Northeast Academy of Aerospace & AdvTech		✓	✓
Prodigal Son Foundation (Sugar Creek Learning)	✓	✓	
Reeves Community Center (RCC) Foundation		✓	
Robeson County Parks & Recreation Dept.		✓	✓

Subgrantee	School Level of Students Served		
	Elem	*Middle*	*High*
St. John Community Development Corp., Inc.	✓		
Stanly County Schools		✓	
The Cindy Platt Boys & Girls Club of Transylvania	✓	✓	
Weldon City Schools	✓	✓	✓
Wilson Youth United, Inc. dba the SPOT		✓	
Winston Salem / Forsyth County Schools	✓		
YMCA of Northwest North Carolina	✓		
YMCA of the Triangle Area	✓	✓	
Total Grantees	**23**	**18**	**6**

Source: 21st CCLC SMG Implementation Reports. Categories are based on K-5=Elementary, 6th-8th-Middle, and 9th-12th=High.

Summary of Types of Academic and Enrichment Services Provided

This section of the report provides a summary of the various academic and enrichment supports that were provided to 21st CCLC SMG participants during summer 2023. In order to improve students' access to innovative learning strategies, the 2023 RFP indicated that 21st CCLC SMG Program academic and enrichment activities should:

- be multi-disciplinary in approach (i.e., students must use academic skills from multiple subject areas);
- be broad in offering (e.g., arts, recreation, health and wellness, cultural activities); and
- build connections between academic skills and knowledge and a students' cultural and community contexts.

Reading Support

Reading/literacy/language arts instruction/tutoring was offered by all subgrantees at a total of 56 of the 59 sites. Thirty-two sites (54%) offered reading supports five or more times per week, 12 sites (20%) offered support four times per week, eight sites (14%) only offered reading supports three times a week, and three sites (5%) offered supports weekly.

Twenty-nine of the 31 subgrantees (94%) who implemented reading supports indicated that they were "very" or "mostly" successful with the implementation, while two subgrantees indicated they were somewhat successful and needed to improve/rethink some of their academic reading activities. As shown in Table 5, reading supports were offered by all 31 subgrantees.

Table 5. Subgrantees by Type of 21st CCLC SMG-funded Academic Programming Focus

Subgrantee	Reading	Math	STEM	Other (Describe)
Boys & Girls Clubs of the Albemarle	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, cultural arts activities, PE, entrepreneurship, community service
Boys & Girls Clubs of North Central North Carolina	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, cultural arts activities, PE, community service
Boys & Girls Clubs of the Coastal Plain	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, cultural arts activities, PE, mentoring, entrepreneurship, community service

Subgrantee	Reading	Math	STEM	Other (Describe)
Boys & Girls Clubs of Wayne County	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, cultural arts activities, PE, mentoring
Boys and Girls Club of the Plateau (BGCP)	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, cultural arts activities, PE, mentoring, entrepreneurship, community service
Brunswick County Schools	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, cultural arts activities, PE
Caring and Sharing Inc.	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, cultural arts activities, PE, mentoring, entrepreneurship
Children's Village Academy	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, cultural arts activities, PE, mentoring, community service
Communities In Schools of Robeson County	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, cultural arts activities, PE, mentoring, entrepreneurship
Diversity Nurtures Achievements Community	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, cultural arts activities, PE, mentoring, entrepreneurship, community service
Empowerment Academy	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, cultural arts activities, PE, community service
Freedom School Partners	✓		✓	SEL/Character education, cultural arts activities, PE, mentoring, entrepreneurship, community service
Gates County Schools	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, cultural arts activities, PE, mentoring, entrepreneurship, community service
Insight Human Services, Inc.	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, cultural arts activities, PE, mentoring
Integrity Unlimited CDC	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, cultural arts activities, PE, mentoring, entrepreneurship, community service
Just Us Kids Enrichment	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, cultural arts activities
MeckEd	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, cultural arts activities, PE, mentoring, entrepreneurship, community service
Movement Charter School	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, cultural arts activities, PE, mentoring, entrepreneurship
My Meta Re-Entry Services, Inc.	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, cultural arts activities, PE, mentoring, entrepreneurship, community service
Northeast Academy of Aerospace & AdvTech	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, PE, mentoring, community service
Prodigal Son Foundation (Sugar Creek Learning)	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, PE, mentoring, entrepreneurship, community service
Reeves Community Center (RCC) Foundation	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, cultural arts activities, PE, mentoring, entrepreneurship, community service
Robeson County Parks & Recreation Dept.	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, cultural arts activities, PE, mentoring, entrepreneurship, community service
St. John Community Development Corp., Inc.	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, cultural arts activities, PE, mentoring, entrepreneurship
Stanly County Schools	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, cultural arts activities, PE, mentoring, entrepreneurship

Subgrantee	Reading	Math	STEM	Other (Describe)
The Cindy Platt Boys & Girls Club of Transylvania	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, cultural arts activities, PE, community service
Weldon City Schools	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, cultural arts activities, PE, community service
Wilson Youth United, Inc. dba the SPOT	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, PE
Winston Salem / Forsyth County Schools	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, PE
YMCA of Northwest North Carolina	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, PE
YMCA of the Triangle Area	✓	✓	✓	SEL/Character education, PE
Total Grantees	**31**	**29**	**31**	

Note: SEL=Social Emotional Learning

As part of the end-of-grant reporting process, subgrantees were asked to describe the summer academic reading curricula/supports they used. There were many different reading programs mentioned including, for example, Brain Gain READ, Tutored by Teachers, Write Brain World Curriculum, Heggerty phonological awareness curriculums, Quirkles, Fuddlebrook, Renaissance Learning, IXL, Ready Reading, Reading A-Z, EPIC, and Khan Academy, to name a few.

Math Support

Math instruction/tutoring was offered by 29 subgrantees (94%). Subgrantees provided the frequency of math supports for 49 sites. Twenty-one of the 49 sites (43%) offered math support five times per week or more, followed by 14 (29%) that offered support four times per week.

Twenty-eight of the 31 subgrantees (90%) who implemented math supports indicated that they were "very" or "mostly" successful with the implementation, while two subgrantees indicated they were somewhat successful and needed to improve/rethink some of their academic math activities.

Subgrantees utilized licensed teachers to design and deliver grade-level appropriate math lessons, worksheets, and manipulatives. Four subgrantees offered online tutoring programs such as the Tutored by Teachers and Khan Academy. Other math curricula utilized by subgrantees included titles such as IXL, Imagine Math, Renaissance Learning, iReady Math, Star Math, Brain POP, enVision Math, and BellXcel. Some subgrantees did not name a specific program but described instructional strategies or a daily routine that incorporated some form of project-based learning such as Fun with Forensics or designing and operating a food truck. Below is an example.

> *The students loved getting to work within a budget to run their taco truck - they'll choose the ingredients, extra food to serve, and their truck. The students practiced addition and subtraction while learning to work within a budget. They finished the project by designing 4 specialty tacos and taking their classmates' orders! This fun project-based learning act ties nutrition, writing, reading, math, and technology together.*

STEM Support

STEM instruction and/or activities were offered at 53 of the 59 total sites (90%). Table 6 summarizes the frequency of offerings across the sites. Of the 53 sites that offered STEM instruction/activities, 40% offered STEM five or more times per week, 17% offered it four times per week, 11% offered STEM three times per week, 17% twice a week, and 15% offered it weekly.

Table 6. Frequency of STEM Support Across All Sites

Reported Frequency	STEM Support
Five or more times per week	21 (40%)
Four times per week	9 (17%)
Three times per week	6 (11%)
Two times per week	9 (17%)
Weekly	8 (15%)
Total Grantees	**53 (100%)**

Other Academic Support

Subgrantees were also asked about additional academic support beyond reading, math, and STEM. Credit recovery was mentioned by three subgrantees. Many subgrantees added social emotional learning (SEL) to this open-ended comment area of their report; however, for the purpose of this report, SEL is covered in the enrichment section below. Other supports mentioned included healthy eating, career exploration, and field trips (See Table 5).

Enrichment Focus

Overall, the subgrantees provided a broad range of focus areas including SEL, cultural arts, physical education, mentoring, entrepreneurship, and community service:

- 31 subgrantees, at 56 sites, provided SEL/Character Education
- 30 subgrantees, at 55 sites, provided Physical Education
- 25 subgrantees, at 48 sites, provided Cultural Arts
- 20 subgrantees, at 32 sites, provided Mentoring
- 18 subgrantees, at 29 sites, provided Community Service
- 17 subgrantees, at 28 sites, provided Entrepreneurship

Examples of additional enrichment supports included environmental education, community financial literacy, digital literacy, health and wellness programs, credit recovery, water safety, etc. (See the Appendix for enrichment foci implemented by subgrantees).

Student Identification, Recruitment and Enrollment

Additionally, subgrantees were asked, "How did your program determine which students were eligible to participate in the program (i.e., how did your organization define/identify students who 'experienced significant disruptions to learning as identified by stagnant or declining academic progress during the 2022-23 school year.')?" Across the 31 subgrantees,

- 24 used student-level academic data
- 21 used teacher identification
- 19 used school referrals
- 17 used program enrollment intake forms
- 12 indicated "other"

The subgrantees that indicated "other" mentioned the Migrant Education Program (MEP), parent recommendations, faith-based community, existing after-school programs, Department of Social Services (DSS) recommendations, housing authority, and student support processes. All but four subgrantees used a combination of ways to identify students.

Subgrantees were also asked, "Was it a challenge to identify, recruit, and enroll the number of eligible students your organization intended to serve?" More than two-thirds grantees (21) indicated that the identification, recruitment, and enrollment process was "not at all" challenging. However, of those who did indicate they experienced a challenge, nine indicated the process was "moderately" challenging, while one indicated it was "extremely" challenging. Challenges specifically mentioned were related to working around staff member vacations, having the program fit into the family's summer schedule, or enrolling students. One subgrantee had to compete with a local school's summer program. Below are examples of challenges described by subgrantees.

- *Most of the permission slips were not returned until multiple phone calls were made home. Most of the migrant parents' first language is Spanish. Staff who speak fluent Spanish had to make the phone calls and/or do the home visits.*
- *The biggest challenge we faced was the turn-around time from our grant-award notice until the proposed first day of camp. With the delayed notification, it was difficult to prepare for the facility needs, the staff, and the student enrollment. Also, many families had already made summer arrangements by the time we were able to offer camp opportunities.*
- *It was moderately challenging to enroll students because of the centralized District recruitment processes that were in place; not a conflict but with several programs in place, sharing transportation, resources, and facilities, we had to consistently make sure SMG23 students were placed on the correct school roster. Also, because of the proficiency levels at the selected schools, some students eligible for SMG23 needed to retest for RtA [Read to Achieve]; those students were referred to the District summer program for RtA tutoring and retesting.*

Program Implementation Features Mentioned in Legislation

Collaboration with High-Poverty and Low-Performing Schools

As indicated in the RFP, under section 4203 of the ESEA, the state must give priority to applications proposing to primarily serve students who attend schools (a) eligible for Title I, Part A schoolwide programs and (b) identified as CSI and/or TSI schools. Thus, since subgrantees were encouraged to work in close collaboration with high poverty and/or low-performing schools

in improving outcomes for at-risk students, subgrantees were required to report the number of Title I, CSI, TSI, and low-performing schools they served using 21st CCLC SMG funding in 2023. Out of the 270 schools[6] that subgrantees reported serving, 72% were identified as Title I schools, 51% low-performing schools, 37% TSI schools, and 22% CSI schools (See Table 7).

Table 7. Types of Schools Served

Schools Served (n=270)	Number (%) Served
Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) schools	60 (22%)
Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) schools	101 (37%)
Receiving Title I services	195 (72%)
Low-performing schools	137 (51%)

Collaboration with Community-Based Organizations

The implementation reporting system asked subgrantees, "To what extent was collaboration with community-based organizations successful in terms of 21st CCLC SMG planning and implementation?" Of those that indicated they collaborated with a community-based organization, 24 subgrantees (77%) indicated "very" successful, and three subgrantees (10%) indicated "mostly" successful while one subgrantee indicated somewhat successful collaboration with community-based organizations. Examples of community-based organizations included: MyGems Science, Public Libraries, Moose Lodge, 4H, YWCA, and Girl Scouts. Those that were successful in the collaboration mostly cited existing relationships as the major contributing factor. Having common values/vision/goals was also listed.

Collaboration with PSUs

The reporting system asked subgrantees, "To what extent was collaboration with public school units (PSUs) successful in terms of 21st CCLC SMG planning and implementation?" Overall, 16 subgrantees indicated "very" successful, nine subgrantees indicated "mostly" successful.[7] Those that were successful mentioned having great partnerships that were already established where PSU partners provided transportation, facilities, and food services. One subgrantee stated that their summer feeding program only lasted 30 days of the 21st CCLC SMG-funded program.

---

[6] Note: This number represents the total of schools reported by each subgrantee; therefore, in some instances this could be a duplicative count (e.g., if multiple subgrantees serve the same school).
[7] Note: Six subgrantees did not respond to this question.

III. Subgrantee Outcomes

With any grant program, it is essential that subgrantees evaluate and report on program impact; however, due to the short funding period and the variation in 21st CCLC SMG programs/services (e.g., grade levels served, academic foci, behavioral goals), it was not possible for SERVE Center to conduct an external evaluation of each of the 2023 program sites in terms of extent of student improvement on key measured outcomes. Thus, as specified in the RFP, 21st CCLC SMG subgrantees were required to provide a summary of their outcome findings as part of the end-of-grant reporting process.

Perception Outcome Measures Reported on End-of-Grant Subgrantee Reports

Furthermore, and again, due to the short turnaround time of the grant, it was not always feasible and/or relevant for subgrantees to collect student-performance-based outcome data. Thus, in instances where student-performance data could not be collected/analyzed within the timeframe of the grant, subgrantees were encouraged to collect student, parent, and/or feeder school perceptions regarding the impact of the 21st CCLC SMG Program on student academic and/or behavioral outcomes. Table 8 provides a summary of what data were reportedly used by each subgrantee. Of the 31 subgrantees,

- 65% (20) utilized data regarding student perceptions of the program's impact on them.
- 61% (19) utilized data regarding parent perceptions of the program's impact on their child.
- 58% (18) utilized data regarding teacher/staff perceptions of the program's impact on the students.

In terms of reporting student performance outcomes, Table 8 shows that, of the 31 subgrantees,

- 100% (31) reported on student attendance data.[8]
- 77% (24) provided academic assessment data for reading.
- 65% (20) provided academic assessment data for math.
- 52% (16) provided data related to SEL.
- 52% (16) provided behavioral assessment data.
- 29% (9) provided academic assessment data for STEM.
- 26% (8) provided data related to physical education.
- 10% (3) provided data related to credit recovery.
- 74% (23) utilized a pre-/post-test approach for measuring student academic progress.

---

[8] Note: Attendance programs that were mentioned included: My ClubHub, Vision Member Tracking System, Member Tracking System, My Attendance Tracker, excel spreadsheets, google sheets and pen/paper.

Table 8. Overview of Measures Reported by Subgrantees in End-of-Grant Report

Subgrantee	Students Served — Target Met	Perception Data (Type)	Academic Assessment (Type)	Behavioral Assessment (Type)	Other (Type)
Boys & Girls Clubs of the Albemarle	Y	✓ (P)	--	--	--
Charter Boys & Girls Clubs of North Central North Carolina	Y	✓ (S)	--	✓	✓ (SEL, PE)
Boys & Girls Clubs of the Coastal Plain	Y	✓ (S)	*✓ (reading, math, STEM)	--	✓ (SEL)
Boys & Girls Clubs of Wayne County	Y	--	--	✓	--
Boys and Girls Club of the Plateau (BGCP)	Y	✓ (S, T)	*✓ (reading)	--	--
Brunswick County Schools	N	✓ (P, T)	*✓ (reading, math)	✓	--
Caring and Sharing Inc.	Y	✓ (P, T)	*✓ (reading, math, STEM)	✓	✓ (SEL, PE, Credit Recovery)
Children's Village Academy	Y	✓ (S)	*✓ (reading, math)	✓	✓ (SEL)
Communities In Schools of Robeson County	Y	✓ (S, P, T)	*✓ (reading, math, STEM)	✓	✓ (SEL, PE, Artistic Creativity)
Diversity Nurtures Achievements Community	Y	✓ (S, P, T)	*✓ (reading, math)	✓	✓ (Individual report reading, math)
Empowerment Academy	Y	✓ (S, P, T)	*✓ (reading, math)	✓	✓ (SEL)
Freedom School Partners	N	✓ (S, P, T)	*✓ (reading)	✓	✓ (SEL)
Gates County Schools	Y	--	*✓ (reading, math, STEM)	--	✓ (SEL, PE)
Insight Human Services, Inc.	Y	--	*✓ (reading, math)	✓	--
Integrity Unlimited CDC	Y	✓ (S, P, T)	*✓ (reading, math, STEM)	--	✓ (SEL, PE)
Just Us Kids Enrichment	Y	--	*✓ (reading, math)	--	--
MeckEd	N	✓ (S, P)	✓ (reading, math, STEM)	--	✓ (Interest and attitudes to STEAM)
Movement Charter School	Y	✓ (P)	✓ (reading)	--	✓ (SEL)
My Meta Re-Entry Services, Inc.	Y	✓ (S, P, T)	*✓ (reading, math, STEM)	✓	✓ (SEL)
Northeast Academy of Aerospace & AdvTech	Y	✓ (S, P, T)	*✓ (reading, math)	--	✓ (SEL, PE, Credit Recovery)
Prodigal Son Foundation (Sugar Creek Learning)	Y	✓ (S, P, T)	*✓ (reading, math)	--	--

Subgrantee	Students Served Target Met	Outcome Measures Reported			
		Perception Data (Type)	Academic Assessment (Type)	Behavioral Assessment (Type)	Other (Type)
Reeves Community Center (RCC) Foundation	Y	✓ (S, P, T)	*✓ (reading, math)	✓	✓ (PE)
Robeson County Parks & Recreation Dept.	Y	✓ (P, T)	*✓ (reading, math)	✓	✓ (SEL)
St. John Community Development Corp., Inc.	N	✓ (P, T)	*✓ (reading, math)	✓	
Stanly County Schools	Y	✓ (S, T)	--	✓ (S, P, T)	✓ (Observation reading & math)
The Cindy Platt Boys & Girls Club of Transylvania	Y	✓ (S)	*✓ (reading, STEM)	--	✓ (SEL, PE)
Weldon City Schools	Y	✓ (T)	--	--	✓ (Credit Recovery)
Wilson Youth United, Inc. dba the SPOT	Y	✓ (P, T)	*✓ (STEM)	--	✓ (SEL)
Winston Salem / Forsyth County Schools	N	✓ (S)	--	✓	
YMCA of Northwest North Carolina	Y	✓ (S, P)	*✓ (reading, math)	--	✓ (SEL)
YMCA of the Triangle Area	Y	✓ (S, P, T)	*✓ (reading, math)	--	--
Total	N=5 Y=26	S=20 P=19 T=18	Reading=24 Math=20 STEM=9	16	SEL=16 Credit Recovery=3 PE=8

*= pre/post academic data collected
S=student survey/data;
P=parent survey/data
T=Teacher/staff survey/data
SEL=Social Emotional Learning
PE=Physical Education

IV. Technical Assistance Suggestions

Subgrantees were asked, "In hindsight, what technical assistance and/or information do you think should have been provided to better assist your organization with administrating/implementing your grant?" Shown in Table 9, 12 subgrantees reported that the technical assistance provided was sufficient, with some subgrantees going further to describe the types of support provided. One subgrantee experienced challenges applying for reimbursements and subsequent delays in funding, and five subgrantees said they needed more assistance related to administrative tasks. Three subgrantees suggested getting access to the final report template at the beginning of the summer to aid with timely reporting. Other suggestions included provision of recordings and slides with active links to aid in reference throughout the implementation of the grant and arranging a meeting with other subgrantees at the beginning of the summer.

Table 9. Technical Assistance Suggestions

Themes	Sample Quotes
Technical assistance was sufficient (12 subgrantees)	• *The 21st Century Summer Mini-Grant team were extremely helpful and responsive to inquiries and providing assistance and oversight as needed. These were accomplished through webinars, emails and phone calls. This helped us run a successful Summer Adventure and Education Camp and has assisted with the reporting requirements and deadlines. We cannot be happier with the partnership that we have with NCDPI.* • *N/A - Although there were parts of the process that were challenging, we received prompt, thorough, and kind responses to our inquiries throughout the grant period.*
Administrative and implementation support (5 subgrantees)	• *Recorded webinars or recorded information sessions in case the grant management team changes during the implementation of the program.* • *The grant portal is quite complex and confusing. It is challenging to find the correct locations to upload required documents and find information needed to file and process reimbursement requests. However, the DPI staff have been wonderful to work with. Thank you* • *We needed technical assistance with gathering or receiving information from the feeder schools. Once the children left school for the summer, it was hard to communicate with staff in order to gather information for concrete measurements.* • *There are challenges around attendance and administration of program pre- and post-testing to ensure valid results. Assistance in this area would be helpful.*
Evaluation and reporting support (3 subgrantees)	• *Having a copy of this report at the beginning of the program would also have been helpful to guarantee tracking of each expected item.* • *This final report would have been helpful to have been sent to our team at the beginning of the program. (And helpful to email to the entire team, in case one person is on summer vacation.) It would be helpful to have this report template on the CCIP system for us to access earlier.* • *Knowing our goals needed to be measured before the beginning of the next school year. We set goals that could only be measured once the students were well into their Fall 2023 semester. We had to shift our goal tracking to weekly performance progress, stagnation, or decline as identified by the licensed teachers of each student group.*
Disbursement of funds (1 grantee)	• *Deep concern and frustration regarding the delay in receiving the allocated funds for our summer program from the state of North Carolina.*
Other suggestions	• *In the future, if awarded, I would like to have at least one meeting in the summer with other grantees to discuss, gain ideas and build relationships.* • *The introductory video webinars were helpful but having copies of each PowerPoint with working links would have helped as would a simplified list or bullet points of what is covered in the 3-4 hours of training to refer back to without having to rewatch multiple times.*

Twenty-nine subgrantees included additional comments within their end-of-grant report. The majority of subgrantees were expressing a mood of accomplishment/success by being able to provide summer programming to students who needed it and extreme gratitude for the funding.

- *We have lots of pictures we would like to share regarding end of camp STEM projects. The students and parents were very grateful for the educational field trips; most students had never visited any of the field trip sites.*
- *Our Summer Connections SMG camp was A LOT of fun! With the money provided, we were able to present our children with opportunities and materials to approach learning*

in unconventional ways. The feedback from students and parents has encouraged us as educators!

Another subgrantee provided this reflection:

> *I can't help but believe if our program had better program administration, we could have avoided some issues. Once we were able to find proper guidance, we were more than capable of submitting documents in CCIP or entering information on the ERaCA system. I appreciate members of the fiscal team stepping outside of their normal role and answering questions to keep our program on track.*

V. Summary

As a result of the 21st CCLC Competitive SMG Program, a total of $5,873,392 was awarded to 32 subgrantee organizations, 31 of which accepted the funding and operated a total of 59 sites across the state (employing 658 staff members) that provided academic and enrichment opportunities for K-12 students during summer 2023. Across the 59 sites, subgrantees delivered 15,513 hours of service supporting a total of 3,867 participating students. Improved student outcomes were reported in the areas of reading, math, STEM, SEL, health/well-being, and credit recovery. (Table 10 provides a cross-year summary of data findings for SMG programming for 2021, 2022, and 2023.)

Table 10. Cross-Year Data Overview (Summer 2021 - 2023)

	Summer 2021	Summer 2022	Summer 2023
Awarded Funds	$8,675,000.00	$2,422,670.01	$5,873,392.56
# Applications Submitted	49 applications	51 applications	47 applications
# Applications Awarded	39 subgrantees	14 subgrantees	32 subgrantees*
# Counties Served	33 counties	10 counties	26 counties
# Sites Operated	74 sites	24 sites	59 sites
Grades Served	K-12	K-12	K-12
# Hours of Services Offered	15,624 hours of service	5,340 hours of service	15,513 hours of service
# Paid Staff	953 staff members	315 staff members	658 staff members
# Volunteers	89 volunteers	30 volunteers	136 volunteers
# Schools Served	170 schools	77 schools	270 schools
% CSI schools [a]	29% CSI	21% CSI	22% CSI
% TSI schools [b]	50% TSI	49% TSI	37% TSI
% Title I schools	84 % Title I	78 % Title I	72 % Title I
% Low-performing	48% low-performing schools	47% low-performing schools	51% low-performing schools
Students Served Target Met (% of grantees)	59% of grantees	83% of grantees	84% of grantees
# Students Served	4,858 students	1,604 students	3,867 students

*A total of 32 organizations were originally approved for 21st CCLC SMG awards; however, one subgrantee declined funding.

[a] Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

[b] Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

Appendix: Type of Enrichment Programming Focus by Grantee

Grantee	Social Emotional Learning/ Character Ed.	Cultural arts	Physical Education	Mentoring	Entre-preneurship	Community Service	Other (Describe)
Boys & Girls Clubs of the Albemarle	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Charter Boys & Girls Clubs of North Central North Carolina	✓	✓	✓			✓	
Boys & Girls Clubs of the Coastal Plain	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Boys & Girls Clubs of Wayne County	✓	✓	✓	✓			Reading groups, healthy lifestyles
Boys and Girls Club of the Plateau (BGCP)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Environmental education, High Yield Activities, Journaling, Art
Brunswick County Schools	✓	✓	✓				
Caring and Sharing Inc.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		Credit recovery
Children's Village Academy	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	Math and basketball
Communities In Schools of Robeson County	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		Arts education
Diversity Nurtures Achievements Community	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Community financial literacy, digital literacy
Empowerment Academy	✓	✓	✓			✓	
Freedom School Partners	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Gates County Schools	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Insight Human Services, Inc.	✓	✓	✓	✓			Health and wellness, creative arts, field trips
Integrity Unlimited CDC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Coordinated Approach to Child Health
Just Us Kids Enrichment	✓	✓					
MeckEd	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Movement Charter School	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		

Grantee	Social Emotional Learning/ Character Ed.	Cultural arts	Physical Education	Mentoring	Entre-preneurship	Community Service	Other (Describe)
My Meta Re-Entry Services, Inc.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Financial literacy, Art, robotics, career and college planning
Northeast Academy of Aerospace & AdvTech	✓		✓	✓		✓	Credit recovery
Prodigal Son Foundation (Sugar Creek Learning)	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	
Reeves Community Center (RCC) Foundation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Career pathways
Robeson County Parks & Recreation Dept.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Test prep
St. John Community Development Corp., Inc.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Stanly County Schools	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		Art activities, health and wellness, college campus activities
The Cindy Platt Boys & Girls Club of Transylvania	✓	✓	✓			✓	Walking classroom
Weldon City Schools	✓	✓	✓			✓	Credit recovery
Wilson Youth United, Inc. dba the SPOT	✓		✓				
Winston Salem / Forsyth County Schools	✓		✓				
YMCA of Northwest North Carolina	✓		✓				Water safety
YMCA of the Triangle Area	✓		✓				Research projects
Total Grantees	**31**	**25**	**30**	**20**	**17**	**18**	