2023-24 North Carolina 21st CCLC Program State-Level Progress Monitoring Report

Cohort 15 and 16 Grantees

Submitted by:

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

Submitted to:

Susan Brigman
Section Chief, Specialty Programs
Federal Program Monitoring and Support Division
NCDPI

May 2025

Table of Contents

2023-24 North Carolina 21st CCLC Program State-Level Progress Monitoring Report: Cohort 15 and 16 Subgrantees

Introduction

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

Each group of awarded grants (subgrantees) is called a cohort. NCDPI funded the first cohort of 16 subgrantees in 2002. Cohorts 2-8 (2003-09) averaged 20 subgrantees per cohort. The following list provides a summary of the State Board approved 21st CCLC grants awarded from 2010 to 2022.

- In 2010, Cohort 9, the largest cohort to date, included 89 awarded subgrantees, totaling $24,982,787.
- In 2013, Cohort 10 included 52 awarded subgrantees, totaling $17,925,136.
- In 2014, Cohort 11 included 68 awarded subgrantees, totaling $22,323,666.
- In 2017, Cohort 12 included 45 awarded subgrantees, totaling $14,917,238.[1]
- In 2018, Cohort 13 included 49 awarded subgrantees, totaling $15,771,977.
- In 2020, Cohort 14 included 45 awarded subgrantees, totaling $15,944,885.
- In 2021, Cohort 15 included 61 awarded subgrantees, totaling $21,349,077.
- In 2022, Cohort 16 included 29 awarded subgrantees, totaling $10,096,226.[2]

This report summarizes data from Cohorts 15 and 16 subgrantees who operated programs in 2023-24. During the 2023-24 school year, Cohort 15, with 57 remaining subgrantees, was in their third year of funding, and Cohort 16, with 26 remaining subgrantees, was in their second year of funding.

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

The NCDPI goals and objectives for the 2023-24 school year programming were:

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

[1] During the May 2017 State Board Meeting it was recommended that the Allotment Policy Manual be revised to offer three-year 21st CCLC grants to approved organizations; thus, Cohort 12 was the first to receive a three-year grant (as opposed to previous cohorts that had four-year grant funding cycles with reduced funding in the final year).
[2] Although not the focus of this report, in 2024, Cohort 17 included 60 awarded subgrantees (totaling $25,624,183). In addition, in 2025, Cohort 18 included 25 awarded subgrantees for afterschool programming with optional summer programming (totaling $10,493,441) and 14 awarded subgrantees implementing "summer only" programming (totaling 2,073,524).

- ***Objective 1.3:*** The majority (over 50%) of students served statewide are in need of academic support.[3]

- **Goal 2:** Enrolled students attend program for 30 days[4] or more.
  - ***Objective 2.1:*** Statewide percentage of students attending 30 days or more is at least 70% (80% in elementary, 60% in middle school, and 40% in high school).
  - ***Objective 2.2:*** Statewide percentage of centers with an average attendance of 30 days or more will not fall below 87%.
- **Goal 3:** Programs will offer services in core academic areas and in enrichment.
  - ***Objective 3.1:*** More than 85% of centers offer services in at least one core academic area.
  - ***Objective 3.2:*** More than 85% of centers offer enrichment support activities.
- **Goal 4:** Enrolled students attending the program (30 days or more) will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.
  - ***Objective 4.1:*** The statewide percentage of participants attending the program (30 days or more), with two years of state assessment data (Grades 4-8), who improve from "non-proficient" or level 3 to "proficient" (levels 4 or 5) will be at least 11%.
  - ***Objective 4.2:*** Participants attending the program (30 days or more) with two years of state assessment data (Grades 4-8) will demonstrate year-to-year change on state assessments in reading and math at least as great or greater than the state population year-to-year change.
  - ***Objective 4.3:*** The majority (over 50%) of participants "in need of improvement" (attending the program 30 days or more) will demonstrate improved engagement in learning.

Goal 1 focuses on the extent to which subgrantees, statewide, enroll the students for whom the program is intended. **Goal 2** addresses the extent to which enrolled students, statewide, are "regularly" attending the after-school programming provided by the subgrantees. For the purpose of this state-level report, "regular" attendees are defined as those students who attend 30 days or more during the course of the school year. (Note. Enrolled participants attending 21st CCLC programming for 30 days or more were historically referred to as "regular" attendees. While the term "regular" attendees is not currently used for federal-level reporting, the 30-day desingation/deliniation will continue to be used/tracked for state-level reporting purposes.) Data related to Goals 1 and 2 come from 21DC (the state database for this program). Subgrantees are required to report daily attendance for all students participating in the program through the 21DC system. NCDPI provided student-level attendance data from 21DC to SERVE for this report.

Goal 3 relates to ensuring funded programs provide the required academic and enrichment activities to students. Data related to Goal 3 come from 21DC. Subgrantees are required to report, through the 21DC system, which academic and enrichment activities centers provide and how often these activities are provided. NCDPI provided center-level activity data from 21DC to SERVE for this report.

Goal 4 focuses on the outcomes desired for those students who participate in 21st CCLC at least 30 days (for the school year). Under Goal 4, typically, two types of data on the progress of participating students are obtained and analyzed. The first type is state EOG assessment scores in reading and math for participating students in Grades 4-8 who attended at least 30 days for the 2023-24 school year.

[3] "In need of academic support" is defined as students' performance on prior year's assessment data.
[4] Starting in 2021, the federal Government Performance Results Act (GPRA) required states to report 21st CCLC student participation by **hours**, as opposed to **days**. Prior to this shift, "regularly" attending program participants were defined by the U.S. Department of Education as students attending the program **30 days** or more. While NCDPI now defines "regularly" attending program participants as students attending the program **90 hours** or more, the statewide goals adhere to the historic definition (i.e., 30 days or more) to allow for more consistent year-to-year longitudinal comparison.

The second type of data are Instructional Staff Survey ratings.[5] The surveys are distributed by subgrantees to the classroom teachers—or other instructional staff—of program participants in order to collect their perceptions of participants' changes to engagement in learning. The subgrantees enter instructors' ratings of attendees into 21DC. NCDPI provided student-level instructor ratings to SERVE for this report. More information about the Instructional Staff Survey is provided in the discussion of Objective 4.3.

Below, we provide data on the extent to which the state objectives for the 21st CCLC program were met for 2023-24 for each of the four goals.

Goal 1: Projected Numbers of Students Are Enrolled

As context for this goal, Table 1 shows the number of subgrantees and centers, statewide, for 2022-23 and 2023-24 and the average number of students enrolled per subgrantee. During the 2023-24 school year, there were a total of 83[6] subgrantees operating 188 centers (average of 2 centers per subgrantee). Statewide, the 83 subgrantees reported 11,368 enrolled students, with an average of 137 students enrolled per subgrantee.

Table 1. 21st CCLC 2022-23 and 2023-24 Subgrantees, Centers, and Participating Students

	Cohort 15 2022-23	Cohort 15 2023-24	Cohort 16 2022-23	Cohort 16 2023-24	Both Cohorts 2022-23	Both Cohorts 2023-24
Subgrantees						
Number of subgrantees	58	57	28	26	**86**	**83**
Number of participating students	8,386	8,033	3,337	3,351	**11,706** *	**11,368** **
Average number of students served by subgrantees	145	141	119	129	**136**	**137**
Centers						
Number of centers	128	130	62	58	**190**	**188**
Number of centers per subgrantee (range)	1-7	1-9	1-8	1-11	**1-8**	**1-11**
Average number of centers per subgrantee	2	2	2	2	**2**	**2**

Note. Includes all students, regardless of days of attendance.
*17 students were reported as participating in *both* Cohort 15 and Cohort 16 centers.
**16 students were reported as participating in *both* Cohort 15 and Cohort 16 centers.

As can be seen in the far righthand column of Table 2, for 2023-24, of the 11,368 students enrolled, 73% were elementary-level students (with 19% from middle schools and 8% from high schools). Approximately half of the students enrolled in 2023-24 were African American, 22% were White, and 18% were Hispanic. Finally, 10% of enrolled students were classified as multilingual learners.

[5] Note. In past years, the U.S. Department of Education required states to report student engagement data collected via a survey administered to the "regular school day teacher" of all "regularly" attending program participants (i.e., students attending the program 30 days or more). However, in 2021, that requirement changed at the federal level, and the target of the survey shifted from the "regular school day teacher" to any "instructional staff" member that could assess changes in the identified student's level of learning engagement (e.g., social worker, psychologist, counselor, teachers aid, 21st CCLC afterschool program staff).
[6] Ten grantees operated both Cohort 15 and 16 centers. Two centers were funded by both Cohorts 15 and 16. In the event that a grantee operated both Cohort 15 and 16 centers, data for these grantees were analyzed and reported separately by cohort.

Table 2. 21st CCLC Participating Students in 2022-23 and 2023-24

	Cohort 15 2022-23	Cohort 15 2023-24	Cohort 16 2022-23	Cohort 16 2023-24	Both Cohorts 2022-23	Both Cohorts 2023-24
Number of centers	128	130	62	58	190	188
Average # of students served per center	66	62	54	58	62	61
Number of participating students	8,386	8,033	3,337	3,351	11,706*	11,368**
By School Level						
% Elementary School	70%	72%	68%	76%	69%	73%
% Middle School	21%	19%	25%	21%	22%	19%
% High School	9%	10%	7%	4%	8%	8%
By Ethnicity						
% African American	53%	53%	45%	45%	50%	51%
% White	20%	19%	29%	30%	22%	22%
% Hispanic	19%	18%	19%	19%	19%	18%
% Other	9%	10%	7%	7%	8%	9%
By Classification						
Multilingual Learners	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Disability	2%	3%	2%	3%	2%	3%
Homeless	3%	3%	4%	4%	3%	3%
Migrant	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%
Foster	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%

*17 students were reported as participating in *both* Cohort 15 and Cohort 16 centers.
**16 students were reported as participating in *both* Cohort 15 and Cohort 16 centers.

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

Applicants seeking a 21st CCLC grant were required to estimate the number of students their program would enroll. Thus, subgrantee performance can be reviewed by examining the percentage of subgrantees who reported enrolling their projected number of participants.[7] The number of students enrolled per subgrantee was calculated using student-level 21st CCLC subgrantee-reported data provided by NCDPI. The reported number of students proposed to be served by Cohort 15 and 16 subgrantees ranged from 60 to 250, while the number of students who were reported as enrolled in 21st CCLC programs in 2023-24 ranged from 23 to 456.

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

✓ Objective 1.1—Met

For 2023-24, this objective was met. Approximately 86% of Cohort 15 subgrantees and 96% of Cohort 16 subgrantees reported serving at least 75% of their projected number of students, with a total across both cohorts of 89%. The objective was met in that over 50% (89%) of subgrantees enrolled at least 75% of their projected number of students.

[7] The "projected number of participants" is based on information submitted by grantees in their original proposal. It is the total number of students the grantee proposed to serve with 21st CCLC funds across centers/sites. It is understood that, since being awarded, grantees may have requested and/or been approved for a programmatic amendment that increases/decreases the "projected number of participants;" however, the indicator for this report is the "actual number of students enrolled" (as grantees report in the 21DC database) compared to the "projected number of participants" (as grantees indicated in their original proposal).

In exploring variations across types of organizations, Table 3 shows that the percentage of subgrantees with at least 75% of projected enrollment was between 75-100%.

Table 3. Subgrantees in 2023-24 that Enrolled At Least 75% of Projected Students by Organization Type

Organization Type	Both Cohorts 2022-23	
	# of Subgrantees	# (%) of subgrantees that enrolled ≥75% of projected students
Charter School (CS)	4	4 **(100%)**
College or University (COU)	0	**n/a**
Community-Based Organization (CBO)	46	43 **(93%)**
Faith-Based Organization (FBO)	11	8 **(73%)**
School District (SD)	18	16 **(89%)**
Other	4	3 **(75%)**
TOTAL	83	74 **(89%)**

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

One focus of the federal 21st CCLC funding is on supporting students from high-poverty schools. Table 4 shows that 90% of students who attended Cohort 15 and Cohort 16 centers in 2023-24 attended schools that qualified for Title I funding.[8] Elementary school participants in 21st CCLC programs were almost all from Title I schools (99%), while 73% of middle school participants and 64% of high school participants were from Title I schools.

Table 4. 21st CCLC Participating Students from Title I Schools in 2022-23 and 2023-24

	Cohort 15 2022-23	Cohort 15 2023-24	Cohort 16 2022-23	Cohort 16 2023-24	Both Cohorts 2022-23	Both Cohorts 2023-24
Average # of students from Title I schools served per center	61	59	45	48	55	56
Average % of students from Title I schools served per center	93%	93%	83%	83%	90%	90%
Number of participating Title I students	7,764	7,672	2,778	2,809	10,542	10,481
Percent in Schools with Title I Funding by School Level						
Elem School	99%	100%	100%	99%	100%	99%
Middle School	89%	86%	62%	45%	80%	73%
High School	46%	75%	0%	3%	35%	64%
Percent in Schools with Title I funding by Ethnicity						
African American	95%	96%	90%	91%	94%	95%
White	83%	89%	71%	75%	78%	83%
Hispanic	96%	95%	88%	85%	94%	92%
Other	92%	96%	77%	75%	89%	91%

✓ **Objective 1.2—Met**
For 2023-24 this objective was met. Overall, an average of 90% of students per center came from schools that qualified for Title I funding (56 students on average, per center, coming from Title I schools).

[8] Title I schools were identified using 2023-24 eligibility data from NCDPI (see www.dpi.nc.gov/districts-schools/office-federal-programs#TitleI-EligibleSchoolsSummaryReportESSR-1751). A school was identified as Title I if "School Served" variable = "Y."

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

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

State EOG assessment results for 2022-23 (one year prior to implementation year) are reported using the following four proficiency levels:[9]

- Not Proficient: Students have limited or partial command of knowledge and skills
- Level 3: Students have sufficient command of the knowledge and skills
- Level 4: Students have solid command of the knowledge and skills
- Level 5: Students have superior command of the knowledge and skills

These levels, adopted by the North Carolina State Board of Education in 2019 (math) and 2021 (reading), are meant to convey the degree to which a student is prepared to proceed to the next grade level. Table 5 shows that, for students served in 2023-24, 84% of Cohort 15 and 81% of Cohort 16 students in Grades 4-8 were "non-proficient" in reading on the 2022-23 assessements, while 81% of Cohort 15 and 77% of Cohort 16 students were "non-proficient" in math.

Table 5. Percentage of 21st CCLC Students (Grades 4-8) "Non-Proficient" in Reading or Math EOG Assessments in 2022-23 (for 2023-24 School Year Participants)

	Reading		Math	
	Cohort 15	Cohort 16	Cohort 15	Cohort 16
% "non-proficient" at end of 2023 (prior to being served in 2023-24 school year)	**84%**	**81%**	**81%**	**77%**

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

✓ Objective 1.3 Met

For participating Cohort 15 and 16 students in Grades 4-8 with end-of-year assessment scores in 2022-23 (one year prior), the majority (over 50%), in this case 77% to 84%, were in need of academic support, as judged by their lack of proficiency on state assessments in reading or math at program entry.

Goal 2: Enrolled Students Attend Program 30 Days or More

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

[9] For the purposes of this report, "non-proficient" is defined as those students who fall within either the Not Proficient or Level 3 category.

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

As Table 6 shows, statewide, 84% (for Cohort 15 and Cohort 16 combined) of enrolled students were reported by subgrantees as attending for 30 days or more in 2023-24, while 16% of students were reported as attending fewer than 30 days. The percentage of students who attendeed 30 or more days was highest at the elementary level (91%) followed by middle school (75%) and high school (45%), when other after-school activities may be more likely to interfere with program attendance.

Table 6. Cohort 15 and 16 Center Attendance in 2022-23 and 2023-24

	Cohort 15 2022-23	Cohort 15 2023-24	Cohort 16 2022-23	Cohort 16 2023-24	Both Cohorts 2022-23	Both Cohorts 2023-24
Students						
% of attendees 30 days or more	76%	83%	77%	86%	77%	84%
% 30-89 days	39%	41%	46%	38%	41%	40%
% 90 days or more	38%	42%	32%	48%	36%	44%
% of attendees less than 30 days	24%	17%	23%	14%	23%	16%
School-Level						
% of ES attendees (30 days or more)	84%	90%	83%	91%	84%	91%
% of MS attendees (30 days or more)	68%	74%	71%	79%	69%	75%
% of HS attendees (30 days or more)	37%	47%	46%	38%	39%	45%

✓ Objective 2.1—Met

Overall, this objective was met in 2023-24. Eighty-four percent (84%) of participants attended 30 days or more. The objective was also met by grade level, as the percentage of students attending 30 days or more was above the target objective for elementary, middle, and high school students.

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

Another way of examining attendance data is based on the percentage of centers, statewide, with average attendance that is high versus low (for the purposes of this report, low attendance is defined as fewer than 30 days). In 2023-24, 96% of 21st CCLC centers, statewide, had average attendance **at or above** 30 days, and 4% had average attendance **below** 30 days. Results for this objective are described in Table 7, by cohort. See Appendix B for a list, by center/subgrantee, of average attendance and percentage of attendees attending 30 days or more.

Table 7. Cohort 15 and 16 Percentage of Centers with Average Attendance Above/Below 30 days in 2022-23 and 2023-24

	Cohort 15 2022-23	Cohort 15 2023-24	Cohort 16 2022-23	Cohort 16 2023-24	Both Cohorts 2022-23	Both Cohorts 2023-24
% of centers statewide with average attendance of 30 days or more	91%	95%	87%	97%	89%	96%
% of centers statewide with average attendance fewer than 30 days	9%	5%	13%	3%	11%	4%

✓ Objective 2.2—Met
Cohort 15 and 16 met this objective in 2023-24. Ninety-six percent (96%) of centers across cohorts reported average attendance rates of 30 days or more, while 4% of centers across cohorts reported fewer than 30 days attendance, on average.

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

In order to meet the federal requirements for this program, subgrantees are expected to offer services that emphasize core academic areas, such as reading or STEM. In addition, subgrantees are expected to offer services that emphasize enrichment areas (e.g., character education, youth leadership, or drug and violence prevention), which complement academic program services.[10]

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

In their reporting to NCDPI, subgrantees indicated how often they emphasized specific academic areas in terms of "high" to "low" frequency. In previous years, subgrantees estimated the frequency of activity offerings with a single report for each activity (e.g., 5 times a week to none), but starting in 2022-23, subgrantees began recording offerings by date and the duration of the offering on the date offered. To provide consistency of reporting across years, we calculated an approximate "high" frequency from the detailed data for each activity offered at each center by taking the number of days that the activity was offered for at least 30 minutes and dividing this by the total number of days that the center reported offering any activities. An activity was designated as "high" frequency if it was offered for at least 20 minutes on 20% or more of the total days that centers reported offereing any activities (i.e., at least one in five days). For example, if a center provided activities for 200 days, 40 of which academic enrichment was offered, this center would be counted as "high" frequency. (Note. In addition, Appendix C provides the total number of hours that centers offered academic activities.)

Across all centers operating in 2023-24 (130 in Cohort 15 and 58 in Cohort 16), 99% reported that they frequently provided activities in Academic Enrichment, STEM, or Literacy Education. (Note. Not shown in Table 8). More specifically, Table 8 shows that Academic Enrichment was reported as the most frequently offered academic activity by centers for both Cohort 15 (98%) and Cohort 16 (100%), followed by STEM for both Cohort 15 (51%) and Cohort 16 (50%) and Literacy for Cohort 15 (50%) and Cohort 16 (40%).

Table 8. Cohort 15 and 16 Center-Reported Frequency of Core Academic Activities in 2022-23 and 2023-24

Academic Activities	Cohort 15 (130 Centers) 2023-24		Cohort 16 (58 Centers) 2023-24		Both Cohorts 2022-23	Both Cohorts 2023-24
	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	Low Frequency (3 Times per Month–Once per Term) to None	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	Low Frequency (3 Times per Month–Once per Term) to None	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)
Academic Enrichment	98%	2%	100%	0%	99%	98%
Activities for English Learners	4%	96%	9%	91%	5%	5%

[10] The U.S. Department of Education reclassified the types of 21st CCLC activities to be tracked and reported by states and local-level centers as part of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) in 2021. Thus, 2021 was the first year of reporting the "reclassified activities" for both academic and enrichment categories.

Academic Activities	Cohort 15 (130 Centers) 2023-24		Cohort 16 (58 Centers) 2023-24		Both Cohorts 2022-23	Both Cohorts 2023-24
	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	Low Frequency (3 Times per Month–Once per Term) to None	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	Low Frequency (3 Times per Month–Once per Term) to None	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)
Expanded Library Service Hours	4%	96%	0%	100%	2%	3%
Literacy Education	50%	50%	40%	60%	43%	47%
Services for Individuals with Disabilities	0%	100%	2%	98%	1%	1%
STEM, including Computer Science	51%	49%	50%	50%	60%	51%
Telecommunications and Technology Education	7%	93%	2%	98%	5%	5%
Well-Rounded Education Activities, including Credit Recovery and Attainment	28%	72%	16%	84%	32%	24%

✓ **Objective 3.1—Met**

This objective was met in 2023-24. Ninety-nine percent (99%) of Cohort 15 and Cohort 16 centers reported that they frequently provided activities in Academic Enrichment, STEM, **or** Literacy Education.

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

Subgrantees also reported to NCDPI on the frequency with which specific enrichment areas were offered during the past year. Table 9 provides the frequency of activity availability, by cohort. Across both cohorts, approximately 90% of all centers reported emphasizing Healthy and Active Lifestyle activities at least once a week (i.e., "high" frequency). Across both cohorts, 27% of all centers reported emphasizing Cultural Program activities with "high" frequency. Less than 10% of all centers reported "high" frequency in any other enrichment activity area. (Note. In addition, Appendix C provides the total number of hours that centers offered enrichment activities.)

Table 9. Cohort 15 and 16 Center-Reported Frequency of Specific Enrichment Activities in 2022-23 and 2023-24

Type of Activity	Cohort 15 (130 Centers) 2023-24		Cohort 16 (58 Centers) 2023-24		Both Cohorts 2022-23	Both Cohort 2023-24
	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	Low Frequency (3 Times per Month–Once per Term) to None	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	Low Frequency (3 Times per Month–Once per Term) to None	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)
Character Education						
Drug Prevention	5%	95%	7%	93%	1%	6%

Type of Activity	Cohort 15 (130 Centers) 2023-24		Cohort 16 (58 Centers) 2023-24		Both Cohorts 2022-23	Both Cohort 2023-24
	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	Low Frequency (3 Times per Month–Once per Term) to None	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	Low Frequency (3 Times per Month–Once per Term) to None	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)
Truancy Prevention	3%	97%	2%	98%	3%	3%
Enrichment						
Career Competencies and Career Readiness	5%	95%	9%	91%	4%	6%
Cultural Programs	26%	74%	29%	71%	23%	27%
Healthy and Active Lifestyle	88%	12%	95%	5%	81%	90%
Parenting Skills and Family Literacy	0%	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%

In terms of the number of centers providing at least one character education or enrichment activity (Note. Not shown in Table 9), 8% of Cohort 15 centers and 9% of Cohort 16 centers reported a "high" frequency of at least one *character education* activity, while 92% of Cohort 15 and 97% Cohort 16 centers indicated a "high" frequency of at least one *enrichment* activity. In total, 94% of centers (92% of Cohort 15 and 97% of Cohort 16) reported a "high" frequency of at least one character education *or* enrichment activity.

✓ Objective 3.2—Met

This objective was met. In total, across both cohorts, this objective was met—with 94% of centers reporting a "high" frequency of at least one character education **or** enrichment activity. By cohort, both Cohort 15 (92%) and Cohort 16 (97%) met the objective.

Goal 4: Enrolled Students Attending the Program (30 Days or More) Will Demonstrate Educational and Social Benefits and Exhibit Positive Behavioral Changes

The federal guidance includes the expectation that 21st CCLC programs should demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes. That is, the expectation of the grant program is that participating students will benefit academically, and in other ways, by participating in this program. Data used to address Goal 4 included (a) state achievement assessment results in reading and math in Grades 4-8 and (b) Instructional Staff Surveys of individual participating students' engagement in learning as collected by subgrantees at the end of the year.

A. State Achievement Results

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

- Indicator 1: *Change in Attendees' Status from "Non-Proficient" to "Proficient:"* We examined the percentage of participants attending the program (30 days or more) whose achievement assessment scores improved from "below proficient" to "proficient" or above on reading or math state assessments.

- Indicator 2: *Average Year-to-Year Change in Participants' Assessment Scores:* We examined standardized year-to-year change scores for participants attending the program (30 days or more) in Grades 4-8 as compared to the state population year-to-year change.

Objective 4.1: The Statewide Percentage of Participants Attending the Program (30 Days or More), With Two Years of State Assessment Data (Grades 4-8), Who Improve from "Non-Proficient" to "Proficient" Will Be At Least 11%[11]

As defined by the North Carolina College and Career Readiness (CCR) Standards, if a reading EOG score is categorized as Level 4 proficiency or above, then the student is considered "proficient." To examine participating students' changes in proficiency status, NCDPI provided two years of state assessment results in reading and math for all students enrolled in 21st CCLC programs in 2023-24.

As shown in Tables 10 and 11, we first calculated the number of students whose scores indicated they were "non-proficient" at the end of the 2022-23 academic year ("Not Proficient or Level 3") categorized by level of attendance (< 30 days "non-regular" attendees / ≥ 30 days "regular" attendees). Next, we show the number of these "non-proficient" students in 2023 who scored "Level 4 or 5 in 2024." Then we calculated the percentage of those students who scored "non-proficient" in 2023 who subsequently scored "proficient" at the end of 2024 (one year later). (Of the 9,569 students reported as "regularly" attending, there were 3,466 in Grades 4-8 who had two years of state assessment scores in reading and 3,276 in math.)

Table 10 shows that, on the **reading EOG** assessment, for both "regular" attendees and those students who did not attend "regularly" in Cohorts 15 and 16, the percentage moving from "non-proficient" to "proficient" in reading was between 6% and 8% for both groups of students. Table 11 shows that, on the **math EOG** assessment, for both "regular" attendees and those students who did not attend "regularly" in Cohorts 15 and 16, the percentage moving from "non-proficient" to "proficient" in math was between 5% and 9% for both groups of students.

Table 10. Percentage of "Non-Proficient" Students Who Become "Proficient" in 2024—**READING EOG**

Grade in 2023	Grade in 2024	21st CCLC Participants: Attended fewer than 30 days			21st CCLC Participants: Attended ≥ 30 days		
		Not Proficient or Level 3 in 2023	Level 4 or 5 in 2024	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.	Not Proficient or Level 3 in 2023	Level 4 or 5 in 2024	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.
03	04	118	11	9%	1,230	143	12%
04	05	129	13	10%	946	62	7%
05	06	165	7	4%	527	35	7%
06	07	133	4	3%	398	25	6%
07	08	134	5	4%	365	20	5%
All Grades 4-8		679	40	**6%**	3,466	285	**8%**

Table 11. Percentage of "Non-Proficient" Students Who Become "Proficient" in 2024—**MATH EOG**

Grade in 2023	Grade in 2024	21st CCLC Participants: Attended fewer than 30 days			21st CCLC Participants: Attended ≥ 30 days		
		Not Proficent or Level 3 in 2023	Level 4 or 5 in 2024	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.	Not Proficent or Level 3 in 2023	Level 4 or 5 in 2024	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.
03	04	104	6	6%	1,067	85	8%
04	05	132	12	9%	964	101	10%

[11] The 11% threshold for Objective 4.1 was based on the 2014-15 baseline.

Grade in 2023	Grade in 2024	21st CCLC Participants: Attended fewer than 30 days			21st CCLC Participants: Attended ≥ 30 days		
		Not Proficient or Level 3 in 2023	Level 4 or 5 in 2024	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.	Not Proficient or Level 3 in 2023	Level 4 or 5 in 2024	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.
05	06	163	5	3%	522	60	11%
06	07	130	6	5%	390	22	6%
07	08	128	4	3%	333	11	3%
All Grades 4-8		657	33	**5%**	3,276	279	**9%**

✓ Objective 4.1—Not Met

The objective of having at least 11% of attendees (attending program 30 days or more) with two years of state assessment results (in Grades 4-8) improving from "non-proficient" to "proficient" was not met in 2023-24 for reading or math. For attendees (attending program 30 days or more) in Cohorts 15 and 16, the percentage moving from "non-proficient" to "proficient" was 8% for reading and 9% for math.

Objective 4.2: Participants Attending the Program (30 Days or More), With Two Years of Assessment Data (Grades 4-8), Will Demonstrate Year-to-Year Change on State Assessments in Reading and Math at Least as Great or Greater Than the State Population Year-to-Year Change

The following table shows the results of a second method of describing the state assessment score changes experienced by Grade 4-8 participants from 2023 to 2024. These analyses describe the year-to-year change in assessment scores for the students served in the 21st CCLC program relative to the year-to-year change in the overall state population. That is, the average change in standardized scores[12] was calculated for participants who "regluarly" attended the program (30 days or more), and that average change was compared to the average change in scores from 2023 to 2024 for all students in the state at the respective grade levels. To meet this objective, "regular" attendees would show average improvement in state assessment scores at the same rate or greater than the state average year-to-year change. The results of the change score analyses, the difference in students' standardized scores across two years (2023 to 2024), are presented below. Table 12 describes the year-to-year change on state EOG reading and math assessments for Cohorts 15 and 16 students in Grades 4-8.

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

For Objective 4.2, each Cohort 15 and Cohort 16 "regular" attendee's scale score was converted to a standardized score within each year to indicate how each student's score compares to the state average in

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

a given year. For example, if a 21st CCLC "regular" attendee had a standardized score of 0 in 2022-23 and a +0.5 in 2023-24, this increase would indicate that in 2022-23 this student's score was the same as the state average, but in 2023-24, this student's score was above average compared to all other students in the state (0.5 standard deviations above the state average).

Table 12. Year-to-Year Change in Reading and Math EOG Scores for Participants (Attending 30 Days or More) in Cohorts 15 and 16 Compared to State Average by Grade

Grade Level	Reading	Math
Grade 4	Same	Below (-0.04)
Grade 5	Same	Above (+0.05)
Grade 6	Above (+0.05)	Above (+0.08)
Grade 7	Same	Same
Grade 8	Same	Above (+0.40)[13]
TOTAL	**Same**	**Above (+0.05)**

These results indicate that, across both Cohort 15 and 16, "regular" attendees experienced slightly greater year-to-year change in overall EOG math scores compared to students across the state, but year-to-year change in overall EOG reading change was the same as the state average.

✓ **Objective 4.2—Met**
This objective was met for both reading and math as participants (who attended 30 days or more) across grade levels (Total row) improved their scores from year-to-year at a rate at least as great or slightly greater than students across the state in math and at the same rate as students across the state in reading. Disaggregated along grade levels, results indicate participants (who attended 30 days or more) generally improved their scores in reading and math at the same or slightly greater rate relative to the rate of change of students statewide.

B. Instructional Staff Survey on Learning Engagement at End of Year

In addition to state assessment results, educators were asked to complete surveys as an indicator of participation impact on students. More specifically, the 21st CCLC Instructional Staff Survey asks for instructors' ratings of improvements in attendees' engagement in learning over the course of the school year. In past years, the U.S. Department of Education required states to:

- Track and report teacher ratings regarding attendees' improvement in classroom performance and behavior; however, during the 2020-21 school year, the federal focus shifted to attendees' improved "engagement in learning."
- Collect/report student-level survey data for program participants in Grades K-12; however, in 2021, that requirement changed at the federal level (and currently states are only required to report student engagement data for Grades 1-5).[14]

[13] This finding should be interpreted with caution. Some 8th grade students take the Math I EOC assessment instead of the 8th grade math EOG assessment. This positive improvement for "regular" program students relative to the state average may be the result of differential patterns of EOG math assessment taking among "regular" program students compared to all students across the state. It should be noted that the overall "Total" finding did not hold when 8th grade students were excluded from the analysis.

[14] In past years, the U.S. Department of Education required states to report student engagement data collected via a survey administered to the "regular school day teacher" of all "regularly" attending program participants (i.e., students attending the program 30 days or more). However, in 2021, that requirement changed at the federal level, and the target of the survey shifted from the "regular school day teacher" to any "instructional staff" member that could assess changes in the identified student's level of learning engagement (e.g., social worker, psychologist, counselor, teachers aid, 21st CCLC afterschool program staff). Thus, starting at the end of the 2021-22 academic year, NCDPI guidance indicated that the intent of survey should remain the

Despite these change at the federal level, NCDPI sees collecting teacher/instructor feedback regarding student engagement as a best practice. Therefore, starting at the end of the 2021-22 academic year, administering an Instructional Staff Survey for students in K-12 was required; however, subgrantees were not required to enter the survey findings in 21DC for kindergarten, middle school, or high school students. Thus, for this report, we provide an overview of data availability of the Instructional Staff Survey ratings for Grades K-12 (see Table 13) and the results of the student engagement in learning data specifically for regular attendees in Grades 1-5 only (see Table 14).

On their subgrantee listserv NCDPI made available a sample Instructional Staff Survey for subgrantees to use. Subgrantees were instructed to distribute an Instructional Staff Survey to an instructional staff member of each participating attendee. It was the responsibility of the subgrantee to enter completed Instructional Staff Survey responses for individual students into the 21DC system. More specifically, for the 2023-24 school year, 21DC included the following two reporting prompts:

- Does participant have outcome data to report?: Subgrantees were provided guidance to report "No" if: (a) the instructor indicated the "student's level of engagement in learning did not need to improve" and/or (b) no instructor completed/returned a survey for the participant. Subgrantees report "Yes" if the participant had a completed learning engagement survey on file.
- Does participant demonstrate an improvement in instructor-/teacher-reported engagement in learning?: Of those that had a completed survey on file, subgrantees were then asked to report if the survey responses indicated that the participant demonstrated an improved engagement in learning.

Objective 4.3: The Majority (Over 50%) of Participants "In Need of Improvement" (Attending the Program 30 Days or More) Will Demonstrate Improved Engagement in Learning

In previous years, we have reported response rates based on data indicators showing whether the survey was distributed and returned. Because we do not have these indicators for the current report, we cannot report a response rate; however, we can report a data availability rate. Thus, Table 13 presents the data availability rates, by grade level, for the 21st CCLC Instructional Staff Survey as reported by subsubgrantees who distributed these surveys. These data availability rates reflect completed surveys for all students (not just "regular" attendees) who attended the 21st CCLC after-school programs in 2023-24.

According to Table 13, the overall data availability rate for all attendees was 68%. However, availability rates in Grades 1-5 were 84% or higher, which is expected given that subgrantees were only required to enter data in 21DC for these grades.

Table 13. Instructional Staff Survey Data Availability for All Participants by Grade (K-12)—Both Cohorts 2023-24

Grade Level	Total Number of Attendees	Number of Attendees with Reported Staff Survey Data	Data Availability Rate
K	749	296	40%
1*	1,202	1,019	85%
2*	1,575	1,354	86%
3*	1,695	1,418	84%
4*	1,663	1,417	85%
5*	1,467	1,239	84%
6	879	383	44%
7	694	247	36%

same; however, "if collecting response from the student's school-day, classroom teacher is not possible, it is then allowable to disseminate the survey to a student support team member that is familiar with the student's level of progress of the past year."

Grade Level	Total Number of Attendees	Number of Attendees with Reported Staff Survey Data	Data Availability Rate
8	614	252	41%
9	295	70	24%
10	258	54	21%
11	208	33	16%
12	145	26	18%
TOTAL	**11,444****	**7,808**	**68%**

*Indicates grade levels for which "engagement in learning" ratings from instructors are required to be entered into the 21DC system.
**Some students attended more than one center and could have multiple surveys, so the denominator here includes duplicated student records.

Table 14 shows the results of the Instructional Staff Surveys as entered into 21DC by subgrantees for attendees in Grades 1-5 (who attended 30 or more days). Subgrantees were asked to enter, in the 21DC database, whether the survey indicated improvement in terms of "engagement in learning." In 2023-24, subgrantees reported that 93% of "regular" attendees (with survey data) were reported to have improved.

Table 14. Instructional Staff Survey Ratings of Improvement (for Participants Attending ≥ 30 Days) by Grade (1-5)—Both Cohorts 2023-24

Grade Level	Number of Regular Attendees with Reported Staff Survey Data	Number of Regular Attendees with Survey Data Reporting: Improved in Terms of "Engagement in Learning"	Percentage Participants (Attending ≥ 30 Days) with Survey Data Reporting: Improved in Terms of "Engagement in Learning"
1	947	867	92%
2	1,262	1,183	94%
3	1,303	1,226	94%
4	1,309	1,210	92%
5	1,134	1,035	91%
TOTAL	**5,955**	**5,521**	**93%**

✓ Objective 4.3—Met

The 21DC system no longer identifies whether the there is a need for improvement. However, we can report that across Cohorts 15 and 16, 93% of all students (who attended 30 days or more) with returned Instructional Staff Surveys (in Grades 1-5) were reported by subgrantees to have demonstrated an improved engagement in learning (regardless of whether improvement was needed or not). Thus, this objective is met given that over 50% of students showed improvement.

Summary

As seen in Table 15, statewide subgrantee performance in 2023-24 "met" nine of the ten reported state objectives, as indicated by the status column. (Note. Appendix A provides subgrantee-level data on enrollment and Appendix B provides center/subgrantee-level data on attendance so that differences across subgrantees can be examined in these areas.)

Table 15. Summary of 2023-24 21st CCLC Progress Monitoring Findings

Goals/Objectives	2023-24 Status	Summary of Findings
Goal 1: Projected Numbers of Students Are Enrolled		
Objective 1.1: The **Majority (Over 50%) of Subgrantees** Enroll At Least 75% of their Projected Number of Students	**Met**	Approximately **86%** of Cohort 15 subgrantees and **96%** of Cohort 16 subgrantees served at least 75% of their proposed number of students, in 2023-24, with a total across both cohorts of **89%**.

Goals/Objectives	2023-24 Status	Summary of Findings
Objective 1.2: The **Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served** Statewide are from Low-Income Schools	**Met**	An average of **90%** of students per center came from schools that qualified for Title I funding (56 students on average, per center, coming from Title I schools).
Objective 1.3: The **Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served** Statewide are in Need of Academic Support	**Met**	For participating Cohort 15 and Cohort 16 students in Grades 4-8 with 2022-23 (one year prior) assessment scores, **77% to 84%** were in need of academic support, as judged by their lack of proficiency on state assessments in reading or math at program entry.
Goal 2: Enrolled Students Attend Program for 30 days or More		
Objective 2.1: Statewide Percentage of Students Attending 30 Days or More **is At Least 70%** (80% in Elementary, 60% in Middle School, and 40% in High School)	**Met**	Overall, **84%** of participants attended 30 days or more (i.e., were "regular" attendees). The percentage of students attending 30 days or more was **91%** among elementary students, **75%** among middle school students, and **45%** among high school students.
Objective 2.2: Statewide Percentage of Centers with an Average Attendance of 30 Days or More **Will Not Fall Below 87%**	**Met**	A total of **96%** of centers within each cohort reported average attendance rates of 30 days or more, while 4% of centers within each cohort reported fewer than 30 days attendance, on average.
Goal 3: Programs Will Offer Services in Core Academic Areas and in Enrichment		
Objective 3.1: **More than 85%** of Centers Offer Services in At Least One Core Academic Area	**Met**	Across Cohort 15 and Cohort 16 centers, **99%** reported that they frequently provided activities in Academic Enrichment, STEM, or Literacy Education.
Objective 3.2: **More than 85%** of Centers Offer Enrichment Support Activities	**Met**	Across Cohort 15 and 16 centers, **94%** reported a "high" frequency of at least one character education **or** enrichment activity. By cohort, both Cohort 15 (92%) and Cohort 16 (97%) met the target.
Goal 4: Enrolled Students Attending the Program (30 Days or More) Will Demonstrate Educational and Social Benefits and Exhibit Positive Behavioral Changes		
Objective 4.1: The Statewide Percentage of Participants Attending the Program (30 days or more), With Two Years of State Assessment Data (Grades 4-8), who Improve from "Non-proficient" (Not Proficient or Level 3) to "Proficient" (Levels 4 or 5) **Will be at Least 11%.**	**Not Met**	**Reading EOG:** For participants attending 30 days or more, **8%** moved from "non-proficient" in 2023 to "proficient" in 2024. **Math EOG:** For participants attending 30 days or more, **9%** moved from "non-proficient" in 2023 to "proficient" in 2024.

Goals/Objectives	2023-24 Status	Summary of Findings
Objective 4.2: Participants Attending the Program 30 Days or More With Two Years of State Assessment Data (Grades 4-8) Will Demonstrate Year-to-Year Change On State Assessments in Reading and Math at Least **As Great Or Greater Than The State Population** Year-to-Year Change	**Met**	On the **Reading EOG**, participants attending the program 30 days or more across Grades 4-8 improved their scores from year-to-year at a rate **as great as** students across the state. On the **Math EOG**, participants attending the program 30 days or more across Grades 4-8 improved their scores from year-to-year at a rate **slightly greater** than (+0.05) students across the state.
Objective 4.3: The Majority (**Over 50%)** of Participants "In Need of Imporvement" (Attending the Program 30 Days or More) Will Demonstrate Improved Engagement in Learning.	**Met**	**Overall, 93%** of participants (who attended 30 days or more) across Cohorts 15 and 16 with returned Instructional Staff Surveys (in Grades 1-5) were reported by subgrantees to have demonstrated an improved engagement in learning.

Appendix A: Total Reported Hours of Services in Core Academic Areas and Enrichment Areas

In order to meet the federal requirements for this program, subgrantees are expected to offer services that emphasize core **academic areas**. In addition, subgrantees are expected to offer services that emphasize **enrichment areas** which complement academic program services.[15] While the statewide Goal 3 Objectives are designed to measure the percentage of centers that offer services in core academic areas (Objective 3.1) and in enrichment areas (Objective 3.2), the tables below provide an overview of the total number of hours subgrantees provided academic and enrichment services.

Total Number of Hours of Services in Core Academic Areas

Academic Activities	Cohort 15 (128 Centers) 2022-23 Total Hours	Cohort 16 (62 Centers) 2022-23 Total Hours	Cohort 15 (130 Centers) 2023-24 Total Hours	Cohort 16 (58 Centers) 2023-24 Total Hours	Both Cohorts (190 Centers) 2022-23 Total Hours	Both Cohorts (188 Centers) 2023-24 Total Hours
Academic Enrichment	19,411	7,832	18,186	9,416	27,242	27,601
Activities for English Learners	506	250	402	415	756	816
Expanded Library Service Hours	134	83	323	46	217	368
Literacy Education	6,078	1,731	6,140	2,329	7,809	8,469
Services for Individuals with Disabilities	82	0	0	55	82	55
STEM, including Computer Science	8,513	3,414	7,483	3,351	11,926	10,833
Telecommunications and Technology Education	573	75	604	48	647	651
Well-Rounded Education Activities, including Credit Recovery and Attainment	5,526	1,975	3,647	700	7,501	4,347

Total Number of Hours of Services in Character Education and Enrichment Activities

Character Education and Enrichment Activities	Cohort 15 (128 Centers) 2022-23 Total Hours	Cohort 16 (62 Centers) 2022-23 Total Hours	Cohort 15 (130 Centers) 2023-24 Total Hours	Cohort 16 (58 Centers) 2023-24 Total Hours	Both Cohorts (190 Centers) 2022-23 Total Hours	Both Cohorts (188 Centers) 2023-24 Total Hours
Character Education						
Drug Prevention	450	257	765	443	707	1,208
Truancy Prevention	89	152	96	111	241	207
Enrichment						
Career Competencies and Career Readiness	487	462	531	454	949	985
Cultural Programs	2,653	1,477	3,312	1,576	4,130	4,887
Healthy and Active Lifestyle	10,225	5,059	12,474	5,404	15,284	17,877
Parenting Skills and Family Literacy	87	26	60	67	113	127

[15] The U.S. Department of Education reclassified the types of 21st CCLC activities to be tracked and reported by states and local-level centers as part of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) in 2021. Thus, 2021 was the first year of reporting the "reclassified activities" for both academic and enrichment categories.

Appendix B: Historical Summary of Indicator Results

Goals/Objectives	SY 2015-2016 Status	SY 2016-2017 Status	SY 2017-2018 Status	SY 2018-2019 Status	SY 2019-2020 Status	SY 2020-2021 Status	SY 2021-2022 Status	SY 2022-2023 Status	SY 2023-2024 Status
Goal 1: Projected Numbers of Students Are Enrolled									
Objective 1.1: The **Majority (Over 50%) of Subgrantees** Enroll At Least 75% of their Projected Number of Students	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
Objective 1.2: The **Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served** Statewide are from Low-Income Schools	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
Objective 1.3: The **Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served** Statewide are in Need of Academic Support	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Not Reported	Met	Met	Met
Goal 2: Enrolled Students Attend Program for 30 Days or More									
Objective 2.1: Statewide Percentage of Students Attending 30 Days or More **is At Least 70%** (80% in Elementary, 60% in Middle School, and 40% in High School)	Met	Met	Partially Met (Met for elementary but not middle or high school students)	Partially Met (Met overall and for middle but not elementary and high school students)	Partially Met (Met overall and for elementary and middle but not high school students)	Not Met (Not met overall and by grade level)	Not Met (Not met overall and by grade level)	Partially Met (Met overall and for elementary and middle but not high school students)	Met
Objective 2.2: Statewide Percentage of Centers with an Average Attendance of 30 Days or More **Will Not Fall Below 87%**	Met	Partially Met (Met in Cohort 11 but not Cohort 10)	Partially Met (Met in Cohort 11 but not Cohort 12)	Met	Met	Not Met	Not Met	Met	Met
Goal 3: Programs Will Offer Services in Core Academic Areas and in Enrichment									
Objective 3.1: **More than 85%** of Centers Offer Services in At Least One Core Academic Area	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
Objective 3.2: **More than 85%** of Centers Offer Enrichment Support Activities	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Partially Met (Met in Cohort 14, but not Cohort 15)	Partially Met (Met in Cohort 16, but not Cohort 15)	Met

Goals/Objectives	SY 2015-2016 Status	SY 2016-2017 Status	SY 2017-2018 Status	SY 2018-2019 Status	SY 2019-2020 Status	SY 2020-2021 Status	SY 2021-2022 Status	SY 2022-2023 Status	SY 2023-2024 Status
Goal 4: Attendees Will Demonstrate Educational and Social Benefits and Exhibit Positive Behavioral Changes									
Objective 4.1: The Statewide Percentage of Participants Attending the Program (30 days or more), With Two Years of State Assessment Data (Grades 4-8), Who Improve from "Non-Proficient or level 3" to "Proficient" (levels 4 or 5) **Will Be At Least 11%**	Met	Partially Met (Met in Math but not Reading)	Partially Met (Met in Math but not Reading)	Not Reported	Not Reported	Not Reported	Met	Not Met	Not Met
Objective 4.2: Participants Attending the Program (30 days or more), With Two Years of State Assessment Data (Grades 4-8) Will Demonstrate Year-to-Year Change On State Assessments in Reading and Math at Least **As Great Or Greater Than The State Population** Year-to-Year Change	Met	Met	Met	Met	Not Reported	Not Reported	Met	Met	Met
Objective 4.3: Participants "In Need of Improvement" (Attending the Program 30 Days or More) Will Demonstrate Improved Engagement in Learning.[16]	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met

Note: When comparing across school years, it is important to remember that SY 2019-2020 was the initial start of the COVID-19 pandemic which had an impact on that year and beyond.

[16] 2021 was the first year of reporting that focuses on "engagement in learning" vs. "classroom performance and behavior." Thus, in previous years, Objective 4.3 was worded as follows: *The Majority (Over 50%) of Classroom Teachers Responding to a Teacher Survey Will Rate 21st CCLC "Regular" Attendees' Classroom Performance and Behavior as Improved.* In addition, in 2022, the 21DC system did not collect information regarding participants "in need of improvement;" thus, this is the first reporting year that included all students that attended the program 30 days or more (whether they were in need of improvement or not).