



# 2019-20 North Carolina 21st CCLC Program State-Level Progress Monitoring Report

---

## Cohort 12 and 13 Grantees

### **Submitted by:**

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

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

### **Submitted to:**

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

**April 2021**

# Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Goal 1: Projected Numbers of Students Are Enrolled .....	3
Objective 1.1: The Majority (Over 50%) of Grantees Enroll At Least 75% of their Projected Number of Students.....	4
Objective 1.2: The Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served Statewide are from Low-Income Schools .....	5
Objective 1.3: The Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served Statewide are in Need of Academic Support .....	6
Goal 2: Enrolled Students Meet Definition of “Regular” Attendance .....	7
Objective 2.1: Statewide Percentage of Students Attending 30 Days or More is At Least 70% (80% in Elementary, 60% in Middle School, and 40% in High School).....	7
Objective 2.2: Statewide Percentage of Centers with an Average Attendance of 30 Days or More Will Not Fall Below 87% .....	8
Goal 3: Programs Will Offer Services in Core Academic Areas and in Enrichment .....	8
Objective 3.1: More than 85% of Centers Offer Services in At Least One Core Academic Area....	8
Objective 3.2: More than 85% of Centers Offer Enrichment Support Activities.....	9
Goal 4: “Regular” Attendees Will Demonstrate Educational and Social Benefits and Exhibit Positive Behavioral Changes .....	10
Objective 4.3: The Majority (Over 50%) of Classroom Teachers Responding to a Teacher Survey Will Rate 21st CCLC “Regular” Attendees’ Classroom Performance and Behavior as Improved.	11
Summary .....	12

# 2019-20 North Carolina 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Program State-Level Progress Monitoring Report: Cohort 12 And 13 Grantees

## Introduction

---

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

Each group of awarded grants (grantees) is called a cohort. NCDPI funded the first cohort of 16 grantees in 2002. Cohorts 2-8 (2003-2009) averaged 20 grantees per cohort. From 2010 to 2016, there were three Cohorts funded, Cohorts 9, 10, and 11. In July 2010, the State Board approved funds for Cohort 9, the largest cohort to date, with 89 grantees, for a total award of \$24,982,787. In July 2013, the State Board approved funds for Cohort 10, with 52 grantees, totaling \$17,925,136. In 2014, funds were approved for Cohort 11, with 68 grantees, totaling \$22,323,666.

No new Cohorts were funded in 2015 or 2016. In 2017, Cohort 12, with 45 grantees, received funding totaling \$14,917,238.<sup>1</sup> Then in 2018, Cohort 13, with 49 grantees, received funding totaling \$15,771,977. This report summarizes data from these two cohorts of grantees who operated programs in 2019-20 (i.e., Cohort 12, with 45 grantees, was in their third year of funding, and Cohort 13, with 49 grantees, 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 grantees and participating students. The report is organized by NCDPI's goals and objectives for the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program, which incorporate required federal 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC objectives and performance measures.<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that data for this report were collected during the 2019-20 school year, during the COVID-19 pandemic. It is unclear how COVID-19 may have impacted grantees, centers, and the attendance and numbers of participating students statewide. However, as in previous years' reports, wherever relevant, we present findings from the current reporting year (2019-20) in tables along with comparison data from the previous year's report (in this case, 2018-19).

Due to COVID-19 and the suspension of state End-of-Grade (EOG) assessments in 2019-20, some goals and objectives that focus on state testing data could not be reported on this year. Consistent with past annual reporting, we will describe the program goals and objectives that

---

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

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



provide the framework for the reporting in the next section, but we will note where reporting on specific goals and objectives was impacted by COVID-19.

The NCDPI goals and objectives for the program are:

- **Goal 1:** Projected numbers of students are enrolled.
  - **Objective 1.1:** The majority (over 50%) of grantees enroll at least 75% of their projected number of students.
  - **Objective 1.2:** The majority (over 50%) of students served statewide are from low-income schools.
  - **Objective 1.3:** The majority (over 50%) of students served statewide are in need of academic support.
- **Goal 2:** Enrolled students meet the definition of “regular” attendance.
  - **Objective 2.1:** Statewide percentage of students attending 30 days or more is at least 70% (80% in elementary, 60% in middle school, and 40% in high school).
  - **Objective 2.2:** Statewide percentage of centers with an average attendance of 30 days or more will not fall below 87%.
- **Goal 3:** Programs will offer services in core academic areas and in enrichment.
  - **Objective 3.1:** More than 85% of centers offer services in at least one core academic area.
  - **Objective 3.2:** More than 85% of centers offer enrichment support activities.
- **Goal 4:** “Regular” attendees will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.
  - **Objective 4.1 (NOT ASSESSED IN 2019-20):** The statewide percentage of “regular” attendees (Grades 4-8), with two years of state test data, who improve from “non-proficient” (levels I, II or III) to “proficient” (levels IV or V) will be at least 11%.
  - **Objective 4.2 (NOT ASSESSED IN 2019-20):** “Regular” attendees (Grades 4-8) with two years of state test data will demonstrate year-to-year change on state tests in reading and math at least as great or greater than the state population year-to-year change.
  - **Objective 4.3:** The majority (over 50%) of classroom teachers responding to a Teacher Survey will rate 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC “regular” attendees’ classroom performance and behavior as improved.

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



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

Goal 4 focuses on the outcomes desired for those students who participate on a “regular” basis (at least 30 days for the school year). Under Goal 4, typically, two types of data on the progress of participating students are obtained and analyzed. The first type is state EOG test scores in reading and math for participating Grades 4-8 students who attended at least 30 days for the 2019-20 school year. Because student-level assessment data are not available for the 2019-20 school year due to the impact of COVID-19, this portion of Goal 4 was not evaluated.

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

Below, we provide data on the extent to which the state objectives for the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program were met for 2019-20 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 grantees and centers, statewide, for 2018-19 and 2019-20 and the average number of students served per grantee. During the 2019-20 school year, there were a total of 94<sup>3</sup> grantees operating 211 centers (average of 2 centers per grantee). Statewide, the 94 grantees reported 15,329 participating students, with an average of 164 students served per grantee.

**Table 1.** 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC 2018-19 and 2019-20 Grantees, Centers, and Participating Students

	Cohort 12 2018-19	Cohort 12 2019-20	Cohort 13 2018-19	Cohort 13 2019-20	Both Cohorts 2018-19	Both Cohorts 2019-20
<b>Grantees</b>						
Number of grantees	45	45	49	49	94	<b>94</b>
Number of participating students	8,578	8,452	6,355	6,899	14,912	<b>15,329*</b>
Average number of students served by grantees	191	188	130	141	159	<b>164</b>

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



	Cohort 12 2018-19	Cohort 12 2019-20	Cohort 13 2018-19	Cohort 13 2019-20	Both Cohorts 2018-19	Both Cohorts 2019-20
<b>Centers</b>						
Number of centers	119	118	87	93	206	<b>211</b>
Number of centers per grantee (range)	1-8	1-8	1-6	1-7	1-8	1-8
Average number of centers per grantee	3	3	2	2	2	<b>2</b>

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

\*22 students were reported as participating in *both* Cohort 12 and Cohort 13 centers.

As can be seen in the far righthand column of Table 2, for 2019-20, of the 15,329 enrolled, 69% were elementary-level students (with 24% from middle schools and 8% from high schools). Approximately half of the students enrolled in 2019-20 were African American (53%), 21% were White, and 17% were Hispanic.

**Table 2.** 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Participating Students in 2018-19 and 2019-20

	Cohort 12 2018-19	Cohort 12 2019-20	Cohort 13 2018-19	Cohort 13 2019-20	Both Cohorts 2018-19	Both Cohorts 2019-20
Number of centers	119	118	87	93	206	<b>211</b>
Average # of students served per center	72	72	73	76	73	74
Number of participating students	8,578	8,452	6,355	6,899	14,912	<b>15,329*</b>
<b>By School Level</b>						
% Elementary School	66%	65%	74%	74%	69%	<b>69%</b>
% Middle School	26%	26%	21%	21%	24%	<b>24%</b>
% High School	9%	9%	5%	6%	7%	<b>8%</b>
<b>By Ethnicity</b>						
% African American	46%	46%	58%	61%	51%	<b>53%</b>
% White	27%	27%	16%	14%	23%	<b>21%</b>
% Hispanic	16%	16%	18%	18%	17%	<b>17%</b>
% Other	10%	10%	7%	8%	9%	9%

\*22 students were reported as participating in *both* Cohort 12 and Cohort 13 centers.

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

Applicants seeking a 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grant were required to estimate the number of students their program would enroll. Thus, grantee performance can be reviewed by examining the percentage of grantees who reported enrolling their projected number of participants. The number of students enrolled per grantee was calculated using student-level 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grantee-reported data provided by NCDPI. The reported number of students proposed to be served by Cohort 12 and 13 grantees ranged from 50 to 370, while the number of students who were reported as enrolled in 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs in 2019-20 ranged from 38 to 540.

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



<b>✓ Objective 1.1—Met</b>
For 2019-20, this objective was met. Approximately 98% of Cohort 12 grantees and 94% of Cohort 13 grantees reported serving at least 75% of their proposed number of students in 2019-20, with a total across both cohorts of 96%. The objective was exceeded in that almost all (96%) grantees enrolled at least 75% of their projected number of students.

In exploring variations across types of organizations, Table 3 shows that the percentage of grantees with at least 75% of projected enrollment was similarly high, 88% or above.

**Table 3.** Grantees in 2018-19 and 2019-20 that Enrolled At Least 75% of Projected Students by Organization Type

Organization Type	Both Cohorts 2018-19		Both Cohorts 2019-20	
	# of Grantees	# (%) of grantees that enrolled ≥75% of projected students	# of Grantees	# (%) of grantees that enrolled ≥75% of projected students
Charter School (CS)	8	8 (100%)	4	4 ( <b>100%</b> )
Community-Based Organization (CBO)	42	38 (90%)	43	40 ( <b>93%</b> )
Faith-Based Organization (FBO)	7	7 (100%)	11	11 ( <b>100%</b> )
School District (SD)	27	27 (100%)	28	28 ( <b>100%</b> )
Other	10	9 (90%)	8	7 ( <b>88%</b> )
<b>TOTAL</b>	94	89 (95%)	94	90 ( <b>96%</b> )

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

One focus of the federal 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC funding is on supporting students from high-poverty schools. Table 4 indicates that 86% of students who attended Cohort 12 and Cohort 13 centers in 2019-20 attended schools that qualified for Title I funding.<sup>4</sup> Elementary school participants in 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs were overwhelmingly from Title I schools (98%), while 77% of middle school participants and 48% of high school participants were from Title I schools.

**Table 4.** 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Participating Students from Title I Schools in 2018-19 and 2019-20

	Cohort 12 2018-19	Cohort 12 2019-20	Cohort 13 2018-19	Cohort 13 2019-20	Both Cohorts 2018-19	Both Cohorts 2019-20
Average # of students from Title I schools served per center	62	62	68	71	65	66
Average % of students from Title I schools served per center	82%	81%	93%	92%	86%	<b>86%</b>
Number of participating Title I students	7,415	7,372	5,949	6,600	13,364	13,972
<b>Percent in Schools with Title I Funding by School Level</b>						
Elem School	98%	97%	100%	99%	99%	<b>98%</b>
Middle School	65%	71%	83%	85%	72%	<b>77%</b>
High School	54%	55%	44%	33%	51%	<b>48%</b>
<b>Percent in Schools with Title I funding by Ethnicity</b>						
African American	88%	89%	93%	93%	91%	91%
White	81%	80%	88%	85%	83%	82%
Hispanic	85%	87%	97%	95%	91%	91%
Other	90%	90%	94%	95%	92%	92%

<sup>4</sup> Title I schools were identified using 2019-20 eligibility data from NCDPI (see <https://files.nc.gov/dpi/documents/program-monitoring/data/2019-20-title-i-essr-data.xlsx>). School was identified as Title I if “School Served” variable = “Y.”



✓ **Objective 1.2—Met**

This objective was met for 2019-20. Overall, an average of 86% of students per center came from schools that qualified for Title I funding (66 students on average per center coming from Title I schools).

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

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

State EOG test results for 2018-19 (prior year for this report) are reported using the following five proficiency levels:<sup>5</sup>

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

This scale, adopted by the North Carolina State Board of Education in 2013, is meant to convey the degree to which a student is prepared to proceed to the next grade level. Table 5 shows that for students served in 2019-20, 73% of Cohort 12 and 77% of Cohort 13 students in Grades 4 to 8 were “non-proficient” in reading at the beginning of the school year, while 74% of Cohort 12 and 77% of Cohort 13 students were “non-proficient” in math. These percentages are similar to the previous year’s percentages.

**Table 5.** Percent of 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Students (Grades 4-8) “Non-Proficient” in Reading or Math EOG Tests in 2018 for 2018-19 School Year and in 2019 for 2019-20 School Year

	Reading		Math	
	Cohort 12	Cohort 13	Cohort 12	Cohort 13
% “non-proficient” at end of 2019 (prior to being served in 2019-20 school year)	73%	77%	74%	77%
% “non-proficient” at end of 2018 (prior to being served in 2018-19 school year)	74%	78%	68%	73%

Note. N sizes varied by cohort and subject.

✓ **Objective 1.3—Met**

This objective was met in 2019-20. For participating Cohort 12 and 13 students in Grades 4 to 8 with prior year test scores, the majority (over 50%), in this case 73% to 77%, were in need of academic support, as judged by their lack of proficiency on state tests in reading or math at program entry.

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





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

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

*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, 74% (for Cohort 12 and Cohort 13 combined) of enrolled students were reported by grantees as attending for 30 days or more in 2019-20, while 26% of students were reported as attending fewer than 30 days. The percentage of students who were “regular” attendees was highest at the elementary level (80%) followed by middle school (68%) and high school (34%), when other after-school activities may be more likely to interfere with program attendance. These percentages are very similar to those reported in 2018-19.

**Table 6.** Cohort 12 and 13 Center Attendance in 2018-19 and 2019-20

	Cohort 12 2018-19	Cohort 12 2019-20	Cohort 13 2018-19	Cohort 13 2019-20	Both Cohorts 2018-19	Both Cohorts 2019-20
<b>Students</b>						
% of “regular” attendees (30 days or more)	72%	73%	69%	75%	71%	<b>74%</b>
% 30-89 days	37%	48%	48%	53%	42%	50%
% 90 days or more	35%	25%	21%	22%	29%	24%
% of “non-regular” attendees	28%	27%	31%	25%	29%	<b>26%</b>
<b>School-Level</b>						
% of ES “regular” attendees	83%	83%	71%	77%	77%	<b>80%</b>
% of MS “regular” attendees	59%	65%	69%	74%	63%	<b>68%</b>
% of HS “regular” attendees	36%	29%	43%	45%	38%	<b>34%</b>

Note. “Regular” attendees =  $\geq 30$  days; “Non-regular” attendees < 30 days

<b>✓ Objective 2.1—Partially Met</b>
Overall, this objective was partially met in 2019-20. Seventy-four percent (74%) of participants attended 30 days or more (were “regular” attendees). The objective was also met for elementary and middle school students, as the percentage of elementary school students attending 30 days or more was 80% and 68% for middle school students. However, the objective was not met for high school students, as the percentage of students attending 30 days or more was 34% (not at least 40%).



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

Another way of examining attendance data is based on the percentage of centers, statewide, with average attendance that is high versus low (according to the federal standard, low attendance is defined as fewer than 30 days). In 2019-20, 90% of 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC centers, statewide, had average attendance at or above the federally-defined 30-day minimum for a “regular” attendee, and 10% had average attendance below the 30-day minimum. Results for this objective are described below, by cohort.

**Table 7.** Cohort 12 and 13 Percentage of Centers with Average Attendance Meeting and Not Meeting “Regular” Attendee Definition in 2018-19 and 2019-20

	Cohort 12 2018-19	Cohort 12 2019-20	Cohort 13 2018-19	Cohort 13 2019-20	Both Cohorts 2018-19	Both Cohorts 2019-20
% of centers statewide with average attendance of 30 days or more	87%	90%	87%	89%	87%	<b>90%</b>
% of centers statewide with average attendance fewer than 30 days	13%	10%	13%	11%	13%	<b>10%</b>

<b>✓ Objective 2.2—Met</b>
Cohort 12 and 13 met this objective in 2019-20. Ninety percent (90%) of centers within each cohort reported average attendance rates of 30 days or more, while 10% of centers within each cohort reported fewer than 30 days attendance, on average.

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

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

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

In their reporting to NCDPI, grantees indicated how often they emphasized specific academic areas in terms of “high” to “low” frequency. Across all centers operating in 2019-20 (118 in Cohort 12 and 93 in Cohort 13), 93% reported a “high frequency” of activity in Literacy, Homework Help, or Tutoring (Note: data analyzed are not shown in Table 8).

Table 8 shows that Homework Help was reported as the most frequently offered academic activity by centers for both Cohort 12 (98%) and Cohort 13 (82%), followed by Literacy (72%) and STEM (72%) for Cohort 12 and STEM (73%) and Literacy (63%) for Cohort 13.



**Table 8.** Cohort 12 and 13 Center-Reported Frequency of Core Academic Activities in 2018-19 and 2019-20

Academic Activities	Cohort 12 (118 Centers) 2019-20		Cohort 13 (93 Centers) 2019-20		Both Cohorts 2018-19	Both Cohorts 2019-20
	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)
English Language Learners Support	12%	78%	11%	79%	14%	11%
Homework Help	<b>98%</b>	3%	<b>82%</b>	18%	90%	91%
Literacy	<b>72%</b>	28%	<b>63%</b>	37%	68%	68%
STEM	<b>72%</b>	28%	<b>73%</b>	27%	77%	73%
Tutoring	61%	39%	61%	39%	66%	61%

<b>✓ Objective 3.1—Met</b>
This objective was met in 2019-20. Ninety-three percent (93%) of Cohort 12 and Cohort 13 centers reported that they frequently provided activities in Literacy, Homework Help, <b>or</b> Tutoring.

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

Grantees also reported to NCDPI on the frequency that specific enrichment areas were offered during the past year. Table 9 provides the frequency of activity availability by cohort. Across both cohorts (Note: not shown in Table 9) approximately 80% of all centers reported emphasizing physical activity at least once a week (i.e., high frequency). Across both cohorts, 63% of all centers reported emphasizing Arts and Music activities with high frequency. In addition, 32% of all centers reported emphasizing Youth Leadership activities with high frequency.

**Table 9.** Cohort 12 and 13 Center-Reported Frequency of Specific Enrichment Activities in 2018-19 and 2019-20

Type of Activity	Cohort 12 (118 Centers) 2019-20		Cohort 13 (93 Centers) 2019-20		Both Cohorts 2018-19	Both Cohort 2019-20
	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)
<b>Character Education</b>						
Counseling Programs	13%	87%	16%	84%	11%	14%
Drug Prevention	2%	98%	8%	92%	2%	4%
Truancy Prevention	1%	99%	1%	99%	1%	1%
Violence Prevention	12%	88%	17%	83%	9%	14%
Youth Leadership	26%	74%	39%	61%	32%	<b>32%</b>
<b>Enrichment</b>						
Arts & Music	73%	27%	50%	50%	53%	<b>63%</b>
Community / Service Learning	6%	94%	13%	87%	4%	9%
Entrepreneurship	3%	97%	5%	95%	4%	4%
Mentoring	25%	75%	22%	78%	17%	23%
Physical Activity	85%	15%	73%	27%	83%	<b>80%</b>



In terms of the number of centers providing at least one character education or enrichment activity (Note: not shown in Table 9), 38% of Cohort 12 centers and 56% of Cohort 13 centers reported a high frequency of at least one *character education* activity, while 86% of Cohort 12 centers and 88% of Cohort 13 centers indicated a high frequency of at least one *enrichment* activity. In total, 88% of centers (89% of Cohort 12 and 87% of Cohort 13) reported a high frequency of at least one character education *or* enrichment activity.

✓ **Objective 3.2—Met**

This objective was met by both cohorts. Eighty-eight percent (88%) of Cohort 12 and 13 centers reported a high frequency of at least one character education **or** enrichment activity.

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

---

The federal guidance includes the expectation that “regular” attendees in 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs should demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes. That is, the expectation of the grant program is that participating students will benefit academically, and in other ways, by participating in this program. Data used to address Goal 4 included classroom Teacher Surveys of individual participating students’ improvement in classroom performance and behavior, as collected by grantees at the end of the year. Due to COVID-19, EOG assessments in reading and math were not available for 2019-20. For this reason, we are unable to report on state achievement test results for Objectives 4.1 and 4.2.

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

Although state EOG assessment results are unavailable for 2019-20 and thus, there is no reporting on Objectives 4.1 and 4.2, grantees did ask classroom teachers to complete Teacher Surveys to provide the data for Objective 4.3. The Teacher Survey asks for the classroom teacher’s ratings of improvements in “regular” attendees’ classroom performance and behavior over the course of the school year. On their website, NCDPI makes available a Teacher Survey for grantees to use.<sup>6</sup> Grantees are instructed to distribute the Teacher Survey to a classroom teacher of each participating “regular” attendee.<sup>7</sup> It is the responsibility of the grantee to enter completed Teacher Survey responses for individual students into the 21DC system<sup>8</sup> as well as indicate whether or not the Teacher Survey is returned.<sup>9</sup> For each Teacher Survey that is completed and returned on a “regular” attendee, grantees must indicate, in 21DC, whether the student had a “reported improvement in homework completion and classroom participation”

---

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.dpi.nc.gov/districts-schools/federal-program-monitoring/21st-century-community-learning-centers#data-collection-&-reporting>

<sup>7</sup> If elementary students, the survey goes to their regular teacher. If middle or high school, the survey goes to only one teacher in the areas in which the student is receiving academic assistance. The choice of teacher is determined by the grantee request to the school and school compliance with the request. Thus, no student will have more than one survey reported.

<sup>8</sup> Grantees enter Teacher Survey distribution data at the individual student level in 21DC (Prompt: Teacher Survey distributed; Response options: Yes or No).

<sup>9</sup> Grantees enter returned Teacher Survey status in 21DC at the individual student level (Prompt: Teacher Survey returned; Response options: Yes or No).



(response options being Yes or No) and/or a “reported improvement in student behavior” (response options being Yes or No).

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

Table 10 presents the response rates, by grade level, for the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Teacher Survey as reported by grantees who distributed these surveys. These response rates reflect completed surveys for students who were “regular” attendees in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC after-school programs in 2019-20. Grantees reported, via their data entry into 21DC, that 11,517 Teacher Surveys were distributed and that 8,409 were returned for a response rate of 73%.

**Table 10.** Teacher Survey Response Rates in 2019-20 by Grade (for “Regular” Attendees)

Grade Level	Both Cohorts 2019-20		
	Teacher Surveys Distributed	Teacher Surveys Returned	Response Rate
Elem	8,615	6,276	73%
Middle	2,494	1,820	73%
High	408	313	77%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>11,517</b>	<b>8,409</b>	<b>73%</b>

At the grantee level (Note: not shown in Table 10), 59% of the Cohort 12 and 13 grantees reported a response rate from teachers in 2019-20 of 70% to 100%. Similarly, in 2018-19, 57% of the Cohort 12 and 13 grantees reported response rates in this range.

Table 11 shows the results of the Teacher Surveys as entered into 21DC by grantees. Grantees were only asked to indicate in the 21DC database whether the Teacher Survey for the “regular” attendee indicated “improvement” or not.<sup>10</sup> In 2019-20, grantees reported, 88% of “regular” attendees (with completed surveys) reported to have improved homework completion and class participation. In addition, 79% of “regular” attendees (with completed surveys) were reported to have improved student behavior. These percentages are similar to the previous year’s percentages.

**Table 11.** Teacher Survey Ratings of Student Improvement (“Regular” Attendees) in 2018-19 and 2019-20

Grade Level	Both Cohorts 2018-19			Both Cohorts 2019-20		
	Responses	Percentage of “Regular” Attendees with Completed Surveys Reported to Have Improved Homework Completion and Class Participation	Percentage of “Regular” Attendees with Completed Surveys Reported to Have Improved Student Behavior	Responses	Percentage of “Regular” Attendees with Completed Surveys Reported to Have Improved Homework Completion and Class Participation	Percentage of “Regular” Attendees with Completed Surveys Reported to Have Improved Student Behavior
Elem	5,776	86%	74%	6,276	88%	77%

<sup>10</sup> In order to align Teacher Survey data with the 21DC response options, it is understood that grantees had to interpret and categorize teacher responses. For example, if a student was reported to have “moderate improvement” in completing homework and a “slight decline” in class participation, it would be at the discretion of the grantee to determine if the student would receive a “Yes” indicating improvement or not.



Grade Level	Both Cohorts 2018-19			Both Cohorts 2019-20		
	Responses	Percentage of “Regular” Attendees with Completed Surveys Reported to Have Improved Homework Completion and Class Participation	Percentage of “Regular” Attendees with Completed Surveys Reported to Have Improved Student Behavior	Responses	Percentage of “Regular” Attendees with Completed Surveys Reported to Have Improved Homework Completion and Class Participation	Percentage of “Regular” Attendees with Completed Surveys Reported to Have Improved Student Behavior
Middle	1,719	90%	78%	1,820	89%	82%
High	373	88%	84%	313	88%	83%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7,868</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>8,409</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>79%</b>

<p>✓ <b>Objective 4.3—Met</b></p> <p>This objective was met in 2019-20. Over 50% of “regular” attendees across Cohorts 12 and 13 with returned Teacher Surveys were reported by grantees to have improved in the following two areas: (1) homework completion and class participation and (2) student behavior.</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Summary

As the summary table below shows, statewide grantee performance in 2019-20 “met” seven of eight reported state objectives, as indicated by the status column. One of the eight objectives was “partially met” (Objective 2.1 on attendance in the after school program). Two objectives (4.1 and 4.2) were not reported on in 2019-20 due to lack of EOG assessment data.

**Table 12.** Summary of 2019-20 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Progress Monitoring Findings

Goals/Objectives	2019-20 Status	Summary of Findings
<b>Goal 1: Projected Numbers of Students Are Enrolled</b>		
Objective 1.1: The <b>Majority (Over 50%) of Grantees</b> Enroll At Least 75% of their Projected Number of Students	<b>Met</b>	Approximately <b>98%</b> of Cohort 12 grantees and <b>94%</b> of Cohort 13 grantees served at least 75% of their proposed number of students, in 2019-20, with a total across both cohorts of <b>96%</b> (which represents the majority, greater than 50%).
Objective 1.2: The <b>Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served</b> Statewide are from Low-Income Schools	<b>Met</b>	An average of <b>86%</b> of students per center came from schools that qualified for Title I funding (66 students on average, per center, coming from Title I schools).
Objective 1.3: The <b>Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served</b> Statewide are in Need of Academic Support	<b>Met</b>	For participating Cohort 12 and Cohort 13 students in Grades 4 to 8 with prior year test scores, <b>73% to 77%</b> were in need of academic support, as judged by their lack of proficiency on state tests in reading or math at program entry.



Goals/Objectives	2019-20 Status	Summary of Findings
<b>Goal 2: Enrolled Students Meet Definition of “Regular” Attendance</b>		
Objective 2.1: Statewide Percentage of Students Attending 30 Days or More <b>is At Least 70%</b> (80% in Elementary, 60% in Middle School, and 40% in High School)	<b>Partially Met</b> (Met overall and for elementary and middle but not high school students)	Overall, <b>74%</b> of participants attended 30 days or more (i.e., were “regular” attendees). The percentage of students attending 30 days or more was <b>80%</b> among elementary students, <b>68%</b> among middle school students, and <b>34%</b> (not at least 40%) among high school students.
Objective 2.2: Statewide Percentage of Centers with an Average Attendance of 30 Days or More <b>Will Not Fall Below 87%</b>	<b>Met</b>	A total of <b>90%</b> of centers within each cohort reported average attendance rates of 30 days or more, while 10% of centers within each cohort reported fewer than 30 days attendance, on average.
<b>Goal 3: Programs Will Offer Services in Core Academic Areas and in Enrichment</b>		
Objective 3.1: <b>More than 85%</b> of Centers Offer Services in At Least One Core Academic Area	<b>Met</b>	Across Cohort 12 and Cohort 13 centers, <b>93%</b> reported that they frequently provided activities in Literacy, Homework Help, <b>or</b> Tutoring.
Objective 3.2: <b>More than 85%</b> of Centers Offer Enrichment Support Activities	<b>Met</b>	Across Cohort 12 and 13 centers, <b>88%</b> reported a high frequency of at least one character education <b>or</b> enrichment activity.
<b>Goal 4: “Regular” Attendees Will Demonstrate Educational and Social Benefits and Exhibit Positive Behavioral Changes</b>		
Objective 4.1: The Statewide Percentage of “Regular” Attendees (Grades 4-8), With Two Years of State Test Data, Who Improve from “Non-Proficient” (Levels I, II or III) to “Proficient” (Levels IV or V) <b>Will Be At Least 11%</b>	<b>Not Reported</b>	<b>N/A—Due to COVID-19, EOG assessments in reading and math were not available for 2019-20.</b>
Objective 4.2: “Regular” Attendees (Grades 4-8) With Two Years of State Test Data Will Demonstrate Year-to-Year Change On State Tests in Reading and Math at Least <b>As Great Or Greater Than The State Population</b> Year-to-Year Change	<b>Not Reported</b>	<b>N/A—Due to COVID-19, EOG assessments in reading and math were not available for 2019-20.</b>
Objective 4.3: The Majority ( <b>Over 50%</b> ) of Classroom Teachers Responding to a Teacher Survey Will Rate 21st CCLC “Regular” Attendees’ Classroom Performance and Behavior as Improved	<b>Met</b>	<b>Over 50%</b> of “regular” attendees across Cohorts 12 and 13 with returned Teacher Surveys were reported to have made improvement in the following two areas: homework completion and class participation, and student behavior.

