



2020-21 North Carolina 21st CCLC Program State-Level Progress Monitoring Report

Cohort 13 and 14 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

May 2022

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%	7
Goal 3: Programs Will Offer Services in Core Academic Areas and in Enrichment	8
Objective 3.1: More than 85% of Centers Offer Services in At Least One Core Academic Area...	8
Objective 3.2: More than 85% of Centers Offer Enrichment Support Activities	9
Goal 4: “Regular” Attendees Will Demonstrate Educational and Social Benefits and Exhibit Positive Behavioral Changes	10
Objective 4.1: The Statewide Percentage of “Regular” Attendees (Grades 4-8) With Two Years of State Test Data, Who Improve from “Non-Proficient” (Levels I, II or III) to “Proficient” (Levels IV or V) Will Be At Least 11%	10
Objective 4.2: “Regular” Attendees (Grades 4-8) With Two Years of State Test Data Will Demonstrate Year-to-Year Change On State Tests in Reading and Math At Least as Great or Greater Than the State Population Year-to-Year Change.....	12
Objective 4.3: The Majority (Over 50%) of Classroom Teachers Responding to a Teacher Survey Will Rate 21 st CCLC “Regular” Attendees’ Classroom Performance and Behavior as Improved..	14
Summary.....	15

2020-21 North Carolina 21st CCLC Program State-Level Progress Monitoring Report: Cohort 13 And 14 Grantees

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) 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 (2003-09) 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. Then in 2017, Cohort 12, with 45 grantees, received funding totaling \$14,917,238.¹

In 2018, Cohort 13, with 49 grantees, received funding totaling \$15,771,977. In 2020, Cohort 14, with 45 grantees, received funding totaling \$15,944,885. This report summarizes data from Cohorts 13 and 14 grantees who operated programs in 2020-21 (i.e., Cohort 13, with 48 grantees, was in their third year of funding, and Cohort 14, with 45 grantees, was in their first year of funding). In addition, some Cohort 12 grantees were approved for no-cost contract extensions to use carryover funds to continue services for a fourth year.

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 21st CCLC program, which incorporate required federal 21st CCLC objectives and performance measures.² It should be noted that data for this report were collected during the 2020-21 school year, which continued to be impacted by 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 (2020-21) in tables along with comparison data from the previous year's report (in this case, 2019-20).

Due to COVID-19 and the suspension of state End-of-Grade (EOG) assessments in 2019-20, some goals and objectives that required the analysis of students' prior year state testing data could not be reported as planned. Therefore, for these goals and objectives, we used students' assessment data from 2018-19, which is assessment data from two years before students participated in 21st CCLC. As such, we report findings using the prior year's assessment data, but do not make determinations as to whether the objectives were met. Consistent with past annual reporting, we will describe the program goals and

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 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).

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



objectives that 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.³
- **Goal 2:** Enrolled students meet the definition of “regular” attendance.
 - **Objective 2.1:** Statewide percentage of students attending 30 days or more is at least 70% (80% in elementary, 60% in middle school, and 40% in high school).
 - **Objective 2.2:** Statewide percentage of centers with an average attendance of 30 days or more will not fall below 87%.
- **Goal 3:** Programs will offer services in core academic areas and in enrichment.
 - **Objective 3.1:** More than 85% of centers offer services in at least one core academic area.
 - **Objective 3.2:** More than 85% of centers offer enrichment support activities.
- **Goal 4:** “Regular” attendees will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.
 - **Objective 4.1:** The statewide percentage of “regular” attendees (Grades 4-8), with two years of state test data, who improve from “non-proficient” (levels I, II or III) to “proficient” (levels IV or V) will be at least 11%.⁴
 - **Objective 4.2:** “Regular” attendees (Grades 4-8) with two years of state test data will demonstrate year-to-year change on state tests in reading and math at least as great or greater than the state population year-to-year change.⁵
 - **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.

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 21st CCLC program-established performance objectives and indicators required by states with 21st CCLC programs as part of the Government Performance and

³ In need of academic support is defined as students’ performance on prior year’s assessment data. Here we report findings using assessment data from two years prior, but do not make a determination as to whether this objective was met, due to missing data.

⁴ Here we report findings using assessment data from two years prior, but do not make a determination as to whether this objective was met due to missing data.

⁵ Here we report findings using assessment data from two years prior, but do not make a determination as to whether this objective was met due to missing data.



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 2020-21 school year.

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 21st 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 21st CCLC program were met for 2020-21 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 2019-20 and 2020-21 and the average number of students enrolled per grantee. During the 2020-21 school year, there were a total of 93⁶ grantees operating 198 centers (average of two centers per grantee). Statewide, the 93 grantees reported 10,803 enrolled students, with an average of 117 students enrolled per grantee.

Table 1. 21st CCLC 2019-20 and 2020-21 Grantees, Centers, and Participating Students

	Cohort 13 2019-20	Cohort 13 2020-21	Cohort 14 2019-20	Cohort 14 2020-21	Both Cohorts 2019-20	Both Cohorts 2020-21
Grantees						
Number of grantees	49	48	N/A	45	N/A	93
Number of participating students	6,899	4,774	N/A	6,056	N/A	10,803*
Average number of students served by grantees	141	100	N/A	135	N/A	117
Centers						
Number of centers	93	90	N/A	108	N/A	198
Number of centers per grantee (range)	1-7	1-7	N/A	1-8	N/A	1-8
Average number of centers per grantee	2	2	N/A	2	N/A	2

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

*27 students were reported as participating in *both* Cohort 13 and Cohort 14 centers.

As can be seen in the far righthand column of Table 2, for 2020-21, of the 10,803 students enrolled, 65% were elementary-level students (with 28% from middle schools and 7% from high schools). Nearly half of

⁶ Fourteen grantees operated both Cohort 13 and 14 centers. Four of these grantees operated nine centers that were reported as being funded by both Cohorts 13 and 14. In the event that a grantee operated both Cohort 13 and 14 centers, data for these grantees were analyzed and reported separately by cohort.



the students enrolled in 2020-21 were African American (46%), 23% were White, and 23% were Hispanic.

Table 2. 21st CCLC Participating Students in 2019-20 and 2020-21

	Cohort 13 2019-20	Cohort 13 2020-21	Cohort 14 2019-20	Cohort 14 2020-21	Both Cohorts 2019-20	Both Cohorts 2020-21
Number of centers	93	90	N/A	108	N/A	198
Average # of students served per center	76	53	N/A	56	N/A	55
Number of participating students	6,899	4,774	N/A	6,056	N/A	10,803*
By School Level						
% Elementary School	74%	64%	N/A	67%	N/A	65%
% Middle School	21%	27%	N/A	28%	N/A	28%
% High School	6%	9%	N/A	5%	N/A	7%
By Ethnicity						
% African American	61%	51%	N/A	41%	N/A	46%
% White	14%	21%	N/A	25%	N/A	23%
% Hispanic	18%	20%	N/A	26%	N/A	23%
% Other	8%	8%	N/A	9%	N/A	8%

*27 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 21st 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.⁷ The number of students enrolled per grantee was calculated using student-level 21st CCLC grantee-reported data provided by NCDPI. The reported number of students proposed to be served by Cohort 13 and 14 grantees ranged from 50 to 400, while the number of students who were reported as enrolled in 21st CCLC programs in 2020-21 ranged from 17 to 361.

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.

✓ Objective 1.1—Met
For 2020-21, this objective was met. Approximately 58% of Cohort 13 grantees and 53% of Cohort 14 grantees reported serving at least 75% of their projected number of students, with a total across both cohorts of 56%. The objective was met in that over 50% (56%) 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 between 58-67%, except for Faith-Based Organizations (FBO), where only 12% of grantees met their projected enrollments.

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).



Table 3. Grantees in 2020-21 that Enrolled At Least 75% of Projected Students by Organization Type

Organization Type	Both Cohorts 2020-21	
	# of Grantees	# (%) of grantees that enrolled \geq 75% of projected students
Charter School (CS)	6	4 (67%)
Community-Based Organization (CBO)	45	26 (58%)
Faith-Based Organization (FBO)	8	1 (12%)
School District (SD)	31	19 (61%)
Other	3	2 (67%)
TOTAL	93	52 (56%)

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 88% of students who attended Cohort 13 and Cohort 14 centers in 2020-21 attended schools that qualified for Title I funding.⁸ Elementary school participants in 21st CCLC programs were overwhelmingly from Title I schools (97%), while 75% of middle school participants and 35% of high school participants were from Title I schools.

Table 4. 21st CCLC Participating Students from Title I Schools in 2019-20 and 2020-21

	Cohort 13 2019-20	Cohort 13 2020-21	Cohort 14 2019-20	Cohort 14 2020-21	Both Cohorts 2019-20	Both Cohorts 2020-21
Average # of students from Title I schools served per center	71	46	N/A	49	N/A	48
Average % of students from Title I schools served per center	92%	92%	N/A	85%	N/A	88%
Number of participating Title I students	6,600	4,120	N/A	5,289	N/A	9,409
Percent in Schools with Title I Funding by School Level						
Elem School	99%	99%	N/A	96%	N/A	97%
Middle School	85%	78%	N/A	73%	N/A	75%
High School	33%	22%	N/A	53%	N/A	35%
Percent in Schools with Title I funding by Ethnicity						
African American	93%	89%	N/A	91%	N/A	90%
White	85%	72%	N/A	78%	N/A	75%
Hispanic	95%	93%	N/A	89%	N/A	91%
Other	95%	87%	N/A	87%	N/A	87%

✓ Objective 1.2—Met
This objective was met for 2020-21. Overall, an average of 88% of students per center came from schools that qualified for Title I funding (48 students on average, per center, coming from Title I schools).

⁸ Title I schools were identified using 2020-21 eligibility data from NCDPI (see <https://www.dpi.nc.gov/documents/program-monitoring/2020-2021-essr-data-5-24-21/download?attachment>). 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 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? Due to the suspension of state assessments in 2019-20, performance on the prior year’s assessments are not available to evaluate Objective 1.3. To provide some descriptive context for the students served, we use assessment results from two years prior instead (2018-19). However, because assessment data are not available from the prior year, we do not make a determination as to whether this goal was met.

State EOG test results for 2018-19 (two year prior for this report) are reported using the following five proficiency levels:⁹

- 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 2020-21, 75% of Cohort 13 and 72% of Cohort 14 students in Grades 4-8¹⁰ were “non-proficient” in reading on the 2018-19 assessments, while 76% of Cohort 13 and 75% of Cohort 14 students were “non-proficient” in math.

Table 5. Percent of 21st CCLC Students (Grades 4-8) “Non-Proficient” in Reading or Math EOG Tests in 2019 for 2020-21 School Year

	Reading		Math	
	Cohort 13	Cohort 14	Cohort 13	Cohort 14
% “non-proficient” at end of 2019 (prior to being served in 2020-21 school year)	75%	72%	76%	75%

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

✓ Objective 1.3—Not Reported
For participating Cohort 13 and 14 students in Grades 4-8 with year test scores in 2018-19 (two years prior), the majority (over 50%), in this case 72% to 76%, were in need of academic support, as judged by their lack of proficiency on state tests in reading or math at program entry. Because prior year scores were not available we cannot report whether or not this objective was met.

⁹ For the purposes of this report, “non-proficient” is defined as those students who fall within proficiency Level I, Level II, or Level III.

¹⁰ Because most students in Grade 4 would not be expected to have EOG results from two years prior, these results are primarily based on students in Grades 5-8.



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. During the 2020-21 school year, “regular” attendance was 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, 51% (for Cohort 13 and Cohort 14 combined) of enrolled students were reported by grantees as attending for 30 days or more in 2020-21, while 49% of students were reported as attending fewer than 30 days. The percentage of students who were “regular” attendees was highest at the elementary level (58%) followed by middle school (44%) and high school (17%), when other after-school activities may be more likely to interfere with program attendance. These percentages are lower than those reported in 2019-20 and are presumed to be due to the continued impacts of COVID-19.

Table 6. Cohort 13 and 14 Center Attendance in 2019-20 and 2020-21

	Cohort 13 2019-20	Cohort 13 2020-21	Cohort 14 2019-20	Cohort 14 2020-21	Both Cohorts 2019-20	Both Cohorts 2020-21
Students						
% of “regular” attendees (30 days or more)	75%	51%	N/A	51%	N/A	51%
% 30-89 days	53%	37%	N/A	38%	N/A	37%
% 90 days or more	22%	14%	N/A	13%	N/A	14%
% of “non-regular” attendees	25%	49%	N/A	49%	N/A	49%
School-Level						
% of ES “regular” attendees	77%	58%	N/A	58%	N/A	58%
% of MS “regular” attendees	74%	47%	N/A	41%	N/A	44%
% of HS “regular” attendees	45%	19%	N/A	15%	N/A	17%

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

✓ Objective 2.1—Not Met
Overall, this objective was not met in 2020-21. Fifty-one percent (51%) of participants attended 30 days or more (were “regular” attendees). The objective was also not met by grade level, as the percentage of students attending 30 days or more was below 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 (according to the federal standard, low attendance is defined as fewer than 30 days). In 2020-21, 70% of 21st CCLC centers, statewide, had average attendance at or above the federally-defined 30-day minimum for a “regular” attendee, and 30% had average attendance below the 30-day minimum. Results for this objective are described below, by cohort.



Table 7. Cohort 13 and 14 Percentage of Centers with Average Attendance Meeting and Not Meeting “Regular” Attendee Definition in 2019-20 and 2020-21

	Cohort 13 2019-20	Cohort 13 2020-21	Cohort 14 2019-20	Cohort 14 2020-21	Both Cohorts 2019-20	Both Cohorts 2020-21
% of centers statewide with a average attendance of 30 days or more	89%	74%	N/A	66%	N/A	70%
% of centers statewide with a average attendance fewer than 30 days	11%	26%	N/A	34%	N/A	30%

✓ Objective 2.2—Not Met
Cohort 13 and 14 did not meet this objective in 2020-21. Seventy percent (70%) of centers across cohorts reported a average attendance rates of 30 days or more, while 30% of centers across cohorts reported fewer than 30 days attendance, on a 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 2020-21 (90 in Cohort 13 and 108 in Cohort 14), 97% reported a “high frequency” of activity in Literacy, Homework Help, or Tutoring (Note: 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 13 (89%) and Cohort 14 (94%), followed by STEM for both Cohort 13 (78%) and Cohort 14 (80%) and Tutoring for Cohort 13 (72%) and Literacy for Cohort 14 (78%).

Table 8. Cohort 13 and 14 Center-Reported Frequency of Core Academic Activities in 2019-20 and 2020-21

Academic Activities	Cohort 13 (90 Centers) 2020-21		Cohort 14 (108 Centers) 2020-21		Both Cohorts 2019-20	Both Cohorts 2020-21
	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	17%	83%	17%	83%	N/A	17%
Homework Help	89%	11%	94%	6%	N/A	92%
Literacy	66%	34%	78%	22%	N/A	72%
STEM	78%	22%	80%	20%	N/A	79%
Tutoring	72%	28%	65%	35%	N/A	68%



✓ **Objective 3.1—Met**

This objective was met in 2020-21. Ninety-seven percent (97%) of Cohort 13 and Cohort 14 centers reported that they frequently provided activities in Literacy, Homework Help, or Tutoring.

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

Grantees also reported to NCDPI on the frequency that specific enrichment areas were offered during the past year. Table 9 provides the frequency of activity availability by cohort. Across both cohorts, approximately 75% of all centers reported emphasizing physical activity at least once a week (i.e., high frequency). Across both cohorts, 61% of all centers reported emphasizing Arts and Music activities with high frequency. In addition, 31% of all centers reported emphasizing Youth Leadership activities with high frequency.

Table 9. Cohort 13 and 14 Center-Reported Frequency of Specific Enrichment Activities in 2019-20 and 2020-21

Type of Activity	Cohort 13 (90 Centers) 2020-21		Cohort 14 (108 Centers) 2020-21		Both Cohorts 2019-20	Both Cohort 2020-21
	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						
Counseling Programs	17%	83%	17%	83%	N/A	17%
Drug Prevention	10%	90%	2%	98%	N/A	6%
Truancy Prevention	4%	96%	2%	98%	N/A	3%
Violence Prevention	22%	78%	4%	96%	N/A	12%
Youth Leadership	31%	69%	31%	69%	N/A	31%
Enrichment						
Arts & Music	60%	40%	61%	39%	N/A	61%
Community / Service Learning	10%	90%	17%	83%	N/A	14%
Entrepreneurship	1%	99%	3%	97%	N/A	2%
Mentoring	14%	86%	20%	80%	N/A	18%
Physical Activity	70%	30%	79%	21%	N/A	75%

In terms of the number of centers providing at least one character education or enrichment activity (Note: not shown in Table 9), 53% of Cohort 13 centers and 45% of Cohort 14 centers reported a high frequency of at least one *character education* activity, while 87% of both Cohort 13 and Cohort 14 centers indicated a high frequency of at least one *enrichment* activity. In total, 89% of centers (88% of Cohort 13 and 90% of Cohort 14) reported a high frequency of at least one character education *or* enrichment activity.

✓ **Objective 3.2—Met**

This objective was met by both cohorts. Eighty-nine percent (89%) of Cohort 13 and 14 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 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 test results in reading and math at Grades 4-8 and (b) classroom Teacher Surveys of individual participating students’ improvement in classroom performance and behavior as collected by grantees at the end of the year.

A. State Achievement Test Results

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

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

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

As defined by the North Carolina College and Career Readiness (CCR) Standards, if a reading EOG score is categorized as Level IV proficiency or above, then the student is considered “proficient.” To examine participating students’ changes in proficiency status, we requested, from NCDPI, two years of state test results in reading and math for all students enrolled in 21st CCLC programs in 2020-21. Because of COVID-19, we do not have two consecutive years of assessment data to calculate changes in assessment scores. Instead, we use assessment data from 2020-21 (year students are served by 21st CCLC) and 2018-19 (two years prior to being served) to complete the analysis. Because NCDPI recommends caution in comparing results between the two assessment years¹² given the impact of COVID-19, for Objective 4.1, we will report the percentage of “regular” attendees who improve from “non-proficient” to “proficient” across two years for context but do not render a determination as to whether Objective 4.1 was met. We encourage caution in drawing inferences from these results.

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 2018-19 academic year (“Level I, II, or III in 2019”) 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 2019 who scored “Level IV or V in 2021.” Then we calculated the percent of those students who scored “non-proficient” in 2019 who subsequently scored

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

¹² <https://www.dpi.nc.gov/media/12854/download?attachment>



“proficient” at the end of 2021 (two years later). (Of the 5,539 students reported as “regularly” attending, there were 1,444 in Grades 4-8 who had two years of state test scores in reading and 1,447 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 13 and 14, the percentage moving from “non-proficient” to “proficient” in reading was between 1% and 3% 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 13 and 14, the percentage moving from “non-proficient” to “proficient” in math was between 1% and 2% for both groups of students.

Table 10. Percentage of “Non-Proficient” Students Who Become “Proficient” in 2021—**READING EOG**

Grade in 2019	Grade in 2021	21 st CCLC “Non-Regular” Attendees			21 st CCLC “Regular” Attendees		
		Level I, II, or III in 2019	Level IV or V in 2021	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.	Level I, II, or III in 2019	Level IV or V in 2021	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.
02	04*	14	**	0%	16	**	6%
03	05	424	**	2%	588	22	4%
04	06	334	**	1%	338	**	1%
05	07	357	19	5%	300	12	4%
06	08	346	**	1%	202	**	4%
All Grades 4-8		1,475	36	2%	1,444	48	3%

*Most students in this grade would not be expected to have a score in 2019.

**Values less than 10 suppressed.

Table 11. Percentage of “Non-Proficient” Students Who Become “Proficient” in 2021—**MATHEOG**

Grade in 2019	Grade in 2021	21 st CCLC “Non-Regular” Attendees			21 st CCLC “Regular” Attendees		
		Level I, II, or III in 2019	Level IV or V in 2021	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.	Level I, II, or III in 2019	Level IV or V in 2021	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.
02	04*	14	**	0%	16	**	0%
03	05	410	**	1%	572	13	2%
04	06	367	**	0%	355	**	1%
05	07	355	**	2%	292	10	3%
06	08	357	**	1%	212	**	0%
All Grades 4-8		1,503	18	1%	1,447	27	2%

*Most students in this grade would not be expected to have a score in 2019.

**Values less than 10 suppressed.

✓ Objective 4.1—Not Reported

Given the lack of consecutive years of assessment data as a result of COVID-19, for 2020-21, we cannot report on this objective of having at least 11% of “regular” attendees (in Grades 4-8 with two years of state test results) improving from “non-proficient” to “proficient.” Instead, we provide the information in Tables 10 and 11 but draw no conclusions for Objective 4.1 from these data.



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

The following table shows the results of a second method of describing the state test score changes experienced by Grade 4-8 participants from 2019 to 2021. These analyses describe the year-to-year change in test 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 scores¹³ was calculated for “regular” attendees, and that average change was compared to the average 2019 to 2021 change for all students in the state at the respective grade levels. To meet this objective, “regular” attendees would show average improvement in state test scores at the same rate or greater than the state average year-to-year change.

The results of the change score analyses, the difference in students’ standardized scores across two years (2019 to 2021), are presented below. Similar to the previous analysis noted above, we provide the results for context, but do not render a determination as to whether Objective 4.2 was met. We encourage caution in drawing inferences from these results.

Table 12 describes the year-to-year change on state EOG reading and math tests for Cohorts 13 and 14 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 13 and Cohort 14 “regular” attendee’s scale score is converted to a standardized score within each year to indicate how each student’s score compares to the state average in a given year. For example, if a 21st CCLC “regular” attendee had a standardized score of 0 in 2018-19 and a +0.5 in 2020-21, this increase would indicate that in 2018-19 this student’s score was the same as the state average, but in 2020-21, this student’s score was above average compared to all other students in the state (0.5 standard deviations above the average).

¹³ Different EOG assessments were used across grades, and the resulting EOG scores are not on a comparable scale. In order to make valid comparisons among scores from one year to the next, the assessments must be placed on a common, standardized scale. Standardization is achieved through a two-step process. First, scores for a given test are centered about the state mean for the grade in question by subtracting the state mean from each score on the EOG. Second, the centered scores are divided by the state standard deviation for the test in question. This results in a standardized score that is interpreted as the number of standard deviations that the original score lies from the state mean for that assessment. A standardized score of 1.5 indicates that the student’s score was 1.5 standard deviations above the state mean for that assessment, while a standardized score of 0 indicates that the student’s score was equivalent to the state mean. Change relative to the state mean was measured using a paired-sample *t*-test with a threshold of $p \leq 0.05$.



Table 12. Year-to-Year Change in Reading and Math EOG Scores for “Regular” Attendees in Cohorts 13 and 14 Compared to State Average by Grade

Grade Level	Reading	Math
Grade 4	Above (+0.55)	Above (+0.47)
Grade 5	Same	Above (+0.08)
Grade 6	Same	Same
Grade 7	Same	Same
Grade 8	Above (+0.09)	Above (+0.51) ¹⁴
TOTAL	Same	Above (+0.06)

These results indicate that, across both Cohort 13 and 14, “regular” attendees experienced similar year-to-year changes in overall EOG reading compared to students across the state, but the average change in “regular” attendees’ EOG math scores were slightly above the statewide average year-to-year change.

✓ Objective 4.2—Not Reported
Given the lack of consecutive years of assessment data as a result of COVID-19, for 2020-21, we cannot report on this objective of having “regular” attendees (in Grades 4-8 with two years of state test results) demonstrate year-to-year change in reading and math that was at least as great or greater than the state average. Instead, we provide the information in Tables 12 but draw no conclusions for Objective 4.2 from these data.

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

In addition to state test results, classroom teachers were asked to complete Teacher Surveys as another possible indicator of participation impact on students. The Teacher Survey asks for classroom teachers’ 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.¹⁵ Grantees are instructed to distribute the Teacher Survey to a classroom teacher of each participating “regular” attendee.¹⁶ It is the responsibility of the grantee to enter completed Teacher Survey responses for individual students into the 21DC system¹⁷ as well as indicate whether or not the Teacher Survey is returned.¹⁸ For each Teacher Survey that is completed and returned on a “regular” attendee, grantees must indicate, in 21DC, whether the student had a “reported improvement in homework completion and classroom participation” (response options being Yes or No) and/or a “reported improvement in student behavior” (response options being Yes or No).

¹⁴ 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 held when 8th grade students were excluded from the analysis.

¹⁵ <https://www.dpi.nc.gov/districts-schools/federal-program-monitoring/21st-century-community-learning-centers#data-collection-&-reporting>

¹⁶ 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.

¹⁷ Grantees enter Teacher Survey distribution data at the individual student level in 21DC (Prompt: Teacher Survey distributed; Response options: Yes or No).

¹⁸ Grantees enter returned Teacher Survey status in 21DC at the individual student level (Prompt: Teacher Survey returned; Response options: Yes or No).



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

Table 13 presents the response rates, by grade level, for the 21st 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 21st CCLC after-school programs in 2020-21. Grantees reported, via their data entry into 21DC, that 5,556 Teacher Surveys were distributed and that 4,006 were returned for a response rate of 72%.

Table 13. Teacher Survey Response Rates in 2020-21 by Grade (for “Regular” Attendees)

Grade Level	Both Cohorts 2020-21		
	Teacher Surveys Distributed	Teacher Surveys Returned	Response Rate
Elem	4,114	2,958	72%
Middle	1,307	925	71%
High	135	123	91%
TOTAL	5,556	4,006	72%

At the grantee level, 54% of the Cohort 13 and 14 grantees reported a response rate from teachers in 2020-21 of 70% to 100%.¹⁹

Table 14 shows the results of the Teacher Surveys as entered into 21DC by grantees. Grantees were asked to indicate, in the 21DC database, only whether the Teacher Survey for the “regular” attendee indicated “improvement” or not.²⁰ In 2020-21, grantees reported that 88% of “regular” attendees (with completed surveys) were reported to have improved homework completion and class participation. In addition, 80% of “regular” attendees (with completed surveys) were reported to have improved student behavior. These percentages are similar to the previous year’s percentages.

Table 14. Teacher Survey Ratings of Student Improvement (“Regular” Attendees) in 2020-21

Grade Level	Both Cohorts 2020-21		
	Responses	Percentage of “Regular” Attendees with Completed Surveys Reported to Have Improved Homework Completion and Class Participation	Percentage of “Regular” Attendees with Completed Surveys Reported to Have Improved Student Behavior
Elementary	2,958	87%	77%
Middle	925	91%	88%
High	123	98%	94%
TOTAL	4,006	88%	80%

✓ Objective 4.3—Met
This objective was met in 2020-21. Over 50% of “regular” attendees across Cohorts 13 and 14 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.

¹⁹ These data are not shown in Table 13.

²⁰ 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.



Summary

As the summary table below shows, statewide grantee performance in 2020-21 “met” five of seven reported state objectives, as indicated by the status column. Three objectives (1.3, 4.1, and 4.2) were not reported on in 2020-21 due to lack of EOG assessment data.

Table 15. Summary of 2020-21 21st CCLC Progress Monitoring Findings

Goals/Objectives	2020-21 Status	Summary of Findings
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	Met	Approximately 58% of Cohort 13 grantees and 53% of Cohort 14 grantees served at least 75% of their proposed number of students, in 2020-21, with a total across both cohorts of 56% .
Objective 1.2: The Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served Statewide are from Low-Income Schools	Met	An average of 88% of students per center came from schools that qualified for Title I funding (48 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	Not Reported	For participating Cohort 13 and Cohort 14 students in Grades 4-8 with 2018-19 test scores, 72% to 76% were in need of academic support, as judged by their lack of proficiency on state tests in reading or math at program entry. Because prior year scores were not available we do not report whether this objective was met.
Goal 2: Enrolled Students Meet 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)	Not Met (Not met overall or by grade level)	Overall, 51% of participants attended 30 days or more (i.e., were “regular” attendees). The percentage of students attending 30 days or more was 58% among elementary students, 44% among middle school students, and 17% 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%	Not Met	A total of 70% of centers within each cohort reported average attendance rates of 30 days or more, while 30% 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 13 and Cohort 14 centers, 97% reported that they frequently provided activities in Literacy, Homework Help, or Tutoring.
Objective 3.2: More than 85% of Centers Offer Enrichment Support Activities	Met	Across Cohort 13 and 14 centers, 89% reported a high frequency of at least one character education or enrichment activity.



Goals/Objectives	2020-21 Status	Summary of Findings
Goal 4: “Regular” Attendees Will Demonstrate Educational and Social Benefits and Exhibit Positive Behavioral Changes		
Objective 4.1: The Statewide Percentage of “Regular” Attendees (Grades 4-8), With Two Years of State Test Data, Who Improve from “Non-Proficient” (Levels I, II or III) to “Proficient” (Levels IV or V) Will Be At Least 11%	Not Reported	<p>Reading EOG: For “regular” attendees, 3% moved from “non-proficient” in 2019 to “proficient” in 2021.</p> <p>Math EOG: For “regular” attendees, 2% moved from “non-proficient” in 2019 to “proficient” in 2021.</p> <p>Because prior year scores were not available we do not report whether this objective was met.</p>
Objective 4.2: “Regular” Attendees (Grades 4-8) With Two Years of State Test Data Will Demonstrate Year-to-Year Change On State Tests in Reading and Math at Least As Great Or Greater Than The State Population Year-to-Year Change	Not Reported	<p>On the Reading EOG, “regular” attendees across Grades 4-8 improved their scores from year-to-year at the same rate as students across the state.</p> <p>On the Math EOG, the “regular” attendees across Grades 4-8 improved their scores from year-to-year at a rate slightly greater than students across the state.</p> <p>Because prior year scores were not available we do not report whether this objective was met.</p>
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	Met	<p>Over 50% of “regular” attendees across Cohorts 13 and 14 with returned Teacher Surveys were reported to have made improvement in the following two areas: (1) homework completion and class participation, and (2) student behavior.</p>

