

2015-16 North Carolina 21st CCLC Program State-Level Progress Monitoring Report

(Cohort 10 and 11 Grantees)

Prepared by:

Wendy McColskey, Ph.D.
J. B. Weir, M.S.
Kathleen Mooney, M.A.
Melissa Williams, M.A.

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

Submitted to:

Donna Brown
Director, Federal Program Monitoring and Support
NC Department of Public Instruction
Office of the Deputy State Superintendent
6351 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699
(919) 807-3957

May 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Goal 1: Targeted Students Are Enrolled.....	2
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	5
Goal 2: Enrolled Students Meet Definition Of “Regular” Attendance.....	6
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 Fewer Than 30 Days Will Not Exceed 13%	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
A. State Achievement Test Results	10
B. Classroom Teacher Survey On “Regular” Attendees’ Improvement At End Of Year..	14
Summary.....	15

2015-16 NORTH CAROLINA 21ST CCLC PROGRAM STATE-LEVEL PROGRESS MONITORING REPORT (COHORT 10 AND 11 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 competitively awarded grants were for four years of funding. The intent of this federal funding is for grantees to provide before school, after school, weekend, and/or summer school academic enrichment opportunities for children attending low-performing schools to help them meet local and state academic standards.

Each four-year 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. In July 2010, the State Board approved funds for the largest cohort to date (89 Cohort 9 grantees, for a total award of \$24,982,787). In July 2013, the State Board approved funds for 52¹ Cohort 10 grantees totaling \$17,925,136. The following year, NCDPI awarded funds to 68 Cohort 11 grantees totaling \$22,323,666. This report summarizes data from the two cohorts of grantees operating programs in 2015-16 (i.e., Cohort 10, with 47 grantees in their third year of the four-year grants, and Cohort 11, with 65 grantees in their second year of the four-year grants).

The purpose of this report is to provide descriptive information to inform NCDPI's monitoring of the performance of the grantees and participating students, statewide. The report is organized by NCDPI's goals and objectives for the 21st CCLC program, which incorporate required federal 21st CCLC objective and performance measures (<https://www2.ed.gov/programs/21stcclc/performance.html>). The NCDPI goals and objectives for the program are:

- **Goal 1: Targeted 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 Fewer Than 30 Days Will Not Exceed 13%
- **Goal 3: Programs Will Offer Services in Core Academic Areas and in Enrichment**

¹ Due to missing data and/or some grantees voluntarily terminating and not offering services in 2015-16, findings from this report will be based on a total of 47 Cohort 10 grantees and 65 Cohort 11 grantees.

- **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%
 - **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
 - **Objective 4.3:** Objective 4.3: The Majority (Over 50%) of Classroom Teachers Responding and Rating a 21st CCLC Participating Student’s Progress Will Indicate Either “Moderate” or “Significant” Improvement

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.

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 Results Act (GPRA). Goal 3 relates to ensuring funded programs provide the required academic and enrichment activities to students. 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, two sources of data on the progress of participating students were obtained and analyzed. The first source was state test score results for participating grades 4-8 students who attended at least 30 days for the 2015-16 school year and who had two years of state test results on End-of-Grade (EOG) tests in reading or math. The second source of data was ratings, by classroom teachers, of participating students regarding students’ degree of improvement over the school year in various areas (i.e., homework completion, etc.).

Below, we provide data on the extent to which the state objectives for the 21st CCLC program were met for 2015-16 for the four goals.

Goal 1: Targeted Students Are Enrolled

As context for this goal, Table 1 describes the number of grantees and centers, statewide, for 2014-15 and 2015-16 and the average number of students served per grantee. During the 2015-16 school year, there were a total of 112 grantees operating 284 centers (average of 3 centers per

grantee). Statewide, the 112 grantees reported 18,710 participating students, with an average of 167 students served per grantee.

Table 1. 21st CCLC 2014-15 and 2015-16 Grantees, Centers, and Participating Students

	Cohort 10 2014-15	Cohort 10 2015-16	Cohort 11 2014-15	Cohort 11 2015-16	Both Cohorts 2014-15	Both Cohorts 2015-16
Grantees						
Number of grantees	48	47	67	65	115	112
Number of participating students	9,809	8,685	10,685	10,025	20,494	18,710
Average number of students served by grantees	166	185	159	154	162	167
Centers						
Number of centers	136	125	157	159	293	284
Number of centers per grantee (range)	1-8	1-7	1-8	1-8	1-8	1-8
Average number of centers per grantee	3	3	2	2	3	3

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

Table 2 shows that 20,494 students were reported as enrolled in 2014-15 compared to 18,710 in 2015-16. As can be seen in last column of Table 2, for 2015-16, of the 18,710 enrolled, 60% were elementary-level students (with 28% from middle schools and 12% from high schools). Roughly half of the students enrolled in 2015-16 were African American, 24% were white, and 17% were Hispanic (similar percentages for ethnicity as reported in 2014-15).

Table 2. 21st CCLC Participating Students in 2014-15 and 2015-16

	Cohort 10 2014-15	Cohort 10 2015-16	Cohort 11 2014-15	Cohort 11 2015-16	Both Cohorts 2014-15	Both Cohorts 2015-16
Number of centers	136	125	157	159	293	284
Average # of students served per center	58	69	68	63	63	66
Number of participating students	9,809	8,685	10,685	10,025	20,494	18,710
By School Level						
% Elementary School	47%	50%	68%	69%	58%	60%
% Middle School	33%	32%	22%	24%	27%	28%
% High School	21%	17%	10%	8%	15%	12%
By Ethnicity						
% African American	47%	48%	53%	55%	50%	52%
% White	25%	25%	25%	22%	25%	24%
% Hispanic	17%	16%	18%	19%	17%	17%
% Other	11%	12%	4%	4%	8%	8%

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 for 2015-16 can be reviewed by examining the percent of grantees who reported enrolling their targeted number of participants. 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 10 and 11 grantees ranged from 50 to 515, while the number of students who were reported as enrolled in 21st CCLC programs in 2015-16 ranged from 44 to 731. To describe the extent of enrollment, the enrollment projections of grantees were classified as “met” if the number of students who were enrolled was at or above 75% of their projections.

✓ Objective 1.1—Met
For 2015-16, this objective was met. Approximately 92% of Cohort 10 grantees and 85% of Cohort 11 grantees served at least 75% of their proposed number of students, in 2015-16, with a total across both cohorts of 88% (which represents the majority, greater than 50%).

In further exploring variations across types of organizations, Table 3 shows that for organization types for which there were 10 or more grantees, Faith Based Organizations had the lowest percentage of grantees that met the 75% enrollment targets (82%), whereas school districts had the highest percentage (94%).

Table 3. Proportion of Grantees that Enroll At Least 75% of Projected Students

Organization Type	Both Cohorts 2015-16	
	# of Grantees	% of Grantees that enrolled \geq 75% of expected students
Charter School (CS)	1	100%
CLUB	2	50%
College or University (COU)	3	67%
Community-Based Organization (CBO)	51	90%
Faith-Based Organization (FBO)	11	82%
For-Profit Entity (FPC)	6	67%
Nationally Affiliated Nonprofit Agency (NANP)	1	0%
YMCA/YWCA (Y)	3	100%
Other Unit of City or County Government (UG)	1	100%
School District (SD)	33	94%
TOTAL	112	88%

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 indicates that 73% of students who attended Cohort 10 and Cohort 11 centers in 2015-16 attended schools that qualified for Title I funding. Elementary school participants in 21st CCLC programs were overwhelmingly from Title I schools (97%), while 49% of middle school participants, and 12% of high school participants, were from Title I schools.

✓ Objective 1.2—Met
This objective was met for 2015-16 in that, overall, an average of 73% of students per center came from schools that qualified for Title I funding (48 students on average per center coming from Title I schools).

Table 4. 21st CCLC Participating Students from Title I Schools in 2015-16

	Cohort 10	Cohort 11	Both Cohorts
Average # of students from Title I schools served per center	43	52	48
Average % of students from Title I schools served per center	62%	83%	73%
Number of participating Title I students	5,416	8,311	13,727
By School Level			
% Elementary School	96%	98%	97%
% Middle School	40%	58%	49%
% High School	7%	22%	12%
By Ethnicity			
% African American	75%	82%	79%
% White	49%	81%	65%
% Hispanic	72%	88%	81%
% Other	27%	84%	43%

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?

State End-of-Grade (EOG) test results are reported according to the following five proficiency levels²:

² For the purposes of this report, “non-proficient” is defined as those students who fall within proficiency Level I, Level II, and Level III.

- 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 2014-15, approximately 75% of both cohorts entered the school year “non-proficient” in reading or math. For students served in 2015-16, 74% of Cohort 10 and Cohort 11 grades 4-8 students were “non-proficient” in reading at the beginning of the school year, while 73% of Cohort 10 and 72% of Cohort 11 students were “non-proficient” in math.

✓ Objective 1.3—Met
This objective was met in 2015-16 because, for participating students in grades 4 to 8 with prior year test scores, about three-quarters were in need of academic support, as judged by their lack of proficiency on state tests in reading or math at program entry.

Table 5. Percent of Grades 4-8 21st CCLC Students “Non-Proficient” in Reading or Math EOG Tests in 2014 for 2014-15 School Year and in 2015 for 2015-16 School Year

	Reading		Math	
	Cohort 10	Cohort 11	Cohort 10	Cohort 11
% “non-proficient” at end of 2014 (prior to being served in 2014-15 school year)	75%	76%	76%	75%
% “non-proficient” at end of 2015 (prior to being served in 2015-16 school year)	74%	74%	73%	72%

Note. N sizes varied by cohort and subject.

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, as well as the percentages by school level (elementary, middle, high) and (Objective 2.2) the percentage of centers, statewide, with average attendance rates of less than 30 (non-“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)

As Table 6 shows, statewide, 75% (for Cohort 10 and Cohort 11 combined) of enrolled students attended for 30 days or more in 2015-16, while 25% of students attended fewer than 30 days. The percentage of students who were “regular” attendees was highest at the elementary level (86%) and then declined in middle school (65%) and high school (45%), when other after school activities may be more likely to interfere with program attendance. These “regular” attendee percentages exceeded the percentages from both Cohorts in 2014-15.

✓ Objective 2.1—Met
This objective was met in 2015-16 in that 75% of participants attended 30 days or more (were “regular attendees”). The percentage of students attending 30 days or more was 86% among elementary students, 65% among middle school students, and 45% among high school students.

Table 6. Cohort 10 and 11 Center Attendance in 2014-15 and 2015-16

	Cohort 10 2014-15	Cohort 10 2015-16	Cohort 11 2014-15	Cohort 11 2015-16	Both Cohorts 2014-15	Both Cohorts 2015-16
Students						
% of “regular” attendees (30 days or more)	65%	67%	75%	82%	70%	75%
% 30-89 days	43%	44%	48%	44%	45%	44%
% 90 days or more	22%	22%	27%	38%	25%	31%
% of “non-regular” attendees	35%	33%	25%	18%	30%	25%
School-Level						
% of ES “regular” attendees	81%	81%	81%	89%	81%	86%
% of MS “regular” attendees	63%	62%	65%	67%	64%	65%
% of HS “regular” attendees	33%	34%	56%	65%	40%	45%

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

Objective 2.2: Statewide Percentage of Centers with an Average Attendance of Fewer Than 30 Days Will Not Exceed 13%

Another way of examining attendance data is based on the percentage of centers, statewide, with average attendance that is low (according the federal standard of less than 30 days). In 2014-15, 85% of 21st CCLC centers statewide had average attendance at or above the federally-defined 30-day minimum for a “regular” attendee and 15% had average attendance below the 30-day minimum. In 2015-16, the percentage of centers statewide with low average attendance decreased to 12%. (Note: 12% of 284 centers equates to roughly 34 centers with low attendance.)

✓ **Objective 2.2—Met**

This objective was met in 2015-16, as 88% of centers across both Cohorts 10 and 11 reported average attendance rates of 30 days or more, with 12% of centers reporting fewer than 30 days attendance, on average.

Table 7. Cohort 10 and 11 Percentage of Centers with Average Attendance Meeting and Not Meeting “Regular” Attendee Definition

	Cohort 10 2014-15	Cohort 10 2015-16	Cohort 11 2014-15	Cohort 11 2015-16	Both Cohorts 2014-15	Both Cohorts 2015-16
% of centers statewide with average attendance of 30 days or more	87%	82%	84%	92%	85%	88%
% of centers statewide with average attendance fewer than 30 days	13%	18%	16%	8%	15%	12%

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 and math. In addition, grantees are expected to offer services that emphasize enrichment areas, which complement academic programs, such as youth leadership and drug and violence prevention activities.

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

In their reporting to NCDPI, grantees indicated the degree to which they emphasized core academic areas on a four-point scale from “no emphasis” to “high emphasis.” Table 8 shows that across all centers operating in 2015-16 (125 in Cohort 10 and 159 in Cohort 11), 94%-100% reported a “high emphasis” or “medium emphasis” on mathematics, reading, or science.

✓ **Objective 3.1—Met**

This objective was met in 2015-16, as 94%-100% of centers across both Cohorts 10 and 11 reported an emphasis on mathematics, reading, or science.

Table 8. Cohort 10 and 11 Center Reported Emphasis on Core Academic Areas

Subject	Cohort 10 (125 Centers)		Cohort 11 (159 Centers)	
	High to Medium Emphasis	Low to No Emphasis	High to Medium Emphasis	Low to No Emphasis
Mathematics	100%	0%	100%	0%
Reading/literacy	100%	0%	97%	3%
Science	98%	2%	94%	6%

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

Programs also reported to NCDPI on their level of programmatic emphasis on specific enrichment areas. Table 9 shows that 91%-99% of centers reported a program emphasis on “academic enrichment” and “tutoring/homework help.” A variety of other activities were provided by smaller percentages of grantees. For example, drug and violence prevention and other character education programs were reported as emphasized by approximately 70%, community service programs by approximately 50%, and career/job training by about one-third.

✓ Objective 3.2—Met
In 2015-16 this objective was met in that, across all centers, 100% reported a high emphasis on at least one enrichment activity and centers, as a whole, indicated that they placed a high emphasis on an average of four enrichment areas.

Table 9. Cohort 10 and 11 Center Reported Emphasis on Enrichment Areas

Type of Activity	Cohort 10 (125 Centers)		Cohort 11 (159 Centers)	
	High to Medium Emphasis	Low to No Emphasis	High to Medium Emphasis	Low to No Emphasis
Academic enrichment	99%	1%	99%	1%
Tutoring/homework help	91%	9%	98%	2%
Remedial education	91%	10%	82%	19%
Programs that promote parental involvement and family literacy	79%	21%	81%	20%
Activities that promote youth leadership	73%	27%	81%	18%
Recreational activities	72%	29%	84%	16%
Drug and violence prevention programs, counseling programs, and character education programs	68%	32%	71%	29%
Supplemental educational services	52%	49%	62%	38%
Mentoring	64%	36%	63%	38%
Community service/service learning programs	54%	46%	55%	45%

Type of Activity	Cohort 10 (125 Centers)		Cohort 11 (159 Centers)	
	High to Medium Emphasis	Low to No Emphasis	High to Medium Emphasis	Low to No Emphasis
Activities for limited English proficient students	38%	61%	34%	66%
Activities that target students who have been truant, suspended, or expelled	36%	64%	34%	67%
Career/job training	32%	68%	41%	59%
Expanded library service hours	23%	77%	29%	71%

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

The federal requirements state that participants in 21st CCLC programs will 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 various areas.

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 students in grades 4-8 as compared to the state population year-to-year change.

The results of these two different approaches to examining participants’ reading and math EOG test score changes from the end of 2015 to the end of 2016 are described below.

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%³

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 enrolled students in 21st CCLC programs in 2015-16.

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 2014-15 academic year (“Level I, II or III in 2015”) 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 2015 who scored “Level IV or V in 2016.” Then we calculated the percent of those students who scored “non-proficient” in 2015 who subsequently scored “proficient” at the end of 2016. (Of the 18,710 students reported as “regularly” participating, there were 6,453 in grades 4-8 who had two years of state test scores in reading and 6,455 in math.)

Table 10 shows that, on the **reading EOG**, for all students statewide (not just those attending 21st CCLC programs), 16% of students who were “non-proficient” at the end of 2015 moved to “proficient” status in 2016. For “regular” attendees in Cohorts 10 and 11, the comparable percentage moving from “non-proficient” to “proficient” in reading was 11% and for those students who did not attend “regularly,” the percentage was 10%.

Table 11 shows that, on the **math EOG**, for all students statewide (not just those attending 21st CCLC programs), 14% of students who were “non-proficient” in 2015 moved to “proficient” status in 2016. For “regular” attendees in Cohorts 10 and 11, the comparable percentage moving from “non-proficient” to “proficient” in math was 11% and for “non-regular” attendees, the percentage moving from “non-proficient” to “proficient” was 9%.

✓ Objective 4.1—Met
The 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” was met in 2015-16. For “regular” attendees in Cohorts 10 and 11, the percentage moving from “non-proficient” to “proficient” was 11% for both reading and math .

³ Note: The 11% threshold for Objective 4.1 was based on the prior year baseline.

Table 10. Percentage of “Non-Proficient” Students Who Become “Proficient” in 2015—**READING EOG**

Grade in 2015	Grade in 2016	All Students (Statewide)			21 st CCLC “Non-Regular” Attendees			21 st CCLC “Regular” Attendees		
		Level I, II, or III in 2015	Level IV or V in 2016	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.	Level I, II, or III in 2015	Level IV or V in 2016	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.	Level I, II, or III in 2015	Level IV or V in 2016	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.
03	04	5,8707	9,522	16%	232	33	14%	1,458	181	12%
04	05	5,7411	7,914	14%	254	19	7%	1,129	89	8%
05	06	5,8696	12,946	22%	369	52	14%	1,011	157	16%
06	07	5,8446	9,164	16%	385	40	10%	729	86	12%
07	08	5,8413	6,607	11%	382	19	5%	533	40	8%
All Grades 4-8		29,1673	46,153	16%	1,622	163	10%	4,860	553	11%

Table 11. Percentage of “Non-Proficient” Students Who Become “Proficient”—**MATH EOG**

Grade in 2015	Grade in 2016	All Students (Statewide)			21 st CCLC “Non-Regular” Attendees			21 st CCLC “Regular” Attendees		
		Level I, II, or III in 2015	Level IV or V in 2016	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.	Level I, II, or III in 2015	Level IV or V in 2016	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.	Level I, II, or III in 2015	Level IV or V in 2016	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.
03	04	56,070	10,415	19%	217	20	9%	1,292	164	13%
04	05	55,724	11,840	21%	262	44	17%	1,084	202	19%
05	06	49,225	4,803	10%	343	13	4%	899	45	5%
06	07	64,436	7,493	12%	426	34	8%	786	59	8%
07	08	65,490	6,315	10%	434	32	7%	602	38	6%
All Grades 4-8		290,945	40,866	14%	1,682	143	9%	4,663	508	11%

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

The following tables describe a second way of describing the state test score changes experienced by grade 4-8 participants from 2015 to 2016. 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 scores⁴

⁴ 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 state mean for the grade in question by subtracting the state mean from each score of 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 as

was calculated for “regular” attendees, and that average change was compared to the average 2015 to 2016 change for all students in the state at the respective grade levels. To meet this objective, “regular” attendees were expected to show average improvement in state test scores at the same rate as the state average year-to-year change, or greater. The change scores, the difference in students’ standardized scores from one year to the next (2015 to 2016), are presented below.

Table 12 describes the year-to-year change on state EOG reading and math tests for Cohorts 10 and 11 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.**”

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

Grade Level	Reading	Math
Grade 4	Same	Below (-0.01)
Grade 5	Above (+0.05)	Above (+0.05)
Grade 6	Below (-0.05)	Below (-0.05)
Grade 7	Same	Same
Grade 8	Same	Same
TOTAL	Same	Same

✓ Objective 4.2—Met
<p>This objective was met in Reading. On the Reading EOG, the 21st CCLC “regular” attendees across grade levels (Total row) improved their scores from year-to-year at the same rate as students across the state. Disaggregated along grade levels, fifth grade students improved their scores in reading at a rate greater than students statewide, while students in the sixth grade showed slightly less improvement in scores than students statewide.</p>
<p>This objective was met in Math. On the Math EOG, the 21st CCLC “regular” attendees across grade levels (Total row) improved their scores from year-to-year at the same rate as students across the state. Disaggregated along grade levels, fifth grade students improved their scores in math at a rate greater than students statewide, while students in the fourth and sixth grades showed slightly less improvement in scores than students statewide.</p>

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

In addition to state test results, classroom teacher reports of improvements in student academic performance and overall behaviors over the school year are also monitored by NCDPI and are another indicator of program impact on students. NCDPI makes available a survey for grantees to provide to the classroom teachers of students who are “regular” attendees. The survey asks the classroom teacher to rate the extent of improvements the student has made over the year in various areas. Teachers were asked to consider areas of improvement for each of their students who participated in 21st CCLC programs, including academic performance, turning in homework on time, turning in quality homework, participation in class, and behavior in class. If a student did not need to improve, the teacher indicated this as well.

Objective 4.3: The Majority (Over 50%) of Classroom Teachers Responding and Rating a 21st CCLC Participating Student’s Progress Will Indicate Either “Moderate” or “Significant” Improvement

Table 13 presents the response rates, by grade, for the 21st CCLC teacher survey. These response rates reflect completed surveys for students who were “regular” attendees in the 21st CCLC after school programs in 2015-16. Across all grantees, survey results were submitted to NCDPI for 55% of “regularly” attending students.

Table 13. Teacher Survey Response Rates by Grade (“Regular” Attendees)

Grade Level	Both Cohorts		
	Expected Responses	Actual Responses	Response Rate
Elementary	9,628	5,425	56%
Middle	3,342	1,809	54%
High	1,035	471	46%
TOTAL	14,005	7,705	55%

Around 50% of the Cohort 10 and 11 grantees achieved a good response rate from teachers in 2015-16, with response rates ranging from 70% to 100%. However, over 40% of grantees reported response rates ranging from 0% to 50%. It is unclear what is at the root of this disparity, but differential response rates can make it difficult to draw sound conclusions at the grantee level about true differences in teachers’ perceptions of improvements in homework completion, classroom engagement, and class participation. That said, even though the response rates are not ideal, roughly 8,000 teacher surveys were returned for 2015-16 and the data do represent one way of looking at participating students’ progress over the year.

✓ Objective 4.3—Met
This objective was met in 2015-16, as over 50% of students across Cohorts 10 and 11 with returned teacher surveys were reported to have made “moderate” to “significant” improvement in the following four areas: academic performance, turning in homework in a timely manner, turning in quality homework, and participating in class.

Table 14. Teacher Survey Ratings of Student Improvement (“Regular” Attendees)

Area for Improvement	No Change	Little Impr.	Moderate Impr.	Significant Impr.	Total Impr. (Mod.+Sig.)
Academic Performance	12%	28%	34%	21%	55%
Turning in Homework on Time	14%	23%	29%	28%	57%
Turning in Quality Homework	12%	23%	31%	29%	60%
Participating in Class	17%	27%	31%	22%	53%
Behaving in Class	21%	24%	27%	18%	46%

Summary

As the summary table below shows, grantee performance statewide in 2015-16 achieved all objectives. Even though all objectives were achieved, there may be some room for improvement in the area of enrolling targeted students (Objective 1.1) in that there was variability across types of grantees in the extent to which they enrolled 75% of their projected target for enrollment (see Table 3). Also, because there is a relatively small number of centers with average attendance of less than 30 days (around 34), these centers/grantees should be easy to monitor more closely in subsequent years and to provide assistance in increasing their attendance rates (Objective 2.2)

Table 15. Summary of 2015-16 21st CCLC Progress Monitoring Findings

Goals/Objectives	2015-16 Status	Summary of Findings
Goal 1: Targeted Students Are Enrolled		
Objective 1.1: The Majority (Over 50%) of Grantees Enroll At Least 75% of their Projected Number of Students	✓	Approximately 92% of Cohort 10 grantees and 85% of Cohort 11 grantees served at least 75% of their proposed number of students, in 2015-16, with a total across both cohorts of 88% (which represents the majority, greater than 50%).
Objective 1.2: The Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served Statewide are from Low-Income Schools	✓	An average of 73% 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 of Students Served Statewide are in Need of Academic Support	✓	For participating students in grades 4 to 8 with prior year test scores, about three-quarters (75%) 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	2015-16 Status	Summary of Findings
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)	✓	75% of participants attended 30 days or more (were “regular attendees”). The percentage of students attending 30 days or more was 86% among elementary students, 65% among middle school students, and 45% among high school students.
Objective 2.2: Statewide Percentage of Centers with an Average Attendance of Fewer Than 30 Days Will Not Exceed 13%	✓	88% of centers across both Cohorts 10 and 11 reported average attendance rates of 30 days or more, with 12% of centers (roughly 34) reporting 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	✓	94%-100% of Cohort 10 and 11 centers reported an emphasis on mathematics, reading, or science.
Objective 3.2: More than 85% of Centers Offer Enrichment Support Activities	✓	Across all centers, 100% reported a high emphasis on at least one enrichment activity and centers reported placing “high emphasis” on an average of four enrichment areas .
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% . (Indicator 1)	✓	Reading EOG: For “regular” attendees, 11 % moved from “non-proficient” in 2015 to “proficient” in 2016. Math EOG: For “regular” attendees, 11% moved from “non-proficient” in 2015 to “proficient” in 2016.
Objective 4.2: The Percentage of “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. (Indicator 2)	✓	On the Reading EOG , “regular” attendees across grades 4-8 in total improved their scores from year-to-year at the same rate as students across the state. On the Math EOG , the “regular” attendees across grades 4-8 in total improved their scores from year-to-year at the same rate as students across the state.

Goals/Objectives	2015-16 Status	Summary of Findings
Objective 4.3: The Majority (Over 50%) of Classroom Teachers Responding and Rating A 21 st CCLC Participating Student’s Progress Will Indicate Either “Moderate” or “Significant” Improvement	✓	Over 50% of students across Cohorts 10 and 11 with returned teacher surveys were reported to have made “moderate” to “significant” improvement in the following four areas: academic performance, turning in homework in a timely manner, turning in quality homework, and participating in class.