



# 2016-17 North Carolina 21st CCLC Program State-Level Progress Monitoring Report

---

## Cohort 10 and 11 Grantees

### **Submitted by:**

Wendy McColskey, Ph.D.  
J. B. Weir, M.S.  
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:**

Donna Brown  
Director, Federal Program  
Monitoring and Support  
NCDPI

**March 2018**

## Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Goal 1: Projected Numbers of 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 .....	4
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).....	6
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 .....	7
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.....	8
Goal 4: “Regular” Attendees Will Demonstrate Educational and Social Benefits and Exhibit Positive Behavioral Changes .....	9
<b>A. State Achievement Test Results</b> .....	9
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 .....	11
<b>B. Classroom Teacher Survey on “Regular” Attendees’ Improvement at End of Year</b> .....	12
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. 13	
Summary .....	14

# 2016-17 North Carolina 21<sup>st</sup> 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 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) to provide after-school services. The competitively awarded grants are 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 52<sup>1</sup> 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 2016-17 (i.e., Cohort 10, with 46 grantees in their fourth and final year of the four-year grants, and Cohort 11, with 63 grantees in their third 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 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program, which incorporate required federal 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC objective and performance measures<sup>2</sup>. 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%

---

<sup>1</sup> Due to missing data and/or some grantees voluntarily terminating and not offering services, findings from this report will be based on a total of 46 Cohort 10 grantees and 63 Cohort 11 grantees.

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



- **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%
  - **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:** 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.

**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. 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 2016-17 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 teacher surveys. (The surveys are distributed by grantees to classroom teachers of “regular” attendees; for those students with returned surveys, the grantees then, in turn, enter teachers’ ratings into 21DC, the state database for this program).

Below, we provide data on the extent to which the state objectives for the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program were met for 2016-17 for the four goals.

## Goal 1: Projected Numbers of Students Are Enrolled

---

As context for this goal, Table 1 describes the number of grantees and centers, statewide, for 2015-16 and 2016-17 and the average number of students served per grantee. During the 2016-



17 school year, there were a total of 109 grantees operating 265 centers (average of 2 centers per grantee). Statewide, the 109 grantees reported 17,619 participating students, with an average of 162 students served per grantee.

**Table 1. 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC 2015-16 and 2016-17 Grantees, Centers, and Participating Students**

	Cohort 10 2015-16	Cohort 10** 2016-17	Cohort 11 2015-16	Cohort 11** 2016-17	Both Cohorts 2015-16	Both Cohorts 2016-17
<b>Grantees</b>						
Number of grantees	47	46	65	63	112	<b>109</b>
Number of participating students	8,685	7,687	10,025	9,952	18,710	<b>17,619*</b>
Average number of students served by grantees	185	167	154	158	167	<b>162</b>
<b>Centers</b>						
Number of centers	125	112	159	153	284	<b>265</b>
Number of centers per grantee (range)	1-7	1-7	1-8	1-8	1-8	1-8
Average number of centers per grantee	3	2	2	2	3	<b>2</b>

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

\* 20 students were reported as participating in *both* Cohort 10 and Cohort 11 centers.

\*\* Each Cohort received a reduction in funding of 20% and 40% in Year 3 and Year 4, respectively. In 2016-17, Cohort 10 was in its fourth year and Cohort 11 was in its third year.

Table 2 shows that 18,710 students were reported as enrolled in 2015-16 compared to 17,619 in 2016-17. As can be seen in last column, for 2016-17, of the 17,619 enrolled, 62% were elementary-level students (with 29% from middle schools and 9% from high schools). Roughly half of the students enrolled in 2016-17 were African American, 22% were White, and 19% were Hispanic (similar percentages for ethnicity as reported in 2015-16).

**Table 2. 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Participating Students in 2015-16 and 2016-17**

	Cohort 10 2015-16	Cohort 10 2016-17	Cohort 11 2015-16	Cohort 11 2016-17	Both Cohorts 2015-16	Both Cohorts 2016-17
Number of centers	125	112	159	153	284	265
Average # of students served per center	69	69	63	68	66	68
Number of participating students	8,685	7,683	10,025	9,952	<b>18,710</b>	<b>17,619*</b>
<b>By School Level</b>						
% Elementary School	50%	52%	69%	70%	60%	<b>62%</b>
% Middle School	32%	35%	24%	23%	28%	<b>29%</b>
% High School	17%	13%	8%	6%	12%	<b>9%</b>
<b>By Ethnicity</b>						
% African American	48%	49%	55%	56%	52%	<b>53%</b>
% White	25%	26%	22%	20%	24%	<b>22%</b>
% Hispanic	16%	17%	19%	20%	17%	<b>19%</b>
% Other	12%	8%	4%	4%	8%	<b>6%</b>

\* 20 students were reported as participating in *both* Cohort 10 and Cohort 11 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 percent 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 10 and 11 grantees ranged from 50 to 330, while the number of students who were reported as enrolled in 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs in 2016-17 ranged from 19 to 425. 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 least 75% of their projected enrollment.

<b>✓ Objective 1.1—Met</b>
For 2016-17, this objective was met. Approximately 83% of Cohort 10 grantees and 87% of Cohort 11 grantees reported serving at least 75% of their proposed number of students, in 2016-17, with a total across both cohorts of 85%. The objective was met and exceeded in that 85% represents the majority of grantees, greater than 50%.

In exploring variations across types of organizations, Table 3 shows that, across organization types, the percentage of grantees with at least 75% of projected enrollment achieved was above 80%.

**Table 3.** Number of Grantees that Enrolled At Least 75% of Projected Students by Organization Type

Organization Type	Both Cohorts 2016-17	
	# of Grantees	#% of grantees that enrolled ≥75% of projected students
Community-Based Organization (CBO)	42	34 (81%)
Faith-Based Organization (FBO)	14	12 (86%)
School District (SD)	41	37 (90%)
Other	12	10 (83%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>93 (85%)</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 77% of students who attended Cohort 10 and Cohort 11 centers in 2016-17 attended schools that qualified for Title I funding. Elementary school participants in 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs were overwhelmingly from Title I schools (97%), while 55% of middle school participants, and 11% of high school participants, were from Title I schools.

<b>✓ Objective 1.2—Met</b>
This objective was met for 2016-17 in that, overall, an average of 77% of students per center came from schools that qualified for Title I funding (54 students on average per center coming from Title I schools).



**Table 4.** 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Participating Students from Title I Schools in 2016-17

	Cohort 10	Cohort 11	Both Cohorts
Average # of students from Title I schools served per center	48	58	<b>54</b>
Average % of students from Title I schools served per center	70%	82%	<b>77%</b>
Number of participating Title I students	5,164	8,843	14,007
<b>By School Level</b>			
% Elementary School	96%	98%	<b>97%</b>
% Middle School	45%	66%	<b>55%</b>
% High School	10%	13%	<b>11%</b>
<b>By Ethnicity</b>			
% African American	75%	84%	80%
% White	55%	81%	68%
% Hispanic	73%	89%	83%
% Other	46%	88%	63%

*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 End-of-Grade (EOG) test results are reported according to the following five proficiency levels<sup>3</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 in grades 4 to 8 with prior year test scores who were served in 2015-16, approximately 75% of both cohorts entered the school year “non-proficient” in reading or math. For students served in 2016-17, 72% of Cohort 10 and 75% of Cohort 11 grades 4-8 students were “non-proficient” in reading at the beginning of the school year, while 69% of Cohort 10 and 70% of Cohort 11 students were “non-proficient” in math.

<b>✓ Objective 1.3—Met</b>
This objective was met in 2016-17 because, for participating students in grades 4 to 8 with prior year test scores, 69% or greater (a majority) were in need of academic support, as judged by their lack of proficiency on state tests in reading or math at program entry.

<sup>3</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.





**Table 5.** Percent of 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Students (Grades 4-8) “Non-Proficient” in Reading or Math EOG Tests in 2015 for 2015-16 School Year and in 2016 for 2016-17 School Year

	Reading		Math	
	Cohort 10	Cohort 11	Cohort 10	Cohort 11
% “non-proficient” at end of 2015 (prior to being served in 2015-16 school year)	<b>74%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>72%</b>
% “non-proficient” at end of 2016 (prior to being served in 2016-17 school year)	<b>72%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>70%</b>

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 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, 72% (for Cohort 10 and Cohort 11 combined) of enrolled students attended for 30 days or more in 2016-17, while 28% of students attended fewer than 30 days. The percentage of students who were “regular” attendees was highest at the elementary level (81%) and decreased in middle school (60%) and high school (50%), when other after-school activities may be more likely to interfere with program attendance. These “regular” attendee percentages were similar to the percentages from both Cohorts in 2015-16.

<b>✓ Objective 2.1—Met</b>
This objective was met in 2016-17 in that 72% of participants attended 30 days or more (were “regular” attendees). The percentage of students attending 30 days or more was 81% among elementary students, 60% among middle school students, and 50% among high school students.

**Table 6.** Cohort 10 and 11 Center Attendance in 2015-16 and 2016-17

	Cohort 10 2015-16	Cohort 10 2016-17	Cohort 11 2015-16	Cohort 11 2016-17	Both Cohorts 2015-16	Both Cohorts 2016-17
<b>Students</b>						
% of “regular” attendees (30 days or more)	67%	69%	82%	75%	75%	<b>72%</b>
% 30-89 days	44%	44%	44%	42%	44%	43%
% 90 days or more	22%	25%	38%	33%	31%	30%
% of “non-regular” attendees	33%	31%	18%	25%	25%	<b>28%</b>





	Cohort 10 2015-16	Cohort 10 2016-17	Cohort 11 2015-16	Cohort 11 2016-17	Both Cohorts 2015-16	Both Cohorts 2016-17
<b>School-Level</b>						
% of ES “regular” attendees	81%	82%	89%	81%	86%	<b>81%</b>
% of MS “regular” attendees	62%	60%	67%	60%	65%	<b>60%</b>
% of HS “regular” attendees	34%	46%	65%	56%	45%	<b>50%</b>

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

### *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 2015-16, 88% 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 12% had average attendance below the 30-day minimum. In 2016-17, the percentage of centers statewide with attendance at or above the federally defined 30-day minimum for a “regular” attendee was 82%. The percentage of centers with low average attendance (less than 30 days) increased to 18% from the previous year. That said, the increase in the percentage of centers with low average attendance in 2016-17 was due to Cohort 10 rather than Cohort 11. Thus, the objective results are described by Cohort.

<p>✓ <b>Objective 2.2—Partially Met</b> (Cohort 10 Not Met; Cohort 11 Met)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cohort 10 <b>did not meet</b> this objective in 2016-17, as 74% of centers reported average attendance rates of 30 days or more, while 26% of centers reported fewer than 30 days attendance, on average.</li> <li>- Cohort 11 <b>did meet</b> this objective in 2016-17, as 87% of centers reported average attendance rates of 30 days or more, while 13% of centers reported fewer than 30 days attendance, on average.</li> </ul>
---

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

	Cohort 10 2015-16	Cohort 10 2016-17	Cohort 11 2015-16	Cohort 11 2016-17	Both Cohorts 2015-16	Both Cohorts 2016-17
% of centers statewide with average attendance of 30 days or more	82%	<b>74%</b>	92%	<b>87%</b>	88%	82%
% of centers statewide with average attendance fewer than 30 days	18%	<b>26%</b>	8%	<b>13%</b>	12%	18%

## **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. Table 8 shows that across all centers operating in 2016-17 (112 in Cohort 10 and 153 in Cohort 11), over 85% reported a “high frequency” of academic activities in the area of Literacy and more generally, in Homework Help, and Tutoring. Over 90% reported a “high frequency” of activities in support of English Language Learners.

<b>✓ Objective 3.1—Met</b>
This objective was met in 2016-17, as over 85% of Cohort 10 and Cohort 11 centers reported that they frequently provided activities in Literacy, Homework Help, and Tutoring.

**Table 8.** Cohort 10 and 11 Center-Reported Frequency of Core Academic Activities

Academic Activities	Cohort 10 (112 Centers)		Cohort 11 (153 Centers)	
	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
English Language Learners Support	96%	4%	94%	6%
Homework Help	100%	0%	100%	0%
Literacy	90%	10%	96%	4%
STEM	82%	18%	77%	23%
Tutoring	100%	0%	99%	1%

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

Grantees also reported to NCDPI on their level of the frequency of specific enrichment areas. For example, as shown in Table 9, over 90% of all centers from both cohorts reported emphasizing physical activity at least once a week. Youth Leadership and Arts and Music activities were reported as occurring with high frequency by over 60% of both cohorts.

Roughly 49% of Cohort 10 centers, and 67% of Cohort 11 centers, reported a high frequency of at least one character education activity. In 2016-17, on average, Cohort 10 grantees reported a high frequency of two character education activities, while Cohort 11 grantees reported a high frequency of three character education activities. On average, Cohort 10 and Cohort 11 grantees reported a high frequency of four enrichment activities. Roughly 88% of Cohort 10 centers, and 84% of Cohort 11 centers, indicated a high frequency of at least one enrichment activity.

<b>✓ Objective 3.2—Met</b>
This objective was met by both cohorts in that 100% of Cohort 10 and 11 centers reported a high frequency of at least one character education or enrichment activity.



**Table 9.** Cohort 10 and 11 Center-Reported Frequency of Specific Enrichment Activities

Type of Activity	Cohort 10 (112 Centers)		Cohort 11 (153 Centers)	
	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
<b>Character Education</b>				
Counseling Programs	54%	46%	65%	35%
Drug Prevention	19%	81%	21%	79%
Truancy Prevention	57%	43%	50%	50%
Violence Prevention	60%	40%	45%	55%
Youth Leadership	62%	38%	67%	33%
<b>Enrichment</b>				
Arts & Music	79%	21%	64%	36%
Community / Service Learning	55%	45%	20%	80%
Entrepreneurship	50%	50%	43%	57%
Mentoring	90%	10%	57%	43%
Physical Activity	98%	2%	98%	2%

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

The federal requirements state that “regular” attendees in 21<sup>st</sup> 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 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.



The results of these two different approaches to examining participants' reading and math EOG test score changes from the end of the 2015-16 school year to the end of 2016-17 school year 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%<sup>4</sup>**

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 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs in 2016-17.

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 2015-16 academic year (“Level I, II or III in 2016”) 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 2016 who scored “Level IV or V in 2017.” Then we calculated the percent of those students who scored “non-proficient” in 2016 who subsequently scored “proficient” at the end of 2017. (Of the 12,676 students reported as “regularly” attending, there were 6,092 in grades 4-8 who had two years of state test scores in reading and 6,091 in math.)

Table 10 shows that, on the **reading EOG** assessment, for all students statewide (not just those attending 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs), 15% of students who were “non-proficient” at the end of academic year 2015-16 moved to “proficient” status at the end of academic year 2016-17. For “regular” attendees in Cohorts 10 and 11, the comparable percentage moving from “non-proficient” to “proficient” in reading was 10% and for those students who did not attend “regularly,” the percentage was also 10%.

Table 11 shows that, on the **math EOG** assessment, for all students statewide (not just those attending 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs), 13% of students who were “non-proficient” in 2016 moved to “proficient” status in 2017. 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 7%.

<b>✓ Objective 4.1—Partially Met</b> (Math Met; Reading Not 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 <b>met in 2016-17 for math but not met for reading</b> . For “regular” attendees in Cohorts 10 and 11, the percentage moving from “non-proficient” to “proficient” was <b>10% for reading and 11% for math</b> .

<sup>4</sup> Note: The 11% threshold for Objective 4.1 was based on the 2014-15 baseline.



**Table 10.** Percentage of “Non-Proficient” Students Who Become “Proficient” in 2017—**READING EOG**

Grade in 2016	Grade in 2017	All Students (Statewide)			21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC “Non-Regular” Attendees			21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC “Regular” Attendees		
		Level I, II, or III in 2016	Level IV or V in 2017	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.	Level I, II, or III in 2016	Level IV or V in 2017	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.	Level I, II, or III in 2016	Level IV or V in 2017	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.
03	04	59,580	7,643	13%	364	33	9%	1,318	121	9%
04	05	60,597	8,498	14%	345	25	7%	1,176	98	8%
05	06	62,100	14,039	23%	586	66	11%	1,017	126	12%
06	07	51,469	8,025	16%	389	40	10%	590	65	11%
07	08	58,147	6,260	11%	389	33	9%	516	42	8%
All Grades 4-8		291,893	44,465	<b>15%</b>	2,073	197	<b>10%</b>	4,617	452	<b>10%</b>

**Table 11.** Percentage of “Non-Proficient” Students Who Become “Proficient” in 2017—**MATH EOG**

Grade in 2016	Grade in 2017	All Students (Statewide)			21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC “Non-Regular” Attendees			21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC “Regular” Attendees		
		Level I, II, or III in 2016	Level IV or V in 2017	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.	Level I, II, or III in 2016	Level IV or V in 2017	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.	Level I, II, or III in 2016	Level IV or V in 2017	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.
03	04	54,825	8,916	16%	328	23	7%	1,185	125	11%
04	05	54,375	10,369	19%	332	44	13%	1,062	187	18%
05	06	49,959	5,035	10%	507	40	8%	865	72	8%
06	07	56,673	5,891	10%	391	19	5%	667	50	8%
07	08	63,628	5,971	9%	431	20	5%	559	39	7%
All Grades 4-8		279,460	36,182	<b>13%</b>	1,989	146	<b>7%</b>	4,338	473	<b>11%</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 as Great or Greater Than the State Population Year-to-Year Change***

The following table describes a second way of describing the state test score changes experienced by grade 4-8 participants from 2016 to 2017. These analyses describe the year-to-year change in test scores for the students served in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program relative to the year-to-year change in the overall state population. That is, the average change in standardized scores<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> 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  $p \leq 0.05$ .



was calculated for “regular” attendees, and that average change was compared to the average 2016 to 2017 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 (2016 to 2017), 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 in Cohorts 10 and 11 Compared to State Average by Grade

Grade Level	Reading	Math
Grade 4	Same	Above (+0.01)
Grade 5	Above (+0.03)	Above (+0.03)
Grade 6	Above (+0.05)	Same
Grade 7	Same	Same
Grade 8	Same	Same
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Same</b>	<b>Above (+0.01)</b>

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

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

In addition to state test results, classroom teacher surveys of improvements in “regular” attendees’ classroom performance and behavior over the school year are another possible indicator of participation impact on students. While grantees may develop their own teacher survey, NCDPI makes available a survey for download on their website<sup>6</sup>. Grantees are instructed

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/21cclc/reporting/>



to distribute a survey to the teacher of each participating “regular” attendee (30 days or more)<sup>7</sup>. It is the responsibility of the grantee to enter survey distribution data into the 21DC system<sup>8</sup> as well as indicate whether or not the survey is returned<sup>9</sup>. For each survey that is completed and returned, grantees must indicate 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).

**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 13 presents the response rates, by grade, 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 2016-17. Grantees reported, via their data entry into 21DC, that classroom teachers returned surveys for 82% of “regularly” attending students (8,093 teacher surveys returned).

**Table 13.** Teacher Survey Response Rates in 2016-17 by Grade (for “Regular” Attendees)

Grade Level	Both Cohorts		
	Teacher Surveys Distributed	Teacher Surveys Returned	Response Rate
Elementary	6,969	5,662	81%
Middle	2,288	1,924	84%
High	673	507	75%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9,930</b>	<b>8,093</b>	<b>82%</b>

Around 74% of the Cohort 10 and 11 grantees achieved a response rate from teachers in 2016-17 of 70% to 100%. By contrast, in 2015-16, only 50% of the Cohort 10 and 11 grantees achieved achieved response rates in this range.

Table 14 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>.

<b>✓ Objective 4.3—Met</b>
This objective was met in 2016-17, as over 50% of “regular” attendees across Cohorts 10 and 11 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.

<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> Survey distribution data are entered at the individual student level (Prompt: Teacher Survey distributed; Response options: Yes or No).

<sup>9</sup> Survey return data are entered at the individual student level (Prompt: Teacher Survey returned; Response options: Yes or No).

<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.





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

Grade Level	Both Cohorts 2016-17		
	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	5,662	86%	68%
Middle	1,924	84%	70%
High	507	84%	75%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>8,093</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>69%</b>

## Summary

---

As the summary table below shows, statewide grantee performance in 2016-17 “met” most of the state objectives as indicated by the status column. For two objectives, 2.2 and 4.1, objectives were partially met.

**Table 15.** Summary of 2016-17 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Progress Monitoring Findings

Goals/Objectives	2016-17 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>83%</b> of Cohort 10 grantees and <b>87%</b> of Cohort 11 grantees served at least 75% of their proposed number of students, in 2016-17, with a total across both cohorts of <b>85%</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>77%</b> of students per center came from schools that qualified for Title I funding (54 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 students in grades 4 to 8 with prior year test scores, <b>69% or greater</b> were in need of academic support, as judged by their lack of proficiency on state tests in reading or math at program entry.
<b>Goal 2: Enrolled Students Meet Definition of “Regular” Attendance</b>		
Objective 2.1: Statewide Percentage of Students Attending 30 Days or More is <b>At Least 70%</b> (80% in Elementary, 60% in Middle School, and 40% in High School)	<b>Met</b>	<b>72%</b> of participants attended 30 days or more (were “regular” attendees). The percentage of students attending 30 days or more was <b>81%</b> among elementary students, <b>60%</b> among middle school students, and <b>50%</b> among high school students.



Goals/Objectives	2016-17 Status	Summary of Findings
Objective 2.2: Statewide Percentage of Centers with an Average Attendance of 30 Days or More <b>Will Not Fall Below 87%</b>	<b>Partially Met</b> (Met in Cohort 11 but not Cohort 10)	Cohort 10 <b>did not meet</b> this objective in 2016-17, as <b>74%</b> of centers reported average attendance rates of 30 days or more, while 26% of centers reported fewer than 30 days attendance, on average.  Cohort 11 <b>did meet</b> this objective in 2016-17, as <b>87%</b> of centers reported average attendance rates of 30 days or more, while 13% of centers 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>	<b>Over 85%</b> of Cohort 10 and Cohort 11 centers reported that they frequently provided activities in Literacy, Homework Help, and Tutoring.
Objective 3.2: <b>More than 85%</b> of Centers Offer Enrichment Support Activities	<b>Met</b>	This objective was met by both cohorts in that <b>100% of Cohort 10 and 11 centers</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> . (Indicator 1)	<b>Partially Met</b> (Met in Math but not Reading)	<b>Reading EOG:</b> For “regular” attendees, <b>10%</b> moved from “non-proficient” in 2015 to “proficient” in 2017.  <b>Math EOG:</b> For “regular” attendees, <b>11%</b> moved from “non-proficient” in 2016 to “proficient” in 2017.
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. (Indicator 2)	<b>Met</b>	On the <b>Reading EOG</b> , “regular” attendees across grades 4-8 improved their scores from year-to-year at the <b>same rate</b> as students across the state.  On the <b>Math EOG</b> , the “regular” attendees across grades 4-8 improved their scores from year-to-year at a rate <b>slightly greater</b> than students across the state.
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 10 and 11 with returned teacher surveys were reported to have made improvement in the following two areas: homework completion & class participation, and student behavior.

