



2018-19 North Carolina 21st CCLC Program State-Level Progress Monitoring Report

Cohort 12 and 13 Grantees

Submitted by:

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

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

Submitted to:

Susan Brigman
Interim Assistant Director, Federal Program
Monitoring and Support
NCDPI

March 2020

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	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 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
A. State Achievement Test Results	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%	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	12
B. Classroom Teacher Survey on “Regular” Attendees’ Improvement at End of Year	14
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. 14	
Summary	15

2018-19 North Carolina 21st CCLC Program State-Level Progress Monitoring Report: Cohort 12 And 13 Grantees

Introduction

Since 2002, the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) has operated a federally-funded competitive grant award program to fund 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 (2003-2009) 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 Cohort 10 grantees totaling \$17,925,136. The following year, funds were approved for 68 Cohort 11 grantees totaling \$22,323,666.

In 2017, 45 Cohort 12 grantees received funding totaling \$14,917,238.¹ Then in 2018, 49 Cohort 13 grantees received funding totaling \$15,771,977. This report summarizes data from the two cohorts of grantees operating programs in 2018-19 (i.e., Cohort 12, with 45 grantees in their second year of funding, and Cohort 13, with 49 grantees in their first year of funding).

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 objectives and performance measures.² 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.

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>



- **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%.
 - **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 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 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, 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 2018-19 school year and who had two years of state test results on End-of-Grade (EOG) tests in reading or math. Student-level assessment data for this report were provided by NCDPI. The second source of data were



Teacher Surveys. The surveys are distributed by grantees to classroom teachers of program participants in order to collect data regarding 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 2018-19 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 2017-18 and 2018-19 and the average number of students served per grantee. Because the first year of operation for Cohort 13 was 2018-19, no data are reported for Cohort 13 in 2017-18. During the 2018-19 school year, there were a total of 94³ grantees operating 206 centers (average of 2 centers per grantee). Statewide, the 94 grantees reported 14,912 participating students, with an average of 159 students served per grantee.

Table 1. 21st CCLC 2017-18 and 2018-19 Grantees, Centers, and Participating Students

	Cohort 12 2017-18	Cohort 12 2018-19	Cohort 13 2017-18	Cohort 13 2018-19	Both Cohorts 2017-18	Both Cohorts 2018-19
Grantees						
Number of grantees	45	45	N/A	49	N/A	94
Number of participating students	8,693	8,578	N/A	6,355	N/A	14,912*
Average number of students served by grantees	194	191	N/A	130	N/A	159
Centers						
Number of centers	117	119	N/A	87	N/A	206
Number of centers per grantee (range)	1-8	1-8	N/A	1-6	N/A	1-8
Average number of centers per grantee	3	3	N/A	2	N/A	2

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

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

As can be seen in the far righthand column of Table 2, for 2018-19, of the 14,912 enrolled, 69% were elementary-level students (with 24% from middle schools and 7% from high schools). Approximately half of the students enrolled in 2018-19 were African American, 23% were White, and 17% were Hispanic.

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



Table 2. 21st CCLC Participating Students in 2017-18 and 2018-19

	Cohort 12 2017-18	Cohort 12 2018-19	Cohort 13 2017-18	Cohort 13 2018-19	Both Cohorts 2017-18	Both Cohorts 2018-19
Number of centers	117	119	N/A	87	N/A	206
Average # of students served per center	75	72	N/A	73	N/A	73
Number of participating students	8,693	8,578	N/A	6,355	N/A	14,912*
By School Level						
% Elementary School	57%	66%	N/A	74%	N/A	69%
% Middle School	29%	26%	N/A	21%	N/A	24%
% High School	14%	9%	N/A	5%	N/A	7%
By Ethnicity						
% African American	45%	46%	N/A	58%	N/A	51%
% White	27%	27%	N/A	16%	N/A	23%
% Hispanic	16%	16%	N/A	18%	N/A	17%
% Other	12%	10%	N/A	7%	N/A	9%

* 21 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 percent of grantees who reported enrolling their projected 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 12 and 13 grantees ranged from 50 to 520, while the number of students who were reported as enrolled in 21st CCLC programs in 2018-19 ranged from 40 to 561.

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 2018-19, this objective was met. Approximately 98% of Cohort 12 grantees and 92% of Cohort 13 grantees reported serving at least 75% of their proposed number of students in 2018-19, with a total across both cohorts of 95%. The objective was exceeded in that almost all (95%) grantees enrolled at least 75% of their projected number of students.

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 was similarly high, 90% or above.

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

Organization Type	Both Cohorts 2018-19	
	# of Grantees	## of grantees that enrolled ≥75% of projected students
Charter School (CS)	8	8 (100%)



Organization Type	Both Cohorts 2018-19	
	# of Grantees	#% of grantees that enrolled ≥75% of projected students
Community-Based Organization (CBO)	42	38 (90%)
Faith-Based Organization (FBO)	7	7 (100%)
School District (SD)	27	27 (100%)
Other	10	9 (90%)
TOTAL	94	89 (95%)

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 86% of students who attended Cohort 12 and Cohort 13 centers in 2018-19 attended schools that qualified for Title I funding.⁴ Elementary school participants in 21st CCLC programs were overwhelmingly from Title I schools (99%), while 72% of middle school participants and 51% of high school participants were from Title I schools.

Table 4. 21st CCLC Participating Students from Title I Schools in 2018-19

	Cohort 12	Cohort 13	Both Cohorts
Average # of students from Title I schools served per center	62	68	65
Average % of students from Title I schools served per center	82%	93%	86%
Number of participating Title I students	7,415	5,949	13,364
By School Level			
% Elementary School	98%	100%	99%
% Middle School	65%	83%	72%
% High School	54%	44%	51%
By Ethnicity			
% African American	88%	93%	91%
% White	81%	88%	83%
% Hispanic	85%	97%	91%
% Other	90%	94%	92%

✓ Objective 1.2—Met
This objective was met for 2018-19. Overall, an average of 86% of students per center came from schools that qualified for Title I funding (65 students on average per center coming from Title I schools).

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

Given the focus of the 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?

⁴ Title I schools were identified using 2018-19 eligibility data from NCDPI (see <https://files.nc.gov/dpi/documents/program-monitoring/data/essr-data-as-of-2-12-19.xlsx>). School was identified as Title I if “School Served” variable = “Y”.



State EOG test results for 2017-18 (prior year for this report) are reported using the following five proficiency levels:⁵

- 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 Cohort 12, based on the total number of students in Grades 4 to 8 (with prior year test scores who were served in 2017-18), 74% entered the school year “non-proficient” in reading and 67% entered “non-proficient” in math. For students served in 2018-19, 74% of Cohort 12 and 78% of Cohort 13 students in Grades 4 to 8 were “non-proficient” in reading at the beginning of the school year, while 68% of Cohort 12 and 73% of Cohort 13 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 2017 for 2017-18 School Year and in 2018 for 2018-19 School Year

	Reading		Math	
	Cohort 12	Cohort 13	Cohort 12	Cohort 13
% “non-proficient” at end of 2017 (prior to being served in 2017-18 school year)	74%	N/A	67%	N/A-
% “non-proficient” at end of 2018 (prior to being served in 2018-19 school year)	74%	78%	68%	73%

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

✓ Objective 1.3—Met
This objective was met in 2018-19. For participating Cohort 12 and 13 students in Grades 4 to 8 with prior year test scores, the majority (over 50%), in this case 68% to 78%, were in need of academic support, as judged by their lack of proficiency on state tests in reading or math at program entry.

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

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

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



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, 71% (for Cohort 12 and Cohort 13 combined) of enrolled students were reported by grantees as attending for 30 days or more in 2018-19, while 29% of students were reported as attending fewer than 30 days. The percentage of students who were “regular” attendees was highest at the elementary level (77%) and decreased in middle school (63%) and high school (38%), when other after-school activities may be more likely to interfere with program attendance.

Table 6. Cohort 12 and 13 Center Attendance in 2017-18 and 2018-19

	Cohort 12 2017-18	Cohort 12 2018-19	Cohort 13 2017-18	Cohort 13 2018-19	Both Cohorts 2017-18	Both Cohorts 2018-19
Students						
% of “regular” attendees (30 days or more)	63%	72%	N/A	69%	N/A	71%
% 30-89 days	37%	37%	N/A	48%	N/A	42%
% 90 days or more	26%	35%	N/A	21%	N/A	29%
% of “non-regular” attendees	37%	28%	N/A	31%	N/A	29%
School-Level						
% of ES “regular” attendees	77%	83%	N/A	71%	N/A	77%
% of MS “regular” attendees	55%	59%	N/A	69%	N/A	63%
% of HS “regular” attendees	20%	36%	N/A	43%	N/A	38%

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

✓ Objective 2.1—Partially Met
Overall, this objective was met in 2018-19. Seventy-one percent (71%) of participants attended 30 days or more (were “regular” attendees). The objective was also met for middle school students as the percentage of middle school students attending 30 days or more was 63%. However, the objective was not met for elementary and high school students as the percentage of students attending 30 days or more was 77% (not 80%) among elementary students and 38% (not 40%) 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%

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 2018-19, 87% of 21st CCLC centers, statewide, had average attendance at or above the federally-defined 30-day minimum for a “regular” attendee, and 13% had average attendance below the 30-day minimum. Results for this objective are described below, by Cohort.



Table 7. Cohort 12 and 13 Percentage of Centers with Average Attendance Meeting and Not Meeting “Regular” Attendee Definition

	Cohort 12 2017-18	Cohort 12 2018-19	Cohort 13 2017-18	Cohort 13 2018-19	Both Cohorts 2017-18	Both Cohorts 2018-19
% of centers statewide with average attendance of 30 days or more	84%	87%	N/A	87%	N/A	87%
% of centers statewide with average attendance fewer than 30 days	16%	13%	N/A	13%	N/A	13%

✓ Objective 2.2—Met
Cohort 12 and 13 met this objective in 2018-19. Eighty-seven percent (87%) of centers within each cohort reported average attendance rates of 30 days or more, while 13% of centers within each cohort reported fewer than 30 days attendance, on average.

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

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

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

In their reporting to NCDPI, grantees indicated how often they emphasized specific academic areas in terms of “high” to “low” frequency. Across all centers operating in 2018-19 (119 in Cohort 12 and 87 in Cohort 13), 96% reported a “high frequency” of activity in Literacy, Homework Help, or Tutoring (Note: Data analyzed are not shown in Table 8).

Table 8 shows that Homework Help was reported as the most frequently offered academic activity by centers for both Cohort 12 (95%) and Cohort 13 (84%), followed by Literacy (77%) and STEM (77%) for Cohort 12 and STEM (78%) and Tutoring (69%) for Cohort 13.

Table 8. Cohort 12 and 13 Center-Reported Frequency of Core Academic Activities

Academic Activities	Cohort 12 (119 Centers)		Cohort 13 (87 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	20%	80%	5%	95%
Homework Help	95%	5%	84%	16%
Literacy	77%	23%	55%	45%
STEM	77%	22%	78%	22%
Tutoring	64%	36%	69%	31%



✓ Objective 3.1—Met
This objective was met in 2018-19. Over 85% of Cohort 12 and Cohort 13 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 for the past year. Table 9 provides the frequency of activity availability by cohort. Across both cohorts (note: not shown in Table 9) approximately 80% of all centers reported emphasizing physical activity at least once a week (i.e., high frequency). Across both cohorts, 53% of all centers reported emphasizing Arts and Music activities with high frequency. In addition, 32% of all centers reported emphasizing Youth Leadership activities with high frequency.

Table 9. Cohort 12 and 13 Center-Reported Frequency of Specific Enrichment Activities

Type of Activity	Cohort 12 (119 Centers)		Cohort 13 (87 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
Character Education				
Counseling Programs	9%	91%	14%	86%
Drug Prevention	2%	98%	3%	97%
Truancy Prevention	0%	100%	2%	98%
Violence Prevention	6%	94%	14%	86%
Youth Leadership	30%	70%	35%	65%
Enrichment				
Arts & Music	56%	44%	49%	51%
Community / Service Learning	3%	97%	5%	95%
Entrepreneurship	5%	95%	3%	97%
Mentoring	19%	81%	14%	86%
Physical Activity	85%	15%	79%	21%

In terms of the number of centers providing at least one character education or enrichment activity (note: not shown in Table 9), 38% of Cohort 12 centers and 51% of Cohort 13 centers reported a high frequency of at least one *character education* activity, while 89% of Cohort 12 centers and 83% of Cohort 13 centers indicated a high frequency of at least one *enrichment* activity. In total, 89% of centers (92% of Cohort 12 and 85% of Cohort 13) reported a high frequency of at least one character education *or* enrichment activity.

✓ Objective 3.2—Met
This objective was met by both cohorts. Eighty-nine percent (89%) of Cohort 12 and 13 centers reported a high frequency of at least one character education or enrichment activity.



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

The federal guidance includes the expectation that “regular” attendees in 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.

In terms of state achievement test results, it should be noted that in 2017 the State Board of Education approved revisions to the North Carolina Standard Course of Study (NCSCOS) in reading and math. The revised NCSCOS in reading and math were implemented in 2018-19. Relatedly, the State Board of Education called for the revision of assessments in these content areas to align with the new NCSCOS. As a result, the new math assessment was implemented in 2018-19 and the new reading assessment was implemented in 2019-20 for students in Grades 4-8. Because assessment data for this report come from 2017-18 and 2018-19, students in this report sample took the same reading assessments across the two years. However, over this two-year period, there were transitions from the previous math assessment (2017-18) to the new math assessment (2018-19). Because of this transition to a new assessment in math for the current reporting year (and a transition to a new reading assessment in 2019-20 that will impact next year’s evaluation report), we have adjusted our reporting methodology to take into consideration this period of transition. In the next section we describe how this transition in assessments impacts current reporting.

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 2017-18 school year to the end of 2018-19 school year are described below. Changes to the state assessments in math (and future changes to the reading



assessment) require a revision to Objective 4.1 from previous reporting years. We begin by reviewing the original Objective 4.1 followed by a discussion of the need to revise this objective.

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%⁶

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 2018-19. In previous years, we used a threshold of 11% of students moving from “non-proficient” to “proficient” as a benchmark for meeting Objective 4.1. However, this baseline was established using assessment data from 2013-14 and 2014-15. Neither year was a transition year for state assessments. Given that the math assessment changed in the time period covered by this report, it is necessary to establish a new baseline in the future when two years of the new assessment data are available. As such, for Objective 4.1 we will report the percentage of “regular” attendees who improve from “non-proficient” to “proficient” and we will compare these students to the statewide average, but we will not render a determination as to whether Objective 4.1 was met.

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 2017-18 academic year (“Level I, II, or III in 2018”) 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 2018 who scored “Level IV or V in 2019.” Then we calculated the percent of those students who scored “non-proficient” in 2018 who subsequently scored “proficient” at the end of 2019. (Of the 10,630 students reported as “regularly” attending, there were 5,289 in Grades 4-8 who had two years of state test scores in reading and 5,230 in math.)

Table 10 shows that, on the **reading EOG** assessment, for all students statewide (not just those attending 21st CCLC programs), 15% of students who were “non-proficient” at the end of academic year 2017-18 moved to “proficient” status at the end of academic year 2018-19. For “regular” attendees in Cohorts 12 and 13, 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 9%.

Table 11 shows that, on the **math EOG** assessment, for all students statewide (not just those attending 21st CCLC programs), 8% of students who were “non-proficient” in 2018 moved to “proficient” status in 2019. For “regular” attendees in Cohorts 12 and 13, the comparable percentage moving from “non-proficient” to “proficient” in math was 7% and for “non-regular” attendees, the percentage moving from “non-proficient” to “proficient” was 5%.

⁶ 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 2019—READING EOG

Grade in 2018	Grade in 2019	All Students (Statewide)			21 st CCLC “Non-Regular” Attendees			21 st CCLC “Regular” Attendees		
		Level I, II, or III in 2018	Level IV or V in 2019	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.	Level I, II, or III in 2018	Level IV or V in 2019	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.	Level I, II, or III in 2018	Level IV or V in 2019	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.
03	04	62,662	9,385	15%	377	42	11%	1,251	106	9%
04	05	63,149	8,174	13%	416	24	6%	1,199	91	8%
05	06	67,824	15,180	22%	391	50	13%	772	127	17%
06	07	55,514	7,877	14%	296	20	7%	475	51	11%
07	08	53,890	5,801	11%	206	15	7%	324	35	11%
All Grades 4-8		303,039	46,417	15%	1,686	151	9%	4,021	410	10%

Table 11. Percentage of “Non-Proficient” Students Who Become “Proficient” in 2019—MATH EOG

Grade in 2017	Grade in 2018	All Students (Statewide)			21 st CCLC “Non-Regular” Attendees			21 st CCLC “Regular” Attendees		
		Level I, II, or III in 2018	Level IV or V in 2019	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.	Level I, II, or III in 2018	Level IV or V in 2019	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.	Level I, II, or III in 2018	Level IV or V in 2019	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.
03	04	53,752	3,770	7%	330	16	5%	1,069	52	5%
04	05	57,132	4,844	8%	389	17	4%	1,124	75	7%
05	06	53,699	3,853	7%	343	10	3%	644	51	8%
06	07	61,654	7,348	12%	302	18	6%	470	47	10%
07	08	60,302	4,359	7%	230	12	5%	312	21	7%
All Grades 4-8		286,539	24,174	8%	1,594	73	5%	3,619	246	7%

✓ Objective 4.1—Not Reported for This Year

Given the transition to new state assessments in math, we did not report this year 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 without drawing conclusions for Objective 4.1 from these data. The tables show that “regular” attendees were slightly more likely to have improved from “non-proficient” to “proficient” compared to “non-regular” attendees in both reading and math. However, “regular” attendees in both reading and math had a slightly lower percentage of students moving from “non-proficient” to “proficient” than the state average (i.e., “All Students (Statewide)” column).

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 shows the results of a second method of describing the state test score changes experienced by Grade 4-8 participants from 2018 to 2019. 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 scores⁷ was calculated for “regular” attendees, and that average change was compared to the average 2018 to 2019 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 from one year to the next (2018 to 2019), are presented below.

Table 12 describes the year-to-year change on state EOG reading and math tests for Cohorts 12 and 13 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.**”

Unlike Objective 4.1, Objective 4.2 is not impacted by the transition to the new math assessment because, for Objective 4.2, students’ scale scores are not directly compared across years. Instead, each Cohort 12 and Cohort 13 “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 2017-18 and a +0.5 in 2018-19, this increase would indicate that in 2017-18 this student’s score was the same as the state average, but in 2018-19 this student’s score was above average compared to all other students in the state (0.5 standard deviations above the average). Because all students were equally impacted by the change in the state assessments, it is still possible to meaningfully report “regular” attendees’ standing compared to the state average even if the test itself changed from one year to the next.

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

Grade Level	Reading	Math
Grade 4	Above (+0.03)	Same
Grade 5	Same	Above (+0.04)
Grade 6	Same	Same

⁷ 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 $p \leq 0.05$.



Grade Level	Reading	Math
Grade 7	Same	Same
Grade 8	Same	Above (+0.43) ⁸
TOTAL	Same	Above (+0.05)

✓ Objective 4.2—Met

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, fourth-grade students improved their scores in reading at a slightly greater rate than students statewide.

This objective was also 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 a rate slightly greater than students across the state**. Disaggregated by grade levels, Grade 5 and Grade 8 “regular” attendees improved their scores in math at a rate greater than students statewide.

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

In addition to state test results, another indicator of program participation impact is reflected in data collected from classroom teachers (i.e., Teacher Surveys 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.⁹ Grantees are instructed to distribute the Teacher Survey to a classroom teacher of each participating “regular” attendee.¹⁰ It is the responsibility of the grantee to enter completed Teacher Survey responses for individual students into the 21DC system¹¹ as well as indicate whether or not the Teacher Survey is returned.¹² 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).

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

⁸ 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.

⁹ <https://www.dpi.nc.gov/districts-schools/federal-program-monitoring/21st-century-community-learning-centers#data-collection-&-reporting>

¹⁰ 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.

¹¹ Grantees enter Teacher Survey distribution data at the individual student level in 21DC (Prompt: Teacher Survey distributed; Response options: Yes or No).

¹² Grantees enter returned Teacher Survey status in 21DC at the individual student level (Prompt: Teacher Survey returned; Response options: Yes or No).



2018-19. Grantees reported, via their data entry into 21DC, that 10,653 Teacher Surveys were distributed and that 7,868 were returned for a response rate of 74%. However, the number of regular attendees was 10,630, and the number of students with completed surveys was 7,868 so the percent of regular attendees without survey information was 26%.

Table 13. Teacher Survey Response Rates in 2018-19 by Grade (for “Regular” Attendees)

Grade Level	Both Cohorts		
	Teacher Surveys Distributed	Teacher Surveys Returned	Response Rate
Elementary	8,013	5,776	72%
Middle	2,228	1,719	77%
High	412	373	91%
TOTAL	10,653	7,868	74%

Around 57% of the Cohort 12 and 13 grantees reported a response rate from teachers in 2018-19 of 70% to 100%. Similarly, in 2017-18, 68% of the Cohort 11 and 12 grantees reported 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 not¹³.

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

Grade Level	Both Cohorts 2018-19		
	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	5,776	86%	74%
Middle	1,719	90%	78%
High	373	88%	84%
TOTAL	7,868	87%	75%

✓ Objective 4.3—Met
This objective was met in 2018-19. Over 50% of “regular” attendees across Cohorts 12 and 13 with returned Teacher Surveys were reported by grantees to have improved in the following two areas: (1) homework completion and class participation and (2) student behavior.

Summary

As the summary table below shows, statewide grantee performance in 2018-19 “met” eight of nine state objectives, as indicated by the status column. One of the nine objectives was “partially met” (Objective 2.1 on attendance in the after school program).

¹³ 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 15. Summary of 2018-19 21st CCLC Progress Monitoring Findings

Goals/Objectives	2018-19 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 98% of Cohort 12 grantees and 92% of Cohort 13 grantees served at least 75% of their proposed number of students, in 2018-19, with a total across both cohorts of 95% (which represents the majority, greater than 50%).
Objective 1.2: The Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served Statewide are from Low-Income Schools	Met	An average of 86% of students per center came from schools that qualified for Title I funding (65 students on average per center coming from Title I schools).
Objective 1.3: The Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served Statewide are in Need of Academic Support	Met	For participating Cohort 12 and Cohort 13 students in Grades 4 to 8 with prior year test scores, 68% to 78% were in need of academic support, as judged by their lack of proficiency on state tests in reading or math at program entry.
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)	Partially Met (Met overall and for middle but not elementary or high school students)	Overall 71% of participants attended 30 days or more (i.e., were “regular” attendees). The percentage of students attending 30 days or more was 77% (not 80%) among elementary students, 63% among middle school students, and 38% (not 40%) among high school students.
Objective 2.2: Statewide Percentage of Centers with an Average Attendance of 30 Days or More Will Not Fall Below 87%	Met	A total of 87% of centers within each cohort reported average attendance rates of 30 days or more, while 13% 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	Over 85% of Cohort 12 and Cohort 13 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	Met	Across Cohort 12 and 13 centers, 89% 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		
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	Reading EOG: For “regular” attendees, 10% moved from “non-proficient” in 2018 to “proficient” in 2019. Math EOG: For “regular” attendees, 7% moved from “non-proficient” in 2018 to “proficient” in 2019.



Goals/Objectives	2018-19 Status	Summary of Findings
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.	Met	<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>
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	Over 50% of “regular” attendees across Cohorts 12 and 13 with returned Teacher Surveys were reported to have made improvement in the following two areas: homework completion and class participation, and student behavior.

