



2021-22 North Carolina 21st CCLC Program State-Level Progress Monitoring Report

Cohort 14 and 15 Grantees

Submitted by:

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

Submitted to:

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

May 2023

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Goal 1: Projected Numbers of Students Are Enrolled	3
Objective 1.1: The Majority (Over 50%) of Grantees Enroll At Least 75% of their Projected Number of Students.....	4
Objective 1.2: The Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served Statewide are from Low-Income Schools	5
Objective 1.3: The Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served Statewide are in Need of Academic Support	6
Goal 2: Enrolled Students Attend Program 30 Days or More	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: Enrolled Students Attending the Program (30 Days or More) Will Demonstrate Educational and Social Benefits and Exhibit Positive Behavioral Changes.....	10
A. State Achievement Test Results	10
B. Instructional Staff Survey on Learning Engagement at End of Year	13
Summary.....	15
Appendix: Historical Summary of Indicator Data	18

2021-22 North Carolina 21st CCLC Program State-Level Progress Monitoring Report: Cohort 14 and 15 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). The intent of this federal funding is for subgrantees 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 (grantees¹) is called a cohort. NCDPI funded the first cohort of 16 grantees in 2002. Cohorts 2-8 (2003-09) averaged 20 grantees per cohort. From 2010 to 2016, there were three cohorts funded, Cohorts 9, 10, and 11. The following list provides a summary of the State Board approved 21st CCLC grants awarded from 2010 to 2021.

- In 2010, Cohort 9, the largest cohort to date, included 89 awarded grantees, totaling \$24,982,787.
- In 2013, Cohort 10 included 52 awarded grantees, totaling \$17,925,136.
- In 2014, Cohort 11 included 68 awarded grantees, totaling \$22,323,666.
- In 2017, Cohort 12 included 45 awarded grantees, totaling \$14,917,238.²
- In 2018, Cohort 13 included 49 awarded grantees, totaling \$15,771,977.
- In 2020, Cohort 14 included 45 awarded grantees, totaling \$15,944,885.
- In 2021, Cohort 15 included 61 awarded grantees, totaling \$21,349,077.

This report summarizes data from Cohorts 14 and 15 grantees who operated programs in 2021-22. During the 2021-22 school year, Cohort 14, with 44 remaining grantees, was in their second year of funding, and Cohort 15, with 61 grantees, was in their first year of funding.

The purpose of this report is to provide descriptive information to inform NCDPI's statewide monitoring of the performance of the grantees and participating students. The report is organized by NCDPI's goals and objectives for the 21st CCLC program, which incorporate required federal 21st CCLC objectives and performance measures.³ It should be noted that data for this report were collected during the 2021-22 school year, which continued to be impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. It is unclear how COVID-19 may have impacted grantees, centers, and the attendance and numbers of participating students statewide. However, as in previous years' reports, wherever relevant, we present findings from the current reporting year (2021-22) in tables along with comparison data from the previous year's report (in this case, 2020-21).

¹ Technically, NCDPI is the "grantee" of federal funds and the "subgrantees" are those organizations at the local level that are awarded 21st CCLC grants to provide after-school programming; however, for the purpose of this report, we will use the term "grantee" when referring to the local level "subgrantees."

² 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 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).

³ <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/21stccle/performance.html>



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.⁴
- **Goal 2:** Enrolled students attend program for 30 days or more.
 - **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:** Enrolled students attending the program (30 days or more) will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.
 - **Objective 4.1:** The statewide percentage of participants attending the program (30 days or more), with two years of state test data (Grades 4-8), who improve from “non-proficient” (levels I, II or III) to “proficient” (levels IV or V) will be at least 11%.
 - **Objective 4.2:** Participants attending the program (30 days or more) with two years of state test data (Grades 4-8) 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 participants “in need of improvement” (attending the program 30 days or more) will demonstrate improved engagement in learning.

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. For the purpose of this state-level report, “regular” attendees are defined as those students who attend 30 days or more during the course of the school year. (Note: Enrolled participants attending 21st CCLC programming for 30 days or more were historically referred to as “regular” attendees. While the term “regular” attendees is not currently used for federal-level reporting, the 30-day designation/delineation will continue to be used/tracked for state-level reporting purposes.) 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.

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.

⁴ In need of academic support is defined as students’ performance on prior year’s assessment data.



Goal 4 focuses on the outcomes desired for those students who participate in 21st CCLC at least 30 days (for the school year). Under Goal 4, typically, two types of data on the progress of participating students are obtained and analyzed. The first type is state EOG test scores in reading and math for participating students in Grades 4-8 who attended at least 30 days for the 2021-22 school year.

The second type of data is Instructional Staff Survey ratings.⁵ The surveys are distributed by grantees to the classroom teachers, or other instructional staff, of program participants in order to collect their perceptions of participants’ “need for improvement” and changes to engagement in learning. The grantees enter instructors’ ratings of attendees into 21DC. NCDPI provided student-level instructor ratings to SERVE Center for this report. More information about the Instructional Staff 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 2021-22 for each of the four goals.

Goal 1: Projected Numbers of Students Are Enrolled

As context for this goal, Table 1 shows the number of grantees and centers, statewide, for 2020-21 and 2021-22 and the average number of students enrolled per grantee. During the 2021-22 school year, there were a total of 105⁶ grantees operating 252 centers (average of 2 centers per grantee). Statewide, the 105 grantees reported 14,815 enrolled students, with an average of 142 students enrolled per grantee.

Table 1. 21st CCLC 2020-21 and 2021-22 Grantees, Centers, and Participating Students

	Cohort 14 2020-21	Cohort 14 2021-22	Cohort 15 2020-21	Cohort 15 2021-22	Both Cohorts 2020-21	Both Cohorts 2021-22
Grantees						
Number of grantees	45	44	N/A	61	N/A	105
Number of participating students	6,056	6,910	N/A	7,923	N/A	14,815*
Average number of students served by grantees	135	157	N/A	130	N/A	142
Centers						
Number of centers	108	121	N/A	131	N/A	252
Number of centers per grantee (range)	1-8	1-8	N/A	1-7	N/A	1-8
Average number of centers per grantee	2	3	N/A	2	N/A	2

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

*18 students were reported as participating in *both* Cohort 14 and Cohort 15 centers.

As can be seen in the far righthand column of Table 2, for 2021-22, of the 14,815 students enrolled, 70% were elementary-level students (with 23% from middle schools and 6% from high schools). Nearly half of the students enrolled in 2021-22 were African American (49%), 21% were White, and 21% were Hispanic. Finally, 11% of enrolled students were classified as multilingual learners and 16% were classified as students with disabilities.

⁵ Note: In past years, the U.S. Department of Education required states to report student engagement data collected via a survey administered to the “regular school day teacher” of all “regularly” attending program participants (i.e., students attending the program 30 days or more). However, in 2021, that requirement changed at the federal level, and the target of the survey shifted from the “regular school day teacher” to any “instructional staff” member that could assess changes in the identified student’s level of learning engagement (e.g., social worker, psychologist, counselor, teachers aid, 21st CCLC afterschool program staff).

⁶ Fourteen grantees operated both Cohort 14 and 15 centers. Five of these grantees operated 12 centers that were reported as being funded by both Cohorts 14 and 15. In the event that a grantee operated both Cohort 14 and 15 centers, data for these grantees were analyzed and reported separately by cohort.



Table 2. 21st CCLC Participating Students in 2020-21 and 2021-22

	Cohort 14 2020-21	Cohort 14 2021-22	Cohort 15 2020-21	Cohort 15 2021-22	Both Cohorts 2020-21	Both Cohorts 2021-22
Number of centers	108	121	N/A	131	N/A	252
Average # of students served per center	56	57	N/A	61	N/A	59
Number of participating students	6,056	6,910	N/A	7,923	N/A	14,815*
By School Level						
% Elementary School	67%	69%	N/A	72%	N/A	70%
% Middle School	28%	25%	N/A	22%	N/A	23%
% High School	5%	7%	N/A	6%	N/A	6%
By Ethnicity						
% African American	41%	44%	N/A	52%	N/A	49%
% White	25%	23%	N/A	19%	N/A	21%
% Hispanic	26%	23%	N/A	19%	N/A	21%
% Other	9%	9%	N/A	9%	N/A	9%
By Classification						
Multilingual Learners	13%	11%	N/A	11%	N/A	11%
Disability	16%	16%	N/A	16%	N/A	16%
Homeless	2%	3%	N/A	3%	N/A	3%
Migrant	0%	0%	N/A	0%	N/A	0%
Foster	1%	1%	N/A	1%	N/A	1%

*18 students were reported as participating in *both* Cohort 14 and Cohort 15 centers.

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

Applicants seeking a 21st CCLC grant were required to estimate the number of students their program would enroll. Thus, grantee performance can be reviewed by examining the percentage of grantees who reported enrolling their projected number of participants.⁷ The number of students enrolled per grantee was calculated using student-level 21st CCLC grantee-reported data provided by NCDPI. The reported number of students proposed to be served by Cohort 14 and 15 grantees ranged from 50 to 400, while the number of students who were reported as enrolled in 21st CCLC programs in 2021-22 ranged from 40 to 390. 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. See Appendix A for the reported enrollment percentages by grantee.

✓ Objective 1.1—Met
For 2021-22, this objective was met. Approximately 80% of Cohort 14 grantees and 79% of Cohort 15 grantees reported serving at least 75% of their projected number of students, with a total across both cohorts of 79%. The objective was met in that over 50% (79%) grantees enrolled at least 75% of their projected number of students.

In exploring variations across types of organizations, Table 3 shows that the percentage of grantees with at least 75% of projected enrollment was between 72-100%, except for Colleges or Universities (COU), where the single grantee did not meet its projected enrollment.

⁷ The “projected number of participants” is based on information submitted by grantees in their original proposal. It is the total number of students the grantee proposed to serve with 21st CCLC funds across centers/sites. It is understood that, since being awarded, grantees may have requested and/or been approved for a programmatic amendment that increases/decreases the “projected number of participants;” however, the indicator for this report is the “actual number of students enrolled” (as grantees report in the 21DC database) compared to the “projected number of participants” (as grantees indicated in their original proposal).



Table 3. Grantees in 2021-22 that Enrolled At Least 75% of Projected Students by Organization Type

Organization Type	Both Cohorts 2021-22	
	# of Grantees	# (%) of grantees that enrolled \geq 75% of projected students
Charter School (CS)	5	5 (100%)
College or University (COU)	2	1 (50%)
Community-Based Organization (CBO)	61	49 (80%)
Faith-Based Organization (FBO)	8	6 (75%)
School District (SD)	28	21 (75%)
Other	1	1 (100%)
TOTAL	105	83 (79%)

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

One focus of the federal 21st CCLC funding is on supporting students from high-poverty schools. Table 4 shows that 90% of students who attended Cohort 14 and Cohort 15 centers in 2021-22 attended schools that qualified for Title I funding.⁸ Elementary school participants in 21st CCLC programs were overwhelmingly from Title I schools (98%), while 81% of middle school participants and 42% of high school participants were from Title I schools.

Table 4. 21st CCLC Participating Students from Title I Schools in 2020-21 and 2021-22

	Cohort 14 2020-21	Cohort 14 2021-22	Cohort 15 2020-21	Cohort 15 2021-22	Both Cohorts 2020-21	Both Cohorts 2021-22
Average # of students from Title I schools served per center	49	51	N/A	56	N/A	54
Average % of students from Title I schools served per center	85%	86%	N/A	94%	N/A	90%
Number of participating Title I students	5,289	6,176	N/A	7,313	N/A	13,489
Percent in Schools with Title I Funding by School Level						
Elem School	96%	97%	N/A	99%	N/A	98%
Middle School	73%	77%	N/A	85%	N/A	81%
High School	53%	52%	N/A	32%	N/A	42%
Percent in Schools with Title I funding by Ethnicity						
African American	91%	93%	N/A	95%	N/A	95%
White	78%	79%	N/A	82%	N/A	81%
Hispanic	89%	90%	N/A	96%	N/A	93%
Other	87%	89%	N/A	87%	N/A	88%

✓ Objective 1.2—Met

For 2021-22 this objective was met. Overall, an average of 90% of students per center came from schools that qualified for Title I funding (54 students on average, per center, coming from Title I schools).

⁸ Title I schools were identified using 2020-21 eligibility data from NCDPI (see <https://www.dpi.nc.gov/districts-schools/office-federal-programs#TitleI-EligibleSchoolsSummaryReportESSR-1751>). A school was identified as Title I if “School Served” variable = “Y.”



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

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

State EOG test results for 2020-21 (one year prior to implementation year) are reported using the following five proficiency levels:⁹

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

This scale, adopted by the North Carolina State Board of Education in 2013, is meant to convey the degree to which a student is prepared to proceed to the next grade level. Table 5 shows that, for students served in 2021-22, 84% of Cohort 14 and 87% of Cohort 15 students in Grades 4-8 were “non-proficient” in reading on the 2020-21 assessments, while 88% of Cohort 14 and 90% of Cohort 15 students were “non-proficient” in math.

Table 5. Percentage of 21st CCLC Students (Grades 4-8) “Non-Proficient” in Reading or Math EOG Tests in 2020-21 (for 2021-22 School Year participants)

	Reading		Math	
	Cohort 14	Cohort 15	Cohort 14	Cohort 15
% “non-proficient” at end of 2021 (prior to being served in 2021-22 school year)	84%	87%	88%	90%

Note. N sizes varied by cohort and subject.

✓ Objective 1.3 Met
For participating Cohort 14 and 15 students in Grades 4-8 with end-of-year test scores in 2020-21 (one year prior), the majority (over 50%), in this case 84% to 90%, 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 Attend Program 30 Days or More

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. For the purpose of this report, “regular” attendance is defined as enrolled students attending the program for 30 days or more. Attendance is measured here in the following two ways: (Objective 2.1) the percentage of students who participated at least 30 days by school level (elementary, middle, high) and (Objective 2.2) the percentage of centers, statewide, with an average attendance of 30 days or more

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



days. 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, 67% (for Cohort 14 and Cohort 15 combined) of enrolled students were reported by grantees as attending for 30 days or more in 2021-22, while 33% of students were reported as attending fewer than 30 days. The percentage of students who attended 30 or more days was highest at the elementary level (75%) followed by middle school (53%) and high school (20%), when other after-school activities may be more likely to interfere with program attendance. (Note: Objective 2.1 was not met; however, it is important to note that the percentages were higher than those reported last year—indicating attendance rates in 2021-22 were less negatively impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic compared to 2020-21.)

Table 6. Cohort 14 and 15 Center Attendance in 2020-21 and 2021-22

	Cohort 14 2020-21	Cohort 14 2021-22	Cohort 15 2020-21	Cohort 15 2021-22	Both Cohorts 2020-21	Both Cohorts 2021-22
Students						
% of attendees 30 days or more	51%	69%	N/A	64%	N/A	67%
% 30-89 days	38%	39%	N/A	38%	N/A	39%
% 90 days or more	13%	30%	N/A	26%	N/A	28%
% of attendees less than 30 days	49%	31%	N/A	36%	N/A	33%
School-Level						
% of ES attendees (30 days or more)	58%	80%	N/A	71%	N/A	75%
% of MS attendees (30 days or more)	41%	53%	N/A	53%	N/A	53%
% of HS attendees (30 days or more)	15%	15%	N/A	24%	N/A	20%

✓ Objective 2.1—Not Met
Overall, this objective was not met in 2021-22. Sixty-seven percent (67%) of participants attended 30 days or more. The objective was also not met by grade level, as the percentage of students attending 30 days or more was below the target objective for elementary, middle, and high school students.

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

Another way of examining attendance data is based on the percentage of centers, statewide, with average attendance that is high versus low (for the purposes of this report, low attendance is defined as fewer than 30 days). In 2021-22, 83% of 21st CCLC centers, statewide, had average attendance **at or above** 30 days, and 17% had average attendance **below** 30 days. Results for this objective are described in Table 7, by cohort. See Appendix B for a list, by center/grantee, of average attendance and percentage of attendees attending 30 days or more.



Table 7. Cohort 14 and 15 Percentage of Centers with Average Attendance Above/Below 30 days in 2020-21 and 2021-22

	Cohort 14 2020-21	Cohort 14 2021-22	Cohort 15 2020-21	Cohort 15 2021-22	Both Cohorts 2020-21	Both Cohorts 2021-22
% of centers statewide with a average attendance of 30 days or more	66%	83%	N/A	82%	N/A	83%
% of centers statewide with a average attendance fewer than 30 days	34%	17%	N/A	18%	N/A	17%

✓ Objective 2.2—Not Met
Cohort 14 and 15 did not meet this objective in 2021-22. Eighty-three percent (83%) of centers across cohorts reported a verage attendance rates of 30 days or more, while 17% of centers across cohorts 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.¹⁰

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 2021-22 (121 in Cohort 14 and 131 in Cohort 15), 99% reported that they frequently provided activities in Academic Enrichment, STEM, or Literacy Education. (Note: not shown in Table 8).

More specifically, Table 8 shows that Academic Enrichment was reported as the most frequently offered academic activity by centers for both Cohort 14 (98%) and Cohort 15 (98%), followed by STEM for both Cohort 14 (80%) and Cohort 15 (88%) and Literacy for Cohort 14 (57%) and Cohort 15 (57%).

Table 8. Cohort 14 and 15 Center-Reported Frequency of Core Academic Activities in 2020-21 and 2021-22

Academic Activities	Cohort 14 (121 Centers) 2021-22		Cohort 15 (131 Centers) 2021-22		Both Cohorts 2020-21	Both Cohorts 2021-22
	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	Low Frequency (3 Times per Month–Once per Term) to None	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	Low Frequency (3 Times per Month–Once per Term) to None	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)
Academic Enrichment	98%	2%	98%	2%	N/A	98%
Activities for English Learners	12%	88%	15%	85%	N/A	13%
Expanded Library Service Hours	3%	97%	5%	95%	N/A	4%

¹⁰ The U.S. Department of Education reclassified the types of 21st CCLC activities to be tracked and reported by states and local-level centers as part of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) in 2021. Thus, 2021 is the first year of reporting the “reclassified activities” for both academic and enrichment categories.



Academic Activities	Cohort 14 (121 Centers) 2021-22		Cohort 15 (131 Centers) 2021-22		Both Cohorts 2020-21	Both Cohorts 2021-22
	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	Low Frequency (3 Times per Month–Once per Term) to None	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	Low Frequency (3 Times per Month–Once per Term) to None	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)
Literacy Education	57%	43%	57%	43%	N/A	57%
Services for Individuals with Disabilities	3%	97%	2%	98%	N/A	3%
STEM, including Computer Science	80%	20%	88%	12%	N/A	84%
Telecommunications and Technology Education	12%	88%	23%	77%	N/A	17%
Well-Rounded Education Activities, including Credit Recovery and Attainment	28%	72%	29%	71%	N/A	29%

✓ Objective 3.1—Met
This objective was met in 2021-22. Ninety-nine percent (99%) of Cohort 14 and Cohort 15 centers reported that they frequently provided activities in Academic Enrichment, STEM, or Literacy Education.

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

Grantees also reported to NCDPI on the frequency with which specific enrichment areas were offered during the past year. Table 9 provides the frequency of activity availability by cohort. Across both cohorts, approximately 79% of all centers reported emphasizing Healthy and Active Lifestyle activities at least once a week (i.e., high frequency). Across both cohorts, 13% of all centers reported emphasizing Cultural Program activities with high frequency. Less than 10% of all centers reported high frequency in any other enrichment activity area.

Table 9. Cohort 14 and 15 Center-Reported Frequency of Specific Enrichment Activities in 2020-21 and 2021-22

Type of Activity	Cohort 14 (121 Centers) 2021-22		Cohort 15 (131 Centers) 2021-22		Both Cohorts 2020-21	Both Cohort 2021-22
	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	Low Frequency (3 Times per Month–Once per Term) to None	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	Low Frequency (3 Times per Month–Once per Term) to None	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)
Character Education						
Drug Prevention	3%	97%	11%	89%	N/A	7%
Truancy Prevention	6%	94%	9%	91%	N/A	8%
Enrichment						
Career Competencies and Career Readiness	5%	95%	13%	87%	N/A	9%



Type of Activity	Cohort 14 (121 Centers) 2021-22		Cohort 15 (131 Centers) 2021-22		Both Cohorts 2020-21	Both Cohort 2021-22
	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	Low Frequency (3 Times per Month—Once per Term) to None	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	Low Frequency (3 Times per Month—Once per Term) to None	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)	High Frequency (1-5 Times per Week)
Cultural Programs	10%	90%	16%	84%	N/A	13%
Healthy and Active Lifestyle	79%	21%	80%	20%	N/A	79%
Parenting Skills and Family Literacy	5%	95%	3%	97%	N/A	4%

In terms of the number of centers providing at least one character education or enrichment activity (Note: not shown in Table 9), 7% of Cohort 14 centers and 14% of Cohort 15 centers reported a high frequency of at least one *character education* activity, while 80% of Cohort 14 and 89% Cohort 15 centers indicated a high frequency of at least one *enrichment* activity. In total, 86% of centers (82% of Cohort 14 and 90% of Cohort 15) reported a high frequency of at least one character education *or* enrichment activity.

✓ Objective 3.2—Partially Met
This objective was partially met. In total, across both cohorts, this objective was met—with 86% of centers reporting a high frequency of at least one character education or enrichment activity. By cohort, Cohort 15 met the target (90%); however, Cohort 14 did not—with only 82% of Cohort 14 centers reporting a high frequency of at least one character education or enrichment activity.

Goal 4: Enrolled Students Attending the Program (30 Days or More) Will Demonstrate Educational and Social Benefits and Exhibit Positive Behavioral Changes

The federal guidance includes the expectation that 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) Instructional Staff Surveys of individual participating students’ engagement in learning 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 Attendees’ Status from “Non-Proficient” to “Proficient:”* We examined the percentage of participants attending the program (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 participants attending the program (30 days or more) in Grades 4-8 as compared to the state population year-to-year change.



Objective 4.1: The Statewide Percentage of Participants Attending the Program (30 Days or More), With Two Years of State Test Data (Grades 4-8), Who Improve from “Non-Proficient” (Levels I, II or III) to “Proficient” (Levels IV or V) Will Be At Least 11%¹¹

As defined by the North Carolina College and Career Readiness (CCR) Standards, if a reading EOG score is categorized as Level IV proficiency or above, then the student is considered “proficient.” To examine participating students’ changes in proficiency status, we requested, from NCDPI, two years of state test results in reading and math for all students enrolled in 21st CCLC programs in 2021-22.

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 2020-21 academic year (“Level I, II, or III”) 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 2021 who scored “Level IV or V in 2022.” Then we calculated the percentage of those students who scored “non-proficient” in 2021 who subsequently scored “proficient” at the end of 2022 (one year later). (Of the 9,981 students reported as “regularly” attending, there were 4,416 in Grades 4-8 who had two years of state test scores in reading and 4,383 in math.)

Table 10 shows that, on the **reading EOG** assessment, for both “regular” attendees and those students who did not attend “regularly” in Cohorts 14 and 15, the percentage moving from “non-proficient” to “proficient” in reading was between 5% and 7% for both groups of students. Table 11 shows that, on the **math EOG** assessment, for both “regular” attendees and those students who did not attend “regularly” in Cohorts 14 and 15, the percentage moving from “non-proficient” to “proficient” in math was between 7% and 11% for both groups of students.

Table 10. Percentage of “Non-Proficient” Students Who Become “Proficient” in 2022—**READING EOG**

Grade in 2021	Grade in 2022	21 st CCLC Participants: Attended fewer than 30 days			21 st CCLC Participants: Attended ≥ 30 days		
		Level I, II, or III in 2021	Level IV or V in 2022	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.	Level I, II, or III in 2021	Level IV or V in 2022	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.
03	04	397	23	6%	1150	110	10%
04	05	422	13	3%	1162	89	8%
05	06	476	19	4%	617	27	4%
06	07	395	25	6%	462	35	8%
07	08	333	21	6%	362	19	5%
All Grades 4-8		2,023	101	5%	3,753	280	7%

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



Table 11. Percentage of “Non-Proficient” Students Who Become “Proficient” in 2022—**MATH EOG**

Grade in 2021	Grade in 2022	21 st CCLC Participants: Attended fewer than 30 days			21 st CCLC Participants: Attended ≥ 30 days		
		Level I, II, or III in 2021	Level IV or V in 2022	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.	Level I, II, or III in 2021	Level IV or V in 2022	% Moving Up to CCR Prof.
03	04	421	30	7%	1203	132	11%
04	05	452	40	9%	1242	167	13%
05	06	507	43	8%	646	56	9%
06	07	407	29	7%	480	52	11%
07	08	311	11	4%	349	16	5%
All Grades 4-8		2,098	153	7%	3,920	423	11%

✓ Objective 4.1—Partially Met
 The objective of having at least 11% of attendees (attending program 30 days or more) with two years of state test results (in Grades 4-8) improving from “non-proficient” to “proficient” was met in 2021-22 for math but not met for reading. For attendees (attending program 30 days or more) in Cohorts 14 and 15, the percentage moving from “non-proficient” to “proficient” was 7% for reading and 11% for math.

The following table shows the results of a second method of describing the state test score changes experienced by Grade 4-8 participants from 2021 to 2022. 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 scores¹² was calculated for participants who “regularly” attended the program (30 days or more), and that average change was compared to the average change in scores from 2021 to 2022 for all students in the state at the respective grade levels. To meet this objective, “regular” attendees would show average improvement in state test scores at the same rate or greater than the state average year-to-year change.

The results of the change score analyses, the difference in students’ standardized scores across two years (2021 to 2022), are presented below.

Table 12 describes the year-to-year change on state EOG reading and math tests for Cohorts 14 and 15 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.**”

¹² 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 $p \leq 0.05$.



- Finally, where there was no measurable difference between the “regular” attendees and the statewide student population as a whole, the change was labeled “**Same.**”

For Objective 4.2, each Cohort 14 and Cohort 15 “regular” attendee’s scale score was 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 2020-21 and a +0.5 in 2021-22, this increase would indicate that in 2020-21 this student’s score was the same as the state average, but in 2021-22, this student’s score was above average compared to all other students in the state (0.5 standard deviations above the average).

Table 12. Year-to-Year Change in Reading and Math EOG Scores for Participants (Attending 30 Days or More) in Cohorts 14 and 15 Compared to State Average by Grade

Grade Level	Reading	Math
Grade 4	Above (+0.05)	Above (+0.06)
Grade 5	Above (+0.06)	Above (+0.10)
Grade 6	Same	Same
Grade 7	Above (+0.07)	Same
Grade 8	Same	Above (+0.35) ¹³
TOTAL	Above (+0.05)	Above (+0.10)

These results indicate that, across both Cohort 14 and 15, “regular” attendees experienced slightly greater year-to-year change in overall EOG reading and math scores compared to students across the state.

<p>✓ Objective 4.2—Met</p> <p>This objective was met for both reading and math as participants (who attended 30 days or more) across grade levels (Total row) improved their scores from year-to-year at a rate slightly greater rate than students across the state. Disaggregated along grade levels, results indicate participants (who attended 30 days or more) improved their scores in reading and math at the same or at a slightly greater rate relative to the rate of change of students statewide.</p>

B. Instructional Staff Survey on Learning Engagement at End of Year

In addition to state test results, educators were asked to complete surveys as an indicator of participation impact on students. More specifically, the 21st CCLC Instructional Staff Survey asks for instructors’ ratings of improvements in attendees’ engagement in learning over the course of the school year.

In past years, the U.S. Department of Education required states to:

- Track and report teacher ratings regarding attendees’ improvement in classroom performance and behavior; however, during the 2020-21 school year, the federal focus shifted to attendees’ improved “engagement in learning.”
- Collect/report student-level survey data for program participants in Grades K-12; however, in 2021, that requirement changed at the federal level (and currently states are only required to report student engagement data for Grades 1-5).¹⁴

¹³ 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.

¹⁴ In past years, the U.S. Department of Education required states to report student engagement data collected via a survey administered to the “regular school day teacher” of all “regularly” attending program participants (i.e., students attending the program 30 days or more). However, in 2021, that requirement changed at the federal level, and the target of the survey shifted from the “regular school day teacher” to any “instructional staff” member that could assess changes in the identified student’s



Despite these change at the federal level, NCDPI sees collecting teacher/instructor feedback regarding student engagement as a best practice. Therefore, starting at the end of the 2021-22 academic year, administering an Instructional Staff Survey for students K-12 was required; however, grantees were not required to enter the survey findings in 21DC for kindergarten, middle school, or high school students. Thus, for this report, and moving forward, we will provide an overview of data availability of the Instructional Staff Survey ratings for Grades K-12 (see Table 13) and the results of the student engagement in learning data specifically for Grades 1-5 only (see Table 14).

On their grantee listserv NCDPI made available an Instructional Staff Survey for grantees to use. Grantees were instructed to distribute the Instructional Staff Survey to an instructional staff member of each participating attendee. It was the responsibility of the grantee to enter completed Instructional Staff Survey responses for individual students into the 21DC system.¹⁵

Objective 4.3: The Majority (Over 50%) of Participants "In Need of Improvement" (Attending the Program 30 Days or More) Will Demonstrate Improved Engagement in Learning.

In previous reports, we have reported a response rate based on indicators in the data as to whether the survey was distributed and returned. Because we do not have these indicators for the current report, we cannot report a response rate; however, we can report a data availability rate. Thus, Table 13 presents the data availability rates, by grade level, for the 21st CCLC Instructional Staff Survey as reported by subgrantees who distributed these surveys. These data availability rates reflect completed surveys for all students who attended the 21st CCLC after-school programs in 2021-22.

According to Table 13, the overall data availability rate for all attendees was 75%. However, availability rates in Grades 1-5 were 97% or higher, which is expected given that grantees were only required to enter data in 21DC for these grades.

Table 13. Instructional Staff Survey Data Availability (for Participants Attending ≥ 30 Days) by Grade (K-12)

Grade Level	Both Cohorts 2021-22		
	Total Number of Attendees	Number of Attendees with Reported Staff Survey Data	Data Availability Rate
K	1,078	527	49%
1*	1,398	1,361	97%
2*	1,738	1,683	97%
3*	2,268	2,211	97%
4*	2,004	1,955	98%
5*	2,001	1,940	97%
6	1,422	510	36%
7	1,109	370	33%
8	914	318	35%
9	367	95	26%
10	258	69	27%
11	164	31	19%
12	159	43	27%

level of learning engagement (e.g., social worker, psychologist, counselor, teachers aid, 21st CCLC afterschool program staff). Thus, starting at the end of the 2021-22 academic year, NCDPI guidance indicated that the intent of survey should remain the same; however, “if collecting response from the student’s school-day, classroom teacher is not possible, it is then allowable to disseminate the survey to a student support team member that is familiar with the student’s level of progress of the past year.”¹⁵ For each Instructional Staff Survey that is completed and returned on an attendee, grantees must indicate, in 21DC, whether the student had a need to improve in terms of “engagement in learning” (response options being Yes or No). If yes, grantees were then asked if the survey indicated improved student “engagement in learning” (response options being Yes or No).



Grade Level	Both Cohorts 2021-22		
	Total Number of Attendees	Number of Attendees with Reported Staff Survey Data	Data Availability Rate
TOTAL	14,880	11,113	75%

*Indicates grade levels for which engagement in learning ratings from instructors are required to be entered into the 21DC system. Note: Additional analysis indicated that missing data rates were minimal (i.e., 0.1-0.2%) for “regular” attendees in Grades 1-5.

Table 14 shows the results of the Instructional Staff Surveys as entered into 21DC by grantees for attendees in Grades 1-5 (who attended 30 or more days). Grantees were asked to enter, in the 21DC database, whether the survey indicated a need for improvement in terms of “engagement in learning” and whether that improvement occurred for those students who were in need of improvement. In 2020-21, grantees reported that 79% of “regular” attendees (with survey data) were in need of improvement in terms of “engagement in learning.” Of these “regular” attendees (with survey data) who were in need of improvement, 91% were reported to have improved.

Table 14. Instructional Staff Survey Ratings of Improvement (for Participants Attending ≥ 30 Days) by Grade (1-5)

Grade Level	Both Cohorts 2021-22		
	Responses	Percentage of Participants (Attending ≥ 30 Days) with Survey Data Reporting: Need for Improvement in Terms of “Engagement in Learning”	Percentage Participants (Attending ≥ 30 Days) with Survey Data Reporting: Improved in Terms of “Engagement in Learning”
1	1,109	80%	92%
2	1,348	80%	91%
3	1,678	79%	92%
4	1,492	80%	91%
5	1,465	76%	90%
TOTAL	7,092	79%	91%

✓ Objective 4.3—Met
 This objective was met in 2020-21. Over 50% of participants identified as “in need of improvement” (who attended 30 days or more) across Cohorts 14 and 15 with returned Instructional Staff Surveys (in Grades 1-5) were reported by grantees to have demonstrated an improved engagement in learning.

Summary

As seen in Table 15, statewide grantee performance in 2021-22 “met” or “partially met” eight of the ten reported state objectives, as indicated by the status column. (Note: Appendix A provides grantee-level data on enrollment and Appendix B provides center/grantee-level data on attendance so that differences across grantees can be examined in these areas.)

Table 15. Summary of 2021-22 21st CCLC Progress Monitoring Findings

Goals/Objectives	2021-22 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 80% of Cohort 14 grantees and 79% of Cohort 15 grantees served at least 75% of their proposed number of students, in 2021-22, with a total across both cohorts of 79% .



Goals/Objectives	2021-22 Status	Summary of Findings
Objective 1.2: The Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served Statewide are from Low-Income Schools	Met	An average of 90% of students per center came from schools that qualified for Title I funding (48 students on a 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 14 and Cohort 15 students in Grades 4-8 with 2020-21 (one year prior) test scores, 84% to 90% were in need of a academic support, as judged by their lack of proficiency on state tests in reading or math at program entry.
Goal 2: Enrolled Students Attend Program for 30 days or More		
Objective 2.1: Statewide Percentage of Students Attending 30 Days or More is At Least 70% (80% in Elementary, 60% in Middle School, and 40% in High School)	Not Met (Not met overall or by grade level)	Overall, 67% of participants attended 30 days or more (i.e., were “regular” attendees). The percentage of students attending 30 days or more was 75% among elementary students, 53% among middle school students, and 20% among high school students.
Objective 2.2: Statewide Percentage of Centers with an Average Attendance of 30 Days or More Will Not Fall Below 87%	Not Met	A total of 83% of centers within each cohort reported average attendance rates of 30 days or more, while 17% of centers within each cohort reported fewer than 30 days attendance, on a average.
Goal 3: Programs Will Offer Services in Core Academic Areas and in Enrichment		
Objective 3.1: More than 85% of Centers Offer Services in At Least One Core Academic Area	Met	Across Cohort 14 and Cohort 15 centers, 99% reported that they frequently provided activities in Academic Enrichment, STEM, or Literacy Education.
Objective 3.2: More than 85% of Centers Offer Enrichment Support Activities	Partially Met (Met overall but not by cohort)	Across Cohort 14 and 15 centers, 86% reported a high frequency of at least one character education or enrichment activity. However, while Cohort 15 met the target (90%), Cohort 14 did not (82%).
Goal 4: Enrolled Students Attending the Program (30 Days or More) Will Demonstrate Educational and Social Benefits and Exhibit Positive Behavioral Changes		
Objective 4.1: The Statewide Percentage of Participants Attending the Program (30 days or more), With Two Years of State Test Data (Grades 4-8), who Improve from “Non-proficient” (Levels I, II or III) to “Proficient” (Levels IV or V) Will be at Least 11%.	Partially Met (Met for math but not for reading)	Reading EOG: For participants attending 30 days or more, 7% moved from “non-proficient” in 2021 to “proficient” in 2022. Math EOG: : For participants attending 30 days or more, 11% moved from “non-proficient” in 2021 to “proficient” in 2022.



Goals/Objectives	2021-22 Status	Summary of Findings
<p>Objective 4.2: Participants Attending the Program 30 Days or More With Two Years of State Test Data (Grades 4-8) 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</p>	<p>Met</p>	<p>On the Reading EOG, participants attending the program 30 days or more across Grades 4-8 improved their scores from year-to-year at a rate slightly greater than (+0.05) students across the state.</p> <p>On the Math EOG, participants attending the program 30 days or more across Grades 4-8 improved their scores from year-to-year at a rate slightly greater than (+0.10) students across the state.</p>
<p>Objective 4.3: The Majority (Over 50%) of Participants “In Need of Improvement” (Attending the Program 30 Days or More) Will Demonstrate Improved Engagement in Learning.</p>	<p>Met</p>	<p>Over 50% of participants identified as “in need of improvement” (who attended 30 days or more) across Cohorts 14 and 15 with returned Instructional Staff Surveys (in Grades 1-5) were reported by grantees to have demonstrated an improved engagement in learning (91%).</p>



Appendix: Historical Summary of Indicator Results

Goals/Objectives	SY 2015-2016 Status	SY 2016-2017 Status	SY 2017-2018 Status	SY 2018-2019 Status	SY 2019-2020 Status	SY 2020-2021 Status	SY 2021-2022 Status
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	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
Objective 1.2: The Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served Statewide are from Low-Income Schools	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
Objective 1.3: The Majority (Over 50%) of Students Served Statewide are in Need of Academic Support	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Not Reported	Met
Goal 2: Enrolled Students Attend Program for 30 Days or More							
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)	Met	Met	Partially Met (Met for elementary but not middle or high school students)	Partially Met (Met overall and for middle but not elementary and high school students)	Partially Met (Met overall and for elementary and middle but not high school students)	Not Met (Not met overall and by grade level)	Not Met (Not met overall and by grade level)
Objective 2.2: Statewide Percentage of Centers with an Average Attendance of 30 Days or More Will Not Fall Below 87%	Met	Partially Met (Met in Cohort 11 but not Cohort 10)	Partially Met (Met in Cohort 11 but not Cohort 12)	Met	Met	Not Met	Not Met
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	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
Objective 3.2: More than 85% of Centers Offer Enrichment Support Activities	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Partially Met (Met in Cohort 14, but not Cohort 15)
Goal 4: Attendees Will Demonstrate Educational and Social Benefits and Exhibit Positive Behavioral Changes							
Objective 4.1: The Statewide Percentage of Participants Attending the Program (30 days or more), With Two Years of State Test Data (Grades 4-8), Who Improve from “Non-Proficient” (Levels I, II or III) to “Proficient” (Levels IV or V) Will Be At Least 11%	Met	Partially Met (Met in Math but not Reading)	Partially Met (Met in Math but not Reading)	Not Reported	Not Reported	Not Reported	Met
Objective 4.2: Participants Attending the Program (30 days or more), With Two Years of State Test Data (Grades 4-8) 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	Met	Met	Met	Not Reported	Not Reported	Met
Objective 4.3: The Majority (Over 50%) of participants “In Need of Improvement” (Attending the Program 30 Days or More) Will Demonstrate Improved Engagement in Learning. ¹⁶	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met

¹⁶ 2021 was the first year of reporting that focuses on “engagement in learning” vs. “classroom performance and behavior.” Thus, in previous years, Objective 4.3 was worded as follows: *The Majority (Over 50%) of Classroom Teachers Responding to a Teacher Survey Will Rate 21st CCLC “Regular” Attendees’ Classroom Performance and Behavior as Improved.*

