Public Schools of North Carolina
State Board of Education
Department of Public Instruction

# Report to the North Carolina General Assembly

## Competitive Grants to Improve After-School Services

*SL 2015-241 (HB 97), sec. 8.29(e)*

**Date Due:** November 15, 2017
Report # 24
DPI Chronological Schedule, 2017-2018

# NC DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
**Mark Johnson, State Superintendent :: 301 N. Wilmington Street :: Raleigh, North Carolina 27601-2825**

In compliance with federal law, the NC Department of Public Instruction administers all state-operated educational programs, employment activities and admissions without discrimination because of race, religion, national or ethnic origin, color, age, military service, disability, or gender, except where exemption is appropriate and allowed by law.

**Inquiries or complaints regarding discrimination issues should be directed to:**
Maria Pitre-Martin, Ph.D., Deputy State Superintendent :: 6307 Mail Service Center, Raleigh, NC 27699-6307
Phone: (919) 807-3759 :: Fax: (919) 807-4065

**Visit us on the Web :: www.ncpublicschools.org**                    M0517

# SERVE CENTER *at* THE UNIVERSITY *of* NORTH CAROLINA *at* GREENSBORO

# Final Report on the "Competitive Grants to Improve After-School Services Act:" Summary of 2014-17 Grantee Activities

**Prepared by:**

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

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

**Submitted to:**

Donna R. Brown, Director
Federal Program Monitoring and Support Division
North Carolina Department of Public Instruction
Raleigh, North Carolina

August 2017

# Table of Contents

# Final Report on the "Competitive Grants to Improve After-School Services Act:" Summary of 2014-17 Grantee Activities

## Executive Summary

In the summer of 2014, the North Carolina General Assembly appropriated $5,000,000 in State funds for the After-School Quality Improvement Grant (ASQIG) Program to be administered by the Department of Public Instruction as part of the *Competitive Grants to Improve After-School Services Act [S.L. 2014-100, Section 8.19.(a-e)]*. According to the legislation, the purpose of the Program was to pilot after-school learning programs for at-risk students. Applicants were eligible to receive two-year grants of up to $500,000 per year with the option of a third year of funding.

In December of 2014, 41 applications from across the state were submitted to the Federal Program Monitoring and Support Division at NCDPI. The applications were scored by trained grant reviewers, and 17 grantees were awarded funding by the State Board of Education in January 2015, for a total of $4,784,539[1]. In the summer of 2015, the North Carolina General Assembly appropriated State funds in the amount of $6,000,000 for the second year of the ASQIG Program *[S.L. 2015-241, Section 8.29.(a-f)]*. In addition to a second year of funding for the 17 grantees, the 2015-16 appropriation provided funding for four new grantees. The 17 first-year grantee recipients received continuations for a second year of funding and four additional organizations (those with the next highest scores from the 2014 application process) were approved for funding at the November 2015 State Board Meeting. Thus, a total of 21 grantees (continuing and new) were funded for the second year of the program (2015-16), for a total of $5,893,019 and in the third year of the program for $3,015,371.

Over the three years (2014-15 to 2016-17), the ASQIG program awarded a total of $13,692,924 to the 21 grantees to provide after-school and summer programs serving at-risk students not performing at grade-level as demonstrated by statewide assessments. Total funds awarded to the 21 grantees, across multiple years of implementation, ranged from $99,303 to $1,078,445 with an average of $652,044.

Of the 21 grantees:

- five grants were operated solely by school districts;
- six grants were operated as a partnership between a district and a non-profit with shared decision-making about key aspects of the program, and one grant was implemented as a collaborative effort between a university and a school district;
- seven grants were operated by non-profits with only fiscal administration handled by the partner district; and
- two grants were operated by non-profits with very little or no district involvement.

---

[1] Of the funds appropriated for the program, the Department of Public Instruction may use up to two hundred thousand dollars ($200,000) for each fiscal year to administer the program.

In terms of the grade-levels served, middle school students were served by 16 grantees, elementary school students were served by 14 grantees, and high school students were served by four grantees. In addition to the after-school programs offered by all grantees, 17 grantees also offered programming during summer 2015 and/or summer 2016.

The legislation required that the after-school programs primarily focus on developing students' reading skills or proficiencies, providing STEM opportunities, or both. Of the 21 grantees, three focused primarily on developing students' reading proficiencies, three focused primarily on engaging students with STEM opportunities, and 15 reported including both reading and STEM instructional areas in their programming.

## Results

At the close of the final year of the program (2016-17), SERVE Center at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, under a contract with NCDPI, used an online Progress Report Survey to collect progress information from all ASQIG grantees (n=21). The survey asked the Program Directors to provide enrollment and attendance data, to describe their experiences with implementation and their use of student performance measures, and to offer recommendations regarding after-school programming in the state. Their responses are summarized below.

Did funded programs enroll their projected number of students?

➢ The 21 programs reported enrolling from 71% to over 100% of their targeted number of after-school students. Overall, in their fully-funded year, the 21 grantees reported offering a total of 3,651 after-school slots and enrolling 3,361 students. On average, grantees reported that 78% of participating after-school students were not proficient on state tests/not at grade-level upon program entry; thus demonstrating grantees' focus on at-risk students, as intended by the legislation.

➢ Several successful enrollment strategies were described by grantees.
  1. Provide early and on-going marketing of the program.
  2. Collaborate with schools, districts, and the community to identify and invite students.
  3. Ensure school staff awareness, commitment, and buy-in.

To what extent did students attend the after-school programs once enrolled?

➢ For each fully-funded year of operation, grantees were asked to report the frequency of students attending at three different levels (high, moderate, low).[2] Across the 21 grantees, the high attendance group ranged in reported size from 30% of total students in the program to 100% (with an average of 65% across all grantees in the high attendance group). They reported an average of 19% in their moderate attendance group and 17% in their low attendance group.

---

[2] High Attendance = # of students who attended greater than 60 days of after-school programming
Moderate Attendance = # of students who attended a total of between 30 and 60 days of after-school programming
Low Attendance = # of students who attended less than 30 days of after-school programming

- Several successful strategies for maintaining high attendance were described by grantees.
  1. Provide engaging, student-centered, relevant, hands-on activities.
  2. Focus on parental involvement and communication.
  3. Ensure a safe and supportive environment.

To what extent did students improve on various student performance measures?

- The legislation required that after the second year of funding, grant recipients should report on their students' academic progress. As part of the 2017 ASQIG Progress Report survey, grantees were asked: "Over the life of the grant, what quantitative student performance measures did you review as a way of evaluating the academic progress of students you served?" Grantees reported using multiple measures. Students' pre- and post-state test scores were the most frequently mentioned quantitative student performance measure reported as used by grantees to review student performance (81%). In addition, 67% reported use of program-administered and/or school-administered diagnostic assessments, and 57% indicated that they monitored report card grades.

## Grantee Experiences and Recommendations

- Implementation: Grantees were asked, "How successful were you in implementing your original vision as described in your application?" Six indicated they were "Very successful," 14 indicated "Mostly successful," and one indicated "Somewhat successful." When asked: "Based on your experience with implementing your particular after-school and/or summer model, what do you think are the 2-3 most important features of an effective, high-quality program?" The feature mentioned most often (15 of 21) was the **quality of their staff**, given the program goals. Twelve of 21 grantees mentioned various aspects of **curriculum/programming** as one of the most important features; 10 of 21 mentioned ensuring high-quality relationships and **communication with parents or schools**; six of 21 mentioned various aspects of **leadership** (e.g., clear vision, stakeholder buy-in, using data for decision-making).

- Sustainability: One hope of state funding for the pilot programs was that the programs, once established and working successfully, would be able to be sustained through other funding sources. Three of 21 Program Directors reported they would "definitely" be able to sustain the program after the funding ends. Eleven indicated that they would "Most likely at least in part" be able to sustain the program. Of the remaining grantees, six indicated sustainability was "Not likely," and one indicated "Definitely Not." The grantees who reported sustainability was likely described various approaches to generating new funding including:
  - Seeking corporate partners/individual contributions
  - Applying for other grants
  - Using various existing funding sources alone or in combination (Title I federal funding, United Way, Juvenile Crime Prevention Council, fees for services)
  - Seeking sources in multiple ways such as through a larger funding umbrella (e.g., an annual support campaign) or through other strategic combinations of approaches.

➢ Recommendations: Grantees were asked to offer recommendations as regards the ASQIG program. The majority of recommendations were arguments, such as those below, for the need to provide state resources for after-school programs in impoverished communities.

- *In a perfect world all students would have access to out-of-school-time activities and services. The benefits are tangible: improved school attendance, improved grades and test scores. Students have a chance to experience a learning setting different from the regular school setting and can explore their interests in greater depth. Students who have special needs—such as (in our program) those learning English—have a space that is designed to help them find success. Our program is certainly grateful for the funding received to start and implement a program that will benefit many students over time. One challenge we face is finding continued funding.*

- *Our county is impoverished and this program has afforded opportunities for many students who would otherwise not have been actively engaged in an after-school learning environment. It saddens us to know we are having to close the doors of opportunity for these students due to the inability to provide the ongoing funding.*

- *The State Board of Education could form a Community Task Force to keep this work going as we must continue to find ways to put more resources into preparing students for the global society we are in.*

# Final Report on the "Competitive Grants to Improve After-School Services Act:" Summary of 2014-17 Grantee Activities

## I. Introduction

### A. Legislation Overview

In the summer of 2014, the North Carolina General Assembly appropriated $5,000,000 in State funds for the After-School Quality Improvement Grant (ASQIG) Program to be administered by the Department of Public Instruction as part of the *Competitive Grants to Improve After-School Services Act [S.L. 2014-100, Section 8.19.(a-e)].* According to the legislation, the purpose of the Program was to pilot after-school learning programs for at-risk students that raise standards for academic outcomes by focusing on the following:

- Use of an evidence-based model with a proven track record of success.
- Inclusion of rigorous quantitative performance measures to confirm their effectiveness during the grant cycle and at the end-of-grant cycle.
- Alignment with State performance measures, student academic goals, and the North Carolina Standard Course of Study.
- Prioritization of programs to integrate clear academic content, in particular, science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) learning opportunities or reading development and proficiency instruction.
- Emphasis on minimizing student class size when providing instruction.
- Expansion of student access to learning activities and academic support that strengthen student engagement and leverage community-based resources, which may include organizations that provide mentoring services and private-sector employer involvement.

In the initial year of the program, applicants were eligible to receive two-year grants of up to $500,000 per year with the option of a third year of funding. The 2014 legislative language stipulated that "at least seventy percent (70%) of students served by the program must qualify for free or reduced-price meals" *[S.L. 2014-100, Section 8.19.(c)].* In December of 2014, 41 applications for funding from across the state were submitted to the Federal Program Monitoring and Support Division at NCDPI. Based on reviews and scoring by trained grant reviewers, 17 grantees were awarded funding by the State Board of Education in January 2015, for a total of $4,784,539.[3]

In the summer of 2015, the North Carolina General Assembly appropriated state funds in the amount of $6,000,000 for the second year of the ASQIG Program *[S.L. 2015-241, Section 8.29.(a-f)].* The 2015 legislation included the following revisions:

---

[3] Of the funds appropriated for the program, the Department of Public Instruction may use up to two hundred thousand dollars ($200,000) for each fiscal year to administer the program."

1. In the 2014 legislation, grant recipients were required to be a local school administrative unit or a non-profit working in collaboration with a local school administrative unit (which served as the fiscal agent for the grant). However, in the 2015 revisions, non-profit organizations were allowed to serve as their own fiscal agents *[S.L. 2015-241, Section 8.29.(d)]*.
2. In addition, whereas the 2014 legislation indicated that at least 70% of students served by grantees must qualify for free or reduced-price meals, the 2015 legislation indicated that "programs should focus on serving at-risk students not performing at grade-level as demonstrated by statewide assessments" *[S.L. 2015-241, Section 8.29.(c)]*.

In addition to a second year of funding for the 17 grantees from the first year, the 2015-16 appropriation provided funding for four new awards. No grant solicitation/review process took place; rather, the 17 first-year grantee recipients received continuations for a second year of funding ("Cohort 1") and four additional organizations (those with the next highest scores from the 2014 application process; "Cohort 2") were approved for funding ($1,108,480) at the November 2015 State Board Meeting. Thus, a total of 21 grantees (continuing and new) were funded for the second year of the program (2015-16), for a total of $5,893,019. The four new Cohort 2 grantees received notification of funding availability on January 9, 2016. Therefore, in 2015-16, 17 Cohort 1 (continuation) grantees received funding to operate for the entire academic year and four (new) Cohort 2 grantees started serving students in January 2016 for the first time.

In the summer of 2016, for the third year of this grant program, the North Carolina General Assembly reduced the total funds appropriated for the ASQIG Program (i.e., $3,215,371 instead of the $6,000,000 appropriated the previous year). According to the new *Session Law 2016-94*,

> The Department shall award third-year grants for the 2016-17 fiscal year with any of the funds remaining after awarding second-year grants to recipients approved under this section. From the funds available, a third-year grant recipient shall be awarded a proportional share of funds based upon the amount of the second-year grant awarded to the recipient in the prior fiscal year.

Thus, in accordance with the 2016 legislative changes, NCDPI allocated funds for the 2016-17 fiscal year such that: (a) all four Cohort 2 grantees received full funding for their second year of implementation and (b) Cohort 1 grantees received reduced funding for their third and final year of implementation (i.e., approximately 40% of the previous year's funding).

NCDPI contracted with SERVE Center at the University of North Carolina to facilitate the required grantee reporting processes and to develop annual reports to be submitted to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee.[4] The first Interim Report (2015) and the second Interim Report (2016) are available on the NCDPI website (http://www.ncpublicschools.org/

---

[4] "The Department of Public Instruction shall provide interim reports on the grant program to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee by September 15, 2015, and September 15, 2016, with a final report on the program by September 15, 2017." (*S.L. 2014-100, Section 8.19. [e]*)

program-monitoring/after-school/). This report is the Final Report (2017) on the activities of the 21 grantees.

## B. Who Were the Grantees?

Table 1 shows the 21 ASQIG grantees by region, county, type of organization, and yearly and total amount awarded. As shown in the first column, funds were awarded to 12 school districts (LEAs) and nine non-profit organizations (NP). The amounts awarded to grantees in 2014-15 and 2015-16 ranged from under $100,000 (two awards) to over $400,000 (five awards) and the amounts awarded in 2016-17 ranged from under $100,000 (six awards) to just over $350,000 (one award). The average per year funding across grantees each year was: $281,443 in 2014-15 (17 grantees); $280,620 in 2015-16 (21 grantees); and $143,589 in 2016-17 (21 grantees, with 17 of those receiving about 40% of their original funding levels).

Grantees were located in each of the eight regions of the state, with Region 6 receiving six of the 21 awards. Across the three years of grant, the total funds allocated, by region, ranged from $215,867 in Region 7 (one grantee) to $3,477,193 in Region 6 (six grantees).

**Table 1. Organizations Receiving ASQIG Awards**

| REGION/ TYPE | ORGANIZATION NAME | 2014-15 $ | 2015-16 $ | 2016-17 $ | TOTAL $ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1** **LEA** | **Beaufort County Schools** (with the Cornerstone Community Learning Center) County: Beaufort | 320,613 | 320,613 | 127,781 | 769,007 |
| **1** **NP** | **McCloud's Computer & Skills Training Center, Inc.** (with Pitt County Schools) County: Pitt | 419,520 | 419,520 | 167,201 | 1,006,241 |
| **2** **LEA** | **Greene County Schools** County: Greene | 283,263 | 283,263 | 112,895 | 679,421 |
| **3** **NP** | **Communities In Schools of Wake County** (with Wake County Public School System) County: Wake | 447,606 | 447,606 | 178,395 | 1,073,605 |
| **3** **LEA** | **Durham Public Schools\*** County: Durham | N/A\* | 358,394 | 358,394 | 716,788 |
| **3** **LEA** | **Northampton County Schools** County: Northampton | 404,368 | 404,368 | 161,162 | 969,897 |
| **3** **NP** | **Silltrist Solutions\*** (with Durham Public Schools) County: Durham | N/A\* | 328,982 | 328,982 | 657,964 |
| **4** **LEA** | **Montgomery County Schools** County: Montgomery | 352,038 | 352,038 | 140,306 | 844,381 |
| **4** **LEA** | **Public Schools of Robeson County** (with Communities In Schools of Robeson County) County: Robeson | 315,593 | 315,593 | 125,780 | 756,966 |
| **5** **LEA** | **Stokes County Schools** (with Stokes Family YMCA) County: Stokes | 301,211 | 301,211 | 120,049 | 722,471 |
| **5** **LEA** | **Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools** County: Forsyth | 41,401 | 41,401 | 16,501 | 99,303 |

| REGION/ TYPE | ORGANIZATION NAME | 2014-15 $ | 2015-16 $ | 2016-17 $ | TOTAL $ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 NP | **YMCA of Northwest North Carolina*** (with Winston Salem Forsyth County Schools) County: Forsyth | N/A* | 181,104 | 181,104 | 362,208 |
| 6 NP | **Above and Beyond Students** (with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools) County: Mecklenburg | 279,106 | 279,106 | 111,238 | 669,450 |
| 6 LEA | **Cabarrus County Schools** County: Cabarrus | 449,623 | 449,623 | 179,199 | 1,078,445 |
| 6 NP | **Citizen Schools** (with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools) County: Mecklenburg | 240,039 | 240,039 | 95,668 | 575,746 |
| 6 NP | **Communities In Schools of Lincoln County*** (with Lincoln County Schools) County: Lincoln | N/A* | 240,000 | 240,000 | 480,000 |
| 6 NP | **First Baptist Church West dba Charlotte Community Services Association** (with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools) County: Mecklenburg | 150,175 | 150,175 | 59,853 | 360,203 |
| 6 NP | **Youth Development Initiatives** (with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools) County: Mecklenburg | 130,641 | 130,641 | 52,067 | 313,349 |
| 7 LEA | **Mount Airy City Schools** County: Surry | 89,999 | 89,999 | 35,869 | 215,867 |
| 8 LEA | **Jackson County Schools** County: Jackson | 142,943 | 142,943 | 56,970 | 342,856 |
| 8 LEA | **McDowell County Schools** County: McDowell | 416,400 | 416,400 | 165,957 | 998,756 |
| | TOTAL[5] | 4,784,539 | 5,893,019 | 3,015,371 | 13,692,924 |

*Cohort 2 programs (initially funded during school year 2015-16)
Data Sources: NCDPI website (including http://www.dpi.state.nc.us/docs/program-monitoring/after-school/2014-15recipients.pdf and http://www.dpi.state.nc.us/docs/program-monitoring/after-school/2015-16recipients.pdf)
Note. LEA – Local Education Agency

# C. What Reporting was Required of Grantees?

## Year 1 Grantee Reporting (2014-15)

The 2014 legislation required grant recipients to report to NCDPI after the first year of funding on the progress of their grants. Although the legislation and funding for this program was approved in August 2014, due to the time required to conduct a competitive process (which took place in the fall of 2014), the funds were made available to grantees in January 2015. Grantees that had pre-existing programs in place were able to begin services as early as January and February; other grantees (e.g., new programs or new school partners that required more planning) reported later start dates for services (March-May). Thus, grantees were able to provide after-school services for only a portion of the 2014-15 school year.

---

[5] Of the funds appropriated for the program, the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction may use up to two hundred thousand dollars ($200,000) for each fiscal year to administer the program.

To address required grantee reporting for the 2015 Interim Report, SERVE Center collected descriptive information on each grantee through (a) interviews with the grantee Program Directors, (b) a site visit to each grantee's facility(s) after they began providing services, and (c) an online Progress Report Survey completed by each Program Director in July 2015. The timing of the survey allowed the grantees who offered summer programs to complete the reporting process after some experience with their summer programs. SERVE Center used the various data sources from Year 1 ASQIG grantees (n=17) to develop a progress report on the grant program for NCDPI who submitted the report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee.

### *Year 2 Grantee Reporting (2015-16)*

After the second year of funding, ASQIG grant recipients were required to report on key performance data, including statewide test results, attendance rates, and promotion rates. To facilitate this process, SERVE Center met with each grantee in the spring of 2016 and customized a student performance data reporting template to reflect their program focus and goals (e.g., reading, STEM or both; elementary vs. high school). Each grantee submitted their 2015-16 student performance data report to NCDPI by August 2016.

In addition, SERVE Center collected data from all Year 2 ASQIG grantees (n=21) using an online Progress Report Survey. The 2015-16 survey collected information from grantees such as: (a) enrollment information for the year, (b) alignment of programming with legislative foci, (c) matching fund totals and sources, and (d) sustainability plans. Grantee data were used to inform NCDPI's 2016 Interim Report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee.[6]

### *Year 3 Grantee Reporting (2016-17)*

At the close of the final year of the program (2016-17), SERVE Center again used an online Progress Report Survey to collect data from all ASQIG grantees (n=21). The survey asked the Program Directors to provide enrollment and attendance data, to describe their experiences with implementation and their use of student performance measures, and to offer recommendations regarding after-school programming in the state. All 21 Program Directors completed the survey in May 2017. In addition, grantees were required to submit a 2016-17 student performance data report, due to NCDPI by August 2017. SERVE Center used grantees' responses from the 2017 and 2016 online Progress Report Surveys in compiling this Final Report.

## II. Results

## A. What was the focus of the 21 programs?

Table 2 shows the foci of the grantee programs. Because Cohort 1 funding was less in their third year of operation, Table 2 (as well as subsequent tables) report on each grantee's fully-funded,

---

[6] Both the 2015 Interim Report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee and the 2016 Interim Report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee is publicly available on the NCDPI website at: www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/program-monitoring/after-school/after-school-services-report.pdf

fully-operational year. That is, the 17 grantees in Cohort 1 had a fully-funded and operational year in 2015-16 and the four grantees in Cohort 2 had a fully funded and operational year in 2016-17.

The legislation required that the grantees primarily focus on reading or STEM or both reading and STEM in their programming. Of the 21 grantees, 18 indicated a focus on reading, 18 on STEM, and 15 on both areas in their fully-funded years. There were three grantees that focused on reading but not STEM (Greene County Schools, Jackson County Schools, and Youth Development Initiatives) and three grantees that focused on STEM but not reading (Cabarrus County Schools, McDowell County Schools, and Montgomery County Schools).

On the survey, grantees were asked: "Do you have a significant focus in improving student outcomes in other areas besides reading development/proficiency and/or STEM?" Of the 14 grantees indicating "yes," one or more of the following areas were mentioned: social emotional skills, life skills, college and career readiness, cultural awareness, character education, health and fitness, art, English as a second language, and parental engagement. Thus, although reading or STEM was a required focus, the program activities provided went beyond those two areas.

In terms of the grade-levels served, middle school students were served by 16 grantees, elementary school students were served by 14 grantees, and high school students were served by four grantees. (Seven grantees served a combination of elementary and middle grade students, while three grantees served a combination of elementary, middle, and high school students). In addition to the after-school programs offered by all grantees, 17 grantees also offered programming during summer 2015 and/or summer 2016.

**Table 2. Grantee Foci in their Fully-Funded and Operational Year**

| REGION/ FULLY-FUNDED YEAR | ORGANIZATION NAME | COMPETITIVE PRIORITY | | SCHOOL LEVELS SERVED | | | SUMMER PROGRAM | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Read | STEM | Elem | Mid | High | Yes | No |
| **2** 15-16 | **Greene County Schools** | ● | | ✓ | ✓ | | ♦ | |
| **4** 15-16 | **Jackson County Schools** | ● | | ✓ | ✓ | | | ♦ |
| **6** 15-16 | **Youth Development Initiatives** (with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools) | ● | | | | ✓ | ♦ | |
| **6** 15-16 | **Cabarrus County Schools** | | ● | ✓ | ✓ | | ♦ | |
| **5** 15-16 | **McDowell County Schools** | | ● | ✓ | ✓ | | ♦ | |
| **4** 15-16 | **Montgomery County Schools** | | ● | | ✓ | | ♦ | |
| **3** 16-17 | **Durham Public Schools*** | ● | ● | | ✓ | | ♦ | |
| **4** 15-16 | **Public Schools of Robeson County** (with Communities In Schools of Robeson County) | ● | ● | | ✓ | | ♦ | |

| REGION/ FULLY-FUNDED YEAR | ORGANIZATION NAME | COMPETITIVE PRIORITY | | SCHOOL LEVELS SERVED | | | SUMMER PROGRAM | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Read | STEM | Elem | Mid | High | Yes | No |
| 5 15-16 | **Stokes County Schools** (with Stokes Family YMCA) | ● | ● | | ✔ | | | ♦ |
| 6 15-16 | **Citizen Schools** (with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools) | ● | ● | | ✔ | | | ♦ |
| 6 16-17 | **Communities In Schools of Lincoln County*** (with Lincoln County Schools) | ● | ● | | ✔ | | ♦ | |
| 3 16-17 | **Silltrist Solutions*** (with Durham Public Schools) | ● | ● | ✔ | | | ♦ | |
| 5 15-16 | **Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools** | ● | ● | ✔ | | | | ♦ |
| 5 16-17 | **YMCA of Northwest North Carolina*** (with Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools) | ● | ● | ✔ | | | ♦ | |
| 4 15-16 | **Mount Airy City Schools** | ● | ● | ✔ | | | ♦ | |
| 1 15-16 | **Beaufort County Schools** (with the Cornerstone Community Learning Center) | ● | ● | ✔ | ✔ | | ♦ | |
| 1 15-16 | **McCloud's Computer & Skills Training Center, Inc.** (with Pitt County Schools) | ● | ● | ✔ | ✔ | | ♦ | |
| 3 15-16 | **Communities In Schools of Wake County** (with Wake County Public School System) | ● | ● | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ♦ | |
| 3 15-16 | **Northampton County Schools** | ● | ● | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ♦ | |
| 6 15-16 | **Above and Beyond Students** (with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools) | ● | ● | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ♦ | |
| 6 15-16 | **First Baptist Church West dba Charlotte Community Services Association** (with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools) | ● | ● | ✔ | ✔ | | ♦ | |
| TOTAL | | **18** | **18** | **14** | **16** | **4** | **17** | **4** |

*Cohort 2 programs (initially funded during school year 2015-16)

Note. For each cohort, first year grant-funding was allocated mid-year. Both cohorts' fully-funded, full year of implementation occurred in their second year. Thus, the fully-funded year for Cohort 1 was 2015-16 (data source: 2015-16 ASQIG Progress Report Survey) and the fully-funded year for Cohort 2 was 2016-17 (data source: 2016-17 ASQIG Progress Report Survey).

One way to understand the range of funded programs and the students they served is to examine their reported purposes in seeking funding. The survey asked "What was your initial purpose in seeking ASQIG funding?" Of the response options, those that resonated with the highest number of grantees (16 of 21) were those reflecting a desire to serve a specific, targeted group of students or communities in which after-school or summer services were limited. Eleven respondents indicated agreement with the purpose of "piloting a brand-new model of an after-school or summer program in order to gain evidence of its effectiveness and seek more sustained funding." Other grantees self-identified as pre-existing programs who aimed to expand their reach or program activities in some way through the grant.

Below we describe a few grantee programs to illustrate the variety of designs represented.

*Examples of Programs Focused Primarily on Building the Reading Skills of a Targeted Group of Students*

**Greene County Schools**, a school district in Region 2, sought funding with the primary goal of extending reading instruction by one hour, after school, for 185 elementary and middle school students who were performing below grade-level in reading. They leveraged an existing after-school program at one school site that was run by the Boys and Girls Club. They identified students below grade-level in reading to instruct in small groups with certified teachers from the district. The teachers were hired for the after-school program because of their proven expertise as reading teachers. The district coordinated the after-school schedule with the Boys and Girls Club so that the ASQIG-funded reading teachers could pull out small groups of students from the Boys and Girls Club after-school program to work on particular reading skills. The additional instructional hour with certified reading teachers was designed to help students "make the catch-up growth they needed to attain grade-level proficiency."

**First Baptist Church dba Charlotte Community Services Association**, a non-profit organization, worked intensively with a small number of elementary and middle school students (approximately 30) throughout the school year and summer. The students served were those below grade-level, at-risk for failing, and/or those for whom English was a second language (ESL). Students were required to maintain a 75% attendance rate. The program focused first on assessing students' academic standing, then individualizing instruction in a small group setting with experienced teachers/tutors. This structured literacy tutoring program was offered four days per week, for 45-60 minutes per session, and alternated with a homework assistance session. There was a pre-post testing structure such that once students had made sufficient progress, they transitioned out of the ASQIG-funded tutoring program and returned to a pre-existing 21st Century Community Learning Centers after-school program that ran concurrently at the same site. This grantee felt that incorporating an intensive tutoring program into a regular after-school program was "a natural fit for addressing the needs of those students who will continue to lag behind their peers without individualized tutoring."

*Example of Program Focused Primarily on Providing STEM Opportunities*

**Cabarrus County Schools**, a school district in Region 6, provided after-school and summer programming at five sites (two elementary schools, two middle schools, and one off-school site at the Boys and Girls Club of Cabarrus County). During their fully-funded year, approximately 300 students were served during the school year and 200 students served during the summer (in an eight-day summer program). Key features of the program were: alignment of the after-school/summer curriculum with the NC Standard Course of Study (NCSCoS), with support by STEM content experts from local organizations (Discovery Place, Duke Energy); use of annual benchmarks of at least 80% of modules (lessons) that were aligned to the NCSCoS; and use of certified teachers from the school sites, experienced in the STEM curriculum, who also received professional development on STEM during the year. The program goal was to engage at-risk elementary and middle school students with high-quality, hands-on STEM activities and community resources.

## Examples of Programs Focused Only on Middle School Students

**Citizen Schools** is a national non-profit organization that serves middle school students in low-income communities. Their ASQIG-funded program, in partnership with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, was based on a two-tier approach. That is, the program provided academic instruction (remediation for at-risk students) and intervention services (via behavior support specialists) during the regular school day. In addition, they operated after-school programs that emphasized hands-on activities and "apprenticeships," which were led by volunteers from local corporations and the community. They provided services in their fully-funded year to a total of 250 students in two middle schools. The after-school curriculum was designed to connect academic and 21st century standards to careers and life skills. Students worked side-by-side with experts to explore new academic/career fields and learn new skills (e.g., website design, dramatic arts, etc.). The program described the centerpieces of their model as "its apprenticeship programs run by volunteers that culminate in public demonstrations and partnering with middle schools to expand learning time for students."

**Public Schools of Robeson County in partnership with Communities In Schools (CIS) of Robeson County** offered a comprehensive after-school and summer program for 45 students at each of two middle schools serving high-poverty, rural communities. In addition to a focus on instruction in reading, math, and science by certified teachers from the schools, they focused on the "whole child" in terms of opportunities to address social skills and to provide opportunities for students to be engaged in cultural experiences and field trips. Their long-term goal was to improve the transition to high school for the targeted group of students.

## Examples of Programs Focused Only on Elementary Students

**Silltrist Solutions,** a non-profit organization, ran an after-school and summer program at two elementary schools in Durham County Schools, with the aim of serving 125 students per school in the after-school program. Their staffing included the use of reading interventionists to target students' reading deficiencies and time for students to take on "real issues" that were important and relevant to them.

**The YMCA of Northwest North Carolina** collaborated with Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools such that an established after-school care provider (YMCA) could operate a program at one low-performing elementary school and at one housing authority location—serving a total of approximately 200 students per year. As part of the program, certified teachers taught reading, math, and STEM lessons for 30 minutes per day, three days per week and teacher assistants provided homework support. In addition, twice a week, enrichment activities included a focus on character development, health/wellness, arts, leadership skills, and/or college and career readiness. The curriculum reflected the overall intent of the program which was to "focus on the child as a whole and that includes academically, emotionally, and socially."

*Examples of Programs Representing Unique, Strategic Partnerships Between Districts, Non-Profit Providers, and/or Universities in the Delivery of Program Activities*

**Jackson County Schools** partnered with Western Carolina University to pilot an after-school program serving 50 elementary and middle school students for whom English was second language (ESL) at a university campus location (Cullowhee United Methodist Church). The curriculum incorporated homework time, ESL instruction, and free choice time. The program recruited university students interested in education as a major who created and implemented activities that reflected the needs of students learning English as a Second Language. The four day per week program incorporated parent outreach/open houses, field trips, and other opportunities for out-of-school learning. Students with special instructional needs had an after-school setting to go to that "was designed to help them find success." In addition, the location on the university campus meant that pre-service teachers in the college of education could gain experience in working with at-risk students or those with special instructional needs.

**Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools** applied, as a district, for the smallest grant of the 21 grantees ($41,401 for the fully-funded year) in order to provide a comprehensive after-school program to 50 students at one elementary school. The ASQIG-funds allowed the program to pilot a partnership model with local community agencies. For example, one partnering agency took the lead on staff hiring and teacher professional development responsibilities (i.e., Imprints), while another partnering agency was responsible for recruiting and training volunteers from the community to provide one-on-one tutoring for participating students (i.e., Augustine Literacy Project). The collaboration between the elementary school, Imprints, and the Augustine Literacy Project allowed the program to operate at a low cost while ensuring a low student/teacher ratio.

In sum, program designs reflected unique community needs, contexts, and opportunities. However, a commonality, as required by the legislation, was a focus on serving underachieving students from low-performing schools and typically from impoverished communities. All after-school programs offered a significant instructional component, whether through certified teachers, individualized reading and math skill-building programs on computers, homework assistance, or project-based activities.

## B. Did Grantees Implement the Required Features?

In this section, we provide detail on the implementation of various aspects of effective programs, as identified in the legislation and as perceived by grantees.

### *Focus on Serving At-Risk Students Not Performing at Grade-Level*

As outlined in the ASQIG legislation, funded programs "should focus on serving at-risk students not performing at grade-level as demonstrated by statewide assessments." The survey asked grantees to indicate, over the grant period, the percentage of participating students who were not proficient on state tests, or otherwise not performing at grade-level, upon entering the after-

school program. Grantees reported that, on average, 78% of their participating students were not proficient on state tests/not at grade-level upon program entry.

More specifically, Table 3 shows that twelve (57%) grantees reported that between 76-100% of their participants entered the program not performing at grade-level with another eight (38%) grantees reporting that between 51-75% were not performing at grade-level.

**Table 3. Number of Grantees by Percentage of Participating Students Not at Grade-Level**

| % OF PARTICIPATING STUDENTS NOT PROFICIENT/ NOT AT GRADE-LEVEL UPON PROGRAM ENTRY | % OF GRANTEES | # OF GRANTEES |
|---|---|---|
| 0-25% | 0% | 0 |
| 26-50% | 5% | 1 |
| 51-75% | 38% | 8 |
| 76-100% | 57% | 12 |
| **TOTAL** | 100% | 21 |

## *Grantee Perceptions of the Importance and Extent of Implementation of Program Implementation Features*

The ASQIG legislation outlined seven implementation features deemed important for grantees to implement. The survey asked grantees to rate how important they thought each feature from the legislation was and then to rate the extent to which they implemented each. Table 4 shows a comparison of the mean ratings (4=Very Important, 3=Mostly Important, 2=Somewhat Important, 1=Not Important; 4=Very Well Implemented, 3=Mostly Implemented, 2=Somewhat Implemented, 1=Not Implemented). As shown, the ratings of importance and extent of implementation were similar for each implementation feature. Although average ratings for all the items were above 3 (indicating "Mostly Important" and "Mostly implemented"), the two features with the highest average Importance and Implementation ratings were "Maintaining a low student/teacher ratio" and "Providing students access to activities that strengthen their engagement with school."

**Table 4. Grantee Perceptions of the Importance and the Extent of Implementation of Program Implementation Features Mentioned in Legislation**

| IMPLEMENTATION FEATURE | MEAN RATINGS OF PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE | MEAN RATINGS OF EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION |
|---|---|---|
| Maintaining a low student/teacher ratio | **3.8** | **3.8** |
| Providing students access to activities that strengthen their engagement with school | **3.8** | **3.7** |
| Selecting and using evidence-based programming | 3.6 | 3.7 |
| Providing access to digital resources/content outside of school | 3.5 | 3.6 |
| Aligning materials and instructional activities with NC Standard Course of Study | 3.7 | 3.5 |
| Leveraging of community-based resources to expand student access to learning or other activities | 3.5 | 3.4 |
| Using certified teachers in providing instruction | 3.4 | 3.4 |

| IMPLEMENTATION FEATURE | MEAN RATINGS OF PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE | MEAN RATINGS OF EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION |
|---|---|---|
| Aligning after-school activities with school day instruction | 3.4 | 3.3 |

Table 5 shows the frequency of their implementation ratings. The four implementation features with more than one grantee indicating only "Somewhat implemented" were:

- aligning after-school activities with school day instruction,
- aligning materials and instructional activities with NCSCoS,
- using certified teachers in providing instruction, and
- leveraging of community-based resources to expand student access to learning or other activities.

The alignment with the school day instruction and use of certified teachers may have been more challenging in cases when the after-school program was housed at a non-school location. For example, certified teacher availability may have been more limited if they had to travel to an externally-located after-school site. The leveraging of community-based resources was reported as "Somewhat implemented" by four school districts operating programs.

**Table 5. Frequency of Implementation Ratings of Program Implementation Features Mentioned in the Legislation**

| IMPLEMENTATION FEATURE | 4 = VERY WELL IMPLEMENTED | 3 = MOSTLY IMPLEMENTED | 2 = SOMEWHAT IMPLEMENTED | 1 = NOT IMPLEMENTED |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Selecting and using evidence-based programming | 15 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| Aligning materials and instructional activities with NC Standard Course of Study | 15 | 2 | **4** | 0 |
| Aligning after-school activities with school day instruction | 11 | 5 | **5** | 0 |
| Using certified teachers in providing instruction[1] | 13 | 4 | **3** | 1 |
| Maintaining a low student/teacher ratio | 18 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Providing students access to activities that strengthen their engagement with school | 16 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Leveraging of community-based resources to expand student access to learning or other activities | 12 | 5 | **4** | 0 |
| Providing access to digital resources/content outside of school | 15 | 4 | 1 | 1 |

## *Grantee Perceptions of the Key Features of an Effective, High-Quality Program*

To supplement the data above on grantee perceptions of the importance of features mentioned in the legislation, the survey included an open-ended question that asked: "Based on your experience with implementing your particular after-school and/or summer model, what do you think are the 2-3 most important features of an effective, high-quality program?"

The feature mentioned most often (by 15 of 21 grantees) was the quality of the staffing (e.g., number, experiences/skills, and/or training). Twelve of 21 grantees mentioned aspects of curriculum/programming as a key feature of a high-quality program and 10 of 21 mentioned ensuring good communication with parents and/or schools. Six of 21 mentioned leadership dimensions (e.g., clear vision, stakeholder buy-in, and using data for decision-making). Sample responses are shown below.

**Quality of the staff.** The quality of staffing was described somewhat differently depending on program goals but the belief expressed seemed to be that if you get the right size staff to allow for individualized attention, with the right training and skills, the program will be strong. Respondents mentioned the importance of using certified staff, hiring enough staff to have small group sizes, and providing high-quality professional development to the staff.

- *From our experience, hiring qualified, properly trained, and motivated staff is a key feature in creating a quality program. If you have the correct certified teachers, teacher assistants, and supervisors in place, the program will be implemented effectively. Even if there are challenges, the overall goals will be accomplished.*
- *Effective after-school programs have a clear vision of what they want to accomplish, adequate funds to do so, and a highly-motivated work force who share that vision. As Director, I held bi-weekly trainings to give staff the tools they needed to implement effective teaching strategies in an after-school environment with a focus on teambuilding.*
- *A feature of our program that made it highly successful was the use of district employees that were familiar with the school (site) and its students; placing retired personnel who were also familiar with the school system and its resources helped to provide students with experienced and trained staff.*
- *Having a staff that is dedicated to the students and their achievement growth is critical; this means the staff will create effective and engaging lessons and will utilize all of their resources to make sure the students are reaching goals daily.*

**Quality of the curriculum and activities.** Respondents' comments touched on aspects of program quality such as alignment with the school curriculum, opportunities for individualized attention based on needs, the use of STEM and other activities that engaged students, and attention to improving students' work habits and motivation in school.

- *We aligned the after-school curriculum to state performance measures and the state course of study with evidence-based activities supported through the provision of content experts from local STEM organizations and linking students to real-world experiences.*

- *By using the iReady Reading and Math program, our students were engaged in, and rewarded for, their individual success in both reading and math.*
- *We provided flexibility in the teaching and learning process and easily identified students' needs.*

**Relationships with parents and/or schools.** Some respondents described how partnering and supporting parents was critical to their success.

- *From our experience, the more involved parents are in their child's success, the more academic growth is displayed. In order to see significant growth, there has to be academic stimulation at home as well. In our parent workshops, we focus on how our parents can assist their children at home to keep them academically stimulated. Our staff develops a rapport with families and this allows our parents to feel supported as well as our students.*
- *We work to ensure that the parents are actively engaged and involved in the program. When parents support the program, you are able to have more impact on the child in the program.*

In summary, when grantees reflected on what makes a high-quality program, they mentioned the quality of the staff, the quality of the curriculum, support for parents and communication with schools, all coalescing under strong leadership.

## C. Did Grantees Enroll Targeted Students?

A key first indicator of an after-school program's success is the extent to which they enroll their targeted number of students. The survey asked grantees to report on the number of centers/sites operated, including the number of slots available through grant funding and the number of slots filled. The number of after-school centers/sites ranged from one to seven across the 21 grantees (with six grantees operating only one site).

Table 6 shows that the reported enrollment capacities for each grantee's fully-funded and operational year ("slots avail") ranged from 32 to 450. The total number of after-school program slots reported as available in the fully-funded year was 3,651 with 3,361 reported as filled. The percentage enrolled ranged from 71% to over 100%.

**Table 6. Enrollment Information by Grantee in the Fully-Funded Year of Operation—After-School Programming[7]**

| REGION/ FULLY-FUNDED YEAR | ORGANIZATION NAME | # CENTERS/ SITES | SLOTS AVAIL | SLOTS FILLED | % ENROLL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 15-16 | **Beaufort County Schools** (with the Cornerstone Community Learning Center) | 3 | 245 | 245 | 100% |

---

[7] Regarding summer programming, as mentioned previously, four grantees did not operate a summer program. Of the 17 grantees who did operate a summer program in 2016, the total number of summer slots reported as available was 3,091 with 2,784 students reported as enrolled.

| REGION/ FULLY-FUNDED YEAR | ORGANIZATION NAME | # CENTERS/ SITES | SLOTS AVAIL | SLOTS FILLED | % ENROLL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 15-16 | **McCloud's Computer & Skills Training Center, Inc.** (with Pitt County Schools) | 1 | 125 | 129 | 100+% |
| 2 15-16 | **Greene County Schools** | 1 | 185 | 185 | 100% |
| 3 15-16 | **Communities In Schools of Wake County** (with Wake County Public School System) | 7 | 402 | 363 | 90% |
| 3 16-17 | **Durham Public Schools\*** | 1 | 150 | 160 | 100+% |
| 3 15-16 | **Northampton County Schools** | 6 | 450 | 321 | 71% |
| 3 16-17 | **Silltrist Solutions\*** (with Durham Public Schools) | 2 | 250 | 180 | 72% |
| 4 15-16 | **Montgomery County Schools** | 2 | 202 | 196 | 97% |
| 4 15-16 | **Public Schools of Robeson County** (with Communities In Schools of Robeson County) | 2 | 90 | 81 | 90% |
| 5 15-16 | **Stokes County Schools** (with Stokes Family YMCA) | 3 | 125 | 115 | 92% |
| 5 15-16 | **Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools** | 1 | 50 | 40 | 80% |
| 5 16-17 | **YMCA of Northwest North Carolina\*** (with Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools) | 2 | 200 | 204 | 100+% |
| 6 15-16 | **Above and Beyond Students** (with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools) | 2 | 100 | 105 | 100+% |
| 6 15-16 | **Cabarrus County Schools** County: Cabarrus | 5 | 300 | 277 | 92% |
| 6 15-16 | **Citizen Schools** (with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools) | 2 | 295 | 246 | 83% |
| 6 16-17 | **Communities In Schools of Lincoln County\*** (with Lincoln County Schools) | 4 | 120 | 130 | 100+% |
| 6 15-16 | **First Baptist Church West dba Charlotte Community Services Association** (with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools) | 1 | 32 | 32 | 100% |
| 6 15-16 | **Youth Development Initiatives** (with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools) | 2 | 45 | 48 | 100+% |
| 7 15-16 | **Mount Airy City Schools** | 2 | 100 | 116 | 100+% |
| 8 15-16 | **Jackson County Schools** | 1 | 50 | 53 | 100+% |
| 8 15-16 | **McDowell County Schools** | 3 | 135 | 135 | 100% |
| **TOTAL** | | 53 | 3,651 | 3,361 | |

\*Cohort 2 programs (initially funded during school year 2015-16)
Note. For each cohort, first year grant-funding was allocated mid-year. Both cohorts' fully-funded, full year of implementation occurred in their second year. Thus, the fully-funded year for Cohort 1 was 2015-16 (data source: 2015-16 ASQIG Progress Report Survey) and the fully-funded year for Cohort 2 was 2016-17 (data source: 2016-17 ASQIG Progress Report Survey).

On the survey, grantees were asked: "To what extent were you successful in enrolling your targeted number of students in the After-School Program?" Eight grantees (38%) self-identified as "very successful." Another 12 (57%) self-identified as "mostly successful".

**Table 7. Grantee Perception of Enrollment Success**

| ANSWER | % OF GRANTEES | # OF GRANTEES |
|---|---|---|
| Very successful | 38% | 8 |
| Mostly successful | 57% | 12 |
| Somewhat successful | 5% | 1 |
| Not successful | 0% | 0 |
| **TOTAL** | 100% | 21 |

The respondents were then asked to provide comments regarding any enrollment challenges or successful strategies in enrollment. A total of 13 grantees identified challenges associated with enrollment. The enrollment challenge mentioned most often by the respondents (6 of 13) was that older students were often involved in other extra-curricular activities (e.g., sports, tutoring, part-time jobs), activities which occurred during the same times that the ASQIG program was in operation. Four of 13 grantees mentioned transportation as a challenge to meeting their enrollment targets. Respondents identified successful enrollment strategies as described below.

1. Provide early and on-going marketing of the program.
   - *Advance notice, multiple methods of communication including phone calls home and a good reputation all help enrollment.*
   - *Several schools wanted to be ready to start the program the first full week of school. These schools began enrolling students during open house. The other schools waited to send information home at the beginning of the school year. These programs ended up starting out slower but progressed as the year passed.*
   - *During the first year, we met our target numbers because of the energy and enthusiasm shown by the Site Coordinators who made the extra effort to contact parents of students on a waiting list when slots became available.*

2. Collaborate with schools, districts, and community to identify and invite students.
   - *We were very successful in meeting our enrollment targets because we established relationships with key school staff (i.e., assistant principals, deans, CTE directors) who could refer and/or put us in contact with our targeted student populations.*
   - *We had great success in reaching our enrollment targets over the cycle of the grant by working closely with the schools. We attended school events prior to the program starting to recruit students and worked to create wait lists as well. Relationships that have been built with the parents and the community also contributed to meeting our target enrollment.*

3. Ensure school staff awareness, commitment, and buy-in.
   - *During the first years of implementation, [neither] the teachers nor [the] students in the district really understood the goal of the program. Students did not want to stay after-school and many did not utilize the option of field experiences. Teachers'*

*awareness/education increased by attending professional development aimed at teaching STEM/PBL. As they learned more, teachers began to target students to stay after-school and it took off.*

## D. To What Extent Did Students Attend the Programs Offered?

A second key indicator of program success is the level of student attendance in the after-school program. For each fully-funded year of operation, grantees were asked to report the frequency of students attending at three different levels:

- High Attendance = # of students who attended greater than 60 days of after-school programming
- Moderate Attendance = # of students who attended a total of between 30 and 60 days of after-school programming
- Low Attendance = # of students who attended less than 30 days of after-school programming

Table 8 shows that grantees reported percentages of students in the high attendance group ranging from 30% to 100% of total enrollment (with an average of 65% of students across all grantees in the high attendance group). The percentage of students in the moderate attendance group ranged from 0% to 42% (average of 19%) and in the low attendance group, from 0% to 30% (average of 17%).

**Table 8. After-School Attendance by Grantee in the Fully-Funded Year of Operation**

| REGION/ FULLY-FUNDED YEAR | GRANTEE NAME | HIGH ATTENDANCE > 60 days | MODERATE ATTENDANCE > 30< 60 days | LOW ATTENDANCE < 30 days |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 15-16 | **Beaufort County Schools** (with the Cornerstone Community Learning Center) | 66% | 16% | 18% |
| 1 15-16 | **McCloud's Computer & Skills Training Center, Inc.** (with Pitt County Schools) | 51% | 21% | 28% |
| 2 15-16 | **Greene County Schools** | 31% | 33% | 36% |
| 3 15-16 | **Communities In Schools of Wake County** (with Wake County Public School System) | 50% | 19% | 31% |
| 3 16-17 | **Durham Public Schools\*** | 63% | 28% | 9% |
| 3 15-16 | **Northampton County Schools** | 81% | 11% | 8% |
| 3 16-17 | **Silltrist Solutions\*** (with Durham Public Schools) | 65% | 20% | 15% |
| 4 15-16 | **Montgomery County Schools** | 30% | 32% | 38% |
| 4 15-16 | **Public Schools of Robeson County** (with Communities In Schools of Robeson County) | 47% | 42% | 11% |

| REGION/ FULLY- FUNDED YEAR | GRANTEE NAME | HIGH ATTENDANCE > 60 days | MODERATE ATTENDANCE > 30< 60 days | LOW ATTENDANCE < 30 days |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 15-16 | **Stokes County Schools** (with Stokes Family YMCA) | 50% | 22% | 28% |
| 5 15-16 | **Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools** | 94% | 6% | 0% |
| 5 16-17 | **YMCA of Northwest North Carolina*** (with Winston Salem Forsyth County Schools) | 64% | 11% | 25% |
| 6 15-16 | **Above and Beyond Students** (with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools) | 100% | 0% | 0% |
| 6 15-16 | **Cabarrus County Schools** County: Cabarrus | 91% | 4% | 5% |
| 6 15-16 | **Citizen Schools** (with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools) | 65% | 18% | 16% |
| 6 16-17 | **Communities In Schools of Lincoln County*** (with Lincoln County Schools) | 49% | 28% | 23% |
| 6 15-16 | **First Baptist Church West dba Charlotte Community Services Association** (with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools) | 100% | 0% | 0% |
| 6 15-16 | **Youth Development Initiatives** (with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools) | 77% | 19% | 4% |
| 7 15-16 | **Mount Airy City Schools** | 54% | 21% | 25% |
| 8 15-16 | **Jackson County Schools** | 87% | 13% | 0% |
| 8 15-16 | **McDowell County Schools** | 49% | 25% | 26% |
| | AVERAGE | 65% | 19% | 17% |

*Cohort 2 programs (initially funded during school year 2015-16)

Note. For each cohort, first year grant-funding was allocated mid-year. Both cohorts' fully-funded, full year of implementation occurred in their second year. Thus, the fully-funded year for Cohort 1 was 2015-16 (data source: 2015-16 ASQIG Progress Report Survey) and the fully-funded year for Cohort 2 was 2016-17 (data source: 2016-17 ASQIG Progress Report Survey).

Grantees were asked: "Given the attendance numbers you entered for the question above, over the life of the grant, to what extent were you successful in maintaining a high level of attendance in the after-school program." Six grantees (29%) rated themselves as "Very successful," 13 (62%) indicated "Mostly successful," and two (10%) felt they were "Somewhat successful."

**Table 9. Grantee Perception of Success in Maintaining a High Level of Attendance**

| ANSWER | % OF GRANTEES | # OF GRANTEES |
|---|---|---|
| Very successful | 29% | 6 |
| Mostly successful | 62% | 13 |
| Somewhat successful | 10% | 2 |
| Not successful | 0% | 0 |
| TOTAL | 100% | 21 |

The respondents were asked to "describe your experience in terms of your success in meeting your student attendance in the after-school program and/or reasons for any low-level attendance." A content analysis of the responses showed that out of the 21 grantees, 11 grantees

identified challenges associated with student attendance. Similar to enrollment challenges, the most frequently mentioned attendance challenge was that some students were involved in other after-school, extra-curricular activities (e.g., sports, band, church), which limited their time available for the ASQIG program. Three of 11 respondents mentioned student mobility or changes in family circumstances/schedules as a reason for low attendance. Several strategies for maintaining high attendance were identified by grantees as described below.

1. Provide engaging, student-centered, relevant, hands-on activities.
   - *The program provided services that were attractive to students. We made the program look different from the day school. Activities were engaging and allowed students to have a voice and choice in the program.*
   - *The students specifically enjoyed the problem-based learning process, field experiences, and real world connections to the STEM content they were mastering, which resulted in high student attendance throughout the school year.*
   - *The tutors in the after-school program created interactive lessons that kept the students anticipating what they were going to learn each day. It was a great opportunity for them to continue working on the skills and strategies learned during the day while getting extra helped mixed with enjoyable activities.*

2. Focus on parental involvement and communication.
   - *We had parental buy-in and they made sure their children were in attendance daily.*
   - *Students and parents were contacted when attendance became an issue so that parents were constantly aware of attendance issues.*
   - *Since the parents have to pick up the students every day, that was the perfect occasion to build relationships with each parent and family. This created a level of trust and interest, which kept them returning.*

3. Ensure a safe and supportive environment.
   - *One of the main reasons some students kept coming regularly was due to the fact they enjoyed the structure and activities involved with the program. Another reason was the program helped their parents know their child was in a safe environment while completing homework and having fun at the same time.*
   - *Because staff were intimately and intricately engaged in the students' project-based learning process and shared freely and openly from their own experiences, students were able to relate to the staff and learned to respect them.*

## E. How Did Grantees Report on Student Performance Measures?

The legislation required that grant recipients report on their progress after the second year of funding in terms of students' academic progress. The survey asked: "Over the life of the grant, what quantitative student performance measures did you review as a way of evaluating the academic progress of students you served?" Grantee responses are shown in Table 10. Students' pre- and post-state-test scores were the most frequently mentioned quantitative student performance measure used across the grant period (81%). Sixty-seven percent (67%) of grantees

reported using assessments in reading, math, or science that either they or the school administered. Twelve grantees (57%) reported using report card grades as measures of improvement.

**Table 10. Quantitative Student Performance Measures Used Over the Life of the Grant**

| ANSWER | % OF GRANTEES | # OF GRANTEES |
|---|---|---|
| Pre- and post-state test scores (EOG, EOC, other). | 81% | 17 |
| Diagnostic pre- and post-assessments in reading, math, or science administered by your program staff. | 67% | 14 |
| Reading and/or math assessments administered by schools who shared data with your program (e.g., mCLASS). | 67% | 14 |
| Improvements in report card grades in ELA, Math, and/or Science over the year. | 57% | 12 |
| Improvements in rates of school attendance, suspension/expulsion rates, or other behavioral measures. | 48% | 10 |
| Classroom teachers' ratings of improvements over the year in participating students' homework completion, classroom participation, and behavior, etc. | 48% | 10 |
| Parents' ratings of their child's academic improvement. | 48% | 10 |
| Students' ratings of their own academic improvement. | 38% | 8 |
| Other | 5% | 1 |

Grantees were asked, "Over the life of this grant, how successful was your program in helping your participating students improve academically (particularly those who were non-proficient on state tests upon program entry)?" Six grantees (29%) self-identified as "Very successful" and 13 (62%) as "Mostly successful" as shown in Table 11.

**Table 11. Grantee Perception of Participating Students' Academic Improvement**

| ANSWER | % OF GRANTEES | # OF GRANTEES |
|---|---|---|
| Very successful | 29% | 6 |
| Mostly successful | 62% | 13 |
| Somewhat successful | 10% | 2 |
| Not successful | 0% | 0 |
| **TOTAL** | 100% | 21 |

Respondents described two key aspects of their programs that they believed had the biggest impact on helping at-risk students improve academically as shown in their comments below.

1. Adapting instruction to individual and small group needs.
   - *We have had a high level of success because we focus on accelerating the students from where they are.*
   - *We provided ongoing feedback to students, school staff, and parents regarding the student's success. We were able to modify programming based on student performance and needs.*
   - *The student to teacher ratio was 10 to 1. This gave each tutor the chance to have two small groups of five and conduct guided reading and guided math lessons. The group sizes gave students the confidence and the comfort to ask questions, make mistakes*

*and strengthen their skills. Groups were created by reading levels which was another advantage. Students were given work on their level while being pushed to the next.*

- *Overall, we had success in helping our students improve academically. This year we were provided quarter grade data to closely evaluate our students' progress and growth. By having this information per quarter, along with our own benchmark data, we were able to make sure each teacher had the correct materials to assist our students.*

2. Providing an engaging and aligned curriculum.
- *Tutors tried a myriad of activities to intrinsically motivate students to read, whether through reader theater, interactive read aloud, free-reading, group read aloud, telling stories, and much more, which then helped their language skills in reading, writing, speaking and listening. We learned that with the proper resources and funding devoted to extra learning, students really rose to the occasion to pursue and love learning.*
- *We provided students various ways to be engaged in the learning process. This eliminated behavior problems and enhanced student interest.*
- *Because the units of study were directly aligned to what students were learning in class, they had the opportunity to see it in action. Most students said this helped them understand the material they had been previously taught in class. Most of the teachers in the after-school program are content teachers who normally teach these students anyway. This was a way to introduce re-teaching in a hands-on way.*

In sum, grantees indicated that adapting instruction to individual and small group needs and providing an engaging and aligned curriculum are key components to helping at risk students improve academically.

## III. Grantee Experiences and Recommendations

## A. What was the Role of School Districts?

For the first year of ASQIG, partner districts had to function as the fiscal agent for the grant. In subsequent years, this requirement was not in place. Of the 21 grants in 2016-17,

- five grants were operated by districts;
- six grants were operated as a partnership between a district and non-profit with shared decision-making about key aspects of the program, and one grant was co-planned and implemented by a higher education institution and a district;
- seven grants were planned and implemented by non-profits with only fiscal administration handled by the partner district; and
- two grants were planned and implemented by non-profits with very little or no district involvement.

Of the 11 grantees who were non-profits or others external to the school district, the survey asked them to rate their success in coordinating and collaborating with the districts. Eight indicated that the partnership with the district was "Very successful" and three indicated it was "Mostly successful." No respondent chose "Somewhat successful" or "Not successful." Grantees who had a shared partnership with their respective districts described emerging areas of partnerships and benefits of close collaboration with the district:

- Facility sharing: *The partnership was most successful in the speedy implementation and access to facilities. Hosting the program on school sites allowed a greater number of students to attend. On the other hand, the least successful aspects related to the relatively slow pace of scheduling training and other activities that required us to operate inside the district's parameters.*
- Data sharing: *This year we had great success collaborating with the district to assist us in getting our students' testing information. This helped us create a more effective implementation of individualized curriculum for each student. We were able to use data from the schools as benchmark data and to group our students for tutoring.*
- Communications: *Communications were very good with the district and schools, providing feedback on students and providing student referrals.*
- Curriculum alignment: *We were successful in working together in identifying the most needed areas of content to address. For example, particular state standards in reading were identified as difficult for each school. We modified our program to address the weaker areas. However, a problem arose when the school district changed their reading enhancement (software) program which made it difficult to stay consistent with them in tracking student data.*
- Staffing: *The partnership worked well with the district because many of the employees for the program were current or retired employees of the district. This bond helped the district have confidence in the decisions made by the after-school programs in teaching and leadership positions.*

## B. What Were the Grantees' Reported Challenges Experienced in Implementation?

One approach to reflecting on implementation is in terms of each project's success in implementing the vision for the program as described in their original applications for funding. The survey asked, "How successful were you in implementing your original vision as described in your application?" Six indicated they were "Very successful," 14 indicated "Mostly successful," and one indicated "Somewhat successful." The respondents were then asked to "describe your challenges in implementing your original vision." The 13 who responded elaborated on issues and how they resolved them in a variety of areas (funding, staffing, student enrollment or attendance, transportation, curriculum, district/school coordination, and achieving student outcomes).

### *Funding*

As mentioned previously, the timing of the initial first year of ASQIG funding was not aligned with the school year. The first-year grant awards were made mid-year (January 2015). In addition, the 17 Cohort 1 grantees, although fully-funded in year two (2015-16), received less than half of the second-year funding for year three (2016-17). These ASQIG funding patterns created some implementation challenges for grantees.

- *Our challenge was funding. We were not able to accept a local grant of $200,000 due to the reporting requirements. Then our ASQIG grant was cut as well by over $140,000. The combined loss has required programmatic cuts and cuts in the number of students that we were able to serve this year.*
- *During the initial implementation of the grant we experienced staffing issues during the summer due to late distribution of funds.*
- *In the third year, we received a partial ASQIG allotment so we were not able to fund transportation home for students.*

### *Staffing*

Respondents indicated some normal challenges with staffing such as unexpected turnover during the year. Other challenges emerged as a result of using school staff in the after-school program.

- *Over time, the additional planning and extra workload of teaching in our after-school program became too much for some teachers even though they were being compensated for the work. We had to adjust the number of days per week or grading period that we offered the program to ensure we had quality staffing available.*
- *There were no challenges to implementation; our only challenge was using teachers from the schools. On Wednesdays, the schools have staff meetings and the staff was required to attend. This left us with limited staff each Wednesday afternoon. We resolved this by bringing in the STEM contractor on Wednesdays to engage students until staff were released from school staff meetings.*
- *The initial choice to select administrators from each after-school site proved to be challenging, but we resolved the issue by selecting Site Coordinators that were not employed directly by the school.*

### *Student Enrollment or Attendance*

Student attendance could vary across sites within a project or from the school year to the summer. In addition, programs at the middle school or high school level generally reported lower student attendance due to other competing student after-school activities. Programs described making needed adjustments or working through initial stages of low enrollment.

- *Overall, we had great success with implementing our vision. We did well with recruitment and meeting our enrollment targets, creating parent workshops that interest*

*our parents, staffing our programs, partnerships with schools, and implementing academic tutoring and enrichment to help our students. Our only challenge was student attendance at one of our sites and making sure we maintained high levels throughout the year.*

- *Our students at the middle grade-level were involved in other extra-curricular activities and programs. This resulted in our program being a "moving target" on any given day due to sports, clubs or required after-school tutoring for End-of-Grade testing.*

## Transportation

Transportation to after-school programs not located at school sites or from the after-school program to the home can be expensive or involve lengthy bus rides for students. One project had to adjust its plans.

- *Transportation was something we had to get a better handle on in the initial year of funding as we did not originally calculate how long the bus rides home for students would take based on the layout of our county. We quickly realized that students were arriving home at 7:30 pm in some cases and we resolved this issue early by adding additional buses for each school.*

## Curriculum

One program described changes made to the original vision for the curriculum.

- *The most significant challenge was integrating global activities (as planned). Our school focus changed from the first to second year so our program became more aligned with the focus of the school. We remained aligned to curriculum standards and continued to implement global lessons/activities, but it was not as much as originally hoped.*

## District/School Coordination

One respondent described challenges around leadership turnover.

- *[There were] unforeseen changes in the district administration such that the assistant superintendent responsible for writing the original grant retired during year two implementation; in addition, there were principal changes that had an impact on programs housed at particular sites."*

## Student Outcomes

One respondent described a realization that the desired student outcomes may be slower to materialize than originally expected.

- *The time frame for student participation and resulting outcomes had to be lengthened. Improvement in literacy reading rates did not necessarily mean automatic improvement on End-of-Grade reading test scores and we had to adjust accordingly.*

Overall, the pattern of responses suggested that although some programs experienced more challenging implementation issues than others, the implementation challenges were logistical (e.g., transportation, staffing) in nature. No grantee indicated a lack of implementation success.

## C. Are the Programs Sustainable? Replicable?

### *Sustainable*

One hope of state funding for the pilot programs was that, once established and working successfully, they would be able to be sustained through other funding sources. However, only three of 21 Program Directors reported they would "definitely" be able to sustain the program after the funding ends. Eleven indicated that they would "Most likely at least in part" be able to sustain the program. Of the remaining seven grantees, six indicated sustainability was "Not likely," and one indicated "Definitely not." Of the 14 grantees who indicated a definite or most likely possibility of sustaining their program after ASQIG funds end, two described short-term sustainability through next year, but no funds after that. Of the 12 others who thought sustainability was likely, they described various approaches to generating new funding including:

1. Seeking corporate partners/individual contributions.
   - *Recently we upgraded our board of directors who are now working with our staff and the community to establish a development plan which has generated modest corporate donations so far but with the goal of potentially collaborating with a disadvantaged school/community to provide after-school programming.*
   - *Next year, we will rely on funds from our corporate partners as well as individual contributions.*

2. Applying for other grants.
   - *Have received another grant to keep the program moving forward.*
   - *Received a 21st Century Community Learning Center Grant.*
   - *Have obtained funding from the City of Charlotte Out-of- School-Time as well as other donations.*

3. Using other types of existing funding sources alone or in combination (Title I federal funding, United Way, Juvenile Crime Prevention Council, fees for services).

4. Seeking sources in multiple ways.
   - *Presently we have applied for more grants to help sustain the program. In addition, families have helped participate in fundraisers. Lastly, the program has approached possible investors in the larger community. While all these funding sources are still*

*unknown, the program will aim, at a minimum, to utilize community and university resources to keep it going.*

To summarize, it appears that about 50% of the grantees were positive about their likelihood of sustaining their programs after ASQIG funding ended, at least in part.

### *Replicable*

Another goal of funding pilot programs statewide was to create model programs that provide new ideas or best practices that others could replicate. When asked if they believed that their ASQIG program was a "model program that other communities could implement successfully," 18 said "Yes" and three said "Not sure." When asked to explain "why you think it could be implemented successfully elsewhere," respondents mentioned various aspects of their programs that were most important or unique. For example, they highlighted the following areas.

1. Serving poor communities, at-risk youth, and/or students struggling academically.
   - *By implementing research-based programming and having a strong partnership with the district, the program is definitely replicable. The program is more needed than ever before. There are many communities and schools that are desperate for additional support to improve students' academic performance and help engage parents in the academic journey.*
   - *Our program offered a unique opportunity for students to gain skills that are required to compete in today's 21st Century schools and society. The program is geared to expose low socio-economic rural students with an opportunity to explore math, science, technology, engineering, and the arts with an emphasis on literacy, healthy living, citizenship, and improving self-esteem. The program focuses on the whole student by effectively increasing the mastery of basic skills, improving school attendance, and homework completion. The program promoted real-world STEM experiences for the 21st Century and can be successfully implemented at other schools.*

2. STEM focus
   - *The goal of our district for this grant was to engage at-risk elementary and middle school students during out of school and summer time using hands-on, evidence-based science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) activities and community experiences delivered by NC certified teachers that raise standards for student academic outcomes. We delivered high-quality programming that included hands-on STEM curriculum relating content to students' learning during the school day without being duplicative.*

3. Well-planned, multi-dimensional and engaging curriculum.
   - *We focus on the whole child and that includes academically, socially, and emotionally. We hire certified teachers that provide a 1:10 student ratio. We rotate our groups 3 days per week for tutoring. Teachers have half a group for an hour*

*teaching math, reading, and STEM while our teacher assistants are helping others with homework; then we rotate again. Twice a week, on enrichment days, we incorporate character development, health and wellness, arts and humanities, college and career readiness and leadership skills. We hold a parent workshop once a month and bring in the school administrators and community partners to ensure we meet our families' needs.*

4. Use of partners.
   - *Certified teachers work with students after-school at the students' home school. We identified 5-6 partners and asked them to come to the site once a month to provide enrichment activities around the projects we were doing during the week. It was not a burden on the partners.*

5. Innovative location and use of university expertise.
   - *With regard to after-school programs, being on a college campus has distinct advantages…. College campuses and their education programs benefit from having a program for younger elementary/middle school students where university students can gain experience under the direction of a qualified coordinator, get inspired to teach and make a difference in the community…. With adequate funding, existing college buildings can be used to build an after-school program that benefits students in the program as well as university students and faculty.*

In sum, grantees identified key aspects of their programs that others could learn from or replicate.

## D. What Do Grantees Recommend?

At the end of the survey, respondents were asked if they would like to offer any recommendations as regards the ASQIG program or effective after-school models. The majority of recommendations were arguments for the need for the state to continue to provide resources for after-school programs in impoverished communities.

- *For years we wanted to rigorously implement a tutoring program but did not have the funds to fully support needed equipment, curriculum, training, or staff while continuing to offer regular after-school services. The ASQIG grant allowed us to test the after-school tutoring model and develop efficiencies to continue providing the service. Our goal is now to help spread the word and seek continued funding for this model.*
- *In a perfect world, all students would have access to out-of-school-time activities and services. The benefits are tangible: improved school attendance, improved grades and test scores. Students have a chance to experience a learning setting different from the regular school setting and can explore their interests in greater depth. Students who have special needs—such as (in our program) those learning English—have a space that is designed to help them find success. Our program is certainly grateful for the funding*

*received to start and implement a program that will benefit many students over time. One challenge we face is finding continued funding.*

- *Our county is impoverished and this program has afforded opportunities for many students who would otherwise not have been actively engaged in an after-school learning environment. It saddens us to know we are having to close the doors of opportunity for these students due to the inability to provide the ongoing funding.*
- *More properly structured and successful after-school programs should be established and supported in every urban and/or under-resourced high school in North Carolina.*
- *The State Board of Education could form a Community Task Force to keep this work going as we must continue to find ways to put more resources into preparing students for the global society we are in.*

## III. Summary

The ASQIG program awarded a total of $13,692,924 to 17 organizations (for three years) and to four organizations (for two years) to provide after-school and summer programs for at-risk students not performing at grade-level as demonstrated by statewide assessments. On average, the 21 grantees reported that 78% of participating after-school students were not proficient on state tests (not at grade-level) upon program entry; thus, demonstrating grantees' focus on at-risk students as intended by the legislation.

In terms of the grade-levels served, middle school students were served by 16 grantees, elementary school students were served by 14 grantees, and high school students were served by four grantees. The legislation required that the after-school programs focus on developing students' reading skills or proficiencies, providing STEM opportunities, or both. Of the 21 grantees, three indicated a focus only on reading, three indicated focusing only on engaging students with STEM opportunities, and 15 reported including both reading and STEM instructional areas in their programming.

The 21 grantees reported enrolling from 71% to over 100% of their targeted number of after-school students. Overall, in their fully-funded year, for example, the 21 grantees offered 3,651 after-school slots, and 3,361 students were reported as served. Seventeen (81%) of the grantees reported 90% or higher of their enrollment targets met, with 12 of those grantees reporting 100% or greater than 100% of enrollment targets met.

In terms of student attendance in the after-school programs, an average of 65% of students across grantees were reported as having high attendance[8] (with an average of 19% having moderate attendance and 17% having low attendance). Some grantees experienced more challenges than others with student attendance (six grantees rated themselves as "Very successful" in this area, 13 indicated they were "Mostly successful," and two indicated "Somewhat successful").

---

[8] High Attendance = # of students who attended greater than 60 days of after-school programming
Moderate Attendance = # of students who attended a total of between 30 and 60 days of after-school programming
Low Attendance = # of students who attended less than 30 days of after-school programming

Because the ASQIG funding was in part intended to help organizations pilot or start-up new programs for at-risk students, the sustainability of the programs with the end of funding is of interest. Three of 21 Program Directors reported they would "definitely" be able to sustain the program after the funding ends. Eleven indicated that they would "Most likely at least in part" be able to sustain the program. Seven indicated sustainability was not likely. Grantees were asked to offer recommendations as regards the ASQIG program. Those responding stressed the importance of state resources for after-school programs in impoverished communities.

# Appendix: At-a-Glance Summary of Grantees

| GRANTEE[1] | TOTAL AWARD | # AFTER-SCHOOL SITES OPERATED | # STUDENT SLOTS AVAILABLE | # STUDENT SLOTS FILLED | % STUDENT ENROLLMENT | % HIGH ATTENDANCE[2] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Above and Beyond Students (with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools) | $669,450 | 2 | 100 | 105 | 100+% | 100% |
| Beaufort County Schools (with the Cornerstone Community Learning Center) | $769,007 | 3 | 245 | 245 | 100% | 66% |
| Cabarrus County Schools | $1,078,445 | 5 | 300 | 277 | 92% | 91% |
| Citizen Schools (with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools) | $575,746 | 2 | 295 | 246 | 83% | 65% |
| Communities In Schools of Lincoln County* (with Lincoln County Schools) | $480,000 | 4 | 120 | 130 | 100+% | 49% |
| Communities In Schools of Wake County (with Wake County Public School System) | $1,073,605 | 7 | 402 | 363 | 90% | 50% |
| Durham Public Schools* | $716,788 | 1 | 150 | 160 | 100+% | 63% |
| First Baptist Church West dba Charlotte Community Services Association (with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools) | $360,203 | 1 | 32 | 32 | 100% | 100% |
| Greene County Schools | $679,421 | 1 | 185 | 185 | 100% | 31% |
| Jackson County Schools | $342,856 | 1 | 50 | 53 | 100+% | 87% |
| McCloud's Computer & Skills Training Center, Inc. (with Pitt County Schools) | $1,006,241 | 1 | 125 | 129 | 100+% | 51% |
| McDowell County Schools | $998,756 | 3 | 135 | 135 | 100% | 49% |
| Montgomery County Schools | $844,381 | 2 | 202 | 196 | 97% | 30% |
| Mount Airy City Schools | $215,867 | 2 | 100 | 116 | 100+% | 54% |
| Northampton County Schools | $969,897 | 6 | 450 | 321 | 71% | 81% |
| Public Schools of Robeson County (with Communities In Schools of Robeson County) | $756,966 | 2 | 90 | 81 | 90% | 47% |
| Silltrist Solutions* (with Durham Public Schools) | $657,964 | 2 | 250 | 180 | 72% | 65% |
| Stokes County Schools (with Stokes Family YMCA) | $722,471 | 3 | 125 | 115 | 92% | 50% |
| Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools | $99,303 | 1 | 50 | 40 | 80% | 94% |
| YMCA of Northwest North Carolina* (with Winston Salem Forsyth County Schools) | $362,208 | 2 | 200 | 204 | 100+% | 64% |
| Youth Development Initiatives (with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools) | $313,349 | 2 | 45 | 48 | 100+% | 77% |

*Cohort 2

[1] Cohort 1 data source—2015-16 ASQIG Progress Report Survey; Cohort 2 data source—2016-17 ASQIG Progress Report Survey.

[2] "High attendance" refers to # of students who attended > 60 days of programming