

North Dakota 21st Century Community Learning Centers



2013-14 School Year Statewide Evaluation

Prepared by:
Westwood Research & Statistical Services
Bismarck North Dakota
January 2015

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	4
Methodology/Report Format.....	5
Executive Summary.....	8
State Mandated Objectives/Progress.....	18
Recommendations for Program Improvement.....	23
Data Reporting and Interpretation Considerations.....	28
Table 1..... Grantees by Location and Number of Centers, 2013-2014	29
Table 2..... Attendance by Attendee Status, 2013-2014	30
Table 3..... Attendance by Age Group, 2013-2014	31
Table 4..... Attendance by Grade Level, 2013-2014	32
Table 5..... Attendance by Racial/Ethnic Group, 2013-2014	34
Table 6..... Number of Attendees, Average Daily Census, Contact Hours, and Average Contact Hours per Attendee, 2013-2014	35
Table 7..... Attendees Participating in Special Services or Programs by Grantee and Specific Special Service or Program, 2013-2014	36

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table 8.....	37
Grantee Activity or Services Offered by Category of Activity or Service and Grantee, 2013-2014	
Table 9.....	39
Total Hours and Percent of Total Hours that Centers Provided Programming in the Core Academic Areas (Mathematics, Reading/Literacy, Science, and Technology/Computer) by Center, 2013-2014	
Table 10.....	42
Total Hours and Percent of Total Hours that Centers Provided Programming in the Enrichment and Support Areas (Arts/Music, Cultural/Social Studies, Entrepreneurial, Health/Nutrition, and Other), 2013-2014	
Table 11.....	45
Mean Programming Hours per Week Center, 2013-2014	
Table 12.....	48
Centers Providing 40% Free/Reduced Meals by Grantee, 2013-2014	
Table 13.....	49
MAP Math and MAP Reading Mean Scores and Number of CCLC Attendees with Reported Scores by Test Timeframe and Test Type, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014	
Table 14.....	50
State Assessment Math Proficiencies and Number of CCLC Attendees with Reported Proficiencies by Test Timeframe, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014	
Table 15.....	51
State Assessment Reading Proficiencies and Number of CCLC Attendees with Reported Proficiencies by Test Timeframe, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014	
Table 16.....	52
Teacher Survey Results (YouthServices.net) by Individual Question, 2013-2014	
Table 17.....	53
Teacher Survey Results (SurveyMonkey) by Individual Question, 2013-2014	

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table 18..... 54
Parent Survey Results (SurveyMonkey) by Individual Question, 2013-2014

Table 19..... 56
Student Survey Results (SurveyMonkey) by Individual Question, 2013-2014

Table 20..... 57
Partner Survey Results (SurveyMonkey) by Individual Question, 2013-2014

Table 21..... 60
Mean Scores by Monitoring and Quality Improvement Tool (MQIT) Category, 2013-2014

Introduction

The 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program (CCLC), as authorized under Title IV, Part B, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), and amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, emphasizes: (1) opportunities for academic enrichment, including tutorial services to help students (particularly students in high-poverty areas and those who attend low-performing schools) meet State and local student performance standards in core academic subjects such as reading, mathematics and science; (2) offers students a broad array of additional services, programs, and activities, such as youth development activities; drug and violence prevention programs; counseling programs; art, music, and recreation programs; technology education programs; and character education programs, all designed to reinforce and complement the regular academic program of participating students; and (3) extends families of students attending community learning centers opportunities for literacy and related educational development.¹

The federally funded North Dakota CCLC program is administered by the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction (NDDPI) and operated locally through grants awarded by the NDDPI. The State's CCLC programs support out-of-school (before-school and/or after-school) programming for K-12 students, emphasizing services to those attending high-poverty or Title I (school-wide) schools across the state. During the summer of 2013 the NDDPI awarded eight operational grants for a period of three years each. The eight grantees are largely located throughout the state.

To measure the effectiveness of these CCLC funded programs and activities, State Education Agencies are required to conduct comprehensive evaluations in addition to identifying performance indicators and measures used to evaluate programs. Each grantee must undergo a periodic evaluation to assess its progress toward achieving the goal of providing high-quality opportunities for academic enrichment. Results of the evaluation must be: (1) used to refine, improve, and strengthen the program and to refine the performance measures; and (2) made available to the public upon request.

North Dakota's CCLC program evaluation framework is based on a continuum emphasizing incremental progress.² Accountability, the first level of the evaluation process, calls attention to basic documentation with regard to program implementation and operations, specifically: (1) adherence to proposal and federal regulations (compliance) and (2) documentation examining staffing patterns, student attendance and eligibility, service hours, and program activities offered.

¹ 21st Century Community Learning Centers; Non-Regulatory Guidance. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Academic Improvement and Teacher Quality Programs, February 2003. Retrieved January 19, 2011 from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/21stcclc/guidance2003.doc>

² Evaluation Plan of 21st Century Community Learning Centers, April 2008, prepared by DMD Consulting, Grand Forks ND.

Introduction (Continued)

Process outcomes, the second level of the evaluation process, emphasize results by documenting the accomplishment of activities related to program implementation and operation. These outcomes focus on the level of success and/or quality related to the implementation, management and ongoing operations of an activity. It includes documentation of program records, combined with methodologies such as surveys, interviews, and focus groups, etc.

Impact, the third level of the evaluation process, measures the effects and/or outcomes of program activities, ideally with direct links to program activities. These outcomes should offer meaningful findings including: (1) increased student achievement and (2) positive changes in student behavior.

Sustainability, the fourth and final level of the evaluation process, refers to program continuity focused on securing continued funding. In a broader view it encompasses various strategies to maintain the programs responsible for its positive impact.

This document presents an evaluation of the North Dakota CCLC program for the 2013-14 school year and focuses on attendee demographic characteristics; programming and programming hours; activities/services; mathematics and reading assessment outcomes; teacher, parent, student, and partner survey results; and an account of program strengths and opportunities for improvement. In addition, it identifies and measures progress toward State mandated objectives, specifically: (1) participants in CCLC programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes; (2) CCLC will offer a range of high-quality educational, developmental and recreational services; and (3) CCLC will serve children and family members with the greatest needs for expanded learning opportunities.

Methodology/Report Format

North Dakota's CCLC program evaluation was conducted in two phases; qualitative, which included site visits to each of North Dakota's eight grantees, including 27 centers (schools); and quantitative, incorporating an analysis of the grantees program information. During the qualitative phase a standardized set of quality indicators was used to assess CCLC programs in terms of general program implementation, operations, and compliance with federal regulations. This standardized set of quality indicators provides grantees and stakeholders a uniform means for identifying challenges, strengths, and opportunities for improvement.

Methodology/Report Format (Continued)

The standardized set of quality indicators employed in this phase, the Colorado Department of Education's Monitoring and Quality Improvement Tool (MQIT), was specifically designed for CCLC programs and (1) serves as a self-assessment tool to improve the quality of CCLC programs and (2) serves as a monitoring tool for the NDDPI.³

The MQIT is organized into eight categories:

- A. Grant Management and Sustainability
- B. Program Management
- C. Staffing and Professional Development
- D. Partnerships
- E. Center Operations
- F. Programming/Activities
- G. Health and Safety
- H. Evaluation/Measuring Outcomes

Section A. addresses the grantees' performance level with regard to individual grant requirements while sections B through H addresses program quality in a broader sense.

During the grantee-specific site visits each of the MQIT's standardized set of quality indicators is scrutinized by the State CCLC Program Evaluator and the grantee (two to four hours). Afterwards, visits are made to a minimum of three randomly selected schools (minimum of six schools for South East Education Cooperative) to further assess the CCLC's out-of-school day programs, activities, program safety/security measures, and interactions between student and teacher/staff, among others (approximately one hour).

Subsequently, the State CCLC Program Evaluator, as evidenced by documentation provided by the grantee and school-specific site visits, arrives at a rating (score) for each of the standardized set of quality indicators and all indicators combined. In addition, the State CCLC Program Evaluator, identifies strengths and opportunities for improvement, and if appropriate, recommends plans of action and timeframes for completion of "lower" rated quality indicators. Any questions regarding the results of the evaluation are addressed by the State CCLC Program Evaluator and grantee.

³ Colorado 21st Century Community Learning Center Monitoring and Quality Improvement Tool. Retrieved March 8, 2010 from http://elo.ccsso.org/alfresco/d/d/workspace/SpacesStore/385e4496-cb7f-11dd-84ce-1bf8a914463c/CO_21stCCLCmonitoringtool07final.pdf

Methodology/Report Format (Continued)

During the quantitative phase of the CCLC program evaluation, attendee demographic characteristics; programming and programming hours; activities/services; mathematics and reading assessment outcomes; and teacher, parent, student, and partner survey result information is assembled and analyzed.

Information used in this phase is provided by the grantees via Cityspan (YouthServices.net) and SurveyMonkey. In previous years information was also obtained from the Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS), however, as of early October 2014, at the instruction of the U.S. Department of Education, PPICS was permanently removed offline and closed for any data-related submission and reporting activities. In its place a new system is being developed to supplant PPICS as the CCLC data collection system. Dates for the new system implementation have not been released at the time this evaluation was completed.

YouthServices.net, a data entry/report generating software program, records key information for each participant including name, address, school, emergency contacts, demographics, and tracks participants and services and their participation in program activities. In addition, the software also manages information about staff, partnering agencies, and facilities. In addition, teacher, parent, student, and partner surveys are conducted and responses entered via YouthServices.net and/or SurveyMonkey.

This report consists of a bulleted executive summary of quantitative and qualitative results, measurements of progress made toward reaching North Dakota's mandated objectives, program strengths and opportunities for improvement, recommendations for program improvement, data reporting and interpretation considerations, and detailed descriptive tables.

When reviewing and interpreting the information contained in this report, the reader should be cognizant of specific data limitations. These are addressed in the "Data Reporting and Interpretation Considerations" section of the report.

Executive Summary

Grantees

1. North Dakota's eight grantees which include 78 centers (schools) are by and large located throughout the state, specifically: Grand Forks, Minot, Mandan, Bottineau, Devils Lake, Grafton, Dickinson, and Fargo. (Table 1).

Attendee Demographic Characteristics

1. Of the 7,767 unduplicated attendees reported statewide, 57.7% (4,478) were regular attendees (30+ days) while 42.3% (3,289) attended less than 30 days. (Table 2).
2. Nearly half (49.7%) of the attendees were ages six through nine. (Table 3).
3. Approximately two-thirds (68.5%) were enrolled in grades one through five. (Table 4).
4. More than half (58.0%) were "White" while nearly one-quarter (24.0%) were "American Indian/Alaskan Native." (Table 5).

Programming and Program Hours

1. The CCLC program's afforded attendees 1,340,249 total contact hours or 172.6 hours per attendee during 2013-14, while the statewide average daily attendance was 2,657.9 attendees during the same time period. (Table 6).
2. Nearly three-fourths (74.7%) of reporting centers provided "homework help", 18.7% "community service/service learning", 14.7% "tutoring", 14.7% "counseling or character education", and 65.3% "recreational activities." Unfortunately 42.7% of the centers reported "other" as an activity or service provided attendees. In all likelihood this large proportion is a result of data entry errors, e.g. assigning various activities/services into an "other" category, rather than pre-established functional activities/services classifications. (Table 8).
3. During the 2012-13 school year, more than one-third (37.5%) of reporting centers specified family members attended "promotion of parental involvement", 21.3% "promotion of family literacy", while 8.8% reported family members attended "career/job training for adults." However during the 2013-14 school year the proportions were 4.0%, 0.0%, and 0.0%, respectively. As cited above, this in all likelihood is a result of data entry errors. (Table 8).

Executive Summary (Continued)

4. Nearly half (49.9%) of attendees participated in the “Free and Reduced Lunch Program (FRLP)”, 3.8% in the “Limited English Proficiency (LEP)”, 3.1% in “special needs”, 8.7% in “Individual Education Plans (IEP)”, and 4.5% in “special education.” (Table 7).
5. More than three-fourths (83.8% or 62) of reporting centers indicated that more than 65.0% of their total hours involved the core academic areas of mathematics, reading/literacy, science, and technology/computer, while the remaining centers (16.2% or 12) reported 65.0% or less of their hours related to the core academic areas. Statewide, 73.6% (41,705.5) of the total 56,679.3 hours of programming involved the core academic areas. (Table 9).
6. Nearly all (98.6% or 73) of reporting centers indicated providing enrichment activities; only one reported not providing such activities. (Table 10).
7. Nearly all (97.4% or 75) of all reporting centers indicated a mean number of hours per week as 12 or more, while 2.6% (two centers) reported a mean of less than 12 hours per week. (Table 11).
8. Nearly all (96.1% or 73) of reporting centers served attendees that met or exceeded 40% free/reduced meals. Two did not specify whether they met the criteria. (Table 12).

Assessments

1. Mean fall MAP math scores were relatively constant throughout the 2009-10 to 2013-14 school years. During that time period, the mean scores declined slightly, from 193.1 in 2009-10 to 191.7 in 2013-14. Mean spring MAP math scores were also relatively constant throughout the 2009-10 to 2013-14 school years. During that time period, the scores decreased slightly, from 203.6 in 2009-10 to 202.0 in 2013-14. Generally, mean math scores were higher in the spring of each school year. (Table 13).
2. Mean fall MAP reading scores were also relatively constant throughout the 2009-10 to 2013-14 school years. During that time period, the mean scores declined very slightly, from 188.7 in 2009-10 to 188.4 in 2013-14. Mean spring MAP reading scores were also relatively constant throughout the 2009-10 to 2013-14 school years. During that time period, the scores declined slightly, from 197.5 in 2009-10 to 196.9 in 2013-14. Generally, mean reading scores were higher in the spring of each school year. (Table 13).
3. With respect to state assessment math proficiencies, in 2009-10, 75.0% of attendees were “advanced proficient” or “proficient” compared to 75.5% during the 2013-14 time period. (Table 14).

Executive Summary (Continued)

4. With respect to state assessment reading proficiencies, in 2009-10, 70.3% of attendees were “advanced proficient” or “proficient” compared to 69.3% during the 2013-14 time period. (Table 15).

Teacher Survey Results (YouthServices.net)

1. Of the 3,253 teacher surveys completed, in the teacher’s opinion, 1,789 attendees needed to improve their behavior in terms of “turning in homework on time”, of those, 61.0% “showed improvement”, 32.6% exhibited “no change”, while 6.3% “showed a decline.” (Table 16).
2. Of the 1,895 attendees needing to improve their behavior in terms of “completing their homework to the teachers satisfaction”, teachers indicated 63.5% “showed improvement”, 30.9% displayed “no change”, while 5.5% “showed a decline.” (Table 16).
3. Of the 1,840 attendees needing to improve their behavior in terms of “participating in class”, 52.3% “showed improvement”, 43.8% exhibited “no change”, while 3.9% “showed a decline.” (Table 16).
4. Of the 1,716 attendees needing to improve their behavior in terms of “volunteering in class”, 33.7% “showed improvement”, 65.0% displayed “no change”, while 1.3% “showed a decline.” (Table 16).
5. Of the 1,085 attendees needing to improve their behavior in terms of “attending class regularly”, 26.6% “showed improvement”, 68.6% exhibited “no change”, while 4.8% “showed a decline.” (Table 16).
6. Of the 1,972 attendees needing to improve their behavior in terms of “being attentive in class”, 46.0% “showed improvement”, 45.0% displayed “no change”, while 9.0% “showed a decline.” (Table 16).
7. Of the 1,784 attendees needing to improve their behavior in terms of “behaving well in class”, 43.0% “showed improvement”, 46.9% exhibited “no change”, while 10.1% “showed a decline.” (Table 16).
8. Of the 2,122 attendees needing to improve their behavior in terms of “performing well academically”, 66.1% “showed improvement”, 28.8% displayed “no change”, while 5.1% “showed a decline.” (Table 16).
9. Of the 1,761 attendees needing to improve their behavior in terms of “coming to school motivated to learn”, 45.8% “showed improvement”, 48.6% exhibited “no change”, while 5.6% “showed a decline.” (Table 16).
10. Of the 1,657 attendees needing to improve their behavior in terms of “getting along well with other students”, 44.1% “showed improvement”, 48.0% displayed “no change”, while 8.0% “showed a decline.” (Table 16).

Executive Summary (Continued)

Teacher Survey Results (SurveyMonkey)

1. Of the 506 teacher surveys completed, 83.4% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “teachers have a good understanding of the goals of the after-school program”, 5.5% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 11.1% were “not sure.” (Table 17).
2. 77.5% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “teachers have a good understanding about the after-school program expectations of my (teacher) contributions”, 6.9% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 15.6% were “not sure.” (Table 17).
3. 68.8% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “program staff communicate regularly with school day staff to inform us (teachers) about program operations”, 17.4% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 14.0% were “not sure.” (Table 17).
4. 63.6% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “program staff communicate regularly with school day staff to receive information about student progress”, 21.9% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 14.4% were “not sure.” (Table 17).
5. 72.3% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “program activities addressing academic and behavioral needs of the students are well designed”, 6.3% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 21.3% were “not sure.” (Table 17).
6. 69.0% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “program activities addressing academic and behavioral needs of students are implemented effectively”, 7.9% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 23.1% were “not sure.” (Table 17).

Parent Survey Results (SurveyMonkey)

1. Of the 1,130 parent surveys completed, the most important reasons for having their child participate in the after-school program were: “safe setting” (2.56), “helps with childcare” (2.60), “improves academic performance” (3.02), “improves behavior in and out of school” (3.36), and “improves attitude towards school” (3.47), respectively. (Note: 1 denotes “most important” while 5 “least important”). (Table 18).
2. 73.5% of parents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “as a result of participating in the after-school program, the child's reading skills have improved”, 4.6% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 21.9% were “not sure.” (Table 18).
3. 70.4% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “as a result of participating in the after-school program, the child's math skills have improved”, 4.4% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 25.1% were “not sure.” (Table 18).

Executive Summary (Continued)

4. 77.7% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “as a result of participating in the after-school program, the child's attitude towards school has improved”, 4.4% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 17.9% were “not sure.” (Table 18).
5. 96.6% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “the after-school program provides a safe setting for the child to participate in activities”, 1.2% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 2.2% were “not sure.” (Table 18).
6. 96.2% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “overall, the parent(s) is very satisfied with the after-school program for which the child participates”, 1.4% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 2.4% were “not sure.” (Table 18).
7. 95.0% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “overall, the child is very satisfied with the after-school program”, 2.4% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 2.6% were “not sure.” (Table 18).

Student Survey Results (SurveyMonkey)

1. Of the 2,633 responses to the question: “Has the after school program helped you improve your reading?”, 63.3% of the students indicated “yes”, 22.5% responded “no”, while 14.2% were “not sure.” (Table 19).
2. Of the 2,615 responses to the question: “Has the after-school program helped you improve your math skills?”, 66.1% of the students indicated “yes”, 18.4% responded “no”, while 15.6% were “not sure.” (Table 19).
3. Of the 2,601 responses to the question: “Do you like attending the after-school program?”, 79.2% of the students indicated “yes”, 12.0% responded “no”, while 8.8% were “not sure.” (Table 19).

Partner Survey Results (SurveyMonkey)

1. Of the 41 completed partner surveys, 97.6% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “the partner has a good understanding of the goals of the after-school program”, none “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 2.4% were “not sure.” (Table 20).
2. All “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “the partner has a good understanding about after-school program expectations of the partner’s contributions.” (Table 20).
3. 90.0% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “the project director communicates regularly with the partner regarding progress of the project”, 2.5% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 7.5% were “not sure.” (Table 20).

Executive Summary (Continued)

4. 87.5% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “the project director communicates regularly with the partner regarding the impact of the partner’s contributions”, 2.5% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 10.0% were “not sure.” (Table 20).
5. 96.7% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “the after-school program is viewed as a helpful resource to families in the community”, none “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 2.4% were “not sure.” (Table 20).
6. 95.1% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “the partner and grantee work together to effectively coordinate services for children, youth, and/or families”, 2.4% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”, while 2.4% were “not sure.” (Table 20).
7. All partners “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “the after-school program is a significant asset in the community.” (Table 20).
8. Regarding “how the partner contributes to the after-school program”, 12.2% “donate money”, 14.6% “volunteer”, 29.3% “donate time”, 46.3% “donate materials”, 22.0% “teach a course”, 2.4% “provide tutors”, 41.5% “provide meeting space”, while 19.5% donate “other.” (Table 20).

MQIT

1. On a scale from 1 to 4 (1 denoting “must improve”, 2 “some progress”, 3 “satisfactory”, and 4 “excellent”) the highest to lowest ranked monitoring category (quality indicators) mean scores were: "programming/activities" (4.00), "staffing and professional development" (3.98), "health and safety" (3.96), "partnerships" (3.95), "grant management and sustainability" (3.93), "program management" (3.93), "center operations" (3.90), and "evaluation/measuring outcomes" (3.73). The overall mean score for all monitoring categories was 3.93. (Table 21).

Program Strengths Based on MQIT Findings and Site Visits

1. While the 2013-14 school year brought grantees’ various challenges in terms trying to meet the demands of required programming hours particularly for new/smaller schools/districts, attaining qualified staffing, regional CCLC project director turnover, geographical reorganization, and the movement from a Regional Education Association (REA) model to a more localized CCLC approach, the grantees have largely welcomed those challenges with enthusiasm while continuing to provide successful programs.
2. Grantees continued to identify and serve eligible students and their families consistent with the new grant applications. As in previous years, students and families benefited from experienced and dedicated staff along with engaged day schools and partners.

Executive Summary (Continued)

3. Organizational structures were well defined, providing lead teachers/coordinators at each center to supervise staff and oversee daily programming. In many instances afterschool teachers were certified teachers.
4. Grantees provided a variety of evidence-based academic and enrichment programs/activities, many similar to those offered by the respective day-schools, including: math, reading, science, homework help, tutoring, computer and technology, music, arts and crafts, and recreational/field trip activities. Furthermore, learning opportunities continued to be broadminded with numerous sites employing evidence-based academic and enrichment activities such as: Readers Theatre, GEM Kits, KidzLit and KidzMath, Frog Publications, STEM Program Kits, hands-on STEM projects, Lakeshore Learning Science and Social Studies, Engineering Adventures, Making Sense of Learning, MindWorks, and Skillastics, among others. By and large, program activities were based on student need and commensurate with the age and skill level of the participants.
5. Academic and enrichment, programs/activities were highly structured and included detailed schedules/lesson plans/calendars. Programs provided appropriate schedules, flows, and duration of activities, etc.
6. Program staff continued to communicate and collaborate regularly with school-day personnel. As a rule, day school and afterschool teachers, either verbally and/or via written documentation, identified individuals needing assistance in particular academic areas. Grantees have made communications/collaborations among principals, teachers, site coordinators, and students a priority, resulting in improved communications/collaborations.
7. Generally, staff was furnished comprehensive “Employee/Staff Handbooks”, while parents/families were provided comprehensive “Parent/Family Handbooks.” “Employee/Staff Handbooks” typically included sections such as: site-specific contact information; goals, confidentiality, vision statements, mission statements; academic and behavioral expectations; program confidentiality; employee pay schedules; job-specific performance review guidelines; proper dress; employment/job descriptions; child pick-up authorizations for parents/guardians; illness and subs; leave request form; community involvement; orientation; training; staff development; communication; meetings; newsletters; lesson plans; attendance; quarterly reports; safe environment; suspected child abuse/neglect; drills/safety measures; accidents/incidents (protocol); program fee base; and purchase order policies; among others. “Parent/Family Handbooks” for the most part included: program mission, program vision, program goals/objectives, program site information, program cost, holidays/storm day policies, release of students, visitor information, field trips, snacks, accident/illness, medications, responsible behavior, dismissal procedures, nondiscrimination/sexual harassment statements, access to student records, technology/computer/network facilities, staff/family partnership agreements, and field trip permission forms.
8. Grantees continued their commitment to conduct outreach to eligible participants by a variety of methods including: newsletters, letters to parents/families, open houses, PTO presentations, brochures, parent/family handbooks, invitations to programs/activities, Facebook, and region-wide and/or school-specific websites, among others.

Executive Summary (Continued)

9. In general, grantees conducted monthly meetings with project directors/site coordinators and staff, and in addition, many held regular meetings with school principals.
10. Grantees made every effort to recruit and retain new partners, including a variety of public, private, and governmental sector agencies to address unmet needs. For example, a single grantee recruited nearly 40 new local businesses, some providing no-cost advertising/promotions for the afterschool program.
11. A vast majority of grantees enhanced current programs/partnerships/staffing/professional development by taking advantage of local universities, colleges, high schools, and other organizations/businesses.
12. School's essential health and safety issues were generally adhered to as required. Specifically: safe/secure spaces/areas for program activities, daily nutritional snacks, addressing unique health issues (such as allergies), clearly defined procedures for participant pick-ups, emergency contact information, readiness plans, after school fire/safety drills, internet access (firewall, etc.), universal precautions, and first aid/CPR trained staff.

Opportunities for Program Improvement Based on MQIT Findings and Site Visits

1. During the 2012-13 school year half of the grantees lacked advisory board(s), those typically comprised of parents, students, partners, and community members at large to provide advice and feedback. During the 2013-14 timeframe only a single CCLC program grantee lacked such a board.
2. Two (2.6%) of the centers reported a mean number of hours per week as less than 12.
3. Nearly one-fifth (16.2% or 12) of the centers reported that 65.0% or less of their hours related to the core academic areas of mathematics, reading/literacy, science, and technology/computer. Furthermore, four centers failed to report any academic or enrichment hour programming times.
4. A vast majority of grantees inform students/families, conduct outreach, and/or promote CCLC programs using various media such as websites, school-specific newsletters, brochures, and program handbooks, for example. Unfortunately during the 2013-14 school year one grantee failed to develop/maintain any region-wide or school-specific CCLC-related websites. These sites are likely to provide the most effective vehicle to promote programs and inform students, parents, family members, staff, partners, and other interested stakeholders than any other single approach.

Executive Summary (Continued)

5. As in past years, many grantees continued to recognize that parent/family programming was limited and/or the perceived struggle with limited parental participation in the afterschool program's parent/family events.
6. Although not typical of most sites, in a few instances access to supplies for emergencies were not accessible after day school classes were dismissed. This non-accessibility issue has been and continues to be problematic for the program and students sustaining injuries or those with "treatable" emergency medical conditions. In addition, fire/safety drills were not conducted during afterschool program hours at all schools. Typically students in the afterschool programs are not "housed" in the same classrooms as they are during the regular school day.
7. Health and safety issues were generally attended to in an effective manner. Past concerns throughout North Dakota related to individual(s) entering a school "unrecorded/unchecked" by any day school or afterschool staff. To address the safe and accessible facility/environment issue, family members/visitors to most schools have access by a single entrance, one which is normally staffed by an individual (doorman concept) who "checks in" persons entering the school. There were however schools, typically "more rural", where it was relatively easy to enter and wander throughout the school, potentially causing personal harm or theft/destruction of property.
8. Nearly one-third (29.2%) of the centers did not report State Assessment math proficiencies, while 25.6% did not report corresponding reading proficiencies. In addition, in some instances "incorrect" proficiency levels were entered. Furthermore, nearly half of the centers did not report any MAP math or MAP reading scores.
9. In many cases, YouthServices and SurveyMonkey-based stakeholder surveys were not conducted. In particular, 17 (21.8%) of the centers did not conduct YouthServices-based teacher surveys; 19 (24.4%) did not conduct SurveyMonkey-based teacher surveys; 22 (28.2%) parent surveys; and 17 (21.8%) student surveys. In addition, two of the eight grantees did not conduct partner surveys.
10. Moreover, a vast majority of the grantees who conducted the above mentioned surveys did not communicate results to staff or other respective stakeholders. Results of these surveys must be fed back to stakeholders bearing in mind that measuring and reporting such outcomes provides useful feedback for individuals and organizations involved in providing fundamental CCLC programs and services. These stakeholders have an investment in programs and services and greatly influence what can and will be accomplished; consequently their input and providing feedback to them is critical in achieving successful outcomes. Effective feedback also encourages stakeholders to buy-into the program while lack or ineffective methods of feedback most often lead to program indifference.
11. For the 2012-13 and 2013-14 school years SurveyMonkey-based school-specific survey results were not available, i.e., results were provided only for each grantee as a whole.

Executive Summary (Continued)

12. Data entry inaccuracies/errors have seemingly increased from previous school years. Example one: 74.7% of reporting centers provided “homework help”, 18.7% “community service/service learning”, 14.7% “tutoring”, 14.7% “counseling or character education”, and 65.3% “recreational activities.” Unfortunately 42.7% of the centers reported “other” as an activity or service provided attendees. In all likelihood this is a result of data entry errors, e.g. assigning various activities/services into an “other” category, rather than pre-established functional activities/services classifications. Example 2: during the 2012-13 school year 37.5% of reporting centers specified family members attended “promotion of parental involvement”, 21.3% “promotion of family literacy”, while 8.8% reported family members attended “career/job training for adults.” However during the 2013-14 school year the proportions were 4.0%, 0.0%, and 0.0%, respectively; again, in all probability the result of data entry errors.

State Mandated Objectives/Progress

Objective 1: Participants in CCLC programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.

Performance Indicator 1.1 Achievement: Continuous improvement in test scores, grades, and/or teacher reports.

1. Mean fall MAP math scores were relatively constant throughout the 2009-10 to 2013-14 school years. During that time period, the mean scores declined slightly, from 193.1 in 2009-10 to 191.7 in 2013-14. Mean spring MAP math scores were also relatively constant throughout the 2009-10 to 2013-14 school years. During that time period, the scores decreased slightly, from 203.6 in 2009-10 to 202.0 in 2013-14. Generally, mean math scores were higher in the spring of each school year.
2. Mean fall MAP reading scores were also relatively constant throughout the 2009-10 to 2013-14 school years. During that time period, the mean scores declined very slightly, from 188.7 in 2009-10 to 188.4 in 2013-14. Mean spring MAP reading scores were also relatively constant throughout the 2009-10 to 2013-14 school years. During that time period, the scores declined slightly, from 197.5 in 2009-10 to 196.9 in 2013-14. Generally, mean reading scores were higher in the spring of each school year.
3. With respect to state assessment math proficiencies, in 2009-10, 75.0% of attendees were “advanced proficient” or “proficient” compared to 75.5% during the 2013-14 timeframe.
4. With respect to state assessment reading proficiencies, in 2009-10, 70.3% of attendees were “advanced proficient” or “proficient” compared to 69.3% during the 2013-14 timeframe.
5. According to teacher’s, nearly two-thirds (61.0%) of the attendees needing improvement “showed improvement” in their behavior in terms of “turning in homework on time.”
6. Approximately two-thirds (63.5%) of the attendees needing improvement “showed improvement” in their behavior in terms of “completing their homework to the teachers satisfaction.”
7. Slightly more than half (52.3%) of the attendees needing improvement “showed improvement” in their behavior in terms of “participating in class.”
8. One-third (33.7%) of the attendees needing improvement “showed improvement” in their behavior in terms of “volunteering in class.”
9. Slightly less than half (46.0%) of the attendees needing improvement “showed improvement” in their behavior in terms of “being attentive in class.”

State Mandated Objectives/Progress (Continued)

10. Approximately two-thirds (66.1%) of attendees needing improvement “showed improvement” in their behavior in terms of “performing well academically.”
11. Slightly less than half (45.8%) of the attendees needing improvement “showed improvement” in their behavior in terms of “coming to school motivated to learn.”
12. Nearly three-fourths (73.5%) of parents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “as a result of participating in the after-school program, their child’s reading skills have improved.”
13. Roughly seven of ten (70.4%) parents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “as a result of participating in the after-school program, their child’s math skills have improved.”
14. Nearly two-thirds (63.3%) of the attendees indicated that “yes”, the “after school program helped improve their reading.”
15. Approximately two-thirds (66.1%) of the attendees reported that “yes”, the “after-school program helped improve their math skills.”

Performance Indicator 1.2 Behavior: Improvements in attendance, classroom performance (other than grades) and number of disciplinary actions/adverse behaviors.

1. According to teachers, slightly less than one-third (26.6%) of the attendees needing improvement “showed improvement” in their behavior in terms of “attending class regularly.”
2. Approximately half (43.0%) of the attendees needing improvement “showed improvement” in their behavior in terms of “behaving well in class.”
3. Roughly half (44.1%) of the attendees needing improvement “showed improvement” in their behavior in terms of “getting along well with other students.”
4. Slightly more than three-fourths (77.7%) of parents indicated that they “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “as a result of participating in the afterschool program, their child’s attitude towards school has improved.”

State Mandated Objectives/Progress (Continued)

Objective 2: CCLC will offer a range of high-quality educational, developmental and recreational services.

Performance Indicator 2.1 Core educational services: More than 65% of daily programming offered at each center will be of high quality in the core academic areas, e.g., reading and literacy, mathematics, science, and technology/computer.

1. More than three-fourths (83.8% or 62) of reporting sites indicated that more than 65.0% of their total hours involved the core academic areas of mathematics, reading/literacy, science, and technology/computer, while the remaining sites (16.2% or 12) reported 65.0% or less of their hours related to the core academic areas.

Performance Indicator 2.2 Enrichment and support activities: All Centers offer enrichment and support activities such as nutrition and health, art, music, and recreation.

1. Nearly all (96.1% or 73) of the reporting sites indicated providing enrichment and support activities, while two reported not providing such activities.

Performance Indicator 2.3 Community involvement: All Centers establish and maintain partnerships within the community that continue to increase levels of community collaboration in planning, implementing and sustaining programs.

1. Types of partners varied considerably and included Clubs, College or Universities, Community-Based Organizations, Faith-Based Organizations, For-Profit Entities, Health Based Organizations, Libraries, Museums, Nationally Affiliated Non-Profit Agencies, Other Unit of City/County Government, Park/Recreation Districts, Regional/Intermediate Education Agencies, School Districts, and YMCA's/YWCA's. All grantees reported partnerships with organizations.
2. Regarding "how the partner contributes to the after-school program", 12.2% "donate money", 14.6% "volunteer", 29.3% "donate time", 46.3% "donate materials", 22.0% "teach a course", 2.4% "provide tutors", 41.5% "provide meeting space", while 19.5% donate "other."
3. Previous statewide evaluations included the total estimated monetary value of contributions and mean contribution by partner classification; however for the 2013-14 school year the information was not accessible seeing as PPICS was permanently removed offline and closed for any data-related submission and reporting activities in October 2014. As indicated earlier, in its place a new system is being developed to supplant PPICS as the CCLC data collection system.
4. A vast majority (97.6%) of partners "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that "they have good understanding of the goals of the after-school program."

State Mandated Objectives/Progress (Continued)

5. All of the partners “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “they have a good understanding about after-school program expectations of their contributions.”
6. Nine of ten (90.0%) partners “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “the project director communicates regularly with them regarding progress of the project.”
7. More than eight of ten (87.5%) partners indicated they “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “the project director communicates regularly with them regarding the impact of the partner’s contributions.”
8. Nearly all (96.7%) partners “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “the after-school program is viewed as a helpful resource to families in the community.”
9. A vast majority (95.1%) of partners “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “they and grantee work together to effectively coordinate services for children, youth, and/or families.”
10. All partners “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that “the after-school program is a significant asset in the community.”
11. Although all grantees provided a written sustainability plan which addressed issues should federal funding be discontinued or should school buildings no longer be eligible to receive funding, one grantee did not address sustainability for all schools within their region.

Performance Indicator 2.4 Services to families of eligible students: All Centers will offer services to families of eligible students.

1. During the 2012-13 school year, more than one-third (37.5%) of reporting centers specified family members attended “promotion of parental involvement”, 21.3% “promotion of family literacy”, while 8.8% reported family members attended “career/job training for adults.” However during the 2013-14 school the proportions were 4.0%, 0.0%, and 0.0%, respectively. In all likelihood this is a result of data entry errors, e.g. assigning various activities/services into an “other” category, rather than pre-established functional activities/services classifications.

Performance Indicator 2.5 Extended hours: All Centers will offer services at least 12 hours a week on average, and provide services when school is not in session, such as summer and holidays.

1. Nearly all (97.4% or 75) of the sites reported a mean number of hours per week as 12 or more, while 2.6% (two schools) reported a mean of less than 12 hours per week.

State Mandated Objectives/Progress (Continued)

Objective 3: CCLC will serve children and family members with the greatest needs for expanded learning opportunities.

Performance Indicator 3.1 High-need communities: All Centers will serve students that attend schools that are in need of improvement or are from schools that meet or exceed 40% free and reduced meals as defined by School Foods.

1. All sites served students that were in need of improvement.
2. Nearly all (96.1% or 73) of the reporting sites served attendees that met or exceeded 40% free/reduced meals, while two (3.9%) did not specify whether they met the 40% free and reduced meal criteria.

Recommendations for Program Improvement

Recommendations for CCLC program improvement are primarily based on results of the MQIT, site visits to centers (schools), and the analysis of data provided by grantees/centers via YouthServices.net, and SurveyMonkey.

1. Performance indicator 1.1 specifies that CCLC attendees continually show improvement in test scores. In order to monitor changes in assessment test scores or proficiency levels test results must be reported by all grantees/centers. Nearly one-third (29.2%) of the centers did not report State Assessment math proficiencies, while 25.6% did not report corresponding reading proficiencies. In addition, in some instances “incorrect” proficiency levels were entered. Furthermore, nearly half of the centers did not report any MAP math or MAP reading scores.
 - ✓ Project Directors or their designee should verify that all student-specific state assessment math and reading proficiencies and MAP math and reading scores are entered correctly and in a timely fashion.
2. Performance indicator 2.1 stipulates that more than 65% of daily programming offered at each center will be of high quality in the core academic areas, e.g., reading and literacy, mathematics, science, and technology/computer. Nearly one-fifth (16.2% or 12) of the centers reported that 65.0% or less of their hours related to the core academic areas. Furthermore, four centers failed to report any academic programming hours.
 - ✓ Project Directors or their designee must develop a means to meet or exceed the requirement. Furthermore, to accurately measure the requirement, all centers must report programming hours. At present, a quarterly monitoring report addressing the 65% plus target is disseminated to individual grantees by the State CCLC Program Evaluator.
3. Performance indicator 2.2 requires that all centers offer enrichment and support activities such as nutrition and health, art, music, and recreation. Only one of the reporting centers did not provide such activities. In addition, four centers failed to report any enrichment programming hours.
 - ✓ Project Directors or their designee must develop a method to meet the requirement that all centers offer enrichment and support activities. Furthermore, to accurately measure the requirement, all centers must report programming hours.

Recommendations for Program Improvement (Continued)

4. Performance indicator 2.4 stipulates that all centers will offer services to families of eligible students. During the 2012-13 school year, more than one-third (37.5%) of reporting centers indicated family members attended “promotion of parental involvement”, 21.3% “promotion of family literacy”, while 8.8% reported family members attended “career/job training for adults.” However during the 2013-14 school year the proportions were 4.0%, 0.0%, and 0.0%, respectively. In all likelihood this is the result of data entry errors, e.g. assigning various activities/services into incorrect or “other” categories, rather than pre-established functional activities/services classifications.
 - ✓ Project Directors or their designee must develop a course of action to meet the requirement that all centers offer services to families of eligible students. (Please note that data entry issues will be addressed later in this section).
5. Performance indicator 2.5 requires that all centers will offer services at least 12 hours a week on average, and provide services when school is not in session, such as summer and holidays. Nearly all (97.4% or 75) of the sites reported a mean number of hours per week as 12 or more, while 2.6% or two reported a mean of less than 12 hours per week.
 - ✓ Project Directors or their designee must develop an approach to meet or exceed the requirement that all centers offer at least 12 hours a week on average.
6. Performance indicator 3.1 specifies that all centers will serve students that attend schools that are in need of improvement or are from schools that meet or exceed 40% free and reduced meals as defined by School Foods. All centers served students that were in need of improvement, Nearly all (96.1% or 73) of the reporting sites served attendees that met or exceeded 40% free/reduced meals, while two (3.9%) did not specify whether they met the 40% free and reduced meal criteria.
 - ✓ Project Directors or their designee must develop a means to meet the requirement that all centers will serve students that attend schools that are in need of improvement or are from schools that meet or exceed 40% free and reduced meals. Furthermore, to accurately measure if this requirement is being met, all centers must report the 40% free/reduced meal information. (Please note that data entry issues will be addressed later in this section).

Recommendations for Program Improvement (Continued)

7. Health and safety issues were generally attended to in an effective manner. Past concerns throughout North Dakota related to individual(s) entering a school “unrecorded/unchecked” by any day school or afterschool staff. To address the safe and accessible facility/environment issue, family members/visitors to most schools have access by a single entrance, one which is normally staffed by an individual (doorman concept) who “checks in” persons entering the school. There were however schools, typically “more rural”, where it was relatively easy to enter and wander throughout the school, potentially causing personal harm or theft/destruction of property.
 - ✓ Project Directors or their designee must take the lead and be responsible to develop, implement, and periodically update a strategic plan to address the “unrecorded/unchecked” safety issue detailed above. For example, the plan should include assigning responsibility to an individual(s) to explore specific steps/options grantees/centers have available to address safety responsibilities; decide on a timeframe when the specific steps/options need be completed; and examine and use various resources available to assist with the specific steps/options (Federal CCLC program staff, NDDPI, other grantees/centers, other states, etc.).
8. One of the grantees lacked an advisory board(s).
 - ✓ Project Directors or their designee must be responsible for establishing an advisory board(s) that meets regularly and is comprised of parents, students, community member at large, and partners to provide advice and feedback.
9. In a few instances access to supplies for emergencies were not accessible after day school classes were dismissed; this has been an ongoing issue for years. In addition, afterschool program fire/safety drills were not conducted at all schools.
 - ✓ Project Directors or their designee should meet with the “source” that is hindering access to supplies. Solutions to this non-accessibility issue needs to be reached before any student sustains injuries or encounters “treatable” emergency medical conditions.
 - ✓ Project Directors or their designee(s) must coordinate or conduct fire/safety drills during afterschool hours at all centers.

Recommendations for Program Improvement (Continued)

10. On many occasions YouthServices and SurveyMonkey-based stakeholder surveys were not conducted. Specifically, 17 (21.8%) of the centers did not conduct YouthServices-based teacher surveys; 19 (24.4%) did not conduct SurveyMonkey-based teacher surveys; 22 (28.2%) parent surveys; and 17 (21.8%) student surveys. In addition, two of the eight grantees did not conduct partner surveys. Moreover, a vast majority of the grantees who conducted the surveys did not communicate results to staff or other stakeholders.

In addition, for the 2012-13 and 2013-14 school years SurveyMonkey-based school-specific survey results were not available, i.e., results were offered only for each grantee as a whole.

- ✓ Project Directors or their designee should coordinate and carry out YouthServices and/or SurveyMonkey-based teacher, student, parent, and partnership surveys using existing standardized questionnaire formats, subsequently communicating the survey results to staff and other stakeholders. Results of these surveys must be fed back to stakeholders bearing in mind that measuring and reporting such outcomes provides useful feedback for individuals and organizations involved in providing fundamental CCLC programs and services. These stakeholders have an investment in programs and services and greatly influence what can and will be accomplished; consequently their input and providing feedback to them is critical in achieving successful outcomes. Effective feedback also encourages stakeholders to buy-into the program while lack or ineffective methods of feedback most often lead to program indifference.
 - ✓ The North Dakota CCLC Project Administrator must assure that SurveyMonkey-based school-specific survey results are available for grantees and the State CCLC Program Evaluator.
11. Data entry inaccuracies/errors have apparently increased from previous school years. Example one: 74.7% of reporting centers provided “homework help”, 18.7% “community service/service learning”, 14.7% “tutoring”, 14.7% “counseling or character education”, and 65.3% “recreational activities.” Unfortunately 42.7% of the centers reported “other” as an activity or service provided attendees. In all likelihood large proportion of “other” is a result of data entry errors/inaccuracies, e.g. assigning various activities/services into the “other” category, rather than pre-established functional activities/services classifications. Example 2: during the 2012-13 school year 37.5% of reporting centers specified family members attended “promotion of parental involvement”, 21.3% “promotion of family literacy”, while 8.8% reported family members attended “career/job training for adults.” However during the 2013-14 school year the proportions were 4.0%, 0.0%, and 0.0%, respectively; again, in all likelihood the result of data entry errors/inaccuracies. Example 3: entering incorrect “scales” for entering State Assessment math and reading proficiencies. Specifically, entering the assessment type as “Proficiency Level Scores” (Below, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced) rather than the correct assessment type, “State Assessment Scores” (Novice, Partially Proficient, Proficient, and Advanced Proficient).

Recommendations for Program Improvement (Continued)

- ✓ Data entry errors/inaccuracies/missing data concerns must be addressed by the grantees and State CCLC Program Evaluator. With the increase in these types of errors and omissions, in addition to the relatively large number of new Project Directors and staff responsible for data entry, the North Dakota CCLC Program Administrator should consider holding formal training sessions conducted by YouthServices.net or other qualified staff.
12. A vast majority of grantees inform students/families, conduct outreach, and/or promote CCLC programs using various media such as websites, school-specific newsletters, brochures, and program handbooks, for example. During the 2013-14 school year however one grantee failed to make available any region-wide or school-specific CCLC-related websites. These sites likely provide the most effective vehicle to promote programs and inform students, parents, family members, staff, partners, and other interested stakeholders than any other single approach.
- ✓ The Project Director or their designee should coordinate the development of a region-wide and/or school-specific CCLC-related website, including appropriate links. The grantee should consider adding: a description of the program, including fees, etc.; registration forms; program/activity schedules; program handbooks (family, staff, site coordinator); school newsletters/brochures; and family member activities/celebrations; for example. Furthermore, the annual regional written evaluations are required to be made available on the grantee and/or school-specific website(s).

Data Reporting and Interpretation Considerations

When examining the information made available in this report the reader should note the following:

1. In certain instances data relevant to the evaluation was not reported by all grantees/centers or reported incorrectly.
2. A sizable number of centers failed to report assessment test results; as a result, tests to measure statistically significant differences or changes in assessment test scores or proficiency levels were not conducted.
3. Changes in math and reading assessment mean scores or proficiency levels from one time period to another are not necessarily a direct result of the CCLC program. Numerous other factors may affect the changes in scores or proficiencies.
4. Math and reading assessments are not necessarily administered to the same grades year after year.
5. In some instances grantees may not have included homework help/tutoring hours spent with attendees in the core academic area of mathematics, reading/literacy, science, and technology/computer (assignments, problems, questions, etc.), consequently the number and proportion of hours relating to the core academic areas may be underreported.
6. Information used in the teacher, parent, student, and partner survey portions of this report are based on responses made by stakeholders and may be subjective in nature.

Detailed Tables

Table 1
Grantees by Region, Location and Number of Centers, 2013-2014
(September 1, 2013 through August 31, 2014)
Source: YouthServices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Grantee	Location	Number of Centers
GFPS - Grand Forks Public Schools	Grand Forks	10
MPS - Minot Public Schools	Minot	5
MREC/ESP - Missouri River Education Cooperative/Extended School Program	Mandan	9
NCEC - North Central Education Cooperative	Bottineau	9
NESC - Northeast Education Services Cooperative	Devils Lake	9
NVCTC - North Valley Career Tech. Center	Grafton	9
RASP - Regional After School Program/Dickinson Public Schools	Dickinson	4
SEEC - South East Education Cooperative	Fargo	23
Total		78

Table 2
Attendance by Grantee and Attendee Status, 2013-2014
(September 1, 2013 through August 31, 2014)
Source: YouthServices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Attendee Status	Total All	Grantee-specific Totals							
	Grantees	GFPS	MPS	MREC	NCEC	NESC	NVCTC	RASP	SEEC
30+ Days	4,478	559	782	550	205	810	596	164	812
< 30 Days	3,289	437	287	157	585	841	391	50	541
Total	7,767	996	1,069	707	790	1,651	987	214	1,353
Attendee Status	Percent All	Grantee-specific Percentages							
	Grantees	GFPS	MPS	MREC	NCEC	NESC	NVCTC	RASP	SEEC
30+ Days	57.7%	56.1%	73.2%	77.8%	25.9%	49.1%	60.4%	76.6%	60.0%
< 30 Days	42.3%	43.9%	26.8%	22.2%	74.1%	50.9%	39.6%	23.4%	40.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Number of centers reporting - 76 of 78 (97.4%)

Table 3
Attendance by Grantee and Age Group, 2013-2014
(September 1, 2013 through August 31, 2014)
Source: YouthServices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Age Group	Total All	Grantee-specific Totals							
	Grantees	GFPS	MPS	MREC	NCEC	NESC	NVCTC	RASP	SEEC
Under 6	233	109	69	13	11	-	3	-	28
6 to 9	3,862	551	681	455	313	668	366	108	720
10 to 13	2,612	198	319	228	285	706	375	78	423
14 to 18	565	8	-	2	13	258	123	-	161
19 and Over	16	-	-	-	-	10	3	-	3
N/S	479	130	-	9	168	9	117	28	18
Total	7,767	996	1,069	707	790	1,651	987	214	1,353

Age Group	Percent All	Grantee-specific Percentages							
	Grantees	GFPS	MPS	MREC	NCEC	NESC	NVCTC	RASP	SEEC
Under 6	3.0%	10.9%	6.5%	1.8%	1.4%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	2.1%
6 to 9	49.7%	55.3%	63.7%	64.4%	39.6%	40.5%	37.1%	50.5%	53.2%
10 to 13	33.6%	19.9%	29.8%	32.2%	36.1%	42.8%	38.0%	36.4%	31.3%
14 to 18	7.3%	0.8%	0.0%	0.3%	1.6%	15.6%	12.5%	0.0%	11.9%
19 and Over	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.3%	0.0%	0.2%
N/S	6.2%	13.1%	0.0%	1.3%	21.3%	0.5%	11.9%	13.1%	1.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Number of centers reporting - 76 of 78 (97.4%)

Table 4
Attendance by Grantee and Grade Level, 2013-2014
(September 1, 2013 through August 31, 2014)
Source: YouthServices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Grade Level	Total All Grantees	Grantee-specific Totals							
		GFPS	MPS	MREC	NCEC	NESC	NVCTC	RASP	SEEC
Kindergarten	617	188	134	73	16	27	8	28	143
1st	1,070	151	184	132	69	162	106	33	233
2nd	1,135	182	202	144	102	187	104	28	186
3rd	1,108	161	159	108	110	225	111	41	193
4th	1,053	110	160	102	147	196	115	31	192
5th	956	93	144	97	132	210	136	31	113
6th	666	90	86	38	95	171	102	8	76
7th	349	5	-	9	44	152	73	-	66
8th	313	7	-	2	33	135	98	-	38
9th	153	6	-	2	3	88	38	-	16
10th	81	-	-	-	-	26	22	-	33
11th	77	-	-	-	-	29	18	-	30
12th	66	-	-	-	-	27	19	-	20
Graduated	17	-	-	-	-	11	6	-	-
Not stated	106	3	-	-	39	5	31	14	14
Total	7,767	996	1,069	707	790	1,651	987	214	1,353

Table 4 (Continued)
Attendance by Grantee and Grade Level, 2013-2014
(September 1, 2013 through August 31, 2014)
Source: YouthServices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Grade Level	Percent	Grantee-specific Percentages							
	All Grantees	GFPS	MPS	MREC	NCEC	NESC	NVCTC	RASP	SEEC
Kindergarten	7.9%	18.9%	12.5%	10.3%	2.0%	1.6%	0.8%	13.1%	10.6%
1st	13.8%	15.2%	17.2%	18.7%	8.7%	9.8%	10.7%	15.4%	17.2%
2nd	14.6%	18.3%	18.9%	20.4%	12.9%	11.3%	10.5%	13.1%	13.7%
3rd	14.3%	16.2%	14.9%	15.3%	13.9%	13.6%	11.2%	19.2%	14.3%
4th	13.6%	11.0%	15.0%	14.4%	18.6%	11.9%	11.7%	14.5%	14.2%
5th	12.3%	9.3%	13.5%	13.7%	16.7%	12.7%	13.8%	14.5%	8.4%
6th	8.6%	9.0%	8.0%	5.4%	12.0%	10.4%	10.3%	3.7%	5.6%
7th	4.5%	0.5%	0.0%	1.3%	5.6%	9.2%	7.4%	0.0%	4.9%
8th	4.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.3%	4.2%	8.2%	9.9%	0.0%	2.8%
9th	2.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.3%	0.4%	5.3%	3.9%	0.0%	1.2%
10th	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	2.2%	0.0%	2.4%
11th	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	1.8%	0.0%	2.2%
12th	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	1.9%	0.0%	1.5%
Graduated	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Not stated	1.4%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	4.9%	0.3%	3.1%	6.5%	1.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Number of centers reporting - 76 of 78 (97.4%)

Table 5
Attendance by Grantee and Racial/Ethnic Groups, 2013-2014
(September 1, 2013 through August 31, 2014)

Source: YouthServices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Note: In some instances more than one race/ethnicity is reported for an attendee, consequently the number of races, not necessarily attendees, is depicted in the table below. The number of races/ethnicities may be greater than the number of attendees.

Racial/Ethnic Groups	Total	Grantee-specific Totals							
	All Grantees	GFPS	MPS	MREC	NCEC	NESC	NVCTC	RASP	SEEC
White	4,554	444	871	449	222	724	599	179	1,066
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1,883	103	65	224	434	934	22	8	93
Asian/Pacific Islander	119	48	10	5	2	3	3	4	44
Black/African American	327	72	64	28	7	8	9	11	128
Hispanic/Latino	533	65	63	7	5	18	309	12	54
N/S	429	264	-	-	120	-	45	-	-
Total	7,845	996	1,073	713	790	1,687	987	214	1,385

Racial/Ethnic Groups	Percent	Grantee-specific Percentages							
	All Grantees	GFPS	MPS	MREC	NCEC	NESC	NVCTC	RASP	SEEC
White	58.0%	44.6%	81.2%	63.0%	28.1%	42.9%	60.7%	83.6%	77.0%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	24.0%	10.3%	6.1%	31.4%	54.9%	55.4%	2.2%	3.7%	6.7%
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.5%	4.8%	0.9%	0.7%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	1.9%	3.2%
Black/African American	4.2%	7.2%	6.0%	3.9%	0.9%	0.5%	0.9%	5.1%	9.2%
Hispanic/Latino	6.8%	6.5%	5.9%	1.0%	0.6%	1.1%	31.3%	5.6%	3.9%
N/S	5.5%	26.5%	0.0%	0.0%	15.2%	0.0%	4.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Number of centers reporting - 76 of 78 (97.4%)

Table 6
Number of Attendees, Average Daily Attendance, Contact Hours and
Average Contact Hours per Attendee by Grantee, 2013-2014
(September 1, 2013 through August 31, 2014)
Source: YouthServices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Characteristics	Total All Grantees	Grantee-specific Totals							
		GFPS	MPS	MREC	NCEC	NESC	NVCTC	RASP	SEEC
Total Attendees	7,767	996	1,069	707	790	1,651	987	214	1,353
Average Daily Attendance	2,657.9	371.1	514.7	351.7	86.9	444.3	328.1	123.2	438.0
Total Contact Hours Provided Attendees	1,340,249.0	157,554.3	285,944.3	208,805.0	120,519.0	158,672.5	117,755.5	31,605.5	259,393.0
Average Contact Hours per Attendee (see above for time period)	172.6	158.2	267.5	295.3	152.6	96.1	119.3	147.7	191.7

Number of centers reporting - 76 of 78 (97.4%)

Table 7
Attendees Participating in Special Services or Programs
by Grantee and Specific Special Service or Program, 2013-2014
(September 1, 2013 through August 31, 2014)
Source: YouthServices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Special Services or Programs	Total	Grantee-specific Totals							
	All Grantees	GFPS	MPS	MREC	NCEC	NESC	NVCTC	RASP	SEEC
Limited English Proficiency (LEP)	292	49	2	3	7	27	140	-	64
Free and Reduced Lunch Program (FRPL)	3,877	439	463	331	413	1,137	488	41	565
Special Needs	240	16	11	18	8	91	60	5	31
Individual Education Plan (IEP)	678	96	44	49	40	235	116	13	85
Special Education	346	24	32	31	8	117	91	8	35
Special Services or Programs	Percent	Grantee-specific Percentages							
	All Grantees	GFPS	MPS	MREC	NCEC	NESC	NVCTC	RASP	SEEC
Limited English Proficiency (LEP)	3.8%	4.9%	0.2%	0.4%	0.9%	1.6%	14.2%	0.0%	4.7%
Free and Reduced Lunch Program (FRPL)	49.9%	44.1%	43.3%	46.8%	52.3%	68.9%	49.4%	19.2%	41.8%
Special Needs	3.1%	1.6%	1.0%	2.5%	1.0%	5.5%	6.1%	2.3%	2.3%
Individual Education Plan (IEP)	8.7%	9.6%	4.1%	6.9%	5.1%	14.2%	11.8%	6.1%	6.3%
Special Education	4.5%	2.4%	3.0%	4.4%	1.0%	7.1%	9.2%	3.7%	2.6%
Total Attendees	7,767	996	1,069	707	790	1,651	987	214	1,353

Number of centers reporting - 76 of 78 (97.4%)

Table 8
Grantee Activity or Services Offered by Category of Activity or Service and Grantee, 2013-2014
(September 1, 2013 through August 31, 2014)
Source: YouthServices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Category of Activity or Service	Total All Grantees	Grantee-specific Totals							
		GFPS	MPS	MREC	NCEC	NESC	NVCTC	RASP	SEEC
Academic Enrichment Learning Programs	74	9	5	8	9	9	9	2	23
Tutoring	11	-	5	3	1	-	1	1	-
Homework Help	56	9	5	3	8	1	8	1	21
Mentoring	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Recreational Activities	49	9	5	8	-	4	5	-	18
Career/Job Training for Youth	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
Substance Abuse & Drug Prevention	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
Violence Prevention	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Counseling or Character Education	11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11
Expanded Library Service Hours	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Supplemental Education Services	8	7	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Community Service/Service Learning	14	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	11
Activities to Promote Youth Leadership	3	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-
Activities Promoting Parental Involvement	3	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1
Activities Promoting Family Literacy	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Career/Job Training for Adults	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	32	9	1	6	-	1	6	-	9

Table 8 (Continued)
Grantee Activity or Services Offered by Category of Activity or Service and Grantee, 2013-2014
(September 1, 2013 through August 31, 2014)
Source: YouthServices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Category of Activity or Service	Percent All Grantees	Grantee-specific Percentages							
		GFPS	MPS	MREC	NCEC	NESC	NVCTC	RASP	SEEC
Academic Enrichment Learning Programs	98.7%	90.0%	100.0%	88.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Tutoring	14.7%	0.0%	100.0%	33.3%	11.1%	0.0%	11.1%	25.0%	0.0%
Homework Help	74.7%	90.0%	100.0%	33.3%	88.9%	11.1%	88.9%	25.0%	91.3%
Mentoring	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Recreational Activities	65.3%	90.0%	100.0%	88.9%	0.0%	44.4%	55.6%	0.0%	78.3%
Career/Job Training for Youth	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Substance Abuse & Drug Prevention	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	21.7%
Violence Prevention	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Counseling or Character Education	14.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	47.8%
Expanded Library Service Hours	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Supplemental Education Services	10.7%	70.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Community Service/Service Learning	18.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	22.2%	11.1%	0.0%	47.8%
Activities to Promote Youth Leadership	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	11.1%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Activities Promoting Parental Involvement	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%
Activities Promoting Family Literacy	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Career/Job Training for Adults	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other	42.7%	90.0%	20.0%	66.7%	0.0%	11.1%	66.7%	0.0%	39.1%

Number of centers reporting - 75 of 78 (96.2.)

Table 9**Total Hours and Percent of Total Hours that Centers Provided Programming in the Core Academic Areas (Mathematics, Reading/Literacy, Science, and Technology/Computer) by Center, 2013-2014****Source: Persons by Subject Area per Grantee - Youthservices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees****Note: Time frame 9/1/13 thru 8/31/14**

Center	Total Hours All Programming	Total Hours Core Academic Areas	Percent Core Academic Areas
GFPS Ben Franklin School	595.3	453.3	76.1%
GFPS Century School	613.0	460.0	75.0%
GFPS Emerado Public Schools	532.0	420.5	79.0%
GFPS Lake Agassiz - Grand Forks	599.5	470.0	78.4%
GFPS Lewis & Clark - Grand Forks	622.0	469.5	75.5%
GFPS LSS	None reported	None reported	0.0%
GFPS Phoenix - Grand Forks	619.5	463.0	74.7%
GFPS West - Grand Forks	548.5	394.0	71.8%
GFPS Wilder Elementary	616.5	467.5	75.8%
GFPS Winship - Grand Forks	628.3	470.0	74.8%
MPS Lewis & Clark - Minot	939.8	735.4	78.3%
MPS McKinley Elementary - Minot	924.0	700.8	75.8%
MPS Roosevelt Elementary - Minot	1,143.3	833.8	72.9%
MPS Sunnyside Elementary	1,049.8	738.1	70.3%
MPS Washington Elementary - Minot	1,096.8	797.5	72.7%
MREC Cannon Ball Elementary	None reported	None reported	0.0%
MREC Custer	961.5	578.5	60.2%
MREC Dorothy Moses	809.0	663.0	82.0%
MREC Fort Lincoln	958.8	650.0	67.8%
MREC Mary Stark	961.8	557.3	57.9%
MREC Myhre Elementary	982.5	729.0	74.2%
MREC Saxvik	972.3	763.6	78.5%
MREC Theodore Jamerson	690.0	548.7	79.5%
MREC Will-Moore	980.8	670.0	68.3%

Table 9 (Continued)**Total Hours and Percent of Total Hours that Centers Provided Programming in the Core Academic Areas (Mathematics, Reading/Literacy, Science, and Technology/Computer) by Center, 2013-2014****Source: Persons by Subject Area per Grantee - Youthservices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees****Note: Time frame 9/1/13 thru 8/31/14**

Center	Total Hours All Programming	Total Hours Core Academic Areas	Percent Core Academic Areas
NCEC Anamoose	322.5	186.5	57.8%
NCEC Bottineau Elementary	506.5	298.5	58.9%
NCEC Dunseith	569.8	551.8	96.8%
NCEC Mt. Pleasant	983.0	797.0	81.1%
NCEC TGU Granville	1,620.8	1,204.7	74.3%
NCEC TGU Towner	868.3	602.2	69.4%
NCEC Turtle Mountain CS - Elementary	1,966.0	1,536.0	78.1%
NCEC Turtle Mountain CS Middle	806.0	516.5	64.1%
NCEC Westhope School	1,653.8	899.5	54.4%
NESC Central Middle School	1,771.3	1,357.9	76.7%
NESC Leeds Public Schools	546.5	369.4	67.6%
NESC Minnewauken	523.5	447.6	85.5%
NESC Minnie H	529.5	394.9	74.6%
NESC Prairie View	750.5	560.5	74.7%
NESC Rolette	893.5	681.1	76.2%
NESC Sweetwater	526.0	438.7	83.4%
NESC Tata Topa Tribal School	916.3	825.1	90.0%
NESC Warwick	701.3	678.1	96.7%
NVCTC Drayton Public School	551.0	378.0	68.6%
NVCTC Grafton Century Elementary	3,611.3	2,776.0	76.9%
NVCTC Grafton High School	454.5	454.5	100.0%
NVCTC Grafton Middle School	656.3	653.3	99.5%
NVCTC Midway Public School	568.0	445.2	78.4%
NVCTC Minto Public School	521.3	398.3	76.4%
NVCTC Northwood Public Schools	867.5	626.5	72.2%
NVCTC St. Thomas Public School	883.8	596.8	67.5%
NVCTC Walhalla Public School	466.3	428.2	91.8%

Table 9 (Continued)

Total Hours and Percent of Total Hours that Centers Provided Programming in the Core Academic Areas (Mathematics, Reading/Literacy, Science, and Technology/Computer) by Center, 2013-2014

Source: Persons by Subject Area per Grantee - Youthservices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Note: Time frame 9/1/13 thru 8/31/14

Center	Total Hours All Programming	Total Hours Core Academic Areas	Percent Core Academic Areas
RASP Heart River Elementary-Dickinson	259.5	235.5	90.8%
RASP Hebron Elementary	None reported	None reported	0.0%
RASP Lincoln Elementary - Beach	None reported	None reported	0.0%
RASP Roosevelt Elementary - Dickinson	279.5	227.5	81.4%
SEEC Barnes County North	694.0	506.0	72.9%
SEEC Carl Ben Eilson	440.0	319.0	72.5%
SEEC Central/Zimmerman	503.0	167.0	33.2%
SEEC CHARISM	210.5	157.0	74.6%
SEEC Eastwood	958.3	725.2	75.7%
SEEC Edgeley	415.0	313.8	75.6%
SEEC Ellendale Elementary	363.3	255.1	70.2%
SEEC Fairmount Elementary	492.5	259.4	52.7%
SEEC Griggs County Central	766.5	633.8	82.7%
SEEC Jefferson Elementary	971.3	735.6	75.7%
SEEC Kulm	105.0	81.7	77.8%
SEEC LaMoure	670.5	501.2	74.7%
SEEC LE Berger Elementary	925.5	689.3	74.5%
SEEC Lincoln Elementary - Jamestown	830.5	499.7	60.2%
SEEC Louis L'Amour Elementary	1,047.3	689.5	65.8%
SEEC Madison Elementary	651.0	479.8	73.7%
SEEC McKinley Elementary - Fargo	719.8	488.3	67.8%
SEEC Medina	270.3	209.0	77.3%
SEEC Midkota	315.0	213.5	67.8%
SEEC New Rockford	319.3	253.3	79.3%
SEEC Roosevelt Elementary - Jamestown	809.5	487.8	60.3%
SEEC Wahpeton Indian School	245.3	118.6	48.4%
SEEC Washington Elementary - Jamestown	877.8	534.0	60.8%
Total all Centers	56,679.3	41,705.5	73.6%

Table 10**Total Hours and Percent of Total Hours that Centers Provided Programming in the Enrichment and Support Areas (Arts/Music, Cultural/Social Studies, Entrepreneurial, Health/Nutrition, and Other****Source: Persons by Subject Area per Grantee - Youthservices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees****Note: Time frame 9/1/13 thru 8/31/14**

Center	Total Hours All Programming	Total Hours Enrichment and Support Activities	Percent Enrichment and Support Activities
GFPS Ben Franklin School	595.3	142.0	23.9%
GFPS Century School	613.0	153.0	25.0%
GFPS Emerado Public Schools	532.0	111.5	21.0%
GFPS Lake Agassiz - Grand Forks	599.5	129.5	21.6%
GFPS Lewis & Clark - Grand Forks	622.0	152.5	24.5%
GFPS LSS	None reported	None reported	0.0%
GFPS Phoenix - Grand Forks	619.5	156.5	25.3%
GFPS West - Grand Forks	548.5	154.5	28.2%
GFPS Wilder Elementary	616.5	149.0	24.2%
GFPS Winship - Grand Forks	628.3	158.3	25.2%
MPS Lewis & Clark - Minot	939.8	204.4	21.7%
MPS McKinley Elementary - Minot	924.0	223.2	24.2%
MPS Roosevelt Elementary - Minot	1,143.3	309.4	27.1%
MPS Sunnyside Elementary	1,049.8	311.6	29.7%
MPS Washington Elementary - Minot	1,096.8	299.3	27.3%
MREC Cannon Ball Elementary	None reported	None reported	0.0%
MREC Custer	961.5	383.0	39.8%
MREC Dorothy Moses	809.0	146.0	18.0%
MREC Fort Lincoln	958.8	308.7	32.2%
MREC Mary Stark	961.8	404.5	42.1%
MREC Myhre Elementary	982.5	253.5	25.8%
MREC Saxvik	972.3	208.6	21.5%
MREC Theodore Jamerson	690.0	141.3	20.5%
MREC Will-Moore	980.8	310.8	31.7%

Table 10 (Continued)**Total Hours and Percent of Total Hours that Centers Provided Programming in the Enrichment and Support Areas (Arts/Music, Cultural/Social Studies, Entrepreneurial, Health/Nutrition, and Other****Source: Persons by Subject Area per Grantee - Youthservices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees****Note: Time frame 9/1/13 thru 8/31/14**

Center	Total Hours All Programming	Total Hours Enrichment and Support Activities	Percent Enrichment and Support Activities
NCEC Anamoose	322.5	136.0	42.2%
NCEC Bottineau Elementary	506.5	208.0	41.1%
NCEC Dunseith	569.8	18.0	3.2%
NCEC Mt. Pleasant	983.0	186.0	18.9%
NCEC TGU Granville	1,620.8	416.1	25.7%
NCEC TGU Towner	868.3	266.0	30.6%
NCEC Turtle Mountain CS - Elementary	1,966.0	430.0	21.9%
NCEC Turtle Mountain CS Middle	806.0	289.5	35.9%
NCEC Westhope School	1,653.8	754.3	45.6%
NESC Central Middle School	1,771.3	413.4	23.3%
NESC Leeds Public Schools	546.5	177.1	32.4%
NESC Minnewauken	523.5	75.9	14.5%
NESC Minnie H	529.5	134.6	25.4%
NESC Prairie View	750.5	190.0	25.3%
NESC Rolette	893.5	212.4	23.8%
NESC Sweetwater	526.0	87.3	16.6%
NESC Tata Topa Tribal School	916.3	91.2	10.0%
NESC Warwick	701.3	23.2	3.3%
NVCTC Drayton Public School	551.0	173.0	31.4%
NVCTC Grafton Century Elementary	3,611.3	835.3	23.1%
NVCTC Grafton High School	454.5	-	0.0%
NVCTC Grafton Middle School	656.3	3.0	0.5%
NVCTC Midway Public School	568.0	122.8	21.6%
NVCTC Minto Public School	521.3	122.9	23.6%
NVCTC Northwood Public Schools	867.5	241.0	27.8%
NVCTC St. Thomas Public School	883.8	287.0	32.5%
NVCTC Walhalla Public School	466.3	38.1	8.2%

Table 10 (Continued)**Total Hours and Percent of Total Hours that Centers Provided Programming in the Enrichment and Support Areas (Arts/Music, Cultural/Social Studies, Entrepreneurial, Health/Nutrition, and Other****Source: Persons by Subject Area per Grantee - Youthservices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees****Note: Time frame 9/1/13 thru 8/31/14**

Center	Total Hours All Programming	Total Hours Enrichment and Support Activities	Percent Enrichment and Support Activities
RASP Heart River Elementary-Dickinson	259.5	24.0	9.2%
RASP Hebron Elementary	None reported	None reported	0.0%
RASP Lincoln Elementary - Beach	None reported	None reported	0.0%
RASP Roosevelt Elementary - Dickinson	279.5	52.0	18.6%
SEEC Barnes County North	694.0	188.0	27.1%
SEEC Carl Ben Eilson	440.0	121.0	27.5%
SEEC Central/Zimmerman	503.0	336.0	66.8%
SEEC CHARISM	210.5	53.5	25.4%
SEEC Eastwood	958.3	233.0	24.3%
SEEC Edgeley	415.0	101.3	24.4%
SEEC Ellendale Elementary	363.3	108.1	29.8%
SEEC Fairmount Elementary	492.5	233.1	47.3%
SEEC Griggs County Central	766.5	132.8	17.3%
SEEC Jefferson Elementary	971.3	235.7	24.3%
SEEC Kulm	105.0	23.3	22.1%
SEEC LaMoure	670.5	169.3	25.3%
SEEC LE Berger Elementary	925.5	236.2	25.5%
SEEC Lincoln Elementary - Jamestown	830.5	330.8	39.8%
SEEC Louis L'Amour Elementary	1,047.3	357.8	34.2%
SEEC Madison Elementary	651.0	171.2	26.3%
SEEC McKinley Elementary - Fargo	719.8	231.5	32.2%
SEEC Medina	270.3	61.3	22.7%
SEEC Midkota	315.0	101.5	32.2%
SEEC New Rockford	319.3	66.0	20.7%
SEEC Roosevelt Elementary - Jamestown	809.5	321.8	39.7%
SEEC Wahpeton Indian School	245.3	126.6	51.6%
SEEC Washington Elementary - Jamestown	877.8	343.8	39.2%
Total all Centers	57,018.8	15,102.2	26.5%

Table 11
Mean Programming Hours per Week by Center, 2013-2014
Includes School Year Only
Source: Data Submitted During Grantee Site Visits

Center	Average Hours Per Week
GFPS Ben Franklin School	15
GFPS Century School	15
GFPS Emerado Public Schools	15
GFPS Lake Agassiz - Grand Forks	15
GFPS Lewis & Clark - Grand Forks	15
GFPS LSS	None reported
GFPS Phoenix - Grand Forks	15
GFPS West - Grand Forks	15
GFPS Wilder Elementary	15
GFPS Winship - Grand Forks	15
MPS Lewis & Clark - Minot	24
MPS McKinley Elementary - Minot	24
MPS Roosevelt Elementary - Minot	24
MPS Sunnyside Elementary	24
MPS Washington Elementary - Minot	24
MREC Cannon Ball Elementary	5
MREC Custer	15
MREC Dorothy Moses	15
MREC Fort Lincoln	15
MREC Mary Stark	15
MREC Myhre Elementary	15
MREC Saxvik	15
MREC Theodore Jamerson	5
MREC Will-Moore	15

Table 11 (Continued)
Mean Programming Hours per Week by Center, 2013-2014
Includes School Year Only
Source: Data Submitted During Grantee Site Visits

Center	Average Hours Per Week
NCEC Anamoose	15
NCEC Bottineau Elementary	15
NCEC Dunseith	15
NCEC Mt. Pleasant	15
NCEC TGU Granville	15
NCEC TGU Towner	15
NCEC Turtle Mountain CS - Elementary	15
NCEC Turtle Mountain CS Middle	15
NCEC Westhope School	15
NESC Central Middle School	13
NESC Leeds Public Schools	13
NESC Minnewauken	13
NESC Minnie H	13
NESC Prairie View	16
NESC Rolette	18
NESC Sweetwater	15
NESC Tata Topa Tribal School	13
NESC Warwick	18
NVCTC Drayton Public School	12
NVCTC Grafton Century Elementary	18
NVCTC Grafton High School	15
NVCTC Grafton Middle School	12
NVCTC Midway Public School	12
NVCTC Minto Public School	12
NVCTC Northwood Public Schools	12
NVCTC St. Thomas Public School	15
NVCTC Walhalla Public School	12

Table 11 (Continued)
Mean Programming Hours per Week by Center, 2013-2014
Includes School Year Only
Source: Data Submitted During Grantee Site Visits

Center	Average Hours Per Week
RASP Heart River Elementary-Dickinson	15
RASP Hebron Elementary	15
RASP Lincoln Elementary - Beach	15
RASP Roosevelt Elementary - Dickinson	15
SEEC Barnes County North	12
SEEC Carl Ben Eilson	15
SEEC Central/Zimmerman	15
SEEC CHARISM	12
SEEC Eastwood	25
SEEC Edgeley	12
SEEC Ellendale Elementary	12
SEEC Fairmount Elementary	18
SEEC Griggs County Central	12
SEEC Jefferson Elementary	22
SEEC Kulm	12
SEEC LaMoure	15
SEEC LE Berger Elementary	24
SEEC Lincoln Elementary - Jamestown	15
SEEC Louis L'Amour Elementary	15
SEEC Madison Elementary	22
SEEC McKinley Elementary - Fargo	16
SEEC Medina	12
SEEC Midkota	12
SEEC New Rockford	12
SEEC Roosevelt Elementary - Jamestown	15
SEEC Wahpeton Indian School	12
SEEC Washington Elementary - Jamestown	15

Number of grantees reporting - 8 of 8 (100.0%)

Table 12
Centers Providing 40% Free/Reduced Meals by Grantee, 2013-2014
Includes School Year and Summer Combined
Source: Service Summary per Grantee - Youthservices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees
Note: Time frame 9/1/12 thru 8/31/13

Grantee	Total Centers	Total Centers Providing 40% Free/Reduced Meal	Percent Total 40% Free/Reduced Meal Attendees
GFPS - Grand Forks Public Schools	10	9	90.0%
MPS - Minot Public Schools	5	5	100.0%
MREC/ESP - Missouri River Education Cooperative/Extended School Program	9	9	100.0%
NCEC - North Central Education Cooperative	9	5	55.6%
NESC - Northeast Education Services Cooperative	9	9	100.0%
NVCTC - North Valley Career Tech. Center	9	9	100.0%
RASP - Regional After School Program/Dickinson Public Schools	4	4	100.0%
SEEC - South East Education Cooperative	23	23	100.0%
Total	78	73	93.6%

Number of centers reporting - 76 of 78 (97.4%)

Note: One of the GFPS and one of the MREC/ESP centers did not report whether they provided 40% free/reduced meals

Table 13
MAP Math and MAP Reading Mean Scores
and Number of CCLC Attendees with Reported Scores
by Test Timeframe and Test Type
2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014
Source: YouthServices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Test Timeframe	MAP Math Mean Scores	MAP Reading Mean Scores	Number of CCLC Attendees with Reported MAP Math Results	Number of CCLC Attendees with Reported MAP Reading Results
Fall (09-10)	193.1	188.7	2,080	2,069
Spring (09-10)	203.6	197.5	3,281	3,503
Fall (10-11)	194.5	188.4	3,433	3,169
Spring (10-11)	201.0	195.2	3,205	3,048
Fall (11-12)	193.1	189.2	3,684	3,512
Spring (11-12)	203.1	198.1	3,755	3,785
Fall (12-13)	195.2	190.2	3,021	3,019
Spring (12-13)	203.2	197.4	3,147	3,271
Fall (13-14)	190.7	188.4	1,866	1,930
Spring (13-14)	202.0	196.9	3,103	2,995

Number of centers reporting math scores (Fall 2013-14) - 38 of 79 (48.1%)
 Number of centers reporting math scores (Spring 2013-14) - 56 of 79 (70.1%)
 Number of centers reporting reading scores (Fall 2013-14) - 38 of 79 (48.1%)
 Number of centers reporting reading scores (Spring 2013-14) - 55 of 78 (70.5%)

Table 14
State Assessment Math Proficiencies
and Number of CCLC Attendees with Reported Proficiencies
by Test Timeframe
2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014
Source: YouthServices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Proficiency	Number of CCLC Attendees with Reported Proficiencies					Percent of CCLC Attendees with Reported Proficiencies				
	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14
Advanced Proficient	431	499	540	390	464	19.4%	20.0%	22.2%	18.1%	24.5%
Proficient	1,234	1,397	1,315	1,177	967	55.6%	56.1%	54.1%	54.8%	51.0%
Partially Proficient	402	392	380	386	306	18.1%	15.7%	15.6%	18.0%	16.1%
Novice	151	203	197	196	159	6.8%	8.1%	8.1%	9.1%	8.4%
Total	2,218	2,491	2,432	2,149	1,896	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Number of centers reporting math proficiencies (2013-14) - 56 of 78 (71.8%)

Table 15
State Assessment Reading Proficiencies
and Number of CCLC Attendees with Reported Proficiencies
by Test Timeframe
2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014
Source: YouthServices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees

Proficiency	Number of CCLC Attendees with Reported Proficiencies					Percent of CCLC Attendees with Reported Proficiencies				
	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14
Advanced Proficient	280	330	379	295	264	13.1%	13.1%	15.7%	14.1%	14.5%
Proficient	1,222	1,441	1,229	1,094	997	57.2%	57.4%	50.9%	52.3%	54.8%
Partially Proficient	454	500	541	504	395	21.2%	19.9%	22.4%	24.1%	21.7%
Novice	181	240	265	199	163	8.5%	9.6%	11.0%	9.5%	9.0%
Total	2,137	2,511	2,414	2,092	1,819	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Number of centers reporting reading proficiencies (2013-14) - 58 of 78 (74.4%)

Table 16
Teacher Survey Results by Individual Question, 2013-2014
Source: Downloaded Teacher Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database
(September 1, 2013 through August 31, 2014)
Source: YouthServices.net - Data Submitted by Grantees
N= 3,253

Question Asked of Teacher	Significant Improvement	Moderate Improvement	Slight Improvement	No Change	Slight Decline	Moderate Decline	Significant Decline	Total Needing Improvement	Did Not Need to Improve
Turning in homework on time.	296	352	444	584	74	22	17	1,789	1,341
Completing homework to your (teachers) satisfaction.	293	431	480	586	70	22	13	1,895	1,236
Participating in class.	146	312	505	806	54	11	6	1,840	1,294
Volunteering in class.	99	175	304	1,115	20	1	2	1,716	1,298
Attending class regularly.	57	90	142	744	36	9	7	1,085	2,052
Being attentive in class.	98	295	515	887	125	37	15	1,972	1,164
Behaving well in class.	109	248	410	837	121	42	17	1,784	1,351
Performing well academically.	200	519	683	612	74	26	8	2,122	1,016
Coming to school motivated to learn.	104	288	415	856	69	15	14	1,761	1,376
Getting along well with other students.	104	229	397	795	91	29	12	1,657	1,480

Percent of Attendees Needing Improvement (Excludes Those tht "Did Not Need to Improve)

Question Asked of Teacher	Significant Improvement	Moderate Improvement	Slight Improvement	No Change	Slight Decline	Moderate Decline	Significant Decline	Total Needing Improvement
Turning in homework on time.	16.5%	19.7%	24.8%	32.6%	4.1%	1.2%	1.0%	100.0%
Completing homework to your (teachers) satisfaction.	15.5%	22.7%	25.3%	30.9%	3.7%	1.2%	0.7%	100.0%
Participating in class.	7.9%	17.0%	27.4%	43.8%	2.9%	0.6%	0.3%	100.0%
Volunteering in class.	5.8%	10.2%	17.7%	65.0%	1.2%	0.1%	0.1%	100.0%
Attending class regularly.	5.3%	8.3%	13.1%	68.6%	3.3%	0.8%	0.6%	100.0%
Being attentive in class.	5.0%	15.0%	26.1%	45.0%	6.3%	1.9%	0.8%	100.0%
Behaving well in class.	6.1%	13.9%	23.0%	46.9%	6.8%	2.4%	1.0%	100.0%
Performing well academically.	9.4%	24.5%	32.2%	28.8%	3.5%	1.2%	0.4%	100.0%
Coming to school motivated to learn.	5.9%	16.4%	23.6%	48.6%	3.9%	0.9%	0.8%	100.0%
Getting along well with other students.	6.3%	13.8%	24.0%	48.0%	5.5%	1.8%	0.7%	100.0%

Number of centers reporting - 61 of 78 (78.2%)

Table 17**Teacher Survey Results by Individual Question, 2013-2014****Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Teacher Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees**

Question Asked of Teacher	Total Teacher Responses					Total
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
I have a good understanding of the goals of the after-school program.	163	259	56	27	1	506
I have a good understanding about the after-school expectations of my contributions.	149	243	79	33	2	506
Program staff communicate regularly with school day staff to inform us about program operations.	125	222	71	70	18	506
Program staff communicate regularly with school day staff to receive information about student progress.	106	216	73	95	16	506
The program activities addressing academic and behavioral needs of the students are well designed.	130	236	108	25	7	506
The program activities addressing academic and behavioral needs of students are implemented effectively.	132	217	117	33	7	506

Question Asked of Teacher	Percent of Teacher Responses					Total
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
I have a good understanding of the goals of the after-school program.	32.2%	51.2%	11.1%	5.3%	0.2%	100.0%
I have a good understanding about the after-school expectations of my contributions.	29.4%	48.0%	15.6%	6.5%	0.4%	100.0%
Program staff communicate regularly with school day staff to inform us about program operations.	24.7%	43.9%	14.0%	13.8%	3.6%	100.0%
Program staff communicate regularly with school day staff to receive information about student progress.	20.9%	42.7%	14.4%	18.8%	3.2%	100.0%
The program activities addressing academic and behavioral needs of the students are well designed.	25.7%	46.6%	21.3%	4.9%	1.4%	100.0%
The program activities addressing academic and behavioral needs of students are implemented effectively.	26.1%	42.9%	23.1%	6.5%	1.4%	100.0%

Number of centers reporting - 59 of 78 (75.6%)

Table 18

Parent Survey Results by Individual Question, 2013-2014

Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Parent Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

What are the most important reasons for having your child participate in the after-school program?

(Note: 1 denotes most important while 5 denotes least important)

Reasons	1 (Most Important)	2	3	4	5 (Least Important)	Total Responses	Mean Response (1)
Safe Setting	417	232	136	124	221	1,130	2.56
Helps With Childcare	282	358	161	190	139	1,130	2.60
Improves Academic Performance	179	201	350	219	181	1,130	3.02
Improves Behavior in and out of School	131	159	273	310	257	1,130	3.36
Improves Attitude Towards School	121	180	210	287	332	1,130	3.47
Safe Setting	36.9%	20.5%	12.0%	11.0%	19.6%	100.0%	
Helps With Childcare	25.0%	31.7%	14.2%	16.8%	12.3%	100.0%	
Improves Academic Performance	15.8%	17.8%	31.0%	19.4%	16.0%	100.0%	
Improves Behavior in and out of School	11.6%	14.1%	24.2%	27.4%	22.7%	100.0%	
Improves Attitude Towards School	10.7%	15.9%	18.6%	25.4%	29.4%	100.0%	

(1) Note: The lower the mean response (score), the more important the reason for participation.

Number of centers reporting - 56 of 78 (71.8%)

Table 18 (Continued)

Parent Survey Results by Individual Question, 2013-2014

Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Parent Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Question Asked of Parent	Total Parent Responses					Total
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
As a result of participating in the after-school program, my child's reading skills have improved?	319	511	248	44	8	1,130
As a result of participating in the after-school program, my child's math skills have improved?	280	516	284	44	6	1,130
As a result of participating in the after-school program, my child's attitude towards school has improved?	346	532	202	42	8	1,130
The after-school program provides a safe setting for my child to participate in activities?	789	303	25	4	9	1,130
Overall, I am very satisfied with the after-school program for which my child participates?	812	275	27	8	8	1,130
Overall, my child is very satisfied with the after-school program?	767	307	29	16	11	1,130
Question Asked of Parent	Percent of Parent Responses					Total
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
As a result of participating in the after-school program, my child's reading skills have improved?	28.2%	45.2%	21.9%	3.9%	0.7%	100.0%
As a result of participating in the after-school program, my child's math skills have improved?	24.8%	45.7%	25.1%	3.9%	0.5%	100.0%
As a result of participating in the after-school program, my child's attitude towards school has improved?	30.6%	47.1%	17.9%	3.7%	0.7%	100.0%
The after-school program provides a safe setting for my child to participate in activities?	69.8%	26.8%	2.2%	0.4%	0.8%	100.0%
Overall, I am very satisfied with the after-school program for which my child participates?	71.9%	24.3%	2.4%	0.7%	0.7%	100.0%
Overall, my child is very satisfied with the after-school program?	67.9%	27.2%	2.6%	1.4%	1.0%	100.0%

Number of centers reporting - 56 of 78 (71.8%)

Table 19

Student Survey Results by Individual Question, 2013-2014

Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Student Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Questions	Yes	Not Sure	No	Total Responses
Has the after school program helped you improve your reading?	1,667	373	593	2,633
Has the after-school program helped you improve your math skills?	1,728	407	480	2,615
Do you like attending the after-school program?	2,060	230	311	2,601
Has the after school program helped you improve your reading?	63.3%	14.2%	22.5%	100.0%
Has the after-school program helped you improve your math skills?	66.1%	15.6%	18.4%	100.0%
Do you like attending the after-school program?	79.2%	8.8%	12.0%	100.0%
Number of centers reporting - 61 of 78 (78.2%)				

Table 20**Partner Survey Results by Individual Question, 2013-2014****Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Partner Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees**

Question Asked of Partner	Total Partner Responses					Total
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
I have a good understanding of the goals of the after-school program?	23	17	1	-	-	41
I have a good understanding about after-school program expectations of my contributions?	22	19	-	-	-	41
Project director communicates regularly with me regarding progress of the project?	24	12	3	1	-	40
Project director communicates regularly with me regarding the impact of my contributions?	24	11	4	1	-	40
The after-school program is viewed as a helpful resource to families in the community?	31	9	1	-	-	41
We work together to effectively coordinate services for children, youth, and/or families?	24	15	1	1	-	41
The after-school program is a significant asset in our community?	31	9	-	-	-	40

Table 20 (Continued)

Partner Survey Results by Individual Question, 2013-2014

Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Partner Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

Question Asked of Partner	Percent of Partner Responses					Total
	Strongly	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly	
I have a good understanding of the goals of the after-school program?	56.1%	41.5%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
I have a good understanding about after-school program expectations of my contributions?	53.7%	46.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Project director communicates regularly with me regarding progress of the project?	60.0%	30.0%	7.5%	2.5%	0.0%	100.0%
Project director communicates regularly with me regarding the impact of my contributions?	60.0%	27.5%	10.0%	2.5%	0.0%	100.0%
The after-school program is viewed as a helpful resource to families in the community?	75.6%	22.0%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
We work together to effectively coordinate services for children, youth, and/or families?	58.5%	36.6%	2.4%	2.4%	0.0%	100.0%
The after-school program is a significant asset in our community?	77.5%	22.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Number of grantees reporting - 6 of 8 (75.0%)						

Table 20 (Continued)

Partner Survey Results by Individual Question, 2013-2014

Source: Downloaded SurveyMonkey Partner Survey Excel Spreadsheet/Database - Data Submitted by Grantees

How does your organization contribute to the after-school program?

Contribution Type	N	%
Donate Money	5	12.2%
Volunteer	6	14.6%
Donate Time	12	29.3%
Donate Materials	19	46.3%
Teach a Course	9	22.0%
Provide Tutors	1	2.4%
Donate Meeting Space	17	41.5%
Other	8	19.5%
Total Respondents	41	

Table 21
Mean Scores by Monitoring and Quality Improvement Tool (MQIT) Category
All Grantees Combined, 2013-2014
 Source: MQIT

MQIT Categories	Excellent	Satisfactory	Some Progress	Must Improve	Mean Score
A. Grant Management and Sustainability	98	5	1	-	3.93
B. Program Management	68	3	1	-	3.93
C. Staffing and Professional Development	63	1	-	-	3.98
D. Partnerships	38	2	-	-	3.95
E. Center Operations	37	2	1	-	3.90
F. Programming/Activities	48	-	-	-	4.00
G. Health and Safety	77	3	-	-	3.96
H. Evaluation/Measuring Outcomes	37	9	2	-	3.73
All MQIT Categories Combined	466	25	5	-	3.93

Table 21 (Continued)
Mean Scores for Grants Management and Sustainability
by Performance Measure (Best Practice)
All Grantees Combined, 2013-2014
Source: MQIT

Grants Management and Sustainability MQIT Categories	Expect. Met	Expect. Met W/Rec.	Partially Met	Not Met	Mean Score
1. Identified and is serving eligible students and their families.	8	-	-	-	4.00
2. Is conducting outreach to eligible participants.	8	-	-	-	4.00
3. Is providing the number of hours of programming.	6	1	1	-	3.63
4. Is implementing the evidence-based academic and enrichment activities.	8	-	-	-	4.00
5. Is implementing the parent/family programming or activities.	7	1	-	-	3.88
6. Is addressing the transportation needs of children.	8	-	-	-	4.00
7. Houses the program in a safe and accessible facility.	7	1	-	-	3.88
8. Is making adequate progress toward meeting goals and objectives.	8	-	-	-	4.00
9. Has developed a sustainability plan and has made efforts to gain other funding, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
10. Staff has attended the required state 21st CCLC meetings.	8	-	-	-	4.00
11. Maintains appropriate documentation for employees of the grant program.	8	-	-	-	4.00
12. Program works in genuine collaboration with at least one partner.	8	-	-	-	4.00
13. Participates as requested in the state monitoring and evaluation process.	6	2	-	-	3.75
Grants Management and Sustainability MQIT Categories Only	98	5	1	-	3.93

Table 21 (Continued)
Mean Scores for Grantee Program Management
by Performance Measure (Best Practice)
All Grantees Combined, 2013-2014
Source: MQIT

Program Management MQIT Categories	Excellent	Satisfactory	Some Progress	Must Improve	Mean Score
1. Organizational structure is well defined and sound. The program has site coordinator.	8	-	-	-	4.00
2. The program has written policies and procedures specific to its operations.	8	-	-	-	4.00
3. Student/staff ratio is appropriate and safe for the specific activity conducted/meets needs.	8	-	-	-	4.00
4. Program holds regular staff and partnership meetings that are more than admin. In nature.	8	-	-	-	4.00
5. Program volunteers are screened and trained effectively.	8	-	-	-	4.00
6. Program staff communicates and collaborates regularly with school-day personnel, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
7. Program employs an effective marketing strategy to publicize program and achievements.	6	2	-	-	3.75
8. Program maintains on-going documentation of contributions (in-kind or resources).	8	-	-	-	4.00
9. Program has an advisory board (community, parents, etc) that meets regularly.	6	1	1	-	3.63
Program Management MQIT Categories Only	68	3	1	-	3.93

Table 21 (Continued)
Mean Scores for Grantee Staffing and Professional Development
by Performance Measure (Best Practice)
All Grantees Combined, 2013-2014
Source: MQIT

Staffing and Professional Development MQIT Categories	Excellent	Satisfactory	Some Progress	Must Improve	Mean Score
1. Project Director and program staff are highly qualified.	8	-	-	-	4.00
2. Program selects staff members based on prior experience, qualifications, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
3. Program completes appropriate background checks for all staff.	8	-	-	-	4.00
4. Staff is sensitive to the culture and language of participants.	8	-	-	-	4.00
5. Staff has competence in core academic areas for an afterschool environment.	8	-	-	-	4.00
6. Staff is trained in program policies/procedures. Staff is aware of program goals, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
7. Program assesses training needs of staff (and school and community partners), etc.	7	1	-	-	3.88
8. Staff and volunteers are evaluated on a regular basis, etc	8	-	-	-	4.00
Staffing and Professional Development MQIT Categories Only	63	1	-	-	3.98

Table 21 (Continued)
Mean Scores for Grantee Partnerships
by Performance Measure (Best Practice)
All Grantees Combined, 2013-2014
Source: MQIT

Partnership MQIT Categories	Excellent	Satisfactory	Some Progress	Must Improve	Mean Score
1. Program makes efforts to recruit new and retain established partners, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
2. Program partners are aware of the program goals and objective, etc.	7	1	-	-	3.88
3. Program regularly communicates with and seeks input from its partners, etc.	7	1	-	-	3.88
4. Program has established linkages with other state, federal and local agencies, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
5. The program enters formal written agreements with subcontractors.	8	-	-	-	4.00
Partnership MQIT Categories Only	38	2	-	-	3.95

Table 21 (Continued)
Mean Scores for Grantee Center Operations
by Performance Measure (Best Practice)
All Grantees Combined, 2013-2014
 Source: MQIT

Center Operations MQIT Categories	Excellent	Satisfactory	Some Progress	Must Improve	Mean Score
1. Program's hours, activity schedules, and locations are available, accessible, etc.	7	1	-	-	3.88
2. Program activities and services are promoted in the targeted schools, etc.	6	1	1	-	3.63
3. Program has adopted clear standards for student behavior and attendance, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
4. Program effectively communicates standards for student behavior to students/parents.	8	-	-	-	4.00
5. Program encourages parent involvement in decision-making, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
Center Operations MQIT Categories Only	37	2	1	-	3.90

Table 21 (Continued)
Mean Scores for Grantee Programming/Activities
by Performance Measure (Best Practice)
All Grantees Combined, 2013-2014
Source: MQIT

Programming/Activities MQIT Categories	Excellent	Satisfactory	Some Progress	Must Improve	Mean Score
1. Program activities reflect the goals and mission of the program.	8	-	-	-	4.00
2. Program provides evidence-based academic support and enrichment activities, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
3. Program addresses the academic, physical, social and emotional needs of students, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
4. Program activities are selected based on student needs and interests, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
5. Program has an appropriate schedule, flow, and duration of activities, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
6. Program accommodates students with special needs/ELL, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
Programming/Activities MQIT Categories Only	48	-	-	-	4.00

Table 21 (Continued)
Mean Scores for Grantee Health and Safety
by Performance Measure (Best Practice)
All Grantees Combined, 2013-2014
Source: MQIT

Health and Safety MQIT Categories	Excellent	Satisfactory	Some Progress	Must Improve	Mean Score
1. Program activities occur in spaces that are adequate, appropriate, and safe, etc.	7	1	-	-	3.88
2. Program provides daily nutritional snacks during program operation, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
3. Program addresses any unique health needs of students, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
4. Program follows established procedures for authorized student pick-ups, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
5. Emergency contact information for students and staff is maintained/easily accessible, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
6. Program has adopted an emergency readiness plan and has provided notice, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
7. Internet use for academic or enrichment activities, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
8. Staff trained in first aid and CPR, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
9. Program conducts all required fire/safety drills.	7	1	-	-	3.88
10. Program has adequate security in place.	7	1	-	-	3.88
Health and Safety MQIT Categories Only	77	3	-	-	3.96

Table 21 (Continued)
Mean Scores for Grantee Evaluation/Measuring Outcomes
by Performance Measure (Best Practice)
All Grantees Combined, 2013-2014
Source: MQIT

Evaluation/Measuring Outcomes MQIT Categories	Excellent	Satisfactory	Some Progress	Must Improve	Mean Score
1. Program has adopted and applies an evaluation process to measure program goals, etc.	6	2	-	-	3.75
2. Evaluation process includes requesting feedback from stakeholders, etc.	6	2	-	-	3.75
3. Program uses the information for decision making, etc.	6	2	-	-	3.75
4. Evaluation findings are regularly and effectively communicated to staff, collaborators, etc.	4	2	2	-	3.25
5. Program also collects photos and stories about program impact, etc.	7	1	-	-	3.88
6. Program identifies and shares promising practices internally, etc.	8	-	-	-	4.00
Evaluation/Measuring Outcomes MQIT Categories Only	37	9	2	-	3.73