

Delaware 21st Century Community Learning Centers Report on 2022-2023 Data

Authors:

Jeffrey R. Klein

E. Carly Hill

Hilary Mead

Shameeka Jelenewicz

Funding Agency:

Delaware Department of Education

CRESP is committed to addressing education and social policy challenges with rigorous, relevant research.

The Center for Research in Education and Social Policy (CRESP) within the College of Education and Human Development at the University of Delaware conducts rigorous research, program evaluation, and policy analysis to help policymakers and practitioners in education, community health and human services determine which policies and programs are most promising to improve outcomes for children, youth, adults and families.

Founded in 2013, CRESP recognizes that poverty, educational achievement, and chronic disease prevention are intertwined in a complex social web that challenges communities and policymakers alike. CRESP's mission, values, and scientific priorities seek to inform program and policy development across local, state, and federal levels. We work alongside program professionals, academic leaders, and students to foster engagement in high-quality, practice-driven research and evaluation. CRESP researchers are trained in evaluation methodology, randomized field experiments, natural experiments, qualitative methods, statistical analysis, mixed-method evaluation and survey research.

Please feel free to contact us should you have any questions about us or our research.

Center for Research in Education and Social Policy
University of Delaware
Pearson Hall, Suite 107
125 Academy Street
Newark, DE 19716
cresp-info@udel.edu
(302) 831-7029

cresp.udel.edu

Twitter: @udcresp

CRESP Leadership Team

Henry May, Director (hmay@udel.edu)
Allison Karpyn, Co-Director (karpyn@udel.edu)
Sue Giancola, Senior Associate Director (giancola@udel.edu)
Jeff Klein, Senior Policy Scientist (kleinjef@udel.edu)
Jill Bathon, Assistant Director (jbathon@udel.edu)

Suggested Citation

Klein, J., Hill, E., Mead, H. & Jelenewicz, S. (2024). *Delaware 21st Century Learning Communities Report on 2022-23 Data* (T24-005). Newark, DE: Center for Research in Education and Social Policy.

DELAWARE 21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS REPORT ON 2022-23 DATA

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report by the Center for Research in Education & Social Policy (CRESP) summarizes data related to the 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) program in Delaware during the 2022-2023 school year. First, it explains the process CRESP used to clean and organize multiple 21st CCLC data files shared by the Delaware Department of Education (DOE) and to develop a full data set of 1,434 student participants. Next, the report answers these questions.

	Evaluation Question	Summary of Data
1	How many students participated in the 21 st CCLC? What grade levels were represented?	1,434 students in analysis representing only some of those reached by 21 st CCLC. Grade composition varies by cohort; in general, elementary school dominates.
2	Who were 21 st CCLC participants in terms of sex, race, ethnicity, language background and special education status?	Even split between sexes; African-Americans largest race group; participants are predominately non-Hispanic, native English speaking and non-special ed.
3	What was the 21 st CCLC program dosage? How many hours did participants attend?	Average participation: 117.47 hours in SY2022-23 (not including summer); 27.06% attended ≥180 hours but 29.26% attended <45 hours..
4	How did the 21 st CCLC program perform on Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) measure indicators? Did participants improve...	
4a	... their ELA test scores? (GPRA 1a)	Just over half improved (50.81%)
4b	... their math test scores? (GPRA 1b)	Just over half improved (50.71%)
4c	... their grades in school? (GPRA 2)	Fewer than a fifth improved (16.88%)
4d	... their attendance in school? (GPRA 3)	Most students improved (86.12%)
4e	... their discipline in school? (GPRA 4)	Indicator only fit one student
4f	... their classroom engagement? (GPRA 5)	Most students improved (73.22%)

The report ends with recommendations for improving 21st CCLC data quality and consistency and the use of data to drive program improvements.

DELAWARE 21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS

REPORT ON 2022-23 DATA

INTRODUCTION

In 2023, the Delaware Department of Education (DOE) contracted with the Center for Research in Education and Social Policy (CRESP) to provide evaluation support for the Nita M. Lowey 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) program in the state. This report represents the third deliverable in that contract. It summarizes 21st CCLC data from the 2022-23 school year and presents early findings related to program reach and performance. It then makes recommendations related to data completeness and quality, for the purpose of continuous program improvement.

METHOD

In order to complete this analysis of data related to Delaware 21st CLCC programming, CRESP relied upon four separate data sets. Three of them came from the State of Delaware's EZ Reports platform.

1. First, we accessed the student demographics reporting module in EZReports. This included **4,186** student records with background characteristics of program participants.
2. Next, we accessed the teacher survey module in EZReports. Teacher surveys measured students' school engagement and are discussed below (Findings, Question 5f). This file had **2,945** records but, in many cases, multiple surveys were completed for the same student. In order to aid data analysis, CRESP recoded the data so that only the highest survey rating was included for any given student. In other words, if a student had more than one teacher completing the survey, only the highest rating was retained.
3. We also used the school attendance file in EZReports in our analysis. This file reports on the number of minutes, hours, and days that a student attended 21st CCLC programming during the 2022-23 school year. It included **2,800** student records.
4. Finally, the fourth data set came from the Delaware DOE and included data related to the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) indicators. Delaware DOE created this file using data from the eSchool system and shared it with CRESP. That data file included **2,417** student records.

Table 1 shows a summary of these four data files.

Table 1. Data files used in the analysis

Data File	Description	Source	#of Records
1. Student Demographics	Student Background data such as race, ethnicity, grade, etc.	EZ Reports	4186
2. Teacher Survey Results	Teacher ratings of student engagement	EZ Reports	2945
3. School Year Attendance	Hours that students attended 21st CCLC programming during SY2022-23	EZ Reports	2800
4. GPRA data	GPRA-aligned data such as school day attendance, GPA, and assessment scores	Delaware Department of Education	2417
CRESP Merged File	CRESP created file including data from the above 4 files	EZ Reports/DDOE	1434

CRESP combined all four data files into a single, student-level file by matching all data to individual students. After completing this match, the resulting file included **1,434** students. That is the number included in this analysis. What proportion of all students reached by the 21st CCLC do these data reflect? This is difficult to answer with certainty, but in our view the data file that most closely approximates the true number of 21st CCLC participants is the third (school attendance file) because there is one record for each student who attended 21st CCLC programming. Of these 2,800 students, this analysis contains information on 1,434 or slightly more than half of them. This is an important limitation of this report. The state is working towards more complete 21st CCLC data, with the implementation of the EZReports system a valuable step in that direction.

During the process of cleaning the data and combining the files, CRESP also determined several cases of data inconsistencies or what appeared to be errors in data entry. This information will be shared with project staff separately from this report in order to respect data privacy concerns.

FINDINGS

The findings section answers the following questions:

1. How many students participated in the 21st CCLC? What grade levels were represented?
2. Who were 21st CCLC participants in terms of sex, race, ethnicity, language background and special education status?
3. What was the 21st CCLC program dosage? How many hours did participants attend?
4. How did the 21st CCLC program perform on the five Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) measure indicators?
 - a. Did participants improve their ELA test scores? (GPRA 1a)
 - b. Did participants improve their math test scores? (GPRA 1b)
 - c. Did participants improve their grades in school? (GPRA 2)
 - d. Did participants improve their attendance in school? (GPRA 3)
 - e. Did participants improve their discipline in school? (GPRA 4)
 - f. Did participants improve their classroom engagement? (GPRA 5)

We answer each of these questions with a **statewide total**, showing data for all 1,434 students in this analysis. This total is always in a shaded box. We also disaggregate data by 21st CCLC cohort for administrative reasons. The Delaware 21st CCLC program is structured into **cohorts** of subgrantees, chosen through a competitive RFP process. Each subgrant is renewable for up to five years. During the 2022-23 school year, programs in Cohorts 16, 17, 18 and 20 were operating. There was no Cohort 19. The cohorts were in different stages of program maturity. Further disaggregation of the data by demographics of potential interest (grade level and race) is available in the report appendix.

HOW MANY STUDENTS PARTICIPATED IN THE 21ST CCLC? WHAT GRADE LEVELS WERE REPRESENTED?

As noted above, there were **1,434** students included in these analyses; we recognize that this does not account for all students who attended 21st CCLC activities. Instead, this represents the students that we had complete data for across the various data sources utilized. Table 2 shows the composition of the data by cohort. Of the total 1,434 students, 654 (45.61%) participated in programs funded in Cohort 16 and 314 (21.90%) in programs from Cohort 17. Cohort 18 was smaller, with data for 140 students (9.76% of the total); this may reflect that only four programs were part of this cohort. Finally, data for 326 students from Cohort 20 (22.73%) were included.

Table 2. Number of students in each cohort

	Cohort 16	Cohort 17	Cohort 18	Cohort 20	Total
Number of students	654 (45.61%)	314 (21.90%)	140 (9.76%)	326 (22.73%)	1434 (100.00%)

21st CCLC programs reach students of all ages. Table 3 shows a portrait of CCLC participation by grade level. We create grade bands for Grades 1-2 (primary), 3-5 (upper elementary), 6-8 (middle school) and 9-12 (high school).

Overall, the 21st CCLC participants included 237 students in the primary grades (16.53% of the total), 495 students in grades 3-5 (34.52%), 427 students in middle school (29.78%) and 275 students in high school (19.18%).

The age balance varied across cohorts, however. Cohorts 17 and 18 were overwhelmingly comprised of students in elementary school. Only 15 students in Cohort 17 (4.78%) and seven students in Cohort 18 (5.00%) were in grades 6 or above. (The single senior in Cohort 17 may be a data entry error). By contrast, the majority of participants in Cohort 16 and 20 were older. Cohort 16 had 376 middle school students (57.49%) and 112 high school students (17.13%) while Cohort 20 had almost half (162 students, 49.69%) in high school plus 30 (9.2%) in middle school.

Table 3. Number of students by grade band by cohort

	Cohort 16	Cohort 17	Cohort 18	Cohort 20	Total
Primary (1-2)	0 (0.00%)	108 (34.39%)	63 (45.0%)	66 (20.25%)	237 (16.53%)
Upper Elementary (3-5)	166 (25.38%)	191 (60.83%)	70 (50.00%)	68 (20.86%)	495 (34.52%)
Middle (6-8)	376 (57.49%)	14 (4.46%)	7 (5.00%)	30 (9.20%)	427 (29.78%)
High (9-12)	112 (17.13%)	1 (0.32%)	0 (0.00%)	162 (49.69%)	275 (19.18%)
Total	654 (100.00%)	314 (100.00%)	140 (100.00%)	326 (100.00%)	1434 (100.00%)

WHO WERE 21ST CCLC PARTICIPANTS IN TERMS OF SEX, RACE, ETHNICITY, LANGUAGE BACKGROUND AND SPECIAL EDUCATION STATUS?

This section delves deeper into the demographics of students in the data set. Table 4 shows the breakdown by sex.

Table 4. Number of students by sex by cohort

Sex	Cohort 16	Cohort 17	Cohort 18	Cohort 20	Total
Female	302 (46.18%)	172 (54.78%)	69 (49.29%)	168 (51.53%)	711 (49.58%)
Male	352 (53.82%)	142 (45.22%)	71 (50.71%)	158 (48.47%)	723 (50.42%)

As shown in Table 4, program participants were fairly evenly divided between males (723, 50.42%) and females (711, 49.58%). While Cohorts 16 and 18 had more males than females and Cohorts 17 and 20 had the opposite, each cohort was relatively balanced by sex.

Table 5 shows the racial breakdown of students in each cohort and in total. Please note that subgroups with fewer than 15 students (across all cohorts) are not shown in this table in order to protect student privacy. Black or African American students made up about two-thirds of all 21st CCLC participants (n=931, 65.66%). This was by far the most represented group. There were 305 White students (21.51%) and 21 students who selected more than one response and were classified as “multiracial” (1.48%). In addition, 161 students (11.35%) were classified in the data file as “some other race.”¹

Examining the race data by cohort reveals slight variation. For example, over 70% of students in Cohort 16 and 20 were Black or African American, whereas that proportion was less than half in Cohort 17. More than 20% of Cohort 17 students were classified as some “other race.”

¹ Considering this large number of students in the “other race” category, it may be beneficial to revisit the categories and/or to include an option for students to self-describe.

Table 5. Number of students by race by cohort

Race	Cohort 16	Cohort 17	Cohort 18	Cohort 20	Total
Black or African American	465 (71.87%)	154 (49.36%)	82 (61.19%)	230 (70.77%)	931 (65.66%)
White	139 (21.48%)	81 (25.96%)	30 (22.39%)	55 (16.92%)	305 (21.51%)
Other Race	40 (6.18%)	64 (20.51%)	18 (13.43%)	39 (12.00%)	161 (11.35%)
Multi-racial	3 (0.46%)	13 (4.17%)	4 (2.99%)	1 (0.31%)	21 (1.48%)

Note: a total of 16 CCLC students are not included in this table because of the small size (<15) of their racial subgroups. Percentages are calculated on the following numbers: Cohort 16 (647), Cohort 17 (312), Cohort 18 (134), Cohort 20 (325) and total (1418).

Table 6 shows the ethnicity of 21st CCLC students. Overall, most students (1275, 89.54%) were not Hispanic and 149 (10.46%) were Hispanic.

Table 6. Number of students by ethnicity by cohort

Ethnicity	Cohort 16	Cohort 17	Cohort 18	Cohort 20	Total
Hispanic	55 (8.45%)	59 (18.85%)	6 (4.48%)	29 (8.90%)	149 (10.46%)
Not Hispanic	596 (91.55%)	254 (81.15%)	128 (95.52%)	297 (91.10%)	1275 (89.54%)

Note: a total of 10 students were missing data for this item: 3 in Cohort 16, 1 in Cohort 17 and 6 in Cohort 18. Percentages are calculated on the number of students with data.

As demonstrated in Table 7, the vast majority of 21st CCLC students had English as their primary language (1380, 97.6%). Twenty-nine students (2.06%) spoke Spanish as a primary language. Four other languages (Haitian Creole, Vietnamese, Chinese and French) were represented but by only one or two students.

Table 7. Number of students by primary language, in each cohort and total

Primary Language	Cohort 16	Cohort 17	Cohort 18	Cohort 20	Total
English	645 (99.23%)	290 (95.08%)	134 (98.53%)	311 (97.80%)	1380 (97.94%)
Spanish	5 (0.79%)	15 (4.92%)	2 (1.47%)	7 (2.20%)	29 (2.06%)

Note: a total of 20 students were missing data for this item: 3 in Cohort 16, 8 in Cohort 17, 2 in Cohort 18 and 7 in Cohort 20. Additionally, 5 students were removed from this analysis because of the small size of their primary language. Percentages are calculated on the number of students with data.

Overall, 297 students in the data set (20.92%) received special education services, according to data provided by the state. The majority (n=1123, 79.08%) did not receive special education services.

Table 8. Number of students by special education status, in each cohort and total

Special Education Status	Cohort 16	Cohort 17	Cohort 18	Cohort 20	Total
In Special Education	152 (23.28%)	52 (16.56%)	17 (13.39%)	76 (23.31%)	297 (20.92%)
Not in Special Education	501 (76.72%)	262 (83.44%)	110 (86.61%)	250 (76.69%)	1123 (79.08%)

Note: a total of 14 students were missing data for this item: 1 in Cohort 16 and 13 in Cohort 18. Percentages are calculated on the number of students with data.

WHAT WAS THE 21ST CCLC PROGRAM DOSAGE? HOW MANY HOURS DID PARTICIPANTS ATTEND?

Please note that this report only covers the 2022-23 **school year**; it reflects attendance in 21st CCLC after-school programs. Some 21st CCLC subgrantees also offer summer programs, but summer attendance hours are not included here.

Table 9 shows the average number of hours attended by a participant during the 2022-23 school year for each cohort as well as an overall average.

Table 9. Average hours of 21st CCLC program attendance, in each cohort and total

Measure	Cohort 16	Cohort 17	Cohort 18	Cohort 20	Total
Average Hours Present	60.76	195.69	193.90	123.10	117.47

The overall average was 117.47 hours. The average varied substantially across cohorts. Cohorts 17 and 18 had higher attendance averages (195.69 and 193.90 respectively). The average in Cohort 20 was 123.10 but in Cohort 16 it was only 60.76. These differences may relate to the difference age composition of each cohort. As noted above, Cohort 16 and 20 programs have older students in general than Cohorts 17 and 18. It is expected that middle and high school students would have more competing demands on their time after-school than elementary students.

Table 8 provides more context for the overall average attendance data. It shows the number of students in different attendance bands, across all cohorts. At the high end, more than a quarter of 21st CCLC participants (n=388, 27.06%) attended for 180 or more hours over the year. On the other hand, 181 students (12.62%) attended fewer than 15 hours, and 240 (16.74%) attended 15-44 hours.

Table 10. Attendance distribution for the total data set

Attendance Span Hours	Frequency	Percent
Fewer than 15	181	12.62%
15-44	240	16.74%
45-89	274	19.11%
90-179	351	24.48%
180-269	266	18.55%
270 or more	122	8.51%
TOTAL	1434	100.00%

HOW DID THE 21ST CCLC PROGRAM PERFORM ON THE FIVE GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE AND RESULTS ACT MEASURE INDICATORS?

As part of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) the United States Department of Education has established performance measures for the 21st CCLC program. The Delaware DOE has set standards to define what constitutes improvement on each measure. Each GPRA measure reflects a different aspect of student experience; some only pertain to certain grade levels. The table below maps out GPRA measure indicators, grade levels, and data sources.

Table 11. GPRA Measure Indicators and Delaware DOE definitions

GPRA Measure Indicators	Grade Levels	Performance Measured/ Data Type	Delaware DOE Definition
1a. Percentage of students in grades 4-8 participating in 21st CCLC programming during the school year and summer who demonstrate growth in reading and language arts on state assessments. 1b. Percentage of students in grades 4-8 participating in 21st CCLC programming during the school year and summer who demonstrate growth in mathematics on state assessments.	4-8	State Assessment, Reading and Language Arts State Assessment, Mathematics	Any increase in Smarter Balanced assessment score from 2022 to 2023 constitutes improvement
2. Percentage of students in grades 7-8 and 10-12 attending 21st CCLC programming during the school year and summer with a prior-year unweighted GPA of less than 3.0 who demonstrated an improved GPA.	7-8 10-12	Grade Point Average	Any numerical increase in GPA over 3.0 is improvement; GPA is based on Math and ELA grades; crosswalk available.
3. Percentage of students in grades 1-12 participating in 21st CCLC during the school year who had a school day attendance rate at/or below 90% in the prior school year and demonstrated an improved attendance rate in the current school year.	1-12	Attendance	Any improvement in attendance percentage from SY 2021-22 to SY 2022-23 constitutes improvement
4. Percentage of students in grades 1-12 attending 21st CCLC programming during the school year and summer who experienced a decrease in in-school suspensions compared to the previous school year.	1-12	In-school suspension	Any decrease in the number of in-school suspensions is sufficient to report
5. Percentage of students in grades 1–5 participating in 21st CCLC programming in the school year and summer who demonstrated an improvement in teacher-reported engagement in learning.	1-5	Engagement in learning	Any degree of improvement is sufficient to report

This section first provides a basic performance snapshot of Delaware’s 21st CCLC in the 2022-23 school year. Then, it examines data related to each GPRA measure indicator in more detail.

Table 12. GPRA Measure Summary of Results

GPRA Measure	Number (percentage) of students showing improvement	Number (percentage) of students not showing improvement	Number of eligible students (i.e., in appropriate grade levels, with valid and complete data)
1a: ELA test scores	281 (50.81%)	272 (49.19%)	553
1b: Math test scores	285 (50.71%)	277 (49.29%)	562
2: GPA	27 (16.88%)	133 (83.13%)	160
3: Attendance	273 (86.12%)	44 (13.88%)	317
4: In school suspension	1 (100.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1
5: Engagement in learning	536 (73.22%)	61 (8.33%)	732

Note: for GPRA 5, there was a third category: *student already met expectations*. 135 students (18.44%) were classified as such.

These results show generally positive results on the GPRA measures, with some variation:

- For GPRA 1, slightly more than half of 21st CCLC students in grades 4-8 showed improvement on the English Language Arts (1a) and Math (1b) state assessments in 2023, compared to their performance in 2022.
- For GPRA 2, a much smaller percentage (16.88%) of secondary students who had struggled academically in 2021-22 (i.e., GPA < 3.0) were able to improve their grades in 2022-23 *and* raise their grades over 3.0.
- Attendance data improved: overall, 86.12% of students who had attendance at or below 90% in 2021-22 improved their attendance to some degree in 2022-23 (GPRA 3). However, since any improvement at all counts towards this metric, these students may still have been classified as chronically absent.
- GPRA 4 is not fully applicable as there was only one student in the data set with an in-school suspension in 2021-22. That student reduced the number of suspensions the subsequent year.
- For GPRA 5, the majority of participating students (73.22%) improved their engagement in learning according to survey reports from their teachers.

Next we look further into each of the GPRA measures to provide more information about the students who did or did not improve on each indicator.

DID PARTICIPANTS IMPROVE THEIR ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS TEST SCORES?

Disaggregation by cohort

As shown in Table 12, 281 21st CCLC students – 50.81% of those eligible – demonstrated improvement in their English Language Arts SBAC score in 2023 compared to 2022. Table 13 below shows these data disaggregated by program cohort.

Table 13. English Language Arts improvement by cohort

Status	Cohort 16	Cohort 17	Cohort 18	Cohort 20	Total
Improved	164 (49.55%)	64 (52.03%)	27 (56.25%)	26 (50.98%)	281 (50.81%)
Did not improve	167 (50.45%)	59 (47.97%)	21 (43.75%)	25 (49.02%)	272 (49.19%)
Number of students with valid data	331 (100.00%)	123 (100.00%)	48 (100.00%)	51 (100.00%)	553 (100.00%)

The rate of ELA improvement varied from 56.25% for students in Cohort 18 programs to 49.55% for students in Cohort 16.

Disaggregation by grade band and race

Disaggregated data by grade level and race are shown in Tables 1 and 2 in the Appendix. This GPRA measure indicator only applies to grades 4-8. Students in upper elementary (grades 4-5) improved at a higher rate than those in middle school (grades 6-8): 53.95% compared to 46.99% respectively. Meanwhile the improvement rates were very similar (within 1 percentage point) across racial subgroups.

DID PARTICIPANTS IMPROVE THEIR MATH TEST SCORES?

Disaggregation by cohort

Math Smarter Balanced testing results were very similar to ELA results overall. Overall, 50.71% of students in grades 4-8 improved their test scores from spring 2022 to spring 2023. Note that more students (n=562) had math testing data than had ELA testing data (n=553). Table 14 shows the breakdown of math improvement by cohort.

Table 14. Math improvement by cohort

Status	Cohort 16	Cohort 17	Cohort 18	Cohort 20	Total
Improved	159 (47.60%)	62 (49.21%)	31 (63.27%)	33 (62.26%)	285 (50.71%)
Did not improve	175 (52.40%)	64 (50.79%)	18 (36.73%)	20 (37.74%)	277 (49.29%)
Number of students with valid data	334 (100.00%)	126 (100.00%)	49 (100.00%)	53 (100.00%)	562 (100.00%)

Math improvement rates varied from 63.27% in Cohort 18 to 47.60% in Cohort 16. This is more of a spread than was evident in the ELA rates (Table 13). Cohort 20 participants had higher rates of improvement in Math (62.26%) than they did in ELA (50.98%).

Disaggregation by grade band and race

Disaggregated data by grade band and race are shown in Tables 3 and 4 in the Appendix. More than 60% (61.88%) of students in grades 4-5 improved their math scores, compared to 38.04% of students in grades 6-8. This gap was greater than the difference in ELA scores between the same grade bands. Meanwhile, Black or African American and White students improved at similar rates (49.86% and 49.24% respectively), but students classified as “some other race” had the greatest improvement (54.29%).

DID PARTICIPANTS IMPROVE THEIR GRADES IN SCHOOL?

Disaggregation by cohort

GPRA measure indicator 2 only applies to students who were in grades 7-8 or 10-12 in the 2022-23 school year and who had an unweighted grade point average (GPA) below 3.0 in the prior year. Overall, there were 160 students fitting this description, of whom 27 (16.88%) improved their grades above 3.0. The breakdown of improvement by cohort is in Table 15.

Table 15. GPA improvement by cohort

Status	Cohort 16	Cohort 17	Cohort 18	Cohort 20	Total
Improved	18 (17.82%)	N/A	N/A	9 (15.52%)	27 (16.88%)
Did not improve	83 (82.18%)	N/A	N/A	49 (84.48%)	133 (83.13%)
Number of students with valid data	101 (100.00%)	N/A	N/A	58 (100.00%)	160 (100.00%)

*Note: subgroups with fewer than 15 students are not included in this analysis.

Fewer than 15 students in Cohorts 17 and 18 had valid data for this indicator. This makes sense given that these cohorts are largely made up of elementary students. The rate of improvement was slightly higher in Cohort 16 compared to 20, but overall only a small number of students with academic difficulty were able to improve their grade point averages over 3.0 in 2022-23.

Note that the criteria for this GPRA measure indicator are higher than others. While *any* increase in test scores (GPRA 1a and 1b), attendance (GPRA 3) or classroom engagement (GPRA 5) is sufficient to count as improvement, for the GPA indicator it must be improvement over 3.0. This may be why we see a relatively lower percentage of students demonstrating improvement on this indicator compared to the others (see Table 12).

Disaggregation by grade band and race

Tables 5 and 6 in the Appendix show GPA improvement data by grade band and by race. This GPRA measure indicator only applies to secondary students. Rates of improvement were very similar (i.e. within one percentage point) for students in grades 7-8 and 10-12. Only two racial

subgroups had more than 15 students and were thus examined in the disaggregation. Overall, Black or African American students improved GPA at higher rates than White students (16.81% compared to 12.90%).

DID PARTICIPANTS IMPROVE THEIR ATTENDANCE IN SCHOOL?

Disaggregation by cohort

GPRA measure indicator 3 applies to students who were classified as chronically absent ($\leq 90\%$ school day attendance) during the 2021-22 school year. Overall, there were 317 students fitting this description, of whom 273 (86.12%) showed any improvement in their attendance. The breakdown of improvement by cohort is in Table 16.

Table 16. Attendance improvement by cohort

Status	Cohort 16	Cohort 17	Cohort 18	Cohort 20	Total
Improved	142 (87.12%)	36 (81.82%)	22 (91.67%)	73 (84.88%)	273 (86.12%)
Did not improve	21 (12.88%)	8 (18.18%)	2 (8.33%)	13 (15.12%)	44 (13.88%)
Number of students with valid data	163 (100.00%)	44 (100.00%)	24 (100.00%)	86 (100.00%)	317 (100.00%)

Students in Cohort 18 programs were the most likely to show improvement on this measure indicator (91.67%) and those in Cohort 17 were least likely (81.82%). More than 80% of the students in each cohort who attended 90% or less of the 2021-22 school year improved their attendance rates at all in 2022-23.

Disaggregation by grade band and race

Tables 7 and 8 in the Appendix show the attendance improvement data by grade band and by race. There were not major differences in improvement rate by grade – all grade bands were within two percentage points of each other. However, it is notable that a much larger number and

percentage of high school students (n=149, 54.18% of the high school students in the data set) were eligible for this metric compared to any other grade band. Since a student had to be chronically absent in 2021-22 for this metric to be relevant, this suggests that high school students may have lower attendance.

Considering the data disaggregated by race (Table 8), the Black or African American subgroup demonstrated the greatest improvement on this metric, with 88.74% improving.

Further analysis of chronic absence

Chronic absence – defined as attending 90% or fewer school days – is an important predictor of educational outcomes. Therefore, CRESPP conducted further research on chronic absence among students participating in 21st CCLC programs and learned that:

- As noted above, **317** students were classified as chronically absent in 2021-22.
- Of that group, **160** were *not* chronically absent in the subsequent year. They improved their attendance above 90% in 2022-23.
- However, **157** of the chronically absent students from 2021-22 remained chronically absent in 2022-23.
- An additional **81** students joined the chronically absent group. These students' attendance had been above 90% in 2021-22 but dipped below that benchmark in 2022-23.

The majority of 21st CCLC students were NOT chronically absent. Out of the 1263 students with attendance data in 2021-22 and 2022-23, 885 (70.07%) had attendance above 90% in both.

DID PARTICIPANTS IMPROVE THEIR DISCIPLINE IN SCHOOL?

GPRA 4 operationalizes student discipline in a narrow way: the percentage of students experiencing an in-school suspension (ISS). Out of the 1434 students in this data analysis, only one had an ISS record in the 2021-22 school year. That student saw five ISS days in that year and decreased to three the following year. Therefore, the one student for whom this measure indicator is relevant demonstrated improvement on it. No further information can be provided.

DID PARTICIPANTS IMPROVE THEIR CLASSROOM ENGAGEMENT?

GPRA only requires reporting classroom engagement data for students in grades 1 – 5. Table 12 (above) shows the results for that age group: 536 (73.22%) of elementary students improved their classroom engagement according to their teachers. However, the Delaware DOE collected teacher survey data related to students in grades 1 – 12. Therefore, here we present data for this broader group. As noted in the methods section, duplicates were removed in the data

cleaning process. If a student had more than one teacher survey response, the response with the highest rating was retained.

Disaggregation by cohort

Here we report on teacher survey data for all participants (grades 1 – 12) in each cohort and in total. The teacher survey had seven response options. A teacher could indicate that a student’s engagement had a *significant decline*, *moderate decline*, *slight decline*, *slight improvement*, *moderate improvement* or *significant improvement* over the course of the year, or that the student’s engagement already met expectations at the start of the year. For simplicity, we collapse the scale into three categories: if a student already met expectations, improved in their engagement, or declined in their engagement. (Conceptually, we see “already meeting expectations” as the most positive description of a student’s engagement).

Table 17. Engagement improvement by cohort

Status	Cohort 16	Cohort 17	Cohort 18	Cohort 20	Total
Already met expectations	190 (29.05%)	43 (13.69%)	44 (31.43%)	78 (23.93%)	355 (24.76%)
Engagement improved	392 (59.94%)	253 (80.57%)	86 (61.43%)	227 (69.63%)	958 (66.81%)
Engagement declined	72 (11.01%)	18 (5.73%)	10 (7.14%)	21 (6.44%)	121 (8.44%)
Number of students with valid data	654 (100.00%)	314 (100.00%)	140 (100.00%)	326 (100.00%)	1434 (100.00%)

According to teacher surveys, almost a quarter of 21st CCLC students (355, 24.76%) were already meeting expectations for engagement at the start of the year and did not need to improve. A further 958 (66.81%) showed at least some degree of improvement in their classroom engagement during the 2022-23 school year, according to their teachers. Only 121 students (8.44%) were reported to have decreased their engagement.

Table 17 also disaggregates teacher ratings of student engagement by cohort. Students in Cohort 18 were the most likely to be judged as already meeting expectations (31.43%), while those in Cohort 17 were the least likely (13.69%). While the specific patterns varied by cohort, in all cases the majority of teachers reported improvements in engagement.

Disaggregation by grade band and race

Tables in the Appendix disaggregate the teacher survey data according to student grade band (Table 9) and by race (Table 10). We observed some variation by grade band.

- Teachers rated the engagement of primary students slightly more positively than those in upper elementary. For example, just nine 1st or 2nd grade students (3.80%) were judged to have declining engagement in primary, compared to 52 (10.51%) in grades 3 – 5.
- The middle school ratings (grades 6-8) were the most positive of any age band, with 153 (38.83%) of students rated already meeting engagement expectations, 259 (60.66%) improving and 15 (3.51%) declining.
- At the high school level, ratings fell back: 45 (16.36%) of students had decreases in their classroom engagement.

Teacher ratings were fairly similar for students in different racial subgroups. White students were the most likely to be already meeting engagement expectations and students in the “some other race” category were the most likely to be classified as improving. The level of students who decreased their engagement was within 1.5% points for all groups (i.e., 8.92% for Black or African American students, 8.20% for White students, and 7.45% for students of some other race).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report includes preliminary analyses of data from the 2022-23 school year for students participating in the 21st CCLC in Delaware. Additional analyses are available upon request. Our focus in this last section is not so much on the *substance* of the findings but rather on increasing data quality and utility. The state has taken strides to systematize and improve data collection and reporting in the 21st CCLC. EZ Reports is an important tool in this effort. To continue this momentum, CRESPP recommends:

1. **Carefully review the log of data issues provided in the supplemental report.** Follow up with subgrantees who may need support, additional professional development, or monitoring for more accurate data entry and reporting.
2. **Continue to offer professional development for EZReports.** Ideally this would include sessions, held at least annually, to set clear expectations for the use of EZReports as well as

ongoing professional learning opportunities, such as those embedded in the monthly 21st CCLC meetings.

3. **Consider revisions to data collection instruments to yield more meaningful information.** These include but are not limited to:

- a. Expanding or adjusting the race categories, considering the high percentage of students classified as “some other race” in this data set;
- b. Refining the teacher survey: simplifying the scale and clarifying the directions, as well as adding questions so that the effort of conducting a survey can have greater payoff.

4. **Review implications of how Delaware has defined the GPRA measure indicators.**

According to information provided by the DOE, GPRA measure indicator 2 effectively has *two* criteria that must be met for a student to be considered “improving”: GPA increases from the prior year *and* is above 3.0. By contrast, GPRA 1, 3 and 5 require only that a student’s math/ELA test scores, their attendance rate, or their classroom engagement increase; there is no minimum level. This may explain why substantially fewer students in this data set showed improvement on GPRA indicator 2 than the others.

5. **Include data with a broader scope than the GPRA in future evaluations.** As noted in point 4, the GPRA measure indicators provide a very specific way of examining the success of the 21st CCLC. The state is required to collect and report these data to the federal government, but there are opportunities to also analyze the data in more depth and/or to collect additional data to round out the picture. For example:

- a. **Collect data for more grade levels than required in the GPRA.** For example, although GPRA 5 only requires student engagement data for children in grades 1-5, the state already collects these data for *all* 21st CCLC participants by conducting teacher surveys in all grade levels, and indeed CRESP included all that data in this report. Similarly, it may be possible and valuable to consider academic improvement for students in the primary grades as well as in the grade levels required by the GPRA.
- b. **Analyze data in more complex ways than just a binary (improved/did not improve).** In this report we added a layer of analysis to the school attendance data (GPRA 3). In addition to reporting on the percentage of students who met the GPRA measure indicator (i.e., improved their attendance), we also considered whether or not those students remained chronically absent. Similarly, as the state has access to student Smarter Balanced scores in math and ELA, it would be possible to identify not only *whether* students’ results improved, but to what extent. These additional

analyses would provide more context for the GPRA result summary and more information to improve programs and better meet student needs.

- c. **Consider additional ways to measure student improvement, beyond those required by the GPRA.** The most obvious example pertains to student discipline. The GPRA measure indicator focuses on students with in-school suspensions (ISS), yet only one student in our data set of 1,434 had any ISS record. Schools now use a variety of disciplinary approaches other than ISS. It may be worthwhile to discuss additional data sources related to student behavior and discipline.

APPENDIX

DISAGGREGATED DATA FOR GPRA MEASURES

Table 1. English Language Arts improvement by grade band (GPRA 1a)

Status	Primary (Grade 1-2)	Upper Elem. (Grade 3-5)	Middle (Grade 6-8)	High (Grade 9-12)	Total
Improved	N/A	164 (53.95%)	117 (46.99%)	N/A	281 (50.81%)
Did not improve	N/A	140 (46.05%)	132 (53.01%)	N/A	272 (49.18%)
Number of students with valid data	N/A	304 (100.00%)	249 (100.00%)	N/A	553 (100.00%)

Table 2. English Language Arts improvement by race (GPRA 1a)

Status	Black or African American	White	Some other race	Total
Improved	172 (50.15%)	66 (51.16%)	35 (50.72%)	273 (50.46%)
Did not improve	171 (49.85%)	63 (48.84%)	34 (49.28%)	268 (49.54%)
Number of students with valid data	343 (100.00%)	129 (100.00%)	69 (100.00%)	541

Note: subgroups with fewer than 15 students are not included in this analysis.

Table 3. Math improvement by grade band (GPRA 1b)

Status	Primary (Grade 1-2)	Upper Elem. (Grade 3-5)	Middle (Grade 6-8)	High (Grade 9-12)	Total
Improved	N/A	188 (61.24%)	97 (38.04%)	N/A	285 (50.71%)
Did not improve	N/A	119 (38.76%)	158 (61.96%)	N/A	277 (49.29%)
Number of students with valid data	N/A	307 (100.00%)	255 (100.00%)	N/A	562 (100.00%)

Table 4. Math improvement by race (GPRA 1b)

Status	Black or African American	White	Some other race	Total
Improved	173 (49.86%)	65 (49.24%)	38 (54.29%)	276 (50.27%)
Did not improve	174 (50.14%)	67 (50.76%)	32 (45.71%)	273 (49.73%)
Number of students with valid data	347 (100.00%)	132 (100.00%)	70 (100.00%)	549 (100.00%)

*Note: subgroups with fewer than 15 students are not included in this analysis.

Table 5. GPA improvement by grade band (GPRA 2)

Status	Primary (Grade 1-2)	Upper Elem. (Grade 3-5)	Middle (Grade 6-8)	High (Grade 9-12)	Total
Improved	N/A	N/A	15 (16.48%)	12 (17.39%)	27 (16.88%)
Did not improve	N/A	N/A	76 (83.52%)	57 (82.61%)	133 (83.13%)
Number of students with valid data	N/A	N/A	91 (100.00%)	69 (100.00%)	160 (100.00%)

Table 6. GPA improvement by race (GPRA 2)

Status	Black or African American	White	Total
Improved	19 (16.81%)	4 (12.90%)	23 (15.97%)
Did not improve	94 (83.19%)	27 (87.10%)	121 (84.03%)
Number of students with valid data	113 (100.00%)	31 (100.00%)	144 (100.00%)

*Note: subgroups with fewer than 15 students are not included in this analysis.

Table 7. Attendance improvement by grade band (GPRA 3)

Status	Primary (Grade 1-2)	Upper Elem. (Grade 3-5)	Middle (Grade 6-8)	High (Grade 9-12)	Total
Improved	33 (84.62%)	61 (85.92%)	50 (86.21%)	129 (86.58%)	273 (86.12%)
Did not improve	6 (15.38%)	10 (14.08%)	8 (13.79%)	20 (13.42%)	44 (13.88%)
Number of students with valid data	39 (100.00%)	71 (100.00%)	58 (100.00%)	149 (100.00%)	317 (100.00%)

Table 8. Attendance improvement by race (GPRA 3)

Status	Black or African American	White	Some other race	Total
Improved	205 (88.74%)	44 (78.57%)	20 (80.00%)	269 (86.22%)
Did not improve	26 (11.26%)	12 (21.43%)	5 (20.00%)	43 (13.78%)
Number of students with valid data	231 (100.00%)	56 (100.00%)	25 (100.00%)	312 (100.00%)

Note: subgroups with fewer than 15 students are not included in this analysis.

Table 9. Engagement improvement by grade band (GPRA 5, for primary and upper elementary only)

Status	Primary (Grade 1-2)	Upper Elem. (Grade 3-5)	Middle (Grade 6-8)	High (Grade 9-12)	Total
Already met expectations	50 (21.10%)	85 (17.17%)	153 (35.83%)	67 (24.36%)	355 (24.76%)
Improved	178 (75.11%)	358 (72.32%)	259 (60.66%)	163 (59.27%)	958 (66.81%)
Declined	9 (3.80%)	52 (10.51%)	15 (3.51%)	45 (16.36%)	121 (8.44%)
Number of students with valid data	237 (100.00%)	495 (100.00%)	427 (100.00%)	275 (100.00%)	1434 (100.00%)

Table 10. Engagement improvement by race (GPRA 5, for primary and upper elementary only)

Status	Black or African American	White	Some other race	Total
Already meeting expectations	229 (24.60%)	86 (28.20%)	32 (19.88%)	347 (24.84%)
Improved	619 (66.49%)	194 (63.61%)	117 (72.67%)	930 (66.57%)
Declined	83 (8.92%)	25 (8.20%)	12 (7.45%)	120 (8.59%)
Number of students with valid data	931 (100.00%)	305 (100.00%)	161 (100.00%)	1397 (100.00%)