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### Three Study Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Describe Cohort 9 grantees, centers, students served, and attendance levels</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics for grantees, centers, and participating students (2012-13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Describe extent of year-to-year change on reading and math EOG tests for Cohort 9 students (grades 4-8)</td>
<td>Average reading and math EOG change from 2012 to 2013, relative to state population change in standard deviation units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Describe variation in centers’ average year-to-year change in reading and math EOG test scores</td>
<td>Average year-to-year change in standard deviation units across Cohort 9 centers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Study Goal 1

Describe the grantees, centers, students served, and attendance levels
Cohort 9 Grantees (85 total)

- Average of 2 centers per grantee
- Average of 178 students served per grantee
- Average of 76 students per center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee Type</th>
<th>Number of Grantees</th>
<th>Average Number of Centers</th>
<th>Average Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Based Organizations</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Districts</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith Based Organizations</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2012-13 Cohort 9 Students

• 15,089 reported as participating by 85 grantees
  ➢ 64% elementary, 27% middle, 9% high school
  ➢ 56% black, 22% white, 16% Hispanic
  ➢ Percent below proficient in 2012
    • 49% for reading EOG
    • 30% for math EOG
  ➢ By type of grantee
    • 31% served by community based organizations
    • 40% by school districts
    • 11% by faith-based organizations
2012-13 Attendance Reported

- Attendance for all Cohort 9 students
  - 21% attended program less than 30 days
  - 47% attended program between 30 and 89 days
  - 32% attended 90 or more days

- Average attendance across 198 centers
  - 6% of centers had an average attendance rate less than 30 days
  - 73% of centers had an average attendance rate between 30 and 89 days
  - 21% of centers had an average attendance rate above 90 days
Study Goals 2 and 3

2. Describe extent of year-to-year change on reading and math EOG tests by Cohort 9 students

3. Describe variation in centers’ average year-to-year change in reading and math EOG test scores
How much year-to-year change on state tests relative to the state population did Cohort 9 students realize?

Interpretation of year-to-year (2012 to 2013) change scores:

- **Zero:** Year-to-year change was the *same* as the state year-to-year change.
- **Positive:** Year-to-year change was *more than* the state year-to-year change.
- **Negative:** Year-to-year change was *less than* the state year-to-year change.

Limitations: for descriptive purposes only, not for judging program success
Reading and Math EOG

- Slightly less year-to-year change compared to the overall change for all students in NC
Disaggregated by Proficiency Levels

- Level I students had greater year-to-year change than the state population
  - More pronounced for math than reading
- Level II math had a year-to-year change value of 0
- Levels III and IV had less change than the state
Reading EOG: Variation Across Centers

- 88% of centers had less average change than the state population.
- 12% had as much or more average change.
Math EOG: Variation Across Centers

- 75% of centers had less average change than the state population
- 25% had as much or more average change than the state
Future Considerations

• Two possible purposes to continue analyses of student outcome data in subsequent years:
  1. Identify centers with average year-to-year changes on key student outcomes greater than the state population and describe promising practices
  2. Provide feedback to grantees about their centers’ average year-to-year changes on key student outcomes (to encourage discussions about ways to improve center programs)