

21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers  
Overview of the  
21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Annual Performance Data:  
2015–2016

U.S. Department of Education  
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education  
21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers

Sylvia E. Lyles, Ph.D.  
Program Director, Office of Academic Improvement

This report was prepared for the U.S. Department of Education under contract number ED-ESE-14-C-0120. The contracting officer representative is Daryn Hedlund of the Office of Academic Improvement.

This report is in the public domain. Authorization to reproduce it in whole or in part is granted. While permission to reprint this publication is not necessary, the suggested citation is as follows:

U.S. Department of Education. (2017). *21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers (21<sup>st</sup> CCLC) analytic support for evaluation and program monitoring: An overview of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC performance data: 2015–16* (12<sup>th</sup> report). Washington, DC.

# Content

INTRODUCTION .....	2
SECTION 1: GPRA RESULTS.....	3
A. GPRA Measures #1-3: Improvement in Mathematics Grades .....	3
B. GPRA Measures #4-6: Improvement in English Grades.....	5
C. GPRA Measures #7-8: Improvement on Reading and Mathematics State Assessments .....	6
D. GPRA Measures #9-11: Improvement on Homework Completion and Class Participation .....	8
E. GPRA Measures #12-14: Percentage of Improvement in Student Behavior.....	9
SECTION 2: GRANTEE AND CENTER CHARACTERISTICS .....	12
A. Center Type.....	12
B. People Served .....	12
C. Activity Participation.....	13
D. Staffing Type .....	15
E. Attendees Served per Demographic.....	16
F. Estimated Per-Student Expenditures.....	17
CONCLUSION.....	20

## Tables

Table 1. Regular Attendees % Improved in Mathematics Grades .....	3
Table 2. Regular Attendees % Improved in English Grades .....	5
Table 3. Regular Attendees % Improved on Reading/Mathematics State Assessments .....	6
Table 4. Regular Attendees % Improved Homework Completion/Class Participation .....	8
Table 5. Regular Attendees % Improved Student Behavior .....	9
Table 6. The GPRA Outcomes for all 54 States/Territories .....	11
Table 7. Grantees' Centers Broken Down by Organization Type .....	12
Table 8. Attendees Served Based on Type .....	13
Table 9. Total Attendees by Center Type .....	13
Table 10. Regular Attendees by Center Type .....	13
Table 11. Times per Week/Month of Each Activity Offered .....	14
Table 12. Frequency of Each Activity Offered.....	14
Table 13. Times per Week/Month of Each Academic Activity Offered .....	14
Table 14. Frequency of Each Academic Activity Offered .....	15
Table 15. Staffing Type per Paid and Volunteer Staff.....	15
Table 16. Participant Demographics.....	16
Table 17. Number of Participants per Grade Level .....	17
Table 18. Estimated Expenditure per Regular Attendee and All Attendees .....	18

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) program provides students in high-need communities with access to high quality afterschool programming. The 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program started in 1994 under the Elementary and Secondary School Act and was expanded in 2001 with the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act. 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC funded after school programs are now present in all fifty states, as well as in the District of Columbia, Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico and in territory of the Bureau of Indian Education. All 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC centers provide programming with academic enrichment and youth development that are designed to support participants' academic success. For the 2015-2016 academic school year, the United States (US) Department of Education funded 8,556 centers under the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program.

In this Annual Performance Report (APR), data from the 21APR Data Collection System were analyzed to report on the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) performance indicators associated with the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program. These metrics assist the federal government in determining progress of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program based on the statutory requirements. The APR has historically been completed by grantees once a year to summarize the operational elements of their program, the student population served, and the extent to which students improved in specific areas.

Based on the available data, the key findings from the 2015-2016 APR are:

- Over 1.8 million people have been served by this program:
  - academic year total student attendees (n = 1,343,232), including regular<sup>1</sup> student attendees (n = 728,126)
  - summer attendees (n = 293,949), and
  - adults/family members (n = 221,322).
- Overall, there was a fairly even split between male (48.7%, n = 653,577) and female (48.1%, n = 646,055) attendees.
- In terms of race/ethnicity, the majority of the attendees were identified as Hispanic (37.0%, n = 497,037), with White (26.6%, n = 357,044) and Black (21.1%, n = 283,655) following.
- 47.2% reported a percentage of improvement in mathematics grades.
- 46.3% reported a percentage of improvement in English grades.
- 25.5% reported a percentage of improvement on state assessments in elementary reading and 19.1% in middle/high school mathematics.
- 62.7% of teachers reported a percentage of improvement in homework completion and class participation.
- 54.6% of teachers reported a percentage of improvement in student behavior.

The data and performance indicate that this broad reaching program touches students' lives in ways that will have far reaching impact.

---

<sup>1</sup> Regular is defined as attendance for more than 30 days during the academic year. See Table 8.

## INTRODUCTION

Originally created in 1994 through the Elementary and Secondary School Act, and expanded in 2001 through No Child Left Behind (NCLB), the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) program, provides students in high-need, high-poverty communities the opportunity to participate in afterschool programming. Present in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and three territories, academic enrichment and youth development programs are designed to enhance participants' well-being and academic success. For the 2015-2016 academic school year, the US Department of Education funded 8,556 centers under the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program.

In this APR, data from the 21APR Data Collection System were analyzed to report on the GPRA indicators associated with the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program. These metrics, which are described in Section 1, are the primary way the federal government determines the success and progress of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program based on the statutory requirements. The APR has historically been completed by grantees once a year to summarize the operational elements of their program, the student population served, and the extent to which students improved in academic-related behaviors and achievement.

This year, the data show that most funded centers were classified as school districts with community-based organizations following second. In the past year, the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program has served a total of more than 1.8 million people and employed 109,577 paid staff and 32,716 volunteer staff. Most of the paid staff were school day teachers (42%) and most of the volunteers were community members and college students (47.1%).

In the following report, the methodological approach taken to data analysis is highlighted before turning to the results of the GPRA analysis. The report concludes with a demographic analysis of students and staff to provide context to the GPRA analysis as well as present a holistic picture of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program.

### **Methodology:**

Data are entered at the state level into the 21APR Data Collection system during three data collection time periods throughout the year. The data must be certified by the State Education Agency (SEA) for the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program in each state.

The MySQL database was queried and exported to SPSS (via Excel) and then analyzed using descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, and averages) and reported in tabular format. As validity checks, the data were run independently by two statisticians. A third researcher, who had not previously worked with the data, conducted a final internal consistency check. As a final validity check, the data were also exported using Tableau queries and checked against the exported data.

To provide a whole program understanding of the data, an aggregate statistic for each of the items analyzed is provided. Descriptive statistics throughout the report are calculated on the states/territories that provided data on the given measure. For example, if only 46 states/territories out of the total 54 provided data around staffing, then the percentages are only based on the data obtained from those 46. Incorporating missing data from the other eight into the statistical analysis would skew the findings and thus cause them to be inaccurate. This method of only using reported data preserves the statistical integrity of the reported results. This change from previous reporting further provides a more accurate representation of performance against the GPRA measure on a national level. Finally, it is important to note that each state or territory is the authoritative source of their data; the APR reports on the data provided.

## SECTION 1: GPRA RESULTS

The GPRA indicators are the primary means by which the US Department of Education measures the effectiveness and efficiency of the program based on the following two overall goals:

1. Participants in 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.
2. 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers will develop afterschool activities and educational opportunities that consider the best practices identified through research findings and other data that lead to high-quality enrichment opportunities that positively affect student outcomes.

To support these overall goals a series of measures are associated with the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC project. However, it is important to note that not all states report data for each GPRA. States are afforded the choice to report performance culled from grades, state assessments, and/or teacher-reported student behavior and report based on this choice.

Data for each GPRA are provided at the end of the academic school year and presented in tabular and summary form below (Section A-E). Any methodological considerations are noted following each GPRA table. A summary of the findings for each GPRA is presented in Table 6.

### A. GPRA Measures #1-3: Percentage of Improvement in Mathematics Grades

- 32 out of 54 states (59.3%) reported a percentage of improvement in mathematics grades.
- Overall, states reported the following % improvement: 48.2% Elementary, 45.5% Middle/High School, and 47.2% for all students.

**Table 1. Regular Attendees % Improved in Mathematics Grades**

State/Territory	Mathematics Elementary	Mathematics Middle/High School	Mathematics All Students
	% Improved	% Improved	% Improved
1. Alabama	0.0	0.0	0.0
2. Alaska	0.0	0.0	0.0
3. Arizona	62.6	57.9	61.1
4. Arkansas	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Bureau of Indian Affairs	0.0	0.0	0.0
6. California	0.0	56.4	56.4
7. Colorado	0.0	0.0	0.0
8. Connecticut	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Delaware	67.3	44.7	59.6
10. District of Columbia	65.6	50.5	59.4
11. Florida	63.0	57.0	61.0
12. Georgia	43.9	44.7	44.2
13. Hawaii	61.4	39.3	45.9
14. Idaho	0.0	0.0	0.0
15. Illinois	51.5	55.1	53.1
16. Indiana	0.0	0.0	0.0
17. Iowa	56.4	45.2	53.1
18. Kansas	73.3	0.0	73.3

State/Territory	Mathematics Elementary	Mathematics Middle/High School	Mathematics All Students
19. Kentucky	54.9	52.8	54.2
20. Louisiana	67.8	68.0	67.8
21. Maine	0.0	0.0	0.0
22. Maryland	63.2	43.2	56.0
23. Massachusetts	0.0	0.0	0.0
24. Michigan	58.7	43.0	52.3
25. Minnesota	0.0	0.0	0.0
26. Mississippi	71.1	61.8	68.7
27. Missouri	47.2	49.4	47.6
28. Montana	0.0	0.0	0.0
29. Nebraska	0.0	0.0	0.0
30. Nevada	29.3	24.5	28.3
31. New Hampshire	0.0	0.0	0.0
32. New Jersey	82.8	80.6	81.8
33. New Mexico	0.0	0.0	0.0
34. New York	53.7	52.6	53.0
35. North Carolina	0.0	0.2	0.1
36. North Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0
37. Ohio	63.2	58.1	61.4
38. Oklahoma	0.0	0.0	0.0
39. Oregon	64.4	70.0	65.1
40. Pennsylvania	45.6	44.4	44.9
41. Puerto Rico	61.5	60.7	61.2
42. Rhode Island	0.0	0.0	0.0
43. South Carolina	61.1	74.7	64.8
44. South Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0
45. Tennessee	71.1	70.3	70.8
46. Texas	25.3	28.7	26.7
47. Utah	71.6	53.6	69.0
48. Vermont	0.0	0.0	0.0
49. Virgin Islands	0.0	0.0	0.0
50. Virginia	51.2	53.7	52.4
51. Washington	71.4	59.7	64.7
52. West Virginia	87.1	64.3	74.4
53. Wisconsin	0.0	0.0	0.0
54. Wyoming	85.3	89.7	85.9
<b>Overall</b>	<b>48.2%</b>	<b>45.5%</b>	<b>47.2%</b>

Note: Raw scores were used to calculate overall % improvement. When calculating the % improvement “Overall”, the total amounts of regular attendees with reported APR results were used in the calculations across all states/territories who reported on this measure. Zeroes do not necessarily reflect delinquency in reporting or lack of improvement; States elect to report on one, two, or three of the GPRA measures. Therefore, zeros in this table may reflect that a State is not reporting on the outcome represented.

\*North Carolina reported K-5 data for “needs improvement,” but reported zero students improved.



## B. GPRA Measures #4-6: Percentage of Improvement in English Grades

- 33 out of 54 states (61.1%) reported a percentage of improvement in English grades.
- Overall, states reported the following % improvement: 46.7% Elementary, 45.5% Middle/High School, and 46.3% for all students.

**Table 2. Regular Attendees % Improved in English Grades**

State/Territory	English Elementary % Improved	English Middle/High School % Improved	English All Students % Improved
1. Alabama	0.0	0.0	0.0
2. Alaska	0.0	0.0	0.0
3. Arizona	56.3	60.9	57.7
4. Arkansas	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Bureau of Indian Affairs	0.0	0.0	0.0
6. California	0.0	77.5	77.5
7. Colorado	0.0	0.0	0.0
8. Connecticut	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Delaware	40.6	68.5	61.4
10. District of Columbia	62.7	52.8	58.7
11. Florida	59.8	57.3	59.0
12. Georgia	44.7	41.2	43.5
13. Hawaii	62.1	42.2	48.6
14. Idaho	0.0	0.0	0.0
15. Illinois	55.6	50.5	53.3
16. Indiana	0.0	0.0	0.0
17. Iowa	56.1	47.0	53.7
18. Kansas	47.6	0.0	47.6
19. Kentucky	53.1	50.4	52.3
20. Louisiana	68.0	71.0	68.7
21. Maine	0.0	0.0	0.0
22. Maryland	61.9	48.9	57.5
23. Massachusetts	0.0	0.0	0.0
24. Michigan	52.5	43.2	48.4
25. Minnesota	0.0	0.0	0.0
26. Mississippi	68.1	57.0	65.3
27. Missouri	47.1	48.8	47.5
28. Montana	0.0	0.0	0.0
29. Nebraska	0.0	0.0	0.0
30. Nevada	27.1	24.4	26.6
31. New Hampshire	0.0	0.0	0.0
32. New Jersey	82.7	78.3	80.6
33. New Mexico	0.0	0.0	0.0
34. New York	53.7	53.4	53.5
35. North Carolina	0.0	0.2	0.1
36. North Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0
37. Ohio	66.4	61.1	64.5
38. Oklahoma	0.0	0.0	0.0
39. Oregon	58.0	69.0	59.4

State/Territory	English Elementary	English Middle/High School	English All Students
40. Pennsylvania	45.2	46.2	45.8
41. Puerto Rico	61.7	63.3	62.1
42. Rhode Island	0.0	0.0	0.0
43. South Carolina	54.8	70.0	58.4
44. South Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0
45. Tennessee	71.1	71.2	71.1
46. Texas	23.9	27.1	25.2
47. Utah	68.0	60.9	67.2
48. Vermont	60.5	0.0	60.5
49. Virgin Islands	0.0	0.0	0.0
50. Virginia	48.8	49.4	49.1
51. Washington	66.3	53.8	58.1
52. West Virginia	83.2	58.4	70.2
53. Wisconsin	0.0	0.0	0.0
54. Wyoming	85.9	79.8	85.0
<b>Overall</b>	<b>46.7%</b>	<b>45.5%</b>	<b>46.3%</b>

Note: Raw scores were used to calculate overall % improvement. When calculating the % improvement “Overall”, the total amounts of regular attendees with reported APR results were used in the calculations across all states/territories. Zeroes do not necessarily reflect delinquency in reporting or lack of improvement; States elect to report on one, two, or three of the GPRA measures. Therefore, zeros in this table may reflect that a State is not reporting on the outcome represented. \*North Carolina reported K-5 data for “needs improvement,” but reported zero students improved.

### C. GPRA Measures #7-8: Percentage of Improvement on Reading and Mathematics State Assessments

- 31 out of 54 states/territories (57.4%) reported a percentage of improvement from not proficient to proficient or above on the Elementary reading state assessment.
- 32 out of 54 states/territories (59.3%) reported a percentage of improvement from not proficient to proficient or above on the Middle/High School mathematics state assessment.
- Overall, the states/territories reported the following % improvement: 25.5% Elementary Reading and 19.1% Middle/High School Mathematics Assessment.

**Table 3. Regular Attendees % Improved on Reading/Mathematics State Assessments**

State/Territory	Reading Elementary % Improved	Mathematics Middle/High School % Improved
1. Alabama	0.0	0.0
2. Alaska	0.0	0.0
3. Arizona	34.9	46.2
4. Arkansas	21.3	22.9
5. Bureau of Indian Affairs	0.0	0.0
6. California	13.3	2.0
7. Colorado	0.0	0.0
8. Connecticut	0.0	0.0
9. Delaware	61.8	33.8
10. District of Columbia	12.9	2.1
11. Florida	36.8	25.8

State/Territory	Reading Elementary	Mathematics Middle/High School
12. Georgia	26.5	22.7
13. Hawaii	0.0	0.0
14. Idaho	34.0	7.8
15. Illinois	6.2	11.0
16. Indiana	0.0	0.0
17. Iowa	35.9	29.6
18. Kansas	63.0	100.0
19. Kentucky	0.0	0.0
20. Louisiana	76.4	69.1
21. Maine	0.0	0.0
22. Maryland	50.2	7.0
23. Massachusetts	21.9	12.7
24. Michigan	0.0	0.0
25. Minnesota	0.0	0.0
26. Mississippi	49.8	30.4
27. Missouri	0.0	0.0
28. Montana	0.0	0.0
29. Nebraska	0.0	0.0
30. Nevada	0.0	0.0
31. New Hampshire	0.0	0.0
32. New Jersey	0.0	58.8
33. New Mexico	0.0	0.0
34. New York	19.5	17.1
35. North Carolina	0.0	0.0
36. North Dakota	13.7	13.5
37. Ohio	27.8	43.6
38. Oklahoma	24.1	26.8
39. Oregon	36.0	7.1
40. Pennsylvania	27.5	17.5
41. Puerto Rico	0.0	0.0
42. Rhode Island	14.1	7.3
43. South Carolina	1.0	13.0
44. South Dakota	26.7	10.3
45. Tennessee	72.2	44.4
46. Texas	23.2	29.3
47. Utah	37.7	28.3
48. Vermont	17.8	13.2
49. Virgin Islands	0.0	0.0
50. Virginia	50.8	48.5
51. Washington	19.7	13.0
52. West Virginia	0.0	8.3
53. Wisconsin	0.0	0.0
54. Wyoming	57.1	0.0
<b>Overall</b>	<b>25.5%</b>	<b>19.1%</b>

Note: Raw scores were used to calculate overall % improvement. When calculating the % improvement “Overall”, the total amounts of regular attendees with reported APR results were used in the calculations across all states/territories. Zeroes do not necessarily reflect delinquency in reporting or lack of improvement; States elect to report on one, two, or

three of the GPRA measures. Therefore, zeros in this table may reflect that a State is not reporting on the outcome represented.

\*Bureau of Indian Affairs reported data for “not proficient,” but reported zero students improved.

#### **D. GPRA Measures #9-11: Percentage of Improvement on Homework Completion and Class Participation**

- 44 out of 54 states (81.5%) reported data on homework completion/class participation.
- Overall, the states reported the following % improvement in homework completion/class participation: 62.8% Elementary, 62.6% Middle/High School, and 63.7% for all students.

**Table 4. Regular Attendees % Improved Homework Completion/Class Participation**

<b>State/Territory</b>	<b>HW/CP Elementary % Improved</b>	<b>HW/CP Middle/High School % Improved</b>	<b>HW/CP All Students % Improved</b>
1. Alabama	89.5	91.7	89.9
2. Alaska	52.7	59.4	54.0
3. Arizona	67.1	66.6	66.9
4. Arkansas	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Bureau of Indian Affairs	0.0	0.0	0.0
6. California	80.1	87.1	83.3
7. Colorado	83.9	77.2	81.7
8. Connecticut	52.1	57.3	53.6
9. Delaware	67.5	70.7	68.2
10. District of Columbia	81.2	75.3	78.7
11. Florida	69.6	71.9	70.4
12. Georgia	75.8	78.4	76.7
13. Hawaii	69.6	64.8	66.0
14. Idaho	0.0	0.0	0.0
15. Illinois	61.8	55.4	59.3
16. Indiana	83.8	78.4	82.4
17. Iowa	46.2	33.7	40.7
18. Kansas	70.5	69.9	70.4
19. Kentucky	64.3	65.5	64.7
20. Louisiana	78.6	75.7	77.9
21. Maine	15.4	15.5	15.4
22. Maryland	89.2	61.6	76.7
23. Massachusetts	0.0	0.0	0.0
24. Michigan	58.4	59.3	58.7
25. Minnesota	52.8	67.8	62.6
26. Mississippi	88.3	92.9	89.3
27. Missouri	0.0	0.0	0.0
28. Montana	56.3	62.5	57.3
29. Nebraska	26.6	29.4	27.2
30. Nevada	70.9	58.7	68.4
31. New Hampshire	44.2	44.0	44.2
32. New Jersey	47.0	49.8	48.5
33. New Mexico	90.5	79.9	87.3

State/Territory	HW/CP Elementary	HW/CP Middle/High School	HW/CP All Students
34. New York	64.6	73.4	67.4
35. North Carolina	47.8	31.1	43.3
36. North Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0
37. Ohio	63.2	77.4	66.9
38. Oklahoma	0.0	0.0	0.0
39. Oregon	64.8	53.6	60.3
40. Pennsylvania	50.7	52.6	51.9
41. Puerto Rico	84.3	83.4	84.0
42. Rhode Island	18.0	29.9	21.8
43. South Carolina	66.2	62.1	65.3
44. South Dakota	80.0	0.0	80.0
45. Tennessee	72.8	68.9	71.6
46. Texas	0.0	0.0	0.0
47. Utah	70.4	65.5	68.7
48. Vermont	0.0	0.0	0.0
49. Virgin Islands	0.0	0.0	0.0
50. Virginia	74.6	77.0	75.6
51. Washington	33.3	62.5	40.6
52. West Virginia	67.8	65.0	67.2
53. Wisconsin	32.3	33.1	32.5
54. Wyoming	79.9	80.6	80.0
<b>Overall</b>	<b>62.8%</b>	<b>62.6%</b>	<b>62.7%</b>

Note: Raw scores were used to calculate overall % improvement. When calculating the % improvement “Overall”, the total amounts of regular attendees with reported APR results were used in the calculations across all states/territories. Zeroes do not necessarily reflect delinquency in reporting or lack of improvement; States elect to report on one, two, or three of the GPRA measures. Therefore, zeros in this table may reflect that a State is not reporting on the outcome represented.

#### E. GPRA Measures #12-14: Percentage of Improvement in Student Behavior

- 43 out of 54 states (79.6%) reported data on student behavior.
- Overall, the states reported the following % improvement: 54.7% Elementary, 54.4% Middle/High School, and 54.6% for all students.

**Table 5. Regular Attendees % Improved Student Behavior**

State/Territory	Student Behavior Elementary	Student Behavior Middle/High School	Student Behavior All Students
	<b>% Improved</b>	<b>% Improved</b>	<b>% Improved</b>
1. Alabama	91.6	93.3	91.9
2. Alaska	53.5	48.8	52.6
3. Arizona	58.2	58.6	58.4
4. Arkansas	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Bureau of Indian Affairs	0.0	0.0	0.0
6. California	81.0	86.7	83.6
7. Colorado	89.0	81.4	86.6
8. Connecticut	38.7	39.7	38.9
9. Delaware	51.1	61.4	53.5
10. District of Columbia	75.7	75.6	75.7

State/Territory	Student Behavior Elementary	Student Behavior Middle/High School	Student Behavior All Students
11. Florida	67.1	69.8	68.0
12. Georgia	49.6	53.1	50.8
13. Hawaii	59.7	50.4	54.2
14. Idaho	0.0	0.0	0.0
15. Illinois	51.5	49.1	50.5
16. Indiana	86.4	81.1	85.0
17. Iowa	35.5	24.5	30.6
18. Kansas	61.8	61.4	61.7
19. Kentucky	42.6	42.2	42.5
20. Louisiana	68.5	68.5	68.5
21. Maine	23.7	22.2	23.3
22. Maryland	84.7	58.9	73.0
23. Massachusetts	0.0	0.0	0.0
24. Michigan	53.8	55.6	54.5
25. Minnesota	58.4	68.3	64.9
26. Mississippi	71.0	93.6	75.9
27. Missouri	0.0	0.0	0.0
28. Montana	44.8	48.1	45.3
29. Nebraska	27.5	23.3	26.6
30. Nevada	41.1	34.3	39.7
31. New Hampshire	29.0	22.8	27.7
32. New Jersey	36.5	42.4	39.7
33. New Mexico	93.6	83.1	90.5
34. New York	65.4	59.1	61.1
35. North Carolina	47.1	29.4	42.4
36. North Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0
37. Ohio	52.7	58.1	54.1
38. Oklahoma	0.0	0.0	0.0
39. Oregon	58.1	40.4	51.0
40. Pennsylvania	38.2	44.1	41.8
41. Puerto Rico	80.6	80.9	80.7
42. Rhode Island	20.4	24.7	21.7
43. South Carolina	42.4	41.2	42.1
44. South Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0
45. Tennessee	60.6	55.3	59.0
46. Texas	0.0	0.0	0.0
47. Utah	61.6	63.7	62.3
48. Vermont	0.0	0.0	0.0
49. Virgin Islands	0.0	0.0	0.0
50. Virginia	64.9	66.9	65.7
51. Washington	39.6	43.8	40.6
52. West Virginia	59.2	60.1	59.4
53. Wisconsin	30.4	29.1	30.1
54. Wyoming	81.1	81.3	81.1
<b>Overall</b>	<b>54.7%</b>	<b>54.4%</b>	<b>54.6%</b>

Note: Raw scores were used to calculate overall % improvement. When calculating the % improvement “Overall”, the total amounts of regular attendees with reported APR results were used in the calculations across all states/territories.

**Table 6. The GPRA Outcomes for all 54 States/Territories**

Program GPRA Measures	2015-2016
1. The percentage of elementary 21 <sup>st</sup> Century regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring.	48.2%
2. The percentage of middle/high school 21 <sup>st</sup> Century regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring.	45.5%
3. The percentage of all 21 <sup>st</sup> Century regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring.	47.2%
4. The percentage of elementary 21 <sup>st</sup> Century regular program participants whose English grades improved from fall to spring.	46.7%
5. The percentage of middle/high school 21 <sup>st</sup> Century regular program participants whose English grades improved from fall to spring.	45.5%
6. The percentage of all 21 <sup>st</sup> Century regular program participants whose English grades improved from fall to spring.	46.3%
7. The percentage of elementary 21 <sup>st</sup> Century regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above in reading on state assessments.	25.5%
8. The percentage of middle/high school 21 <sup>st</sup> Century regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above in mathematics on state assessments.	19.1%
9. The percentage of elementary 21 <sup>st</sup> Century regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation.	62.8%
10. The percentage of middle/high school 21 <sup>st</sup> Century program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation. <sup>2</sup>	62.6%
11. The percentage of all 21 <sup>st</sup> Century regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation.	62.7%
12. The percentage of elementary 21 <sup>st</sup> Century participants with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior.	54.7%
13. The percentage of middle/high school 21 <sup>st</sup> Century participants with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior.	54.4%
14. The percentage of all 21 <sup>st</sup> Century participants with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior.	54.6%

---

<sup>2</sup> Only States reporting on this measure were used to calculate the total percentage.

## SECTION 2: GRANTEE AND CENTER CHARACTERISTICS

### A. Center Type

Table 7 displays the results of the grantees' centers for all 54 states/territories. Of the 8,556 centers listed, 82.8% were classified as school districts (n = 7,083) and 9.7% as community-based organizations (n = 828).

**Table 7. Grantees' Centers Broken Down by Organization Type**

Center Type	All 54 States/Territories N	All 54 States/Territories %
Charter School	355	4.1
College/University	26	0.3
Community Based Organization	828	9.7
Faith Based Organization	105	1.2
Public School Districts	7,083	82.8
Other	159	1.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,556</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Note: The category Other is a combination of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Health-Based Organization, Library, Museum, Park/Recreation District, Other Unit of City or County Government, Private School, Regional/Intermediate Education Agency, and Other.

### B. People Served

During SY 15-16 over 1.8 million people have been served by the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program. The total number of attendees served by the program is calculated by adding the total number of student attendees, which includes the number of regular<sup>3</sup> student attendees, to the number of summer attendees and adults/family members served. Table 8 displays the amount of people served by the program per classification:

- total student attendees (n = 1,343,232) including regular student attendees (n = 728,126),
- summer attendees (n = 293,949), and
- adults/family members (n = 221,322).

Tables 9 and 10 provide a look at attendance based on center type. The majority of regular attendees attended programs provided by public school districts (83.2%, n = 605,662).

---

<sup>3</sup> Regular is defined as attendance for more than 30 days during the academic year.



**Table 8. Attendees Served Based on Type**

Attendees Served	Total N	Total %
Regular Student Attendees	728,126	39.2
Non-regular Student Attendees	615,106	33.1
Total Student Attendees (including regular students)	1,343,232	72.3
Summer Attendees	293,949	15.8
Adults/Family Members	221,322	11.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,858,503</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Note: Total amounts were calculated by adding the total number of attendees to the number of summer attendees and adults/family members served.

**Table 9. Total Attendees by Center Type**

Center Type	All 54 States/Territories N	All 54 States/Territories %
Charter School	86,732	6.5
College/University	3,012	0.2
Community Based Organization	78,271	5.8
Faith Based Organization	8,903	0.7
Public School Districts	1,150,981	85.7
Other	15,333	1.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,343,232</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Note: The category Other is a combination of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Health-Based Organization, Library, Museum, Park/Recreation District, Other Unit of City or County Government, Private School, Regional/Intermediate Education Agency, and Other.

**Table 10. Regular Attendees by Center Type**

Center Type	All 54 States/Territories N	All 54 States/Territories %
Charter School	51,196	7.0
College/University	2,057	0.3
Community Based Organization	53,281	7.3
Faith Based Organization	6,596	0.9
Public School Districts	605,662	83.2
Other	9,334	1.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>728,126</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Note: The category Other is a combination of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Health-Based Organization, Library, Museum, Park/Recreation District, Other Unit of City or County Government, Private School, Regional/Intermediate Education Agency, and Other.

### C. Activity Participation

Program sites offer various types of activities throughout the academic school year. The activities held most frequently were focused on homework assistance (51,353 times/week), physical activity (47,606 times/week), literacy (39,323 times/week), and Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) (39,083 times/week). The majority of activities were offered from less than 1-hour to 1-2 hours per week with the exception of arts & music, community/service learning, physical activity,

literacy, college & career readiness, homework help, and STEM activities, which were offered anywhere from less than 1-hour to 2-4 hours per week.

**Table 11. Times per Week/Month of Each Activity Offered<sup>4</sup>**

Activity	Times per Week	Times per Month
Community/Service Learning	5,820	6,625
Counseling Programs	4,036	3,690
Drug Prevention	2,270	2,870
College & Career Readiness	9,467	4,607
Homework Help	51,353	1,332
Mentoring	8,183	4,075
Physical Activity	47,606	5,574
Tutoring	31,060	2,381
Youth Leadership	11,617	8,426

**Table 12. Frequency of Each Activity Offered**

Activity	Less than 1 Hour	1-2 Hours	2-4 Hours	More than 4 Hours
Community/Service Learning	1,072	4,036	1,356	220
Counseling Programs	918	1,799	370	45
Drug Prevention	956	1,911	334	65
College & Career Readiness	658	3,153	1,048	224
Homework Help	4,957	6,416	1,150	152
Mentoring	996	2,364	636	96
Physical Activity	4,661	7,278	1,594	166
Tutoring	2,278	5,374	1,080	151
Youth Leadership	1,827	4,294	965	149

**Table 13. Times per Week/Month of Each Academic Activity Offered**

Academic Activity	Times per Week	Times per Month
Arts & Music	29,773	9,938
Entrepreneurship	4,444	3,217
Literacy	39,323	4,282
English Language Learners' Support	10,690	1,447
STEM	39,083	7,201

<sup>4</sup> Previously, activities were reported in hours. This more closely aligns with the data collection in the new system, but may make comparisons with old reports more challenging.

Academic Activity	Times per Week	Times per Month
Truancy Prevention	3,423	1,260
Violence Prevention	2,919	2,841

**Table 14. Frequency of Each Academic Activity Offered**

Academic Activity	Less than 1 Hour	1-2 Hours	2-4 Hours	More than 4 Hours
Arts & Music	2,810	7,794	1,501	185
Entrepreneurship	431	2,048	526	82
Literacy	2,670	7,539	1,544	229
English Language Learners' Support	715	1,742	876	88
STEM	2,056	8,686	2,256	302
Truancy Prevention	561	794	374	40
Violence Prevention	1,000	1,728	282	39

#### D. Staffing Type

Participating centers employ paid and volunteer staff to assist with programming. There were a reported 109,577 paid staff and 32,716 volunteer staff. Table 15 provides the amount of paid and volunteer staff broken down by type for all 54 states/territories. Among the paid staff, the majority were school day teachers (42.0%, n = 45,994) followed by other non-teaching school staff (16.4%, n = 17,969). Community members served as the majority of volunteers (25.6%, n = 8,382) used by the centers followed by college students (21.5%, n = 7,041).

**Table 15. Staffing Type per Paid and Volunteer Staff**

Staffing Type	Paid Staff		Volunteer Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Center Administrators	9,521	8.7	1,068	3.3
College Students	8,748	8.0	7,041	21.5
Community Members	4,572	4.2	8,382	25.6
High School Students	3,584	3.3	5,358	16.4
Parents	848	0.8	5,709	17.5
School Day Teachers	45,994	42.0	1,844	5.6
Other Non-Teaching School Staff	17,969	16.4	1,137	3.5
Subcontracted	9,755	8.9	641	2.0
Other	8,586	7.8	1,536	4.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>109,577</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>32,716</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

## E. Attendees Served per Demographic

Tables 16 and 17 provide a demographic depiction of the program attendees broken down by gender, race/ethnicity, and grade level. Overall, there was a fairly even split between male (48.7%, n = 653,577) and female (48.1%, n = 646,055) attendees. In terms of race/ethnicity, the majority of the attendees were identified as Hispanic (37.0%, n = 497,037), with White (26.6%, n = 357,044) and Black (21.1%, n = 283,655) following. There was a considerably larger number of Pre-K-5 regular attendees (59.5%, n = 433,022) in comparison to 6<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> grade regular attendees (40.5%, n = 295,104).

**Table 16. Participant Demographics**

	Spring N	Spring %
<b>1. Attendance</b>		
<30 Days	615,106	45.8
30-59 Days	270,306	20.1
60-89 Days	181,653	13.5
>90 Days	276,167	20.6
Total	<b>1,343,232</b>	100.0%
<b>2. Sex</b>		
Male	653,577	48.7
Female	646,055	48.1
Unknown	43,600	3.2
Total	<b>1,343,232</b>	100.0%
<b>3. Race/Ethnicity</b>		
Asian	49,409	3.7
Black	283,655	21.1
Hispanic	497,037	37.0
Native American	31,371	2.3
Pacific Islander	7,634	0.6
White	357,044	26.6
Two or More Races	44,793	3.3
Unknown	72,289	5.4
Total	<b>1,343,232</b>	100.0%
<b>4. Grade Level</b>		
Pre-K – 5 <sup>th</sup>	596,550	44.4
6 <sup>th</sup> – 12 <sup>th</sup>	746,682	55.6
Total	<b>1,343,232</b>	100.0%
<b>5. English Language Learners*</b>	170,442	12.6%
<b>6. Free &amp; Reduced Lunch*</b>	870,803	64.8%
<b>7. Special Needs*</b>	131,075	9.8%

\*The percentages were calculated using the total number of attendees.

**Table 17. Number of Participants per Grade Level**

Grade Level	Total Student Attendees N	Total Student Attendees %	Total Regular Student Attendees N	Total Regular Student Attendees %
	N	%	N	%
Pre-K – 5 <sup>th</sup>	596,550	44.4	433,022	59.5
6 <sup>th</sup> – 12 <sup>th</sup>	746,682	55.6	295,104	40.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,343,232</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>728,126</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**F. Estimated Per-Student Expenditures**

For the 2015-2016 academic school year, the US Department of Education awarded \$1,137,256,179 to 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center programs across 54 states/territories. Table 18 displays the total award amounts, the total of regular attendees, estimated expenditure per regular student, the total of all attendees, and the estimated expenditure total student by state/territory.

Total Award for the Year was sourced from budget history tables published by the US Department of Education<sup>5</sup>.

Total Regular Attendees was reported by each State to the 21APR Data Collection System. Regular attendance is defined as attendance for more than 30 days during the academic year. Impact, based on the GPRA, is measured in terms of regular students.

Total All Attendees was reported by each State to the 21APR Data Collection System. This number reflects the sum of all regular students and all students who attended for 30 days or less.

Estimated Expenditure per Regular Attendee and Estimated Expenditure per Attendee is an estimate at best, and it does not take into account any one of a number of factors that may contribute to the actual expenditure per regular attendee overall or in any given State/Territory.

This estimated expenditure does not take into account funding provided by other partners. It does not consider the 27-month time frame during which States can spread their award distribution. It does not reflect any invoices or receipts documenting actual disbursement of funds towards programming. The estimated expenditure per regular student is not a weighted average; in other words, higher attendance is not given more value than lower attendance when calculating this estimate. The dollar value estimate was calculated by dividing the total award for the year by the total regular attendees or the total all attendees. The denominator does not include summer attendees (n = 293,949) or family members served (n = 221,322). This estimated expenditure is not connected in any way to G5, the Department of Education's grant management system.

<sup>5</sup> <https://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/history/index.html?exp=6>

**Table 18. Estimated Expenditure per Regular Attendee and All Attendees**

State/Territory	Total Award for the Year	Total Regular Attendees	Total All Attendees	Estimated Expenditure per Regular Attendee	Estimated Expenditure per All Attendees
<b>Overall</b>	<b>\$1,137,256,179</b>	<b>728,126</b>	<b>1,343,232</b>	<b>\$1,561.89*</b>	<b>\$846.66*</b>
1. Alabama	\$17,135,242	4,714	6,680	\$3,634.97	\$2,565.16
2. Alaska	\$5,643,198	2,715	4,200	\$2,078.53	\$1,343.62
3. Arizona	\$24,696,549	38,535	81,114	\$640.89	\$304.47
4. Arkansas	\$12,195,332	6,772	12,198	\$1,800.85	\$999.78
5. Bureau of Indian Education	\$7,892,374	2,344	5,963	\$3,367.05	\$1,323.56
6. California	\$132,439,027	116,163	301,676	\$1,140.11	\$439.01
7. Colorado	\$11,925,141	6,195	16,206	\$1,924.96	\$735.85
8. Connecticut	\$8,966,295	6,943	8,443	\$1,291.42	\$1,061.98
9. Delaware	\$5,643,198	2,236	3,060	\$2,523.79	\$1,844.18
10. District of Columbia	\$5,643,198	2,804	3,631	\$2,012.55	\$1,554.17
11. Florida	\$61,414,141	35,948	52,674	\$1,708.42	\$1,165.93
12. Georgia	\$39,347,084	20,204	26,236	\$1,947.49	\$1,499.74
13. Hawaii	\$5,643,198	1,559	4,350	\$3,619.75	\$1,297.29
14. Idaho	\$5,643,198	4,152	6,877	\$1,359.15	\$820.59
15. Illinois	\$50,808,494	28,926	50,791	\$1,756.50	\$1,000.34
16. Indiana	\$20,236,679	13,455	20,757	\$1,504.03	\$974.93
17. Iowa	\$6,572,166	6,161	9,659	\$1,066.74	\$680.42
18. Kansas	\$8,286,212	9,291	18,176	\$891.85	\$455.89
19. Kentucky	\$17,188,889	11,949	29,837	\$1,438.52	\$576.09
20. Louisiana	\$22,316,104	13,672	19,388	\$1,632.25	\$1,151.03
21. Maine	\$5,643,198	3,127	5,558	\$1,804.67	\$1,015.33
22. Maryland	\$15,604,645	7,194	10,160	\$2,169.12	\$1,535.89
23. Massachusetts	\$16,671,886	13,914	15,853	\$1,198.21	\$1,051.65
24. Michigan	\$38,833,081	13,877	20,498	\$2,798.38	\$1,894.48
25. Minnesota	\$11,253,198	12,061	21,587	\$933.02	\$521.30
26. Mississippi	\$14,134,129	5,656	7,566	\$2,498.96	\$1,868.11
27. Missouri	\$18,194,441	6,466	10,915	\$2,813.86	\$1,666.92
28. Montana	\$5,643,198	6,368	14,466	\$886.18	\$390.10
29. Nebraska	\$5,643,198	10,470	15,277	\$538.99	\$369.39
30. Nevada	\$9,133,188	6,172	10,395	\$1,479.78	\$878.61
31. New Hampshire	\$5,643,198	5,408	9,572	\$1,043.49	\$589.55
32. New Jersey	\$23,666,114	9,814	11,424	\$2,411.46	\$2,071.61
33. New Mexico	\$8,392,219	1,700	3,016	\$4,936.60	\$2,782.57
34. New York	\$84,279,065	30,367	68,876	\$2,775.35	\$1,223.63
35. North Carolina	\$32,539,202	14,043	18,796	\$2,317.11	\$1,731.18
36. North Dakota	\$5,643,198	4,969	6,789	\$1,135.68	\$831.23
37. Ohio	\$43,888,443	4,347	11,258	\$10,096.26	\$3,898.42
38. Oklahoma	\$11,926,077	6,749	9,994	\$1,767.09	\$1,193.32
39. Oregon	\$11,429,471	9,966	21,615	\$1,146.85	\$528.77
40. Pennsylvania	\$42,558,875	16,837	35,342	\$2,527.70	\$1,204.20

State/Territory	Total Award for the Year	Total Regular Attendees	Total All Attendees	Estimated Expenditure per Regular Attendee	Estimated Expenditure per All Attendees
41. Puerto Rico	\$28,860,357	12,345	14,533	\$2,337.82	\$1,985.85
42. Rhode Island	\$5,643,198	4,150	9,757	\$1,359.81	\$578.37
43. South Carolina	\$16,787,291	6,465	7,716	\$2,596.64	\$2,175.65
44. South Dakota	\$5,643,198	4,168	11,796	\$1,353.93	\$478.40
45. Tennessee	\$21,760,677	28,823	46,095	\$754.98	\$472.08
46. Texas	\$101,389,315	77,073	115,403	\$1,315.50	\$878.57
47. Utah	\$6,982,788	9,237	20,646	\$755.96	\$338.22
48. Vermont	\$5,643,198	5,912	11,508	\$954.53	\$490.37
49. Virgin Islands	\$724,265	84	116	\$8,622.20	\$6,243.66
50. Virginia	\$18,141,534	6,219	13,688	\$2,917.11	\$1,325.36
51. Washington	\$16,694,742	9,497	15,035	\$1,757.90	\$1,110.39
52. West Virginia	\$6,849,474	4,563	9,725	\$1,501.09	\$704.32
53. Wisconsin	\$16,137,201	20,432	33,757	\$789.80	\$478.04
54. Wyoming	\$5,643,198	4,527	8,328	\$1,246.56	\$677.62

Note. Funding per state was obtained from directly from the US Department of Education. The number of participants was dependent on the data provided by each State/territory. Estimated Expenditure per Regular Attendee and Estimated Expenditure per Attendee is an estimate at best, and it does not take into account any one of a number of factors that may contribute to the actual expenditure per regular attendee overall or in any given State/Territory.

\*Average funding per attendee across all 54 states/territories.

## CONCLUSION

For the 2015-2016 academic school year, 8,556 centers received federal funding to implement the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grant. The majority of these were classified as school districts with community-based organizations following second. During SY 15-16 this program served over 1.8 million student and family member participants and employed 109,577 paid staff and 32,716 volunteer staff. The majority of the paid staff was school day teachers and most of the volunteers were reported to be community members and college students.

The purpose of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program is to 1) provide opportunities for academic enrichment; 2) offer students a broad array of additional services, programs, and activities; and 3) offer families of students served by community learning centers opportunities for active and meaningful engagement in their child's education. Over the past year this program has resulted in over 1.8 million low-income students and family members having a safe place to receive academic enrichment. The students who participate in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program are among the most at risk. The performance on the GPRA measures indicate that many participants are showing improved behavior and homework completion as well as, in some cases, movement in mathematics or English proficiency. The data in this annual performance report will inform continuous program improvement, including proficiency on tests, English-language, proficiency, and graduation rates, through monitoring and technical assistance.