

21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers  
Overview of the  
21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Annual Performance Data:  
2016–2017

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

Sylvia Lyles, PhD  
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. (2018). *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: 2016–17 (13<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.....	15
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 .....	12
Table 9. Total Attendees by Center Type .....	12
Table 10. Regular Attendees by Center Type.....	13
Table 11. Times per Week/Month of Each Activity Offered .....	13
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 .....	14
Table 15. Staffing Type per Paid and Volunteer Staff.....	15
Table 16. Participant Demographics.....	15
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 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. 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 2016-2017 academic school year, the United States (US) Department of Education funded 9,592 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 2016-2017 APR are:

- Over 2 million people have been served by this program:
  - academic year total student attendees (n = 1,423,709), including regular<sup>1</sup> student attendees (n = 770,774)
  - summer attendees (n = 303,013), and
  - adults/family members (n = 286,039).
- Overall, there was a fairly even split between male (49.1%, n = 698,684) and female (48.7%, n = 693,467) attendees.
- In terms of race/ethnicity, the majority of the attendees were identified as Hispanic (38.1%, n = 543,091), with White (26.3%, n = 374,297) and Black (20.3%, n = 289,221) following.
- 50.0% reported a percentage of improvement in mathematics grades.
- 49.4% reported a percentage of improvement in English grades.
- 25.4% reported a percentage of improvement on state assessments in elementary reading and 19.1% in middle/high school mathematics.
- 67.5% of teachers reported a percentage of improvement in homework completion and class participation.
- 60.4% 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 21st 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 3 territories, academic enrichment and youth development programs are designed to enhance participants' well-being and academic success. For the 2016-2017 academic school year, the United States (US) Department of Education funded 9,592 centers under the 21st 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) indicators associated with the 21st CCLC program. These metrics, which are described in Section 1, are the primary way the federal government determines the success and progress of the 21st 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 21st CCLC program has served a total of more than 2 million people and employed 112,571 paid staff and 36,331 volunteer staff. Most of the paid staff were school day teachers and most of the volunteers were community members and college students.

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 21st 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

- 25 out of 54 states (46.3%) reported a percentage of improvement in mathematics grades.
- Overall, states reported the following % improvement: 51.4% Elementary, 47.6% Middle/High School, and 50.0% 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	69.9	61.2	67.0
4. Arkansas	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Bureau of Indian Affairs	100.0	98.0	98.1
6. California	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. Colorado	0.0	0.0	0.0
8. Connecticut	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Delaware	74.5	72.6	73.8
10. District of Columbia	64.3	44.6	55.2
11. Florida	62.8	55.8	60.4
12. Georgia	0.0	0.0	0.0
13. Hawaii	0.0	0.0	0.0
14. Idaho	0.0	0.0	0.0
15. Illinois	0.0	0.0	0.0
16. Indiana	0.0	0.0	0.0
17. Iowa	0.0	0.0	0.0
18. Kansas	69.1	63.7	68.0
19. Kentucky	55.5	55.4	55.5

State/Territory	Mathematics Elementary	Mathematics Middle/High School	Mathematics All Students
20. Louisiana	78.9	76.8	78.3
21. Maine	0.0	0.0	0.0
22. Maryland	69.8	65.2	68.0
23. Massachusetts	0.0	0.0	0.0
24. Michigan	59.1	41.1	51.6
25. Minnesota	0.0	0.0	0.0
26. Mississippi	67.2	76.0	69.8
27. Missouri	35.9	57.9	40.5
28. Montana	31.8	30.6	31.6
29. Nebraska	0.0	0.0	0.0
30. Nevada	39.0	28.7	37.0
31. New Hampshire	0.0	0.0	0.0
32. New Jersey	0.0	0.0	0.0
33. New Mexico	0.0	0.0	0.0
34. New York	55.7	45.7	49.7
35. North Carolina	0.0	0.2	0.1
36. North Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0
37. Ohio	67.7	58.3	64.7
38. Oklahoma	0.0	0.0	0.0
39. Oregon	0.0	0.0	0.0
40. Pennsylvania	42.9	44.8	43.8
41. Puerto Rico	61.6	62.4	61.9
42. Rhode Island	0.0	0.0	0.0
43. South Carolina	71.0	72.4	71.5
44. South Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0
45. Tennessee	67.3	70.2	68.3
46. Texas	27.5	27.0	27.3
47. Utah	0.0	0.0	0.0
48. Vermont	0.0	0.0	0.0
49. Virgin Islands	72.2	84.1	78.6
50. Virginia	70.0	58.3	64.0
51. Washington	0.0	0.0	0.0
52. West Virginia	0.0	0.0	0.0
53. Wisconsin	0.0	0.0	0.0
54. Wyoming	89.8	80.2	88.1
<b>Overall</b>	<b>51.4%</b>	<b>47.6%</b>	<b>50.0%</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

- 25 out of 54 states (46.3%) reported a percentage of improvement in English grades.
- Overall, states reported the following % improvement: 50.1% Elementary, 48.1% Middle/High School, and 49.4% 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	67.3	63.5	66.1
4. Arkansas	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Bureau of Indian Affairs	0.5	95.7	92.0
6. California	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. Colorado	0.0	0.0	0.0
8. Connecticut	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Delaware	76.6	68.7	73.8
10. District of Columbia	57.9	49.2	53.8
11. Florida	57.1	59.6	58.0
12. Georgia	0.0	0.0	0.0
13. Hawaii	0.0	0.0	0.0
14. Idaho	0.0	0.0	0.0
15. Illinois	0.0	0.0	0.0
16. Indiana	0.0	0.0	0.0
17. Iowa	0.0	0.0	0.0
18. Kansas	69.2	66.1	68.6
19. Kentucky	54.5	56.5	55.0
20. Louisiana	78.0	78.3	78.1
21. Maine	0.0	0.0	0.0
22. Maryland	71.5	67.3	69.9
23. Massachusetts	0.0	0.0	0.0
24. Michigan	55.6	42.9	50.5
25. Minnesota	0.0	0.0	0.0
26. Mississippi	68.1	72.8	69.5
27. Missouri	38.4	52.6	41.3
28. Montana	35.5	36.4	35.7
29. Nebraska	0.0	0.0	0.0
30. Nevada	33.6	26.8	32.3
31. New Hampshire	0.0	0.0	0.0
32. New Jersey	0.0	0.0	0.0
33. New Mexico	0.0	0.0	0.0
34. New York	56.2	47.9	51.4
35. North Carolina	0.0	0.3	0.1
36. North Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0
37. Ohio	66.6	62.1	65.2
38. Oklahoma	0.0	0.0	0.0
39. Oregon	0.0	0.0	0.0

State/Territory	English Elementary	English Middle/High School	English All Students
40. Pennsylvania	42.2	43.6	42.8
41. Puerto Rico	58.0	62.7	59.5
42. Rhode Island	0.0	0.0	0.0
43. South Carolina	62.1	67.0	63.7
44. South Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0
45. Tennessee	67.8	69.7	68.4
46. Texas	27.9	26.7	27.4
47. Utah	0.0	0.0	0.0
48. Vermont	0.0	0.0	0.0
49. Virgin Islands	86.6	72.6	80.7
50. Virginia	65.2	58.2	61.8
51. Washington	0.0	0.0	0.0
52. West Virginia	0.0	0.0	0.0
53. Wisconsin	0.0	0.0	0.0
54. Wyoming	86.8	78.5	85.5
<b>Overall</b>	<b>50.1%</b>	<b>48.1%</b>	<b>49.4%</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

- 25 out of 54 states/territories (46.3%) reported a percentage of improvement from not proficient to proficient or above on the Elementary reading state assessment.
- 24 out of 54 states/territories (44.4%) 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: 25.4% 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	0.0	0.0
4. Arkansas	19.4	17.0
5. Bureau of Indian Affairs	14.4	5.8
6. California	13.9	8.4
7. Colorado	0.0	0.0
8. Connecticut	0.0	0.0
9. Delaware	0.0	0.0
10. District of Columbia	31.9	20.1
11. Florida	0.0	0.0

State/Territory	Reading Elementary	Mathematics Middle/High School
12. Georgia	29.2	30.0
13. Hawaii	0.0	0.0
14. Idaho	21.3	8.4
15. Illinois	8.6	15.5
16. Indiana	0.0	0.0
17. Iowa	29.4	36.4
18. Kansas	47.6	27.4
19. Kentucky	0.0	0.0
20. Louisiana	0.0	0.0
21. Maine	0.0	0.0
22. Maryland	35.0	29.2
23. Massachusetts	8.0	4.3
24. Michigan	0.0	0.0
25. Minnesota	0.0	0.0
26. Mississippi	0.0	0.0
27. Missouri	0.0	0.0
28. Montana	14.2	13.0
29. Nebraska	0.0	0.0
30. Nevada	0.0	0.0
31. New Hampshire	0.0	0.0
32. New Jersey	0.0	0.0
33. New Mexico	0.0	0.0
34. New York	16.4	22.5
35. North Carolina	0.0	0.0
36. North Dakota	25.9	10.7
37. Ohio	54.8	43.8
38. Oklahoma	0.0	0.0
39. Oregon	0.0	0.0
40. Pennsylvania	16.8	10.0
41. Puerto Rico	0.0	0.0
42. Rhode Island	15.1	3.9
43. South Carolina	50.0	0.0
44. South Dakota	27.6	14.1
45. Tennessee	0.0	0.0
46. Texas	30.4	41.7
47. Utah	34.0	29.0
48. Vermont	19.2	16.1
49. Virgin Islands	32.3	42.0
50. Virginia	53.0	54.8
51. Washington	21.9	11.3
52. West Virginia	0.0	0.0
53. Wisconsin	0.0	0.0
54. Wyoming	0.0	0.0
<b>Overall</b>	<b>25.4%</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.

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

- 40 out of 54 states (74.1%) reported data on homework completion/class participation.
- Overall, the states reported the following % improvement in homework completion/class participation: 68.1% Elementary, 66.3% Middle/High School, and 67.5% 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	92.0	92.2	92.1
2. Alaska	54.8	59.4	55.8
3. Arizona	77.1	71.6	75.3
4. Arkansas	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Bureau of Indian Affairs	76.0	75.6	75.8
6. California	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. Colorado	83.0	82.0	82.7
8. Connecticut	36.9	47.1	39.9
9. Delaware	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. District of Columbia	65.2	46.5	59.2
11. Florida	69.9	69.9	69.9
12. Georgia	76.4	76.0	76.3
13. Hawaii	84.0	74.2	78.8
14. Idaho	0.0	0.0	0.0
15. Illinois	72.6	71.3	72.1
16. Indiana	84.1	78.0	82.6
17. Iowa	75.7	77.7	76.1
18. Kansas	65.2	63.9	64.9
19. Kentucky	62.9	62.5	62.8
20. Louisiana	78.3	80.1	78.8
21. Maine	29.0	40.5	32.3
22. Maryland	61.2	88.4	69.6
23. Massachusetts	0.0	0.0	0.0
24. Michigan	48.0	49.5	48.6
25. Minnesota	64.6	66.7	65.9
26. Mississippi	77.8	78.5	78.0
27. Missouri	0.0	0.0	0.0
28. Montana	66.9	66.2	66.8
29. Nebraska	63.9	66.7	64.6
30. Nevada	74.8	69.7	73.9
31. New Hampshire	37.5	32.9	36.6
32. New Jersey	47.5	60.7	54.8
33. New Mexico	88.8	86.0	88.3
34. New York	0.0	0.0	0.0

State/Territory	HW/CP Elementary	HW/CP Middle/High School	HW/CP All Students
35. North Carolina	65.5	68.3	66.3
36. North Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0
37. Ohio	0.0	0.0	0.0
38. Oklahoma	0.0	0.0	0.0
39. Oregon	70.7	71.0	70.8
40. Pennsylvania	49.9	49.1	49.5
41. Puerto Rico	86.6	84.2	86.0
42. Rhode Island	35.3	35.8	35.5
43. South Carolina	66.4	67.5	66.7
44. South Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0
45. Tennessee	63.4	58.1	61.6
46. Texas	0.0	0.0	0.0
47. Utah	68.5	68.2	68.4
48. Vermont	0.0	0.0	0.0
49. Virgin Islands	93.9	97.8	95.0
50. Virginia	76.4	70.2	73.7
51. Washington	0.0	0.0	0.0
52. West Virginia	64.4	53.0	61.6
53. Wisconsin	56.8	51.6	55.5
54. Wyoming	59.3	62.9	59.9
<b>Overall</b>	<b>68.1%</b>	<b>66.3%</b>	<b>67.5%</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

- 40 out of 54 states (74.1%) reported data on student behavior.
- Overall, the states reported the following % improvement: 61.2% Elementary, 58.8% Middle/High School, and 60.4% for all students.

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

State/Territory	Student Behavior Elementary % Improved	Student Behavior Middle/High School % Improved	Student Behavior All Students % Improved
1. Alabama	93.3	93.0	93.2
2. Alaska	59.0	50.0	57.1
3. Arizona	68.5	65.5	67.5
4. Arkansas	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Bureau of Indian Affairs	73.4	68.3	71.4
6. California	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. Colorado	88.6	83.0	87.1
8. Connecticut	41.5	43.5	42.1
9. Delaware	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. District of Columbia	56.7	38.9	51.0
11. Florida	68.3	67.8	68.1

State/Territory	Student Behavior Elementary	Student Behavior Middle/High School	Student Behavior All Students
12. Georgia	47.6	52.4	49.2
13. Hawaii	79.9	70.3	74.8
14. Idaho	0.0	0.0	0.0
15. Illinois	62.5	61.7	62.2
16. Indiana	86.7	81.0	85.3
17. Iowa	77.4	73.4	76.6
18. Kansas	58.0	45.4	55.4
19. Kentucky	41.1	38.7	40.3
20. Louisiana	77.4	80.7	78.3
21. Maine	37.3	37.4	37.3
22. Maryland	54.4	74.1	60.5
23. Massachusetts	0.0	0.0	0.0
24. Michigan	46.3	46.2	46.3
25. Minnesota	61.0	59.6	60.1
26. Mississippi	38.3	55.0	42.5
27. Missouri	0.0	0.0	0.0
28. Montana	64.0	65.8	64.3
29. Nebraska	59.4	59.1	59.3
30. Nevada	41.2	41.7	41.3
31. New Hampshire	30.8	19.2	28.6
32. New Jersey	38.3	51.0	45.3
33. New Mexico	93.0	90.3	92.5
34. New York	0.0	0.0	0.0
35. North Carolina	52.4	58.4	54.1
36. North Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0
37. Ohio	0.0	0.0	0.0
38. Oklahoma	0.0	0.0	0.0
39. Oregon	72.2	60.6	68.4
40. Pennsylvania	37.0	37.8	37.4
41. Puerto Rico	79.2	81.4	79.8
42. Rhode Island	28.3	33.2	29.9
43. South Carolina	82.8	81.1	82.4
44. South Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0
45. Tennessee	52.4	47.0	50.6
46. Texas	0.0	0.0	0.0
47. Utah	54.4	57.6	55.3
48. Vermont	0.0	0.0	0.0
49. Virgin Islands	89.5	91.1	89.9
50. Virginia	63.4	62.0	62.8
51. Washington	0.0	0.0	0.0
52. West Virginia	60.3	56.7	59.4
53. Wisconsin	58.6	56.2	58.0
54. Wyoming	55.4	60.4	56.2
<b>Overall</b>	<b>61.2%</b>	<b>58.8%</b>	<b>60.4%</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.

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

Program GPRA Measures	2016-2017
1. The percentage of elementary 21 <sup>st</sup> Century regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring.	51.4%
2. The percentage of middle/high school 21 <sup>st</sup> Century regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring.	47.6%
3. The percentage of all 21 <sup>st</sup> Century regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring.	50.0%
4. The percentage of elementary 21 <sup>st</sup> Century regular program participants whose English grades improved from fall to spring.	50.1%
5. The percentage of middle/high school 21 <sup>st</sup> Century regular program participants whose English grades improved from fall to spring.	48.1%
6. The percentage of all 21 <sup>st</sup> Century regular program participants whose English grades improved from fall to spring.	49.4%
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.	25.4%
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.	68.1%
10. The percentage of middle/high school 21 <sup>st</sup> Century program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation.	66.3%
11. The percentage of all 21 <sup>st</sup> Century regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation.	67.5%
12. The percentage of elementary 21 <sup>st</sup> Century participants with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior.	61.2%
13. The percentage of middle/high school 21 <sup>st</sup> Century participants with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior.	58.8%
14. The percentage of all 21 <sup>st</sup> Century participants with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior.	60.4%

## 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 9,592 centers listed, 82.3% were classified as school districts (n = 7,892) and 10.0% as community-based organizations (n = 959).

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

Center Type	All 54 States/Territories N	All 54 States/Territories %
Charter School	386	4.0
College/University	30	0.3
Community Based Organization	959	10.0
Faith Based Organization	115	1.2
Public School Districts	7,892	82.3
Other	210	2.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,592</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 16-17 over 2 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>2</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 = 1,423,709) including regular student attendees (n = 770,774),
- summer attendees (n = 303,013), and
- adults/family members (n = 286,039).

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 (84.2%, n = 649,346).

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

Attendees Served	Total N	Total %
Regular Student Attendees	770,774	38.3
Non-regular Student Attendees	652,935	32.4
Total Student Attendees (including regular students)	1,423,709	70.7
Summer Attendees	303,013	15.1
Adults/Family Members	286,039	14.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,012,761</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**

<sup>2</sup> Regular is defined as attendance for more than 30 days during the academic year.

Center Type	All 54 States/Territories N	All 54 States/Territories %
Charter School	85,672	6.0
College/University	3,372	0.2
Community Based Organization	85,373	6.0
Faith Based Organization	8,633	0.6
Public School Districts	1,222,832	85.9
Other	17,827	1.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,423,709</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	43,633	5.7
College/University	1,843	0.2
Community Based Organization	58,079	7.5
Faith Based Organization	6,579	0.9
Public School Districts	649,346	84.2
Other	11,294	1.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>770,774</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 (55,836 times/week), physical activity (51,351 times/week), literacy (39,969 times/week), and STEM (39,679 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>3</sup>**

Activity	Times per Week	Times per Month
Community/Service Learning	6,451	7,164
Counseling Programs	3,950	3,901
Drug Prevention	2,125	2,839
College & Career Readiness	11,010	4,680
Homework Help	55,836	1,493
Mentoring	9,806	5,144

<sup>3</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.

Activity	Times per Week	Times per Month
Physical Activity	51,351	5,506
Tutoring	33,362	2,509
Youth Leadership	13,471	8,129

**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	1,361	4,441	1,552	331
Counseling Programs	995	1,891	341	44
Drug Prevention	1,072	2,106	334	53
College & Career Readiness	882	3,514	1,084	228
Homework Help	5,531	6,726	1,215	177
Mentoring	1,323	2,750	814	119
Physical Activity	5,286	7,445	1,640	239
Tutoring	2,759	5,492	1,140	147
Youth Leadership	2,126	4,507	1,075	142

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

Academic Activity	Times per Week	Times per Month
Arts & Music	30,222	10,830
Entrepreneurship	3,475	2,814
Literacy	39,969	4,785
English Language Learners' Support	8,947	1,978
STEM	39,679	8,564
Truancy Prevention	2,268	1,142
Violence Prevention	3,419	2,616

**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	3,168	8,119	1,481	194
Entrepreneurship	506	2,020	442	69
Literacy	3,218	7,477	1,544	250
English Language Learners' Support	840	1,930	518	68

Academic Activity	Less than 1 Hour	1-2 Hours	2-4 Hours	More than 4 Hours
STEM	2,765	9,190	1,983	330
Truancy Prevention	689	773	228	36
Violence Prevention	1,193	1,808	282	37

#### D. Staffing Type

Participating centers employ paid and volunteer staff to assist with programming. There were a reported 112,571 paid staff and 36,331 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 (42.9%, n = 48,275) followed by other non-teaching school staff (16.9%, n = 18,992). Community members served as the majority of volunteers (25.4%, n = 9,223) used by the centers followed by college students (20.7%, n = 7,520).

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

Staffing Type	Paid Staff N	Paid Staff %	Volunteer Staff N	Volunteer Staff %
Center Administrators	9,557	8.5	1,501	4.1
College Students	8,469	7.5	7,520	20.7
Community Members	4,823	4.3	9,223	25.4
High School Students	3,834	3.4	5,691	15.7
Parents	978	0.9	6,540	18.0
School Day Teachers	48,275	42.9	2,025	5.6
Other Non-Teaching School Staff	18,992	16.9	1,890	5.2
Subcontracted	10,715	9.5	707	1.9
Other	6,928	6.2	1,234	3.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>112,571</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>36,331</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 (49.1%, n = 698,684) and female (48.7%, n = 693,467) attendees. In terms of race/ethnicity, the majority of the attendees were identified as Hispanic (38.1%, n = 543,091), with White (26.3%, n = 374,297) and Black (20.3%, n = 289,221) following. There was a considerably larger number of Pre-K-5 regular attendees (59.8%, n = 460,570) in comparison to 6<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> grade regular attendees (40.2%, n = 310,204).

**Table 16. Participant Demographics**

	Spring N	Spring %
--	----------	----------

	Spring N	Spring %
<b>1. Attendance</b>		
<30 Days	652,935	45.9
30-59 Days	281,109	19.7
60-89 Days	189,051	13.3
>90 Days	300,614	21.1
Total	<b>1,423,709</b>	100.0%
<b>2. Sex</b>		
Male	698,684	49.1
Female	693,467	48.7
Unknown	31,558	2.2
Total	<b>1,423,709</b>	100.0%
<b>3. Race/Ethnicity</b>		
Asian	55,349	3.9
Black	289,221	20.3
Hispanic	543,091	38.1
Native American	46,231	3.2
Pacific Islander	10,617	0.7
White	374,297	26.3
Two or More Races	50,719	3.6
Unknown	54,184	3.8
Total	<b>1,423,709</b>	100.0%
<b>4. Grade Level</b>		
Pre-K – 5 <sup>th</sup>	636,559	44.7
6 <sup>th</sup> – 12 <sup>th</sup>	787,150	55.3
Total	<b>1,423,709</b>	100.0%
<b>5. English Language Learners*</b>	198,669	14.0%
<b>6. Free &amp; Reduced Lunch*</b>	947,096	66.5%
<b>7. Special Needs*</b>	144,529	10.2%

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

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

<b>Grade Level</b>	<b>Total Student Attendees</b>	<b>Total Student Attendees</b>	<b>Total Regular Student Attendees</b>	<b>Total Regular Student Attendees</b>
	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Pre-K – 5 <sup>th</sup>	636,559	44.7	460,570	59.8
6 <sup>th</sup> – 12 <sup>th</sup>	787,150	55.3	310,204	40.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,423,709</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>770,774</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

## **F. Estimated Per-Student Expenditures**

For the 2016-2017 academic school year, the Department of Education awarded \$1,152,275,862 to 21st 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>4</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 = 286,039) or family members served (n = 303,013). This estimated expenditure is not connected in any way to G5, the Department of Education's grant management system.

---

<sup>4</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>\$1,152,275,862</b>	<b>770,774</b>	<b>1,423,709</b>	<b>\$1,494.96*</b>	<b>\$809.35*</b>
1. Alabama	\$17,260,111	8,610	12,423	\$2,004.66	\$1,389.37
2. Alaska	\$5,716,698	2,756	4,222	\$2,074.27	\$1,354.03
3. Arizona	\$24,922,689	46,393	102,340	\$537.21	\$243.53
4. Arkansas	\$11,770,721	7,888	13,745	\$1,492.23	\$856.36
5. Bureau of Indian Education	\$8,244,923	5,633	13,649	\$1,463.68	\$604.07
6. California	\$132,664,805	134,056	335,139	\$989.62	\$395.85
7. Colorado	\$11,580,347	6,274	15,862	\$1,845.77	\$730.07
8. Connecticut	\$9,056,726	7,551	9,262	\$1,199.41	\$977.84
9. Delaware	\$5,716,698	2,174	2,863	\$2,629.58	\$1,996.75
10. District of Columbia	\$5,716,698	3,067	4,339	\$1,863.94	\$1,317.52
11. Florida	\$61,676,722	38,142	52,698	\$1,617.03	\$1,170.38
12. Georgia	\$38,753,514	20,030	26,613	\$1,934.77	\$1,456.19
13. Hawaii	\$5,716,698	3,349	8,738	\$1,706.99	\$654.23
14. Idaho	\$5,716,698	4,465	7,044	\$1,280.34	\$811.57
15. Illinois	\$52,512,685	26,612	46,009	\$1,973.27	\$1,141.36
16. Indiana	\$20,107,308	13,094	20,035	\$1,535.61	\$1,003.61
17. Iowa	\$7,163,818	7,445	13,337	\$962.23	\$537.14
18. Kansas	\$8,141,897	9,597	16,674	\$848.38	\$488.30
19. Kentucky	\$16,237,484	13,611	32,946	\$1,192.97	\$492.85
20. Louisiana	\$21,909,516	9,690	15,318	\$2,261.04	\$1,430.31
21. Maine	\$5,716,698	3,759	6,760	\$1,520.80	\$845.67
22. Maryland	\$15,545,639	6,951	9,581	\$2,236.46	\$1,622.55
23. Massachusetts	\$18,330,515	17,239	19,156	\$1,063.32	\$956.91
24. Michigan	\$36,796,796	12,724	18,550	\$2,891.92	\$1,983.65
25. Minnesota	\$11,691,963	11,306	21,779	\$1,034.14	\$536.85
26. Mississippi	\$14,624,111	2,326	3,138	\$6,287.24	\$4,660.33
27. Missouri	\$18,745,946	9,748	17,915	\$1,923.06	\$1,046.38
28. Montana	\$5,716,698	6,097	14,419	\$937.62	\$396.47
29. Nebraska	\$5,716,698	13,380	19,129	\$427.26	\$298.85
30. Nevada	\$9,212,312	6,443	10,081	\$1,429.82	\$913.83
31. New Hampshire	\$5,716,698	4,538	8,124	\$1,259.74	\$703.68
32. New Jersey	\$26,176,381	11,900	14,515	\$2,199.70	\$1,803.40
33. New Mexico	\$9,094,016	7,542	11,267	\$1,205.78	\$807.14
34. New York	\$87,479,759	26,184	62,734	\$3,340.96	\$1,394.46
35. North Carolina	\$32,912,088	13,076	18,047	\$2,516.98	\$1,823.69
36. North Dakota	\$5,716,698	4,546	6,795	\$1,257.52	\$841.31
37. Ohio	\$43,194,896	12,883	20,243	\$3,352.86	\$2,133.82
38. Oklahoma	\$12,205,458	8,734	13,035	\$1,397.46	\$936.36
39. Oregon	\$10,765,240	9,429	21,739	\$1,141.72	\$495.20
40. Pennsylvania	\$42,265,238	15,225	30,386	\$2,776.04	\$1,390.94

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	\$29,380,201	11,028	13,060	\$2,664.15	\$2,249.63
42. Rhode Island	\$5,716,698	4,151	10,659	\$1,377.19	\$536.33
43. South Carolina	\$17,895,679	10,720	13,017	\$1,669.37	\$1,374.79
44. South Dakota	\$5,716,698	4,648	12,183	\$1,229.93	\$469.24
45. Tennessee	\$22,420,011	29,998	45,652	\$747.38	\$491.11
46. Texas	\$103,166,330	70,487	107,187	\$1,463.62	\$962.49
47. Utah	\$6,946,194	10,184	21,632	\$682.07	\$321.11
48. Vermont	\$5,716,698	5,539	11,579	\$1,032.08	\$493.71
49. Virgin Islands	\$691,399	928	1,251	\$745.04	\$552.68
50. Virginia	\$19,244,252	8,929	17,248	\$2,155.25	\$1,115.74
51. Washington	\$18,057,689	9,830	16,213	\$1,837.00	\$1,113.78
52. West Virginia	\$6,972,211	5,455	12,054	\$1,278.13	\$578.41
53. Wisconsin	\$16,424,500	19,925	33,278	\$824.32	\$493.55
54. Wyoming	\$5,716,698	4,485	8,047	\$1,274.63	\$710.41

Note. Funding per state was obtained from directly from the 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 2016-2017 academic school year, 9,592 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 16-17 this program served over 2 million student and family member participants and employed 112,571 paid staff and 36,331 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 2 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.