

21st Century Community Learning Centers
(21st CCLC)
Overview of the
21st CCLC Annual Performance Data:
2017-2018

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

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 Elementary and Secondary Education.

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. (2019). *21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) analytic support for evaluation and program monitoring: An overview of the 21st CCLC performance data: 2017-2018* (14th report). Washington, DC.

CONTENT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	2
SECTION 1: GPRA RESULTS	3
A. GPRA Measures #1-3: Percentage of Participants Improving their Mathematics Grade	3
B. GPRA Measures #4-6: Percentage of Participants Improving their English Grade	4
Table 2. Regular Attendees Who Improved their English Grade	4
C. GPRA Measures #7-8: Percentage of Participants Improving on Reading and Mathematics State Assessments	5
Table 3. Regular Attendees Improving their Performance on Reading or Mathematics State Assessments	5
D. GPRA Measures #9-11: Percentage of Participants Improving on Homework Completion and Class Participation	6
Table 4. Percentage of Regular Attendees Who Improved their Homework Completion and Class Participation	7
E. GPRA Measures #12-14: Percentage of Participants Demonstrating Improvement in Student Behavior	8
Table 5. Percentage of Regular Attendees Who Improved Student Behavior	8
SECTION 2: GRANTEE AND CENTER CHARACTERISTICS	9
A. Center Type	9
Table 6. Grantees' Centers Broken Down by Organization Type	9
B. People Served	10
Table 7. Attendees Served based on Type	10
Table 8. Total Attendees by Center Type	10
Table 9. Regular Attendees by Center Type	10
C. Activity Participation	11
Table 10. Times per Week/Month of Each Activity Offered	11
Table 11. Frequency of Each Activity Offered	11
Table 12. Times per Week/Month of Each Academic Activity Offered	12
Table 13. Frequency of Each Academic Activity Offered	12
D. Staffing Type	12
Table 14. Staffing Type per Paid and Volunteer Staff	13
E. Attendees Served per Demographic	13
Table 15. Participant Demographics	13
Table 16. Number of Participants per Grade Level	14
CONCLUSION	14

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) program provides students in high-need communities with access to high-quality afterschool programming in the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands and the Bureau of Indian Education. All 21st CCLC centers provide programming with academic enrichment and youth development that are designed to support participants' academic success. For the 2017-2018 school year, the U.S. Department of Education (Department) awarded grants to State educational agencies, which in turn provided subgrants to 10,249 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) performance indicators associated with the 21st CCLC program. These metrics assist the Department in evaluating the progress of the 21st CCLC program. The APR is completed annually by grantees to summarize the operational elements of their program, the student population served, and the extent to which students improved in specific areas.

2017-2018 APR highlights:

- In 2017-2018, 2 million people were served by this program:
 - School year total student attendees (1,382,570), including regular¹ student attendees (752,195)
 - Summer attendees (293,232)
 - Adults and family members (348,565)
- Overall, there was a fairly even split between males (48.7 percent, or 673,007) and females (48.8 percent, or 674,805).
- The majority of the attendees were identified as Hispanic (34.2 percent or 472,773), followed by White (29.5 percent, or 407,937) and Black (21.0 percent, or 290,195).
- 49.7 percent improved their mathematics grade.
- 48.8 percent improved their English grade.
- 25.5 percent improved scores on the State assessments in elementary reading and 18.6 percent reported improved scores in middle or high school mathematics.
- 69.3 percent of teachers reported improved rates of homework completion and class participation among participating students.
- 62.4 percent of teachers reported improved student behavior among participating students.

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

¹ Regular is defined as attendance for more than 30 days during the academic year. See Table 8 for more information.

INTRODUCTION

Originally created in 1994 through the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and expanded through Congress's approval of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in 2001, the 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) program was reauthorized in 2015 as part of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). It provides students in high-need, high-poverty communities the opportunity to participate in afterschool programming. Present in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands and the Bureau of Indian Education programming, academic enrichment and youth development programs are designed to enhance participants' well-being and academic success. For the 2017-2018 academic school year, the U.S. Department of Education (Department) awarded grants to State educational agencies, which in turn provided subgrants to 10,249 centers.

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 an important way that the Department evaluates the success and progress of the 21st CCLC program. The APR is completed annually by grantees to summarize the operational elements of their programs, 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, followed by community-based organizations. In the past year, the 21st CCLC program served more than 2 million people and employed 108,509 paid staff and 33,622 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 data. The report concludes with a demographic analysis of students and staff to provide context and a holistic picture of the 21st CCLC program.

Methodology

Data were entered at the State level into the 21APR Data Collection system during a collection period throughout the year.

State definitions of elementary and middle may differ slightly. 21APR collects the number of participants by grade level, then aggregates the demographic and performance data into two categories as listed in the GPRA: elementary and middle/high. In 21APR, elementary includes PreK – 5th grades and middle/high includes 6th through 12th grades. States report the total number days attended by participants per grade level. Attendance is differentiated between “regular” and “non-regular”. For the purposes of reporting on the GPRA, “regular” is defined as attending 30 days or more throughout the academic year. Performance on the GPRA are not collected for non-regular, or those who attend less than 30 days during the academic year. Some data definitions are determined by the States themselves. For instance, on GPRA indicators where “needs to improve” is measured, States define and communicate to their Grantees what “needs to improve” means

An aggregate statistic for each of the items analyzed is provided. States were not required to submit on every indicator (State assessment, teacher-reported or grades) and they had discretion to select from among the indicators. As a result, descriptive statistics throughout the report are calculated on the States that provided data on the given measure. For example, if only 46 States out of the total 50 provided data on student grades, then the percentages are only based on the data obtained from those 46. Incorporating missing data from the other four 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 is a change from previous reporting of the 21st CCLC APR, but it provides a more accurate representation of

performance against the GPRA measure on a national level. Finally, it is important to note that each States, territory or the Bureau of Indian Education is the authoritative source of their data; the APR reports on the data provided.

The data were certified by the State educational agency (SEA) for the 21st CCLC program in each State.

SECTION 1: GPRA RESULTS

The GPRA indicators are a key method by which the Department measures the effectiveness and efficiency of the program based on the following two overall goals:

1. Participants in the 21st CCLC programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.
2. 21st CCLC 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 have been established for the 21st CCLC program. 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. Each State had to report on at least one of the sets of measures – grades, State assessments, or teacher-reported student behavior. Some States chose to report on more than one of the sets of measures. For each measure, the analysis below is based only on the States who elected to provide data for that measure; if a States does not report on a particular GPRA measure, they are not listed in association with that measure. In addition, the GPRA measures ask States to report only on regular participants (30 days or more of participation). This provides a narrower slice of 21st CCLC participants for the GPRA analysis than if all participating students’ data were used in the calculations.

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 Participants Improving their Mathematics Grade

- States are asked to report on participants who needed to improve; some students may have participated but were not in need of grade improvement. Each state may set the scale or definition for improvement.
- 22 out of 54 States reported on these measures.
- Overall, States reported 51.3 percent improved mathematics grades in elementary grades, 46.5 percent in middle and high school, and 49.7 percent for all students.

Table 1. Regular Attendees Who Improved their Mathematics Grade

State/Territory	Mathematics Elementary	Mathematics Middle/High School	Mathematics All Students
1. Arizona	65.6	55.9	62.5
2. Delaware	78.8	60.7	71.9
3. District of Columbia	57.2	49.4	56.4

State/Territory	Mathematics Elementary	Mathematics Middle/High School	Mathematics All Students
4. Florida	61.2	55.4	59.2
5. Georgia	43.4	43.7	43.5
6. Iowa	44.9	45.7	45.1
7. Kansas	51.4	59.8	53.3
8. Kentucky	56.2	51.6	54.6
9. Louisiana	80.9	88.0	82.8
10. Maryland	66.1	53.3	62.0
11. Michigan	60.4	43.2	53.4
12. Mississippi	74.8	70.2	72.9
13. Missouri	34.7	52.8	38.3
14. Nevada	29.1	29.5	29.2
15. Pennsylvania	45.9	42.0	44.1
16. Puerto Rico	69.8	64.4	67.8
17. South Carolina	80.5	83.2	81.4
18. Tennessee	56.0	57.0	56.3
19. Texas	27.0	26.9	27.0
20. Virgin Islands	84.3	60.8	71.3
21. Virginia	64.4	54.2	59.7
22. Wyoming	86.9	79.6	86.1
Overall	51.3	46.5	49.7

Note: States elect to report on one, two, or three of the GPRA measures. Raw scores were used to calculate overall percentage improvement. When calculating the percentage improvement “overall,” the total amount of regular attendees with reported APR results were used in the calculations across all States/territories who reported on this measure.

B. GPRA Measures #4-6: Percentage of Participants Improving their English Grade

- States are asked to report on participants who needed to improve; some students may have participated but were not in need of grade improvement.
- 22 States reported on these measures.
- Overall, States reported 50.1 percent of students improved English grades in elementary, 46.2 percent in middle or high school, and 48.8 percent for all students.

Table 2. Regular Attendees Who Improved their English Grade

State/Territory	English Elementary	English Middle/High School	English All Students
1. Arizona	65.5	55.9	62.6
2. Delaware	80.4	70.0	76.9
3. District of Columbia	59.8	52.6	58.9
4. Florida	57.7	57.5	57.7
5. Georgia	42.3	44.0	42.9
6. Iowa	51.7	59.6	53.4
7. Kansas	57.2	43.5	53.9

State/Territory	English Elementary	English Middle/High School	English All Students
8. Kentucky	55.5	50.5	53.9
9. Louisiana	82.9	88.8	84.4
10. Maryland	60.6	55.9	59.2
11. Michigan	56.7	45.8	52.5
12. Mississippi	70.5	67.9	69.5
13. Missouri	33.0	55.2	37.4
14. Nevada	27.9	29.3	28.1
15. Pennsylvania	45.2	41.1	43.3
16. Puerto Rico	68.5	66.1	67.8
17. South Carolina	75.0	83.8	78.2
18. Tennessee	53.9	54.1	54.0
19. Texas	25.2	25.8	25.5
20. Virgin Islands	78.6	60.3	67.0
21. Virginia	64.5	54.7	60.2
22. Wyoming	88.0	81.2	87.2
Overall	50.1	46.2	48.8

Note: States elect to report on one, two, or three of the GPRA measures. Raw scores were used to calculate overall percentage improvement. When calculating the percentage improvement “overall,” the total amount of regular attendees with reported APR results were used in the calculations across all States/territories.

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

- States are asked to report on participants who needed to improve their State assessment scores; some students may have participated but who were not identified as in need of improving their State assessment score.
- 25 States reported on this measure – improving from not proficient to proficient or above on the reading/language arts State assessment.
- Overall, the States reported that 25.5 percent of students improved their reading/language arts State assessment score in elementary and 18.6 percent on middle or high school mathematics assessment.

Table 3. Regular Attendees Improving their Performance on Reading or Mathematics State Assessments

State/Territory	Reading Elementary	Mathematics Middle/High School
1. Arkansas	12.9	11.9
2. Alaska	6.7	3.9
3. California	9.3	10.2
4. District of Columbia	17.2	20.0
5. Georgia	27.7	27.3
6. Idaho	33.6	11.4

State/Territory	Reading Elementary	Mathematics Middle/High School
7. Illinois	16.6	22.8
8. Iowa	30.7	33.6
9. Kansas	36.4	24.7
10. Maryland	28.8	19.8
11. Massachusetts	17.6	8.3
12. Michigan	9.1	4.0
13. Minnesota	6.8	10.4
14. Montana	19.3	15.3
15. New York	24.6	24.6
16. Ohio	49.5	42.4
17. Oklahoma	11.7	10.7
18. Pennsylvania	20.2	10.0
19. South Dakota	19.7	7.2
20. Texas	38.3	44.6
21. Utah	30.9	22.3
22. Vermont	23.8	16.3
23. Virgin Islands	60.0	0.0
24. Virginia	52.8	46.2
25. Washington	37.3	29.4
Overall	25.5	18.6

Note: States elect to report on one, two, or three of the GPRA measures. Raw scores were used to calculate overall percentage improvement. When calculating the percentage improvement “overall,” the total amounts of regular attendees with reported APR results were used in the calculations across all States/territories. Not all grade levels take States assessments each year. Only reported data are used in the analysis, but this may not represent all participants.

D. GPRA Measures #9-11: Percentage of Participants Improving on Homework Completion and Class Participation²

- States are asked to report on participants who needed to improve; some students participating in the 21st CCLC program were not identified as need to improve either their rate of homework completion or class participation.
- 41 States reported data on homework completion/class participation, which was reported and submitted by teachers.
- Overall, the States reported 70.1 percent of regular attendees improved their homework completion and class participation in elementary, 67.5 percent in middle or high school, and 69.3 percent for all students.

² The definitions of who needed to improve and/or scale for class participation and homework completion are operationalized by each state or territory.

Table 4. Percentage of Regular Attendees Who Improved their Homework Completion and Class Participation

State/Territory	HW/CP Elementary	HW/CP Middle/High School	HW/CP All Students
1. Alabama	93.2	86.3	91.7
2. Alaska	54.8	56.1	55.1
3. Arizona	76.3	70.4	74.4
4. Bureau of Indian Affairs	63.1	78.6	70.0
5. Colorado	69.2	53.0	62.7
6. Connecticut	41.0	43.5	41.9
7. Delaware	72.2	69.4	71.2
8. District of Columbia	47.9	45.9	47.5
9. Florida	84.7	82.7	84.0
10. Georgia	75.5	76.6	75.9
11. Hawaii	84.3	82.3	83.3
12. Illinois	68.2	70.2	69.1
13. Indiana	82.5	79.7	81.8
14. Iowa	75.1	56.8	70.7
15. Kansas	63.4	70.6	64.6
16. Kentucky	62.6	62.5	62.6
17. Louisiana	80.5	86.6	82.0
18. Maine	33.4	39.5	35.3
19. Maryland	73.8	92.3	77.5
20. Michigan	59.5	54.7	57.9
21. Mississippi	80.3	73.1	78.0
22. Montana	63.7	70.9	64.6
23. Nebraska	64.5	67.1	65.1
24. Nevada	72.3	66.5	71.4
25. New Hampshire	29.2	29.9	29.3
26. New Jersey	57.0	59.1	58.0
27. New Mexico	86.1	91.1	87.1
28. North Carolina	84.2	86.1	84.7
29. North Dakota	87.3	88.0	87.4
30. Oregon	74.4	72.1	73.3
31. Pennsylvania	51.4	50.2	50.9
32. Puerto Rico	87.8	77.2	84.6
33. Rhode Island	30.9	37.0	33.0
34. South Carolina	62.9	65.0	63.3
35. Tennessee	66.5	64.6	65.9
36. Utah	78.1	76.5	77.7
37. Virgin Islands	78.8	98.1	90.7
38. Virginia	79.1	71.4	75.9
39. West Virginia	92.2	95.2	92.9
40. Wisconsin	60.3	54.4	58.9
41. Wyoming	57.2	61.1	57.7

State/Territory	HW/CP Elementary	HW/CP Middle/High School	HW/CP All Students
Overall	70.1	67.5	69.3

Note: States elect to report on one, two, or three of the GPRA measures. Raw scores were used to calculate overall percentage improvement. When calculating the percentage improvement “overall,” the total amounts of regular attendees with reported APR results were used in the calculations across all States/territories/bureau.

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

- States are asked to report on participants who needed to improve³; some students participating in the 21st CCLC program were not identified as needing to improve their behavior.
- 41 States reported data on student behavior, as reported by a survey administered to teachers.
- Overall, the States reported that 63.1 percent of regular attendees demonstrated improved student behavior in elementary, 60.7 percent in middle or high school, and 62.4 percent for all students.

Table 5. Percentage of Regular Attendees Who Improved Student Behavior

State/Territory	Student Behavior Elementary	Student Behavior Middle/High School	Student Behavior All Students
1. Alabama	94.5	89.9	93.5
2. Alaska	55.4	55.0	55.3
3. Arizona	72.6	67.9	71.1
4. Bureau of Indian Affairs	58.8	69.6	63.6
5. Colorado	44.9	37.1	41.7
6. Connecticut	43.6	41.5	42.9
7. Delaware	67.8	64.2	66.5
8. District of Columbia	35.1	40.6	36.2
9. Florida	75.9	77.7	76.5
10. Georgia	47.5	49.8	48.2
11. Hawaii	81.5	78.4	80.1
12. Illinois	57.7	62.5	59.8
13. Indiana	85.0	83.9	84.7
14. Iowa	71.6	54.2	67.4
15. Kansas	51.7	53.8	52.0
16. Kentucky	42.1	38.5	40.8
17. Louisiana	82.3	84.6	82.9
18. Maine	40.4	40.4	40.4
19. Maryland	60.7	86.9	65.9
20. Michigan	57.3	52.0	55.5
21. Mississippi	63.1	55.4	60.7
22. Montana	62.7	68.9	63.4

³ The definitions of who needed to improve is operationalized by each state or territory.

State/Territory	Student Behavior Elementary	Student Behavior Middle/High School	Student Behavior All Students
23. Nebraska	64.5	58.0	59.7
24. Nevada	40.9	34.7	40.0
25. New Hampshire	31.5	23.4	29.4
26. New Jersey	50.3	51.0	50.6
27. New Mexico	90.3	92.9	90.8
28. North Carolina	67.6	74.9	69.4
29. North Dakota	73.4	81.8	74.2
30. Oregon	69.8	62.8	66.9
31. Pennsylvania	41.5	40.0	40.8
32. Puerto Rico	84.4	75.2	81.6
33. Rhode Island	30.3	34.9	31.9
34. South Carolina	79.9	80.9	80.1
35. Tennessee	61.2	60.1	60.8
36. Utah	67.1	64.1	66.4
37. Virgin Islands	72.7	0.0	27.9
38. Virginia	67.3	68.6	67.8
39. West Virginia	91.3	95.3	92.3
40. Wisconsin	62.4	61.1	62.1
41. Wyoming	53.5	52.1	53.4
Overall	63.1	60.7	62.4

Note: States elect to report on one, two, or three of the GPRA measures. Raw scores were used to calculate overall percentage improvement. When calculating the percentage improvement “overall,” the total amounts of regular attendees with reported APR results were used in the calculations across all States/territories/bureau.

SECTION 2: GRANTEE AND CENTER CHARACTERISTICS

A. Center Type

Table 6 displays the results of the types of centers for all 54 States/territories/bureaus. Of the 10,249 centers, 82.1 percent were classified as school districts (8,417) and 9.9 percent as community-based organizations (1,012).

Table 6. Grantees’ Centers Broken Down by Organization Type

Center Type	Number	Percentage
Charter School	462	4.5
College/University	31	0.3
Community Based Organization	1,012	9.9
Faith Based Organization	122	1.2
Public School Districts	8,417	82.1
Other	205	2.0
Total	10,249	100.0

Note: The category “Other” is a combination of the following types: 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 2017-2018, over 2 million people were served by the 21st CCLC program. The total number of attendees served by the program was calculated by adding the total number of student attendees, which includes the number of regular⁴ student attendees, to the number of summer attendees and adults/family members served. Table 7 displays the number of people served by the program per classification:

- Total student attendees (1,382,570) including regular student attendees (752,195),
- Summer attendees (293,232), and
- Adults/family members (348,565).

Tables 8 and 9 provide a look at attendance based on center type. The majority of regular attendees attended programs provided by public school districts (83.7 percent or 629,420).

Table 7. Attendees Served based on Type

Attendees Served	Number	Percentage
Regular Student Attendees	752,195	54.4
Non-regular Student Attendees	630,375	45.6
<i>Total Student Attendees (including regular students)</i>	1,382,570	68.3
Summer Attendees	293,232	14.5
Adults/Family Members	348,565	17.2
Total	2,024,367	100.0

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

Table 8. Total Attendees by Center Type

Center Type	Number	Percentage
Charter School	94,832	6.9
College/University	806	0.1
Community Based Organization	84,141	6.1
Faith Based Organization	8,057	0.6
Public School Districts	1,176,698	85.1
Other	18,036	1.3
Total	1,382,570	100.0

Note: The category Other is a combination of the following types: 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 9. Regular Attendees by Center Type

Center Type	Number	Percentage
Charter School	49,481	6.6

⁴ Regular is defined as attendance for more than 30 days during the academic year.

Center Type	Number	Percentage
College/University	420	0.1
Community Based Organization	54,584	7.3
Faith Based Organization	6,644	0.9
Public School Districts	629,420	83.7
Other	11,646	1.5
Total	752,195	100.0

Note: The category Other is a combination of the following types: 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 (43,253 times/week), physical activity (41,565 times/week), literacy (32,562 times/week), and STEM (34,102 times/week). The majority of activities were offered from less than 1-hour to 1-2 hours per week with the exception of arts and music, community/service learning, physical activity, literacy, college and career readiness, homework help, and STEM activities, which were offered anywhere from less than 1-hour to 2-4 hours per week. Tables 10-13, below, provide the participation frequency and amount for the most common activities identified by grantees, within the categories provided in the 21APR system. It does not include all possible activities that may be offered by a center.

Table 10. Times per Week/Month of Each Activity Offered⁵

Activity	Times per Week	Times per Month
Community/Service Learning	5,807	5,544
Counseling Programs	3,828	3,221
Drug Prevention	1,785	2,400
College and Career Readiness	8,023	3,668
Homework Help	43,253	1,127
Mentoring	8,244	4,368
Physical Activity	41,565	4,394
Tutoring	25,192	2,218
Youth Leadership	10,918	6,737

Table 11. Frequency of Each Activity Offered

Activity	Less than 1 Hour	1-2 Hours	2-4 Hours	More than 4 Hours
Community/Service Learning	1,052	3,585	1,317	236
Counseling Programs	1,135	1,528	240	33
Drug Prevention	930	1,759	243	61

⁵ Previously, activities were reported in hours. This aligns with the data collection in the new system but may make comparisons with older reports more challenging.

Activity	Less than 1 Hour	1-2 Hours	2-4 Hours	More than 4 Hours
College and Career Readiness	679	2,636	859	175
Homework Help	4,617	4,968	962	117
Mentoring	1,212	2,362	604	92
Physical Activity	4,193	6,018	1,344	190
Tutoring	2,246	4,039	891	103
Youth Leadership	1,744	3,681	884	127

Table 12. Times per Week/Month of Each Academic Activity Offered

Academic Activity	Times per Week	Times per Month
Arts and Music	25,658	8,826
Entrepreneurship	2,903	2,601
Literacy	32,562	3,880
English Language Learners' Support	7,252	1,550
STEM	34,102	6,133
Truancy Prevention	1,882	1,127
Violence Prevention	2,362	2,455

Table 13. Frequency of Each Academic Activity Offered

Academic Activity	Less than 1 Hour	1-2 Hours	2-4 Hours	More than 4 Hours
Arts and Music	2,618	6,636	1,249	183
Entrepreneurship	454	1,745	442	59
Literacy	2,636	6,175	1,159	167
English Language Learners' Support	771	1,437	421	45
STEM	2,343	7,635	1,516	306
Truancy Prevention	656	680	171	37
Violence Prevention	918	1,630	212	51

D. Staffing Type

Participating centers employed paid and volunteer staff to assist with programming. There were a reported 108,509 paid staff and 33,622 volunteer staff. Table 14 provides the amount of paid and volunteer staff broken down by type for all 54 States/territories. Among the paid staff, the majority were center administrators (20.7%, n = 22,412) followed by school day teachers (20.1%, n = 21,784). Center administrators also served as the majority of volunteers (23.0%, n = 7,717) used by the centers followed by school day teachers (19.8%, n = 6,666).

Table 14. Staffing Type per Paid and Volunteer Staff

Staffing Type	Paid Staff Number	Paid Staff Percentage	Volunteer Staff Number	Volunteer Staff Percentage
Center Administrators	22,412	20.7	7,717	23.0
College Students	10,860	10.0	2,150	6.4
Community Members	7,934	7.3	1,802	5.4
High School Students	6,850	6.3	3,282	9.8
Parents	3,574	3.3	1,056	3.1
School Day Teachers	21,784	20.1	6,666	19.8
Other Non-Teaching School Staff	21,463	19.8	5,773	17.2
Subcontracted	7,004	6.5	3,068	9.1
Other	6,628	6.1	2,108	6.3
Total	108,509	100.0	33,622	100.0

E. Attendees Served per Demographic

Tables 15 and 16 provide a demographic depiction of the program attendees broken down by sex, race/ethnicity, and grade level. Overall, there was a fairly even split between male (48.7 percent or 673,007) and female (48.8 percent or 674,805) attendees. In terms of race/ethnicity, the majority of the attendees were identified as Hispanic (34.2 percent or 472,773), with white (29.5 percent or 407,937) and black (21.0 percent or 290,195) following. There was a considerably larger number of regular attendees in prekindergarten through grade 5 (60.9 percent or 458,082) in comparison to (39.1294,113).

Table 15. Participant Demographics

	Number	Percentage
1. Attendance		
<30 Days	630,375	45.6
30-59 Days	265,664	19.2
60-89 Days	174,506	12.6
>90 Days	312,025	22.6
Total	1,382,570	100.0
2. Sex		
Male	673,007	48.7
Female	674,805	48.8
Data Not Provided	34,758	2.5
Total	1,382,570	100.0
3. Race/Ethnicity		
Asian	51,471	3.7
Black	290,195	21.0
Hispanic	472,773	34.2
Native American	45,130	3.3
Pacific Islander	12,194	0.9
White	407,937	29.5
Two or More Races	47,748	3.5
Data Not Provided	55,122	4.0
Total	1,382,570	100.0
4. Grade Level		

	Number	Percentage
Pre-K – 5th	632,999	45.8
6th – 12th	749,571	54.2
Total	1,382,570	100.0
5. English Language Learners*	195,742	14.2
6. Free and Reduced Lunch*	966,482	69.9
7. Special Needs*⁶	146,930	10.6

*Percentages were calculated using the total number of attendees.

Table 16. Number of Participants per Grade Level

Grade Level	Total Student Attendees Number	Total Student Attendees Percentage	Total Regular Student Attendees Number	Total Regular Student Attendees Percentage
Pre-K – 5th	632,999	45.8	458,082	60.9
6th – 12th	749,571	54.2	294,113	39.1
Total	1,382,570	100.0	752,195	100.0

CONCLUSION

For the 2017-2018 academic school year, 10,249 centers received Federal funding to implement the 21st CCLC program. The majority of these were classified as school districts followed by community-based organizations. During 2017-2018, this program served over 2 million student and family member participants and employed 108,509 paid staff and 33,622 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 21st 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 21st 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, student grades, and mathematics or reading/language arts assessment results.

⁶ Special Needs is defined as a participant who has a current IEP (Individualized Education Program) or 504 Plan (Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973).