

Overview of the
Nita M. Lowey 21st Century Learning
Centers (21st CCLC)
Annual Performance Data:
2018-2019

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-OPE-17-A-0015/91990019F0370. 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. (2020). *21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) analytic support for evaluation and program monitoring: An overview of the 21st CCLC performance data: 2018-2019* (15th 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	6
D. GPRA Measures #9-11: Percentage of Participants Improving on Homework Completion and Class Participation	7
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	10
B. People Served	10
Table 7. Attendees Served based on Type	10
Table 8. Total Attendees by Center Type	11
Table 9. Regular Attendees by Center Type	11
C. Activity Participation	11
Table 10. Times per Week/Month of Each Activity Offered	11
Table 11. Frequency of Each Activity Offered	12
Table 12. Times per Week/Month of Each Academic Activity Offered	12
Table 13. Frequency of Each Academic Activity Offered	12
D. Staffing Type	13
Table 14. Staffing Type per Paid and Volunteer Staff	13
E. Attendees Served per Demographic	13
Table 15. Participant Demographics	13
CONCLUSION	14

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Nita M. Lowey 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) grant provides students in high-need communities with access to high-quality afterschool programming in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands and for 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 2018-2019 school year, the U.S. Department of Education (Department) awarded grants to State educational agencies, which in turn provided sub-awards to 10,125 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. APR data are collected throughout the program year and certified annually by the State Education Agent (SEA). The data include specified details on student demographics, attendance, staffing, programming and the extent to which students improved on the outcomes put forth by the GPRA.

2018-2019 APR highlights:

- In 2018-2019, over 2 million people were served by this program:
 - School year total student attendees (1,367,012), including regular¹ student attendees (749,877)
 - Summer attendees (297,383)
 - Adults and family members (381,018)
- Overall, there was a fairly even split between males (48.9 percent, or 667,881) and females (49.7 percent, or 679,854).
- The majority of the attendees were identified as Hispanic (39.0 percent or 532,907), followed by White (25.0 percent, or 341,338) and Black (20.5 percent, or 280,664).
- 47.6 percent improved their mathematics grade.
- 47.7 percent improved their English grade.
- 26.0 percent improved scores on the State assessments in elementary reading and 19.2 percent reported improved scores in middle or high school mathematics.
- 69.2 percent of teachers reported improved rates of homework completion and class participation among participating students.
- 62.0 percent of teachers reported improved student behavior among participating students.

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 Nita M. Lowey 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st 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, the Virgin Islands and the Bureau of Indian Education, 21st CCLC funded programs provide academic enrichment and youth development. 21st CCLC programs are designed to enhance participants' well-being and academic success. For the 2018-2019 academic school year, the U.S. Department of Education (Department) awarded grants to State educational agencies, which in turn provided sub-awards to 10,125 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. APR data are collected throughout the program year and certified annually by the State Education Agent (SEA). The data include details on student demographics, attendance, staffing, programming and to the extent which students improved on outcomes put forth by the GPRA indicators.

In the past year, the 21st CCLC program served more than 2 million people and employed 111,607 paid staff and 31,163 volunteer staff. Most of the paid staff were school day teachers and most of the volunteers were community members and college students. The data show that most funded centers were classified as school districts, followed by community-based organizations.

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 collection

Data were entered at the State level into the 21APR Data Collection system during three distinct collection periods throughout the year; data are certified annually by the State education agency (SEA) designated by the Department.

Definitions

Overall, the APR is guided by the GPRA in terms of both data collection and reporting. Basic parameters of operational definitions are put forth by the Department and provided both within the 21APR system and within the support materials. However, some State-to-State variation exists. For example, State definitions of elementary and middle may differ slightly. 21APR collects the number of participants by grade level and aggregates the demographic and performance data into two categories as listed in the GPRA: elementary and middle/high. Elementary includes PreK–5th grade and middle/high includes 6th–12th grade. Of further note, 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 indicators, “regular” is defined as attending 30 days or more throughout the academic year. Performance on the GPRA indicators are not collected for non-regular attendance, 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 subgrantees what “needs to improve” means based on the State’s educational context and policies.

Analysis

While the GPRA indicators are the outcome metrics used in this APR, States were not required to submit on every GPRA indicator. States have the discretion to choose among the three GPRA indicators – State assessment, teacher-reported student behavior or grades – but are required to provide data on at least one of the outcome measures stipulated in the GPRA report. 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 provided data on student grades, then the percentages are only based on the data obtained from those 46 States. 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. In addition, the GPRA indicators ask States to report only on participants with regular attendance (30 days or more of participation). This provides a narrower sample of 21st CCLC participants for the GPRA indicator analysis than if all participating students' data were used in the calculations. Finally, it is important to note that each State educational agency is responsible for verifying the accuracy of their data.

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. As noted above, States must report on at least one of the GPRA outcome measures – State assessments, teacher-reported student behavior, or grades – but may choose to provide data on more than one of the outcome measures. 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 State 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. 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 States/territories reported on these measures.
- Overall, States reported 48.5 percent improved mathematics grades in elementary grades, 45.6 percent in middle and high school, and 47.6 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. Alabama	53.3	53.3	53.3
2. Arizona	71.7	63.7	69.2
3. Delaware	74.6	76.3	75.4
4. District of Columbia	40.7	45.1	40.9
5. Florida	58.2	56.4	57.7
6. Georgia	47.8	45.0	46.7
7. Iowa	79.8	56.7	76.2
8. Kentucky	64.3	57.0	62.1
9. Louisiana	78.7	77.3	78.2
10. Michigan	59.3	40.9	51.3
11. Mississippi	72.7	71.2	72.4
12. Missouri	28.9	57.4	34.9
13. Nevada	32.7	30.6	32.3
14. New York	42.0	42.1	42.0
15. Pennsylvania	46.2	46.5	46.4
16. Puerto Rico	56.9	48.2	53.6
17. South Carolina	69.7	72.1	70.3
18. Tennessee	55.8	54.6	55.4
19. Texas	28.2	27.1	27.7
20. Virgin Islands	68.8	87.4	83.8
21. Virginia	65.5	58.1	61.9
22. Wyoming	83.4	70.6	81.7
Overall	48.5	45.6	47.6

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 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/territories reported on these measures.
- Overall, States reported 48.2 percent of students improved English grades in elementary, 46.7 percent in middle or high school, and 47.7 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. Alabama	54.4	58.0	55.5

State/Territory	English Elementary	English Middle/High School	English All Students
2. Arizona	70.2	65.3	68.7
3. Delaware	75.2	78.0	76.3
4. District of Columbia	43.1	49.7	43.4
5. Florida	55.2	57.6	55.9
6. Georgia	49.0	47.4	48.4
7. Iowa	75.8	56.5	72.8
8. Kentucky	62.4	58.1	61.3
9. Louisiana	79.8	81.1	80.2
10. Michigan	55.6	0.0	55.6
11. Mississippi	75.3	67.0	73.2
12. Missouri	28.0	57.2	34.2
13. Nevada	30.5	29.4	30.3
14. New York	51.6	46.8	49.9
15. Pennsylvania	45.8	45.8	45.8
16. Puerto Rico	53.8	52.2	53.2
17. South Carolina	63.3	68.9	64.9
18. Tennessee	54.8	52.9	54.1
19. Texas	26.8	28.5	27.5
20. Virgin Islands	68.5	79.2	76.4
21. Virginia	67.2	59.7	63.7
22. Wyoming	81.1	70.8	79.7
Overall	48.2	46.7	47.7

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.

C. GPRA Measures #7-8: Percentage of Participants Improving on Reading/Language Arts 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.
- 27 States/territories reported on this measure – improving from not proficient to proficient or above on the reading/language arts State assessment.
- Overall, the States reported that 26.0 percent of students improved their reading/language arts State assessment score in elementary and 19.2 percent on middle or high school mathematics assessment.

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

State/Territory	Reading/Language Arts Elementary	Mathematics Middle/High School
1. Alaska	9.1	5.7
2. Arkansas	15.9	26.0
3. California	24.8	11.0
4. District of Columbia	5.5	14.1
5. Georgia	1.4	1.9
6. Hawaii	23.3	16.0
7. Idaho	28.8	9.7
8. Illinois	18.2	14.5
9. Iowa	60.3	65.1
10. Kansas	33.7	17.0
11. Maryland	36.6	28.2
12. Massachusetts	14.7	11.2
13. Minnesota	13.8	7.2
14. Montana	18.1	28.3
15. Nevada	14.9	7.5
16. New York	21.5	24.0
17. Ohio	51.6	36.6
18. Oklahoma	8.1	10.4
19. Pennsylvania	31.0	13.9
20. Rhode Island	12.6	4.4
21. South Dakota	28.3	7.4
22. Texas	43.8	46.8
23. Utah	32.7	23.4
24. Vermont	21.8	12.9
25. Virgin Islands	17.5	16.7
26. Virginia	55.3	55.1
27. Washington	20.0	12.6
Overall	26.0	19.2

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.
- 38 States/territories reported data on homework completion/class participation, which was reported and submitted by teachers.
- Overall, the States reported 68.9 percent of regular attendees improved their homework completion and class participation in elementary, 69.9 percent in middle or high school, and 69.2 percent for all students.

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	93.5	88.6	92.4
2. Alaska	53.7	48.9	52.8
3. Arizona	75.9	75.3	75.7
4. Bureau of Indian Education	64.3	75.0	68.8
5. Colorado	85.2	81.4	83.9
6. Connecticut	37.9	44.7	40.1
7. Delaware	76.2	68.5	72.5
8. District of Columbia	51.7	54.8	51.9
9. Florida	84.7	88.2	85.9
10. Georgia	75.8	75.8	75.8
11. Illinois	69.7	67.0	68.7
12. Indiana	83.3	82.6	83.2
13. Iowa	59.9	79.0	66.0
14. Kansas	75.4	80.2	75.9
15. Kentucky	61.4	59.5	60.7
16. Louisiana	81.2	85.0	82.3
17. Maine	29.9	46.6	35.4
18. Michigan	59.3	55.7	58.2
19. Mississippi	87.8	84.8	86.7
20. Montana	67.5	70.1	68.0
21. Nebraska	63.9	67.7	64.7
22. Nevada	71.9	60.2	69.7
23. New Hampshire	26.7	33.7	28.2
24. New Jersey	63.0	66.5	64.6
25. New Mexico	89.7	89.8	89.8
26. North Carolina	86.2	89.5	87.1
27. North Dakota	85.4	84.1	85.3

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

State/Territory	HW/CP Elementary	HW/CP Middle/High School	HW/CP All Students
28. Oregon	64.2	70.6	66.0
29. Pennsylvania	48.4	51.1	49.4
30. Puerto Rico	74.9	73.0	74.3
31. Rhode Island	33.6	35.8	34.3
32. South Carolina	63.8	66.9	64.5
33. Tennessee	66.5	66.8	66.6
34. Utah	67.7	78.2	70.8
35. Virginia	79.1	76.9	78.2
36. West Virginia	62.5	68.8	63.8
37. Wisconsin	47.9	45.9	47.4
38. Wyoming	52.8	63.4	54.0
Overall	68.9	69.9	69.2

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.
- 38 States/territories reported data on student behavior, as reported by a survey administered to teachers.
- Overall, the States reported that 62.0 percent of regular attendees demonstrated improved student behavior in elementary, 62.1 percent in middle or high school, and 62.0 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	92.3	92.2	92.3
2. Alaska	61.7	47.9	59.0
3. Arizona	71.9	72.4	72.1
4. Bureau of Indian Education	60.5	76.1	67.1
5. Colorado	89.0	83.2	87.0
6. Connecticut	40.9	43.5	41.7
7. Delaware	67.6	71.1	69.3
8. District of Columbia	42.2	37.9	42.0
9. Florida	74.4	77.8	75.5
10. Georgia	48.9	49.3	49.0

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
11. Illinois	61.6	57.4	60.0
12. Indiana	85.8	85.6	85.7
13. Iowa	56.0	65.4	59.0
14. Kansas	65.9	68.2	66.2
15. Kentucky	41.5	35.9	39.6
16. Louisiana	71.9	76.6	73.3
17. Maine	38.4	47.1	41.3
18. Michigan	57.4	51.4	55.5
19. Mississippi	68.6	73.1	70.3
20. Montana	64.4	68.6	65.1
21. Nebraska	61.0	56.9	60.2
22. Nevada	40.4	33.1	39.0
23. New Hampshire	29.5	23.9	28.3
24. New Jersey	56.4	54.9	55.7
25. New Mexico	92.3	91.6	92.2
26. North Carolina	74.2	78.8	75.4
27. North Dakota	72.6	77.6	73.0
28. Oregon	69.7	76.2	71.5
29. Pennsylvania	39.2	42.3	40.4
30. Puerto Rico	61.3	64.0	62.1
31. Rhode Island	32.9	37.2	34.4
32. South Carolina	78.7	80.4	79.1
33. Tennessee	64.0	63.3	63.8
34. Utah	58.0	69.1	61.2
35. Virginia	69.2	71.2	70.1
36. West Virginia	53.8	50.4	53.1
37. Wisconsin	50.5	52.8	51.0
38. Wyoming	48.1	49.3	48.2
Overall	62.0	62.1	62.0

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 10,125 centers, 81.4 percent were classified as school districts (8,242) and 10.0 percent as community-based organizations (1,014).

Table 6. Grantees' Centers Broken Down by Organization Type

Center Type	Number	Percentage
Charter School	524	5.2
College/University	26	0.2
Community Based Organization	1,014	10.0
Faith Based Organization	129	1.3
Public School Districts	8,242	81.4
Other	190	1.9
Total	10,125	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 2018-2019, 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 (1,367,012) including regular student attendees (749,877),
- Summer attendees (297,383), and
- Adults/family members (381,018).

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 (85.3 percent or 639,507).

Table 7. Attendees Served based on Type

Attendees Served	Number	Percentage
Regular Student Attendees	749,877	54.9
Non-regular Student Attendees	617,135	45.1
<i>Total Student Attendees (including regular students)</i>	1,367,012	66.8
Summer Attendees	297,383	14.6
Adults/Family Members	381,018	18.6
Total	2,045,413	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.

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

Table 8. Total Attendees by Center Type

Center Type	Number	Percentage
Charter School	76,964	5.6
College/University	1,027	0.1
Community Based Organization	79,495	5.8
Faith Based Organization	6,850	0.5
Public School Districts	1,184,678	86.7
Other	17,998	1.3
Total	1,367,012	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	39,121	5.2
College/University	558	0.1
Community Based Organization	55,007	7.3
Faith Based Organization	4,978	0.7
Public School Districts	639,507	85.3
Other	10,706	1.4
Total	749,877	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 (53,266 times/week), physical activity (51,004 times/week), literacy (41,440 times/week), and science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) (42,074 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, 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	6,331	7,087

⁵ Previously, activities were reported in hours. The current reporting in Table 10 aligns with the data collection in the 21APR system but may make comparisons with older reports more challenging.

Activity	Times per Week	Times per Month
Counseling Programs	5,033	4,546
Drug Prevention	2,220	3,495
College and Career Readiness	11,353	5,624
Homework Help	53,266	1,544
Mentoring	10,418	6,093
Physical Activity	51,004	5,890
Tutoring	31,750	2,868
Youth Leadership	13,166	9,258

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	1,438	4,436	1,414	260
Counseling Programs	1,654	1,922	289	43
Drug Prevention	1,356	2,073	265	42
College and Career Readiness	1,080	3,873	1,113	208
Homework Help	5,931	6,256	912	129
Mentoring	1,689	3,120	693	106
Physical Activity	5,348	7,608	1,532	196
Tutoring	3,009	5,055	1,061	131
Youth Leadership	2,327	4,597	1,023	159

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

Academic Activity	Times per Week	Times per Month
Arts and Music	31,248	11,215
Entrepreneurship	4,115	3,467
Literacy	41,440	5,706
English Language Learners' Support	8,000	1,872
STEM	42,074	9,375
Truancy Prevention	2,407	1,600
Violence Prevention	3,059	3,084

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	3,454	8,104	1,416	208
Entrepreneurship	716	2,371	413	86
Literacy	3,726	7,737	1,556	202
English Language Learners' Support	1,003	1,659	414	66

Academic Activity	Less than 1 Hour	1-2 Hours	2-4 Hours	More than 4 Hours
STEM	3,333	9,617	1,764	338
Truancy Prevention	939	887	184	41
Violence Prevention	1,414	1,745	207	38

D. Staffing Type

Participating centers employed paid and volunteer staff to assist with programming. There were a reported 111,607 paid staff and 31,163 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 school day teachers (41.7%, n = 46,538) followed by other non-teaching school staff (17.4%, n = 19,433). Community members also served as the majority of volunteers (28.9%, n = 9,005) used by the centers followed by college students (17.9%, n = 5,568).

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	10,315	9.2	1,435	4.6
College Students	7,726	6.9	5,568	17.9
Community Members	4,639	4.2	9,005	28.9
High School Students	3,454	3.1	4,920	15.8
Parents	1,084	1.0	4,929	15.8
School Day Teachers	46,538	41.7	2,333	7.5
Other Non-Teaching School Staff	19,433	17.4	1,474	4.7
Subcontracted	11,219	10.1	571	1.8
Other	7,199	6.5	928	3.0
Total	111,607	100.0	31,163	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 (48.9 percent or 667,881) and female (49.7 percent or 679,854) attendees. In terms of race/ethnicity, the majority of the attendees were identified as Hispanic (39.0 percent or 532,907), with white (25.0 percent or 341,338) and black (20.5 percent or 280,664) following. There was a considerably larger number of regular attendees in prekindergarten through grade 5 (61.9 percent or 463,911) in comparison to sixth through twelfth grade (38.1 percent or 285,966).

Table 15. Participant Demographics

	Number	Percentage
1. Attendance		
<30 Days	617,135	45.1
30-59 Days	267,730	19.6
60-89 Days	174,146	12.7
>90 Days	308,001	22.6
Total	1,367,012	100.0

	Number	Percentage
2. Sex		
Male	667,881	48.9
Female	679,854	49.7
Data Not Provided	19,277	1.4
Total	1,367,012	100.0
3. Race/Ethnicity		
Asian	46,960	3.4
Black	280,664	20.5
Hispanic	532,907	39.0
Native American	46,209	3.4
Pacific Islander	10,395	0.8
White	341,338	25.0
Two or More Races	62,272	4.6
Data Not Provided	46,267	3.4
Total	1,367,012	100.0
4. Grade Level		
Pre-K – 5th	639,472	46.8
6th – 12th	727,540	53.2
Total	1,367,012	100.0
5. English Language Learners*	188,192	13.8
6. Free and Reduced Lunch*	922,949	67.5
7. Special Needs*⁶	141,131	10.3

*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	639,472	46.8	463,911	61.9
6th – 12th	727,540	53.2	285,966	38.1
Total	1,367,012	100.0	749,877	100.0

CONCLUSION

For the 2018-2019 academic school year, 10,125 centers received Federal funding to implement the Nita M. Lowey 21st CCLC program. 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.

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).

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.