

Nita M. Lowey 21st Century Community
Learning Centers (21st CCLC)
Overview of the
Annual Performance Data:
2020-2021

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. (2022). *Nita M. Lowey 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) Overview of the Annual Performance Data: 2020-2021 (17th report)*. Washington, DC.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	3
SECTION 1: GPRA RESULTS	4
A. GPRA Measures 1-3: Percentage of Participants Improving their Mathematics Grade	5
B. GPRA Measures 4-6: Percentage of Participants Improving their English Grade	6
C. GPRA Measures 7-8: Percentage of Participants Improving on Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics State Assessments	7
D. GPRA Measures 9-11: Percentage of Participants Improving on Homework Completion and Class Participation	7
Table 4. Among Students Identified by the State as Needing to Improve Homework Completion and Class Participation, the Percentage of Regular Attendees Who Improved their Homework Completion and Class Participation in School Year 2020-2021	8
E. GPRA Measures 12-14: Percentage of Participants Demonstrating Improvement in Student Behavior	9
Table 5. Among Students Identified by the State as Needing to Improve Student Behavior, the Percentage of Regular Attendees Who Improved Student Behavior in School Year 2020-2021	9
SECTION 2: CENTER CHARACTERISTICS	10
A. Center Type	10
Table 6. Centers by Organization Type for School Year 2020-2021	10
B. People Served	10
Table 7. Attendees Served in School Year 2020-2021	11
Table 8. Total Attendees by Center Type in School Year 2020-2021	11
Table 9. Regular Attendees by Center Type in School Year 2020-2021	11
C. Activity Participation	11
Table 10. Number of Times per Week/Month of Each Activity Offered in School Year 2020-2021	12
Table 11. Frequency of Activity Duration in School Year 2020-2021	12
Table 12. Number of Times per Week/Month of Each Academic Activity Offered in School Year 2020-2021	13
Table 13. Frequency of Academic Activity Duration in School Year 2020-2021	13
D. Staffing Type	13
Table 14. Staffing Type per Paid and Volunteer Staff in School Year 2020-2021	13
E. School-Year Attendees Served by Demographic Characteristics	14
Table 15. Description of School-Year Participants, by Attendance and Demographic Characteristics, in School Year 2020-2021	14
SUMMARY	15

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Nita M. Lowey 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st 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.

The program offers communities the opportunity to establish or expand activities in community learning centers that provide academic enrichment and support, as well as family engagement.

All 21st CCLC programs provide programming with academic enrichment and youth development that are designed to support participants' academic success. For the 2020-2021 school year, the U.S. Department of Education (Department) awarded grants to State educational agencies (SEAs), which in turn provided subgrants to 10,652 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 programs, the student populations served, and the extent to which students improved in specific areas.

2020-2021 APR highlights:

- In 2020-2021, over 1.1 million people were served by this program:
 - School year student attendees: 781,099, of which 373,101 were regular¹ student attendees
 - Summer 2020 student attendees: 183,562
 - Adults and family members: 200,786
- Overall, there was a fairly even split between males (48.0 percent or 374,926) and females (49.8 percent or 389,158).
- Hispanic students were the most common race or ethnicity (37.5 percent or 292,586), followed by White (28.6 percent or 223,531), and Black students (19.7 percent or 154,198).
- Of those reporting on State assessments²:
 - In reading, 27.2 percent of students improved their reading State assessment score in elementary school.
 - In mathematics, 15.6 percent improved their mathematics State assessment score in middle or high school.
- Of those reporting on student grades:
 - In mathematics, 48.3 percent of students identified by the subgrantee as needing to improve their mathematics grade did so.
 - In reading, 48.0 percent of students identified by the subgrantee as needing to improve their English grade did so.
- Of those that administered a teacher survey:
 - With respect to homework and class participation, 69.4 percent of teachers reported improved rates of homework completion and class participation among participating students.

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

² States were not required to submit on every GPRA indicator and instead selected a minimum of one or up to all three indicators. Thus, the data reported are based only on the States which submitted on that GPRA measure.

- With respect to student behavior, 64.3 percent of teachers reported improved student behavior among participating students.

These reported data indicate that the 21st CCLC program is broad reaching both in terms of overall students served and in terms of the diversity of students and families enrolled in programming.

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).

The purpose of this program is to provide opportunities for communities to establish or expand activities in community learning centers that—

1. Provide opportunities for academic enrichment, including providing tutorial services to help students, particularly students who attend low-performing schools, to meet the challenging State academic standards;
2. Offer students a broad array of additional services, programs, and activities, such as youth development activities, service learning, nutrition and health education, drug and violence prevention programs, counseling programs, arts, music, physical fitness and wellness programs, technology education programs, financial literacy programs, environmental literacy programs, mathematics, science, career and technical programs, internship or apprenticeship programs, and other ties to an in-demand industry sector or occupation for high school students that are designed to reinforce and complement the regular academic program of participating students; and
3. Offer families of students served by community learning centers opportunities for active and meaningful engagement in their children's education, including opportunities for literacy and related educational development.

21st CCLC funds are awarded to all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE). The program provides students in high-need, high-poverty communities the opportunity to participate in afterschool programming in which academic enrichment and youth development activities are designed to enhance participants' well-being and academic success. For the 2020-2021 school year, the Department awarded grants to SEAs, which in turn provided subgrants to 10,652 centers.

In this annual performance report (APR), data from the 21APR Data Collection (21APR) 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 for the Department to evaluate 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 populations served, and the extent to which students improved in academic-related behaviors and achievement.

This year, data show that most funded centers were classified as school districts, followed by community-based organizations (CBOs). 21st CCLC programs served more than 1.1 million people, employed 84,930 paid staff, and hosted 11,403 volunteer staff. Most of the paid staff were school day teachers and most of the volunteers were community members.

Within the report, the methodological approach to data collection and reporting is outlined before turning to the results of these 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 submitted by SEAs during three collection periods throughout the year:

Summer data entry window: May 5, 2021-June 30, 2021

Fall data entry window: July 1, 2020-August 31, 2021

Spring data entry window: September 1, 2021-December 15, 2021

The 21APR system collects the number of participants by grade level, then aggregates the demographic and performance data into the two categories that are delineated according to the GPRA measures: elementary and middle/high school. In 21APR, elementary includes PreK through 5th grade and middle/high school includes 6th through 12th grade. States report the total number of days attended by participants per grade level. Attendance is differentiated between “regular” and “non-regular.” For the purposes of reporting on the GPRA measures, “regular” is defined as attending 30 days or more throughout the academic year. Performance on the GPRA measures is not collected for non-regular participants (those attending less than 30 days in the academic year). Demographic and attendance information is collected on all participants. In addition, States had the opportunity to add narrative text in an open-ended text box to explain any data anomalies due to programming, process, or data entry issues.

From a methodological perspective, it should be further noted that some data definitions for specific GPRA measures are determined by each State. For instance, on GPRA indicators where “needs to improve” is measured, each State has the discretion to define (and communicate to their grantees) what “needs to improve” means; thus, the definition is consistent within the State but may not be comparable across States.

To complete reporting on the GPRA measures, an aggregate statistic for each of the items analyzed is provided. The GPRA indicators fall into three main categories, defined by their means of data collection: State assessment, grades, and teacher reported data. States were not required to submit on every GPRA indicator and instead selected from among the indicators. Each year, technical assistance is provided explaining that each State must report on at least one of the three GPRA categories, but it is a State-level decision as to which GPRA measure(s) to choose. As a result, descriptive statistics throughout the report are calculated on the States that provided data on a given GPRA measure. For example, if 46 States provided data on student grades, then the percentages are only based on the data obtained from those 46 States. It is important to note that each SEA is the authoritative source of its data and as such, must certify its APR data for the 21st CCLC program.

Of note this year, these data were collected during the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, which caused ongoing changes in education policy throughout the United States, including shifts to remote learning in some local education agencies (LEAs). This impacted the number of States choosing to report State assessments for their GPRA measures; only four States reported assessment data this year. Ten States³ that normally would have reported State assessment data chose not to do so this year due to concerns about data quality due to the impact of COVID-19.

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:

³ Arkansas, Bureau of Indian Education, Hawaii, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Oklahoma, Vermont, Washington, and South Dakota.

1. Participants in the 21st CCLC programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.
2. 21st CCLC grantees and subgrantees 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 from one of the following sets of measures: grades, State assessments, and/or teacher-reported student behavior. Each State reports on at least one of these sets of measures annually. 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, it is not included in the analysis for that measure. In addition, for each GPRA measure, the State reports only on regular participants. The reason for this is to evaluate the impact of the 21st CCLC program on those students who were regular or frequent participants rather than all participants, which might include students who attended a program only once or a handful of times.

Data for each GPRA measure were provided at the end of the academic school year and presented in tabular and summary form below (Sub-sections A-F). Any methodological considerations for the measure are noted following each table.

A. GPRA Measures 1-3: Percentage of Participants Improving their Mathematics Grade

- Overall, States reported that 48.6 percent of students who needed to improve their mathematics grades in elementary grades did so, along with 47.9 percent of students in middle and high school, and 48.3 percent of all students.
- States were asked to report on participants who the State determined needed to improve their mathematics grade; some students may have participated but were not in need of grade improvement. Each State established both how to determine that a student needed to improve his or her mathematics grade and the definition of improvement.
- 21 States or territories reported on these measures.

Table 1. Among Students Identified by the State as Needing to Improve their Mathematics Grade, Regular Attendees Who Improved their Mathematics Grade in School Year 2020-2021

State/Territory	Mathematics Elementary	Mathematics Middle/High School	Mathematics All Students
1. Alabama	50.1	57.5	52.2
2. Arizona	66.7	61.4	65.2
3. Delaware	66.9	39.0	51.5
4. District of Columbia	62.3	59.4	61.2
5. Florida	48.6	51.0	49.1
6. Georgia	49.1	51.9	50.0
7. Iowa	52.4	55.3	53.0
8. Kentucky	64.7	58.7	62.0
9. Louisiana	81.0	84.3	82.0
10. Michigan	54.0	44.6	49.6
11. Mississippi	78.0	79.8	78.6
12. Missouri	42.4	63.3	46.7
13. Nevada	35.9	39.2	36.9
14. Pennsylvania	48.9	48.9	48.9

15. Puerto Rico	57.5	64.0	60.6
16. South Carolina	69.8	63.8	67.6
17. Tennessee	54.1	55.7	54.6
18. Texas	31.1	34.4	32.4
19. Virgin Islands	84.4	81.3	82.1
20. Virginia	72.7	51.6	65.7
21. Wyoming	86.9	68.6	83.3
Overall	48.6	47.9	48.3

Note: Raw scores were used to calculate overall percentage improvement. This is done to prevent presenting the overall percentage data as an average of averages, or, in other words, to preserve the accuracy of the calculation.

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

- Overall, States reported that 47.9 percent of students who needed to improve their English grades in elementary did so, along with 48.3 percent of students improving their English grades in middle or high school, and 48.0 percent of all students.
- States were asked to report on participants who the State determined needed to improve their English grade; some students may have participated but were not in need of grade improvement. Each State established both how to determine that a student needed to improve his or her English grade and the definition of improvement.
- 21 States or territories reported on these measures.

Table 2: Among Students Identified by the State as Needing to Improve their English Grade, Regular Attendees Who Improved their English Grade in School Year 2020-2021

State/Territory	English Elementary	English Middle/High School	English All Students
1. Alabama	50.8	56.6	52.2
2. Arizona	67.7	60.6	65.8
3. Delaware	73.4	70.8	72.9
4. District of Columbia	57.2	66.4	60.6
5. Florida	46.6	52.7	47.8
6. Georgia	47.2	53.2	49.0
7. Iowa	49.3	64.0	52.0
8. Kentucky	62.9	62.3	62.6
9. Louisiana	72.6	89.1	77.9
10. Michigan	53.7	0.0	53.7
11. Mississippi	83.2	81.0	82.4
12. Missouri	43.1	60.6	46.5
13. Nevada	34.6	40.7	36.3
14. Pennsylvania	50.2	56.0	52.2
15. Puerto Rico	63.5	60.3	62.0
16. South Carolina	70.1	72.2	71.0
17. Tennessee	54.3	54.8	54.4
18. Texas	29.8	33.9	31.5
19. Virgin Islands	87.5	88.0	87.9
20. Virginia	75.7	55.9	69.6
21. Wyoming	86.1	72.4	83.5
Overall	47.9	48.3	48.0

Note: Raw scores were used to calculate overall percentage improvement. This is done to prevent presenting the overall percentage data as an average of averages, or, in other words, to preserve the accuracy of the calculation.

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

- Overall, the States reported that 27.2 percent of students improved their reading/language arts State assessment score in elementary and 15.6 percent of students improved their mathematics State assessment score in middle or high school.
- States were asked to report on participants who needed to improve their State assessment scores; some students may have participated but were not identified as in need of improving their State assessment score.
- Four States/territories reported on this measure – improving from not proficient to proficient or above on the reading/language arts and mathematics State assessments.

Table 3. Regular Attendees Improving their Performance on Reading/Language Arts or Mathematics State Assessments in School Year 2020-2021

State/Territory	Reading/Language Arts Elementary	Mathematics Middle/High School
1. California	18.1	9.4
2. Kansas	31.9	27.8
3. Michigan	26.8	12.6
4. Utah	36.9	57.8
Overall	27.2	15.6

Note: Since States elect to report on one, two, or three of the overall GPRA measures (State assessments, Grades and/or Teacher reported), raw scores were used to calculate overall percentage improvement and when calculating the percentage improvement “overall,” the total number of regular attendees with reported APR results were used in the calculations across all States/territories. Not all grade levels take State assessments each year. Only reported data are used in the analysis, but this may not represent all participants due to lower-than-normal participation on State assessments in the 2020-2021 school year. Due to the onset of Covid-19 in March 2020, the Department granted every State a waiver from administering State assessments in the 2019-2020 school year, for this year only, States reported improvement by comparing 2020-2021 assessment data with the most recent previous state assessment data available in their state.

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

- Overall, the States reported that 70.8 percent of elementary, 65.7 percent of middle or high school, and 69.4 percent of all regular attendees improved their homework completion and class participation as determined by the State.
- States were asked to report on participants who the State determined needed to improve their rate of homework completion and class participation; some students participating in the 21st CCLC program were not identified as needing to improve their rate of homework completion and class participation. Each State established both how to determine that a student needed to improve and the definition of improvement.
- Thirty-nine (39) States and Territories reported data on homework completion and class participation. These data were reported by teachers.

Table 4. Among Students Identified by the State as Needing to Improve Homework Completion and Class Participation, the Percentage of Regular Attendees Who Improved their Homework Completion and Class Participation in School Year 2020-2021

State/Territory	HW/CP Elementary	HW/CP Middle/High School	HW/CP All Students
1. Alabama	92.6	91.2	92.4
2. Alaska	55.5	64.7	58.2
3. Arizona	80.3	76.9	79.3
4. Colorado	90.7	86.1	89.3
5. Connecticut	37.8	52.5	41.5
6. Delaware	70.4	62.0	68.3
7. District of Columbia	86.7	74.7	77.2
8. Florida	86.1	73.5	83.5
9. Georgia	73.6	68.8	72.4
10. Idaho	90.5	75.6	88.3
11. Illinois	61.8	64.9	63.2
12. Indiana	21.7	25.1	22.5
13. Iowa	64.9	83.2	70.6
14. Kansas	65.4	71.0	66.0
15. Kentucky	70.2	70.4	70.3
16. Louisiana	85.5	89.1	86.5
17. Maine	45.3	51.3	46.9
18. Michigan	30.1	30.1	30.1
19. Mississippi	82.2	85.7	83.3
20. Montana	71.3	79.8	72.4
21. Nebraska	62.2	46.2	58.6
22. Nevada	72.7	71.5	72.4
23. New Hampshire	16.7	28.3	19.5
24. New Jersey	63.4	62.3	62.8
25. New Mexico	88.4	93.4	89.4
26. New York	81.9	78.1	80.6
27. North Carolina	86.7	91.4	88.0
28. North Dakota	91.0	92.6	91.2
29. Oregon	59.2	57.5	58.4
30. Pennsylvania	47.1	51.6	48.5
31. Rhode Island	34.0	32.1	33.4
32. South Carolina	62.0	71.9	64.6
33. Tennessee	68.5	66.6	68.0
34. Utah	75.1	80.2	76.6
35. Virgin Islands	87.3	95.8	92.1
36. Virginia	83.8	78.3	81.9
37. West Virginia	70.6	63.5	69.1
38. Wisconsin	73.9	60.2	72.0
39. Wyoming	70.7	68.7	70.3
Overall	70.8	65.7	69.4

Note: Raw scores were used to calculate overall percentage improvement. This is done to prevent presenting the overall percentage data as an average of averages, or, in other words, to preserve the accuracy of the calculation. When calculating the percentage improvement “overall,” the total number of regular attendees included in these measures across all States/territories were aggregated.

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

- Overall, the States reported that 64.8 percent of regular attendees who were determined by the State to need to improve behavior, demonstrated improved student behavior in elementary, 62.9 percent of students in middle or high school, and 64.3 percent of all students.
- States were asked to report on participants who the State determined needed to improve their behavior. Each State established both how to determine that a student needed to improve and the definition of improvement.
- 39 States/territories reported data on student behavior, as reported by a survey administered to teachers.

Table 5. Among Students Identified by the State as Needing to Improve Student Behavior, the Percentage of Regular Attendees Who Improved Student Behavior in School Year 2020-2021

State/Territory	Student Behavior Elementary	Student Behavior Middle/High School	Student Behavior All Students
1. Alabama	94.6	92.5	94.2
2. Alaska	57.3	59.2	57.8
3. Arizona	79.6	75.6	78.4
4. Colorado	92.5	89.8	91.7
5. Connecticut	41.2	40.5	41.0
6. Delaware	48.7	50.0	49.1
7. District of Columbia	68.3	78.7	76.5
8. Florida	88.4	74.8	85.5
9. Georgia	41.0	38.6	40.4
10. Idaho	93.6	76.0	90.9
11. Illinois	56.6	58.3	57.4
12. Indiana	26.6	22.0	25.5
13. Iowa	61.3	82.2	67.7
14. Kansas	56.2	59.6	56.6
15. Kentucky	41.0	39.6	40.5
16. Louisiana	76.4	85.1	78.9
17. Maine	52.1	47.8	51.0
18. Michigan	34.5	36.4	35.1
19. Mississippi	82.5	76.7	80.7
20. Montana	71.4	80.8	72.7
21. Nebraska	57.1	39.1	53.0
22. Nevada	40.2	41.6	40.5
23. New Hampshire	30.5	24.5	29.1
24. New Jersey	58.6	59.0	58.8
25. New Mexico	90.9	91.2	90.9
26. New York	84.3	79.9	82.8
27. North Carolina	77.5	89.5	80.8
28. North Dakota	87.3	96.7	88.0

29. Oregon	63.1	60.3	61.8
30. Pennsylvania	36.8	40.6	38.0
31. Rhode Island	28.6	25.5	27.7
32. South Carolina	81.5	86.3	82.6
33. Tennessee	65.6	59.4	64.0
34. Utah	68.5	73.5	69.9
35. Virgin Islands	47.3	97.2	75.6
36. Virginia	79.8	79.3	79.6
37. West Virginia	56.7	60.4	57.5
38. Wisconsin	79.1	82.1	79.5
39. Wyoming	64.0	52.7	62.0
Overall	64.8	62.9	64.3

Note: Raw scores were used to calculate overall percentage improvement. This is done to prevent presenting the overall percentage data as an average of averages, or, in other words, to preserve the accuracy of the calculation. When calculating the percentage improvement “overall,” the total number of regular attendees included in these measures across all States and Territories were aggregated.

SECTION 2: CENTER CHARACTERISTICS

A. Center Type

Table 6 displays the results of the types of centers for all 54 SEAs. Of the 10,652 centers, 82.4 percent were classified as LEAs (8,776) and 9.7 percent as community-based organizations (1,028).

Table 6. Centers by Organization Type for School Year 2020-2021

Center Type	Number	Percentage
Charter School	541	5.1
College/University	23	0.2
Community-Based Organization	1,028	9.7
Faith-Based Organization	116	1.0
Local Educational Agencies	8,776	82.4
Other	168	1.6
Total	10,652	100.0

Note: The category “Other” is a combination of the following types: Bureau of Indian Education, 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 2020-2021, over 1.1 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 regular 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 (781,099), of which 373,101 were regular student attendees
- Summer attendees (183,562)
- Adults/family members (200,786)

Tables 8 and 9 provide a look at attendance based on center type. Most regular attendees attended programs provided by LEAs (83.6 percent or 312,089 students)

Table 7. Attendees Served in School Year 2020-2021

Attendees Served	Number	Percentage
Regular School-Year Student Attendees	373,101	47.8
Non-Regular School-Year Student Attendees	407,998	52.2
Total Student Attendees for School Year	781,099	67.0
Summer Attendees	183,562	15.8
Adults/Family Members	200,786	17.2
Total	1,165,447	100.0

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

Table 8. Total Attendees by Center Type in School Year 2020-2021

Center Type	Number	Percentage
Charter School	55,487	7.1
College/University	484	0.1
Community-Based Organization	46,891	6.0
Faith-Based Organization	3,900	0.5
Local Educational Agency	665,921	85.3
Other	8,416	1.1
Total	781,099	100.0

Note: The category Other is a combination of the following types: Bureau of Indian Education, 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 in School Year 2020-2021

Center Type	Number	Percentage
Charter School	24,929	6.7
College/University	142	0.0
Community-Based Organization	29,653	7.9
Faith-Based Organization	2,075	0.6
Local Educational Agency	312,089	83.6
Other	4,213	1.1
Total	373,101	100.0

Note: The category Other is a combination of the following types: Bureau of Indian Education, 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. 21APR provides States with a list of activity categories, based on statutory language, and States report their activities under these general categories. Specifically, under these activity categories, States provide information about activities offered through 21st CCLC funding in two ways. In the first, they report on how often in a week and how

often in a month any given activity category is offered. Centers are instructed to report in the weekly category if the activity is offered at least once a week, and in the monthly category if it is offered less than once a week. Since multiple activities are mapped to the larger activity categories provided by statute (e.g., one center might offer several different weekly community/service learning and several different monthly service learning as separate activities), it is important to remember that these number represent a larger aggregate of the state’s activity offerings and therefore provide a general picture of the frequency of these activity categories. In addition to reporting on frequency, each State reports on the duration of each session offered within the activity category.

In short, this type of reporting shows both the frequency (e.g., times per week) and the intensity (duration of each activity session) of activities supported by 21st CCLC funding. The activities held most frequently were focused on homework assistance (23,394 times/week), physical activity (21,777 times/week), literacy (19,082 times/week), STEM (18,971 times/week), tutoring (15,374 times/week), and arts and music (14,075 times/week). Tables 10-13, below, provide the participation frequency and amount of time for the most common activities identified by centers. It does not include all possible activities that may be offered by a center.

Table 10. Number of Times per Week/Month of Each Activity Offered in School Year 2020-2021

Activity	Times per Week (For activities offered at least one time per week)	Times per Month (For activities offered less than one time per week)
Community/Service Learning	2,504	2,701
Counseling Programs	2,463	2,183
Drug Prevention	795	1,142
College and Career Readiness	4,942	2,575
Homework Help	23,396	972
Mentoring	4,776	2,456
Physical Activity	21,777	3,734
Tutoring	15,374	1,618
Youth Leadership	5,802	3,921

Table 11. Frequency of Activity Duration in School Year 2020-2021

Activity	Less than 1 Hour	1-2 Hours	2-4 Hours	More than 4 Hours
Community/Service Learning	707	1,617	442	108
Counseling Programs	761	848	108	39
Drug Prevention	656	604	66	15
College and Career Readiness	536	1,670	357	60
Homework Help	2,690	2,719	514	87
Mentoring	810	1,221	226	75
Physical Activity	2,727	3,341	549	132
Tutoring	1,491	2,316	635	102
Youth Leadership	1,198	1,782	340	74

Table 12. Number of Times per Week/Month of Each Academic Activity Offered in School Year 2020-2021

Academic Activity	Times per Week (For activities offered at least one time per week)	Times per Month (For activities offered less than one time per week)
Arts and Music	14,075	6,410
Entrepreneurship	1,549	1,360
Literacy	19,082	3,398
English Learners' Support	3,682	686
STEM	18,971	5,315
Truancy Prevention	1,288	507
Violence Prevention	1,451	1,073

Table 13. Frequency of Academic Activity Duration in School Year 2020-2021

Academic Activity	Less than 1 Hour	1-2 Hours	2-4 Hours	More than 4 Hours
Arts and Music	1,863	3,714	584	121
Entrepreneurship	349	833	142	17
Literacy	1,899	3,738	556	98
English Learners' Support	473	669	128	21
STEM	1,822	4,420	733	130
Truancy Prevention	487	285	55	14
Violence Prevention	714	526	51	7

D. Staffing Type

Participating centers employed paid staff and volunteers to assist with programming. There was a reported 84,930 paid staff and 11,403 volunteer staff in 2020-2021. Table 14 shows the number of paid and volunteer staff broken down by type for all SEAs. Among the paid staff used by centers, the majority were school day teachers (41.2 percent, or 35,032) followed by other non-teaching school staff (17.1 percent, or 14,541). Community members were the plurality of volunteers (25.7 percent, or 2,934) used by the centers followed by college students (16.0 percent, or 1,823).

Table 14. Staffing Type per Paid and Volunteer Staff in School Year 2020-2021

Staffing Type	Paid Staff Number	Paid Staff Percentage	Volunteer Staff Number	Volunteer Staff Percentage
Center Administrators	9,670	11.4	1,071	9.4
College Students	5,779	6.8	1,823	16.0
Community Members	3,552	4.2	2,934	25.7
High School Students	1,937	2.3	1,209	10.6
Parents	432	0.5	1,724	15.1
School Day Teachers	35,032	41.2	902	7.9
Other Non-Teaching School Staff	14,541	17.1	870	7.6
Subcontracted	7,334	8.6	315	2.8
Other	6,653	7.8	555	4.9

Total	84,930	100.0	11,403	100.0
--------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	--------------

E. School-Year Attendees Served by Demographic Characteristics

Tables 15 and 16 detail program attendees by the amount of participation, sex, race/ethnicity, and grade level. Overall, there was a fairly even split between male (48.0 percent or 374,926) and female (49.8 percent or 389,158) attendees. In terms of race/ethnicity, the plurality of the attendees was identified as Hispanic (37.5 percent or 292,586), followed by White students (28.6 percent or 223,531), and Black students (19.7 percent or 154,198). There was a considerably larger number of regular attendees in pre-kindergarten through grade 5 (66.6 percent or 248,314) in comparison to 6th through 12th grade (33.4 percent or 124,787).

Table 15. Description of School-Year Participants, by Attendance and Demographic Characteristics, in School Year 2020-2021

Base	Number	Percentage
1. Attendance		
Fewer than 30 Days	407,998	52.2
30-59 Days	158,062	20.3
60-89 Days	93,115	11.9
90 Days or More	121,924	15.6
Total	781,099	100.0
2. Sex		
Male	374,926	48.0
Female	389,158	49.8
Data Not Provided	17,015	2.2
Total	781,099	100.0
3. Race/Ethnicity		
Asian	24,635	3.2
Black	154,198	19.7
Hispanic	292,586	37.5
Native American	19,538	2.5
Pacific Islander	4,605	0.6
White	223,531	28.6
Two or More Races	26,614	3.4
Data Not Provided	35,392	4.5
Total	781,099	100.0
4. Grade Level		
Pre-K – 5th	409,102	52.4
6th – 12th	371,997	47.6
Total	781,099	100.0
5. English Learners	117,838	15.1
6. Free and Reduced Lunch	536,841	68.7
7. Special Needs⁴	98,363	12.6

⁴ 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).

Table 16. Number of 2020-2021 School Year Participants per Grade Level

Grade Level	Total School Year Student Attendees Number	Total Student Attendees Percentage	Total Regular Student Attendees Number	Total Regular Student Attendees Percentage
Pre-K – 5th	409,102	52.4	248,314	66.6
6th – 12th	371,997	47.6	124,787	33.4
Total	781,099	100.0	373,101	100.0

SUMMARY

For the 2020-2021 school year, 10,652 centers received Federal funding to implement 21st CCLC programming. The majority of these were classified as school districts followed by CBOs. They served over 1.1 million students and family members of participants. They employed 84,930 paid staff, largely school day teachers, and hosted 11,403 volunteer staff, many of which were community members. The performance on the GPRA measures indicate that many participants are showing improved grades, rates of homework completion and class participation, and behavior.