

21st Century Community Learning Centers
Overview of the
21st CCLC Annual Performance Data:
2014–2015

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

Sylvia Lyles, PhD
Program Director, Office of Academic Improvement

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

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

U.S. Department of Education. (2016). *21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) overview of the 21st CCLC performance data: 2014–2015* (11th report). Washington, DC.

Content

Tables	4
INTRODUCTION	6
SECTION 1: GPRA RESULTS	8
A. GPRA Measures #1-3: Percentage of Improvement in Mathematics Grades.....	10
B. GPRA Measures #4-6: Percentage of Improvement in English Grades	11
C. GPRA Measures #7-8: Percentage of Improvement on Reading and Mathematics State Assessments.....	13
D. GPRA Measures #9-11: Percentage of Improvement on Homework Completion and Class Participation.....	15
E. GPRA Measures #12-14: Percentage of Improvement in Student Behavior.....	17
SECTION 2: GRANTEE AND CENTER CHARACTERISTICS	19
A. Center Type	19
B. People Served.....	19
C. Activity Participation	20
D. Staffing Type	22
E. Attendees Served per Demographic.....	23
F. Estimated Per-Student Expenditures	25
CONCLUSION	29

Tables

Table 1. The GPRA Outcomes for all 54 States/Territories	8
Table 2. Regular Attendees % Improved in Mathematics Grades.....	10
Table 3. Regular Attendees % Improved in English Grades	12
Table 4. Regular Attendees % Improved on Reading/Mathematics State Assessments.....	13
Table 5. Regular Attendees % Improved Homework Completion/Class Participation.....	15
Table 6. Regular Attendees % Improved Student Behavior.....	17
Table 7. Grantees' Centers Broken Down by Organization Type.....	19
Table 8. Attendees Served Based on Type	20
Table 9. Total Attendees by Center Type.....	20
Table 10. Regular Attendees by Center Type.....	20
Table 11. Times per Week of Each Activity Offered.....	21
Table 12. Frequency of Each Activity Offered	21
Table 13. Times per Week of Each Academic Activity Offered	22
Table 14. Frequency of Each Academic Activity Offered.....	22
Table 15. Staffing Type per Paid and Volunteer Staff	22
Table 16. Participant Demographics.....	23
Table 17. Number of Participants per Grade Level	24
Table 18. Estimated Expenditure per Regular Attendee and All Attendees	26

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Originally created in 1994 through the *Elementary and Secondary School Act* and expanded in 2001 through *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB), the 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) program provides students in high-need, high-poverty communities the opportunity to participate in afterschool programming. Present in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and 3 Territories (Bureau of Indian Education, Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico), academic enrichment and youth development programs are designed to enhance participants' well-being and academic success. For the 2014-2015 academic school year, the United States (US) Department of Education funded 11,512 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 federal government in determining progress of the 21st CCLC program based on the statutory requirements. The APR has historically been completed by grantees once a year to summarize the operational elements of their program, the student population served, and the extent to which students improved in specific areas. 30 States reported data to assess for student improvement in mathematics and English grades across all grade levels, while an additional six and seven States respectively only reported the data for some grade levels and not others. Eighteen States/Territories did not report data on mathematics grades and 17 States/Territories did not report data on English grades.

Based on the available data, the key findings from this year's APR are:

- During SY14-15 over 1.8 million people have been served by this program:
 - academic year total student attendees (n = 1,405,722), including regular¹ student attendees (n = 752,008)
 - summer attendees (n = 279,314), and
 - adults/family members (n = 183,461).
- Overall, there was an even split between male (49.2%, n = 687,464) and female (48.2%, n = 673,800) attendees.
- In terms of race/ethnicity, the majority of the attendees (84.5%) were identified as Hispanic or Latino (35.9%, n = 504,661), with White (27.8%, n = 391,422) and Black or African American (20.8%, n = 292,260) following.
- 48.0% reported a percentage of improvement in mathematics grades.
- 48.5% reported a percentage of improvement in English grades.
- 28.4% reported a percentage of improvement on state assessments in elementary reading and 22.6% in middle/high school mathematics.
- 65.2% of teachers reported a percentage of improvement in homework completion and class participation.
- 56.8% of teachers reported a percentage of improvement in student behavior.

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

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

INTRODUCTION

Originally created in 1994 through the *Elementary and Secondary School Act*, and expanded in 2001 through *No Child Left Behind (NCLB)*, the 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) program, provides students in high-need, high-poverty communities the opportunity to participate in afterschool programming. Present in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and 3 Territories, academic enrichment and youth development programs are designed to enhance participants' well-being and academic success. For the 2014-2015 academic school year, the United States (US) Department of Education funded **11,512 centers** under the 21st CCLC program.

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

This year, the data show that the majority of funded centers were classified as school districts with community-based organizations following second. In the past year, the 21st CCLC program has served a total of more than 1.8 million people and employed 115,000 paid and 31,319 volunteer staff. The majority of the paid staff were school day teachers and most of the volunteers were reported to be community members and college students.

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

Methodology:

There are several key changes in this data collection system designed specifically to increase validity of the overall data. Most significantly the vast majority of questions asked are related directly to the participation demographics or the GPRA indicators. This results in less data entry. Likewise, data are collected for each term of the program, with a cumulative academic year total also collected in the spring. It should be noted that the collection of the cumulative year score in the spring term translates as a proxy for the academic year.

Another significant change involves the calculation of the GPRA measure. In previous reports the total number of participants was used as the population from which to determine the percentage of improvement on State tests and State grades. The new system asks States to report the total number of participants but also the total number of students who needed to improve (e.g., were failing); the system uses the number of students who needed to improve to calculate the percentage of improvement. This provides a more accurate representation of performance against the GPRA measure. All GPRA calculations were made using the data entered into the 21APR system by the States, which ties attendance and outcomes together, reducing duplicative data entry and improving accuracy.

Data for the participating 54 States/Territories were entered by each State and certified by the State Education Agency (SEA) for the 21st CCLC program. The MySQL database was queried and exported to SPSS (via Excel) and then analyzed using descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, and averages) and reported in tabular format. As validity checks, the data were run independently by two statisticians. A third researcher, who had not previously worked with the data, conducted a final internal consistency check.

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

SECTION 1: GPRA RESULTS

In addition to collecting information on the operational characteristics of 21st CCLC programs, a primary purpose of the system is to collect data that inform the GPRA indicators established for the 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. Certain GPRA then seek data based on these instruments. The GPRA indicators are the primary means by which the US Department of Education measures the effectiveness and efficiency of the program based on the following two overall goals:

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

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 1.

Table 1. The GPRA Outcomes for all 54 States/Territories²

Program GPRA Measures	2014-2015
1. The percentage of elementary 21st Century regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring.	49.7%
2. The percentage of middle/high school 21st Century regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring.	45.4%
3. The percentage of all 21st Century regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring.	48.0%
4. The percentage of elementary 21st Century regular program participants whose English grades improved from fall to spring.	49.6%

² Statistics for each GPRA measure are calculated using only the States/Territories that provided data on the given measure. See Methodology starting on page 6 for detailed explanation.

Program GPRA Measures	2014-2015
5. The percentage of middle/high school 21st Century regular program participants whose English grades improved from fall to spring.	46.9%
6. The percentage of all 21st Century regular program participants whose English grades improved from fall to spring.	48.5%
7. The percentage of elementary 21st Century regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above in reading on state assessments.	28.4%
8. The percentage of middle/high school 21st Century regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above in mathematics on state assessments.	22.6%
9. The percentage of elementary 21st Century regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation.	66.2%
10. The percentage of middle/high school 21st Century program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation.	63.1%
11. The percentage of all 21st Century regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation.	65.2%
12. The percentage of elementary 21st Century participants with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior.	57.5%
13. The percentage of middle/high school 21st Century participants with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior.	55.3%
14. The percentage of all 21st Century participants with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior.	56.8%

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

- 36 out of 54 States (66.7%) reported a percentage of improvement in mathematics grades (23 more States reported data than the previous year: 42.6% increase).
- Overall, States reported the following % improvement: 49.7% Elementary, 45.4% Middle/High School, and 48.0% for all students (13.0%, 9.4%, and 11.4% improvement from the previous year respectively).

Table 2. Regular Attendees³ % Improved in Mathematics Grades

State/Territory	Mathematics Elementary % Improved	Mathematics Middle/High School % Improved	Mathematics All Students % Improved
Overall	49.7%	45.4%	48.0%
1. Alabama	0.0	0.0	0.0
2. Alaska	0.0	0.0	0.0
3. Arizona	60.5	56.9	59.3
4. Arkansas	0.0	77.3	77.3
5. Bureau of Indian Affairs	0.0	0.0	0.0
6. California	44.4	49.1	47.6
7. Colorado	0.0	0.0	0.0
8. Connecticut	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Delaware	72.1	86.3	79.3
10. District of Columbia	74.9	61.7	69.6
11. Florida	64.8	70.1	66.4
12. Georgia	0.0	0.0	0.0
13. Hawaii	61.9	41.4	51.0
14. Idaho	0.0	0.0	0.0
15. Illinois	60.8	60.6	60.7
16. Indiana	0.0	0.0	0.0
17. Iowa	75.0	42.6	48.4
18. Kansas	87.7	0.0	86.7
19. Kentucky	53.9	53.1	53.6
20. Louisiana	73.5	67.2	71.6
21. Maine	0.0	0.0	0.0
22. Maryland	58.5	63.0	60.2
23. Massachusetts	0.0	0.0	0.0
24. Michigan	55.8	44.5	50.5
25. Minnesota	0.0	18.3	18.3
26. Mississippi	60.0	49.2	55.7
27. Missouri	32.1	33.7	32.6

³ Regular is defined as attendance for 30 days or more during the academic year.

State/Territory	Mathematics Elementary % Improved	Mathematics Middle/High School % Improved	Mathematics All Students % Improved
28. Montana	0.0	0.0	0.0
29. Nebraska	0.0	0.0	0.0
30. Nevada	35.2	35.9	35.3
31. New Hampshire	0.0	0.0	0.0
32. New Jersey	76.3	72.6	74.9
33. New Mexico	0.0	0.0	0.0
34. New York	54.8	44.6	48.2
35. North Carolina	13.9	6.0	9.6
36. North Dakota	0.0	100.0	100.0
37. Ohio	56.4	61.0	58.4
38. Oklahoma	0.0	0.0	0.0
39. Oregon	70.1	0.0	70.1
40. Pennsylvania	45.6	41.7	43.2
41. Puerto Rico	58.9	60.6	59.5
42. Rhode Island	0.0	0.0	0.0
43. South Carolina	42.2	77.8	44.4
44. South Dakota	76.1	0.0	76.1
45. Tennessee	69.7	67.9	69.0
46. Texas	26.6	25.7	26.2
47. Utah	71.4	73.2	71.8
48. Vermont	0.0	0.0	0.0
49. Virgin Islands	61.3	75.9	64.7
50. Virginia	68.2	66.9	67.6
51. Washington	61.1	26.7	55.3
52. West Virginia	79.0	72.0	75.6
53. Wisconsin	59.6	66.7	59.7
54. Wyoming	0.0	0.0	0.0

Note: Raw scores were used to calculate overall % improvement. When calculating the % improvement “Overall”, the total amounts of regular attendees with reported APR results were used in the calculations across all States/Territories who reported on this measure. Zeroes do not necessarily reflect delinquency in reporting or lack of improvement; States elect to report on grades, state assessments, and/or teacher-reported student behavior. Therefore, zeros in this table may reflect that a State is not reporting on the outcome represented.

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

- 37 out of 54 States (68.5%) reported a percentage of improvement in English grades (24 more States reported data than the previous year: 44.4% increase).
- Overall, States reported the following % improvement: 49.6% Elementary, 46.9% Middle/High School, and 48.5% for all students (12.9%, 9.6%, and 11.7% improvement from the previous year respectively).

Table 3. Regular Attendees % Improved in English Grades

State/Territory	English Elementary % Improved	English Middle/High School % Improved	English All Students % Improved
Overall	49.6%	46.9%	48.5%
1. Alabama	0.0	0.0	0.0
2. Alaska	0.0	0.0	0.0
3. Arizona	67.8	58.3	56.6
4. Arkansas	0.0	50.0	50.0
5. Bureau of Indian Affairs	0.0	0.0	0.0
6. California	69.0	52.7	60.2
7. Colorado	0.0	0.0	0.0
8. Connecticut	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Delaware	70.5	81.0	75.3
10. District of Columbia	76.1	69.6	73.6
11. Florida	66.0	71.8	67.8
12. Georgia	0.0	0.0	0.0
13. Hawaii	56.4	36.4	46.2
14. Idaho	0.0	0.0	0.0
15. Illinois	56.1	83.3	63.0
16. Indiana	0.0	0.0	0.0
17. Iowa	66.1	28.7	32.1
18. Kansas	77.7	0.0	77.6
19. Kentucky	55.7	54.6	55.3
20. Louisiana	74.0	67.1	72.0
21. Maine	0.0	0.0	0.0
22. Maryland	57.6	67.1	61.3
23. Massachusetts	0.0	0.0	0.0
24. Michigan	54.0	46.5	50.9
25. Minnesota	0.0	17.3	17.3
26. Mississippi	58.8	49.6	54.9
27. Missouri	36.4	36.2	36.3
28. Montana	0.0	0.0	0.0
29. Nebraska	0.0	0.0	0.0
30. Nevada	30.2	33.5	30.9
31. New Hampshire	0.0	0.0	0.0
32. New Jersey	75.0	75.1	75.0
33. New Mexico	0.0	0.0	50.2
34. New York	56.1	46.9	50.2
35. North Carolina	10.2	9.9	10.1
36. North Dakota	0.0	100.0	100.0
37. Ohio	55.9	58.3	56.9
38. Oklahoma	0.0	0.0	0.0

State/Territory	English Elementary	English Middle/High School	English All Students
39. Oregon	96.8	0.0	96.8
40. Pennsylvania	46.4	42.4	44.0
41. Puerto Rico	59.7	65.8	61.6
42. Rhode Island	0.0	0.0	0.0
43. South Carolina	33.0	0.0	33.3
44. South Dakota	63.3	60.0	62.8
45. Tennessee	71.5	68.1	70.3
46. Texas	21.6	33.8	26.6
47. Utah	77.3	73.7	76.6
48. Vermont	0.0	0.0	0.0
49. Virgin Islands	55.4	74.6	59.8
50. Virginia	66.7	68.9	67.7
51. Washington	49.7	38.2	47.5
52. West Virginia	78.2	67.6	73.2
53. Wisconsin	65.1	40.0	64.5
54. Wyoming	0.0	0.0	0.0

Note: Raw scores were used to calculate overall % improvement. When calculating the % improvement “Overall”, the total amounts of regular attendees with reported APR results were used in the calculations across all States/Territories. Zeroes do not necessarily reflect delinquency in reporting or lack of improvement; States elect to report on grades, state assessments, and/or teacher-reported student behavior. Therefore, zeros in this table may reflect that a State is not reporting on the outcome represented.

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

- 36 out of 54 States/Territories (66.7%) reported a percentage of improvement from not proficient to proficient or above on the Elementary reading state assessment (16 more States/Territories reported data than the previous year: 48.2% increase).
- 34 out of 54 States/Territories (63.0%) reported a percentage of improvement from not proficient to proficient or above on the Middle/High School mathematics state assessment (14 more States reported data than the previous year: 44.5% increase).
- Overall, the States/Territories reported the following % improvement: 28.4% Elementary Reading and 22.6% Middle/High School Mathematics Assessment (23.0% and 10.0% improvement from the previous year respectively).

Table 4. Regular Attendees % Improved on Reading/Mathematics State Assessments

State/Territory	Reading Elementary % Improved	Mathematics Middle/High School % Improved
Overall	28.4%	22.6%
1. Alabama	0.0	0.0
2. Alaska	0.0	0.0

State/Territory	Reading Elementary % Improved	Mathematics Middle/High School % Improved
3. Arizona	14.7	33.7
4. Arkansas	34.6	41.5
5. Bureau of Indian Affairs	0.0	0.0
6. California	0.0	0.0
7. Colorado	0.0	0.0
8. Connecticut	0.0	0.0
9. Delaware	38.1	49.0
10. District of Columbia	38.0	52.4
11. Florida	87.2	57.8
12. Georgia	6.5	19.6
13. Hawaii	0.0	0.0
14. Idaho	6.7	0.9
15. Illinois	0.6	3.4
16. Indiana	0.0	0.0
17. Iowa	27.7	28.0
18. Kansas	66.7	50.0
19. Kentucky	0.0	0.0
20. Louisiana	69.2	60.6
21. Maine	0.0	0.0
22. Maryland	9.7	42.9
23. Massachusetts	21.2	12.4
24. Michigan	0.0	0.0
25. Minnesota	0.0	0.0
26. Mississippi	34.9	33.1
27. Missouri	0.0	0.0
28. Montana	0.0	0.0
29. Nebraska	0.0	0.0
30. Nevada	0.0	0.0
31. New Hampshire	0.0	0.0
32. New Jersey	48.6	62.4
33. New Mexico	0.0	0.0
34. New York	16.2	13.4
35. North Carolina	0.0	0.0
36. North Dakota	2.0	0.0
37. Ohio	54.7	28.0
38. Oklahoma	30.8	29.0
39. Oregon	0.7	0.0
40. Pennsylvania	26.1	29.0
41. Puerto Rico	49.4	27.3
42. Rhode Island	0.0	0.0
43. South Carolina	16.0	1.3
44. South Dakota	10.6	1.6

State/Territory	Reading Elementary % Improved	Mathematics Middle/High School % Improved
45. Tennessee	37.2	40.6
46. Texas	41.3	31.3
47. Utah	21.4	25.0
48. Vermont	25.4	27.3
49. Virgin Islands	0.0	0.0
50. Virginia	49.2	55.1
51. Washington	6.7	1.6
52. West Virginia	68.0	77.8
53. Wisconsin	56.9	0.0
54. Wyoming	69.3	50.5

Note: Raw scores were used to calculate overall % improvement. When calculating the % improvement “Overall”, the total amounts of regular attendees with reported APR results were used in the calculations across all States/Territories. Zeroes do not necessarily reflect delinquency in reporting or lack of improvement; States elect to report on grades, state assessments, and/or teacher-reported student behavior. Therefore, zeros in this table may reflect that a State is not reporting on the outcome represented.

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

- 44 out of 54 States (81.5%) reported data on homework completion/class participation (23 more States reported data than the previous year: 42.6% increase).
- Overall, the States reported the following % improvement in homework completion/class participation: 66.2% Elementary, 63.1% Middle/High School, and 65.2% for all students (16.4%, 14.7%, and 15.8% improvement from the previous year respectively).

Table 5. Regular Attendees % Improved Homework Completion/Class Participation

State/Territory	HW/CP Elementary % Improved	HW/CP Middle/High School % Improved	HW/CP All Students % Improved
Overall	66.2%	63.1%	65.2%
1. Alabama	93.1	89.1	92.4
2. Alaska	52.7	73.9	57.4
3. Arizona	67.7	65.1	66.9
4. Arkansas	0.0	100.0	100.0
5. Bureau of Indian Affairs	0.0	0.0	0.0
6. California	0.0	95.7	95.7
7. Colorado	85.8	82.7	84.9
8. Connecticut	59.2	63.5	60.4
9. Delaware	55.4	68.1	57.7
10. District of Columbia	75.1	78.2	75.7

State/Territory	HW/CP Elementary % Improved	HW/CP Middle/High School % Improved	HW/CP All Students % Improved
11. Florida	79.9	76.8	79.0
12. Georgia	65.7	67.3	66.3
13. Hawaii	69.4	54.7	61.4
14. Idaho	100.0	0.0	100.0
15. Illinois	96.7	82.6	90.6
16. Indiana	85.7	82.1	84.8
17. Iowa	66.7	60.1	65.0
18. Kansas	72.3	72.2	72.3
19. Kentucky	51.8	44.1	49.2
20. Louisiana	75.1	64.0	71.7
21. Maine	13.5	11.6	12.9
22. Maryland	82.8	100.0	92.2
23. Massachusetts	0.0	0.0	0.0
24. Michigan	59.4	58.8	59.2
25. Minnesota	46.5	63.4	57.8
26. Mississippi	59.7	75.7	67.1
27. Missouri	0.0	0.0	0.0
28. Montana	0.0	0.0	0.0
29. Nebraska	31.1	23.2	28.9
30. Nevada	71.4	61.6	69.3
31. New Hampshire	55.0	49.2	53.5
32. New Jersey	47.2	56.4	52.3
33. New Mexico	89.7	86.1	89.0
34. New York	74.7	80.9	76.8
35. North Carolina	0.0	0.0	0.0
36. North Dakota	42.2	66.7	42.6
37. Ohio	58.3	70.1	62.5
38. Oklahoma	0.0	0.0	0.0
39. Oregon	56.5	58.8	57.5
40. Pennsylvania	55.9	56.0	55.9
41. Puerto Rico	88.4	87.6	88.1
42. Rhode Island	26.8	39.6	31.5
43. South Carolina	72.0	65.4	70.3
44. South Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0
45. Tennessee	77.1	74.9	76.4
46. Texas	0.0	0.0	0.0
47. Utah	66.6	63.3	65.8
48. Vermont	0.0	0.0	0.0
49. Virgin Islands	90.1	94.3	90.9
50. Virginia	63.6	64.1	63.9
51. Washington	0.0	0.0	0.0
52. West Virginia	66.1	49.2	63.0

State/Territory	HW/CP Elementary % Improved	HW/CP Middle/High School % Improved	HW/CP All Students % Improved
53. Wisconsin	51.1	50.8	51.0
54. Wyoming	79.9	80.1	80.0

Note: Raw scores were used to calculate overall % improvement. When calculating the % improvement “Overall”, the total amounts of regular attendees with reported APR results were used in the calculations across all States/Territories. Zeroes do not necessarily reflect delinquency in reporting or lack of improvement; States elect to report on grades, state assessments, and/or teacher-reported student behavior. Therefore, zeros in this table may reflect that a State is not reporting on the outcome represented.

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

- 44 out of 54 States (81.5%) reported data on student behavior (23 more States reported data than the previous year: 42.6% increase).
- Overall, the States reported the following % improvement: 57.5% Elementary, 55.3% Middle/High School, and 56.8% for all students (20.3%, 20.0%, and 20.3 improvement from the previous year respectively).

Table 6. Regular Attendees % Improved Student Behavior

State/Territory	Student Behavior Elementary % Improved	Student Behavior Middle/High School % Improved	Student Behavior All Students % Improved
Overall	57.5%	55.3%	56.8%
1. Alabama	94.7	90.7	93.9
2. Alaska	45.7	48.8	46.4
3. Arizona	60.8	56.2	59.3
4. Arkansas	0.0	70.0	70.0
5. Bureau of Indian Affairs	0.0	0.0	0.0
6. California	0.0	96.7	96.7
7. Colorado	91.0	85.1	89.3
8. Connecticut	37.9	41.3	38.9
9. Delaware	43.4	62.7	46.9
10. District of Columbia	56.0	67.2	58.3
11. Florida	71.4	70.6	71.2
12. Georgia	46.9	51.7	48.8
13. Hawaii	68.8	57.8	62.8
14. Idaho	93.8	0.0	93.8
15. Illinois	96.7	82.6	90.6
16. Indiana	87.9	85.7	87.4
17. Iowa	63.1	62.7	63.0
18. Kansas	56.7	56.5	56.6
19. Kentucky	46.0	36.3	42.8

State/Territory	Student Behavior Elementary % Improved	Student Behavior Middle/High School % Improved	Student Behavior All Students % Improved
20. Louisiana	68.4	56.2	64.7
21. Maine	21.0	17.1	19.8
22. Maryland	82.8	100.0	92.2
23. Massachusetts	0.0	0.0	0.0
24. Michigan	54.9	54.8	54.8
25. Minnesota	50.9	67.3	61.9
26. Mississippi	38.2	43.4	40.6
27. Missouri	0.0	0.0	0.0
28. Montana	0.0	0.0	0.0
29. Nebraska	29.8	20.2	27.1
30. Nevada	42.4	39.0	41.6
31. New Hampshire	26.5	24.3	25.9
32. New Jersey	34.4	47.7	41.8
33. New Mexico	92.1	89.8	91.7
34. New York	71.1	66.9	69.7
35. North Carolina	0.0	0.0	0.0
36. North Dakota	21.3	16.7	21.3
37. Ohio	42.7	53.2	46.4
38. Oklahoma	0.0	0.0	0.0
39. Oregon	50.1	49.5	49.8
40. Pennsylvania	42.4	49.5	46.8
41. Puerto Rico	87.7	86.0	87.2
42. Rhode Island	31.4	36.0	33.1
43. South Carolina	43.9	41.8	43.4
44. South Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0
45. Tennessee	64.1	64.5	64.3
46. Texas	0.0	0.0	0.0
47. Utah	58.5	50.8	56.8
48. Vermont	0.0	0.0	0.0
49. Virgin Islands	87.7	92.0	88.6
50. Virginia	47.6	54.8	51.2
51. Washington	0.0	0.0	0.0
52. West Virginia	67.4	43.9	63.1
53. Wisconsin	43.6	41.3	43.0
54. Wyoming	72.9	74.1	73.2

Note: Raw scores were used to calculate overall % improvement. When calculating the % improvement “Overall”, the total amounts of regular attendees with reported APR results were used in the calculations across all States/Territories. Zeroes do not necessarily reflect delinquency in reporting or lack of improvement; States elect to report on grades, state assessments, and/or teacher-reported student behavior. Therefore, zeros in this table may reflect that a State is not reporting on the outcome represented.

SECTION 2: GRANTEE AND CENTER CHARACTERISTICS

A. Center Type

Table 7 displays the results of the grantees' centers for all 54 States/Territories. Of the 11,512 centers, 82.1% were classified as school districts (n = 9,446) and 9.8% as community-based organizations (n = 1,125).

Table 7. Grantees' Centers Broken Down by Organization Type

Center Type	All 54 States/Territories N	All 54 States/Territories %
	N	%
Charter School	463	4.0
College/University	15	0.1
Community Based Organization	1,125	9.8
Faith Based Organization	160	1.4
Public School Districts	9,446	82.1
Other	303	2.6
Total	11,512	100.0%

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

B. People Served

During SY 14-15 a total of over 1.8 million people have been served by this program. The total number of attendees served by the program is calculated by adding the total number of student attendees, which includes the number of regular⁴ student attendees, to the number of summer attendees and adults/family members served. Table 8 displays the amount of people served by the program per classification:

- total student attendees (n = 1,405,722) including regular student attendees (n = 752,008),
- summer attendees (n = 279,314), and
- adults/family members (n = 183,461).

Tables 9 and 10 provide an even further examination into the amount/percentage of people served broken down by the type of center attended. The majority of regular attendees attended programs provided by school districts (84.7%, n = 636,939).

Table 8. Attendees Served Based on Type

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

Attendees Served	Total N	Total %
Regular Student Attendees	752,008	40.2%
Non-regular Student Attendees	653,714	35%
Total Student Attendees (including regular students)	1,405,722	75.2%
Summer Attendees	279,314	14.9%
Adults/Family Members	183,461	9.9%
Total	1,868,497	100%

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

Table 9. Total Attendees by Center Type

Center Type	All 54 States/Territories N	All 54 States/Territories %
Charter School	76,191	5.4
College/University	2,249	0.2
Community Based Organization	79,812	5.7
Faith Based Organization	8,783	0.6
Public School Districts	1,218,256	86.7
Other	20,431	1.5
Total	1,405,722	100.0%

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

Table 10. Regular Attendees by Center Type

Center Type	All 54 States/Territories N	All 54 States/Territories %
	N	%
Charter School	40,880	5.4
College/University	1,417	0.2
Community Based Organization	52,380	7.0
Faith Based Organization	6,485	0.9
Public School Districts	636,939	84.7
Other	13,907	1.8
Total	752,008	100.0%

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

C. Activity Participation

Program sites offered various activities for attendees. Tables 11 to 14 display the results of the amount of times per week/month each of the activities are provided throughout the academic school year. The majority of times were held providing activities centered on homework assistance (27,123 times/week), physical activity (24,073 times/week), literacy (23,953 times/week), and STEM (21,771 times/week). The majority of activities were offered from less than 1-hour to 1-2 hours per week with the exception of Arts & Music, literacy, and STEM activities, which were offered anywhere from less than 1-hour to 2-4 hours per week.

Table 11. Times per Week of Each Activity Offered⁵

Activity	Times per Week	Times per Month
Community/Service Learning	2,804	2,998
Counseling Programs	1,954	1,952
Drug Prevention	1,027	1,441
College & Career Readiness	4,164	2,142
Homework Help	27,123	705
Mentoring	3,888	2,135
Physical Activity	24,073	3,423
Tutoring	16,165	1,534
Youth Leadership	5,495	4,316

Table 12. Frequency of Each Activity Offered

Activity	Less than 1 Hour	1-2 Hours	2-4 Hours	More than 4 Hours
Community/Service Learning	578	1,910	656	151
Counseling Programs	463	919	156	25
Drug Prevention	514	989	115	33
College & Career Readiness	351	1,373	432	137
Homework Help	2,606	3,451	600	102
Mentoring	524	1,150	284	59
Physical Activity	2,426	3,880	817	119
Tutoring	1,274	2,733	656	92
Youth Leadership	920	2,163	502	84

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

Table 13. Times per Week of Each Academic Activity Offered

Academic Activity	Times per Week	Times per Month
Arts & Music	17,197	4,970
Entrepreneurship	3,286	1,472
Literacy	23,953	2,288
English Language Learners' Support	7,565	663
STEM	21,771	3,727
Truancy Prevention	3,253	623
Violence Prevention	1,201	1,274

Table 14. Frequency of Each Academic Activity Offered

Academic Activity	Less than 1 Hour	1-2 Hours	2-4 Hours	More than 4 Hours
Arts & Music	1,452	4,244	1,004	163
Entrepreneurship	302	1,126	362	63
Literacy	1,475	4,346	1,160	157
English Language Learners' Support	401	1,037	718	52
STEM	1,029	4,764	1,368	155
Truancy Prevention	309	477	400	37
Violence Prevention	521	734	94	33

D. Staffing Type

Participating centers employ paid and volunteer staff to assist with programming. There were a reported 115,000 paid staff and 31,319 volunteer staff. Table 15 provides the amount of paid and volunteer staff broken down by type for all 54 States/Territories. Among the paid staff, the majority were school day teachers (43.1%, n = 49,553) followed by other non-teaching school staff (14.7%, n = 17,213). College students served as the majority of volunteers (21.9%, n = 6,856) used by the centers followed by members of the community (25.2%, n = 7,886).

Table 15. Staffing Type per Paid and Volunteer Staff

Staffing Type	Paid Staff N	Paid Staff %	Volunteer Staff N	Volunteer Staff %
Center Administrators	8,723	7.6%	1,061	3.4%
College Students	8,938	7.8%	6,856	21.9%

Staffing Type	Paid Staff N	Paid Staff %	Volunteer Staff N	Volunteer Staff %
Community Members	4,837	4.2%	7,886	25.2%
High School Students	4,018	3.5%	5,302	16.9%
Parents	923	0.8%	5,456	17.4%
School Day Teachers	49,553	43.1%	1,598	5.1%
Other Non-Teaching School Staff	19,006	16.5%	1,350	4.3%
Other Non-Teaching School Staff with Some or No College	10,262	8.9%	501	1.6%
Other	8,740	7.6%	1,309	4.2%
Total	115,000	100.0%	31,319	100.0%

E. Attendees Served per Demographic

Tables 16 and 17 provide a demographic depiction of the program attendees broken down by gender, race/ethnicity, and grade level. Overall, there was a fairly even split between male (49.2%, n = 687,464) and female (48.2%, n = 673,800) attendees. In terms of race/ethnicity, the majority of the attendees were identified as Hispanic (36.1%, n = 504,661), with White (28.0%, n = 391,422) and Black (20.9%, n = 292,260) following. There was a considerably larger amount of Pre-K-5 regular attendees (60.5%, n = 454,677) in comparison to 6th-12th grade regular attendees (39.5%, n = 297,331).

Table 16. Participant Demographics

Demographic	N	%
1. Attendance		
<30 Days	653,714	46.5%
30-59 Days	301,059	21.4%
60-89 Days	181,843	12.9%
90 Days or More	269,106	19.1%
Total	1,405,722	100.0%
2. Sex		
Male	687,464	48.9%
Female	673,800	47.9%
Unknown	44,458	3.2%
Total	1,405,722	100.0%
3. Race/Ethnicity		
Asian	52,198	3.7%
Black	292,260	20.8%
Hispanic	504,661	35.9%
Native American	44,279	3.1%
Pacific Islander	6,193	0.4%
White	391,422	27.8%

Demographic	N	%
Two or More Races	34,866	2.5%
Unknown	79,843	5.7%
Total	1,405,722	100.0%
4. Grade Level		
Pre-K – 5th	636,186	45.3%
6th – 12th	769,536	54.7%
Total	1,405,722	100.0%
5. English Language Learners*	185,628	13.2%
6. Free & Reduced Lunch*	941,952	67.0%
7. Special Needs*	137,455	9.8%

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

Table 17. Number of Participants per Grade Level

Grade Level	Total Student Attendees N	Total Student Attendees %	Total Regular Student Attendees N	Total Regular Student Attendees %
Pre-K – 5th	636,186	45.3%	454,677	60.5%
6th – 12th	769,536	54.7%	297,331	39.5%
Total	1,405,722	100.0%	752,008	100.0%

F. Estimated Per-Student Expenditures

For the 2014-2015 academic school year, the Department of Education awarded \$1,135,149,873 to 21st Century Community Learning Center programs across 54 States/Territories. Table 18 displays the total award amounts, the total of regular attendees, estimated expenditure per regular student, the total of all attendees, and the estimated expenditure per total student by State/Territory.

Total Award for the Year was sourced from budget history tables published by the US Department of Education⁶.

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

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

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

This estimated expenditure does not take into account funding provided by other partners. It does not consider the 27-month time frame during which States can spread their award distribution. It does not reflect any invoices or receipts documenting actual disbursement of funds towards programming. The estimated expenditure is not a weighted average; in other words, higher attendance is not given more value than lower attendance when calculating this estimate. The dollar value estimate was calculated by dividing the total award for the year (numerator) by the total regular attendees or the total all attendees (denominator). The denominator does not include summer attendees (n = 279,314 nationwide) or family members served (n = 183,461 nationwide). This estimated expenditure is not connected in any way to G5, the Department of Education's grant management system.

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

Table 18. Estimated Expenditure per Regular Attendee and All Attendees

State/Territory	Total Award for the Year	Total Regular Attendees	Estimated Expenditure per Regular Attendee*	Total All Attendees	Estimated Expenditure per All Attendees*
Overall	\$1,135,149,873	752,008	\$1,509.49	1,405,722	\$807.52
1. Alabama	\$17,303,700	8,332	\$2,076.78	12,415	\$1,393.77
2. Alaska	\$5,631,913	2,598	\$2,167.79	3,850	\$1,462.83
3. Arizona	\$25,045,386	42,337	\$591.57	85,546	\$292.77
4. Arkansas	\$11,456,864	6,647	\$1,723.61	12,671	\$904.18
5. Bureau of Indian Affairs	\$8,054,658	1,648	\$4,887.54	3,896	\$2,067.42
6. California	\$124,944,905	102,130	\$1,223.39	281,502	\$443.85
7. Colorado	\$11,325,268	5,632	\$2,010.88	18,525	\$611.35
8. Connecticut	\$9,115,045	8,943	\$1,019.24	11,045	\$825.26
9. Delaware	\$5,631,913	2,186	\$2,576.36	2,805	\$2,007.81
10. District of Columbia	\$5,631,913	2,611	\$2,156.99	2,978	\$1,891.17
11. Florida	\$59,746,279	26,026	\$2,295.64	40,056	\$1,491.57
12. Georgia	\$38,389,509	18,359	\$2,091.05	24,619	\$1,559.34
13. Hawaii	\$5,631,913	1,886	\$2,986.17	4,946	\$1,138.68
14. Idaho	\$5,631,913	3,883	\$1,450.40	7,133	\$789.56
15. Illinois	\$52,083,676	23,895	\$2,179.69	44,717	\$1,164.74
16. Indiana	\$20,037,958	12,963	\$1,545.78	20,533	\$975.89
17. Iowa	\$7,033,211	4,611	\$1,525.31	7,980	\$881.3
18. Kansas	\$7,774,542	10,959	\$709.42	19,881	\$391.05
19. Kentucky	\$17,054,721	11,719	\$1,455.31	32,256	\$528.73
20. Louisiana	\$22,386,376	19,644	\$1,139.60	32,194	\$695.36
21. Maine	\$5,631,913	3,701	\$1,521.73	7,277	\$773.93
22. Maryland	\$15,545,716	2,892	\$5,375.42	4,579	\$3,395.00
23. Massachusetts	\$16,842,674	12,532	\$1,343.97	14,857	\$1,133.65
24. Michigan	\$39,049,235	13,708	\$2,848.65	21,481	\$1,817.85
25. Minnesota	\$11,646,545	13,832	\$842.00	24,387	\$477.57
26. Mississippi	\$13,258,721	1,535	\$8,637.60	2,783	\$4,764.18

State/Territory	Total Award for the Year	Total Regular Attendees	Estimated Expenditure per Regular Attendee*	Total All Attendees	Estimated Expenditure per All Attendees*
27. Missouri	\$17,648,808	15,001	\$1,176.51	30,025	\$587.80
28. Montana	\$5,631,913	13,533	\$416.16	14,851	\$379.23
29. Nebraska	\$5,631,913	11,301	\$498.36	18,216	\$309.17
30. Nevada	\$8,788,719	6,338	\$1,386.67	10,959	\$801.96
31. New Hampshire	\$5,631,913	4,723	\$1,192.44	8,211	\$685.90
32. New Jersey	\$22,245,555	9,572	\$2,324.02	11,899	\$1,869.53
33. New Mexico	\$8,812,967	6,201	\$1,421.22	11,388	\$773.88
34. New York	\$84,544,562	32,586	\$2,594.51	71,075	\$1,189.51
35. North Carolina	\$31,709,298	17,352	\$1,827.41	24,766	\$1,280.36
36. North Dakota	\$5,631,913	5,965	\$944.16	7,996	\$704.34
37. Ohio	\$45,173,267	9,114	\$4,956.47	18,694	\$2,416.46
38. Oklahoma	\$11,603,580	14,367	\$807.66	22,234	\$521.88
39. Oregon	\$12,225,580	9,489	\$1,288.39	23,511	\$519.99
40. Pennsylvania	\$42,806,153	17,426	\$2,456.45	33,069	\$1,294.45
41. Puerto Rico	\$30,763,351	15,270	\$2,014.63	17,755	\$1,732.66
42. Rhode Island	\$5,631,913	4,961	\$1,135.24	12,316	\$457.28
43. South Carolina	\$16,916,143	9,186	\$1,841.51	11,042	\$1,531.98
44. South Dakota	\$5,631,913	6,759	\$833.25	17,737	\$317.52
45. Tennessee	\$21,785,985	30,596	\$712.05	45,742	\$476.28
46. Texas	\$106,206,512	74,242	\$1,430.54	115,321	\$920.96
47. Utah	\$7,192,144	9,870	\$728.69	20,070	\$358.35
48. Vermont	\$5,631,913	6,544	\$860.62	11,699	\$481.40
49. Virgin Islands	\$712,615	890	\$800.69	947	\$752.50
50. Virginia	\$17,822,791	8,781	\$2,029.70	20,279	\$878.88
51. Washington	\$16,744,986	9,532	\$1,756.71	14,869	\$1,126.17
52. West Virginia	\$7,450,724	4,615	\$1,614.46	11,011	\$676.66
53. Wisconsin	\$17,054,362	24,126	\$706.89	39,695	\$429.64
54. Wyoming	\$5,631,913	8,459	\$665.79	15,433	\$364.93

*This estimated expenditure does not take into account funding provided by other partners, the 27-month time frame during which States can spread their award distribution, or any invoices or receipts documenting actual disbursement of funds. The estimated expenditure is not a weighted average; in other words, higher attendance is not given more value than lower attendance when calculating this estimate. The dollar value estimate was calculated by dividing the total award for the year by the total regular attendees or the total all attendees and does not include summer attendees (n = 279,314 nationwide) or family members served (n = 183,461 nationwide). This estimated expenditure is not connected in any way to G5, the Department of Education's grant management system.

CONCLUSION

For the 2014-2015 academic school year, 11,512 centers received federal funding to implement the 21st CCLC grant. The majority of these were classified as school districts with community-based organizations following second. During SY 14-15 this program has served over 1.8 million student and family member participants and employed 115,000 paid and 31,319 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.

In the spirit of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESSA), 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 (ESSA, Sec. 4201 (a) [Purpose](#)). Over the past year this program has resulted in over 1.8 million low-income students and family members having a safe place to receive academic enrichment. Data will be used to bolster continuous improvement through monitoring and technical assistance efforts. The 21st CCLC programs will continue to contribute positively to States' efforts to close gaps in achievement and graduation rates as Every Student Succeeds Act is implemented. The data in this annual performance report will inform continuous program improvement, including proficiency on tests, English-language, proficiency, and graduation rates, through monitoring and technical assistance.