

## Executive Summary

For approximately ten years, the 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) program, as reauthorized by Title IV, Part B, of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, has provided students in high-poverty communities across the nation the opportunity to participate in academic enrichment and youth development programs designed to enhance their well-being. In crafting activities and programs to serve participating students and adult family members, centers funded by the 21st CCLC program have implemented a wide spectrum of program delivery, staffing, and operational models to help students improve academically as well as socially.

In this report, data collected through the 21st CCLC Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS) have been synthesized to further inform an improved understanding of the intersection of program attributes and student achievement outcomes for children who participate in 21st CCLC programs. An Annual Performance Report (APR) is completed by grantees through PPICS 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. One of the core purposes of the APR is to collect information on the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) performance indicators associated with the 21st CCLC program. These metrics, described in greater detail in Section 2, represent the primary mechanism by which the federal government determines the success and progress of the 21st CCLC program against clearly-defined, statutorily-based requirements.

Key findings of this report include:

- A total of 3,613 grantees representing 9,141 centers reported annual performance report data for 2009-10. These centers served a total of 1,660,954 students, with 808,710 of these attending 30 days or more.
- Approximately two thirds of centers in 2005–06, 2006-07, 2007–08, 2008-09, and 2009-10 served elementary students in some capacity, approximately 20 percent exclusively served middle school students, and 5 percent to twelve percent exclusively served high school students. The percent of programs serving high school students has risen year-over-year since 2006, from five to six to eight to ten to twelve percent of programs.
- A total of 253,283 adult family members were provided with services in 2009-10. That is an increase from the 213,552 adult family members served in 2008-09, as well as an increase from the 223,165 adult family members served in 2007-08. In 2005-06, 199,489 adult family members were served, and 210,890 in 2006-07, making the number of adult family members served in 2009-10 the highest in five years.
- School Districts (SD) were the largest grantee organization category, accounting for more than 60 percent of all grantees. Community Based Organizations (CBO) were the second largest grantee organization group accounting for 19 percent of grantees. Taken together, CBOs and Nationally Affiliated Nonprofit Agencies (NPAs) accounted for nearly a quarter (24 percent) of all grantees.

- Approximately 88 percent of all centers are SDs; around six percent are CBOs or NPAs.
- A total of 166,480 school year staff were reported. Of these, 39,470 were identified as volunteer staff.
- School-day teachers account for the largest percentage of paid staff at 45 percent. Non-teaching school staff account for the second largest at approximately 13 percent. For volunteer staff, college students account for the largest percentage at 21 percent with community members second at 19 percent. Similar trends are seen for other years.
- Of 3,812 centers reporting individual—as opposed to aggregated—activity data, nearly a fifth of centers were classified as falling within either the *Mostly Homework Help* (12 percent) or *Mostly Tutoring* clusters (9 percent); 20 percent were classified as *Mostly Recreation*; and 24 percent were classified as *Mostly Enrichment*. Thirty-five percent were classified as *Variety*.
- States have some flexibility in reporting GPRA-related data. For 2009-10, 57 percent of states provided grades data, 46 percent provided state assessment data, 80 percent provided teacher survey data, and 100 percent provided activity data.
- Nearly all of the performance targets for the 2009–10 reporting period were not reached. For the range of indicators related to regular attendee improvement in student achievement and behaviors, the only indicators where the performance target was reached were related to the percentage of regular program participants who were below proficient in mathematics or reading on 2008-09 state assessments who moved to proficient or above in 2009-10.
- Students who spend more time in programs (based on number of attendance days) tend to show greater improvement along several measures. For example, looking at State Assessment results across five years, students attending 60-89 days on average did better in mathematics than students attending 30-59 days. Students attending 90+ days, on average did better than students attending fewer than 90 days. Similar results hold true for other measures across all five years, with the exception of grades data for 2008-09 and 2009-10, where improvement rates were relatively flat or slightly declined with increased attendance. Grades data for 2008-09 and 2009-10 notwithstanding, these data suggest that there is a positive relationship between higher levels of participation in 21st CCLC programs and the likelihood that students will demonstrate improvement in student achievement and academic-related behaviors.
- Grade improvement rates for 2009-10 for both math and reading were mixed compared with 2008-09, but were on the whole lower than previous years' improvement rates. It is not immediately clear why this is the case, as the trend is consistent across activity clusters, staffing clusters, grade levels, school-based status, cost-per-student quartile, and grant maturity. It should be noted that, across the same time frame, an increasingly higher proportion of students were reported as maintaining the highest grade possible.

- Regular attendees in centers associated with the *Mostly Teachers* cluster were generally more apt to demonstrate an improvement in mathematics grades and state assessments in 2005–06, 2006-07, 2007–08, 2008-09 and 2009-10 than regular attendees participating in programs with other staffing types.
- In 2009-10, the average funding per student was \$595. This is a slight increase from the previous year where the funding per student was approximately \$580, but is consistent with the funding levels of prior years. (Note that per-student funding does not take other sources of funding into account. See Estimated Per-Student Expenditures for an explanation of how these numbers are calculated.)
- There is a large jump in the average estimated per-student expenditure moving from the third to the fourth quartile. It appears that there is a fair degree of variation among centers classified within this fourth quartile, with the range of funding levels spanning \$1,229 to \$7,988 in 2005–06, \$1,220 to \$8,051 in 2006-07, \$1,230 to \$7,805 in 2007-08, \$1,230 to \$8,006 in 2008-09, and \$1,313 to \$7,865 in 2009-10.
- In relation to the mathematics-related measures, there is a positive, linear trend in the percentage of regular attendees witnessing an improvement in state assessment results as the level of funding increases. There is a drop-off between the third and fourth quartiles for some years, however. The results for reading/language arts grades and state assessment measures are very similar to these findings.
- Preliminary evidence outlined in this report suggests that programs providing *Mostly Tutoring* services appear to have a slight advantage in contributing to mathematics and reading achievement for grades, while centers staffed mostly by teachers and centers receiving higher levels of funding per student seem to demonstrate higher levels of achievement in both mathematics and reading. This is consistent with 2008-09. More rigorous investigation and focus should be centered on program effectiveness based on the staffing model employed by centers and of school-based and non-school-based afterschool programs, especially in the area of the allocation and distribution of funds.

Building on these key findings, there are four trends worthy of special note: First, it appears that there is a fairly strong relationship between student levels of participation (attendance) and student progress (performance indicators). Second, improvement rates for math and reading grades, though mixed compared with 2008-09, were still lower than improvement rates of prior years. Third, students attending centers classified as falling within the *Mostly Tutoring* cluster appear more likely to demonstrate an improvement in both mathematics and reading grades. Finally, data on staffing suggest the possibility of a relationship between staffing type and student outcomes. In particular, students in centers associated with the *Mostly Teachers* staffing cluster were generally more apt to attain proficiency in both mathematics and reading.