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 3,304 grantees representing 8,704 centers reported annual performance report data for 2008-09. These centers served a total of 1,506,852 students, with 754,338 of these attending 30 days or more.

- Approximately two thirds of centers in 2005–06, 2006-07, 2007–08, and 2008-09 served elementary students in some capacity, approximately 20 percent exclusively served middle school students, and 5 percent to ten 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 percent of programs, respectively.

- A total of 213,552 adult family members were provided with services in 2008-09. That is a decrease from the 223,165 adult family members served in 2007-08, but still higher than the 199,489 adult family members served in 2005-06 and 210,890 in 2006-07.

- School Districts (SD) were the largest grantee organization category, accounting for more than 65 percent of all grantees. Community Based Organizations (CBO) were the second largest grantee organization group accounting for more than 15 percent of grantees. Taken together, CBOs and Nationally Affiliated Nonprofit Agencies (NPAs) accounted for over 20 percent of all grantees.

- Approximately 89 percent of all centers are SDs; six percent are CBOs or NPAs.

- A total of 162,840 school year staff members were reported as serving in a role in afterschool programs. Of these, 38,999 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 12 percent. For volunteer staff, college students account for the largest percentage at 24 percent with community members second at 20 percent. Similar trends are seen for other years.

- Of 4,032 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 (7 percent); 22 percent were classified as *Mostly Recreation*; and 25 percent were classified as *Mostly Enrichment*. Thirty-four percent were classified as *Variety*.

- States have some flexibility in reporting GPRA-related data. For 2008-09, 53 percent of states provided grades data, 43 percent provided state assessment data, 81 percent provided teacher survey data, and 100 percent provided activity data.

- Nearly all of the performance targets for the 2008–09 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 2007-08 state assessments who moved to proficient or above in 2008-09.

- 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 three 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 three years, with the exception of grades data for 2008-09, where improvement rates were relatively flat or slightly declined with increased attendance. Grades data for 2008-09 notwithstanding, 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 2008-09 for both mathematics and reading fell compared with 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. The trend is not consistent across states, but the decline is spread across enough states that no single state's grades data seems to be causing the relative drop, whether through high 2007-08 rates or low

2008-09 rates. It should be noted that, across the same time frame, an increasingly higher proportion of students were reported as maintaining the highest grade possible across the span of the school year.

- 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 reading than regular attendees participating in programs with other staffing types. In particular, students in centers staffed by *Mostly Teachers* seemed to show consistently greater achievement along the *attaining proficiency* state assessment measures.

- In 2008-09, the average funding per student was $580. This is a slight drop from the previous two years where the funding per student was approximately $594. (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 $1,220 to $7,252 in 2005–06, $1,221 to $10,417 in 2006-07, $1,231 to $10,000 in 2007-08, and $1,213 to $5,037 in 2008-09.

- In relation to the mathematics-related measures, there is an overall positive, linear trend in the percentage of regular attendees witnessing an improvement in state assessment results as the level of funding increases. This linear trend especially is pronounced and consistent in relation to the state assessment measures related to the percentage of regular attendees attaining proficiency (*Attained Prof*), though there is a slight drop between the third and fourth quartiles. 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. 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 mathematics and reading grades dropped from prior years' improvement rates, and did so consistently across all sub-categories. 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.