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# Executive Summary

For approximately eleven 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. The core purpose 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 this report, 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 4,100 grantees representing 10,188 centers reported annual performance report data for 2010-11. These centers served a total of 1,873,290 students, with 897,642 of these attending 30 days or more.
* Fifty-nine to 69 percent of centers from 2005–06 to 2010-11 served elementary students in some capacity, approximately 20 percent exclusively served middle school students, and 5 percent to 13 percent exclusively served high school students. The percent of programs serving exclusively 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 274,364 adult family members were provided with services in 2010-11. That is an increase from the 253,283 adult family members served in 2009-10, as well as an increase from the 213,552 adult family members served in 2008-09. In 2005-06, 199,489 adult family members were served, 210,857 in 2006-07, and 223,042 in 2007-08, making the number of adult family members served in 2010-11 the highest in six years.
* School Districts (SD) were the largest grantee organization category, accounting for approximately 60 percent of all grantees. Community Based Organizations (CBO) were the second largest grantee organization group accounting for 20 percent of grantees. Taken together, CBOs and Nationally Affiliated Nonprofit Agencies (NPAs) accounted for a quarter (25 percent) of all grantees.
* Approximately 86 percent of all centers are SDs; around seven percent are CBOs or NPAs.
* A total of 176,135 school year staff were reported. Of these, 40,992 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 19 percent. Similar trends are seen for other years.
* States have some flexibility in reporting GPRA-related data. For 2010-11, 50 percent of states provided grades data, 50 percent provided state assessment data, 79 percent provided teacher survey data, and 100 percent provided activity data.
* Nearly all of the performance targets for the 2010–11 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 *Measure 1.7* The percentage of elementary 21st Century regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above in reading on state assessments, and *Measure 1.8* The percentage of middle and high school 21st Century regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above in mathematics on state assessments.

# Section 1: Grantee and Center Characteristics

## Grantee Type

One of the hallmarks of the 21st CCLC program is that all types of entities are eligible to apply for State-administered 21st CCLC grants, including, but not limited to, school districts, charter schools, private schools, community-based organizations, nationally affiliated nonprofit organizations (e.g., Boys and Girls Clubs, YMCAs, etc.), faith-based organizations, and for-profit entities. These applicants are referred to in this report as *grantees*.

As shown in Table 1, School Districts (SD) were the largest grantee organization category every year from 2005-06 to 2010-11, accounting for more than 58 percent of all grantees each year. Community Based Organizations (CBO) were the second largest grantee organization group accounting for more than 15 percent of grantees each year. It should also be noted that Nationally-Affiliated Non-Profit Agencies (NPAs) like Boys and Girls Clubs and YMCAs/YWCAs accounted for more than 4 percent of grantees each year. Taken together, CBOs and NPAs accounted for over 19 percent of all grantees each year.

Table 1. Grantees by Organization Type

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grantee Type[[1]](#footnote-1)** | **No. in 2005-06** | **No. in 2006-07** | **No. in 2007-08** | **No. in 2008-09** | **No. in 2009-10** | **No. in 2010-11** | **Percent in 2005-06** | **Percent in 2006-07** | **Percent in 2007-08** | **Percent in 2008-09** | **Percent in 2009-10** | **Percent in 2010-11** |
| Unknown | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 60 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.1% | 1.5% |
| CBO  | 447 | 488 | 496 | 545 | 687 | 802 | 15.0% | 15.7% | 15.3% | 16.5% | 19.0% | 19.6% |
| COU  | 44 | 49 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 71 | 1.5% | 1.6% | 1.5% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% |
| CS  | 63 | 68 | 81 | 85 | 102 | 113 | 2.1% | 2.2% | 2.5% | 2.6% | 2.8% | 2.8% |
| FBO  | 48 | 57 | 60 | 66 | 71 | 111 | 1.6% | 1.8% | 1.9% | 2.0% | 2.0% | 2.7% |
| FPC  | 16 | 19 | 13 | 21 | 36 | 56 | 0.5% | 0.6% | 0.4% | 0.6% | 1.0% | 1.4% |
| NPA  | 129 | 127 | 151 | 163 | 173 | 213 | 4.3% | 4.1% | 4.7% | 4.9% | 4.8% | 5.2% |
| Other  | 206 | 205 | 234 | 242 | 267 | 286 | 6.9% | 6.6% | 7.2% | 7.3% | 7.4% | 7.0% |
| SD  | 2,018 | 2098 | 2150 | 2,122 | 2,213 | 2,388 | 67.9% | 67.4% | 66.4% | 64.2% | 61.3% | 58.2% |
| **Total** | 2,971 | 3112 | 3236 | 3,304 | 3,613 | 4,100 | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Center Type

While grantees are the organizations that apply for and receive funds, each grantee in turn may operate several *centers*, which are the physical places where student activities actually occur. Center types include school districts, charter schools, private schools, community-based organizations, nationally affiliated nonprofit organizations (e.g., Boys and Girls Clubs, YMCAs, etc.), faith-based organizations, and for-profit entities. As shown in Table 2, approximately 86 percent of centers were housed in school district buildings in 2010-11. Approximately 5 percent of centers were housed in community-based organization buildings in 2010-11, making this the second largest category. All other categories are at less than 3%. This general trend held true for the previous years as well.

Table 2. Centers by Type

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Center Type[[2]](#footnote-2)** | **No. in 2005-06** | **No. in 2006-07** | **No. in 2007-08** | **No. in 2008-09** | **No. in 2009-10** | **No. in 2010-11** | **Percent in 2005-06** | **Percent in 2006-07** | **Percent in 2007-08** | **Percent in 2008-09** | **Percent in 2009-10** | **Percent in 2010-11** |
| Unknown\* | 5 | 6 | 5 | 14 | 77 | 154 | 0.1% | 0.1% | 0.1% | 0.2% | 0.8% | 1.5% |
| CBO  | 332 | 347 | 381 | 389 | 399 | 493 | 3.5% | 3.9% | 4.2% | 4.5% | 4.4% | 4.8% |
| COU  | 23 | 26 | 27 | 21 | 18 | 25 | 0.2% | 0.3% | 0.3% | 0.2% | 0.2% | 0.2% |
| CS  | 89 | 92 | 105 | 118 | 151 | 175 | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.2% | 1.4% | 1.7% | 1.7% |
| FBO  | 120 | 129 | 125 | 128 | 117 | 171 | 1.3% | 1.4% | 1.4% | 1.5% | 1.3% | 1.7% |
| FPC  | 9 | 9 | 8 | 6 | 9 | 26 | 0.1% | 0.1% | 0.1% | 0.1% | 0.1% | 0.3% |
| NPA  | 183 | 176 | 200 | 170 | 200 | 219 | 2.0% | 2.0% | 2.2% | 2.0% | 2.2% | 2.1% |
| Other  | 162 | 166 | 166 | 174 | 172 | 208 | 1.7% | 1.8% | 1.8% | 2.0% | 1.9% | 2.0% |
| SD  | 8,430 | 8,036 | 8,036 | 7,684 | 7,998 | 8,717 | 90.1% | 89.4% | 88.8% | 88.3% | 87.5% | 85.6% |
| **Total** | 9,353 | 8,987 | 9,053 | 8,704 | 9,141 | 10,188 | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

As shown in Figure 1, approximately 89 percent of centers were housed in schools; the other centers were located at a variety of non-school-based sites. Differences in certain types of student outcomes were found between school-based and non-school-based centers. These differences are explored more thoroughly in Section 3 of this report.

Figure 1. Number of 21st CCLCs by School-Based Status
During the 2005–06, 2006-07, 2007–08, 2008–09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 Reporting Periods

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **School-Based Status** | **No. in 2005-06** | **No. in 2006-07** | **No. in 2007-08** | **No. in 2008-09** | **No. in 2009-10** | **No. in 2010-11** | **Percent in 2005-06** | **Percent in 2006-07** | **Percent in 2007-08** | **Percent in 2008-09** | **Percent in 2009-10** | **Percent in 2010-11** |
| **\* MISSING** | 5 | 6 | 5 | 14 | 77 | 154 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **School-Based** | 8565 | 8175 | 8179 | 7841 | 8187 | 8946 | 91.6% | 91.0% | 90.4% | 90.2% | 90.3% | 89.2% |
| **Non-School-Based** | 783 | 806 | 869 | 849 | 877 | 1088 | 8.4% | 9.0% | 9.6% | 9.8% | 9.7% | 10.8% |

## People Served

As part of the APR submission process, centers are asked to report on the total number of students they served during the reporting period. In addition, students who attend 30 days or more are considered to be in a special category called *regular attendees*. As shown in Table 3, there were 1,873,290 students who attended 21st CCLC programming in 2010-11. Of those, 897,642 or 48 percent were regular attendees.

Table 3: Total and Regular Attendee Students per Year

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **APR Year** | **Total Students** | **Total Regular Attendee Students** |
| **2006** | 1,433,713 | 795,955 |
| **2007** | 1,388,776 | 753,307 |
| **2008** | 1,416,154 | 757,962 |
| **2009** | 1,506,920 | 754,338 |
| **2010** | 1,660,945 | 808,710 |
| **2011** | 1,873,290 | 897,642 |

Table 4 shows where students participated in 21st CCLC activities by center type. In 2010-11 for example, over 88 percent of all students went to centers housed in school district (SD) buildings. Community Based Organization (CBO)-housed centers accounted for the second highest percentage of students at just under 4 percent. Almost ninety percent of all regular attendees in 2011 attended programming in centers housed in school district (SD) buildings. Community-Based Organization (CBO) centers accounted for the second highest percentage of regular attendees at just over 3 percent. Similar trends are seen for 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10.

Table 4: Total and Regular Student Attendees by Center Type

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Center Type[[3]](#footnote-3)** | **2006 Tot** | **206 Reg** | **2007 Tot**  | **2007 Reg** | **2008 Tot** | **2008 Reg** | **2009 Tot** | **2009 Reg** | **2010 Tot** | **2010 Reg** | **2011 Tot** | **2011 Reg** |
| **Unknown** | 0.03% | 0.04% | 0.06% | 0.05% | 0.03% | 0.02% | 0.10% | 0.12% | 0.58% | 0.64% | 1.08% | 1.17% |
| **CBO** | 2.58% | 2.53% | 2.68% | 2.77% | 2.72% | 3.29% | 3.01% | 3.56% | 3.25% | 2.71% | 3.58% | 3.03% |
| **COU** | 0.13% | 0.13% | 0.35% | 0.29% | 0.33% | 0.26% | 0.24% | 0.17% | 0.12% | 0.13% | 0.13% | 0.12% |
| **CS** | 0.98% | 1.22% | 1.10% | 1.24% | 1.36% | 1.52% | 1.62% | 1.83% | 2.09% | 1.77% | 2.27% | 1.92% |
| **FBO** | 0.54% | 0.67% | 0.66% | 0.79% | 0.67% | 0.80% | 0.72% | 0.94% | 0.81% | 0.58% | 1.06% | 0.75% |
| **FPC** | 0.05% | 0.07% | 0.05% | 0.04% | 0.04% | 0.04% | 0.03% | 0.04% | 0.06% | 0.05% | 0.13% | 0.09% |
| **NPA** | 2.26% | 2.31% | 2.70% | 2.56% | 2.97% | 3.03% | 1.99% | 2.15% | 2.16% | 1.87% | 2.11% | 1.93% |
| **Other** | 1.41% | 1.38% | 1.62% | 1.61% | 1.74% | 1.57% | 1.59% | 1.38% | 1.41% | 1.42% | 1.48% | 1.34% |
| **SD** | 92.03% | 91.66% | 90.79% | 90.65% | 90.14% | 89.47% | 90.70% | 89.81% | 89.53% | 90.83% | 88.16% | 89.65% |

Centers were also open to the adult family members of student attendees. Here again information about the number of adult family members served by a given center during the reporting period was obtained via the APR. As shown in Table 5, 274,364 adult family members were provided with services in 2010-11. With the exception of a slight decline in 2008-09, this number has increased every year.

Table 5: Family Members Served

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2006** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **2010** | **2011** |
| **Family Members Served** | 199,489 | 210,857 | 223,042 | 213,552 | 253,283 | 274,364 |

## Activity Cluster

The mission of the 21st CCLC program is to provide academic and other enrichment programs that reinforce and complement the regular academic program of participating students. Generally, this broad mandate encompasses a host of different types of activities, including the following activity categories:

* Academic enrichment learning programs
* Tutoring
* Supplemental educational services
* Homework help
* Mentoring
* Recreational activities
* Career or job training for youth
* Drug and violence prevention, counseling, and character education programs
* Expanded library service hours
* Community service or service-learning programs
* Activities that promote youth leadership

Given the wide range of activities that an individual 21st CCLC could provide, a series of “activity clusters” were identified based on the relative emphasis given to providing the categories of activities listed previously during the 2005–06, 2006-07, 2007–08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 school years. To do this clustering,21st CCLC activity data were used to calculate the percentage of total hours of center programming allocated to each of the activity categories. This was done by multiplying the number of weeks an activity was provided by the number of days per week it was provided by the number of hours provided per session. These products were then summed by activity category for a center. The center-level summations by category were then divided by the total number of hours of activity provided by a center to determine the percentage of hours a given category of activity was offered. Based on the results of these calculations, the following question can be answered: What percentage of a center’s total activity hours was dedicated to academic enrichment, tutoring, homework help, etc?

In order to further summarize these data related to the 21st CCLC activity provision, K-Means cluster analysis was employed using the center-level percentages for each category of activity. Cluster analysis is typically employed to combine cases into groups using a series of variables as criteria to determine the degree of similarity between individual cases, and it is particularly well-suited when there is a desire to classify a large number of cases into a smaller domain of discrete groupings. In this case, employing cluster analysis resulted in the identification of five primary program clusters defined by the relative emphasis centers placed on *offering* one or more programming areas during the course of the 2005–06, 2006-07, 2007–08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 school years. Following are the five clusters:

* Centers mostly providing tutoring activities
* Centers mostly providing homework help
* Centers mostly providing recreational activities
* Centers mostly providing academic enrichment
* Centers providing a wide variety of activities across multiple categories

It is important to note that the data used to assign centers to program clusters were available only from states that employed the individual activities reporting option in PPICS for the 2005–06, 2006-07, 2007–08, 2008-09, 2009-10 and/or 2010-11 reporting periods. For clarification, one of the foundational design elements of PPICS was to construct a system made up of two primary types of data: (1) data that would be supplied by *all* 21st CCLCs and (2) data that could vary based on a series of options afforded to SEAs to customize the APR to meet the unique data and reporting needs of the state. Activities data collected in PPICS is an example of the latter approach. In this case, states supply data using (1) an *aggregated* approach in which sites identify the typical number of hours per week a given category of activity was provided or (2) an *individual* activities approach in which each discrete activity provided by a center (e.g., a rocketry club that met from 4:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. each Tuesday and Thursday for eight weeks during the school year) is added to the system as a separate record. The cluster analysis described in this report relies on data supplied by states that required their grantees to report activities data through the individual activities reporting option (22 states in 2005–06, 27 states in 2006-07, 26 states in 2007–08, 25 states in 2008-09, 26 states in 2009-10, and 29 in 2010-11).

As shown in Figure 2, the relative distribution of centers across each cluster type was found to be somewhat stable across reporting periods, with the majority of centers falling in either the *Variety* or *Mostly Enrichment* cluster. A fifth of centers were classified as falling within either the *Mostly Homework Help* or *Mostly Tutoring* clusters, while about 20 percent of centers in each year were identified as providing *Mostly Recreation* programming.

Figure 2. Primary Program Clusters Based on Activity Data Provided
in Relation to the 2005–06, 2006-07, 2007–08, 2008–09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 School Years

| **Activity Cluster** | **No. in 2005-06** | **No. in 2006-07** | **No. in 2007-08** | **No. in 2008-09** | **No. in 2009-10** | **No. in 2010-11** | **Percent in 2005-06** | **Percent in 2006-07** | **Percent in 2007-08** | **Percent in 2008-09** | **Percent in 2009-10** | **Percent in 2010-11** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Unknown\* | 5,908 | 4,409 | 4,835 | 4,656 | 5,305 | 5,492 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Variety | 1,023 | 1,687 | 1,331 | 1,446 | 1,348 | 1,641 | 33.6% | 38.9% | 32.8% | 35.9% | 35.4% | 34.9% |
| Enrichment | 727 | 1,005 | 1,021 | 958 | 919 | 1,072 | 23.8% | 23.2% | 25.1% | 23.8% | 24.1% | 22.8% |
| Recreation | 652 | 868 | 836 | 878 | 752 | 1,004 | 21.4% | 20.0% | 20.6% | 21.8% | 19.7% | 21.4% |
| Tutoring | 366 | 427 | 505 | 342 | 342 | 473 | 12.0% | 9.8% | 12.4% | 8.5% | 9.0% | 10.1% |
| Homework Help | 281 | 354 | 371 | 408 | 451 | 506 | 9.2% | 8.2% | 9.1% | 10.1% | 11.8% | 10.8% |

\*Primarily includes centers in states electing not to report individual activities data.

## Staffing

### Types of Employees

Staff for 21st CCLC programs come from many sources including teachers, parents, and local college students. Some are paid, while others serve as volunteers. As shown in Table 6, for the 2010‑11 school year, 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. As for volunteer staff, college students account for the largest percentage at 24 percent with community members second at 19 percent.

Table 6. 2010-11 Staffing Types

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Staff Type** | **Paid Staff** | **Percent Paid Staff** | **Volunteer Staff** | **Percent Volunteer Staff** |
| School-day teachers | 60,520 | 45% | 2,938 | 7% |
| College students | 11,256 | 8% | 9,794 | 24% |
| High school students | 4,595 | 3% | 7,523 | 18% |
| Parents | 1,059 | 1% | 6,214 | 15% |
| Youth development workers | 12,768 | 9% | 2,840 | 7% |
| Other community members | 3,668 | 3% | 7,878 | 19% |
| Other non-teaching school staff | 16,794 | 12% | 1,431 | 3% |
| Center administrators and coordinators | 11,378 | 8% | 516 | 1% |
| Other nonschool-day staff with some or no college | 9,148 | 7% | 1,056 | 3% |
| Other | 3,957 | 3% | 802 | 2% |
| **Total** | 135,143 | 100% | 40,992 | 100% |

### Staffing Clusters

Similar to the activities clusters, we classified centers into clusters based on the extent to which they relied on different categories of staff to deliver programming during the 2005–06, 2006-07, 2007–08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 school years. Each of these staff categories are a combination of the different staff types above. As shown in Figure 3, five primary staffing models were identified:

* Centers staffed mostly by school-day teachers
* Centers staffed mostly by a combination of school-day teachers and other school staff
* Centers staffed mostly by college students and school day teachers
* Centers staffed mostly by youth development workers and school-day teachers
* Centers staffed by other staff with some or no college and school-day teachers

Note that teachers, at least to some extent, were involved in each of the staffing clusters outlined in Figure 3, although the degree of involvement varied significantly from one cluster to the next. For example, on average, centers falling within the *Mostly Teachers* cluster had school-day teachers making up 77 percent of their school year staff. By comparison, centers identified as falling within the *Mostly Youth Development Workers and School Day Teachers* and *Mostly Other Staff with Some or No College* were both found on average to have 17 percent of their school-year afterschool staff made up of school-day teachers. Centers staffed by *Mostly School-Day Teachers and Other School Staff* and *Mostly College Students and School-Day Teachers* had average rates of teacher involvement of 20 percent and 26 percent, respectively.

Figure 3. Primary Staffing Clusters Based on Staffing Data Reported
by States for the 2005–06, 2006-07, 2007–08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 School Years

| **Staffing Cluster** | **No. in 2005-06** | **No. in 2006-07** | **No. in 2007-08** | **No. in 2008-09** | **No. in 2009-10** | **No. in 2010-11** | **Percent in 2005-06** | **Percent in 2006-07** | **Percent in 2007-08** | **Percent in 2008-09** | **Percent in 2009-10** | **Percent in 2010-11** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Unknown** | 442 | 330 | 314 | 313 | 400 | 514 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Mostly School-day Teachers** | 4118 | 4260 | 4461 | 4013 | 4049 | 4409 | 47.80% | 50.50% | 52.00% | 47.90% | 46.40% | 46.10% |
| **Mostly School-day Teachers & Other Staff** | 256 | 318 | 210 | 211 | 287 | 306 | 3.00% | 3.80% | 2.40% | 2.50% | 3.30% | 3.20% |
| **Mostly College Students & School-day Teachers** | 2733 | 2577 | 2484 | 2575 | 2692 | 2916 | 31.70% | 30.60% | 28.90% | 30.70% | 30.90% | 30.50% |
| **Mostly Youth Develop. Workers & Teachers** | 754 | 653 | 679 | 811 | 869 | 1015 | 8.80% | 7.70% | 7.90% | 9.70% | 10.00% | 10.60% |
| **Mostly Other School Staff w/Some or No College** | 750 | 620 | 748 | 766 | 822 | 910 | 3.20% | 3.90% | 2.60% | 2.70% | 3.50% | 3.40% |

Similar to the analysis of activity patterns, note that the overall distribution of centers across each of the categories identified in Figure 3 was consistent across the 2005–06, 2006-07, 2007–08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 reporting periods. Here again, an effort also was made to explore how likely it was that a center would move from one cluster to another between the years (starting with 2007-08 due to the fact very few centers had cluster designations for both 2006-07 and 2010-11). In this case, it was found that 39 percent of centers moved from one cluster to another between 2007–08 and 2010–11, 38 percent of centers moved from one cluster to another between 2008-09 and 2010-11, and 34 percent of centers moved from one cluster to another between 2009-10 and 2010-11.

## Grade Level Served

### Students and Grade Level

Table 7 shows the number of students served per grade level in 2010-11. The distribution is broad with grades 3 through 7 having the highest total number of students attending. Each of those grades account for approximately 9 percent of all student attendees. Students who attend programming for 30 days or more, are considered to be in a special category called *regular attendees*. As shown in Table 7, grades 2 through 6 have the highest number of regular attendees with each grade level accounting for over 9 percent of all regular attendees.

Table 7. Students per Grade Level in 2010-11

| **Grade Level** | **(Tot of Students Attendees)No. of Students** | **(Tot of Students Attendees)Percent of Students** | **(Tot reg Students Attendees)No. of Students** | **(Tot reg Students Attendees)Percent of Students** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Pre-K** | 7,536 | 0.4% | 3,889 | 0.4% |
| **K** | 71,515 | 4.0% | 42,046 | 4.8% |
| **1st** | 111,723 | 6.3% | 69,074 | 8.0% |
| **2nd** | 127,032 | 7.1% | 81,089 | 9.3% |
| **3rd** | 153,894 | 8.6% | 99,161 | 11.4% |
| **4th** | 161,013 | 9.0% | 100,866 | 11.6% |
| **5th** | 159,597 | 9.0% | 94,001 | 10.8% |
| **6th** | 176,164 | 9.9% | 92,252 | 10.6% |
| **7th** | 155,185 | 8.7% | 73,621 | 8.5% |
| **8th** | 138,008 | 7.7% | 60,662 | 7.0% |
| **9th** | 142,285 | 8.0% | 38,944 | 4.5% |
| **10th** | 135,424 | 7.6% | 39,417 | 4.5% |
| **11th** | 127,882 | 7.2% | 39,431 | 4.5% |
| **12th** | 115,815 | 6.5% | 34,190 | 3.9% |
| **Total[[4]](#footnote-4)** | 1,783,073 | 100% | 868,643 | 100% |

### Centers and Grade Level

Using data collected in PPICS related to the grade level of students attending a center, centers were classified as: 1) *Elementary Only*, defined as centers serving students up to Grade 6; 2) *Elementary/Middle*, defined as centers serving students up to Grade 8; 3) *Middle Only*, defined as centers serving students in Grades 5–8; 4) *Middle/High*, defined as centers serving students in Grades 5–12; and 5) *High Only*, defined as centers serving students in Grades 9–12. A sixth *Other* category includes centers that did not fit one of the other five categories, including centers that served students in elementary, middle, and high school grades. Only the grade level of students considered *regular attendees* were used for the category assignments in this report.

As shown in Figure 4, 59 percent to 69 percent of centers in 2005–06, 2006-07, 2007–08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 served elementary students in some capacity, approximately 20 percent exclusively served middle school students, and 5 percent to 13 percent exclusively served high school students.

Figure 4. Number of 21st CCLCs by Grade Level Served
During the 2005–06, 2006-07, 2007–08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 Reporting Periods

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level** | **No. in 2005-06** | **No. in 2006-07** | **No. in 2007-08** | **No. in 2008-09** | **No. in 2009-10** | **No. in 2010-11** | **Percent in 2005-06** | **Percent in 2006-07** | **Percent in 2007-08** | **Percent in 2008-09** | **Percent in 2009-10** | **Percent in 2010-11** |
| **Unknown** | 883 | 917 | 1,022 | 467 | 478 | 563 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Elem Only** | 4,625 | 4,363 | 4,325 | 4,310 | 4,319 | 4,678 | 57.9% | 56.0% | 55.1% | 52.5% | 50.0% | 49.4% |
| **Elem-Mid** | 814 | 842 | 770 | 848 | 930 | 965 | 10.2% | 10.8% | 9.8% | 10.3% | 10.8% | 10.2% |
| **Mid Only** | 1,563 | 1,499 | 1,501 | 1,654 | 1,764 | 1,989 | 19.6% | 19.2% | 19.1% | 20.1% | 20.4% | 21.0% |
| **Mid-High** | 258 | 300 | 282 | 298 | 306 | 388 | 3.2% | 3.9% | 3.6% | 3.6% | 3.5% | 4.1% |
| **High Only** | 425 | 497 | 643 | 824 | 1,020 | 1,172 | 5.3% | 6.4% | 8.2% | 10.0% | 11.8% | 12.4% |
| **Other**  | 303 | 291 | 326 | 279 | 295 | 279 | 3.8% | 3.7% | 4.2% | 3.4% | 3.4% | 2.9% |

Section 2: Performance on the GPRA Indicators

The primary purpose of PPICS is to collect data to inform performance in meeting the GPRA indicators established for the program. The GPRA indicators, outlined in Table 8, are a primary tool by which ED evaluates the effectiveness and efficiency of 21st CCLCs operating nationwide relative to two primary objectives defined for the program.

1. Participants in 21st Century Community Learning Center programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes (indicators 1.1 to 1.14).
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 (i.e., use highly qualified staff; offer afterschool programs every day and on weekends; structure afterschool curriculum on school-based curriculum, etc.).

Also, in addition to the indicators identified in Table 8, it is important to note that ED has established a series of efficiency indicators for the program as well, which are assessed using information collected directly by ED outside the domain of PPICS. These efficiency indicators relate to the formal processes employed by ED program staff to monitor SEA implementation of the program:

1. The average number of days it takes the Department to submit the final monitoring report to an SEA after the conclusion of a site visit.
2. The average number of weeks a State takes to resolve compliance findings in a monitoring visit report.

Information related to ED and SEA performance relative to these measures is not provided in this report.

This section of the report provides a summary of the status of the performance indicators based on data collected as part of the 2010–11 APR and discusses how performance relative to these indicators has varied across the past four reporting periods.

Table 8. 21st CCLC GPRA Performance Indicators

| **GPRA Performance Indicators** |
| --- |
| Measure 1.1 of 14: The percentage of *elementary* 21st Century regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring.   |
| Measure 1.2 of 14: The percentage of *middle and high school* 21st Century regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring.   |
| Measure 1.3 of 14: The percentage of *all* 21st Century regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring. |
| Measure 1.4 of 14: The percentage of *elementary* 21st Century regular program participants whose English grades improved from fall to spring.   |
| Measure 1.5 of 14: The percentage of *middle and high school* 21st Century regular program participants whose English grades improved from fall to spring.   |
| Measure 1.6 of 14: The percentage of *all* 21st Century regular program participants whose English grades improved from fall to spring.   |
| Measure 1.7 of 14: The percentage of *elementary* 21st Century regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above in reading on state assessments.   |
| Measure 1.8 of 14: The percentage of *middle and high school* 21st Century regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above in mathematics on state assessments.   |
| Measure 1.9 of 14: The percentage of *elementary* 21st Century regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation.   |
| Measure 1.10 of 14: The percentage of *middle and high school* 21st Century program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation.   |
| Measure 1.11 of 14: The percentage of *all* 21st Century regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation.   |
| Measure 1.12 of 14: The percentage of *elementary* 21st Century participants with teacher-reported improvement in student behavior |
| Measure 1.13 of 14: The percentage of *middle and high school* 21st Century participants with teacher-reported improvement in student behavior.   |
| Measure 1.14 of 14: The percentage of *all* 21st Century participants with teacher-reported improvement in student behavior.   |
| Measure 2.1 of 2: The percentage of 21st Century Centers reporting emphasis in at least one core academic area. |
| Measure 2.2 of 2: The percentage of 21st Century Centers offering enrichment and support activities in other areas. |

## GPRA Indicator Results for 2010–11

Table 9 provides an overall summary of the 21st CCLC program GPRA indicator data for the 2010−11 reporting period along with the performance targets for this period. Note that not all states collect each of the different types of indicator data. See Appendix for more detail.

As Table 9 shows, nearly all of the performance targets for the 2010–11 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 improving from not proficient to proficient or above on math or reading state assessments.

Table 9. GPRA Performance Indicators for the 2010–11 Reporting Period

| **GPRA Performance Indicator** | **Performance Target** | **2010–11 Reporting Period** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Measure 1.1 of 14: The percentage of elementary 21st Century regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring.   | 47.5% | 35.88% |
| Measure 1.2 of 14: The percentage of middle and high school 21st Century regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring.   | 47.5% | 33.46% |
| Measure 1.3 of 14: The percentage of all 21st Century regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring. | 47.5% | 34.57% |
| Measure 1.4 of 14: The percentage of elementary 21st Century regular program participants whose English grades improved from fall to spring.   | 47.5% | 37.19% |
| Measure 1.5 of 14: The percentage of middle and high school 21st Century regular program participants whose English grades improved from fall to spring.   | 47.5% | 34.12% |
| Measure 1.6 of 14: The percentage of all 21st Century regular program participants whose English grades improved from fall to spring.   | 47.5% | 35.64% |
| Measure 1.7 of 14: The percentage of elementary 21st Century regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above in reading on state assessments.   | 24% | 26.21% |
| Measure 1.8 of 14: The percentage of middle and high school 21st Century regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above in mathematics on state assessments.   | 16% | 18.46% |
| Measure 1.9 of 14: The percentage of elementary 21st Century regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation.   | 75% | 73.83% |
| Measure 1.10 of 14: The percentage of middle and high school 21st Century program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation.   | 75% | 69.00% |
| Measure 1.11 of 14: The percentage of all 21st Century regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation.   | 75% | 71.92% |
| Measure 1.12 of 14: The percentage of elementary 21st Century participants with teacher-reported improvement in student behavior | 75% | 68.44% |
| Measure 1.13 of 14: The percentage of middle and high school 21st Century participants with teacher-reported improvement in student behavior.   | 75% | 64.63% |
| Measure 1.14 of 14: The percentage of all 21st Century participants with teacher-reported improvement in student behavior.   | 75% | 67.05% |
| Measure 2.1 of 2: The percentage of 21st Century Centers reporting emphasis in at least one core academic area. | 100% | 97.46% |
| Measure 2.2 of 2: The percentage of 21st Century Centers offering enrichment and support activities in other areas. | 100% | 96.45% |

## Trends in GPRA Indicator Performance

The 2010–11 reporting period represented the eighth wave of data collected in PPICS that allowed for an assessment of how well the program was functioning relative to the established GPRA measures for the program.

Table 10 describes the overall performance of programs (without breakdowns by grade level) by reporting period across each of the GPRA indicator categories. The performance levels, based on attendance gradation for the two reporting periods in which data were collected in this manner, are also included. Note that in Table 10, two different state assessment-based measures are presented: (1) *Improving* represents the percentage of regular attendees who scored below proficiency on the assessment taken in the prior year that moved to a higher proficiency category during the reporting period in question, and (2) *Attaining* represents the percentage of regular attendees who moved from below proficiency on the prior year’s assessment to proficiency or above on the assessment taken during the reporting period. The difference between the two measures is that the *Improving* metric counts regular attendees as having improved even if they did not achieve proficiency based on state standards; the latter measure does not count these students as having improved even though they demonstrated a higher level of performance on the state assessment in question. The GPRA indicator calculation is based on the latter approach.

Finally, Table 10 demonstrates the positive relationship that appears between higher levels of attendance and the percentage of regular attendees witnessing improvement on a given outcome measure type. For example, during the 2005–06 reporting period, approximately 34 percent of regular attendees participating in 21st CCLC programming from 30–59 days that scored below proficiency on the 2005 state assessment in mathematics improved to a higher proficiency level in 2006. For regular attendees participating 90 days or more, this percentage was 46 percent. This result is largely replicated in 2006-07, 2007–08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 where the gap between the 30–59 day group and the 90 days or more groups was found to be 4 to 12 percentage points. This general finding is consistent across many of the impact categories and reporting periods in which attendance gradation data were collected.

Table 10. Grades, State Assessment Results, and Teacher Survey Results Across Years

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grades** | ***% Increase 2010-11*** | ***% Increase 2009-10*** | ***% Increase 2008-09*** | ***% Increase 2007-08*** | ***% Increase 2006-07*** | ***% Increase 2005-06*** | ***% Increase 2004-05*** |
| Mathematics Grades | 35 | 36 | 37 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 40 |
| Reading Grades | 36 | 37 | 38 | 42 | 43 | 45 | 43 |
|   |
| **By Attendance Gradation** | ***% Increase 2010-11*** | ***% Increase 2009-10*** | ***% Increase 2008-09*** | ***% Increase 2007-08*** | ***% Increase 2006-07*** | ***% Increase 2005-06*** | ***% Increase 2004-05*** |
| Mathematics Grades (30–59) | 34 | 34 | 35 | 37 | 39 | 36 | N/A |
| Mathematics Grades (60–89) | 33 | 36 | 35 | 39 | 39 | 39 | N/A |
| Mathematics Grades (90+) | 33 | 36 | 35 | 40 | 43 | 40 | N/A |
| Reading Grades (30–59) | 35 | 35 | 37 | 38 | 41 | 39 | N/A |
| Reading Grades (60–89) | 34 | 36 | 37 | 40 | 41 | 44 | N/A |
| Reading Grades (90+) | 35 | 38 | 36 | 41 | 45 | 43 | N/A |
|   |
| **State Assessment Results (All Regular Attendees)** | ***% Increase 2010-11*** | ***% Increase 2009-10*** | ***% Increase 2008-09*** | ***% Increase 2007-08*** | ***% Increase 2006-07*** | ***% Increase 2005-06*** | ***% Increase 2004-05*** |
| Mathematics Proficiency (Attaining) | 23 | 22 | 23 | 22 | 22 | 17 | 30 |
| Reading Proficiency (Attaining) | 24 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 17 | 29 |
| Mathematics Proficiency (Improving) | 37 | 35 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 32 | 41 |
| Reading Proficiency (Improving) | 38 | 36 | 38 | 38 | 39 | 33 | 37 |
|   |
| **By Attendance Gradation** | ***% Increase 2010-11*** | ***% Increase 2009-10*** | ***% Increase 2008-09*** | ***% Increase 2007-08*** | ***% Increase 2006-07*** | ***% Increase 2005-06*** | ***% Increase 2004-05*** |
| Mathematics Proficiency (Attaining, 30–59) | 33 | 32 | 29 | 29 | 27 | 24 | N/A |
| Mathematics Proficiency (Attaining, 60–89) | 35 | 36 | 34 | 31 | 31 | 24 | N/A |
| Mathematics Proficiency (Attaining, 90+) | 39 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 33 | 31 | N/A |
| Reading Proficiency (Attaining, 30–59) | 33 | 32 | 33 | 37 | 37 | 31 | N/A |
| Reading Proficiency (Attaining, 60–89) | 34 | 35 | 37 | 38 | 41 | 27 | N/A |
| Reading Proficiency (Attaining, 90+) | 37 | 38 | 39 | 41 | 41 | 33 | N/A |
| Mathematics Proficiency (Improving, 30–59) | 40 | 40 | 37 | 36 | 37 | 34 | N/A |
| Mathematics Proficiency (Improving, 60–89) | 42 | 43 | 42 | 39 | 41 | 37 | N/A |
| Mathematics Proficiency (Improving, 90+) | 46 | 45 | 47 | 47 | 43 | 46 | N/A |
| Reading Proficiency (Improving, 30–59) | 41 | 40 | 44 | 45 | 47 | 42 | N/A |
| Reading Proficiency (Improving, 60–89) | 43 | 43 | 48 | 45 | 51 | 40 | N/A |
| Reading Proficiency (Improving, 90+) | 45 | 46 | 49 | 48 | 51 | 48 | N/A |
|   |
| **Teacher Survey Results** | ***% Increase 2010-11*** | ***% Increase 2009-10*** | ***% Increase 2008-09*** | ***% Increase 2007-08*** | ***% Increase 2006-07*** | ***% Increase 2005-06*** | ***% Increase 2004-05*** |
| Improved HW Completion and Class Partic. | 72 | 72 | 73 | 76 | 75 | 73 | 72 |
| Improved Student Behavior | 67 | 67 | 69 | 72 | 71 | 68 | 67 |
|   |
| **By Attendance Gradation** | ***% Increase 2010-11*** | ***% Increase 2009-10*** | ***% Increase 2008-09*** | ***% Increase 2007-08*** | ***% Increase 2006-07*** | ***% Increase 2005-06*** | ***% Increase 2004-05*** |
| Improved HW Completion and Class Partic. (30–59) | 68 | 68 | 69 | 71 | 72 | 71 | N/A |
| Improved HW Completion and Class Partic. (60–89) | 71 | 70 | 71 | 72 | 73 | 74 | N/A |
| Improved HW Completion and Class Partic. (90+) | 71 | 70 | 72 | 73 | 73 | 76 | N/A |
| Improved Student Behavior (30–59) | 63 | 62 | 64 | 66 | 67 | 66 | N/A |
| Improved Student Behavior (60–89) | 65 | 65 | 65 | 66 | 67 | 69 | N/A |
| Improved Student Behavior (90+) | 66 | 65 | 67 | 68 | 69 | 72 | N/A |

\*2003-2004 data were not included in the table.

Table 11. Number and Percent of Students Maintaining Highest Grade, 2010-11

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Highest Grade as % of All Grades Reported: Math** | **Highest Grade as % of All Grades Reported: Reading** | **Highest Grade N: Math** | **Highest Grade N: Reading** |
| **2007** | 5.96% | 5.76% | 20,214 | 19,662 |
| **2008** | 6.06% | 6.13% | 19,962 | 20,088 |
| **2009** | 8.06% | 8.42% | 24,216 | 25,324 |
| **2010** | 8.38% | 8.51% | 28,757 | 29,248 |
| **2011** | 8.97% | 8.78% | 32,481 | 31,679 |

# Summary and Conclusions

The goal of this report is to report on the GPRA measures and to provide data on the overall efficacy of the program. PPICS data offer information on the operation of the projects funded by 21st CCLC, which has proven useful in providing descriptive profiles of active 21st CCLC grantees:

* The program as a whole continues to fall below the established targeted performance thresholds associated with the GPRA performance indicators for the program. A rigorous study of the program may result in the development of more relevant GPRA measures.
* Grade improvement rates for 2010-11 dropped relative to the 2009-10, continuing a trend observed over the last several years. The reason or reasons for this decline are not clear. During the same period, however, a higher proportion of regular attendees maintained the highest grade possible.
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# AppendixState Discretion in APR Reporting and Data Completeness

When reviewing GPRA indicator-related data, it should be noted that states have been afforded the option to collect and report different subsets of indicator data. States have discretion in PPICS to collect and report data on one or more of the following: changes in student grades, state assessment results, and teacher-reported behaviors. In addition, states are allowed some discretion in the manner in which information about the activities supported by 21st CCLC funding are reported. The following information is intended to provide clarification on the data underpinning each indicator calculation:

* The number of states that selected a given APR reporting option (i.e., grades, state assessment, and teacher survey). States are required to supply data for at least one of these categories as part of the APR process but could also opt to report any combination of these three categories.
* The total number of centers active during the 2010-11 reporting period across all states selecting a given indicator option.
* The extent to which centers associated with a given reporting option were found to have (1) provided actual data for the APR section in question and (2) met all validation criteria associated with that section of the APR and, thereby, are included in associated indicator calculations.

The process of determining whether or not a given section of the APR is complete is predicated on a fairly complex set of validation criteria embedded in the PPICS application. It is important to note that for a given section of the APR related to performance reporting to be considered complete, not only does that section of the APR need to meet all validation criteria, but sections related to operations and attendance also need to pass a validation screen. These crosschecks help to ensure consistency across sections in terms of the data being provided, thereby enhancing the likelihood that the appropriate domain of activities and regular attendees are being reported in the appropriate sections of the APR.

In addition, it is anticipated that for some sections of the APR related to GPRA indicator calculations, not all centers will be able to provide the requested information. This is seen most often in relation to the reporting of state assessment results, where some centers exclusively serve students in grade levels outside of those participating in the state’s assessment and accountability system. To a lesser extent, this also is true with the reporting of grades data in which a center serves students who attend schools that do not provide grades in a common format that would allow for aggregation in the APR reporting process. In addition, centers that operate only during the summer are not asked to provide grades or teacher survey information. In summary, grades, states assessment, or teacher survey data cannot be obtained from 100 percent of centers even in states that have selected those measures to report on.

As shown in Table B.1, the percentage of centers that provided data relative to a given section of the APR and that met all validation criteria were high, with rates all above 77 percent.

Table B.1. Centers Active During the 2010–11 Reporting Period by APR Section and
by Degree of Completion and Data Provision

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section of the APR Related to Indicator Reporting** | **Domain of States Reporting** | **Centers Active in These States During the Reporting Period** | **Number of Centers Meeting All Validation Criteria and That Reported Data** | **Percentage of Centers Meeting All Validation Criteria and That Reported Data** |
| **Grades****(Measures 1.1 to 1.6)** | 27(50.0%) | 6,624(61.5%) | 5,325 | 85.0% |
| **State Assessment (Measures 1.7 to 1.8)** | 27(50.0%) | 5,321(52.2%) | 4,120 | 77.4% |
| **Teacher Survey (Measures 1.9 to 1.14)** | 42(77.8%) | 6,903(67.8%) | 5,906 | 85.6% |
| **Activities** **(Measures 2.1 to 2.2)** | 54(100%) | 10,188(100%) | 9,968 | 97.8% |

1. To make this report more readable, two of the displayed categories consist of data from multiple categories. Nationally Affiliated Non-Profit Agency (NPA) is the combination of the Big Brothers/Big Sisters, Boys & Girls Club, Boy Scouts/Girl Scouts, YMCA/YWCA, and other Nationally Affiliated Non-Profit Agencies categories. Other is the combination of the Other, Unit of City or County Government, Regional/Intermediate Education Agency, Health-Based Organization, Library, Park/Recreation District, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Museum, and Private School categories. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. To make this report more readable, two of the displayed categories consist of data from multiple categories. Nationally Affiliated Non-Profit Agency (NPA) is the combination of the Big Brothers/Big Sisters, Boys & Girls Club, Boy Scouts/Girl Scouts, YMCA/YWCA, and other Nationally Affiliated Non-Profit Agencies categories. Other is the combination of the Other, Unit of City or County Government, Regional/Intermediate Education Agency, Health-Based Organization, Library, Park/Recreation District, Library, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Museum, and Private School categories. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Two of the displayed categories consist of data from multiple categories. Nationally Affiliated Non-Profit Agency (NPA) is the combination of the Big Brothers/Big Sisters, Boys & Girls Club, Boy Scouts/Girl Scouts, YMCA/YWCA, and other Nationally Affiliated Non-Profit Agencies categories. Other is the combination of the Other, Unit of City or County Government, Regional/Intermediate Education Agency, Health-Based Organization, Library, Park/Recreation District, Library, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Museum, and Private School categories. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The student totals here will not match the totals of Table 3, because students for whom the grade level is unknown are not included in this table. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)