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# Executive Summary

For approximately thirteen 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 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 4,077 grantees representing 9,989 centers reported annual performance report data for 2012-13. These centers served a total of 1,732,567 students, with 875,226 of these students attending 30 days or more days in programs.
* Fifty-nine percent to 65 percent of centers from 2007-08 to 2012-13 served elementary students in some capacity,19 percent to 21 percent of centers exclusively served middle school students, and six percent to 13 percent exclusively served high school students. The most recently reported three years represent the highest percentage of high school centers being served.
* A total of 293,059 adult family members were provided with services in 2012-13. Over the last eight years, 2012-13 and 2011-12 represent the highest number of adult family members served. Specifically, 297,723 adult family members were served in 2011-12, 274,364 in 2010-11, 253,283 in 2009-10, 213,552 in 2008-09, 223,042 in 2007-08, and 210,857 in 2006-07.
* School Districts (SD) were States’ largest subgrantee organization category, accounting for 57 percent of all subgrantees. Community Based Organizations (CBO) were the second largest subgrantee organization group accounting for 18 percent of subgrantees. Taken together, CBOs and Nationally Affiliated Nonprofit Agencies (NPAs) accounted for over 23 percent of all grantees.
* Approximately 83 percent of all centers are in SDs, and nearly seven percent are in Community Based Organizations (CBOs) or Nationally Affiliated Non-Profit Agencies (NPAs).
* Centers reported a total of 163,216 staff. Of these, 128,272 (79%) were identified as paid staff and 34,944 (21%) were volunteers.
* School-day teachers account for the largest percentage of paid staff at 44 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 27 percent with community members second at 18 percent. Similar trends were seen in other years.
* Of the 4,908 centers reporting individual—as opposed to aggregated—activity data, nearly a fifth of centers were classified as falling within either the *Mostly Homework Help* (13 percent) or *Mostly Tutoring* clusters (eight percent); 23 percent were classified as *Mostly Recreation,* 25 percent were classified as *Mostly Enrichment*, andapproximately 31 percent were classified as *Variety*.
* States have some flexibility in reporting GPRA-related data. For 2012-13, 46 percent of states provided grades data, 50 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 2012-13 reporting period were not reached. For the range of indicators related to regular attendee improvement in student achievement and behaviors, the indicator showing improvement included the percentage of middle and high school 21st CCLC regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above in mathematics on state assessments.
* Grade improvement rates for 2012-13 for both math and reading were on the whole lower than previous years’ improvement rates. It is not immediately clear why this is the case. It should be noted that across the same time frame, an increasingly higher proportion of students were reported as maintaining the highest grade possible.

# Introduction

For approximately thirteen 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, the 21st CCLCs 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. 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, represent the primary mechanism by which the federal government determines the success and progress of the 21st CCLC program against statutory requirements.

In Section 1 of this report, descriptive information is provided on the domain of centers active during the 2012-13 reporting period, including activities, staffingand grade levels served. In Section 2, information on 21st CCLC program performance during the 2012-13 reporting period relative to the GPRA indicators.

# Section 1: Grantee and Center Characteristics

## Grantee Type

One of the hallmarks of the 21st CCLC program is that many 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 2007-08 to 2012-13, accounting for 57 percent or more 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 nearly 5 percent of grantees each year. Taken together, CBOs and NPAs accounted for 20 to 25 percent of all grantees each year.

Table 1. Grantees by Organization Type

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grantee Type[[1]](#footnote-1)** | **No. in 2007-08** | **No. in 2008-09** | **No. in 2009-10** | **No. in 2010-11** | **No. in 2011-12** | **No. in 2012-13** | **Percent in 2007-08** | **Percent in 2008-09** | **Percent in 2009-10** | **Percent in 2010-11** | **Percent in 2011-12** | **Percent in 2012-13** |
|  | 1 | 5 | 4 | 60 | 142 | 207 | 0.00% | 0.20% | 0.10% | 1.50% | 3.40% | 5.10% |
| CBO | 496 | 545 | 687 | 802 | 774 | 750 | 15.30% | 16.50% | 19.00% | 19.60% | 18.60% | 18.40% |
| COU | 50 | 55 | 60 | 71 | 67 | 71 | 1.50% | 1.70% | 1.70% | 1.70% | 1.60% | 1.70% |
| CS | 81 | 85 | 102 | 113 | 104 | 115 | 2.50% | 2.60% | 2.80% | 2.80% | 2.50% | 2.80% |
| FBO | 60 | 66 | 71 | 111 | 97 | 71 | 1.90% | 2.00% | 2.00% | 2.70% | 2.30% | 1.70% |
| FPC | 13 | 21 | 36 | 56 | 56 | 59 | 0.40% | 0.60% | 1.00% | 1.40% | 1.30% | 1.40% |
| NPA | 151 | 163 | 173 | 213 | 223 | 221 | 4.70% | 4.90% | 4.80% | 5.20% | 5.40% | 5.40% |
| Other | 234 | 242 | 267 | 286 | 295 | 284 | 7.20% | 7.30% | 7.40% | 7.00% | 7.10% | 7.00% |
| SD | 2,150 | 2,122 | 2,213 | 2,388 | 2,408 | 2,338 | 66.40% | 64.20% | 61.30% | 58.20% | 58.00% | 57.30% |
| **Total** | 3,236 | 3,304 | 3,613 | 4,100 | 4,154 | 4,077 | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

## 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 83 percent of centers were housed in school district buildings in 2012-13. Community-based organizations and unknown both accounted for nearly five percent of centers, making these the second most used center location type in 2012-13. All other categories of location are less than three percent. This general trend held true in previous years as well, with the exception of more centers being classified as unknown.

Table 2. Centers by Type

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Center Type[[2]](#footnote-2)** | **No. in 2007-08** | **No. in 2008-09** | **No. in 2009-10** | **No. in 2010-11** | **No. in 2011-12** | **No. in 2012-13** | **Percent in 2007-08** | **Percent in 2008-09** | **Percent in 2009-10** | **Percent in 2010-11** | **Percent in 2011-12** | **Percent in 2012-13** |
| Unknown | 5 | 14 | 77 | 154 | 310 | 476 | 0.10% | 0.20% | 0.80% | 1.50% | 3.00% | 4.80% |
| CBO | 381 | 389 | 399 | 493 | 489 | 460 | 4.20% | 4.50% | 4.40% | 4.80% | 4.80% | 4.60% |
| COU | 27 | 21 | 18 | 25 | 21 | 19 | 0.30% | 0.20% | 0.20% | 0.20% | 0.20% | 0.20% |
| CS | 105 | 118 | 151 | 175 | 171 | 184 | 1.20% | 1.40% | 1.70% | 1.70% | 1.70% | 1.80% |
| FBO | 125 | 128 | 117 | 171 | 148 | 118 | 1.40% | 1.50% | 1.30% | 1.70% | 1.50% | 1.20% |
| FPC | 8 | 6 | 9 | 26 | 24 | 17 | 0.10% | 0.10% | 0.10% | 0.30% | 0.20% | 0.20% |
| NPA | 200 | 170 | 200 | 219 | 226 | 219 | 2.20% | 2.00% | 2.20% | 2.10% | 2.20% | 2.20% |
| Other | 166 | 174 | 172 | 208 | 206 | 190 | 1.80% | 2.00% | 1.90% | 2.00% | 2.00% | 1.90% |
| SD | 8,036 | 7,684 | 7,998 | 8,717 | 8,623 | 8,331 | 88.80% | 88.30% | 87.50% | 85.60% | 84.50% | 83.40% |
| **Total** | 9,053 | 8,704 | 9,141 | 10,188 | 10,199 | 9,989 | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

In addition to the detailed categories shown above, centers can also be grouped based on two larger categories, *school-based* and *non-school-based*.

As shown in

Figure 1, approximately 90 percent of centers were housed in schools; the other centers were located at a variety of non-school-based sites.

Figure 1. Number of 21st CCLCs by School-Based Status
During the 2007–08, 2008–09, 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13 Reporting Periods



**Table 3. Number and Percent of 21st CCLCs by School-Based Status During the 2007–08, 2008–09, 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13 Reporting Periods**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **School-Based Status** | **No. in 2007-08** | **No. in 2008-09** | **No. in 2009-10** | **No. in 2010-11** | **No. in 2011-12** | **No. in 2012-13** | **Percent in 2007-08** | **Percent in 2008-09** | **Percent in 2009-10** | **Percent in 2010-11** | **Percent in 2011-12** | **Percent in 2012-13** |
| **MISSING\*** | 5 | 14 | 77 | 154 | 310 | 476 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **School-Based** | 8179 | 7841 | 8187 | 8946 | 8842 | 8567 | 90.40% | 90.20% | 90.30% | 89.20% | 89.40% | 90.10% |
| **Non-School-Based** | 869 | 849 | 877 | 1088 | 1047 | 946 | 9.60% | 9.80% | 9.70% | 10.80% | 10.60% | 9.90% |

*\** Centers are marked as “missing” in cases where the organization type is not indicated in the Grantee Profile (i.e., the data for the given center are only partially complete in the Grantee Profile).

## 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 categorized in PPICS as *regular attendees*. As shown in Table 4, there were 1,732,567 students who attended 21st CCLC programming in 2012-13. Of those, 875,226, or approximately 50 percent, were regular attendees.

Table 4. Total and Regular Attendee Students per Year

| **APR Year** | **Total Students** | **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 |
| **2012** | 1,876,544 | 937,972 |
| 2013 | 1,732,567 | 875,226 |

Table 5 shows where students participated in 21st CCLC activities by center type. In 2012-13 for example, nearly 88 percent of all students attended centers housed in SD buildings. Excluding center type classified as unknown, CBO-housed centers accounted for the second highest percentage of students at just under three percent. Nearly 86 percent of all regular attendees in 2013 attended programming in centers housed in SD buildings. CBO-housed centers accounted for the second highest percentage of regular attendees at over three percent. Similar trends are seen for 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12.

Table 5. Total and Regular Student Attendees by Center Type

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Center Type[[3]](#footnote-3)** | **2008 Tot** | **2008 Reg** | **2009 Tot** | **2009 Reg** | **2010 Tot** | **2010 Reg** | **2011 Tot** | **2011 Reg** | **2012 Tot** | **2012 Reg** | **2013 Tot** | **2013 Reg** |
| **Unknown** | 0.03% | 0.02% | 0.10% | 0.12% | 0.58% | 0.64% | 1.08% | 1.17% | 2.32% | 2.38% | 3.59% | 3.92% |
| **CBO** | 2.72% | 3.29% | 3.01% | 3.56% | 3.25% | 2.71% | 3.58% | 3.03% | 2.92% | 3.49% | 2.80% | 3.30% |
| **COU** | 0.33% | 0.26% | 0.24% | 0.17% | 0.12% | 0.13% | 0.13% | 0.12% | 0.13% | 0.10% | 0.11% | 0.06% |
| **CS** | 1.36% | 1.52% | 1.62% | 1.83% | 2.09% | 1.77% | 2.27% | 1.92% | 1.99% | 2.32% | 2.21% | 2.36% |
| **FBO** | 0.67% | 0.80% | 0.72% | 0.94% | 0.81% | 0.58% | 1.06% | 0.75% | 0.64% | 0.89% | 0.54% | 0.76% |
| **FPC** | 0.04% | 0.04% | 0.03% | 0.04% | 0.06% | 0.05% | 0.13% | 0.09% | 0.06% | 0.10% | 0.04% | 0.06% |
| **NPA** | 2.97% | 3.03% | 1.99% | 2.15% | 2.16% | 1.87% | 2.11% | 1.93% | 1.99% | 2.38% | 2.07% | 2.36% |
| **Other** | 1.74% | 1.57% | 1.59% | 1.38% | 1.41% | 1.42% | 1.48% | 1.34% | 1.15% | 1.30% | 1.03% | 1.18% |
| **SD** | 90.14% | 89.47% | 90.70% | 89.81% | 89.53% | 90.83% | 88.16% | 89.65% | 88.80% | 87.04% | 87.62% | 85.99% |

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 6, 293,059 adult family members were provided with services in 2012-13. With the exception of a slight decline in 2008-09 and 2012-13, this number has increased every year.

Table 6. Family Members Served

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2006** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2012** | **2013** |
| **Family Members Served** | 199,489 | 210,857 | 223,042 | 213,552 | 253,283 | 274,364 | 297,723 | 293,059 |

## Activity Cluster

The purpose of the 21st CCLC program is to provide academic 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 may provide, a series of “activity clusters” were identified based on the relative emphasis given to providing the categories of activities listed previously during the 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13 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 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13 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 data used to assign centers to program clusters were available only from states that employed the individual activities reporting option in PPICS for the 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, and/or 2012-13 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 (26 states in 2007-08, 25 states in 2008-09, 26 states in 2009-10, 29 in 2010-11, 29 in 2011-12, and 28 in 2012-13).

As shown in Figure 2 and Table 7, 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. The 2012-13 reporting period was the only exception to this trend. Approximately a fifth of centers were classified as falling within either the *Mostly Homework Help* or *Mostly Tutoring* clusters, or the *Mostly Recreation* programming cluster.

Figure 2. Primary Program Clusters Based on Activity Data Reported
for the 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, & 2012-13 School Years



**Table 7. Number and Percent Share of Primary Program Clusters, Based on Activity Data Reported for the 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, & 2012-13 School Years**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity Cluster** | **No. in 2007-08** | **No. in 2008-09** | **No. in 2009-10** | **No. in 2010-11** | **No. in 2011-12** | **No. in 2012-13** | **Percent in 2007-08** | **Percent in 2008-09** | **Percent in 2009-10** | **Percent in 2010-11** | **Percent in 2011-12** | **Percent in 2012-13** |
| Unknown\* | 4,835 | 4,656 | 5,305 | 5,492 | 5,360 | 5,081 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Variety | 1,331 | 1,446 | 1,348 | 1,641 | 1,630 | 1,526 | 32.80% | 35.90% | 35.40% | 34.90% | 33.70% | 31.10% |
| Enrichment | 1,021 | 958 | 919 | 1,072 | 1,008 | 1,218 | 25.10% | 23.80% | 24.10% | 22.80% | 20.80% | 24.80% |
| Recreation | 836 | 878 | 752 | 1,004 | 1,120 | 1,127 | 20.60% | 21.80% | 19.70% | 21.40% | 23.10% | 23.00% |
| Tutoring | 505 | 342 | 342 | 473 | 476 | 377 | 12.40% | 8.50% | 9.00% | 10.10% | 9.80% | 7.70% |
| Homework Help | 371 | 408 | 451 | 506 | 605 | 660 | 9.10% | 10.10% | 11.80% | 10.80% | 12.50% | 13.40% |

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

## Staffing

This section provides an overview of the different types and numbers of staff serving 21st CCLC programs.

### Types of Employees

Staff for 21st CCLC programs comes from many sources including teachers, parents, and local college students. Some are paid, while others serve as volunteers. As shown in Table 8, for the 2012‑13 school year, school-day teachers account for the largest percentage of paid staff at 44 percent. Non-teaching school staff account for the second largest at approximately 13 percent. As for volunteer staff, college students account for the largest percentage at 27 percent with community members second at 18 percent.

Table 8. 2012-13 Staffing Types

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Staff Type** | **Paid Staff** | **Percent Paid Staff** | **Volunteer Staff** | **Percent Volunteer Staff** |
| School-day teachers | 56,343 | 44% | 2,487 | 7% |
| College students | 9,978 | 8% | 9,476 | 27% |
| High school students | 4,459 | 3% | 6,042 | 17% |
| Parents | 1,182 | 1% | 5,041 | 14% |
| Youth development workers | 13,014 | 10% | 2,455 | 7% |
| Other community members | 3,319 | 3% | 6,299 | 18% |
| Other non-teaching school staff | 16,643 | 13% | 1,290 | 4% |
| Center administrators and coordinators | 10,996 | 9% | 403 | 1% |
| Other nonschool-day staff with some or no college | 9,010 | 7% | 757 | 2% |
| Other | 3,328 | 3% | 694 | 2% |
| **Total** | 128,272 | 100% | 34,944 | 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 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13 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 college students, school-day teachers
* Centers staffed mostly by other non-school-day staff with some or no college, school-day teachers
* Centers staffed mostly by non-teaching school-day staff, school-day teachers
* Centers staffed mostly by youth development (YD) workers, other staff

Note that teachers, at least to some extent, were included in each of the staffing clusters outlined in Figure 3 and Table 9, although the degree of involvement varied significantly from one cluster to the next. On average, the percent of teachers falling within each staffing cluster follows: (a) *Mostly school-day teachers* (81 percent), (b) *mostly youth development (YD) workers, other staff* (17 percent), (c) *mostly other non-school-day staff with some or no college, school-day teachers* (16 percent), (d) *mostly college students, school-day teachers* (15 percent), and (e) *mostly non-teaching school-day staff, school-day teachers* (37 percent).

Figure 3. Primary Staffing Clusters Based on Total Staffing Data Reported
for the 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13 School Years



**Table 9. Number and Percent of Primary Staffing Clusters, Based on Total Staffing Data Reported for the 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13 School Years**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Staffing Cluster** | **No. in 2007-08** | **No. in 2008-09** | **No. in 2009-10** | **No. in 2010-11** | **No. in 2011-12** | **No. in 2012-13** | **Percent in 2007-08** | **Percent in 2008-09** | **Percent in 2009-10** | **Percent in 2010-11** | **Percent in 2011-12** | **Percent in 2012-13** |
| **Unknown** | 226 | 233 | 305 | 434 | 316 | 340 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1- Mostly School-Day Teachers** | 3796 | 3369 | 3348 | 3646 | 3760 | 3382 | 43.90% | 39.90% | 38.10% | 38.00% | 38.80% | 36.20% |
| **2-Mostly College Students, School-Day Teachers** | 854 | 992 | 1035 | 1103 | 1058 | 963 | 9.90% | 11.70% | 11.80% | 11.50% | 10.90% | 10.30% |
| **3-Mostly Other Non-School-Day Staff without College, School-Day Teachers** | 694 | 689 | 714 | 807 | 797 | 847 | 8.00% | 8.20% | 8.10% | 8.40% | 8.20% | 9.10% |
| **4-Mostly Non-Teaching School-Day Staff, School-Day Teachers** | 2618 | 2589 | 2846 | 3054 | 3040 | 3022 | 30.30% | 30.70% | 32.40% | 31.80% | 31.30% | 32.30% |
| **5-Mostly YD Workers, Other Staff** | 678 | 806 | 848 | 988 | 1048 | 1129 | 7.80% | 9.50% | 9.60% | 10.30% | 10.80% | 12.10% |

The overall distribution of centers across each of the categories identified in Figure 3 was consistent across the 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13 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 (beginning with 2009-10). In this case, it was found that 45 percent of centers moved from one cluster to another between 2009–10 and 2012–13, 43 percent of centers moved from one cluster to another between 2010-11 and 2012-13, and 36 percent of centers moved from one cluster to another between 2011-12 and 2012-13.

## Grade Level Served

This section provides an overview of the extent to which 21st CCLC programs served students from each grade level.

### Students and Grade Level

Table 10 shows the number of students served per grade level in 2012-13. The distribution is broad with grades three through seven having the highest total number of students attending. Students from each of these grades account for approximately nine percent of all student attendees. Students who attend programming for 30 days or more are categorized in PPICS as *regular attendees*. As shown in Table 10, grades two through six have the highest number of regular attendees with each grade level accounting for over nine percent of all regular attendees.

Table 10. Students per Grade Level in 2012-13

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level** | **(Total of Students Attendees) Number of Students** | **(Total of Students Attendees) Percent of Students** | **(Total Regular Students Attendees) Number of Students** | **(Total Regular Students Attendees) Percent of Students** |
| **Pre-K** | 7,391 | 0.4% | 3,753 | 0.4% |
| **K** | 69,827 | 4.2% | 44,096 | 5.1% |
| **1st** | 109,281 | 6.5% | 71,565 | 8.3% |
| **2nd** | 125,323 | 7.5% | 83,967 | 9.8% |
| **3rd** | 147,636 | 8.8% | 98,939 | 11.5% |
| **4th** | 150,008 | 9.0% | 97,911 | 11.4% |
| **5th** | 146,600 | 8.7% | 91,945 | 10.7% |
| **6th** | 165,038 | 9.9% | 90,055 | 10.5% |
| **7th** | 146,128 | 8.7% | 70,544 | 8.2% |
| **8th** | 125,416 | 7.5% | 57,427 | 6.7% |
| **9th** | 134,064 | 8.0% | 39,505 | 4.6% |
| **10th** | 123,437 | 7.4% | 37,633 | 4.4% |
| **11th** | 117,242 | 7.0% | 37,222 | 4.3% |
| **12th** | 108,104 | 6.5% | 32,584 | 3.8% |
|  **Total[[4]](#footnote-4)** | 1,675,495 | 100.0% | 857,146 | 100.0% |

### 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 and Table 11, 59 percent to 65 percent of centers from 2007-08 to 2012-13 served elementary students in some capacity, 19 percent to 21 percent of centers exclusively served middle school students, and eight percent to 13 percent exclusively served high school students.

Figure 4. Number of 21st CCLCs by Grade Level Served
During the 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13 Reporting Periods



**Table 11. Number and Percent of 21st CCLCs by Grade Level Served During the 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13 Reporting Periods**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level** | **No. in 2007-08** | **No. in 2008-09** | **No. in 2009-10** | **No. in 2010-11** | **No. in 2011-12** | **No. in 2012-13** | **Percent in 2007-08** | **Percent in 2008-09** | **Percent in 2009-10** | **Percent in 2010-11** | **Percent in 2011-12** | **Percent in 2012-13** |
| **Unknown** | 1,022 | 467 | 478 | 563 | 449 | 497 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Elem Only** | 4,325 | 4,310 | 4,319 | 4,678 | 4,740 | 4,554 | 55.10% | 52.50% | 50.00% | 49.40% | 49.30% | 49.10% |
| **Elem-Mid** | 770 | 848 | 930 | 965 | 1,012 | 928 | 9.80% | 10.30% | 10.80% | 10.20% | 10.50% | 10.00% |
| **Mid Only** | 1,501 | 1,654 | 1,764 | 1,989 | 1,914 | 1,896 | 19.10% | 20.10% | 20.40% | 21.00% | 19.90% | 20.40% |
| **Mid-High** | 282 | 298 | 306 | 388 | 451 | 426 | 3.60% | 3.60% | 3.50% | 4.10% | 4.70% | 4.60% |
| **High Only** | 643 | 824 | 1,020 | 1,172 | 1,176 | 1,187 | 8.20% | 10.00% | 11.80% | 12.40% | 12.20% | 12.80% |
| **Other**  | 326 | 279 | 295 | 279 | 322 | 293 | 4.20% | 3.40% | 3.40% | 2.90% | 3.30% | 3.20% |

# Section 2: Performance on the GPRA Indicators

In addition to collecting information on the operational characteristics of 21st CCLC programs, a 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 12, 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 12, 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 2012-13 APR and discusses how performance relative to these indicators has varied across the past reporting periods.

Table 12. 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 2012-13

Table 13 provides an overall summary of the 21st CCLC program GPRA indicator data for the 2012-13 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 13 shows, nearly all of the performance targets for the 2012-13 reporting period were not reached. For the range of indicators related to regular attendee improvement in student achievement and behaviors, the indicator showing improvement included 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.

Table 13. GPRA Performance Indicators for the 2012-13 Reporting Period

| **GPRA Performance Indicator** | **Performance Target** | **2012–13 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% | 30.65% |
| 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% | 30.34% |
| Measure 1.3 of 14: The percentage of all 21st Century regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring. | 47.5% | 30.67% |
| Measure 1.4 of 14: The percentage of elementary 21st Century regular program participants whose English grades improved from fall to spring.   | 47.5% | 31.03% |
| 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% | 30.27% |
| Measure 1.6 of 14: The percentage of all 21st Century regular program participants whose English grades improved from fall to spring.   | 47.5% | 30.97% |
| 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% | 20.21% |
| 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% | 17.80% |
| 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% | 74.01% |
| 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% | 68.88% |
| 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% | 72.05% |
| Measure 1.12 of 14: The percentage of elementary 21st Century participants with teacher-reported improvement in student behavior | 75% | 68.51% |
| Measure 1.13 of 14: The percentage of middle and high school 21st Century participants with teacher-reported improvement in student behavior.   | 75% | 64.16% |
| Measure 1.14 of 14: The percentage of all 21st Century participants with teacher-reported improvement in student behavior.   | 75% | 67.06% |
| Measure 2.1 of 2: The percentage of 21st Century Centers reporting emphasis in at least one core academic area. | 100% | 97.40%\* |
| Measure 2.2 of 2: The percentage of 21st Century Centers offering enrichment and support activities in other areas. | 100% | 97.03%\* |

\*Note: The reported percent includes missing students. If missing students are excluded from the denominator, the new percent for measure 2.1 equals 98.81% and the new percent for measure 2.2 equals 98.56%.

## Trends in GPRA Indicator Performance

The 2011-12 reporting period represented the tenth 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 14 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 14, 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.

As shown in Table 14, when the measures are examined without taking into consideration attendance gradation, no apparent trend toward higher levels of program performance is discernable across the reporting periods, and in the case of grades, state assessment and behavioral improvement rates increases are lower in 2012-13 compared to more recent years. Further, when cross-year progress is assessed employing the gradation reporting option, increases are also lower than prior years.

Finally, with the exception of the current year, Table 14 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. While not true for 2012-13, this result is largely replicated in 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12 where the gap between the 30-59 day group and the 90 days or more groups was found to be 2 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 14. Grades, State Assessment Results, and Teacher Survey Results Across Years

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grades | ***% Increase******2012–13*** | ***% Increase******2011–12*** | ***% Increase******2010–11*** | ***% Increase******2009–10*** | ***% Increase******2008–09*** | ***% Increase******2007–08*** | ***% Increase******2006–07*** | ***% Increase******2005–06*** |
| Mathematics Grades | 31 | 33 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 40 | 41 | 42 |
| Reading Grades | 31 | 34 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 42 | 43 | 45 |
|  |
| By Attendance Gradation | ***% Increase******2012–13*** | ***% Increase******2011–12*** | ***% Increase******2010–11*** | ***% Increase******2009–10*** | ***% Increase******2008–09*** | ***% Increase******2007–08*** | ***% Increase******2006–07*** | ***% Increase******2005–06*** |
| Mathematics Grades (30–59) | 30 | 32 | 34 | 34 | 35 | 37 | 39 | 36 |
| Mathematics Grades (60–89) | 30 | 33 | 33 | 36 | 35 | 39 | 39 | 39 |
| Mathematics Grades (90+) | 29 | 33 | 33 | 36 | 35 | 40 | 43 | 40 |
| Reading Grades (30–59) | 30 | 33 | 35 | 35 | 37 | 38 | 41 | 39 |
| Reading Grades (60–89) | 29 | 33 | 34 | 36 | 37 | 40 | 41 | 44 |
| Reading Grades (90+) | 28 | 33 | 35 | 38 | 36 | 41 | 45 | 43 |
|  |
| State Assessment Results (All Regular Attendees) | ***% Increase******2012–13*** | ***% Increase******2011–12*** | ***% Increase******2010–11*** | ***% Increase******2009–10*** | ***% Increase******2008–09*** | ***% Increase******2007–08*** | ***% Increase******2006–07*** | ***% Increase******2005–06*** |
| Mathematics Proficiency (Attaining) | 19 | 24 | 23 | 22 | 23 | 22 | 22 | 17 |
| Reading Proficiency (Attaining) | 21 | 25 | 24 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 17 |
| Mathematics Proficiency (Improving) | 29 | 37 | 37 | 35 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 32 |
| Reading Proficiency (Improving) | 31 | 37 | 38 | 36 | 38 | 38 | 39 | 33 |
|  |
| By Attendance Gradation | ***% Increase******2012–13*** | ***% Increase******2011–12*** | ***% Increase******2010–11*** | ***% Increase******2009–10*** | ***% Increase******2008–09*** | ***% Increase******2007–08*** | ***% Increase******2006–07*** | ***% Increase******2005–06*** |
| Mathematics Proficiency (Attaining, 30–59) | 28 | 38 | 33 | 32 | 29 | 29 | 27 | 24 |
| Mathematics Proficiency (Attaining, 60–89) | 28 | 41 | 35 | 36 | 34 | 31 | 31 | 24 |
| Mathematics Proficiency (Attaining, 90+) | 27 | 47 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 33 | 31 |
| Reading Proficiency (Attaining, 30–59) | 28 | 38 | 33 | 32 | 33 | 37 | 37 | 31 |
| Reading Proficiency (Attaining, 60–89) | 27 | 39 | 34 | 35 | 37 | 38 | 41 | 27 |
| Reading Proficiency (Attaining, 90+) | 27 | 43 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 41 | 41 | 33 |
| Mathematics Proficiency (Improving, 30–59) | 32 | 46 | 40 | 40 | 37 | 36 | 37 | 34 |
| Mathematics Proficiency (Improving, 60–89) | 33 | 49 | 42 | 43 | 42 | 39 | 41 | 37 |
| Mathematics Proficiency (Improving, 90+) | 32 | 55 | 46 | 45 | 47 | 47 | 43 | 46 |
| Reading Proficiency (Improving, 30–59) | 32 | 44 | 41 | 40 | 44 | 45 | 47 | 42 |
| Reading Proficiency (Improving, 60–89) | 32 | 47 | 43 | 43 | 48 | 45 | 51 | 40 |
| Reading Proficiency (Improving, 90+) | 32 | 51 | 45 | 46 | 49 | 48 | 51 | 48 |
|  |
| Teacher Survey Results | ***% Increase******2012–13*** | ***% Increase******2011–12*** | ***% Increase******2010–11*** | ***% Increase******2009–10*** | ***% Increase******2008–09*** | ***% Increase******2007–08*** | ***% Increase******2006–07*** | ***% Increase******2005–06*** |
| Improved HW Completion and Class Partic. | 72 | 73 | 72 | 72 | 73 | 76 | 75 | 73 |
| Improved Student Behavior | 67 | 68 | 67 | 67 | 69 | 72 | 71 | 68 |
|  |
| By Attendance Gradation | ***% Increase******2012–13*** | ***% Increase******2011–12*** | ***% Increase******2010–11*** | ***% Increase******2009–10*** | ***% Increase******2008–09*** | ***% Increase******2007–08*** | ***% Increase******2006–07*** | ***% Increase******2005–06*** |
| Improved HW Comp. and Class Partic. (30–59) | 69 | 69 | 68 | 68 | 69 | 71 | 72 | 71 |
| Improved HW Comp. and Class Partic. (60–89) | 71 | 71 | 71 | 70 | 71 | 72 | 73 | 74 |
| Improved HW Comp. and Class Partic. (90+) | 70 | 72 | 71 | 70 | 72 | 73 | 73 | 76 |
| Improved Student Behavior (30–59) | 64 | 64 | 63 | 62 | 64 | 66 | 67 | 66 |
| Improved Student Behavior (60–89) | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 66 | 67 | 69 |
| Improved Student Behavior (90+) | 64 | 66 | 66 | 65 | 67 | 68 | 69 | 72 |

\*2003-2004 and 2004-2005 data were not included in the table.

Table 15. Number and Percent of Students Maintaining Highest Grade

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 |
| **2012** | 9.43% | 9.52% | 34,596 | 34,895 |
| **2013** | 10.55% | 10.20% | 36,198 | 34,754 |

# 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.

* In previous years, analyses predicated on examining the relationship between higher levels of program attendance and the achievement of GPRA-related outcomes suggest that students benefited more from 21st CCLC the more they attended the program. This finding was not as strongly evident during the most recent APR period; additional research into the relationship between attendance and outcomes is warranted.
* Grade improvement rates for 2012-13 dropped relative to the 2011-12, continuing a multi-year trend. The reason or reasons for this decline are still not clear, though it is hypothesized that changing grade standards, notably shifts to standards-based grading, could be affecting this. During the same period, however, a higher proportion of regular attendees maintained the highest grade possible.
* 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.
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# Appendix State 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 2012-13 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 A.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 A.1. Centers Active During the 2012–13 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)** | 25(46.3%) | 6,024(60.3%) | 4,768 | 79.2% |
| **State Assessment (Measures 1.7 to 1.8)** | 27(50.0%) | 6,163(61.7%) | 4,810 | 78.0% |
| **Teacher Survey (Measures 1.9 to 1.14)** | 44(81.5%) | 7,097(71.0%) | 5,506 | 77.6% |
| **Activities** **(Measures 2.1 to 2.2)** | 54(100%) | 9,989(100%) | 9,761 | 97.7% |

1. “Unknown” indicates grantees that had not selected an organization classification in the Grantee Profile. “CBO” indicates Community Based Organization; “COU” indicates College or University; “CS” indicates Charter School; “FBO” indicates Faith-Based Organization; “FPC” indicates For-Profit Company; “NPA” indicates Non-Profit Association (including YWCA/YMCA, Big Brothers/Big Sisters, Boys & Girls Club, Boy Scouts/Girl Scouts, etc.); “SD” indicates School District; “Other” indicates all other classifications, including Units of Government, Regional/Intermediate Education Agency, Health Based Organization, Park/Recreation district, Library, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Museum, and Private School categories. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. “Unknown” indicates grantees that had not selected an organization classification in the Grantee Profile. “CBO” indicates Community Based Organization; “COU” indicates College or University; “CS” indicates Charter School; “FBO” indicates Faith-Based Organization; “FPC” indicates For-Profit Company; “NPA” indicates Non-Profit Association (including YWCA/YMCA, Big Brothers/Big Sisters, Boys & Girls Club, Boy Scouts/Girl Scouts, etc.); “SD” indicates School District; “Other” indicates all other classifications, including Units of Government, Regional/Intermediate Education Agency, Health Based Organization, Park/Recreation district, Library, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Museum, and Private School categories. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. “Unknown” indicates grantees that had not selected an organization classification in the Grantee Profile. “CBO” indicates Community Based Organization; “COU” indicates College or University; “CS” indicates Charter School; “FBO” indicates Faith-Based Organization; “FPC” indicates For-Profit Company; “NPA” indicates Non-Profit Association (including YWCA/YMCA, Big Brothers/Big Sisters, Boys & Girls Club, Boy Scouts/Girl Scouts, etc.); “SD” indicates School District; “Other” indicates all other classifications, including Units of Government, Regional/Intermediate Education Agency, Health Based Organization, 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)