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**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

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

In this Annual Performance Report (APR), data from the 21APR Data Collection System were analyzed to report on the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) performance indicators associated with the 21st CCLC program. These metrics assist the federal government in determining progress of the 21st CCLC program based on the statutory requirements. The APR has historically been completed by grantees once a year to summarize the operational elements of their program, the student population served, and the extent to which students improved in specific areas. 30 States reported data to assess for student improvement in mathematics and English grades across all grade levels, while an additional six and seven States respectively only reported the data for some grade levels and not others. Eighteen States/Territories did not report data on mathematics grades and 17 States/Territories did not report data on English grades.

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

* During SY14-15 over 1.8 million people have been served by this program:
  + academic year total student attendees (n = 1,405,722), including regular[[1]](#footnote-2) student attendees (n = 752,008)
  + summer attendees (n = 279,314), and
  + adults/family members (n = 183,461).
* Overall, there was an even split between male (49.2%, n = 687,464) and female (48.2%, n = 673,800) attendees.
* In terms of race/ethnicity, the majority of the attendees (84.5%) were identified as Hispanic or Latino (35.9%, n = 504,661), with White (27.8%, n = 391,422) and Black or African American (20.8%, n = 292,260) following.
* 48.0% reported a percentage of improvement in mathematics grades.
* 48.5% reported a percentage of improvement in English grades.
* 28.4% reported a percentage of improvement on state assessments in elementary reading and 22.6% in middle/high school mathematics.
* 65.2% of teachers reported a percentage of improvement in homework completion and class participation.
* 56.8% of teachers reported a percentage of improvement in student behavior.

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

# INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

**Methodology:**

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

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

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

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

# SECTION 1:  GPRA RESULTS

In addition to collecting information on the operational characteristics of 21st CCLC programs, a primary purpose of the system is to collect data that inform the GPRA indicators established for the program. It is important to note that not all States report data for each GPRA. States are afforded the choice to report performance culled from grades, state assessments, and/or teacher-reported student behavior. Certain GPRA then seek data based on these instruments. The GPRA indicators are the primary means by which the US Department of Education measures the effectiveness and efficiency of the program based on the following two overall goals:

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

Data for each GPRA are provided at the end of the academic school year and presented in tabular and summary form below (Section A-E). Any methodological considerations are noted following each GPRA table. A summary of the findings for each GPRA is presented in Table 1.

### Table 1. The GPRA Outcomes for all 54 States/Territories[[2]](#footnote-3)

| **Program GPRA Measures** | **2014-2015** |
| --- | --- |
| 1. The percentage of elementary 21st Century regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring. | 49.7% |
| 2. The percentage of middle/high school 21st Century regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring. | 45.4% |
| 3. The percentage of all 21st Century regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring. | 48.0% |
| 4. The percentage of elementary 21st Century regular program participants whose English grades improved from fall to spring. | 49.6% |
| 5. The percentage of middle/high school 21st Century regular program participants whose English grades improved from fall to spring. | 46.9% |
| 6. The percentage of all 21st Century regular program participants whose English grades improved from fall to spring. | 48.5% |
| 7. The percentage of elementary 21st Century regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above in reading on state assessments. | 28.4% |
| 8. The percentage of middle/high school 21st Century regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above in mathematics on state assessments. | 22.6% |
| 9. The percentage of elementary 21st Century regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation. | 66.2% |
| 10. The percentage of middle/high school 21st Century program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation. | 63.1% |
| 11. The percentage of all 21st Century regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation. | 65.2% |
| 12. The percentage of elementary 21st Century participants with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior. | 57.5% |
| 13. The percentage of middle/high school 21st Century participants with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior. | 55.3% |
| 14. The percentage of all 21st Century participants with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior. | 56.8% |

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

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

### Table 2. Regular Attendees[[3]](#footnote-4) % Improved in Mathematics Grades

| **State/Territory** | **Mathematics**  **Elementary**  **% Improved** | **Mathematics**  **Middle/High School**  **% Improved** | **Mathematics**  **All Students**  **% Improved** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall** | **49.7%** | **45.4%** | **48.0%** |
| 1. Alabama | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 2. Alaska | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 3. Arizona | 60.5 | 56.9 | 59.3 |
| 4. Arkansas | 0.0 | 77.3 | 77.3 |
| 5. Bureau of Indian Affairs | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 6. California | 44.4 | 49.1 | 47.6 |
| 7. Colorado | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 8. Connecticut | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 9. Delaware | 72.1 | 86.3 | 79.3 |
| 10. District of Columbia | 74.9 | 61.7 | 69.6 |
| 11. Florida | 64.8 | 70.1 | 66.4 |
| 12. Georgia | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 13. Hawaii | 61.9 | 41.4 | 51.0 |
| 14. Idaho | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 15. Illinois | 60.8 | 60.6 | 60.7 |
| 16. Indiana | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17. Iowa | 75.0 | 42.6 | 48.4 |
| 18. Kansas | 87.7 | 0.0 | 86.7 |
| 19. Kentucky | 53.9 | 53.1 | 53.6 |
| 20. Louisiana | 73.5 | 67.2 | 71.6 |
| 21. Maine | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 22. Maryland | 58.5 | 63.0 | 60.2 |
| 23. Massachusetts | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 24. Michigan | 55.8 | 44.5 | 50.5 |
| 25. Minnesota | 0.0 | 18.3 | 18.3 |
| 26. Mississippi | 60.0 | 49.2 | 55.7 |
| 27. Missouri | 32.1 | 33.7 | 32.6 |
| 28. Montana | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 29. Nebraska | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 30. Nevada | 35.2 | 35.9 | 35.3 |
| 31. New Hampshire | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 32. New Jersey | 76.3 | 72.6 | 74.9 |
| 33. New Mexico | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 34. New York | 54.8 | 44.6 | 48.2 |
| 35. North Carolina | 13.9 | 6.0 | 9.6 |
| 36. North Dakota | 0.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 37. Ohio | 56.4 | 61.0 | 58.4 |
| 38. Oklahoma | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 39. Oregon | 70.1 | 0.0 | 70.1 |
| 40. Pennsylvania | 45.6 | 41.7 | 43.2 |
| 41. Puerto Rico | 58.9 | 60.6 | 59.5 |
| 42. Rhode Island | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 43. South Carolina | 42.2 | 77.8 | 44.4 |
| 44. South Dakota | 76.1 | 0.0 | 76.1 |
| 45. Tennessee | 69.7 | 67.9 | 69.0 |
| 46. Texas | 26.6 | 25.7 | 26.2 |
| 47. Utah | 71.4 | 73.2 | 71.8 |
| 48. Vermont | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 49. Virgin Islands | 61.3 | 75.9 | 64.7 |
| 50. Virginia | 68.2 | 66.9 | 67.6 |
| 51. Washington | 61.1 | 26.7 | 55.3 |
| 52. West Virginia | 79.0 | 72.0 | 75.6 |
| 53. Wisconsin | 59.6 | 66.7 | 59.7 |
| 54. Wyoming | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

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

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

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

### Table 3. Regular Attendees % Improved in English Grades

| **State/Territory** | **English**  **Elementary** | **English**  **Middle/High School** | **English**  **All Students** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **% Improved** | **% Improved** | **% Improved** |
| **Overall** | **49.6%** | **46.9%** | **48.5%** |
| 1. Alabama | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 2. Alaska | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 3. Arizona | 67.8 | 58.3 | 56.6 |
| 4. Arkansas | 0.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| 5. Bureau of Indian Affairs | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 6. California | 69.0 | 52.7 | 60.2 |
| 7. Colorado | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 8. Connecticut | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 9. Delaware | 70.5 | 81.0 | 75.3 |
| 10. District of Columbia | 76.1 | 69.6 | 73.6 |
| 11. Florida | 66.0 | 71.8 | 67.8 |
| 12. Georgia | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 13. Hawaii | 56.4 | 36.4 | 46.2 |
| 14. Idaho | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 15. Illinois | 56.1 | 83.3 | 63.0 |
| 16. Indiana | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17. Iowa | 66.1 | 28.7 | 32.1 |
| 18. Kansas | 77.7 | 0.0 | 77.6 |
| 19. Kentucky | 55.7 | 54.6 | 55.3 |
| 20. Louisiana | 74.0 | 67.1 | 72.0 |
| 21. Maine | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 22. Maryland | 57.6 | 67.1 | 61.3 |
| 23. Massachusetts | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 24. Michigan | 54.0 | 46.5 | 50.9 |
| 25. Minnesota | 0.0 | 17.3 | 17.3 |
| 26. Mississippi | 58.8 | 49.6 | 54.9 |
| 27. Missouri | 36.4 | 36.2 | 36.3 |
| 28. Montana | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 29. Nebraska | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 30. Nevada | 30.2 | 33.5 | 30.9 |
| 31. New Hampshire | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 32. New Jersey | 75.0 | 75.1 | 75.0 |
| 33. New Mexico | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.2 |
| 34. New York | 56.1 | 46.9 | 50.2 |
| 35. North Carolina | 10.2 | 9.9 | 10.1 |
| 36. North Dakota | 0.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 37. Ohio | 55.9 | 58.3 | 56.9 |
| 38. Oklahoma | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 39. Oregon | 96.8 | 0.0 | 96.8 |
| 40. Pennsylvania | 46.4 | 42.4 | 44.0 |
| 41. Puerto Rico | 59.7 | 65.8 | 61.6 |
| 42. Rhode Island | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 43. South Carolina | 33.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 |
| 44. South Dakota | 63.3 | 60.0 | 62.8 |
| 45. Tennessee | 71.5 | 68.1 | 70.3 |
| 46. Texas | 21.6 | 33.8 | 26.6 |
| 47. Utah | 77.3 | 73.7 | 76.6 |
| 48. Vermont | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 49. Virgin Islands | 55.4 | 74.6 | 59.8 |
| 50. Virginia | 66.7 | 68.9 | 67.7 |
| 51. Washington | 49.7 | 38.2 | 47.5 |
| 52. West Virginia | 78.2 | 67.6 | 73.2 |
| 53. Wisconsin | 65.1 | 40.0 | 64.5 |
| 54. Wyoming | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

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

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

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

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

| **State/Territory** | **Reading**  **Elementary**  **% Improved** | **Mathematics**  **Middle/High School**  **% Improved** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall** | **28.4%** | **22.6%** |
| 1. Alabama | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 2. Alaska | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 3. Arizona | 14.7 | 33.7 |
| 4. Arkansas | 34.6 | 41.5 |
| 5. Bureau of Indian Affairs | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 6. California | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 7. Colorado | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 8. Connecticut | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 9. Delaware | 38.1 | 49.0 |
| 10. District of Columbia | 38.0 | 52.4 |
| 11. Florida | 87.2 | 57.8 |
| 12. Georgia | 6.5 | 19.6 |
| 13. Hawaii | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 14. Idaho | 6.7 | 0.9 |
| 15. Illinois | 0.6 | 3.4 |
| 16. Indiana | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 17. Iowa | 27.7 | 28.0 |
| 18. Kansas | 66.7 | 50.0 |
| 19. Kentucky | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 20. Louisiana | 69.2 | 60.6 |
| 21. Maine | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 22. Maryland | 9.7 | 42.9 |
| 23. Massachusetts | 21.2 | 12.4 |
| 24. Michigan | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 25. Minnesota | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 26. Mississippi | 34.9 | 33.1 |
| 27. Missouri | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 28. Montana | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 29. Nebraska | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 30. Nevada | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 31. New Hampshire | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 32. New Jersey | 48.6 | 62.4 |
| 33. New Mexico | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 34. New York | 16.2 | 13.4 |
| 35. North Carolina | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 36. North Dakota | 2.0 | 0.0 |
| 37. Ohio | 54.7 | 28.0 |
| 38. Oklahoma | 30.8 | 29.0 |
| 39. Oregon | 0.7 | 0.0 |
| 40. Pennsylvania | 26.1 | 29.0 |
| 41. Puerto Rico | 49.4 | 27.3 |
| 42. Rhode Island | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 43. South Carolina | 16.0 | 1.3 |
| 44. South Dakota | 10.6 | 1.6 |
| 45. Tennessee | 37.2 | 40.6 |
| 46. Texas | 41.3 | 31.3 |
| 47. Utah | 21.4 | 25.0 |
| 48. Vermont | 25.4 | 27.3 |
| 49. Virgin Islands | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 50. Virginia | 49.2 | 55.1 |
| 51. Washington | 6.7 | 1.6 |
| 52. West Virginia | 68.0 | 77.8 |
| 53. Wisconsin | 56.9 | 0.0 |
| 54. Wyoming | 69.3 | 50.5 |

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

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

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

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

| **State/Territory** | **HW/CP**  **Elementary**  **% Improved** | **HW/CP**  **Middle/High School**  **% Improved** | **HW/CP**  **All Students**  **% Improved** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall** | **66.2%** | **63.1%** | **65.2%** |
| 1. Alabama | 93.1 | 89.1 | 92.4 |
| 2. Alaska | 52.7 | 73.9 | 57.4 |
| 3. Arizona | 67.7 | 65.1 | 66.9 |
| 4. Arkansas | 0.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 5. Bureau of Indian Affairs | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 6. California | 0.0 | 95.7 | 95.7 |
| 7. Colorado | 85.8 | 82.7 | 84.9 |
| 8. Connecticut | 59.2 | 63.5 | 60.4 |
| 9. Delaware | 55.4 | 68.1 | 57.7 |
| 10. District of Columbia | 75.1 | 78.2 | 75.7 |
| 11. Florida | 79.9 | 76.8 | 79.0 |
| 12. Georgia | 65.7 | 67.3 | 66.3 |
| 13. Hawaii | 69.4 | 54.7 | 61.4 |
| 14. Idaho | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 15. Illinois | 96.7 | 82.6 | 90.6 |
| 16. Indiana | 85.7 | 82.1 | 84.8 |
| 17. Iowa | 66.7 | 60.1 | 65.0 |
| 18. Kansas | 72.3 | 72.2 | 72.3 |
| 19. Kentucky | 51.8 | 44.1 | 49.2 |
| 20. Louisiana | 75.1 | 64.0 | 71.7 |
| 21. Maine | 13.5 | 11.6 | 12.9 |
| 22. Maryland | 82.8 | 100.0 | 92.2 |
| 23. Massachusetts | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 24. Michigan | 59.4 | 58.8 | 59.2 |
| 25. Minnesota | 46.5 | 63.4 | 57.8 |
| 26. Mississippi | 59.7 | 75.7 | 67.1 |
| 27. Missouri | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 28. Montana | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 29. Nebraska | 31.1 | 23.2 | 28.9 |
| 30. Nevada | 71.4 | 61.6 | 69.3 |
| 31. New Hampshire | 55.0 | 49.2 | 53.5 |
| 32. New Jersey | 47.2 | 56.4 | 52.3 |
| 33. New Mexico | 89.7 | 86.1 | 89.0 |
| 34. New York | 74.7 | 80.9 | 76.8 |
| 35. North Carolina | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 36. North Dakota | 42.2 | 66.7 | 42.6 |
| 37. Ohio | 58.3 | 70.1 | 62.5 |
| 38. Oklahoma | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 39. Oregon | 56.5 | 58.8 | 57.5 |
| 40. Pennsylvania | 55.9 | 56.0 | 55.9 |
| 41. Puerto Rico | 88.4 | 87.6 | 88.1 |
| 42. Rhode Island | 26.8 | 39.6 | 31.5 |
| 43. South Carolina | 72.0 | 65.4 | 70.3 |
| 44. South Dakota | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 45. Tennessee | 77.1 | 74.9 | 76.4 |
| 46. Texas | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 47. Utah | 66.6 | 63.3 | 65.8 |
| 48. Vermont | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 49. Virgin Islands | 90.1 | 94.3 | 90.9 |
| 50. Virginia | 63.6 | 64.1 | 63.9 |
| 51. Washington | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 52. West Virginia | 66.1 | 49.2 | 63.0 |
| 53. Wisconsin | 51.1 | 50.8 | 51.0 |
| 54. Wyoming | 79.9 | 80.1 | 80.0 |

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

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

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

### Table 6. Regular Attendees % Improved Student Behavior

| **State/Territory** | **Student Behavior**  **Elementary**  **% Improved** | **Student Behavior**  **Middle/High School**  **% Improved** | **Student Behavior**  **All Students**  **% Improved** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall** | **57.5%** | **55.3%** | **56.8%** |
| 1. Alabama | 94.7 | 90.7 | 93.9 |
| 2. Alaska | 45.7 | 48.8 | 46.4 |
| 3. Arizona | 60.8 | 56.2 | 59.3 |
| 4. Arkansas | 0.0 | 70.0 | 70.0 |
| 5. Bureau of Indian Affairs | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 6. California | 0.0 | 96.7 | 96.7 |
| 7. Colorado | 91.0 | 85.1 | 89.3 |
| 8. Connecticut | 37.9 | 41.3 | 38.9 |
| 9. Delaware | 43.4 | 62.7 | 46.9 |
| 10. District of Columbia | 56.0 | 67.2 | 58.3 |
| 11. Florida | 71.4 | 70.6 | 71.2 |
| 12. Georgia | 46.9 | 51.7 | 48.8 |
| 13. Hawaii | 68.8 | 57.8 | 62.8 |
| 14. Idaho | 93.8 | 0.0 | 93.8 |
| 15. Illinois | 96.7 | 82.6 | 90.6 |
| 16. Indiana | 87.9 | 85.7 | 87.4 |
| 17. Iowa | 63.1 | 62.7 | 63.0 |
| 18. Kansas | 56.7 | 56.5 | 56.6 |
| 19. Kentucky | 46.0 | 36.3 | 42.8 |
| 20. Louisiana | 68.4 | 56.2 | 64.7 |
| 21. Maine | 21.0 | 17.1 | 19.8 |
| 22. Maryland | 82.8 | 100.0 | 92.2 |
| 23. Massachusetts | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 24. Michigan | 54.9 | 54.8 | 54.8 |
| 25. Minnesota | 50.9 | 67.3 | 61.9 |
| 26. Mississippi | 38.2 | 43.4 | 40.6 |
| 27. Missouri | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 28. Montana | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 29. Nebraska | 29.8 | 20.2 | 27.1 |
| 30. Nevada | 42.4 | 39.0 | 41.6 |
| 31. New Hampshire | 26.5 | 24.3 | 25.9 |
| 32. New Jersey | 34.4 | 47.7 | 41.8 |
| 33. New Mexico | 92.1 | 89.8 | 91.7 |
| 34. New York | 71.1 | 66.9 | 69.7 |
| 35. North Carolina | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 36. North Dakota | 21.3 | 16.7 | 21.3 |
| 37. Ohio | 42.7 | 53.2 | 46.4 |
| 38. Oklahoma | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 39. Oregon | 50.1 | 49.5 | 49.8 |
| 40. Pennsylvania | 42.4 | 49.5 | 46.8 |
| 41. Puerto Rico | 87.7 | 86.0 | 87.2 |
| 42. Rhode Island | 31.4 | 36.0 | 33.1 |
| 43. South Carolina | 43.9 | 41.8 | 43.4 |
| 44. South Dakota | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 45. Tennessee | 64.1 | 64.5 | 64.3 |
| 46. Texas | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 47. Utah | 58.5 | 50.8 | 56.8 |
| 48. Vermont | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 49. Virgin Islands | 87.7 | 92.0 | 88.6 |
| 50. Virginia | 47.6 | 54.8 | 51.2 |
| 51. Washington | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 52. West Virginia | 67.4 | 43.9 | 63.1 |
| 53. Wisconsin | 43.6 | 41.3 | 43.0 |
| 54. Wyoming | 72.9 | 74.1 | 73.2 |

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

# SECTION 2: GRANTEE AND CENTER CHARACTERISTICS

## A. Center Type

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

### Table 7. Grantees’ Centers Broken Down by Organization Type

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

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

## B. People Served

During SY 14-15 a total of over 1.8 million people have been served by this program. The total number of attendees served by the program is calculated by adding the total number of student attendees, which includes the number of regular[[4]](#footnote-5) student attendees, to the number of summer attendees and adults/family members served. Table 8 displays the amount of people served by the program per classification:

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

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

### Table 8. Attendees Served Based on Type

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

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

### Table 9. Total Attendees by Center Type

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

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

### Table 10. Regular Attendees by Center Type

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

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

## C. Activity Participation

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

### Table 11. Times per Week of Each Activity Offered[[5]](#footnote-6)

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

### Table 12. Frequency of Each Activity Offered

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

### Table 13. Times per Week of Each Academic Activity Offered

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

### Table 14. Frequency of Each Academic Activity Offered

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

## D. Staffing Type

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

### Table 15. Staffing Type per Paid and Volunteer Staff

| **Staffing Type** | **Paid Staff**  **N** | **Paid Staff**  **%** | **Volunteer Staff N** | **Volunteer Staff %** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Center Administrators | 8,723 | 7.6% | 1,061 | 3.4% |
| College Students | 8,938 | 7.8% | 6,856 | 21.9% |
| Community Members | 4,837 | 4.2% | 7,886 | 25.2% |
| High School Students | 4,018 | 3.5% | 5,302 | 16.9% |
| Parents | 923 | 0.8% | 5,456 | 17.4% |
| School Day Teachers | 49,553 | 43.1% | 1,598 | 5.1% |
| Other Non-Teaching School Staff | 19,006 | 16.5% | 1,350 | 4.3% |
| Other Non-Teaching School Staff with Some or No College | 10,262 | 8.9% | 501 | 1.6% |
| Other | 8,740 | 7.6% | 1,309 | 4.2% |
| **Total** | **115,000** | **100.0%** | **31,319** | **100.0%** |

## E. Attendees Served per Demographic

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

### Table 16. Participant Demographics

| **Demographic** | **N** | **%** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Attendance** |  |  |
| <30 Days | 653,714 | 46.5% |
| 30-59 Days | 301,059 | 21.4% |
| 60-89 Days | 181,843 | 12.9% |
| 90 Days or More | 269,106 | 19.1% |
| Total | 1,405,722 | 100.0% |
| **2. Sex** |  |  |
| Male | 687,464 | 48.9% |
| Female | 673,800 | 47.9% |
| Unknown | 44,458 | 3.2% |
| Total | 1,405,722 | 100.0% |
| **3. Race/Ethnicity** |  |  |
| Asian | 52,198 | 3.7% |
| Black | 292,260 | 20.8% |
| Hispanic | 504,661 | 35.9% |
| Native American | 44,279 | 3.1% |
| Pacific Islander | 6,193 | 0.4% |
| White | 391,422 | 27.8% |
| Two or More Races | 34,866 | 2.5% |
| Unknown | 79,843 | 5.7% |
| Total | 1,405,722 | 100.0% |
| **4. Grade Level** |  |  |
| Pre-K – 5th | 636,186 | 45.3% |
| 6th – 12th | 769,536 | 54.7% |
| Total | 1,405,722 | 100.0% |
| **5. English Language Learners\*** | 185,628 | 13.2% |
| **6. Free & Reduced Lunch\*** | 941,952 | 67.0% |
| **7. Special Needs\*** | 137,455 | 9.8% |

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

### Table 17. Number of Participants per Grade Level

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

## F. Estimated Per-Student Expenditures

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

Total Award for the Year was sourced from budget history tables published by the US Department of Education[[6]](#footnote-7).

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

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

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

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

### 

### Table 18. Estimated Expenditure per Regular Attendee and All Attendees

| **State/Territory** | **Total  Award**  **for the Year** | **Total Regular Attendees** | **Estimated Expenditure**  **per Regular Attendee\*** | **Total  All Attendees** | **Estimated Expenditure**  **per All Attendees\*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Overall | **$1,135,149,873** | **752,008** | **$1,509.49** | **1,405,722** | **$807.52** |
| 1. Alabama | $17,303,700 | 8,332 | $2,076.78 | 12,415 | $1,393.77 |
| 2. Alaska | $5,631,913 | 2,598 | $2,167.79 | 3,850 | $1,462.83 |
| 3. Arizona | $25,045,386 | 42,337 | $591.57 | 85,546 | $292.77 |
| 4. Arkansas | $11,456,864 | 6,647 | $1,723.61 | 12,671 | $904.18 |
| 5. Bureau of Indian Affairs | $8,054,658 | 1,648 | $4,887.54 | 3,896 | $2,067.42 |
| 6. California | $124,944,905 | 102,130 | $1,223.39 | 281,502 | $443.85 |
| 7. Colorado | $11,325,268 | 5,632 | $2,010.88 | 18,525 | $611.35 |
| 8. Connecticut | $9,115,045 | 8,943 | $1,019.24 | 11,045 | $825.26 |
| 9. Delaware | $5,631,913 | 2,186 | $2,576.36 | 2,805 | $2,007.81 |
| 10. District of Columbia | $5,631,913 | 2,611 | $2,156.99 | 2,978 | $1,891.17 |
| 11. Florida | $59,746,279 | 26,026 | $2,295.64 | 40,056 | $1,491.57 |
| 12. Georgia | $38,389,509 | 18,359 | $2,091.05 | 24,619 | $1,559.34 |
| 13. Hawaii | $5,631,913 | 1,886 | $2,986.17 | 4,946 | $1,138.68 |
| 14. Idaho | $5,631,913 | 3,883 | $1,450.40 | 7,133 | $789.56 |
| 15. Illinois | $52,083,676 | 23,895 | $2,179.69 | 44,717 | $1,164.74 |
| 16. Indiana | $20,037,958 | 12,963 | $1,545.78 | 20,533 | $975.89 |
| 17. Iowa | $7,033,211 | 4,611 | $1,525.31 | 7,980 | $881.3 |
| 18. Kansas | $7,774,542 | 10,959 | $709.42 | 19,881 | $391.05 |
| 19. Kentucky | $17,054,721 | 11,719 | $1,455.31 | 32,256 | $528.73 |
| 20. Louisiana | $22,386,376 | 19,644 | $1,139.60 | 32,194 | $695.36 |
| 21. Maine | $5,631,913 | 3,701 | $1,521.73 | 7,277 | $773.93 |
| 22. Maryland | $15,545,716 | 2,892 | $5,375.42 | 4,579 | $3,395.00 |
| 23. Massachusetts | $16,842,674 | 12,532 | $1,343.97 | 14,857 | $1,133.65 |
| 24. Michigan | $39,049,235 | 13,708 | $2,848.65 | 21,481 | $1,817.85 |
| 25. Minnesota | $11,646,545 | 13,832 | $842.00 | 24,387 | $477.57 |
| 26. Mississippi | $13,258,721 | 1,535 | $8,637.60 | 2,783 | $4,764.18 |
| 27. Missouri | $17,648,808 | 15,001 | $1,176.51 | 30,025 | $587.80 |
| 28. Montana | $5,631,913 | 13,533 | $416.16 | 14,851 | $379.23 |
| 29. Nebraska | $5,631,913 | 11,301 | $498.36 | 18,216 | $309.17 |
| 30. Nevada | $8,788,719 | 6,338 | $1,386.67 | 10,959 | $801.96 |
| 31. New Hampshire | $5,631,913 | 4,723 | $1,192.44 | 8,211 | $685.90 |
| 32. New Jersey | $22,245,555 | 9,572 | $2,324.02 | 11,899 | $1,869.53 |
| 33. New Mexico | $8,812,967 | 6,201 | $1,421.22 | 11,388 | $773.88 |
| 34. New York | $84,544,562 | 32,586 | $2,594.51 | 71,075 | $1,189.51 |
| 35. North Carolina | $31,709,298 | 17,352 | $1,827.41 | 24,766 | $1,280.36 |
| 36. North Dakota | $5,631,913 | 5,965 | $944.16 | 7,996 | $704.34 |
| 37. Ohio | $45,173,267 | 9,114 | $4,956.47 | 18,694 | $2,416.46 |
| 38. Oklahoma | $11,603,580 | 14,367 | $807.66 | 22,234 | $521.88 |
| 39. Oregon | $12,225,580 | 9,489 | $1,288.39 | 23,511 | $519.99 |
| 40. Pennsylvania | $42,806,153 | 17,426 | $2,456.45 | 33,069 | $1,294.45 |
| 41. Puerto Rico | $30,763,351 | 15,270 | $2,014.63 | 17,755 | $1,732.66 |
| 42. Rhode Island | $5,631,913 | 4,961 | $1,135.24 | 12,316 | $457.28 |
| 43. South Carolina | $16,916,143 | 9,186 | $1,841.51 | 11,042 | $1,531.98 |
| 44. South Dakota | $5,631,913 | 6,759 | $833.25 | 17,737 | $317.52 |
| 45. Tennessee | $21,785,985 | 30,596 | $712.05 | 45,742 | $476.28 |
| 46. Texas | $106,206,512 | 74,242 | $1,430.54 | 115,321 | $920.96 |
| 47. Utah | $7,192,144 | 9,870 | $728.69 | 20,070 | $358.35 |
| 48. Vermont | $5,631,913 | 6,544 | $860.62 | 11,699 | $481.40 |
| 49. Virgin Islands | $712,615 | 890 | $800.69 | 947 | $752.50 |
| 50. Virginia | $17,822,791 | 8,781 | $2,029.70 | 20,279 | $878.88 |
| 51. Washington | $16,744,986 | 9,532 | $1,756.71 | 14,869 | $1,126.17 |
| 52. West Virginia | $7,450,724 | 4,615 | $1,614.46 | 11,011 | $676.66 |
| 53. Wisconsin | $17,054,362 | 24,126 | $706.89 | 39,695 | $429.64 |
| 54. Wyoming | $5,631,913 | 8,459 | $665.79 | 15,433 | $364.93 |

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

# CONCLUSION

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

In the spirit of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESSA), the purpose of the 21st CCLC program is to 1) provide opportunities for academic enrichment; 2) offer students a broad array of additional services, programs, and activities; and 3) offer families of students served by community learning centers opportunities for active and meaningful engagement in their child’s education (ESSA, Sec. 4201 (a) [Purpose](https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg55.html)). Over the past year this program has resulted in over 1.8 million low-income students and family members having a safe place to receive academic enrichment. Data will be used to bolster continuous improvement through monitoring and technical assistance efforts. The 21st CCLC programs will continue to contribute positively to States’ efforts to close gaps in achievement and graduation rates as Every Student Succeeds Act is implemented. The data in this annual performance report will inform continuous program improvement, including proficiency on tests, English-language, proficiency, and graduation rates, through monitoring and technical assistance.

1. Regular is defined as attendance for 30 days or more during the academic year. See Table 8. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Statistics for each GPRA measure are calculated using only the States/Territories that provided data on the given measure. See Methodology starting on page 6 for detailed explanation. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Regular is defined as attendance for 30 days or more during the academic year. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Regular is defined as attendance for 30 days or more during the academic year. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Previously, activities were reported in hours. This more closely aligns with the data collection in the new system, but may make comparisons with old reports more challenging. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. https://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/history/index.html?exp=6 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)