

# Nita M. Lowey 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers (21<sup>st</sup> CCLC) Overview of the Annual Performance Data: 2019-2020

U.S. Department of Education  
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education  
21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers

This report was prepared for the U.S. Department of Education under contract number ED-OPE-17-A-0015/91990019F0370. The contracting officer representative is Daryn Hedlund of the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education.

This report is in the public domain. Authorization to reproduce it in whole or in part is granted. While permission to reprint this publication is not necessary, the suggested citation is as follows:

U.S. Department of Education. (2021). *Nita M. Lowey 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers (21<sup>st</sup> CCLC) Overview of the Annual Performance Data: 2019-2020* (16<sup>th</sup> report). Washington, DC.

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>SECTION 1: GPRA RESULTS</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>A. GPRA Measures 1-3: Percentage of Participants Improving their Mathematics Grade</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>B. GPRA Measures 4-6: Percentage of Participants Improving their English Grade</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>C. GPRA Measures 9-11: Percentage of Participants Improving on Homework Completion and Class Participation</b>	<b>7</b>
Table 3. Among Students Identified by the State as Needing to Improve Homework Completion and Class Participation, the Percentage of Regular Attendees Who Improved their Homework Completion and Class Participation in School Year 2019-2020	8
<b>D. GPRA Measures 12-14: Percentage of Participants Demonstrating Improvement in Student Behavior</b>	<b>9</b>
Table 4. Among Students Identified by the State as Needing to Improve Student Behavior, the Percentage of Regular Attendees Who Improved Student Behavior in School Year 2019-2020	9
<b>E. Analysis of State and Center Responses on Impact of COVID-19 on 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Programming and Data Collection</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>SECTION 2: CENTER CHARACTERISTICS</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>A. Center Type</b>	<b>12</b>
Table 6. Centers by Organization Type for School Year 2019-2020	12
<b>B. People Served</b>	<b>12</b>
Table 6. Attendees Served in School Year 2019-2020	12
Table 7. Total Attendees by Center Type in School Year 2019-2020	13
Table 8. Regular Attendees by Center Type in School Year 2019-2020	13
<b>C. Activity Participation</b>	<b>13</b>
Table 9. Number of Times per Week/Month of Each Activity Offered in School Year 2019-2020	13
Table 10. Frequency of Activity Duration in School Year 2019-2020	14
Table 11. Number of Times per Week/Month of Each Academic Activity Offered in School Year 2019-2020	14
<b>D. Staffing Type</b>	<b>15</b>
Table 13. Staffing Type per Paid and Volunteer Staff in School Year 2019-2020	15
<b>E. School-Year Attendees Served by Demographic Characteristics</b>	<b>15</b>
Table 14. Description of School-Year Participants, by Attendance and Demographic Characteristics, in School Year 2019-2020	15
<b>CONCLUSION</b>	<b>16</b>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Nita M. Lowey 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers (21<sup>st</sup> CCLC) program provides students in high-need communities with access to high-quality afterschool programming in the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and the Bureau of Indian Education.

The purpose of this program is to provide opportunities for communities to establish or expand activities in community learning centers that—

1. Provide opportunities for academic enrichment, including providing tutorial services to help students, particularly students who attend low-performing schools, to meet the challenging State academic standards;
2. Offer students a broad array of additional services, programs, and activities, such as youth development activities, service learning, nutrition and health education, drug and violence prevention programs, counseling programs, arts, music, physical fitness and wellness programs, technology education programs, financial literacy programs, environmental literacy programs, mathematics, science, career and technical programs, internship or apprenticeship programs, and other ties to an in-demand industry sector or occupation for high school students that are designed to reinforce and complement the regular academic program of participating students; and
3. Offer families of students served by community learning centers opportunities for active and meaningful engagement in their children's education, including opportunities for literacy and related educational development.

All 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs provide programming with academic enrichment and youth development that are designed to support participants' academic success. For the 2019-2020 school year, the U.S. Department of Education (Department) awarded grants to State educational agencies (SEAs), which in turn provided subgrants to 10,496 centers under the 21<sup>st</sup> 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 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program. These metrics assist the Department in evaluating the progress of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program. The APR is completed annually by grantees to summarize the operational elements of their programs, the student populations served, and the extent to which students improved in specific areas. This year, a summary of narrative data collected on the impact of COVID-19 on 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programming is also included.

### 2019-2020 APR highlights:

- In 2019-2020, over 1.8 million people were served by this program:
  - School year student attendees (1,208,293), of which 602,469 were regular<sup>1</sup> student attendees
  - Summer 2019 student attendees (356,145)
  - Adults and family members (290,080)
- Overall, there was a fairly even split between males (48.6 percent, or 586,803) and females (49.3 percent, or 595,787).
- Hispanic students were the most common race or ethnicity (38.5 percent or 465,295), followed by White (24.9 percent, or 301,096) and Black students (21.5 percent, or 260,001).

---

<sup>1</sup> Regular is defined as attendance for more than 30 days during the academic year. See Table 8 for more information.

- Of those reporting on student grades<sup>2</sup>:
  - 49.7 percent of students identified by the subgrantee as needing to improve their mathematics grade did so.
  - 51.5 percent of students identified by the subgrantee as needing to improve their English grade did so.
- Of those that administered a teacher survey<sup>2</sup>:
  - 70.1 percent of teachers reported improved rates of homework completion and class participation among participating students.
  - 63.4 percent of teachers reported improved student behavior among participating students.

The data reported here indicate that the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program is broad-reaching both in terms of overall students served and in terms of the diversity of students and families enrolled in programming.

---

<sup>2</sup> States were not required to submit on every GPRA indicator and instead selected a minimum of one or up to all three indicators. Thus, the data reported are based only on the States which submitted on that GPRA measure. In addition, because of the COVID-19 pandemic, the Department of Education issued a waiver on all state assessment requirements. Consequently, the GPRA measures associated with state assessment data are not reported in this APR. See the Methodology section for more information.

## INTRODUCTION

Originally created in 1994 through the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and expanded through Congress's approval of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in 2001, the Nita M. Lowey 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers (21<sup>st</sup> CCLC) program was reauthorized in 2015 as part of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

The purpose of this program is to provide opportunities for communities to establish or expand activities in community learning centers that—

1. Provide opportunities for academic enrichment, including providing tutorial services to help students, particularly students who attend low-performing schools, to meet the challenging State academic standards;
2. Offer students a broad array of additional services, programs, and activities, such as youth development activities, service learning, nutrition and health education, drug and violence prevention programs, counseling programs, arts, music, physical fitness and wellness programs, technology education programs, financial literacy programs, environmental literacy programs, mathematics, science, career and technical programs, internship or apprenticeship programs, and other ties to an in-demand industry sector or occupation for high school students that are designed to reinforce and complement the regular academic program of participating students; and
3. Offer families of students served by community learning centers opportunities for active and meaningful engagement in their children's education, including opportunities for literacy and related educational development.

21<sup>st</sup> CCLC is awarded to all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE). It provides students in high-need, high-poverty communities the opportunity to participate in afterschool programming in which academic enrichment and youth development activities are designed to enhance participants' well-being and academic success. For the 2019-2020 school year, the U.S. Department of Education (Department) awarded grants to State educational agencies, which in turn provided subgrants to 10,496 centers.

In this annual performance report (APR), data from the 21APR Data Collection (21APR) System were analyzed to report on the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) indicators associated with the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program. These metrics, which are described in Section 1, are an important way for the Department to evaluate the success and progress of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program. The APR is completed annually by grantees to summarize the operational elements of their programs, the student populations served, and the extent to which students improved in academic-related behaviors and achievement.

This year, the data show that most funded centers were classified as school districts, followed by community-based organizations. In the past year, the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program served more than 1.8 million people and employed 101,908 paid staff and 25,158 volunteer staff. Most of the paid staff were school day teachers and most of the volunteers were community members and college students. While these numbers are consistent with previous years, it is important to note that these data report on programming that was impacted by the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic.

In the following report, the methodological approach to data analysis is outlined before turning to the results of the data. The report concludes with a demographic analysis of students and staff to provide context and a holistic picture of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program.

## Methodology

Data were entered by SEAs into the 21APR system during three collection periods throughout the year.

21APR collects the number of participants by grade level, then aggregates the demographic and performance data into the two categories that are delineated according to the GPRA measures: elementary and middle/high school. In 21APR, elementary includes PreK through 5th grade and middle/high school includes 6th through 12th grade. States report the total number days attended by participants per grade level. Attendance is differentiated between “regular” and “non-regular.” For the purposes of reporting on the GPRA measures, “regular” is defined as attending 30 days or more throughout the academic year. Performance on the GPRA measures is not collected for non-regular participants (those attending less than 30 days) during the school year. Demographic and attendance information is collected on all participants. In addition, States had the opportunity to add narrative text in an open-ended text box to explain any data anomalies due to programming, process, or data entry issues. This year, a narrative context box was also added at the grantee level so grantees could enter narrative data on the impact COVID-19 had on their performance data.

From a methodological perspective, it should be further noted that some data definitions for specific GPRA measures are determined by each State. For instance, on GPRA indicators where “needs to improve” is measured, each State has the discretion to define (and communicate to their grantees) what “needs to improve” means; thus, the definition is consistent within the State but may not be comparable across States.

To complete reporting on the GPRA measures, an aggregate statistic for each of the items analyzed is provided. The GPRA indicators fall into three main categories, defined by their means of data collection: State assessment, grades, and teacher reported data. States are not required to submit on every GPRA indicator and instead select from among the indicators. Each year, technical assistance is provided explaining that each State must report on at least one of the three GPRA categories, but it is a State-level decision as to which GPRA measure(s) to choose. As a result, descriptive statistics throughout the report are calculated on the States that provided data on the given GPRA measure. For example, if 46 States provided data on student grades, then the percentages are only based on the data obtained from those 46 States. It is important to note that each SEA is the authoritative source of its data and, as such, must certify its APR data for the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program.

Of note this year, a portion of these data were collected in the spring of 2020, as the COVID-19 pandemic forced significant changes in education policy, including a shift to remote learning in many school districts. The U.S. Department of Education granted each State a waiver from the requirement to administer its state assessments in the 2019-2020 school year. Consequently, the GPRA measures associated with State assessments are not reported in this APR; therefore, States that historically reported only on assessment data may not have had any GPRA data to report.

Finally, to better understand the potential impact of COVID-19 on performance data and programming, a high-level qualitative analysis of narrative data submitted by States as part of the APR data collection process was completed. Two forms of data are analyzed for this portion of the APR. The first, at the center level, is binomial data which indicates whether a center could or could not provide data because of the COVID-19 pandemic. The second, at the grantee and state levels, is free text from an open-ended text box where grantees and SEA representatives were prompted to provide any COVID-19 related context. Specifically, grantees (those entities receiving funds from the State through competition) were asked to respond to the following prompt: “COVID-19 IMPACT STATEMENT For the 2019-2020 collection, you can add a narrative to describe how COVID-19 has affected this Grantee.” At the state level, as normal part of the data certification process, SEAs were asked to provide justification “for any aspect of operations that might impact the data submitted” Through the 21APR Analytic and Data Support to 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning

Centers contract, States also received technical assistance from subject matter experts, emphasizing that they could provide context for the impact of COVID-19 on their programs via these fields.

The brief narratives provided by the grantees and the States were read and coded into categories using a two-step process of first assigning codes based on the read-through and then developing a framework of codes that could be more consistently applied through subsequent readings of the qualitative data.

After the initial analysis, it was clear that most of the narratives reflected how States, particularly at the grantee level, adapted programming to COVID-19 conditions. This was then reflected in the coding categories listed below that were developed and applied during the secondary read throughs:

- Creation and support of virtual learning
- Creation of take-home packets
- Creation of or attendance of professional development for staff
- Spending time in coordination with school day teachers to support
- Creating processes and monitoring lending of electronic devices and
- Engaging in family engagement

After the data were re-read multiple times and coded using the categories above, a basic quantitative analysis of the presence of each of these codes in the narratives was undertaken. As a validity check on the process, a second researcher conducted the same process independently with the data. This process of reading the data multiple times to establish and apply codes consistently, as well as peer-review of the data, are standard best practices in qualitative research to ensure overall validity of the analysis. The most significant limitation to this analysis was that providing a response was optional for the State and its centers. In addition, the responses should not be considered comprehensive by any State or center or encompassing all possible impacts of COVID-19 during spring 2020. Furthermore, each grantee and center likewise had the option to report. A given State might have instructed centers or grantees not to provide context because the state level justification would be provided for the entire state. There were also some instances of data being incomplete, likely due to word limits.

## **SECTION 1: GPRA RESULTS**

The GPRA indicators are a key method by which the Department measures the effectiveness and efficiency of the program based on the following two overall goals:

1. Participants in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.
2. 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grantees and subgrantees 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.

To support these overall goals, a series of measures have been established for the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC 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. Each State reports on at least one of the sets of measures annually – grades, State assessments, or teacher-reported student behavior. Some States chose to report on more than one of the sets of measures. For each measure, the analysis below is based only on the States who elected to provide data for that measure; if a State does not report on a particular GPRA measure, it is not included in the analysis for that measure. In addition, for each GPRA measure, the State reports only on regular participants (those who participate for 30 days or

more). The reason for this is to evaluate the impact of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program on those students who are regular or frequent participants rather than all participants, which may include students who attend a program only once or a handful of times.

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

It should be noted that 10 States, Territories, and the Bureau of Indian Education, were not able to provide data for GPRA measures because these States historically only report on assessment data which was not available for the 2019-20 school year. Because of COVID-19, the U.S. Department of Education granted a waiver to all States regarding the requirement to administer State assessments. Arkansas, the Bureau of Indian Education, California, Minnesota, Ohio, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, and Washington did not submit any data for GRPA measures. See Appendix A: COVID-19 Impact, for more information.

### A. GPRA Measures 1-3: Percentage of Participants Improving their Mathematics Grade

- States were asked to report on participants who the State determined needed to improve their mathematics grade; some students may have participated but were not in need of grade improvement. Each State established both how to determine that a student needed to improve his or her mathematics grade and the definition of improvement.
- 16 States or territories reported on these measures.
- Overall, States reported that 49.0 percent of students who needed to improve their mathematics grades in elementary grades did so, along with 51.7 percent of students in middle and high school, and 49.7 percent of all students.

**Table 1. Among Students Identified by the State as Needing to Improve their Mathematics Grade, Regular Attendees Who Improved their Mathematics Grade in School Year 2019-2020**

State/Territory	Mathematics Elementary	Mathematics Middle/High School	Mathematics All Students
1. Arizona	67.1	57.1	64.2
2. Delaware	57.5	48.2	53.7
3. District of Columbia	46.0	70.3	49.6
4. Florida	33.3	30.2	32.6
5. Georgia	48.9	45.6	47.7
6. Iowa	72.8	52.0	71.1
7. Kentucky	65.5	57.0	62.4
8. Louisiana	75.1	80.9	77.0
9. Michigan	22.0	39.2	28.7
10. Mississippi	54.9	72.6	60.0
11. Missouri	35.7	56.2	40.0
12. New York	50.6	48.9	49.7
13. Pennsylvania	48.2	50.4	48.9
14. Virgin Islands	66.7	92.3	91.6
15. Virginia	73.6	65.8	70.6
16. Wyoming	91.2	84.2	91.1
<b>Overall</b>	<b>49.0</b>	<b>51.7</b>	<b>49.7</b>



Note: Raw scores were used to calculate overall percentage improvement. This is done to prevent presenting the overall percentage data as an average of averages or, in other words, to preserve the accuracy of the calculation.

**B. GPRA Measures 4-6: Percentage of Participants Improving their English Grade**

- States were asked to report on participants who the State determined needed to improve their English grade; some students may have participated but were not in need of grade improvement. Each State established both how to determine that a student needed to improve his or her mathematics grade and the definition of improvement.
- 16 States or territories reported on these measures.
- Overall, States reported that 50.7 percent of students who needed to improve their English grades in elementary did so, along with 53.9 percent of students in middle or high school, and 51.5 percent of all students.

**Table 2: Among Students Identified by the State as Needing to Improve their Reading/English Grade, Regular Attendees Who Improved their Reading/English Grade in School Year 2019-2020**

State/Territory	English Elementary	English Middle/High School	English All Students
1. Arizona	68.1	56.4	64.9
2. Delaware	63.1	58.5	61.4
3. District of Columbia	48.3	74.3	51.9
4. Florida	32.1	28.7	31.3
5. Georgia	45.2	47.0	45.8
6. Iowa	89.5	56.5	86.7
7. Kentucky	63.7	56.2	61.2
8. Louisiana	76.8	82.4	78.6
9. Michigan	48.7	0.0	48.7
10. Mississippi	56.6	70.0	60.5
11. Missouri	35.5	53.9	39.3
12. New York	65.8	54.8	59.6
13. Pennsylvania	46.9	51.4	48.3
14. Virgin Islands	75.0	91.2	90.9
15. Virginia	70.7	67.5	69.5
16. Wyoming	85.1	89.7	85.3
<b>Overall</b>	<b>50.7</b>	<b>53.9</b>	<b>51.5</b>

Note: Raw scores were used to calculate overall percentage improvement. This is done to prevent presenting the overall percentage data as an average of averages or, in other words, to preserve the accuracy of the calculation. When calculating the percentage improvement “overall,” the total number of regular attendees included in these measures across all States/territories were aggregated.

**C. GPRA Measures 9-11: Percentage of Participants Improving on Homework Completion and Class Participation**

- States were asked to report on participants who the State determined needed to improve their rate of homework completion and class participation; some students participating in the 21<sup>st</sup>

CCLC program were not identified as needing to improve their rate of homework completion and class participation. Each State established both how to determine that a student needed to improve and the definition of improvement.

- 31 States and Territories reported data on homework completion and class participation. This data was reported by teachers.
- Overall, the States reported that 70.1 percent of regular attendees who the State determined needed to improve either homework completion and class participations improved their homework completion and class participation in elementary, 70.0 percent of students in middle or high school, and 70.1 percent of all students.

**Table 3. Among Students Identified by the State as Needing to Improve Homework Completion and Class Participation, the Percentage of Regular Attendees Who Improved their Homework Completion and Class Participation in School Year 2019-2020**

State/Territory	HW/CP Elementary	HW/CP Middle/High School	HW/CP All Students
1. Alabama	90.6	88.5	90.2
2. Alaska	56.1	58.9	56.8
3. Arizona	81.0	80.3	80.8
4. Colorado	86.2	77.6	83.4
5. Connecticut	42.3	45.7	43.5
6. Delaware	61.6	67.2	63.8
7. District of Columbia	72.0	90.0	81.5
8. Florida	86.7	86.1	86.5
9. Georgia	77.1	75.5	76.6
10. Illinois	70.8	68.8	70.0
11. Indiana	22.2	25.7	23.1
12. Iowa	85.8	86.0	85.8
13. Kansas	68.1	68.4	68.1
14. Kentucky	63.5	62.1	63.0
15. Louisiana	80.8	88.8	83.6
16. Mississippi	68.5	72.6	70.0
17. Montana	77.0	73.8	76.6
18. Nebraska	64.2	69.7	65.0
19. New Jersey	58.7	58.9	58.8
20. New Mexico	89.7	92.9	90.4
21. North Carolina	88.2	88.7	88.3
22. North Dakota	88.3	91.4	88.7
23. Oregon	68.4	74.0	70.3
24. Pennsylvania	56.3	57.7	56.7
25. Tennessee	64.4	60.0	63.3
26. Utah	83.0	78.7	81.5
27. Virgin Islands	65.2	84.9	83.3
28. Virginia	78.6	79.2	78.8
29. West Virginia	64.8	59.5	63.8
30. Wisconsin	70.3	61.5	68.6
31. Wyoming	74.5	34.5	72.2
<b>Overall</b>	<b>70.1</b>	<b>70.0</b>	<b>70.1</b>

Note: Raw scores were used to calculate overall percentage improvement. This is done to prevent presenting the overall percentage data as an average of averages or, in other words, to preserve the accuracy of the calculation. When calculating the percentage improvement “overall,” the total number of regular attendees included in these measures across all States/territories were aggregated.

**D. GPRM Measures 12-14: Percentage of Participants Demonstrating Improvement in Student Behavior**

- States were asked to report on participants who the State determined needed to improve their behavior. Each State established both how to determine that a student needed to improve and the definition of improvement.
- 32 States/territories reported data on student behavior, as reported by a survey administered to teachers.
- Overall, the States reported that 63.6 percent of regular attendees who were determined by the State to be in need of improved behavior demonstrated improved student behavior in elementary, 62.8 percent of students in middle or high school, and 63.4 percent of all students.

**Table 4. Among Students Identified by the State as Needing to Improve Student Behavior, the Percentage of Regular Attendees Who Improved Student Behavior in School Year 2019-2020**

State/Territory	Student Behavior Elementary	Student Behavior Middle/High School	Student Behavior All Students
1. Alabama	92.2	88.9	91.6
2. Alaska	60.6	47.6	57.5
3. Arizona	82.6	81.0	82.1
4. Colorado	89.8	80.7	86.9
5. Connecticut	41.4	44.4	42.4
6. Delaware	46.4	62.8	52.9
7. District of Columbia	66.4	80.6	73.9
8. Florida	78.8	81.3	79.5
9. Georgia	46.4	46.2	46.3
10. Illinois	62.0	62.7	62.3
11. Indiana	26.8	26.4	26.7
12. Iowa	84.0	86.5	84.8
13. Kansas	59.3	57.2	59.0
14. Kentucky	42.1	34.7	39.7
15. Louisiana	81.1	66.5	76.0
16. Maine	45.1	39.6	43.7
17. Mississippi	68.9	61.1	66.0
18. Montana	76.0	71.5	75.5
19. Nebraska	60.5	60.5	60.5
20. New Jersey	48.4	52.6	50.1
21. New Mexico	92.3	93.9	92.7
22. North Carolina	77.3	82.5	78.6
23. North Dakota	81.6	91.0	82.7
24. Oregon	76.0	77.9	76.7
25. Pennsylvania	44.0	45.1	44.3
26. Tennessee	60.5	54.4	58.9
27. Utah	74.9	69.9	73.2
28. Virgin Islands	65.2	97.0	94.6

29. Virginia	72.0	76.9	73.7
30. West Virginia	59.5	64.7	60.5
31. Wisconsin	73.3	77.0	74.0
32. Wyoming	66.7	30.9	64.6
<b>Overall</b>	<b>63.6</b>	<b>62.8</b>	<b>63.4</b>

Note: Raw scores were used to calculate overall percentage improvement. This is done to prevent presenting the overall percentage data as an average of averages or, in other words, to preserve the accuracy of the calculation. When calculating the percentage improvement “overall,” the total number of regular attendees included in these measures across all States and Territories were aggregated.

### E. Analysis of State and Center Responses on Impact of COVID-19 on 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Programming and Data Collection

As grantees transitioned to new operations under COVID-19 precautionary measures, the Department realized that 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programming and processes, including data collection for the APR, would be impacted by the pandemic. Several adjustments were made to the data collection process to maximize the opportunity for grantees to collect and submit their APR data. Most notably, an additional data entry window was created, providing States with two additional months for data entry. Furthermore, several additional fields were added to 21APR, allowing States and their grantees to report on COVID-19 impacts and provide context for missing or impacted data.

In total, 2,280 grantees across 41 States submitted COVID-19 narratives. Every respondent indicated that COVID-19 was a significant disrupter to 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programming because grantees spent most of the spring serving students remotely.

The responses were analyzed and separated into the following categories: creation and support of virtual learning, creation of take-home packets, creation of or attendance of professional development for staff, spending time in coordination with school day teachers, creating processes and monitoring lending electronic devices and engaging in family engagement. The table below provides a summary description of these coding categories as well as the percentage of the responding grantees that discussed each category.

What is very evident in these data is the concern staff had for their students and families and the need to manage basic needs before academic needs.

**Table 5. Summary Description of Coding Categories Applied to Narrative Data with Percentage Evident in Data**

Category	Overall Percentage of Respondents
<b>Virtual Learning:</b> Describes the 21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC funded staff working to directly provide virtual out-of-school time learning using technology, including phone and internet-based devices.	Over <b>80%</b> of grantees discussed virtual schooling as a means of continuing programming.  Out of these respondents, <b>76%</b> of the grantees directly discussed internet connectivity or availability of devices as a problem.
<b>Take Home Packets:</b> Describes the 21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC funded staff creating, distributing, and using take home activity packets and kits for instruction	<b>38%</b> of grantees explicitly mentioned creating materials or take-home packets. It is important to note that this does not mean that other centers did

(sometimes via virtual learning and sometimes to support parents).	not do this activity, but these narratives contained more specific mention of it.
<b>Professional Development of Staff:</b> Describes the 21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC funded staff completing extensive professional development because they did not have an opportunity to fulfill all of their hours with direct student contact or preparation for direct student instruction.	<b>90%</b> of grantees mentioned some sort of training or professional development; in a small number of cases, this appeared to be the main work of center staff once remote learning began, but that can only be surmised from the data and would require verification
<b>Coordination with school day teachers:</b> Describes the 21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC funded staff using significant time to coordinate with school day teachers, including attending grade level meetings to plan for out-of-school time that supported the school’s switch to remote learning.	<b>22%</b> of grantees mentioned coordination with school day teachers directly, but a much larger number, <b>47%</b> , mention some degree of collaboration or coordination more generally. Overall, <b>69%</b> of grantees mentioned some form of coordination being a significant focus of their work during COVID-19.
<b>Providing electronic devices:</b> Describes the 21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC funded staff using significant time to source, package and deliver electronic devices (e.g., laptops, tablets, and hotspots) to loan to 21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC students so they can participate in 21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC virtual learning activities.	<b>43%</b> of grantees mentioned creating a hotspot or device loan/delivery system as part of their new programming
<b>Family engagement:</b> Describes the 21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC funded staff using significant time to do outreach and activity planning for family engagement—primarily for emotional support and to support parents as they supported their children in remote learning, but also to arrange meal delivery or help with other basic needs. This category often overlapped with other categories mentioned here.	<b>83%</b> of grantees discussed some sort of outreach to families to provide support with COVID-19 related issues. For example, some grantees described providing emotional support to parents who were suddenly unemployed or helping parents develop strategies to support their children in remote learning. In this category there were also examples of 21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC staff providing technical support, sometimes in a home language, e.g., Spanish to parents trying to use different apps on school provided devices. Other examples included developing virtual family engagement activities that might have otherwise been in person, such as cooking a meal together, which had to be completely re-vamped to work in a virtual environment.

When drawing conclusions about the impact of COVID-19, it is important to examine all available data—at state, grantee, and center levels. It should be further noted that the categories coded in the qualitative analysis, although emerging in-vivo from the data, were not provided as mandatory topics to be covered. Consequently, because the context fields were not required, their absence from any given state or grantee does not constitute a lack of COVID-19 impact; rather it only means the context was not provided. Likewise, lack of information on a specific code category (e.g., virtual summer) does not mean the service or issue was not present at a given site, but rather that it was not reported in the narrative. This analysis is meant as an overview and summary, not a deep textual analysis. Such an overview analysis allows the Department to have a general understanding of the questions posed; it does not seek to provide a highly nuanced narrative picture of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC experience during the COVID-19 pandemic.

While limitations to both the methodology and the data themselves exist, as outlined in the methodology section above, overall, this analysis concludes that while there was a clearly narrated COVID-19 impact on 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program operations, many grantees continued to provide services and report data from the spring of 2020.

## SECTION 2: CENTER CHARACTERISTICS

### A. Center Type

Table 6 displays the results of the types of centers for all 54 SEAs. Of the 10,496 centers, 82.8 percent were classified as school districts (8,694) and 9.4 percent as community-based organizations (991).

**Table 6. Centers by Organization Type for School Year 2019-2020**

Center Type	Number	Percentage
Charter School	517	4.9
College/University	23	0.2
Community-Based Organization	991	9.4
Faith-Based Organization	108	1.0
Public School Districts	8,694	82.8
Other	163	1.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>10,496</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Note: The category “Other” is a combination of the following types: 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 2019-2020, over 1.8 million people were served by the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program. The total number of attendees served by the program was calculated by adding the total number of student attendees, which includes the number of regular<sup>3</sup> student attendees, to the number of summer attendees and adults/family members served. Table 7 displays the number of people served by the program per classification:

- Total student attendees (1,208,293), of which 602,469 were regular student attendees
- Summer attendees (356,145)
- Adults/family members (290,080)

Tables 8 and 9 provide a look at attendance based on center type. Most regular attendees attended programs provided by public school districts (84.5 percent or 508,890 students).

**Table 6. Attendees Served in School Year 2019-2020**

Attendees Served	Number	Percentage
Regular School-Year Student Attendees	602,469	49.9
Non-Regular School-Year Student Attendees	605,824	50.1
<i>Total Student Attendees (including regular students)</i>	1,208,293	65.2
Summer Attendees	356,145	19.2
Adults/Family Members	290,080	15.6

<sup>3</sup> Regular is defined as attendance for more than 30 days during the academic year.

<b>Total</b>	<b>1,854,518</b>	<b>100.0</b>
--------------	------------------	--------------

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

**Table 7. Total Attendees by Center Type in School Year 2019-2020**

<b>Center Type</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Charter School	86,153	7.1
College/University	817	0.1
Community-Based Organization	72,290	6.0
Faith-Based Organization	6,461	0.5
Public School Districts	1,031,463	85.4
Other	11,109	0.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,208,293</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Note: The category Other is a combination of the following types: 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 8. Regular Attendees by Center Type in School Year 2019-2020**

<b>Center Type</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Charter School	35,672	5.9
College/University	297	0.0
Community-Based Organization	46,701	7.8
Faith-Based Organization	4,609	0.8
Public School Districts	508,890	84.5
Other	6,300	1.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>602,469</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Note: The category Other is a combination of the following types: 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 offer various types of activities throughout the academic school year. 21APR provides States with a list of activity categories, based on statutory language, and States report their activities under these general categories. Specifically, under these activity categories, States provide information about activities offered through 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC funding in two ways. In the first, they report on how often in a week and how often in a month any given activity category is offered. In the second, they report the duration of each session offered within the activity category. In short, this type of reporting shows both the frequency (e.g., times per week) and the intensity (duration of each activity session) of activities supported by 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC funding. The activities held most frequently were focused on homework assistance (54,307 times/week), physical activity (51,970 times/week), literacy (41,201 times/week), STEM (42,147 times/week), tutoring (31,861 times/week), and arts and music (32,939 times/week). Tables 10-13, below, provide the participation frequency and amount of time for the most common activities identified by centers. It does not include all possible activities that may be offered by a center.

**Table 9. Number of Times per Week/Month of Each Activity Offered in School Year 2019-2020**

Activity	Times per Week	Times per Month
Community/Service Learning	5,900	7,473
Counseling Programs	5,751	4,677
Drug Prevention	2,063	3,122
College and Career Readiness	11,562	5,970
Homework Help	54,307	1,662
Mentoring	11,239	5,873
Physical Activity	51,970	6,258
Tutoring	31,861	2,796
Youth Leadership	13,559	8,959

**Table 10. Frequency of Activity Duration in School Year 2019-2020**

Activity	Less than 1 Hour	1-2 Hours	2-4 Hours	More than 4 Hours
Community/Service Learning	1,531	4,305	1,162	189
Counseling Programs	1,752	2,044	250	28
Drug Prevention	1,471	1,878	187	25
College and Career Readiness	1,280	3,757	1,022	127
Homework Help	6,202	6,176	1,052	98
Mentoring	1,900	2,979	767	94
Physical Activity	5,706	7,532	1,446	187
Tutoring	3,192	5,022	980	109
Youth Leadership	2,451	4,547	985	97

**Table 11. Number of Times per Week/Month of Each Academic Activity Offered in School Year 2019-2020**

Academic Activity	Times per Week	Times per Month
Arts and Music	32,939	11,975
Entrepreneurship	3,963	3,741
Literacy	41,201	5,457
English Learners' Support	8,860	1,651
STEM	42,147	9,594
Truancy Prevention	3,489	1,332
Violence Prevention	3,249	2,916

**Table 12. Frequency of Academic Activity Duration in School Year 2019-2020**

Academic Activity	Less than 1 Hour	1-2 Hours	2-4 Hours	More than 4 Hours
Arts and Music	3,841	8,246	1,445	154
Entrepreneurship	756	2,326	383	53
Literacy	4,075	7,512	1,206	99
English Learners' Support	1,185	1,535	428	22
STEM	3,717	9,379	1,656	244
Truancy Prevention	1,138	774	196	21
Violence Prevention	1,467	1,554	170	13



#### D. Staffing Type

Participating centers employed paid and volunteer staff to assist with programming. There were a reported 101,908 paid staff and 25,158 volunteer staff in 2019-2020. Table 14 shows the number of paid and volunteer staff broken down by type for all SEAs. Among the paid staff, the majority were center school day teachers (40.8 percent, or 41,529) followed by other non-teaching school staff (18.4 percent, or 18,769). Community members were the plurality of volunteers (28.1 percent, or 7,073) used by the centers followed by parents (17.4 percent, or 4,390).

**Table 13. Staffing Type per Paid and Volunteer Staff in School Year 2019-2020**

Staffing Type	Paid Staff Number	Paid Staff Percentage	Volunteer Staff Number	Volunteer Staff Percentage
Center Administrators	9,730	9.5	1,503	6.0
College Students	7,624	7.5	3,926	15.6
Community Members	4,340	4.3	7,073	28.1
High School Students	3,024	3.0	3,203	12.7
Parents	925	0.9	4,390	17.4
School Day Teachers	41,529	40.8	2,369	9.4
Other Non-Teaching School Staff	18,769	18.4	1,295	5.1
Subcontracted	9,254	9.1	507	2.0
Other	6,713	6.6	892	3.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>101,908</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>25,158</b>	<b>100.0</b>

#### E. School-Year Attendees Served by Demographic Characteristics

Tables 14 and 15 detail program attendees by the amount of participation, sex, race/ethnicity, and grade level. Overall, there was a fairly even split between male (48.6 percent or 586,803) and female (49.3 percent or 595,787) attendees. In terms of race/ethnicity, the plurality of the attendees was identified as Hispanic (38.5 percent or 465,295), followed by White students (24.9 percent or 301,096) and Black students (21.5 percent or 260,001). There was a considerably larger number of regular attendees in prekindergarten through grade 5 (65.3 percent or 393,591) in comparison to sixth through twelfth grade (34.7 percent or 208,878).

**Table 14. Description of School-Year Participants, by Attendance and Demographic Characteristics, in School Year 2019-2020**

Base	Number	Percentage
<b>1. Attendance</b>		
Fewer than 30 Days	605,824	50.1
30-59 Days	263,721	21.8
60-89 Days	165,714	13.7
90 Days or More	173,034	14.3
Total	<b>1,208,293</b>	100.0
<b>2. Sex</b>		
Male	586,803	48.6
Female	595,787	49.3
Data Not Provided	25,703	2.1
Total	<b>1,208,293</b>	100.0

<b>3. Race/Ethnicity</b>		
Asian	42,010	3.5
Black	260,001	21.5
Hispanic	465,295	38.5
Native American	32,588	2.7
Pacific Islander	10,581	0.9
White	301,096	24.9
Two or More Races	49,168	4.1
Data Not Provided	47,554	3.9
Total	<b>1,208,293</b>	100.0
<b>4. Grade Level</b>		
Pre-K – 5th	586,231	48.5
6th – 12th	622,062	51.5
Total	<b>1,208,293</b>	100.0
<b>5. English Learners*</b>	162,494	13.4
<b>6. Free and Reduced Lunch*</b>	796,673	65.9
<b>7. Special Needs<sup>4*</sup></b>	125,043	10.3

\*Percentages were calculated using the total number of attendees. This differs from other demographic data in this report because not all participants will be reported into these categories. In all other demographic data, for example, race, all attendees will have data reported.

**Table 15. Number of 2019-2020 School Year Participants per Grade Level**

Grade Level	Total School Year Student Attendees Number	Total Student Attendees Percentage	Total Regular Student Attendees Number	Total Regular Student Attendees Percentage
Pre-K – 5th	586,231	48.5	393,591	65.3
6th – 12th	622,062	51.5	208,878	34.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,208,293</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>602,469</b>	<b>100.0</b>

## CONCLUSION

For the 2019-2020 school year, 10,496 centers received federal funding to implement 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programming. The majority of these were classified as school districts followed by community-based organizations. They served over 1.8 million students and family members of participants served. They employed 101,908 paid staff, largely school day teachers, and 25,158 volunteer staff, many of which were community members. While the COVID-19 pandemic had an impact on 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program operations, most programs continued to provide services designed to enhance participants' well-being and academic success. The performance on the GPRA measures indicate that many participants are showing improved student grades, behavior, and rates of homework completion and class participation.

<sup>4</sup> Special Needs is defined as a participant who has a current IEP (Individualized Education Program) or 504 Plan (Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973).