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Introduction

For the past nine years, 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLCs) across the state of Washington have provided opportunities for students in high-poverty communities to participate in academic enrichment programs and other youth development and support activities designed to enhance their academic well-being. Using data that were collected through the 21st CCLC Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS) and obtained from local evaluation reports prepared for the 2010-11 reporting period, the primary purpose of this report is twofold:

1. To provide an overview of the characteristics and attributes of 21st CCLC grantees and their centers in Washington that have been funded by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) under the auspices of the 21st CCLC Program;

2. To highlight how well afterschool programs funded by 21st CCLC have fared relative to the goals and objectives specified for the program by OSPI in terms of supporting student growth and development.

PPICS is a web-based system funded by the U.S. Department of Education (ED) designed to collect from all active 21st CCLC centers comprehensive descriptive information on program characteristics and services as well as performance data across a range of outcomes. PPICS consists of various data collection modules, including the Annual Performance Report (APR) completed by grantees once a year to summarize operational elements of their program, the student population served, and the extent to which students showed improvements in academic-related behaviors and achievement. In this report, we analyze grantee and center data primarily along two dimensions: across APR years and across various program categories. In some places, where appropriate, national numbers are provided for reference. Where otherwise unmarked, data are taken from APR 2011, which covered program operations during the summer of 2010 and the 2010-11 school year.
Section 1: Grantees

During the Annual Reporting Period (APR) covering summer 2010 through school year 2010-11, there were 55 active 21st CCLC grantees across the state of Washington, which in turn were operating a total of 185 centers. The term grantee in this report refers to an entity that applies for grants and serves as the fiscal agent for a given 21st CCLC grant. The term center refers to the physical location where grant-funded services and activities are provided to participating students and adults.

1.1 General Information

States are responsible for distributing 21st CCLC funds they receive from the U.S. Department of Education via a competitive bidding process that results in the awarding of new grants to entities that propose to operate centers in high-poverty communities. This section considers elements that can be considered only at the grant level, notably grant organization type, typical first-year award amounts, and grant maturity.

As shown in Table 1, during APR 2011 there was a smaller proportion of grants that were sustaining (defined as being within their last year of operation) and a higher proportion of grants that were either new (defined as being in the first year of funding) or mature (defined as any grant not in its first year of funding, but also not in its last year of funding as determined by award date and award length).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Maturity</th>
<th>WA Grants</th>
<th>All Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N Grants</td>
<td>% Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Grantees</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Organization maturity could not be determined for four grantees at the national level.*

Note that awards in Washington are for five years. Award lengths across the nation vary from three years to five.

All grantee organizations can be placed into one of two main groups: school-based and non-school-based. With the passage of the NCLB Act, funding eligibility was expanded beyond schools to include public and private educational and youth organizations. These organizations are referred to as non-school-based organizations. School-based organizations (SBO) include school districts, charter schools, and private schools. Non-school-based organizations (NSBO) include, among other entities, community-based organizations, faith-based organizations, health-based organizations, and park districts. Both types of organizations may apply for grants.
Of 21st CCLC grantees funded by Washington, school-based and non-school based organizations have been represented roughly equally. In 2010, for example, school districts were the fiscal agents on 29 of the 55 active grants (53 percent of all 21st CCLC grants). Figure 1 shows the comparison across six APR years.

**Figure 1: School-Based versus Non-School-Based Grantees**

Of the non-school-based grantees, *Regional/Intermediate Educational Agency* are the largest group, making up more than 18 percent of all grantees in 2011. The next highest non-school based grantee type was *Community-based Organizations*, making up approximately 16 percent of all fiscal agents.

Washington’s first-year grant award amounts and the duration of the grants were assessed alongside national averages, as shown in Table 2. No major differences in terms of the average length of a grant were noted between the two groups, though the average first-year award for Washington grantees was somewhat higher compared to the national average. Note that the median first-year award amounts for Washington and the nation (Washington inclusive) were, respectively, $230,000 and $200,000.
Table 2. Grants by First Year Award Amount*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award Amount and Duration</th>
<th>WA Grants</th>
<th>All Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 Award Amount</td>
<td>$273,504</td>
<td>$326,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award Length</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Grantees</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Number of Centers per Grant</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.5**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Of grantees reporting data for APR 2011.
**Exclusive Washington Grants.

1.2 Grantee Summary

In this section, data was outlined showing the number of grantees growing in Washington year over year. School-based and non-school-based grantees have been roughly evenly represented, with Regional/Intermediate Educational Agencies and Community Based Organizations making up the largest non-school-based fiscal agent blocs. Awards in Washington have been made for five years and have tended to be somewhat lower than awards across the nation in terms of both average and median.

Grantees once again are the entities that apply for grants. Actual services to youth and adults however, are provided by the centers that are run by these grantees. The next section of this report will provide an analysis of center data.
Section 2: Centers

2.1 Center Characteristics

This section considers center-level elements such as center operational data and attendance rates. Within the confines of PPICS, a center is defined as the physical location where grant-funded services and activities are provided to participating students and adults. A center is characterized by defined hours of operation; a dedicated staff that plans, facilitates, and supervises program activities; and an administrative structure that may include a position akin to a center coordinator. Each 21st CCLC grant must fund at least one 21st CCLC center.

2.1.1 Center Type

Like grants, centers can be classified as either school-based or non-school based. During APR 2011, approximately 97.5 percent of Washington’s centers were located in schools. This is a little over the national average of 89.3 percent.

2.1.2 School-Year and Summer Operations

A total of 185 centers in Washington (100 percent) offered school-year programming during the 2011 reporting period. This is similar to the national average, 94.8 percent. Washington centers tended most often to offer programming after the school day (as opposed to before the school day, during the school day, or on weekends), offering on average 10.3 hours of programming after school each week. On average, Washington offered slightly less programming during the
school year than did centers across the nation, with roughly 11.8 hours of programming per week compared with 13.2 hours per week on average. Washington centers offered programming an average of 4.3 days per week over 33 weeks, which is similar to the national averages.

In terms of summer operations, a total of 110 of Washington’s centers (59.5 percent) offered summer programming. This was an increase from previous years in terms of percentage of centers offering summer programming: the percentage of centers with summer programs was 55.1 percent in 2006, 62.4 percent in 2007, 45.1 percent in 2008, 48.8 percent in 2009, and 34.3 percent in 2010. In this regard, in 2011 Washington centers were more likely than other centers nationwide to offer summer programming (with a national average of 57.4 percent). Otherwise, Washington centers tended to be very similar to other centers nationwide in terms of summer operation averages. Washington centers with summer programs had, on average, 5.3 weeks of programming (compared with 5.4 nationally), and approximately 19 hours of programming per week (compared with 24 hours of programming per week). Overall, Washington centers are fairly typical for the nation in terms of program operation.

2.1.3 Attendance

As part of the APR data-collection process in PPICS, information is collected on the total number of students that a given center served during the reporting period, how many of those students met the definition of regular attendee by participating in 30 or more days of programming, and demographic information about the student population in question, including grade level and ethnicity.

In Washington state, a total of 23,780 students were reported as attending 21st CCLCs for at least one day during the 2011 reporting period. Of these, 14,951 were Regular Attendees (students who attended a total of 30 days or more during the reporting period), or 62.9 percent (compared with 47.7 percent nationally). Attendance levels year-over-year are presented in Figure 3 below.
Among regular attendees, attendance rates varied in a fairly normal distribution (given that only students attending at least 30 days are included as regular attendees). See Figure 4.

**Figure 4. Number of Students by Number of Days Attended**

Overall, the mean school-year attendance rate for regular attendees was 59 days, with a median of 51. For summer, the mean attendance rate for regular attendees was 16 days, with a median of 14 days. On average, each center in Washington had approximately 129 total students and 81 regular attendees. This was about the same as total attendance in APR 2010. Median values show a similar trend. See Figure 5 for year-over-year trends.
In terms of grade levels served, centers in Washington most commonly serve elementary school students exclusively, with 38% of all centers being classified as “Elementary Only” in APR 2011. The percentage of centers serving elementary students exclusively has stayed about the same over the past few years. See Figure 6.

**Figure 6: Percentage of Centers per Grade-Level Cluster per Year**

*Note.* Reflective of 185 centers with grade-levels-served status available.
In terms of ethnicity, Washington centers mostly served Hispanic and White students, with 43 percent of all regular attendees being Hispanic and 39 percent of regular attendees white. See Figure 7 for more detail on the number of students served in Washington by ethnic group.

**Figure 7. Number of Total Students and Regular Attendees by Ethnicity**

![Graph showing the number of total students and regular attendees by ethnicity in Washington.](image)

In terms of special status (limited English proficiency, free- or reduced-price lunch status, or special needs), the proportion of students stayed roughly level over the six APR periods. There was a slight increase in the proportion of attendees being identified as special needs from 2006 to 2009, however, both for total attendees and for regular attendees. See Figures 8 through 11.

**Figure 8. Percentage of Attendees by LEP, FRPL, and Special Needs Status**

![Graph showing the percentage of attendees by LEP, FRPL, and special needs status from 2006 to 2011.](image)
Figure 9. Number of Total and Regular Attendees by Limited English Proficiency Status

Note. The number of students whose LEP status was unknown is not shown.

Figure 10. Number of Total and Regular Attendees by FRPL Status

Note. The number of students whose FRPL status was unknown is not shown.
Figure 11. Number of Total and Regular Attendees by Special Needs Status

Note. The number of students whose FRPL status was unknown is not shown.

2.1.4 Staffing and Activities

In terms of the staffing of Washington 21st CCLCs, a total of 3,226 staff members were reported for 2010-11 school year operations (37.1 percent volunteer), and 812 for the summer of 2010 (28.8 percent volunteer). Of the school year staff, 22.3 percent were paid school day teachers. Another 13.2 percent were paid staff with a college degree. Volunteer high school students were the largest volunteer group, accounting for 10.6 percent of school year staff.

Summer staffing was very similar to school year staffing in terms of relative configuration, with 25.0 percent summer staff being paid school day teachers, and 13.9 percent other paid staff with a college degree. Volunteer high school students accounted for 7.0 percent of all summer staff.

In order to further classify centers into categories that meaningfully represent the extent to which different types of staff are employed to deliver programming to youth (e.g., school-day teachers, youth development workers, college students), K-Means cluster analysis was employed using center-level percentages for each category of staff. These percentages represented the extent to which centers nationwide emphasized certain types of staff in the programming offered to participating youth. Cluster analysis typically is employed to combine cases into groups using a series of variables as criteria to determine the degree of similarity between individual cases, and it is particularly well suited when there is a desire to classify a large number of cases into a smaller domain of discrete groupings.

Based on this analysis, Washington has a relatively high percentage of centers classified as Mostly School Day Teachers, Other School Staff, and College Students as well as Mostly School-Day Teachers, though in both cases this follows national trends. See Figure 8 below.
Both the staff working at a given 21st CCLC and the activities offered to students attending the program in question are critical elements in how youth experience and potentially benefit from their participation in 21st CCLC, and so cluster analysis was conducted with activities as well. In order to further classify centers into categories that meaningfully represent the relative emphasis given to providing different types of activities (academic enrichment, tutoring, homework help, recreation, etc.), K-Means cluster analysis was also employed using center-level percentages for each category of activity. When compared to the nation, centers in Washington were more likely to fall into the Mostly Enrichment cluster (percent of all centers compared with percent of centers nationally) or the Mostly Homework Help cluster (with 19 percent of all centers in Washington, compared with 12 percent nationally). See Figure 9 below.
Figure 13. Activity Clusters, Washington and the Nation (APR 2011)

*States have the option to require their centers to submit activities data in the APR in one of two different ways: as aggregated hours or as individual activity records. Because only individual activity records are used to carry out the cluster analysis in question, the numbers presented under “Activity Cluster” represent centers in states that opted to employ the individual activity record option. For all states, there were 4,708 centers with individual activity cluster designations (Washington inclusive); for Washington, there were 165 centers with individual activity cluster designations.
Section 3. Regular Attendee Data Analysis

This section contains basic descriptive analysis of the individual student data collected during the 2011 APR. This section focuses on attendance and outcome data, given that these are the data types collected in the Regular Attendees module of PPICS.

3.1 Attendance

As noted above in Section 2, a total of 23,780 students were reported as attending 21st CCLCs in Washington for at least one day during the 2011 reporting period. Of these, 14,951 were Regular Attendees (students who attended a total of 30 days or more during the reporting period), or 62.9 percent. See Section 2 for more detail on attendance.
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