Archived Information

21st Century Community Learning Centers

Goal: To enable public elementary and secondary schools to plan, implement, or expand extended learning opportunities for the benefit of the educational, health, social service, cultural, and recreational needs of their communities.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Supports Objective 1.5 (families and communities are fully involved with schools and school improvement efforts) by turning schools into Community Learning Centers. Also supports Objective 1.3 by supporting extended learning programs based in schools, such as after-school or summer-school hours; and supports Objectives 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4 by providing academic support and enrichment in core subject areas including reading and mathematics to help students meet or exceed state and local standards.

FY 2000—\$453,377,000

FY 2001—\$1,000,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: PARTICIPANTS IN 21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTER PROGRAMS WILL DEMONSTRATE EDUCATIONAL AND SOCIAL BENEFITS AND EXHIBIT POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL CHANGES.

FOSITIVE BEHA	POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL CHANGES.							
Indicator 1.1 Achievement: Students regularly participating in the program will show continuous improvement in achievement through measures such as test								
scores, grades, and/or teacher reports.								
Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality		
Percentage of students with 1999 teacher-reported changes in student homework completion and class participation (second cohort of grantees)				nt homework	Status: Unable to judge until further data are available.	Source: Grantee performance reports. Frequency: Annually. Next Update: 2000.		
Actual		Middle or			Explanation: Asserting to 1000 toppher remorts	Next Opadie. 2000.		
Performance	Elementary	High School	Both	Total	Explanation: According to 1999 teacher reports,	Volidation Procedures Data sympled by good		
Increased	75%	50%	35%	41%	75 percent of the students participating in 21st Century Community Learning Center programs	Validation Procedure: Data supplied by second round grantees. No formal verification		
Decreased	1%	18%	6%	10%	at the elementary school level showed	procedure applied.		
Stayed Same	24%	32%	59%	49%		procedure applied.		
Performance T: 1999: 2000: 2001:	argets	No tar Baseline data Target w	a established		improvement in homework completion and class participation. The percentages for students in programs serving middle or high schools and those serving students at both the elementary and middle/high school levels are 50 percent and 35 percent, respectively. The comparatively lower proportion of increases at the non-elementary level is partially attributable to the age group serviced and the relatively less intensive services received at the middle and high school levels.	Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Data are based on reports from a subset (22 percent) of second-round grantees who voluntarily followed a standardized reporting form. "Regular attendees" are defined as students who have attended the program a minimum of 10 days. However, the data in this report are not limited to regularly attending participants. The activities reported and the use of teacher reports are an imprecise estimate of student achievement. Beginning in 2000, all grantees will report performance in a standardized format. Also, data from grantee reports will be compared with the evaluation results for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers.		

Indicator 1.2 Behavior: Students participating in the program will show improvements on measures such as school attendance, classroom performance, and
decreased disciplinary actions or other adverse behaviors.

	Targets	Assessment of Progress			
Percentage of st	udents with 1999 of grantees)	Status: Unable to judge until further data are available.			
Actual Performance	Elementary	Middle or High School	Both	Total	Explanation: According to 1999 teacher rep 70 percent of the students participating in 21s
Increase	70%	57%	38%	45%	Century Community Learning Center program
Decrease	1%	5%	7%	6%	at the elementary school level showed behavi
Stayed Same	29%	38%	55%	49%	improvements. The percentages for students
Performance T	argets	programs serving middle or high schools and those serving students at both levels are 57			
1999: No target set					percent and 38 percent respectively. The low
2000:		Baseline data	a established	proportion of increases at the non-elementary	
2001:		Target w	ill be set	level is partially attributable differences in ag	

ports, 1st ams vioral ts in ıd wer ry level is partially attributable differences in age and the relatively less intensive services received at the middle and high school levels.

Source: Grantee reports; planned external evaluation. Frequency: Annually. Next Update: 2000.

Sources and Data Quality

Validation Procedure: Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Data are based on reports from a subset (22 percent) of second-round grantees who voluntarily followed a standardized reporting form. In addition, teacher reports are subjective and thus subject to variation over time and across sites. Beginning in 2000, all grantees

will report performance in a standardized format.

OBJECTIVE 2: 21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS WILL OFFER A RANGE OF HIGH-QUALITY EDUCATIONAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, AND RECREATIONAL SERVICES.

Indicator 2.1 Core educational services: More than 85 percent of centers will offer high-quality services in at least one core academic area, such as reading and
literacy, mathematics, and science.

nteracy, ma	meracy, mathematics, and science.							
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality				
Percentage of 21st Century Centers reporting emphasis in at least one core academic area (second cohort of grantees) Year Actual Performance Performance Targets			Status: Target not met, but future progress toward target is likely.	Source: Grantee performance reports. Frequency: Annually. Next Update: 2000.				
1999:			Explanation: A substantial proportion of the	William I Down II II				
2000:	<u> </u>	85% or higher	grantees (82 percent) offers at least one core academic service (e.g., supplementary help in	Validation Procedure: Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure				
2001:		85% or higher	reading, mathematics, or science).	applied.				
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Data are based on reports from a subset (49 percent) of second-round grantees. Also, current data do not reflect quality, only whether the service is offered. Beginning in 2000, all grantees will report performance in a standardized format and will include objective measures of service quality.				

	Targets and Perform	nance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	of 21st Century Centers offering en second cohort of grantees)	nrichment and support activities in	Status: Target exceeded.	Source: Grantee performance reports. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually.
Year Actual Performance Performance Targets		Explanation: The vast majority of the centers	Next Update: 2000.	
1999:	58%	85% or higher	(93 percent) offer enrichment and support services with a significant proportion (58	Validation Procedure: Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure
2000:		85% or higher	percent) offering computer- or technology-	
2001:		85% or higher	related activities.	applied.
	of 21st Century Centers offering en (second cohort of grantees)	nrichment and support activities in		Limitations of Data and Planned
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Improvements: Data are based on reports from
1999:	93%	85% or higher		the second cohort. Beginning in 2000, all
2000:		85% or higher		grantees will report performance in a standardized format.
2001:		85% or higher		standardized format.
	2.3 Community involvement:		tain partnerships within the community that	continue to increase levels of community
Collabol att	Targets and Perform		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	Targets and Ferrori	nance Data	Status: Unable to judge.	Sources and Data Quanty Source: Grantee performance reports.
	nber of community partners report		Status. Onable to judge.	Frequency: Annually.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Explanation: The average number of	Next Update: 2000.
1999:	5	No target set	community partners (5) is a proxy measure of	Tress Spanier 2000.
2000:		Baseline data established	community involvement. More accurately	Validation Procedure: Data supplied by
2001:		Target will be set	assessing the depth of involvement will be a goal	grantees. No formal verification procedure
			for future data collection.	applied.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Data are based on reports from the second cohort. The quality of partnership activities is not reported by grantees and is difficult to measure. Beginning in 2000, all grantees will report performance in a standardized format. The national impact evaluation will collect more detailed informatio
				on the quality of collaboration.
	nunity members.		More than 85 percent of centers will offer ser	on the quality of collaboration. vices to parents, senior citizens, and other
			Assessment of Progress	on the quality of collaboration. vices to parents, senior citizens, and other Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of	nunity members. Targets and Perform of 21st Century Centers offering se	mance Data	Assessment of Progress Status: Target not met.	on the quality of collaboration. vices to parents, senior citizens, and other Sources and Data Quality Source: Grantee performance reports. Frequency: Annually.
Percentage of community m	Targets and Perform of 21st Century Centers offering semembers:	mance Data ervices to parents and other adult	Assessment of Progress Status: Target not met. Explanation: Approximately half (51 percent)	on the quality of collaboration. vices to parents, senior citizens, and other Sources and Data Quality Source: Grantee performance reports.
Percentage of community m	Targets and Perform of 21st Century Centers offering semembers: Actual Performance	mance Data ervices to parents and other adult Performance Targets	Assessment of Progress Status: Target not met. Explanation: Approximately half (51 percent) of the grantees offer services to parents, senior	on the quality of collaboration. vices to parents, senior citizens, and other Sources and Data Quality Source: Grantee performance reports. Frequency: Annually. Next Update: 2000.
Percentage of community m	Targets and Perform of 21st Century Centers offering semembers:	rvices to parents and other adult Performance Targets 85% or higher	Assessment of Progress Status: Target not met. Explanation: Approximately half (51 percent) of the grantees offer services to parents, senior citizens, and other adult community members.	on the quality of collaboration. vices to parents, senior citizens, and other Sources and Data Quality Source: Grantee performance reports. Frequency: Annually. Next Update: 2000. Validation Procedure: Data supplied by
Percentage of community m Year 1999:	Targets and Perform of 21st Century Centers offering semembers: Actual Performance	mance Data ervices to parents and other adult Performance Targets	Assessment of Progress Status: Target not met. Explanation: Approximately half (51 percent) of the grantees offer services to parents, senior	on the quality of collaboration. vices to parents, senior citizens, and other Sources and Data Quality Source: Grantee performance reports. Frequency: Annually. Next Update: 2000.

Indicator 2.4 Services to parents and other adult community members: More than 85 percent of centers will offer services to parents, senior citizens, and other adult community members (continued).					
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality			
		Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Data are based on reports from the second cohort. Beginning in 2000, all grantees will report performance in a standardized format.			
Indicator 2.5 Extended hours: More than 75 percent of centers will offer services at least 15 hours a week on average and provide services when school is not in					

Indicator 2.5 Extended hours: More than 75 percent of centers will offer services at least 15 hours a week on average and provide services when school is not in session, such as during the summer and holidays.

Targets and Performance Data

Assessment of Progress

Sources and Data Quality

	of 21st Century Centers offering 15 in 1999 (second cohort of grantees	Explanation: The percentages of centers offering extended hours during the school year and the summer sessions are 62 percent and 90 percent, respectively. The Department intends to emphasize this aspect of the program in the
Year	Actual Performance	
1999:	62%	
2000:		
2001:		
	of 21st Century Centers offering 15 999 (second cohort of grantees):	future.

Performance Targets

75% or higher

75% or higher

75% or higher

Source: Grantee performance reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Update: 2000.

Validation Procedure: Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Data are based on reports from the second cohort. Beginning in 2000, all grantees will report performance in a standardized format.

OBJECTIVE 3: 21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS WILL SERVE CHILDREN AND COMMUNITY MEMBERS WITH THE GREATEST NEEDS FOR EXPANDED LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES.

Indicator 3	Indicator 3.1 High-need communities: More than 80 percent of Centers are located in high-poverty communities.							
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality				
Targets and Performance Data Percentage of 21st Century Centers located in schools with at least 35 percent of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch (second cohort of grantees): Year Actual Performance Performance Targets FY 1999: 80% 80% or higher FY 2000: 80% or higher FY 2001: 80% or higher			Explanation: 80 percent of the grantees are in schools in which more than 35 percent of students are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. However, the school lunch measure is only a proxy for community poverty status. Census/Common Core Data will be used in the future to provide data for this indicator.	Source: Grantee performance reports. Frequency: Annually. Next Update: 2000. Validation Procedure: Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Data are based on reports from the second cohort. Eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch is not a reliable measure for community poverty. Beginning in 2000, ED will use Census/Common Core Data to measure community poverty levels.				

Year

1999:

2000:

2001:

Actual Performance

90%

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- **Stablish absolute priority for programs that offer extended learning opportunities.**
- Establish competitive preference for programs that help students meet or exceed state and local standards in core subjects such as reading, mathematics, or science.
- In partnership with national foundations, develop training and technical assistance opportunities for grantees to ensure the quality of implemented programs.
- Provide ongoing training and technical assistance to center leadership and staff.
- Create grantee advisory groups and listservs to facilitate exchange of best practices and materials.
- Establish priorities for programs that serve economically distressed rural and urban communities.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- In partnership with national foundations, develop training and technical assistance opportunities for grantees to foster sustainability of implemented programs.
- Create grantee searchable database on the Web for public access to detailed information regarding local programs and to assist local areas plan their own after-school programs and applications for this grant.
- In partnership with national foundations, provide national task forces on special topics such as evaluation, equity of access, and promising practices.
- In partnership with national foundations, expanded grant application workshop opportunities for potential applicants in all the states and territories.
- Establish competitive grants, giving priority to applications from Local Education Agencies (LEAs) that are in Title I "corrective action" or "school improvements" status.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Through collaboration with other Federal offices, shares information with applicants and grantees on programs such as America Reads (ED), Gear Up (ED), Safe and Drug-Free Schools (ED), AmeriCorps (CNS), Child Care Development Block Grants (HHS), and the National School Lunch Program (USDA).
- As part of the Federal Support to Communities initiative, housed by Vice President Gore's National Partnership for Reinventing Government, coordinates its resources and efforts with 14 federal agencies to create and maintain a Web site (http://www.afterschool.gov) and other outreach efforts.
- In partnership with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, co-chairs a coordination task force to better serve citizens through our federal programs that support after-school.
- In coordination with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, actively promotes local awareness and access to the USDA federal funds for after-school snacks and meals through their various funding programs.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Community needs across the country vary in nature and in gaps in services.
- There are many influences on student achievement and behavior outside the impact of afterschool services to students. Given these other influences, it is difficult to indicate exact changes in student achievement and behavior due to these programs.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted-None.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.1 was adjusted to include test score data where available.
- Indicator 1.3 was adjusted to focus on behavior measures, moving test scores to indicator 1.1 and dropping a measure of challenging coursework.
- Indicator 2.5 was formerly indicator 2.3. The data element was changed to 15 hours per week from 3 hours per day for 5 days, as this is a more standardized number for collection.
- Indicator 3.1 was adjusted to reflect community need instead of student need.

Dropped

- Indicator 1.3 was dropped.
- Indicator 1.4 was dropped because teacher reports could be included as sources of data for indicators 1.1 and 1.2.
- ❖ Indicator 2.4 was dropped.
- Indicator 3.2 was dropped because the new indicator 3.1 addresses the entire community need, not just elementary, middle or high school students.

New

- Indicator 2.3 was added to address the importance of collaboration in planning, implementing, and sustaining these programs.
- Indicator 2.4 was added to address services to adults in the community instead of program retention as students move frequently from school to school.