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Overview

- Brief Look at Outcomes
- How We Use the Data
2010–2011
Integrated, Focused Plan of Action

- Improve **Student Retention** (by 10%)
- Improve **Family Programming**
- Provide Targeted and Intensive **Technical Assistance**
- Implement More Effective **Monitoring and Evaluation** of 21st CCLC Programs
The Big Picture

As reported on Annual/Spring Survey
Number of Students

Registered Regular Attendees

- 2007: 46,107
- 2008: 44,948
- 2009: 43,243
- 2010: 52,736
- 2011: 52,800

Regular Attendees

- 2007: 24,957
- 2008: 24,206
- 2009: 22,745
- 2010: 24,725
- 2011: 24,815
More middle school and high school projects added.
Serving Low-Income Students

- Low-Income
  - 75% + all 21st CCLC students
  - 85% + students attending 30 or more days

- Similar to 2010 data
Locations

- 93.5% in public schools
- 2.5% in community centers
- 2.2% in churches
- 1.7% in other places or combination
Filled Seats

- Decrease in the number of proposed students to change from 2010 to 2011

- In 2011, filled 125% of the adjusted number of proposed students to serve
Breakdown by Grade

Regular Attendees

- PK: 200
- K: 675
- 1: 1674
- 2: 1988
- 3: 2787
- 4: 2808
- 5: 2839
- 6: 3002
- 7: 2774
- 8: 2294
- 9: 1076
- 10: 1093
- 11: 897
- 12: 708
Adult Programming

- Number of adults projected = 16,649
- Number reported = 16,858

- Last year served 8,857

- But programming still is not ongoing, skill development of parent/guardians, which is a requirement for 2010 and 2012 cohorts
Improved by Half Grade or More

![Bar chart showing improvements in Elementary Math, Elementary English, MS/HS Math, and MS/HS English between 2010 and 2011 compared to Comparable States.](chart.png)
Teachers Reported

- Improve homework and participation
  - Elementary – trend data of 71–73% compared to 72% for comparable states
  - MS/HS – trend data of 66–67% compared to 69% for comparable states

- Improved behavior
  - Elementary – trend data of 65–66% compared to 66% for comparable states
  - MS/HS – trend data 63–62% compared to 65% for comparable states
EVALUATION and MONITORING/COMPLIANCE

- **Statewide**
  Evaluation of State Objectives

- **Local**
  Tracking Indicators for Local Objectives

- **Local Grantee Evaluation**

- **Federal**
  ISBE Monitoring and Compliance
  PPICS
A trend analysis for 2003–2010 of how projects evolve
What was sustained in regards to programming, staffing, number of students served, and parent/guardians served?
Were there barriers that had to be addressed to facilitate the sustainability?
Were there specific features or characteristics of 21st CCLC programs that are associated with sustainability and exemplary outcomes over the long term?
Did student participation beyond required minimum days (dosage) affect behavior changes, academic achievement, and/or school involvement?
Did high quality programs lead to higher student retention and achievement?
Did programs showing short-term gains in their early years sustain the momentum during and after the funding period?
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