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## Chronic Absenteeism and Discipline Related to Boys \& Girls Club

## Participation

## Introduction

The data match for about 14,000 BGC members yielded matches in the CSDE data base for about half of the records submitted. Some of the problems occurred because of the way clubs recorded names. Nick names and other kinds of abbreviations for first or last names lead to failed matches.

## Chronic Absenteeism

In Connecticut in 2013-14, 10.7 percent of the students in grades K-12 statewide are chronically absent, that is they miss more than 10 percent of the school days. In contrast, among the children and youth attending Boys and Girls Clubs in 2013-2014, 6.9 percent are chronically absent.

Looking at the impact of poverty on chronic absenteeism, Connecticut students eligible for free lunch, have a chronic absenteeism rate of 19.9 percent. Those eligible for reduced lunch price lunch are at 9.1 percent and those not eligible for free or reduced lunch are at 6.1. (Table 1)

Table 1: Statewide Chronic Absenteeism in Related to Income

| Location | Eligible for Free or Reduced-price Meals | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 |
| :---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Connecticut | All | $11.0 \%$ | $11.5 \%$ | $10.7 \%$ |
| Connecticut | Eligible for free meal | $20.0 \%$ | $20.9 \%$ | $19.9 \%$ |
| Connecticut | Eligible for reduced-price meal | $10.7 \%$ | $10.4 \%$ | $9.1 \%$ |
| Connecticut | Not eligible | $6.7 \%$ | $6.9 \%$ | $6.1 \%$ |

Among Boys and Girls club member (see Table 2), those with Low income (eligible for either free or reduced price lunches) had a rate of $10.7 \%$ for chronic absenteeism. Those not eligible had a $3.5 \%$ rate of chronic absenteeism. Although it is difficult to compare the statewide numbers for free and reduced price with BGC's low income level, it appears that chronic absenteeism is lower for BGC members in both income categories compared to chronic absenteeism for free, reduced and non-eligible (not low income) students statewide.

Table 2: Income and Chronic Absenteeism among Boys and Girls Club Members

|  |  | Chronically Absent |  |  | Total |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | YES |  | NO |  | \% Chronically <br> Absent $^{1}$ |
| Income Level | Low Income | 150 | 1253 | $10.7 \%$ | 1403 |
|  | Not low income | 59 | 1604 | $3.5 \%$ | 1663 |
| Total |  | 209 | 2857 |  | 3066 |

[^0]Statewide, chronic absenteeism was 8.4 across elementary and middle school. The chronic absenteeism rate rose to 15.4 for high school. (see Table 3)

Table 3: Chronic Absenteeism by School Level Among Boys and Girls Club Members

|  |  |  | Chronically Absent |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | YES | NO | \% Chronically Absent ${ }^{2}$ |  |
|  | Elementary School | Count | 182 | 3859 | 4.5 | 4041 |
|  | Middle School | Count | 122 | 1480 | 7.6\% | 1602 |
|  | High School | Count | 149 | 892 | 14.3\% | 1041 |
| Total |  | Count | 453 | 6231 |  | 6684 |

Table 4: By Elementary/Middle/High School and Income level for BGC Members

|  |  |  |  | Chronically Absent |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | YES | NO | \% Chronically Absent ${ }^{3}$ |  |
| Elementary <br> School | Income | Low Income | Count | 73 | 853 | 7.9\% | 926 |
|  | Level ID | Not low income | Count | 25 | 1124 | 2.2\% | 1149 |
|  | Total |  | Count | 98 | 1977 |  | 2075 |
| Middle <br> School | Income Level ID | Low Income | Count | 38 | 253 | 13.1\% | 291 |
|  |  | Not low income | Count | 20 | 314 | 6.0\% | 334 |
|  | Total |  | Count | 58 | 567 |  | 625 |
| High <br> School | Income Level ID | Low Income | Count | 39 | 147 | 21.0\% | 186 |
|  |  | Not low income | Count | 14 | 166 | 7.8\% | 180 |
|  | Total |  | Count | 53 | 313 |  | 366 |

Considering the engagement level of club members in relation to chronic absenteeism in school (Table 5), club members that go to the club two or more times a week are significantly less likely to be chronically absent than those who attend one to two times a week or less than once weekly.

Table 5: Engagement Level by Chronic Absenteeism

|  |  | Chronically Absent |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | YES |  |  | NO |  |
| Engagement Level | Less than once weekly | 131 | 1564 | $7.7 \%$ | 1695 |
|  | One to two times a week | 46 | 468 | $8.9 \%$ | 514 |
|  | Two or more times a week | 41 | 876 | $4.5 \%$ | 917 |
| Total | 218 | 2908 |  | 3126 |  |

[^1]Table 6: School Level by Engagement by Chronic Absenteeism


## Suspensions

In regard to suspensions (in and out of school) and expulsions, the percentage of students receiving at least one suspension or expulsion in 2013-14 declined to 7.5\% (approx. 41,500). The percentage of Boys and Girls Clubs members with at least one suspension or expulsion was $7.5 \%$ the same as the rate in Connecticut overall for grades K-12.

We also looked at those who had attended a club for less than 1 year, those who attended 1-2 years, and those who attended a club for more than two years. The data are below in Table 7 with a breakout by school grade in Table 8.

Table 7: Years of Membership by Disciplinary Action

|  |  |  | One or m | disciplin | y actions | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | No | Yes | \% with 1 or more ${ }^{5}$ |  |
| Years of Membership | More than 2 years | Count | 355 | 54 | 13.2\% | 409 |
|  | 1-2 years | Count | 1504 | 109 | 6.8\% | 1613 |
|  | Less than 1 year | Count | 2191 | 216 | 9.0\% | 2407 |
| Total |  | Count | 6920 | 563 |  | 4429 |

Table 8: School Level by Retention by Disciplinary Action


Of those with more than 2 years of club experience, $13.2 \%$ had one or more disciplinary actions. Of those with 1-2 years of club experience, $6.8 \%$, had one or more disciplinary actions. Of those with less than a year's club experience, $9 \%$ had one or more disciplinary actions. These data do not present a clear picture of the relationship between years of attendance and incidence of disciplinary actions.

The number of years of club attendance do not seem related to school behavior. However, the data suggest that club engagement is an important factor in relation to disciplinary actions in school (see Table 9). The group that attend the club less than once a week have the highest incidence (9.1\%) of individuals with at least one disciplinary action. The group attending 1 to 2

[^2]times a week have the next lowest incidence (7.0\%) of individuals with at least one disciplinary action. Those with the most engagement, two or more times a week at the club, have the lowest incidence (4.1\%) of individuals with at least one disciplinary action. This suggest that level of engagement is strongly related to school behavior. (see Table 10 for school breakouts)

Table 9: Club Engagement by School Disciplinary Actions

|  |  |  | One or more disciplinary actions |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | No | Yes | \% with 1 or more ${ }^{7}$ |  |
| Engagement Level | Less than once weekly | Count | 1613 | 162 | 9.1\% | 1775 |
|  | One to two times a week | Count | 489 | 37 | 7.0\% | 526 |
|  | Two or more times a week | Count | 880 | 38 | 4.1\% | 918 |
| Total |  | Count | 2982 | 237 |  | 3219 |

Table 10: School Level by Club Engagement by School Disciplinary Actions


[^3]Table 10, continued: School Level by Club Engagement by School Disciplinary Actions

| High <br> School | Engagement <br> Level ID | Less than <br> once weekly | Count | 287 | 73 | $20.3 \%$ | 360 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | One to two <br> times a week | Count | 30 | 8 | $21.1 \%$ | 38 |  |
|  | Two or more <br> times a week | Count | 24 | 3 | $11.1 \%$ | 27 |  |
|  |  | Count | 341 | 84 |  | 425 |  |

## Club Experience

None of the apparent differences (Tables 11 and 12) in disciplinary action or chronic absenteeism by club experience are significant.

Table 11: Club Experience by School Level for Disciplinary Action

|  |  |  |  | One of More Disciplinary Actions |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | No | Yes | \% with 1 or More ${ }^{9}$ |  |
| Elementary <br> School | Club Experience | Insufficient | Count | 120 | 6 | 4.8\% | 126 |
|  |  | Neutral | Count | 107 | 11 | 9.3\% | 118 |
|  |  | Optimal | Count | 101 | 4 | 3.8\% | 105 |
|  | Total |  | Count | 328 | 21 |  | 349 |
| Middle <br> School | Club Experience | Insufficient | Count | 58 | 6 | 9.4\% | 64 |
|  |  | Neutral | Count | 70 | 16 | 18.6\% | 86 |
|  |  | Optimal | Count | 65 | 22 | 25.3\% | 87 |
|  | Total |  | Count | 193 | 44 |  | 237 |
| High <br> School | Club Experience | Insufficient | Count | 21 | 6 | 22.2\% | 27 |
|  |  | Neutral | Count | 33 | 5 | 13.2\% | 38 |
|  |  | Optimal | Count | 60 | 20 | 25.0\% | 80 |
|  | Total |  | Count | 114 | 31 |  | 145 |

[^4]Table 12: Club Experience by School Level for Chronic Absenteeism


## Summary

Overall, it appears that being a club member is related to chronic absenteeism, those who are club members have lower rates of chronic absenteeism than the average rate of students rate statewide. In particular, there is a strong relationship with level of engagement and school disciplinary behavior. The most engaged club members (those at the club two or more times a week) are the less likely than those with less intensive experience to get into trouble in school. A third finding, for the youngest cohort, those in the elementary grades, the experience in the club does not seem to affect absenteeism or school behavior (e.g., detentions, suspensions, and dismissals).

Table 13: Clubs Included in the Data Set

|  | Frequency | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Wakeman Boys \& Girls Club | 2011 | 29.3 |
| Ulbrich Boys \& Girls Club | 50 | .7 |
| Ridgefield Boys \& Girls Club | 18 | .3 |
| Bristol Boys \& Girls Club Association | 485 | 7.1 |
| Boys and Girls Clubs of Hartford | 728 | 10.6 |
| Boys and Girls Club of New Britain | 264 | 3.9 |
| Boys \& Girls Club of the Lower Naugatuck Valley | 814 | 11.9 |
| Boys \& Girls Club of Stamford | 319 | 4.7 |
| Boys \& Girls Club of Southeastern Connecticut | 87 | 1.3 |
| Boys \& Girls Club of Redding-Easton | 241 | 3.5 |

[^5]|  | Frequency | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Boys \& Girls Club of New Haven | 213 | 3.1 |
| Boys \& Girls Club of Milford | 155 | 2.3 |
| Boys \& Girls Club of Meriden | 338 | 4.9 |
| Boys \& Girls Club of Greenwich | 1087 | 15.9 |
| Boys \& Girls Club of Greater Waterbury | 44 | .6 |
| Total | 6854 | 100.0 |

## Club by Club Analyses

There is a lot of missing data for individual clubs. Hartford, for example, has mostly " 0 " in the income field (indicating not reported according to your code book).

|  |  | Chronically Absent |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | YES |  | NO |
|  |  | Count | Percent | Count |
| Wakeman Boys \& Girls Club | Low Income | 0 | 0.0\% | 4 |
|  | Not low income | 2 | 1.1\% | 181 |
|  | Sub-total | 2 | 1.1\% | 185 |
| Ulbrich Boys \& Girls Club | Low Income | 3 | 13.6\% | 19 |
|  | Not low income | 1 | 7.1\% | 13 |
|  | Sub-total | 4 | 11.1\% | 32 |
| Ridgefield Boys \& Girls Club | Low Income | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 |
|  | Not low income | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 |
|  | Sub-total | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 |
| Bristol Boys \& Girls Club Association | Low Income | 28 | 13.5\% | 179 |
|  | Not low income | 6 | 3.1\% | 189 |
|  | Sub-total | 34 | 8.5\% | 368 |
| Boys and Girls Clubs of Hartford | Low Income | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 |
|  | Not low income | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 |
|  | Sub-total | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 |
| Boys and Girls Club of New Haven | Low Income | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 |
|  | Not low income | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 |
|  | Sub-total | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 |
| Boys and Girls Club of New Britain | Low Income | 0 | 0.0\% | 3 |
|  | Not low income | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 |
|  | Sub-total | 0 | 0.0\% | 3 |
| Boys \& Girls Club of the Lower Naugatuck Valley | Low Income | 23 | 11.0\% | 186 |
|  | Not low income | 15 | 5.7\% | 249 |


|  |  | Chronically Absent |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | YES |  | NO |
|  |  | Count | Percent | Count |
|  | Sub-total | 38 | 8.0\% | 435 |
| Boys \& Girls Club of Stamford | Low Income | 11 | 5.5\% | 190 |
|  | Not low income | 0 | 0.0\% | 40 |
|  | Sub-total | 11 | 4.6\% | 230 |
| Boys \& Girls Club of Southeastern Connecticut | Low Income | 7 | 11.9\% | 52 |
|  | Not low income | 1 | 11.1\% | 8 |
|  | Sub-total | 8 | 11.8\% | 60 |
| Boys \& Girls Club of Redding-Easton | Low Income | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 |
|  | Not low income | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 |
|  | Sub-total | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 |
| Boys \& Girls Club of New Haven | Low Income | 20 | 15.3\% | 111 |
|  | Not low income | 7 | 8.8\% | 73 |
|  | Sub-total | 27 | 12.8\% | 184 |
| Boys \& Girls Club of Milford | Low Income | 10 | 13.2\% | 66 |
|  | Not low income | 2 | 3.0\% | 65 |
|  | Sub-total | 12 | 8.4\% | 131 |
| Boys \& Girls Club of Meriden | Low Income | 27 | 19.0\% | 115 |
|  | Not low income | 11 | 8.2\% | 123 |
|  | Sub-total | 38 | 13.8\% | 238 |
| Boys \& Girls Club of Greenwich | Low Income | 21 | 6.0\% | 328 |
|  | Not low income | 14 | 2.1\% | 663 |
|  | Sub-total | 35 | 3.4\% | 991 |
| Boys \& Girls Club of Greater Waterbury | Low Income | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 |
|  | Not low income | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 |
|  | Sub-total | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 |
| Statewide | Low Income | 150 | 10.7\% | 1253 |
|  | Not low income | 59 | 3.5\% | 1604 |
|  | Sub-total | 209 | 6.8\% | 2857 |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Low income significantly different from not low income.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Elementary and middle school percentages significantly different from high school scores.
    ${ }^{3}$ Low income and not low income significantly different at each school level.
    ${ }^{4}$ Two or more times a week absenteeism rate significantly different from the other two engagement levels.

[^2]:    ${ }^{5}$ The percentages are significantly different.
    ${ }^{6}$ Significant differences within each school level.

[^3]:    ${ }^{7}$ Significant difference only between "two or more times a week" and the other two level of engagement.
    ${ }^{8}$ No significant differences.

[^4]:    ${ }^{9}$ Differences in percentages only significant for 11 to less than 14.

[^5]:    ${ }^{10}$ No significant differences.

