

Support Local After-School Programs with Funds from Local Control Funding Formula

As school districts, county offices of education and communities begin to plan how to invest new funding provided by the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), we encourage you to support investments in after-school programs. After-school programs maximize time outside of the classroom to address the academic, social, emotional and physical needs and interests of students through individualized and engaging learning. In California, they typically serve the highest-needs students, including the low-income and English learner students targeted for increased programs and services by LCFF.¹

Each district and county office of education must prepare Local Control and Accountability Plans that ensure that LCFF funding addresses 8 specified state priorities. After-school programs are a smart investment because they help advance several required state priorities, including pupil achievement, pupil engagement, school climate, course-related outcomes, and parental involvement.

After-School Programs Advance LCFF-Required State Priorities

Priority: Pupil Achievement, Ed. Code 52060 (d)(4)(A), as measured by:

Statewide assessments, Ed. Code 52060 (d)(4)(A):

- ✓ After three charter schools in South Central Los Angeles implemented THINK Together's after-school program for the majority of their students, twice as many students scored at proficient or above on English and math standardized tests²
- ✓ 41% of Los Angeles public school students regularly attending after-school programs through Beyond the Bell scored as proficient or advance on the English/Language Arts portion of the California Standards Test, compared to 32% for non-participants.³
- ✓ Participation in Oakland after-school programs was associated with better performance on standardized tests. Youth who attended for 100 days were about 40% more likely to score at proficient or advanced than those who attended just one day.⁴

English learner reclassification rate, Ed. Code 52060 (d)(4)(3):

- ✓ In the Central Valley, English language learners who participated in 80 state- and federally-funded after-school programs were more than three times as likely to be reclassified as fluent in English as students in the region overall.⁵
- ✓ Participation in Oakland after-school programs increased the likelihood of English fluency. Participation of 25 days was associated with about 10% greater likelihood of being re-classified as English fluent. This increased to about 40% greater likelihood for attendees participating in 100 days.⁶

Priority: Pupil Engagement, Ed. Code 52060 (d)(5), as measured by:

School attendance & Chronic absenteeism rates. Ed. Code 52060 (d)(5)(A) & (B):

- ✓ At 80 state- and federally-funded after-school programs in the Central Valley, after-school participants improved their school day attendance by 14 days (nearly three weeks).⁷
- ✓ Participants in the Citizen Schools after-school program, which operates at middle schools nationally and in California, attended middle school 11 days more than comparable students, and their high school attendance rates were even higher, although it is just a middle school program.⁸
- ✓ Students participating on Oakland Unified School District's after-school programs were less likely than non-participants to be chronically absent from school, and as a whole increased their school-day attendance by 35,343 days in the 2010-2011 school year, earning the district between \$827,000 and \$989,000 in additional revenue.⁹

Middle school and high school dropout rates, Ed. Code 52060 (d)(5)(C) & (D):

- ✓ In a 20-year UCLA longitudinal study, researchers found that LA's BEST elementary school after-school students who participated for three or more years were about 20 percent less likely to drop out years later than similar students who did not attend LA's BEST.¹⁰

High school graduation rates. Ed. Code 52060 (d)(5)(E):

- ✓ A UCLA study found that students attending California's High School After School Safety and Enrichment for Teens (ASSETs) program performed better than non-participants on the English language arts and math sections of the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE).¹¹
- ✓ According to school officials at Blair High School in Pasadena, after-school credit reclamation classes more than doubled the number of on-time graduates.¹²

Priority: **School Climate,** Ed. Code 52060 (d)(6), as measured by pupil suspension rates, expulsion rates, and other local measures, including surveys of pupils, parents, and teachers on the sense of safety and school connectedness.

- ✓ Improved behavior: The Promising Programs evaluation found that regular participation in high-quality afterschool programs in California and several other states was linked to "reductions in behavior problems among disadvantaged students," including "significant reductions in aggressive behaviors with peers" and "reductions in misconduct."¹³
- ✓ School connectedness: After-school programs promote school connectedness through promotion of positive relationships, development of a sense of belonging to the

program and to the school, provision of safety, enhancement of school activities, engagement of parents/guardians and the community, fostering of connections to teachers and classrooms, reinforcement of school rules and practices and establishment of high expectations and standards.¹⁴

- ✓ Safety: According to the California Healthy Kids Survey, 31% of regularly supervised 7th graders report having been in a physical fight at school in the last year, compared to 38% of their peers.¹⁵ A UCLA study found that LA's BEST participants are 30 percent less likely to participate in criminal activities than similar children.¹⁶

Priority: **Pupil Outcomes**, Ed. Code 52060 (d)(8), in subject areas including physical education.

- ✓ After participating in the A World Fit for Kids! after-school program, 5th graders at a Los Angeles area elementary school were nearly twice as likely to meet California's Fitnessgram standards on physical fitness tests, compared to before (70% vs. 40%).¹⁷

Priority: **Parental Involvement** Ed. Code 52060 (d)(3)

- ✓ After-school programs offer excellent opportunities for parental involvement, especially because parents often visit the program at the end of the day to pick up their child. An evaluation of Woodcraft Rangers' Nvision After School Program (NASP) in Los Angeles found that, "In focus groups, parents said that NASP helped them become more involved in their children's education, for example, through volunteering for the program. Parents also said that they were more aware of school activities and ways to volunteer at the school."¹⁸

How LCFF funding can support after-school programs:

LCFF funding can **increase access** to and/or **strengthen the quality** of after-school programs.

- ✓ *Many schools need programs:* While there are over 4,000 state- and federally-funded after-school programs statewide, still only 44 percent of public schools have programs.¹⁹ Data on the number of after-school programs by district are available at http://programs.afterschoolnetwork.org/search/afterschool_allocation
- ✓ *Existing programs can serve more students:* Even where programs exist, there are often long waiting lists of interested students due to insufficient funding. Maximum funding levels generally only serve 83 students in an elementary school and 111 students in a middle school.
- ✓ *Existing programs can be extended year-round.* Extending programs into summer can help address summer slide academically and summer weight gain, as well as help reduce staff turnover. Only one in four state- and federally-funded after-school programs have supplemental funding that can be used in summer.²⁰

- ✓ *Need to maintain and strengthen program quality:* Programs also may need additional resources to maintain and improve program quality, given that the state only provides \$7.50 per student per day and has not increased that daily rate since 2006, despite increases in the cost of living and the recent increase in the minimum wage.

[INSERT STAND-ALONE BOX – After-School programs pay for themselves: The Rose Institute at Claremont McKenna College found that every dollar invested in after-school programs results in \$9 to \$13 in benefits to taxpayers, crime victims and participants.²¹ UCLA researchers estimate that every dollar invested in the LA’s BEST program saves the city \$2.50 in crime-related costs alone.²²

¹ In 2011-12, schools served by state and federally funded after-school programs had an average of 78% of their students eligible for free or reduced-price school meals (compared to a 41% average in schools without programs), and had 34% of their students as English learners, compared to a 14% average at schools without programs.

² Randy Barth, Founder and Chief Executive Officer, THINK Together, Santa Ana, CA. Personal communication on September 24, 2009; Jenel Prenovost, Director of Evaluation, THINK Together, Santa Ana, CA. Personal communication on December 7, 2009. 44 percent of the Celerity charter school students scored proficient or above in English and 57 percent on math in 2009, compared to 41 percent district-wide on English and 46 percent on math. Among the three charter schools, Nascent’s API score increased 112 points, Dyad’s 119 points, and Troika’s 279 points. District-wide, API scores increased only 13 points.

³ Education Research Consultants, 2011 [need more]

⁴ OASm 11/12 eval, Oct 2012,

http://www.publicprofit.net/site/uploads/PDF/PUBLICPROFIT_2012_OAKLAND_SCHOOL_OST_FINDINGS_REPORT.pdf

⁵ Newhouse, C. (2008). *Afterschool programs in the Central Valley benefit children and youth: Evaluation results from the 2006-2007 school year*. Clovis, CA: Central Valley Afterschool Foundation. Retrieved on January 25, 2010 from <http://centralvalleyafterschool.org/documents/CVAFFinalReport5-7-08.pdf>

⁶ OASm 11/12 eval, Oct 2012,

http://www.publicprofit.net/site/uploads/PDF/PUBLICPROFIT_2012_OAKLAND_SCHOOL_OST_FINDINGS_REPORT.pdf

⁷ Newhouse, C. (2008). *Afterschool programs in the Central Valley benefit children and youth: Evaluation results from the 2006-2007 school year*. Clovis, CA: Central Valley Afterschool Foundation. Retrieved on January 25, 2010 from <http://centralvalleyafterschool.org/documents/CVAFFinalReport5-7-08.pdf>

⁸ Vile, J.D., Arcaira, E. & Reisner, E.R. (2009). *Progress toward high school graduation: Citizen Schools’ youth outcomes in Boston*. Washington, D.C.: Policy Studies Associates, Inc. Retrieved on January 25, 2010 from <http://www.citizenschools.org/uploads/PSA%20Phase%20VI%20Progress%20toward%20HS%20Graduation%2020090819.pdf>; Pearson, L.M., Vile, J.D. & Reisner, E.R. (2008). *Establishing a foundation for progress toward high school graduation*. Washington, D.C.: Policy Studies Associates, Inc. Retrieved on January 25, 2010 from <http://www.citizenschools.org/uploads/PSA%20CS%20Phase%20V%20Report.pdf> In the 11th grade, participants attended school 13 more days than those who did not attend the after-school program in eighth grade.

⁹ Public Profit. (2011). Oakland Out-of-School Time Program Evaluation Findings Report 2010-11. Oakland, CA: Oakland Fund for Children and Youth & OUSD After School Programs Office.

¹⁰ Huang, D., Kim, K.S., Marshall, A., & Perez, P. (2005). *Keeping kids in school: An LA's BEST example*. Los Angeles, CA: National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards and Student Testing, University of California, Los Angeles. Retrieved on January 25, 2010 from http://www.lasbest.org/what/publications/Keeping_Kids_in_School_Exec_Sum.pdf; LA's BEST After School Enrichment Program. (2006). *Annual Report 2005-2006. Caught up in the act ... of success*. Retrieved on December 7 from http://www.lasbest.org/what/publications/annual_reports/AR0506-web%5B1%5D.pdf
¹¹ get cite

¹² Bill Fennessy, Site Coordinator, BlairLEARNS Afterschool Program, Pasadena, CA. Personal communication on July 16, 2009. Of 155 on-time graduates in 2009, 84 relied on after-school credit recovery programs.

¹³ Vandell, D. L., Reisner, E. R. & Pierce, K. M. (2007). *Outcomes linked to high-quality afterschool programs: Longitudinal findings from the Study of Promising Afterschool Programs*. Policy Studies Associates, Inc.

¹⁴ Anderson-Butcher, D. (2010). The promise of afterschool programs for promoting school connectedness. *The Prevention Researcher*, 17(3), 11-20. - See more at: <http://www.expandinglearning.org/expandingminds/article/supporting-english-language-learners-school-and-afterschool-and-summer#sthash.lmsEAI8.dpuf>

¹⁵ Corey Newhouse, Founder and Principal of Public Profit. Personal communication on February 4, 2010.

¹⁶ Goldschmidt, P., & Huang, D. (2007). *The Long-Term Effects of After-School Programming on Educational Adjustment and Juvenile Crime: A Study of the LA's BEST After-School Program*. Los Angeles, CA: Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards and Student Testing, University of California, Los Angeles. Retrieved on November 30, 2010 from http://www.lasbest.org/what/publications/LASBEST_DOJ_Final%20Report.pdf

¹⁷ A World Fit for Kids! delivers proven results. (n.d.). Evaluation by Kaiser Group, Inc. Retrieved on November 11, 2010 from http://www.worldfitforkids.org/images/pdfs/WFIT_Evaluation_Summary_2-PG_12-09.pdf

¹⁸ Need WR cite

¹⁹ California Afterschool Network and UC Davis School of Education. (2013). *State of the State of Expanded Learning in California 2012-2013*.

²⁰ Id.

²¹ Brown, W.O., Frates, S.B., Rudge, I.S., Tradewell, R.L. (2002). *The Costs and Benefits of After School Programs: The Estimated Effects of the After School Education and Safety Program Act of 2002*. Claremont, CA: The Rose Institute of Claremont-McKenna College. Retrieved on November 30, 2010 from http://www.claremontmckenna.edu/rose/publications/pdf/after_school.pdf

²² Goldschmidt, P., & Huang, D. (2007). *The Long-Term Effects of After-School Programming on Educational Adjustment and Juvenile Crime: A Study of the LA's BEST After-School Program*. Los Angeles, CA: Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards and Student Testing, University of California, Los Angeles. Retrieved on November 30, 2010 from http://www.lasbest.org/what/publications/LASBEST_DOJ_Final%20Report.pdf