



NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES
Institute for Youth, Education, and Families

Making After School Work: Extended-Service Schools
October 23, 2002

Moderator: **John E. Kyle**, Program Director, Outreach and Strategic Planning
Institute for Youth, Education, and Families

Speakers:

Jean Grossman - Senior Vice President of Public/Private Ventures, Philadelphia, PA
Karen Pittman - Executive Director of the Forum for Youth Investment, Washington, D.C.

KYLE: Welcome. My name is John Kyle with the National League of Cities' Institute for Youth, Education, and Families. Today, we're going to be talking about afterschool programs -- quality, policy, and a variety of other implications of high-quality afterschool programs. This particular call is made possible with support from the Wallace Reader's Digest Funds. We thank them very much for their assistance.

Today, the guests are Jean Grossman of Public/Private Ventures in Philadelphia, who conducted a study on extended service schools. And, Karen Pittman, who is based here in Washington, with the Forum for Youth Investment.

As I said, our topic today is about extended service schools. Over time, a lot of communities have realized that afterschool programs help kids grow up stronger and be more productive citizens, as well as help parents be responsible. In 1997, the Wallace funds launched what they referred to as the Extended Service School Initiative in response to this growing interest. The Funds supported the creation of 60 afterschool programs in 20 different communities around the country. Each community adapted one or more of four models -- the Beacons model, the Bridges to Success model, the Community Schools model, or the model used by West Philadelphia Improvement Corporation. These models promote academic and non-academic development of young people.

Jean Grossman and Public/Private Ventures have been responsible for studying what this has meant over the past five years and have recently released findings. We're proud to bring her to you today to help discuss some of these findings. Can you add a little bit more, Jean, to what you've been doing and what this ESS initiative is about?

GROSSMAN: Sure. We started looking at ESS in about 1997. What we wanted to do was track how these 60 schools around the country were getting on the ground, who they were attracting, how they were doing that, what kind of effects they were having, and how much it cost. We spent four or five years doing that. I think we've learned a lot of really valuable lessons.

KYLE: Karen, what perspective are you bringing to us today? Jean is talking about the study of these particular sites. Can you talk a little bit about your perspectives?

PITTMAN: The basic work that the Forum does is to try to bridge research, policy, and practice around the range of issues that help support youth development. So, the perspective that we're bringing to this is we have spent time over the past three years out in cities, and some at the state level, as municipal leaders, foundations, United Ways, and community organizations have been trying to respond to this call for a more intentional creation of an infrastructure around what we do in the out-of-school hours. We have really been trying to do our best to bring what we know from research into these conversations with policy makers and practitioners.

KYLE: Let's begin to talk about some of the things that the study found, Jean. Quality seems to be one of the things that you've found interesting information about. Can you begin to talk a little bit about that?

GROSSMAN: I think one of the points that comes out of this study is that any afterschool program -- no matter what its topic is, as long as it's deliberate in high quality ways, which I'll get to in a second -- can really have a lot of beneficial effects on the lives of kids. One of the key indicators of quality is that it's multi-dimensional, that there are a variety of different activities. They might be around the same thing. They might be around different things because different kids are attracted to different types of activities. There's a variety of ways of interacting within different activities. Quality programs have staff that really engage -- actively engage -- the children and help them to discover things for themselves. And they provide very warm, yet challenging, environments for the kids to grow in.

KYLE: Can you talk a little bit more about the variety of activities? We talked about non-academic as well as academic. Can you be a little more specific about the kinds of things you've seen in these programs and what you're recommending or what the findings suggest are the best ones to include?

GROSSMAN: The basic finding is that you need a little bit of both. You need the academic and non-academic. There is homework help. Some academic portion is the mainstay of all these programs because parents want it, teachers want it, schools want it. And the truth is, actually, the kids even want it. Some of the times, the kids are nervous about getting their homework done. While they want to do their fun things, they also want to get their homework done.

But on the other hand, if that's all you do, then there are some kids you'll never attract because some kids don't want to do their homework. And even the kids who want to do their homework don't want to be stuck in a boring program all the time. They may want to do their homework, and then do this really fun enrichment program or maybe sports or practice singing or their music or something like that. So, it was programs that had a variety of activities that really both drew the widest range of kids and were able to hold onto them.

KYLE: What does it look like when you walk into a program that's after school? Where is it? What kind of facility is it in? The ones that you are describing as high-quality that you've been looking at -- what do they look like?

GROSSMAN: They look like a lot of different things. But often what will happen is that the bell rings and a million children empty into the halls -- these are all school-based programs. And after maybe 15 minutes of people getting their books and some kids leaving, a bunch of kids

often end up in the cafeteria, the library, or some big room. There is usually a sorting process -- there are snacks and down time and check-in. In some places, everybody does their homework first thing. Other places, some groups go off to do activities first, and they'll do their homework later on. There is a sorting that goes on. But then there's usually something between a half-hour and an hour of homework help, or just time for them to sit and do their homework. It's quieter. If you don't have homework, maybe you're playing games, or you're in some corner talking to a staff member.

Then, maybe after about an hour or half-hour of that, you then transition to another activity. And depending on the place, maybe you'll do two other things. Maybe you'll do one other thing. Maybe you'll stay to five, maybe to six. But somewhere between three and six is filled up with between two and three different types of activities.

Programs do differ on what their purpose is. Some would say it would be a five-day or four-day a week program; kids sign up, and they're expected to show up all the time. Other programs run quite differently where there's homework help, and there is karate on Monday and Wednesday and choir on Tuesday and Thursday, and you can sign up for whatever you want.

PITTMAN: You've asked a wonderful question -- what does it look like? And, it's an important question. We have to be careful that the picture that's now emerging of what afterschool looks like doesn't solidify in a way that makes it difficult for us to serve all young people. And by all young people, I mean young people six to 18. In various communities having this based in a school may or may not be the best solution. So, the overall picture that Jean painted could happen if people come out of the school when the bell rings, and get on the bus or grab their lunchboxes and walk to a faith-based institution, a YMCA, a library, or a community recreation center. That same thing could happen in lots of different settings.

The other thing that we have to suggest is that for younger children -- for elementary school children -- it's often easier for it to happen in the same setting every day because that helps parents come get their children. But, by the time we get to middle and high school, students can move around more on their own, are going to use the school bus system or public transportation, and may go to a different place each day. They may decide that they want to go to the library to get their homework done and then pick up a program that's running at the library. They may want to go to the YMCA and do swimming and recreation on Tuesday. So this can look different. What we know from general developmental studies, from programs that young people want to attend, and certainly from the young people themselves is that by the time they get to middle or high school, things that happen in the same place in the same way every day are not really what they want.

GROSSMAN: I definitely second that with Karen. The description I was telling you was much more of the elementary school-based program. And even ESS found that older kids need different types of things to choose from. And as a mayor or policy maker, you want to make sure that your community has a variety of programs that kids can transition through as they grow up. You might start off in your elementary school with a three, four, five day a week program. But then as you get older, we want children's horizons to expand. They'll do sports. They'll go to their church choir. They go to the library for something, and you really want them to be able to experience different settings, different rules, different adults. And as a policy maker, you want to kind of pepper your community with a variety of things.

KYLE: I want to continue, Karen, a little bit further with the work you've been doing that takes you to more communities than just the ones where the ESS Initiative is operating and into these other settings where it looks different. Think a bit about the findings that Jean was talking about in terms of quality and a good mix of academic and non-academic programming. The statement you said was that it could look like that in all these other places as well. Do you think it is? Is that more of a challenge? A similar challenge? Do you think that programs that are faith-based, YMCA, home-based, etc. are striving to meet the kinds of quality standards that Jean is bringing up?

PITTMAN: I think the basic answer is yes. Each of these kinds of programs -- or each of the settings that are trying to provide these kinds of supports for young people -- have different challenges. Some of the challenges that we have right now in the schools, as the ESS study points out, are really around space challenges. While we think that schools are a convenient place to have these programs, if it's already an overcrowded school and there's a lot of competition in the immediate hours after school for the gym, the library, the computer center, etc., your new afterschool program may not get all the space that you think it deserves. Other programs may struggle to find the gym to do the recreation in or to find the athletic facility and sign up for it.

On the other hand, programs that are not based in schools, depending on where their funding is coming from, have to struggle a little bit less with the balance between the pressure to provide or not to provide academic support. But, I think we're really getting to universal agreement that it's very important to help young people succeed in school. Programs that are not operating strictly on the school grounds may have a little less pressure to provide that academic support in a way that looks like school. They may get to define it a bit differently and a bit more creatively.

But I think the main thing that we have learned -- and I want to emphasize this -- is that the setting is not the defining characteristic of quality. What we know from the ESS study; from the vast amount of research that Deborah Vandell and her colleagues have done at the University of Wisconsin [Center for Educational Research], looking at an array of afterschool programs, school and community-based, but for the most part, elementary school programs [Go to the Center for Educational Research at <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu> or to learn more about Deborah Vandell's research at <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/childcare/bio.html> or call (608)263-1902]; and what we know from the National Research Council's recent report called "Community Programs to Promote Youth Development" [To order a copy of the 432-page report, go to: <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/10022.html>; To read a copy free online, go to: <http://www.nap.edu/books/0309072751/html/>; To read the 18-page executive summary, go to: <http://books.nap.edu/books/0309072751/html/1.html#pagetop>] is that quality is really pretty setting-neutral.

By the time we get into an environment that's a good, supportive learning environment for young people, the characteristics of that environment are really pretty clear and pretty consistent. They are providing supportive staff. They are providing high expectations. They are providing challenging and meaningful experiences. First and foremost, they are physically and psychologically safe environments. There is a range of things that these environments are doing. And the good news is -- and this is backed up by the National Research Council's National Academy of Sciences' report -- not only do we know that these are the

characteristics, but also that report tells us what programs look like when they're good, and it tells us what those characteristics look like when it's bad, when they can actually do harm. I think that one of the key things you want to get across in this quality conversation is that we really can do harm by putting young people into bad programs. Especially if we're thrusting them into bad programs where they don't get to vote with their feet, if they don't feel that it's meeting their needs.

KYLE: You mentioned the challenge of space. Jean, as you visited those programs, is that bearing itself out? I just want to probe a little bit more on this challenge of space.

GROSSMAN: Yes, space is one that typically does get resolved in a few years. The first year or so, it is inevitably a big problem in schools. The principal is responsible for maintaining that space and the more things get used, the more they break. And if they break, they break for the in-school people kids as well as the afterschool people. So they sort of have to develop a trust and a way of dealing with broken chairs, computers, and things like that. But inevitably what we saw around the country was in about one or two years, that works out. It also works out because the school comes to see that this program really is helping them and getting their kids more ready to learn during the school day, and the principal becomes much more willing to open up classrooms, libraries, and computer labs.

KYLE: The challenge that I'm alluding to that you've begun to raise questions about in peoples' minds is cost. What is the cost to achieve the kind of quality you're talking about? How are the programs able to do this, Jean? Can you talk about that in fixed dollar amounts? Can you talk about where they got the dollars?

GROSSMAN: What we did, which is pretty unusual, is we tried to really cost out everything. Not only the out-of-pocket costs and the cash costs, but we also put a dollar value on in-kind costs. When we did that, we came out with an average cost of something like \$15 per kid, per day. And about 60% of that, on most sites, was picked up with cash, from grants that they had raised from various places, we'll talk about that in a second. And, 40% was in-kind. But we thought it was very important to give people the full-blown number because there was a big range. Some programs weren't very good at being able to develop other in-kind relationships, where a YMCA wasn't willing to give their staff member for free to deliver a cost. Or maybe they had to pay for space or for a janitor. In other places, the school just provided the janitor. So we wanted to give the full-blown cost, and then hopefully give people an idea that about 40% of this you will be able to raise by in-kind stuff.

Now because these were all school-based programs, the school and the school district was a very, very important partner, both in the cash and definitely in the in-kind contribution. Now, in that \$15 per kid, per day cost, we have not included the cost of the space. The other kinds of places that they turn to were other youth-serving organizations in the cities. It was places like the YMCA or Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts who would come in and do services. Or a museum that would come in and give something, or a librarian would come in and do a reading session. There were volunteers who came in. But the dollar amounts came from places like the United Way, local foundations, and some private donors like businesses and community leaders.

KYLE: What are you seeing, Karen, about costs and how those have been borne?

PITTMAN: I think that Jean's average -- the \$15 -- is what lots of folks have come to as they try to do these studies. And this is definitely art, not science, as we try to figure out what the cost is. I don't think we have as good a handle on what the cost is for high school students or middle school students. Again, this is a cost that reflects doing the program in one place. You get some economies of scale out of doing it in one place and often having larger numbers of young people come in. What we know about programs for high school students is that they tend to get smaller -- the number of young people in them -- because they get more project-based, if it's the teen theater or whatever. So we don't have as good a handle on that.

I'll say two things quickly about the challenge that we have on cost. One is this in-kind versus dollar balance and the fact that we're talking about that range of \$8 to \$35 or so, with \$15 being the average, and we aren't even including space. So again in the calculations, unless we're assuming that every community organization that wants to apply for those dollars is not going to have to pay for space or is going to be able to successfully negotiate for space, we're building some biases into our averages so that when municipal leaders say, "Okay, if the research says the average is \$15 and I really want to serve more young people, how about if we cut it down to \$12 or \$11.50?" We may be locking out of the equation organizations that have to pay for more of those services and are not able to provide them.

We're also coming back to that quality issue. At some point, if programs have to sacrifice either the kind of material resources that make the program interesting or have to sacrifice the staff quality, either by foregoing training or offering such a small amount of money or covering such a small number of hours, that we just don't get the staff that we need in terms of the quality of what they do when they're with young people or how long they stay in the program. And we know that turnover is really a terrible issue. And it's very, very hard to get a quality program going, no matter how exciting the activities are if staff are turning over every three or four months. Young people really react to that. So the concern that we have is that while the research is emerging that says quality counts, it's coming at a time when this afterschool train is really pushing on the quantity button and it's saying, "We want to have more." As it becomes more popular and folks are saying "we want to have more of this," when we get into tight budget times, "more" means perhaps a lower dollar amount per young person rather than pushing that dollar amount up every year. So one real question that may end up being a key question for leadership is: are municipal leaders really ready to come to the table with their public and private partners and talk about improving quality? Which means putting the dollar amount per child up every year, as opposed to having it slide down and pretending that we're getting efficiencies that really aren't coming.

GROSSMAN: One of the things that a lot of places did -- either they started out this way or they tried to change to save money -- was to say, "well, afterschool, if we're just doing three to six PM, five days a week, that's 15 hours. That's a part-time job. Maybe I'll hire this site person for 20 hours. That gives them a little bit of prep time -- an hour a day -- that should be plenty. And that way we can save money." Well, it turned out that when places tried that, the quality just wasn't there. One of the real findings of this study was that the quality of the staff is what makes a quality program. And that having a site director, a school director, or a project director who is full-time had enormous quality implications because there was continuity. People who are part-time don't stay in the job very long. They have families to raise, and they're going to go and try

to find a full-time job, and so they move on. There is a lot of transition in programs where they try to cut costs by shaving on the staff. And as Karen said, you want to attract high-quality staff, because they really are the key to high-quality programs.

KYLE: Do you all have information from the findings or from your experience in the community of what the qualifications of a high-quality staff person are? And what kinds of layers or levels of staff a high-quality functioning program might have?

GROSSMAN: One of the things we did find was that they can come in many shapes, sizes, and types. Teachers are not necessarily better than non-teachers. The key was that it was someone who is good at relating to kids. Often staff that looked a lot like the kids you wanted to attract was very important. But they were also not just the warm, fuzzy types, but they were warm and fuzzy, but challenging too, and really pushed and stretched the kids. And that's what made it an interesting place to be.

PITTMAN: What some large programs -- like L.A.'s BEST, for example, in Los Angeles [<http://www.lasbest.org/>] and the Beacons in New York City [<http://www.nccic.org/ccpartnerships/profiles/beacons.htm>] -- are finding is that, as Jean said, a mix of staff in the programs is useful: some teachers, some non-teachers, some from the community, others not from the community. The critical piece, however, is that the real key is ongoing training because even if we have the coordinator and a couple of key workers as full-time people, whether this is a school program or not, who can traverse the school day, work with the teachers, get to make those relationships happen, so that we can get that continuity of the school day into out-of-school. You are going to end up with staff that is part-time.

If you've ever been at an afterschool conference in a state or in a city, you will find that a bulk of that staff is really very young. You've attracted college students. You've attracted people who are trying to figure out what to do next after graduating from high school or after having worked in a couple of jobs. If we look at who the workforce is for afterschool programs -- and if you're in a state like California where, if the Schwarzenegger legislation passes [On November 5, 2002, California voters passed Proposition 49, the After School Education and Safety Program Act of 2002. http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/prop_49.cfm] you're going to end up with a need perhaps for 15,000 new afterschool workers. And the question is where would they possibly come from? Building an infrastructure for ongoing training is critical. We can't just expect these programs to run an ad in the paper and somehow magically attract the people who are going to have the qualities that Jean talked about.

So the two elements that seem to be essential -- learned from programs that have been doing this for a while -- is definitely invest in making sure that you have a well-trained, well-qualified coordinator. Do whatever it takes once you have a good one to keep that person there for a while. Then, put in place training and support networks that allow the rest of the staff to come in full or part time to be able to get the backup that they need to do their job. Make sure that you've got ratios that allow for supervision.

GROSSMAN: Again, what we found was that people who come forward to be afterschool or youth development workers generally are people who like kids. They wouldn't be taking this job unless they liked children. So that was a very consistent finding, that pretty much all the providers were able to provide a really nice warm, supportive environment. Where training

really helped was realizing that the activity could be made so much richer when you allow the kids to have some say over what the activity looked like or had some decision making, to realize that the adult is really setting the social interaction parameters in that place.

One of the things we found -- and we're not the only study to have found it -- is that young college students, while they could be good at attracting and being nice to the kids and getting them engaged, often didn't understand that they needed to set rules as to how the kids in the activity interacted with each other, not just with them [the staff], and that the kids needed to respect each other. And when the college student volunteer didn't stop some kind of negative interaction that was happening, that made it a less psychologically safe place for all the kids to be, not just the kids that were being currently picked on. Because they know that that kind of exchange was okay in their environment. So that's the type of training that a person with a big heart might not think about.

KYLE: You identified one area of training -- training for staff in building appropriate and positive relationships among and between children, not just between children and staff. Are there other elements of training that you would pinpoint as being exceptionally beneficial that folks ought to include in the training regimen of their staff?

GROSSMAN: One I've seen actually outside of ESS -- this didn't come out so much in ESS, but in some of the other afterschool programs that I've looked at -- is actually management behavior. Again, you get people with big hearts, but they don't know how to keep a room of 15 kids at bay and set up rules and structure, still making it a fun place, but a controlled place, not a chaotic place.

I think one of the big things that we didn't see a lot of in the past is incorporating kids into the decision-making process. So giving them some say. For example, "We're going to do an art project. Let's jointly come up with the theme." Appropriate decision-making changes by the age of the child. So what you do for a kindergarten class is very different from a middle school class, which is very, very different from a high school activity. At a high school level, the high school students themselves can figure it out, plan it, do it, can really take real ownership of it. In the middle school ages, they can take quite a bit of ownership with some support.

Most adult providers didn't know how to do that instinctively. And we found some wonderful examples where that did just happen. It was just an adult who instinctively knew how to do that. But they often were able to show their co-workers. When the co-workers would come and see the activity, they would go, "Oh! I can do that in my class. I can do X, Y and Z." So there are some things like how to incorporate decision-making or youth input into your activity that is less intuitive where training can really help.

KYLE: My little list now has relationships between kids, managing a class, and getting input from the kids who are participating in the program. Karen, is there some other aspect of training you think should be on this list and part of the regimen?

PITTMAN: Yes, we're slowly working our way down that list that makes for a good learning environment. And there are eight on the National Academy of Sciences list. There are four or five that come up consistently. Let me jump up age groups to give a little balance and give you the findings from a study the Community Network for Youth Development did out in the [San Francisco] Bay area, working with community-based programs that work with middle school and

high school age students. [For more information on CNYD, go to: <http://www.gse.uci.edu/afterschool/ca/Documents/cnyd/cnyd.html> or call 415-495-0622. To read the CNYD Youth Development Guide online, go to: http://www.gse.uci.edu/afterschool/ca/Documents/cnyd/YD_Guide/YD_GuideSections.html or to read chapter 2 of the guide, “Creating Afterschool Programs with Impact” at: http://www.gse.uci.edu/afterschool/ca/Documents/cnyd/YD_Guide/ch2.pdf. To order a copy of the Youth Development Guide, call 530-752-1277.]

What they did, working with two researchers – Dr. Michelle Gambone and Dr. Jim Connell -- was to take five of these key elements: physical and psychological safety, supportive adult/student and peer relationships, high expectations, challenging experiences built into the program, and opportunities for meaningful participation in the program and out in the community. So, it’s safety, relationships, expectations, challenging experiences, and opportunities for participation. What they did was to define those fairly clearly as to what they looked like and ask the young people in the program whether they thought they got these things consistently. What they found was that even though we think of these things as sort of the “bread and butter” of what community programs do for young people, that the scores are pretty low, even on things like safety, primarily because of psychological safety, which is what Jean just spoke to. Physical safety . . . we’ve figured out how to deal with this in supportive ways. Psychological safety . . . we’re not training folks enough. But on all of them, the programs are surprised that they scored lower than they thought. The good news was they came together as a network. They listened to what young people were saying. They did some intentional training and support. This was not about a big infusion of dollars. And nine months later when they came back to re-interview the young people, the scores were really up above the benchmarks that they had set.

So we really do need to look at some of these things that seem to emphasize a good learning environment. I would encourage everyone to either go to the National Academies Press website at <http://www.nap.edu/> or you can go to the Forum for Youth Investment website [<http://www.forumforyouthinvestment.org/>] and download a piece that we’ve written called “Off the Shelf and Into the Field” and get that chart and look at it [To download the 7-page PDF report go to <http://www.forumforyouthinvestment.org/offtheshelf.pdf>]. It’s a very important list and we should all carry it around.

The important thing that we’re emphasizing -- and this is true whether we’re talking about an elementary school program or a high school program, a program that’s based in a school or community setting, or a program whose focus is arts, employment, or service -- is that what we’re doing is creating environments that are supportive of learning and development. What we’re doing, whether young people *have* to be there or not, is creating environments in which young people *want* to be there. They would come whether someone told them to or not.

We have learned a lot about what those characteristics are, and increasingly we’re trying to develop training that makes sure that folks respond to those. That doesn’t necessarily address the other thing, which is to get to that hidden curriculum that we want to have in all these programs is making sure that we’re putting into place content-rich activities that are reinforcing reading, writing, math, and communication skills. You also have to have a staff that feels comfortable with reading, writing, math, and communication skills. So we have to look at that as well.

GROSSMAN: One of the things that we found that I thought was amazing was that the activities

that were the best were just loaded with lots of supports and opportunities very intentionally. Now occasionally there was a blessed provider who instinctively did all of this. But much more often the high-quality programs had really thought about, “Okay, so this art class -- what are we going to do here? We really want the kids to come up and solve this visual problem. And this is how we’re going to do it.” And there was a lot of thinking that had gone on before the activity occurred about “let’s think of all the different things we can kind of chock this activity with -- peer learning, peer stuff as well as problem solving and challenge.” And it really was very intentional.

KYLE: I’d like to add one thing here about parents and how parents are reacting to the programs you looked at, whether parents were paying any fees for these programs, whether parents paying makes any difference versus a school district provided program. Did the study come across anything that can help us on those kinds of questions?

GROSSMAN: The parents love the program. They scored very highly. The parents thought this program was helping their kids socially, academically, and it was helping them back in the family. So really on all dimensions, the parents thought that going to high-quality afterschool programs really made a difference in a wide range of domains.

KYLE: Were there strategies that were used to involve those parents? Some of the folks listening have commented about parents being uninvolved and not wanting to participate, even if the program were free.

GROSSMAN: Parent involvement is tough. So listeners shouldn’t feel frustrated on how difficult it is to get parents involved. What we found was that it was the places that were just persistent at trying to get parents in a variety of ways. The ways that seemed to work best were having a variety of ways in which parents can come in. It could be to watch the play that the kids figured out, or have the kids share the books they wrote with their parents. Often celebrations are a good way of getting parents to walk in the door for the first time. Then, there could be volunteer opportunities that parents can do. Maybe they can’t do it during the day. They can do it on the weekend. Maybe they stop in an extra half-hour, and they stuff envelopes, or they do something, but they’re around. What we found was maybe they won’t just jump from coming in one time to volunteering every week, but you can slowly reel in parents by getting them in one time.

The other interesting thing we found was that for a lot of parents, having the afterschool staff talk to them when they picked up their child. For example, a staff member could say, “Johnny just did a really outstanding job today.” That allowed that parent to really feel proud of the child. And by sharing what they did in the afterschool program with their parent, they then sort of got used to sharing what they did in the school day. Now, that doesn’t come immediately, but it started a dialogue about perhaps some enrichment activity or a science program or a book that they had read that could continue. But the thing to remember is that it takes time and not to get disillusioned if it doesn’t happen in a year or two -- just keep at it.

PITTMAN: To add to that, it is a slow process if we’re asking the question of getting parent involvement in 3 to 6 PM programs, for elementary school students. Because one of the reasons -- not the only reason -- but one of the reasons parents want 3 to 6 PM programs for elementary

school students is because they're working. So you can beef up that interaction when the parent comes to pick up the child, when there are special events that happen perhaps outside of the three-to-six hours or if the parents will take off from work to see that special event. But it is hard to put in place a program in one breath that we say is there to help parents feel confident that their child has a safe place to be while they're working, and then on the other hand expect them to show up and volunteer three days a week. So we do have to look at that reality.

The other thing that we know is that when we broaden the definition of what afterschool programs are, when the time goes from 3-6 PM to 3-8 PM or 3-9 PM. When they're open on the weekends, they're doing things that are not just focused on elementary school young people, but all young people, and even providing things for parents, parents will come. Jean can speak to how the adaptation of the Beacons model and some of the community schools models around the country looked like. But certainly in their original forms, Beacons here in New York City is open until 10:00 at night, offering everything from English language instruction to cooking classes, you can walk in the door and see lots of parents. It isn't an issue because they're coming in for their own education, their own learning, their own development. We're creating -- and we haven't used this word enough -- we're creating programming that's actually for families, not just for the young people so that the parents come and watch. But we're actually thinking about "what does family learning activity look like?"

KYLE: From my own experience, in terms of programming for families, is a program that provided meals. Parents could pick up a meal when they picked their children up at the afterschool program, take it home, and have a family meal together, without that working parent having to go home and cook at the end of a long and tiring day and picking up kids all over the place. They figured out a way that was either low cost or was part of the food program, taking advantage of connecting food -- a basic necessity of those families -- to involving the parents more.

I want to switch into some policy implications. We've talked a little bit about how it would be nice if a municipal official did this, that, or the other thing. Can we get real about this a little bit and talk about what roles that local elected officials and other prominent community leaders might play in supporting the quality, supporting the training, supporting the quality staff? What did you see in the sites that were policy impactful by those kinds of leaders that help to make the program go, Jean?

GROSSMAN: The city in particular that really stood out in my mind at least, where the city level officials were really instrumental was Jacksonville, Florida. At that point it was the mayor and the superintendent who really got together and decided that youth issues, and in particular what happened between three and eight at night, were a really important thing for the city to address. And the mayor and the superintendent made it "the thing to do." If you wanted to have access to these very important people, you had to join the table and bring money, ideas, and space to the table about what we were going to do. So what I've seen in ESS in Jacksonville has also been replicated in a lot of other cities -- San Francisco, Philadelphia, Chicago, Boston -- there are a lot of places where mayors really stand up and say, "This is an important issue. Come join my table to address this."

PITTMAN: I think that the key word here that you said is "leadership." And the thing that we are seeing around the country is that municipal leaders really are taking this on as a leadership

role. And identifying it as important, making it a key part of what they say they're going to do for their cities, figuring out what it means to work with the school district and with the community, figuring out where dollars are coming from to make this sustainable, whether or not federal dollars are flowing in from one program or another.

Backing up in time, we certainly have Mayor Thomas Menino with the Two-to-Six initiative in Boston now working in full partnership with Thomas Payzant [Boston Public Schools Superintendent] to create "ReadBoston" and more of a whole range of issues involving the libraries in that community [ReadBoston is a public/private partnership to ensure that all children read at grade level by the end of the third grade. See <http://www.cityofboston.gov/bra/readboston.asp> or call 617-635-READ].

We have Mayor Daley in Chicago with "After School Matters" [a program designed to provide afterschool activities to Chicago youth, while simultaneously preparing them for the demands of the workplace]. The program has created a range of project-based learning opportunities for young people that have work stipends attached to them around technology, the arts, sports, recreation, and storytelling. [See <http://www.afterschoolmatters.org/home> or call 773-553-1522.]

One of the things that I think is important and worth recognizing is that leadership is extending into looking for long-term financing and long-term institutional structures for where this stuff should live. So in San Francisco, for example, you have an Office for Children, Youth, and Families. I just came from Nashville where Mayor Bill Purcell just created a new Mayor's Office of Children and Youth [<http://www.nashville.gov/mocy/> or call 615-862-6000]. Now the effort to expand afterschool/out-of-school opportunities can be the first task handed to that office.

But it's very important that we're seeing an increase of infrastructure development, both inside of government and then outside in the community. So those are the kinds of things that are happening that suggest to me that we're taking this seriously.

The last thing -- and I think it's critically important for the sustainable funding issue -- is that in Chicago, for example, not only do we have innovative programming happening and moving with city and private dollars to get to a level of scale, you also have a mayor calling for a comprehensive analysis of where the money is. Not just looking in the easy places that are called "afterschool" or "child care," but asking across every department, "What programs are you running that are operating anywhere in the out-of-school hours? What dollars do you have devoted to prevention, to development, to neighborhood development, etc.? How can we really identify what the potential resources are? Then, how do we start using those differently?" Ultimately, as we've said earlier, John, it's a money question. If we don't use this sort of high tide as a time to really figure out where those dollars are and to look across the spectrum of prevention dollars, or if we back away, then we'll see this drop as quickly as it came upon us. So I think it's very important that we start to think long term about funding and infrastructure and not do everything in the name of afterschool and not try to get everything done with short-term task forces and committees.

KYLE: One of the things that I want to emphasize is the comment about leadership and the connection between the various departments that municipal governments are responsible for, from parks and recreation to libraries to health departments to planning and zoning departments and liaisons with schools. Even though most cities don't run or operate schools, they often have very strong connections there. Just bringing those folks to the same table and talking about the

issue of afterschool. And then pushing that and driving that even further, as you're mentioning, Karen, figuring out where the dollars actually are being spent and asking if they can be grouped in some way to make ease of economy and perhaps reach more folks.

In terms of funding, keep an eye open for any unique or interesting examples that might be replicated. One of the listeners commented that their city is considering an amusement tax that would be dedicated to afterschool or other youth-serving events. Another option is a restaurant tax or things that would generate dollars over time, as well as the organizational and leadership modes that you were mentioning.

PITTMAN: We have numerous resources and publications on our website, <http://www.forumforyouthinvestment.org>. For example, you can download a PowerPoint presentation called "Moving an Out-of School Agenda: Lessons and Challenges for Educators and Community Leaders" [http://www.forumforyouthinvestment.org/movingoutofschoolagenda_files/frame.htm].

GROSSMAN: You can find more information on the Public/Private Ventures website as well. [To order the study findings, "Multiple Choices After School: Findings from the Extended-Service Schools Initiative," go to: <http://www.ppv.org/content/orderform.html>. To download the PDF file of the 84-page report, go to http://www.ppv.org/pdffiles/multi%20choice_ess_full.pdf. To download the 12-page Executive Summary, go to <http://www.ppv.org/content/reports/ess-multi-choice-summm.html>. Or, contact Public/Private Ventures at 2000 Market St., Suite 600, Philadelphia, Pa. 19103; tel: 215/557-4400; fax: 215/557-4469; Url: <http://www.ppv.org/>.]

You can also go to The Finance Project website at <http://www.financeproject.org/> for information on financing strategies for afterschool programs and other children and youth initiatives.

KYLE: Thank you all very much for your participation today. Thanks to the Wallace-Reader's Digest Funds for supporting the ESS work and supporting this audioconference today. This is John Kyle at the National League of Cities' Institute for Youth, Education, and Families. We hope to hear from you and visit with you in future audioconferences. For more information, visit us at <http://www.nlc.org/iyef>. You can download copies of two relevant action kits for municipal officials and other community leaders. One is on "Improving Public Schools," and the other is on "Expanding Afterschool Opportunities." Requests for single copies can also be sent by email to rpdl@nlc.org or you can leave a detailed phone message with your name and address, etc. on our information line at 202/626-3014.