



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

*What Do High-Quality Out-of-School Time Programs Cost? Research Findings from the
Wallace Foundation*

January 22, 2009

*Moderator: **Bela Shah***

Senior Program Associate, Afterschool
Institute for Youth, Education, and Families
National League of Cities (NLC)

Speakers:

Dr. Jean Grossman, senior research fellow, Public/Private Ventures;
Erin Brownfield, senior communications officer, The Wallace Foundation;
Debbie Bergthold, human services manager, City of Tacoma, Wash.;
Sabrina Sutton, special assistant on youth and education, Mayor's Office, City of Baltimore,
Md; and
Chris Caruso, assistant commissioner, department of youth and community development, City
of New York City, N.Y.

SHAH: Thank you very much. Welcome everyone. This is Bela Shah from the National League of Cities' Institute for Youth, Education, and Families (YEF Institute). We welcome you all to part of our audioconference series. This call is on "What Do High-Quality Out-of-School Time Programs Cost? Research Findings from the Wallace Foundation."

We are thrilled to have such a large audience with us today for this call. We have a wonderful group of speakers with us today to talk about a new cost study from the commission by the Wallace Foundation as well as great city leaders who will talk about some of their innovative funding approaches to supporting out-of-school time. I would like to just go through the speakers and have you say hello. We have Erin Brownfield, senior communications officer from the Wallace Foundation.

BROWNFIELD: Hi everyone.

SHAH: Great. We have Dr. Jean Grossman, senior research fellow from Public/Private Ventures.

January 22, 2009 *What Do High-Quality Out-of-School Time Programs Cost? Research Findings from
the Wallace Foundation*

National League of Cities' Institute for Youth, Education, and Families

Page 1 of 22

GROSSMAN: Hi. It is nice to be here.

SHAH: We have Sabrina Sutton, special assistant on youth and education from the Mayor's Office of the City of Baltimore.

SUTTON: Good afternoon everyone.

SHAH: Good afternoon. And Debbie Bergthold, human resource manager for the City of Tacoma, Washington.

BERGTHOLD: Good morning.

SHAH: Good morning, well morning where you are. We will also have Chris Caruso, the assistant commissioner at the department of youth and community development in the City of New York join us momentarily.

So thank you all for joining us. We are excited about this call. We will go ahead and turn it over to Erin Brownfield to make a few remarks.

BROWNFIELD: Thank you Bela. On behalf of the Wallace Foundation, I just want to thank you for participating in the call today. We are just thrilled that so many of you are interested in the cost of quality out-of-school time, even in these difficult economic times. Before we start, let me just tell you briefly why we supported this research and why we think it is important. Over many years of supporting out-of-school time (OST) initiatives, people would often say that though the field and OST funders talk a lot about quality, there is a lack of good information about what it really costs. So the cost of quality study, which will be released next Tuesday – that is January 27th – is meant to provide some data around that question, and to highlight the issue of quality as a key element in building out-of-school time systems. In addition to the study, we have been working with Dr. Grossman to produce an online task calculator for OST programs. It is still in beta form but we are very pleased to be able to share it with you today. You will hear more about it and will be able to see the web address later in this call.

So now, with no further delay, I am going to turn us over to the lead author of the study, Dr. Jean Grossman.

GROSSMAN: Thank you very much Erin. Hi. Good morning everyone, or good afternoon. Let me tell you, the purpose of this study was, much as Erin said, to produce a set of cost estimates that people could use so that they could better plan what it takes to build high-quality OST capacity in their cities, especially the capacity that would serve low-income youth. What is unique about what we are going to be doing and what we developed is that we don't produce just one number, but a bunch of numbers that differentiate costs by different program characteristics.

Just to jump right into the punch line, one of our biggest findings is that cost does indeed vary, sometimes dramatically, by the program characteristics. But even more surprisingly is that the range of costs for similar programs is quite large. You might say, well why? Why would there be such a large range? What we found is that the program professionals use their knowledge about the needs, the context, the preferences and the prior experiences of the families

they serve and the families they hope to serve to structure their programs in a way that will attract and retain children. So there are very good reasons why two high quality programs can differ both in structure and in cost and even similar programs can differ in cost because they will be serving slightly different peoples in slightly different ways, in ways they think they can best serve the target population.

So let's move on and talk about how did we collect, or how do we know what we know?

SHAH: If I may interrupt for just a second. Just in case anyone is having any trouble viewing what the presentation that Dr. Grossman is about to present – if you are not able to view it – underneath the ready/show conference logo there is that link there that says ready/show installation kit at the bottom of the screen. So go ahead and click that. Most of you should have no problems doing this but in case, go ahead and click that. I'm sorry Jean, go ahead.

GROSSMAN: No problem. So in order to learn about the range of resources that were needed to provide high quality programming, we collected a consistent set of data, cost data, on an intentionally diverse set of 111 high-quality, mature out-of-school time programs all of which serve low-income children. So while the sample is quite large – very large for a cost study – it is not a random sample. It was collected in six cities, and we have a little map there that shows you where they are: Boston, New York, Charlotte, Chicago, Denver and Seattle. We ended up finding a very strong set of programs. On average, the staff-to-youth ratio was 1:8 or 1:9. You have a fairly highly educated staff. Many of them had either two- or four-year degrees. And over 70 percent of them had been in existence for at least five years.

How did we find these programs? Well these programs, all of them in the six cities, we called and had the OST leaders in that city nominate programs that they thought were strong. And then we went in and we did a secondary screening to make sure that all the programs had characteristics of strong programs. In particular, they had to be at least two years old. The operators had to say that at least three quarters of the participants showed up for most of their scheduled days and they had to have reasonable staff-to-youth ratios. We actually made a cut off at 1:20 but we ended up, as you see, getting a pretty high quality group. We collected data on full cost – meaning the cost of all the resources that a program uses, whether they were donated or paid for out of pocket. So we valued things like space and volunteer time. For financial cost, we adjusted by the cost of living in the city so that we could pool costs across cities. Now why did we look at cost rather than just out-of-pocket costs, because out-of-pocket cost is what people really have to do fundraising for? Well the reason is, we didn't want our estimates to embody a stealth assumption about how generous a particular community was. As we all know, communities have different abilities of providing in kind services and we happen to have a particular six, but we didn't want our estimates to just basically assume that another city would have the same level of in kind services available to out-of-school time providers. This way, by costing it out, each user can say, "Well in my city, I can get 30 percent of this raised in kind," or another city will say, "No I am only going to be able to raise 10 percent of this through donations." Now, just so that you know, in our sample approximately 20 percent were donated.

Let's see, now we are going to present the cost information as cost per slot, not cost per youth, so let me explain exactly what a slot is and why we did it that way. The number of slots that a program has is the capacity of program, the average daily capacity a program has. So if a

program can serve 100 children a day, it has 100 slots. That is what we were trying to do, to give you a cost of capacity. Why don't we do cost per youth? Well, attendance rules are a program decision. You can make mandatory 5-day-a-week rules and then you will have this same child sitting in the same slot all year round, or you can not have mandatory attendance. So think of a slot as sort of the number of chairs around the table and the number of chairs you have is the number of slots your program has.

So I have a little figure up here on my PowerPoint where we see in slots one, three, and five, the same child sits in that chair, in that slot, every single day all year. If you happen to have a program that you had to sign up at the beginning of the year, you had to say that you would commit to coming every day of the year – that is the type of program where you might have had all slots that look like that. But many programs have sessions, so children sign up for a session and they don't have to sign up for all the sessions. So in the fourth slot, you will see that there is one child sitting in the first slot for the whole time and a second child sitting in the second half of the year, the whole time, so that slot is filled by two children. The second box is a little more complicated and maybe during the first session we have one child coming on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday and another child coming on Tuesday and Thursday but in the second session there is a child who comes every single day. So that slot is filled by three students. So you can see it is very common for – this has five slots but eight children who have been served – and that is a very common phenomenon to have more children served than slots.

But we want to give you slots because if we didn't, then our cost estimate when you see or read cost estimates per youth, again there is this stealth assumption behind there that your participation rate will be the same as the data that we are reading about, the cost estimate. And so by giving you a cost per slot, every user can decide, well I am going to require mandatory five-day-a-week attendance all year or I am not and approximately, probably two kids, will fill every slot and then you can go back and forth between slot cost and youth cost based on your own assumptions.

Okay, next, let's go through some of the findings. The banner headline for the study is that we find that program costs do differ by their characteristics, by program characteristics but we also find that programs of similar types have quite large ranges when it comes to their costs. Before we dive right into the specific numbers, let me show you how I am going to show you the numbers. I am going to show them through range boxes and the yellow box shows you the range across from the 25th percentile to the 75th percentile of cost of programs like whatever type I am looking at. The diamond is the average of all the programs of that type. So in this particular example, the cost ranged from \$14 a day to \$32 a day with an average of \$24 a day.

Okay. So next I am going to show you two main findings slides. We divided programs into two broad groups, at least to begin with. Those programs that served elementary students, they don't have to serve exclusively elementary, they could, but they could also be elementary and middle school students or elementary, middle and high school students. And then the second broad category of programs were those that served teens and only teens, so only high school, high school and middle school students, or just middle school students. We broke them up because we found that there were very different structures if programs served elementary school kids or they didn't.

So the next slide shows you what the average daily cost and average hourly cost were for programs serving the younger kids, the elementary and middle school kids. The top two boxes

are daily costs and the bottom two boxes are hourly costs. Now before we go into details, we just look at the pattern. Well the first thing that jumps out at you is ranges are pretty big. You know, there is a mean but there is a fair amount of variation around that mean. Looking a little bit more deeply at the pattern, we find that the daily cost of summer programs is on average more expensive than the daily cost of school year programs. That is not surprising because summer programs are usually offered for more hours during the day. But what is interesting is now look at the hourly cost and you see that the hourly cost in the summer is lower on average than the hourly cost in the school year.

Now let's turn to the teen program and see what we see there. Again, let's look at the pattern first. Here you see, I think the thing that will strike you is, how wide the ranges are. They are much wider for teen programs than they were for programs that served younger kids. But you do find the same kind of pattern between summer and school year that we found for the younger kids, mainly that the summer programs are more expensive when you look at them at the daily rate but on an hourly basis, they are cheaper.

Now looking a little more closely, let's go back to the younger kids' program and dive into some of the details of it. We found that on the, let's start at the bottom, the average hourly cost of school year programs is about \$7 an hour for the younger kid's programs but there is a pretty wide range. It ranges from \$3 to \$9. That translates into a daily cost that averages about \$24 a day but again a pretty wide range from \$14 to \$31. If you look at the summer costs, the third box from the bottom, the hourly cost is about \$4 an hour. Again there is a range from \$2 to \$5 and it translates to a daily cost of \$32 a day again with a range from \$21 to \$30. Turning back to the teen programs, we find that, starting at the bottom box, the average hourly cost for a school year program is about \$10 an hour with a big range from \$4 to \$12 an hour. If you remember for the program serving younger kids it was like \$7 an hour. The daily cost is \$33 a day during the school year and remember it was \$24 for the younger kids' programs. In the summer we got an average hourly earnings of about \$8.40 and a daily cost of \$44 a day.

So you might ask why is it more expensive to serve teens? Well when we look out into the components of what made up costs, we found that activity leaders are paid more in teen programs than they are in programs serving younger youth. In particular, they averaged about \$19 an hour for overall activity providers, in the teen programs and \$14 an hour in the programs serving younger children. Another reason is that teen programs can spread their costs over fewer youth and fewer hours. They serve fewer youth and they run fewer days per year and therefore fewer hours over the year. Now one thing to remember of all the things that I have said, is remember, this is full cost. On average, about 80 percent of that is paid out of pocket and 20 percent is donated.

So the quality programs really have a range of costs. Why is that? Why did we find that? It seems that program operators face local youth needs, preferences and priorities. If your goal was to get kids off the street and that was your main goal, you want to provide things that would really draw in a lot of children, so your focus might be different if it was in one place versus another because children in different areas have different interests. A second thing is program operators face different resource constraints and we found that programs that had a lot of in kind resources available made use of those resources, and therefore were able to provide much richer programs which translate into looking like they had higher costs but most of that cost was provided in kind. That is what we find, is that program operators are making different choices

based on their judgment of how best to serve their target population and achieve the mission that they wish within the resource constraints that they have.

I have been showing you everything that has to do with all the cost data in terms of per slot, but I did want to also show you what we came up with when you look at it per youth, which is the more common way of presenting this data. But in every cost per youth number that you see, or in the stealth assumptions about what the underlying participation rates are – you won't be able to explicitly control that if you use those numbers as opposed to using a slot number and coming up with that assumption itself. So this slide shows you that – let's look at the younger kids' programs during the school year – it costs \$4,320 to fund a slot for the year. But more than one child fills that slot so when you look at it as per enrollee, it is \$2640. If you look at the teen school year programs, it is \$4580 to fund a slot, but because many teens fill a slot on a per youth basis it is only \$1880. So you get this interesting split that the slot cost for teens is more expensive than for the younger kids but the per youth cost splits the other way.

I want, before we go on, I want to compare our costs to other costs that have been done in the field. Well conveniently the Rand Corporation just finished a report where they compiled all the major OST cost studies that had been studied by 2000 and I was able to take our figures and make them comparable to theirs. It was not a completely straightforward job because no one else has ever valued that space and because they typically are spaces similar within the program type that other studies have been looking at. And so what I did to make our numbers comparable, is I took out all the space numbers and I did it per enrollee, which is what many of the other studies had done. And when you do that – our numbers are in the red line – it turns out we are smack dab in the middle. We are exactly right in the average of what other studies have shown. There are three studies, three programs that came up with costs that were higher than ours, one where it was equal to ours – \$21 a day in coral and in our study when you took out space, and there are four studies that came up with costs that were less than ours. Now just as an aside, the four that are less, none of them valued in kind resources. The top ones did and the bottom ones did not. So perhaps one of the reasons, even if you were to inflate those a bit for say 20 percent extra because of in kind resources, they would still fall below our number but not as far below.

Let's look now at one of the unique aspects of the study, which is how costs differ by program characteristics. I am just going to go through three. There are many more that are in the report. How does the cost differ by the age group that you serve? Well it turns out that every time you add an age group, your hourly costs go up. So for example, here is a figure shows that if you serve only elementary school kids, it costs about \$5 – \$6 an hour to serve them. If you serve elementary and middle school kids, it goes up to about \$8 an hour. If you serve elementary, middle and high school, you come up to \$9 an hour. And we see that same pattern when you look at the teen program.

Does a program's cost differ by its focus? Well yes it does, and it turns out that the most expensive programs are the academic programs where it a purely academic program and they cost about \$12.50 where the least expensive programs, the programs that have the least resources are the mixed focus programs and they cost \$5.70 an hour. So you might ask well why do the academic programs cost more? And it is because they spend more on salaries. They have more qualified staff and they spend more on materials.

The last one we will look at is how does cost relate to size? And what you find is sort of an interesting ratcheting affect. Look at the blue – those are the daily costs. You can see the ratcheting most clearly there, is costs go down as you expand until it ratchets up and then, so here it continues to go down between 0 and 100 and then it ratchets back up and then it goes down to when it gets to 200 and then when you get to 200 it ratchets up. What is going on is as you get more participants present every day –that is the average daily attendances go up – you add core staff to the program. So you start off with one executive director and then when you get to about 100, you add an assistant director and when you get to 200, you add another assistant director and these core staff are what is ratcheting the cost up.

Now let's turn quickly to financing and how programs funded themselves. If you just look at where programs get resources, what we found – and I am just going to show it for the younger kid programs, it is relatively similar for the teen programs – what you find is that the most common resources were in kind resources: volunteers and free space. About 87 percent of the programs got some kind of in kind resources. The next most common place to find resources were public funds: federal, state or local dollars. Follow that, that was almost 80 percent, and following that was foundation grants, where just over half of the programs in our sample got foundation grants. One thing to notice before we turn to the next slide is that about tax fees are collected by only 20 percent of the programs.

Now if you look at if you do get a source of funding – how important is that source if you get it? So what you find, the two most common funding sources, if you remember, were the in kind and public dollars. So from this graph you can see, in the middle, that in kind contributions represent about 22 percent of a program's budget if they get that type of funding. And if you turn to public funds, if a program does get public funds, it accounts for about 50 percent of the resources it uses. But what is sort of surprising is more than 20 percent of the programs that do charge parent fees, those parent fees are really an important part of the resources that it uses. They make up, on average, 54 percent of the resources that it uses. Now some of these, many of these programs, the parents will get reimbursed for their child care expenses from other public sources but not always. So it is just something to note that for those programs who do charge parent fees, and this is all low income parents who are being charged the fees, that it is a relatively important source.

I thought for this group that you might be interested to know at a city level, if you look at all the dollars that are flowing to support out-of-school time, for these high-quality out-of-school time programs, where are they coming from? Well about a third of them are coming from some kind of public fund. For the programs serving younger kids, about 40 percent are private, for teens 45 percent and parent fees are obviously more important for the programs serving younger kids than for teens.

Just to give a quick summary – I am going to skip this for time – our key findings were that costs do vary by program type, but even for similar types of programs both the hourly and daily costs really do vary quite a bit and that variation is driven by programming and staffing choices that directors make based on local conditions and priorities as well as available funds. One think that I did not stress so much in the main part of the talk is that staff cost is really the primary drive for out-of-school time, that won't come as a surprise to anybody. Thus the number of hours per day and days per year is a major factor for what the annual costs of serving kids are. The other point I made is that the average, the cost per enrollee on average is substantially lower

than the cost per slot, which is what I am presenting, but that a slot cost allows a user to make the assumption consciously rather than having to accept some kind of stealth assumption that is behind a cost per enrollee number that you pick up. Another thing was that we found, about 20 percent of these costs are supported through in kind contributions and that OST programs, at least these higher quality OST programs rely on approximately three to five sources of funding and they try to balance both public and private sources.

So you can get a lot more detail about the report. As Erin mentioned earlier, the report is about to be released next week. It will be available on all three of our websites, Public/Private Ventures, the Finance Project and the Wallace Foundation and the online calculator will be available soon on the Wallace website. If you have any questions further on, you can either contact me at Public-Private Ventures or Cheryl Hayes or Christianne Lind at The Finance Project. That is all.

SHAH: Thanks so much Jean. A study like this was obviously quite an undertaking and your explanation really helps to clarify the findings. We know that there is such a demand for this type of information especially in these tight budget times so this study will help to benefit the field in many ways. We are really pleased to partner with the Wallace Foundation to present this study to all of you in this first public release. So we are actually going to move on and hear about some real examples from cities about how they have managed to generate and pool resources to support OST programs and systems in their communities. We have city leaders from a big range in size to give you different pictures of how cities are approaching this. We will start with Chris Caruso from New York City. You know in a city as large and complex as New York is with the huge number of young people that you have to serve and all the politics that go in, tell us a little bit about what your funding scenario looks like in supporting your out-of-school time system.

CARUSO: Sure. Thanks very much Bela for the opportunity to participate on this call and to Erin and the folks at Wallace. So in New York City, Mayor Bloomberg launched an out-of-school time initiative three and a half years ago, and the funding behind that is predominantly city general fund money so it is local tax dollars that support that. We are right now budgeted at about \$116 million a year of which 91 percent comes from local city tax dollars, so kind of in line with what Jean was saying, a lot of our programs here in New York, the bulk of their funding actually comes from public sources. Now we know that many organizations get funding out side of what we provide as well and so what we have tried to do is create a system that promotes quality and has some standards for excellence and we have also targeted our resources to the neighborhoods that were most high needs. So what I thought I would do is to take a minute to talk about kind of the funding in general and how the cash flows from the city to the programs and then get into a little bit into our targeting model and how we identify our priorities. Our budge process for the city revolves around a five-year budget plan. So our funding is committed not only in our current year, but the four future years and this enables New York City to enter into long-term contracts with non-profit CBOs (community based organizations) to provide OST services. The value behind these contracts is it allows for a level of sustainability to the system because our providers have assurances that the funding will be there from one year to the next and they don't have to worry about scrambling to do fundraising and submit grant

proposals each year. We also encourage our providers to seek additional funding to supplement kind of the core basic services that we give and in line with the report that we just heard about, we base our funding on a number of slots. Although we track participants and those things, we agree that the most important measure is the slot. And we actually take an approach that looks at the cost per hour. That is our basic unit of measurement and for a year-round program it comes down to about \$2.46 an hour or a little less than \$3,000 a year that we end up funding our providers for.

In terms of the way we targeted our resources, with a city that has, you know, a large geographic reach, we wanted to make sure that our funding wasn't condensed in certain neighborhoods and folks were left out. We know that can often be the case and you are introducing competition that if there are providers or groups that specify or are especially rooted in one neighborhood, other neighborhoods might be left out. So we actually place the funding in specific neighborhoods by looking at the share of young people in a neighborhood, the share of low income young people, and also the number of children that are eligible for subsidized child care. So we really want to make sure that zip codes in the neighborhoods that have 1) the most children, and 2) the neediest children, were getting the funding. When we did our mapping and our resource allocation, we did things at a zip code level and made sure the zip codes across the city were getting funds and resources were allocated sufficiently and as fairly as possible across the city. So I will leave it there and then if there are follow up questions, I can take those as well.

SHAH: Okay. Sounds great Chris. Thank you. Next is Sabrina Sutton from Baltimore. Tell us a little bit about your system and the funding streams that you were able to put in place to support your out-of-school time work in Baltimore.

SUTTON: Good afternoon everyone. In 2005 Baltimore's city government at the time had contributed a little bit over \$1 million to after school in our general funds. At that time private dollars were drying up and there was a strong grass roots push to really advocate for the city to step up for these dollars were drying up. So in 2005-2006, that school year, we had a very large surplus so the mayor currently – Mayor Sheila Dixon – at that time she was the council president and she and the council really advocated for a substantial amount of debt surplus to go into afterschool programs. So for two years, 2005 and 2006, we had a surplus. We were able to give a substantial amount of money to the afterschool strategy. In 2007-2008, we were able to sustain that commitment by putting these dollars in the general fund. So currently this afterschool money is in a line item on our city budget and currently we are up to close to \$5.5 billion in what the city contributes. Not only the city, but we also receive money from the governor's Office of Children and that is a little bit over \$800,000 along with our school system which has contributed a significant amount of dollars towards after school programming in our schools. The dollars that we put in not only pay for the afterschool program but they also pay for the local management board who are contract managers plus they facilitate the RFP (request for proposals) process. Also we have an afterschool entity that deals with our technical assistance, our networking and all of that. So we are doing a lot this year under financial restraints, we want to sustain the amount that we have in our general budget so I will entertain questions later but I wanted to be quick to kind of let you guys know how we are pulling together the finances.

January 22, 2009 *What Do High-Quality Out-of-School Time Programs Cost? Research Findings from the Wallace Foundation*

National League of Cities' Institute for Youth, Education, and Families

Page 9 of 22

SHAH: Thank you Sabrina. It sounds like partnerships are key advocacies as well in Baltimore. Now moving to a smaller community, we have Debbie from Tacoma, Washington. Share with us a little bit about what is happening there and how some of your programs are supported and the city's involvement.

BERGTHOLD: Sure. Thanks Bela. Tacoma, for those of you who don't know, is a city of about 200,000 people and it is located on the I5 corridor just south of Seattle, about 40 miles. The city and its Metropolitan Parks District, in Tacoma, have consistently had a memorandum of understanding (MOU). The city provides several million dollars to Metro Parks and has traditionally used its money to support the maintenance and operation of the parks, community centers and other facilities.

About eight years ago Metro Parks made a strategic move to focus its programming on the 11 middle schools. They focused on that age group with kind of an unofficial understanding at that point in time that the Boys and Girls Clubs would use their programming more towards elementary aged youth. So Metro Parks approached the city and asked to take some of that MOU money and put about \$300,000-400,000 into the staffing at those 11 middle schools. It turned out to be a truly collaborative effort. It took several years but the school district stepped up and they provide not only the facility where the afterschool programming can occur but they also provide, they oriented the counselors so that the counselors were referred at-risk youth. They provide transportation through afterschool activity buses. They provide snacks to youth who are eligible for free and reduced lunches. They also provide an office for the Metro Parks coordinator at each of the sites and then what Metro Parks does, is they take some, not only the \$300,000-\$400,000 that the city provides but also several hundred thousands of dollars from their own budget to provide the marketing for the program and then access for other programs, human services programs, to come in and provide afterschool programming at the schools. So the coordinator is on campus all day building relationships, using kind of the America's Promise 5 promises to build those relationships with the youth to get them to come to the afterschool programs. Then Metro Parks uses volunteers and instructors to provide both directly and indirectly academic support programs – everything from environmental education, cultural and performing arts, sports, sickness and health – and then the human services programs from the community come in and provide tutoring, clubs like Girl Scouts, Lego robotics, things like that. So it is really truly a collaborative effort among the entire community throughout the whole city.

SHAH: Great. Thank you very much to all of you. We are able to take questions. If the operator could give the group instructions on how to ask a question.

OPERATOR: If anyone would like to ask a question you can hit star 1 on your telephone key pads. Star-one and I will access your line so you can ask your question.

SHAH: Thank you very much. Now, I will just kick off, and operator you can let us know when we have folks that are queued up. So our question to Chris, so with the large municipal

investment that you have in New York, how are you ensuring accountability of funds and how have you gotten buy-in from some of your leadership in your community?

CARUSO: Sure. It is a great question and I think that getting the buy-in up front was an essential piece of this. The mayor convened a number of working groups that included community leaders and local political officials as well as representatives from the school system. So we had a lot of buy-in on board and I think the mission that we were going to try to coordinate and better systemize the various OST programs was very appealing to those folks that were providing the services. As I mentioned before, it would be a consistent funding stream, one that was more, that led to larger contracts and provided more cash than the system had previously done that and I think that getting that buy-in allowed us to introduce a measure of accountability that we were very transparent about from the beginning.

The first thing that we did and the one that stuck the most is really taking a look at this notion of slots and if we are funding someone for a certain number of slots, we want to have a level of reassurance that those slots will be filled, so we introduced some performance-based payment models to our contracts where we measured rates of participation and to see what percentage of the slots are filled for what percentage of the hours and then we actually based the payment of the contracts on that. So if an organization is not performing well, we have the ability to reduce the number of slots that their contract is funded for and then we can reallocate those to some neighborhood organizations that are having more success at making sure their capacity is full. The other level of accountability is that we have a staff here at the Department of Youth and Community Development, which is a mayoral agency that oversees this initiative that goes out and does regular site visits. We provide technical assistance and training opportunities for all of our programs. So we really have a hands on approach and kind of monitoring not only the utilization and capacity of these programs but also the quality of the services that are being delivered.

SHAH: Thank you very much. Are there other questions that are in the queue?

OPERATOR: Yes. We do have a few questions.

SHAH: Okay.

OPERATOR: Our first question is from Shari Spearman. Please proceed with your question.

SPEARMAN: Yes. Are there slides available for the second portion of this web cast, web conference?

SHAH: The second portion meaning the city's examples?

SPEARMAN: Yes.

SHAH: We did not put slides together specifically for that. There will be a recording of this call that will be available to all participants within two to three weeks. So we will be able to

have the whole conference complete with the power point from the cost study available on our web site.

SPEARMAN: Oh good. Thank you.

BROWNFIELD: Bela, are these examples available in your funding guide?

SHAH: Yes. Thank you. We have just published a new funding strategy guide looking at financial strategies to support city-wide systems about out-of-school type programs. There will be a follow up email coming out today or tomorrow with this funding guide and brief examples from New York, Baltimore and Tacoma as well as various other cities will be provided to you there. This basically breaks down different options around funding strategies, looking at creating dedicated local funding streams, making better use of existing funding streams, looking at how to maximize state and federal funding sources as well as building and strengthening those collaborative efforts and the kind of partnerships that Debbie, in particular was talking about. So there will be an email coming out to all of you who signed up within the next 24 hours. Thank you for your question.

OPERATOR: You have a couple more questions on the line. The next question is from Darnell Moore. Please proceed with your question.

MOORE: My question is directed to Dr. Grossman. Will the report that is going to be produced, will it speak more about the methodology used to sort of determine slots versus enrollees? I was a little bit confused about the way you came about figuring out how you are going to allocate slots.

GROSSMAN: Yes it will. The quick answer to that, and thank you for letting me clarify it, is a slot is basically a notion that you are very familiar with. It is just your average daily attendance. So when a program has an average daily attendance of 50, you know, on average, across the year, that is the number of slots. And so that is how we did it. We asked the programs what their average daily attendance was and that is what we took to be their number of slots.

MOORE: Great. Thank you.

OPERATOR: Our next question is from Darryl Aniton. Please proceed with your question.

ANITON: Yes. So this is for the cities. How has the economic slow down and diminishing revenue of local governments affected out of school funding in your communities?

CARUSO: I can take a crack at that. Chris Caruso from New York City. It has been rough as I am sure it has been on all of us. For us particularly, on kind of two levels: one, the tax revenue that the City of New York is accustomed to turning in is way down, and we have been required to make some reductions. But we also see that the private fundraising from our partners and the non-profit agencies that we contract with is down, so you know, unfortunately right now

January 22, 2009 *What Do High-Quality Out-of-School Time Programs Cost? Research Findings from the Wallace Foundation*

National League of Cities' Institute for Youth, Education, and Families

Page 12 of 22

they are kind of getting hit from both sides. What we are doing is really trying to preserve service levels as much as possible and not touch core services and we have been successful with that up to a point. The fact that we have implemented this performance-based model which I spoke about, allows us to realize some savings just due to the fact that some programs are underutilized. So, I mentioned that we have the ability to reallocate slots, but we also have the ability to take them down when they are not being used, and in this environment, those have not been able to be reallocated but it was a savings that did not have quite the same sting as closing down a program it was operating.

ANITON: Can I ask Chris another question? Chris, are you still able to fulfill your commitment for that five-year funding cycle based upon diminishing revenues?

CARUSO: That is a great question. We have been to date – and you know, the situation does not look like it is getting any better here – but so far to date, yes we have been able to do that. As I mentioned we have made some reductions when there have been folks that have not been at capacity and when, you know, we have had some other instances when folks have decided that since they lost other funding they could not afford to continue with us and so some of those programs have ended but we have not had to change any contracts thus far and we hope that will be able to continue.

SHAH: Sabrina, how has the economic situation affected programs in Baltimore?

SUTTON: In Baltimore, the mayor has asked all of the agencies and funded programs to cut 12.9 percent, so what it is forcing us to do is really to collaborate more to really look at where programs are located and see if there is duplication. We have some recreation centers – 46 rec centers – that are connected to schools and some of the schools that they are connected to have these after school programs that we fund. So it is forcing us to really look at where these programs are and how we can really collaborate more. That is what we are doing here in Baltimore.

BERGTHOLD: This is Debbie Berghold with the City of Tacoma and we have kind of a mixed bag here. The city has not been hit significantly hard by the recession yet. We have a fairly diverse tax base, so our contribution towards Metro Parks has continued to be relatively stable. However, Metro Parks is a junior taxing district and its revenues have been hit. User fees are down and other public contributions are down so they are looking at some potential reductions in their service. However, one of the saving graces is that 2 of the middle schools are merging into one school, which means instead of having 11 schools to staff, which we know that staffing costs are high, there will only be ten. So there will be some limited reduction in service but hopefully next fall it will not be as significant as we might expect.

SHAH: Right. Thank you. We have one question that was submitted online. This is more from Jean. Were local public library out-of-school time programs included or considered in the Wallace study?

GROSSMAN: Local?

SHAH: Public library.

GROSSMAN: If they fulfilled their criteria they were. So they had to be nominated by their local leaders and then they had to pass the screener that we had, on how long they have been operating and how often their kids show up. But yes, they were included.

SHAH: Okay. Thank you. Are there other questions in the queue?

OPERATOR: Yes. We have a couple more questions. Our next question is from Anne Bowles. Please proceed with your question.

SHAH: And please state your city too, so we get a sense of who is on the line.

BOWLES: Sure. This is Anne Bowles. I am in Washington, DC with the American Youth Policy Forum. Thank you everyone for all the information. It is very helpful. My question was kind of answered by Bela, but I was wondering what the federal level policy implications were from the study? I don't know if Jean would be able to speak to that, or, I mean most of the programs that chimed in are more municipal-led, but I was wondering what the federal policy implications were.

GROSSMAN: This is Jean. I think for me, the biggest policy implication at all levels – federal, state, and local – is that it is not really, there isn't one number, one cost number that can fit all programs and that maybe we need to think of the federal policy or public policy needs to think in a little bit more nuanced way on how to reimburse programs and that different types of programs cost more. So if you end up funding at the end of the day per child you will be overfunding some kinds of programs and underfunding others. So I think the implication is to have differential reimbursement or funding rates for different types of programs.

BOWLES: Thank you.

SHAH: Other questions?

OPERATOR: Our next question is from Rebecca Benna. Please proceed with your question.

BENNA: Hi. This is Rebecca Benna, I am with the City of Glendale, Arizona and I have a couple of questions. The first one is, how many of the programs surveyed in the study that was conducted actually charged fees to their users?

GROSSMAN: It was 20 percent.

Of the six cities?

GROSSMAN: Of all the programs, of the 111 programs 20% of those charged any parent fees.

BENNA: Okay. And then the second question – I have several staff sitting in my office here that are involved in our afterschool programs – and one other question is, how much of the urban sprawl, or if there was urban sprawl in the Tacoma area, how much have been experienced in the last five to ten years and has the sprawl impacted committing funds to the youth programs?

SHAH: Urban sprawl?

BENNA: Yes, urban sprawl.

BERGTHOLD: Tacoma has not sprawled. I know that Pierce County, which is the county in which Tacoma resides, has had tremendous growth in terms of sprawl, lots of vacant land, but the City of Tacoma is a fairly old city for Washington State and fairly compact so there has not been much sprawl.

BENNA: Okay. Has the growth in the county – you said that you do a cooperative program with the district, I am assuming the district represents people that are in the county?

BERGTHOLD: No. Only the city of Tacoma.

BENNA: Okay. They have to reside within the city.

BERGTHOLD: Yes.

BENNA: Okay. Thanks.

OPERATOR: Our next question is from Susan Richards. Please proceed with your question.

RICHARDS: Hi. My name is Susan Richards and I am calling from Cambridge, Massachusetts. My question is really to Chris in New York. Chris, you talked about a performance measure really as kind of getting the attendance and enrollment in, and then you referred somewhat to site visits to, I guess. I am just curious how much you are using the fact that we have been working so hard in afterschool on quality improvement, like at the time of shrinking resources, sometimes you can kind of help people be more attentive to delivering a higher-quality service to, you know, basically stay in the game. You have the children's attendance to see whether they are going to keep the contract with you, but how are you tracking real performance, like the quality of programming in lean times?

CARUSO: That is a great question. I am glad that you brought that up. I don't want to give the impression that the only indicator or only outcome that we are interested in is attendance. So we track quality on a number of different fronts. We know that in order for – no matter how good a program is, kids have to come in order for there to be positive outcomes, and so that is why we do focus on participation and attendance. But we have kind of three levels of quality

observation and assessment. We do our site-based work where we actually go out to sites and we will observe and have conversations, and we monitor and do some onsite coaching there – that is with my staff that has also received training in network. And then we have a contract with a technical assistance (TA) provider, a local one here called the Partnership for After School Education, and if an organization needs assistance with something in particular we can assign site-based TAs. So they will send some consultants out to the program and work with them over a couple of days, in some cases even longer than that if they need more attention and more work. And finally we have invested in a longitudinal evaluation with Policy Studies Associates, the DC-based firm. So each year we get a report on progress across a number of youth development indicators and we also look at some survey data where the kids and the programs are surveyed and we also, beginning this year, we will start to look at some Department of Education results as well. When it comes to the performance-based contracting, we do only use the attendance as something that will impact the payment on the contract. But when we do our assessment and evaluations and when we think about who is going to get funded or renewed, we have the ability to take into consideration all of the different contextual evaluations that occur also.

RICHARDS: Thank you.

SHAH: We have one question, we will keep taking questions from the audience for a few more minutes, but in case people have to get off, I want to go back to the discussion around the cost calculator, an exciting new tool that is coming out. I understand it is a companion to the study but Jean can you tell me a little bit about what is the purpose of this cost calculator and what would be the best way to use it?

GROSSMAN: That is a great question. The purpose of the calculator is to allow users to tailor cost estimates to the types of programs that they want to fund. In the report we give you lots of different numbers of different type broad categories, you know, where they are located, who runs them, things like that. But there are many things that you can vary, many dimensions on which you can vary and the cost calculator will allow you to develop an estimate, sort of an average estimate, for a program of the type exactly like you want. I think the way to best use it is you should first decide who do you want to serve with what types of programs will attract and retain those types of children that you are trying to target and think specifically about what is the focus? What types of services are you going to be using? How do you want to distribute the foci? Maybe you want 10 percent academic, 75 percent mixed, and the remaining more singularly focused: art programs or dance programs and things. But first figure out what it is you want to fund and then go to the cost calculator and put in the various assumptions.

You will do it one type at a time. It will provide you a ballpark figure. And then with that ballpark figure, each planner can then adjust that number based on more knowledge of their own situation. So for example, they will be able to say, well in my town, I bet I can get half of this funded through in kind, or only 15 percent in kind, so they will figure out how much will be in kind and not in kind. Similarly, because we saw it with teen programs, there is really a great range. You may know that you're doing an academic program but this is going to take really high skilled people to do it, so on a realized average cost increase it by 20 percent because the cost for that particular staff is going to be higher than what the average is. So with that, you

can then take these numbers and really adjust them and fine tune how much money it will cost to actually run a program.

What I think is really not a good use of this is using the cost calculator to figure out how to minimize cost. Because what we did, we collected data on programs that naturally developed. And there are certain types of programs that have certain types of structures that you shouldn't be mucking around with. So for example, academic programs typically have relatively low youth to staff ratios and you could simulate bringing it down and increase to make it a ratio of 20:1 perhaps, but that is not really what we found. You are going outside of the bounds of reality. So I think the best way to use this is to figure out what kinds of programs you want to run, and then use the calculator to cost those up.

BROWNFIELD: Jean, would you mind putting that calculator URL back up? Going back one slide? This is Erin from Wallace. I just want to reiterate that it is available now in a beta form on the Wallace Foundation site: cost of quality is the header, following after the www.wallacefoundation.org address.

SHAH: And for those who were not able to access it, could one of you read it off slowly?

BROWNFIELD: I will do that. It is www.wallacefoundation.org/cost-of-quality

SHAH: Thank you. I appreciate that. Okay. We have one question submitted online from Parsons, Kansas. It is a question about buy-in. Maybe I will direct this to Sabrina. How were you successful and what were the major issues? And this is from a town that is pretty small, only about 12,000. But maybe some of your experiences in how you got some of that surplus money targeted towards afterschool and what are some key champions or advocates that push for it? How did you get sort of the emphasis on after school?

SUTTON: Well we had a lot of advocacies that were spearheaded by the Safe and Sound organization here in Baltimore City, and they really came together with parents, community-based organizations, and faith-based organizations. They came and rallied during our budget meetings, during some citywide meetings that we had pertaining to youth and things like that. They really rallied people behind getting that money into the surplus. Also, when it was really time to look at putting that funding in as a line item, they rallied behind that. So I would say that the support that was given from the community to really show their insistence on, making sure that we had the proper funding, was tremendous. It really was.

SHAH: Is there some particular data that was really key to getting the attention of those leaders that you would advise communities to gather to be able to make their case strong?

SUTTON: Well actually the data showed that young people who were involved in afterschool stayed in school. They not only stayed in school, but they participated in more school academic leagues. They were achieving. So they definitely came to us with a lot of data. They said that young people were safe, because we know at a certain time when young people are out of school, there are certain things that they can get involved in but if they are involved in

things in after school they were safe. So they brought all of this to our council members, to the mayor, to other leaders in municipal government and they made a point that was strong and that is why we are where we are today.

SHAH: Great. Thank you. I hope that answered some of the questions for Parsons. Are there other questions?

OPERATOR: Yes, we have a question from Colleen Fitzgerald. Please proceed with your question.

FITZGERALD: Hi. My name is Colleen and I am with the Boulder, Colorado Parks and Recreation Department and I actually have two questions. The first one being, we have services provided through the YMCA and the school district generally for the city and the school district but our department has found that there is a high number of kids that don't stay afterschool, that return back to their public housing sites. So we have developed the program On Site and I am wondering if there are any other communities – and my apologies if any of those who have presented do actually do that, I was trying to listen – but I was wondering if there were any other models that were similar that are coordinated on site at the housing sites?

SHAH: Do any of the speakers on the call do that?

GROSSMAN: This is Jean Grossman. I was the researcher, but I am involved in a little local non-profit here in Princeton, New Jersey and that is exactly that. We run an afterschool program in the public housing units that are here.

FITZGERALD: Okay, and so is some of the funding similar to what has been found in this report do you know?

GROSSMAN: Yes. There is a mixed of public and private and yes, exactly.

FITZGERALD: Great. Well that was one question. My second question is, in the study, was there any consideration for the additional funds necessary to accommodate children with disabilities?

GROSSMAN: That is an excellent question. We wanted to have a broad set of programs but we did not want it to be so diverse that, because we were only collecting 111 programs, and so you were not included if you targeted a very specialized – like either handicapped or mentally challenged or any really specialized population, you were not included in the study. You also were not included, there were a set of afterschool programs that provided services but they moved from location to location to location, so they don't operate anywhere for 8 months in a year. That does not mean they aren't providing good services, but they are constantly moving and those types of programs were also not included in the study.

FITZGERALD: Okay. And I do understand that, but for those communities that reported, Baltimore and New York, I am guessing you serve kids inclusively in the program, and is there a separate line item to a system of cost assessment for kids with disabilities or is that just included as a part of the staff ratio?

SUTTON: In Baltimore, that is included.

CARUSO: In New York we allow providers, we cap, normally, the cost per participant we are willing to pay, but we allow for a greater price per participant when specific disabilities are being served.

FITZGERALD: -Perfect. Thank you.

CARUSO: You are welcome.

SHAH: I would offer also to our friend from Boulder, that if you email my colleague Lane Russell at Russell@nlc.org. We can give you some information and connect you to some of our colleagues in Florence, South Carolina who have also done great programs and have found those to be very successful.

FITZGERALD: Great. Thank you very much.

SHAH: You are welcome.

OPERATOR: Our next question is from Fred Gress. Please proceed with your question.

GRESS: We went online and you have already taken care of it.

SHAH: That was from Parsons. Hi Fred.

OPERATOR: Our next question is from Angie Kim. Please proceed with your question. Angie Kim?

CROCKER: This is actually Katie Crocker from Inner Community Mercy Housing and it is just a follow up to a question that has already been asked. I heard from the person from the Wallace Foundation talk about how they do surveys and survey self report and there was one other one, ways of getting your measurement for your outcomes. Are there any other ways that you have been successful in measuring outcomes? I understand you talked about participation, but I am also looking at the outcomes that are on the report in regards to social skills, better attitudes towards school, less risky behavior, self confidence, I would just like a little bit more information on how you measure those?

SHAH: Jean can you take that one?

GROSSMAN: Actually I think it was Chris who was talking about the observations.

CARUSO: You know, the survey instrument that Policy Studies Associates uses does take into account many of those developmental indicators: relationships with peers, relationships with adults, connections to schools and other institutions in the community. If you would like, I can try and get you a copy of that. I would just have to check to see if it a public document, but I would think that it might be. But I think, I would also encourage you to go to our Web site or the Wallace Web site and you can see some of the more recent reports and actually I think the instrument tools are an addendum to those reports.

CROCKER: Thank you.

SHAH: Can you give that Web site?

CARUSO: Sure. Our Web site is www.nyc.gov/dycd.

GROSSMAN: The Forum for Youth Investment also just did a report on how you measure quality of afterschool environments and many of them, many of the tools that they refer have measurements for youth engagement and things like that, that you might look at.

SHAH: Right and you can find that report at www.forumfyi.org.

OPERATOR: Our next question is from Robin Harwell. Please proceed with your question.

HARWELL: Hi there. Robin Harwell from Memphis, Tennessee. My question relates to the planning processes in coordination of the OST programs within highlighted communities. Here is the question: How many of these communities began with say a five or ten year youth master plan or blue print?

SUTTON: Good question. This is Sabrina from Baltimore. Initially Safe and Sound received some dollars from the Robert Johnson Foundation and that grant that they received was a ten year grant. Through that grant they began to plan as far as strategies around young people around neighborhoods and things like that and after school was really one of the largest, one of the biggest components. So that is the plan that really initiated the afterschool strategy that we have here in Baltimore City. It was a ten year plan.

SHAH: Debbie, did you guys have any type of comprehensive plan going into this work before the city put in the resources into the general fund?

BERGTHOLD: Not specifically around the memorandum of understanding for funding that went in. But over the course of time, the city has participated and developed a human services strategic plan. As a part of that, children and youth have always been one of their three strategic priorities. So it has always been a very important part of the city's planning process. In addition, when Metro Parks came to the city around this, the initiative was also taken to what is

called the Joint Municipal Action Committee and is elected from the school district, the city, Metro Parks and the one county-elected council person who represents the City of Tacoma. They dealt with the issues. They worked around policy issues before Metro Parks actually went out for their afterschool parks program.

SHAH: Thank you. I think we are going to wrap up soon here. I will just ask if each of the speakers, the city leaders, what general advice would you have for other communities who are trying to come up with strategies to fund their programs, especially in these tight fiscal times. What sort of parting words do you have? We can go through each of you real quick starting with Sabrina.

SUTTON: Well I would say collaboration, collaboration, collaboration. When we count slots in Baltimore City, we initially didn't count recreation and parks or libraries. We didn't count the Mayor's Office of Employment and Development, which has strong youth employment piece. I mean if we collaborate, we can build upon things that we are doing right now, rec centers that are attached to schools and that sort of thing. So in these fiscal times, collaboration, collaboration, collaboration.

SHAH: Okay. Thank you. How about Chris?

CARUSO: Yeah I would like to echo what Sabrina said. Really take into account the partners and get folks on board, especially the school system. I know that someone mentioned public housing, we are doing work in about 35 different public housing facilities right now, which has proven to be very beneficial to both sides and to look for things that might not necessarily appear on face to be a natural fit. A couple of our partnerships are with family homeless shelters that have some space and we fund after school programs there as well as the parks and library systems. And just to echo what I said earlier, I think especially in times of tight resources, to target where you want your services based on the needs of the communities and, to make sure that there is a clear and transparent way that shows how you are allocating resources are critically important.

SHAH: So really collecting the data to make sure you are able to document those needs and where those kids are. Great, thank you. And Debbie, what would you say to the folks on the line?

BERGTHOLD: I agree wholeheartedly with Sabrina and the whole concept of partnering and collaboration. I think that is really important. I think that by doing things more effectively and more efficiently, hopefully it will serve more kids for an equal amount of resources and in the declining economic environment you are not going to have to cut services too much. I also really believe in focusing in on outcomes and impact that services have on the youth, and making sure that you continue using the programs that are the most efficient and effective. I believe that partnering, collaboration and focusing on impact are key.

SHAH: Thank you. And again, we will have the funding guide to you in your email boxes that will go through some additional examples and talk about different ways that cities have been able to expand their funding streams or target new ones. Jean, closing thoughts from you? Not advice specifically but a closing thought on your study and the best way to use some of these findings.

GROSSMAN: Right. Well thank you very much and thanks for putting up with all the technical stuff to all the listeners. I think, you know, I echo a lot of what the cities have been saying. I think that what I have learned in looking in so much detail on costs that if you can keep your slots filled in a way – they don't have to be filled with the same kids but what you definitely don't want is an empty chair at the table. That you funded that, especially in tight times, that you are really paying attention to keeping those slots filled. I was really interested to hear Chris on your mechanism of tracking hours that slots are actually filled. I think that might be a really good technique, because what you find is expensive programs are often those that have the spare capacity that is not being used, so they are funding empty chairs. And then the other thought I had is, you know, I think you don't want to undercut programs. If you are looking for outcomes, there are certain staff to youth ratios you need if you are going to get outcomes. If you just want to babysit, that is another matter, but if you are actually looking to have impact, it would be better to target more specifically kids you really need but then serve them well, I think. Take your money and spread it, and then you won't get your outcomes. You will have babysitting but you won't get your outcomes.

SHAH: Thank you very much. I appreciate all of our speakers today. Thank you very much for your comments and your insights. Thank you to all of the participants as well. I want to remind the participants, or let you know that our new round of audioconferences will be available for sign up after this call. You can go to the National League of Cities' web page at www.nlc.org/iyef, and you will see the next round of audio conferences that we have available. Again, thank you very much.

I will just make one plug. We have another new publication that is hot off the presses and it is a good opportunity to think about additional funding streams as well. It really connects to how cities can connect with their statewide afterschool networks, the networks across the country, so it is very likely that you are in a city that is in a state that has one of these statewide after school networks funded by the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation. We have a new strategy guide that talks about ways in which cities and networks have collaborated and leveraged relationships at the city level to make some impact at your state legislative level to bring down additional resources from the state to communities. So there are some examples there too. We will have this available on our Web site as well.

So thank you all very much. I appreciate all of this good information. Afterschool is such a key focus of the Institute here at the National League of Cities and thanks to the wonderful partnership of the Wallace Foundation and the Mott Foundation. I know this conversation will continue. It is a topic that is under constant need. As more resources become available, we are happy to share them with you. Thank you to you all. Take care.