

# **STRATEGY FOR IMPROVING PHILADELPHIA'S OUT-OF-SCHOOL-TIME SYSTEM**

January 14, 2008

by

*Task Force Director:*

Dr. Jean Grossman

*Task Force Members:*

Robert Barnett

Camille Bridges

Chelsea Craigie

Helen Pajcic

Rachel Rizal

Devjoy Sengupta

The Center for Research on Child Well-Being  
~A Center of The Woodrow Wilson School of Princeton University

# Table of Contents

<b>Goal</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Summary of Best Practices .....	1
Definition of a System .....	1
<b>Structure</b> .....	<b>2</b>
Management Structure .....	2
Programming Structure .....	3
<b>Collaboration</b> .....	<b>4</b>
External Collaboration .....	5
System Collaboration .....	5
Program Collaboration .....	5
<b>Funding</b> .....	<b>6</b>
Public Funding .....	6
Private Funding .....	7
<b>Quality Control</b> .....	<b>8</b>
Data Collection .....	8
Site Monitoring .....	8
Professional Development .....	9
Independent Evaluations .....	9
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>9</b>

## **Appendix A: The OST Systems in Brief**

### **Appendix B: Full Papers**

- Baltimore
- Boston
- Chicago
- Los Angeles
- New York City
- Washington D.C

# STRATEGY FOR IMPROVING PHILADELPHIA'S OUT-OF-SCHOOL-TIME SYSTEM

## THE GOAL

Based on studies on out-of-school time (OST) systems in six major cities (Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles, New York City, and Washington DC), this paper presents recommendations on how Philadelphia can improve the accessibility, quality and sustainability of its OST programs.

## SUMMARY OF BEST PRACTICES

- Structure
  - Private-public partnership: An intermediary with political oversight
- Collaboration
  - A diverse governing board
  - Frequent and regular meetings of partners (program and system leaders, stakeholders)
- Funding
  - Stable public funding stream (city and state level) supplemented by private contributions (business and foundations)
- Quality Control
  - Routine data collection
  - Site monitoring
  - External evaluations

## DEFINITION OF A SYSTEM

An OST system is the structure that exists in a city to achieve three goals: to promote accessibility, sustainability and quality of OST programs. It does so through efforts to:

- Encourage collaboration
- Secure funding
- Control quality

Strong collaboration creates a more cohesive system which makes it easier to advocate and fundraise for OST programs. Systems also usually provide monitoring, training and technical assistance, which improves program quality and helps promote accountability. Without a cohesive system, individual OST programs lack the capacity to achieve these city-wide goals.

This paper seeks both to recommend a framework for an exemplary OST system, as well as to provide examples of systems that are currently working well. Each of the six cities we examined has a distinct system, indicating that there is no ideal model to share, only ideal goals. Philadelphia is one of the few cities that have the elements of a complete OST system already poised for assembly. First, we will describe and analyze the structure of a system. Then, we will discuss and provide examples of the fundamental components of a system: collaboration, funding, and quality control.

## STRUCTURE

The rationale for an OST system is straightforward: to make the large number of OST programs available to children through the city in a coordinated rational manner and to ensure that these programs provide high-quality services to targeted children. Cities have two sets of structural choices. First, in order to efficiently coordinate and support large numbers of programs cities usually create an umbrella institution. The umbrella organization (or intermediary) can be located in a dedicated government department, be an independent private organization, or formed as some sort of public-private partnership to oversee OST in the city. Second, when deciding how best to ensure accessible high-quality programming, a city may either take a “grassroots” approach which funds existing community-based providers, or adopt a “model-based” strategy which standardizes OST programs in the city according to a specific rubric or design. This section of the paper will describe and analyze each of these choices in depth, and explain the various structural choices made by the cities studied.

### Management Structure

The first choice that a city must make is a choice of management. It is unclear whether a city’s OST system should be managed by the city government, private intermediaries, or a public-private partnership. Each structure offers its own advantages and disadvantages, and as this report will show, each has been implemented successfully in a major city. To decide which is right for Philadelphia, a closer examination—theoretically and in practice—of each option will be necessary.

One way that a city may manage its OST programs is by subsuming the management of the OST system into the city government. This approach has a number of advantages. The governance structure of such a system is both clear and efficient because decisions come down directly from the mayor’s office. Collaboration between relevant public partners, including the School District and Department of Human Services, is relatively smooth and easy. At the same time, however, the system’s governmental status may make partnerships with private agencies and foundations more difficult, especially when it comes to fundraising. Moreover, a system under the control of a city mayor may be less stable in the face of mayoral changes than a system headed by a private or public-private intermediary.

The most prominent example of such an OST system is in New York. In 2003, Mayor Michael Bloomberg created the OST system under the city’s Department of Youth and Community Development. Spearheaded by the Mayor, this initiative was able to increase overall levels of public funding and foster collaboration between the city, the state, and city schools in large part because of its governmental nature. Because so much of the OST system’s success was dependent on Mayor Bloomberg’s strong financial support, it is unclear how replicable New York’s model may be.

The second option available to a city is to effectively “outsource” its OST operations to one or more private intermediary organization. These intermediaries operate independently, without direct oversight from the Mayor (though the Mayor may be involved through funding for the system). Not surprisingly, this scheme has the opposite positives and negatives as the system incorporated into the city government. Independent intermediaries can be effective precisely because they are stable institutions and because they are able to raise money from public and private sources alike. In many cases, private intermediaries may also have efficient, top-down

governance structures. However, private organizations have inherently less access to key government officials. Moreover, because city governments may be hesitant to give a private entity too much power or money without direct control, a system run exclusively through a private intermediary may be less powerful. It can also be less efficient, especially if several organizations coordinate to do the job of “the intermediary.”

The experiences of cities with private-run systems have been mixed. Baltimore and Boston are two cities with such private-run systems. Both systems are managed by a combination of several private organizations, each with its own responsibilities. In Baltimore, three intermediary organizations work together closely, meeting regularly to intentionally coordinate their efforts, collaborate and perform all the duties of a system, from fundraising to quality assurance. In Boston, many private organizations are involved in supporting OST programs. There are no clear management relationships among these organizations and none of them are involved in large-scale program funding, thus restricting their ability to effectively influence programs in Boston in a coordinated manner.

The alternative to an exclusively public or private system is a partnered approach, in which a city government works closely with one or more intermediary organizations to manage its system. Generally, such a system will consist of a private intermediary with one or more boards made up of public officials, or vice versa. This approach has a few distinct advantages. Perhaps most importantly, such a partnership has access to a wide range of public and private funding sources. Furthermore, a public-private partnership can remain accountable to elected officials while still becoming a stable, established system. Finally, this approach involves the broadest set of stakeholders in the decision-making process. The disadvantage of this approach, however, is that the involvement of so many stakeholders may make effective governance difficult.

The complexities involved in creating such a system have led cities to create partnerships with vastly different structures. In Washington, DC, the DC Trust is an independently run, quasi-governmental organization with a Board of Directors comprised of mayoral and city council appointees. Los Angeles has adopted the opposite approach: LA’s BEST is run jointly out of the offices of L.A.’s mayor and school district, but is accountable to a Board of Directors composed of major corporate and private donors. While Chicago’s OST system is less centralized than either DC’s or L.A.’s, each of its major component organizations works closely with (and draws funding from) both public and private partners. The experiences of these three cities demonstrate the wide range of possibilities for and great potential of partnership-oriented OST systems.

### Programming Structure

The second major structural choice facing a city concerns the types of programs that its OST system is designed to support. This is generally a choice between two broad approaches—“grassroots” or “model-based”—though some blending of the two is possible as well. Again, it is instructive to examine each option more closely.

In a grassroots OST system, OST services are offered through a wide range of community-based organizations (CBOs), which are in turn supported—with funding, technical assistance, etc.—by the system. In such a system, CBOs may be held to some basic standards, and are assessed regularly to monitor performance, but have a great deal of freedom to determine what kind of programming to offer. A grassroots system, therefore, provides families with a

great deal of choice in OST programs, and is uniquely responsive to demand; such an approach takes into account the particular desires of different populations within the city. On the other hand, a wide range of programs is harder to monitor, and can lead to large disparities in quality among system-funded CBOs (especially if some CBOs seek funding from elsewhere, or have significantly more resources than others).

A good example of a successful grassroots approach is Washington, DC, where the DC Trust funds over 100 CBO providers for children and youth throughout the city. Grantees are required to offer free services for a minimum number of hours per week and to maintain a minimum attendance rate throughout the year. But otherwise the CBOs have great deal of freedom, ensuring a wide range of programming across the city. Boston follows the same approach: even though Boston's system does not provide funding, its goal is to provide assistance to existing CBOs within the city, no matter what type of OST services are offered.

The second option is for a system to create and implement a model for all of the programs it funds. This approach generally entails coming up with a set of guidelines or standards that all supported programs must fulfill, and allowing programs some amount of flexibility beyond these standards (though not nearly as much as in a grassroots approach). Standardizing OST programs according to a model ensures a consistent level of quality among programs and makes programs easier to monitor and evaluate. At the same time, however, a model-based approach bears risk: if the model is ineffective, OST programs will not achieve their desired effects; if the model is too rigid, children seeking different kinds of activities may be alienated.

The model-based approach has been adopted successfully by New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago. LA's BEST is a particularly good example: every program it funds is organized in the same manner, with some flexibility within the uniform structure. OST programs in New York operate on the same principle, but offer providers three different models that they may follow. And each of Chicago's various intermediary organizations offers its own programmatic model. Each of these systems has been able to implement its model across the city with a high degree of success.

The choice between the grassroots and model-based approaches, however, is not all-or-nothing; in fact, some cities have begun blending the two approaches in interesting new ways. Baltimore's funding intermediary, for example, funds programs offered by CBOs as well as programs that follow its BOOST model. And, having established a citywide network of CBO providers in Washington, the DC Trust has begun to develop its own unique model, which it hopes to spread throughout the city in the next few years. As with the question of public versus private management, the experience of these cities in blending grassroots and model-based approaches to OST provision demonstrates the great potential for innovation and creativity in designing successful OST systems.

## **COLLABORATION**

Collaboration is essential for maximizing resources and achieving optimal benefits. Collaboration is needed on three levels: external collaboration with stakeholders in the community (donors, policy makers, business, etc.), system collaboration of the organizations involved in supporting programs, and internal collaboration of the programs themselves. Whatever institutional structure the city chooses, the system should facilitate these collaborations through formal boards, strong communication, and regular meetings.

## External Collaboration

One common method to foster collaboration is through the board of directors of the intermediary. This governance board should be designed to ensure the participation and engagement of all key stakeholders. These stakeholders include the large practitioners, donors, and experts in technical assistance (TA) and professional development (PD). The role of the board of directors is multifold: advising on key policy decisions regarding each of their respective sectors (running the programs, fundraising, TA and PD); fundraising for the OST system; reflecting the community perspectives on the OST programs; and helping to maintain the quality of the system and programs. In addition, this board can utilize the resources of different members who contribute through different means to provide social and political capital for the intermediary.

One strong example of this type of board of directors is in Los Angeles's LA's BEST, which has three boards: the Board of Directors, the Advisory Board, and LA's BEST Friends. The Board of Directors has a sustainable funding base of corporate and personal donors that approves the annual budget and monitors quarterly expenditures. The Advisory Board gathers community perspectives, maintains quality assurance, and reviews evaluation data. A third board, LA's BEST Friends, is composed of young professionals and urban leaders in Los Angeles who hold fundraisers and volunteer at school sites. Although this tri-fold breakdown of three separate boards is not a necessity, each of the roles that LA's BEST boards play are critical in the success of its system because they connect the OST system and programs with individuals who have the social, political, intellectual, and financial capital to best support the initiative.

## System Collaboration

Beyond facilitating collaboration among community leaders, the elements of the system have to communicate with each other. If the structure of the system incorporates more than one organization, it is imperative that these organizations work together through well-established patterns of communication. Baltimore's After-School Strategy is a strong example of multiple organizations cooperating within a system. In Baltimore, there are three different organizations that combine to fulfill the roles of the intermediary. Each of these components—Safe and Sound, The After School Institute, and the Family League of Baltimore City—has a different role, but they overlap and all work towards the same mission to enact a multi-pronged offensive in Baltimore.

## Program Collaboration

Finally, the OST system ought to also facilitate communication and collaboration among program staffs in order to produce a forum for joint learning, develop a field identity, and create coherent system that has strong public will behind it. One way commonly used by other cities is for the intermediary to hold regular meetings for executive directors or other program staff to facilitate conversations, build relationships and foster improvements. In addition, the intermediary could also promote communication by other means, such as virtual collaboration networks, newsletters, and smaller group meetings. All of these methods of communication

work towards the common goal of collaboration and increasing the public will and developing a sense of community amongst and within the different sectors of the system.

Baltimore provides a strong example of collaboration. The After School Institute (TASI) assists collaboration within the system by holding open monthly meetings. Staff members from programs around Baltimore attend the meetings to network, reflect, and plan. In the same vein, TASI mediates the relationship between BOOST programs (programs run by CBOs in partnership with school principals) and the public schools. These meetings of practitioners and regular meetings with schools is a practice seen in many other cities. In Washington, DC, the DC Trust requires the directors of its grantees to attend bimonthly grantee meetings. These meetings provide an opportunity for the Trust leadership to share its agenda with the organizations that represent it on the ground. In this way, the Trust may use its grantees strategically, build public will for OST programs, and make the OST system a priority for city policymakers.

## **FUNDING**

A fully sustainable OST system requires a steady public funding stream supported by innovative fundraising. However, many cities across the United States have struggled to simultaneously maintain both public and private funding sources. For example, after the City of Baltimore demonstrated its dedication to the OST system through a funding allocation on the city's budget, its system experienced a complete decline in private funding sources. Meanwhile, in Chicago, the system continues to further its growth by combining innovative public and private fundraising, but lacks the long-term security of a public funding stream. While neither Baltimore nor Chicago exhibits an ideal funding model that amalgamates public and private financing, Philadelphia can learn lessons from them. The ideal would be to configure Philadelphia's funding model to have a guaranteed core of public funding, while simultaneously receiving private financial supplements.

### Public Funding

Some cities have parlayed the guarantee of public funding into tremendous growth for their OST system. Supported by city officials, Washington, DC's Trust secured a line-item within the city's budget. The DC Trust, which receives around 65% of its funding through public money, has boosted growth through an annual public grant, the Children and Youth Investment Fund. Likewise, the mayors of New York and Baltimore, who have identified OST programming as a cornerstone of their administrations, have secured public funding for OST programs through a line-item on the city's annual budget.

Yet, OST systems have not limited fulfilling their financial needs with only local line-item appropriations. In fact, several OST systems have partnered with the state government to secure funding. In Los Angeles, LA's BEST receives direct support from California's Beyond the Bell Grant, which provides funding contingent on LA's BEST achieving an attendance rate of over 95%.

Other cities have ensured a constant funding stream by integrating the OST system into an already well-funded portion of the public domain. In Los Angeles during the late-1980s, Mayor Tom Bradley created LA's BEST within the school district and directed public funding towards it. Today, LA's BEST receives steady public funding from the school district's budget

(although LA's BEST's fundraising from the state and private sources enables them to "pay the school district back"). Similarly, the Chicago Park District operates its program, PARK Kids, under an Illinois statute that permits it to levy taxes on property to fund its operations. While a line-item on a city's budget, integration into a school district or a creative tax revenue stream provide long-term financial security, the demand for programs outstrips public funding. Thus, additional fundraising is warranted.

### Private Funding

While steady public financing strengthens the foundation of a city's OST system, it alone does not provide the requisite financial support for the wide array of programs usually offered. Private funding traditionally arrives from two categories of financial sponsors: foundations and businesses. In similar cities to Philadelphia, such as Washington, Boston, and Chicago, the private foundations have played a major role within the city's system. National private foundations often target their funding to system components, like professional development, and specific initiatives, like Chicago's attempts to consolidate its OST system under one umbrella. While these grants help to execute systematic reform, they expire after a few years, often leaving a gaping funding hole in the system. Local foundations, on the other hand, tend to fund the OST programs themselves, as the Barr Foundation and the Boston Foundation do in Boston.

Effective ties with both corporate leaders and the general business community are also useful for funding a successful OST system. Both Chicago and Los Angeles feature creative fundraising schemes that involve the business community. Chicago's After School Matters, the city's flagship apprenticeship program directed at teenagers, collects around 14% of its yearly revenue from corporate fundraising. Every year, the organization holds a spectacular gala, inviting some of the city's most prominent financiers and philanthropists, and providing them with opportunities to network with other luminaries and the organization's leader, First Lady of Chicago, Maggie Daley. Similarly, in Los Angeles, LA's BEST's Corporate Office employs a Fund Development Unit which recruits and then requests funding from corporations and private donors.

At the aggregate contribution level, corporate donations to OST programs pale in comparison to governmental grants and in-kind contributions. However, the involvement of business leaders and the system extends farther than a fiduciary role. Instead, the business community has undertaken a significant leadership role. Chicago's After School Matters and Los Angeles' LA's BEST both feature Boards of Directors which contain prominent local business leaders. These leaders help to shape the curricula of the programs, participate as volunteers, offer corporate support through apprenticeships and internships, and advocate directly for the programs. In fact, some business leaders have united together to garner support for OST programming. Chicago Metropolis 2020, a collection of business leaders from the metropolitan area, has funded studies on the benefits of after-school programs and early childcare, and has used its financial prowess to lobby for additional funding at the local and state level. The business community also aids the development and survival of the OST system through political advocacy, programmatic assistance, and calls for measurable accountability within the programs.

In summary, a successful OST system depends on a strong public-private funding partnership. The guarantee of consistent funding through a city budget offers unparalleled financial stability. However, governmental funding often does not completely fulfill the funding

needs of the system. Consequently, systems should turn to private contributors, including foundations and businesses. Incorporating these contributions not only increases accessibility to funds, but also provides critical alternative forms of support through added exposure and advocacy. The combination of government funding and business support results in a system that fulfills its necessary funding requirements.

## **QUALITY CONTROL**

Another goal of OST systems is to promote and increase the quality of program. Most systems do so by providing professional development services for program staff and/or setting and monitoring standards of quality. Staff development can be either mandatory or voluntary, but it is important to have a formalized training program to ensure a level of quality is met. The OST system monitors quality by collecting data through internal evaluations, site visitations, and external evaluations. This section will discuss various ways different OST systems support quality and content of their programs to ensure they make an impactful difference.

### Data Collection

Many intermediaries have a management information system (MIS) where individual programs submit daily attendance and enrollment records. A central data collection system allows both programs and the intermediary to figure out participation rates at each program. One obstacle often encountered in using an MIS is how to ensure each program submits all the information weekly. In New York City and Washington, DC, programs cannot receive any more funding if they do not submit the requested information. In Los Angeles, the intermediary has an Internal Evaluations Department in which staff members in this department are responsible for a group of programs and making sure all the data are collected.

In addition to a MIS, some intermediaries have internal evaluations throughout the year. Boston has annual surveys for all after school programs funded by the intermediary, while Los Angeles has surveys twice a year for all its programs. Surveys cover four major themes: academic achievement, family enrichment, safety and social development. Intermediaries can use the information collected from attendance records and surveys to understand the participation in each school and to identify schools in need of help. In addition, they can use this knowledge for grant proposals and reports, which may give the OST system incremental funding. Most grants require participation rates and academic trends, but they are also interested in parental involvement and social development of students.

### Site Monitoring

Washington, DC and New York City use site visitations as a way to measure quality of different after school programs through first-hand observation. In both cases, part of the contract between the city's intermediary and the OST program is to maintain a certain level of quality and satisfy certain requirements. In Washington, DC, each OST program has a Program Officer visiting the site on a quarterly basis. They inspect safety and health, community involvement, and diversity of program activities. With this system of regular site visitations, the intermediary can assess and make sure that the programs are fulfilling their requirements beyond self-reports. In addition, feedback from site visitations can help programs find ways for improvement.

## Professional Development

Staff development is another important step to promoting quality within the programs. Los Angeles has the most refined staff development program. It has a division within the central office that focuses solely on staff development. All new staff members are required to attend “orientation training.” These sessions focus on fruitful ways to engage students, youth development, and outline expectations of staff members and the resources that the LA’s BEST intermediary has to offer. A city might not be capable of providing training to *all* staff members; however, there are advantages to requiring training for the director of each program. DC takes an intermediate approach requiring that the executive director and at least one staff member in all programs that it funds receive training. LA’s BEST’s Staff Development Department also offers optional training modules every month. These training modules are offered in the topics requested by staff members. The combination of mandatory “orientation training” and optional training modules allow LA’s BEST to guide everyone on a basic level, but also offer lessons that staff members value, creating a sense of motivation for learning and improving their school programs.

## Independent Evaluations

In addition to internal evaluations, the intermediary can form partnerships with another organization or university for external evaluations that provide objective research and analysis of the system. In both Chicago and Los Angeles, the OST systems partner with local universities. In Chicago, Chapin Hall (of the University of Chicago) studied the OST programs’ effects on academic achievement. Chicago also uses the findings from research done at the University of Illinois, Chicago, to learn how it can effectively reach its target cohorts. Los Angeles has had a partnership with the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) since 1990, in which LA’s BEST funds the annual research. This longstanding partnership has produced short-term and long-term findings at LA’s BEST. Every year, LA’s BEST’s Chief Executive Officer and the head researcher at UCLA discuss a general area of research. Because it may increase awareness about the successes of the city’s OST system, external evaluation is invaluable for fundraising.

## **CONCLUSION**

This paper has examined six major OST systems and identified four best practices. First, we recommend that systems structure themselves as public-private partnerships either run privately with public oversight or run publicly with private oversight. Second, the intermediary should promote collaboration both externally and internally through a diverse governing board or boards and frequent meetings of partners. Third, the intermediary should pursue a stable public funding stream supplemented by private contributions. Finally, the intermediary should promote quality through mandatory data collection, site monitoring, and periodic external evaluations. In other areas of OST systems, such as whether to promote a model, clear best practices have not yet emerged.

## **Appendix A**

### **Out-of-School Time Systems in Brief**

**Baltimore**  
**Boston**  
**Chicago**  
**Los Angeles**  
**New York City**  
**Washington, D.C.**

## **Baltimore After School in Brief**

Helen Pajcic

The unique feature of the Baltimore After-School Strategy (ASS) is that there are three organizations that share the role of the intermediary, and that the system grew from their efforts instead of a governmental initiative. Each of these components—Safe and Sound (SS), The After School Institute (TASI), and the Family League of Baltimore City (FLBC)—plays distinct roles in the system. The three components collaborate and communicate to enact a multi-pronged offensive in Baltimore.

SS is the moving force behind creating the four main program models that receive funding. There are 21 Youth Places based in community centers, such as churches, public housing developments and child-care centers. There are 18 A-Teams that are athletic and arts oriented programs with an emphasis on exhibiting progress in a skill. Most elementary and middle school students are served by the BOOST programs based in schools which are run by CBOs in partnership with the principals of 57 schools. BOOST-High (BYAP) is a newer variation of BOOST at 11 high schools.<sup>1</sup> Youth Places and BOOST programs are five days a week for three hours. These programs are required to offer four features: academic, enrichment, nutrition and fitness, and family and community involvement. A-Team and BYAP are more flexible, less comprehensive programs. All programs except A-Teams are required to provide 20% matching funds. CBOs may apply for support through any of these frameworks.<sup>2</sup>

SS also fundraises, advocates, and influences policy. The fundraising focuses on lobbying the government. Since SS's local effort has proven highly successful, SS is now attempting to secure state funding.

FLBC was already in existence when SS began formulating Baltimore's ASS, but it reformulated its mission and its name to become an integral part of the OST system. FLBC is a quasi-public arm of the Baltimore City government. As funding for the OST system has evolved to rely on city funds, FLBC's role has grown. It now controls the program monitoring and funding allocation process.<sup>3</sup> FLBC conducts annual visits to the programs sites that are funded. It also has its own data collection program in its effort to standardize the system and enforce accountability. It coordinates the review and approval of RFPs, although the other components of the intermediary and the City and BCPSS continue to collaborate to determine the distribution of funds.

TASI relates most directly with the programs. It was formed specifically as a support organization for the CBOs involved in the Baltimore A-SS. It provides technical assistance and works with the community to professionalize the after-school programs. Training, site monitoring, data collection, collaboration and communication, and grant writing assistance are the dominant efforts of TASI. Monthly training sessions are held to increase the workforce and further develop staff. Its site monitoring is less formal than that conducted by FLBC and provides an alternative perspective since the CBOs do not link TASI directly with funding. TASI collects data on attendance and enrollment and conducts surveys of youth and staff.

Perhaps most importantly, TASI facilitates collaboration by holding open monthly meetings. Staff members from programs from around Baltimore attend the meetings to network,

---

<sup>1</sup> "After School in Baltimore," Power Point Presentation

<sup>2</sup> OST operative, interview

<sup>3</sup> OST operative, interview

reflect, and plan. In the same vein, TASI mediates the relationship between BOOST programs and the public schools. Meetings with the principal are held three times yearly and a memorandum is drafted to ensure satisfaction of both parties. The director of TASI seems particularly proud of its positive relationship and good communication with BCPSS.

Since the end of the Robert Wood Johnson grant in 2005, public money is the dominant source of funding for Baltimore's OST system. Most notably, SS obtained a line-item to support Baltimore OST program in the city budget. Private foundations, however, provide resources and aid to some programs directly, as well as to some of the intermediary components.

## **Boston After School In Brief**

Camille Bridges

Unlike the OST system in many cities, where one or two intermediaries provide all the services for OST programs, the OST system in Boston now consists of several intermediaries that vary in size, mission, and capacity. Each Boston intermediary specializes in one or more services typical of intermediaries, such as technical assistance, research, or advocacy for OST programs. The three main organizations that provide the bulk of services for afterschools are *BOSTnet*, Boston After School and Beyond, and Massachusetts 2020.

- *BOSTnet* provides technical assistance to individual programs and sponsors networking and training meetings for program staff to encourage program directors to learn from one another and field experts.
- Boston After School and Beyond is primarily a knowledge development organization. Using money from private foundations it operations pilot programs to test new initiatives in out-of-school time programming. One of the Boston and Beyond initiatives, Partners for Student Success, is a school-based afterschool program in which the after school curriculum is being aligned with that of the school. Boston and Beyond monitors the progress of its initiatives and uses the information to keep track of best practices for afterschool programs.
- Massachusetts 2020 is a state-level organization that advocates and helps after school and out-of-school time programs. It also runs pilot programs, such as its current pilot, the Expanded Learning Time initiative, in which the school day is extended to make room for OST activities. Mass 2020 offers technical assistance to schools that join the ELT program, helping them to develop appropriate content for the afterschool curriculum and to retain their professional staff.

Several other organizations are also involved in Boston's system, including The Medical Foundation/BEST which provides OST training; and Achieve Boston, a collaboration that is designing a youth development certification.

**How Are OST Programs and Afterschool Intermediaries Funded?** Individual afterschool programs each have to struggle to find continuous funding. Boston Beyond and *BOSTnet* do not fund non-pilot afterschool programs, thus requiring existing programs to apply directly to the city, state, or private foundations for support. According to a key leader in the afterschool field, funding commitment to OST “dried up” at the mayoral level once the 2:00-6:00 Initiative moved out of the mayor's office. The intermediary organizations receive their funding from private foundations.

**How Is Training and Technical Assistance Provided?** *BOSTnet* and Mass 2020 offer a reasonable amount of technical assistance, the afterschool programs in Boston seem relatively content with the help they receive. The BEST program provides training opportunities to program staff for a cost.

**How Do Boston Intermediaries Monitor OST Programs and Do Research?** Boston Beyond commissions and conducts research on its pilots and disseminates learnings. It has also commissioned the design of a web-based monitoring system for its pilots since no city-wide system existed. Once field tested, it is hoped this data system could be used city wide. Mass 2020 has also commissioned external evaluations.

**How is Public Advocacy Done?** All the intermediary organizations advocate at multiple levels. Boston Beyond primarily targets the city and state for advocacy, BOST*net* focuses on Boston public awareness as well as some state advocacy, while Mass 2020 targets primarily the state.

In an intermediary system as complex as the one in Boston, collaboration is essential to creating a coherent OST system that functions smoothly and distributes resources where they are most needed. Although Boston intermediaries have made some progress with establishing an out-of-school time system, the stakeholders in the out-of-school time system still face the challenge of interweaving their work. Each intermediary and out-of-school time organization was founded with a different purpose, however, which complicates their potential to cooperate. There is no mechanism that compels the organizations to recognize one of them as the oversight entity, responsible for coordinating all OST efforts. Boston Beyond has the potential to serve this role but without either monetary or strong political persuasion, it is unlikely to occur.

# Chicago After-School in Brief

Devjoy Sengupta

As in many cities across the United States, Chicago has attempted to construct a diverse after-school system. Students have increasingly demanded access to programs, but have often encountered long waiting lists or a general absence of options. While Chicago must remedy its challenges to ensure future sustainability, it has achieved successes through innovative program design and partnerships that other American cities should strive to replicate.

Overview of Chicago's System: Chicago's system, which has evolved with the support of Mayor Richard M. Daley, has four main components: After School Matters, which serves teenagers from ninth to twelfth grade; Chicago Public Schools and the Chicago Park District, which serve students until the completion of eighth grade; and the Department of Children and Youth Services, which represents an attempt to consolidate the city's sprawling after-school system.

*After School Matters:* Developed in 2001 by Chicago First Lady Maggie Daley and targeted to teenagers between the ages of 13 and 18, ASM is an independent organization with significant ties to the Mayor's Office and other city departments. ASM offers apprenticeships in the arts, sports, technology, and communications for teenage students. In order to participate in an ASM apprenticeship, a teenager must attend a full day of school; ASM then rewards consistent attendance with a \$45 weekly stipend.

*Chicago Public Schools:* In addition to its academic reinforcement programs, Chicago Public Schools organizes the Community Schools Initiative (CSI), a public-private partnership aimed at students between kindergarten and 8<sup>th</sup> grade. CSI represents a partnership between Chicago Public Schools, the Chicago Community Trust, and community-based organizations. CSI features an Advisory Committee which works with teachers and parents to develop a school-specific curriculum. CSI has resonated with the community: in the ten years since its inception, the program has grown from 3 participating schools to 110.

*Chicago Park District:* The Chicago Park District organizes PARK Kids, which serves a large portion of city youth from 1<sup>st</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> grade. PARK Kids stands unique in that the Park District supports low-income families with transportation to the program. The Park District also remains distinctive for its unique funding model which reduces financial challenges.

*Department of Children and Youth Services:* Founded in 2004, DCYS represents Mayor Daley's attempt to consolidate Chicago's sprawling system. DCYS funds community partners, recommends best practice guidelines, and builds relationships with the players in Chicago's system. While consolidation remains incomplete, DCYS has attempted to remedy problems of access and awareness through its six Regional Consortium Centers (RCCs), which advise families on programs and facilitate communication between the local community and City Hall.

Funding and Financing: As Chicago's system does not have a dedicated funding stream, its major players have adapted. ASM's funding stream depends on the leadership of Maggie Daley, who brings government funds and in-kind donations from city partners. ASM has also developed strong relationships with the business community, providing both networking opportunities

through its annual gala and influential positions of leadership. CSI relies on a combination of public and private funding; the school district carries the largest share of the financial burden, but funding responsibility also falls on the shoulders of the community partners. As a result, this financial requirement deters many potential participants. The Park District, unlike ASM and CSI, has a dedicated funding stream, capitalizing on its legal right to levy taxes on property to raise revenue. DCYS operates as a funder intermediary, picking community partners it will support, but does not have enough funding to meet program demand. Given the complete absence of a dedicated funding stream, Chicago business leaders have publicly lobbied both the state and federal government for guaranteed financing.

Professional Development: Wide inconsistencies exist in the professional development standards between each Chicago program. ASM trains its core of professional instructors on effective interaction with teenagers, and subsequently monitors their performance. Within the CSI, the lead partner agency selects a Resource Coordinator, who hires both teachers and volunteers and sets basic training requirements. The Chicago Park District, on the other hand, relies on a completely untrained, volunteer staff for its PARK Kids program. Mayor Daley and DCYS have, therefore, identified professional development as a critical, unresolved issue. As a result, DCYS has defined a series of expectations for program staff and might create a single training program.

Accessibility and Awareness: In many parts of the city, the current demand exceeds the supply of programs. Meanwhile, teenagers remain underserved by the system's current apparatus. City programs have devised various ways to improve awareness about the city's programs and reach target cohorts. Both ASM and CSI have developed recruitment strategies that seek out loners, as well as students with inherent academic challenges. In moving closer to its intended umbrella role, DCYS uses its RCCs to match students with local after-school programs. DCYS also has moved to solve the deficit in teenager programs through the expansion of KidStart YouthNet, a group of programs that strengthens teenager participation by providing leadership opportunities.

Data Collection and Evaluation: The majority of Chicago's programs lack data collection systems and cannot provide daily participation data. Yet, some exceptions do exist. ASM effectively collects data on program attendance, as well as each participant's school attendance, test scores, and graduation rates. CSI, and other CPS programs, use the online "After School Attendance Reporting" system, which links program attendance with school attendance, ITBS scores, immunizations, and other records. Through this data, researchers have concluded that high levels of participation in ASM can lead to higher school attendance and higher graduation rates, and have also found that CSI currently reaches members of its target cohorts. Effective data collection displays accountability and aids in fundraising efforts.

Conclusion: Chicago faces unresolved challenges. It currently has an inefficient professional development system and a variable funding stream, and suffers from a system rendered inaccessible with long waiting lists and limited programs for teenagers. Nonetheless, Chicago has critical strengths worth replicating in other American cities. Chicago continues to pursue creative solutions to develop their system, relying on heavy involvement with the community and providing local links to City Hall through RCCs. The system also relies on bold leadership from the Mayor's Office and the extensive ties to the local business community. This combination of factors provides critical lessons for similar cities, like Philadelphia.

## Los Angeles After School In Brief

Rachel Rizal

LA's BEST (Better Educated Students for Tomorrow) After School Enrichment Program has served as a model after school system for cities nationwide, including Sacramento START and San Diego Community School Innovation Incorporated. LA's BEST was started by former Los Angeles Mayor Tom Bradley and the Mayor's Education Council in 1988. It is currently headed by Chief Executive Office and President Carla Sanger, and it has 180 after school programs around the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). It has strong ties with both the Mayor's Office and LAUSD, which promote better communication, support and visibility for LA's BEST. Since its inception, LA's BEST has strengthened different components of its after school system including its governance structure, staff development, fundraising, evaluations, public awareness, and partnerships.

LA's BEST has two main offices: the Corporate Office and the Operations Office. The Corporate Office is in charge of external affairs such as creating private partnerships, finding sources of funding, and promoting public awareness about LA's BEST. The Operations Office deals with day-to-day tasks with each program at each school. Staff members see this structure as beneficial because it allows each Office to focus on different aspects of LA's BEST.

LA's BEST has three Governing Boards. The Board of Directors raises funds through corporate and private donors and approves the annual budget. The Advisory Board focuses on gathering community perspectives, promoting a positive image of LA's BEST to the public, and maintaining quality assurance throughout the system. LA's BEST Friends is a newly established Board that was created in order to get young professionals and urban leaders more involved with the system. They volunteer at school sites and fundraise for LA's BEST.

Schools that host LA's BEST are chosen based on the percentage of students on free or reduced lunches, high-crime rates in their neighborhoods, and low academic achievement. In addition, school principals have to support LA's BEST and are asked to submit petitions to host LA's BEST at their schools.

Each LA's BEST school site has a Site Coordinator who oversees activities, staff, and attendance. At each program, there is a 1:20 staff to student ratio. Many of the school site staff members are recruited from the surrounding communities, which create is beneficial because there is a shared understanding about the community. In order to provide support, communication and consistency throughout the 180 schools, five schools are geographically grouped into a cluster. Each cluster has its own support staff members who help convey information, create learning opportunities at each school and ensure compliance with regulations.

LA's BEST is a public and private partnership so that it does not have to rely on a singular source for funding. The Fund Development Unit within the Corporate Office researches potential private donors and requests funding from corporations, foundations and private donors. However, most funding is obtained through state and federal grants. Through different methods of financing, LA's BEST is insured money every year, which allows it to continue operating quality programs and even aim for expansion.

LA's BEST has mandatory and optional professional development programs. Once hired, program staff members are required to attend an Orientation Training. In addition, staff members can request for additional training offered by the Department of Staff Development in the Operations Office. This allows the central office to offer training modules that staff members *value*, creating a sense of motivation for learning and improving their school programs, rather

than burdening them with multiple mandatory sessions. Additionally, there are monthly meetings with all Site Coordinators that relay information and provide additional support.

LA's BEST uses the data to learn about the student population at each school. At each school, attendance data are collected weekly. In addition, there are annual student surveys that cover four major themes: academic achievement, family enrichment, safety, and social development. The main purpose of collecting data throughout the 180 schools is to use the information for grant proposals and reports.

LA's BEST funds research studies using an objective, external evaluator from the University of California, Los Angeles. UCLA is able to provide short-term and long-term evaluations of LA's BEST. Findings from external evaluations are conveyed through websites, publications of studies, staff and Board members, and reports to after school organizations. They help promote the success of LA's BEST to other people and organizations.

Numerous partnerships with community-based organizations, corporations, non-profits and city departments strengthen LA's BEST. Partnerships make programs throughout LA's BEST cost-effective and present learning activities through differing media. Corporations contribute financial, intellectual and social capital to help create and enrich activities throughout the system. Partnerships also help LA's BEST in various ways beyond program development. For instance, partnerships and connections with local high school and college counselors promote volunteer opportunities. Strategy and management consulting corporations have also donated pro-bono services to help improve LA's BEST governance structure and public outreach strategies.

LA's BEST promotes its image and name in a variety of ways. The Corporate and Operations Offices create numerous city-wide events throughout the year where students and their families can participate and exhibit their talents. These events also allow stakeholders and policy makers to show their support publicly. Staff members serve in both local and national organizations, which serve as a dual purpose of keeping LA's BEST up-to-date and promoting the organization.

While LA's BEST cannot be exactly replicated, after school systems can integrate different strengths from LA's BEST into their own systems. The ongoing communication and support with all staff members creates consistency in the quality of the programs, allowing uniform results in different schools. Partnerships are also integral to LA's BEST's success because they provide public awareness, a source of funding, and assistance with program development. This support ultimately ensures that the organization will have long-time presence and impact in the community and out-of-school time policies.

# **New York City's After School System**

## **Chelsea Craigie**

In New York City, the new century has brought with it a new resolve to provide quality education for all. As part of his Children First campaign, in 2003 Mayor Bloomberg looked beyond the school day to create the Out-of-School Time (OST) Programs for Youth under the Department of Youth and Community Development. OST seeks to provide programs that support, “academic, civic, creative, social, physical and emotional development of young people and serve the needs of the City’s families and their communities” in its vision and has nine specific goals to fulfill this vision. This step centralized the many different independent sites and some large intermediaries running in the city into one system with consistent and increasing municipal funding. Today, there continue to be independent programs and other entities that contribute to the after school opportunities for children in New York City, but the most significant and influential initiative in the city is at its center, OST.

The OST Initiative has strict requirements and contract stipulations for its programs. The initiative has nine goals; each is linked to a set of program requirements, sample activities, and quality indicators so that providers offer programs that achieve OST’s goals. The initiative funds contracts for three types of direct service providers, a contract for technical assistance, and finally a contract for an external evaluator. In a city with incredible demographic challenges, the mayor and the city have set a priority on education and after school programs, and the results provide a model for other cities.

Despite the fact that the capacity still needs to expand, there are six key features of the New York City system that deserve attention from other cities: the collaborative creation process, the transparent system for distributing all funding, the online data collection system, the centralized system with accountability and leadership from the mayor, the outsourcing of technical assistance and auditing, and the steps toward coordination with the state. These six characteristics, described below, create the NYC after school system and can be used as examples for cities elsewhere.

### **1. The Collaborative Creation Process**

In order to build a system with transparency, accountability, and understanding, New York City built its system in a collaborative and inclusive way by bringing everyone involved in after school programs to the table to create the plan for the new OST system. Practitioners and policy makers worked together to create a system that they believed adapted the best elements of each of the different models and they wrote it down in a concept paper. This concept paper outlined the plan for the new city-wide system that Mayor Bloomberg constructed.

### **2. Transparent System for Distributing all City Funding**

From this original concept paper, OST created the first Requests for Proposals (RFPs), documents that provide detailed explanations of the entire OST system and the ways through which providers can become OST programs. This process was the same for every community based organization (CBO). From the requested proposals, OST selected partners and administered individual contracts with each provider. This funding system created transparency for the entire system. Clear expectations were outlined through a collective process in which everyone could participate, understand the rules, and then apply for a contract.

### **3. Online Data Collection System**

Part of each program's individual contract with OST is mandatory online data recording of attendance and participation rates. This data is used by OST to indicate whether each program is meeting its individual contract requirements for funding and it also allows the city to track who is being served. The implementation of this program is one of the largest critiques of OST because of early glitches in technology, but the fundamental ideas of data recording for *accountability* and *improvement* in an online database are important factors.

### **4. Centralized System with Accountability and Leadership from the Mayor**

By creating OST, NYC put the responsibility for after school programs and their funding all in one place, the Department of Youth and Community Development (DYCD). DYCD is a part of the mayor's office and its staff has direct accountability to the mayor, and therefore to the voting public. Since its inception, OST has been supported by the mayor, giving it credibility within the entire system and the city and providing secure funding. While these developments may have happened without the leadership of Mayor Bloomberg, his leadership pushed the progress and helped gain public well. In October, 2007, the OST budget was expanded and put into NYC's five year plan, securing its immediate future. In addition, using the data collected online and the external audit, the system itself is set up with many layers of accountability.

### **5. Outsourcing Technical Assistance and Audits with Accountability**

By including Option IV for OST Technical Assistance (TA) and Option V for External Auditing in the Request for Proposals, OST achieved two accomplishments. First it identified the capacity to provide these two services in organizations outside of OST. By contracting with the Partnership for After School Education (PASE) and Policy Studies Associates (PSA), OST enlisted high quality organizations to fulfill needs it recognized as important but could not perform itself. In addition, by creating contracts with PASE and PSA, OST can hold both of these organizations accountable for performing the tasks outlined in the contracts.

### **6. Coordination with New York State After School Efforts**

Although OST worked towards streamlining after school within its system, many programs also receive state funding through the Advantage After School Program and 21<sup>st</sup> Century grants, creating some replication and overlap between systems. Instead of fighting against this, the city is working to streamline its data collection and assessments with state requirements and coordinate the professional development in the city. This is done primarily through the New York State Education Department (who administers the state funding) self-assessment tool that creates a framework and language for understanding all after school programs and cuts down on duplication.

## Washington, D.C. After School In Brief

Robert Barnett

In 1999, a partnership of key stakeholders involved in children's issues in Washington, D.C. came together to form the DC Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation. The Trust, as it is commonly known, was a quasi-governmental organization designed to build an OST system from the ground up, by establishing networks of collaboration between key partners (both public and private), raising money from private donors and distributing city funds to OST programs throughout the city, and monitoring grantee programs to ensure high-quality programming. Consistent with its "youth development" philosophy, which seeks to treat young people as assets that need developing rather than problems that need solving, the Trust's goal was to provide free, high-quality OST programs to all children and youth in Washington, D.C., particularly those in the city's neediest areas.

In the past 8 years, the Trust has built a system with all the necessary components:

- **Partnerships and Collaboration** – The Trust was formed by the joint initiative of DC Public Schools, the Mayor, other city agencies, and a number of private stakeholders (i.e. universities). These partners serve on an advisory council for the Trust, and meet regularly to discuss the direction of the Trust's work.
- **Governance** – The Trust's Board of Directors, which oversees the Trust and works closely with its Executive Director, is made of both Mayoral and City Council appointees. The Trust's Director has also established a "kitchen cabinet" of non-governmental organizations involved in youth work and advocacy.
- **Funding** – The Trust's \$30 million budget comes in part directly from the city, in part through related city agencies, and in part from a variety of private donors.
- **Granting Process** – The Trust funds CBO providers through a competitive granting process that includes an RFP and evaluation of programs by Trust staff.
- **Public Will** – The Trust requires grantees to attend bimonthly meetings, at which it discusses its long-term plans. Grantees are used to build support on the ground for these plans.
- **Data Collection** – Grantees are required to collect and report attendance and participation, as well as financial, data, which they report quarterly using a centralized, web-based database.
- **Monitoring** – The Trust requires its grantees to submit quarterly self-evaluations, and sends program officers on evaluative site visits to providers at least four times per year.
- **Technical Assistance** – While the Trust is still developing its formal technical assistance capabilities, it holds various conferences and monthly "affinity group" meetings for CBOs to come and discuss (with the Trust/each other) methods of improving their program outcomes.
- **Professional Development** – Training through the DC BEST program is required for staff of Trust grantees, and is also offered to hundreds of workers in other youth-related city agencies.
- **Research** – The Trust has commissioned a few studies of its programs over the years, but has yet to develop a plan for comprehensive research (either internally or externally). The Trust also has plans to develop its system through the Project My Time initiative, which will consolidate communities' OST programs within local schools, forge closer partnerships between CBOs, schools, and community leaders, and integrate OST data with students' school and demographic data. The Trust also has plans to expand its professional development and research capacities.

Since its creation, the Trust has been successful in building a cohesive OST system from the ground up, and now reaches a wide variety of youth populations all across the city. The Trust's granting process, evaluation methods, and professional development programs are particularly strong, and should be used as examples for other cities looking to strengthen their OST systems. At the same time, the Trust's efforts are impeded by unsustainable funding and an at-times unstable relationship with the City Government and the Public Schools. Looking forward, the Trust must work to address these issues if it is to fulfill its mission of providing free, high-quality programs to every child and youth in D.C.

## **Appendix B: Full Papers**

**Baltimore**

**Boston**

**Chicago**

**Los Angeles**

**New York City**

**Washington, D.C.**

