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DCAYA is a citywide coalition of youth-engaged organizations, youth and concerned residents formed to ensure that all children and youth in the District of Columbia have access to high-quality and affordable developmental opportunities.

MISSION

DCAYA works to ensure that policies, programs and practices within the District of Columbia promote and propel youth into a productive and healthy adulthood. We accomplish this mission by crafting policy recommendations, providing structured advocacy opportunities for our members and allies, networking and empowering youth.

VISION

We envision a community where no young person is considered to be “at-risk”, where all youth are respected and treated as valued members of society, and where our city’s leaders actively represent the interests of young people.

COALITION

DCAYA was founded in 2004 and since then has grown into a vibrant and diverse membership organization. We currently boast over 130 members, who all share our vision for a city committed to all of its citizens. DCAYA believes being truly dedicated to children and youth means collaborating with a range of individuals, organizations and groups. Most of our membership is comprised of non-profits that provide direct services such as out-of-school time programming, health/nutritional support, housing and shelter, workforce development opportunities or education.

NOTE: This report was initially released in April 2016. It has since been updated following a vote that month by the DC Trust’s Board of Directors to dissolve the organization. This version also uses updated data to better reflect trends in out-of-school time access within DCPS. To obtain an archived copy of the earlier version of the report, please contact DCAYA.

For More Information Please Contact
Joseph Gavrilovich, Senior Policy Analyst
joseph@dc-aya.org or 202-587-0616
Follow us on Twitter @DCAYA

Notes on scope and language: While this brief generally refers to out-of-school time learning that takes place after school and during the summer, most of the discussion surrounds afterschool programs in DCPS due to the availability of data. Many community-based programs throughout DC offer afterschool and summer learning opportunities to high school youth and students in our public charter schools, and DCAYA absolutely promotes quality opportunities such as these being made available. In the next year, we would like to work more closely with education policy makers and DC public charter school LEA’s to more closely look at out-of-school time programming and access in the charter sector. This brief primarily uses “children,” “youth,” or “kids” (for the most part interchangeably) in reference to kids in pre-K through 8th grade in DCPS. Finally, the terms “we,” “our,” or “us” refers broadly to DCAYA and its members, government leaders, education policy makers, and other community stakeholders.
We believe the District of Columbia could be a leader among states and cities in ensuring quality community and neighborhood-based afterschool and summer learning opportunities are within reach for all our kids, regardless of what school they attend or what ward they live in.

Expanded Learning provides out-of-school time enrichment through creative community partnerships.

Quality standards for out-of-school time systems:
1. Modeled on Youth Development
2. Data-Driven Approach
3. Defined Duration of Services
4. Youth and Family-Friendly Policies
5. Sound Finances and Organizational Structures
6. Effective Coordination

Outcomes associated with expanded learning:
- **Academic Performance**: kids increase test scores and get better grades
- **Attendance & Participation**: kids stay in school and bring essential skills to the classroom
- **Social & Emotional Development**: kids experience positive growth and success in life
- **Fitness & Wellness**: kids learn physical, mental and behavioral habits to lead a healthy life

DCPS schools with the highest “at-risk” student enrollment also tend to have the lowest share of available afterschool enrollment slots through OSTP. While all young people benefit from these opportunities, kids who are considered “at-risk” stand to gain the most from participating in afterschool. The present trend in funding to schools gives reason to be optimistic, but overall need in the District persists.

Local funding for community-based out-of-school time programs has declined by 60% since 2010. This has resulted in only a quarter of the locally-funded slots for community-based afterschool and summer learning that were there for kids just six years ago, from close to 10,000 in 2010 to under 2,500 in 2016.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

If we are serious about providing safe, youth-friendly opportunities focused on improving outcomes and quality of life for all our children now and in future, we must reverse these trends. To do so on the scale that is needed, policy makers, funders, intermediaries and educational leaders must embrace an approach that fully integrates expanded learning into our public education continuum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Funding &amp; Vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How much and how well are kids connected to expanded learning opportunities throughout DCPS?</strong></td>
<td><strong>How can we to envision a path forward for the District where community-based partnerships are valued and abundantly available where most needed?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1) DCPS should **expand access to afterschool in Title I elementary and middle schools** which have a high number of “at-risk” students and relatively low or no OSTP enrollment. | 1) Government leaders must **partner directly with community-based organizations to promote a broad vision and actively integrate a path forward for afterschool and summer learning in the District.**
| 2) DCPS policy and practice should **be responsive to family concerns** in the out-of-school time hours. | 2) Government agencies and CBOs must **join in collective, data-driven efforts with expanded learning providers and other agency partners** toward continuous improvement and shared outcomes for success.
| 3) DCPS should **better coordinate extended learning with expanded learning.** | 3) All stakeholders should **establish and use a common checklist of quality standards** for OST programs and the system as a whole.
| 4) DCPS and DGS should **coordinate to increase access to recreational OST programming** through shared use agreements for CBOs. | 4) The DC Council and the Mayor should **work toward scaled-up funding for community-based expanded learning** in FY2018 and beyond. |
I. INTRODUCTION

In June 2015, the National Research Council (NRC) released An Evaluation of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia, reporting that the District’s achievement gap remains stark. Our low-income minority students are far less likely among their peers to perform at grade level and to graduate from high school in four years. One in four kids in DC (or some 29,000 children and youth) is growing up in a family that is surviving on an annual income below the federal poverty level, and only about 66% of DC’s low-income youth graduated from high school in 2015.1 In an intellectual economy like DC, these young peoples’ future prospects are limited at best. The NRC recommended that a primary objective of our public schools should be “to address the serious and persistent disparities in learning opportunities and academic progress across student groups and wards by attending to [among other things] the fair distribution of educational resources across schools and wards.”

A growing body of research demonstrates that it takes more than classroom resources to create engaged and educated students.2 If our public education goal in DC is to fully address equitable learning opportunities across schools and wards, then it stands to reason that a key component to achieving that vision has to be greater access for all children and youth to quality expanded learning opportunities.

Expanded learning is a model of education that occurs outside of the traditional school day (mainly after school and during the summer) to provide kids from pre-Kindergarten through high school with academic enrichment and development opportunities. Importantly, it uses partnerships with community-based organizations (CBOs) to go beyond “more of the same” classroom instruction and embrace kids’ natural inclinations for fun and time to play, often giving experiential learners spaces to thrive. Programs include personalized arts and cultural learning, health education and physical activity, life skills and social development, and “hands on” science and technology.3

The range of academic outcomes that result from quality expanded learning opportunities cannot be discounted – extensive research has already made the case that these programs help with student performance, school attendance and classroom participation. Holistic outcomes go beyond the school building, with quality expanded learning programs showing positive impacts on kids’ social and emotional development and overall health. Research holds that these outcomes hold true for any quality program with a youth development focus, and that the greatest gains from all these outcomes are shown to be for youth who are considered “at-risk” of academic failure due to poverty. In DC, that means more than 40,000 students in the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) and our public charter schools in the coming school year.4

Outcomes of Expanded Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Performance</th>
<th>Expanded learning helps kids increase test scores and get better grades.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance &amp; Participation</td>
<td>Expanded learning helps kids stay in school and bring essential skills to the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Emotional Development</td>
<td>Expanded learning uniquely contributes to kids’ positive growth and success in life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness &amp; Wellness</td>
<td>Expanded learning helps instill physical, mental and behavioral habits for kids to lead a healthy life.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more detail on these outcomes and supporting research, please see appendices, “Outcomes from the Growing Body of Research on Expanded Learning”

Expanded Learning in DC

With better outcomes for kids in mind, the District of Columbia joined with the Wallace Foundation and four other cities in 2003 on a ground-breaking venture focused on building a city-wide afterschool system. Each city introduced a centralized coordination structure that wove together their existing patchwork of programs to elevate quality overall through training and credentialing, and to increase access to afterschool opportunities. In DC, this coordination structure rested at the time and up until recently with a nonprofit intermediary that had been established in 1999 with the express purpose of building a quality out-of-school time (OST) system – the Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation, more commonly known as the DC Trust.

Until its recent dissolution, the DC Trust had received an annual allocation from DC government to provide grant funding to more than 60 community-based nonprofit organizations in the District which provide OST
programming directly in schools or in neighborhood-based sites. In this way, CBOs in DC operate as afterschool program partners with many DCPS and public charter schools, providing specialized enrichment programming such as team sports, artistic projects and service learning. While most if not all providers rely on multiple funding streams for their programming (including from donors, private foundations, federal 21st Century Community Learning Centers funding, and other District agencies), the District government’s allocation to the DC Trust made up a significant annual portion of the overall funding that sustained viable OST programming in the District. This funding stream has historically helped CBOs nimbly partner with multiple schools to reach more kids each year, and thus, it has directly reflected the value we as a District place on our kids’ learning in the hours after school and in the summer.

The Budget Support Act passed in May 2016 included $4.9 million for OST funding in FY2017. At present, with the DC Trust set to dissolve at the end of this fiscal year, this funding will be diverted to a short-term, external to government funding vehicle to administer OST grantmaking from October 2016 through September 2017. This report discusses possibilities for a path forward beyond that timeframe.

**The Current Opportunity Gap**

As we consider new opportunities in the local funding landscape, we must bear in mind the sobering reality that the District continues to surpass any state in its overall shortage of afterschool opportunities for our elementary and middle school students. The Afterschool Alliance’s *America After 3PM* survey report estimates that more than 70% of our kids in grades K through 8 would participate in an afterschool program if one were available to them, and the same report suggests that 21% of DC kids in grades 6 through 8 were regularly alone and unsupervised from 3 to 6pm during the school week in 2014.

These evident shortages in access, which this report explores in more detail for students in DCPS, are compounded by differences in family incomes in the District. We know that all parents want for what’s best for their children, but research has shown us that on their own, low-income families are discernibly prevented by economic hardship from providing out-of-school time enrichment learning opportunities to their kids. While we can wish for it, such exposure to enrichment learning – and the social/emotional development and healthy life habits that result from it – is simply not going to happen for many of our District’s kids without quality, publicly-funded community interventions.

Nationally, the income gap between our richest families and poorest families has continued to widen since the 1970’s, a trend which is noticeably reflected here in the District. While median annual family income has increased since 2000 in six of DC’s eight wards, but in Wards 7 and 8, it has actually decreased, to the present rate of roughly $31,000 in Ward 7 and $26,000 in Ward 8. This is especially relevant given the great number of District kids affected: fully 37% of DC’s kids live east of the Anacostia River in just these two of our eight wards, with more than one in five kids in the District living in Ward 8. With family income differences in DC continuing to increase, the children in our lowest income families are missing out on opportunities for expanded learning which are abundantly available to middle class and higher-income families.

In recent years, the decline in local funding to CBOs through the DC Trust for expanded learning combined with policy and funding shifts within DCPS has caused this opportunity gap to widen further. Without quality community-based options available to all lower-income families, we face a serious opportunity gap as a District, one which accessible, quality expanded learning opportunities that are consistently funded can serve to close.
II. CLOSING THE GAP

This brief explores current dynamics in the District to arrive at eight broad recommendations exploring what it will take for more expanded learning opportunities to reach the many thousands of children and youth in the District who stand to benefit from them. These recommendations fall into two broad categories:

• **Access:** How much and how well are kids connected to expanded learning opportunities throughout DCPS?

• **Funding & Vision:** How can we envision a path forward for the District where community-based partnerships are valued and abundantly available where most needed?

The two sections which follow the table on the next page explore these questions in greater depth, employing data, known outcomes and community feedback to provide a primer for both access and funding.

**The First Step: Defining “Quality”**

The Wallace Foundation reports that the afterschool field in any given jurisdiction has historically been “decentralized and disorganized, with different programs – and the government agencies and private groups that fund them – operating in isolation from one another.” Such a situation leads families and children to an overall shortage of access not just to programs generally, but to programs considered to be “high quality”.10

This is as true of DC as any other jurisdiction.

So in addition to focusing on the access, funding and vision tasks at hand, we must also renew our focus on the concept of quality: *What makes for a quality out-of-school time community-based program and District-wide system?*

The **DCPS Community and Neighborhood Based Organizations Directory** for the 2015-2016 school year includes some 233 organizations throughout the District which provide afterschool programming in DCPS schools, or which provide afterschool services to DCPS students in non-DCPS locations such as community centers, DPR facilities or other sites. More than 60 of these organizations received some of their annual funding from the DC Trust. Given that such an immense assortment of CBOs work in the expanded learning space in DC, and that they each affect the learning trajectory of DC students in any number of ways, it raises several questions of each:

• What learning services are these organizations providing? Do they have a youth development model which they effectively blend with classroom curricula by actively partnering with the schools they serve? Are they whole child focused?

• Do they have sound organizational finances and sustainable revenue streams that enable them to leverage significant in-kind resources?

• Do they employ an outcomes-driven approach, using student-level data to track performance over time and to continuously improve upon their own work?

• Are they providing expanded learning where the need is greatest, working with “at-risk” students in underserved communities to ensure that they have exposure to valuable enrichment learning where they live and go to school?

These are among the questions which government leaders and community stakeholders must come together and address in active partnership on a broad, District-wide scale if we are going to achieve equitable access to quality afterschool and summer learning opportunities for all DC students. To facilitate such a discussion, education leaders, policy makers, funders and providers could employ a “quality checklist” such as the one on the next page. The checklist draws from lessons learned in our current system, as well as emerging best practices and lessons learned from other communities, to begin consistently clarifying standards for out-of-school time quality.11
### Checklist: What Standards make for a Quality out-of-school time...

#### ...Program?

- Program model is data-informed, approaching child and youth development using creative and alternative ways to engage students in learning
- Program model reinforces academics and school curriculum by blending concepts through challenging, enrichment-based learning

#### ...System?

- System leaders (including LEAs, funding intermediary) embrace broad vision for positive youth development that includes afterschool and summer learning as key components for ensuring outcomes (academic achievement, attendance & participation, social & emotional development, and fitness & wellness)

#### 1. Modeled on Youth Development

- System provides programs with easy access to meaningful student-level data to track impact and guide programming
- System provides advocates and policy makers with aggregate level data on access, utilization and impact to guide meaningful public investments
- System leaders strategically use data for the outcomes of expanded learning to reflect on how students considered “at-risk” stand to gain the most from access to afterschool and summer learning

#### 2. Data-Driven Approach

- OST contracts for CBOs should be granted at minimum on a 2-year basis to achieve desired program impacts; contracts for 3 years or more in duration are optimal
- Multi-year contracts provide year-to-year continuity for schools in sharing facilities, and students and families seeking consistency in program location
- Multi-year contracts simplify budgeting, reduce overhead, and help to bring systems to scale

#### 3. Defined Duration of Services

- School-based policy must meet unique needs of schools and school populations (e.g., a sliding scale-based “buy-in” option for non-low income families)
- Transportation barriers to programming should be removed by ensuring all children over the age of 10 who participate in an expanded learning program have a free Metro pass under Kids Ride Free
- Policies that address family concerns are followed equitably and judiciously and under clear authority (e.g., policy of referring to CFSA when children are not picked up is modeled to be a clear “last resort”)

#### 4. Youth and Family-Friendly Policies

- To receive public local funding, program should be administered by an established, tax-exempt 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization; or a social profit enterprise
- Organization should have a clearly disclosed board and staff structure, financial statements, and written policies and procedures governing programmatic execution

#### 5. Sound Finances & Organizational Structures

- Local OST funding for CBOs should be administered by a strong public-private intermediary funded to scale to ensure a dedicated stream of OST funding
- Intermediary should coordinate and provide OST training and credentialing, and consistently assess overall infrastructure/system design
- Intermediary’s annual overhead/administrative costs should be justifiable and within a reasonable range

#### 6. Effective Coordination

- System leaders should facilitate greater collaboration with community-based partners and Title I schools as a necessity to better leverage resources
- System leaders should promote a culture of continuous improvement among program grantees through the provision of affordable capacity building, professional development and technical assistance
- Programs should have the ability to leverage other city resources (i.e. recreational space/facilities through shared use agreements) at low/no cost

---

Sources: This table is a blend of several sources, including research previously done by DCAYA staff about key features that would make for quality programming and system design in the District. Additional checklist elements were gathered from two reports from the Wallace Foundation and one from the Harvard Family Research Project: Growing Together, Learning Together: What Cities Have Discovered About Building Afterschool Systems (Wallace, July 2015), Building Citywide Systems for Quality: A Guide and Case Studies for Afterschool Leaders (Wallace, October 2012), and After School Programs in the 21st Century: Their Potential and What It Takes to Achieve It (Harvard, February 2008). [*e.g., best practice duration 15 hours/5 days per week, concluding between 6-7pm]*
ACCESS: How are kids connected to Expanded Learning opportunities throughout DCPS?

In DCPS, the Division of Out of School Time Programs (OSTP) manages afterschool at more than 50 elementary schools and education campuses. Typically, for kids who aren’t already in an extended day, programming at these schools consists of an academic “power hour” from 3:30 to 4:30pm where students get homework help and additional lesson time, a supper or snack until 5pm, and an hour of structured enrichment until 6pm. Enrichment can range from lessons offered by school staff to that which is provided by nonprofit CBOs through partnerships. The network of OSTP schools was established in 2008 and was built up in tandem with the District-wide afterschool system in the years that followed.

In school year 2014-2015, OSTP offered afterschool programming in 58 of DCPS’s Title I elementary schools, middle schools and education campuses, and a point-in-time count of students across these schools showed that there were 6,790 kids enrolled in OSTP-managed afterschool. Shifts in guidance on the use of federal funds supporting OSTP at the end of the 2014-2015 school year suggested a decline in the District’s use of afterschool: the DC Council’s Committee on Education approved an FY2016 budget which cut 25 OSTP site coordinator positions and dismantled much of OSTP’s coordinating capacity. Finally, OSTP programs were offered at eight fewer Title I schools.

Responding to Need and Demand

DCPS projects that in school year 2016-2017, there will be 36,470 students enrolled in pre-K through 8th grade. Approximately half of these students, or 17,945 kids, are considered “at-risk” of academic failure due to poverty, and 17,311 of these kids (96% of all “at-risk” pre-K through 8th grade students) will be enrolled in DCPS’s Title I elementary and middle schools. While all young people benefit from these opportunities, kids who are considered “at-risk” stand to gain the most from participating in afterschool. Given the large number of these students in DCPS compared to the number of available afterschool slots, the overall need in the District persists. The table below shows the varying rates of “at-risk” enrollment in DCPS Title I schools, and the corresponding availability of OSTP afterschool slots.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title I Elementary and Middle Schools in DCPS, SY2016-17</th>
<th>Total Enrollment (Projected for FY17)</th>
<th>“At-Risk” Enrollment (Projected for FY17)</th>
<th>OSTP Afterschool Enrollment (Maximum Allocated for FY17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 Highest “At-Risk” Enrollment Schools</td>
<td>8,716</td>
<td>7,281</td>
<td>1,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Medium “At-Risk” Enrollment Schools</td>
<td>8,588</td>
<td>5,564</td>
<td>2,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Lowest “At-Risk” Enrollment Schools</td>
<td>10,392</td>
<td>4,466</td>
<td>3,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>27,696</td>
<td>17,311</td>
<td>7,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Analysis based on data from DCPS’s School Year 2016-2017 Enrollment Projections and DCPS’s Division of Out-of-School Time Programs’ FY17 Afterschool Budget. The 25 schools with highest “at-risk” enrollment show “at-risk” enrollment greater than 75% of projected total enrollment, and the 25 schools with the lowest show less than 50%. The 25 medium “at-risk” enrollment schools show “at-risk” enrollment in the range in between.
In short, schools with the highest “at-risk” student enrollment also tend to have the lowest share of available afterschool enrollment slots through OSTP. There are a few factors which feed into this distribution:

1) **Number of OSTP Schools.** Nearly one in three Title I elementary and middle schools in DCPS do not have an OSTP-managed afterschool program. Enrollment projections for school year 2016-2017 estimate there will be 4,757 students in these schools considered “at-risk” — which is 27% of all “at-risk” kids in elementary and middle school throughout DCPS in the coming school year.\(^{15}\)

It is important to note that if a DCPS school does not have afterschool programming managed by OSTP, it does not mean there are no afterschool options for the school’s students. Some school principals use their discretion to “opt out” of OSTP programming, and either they or parents fill the expanded learning gap by forging discrete CBO partnerships. While valuable, these partnerships often depend on relationships with individual teachers and principals, and do not always reach all the students at these schools who most need the exposure afterschool provides.\(^{16}\)

2) **Number of Available Slots in Each School.** The DCPS Afterschool Budget for school year 2016-2017 allocates a range of budgeted slots in each OSTP school, from as few as 20 to as many as 400 in one school, for a total of 7,700 slots District-wide. How many slots a school gets is determined in large part by annual demand for the programming. In DCPS, it is up to parents to opt their kids in to afterschool, and this is done through a District-wide enrollment on a first-come basis for a limited number of overall spaces.

This process leads to waitlists resulting from over-enrollment in some schools where parent engagement and demand are high, and generally low enrollment at others where there is less parent engagement but evident need based on “at-risk” enrollment trends.\(^{17}\) This means that there are scores of students at schools with high “at-risk” populations who have limited afterschool options from OSTP while other Title I schools where there are far fewer “at-risk” kids would appear to be flourishing.

3) **Availability of Afterschool Spaces for Recreational Use.** The recreational use of DCPS facilities during non-school hours varies across the District, and this affects programming for CBOs. For example, 78% of elementary schools, middle schools, and education campuses in Ward 3 open their grounds during non-school hours for recreational use, compared to only 25% in Ward 7. This illustrates uneven access for “at-risk” DCPS students, who make up 73% of total enrollment in Ward 7 compared to just 6% in Ward 3.\(^{18}\) Further, as DCPS’ central office funding has declined, the costs to use facilities – even when open – have increased substantially and are falling entirely on CBO partners to cover.

These findings speak to more than just a need for a more fair distribution of afterschool slots and spaces throughout DCPS. Afterschool participation, after all, is not compulsory, and slots for enrollment are not assigned by central office to specific kids and schools. Rather, DCPS develops funding allocations and afterschool enrollment slots to meet the evident *demand* at each school (adding seats to accommodate waitlists when possible). Meeting each school community’s need requires a different approach. Such an approach would effectively factor in the importance of afterschool access for “at-risk” students, targeted outreach from central office to low-income families in underserved neighborhoods, and opening more schools in those neighborhoods for recreational use. This level of community engagement would serve to make the enrollment process more accessible for families while highlighting the importance of afterschool and what gains it brings for “at-risk” children and youth.

All of this will likely require additional, dedicated resources in the years ahead. Following the passage of the FY2016 budget, the DC Council did not find funding to stop cuts to OSTP. Instead the cuts came with certain assurance from DCPS that there would be “no reduction in service levels to families in FY16.”\(^{15}\) But the clear shortage of afterschool spaces at most OSTP schools that have high numbers of “at-risk” students, coupled with a significant number of school sites that have high numbers of “at-risk” students and no OSTP programming at all, both signify a shortfall in the level of services families do need and should expect from their school district. Taken together, the evident demand from OSTP enrollment trends and the evident need from the “at-risk” numbers are clear indications that more afterschool slots spaces available in Title I schools throughout DCPS would be desirable.
Priorities and Promising Trends
Given the importance of out-of-school time activities for many working parents to provide peace of mind and stability in their schedule, combined with the very real gains for kids inherent to afterschool and summer learning opportunities, it would be wise for DCPS to take a more strategic approach to how they are responding to demand and need in offering OSTP access to students.

To date, DCPS understandably aimed most of its reform efforts on the classroom experience and extending the school day. The leadership of DCPS reasons that having more time for math and literacy instruction in low-performing elementary and middle schools will help kids in those schools catch up to their higher-performing peers. To this end, DCPS is extending school days to 4:15pm or later in 31 Title I schools in school year 2016-2017, and extending the school year to include an additional 20 days in the summer of 2017 at another 11 schools.

At the same time, the school district’s FY2017 budget for afterschool programming shows a 33% increase from the current fiscal year, and includes more than 800 new afterschool spaces for student enrollment and 183 new FTE positions to provide afterschool coverage at more schools. Although they do not fully address the overall need, these investments signify the start of an approach that more fully integrates expanded learning into our public education continuum. While the present trends give reason to be optimistic, it will take extensive examination of DCPS policy and practice in the years ahead to expand access to afterschool opportunities on a greater scale. The approach of adding time to the school day and year is not without merit, but research from the field holds that academic gains will not be reached through more instructional time on its own. The time has come for DCPS to broaden its strategic vision to include access to out-of-school time learning.

Recommendations
1) DCPS should expand access to afterschool in Title I elementary and middle schools which have a high number of “at-risk” students and relatively low or no OSTP enrollment.
   - Establish and use formal criteria to reserve dedicated OSTP spaces in schools based on need. At present, the distribution of afterschool program spaces responds to demand, with no formal process with scoring or criteria to determine how many OSTP spaces go to which schools. As a result, the schools with majority “at-risk” students are receiving a deficit of OSTP programming relative to the need. Priority criteria that align with the school district’s definitions for “at-risk” could open more afterschool enrollment opportunities to these students.
   - Seek to fill spaces based on need through active engagement with low-income families. The school system should encourage participation in OSTP programs among low-income families through active and targeted outreach. Central office could provide resources to families about the benefits of afterschool, and help parents, teachers and providers best match “at-risk” students to programs able to meet their learning needs (be it civic engagement, physical activity, artistic expression, one-on-one tutoring, others).
   - Broaden enrollment procedures to offer greater opportunities for low-income families to opt in. Presently, system-wide enrollment is offered in spring for the next school year on a first-come, first-served basis. A system-wide model should be explored for a longer enrollment window for afterschool, multiple enrollment periods, or both.
   - Budget in future years to bring OSTP programming and funding to all Title I elementary and middle schools that don’t have coverage. This would require adding staffing positions for teaching and support and creating at least 4,000 new OSTP spaces. Priority based on formal criteria could go to schools where the number of afterschool spaces as a percentage of “at-risk” enrollment is lowest (and where there isn’t already school-wide CBO coverage).

2) DCPS policy and practice should be responsive to family concerns in the out-of-school time hours.
   - Build in safeguards for “No-Pickup” procedures. Current policy states that children in afterschool are to be “referred to the DC Child and Family Services Agency (CFSA) if left in afterschool unattended after removal from program [or] if not picked up and afterschool staff is unable to reach parent/guardian or emergency contacts after numerous attempts”. As written, this leaves decisions to refer to CFSA occurring in isolation at the discretion of individual school staff. As a safeguard to ensure the policy is followed as intended and under a clear authority, we recommend building in a chain of approval for all CFSA referrals to include, at minimum, the school’s principal and ideally a single DCPS central office designee. As a preventative policy, school staff should be required to orient parents by walking them through handbook policies and ensuring emergency contacts are current and include backups.
• **Determine a strategy that addresses shortages for before-school care.** Although the focus of this brief is on afterschool, it is important for LEA's to recognize the need at some schools for before-school care. There are very few community-based child care options available to parents in the before-school hours.23 Having space and staff available and a sliding scale fee-based option for families would help address this need.

• **Fill current gaps in aftercare for pre-K and Kindergarten students.** Similarly, there are few CBOs that provide afterschool services tailored to younger kids (3 to 5 year olds). The school district should focus on those that do, and work to expand the partnerships with those that have the best model programs.24

3) **DCPS should better coordinate extended learning with expanded learning.**

• **Conduct an independent evaluation of extended learning time in DCPS.** As the school district moves forward with extended school day and school year approaches in Title I schools, it is critical that the impact of these interventions be clearly understood by the school district, policy makers and parents. A comprehensive independent evaluation should be conducted on the academic gains resulting from the extended learning time. The evaluation results should be made available via a public hearing.

• **Re-examine models for staffing and grade coverage.** The school district must look at its staffing model to address challenges extending the school day is creating for afterschool programs in many schools (i.e., where a certain number of staff need to be available per student but are being used for extended day, thus creating a shortage). As well, DCPS should address parent concerns about the practicality of an extended school day for 3 and 4-year-olds in pre-Kindergarten when taking a “whole school” approach to extended day.

• **Extend enrichment time.** To ensure equity, all OSTP schools that have opted in to extend the day (for the entire school or just certain grades) should also extend afterschool to ensure enrichment-based programming is being provided for those students until 6:30pm.

4) **DCPS and the Department of General Services (DGS) should coordinate to increase access to recreational OST programming through shared use agreements for CBOs.** Increasing the shared use of DCPS spaces for recreational use could be used as a community-based strategy to provide more expanded learning opportunities in areas where the need is high. A survey of CBOs conducted by the Advocates for Better Children’s Diets reported that CBOs regularly encounter barriers that prevent them from providing programming in schools and wards with the greatest need; these include difficulty navigating the administrative system, costs of rental and security fees, and unpredictability of securing space.25 Barriers such as these should be addressed to achieve a quality and equitable system that provides a variety of expanded learning and recreational opportunities for all DC students.
FUNDING & VISION: How can we to envision a path forward for the District where community-based partnerships are valued and abundantly available where most needed?

After the launch of the Wallace-funded initiative, the DC Trust was funding programming far closer to scale. At the peak of funding in FY2009 at close to $18.5 million, there were 12,380 children and youth from all grades in DCPS and our public charter schools who were served in the District by community-based OST programs. Despite the Wallace Foundation’s departure in early FY2010, District funding remained fairly stable with an allocated $10.6 million to the DC Trust, to serve 9,665 kids through CBOs.

Early in 2010, it came to light that funds had been mismanaged between the DC Trust and a then-member of DC Council. That unfortunate chain of events, coupled with budget pressures in subsequent years, resulted in a significant decline in the DC Trust’s – and by extension, the District government’s – overall investment in expanded learning. Annual funding in the fiscal years for 2010 to 2015 has been between $3 million and $6.5 million. At last report, the DC Trust’s FY2016 budget of $4.2 million had only provided for 2,465 total OST program slots. This represents a 60% decline in overall funding since 2010, resulting in a 75% decline in OST slots.26

The Wallace Foundation initiative has since expanded and moved on to nine other cities. Sadly, as other communities embrace OST system-building, DC is at risk of regressing toward a decentralized patchwork. At the same time, there is clear demand for more locally-funded, multi-year expanded learning opportunities for the many thousands of kids who stand to benefit – demand which community-based providers are unlikely to meet without funding closer to scale.27

Amid these downward trends in funding and access, the recent collapse of the DC Trust raises a further, more fundamental question that ties funding challenges to an opportunity to lay out a new vision: How are we to proceed on a path forward for funding youth development in the District?

A New Opportunity

The continuation of the youth development work that was central to the mission of the DC Trust, “ensur(ing) that every DC youth develops the skills to grow into a healthy, caring and productive adult” is paramount. Taking a
thoughtful approach to the management of youth development funding is critical, and as we work to explore and consider next steps and solutions, we must remain both aware of the unique space a nonprofit intermediary exists in and also examine the particular risks and opportunities associated with housing these funds in a government agency or other blended option. Whatever the path, there are going to be certain trade-offs and considerations the community will need to manage. For example, while a government agency designed would have clear authority to require accountability around youth outcomes, a nonprofit intermediary would be better positioned to remain nimble and responsive to provider and community needs.

What’s clear is that there is a multitude of options before us, and as they are considered, the needs of stakeholders – namely families, providers and government agencies – should be carefully factored in. The table below revisits the quality standards enumerated in our checklist, tying them to some examples of priority considerations we might expect from these OST stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Standards</th>
<th>Example Out-of-School Time System-Building PRIORITIES for...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Families</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Model on Youth Development</td>
<td>Kids are exposed to enrichment opportunities that are fun and go beyond the classroom approach, allowing them to progress and improve at their own pace without having to worry about being graded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Data-Driven Approach</td>
<td>Kids clearly benefit from participation in OST programs with noticeable gains in knowledge, skills, confidence and abilities; and expressed feelings of safety and satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Defined Duration of Services</td>
<td>A variety of quality six-week summer and daily afterschool year-round program options are available to families consistently from year to year throughout the District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Youth and Family-Friendly Policies</td>
<td>There are no barriers that prohibit participation, including high costs, limited enrollment opportunities, or unnecessarily punitive policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Sound Finances &amp; Organizational Structures</td>
<td>Options that are available to low-income families are free or affordable from year to year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Effective Coordination</td>
<td>Multiple, quality program options are accessible in the community at school and neighborhood sites, with thoughtful transitions between end of school day/year and start of OST.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: This table is a blend of several sources, including current community feedback and research previously done by DCAYA staff (in January 2013). Additional elements were gathered from two reports: Growing Together, Learning Together: What Cities Have Discovered About Building Afterschool Systems (Wallace, July 2015); and The Role of Local Intermediary Organizations in the Youth Development Field (Chapin Hall, February 2000).
While it’s tempting in times of opportunity to forge full speed ahead, it would be a mistake to do so without learning from our recent past. While we can conscientiously work toward a better community result in our next funding model, we cannot predict or guarantee it.

The consequences of any decision about moving forward must be fully understood, and a vision for the path forward cannot merely be that we do things differently than we had been. Indeed, there was a time not so long ago when the DC Trust was optimal for serving DC’s kids, both operationally and programmatically. What was working then? What went wrong? What elements are worth keeping? What are some alternatives to consider? By leveraging the insights of philanthropic partners and other local experts to help answer questions like these, we will act on this new opportunity for DC’s kids and families with greater confidence.

By working collaboratively with all stakeholders and understanding their interrelated priorities, we can better clarify our shared vision and establish our common priorities, using both as decision-making tools as we embark on the path ahead.

**Recommendations**

1) **Government leaders must partner directly with community-based organizations to promote a broad vision and actively integrate a path forward for afterschool and summer learning in the District.** Whatever the funding vehicle, DC will only be able to offer all our kids enriching out-of-school time learning experiences and the gains in achievement, engagement, wellness and social-emotional growth that come with them if we take seriously and enhance community-based partnerships like those which we already have in place. Using a partnership model like that which many school principals and teachers are already employing, agency leaders should bring CBO leaders to the table to better leverage the in-kind resources they contribute and ensure their maximum reach and distribution.

2) **Government agencies and CBOs must join in collective, data-driven efforts with expanded learning providers and other agency partners toward continuous improvement and shared outcomes for success.** DCPS and other LEA’s have essential student-level and geographic data as well as significant technological and human analytical resources to put those data to use. A data-driven partnership that includes these agencies plus OSSE would collectively gather, share, interpret and act on these and other data to regularly assess expanded learning programs in the District for supply and demand, program retention, and quality and performance. Under this paradigm, the positive results locally-funded OST programming has on the holistic well-being of children would be classified as “whole child” outcomes, and providers and partner agencies would promote a broad awareness among policy makers and the community of the powerful role CBOs are playing in supporting stronger outcomes.

3) **As longer-term solutions are considered, all stakeholders should establish and use a common checklist of quality standards for OST programs and the system as a whole.** Any and all funders, programs, schools, parent-teacher organizations, government leaders, LEAs and agency partners would have access to the tool. Any CBOs receiving OST grants from the funding intermediary would be expected to meet the quality standards. Similarly, all policy and funding decisions impacting OST would be assessed according to this checklist.

4) **Whatever the funding vehicle, the DC Council and the Mayor should work toward scaled-up funding for community-based expanded learning in FY2018 and beyond.** The DC Trust’s annual share of funding for OST has declined by more than half from 2010 to the present year. This has resulted in only a quarter of the locally-funded slots for community-based afterschool and summer learning that were there for kids six years ago. If we are serious about providing safe, youth-friendly opportunities focused on improving outcomes and quality of life for all our children now and in future, we must reverse these trends.
CONCLUSION

Anyone who has children in their life knows that learning is a continuous process and not just something that happens for kids from 8:15am to 3:15pm, Monday through Friday. Families recognize this, and those with the financial means expose their children to sports, civic clubs, music and art lessons after school, and travel and camps in the summer. But a family’s ability to provide such opportunities to their kids diminishes considerably as parents’ income decreases. As a result, children in the lowest-income families rarely receive exposure to the enrichment experiences offered by expanded learning.29

Meanwhile, as more states and other localities are increasingly building OST systems to achieve their educational policy goals, funding and political will for expanded learning in the District has been inconsistent and generally declining since 2009. A few thousand slots for community-based out-of-school time programming, for what we know to be thousands more “at-risk” children and youth who stand to benefit from quality programs, signifies a disparity in the level of services many DC families do need and should expect.

Afterschool can no longer be an afterthought. Policy makers, education and funding leaders must fully embrace expanded learning as a valuable and powerful complement to the classroom experience across our schools, particularly our Title I schools serving so-called “at-risk” students. Achieving scale in funding and access will require working together to ensure that community-based programming is reaching the kids, schools, and neighborhoods that need it most.

As Andria Tobin, executive director of Kid Power Inc. puts it, in rising to this task of better meeting their academic, social-emotional, and health and wellness needs over time, “our young people will gain a sense of agency to help create a stronger District.”30 As our community continues to explore the various options at hand, DCAYA will continue to provide information and resources to help ensure a productive conversation in the months to come.

#ExpandLearningDC Appendices

Please visit bit.ly/ExpandLearningDCreport to download these resources:

Outcomes from the Growing Body of Research on Expanded Learning

DCPS Schools sorted by Title I Status and Category

Report Fact Sheets: Wards 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8

For More Information Please Contact

Joseph Gavrilovich, Senior Policy Analyst
joseph@dc-aya.org or 202-587-0616
Follow us on Twitter @DCAYA
References, Citations, Definitions and Explanatory Endnotes

1 Poverty estimate is based on 2014 data from Kids Count 2014 for children in the District ages 0 up to 18; about half of these kids are in extreme poverty (below 50% of fed poverty level). Graduation rate is an October 2015 estimate from DC Action for Children using OSSE data to estimate graduation rate for “economically disadvantaged” youth.


3 Findings from a February 2016 DCAYA survey of community-based expanded learning program providers illustrate the range of expanded learning service offerings in DC (out of 51 respondents):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Category</th>
<th># CBOs offering (n=51)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Skills/Social Development</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Learning</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Education/Promotion</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Learning</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Readiness</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Activity</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Technology (STEM)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Readiness</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 The District’s FY2017 budget includes cost projections based on estimates of 43,000 “at-risk” students enrolled in DCPS and our public charter schools in the coming school year 2016-2017 (the OSSE enrollment audit for SY2014-2015 counted 39,556 total “at-risk” students in both sectors).

5 OTHER LOCAL FUNDING: The DC Trust was not the lone agency in the District funding out-of-school time activities for children and youth. Other sources historically have included the following agencies:

- Department of Employment Services
- Department of Energy & Environment
- Department of Parks and Recreation
- DC National Guard
- DC Youth Advisory Council
- Office of Latino Affairs
- DC Public Library
- Commission on Arts & Humanities

These agencies’ annual budgets include hundreds of thousands to millions of dollars for OST, with several hosting programs specifically targeted to older youth (e.g. DOES, DCYAC). For those that serve younger kids, little is known about how effectively programming blends into or complements the school-day. There may be an opportunity to better leverage these funds to ensure quality programming in future years. FEDERAL FUNDING: In school year 2015-2016, the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) has brought close to $7.7 million to the table in federal 21st Century Community Learning Center funding for CBOs. It’s worth noting that with the implementation of ESSA, this funding is subject to change in future years.

6 According to the Afterschool Alliance, an estimated 76% of children in the District in grades K through 5 would participate in a program if one were available after school, along with 72% of children in grades 6 through 8 (compared to 40% nationally for all kids). For those that serve younger kids, little is known about how effectively programming blends into or complements the school-day. There may be an opportunity to better leverage these funds to ensure quality programming in future years. FEDERAL FUNDING: In school year 2015-2016, the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) has brought close to $7.7 million to the table in federal 21st Century Community Learning Center funding for CBOs. It’s worth noting that with the implementation of ESSA, this funding is subject to change in future years.


8 DC Action for Children, 2014 and 2000 data. The table below illustrates the rate of change in Median Family Income by Ward from 2000 to 2014. [Note: the 2016 Federal Poverty guideline for a family of four is $24,300.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$38,400</td>
<td>$62,287</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$47,300</td>
<td>$90,417</td>
<td>303%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$195,400</td>
<td>$220,307</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$74,800</td>
<td>$87,799</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$44,400</td>
<td>$57,188</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$39,500</td>
<td>$119,719</td>
<td>203%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$33,500</td>
<td>$31,142</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$26,269</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>$44,200</td>
<td>$63,587</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 DC Action for Children, 2014 data. Actual rates are 22% for Ward 8 (23,793 children and youth under 18 years old) and 15% for Ward 7 (15,949). The District-wide total in 2014 was 107,989
At the present scale, school partnerships with CBOs providing afterschool enrichment are often productive relationships that deliver considerable results. Some of the most innovative afterschool and summer learning programs in the country are based here in DC, and they offer expanded learning affordably or free to thousands of families with those “at-risk” students who would not otherwise have access (see Afterschool Alliance, *Afterschool by the Numbers in the District of Columbia*, March 2015). Among the 51 CBOs that responded to DCAYA’s recent survey of community-based expanded learning program providers, virtually all indicated that “most if not all” of the students they served were “at-risk”. The profiles that follow provide just a few examples among numerous organizations that are using their local funding to great effect in terms of partnerships, in-kind resources and outcomes:

### Partnerships

**After-School All-Stars**
Provides tailored health, enrichment and academic programming to supplement school-day curricula for students at two middle school sites in Wards 6 and 8.

**Program Result:** In addition to providing their own enrichment offerings, program staff are indispensable members of both school communities. They assist during the academic hour immediately following the school day and also coordinate all other afterschool team sports and clubs.

**System Impact:** When DCPS principals actively collaborate with CBO leaders to ensure harmony and integration, it yields the best possible experience for students. A recent DCAYA survey of 51 CBOs like ASAS showed that 83% of kids served after school in DC this year were in DCPS.

### In-Kind Resources

**DC SCORES**
Combines poetry and spoken word, soccer, and service-learning in an afterschool model at 31 DCPS schools across the District, including ten in Wards 7 and 8.

**Program Result:** For every $1 of local funding received through the DC Trust, DC SCORES is able to raise and deploy more than $2 of private money, thus bringing well over $1 million in private resources annually to bear on positive outcomes for children and youth.\(^a\)

**System Impact:** Given that CBOs cultivate multiple sources of private funding, they bring significant additional funds to their partnerships with DCPS schools. In FY2015, expanded learning providers like DC SCORES brought an estimated $20 million of in-kind resources to DCPS.\(^b\)

\(^a\) Bethany Henderson, Executive Director of DC SCORES, testimony to DC Council’s Committee on Education (February 18, 2016).

\(^b\) DCPS, Office of Out of School Time Programs (spring 2016).

### Outcomes

**Horton’s Kids**
Provides a holistic, research-based continuum of academic, enrichment and basic needs support to empower children living in Wellington Park in Ward 8.

**Program Result:** The graduation rate among Horton’s Kids participants is twice the neighborhood average, and the majority of participants improved their school test scores in reading (74%) and math (84%) or maintained a proficient or high-performing ranking in each subject.\(^c\)

**System Impact:** Student-level data, when accessible, reveal significant outcomes. CBOs like Horton’s Kids provide valuable complements to school-day curricula, and the school system would be wise to integrate their programs into an overall strategy to boost student achievement.

\(^c\) Robin Berkley, Executive Director of Horton’s Kids, testimony to Committee on Health & Human Services (February 23, 2016).

---


\(^11\) All “at-risk” and other enrollment data throughout this brief are from DCPS’s SY2016-17 Enrollment Projections, presented to the DC Council’s Committee on Education in April 2016.

- **“AT-RISK” ENROLLMENT OVERALL:** According to DCPS, there will be a projected 47,820 pre-K through 12th grade students enrolled in DCPS in SY2016-17, and 24,858 of these students are considered “at-risk” of academic failure due to poverty. The mayor’s proposed budget for FY2017 includes cost projections based on estimates of 43,000 “at-risk” students enrolled in DCPS and our public charter schools in the coming school year.
- **DCPS PRE-K THROUGH 8TH GRADE “AT-RISK” ENROLLMENT:** Of the 47,820 total DCPS students, 36,470 will be enrolled in pre-K through 8th grade; and of the 24,858 total DCPS students considered “at risk”, 17,945 will be in pre-K through 8th grade. [Note: “at-risk” enrollments included in this total for middle school grades at Cardozo and Columbia Heights Education Campuses, which both serve grades 6 through 12, are estimates derived from each school’s overall % “at-risk” enrollment.]
- **DCPS TITLE I PRE-K THROUGH 8TH GRADE “AT-RISK” ENROLLMENT:** 17,311 of these 17,945 “at-risk” students (96%) were in Title I elementary and middle schools, and elementary/middle education campuses.
- Please note that for the purposes of this report, River Terrace, which is technically not an education campus but is actually a special education center that serves youth and adults, is being counted among education campuses because it receives an OSTP allocation and tracks its “at-risk” student enrollment.
Further analysis of this table shows the following percentages associated with OSTP Afterschool Enrollment:

| 25 Highest “At-Risk” Enrollment Schools | 1,920 | 22% of total enrollment at these schools 26% of “at-risk” enrollment at these schools 25% of all OSTP slots in DCPS |
| 25 Medium “At-Risk” Enrollment Schools | 2,140 | 25% of total enrollment at these schools 38% of “at-risk” enrollment at these schools 28% of all OSTP slots in DCPS |
| 25 Lowest “At-Risk” Enrollment Schools | 3,640 | 35% of total enrollment at these schools 82% of “at-risk” enrollment at these schools 47% of all OSTP slots in DCPS |

7,700

Among all 75 Title I elementary schools, middle schools and education campuses in DCPS, nine elementary schools will not have OSTP-managed afterschool in the coming school year, nor will any of DCPS’ 14 Title I middle schools (including the middle schools at Cardozo and CHEC Education Campuses, which both serve grades 6 through 12). The 23 Title I schools with no OSTP programming next school year are listed below. See DCPS Schools list in appendices for more detail.

For example, Bruce Monroe Elementary School at Parkview in Ward 1, where just over half of the students are “at-risk”, reported a waitlist for afterschool of more than 70 students this school year.

Regardless of income level, for most working families, there exists an “after school gap” of 15 to 25 hours per week when children are out of school while parents or guardians are still at work. Because it’s far easier to be present and attentive at work when you know your kids are safe and supervised, the availability of funded and affordable programs after school offers these parents reassurance and adds to the likelihood of keeping their full-time jobs. [Sources: Brandeis University Women’s Studies Research Center, After school worries: Tough on parents, bad for business (2006); and Afterschool Alliance, Afterschool Programs Help Working Families (2003)]

DC Council, Committee on Education, DC Public Schools FY2017 Budget Oversight Hearing Responses (April 2016). DCPS provided a narrative of their proposed FY2017 budgets for afterschool and extended day at individual schools, which showed the following:

- **DCPS will bring afterschool programs back in three elementary schools in Ward 7 in FY2017.** Anne Beers, Randle Highlands and Smothers elementary schools all had OSTP programming in school year 2014-2015 which was discontinued the following year. All three schools will see this programming restored in the coming school year, with 380 new seats for afterschool student enrollment and 37 new afterschool FTE positions between the three schools. This means 52 schools will offer OSTP afterschool programming in the coming school year. (This is up from 49 as reported in an earlier version of this policy brief.)

- **DCPS projects adding more than 800 new afterschool spaces for student enrollment in FY2017.** In addition to the seats for restored programming at the three new schools, DCPS plans to add 452 new afterschool seats in existing OSTP schools. Some of the biggest gains from the current school year into next will be seen at Bruce Monroe at Park View, Noyes, Bunker Hill, Leckie and Stanton elementary schools. The total number of OSTP afterschool slots budgeted for in the coming school year is 7,700. (This is up from 6,790 at the end of last school year, as reported in an earlier version of this policy brief.)
• DCPS’s total proposed budget for afterschool programming in FY2017 is $5.4 million, a 33% increase from the current school year. Funding will cover programming at three additional schools and the new afterschool enrollment spaces, as well as 183 new FTE positions to provide afterschool coverage at the schools, for a total of 804 FTE positions system-wide.

22 DCPS’s uniform policy for calling CFSA is found in OSTP’s Afterschool Program Parent/Guardian Handbook: 2015–2016 School Year.

23 DCAYA’s recent survey of community-based expanded learning program providers showed that among 51 CBOs that responded, only six (12%) offer some form of before-school care. (These respondents included DC SCORES, Playworks, Shaw Community Ministry, Girls on the Run, Wonders Child Care and Martha’s Table.) By comparison, 92% of respondents offer afterschool and 86% offer summer learning.

24 DCAYA’s recent survey of community-based expanded learning program providers showed that among 51 CBOs that responded, only 9% of all students served in afterschool were in pre-K through 1st grade. By comparison, 48% were in 2nd through 5th grade, 21% were in 6th through 8th grade, and 22% were in 9th through 12th grade. The 9% rate was the same for summer programming.

25 Advocates for Better Children’s Diets, Successes, Limitations and Barriers to Community Groups Usage of Public Schools (October 2015).

26 FY2009 and FY2010 funding and slots data: Susie Cambria, Do we really value our children 44% less now than in 2009? An analysis of OST funding, FYs 2009-2012 (February 2012); 2016 funding and slots data: DC Council, Committee on Health and Human Services, DC Trust FY15-16 Performance Oversight Questions (February 2016). $4.2 million total includes initially budgeted amount plus mid-year reprogrammed funds. All slot numbers are for community-based OST slots for pre-K through 12th grade students in DCPS and other LEAs.

27 Chess Challenge in DC offers one example of this. Their afterschool program uses the game of chess to help children learn to think strategically, develop self-discipline and positive social skills, and increase self-esteem. For every school site at which Chess Challenge is active in this school year, there are two more schools on their waiting list, a situation that is not unfamiliar to other CBOs in DC. (Email correspondence with Chess Challenge in DC, April 7, 2016.)

28 Such an effort is underway. DCAYA is facilitating a data-driven partnership with OSSE and a group of nine (and counting) community-based expanded learning program providers. The DC Expanded Learning Data Partnership will seek to build a technological platform for sharing student-level data through OSSE and to demonstrate impact toward common outcomes. At present, the partnership includes representatives from Asian American LEAD, Chess Challenge, DC SCORES, For Love of Children, Higher Achievement, Horton’s Kids, Kid Power, Martha’s Table and Reading Partners. Recently, the Data Quality Campaign released their Four Policy Priorities to Make Data Work for Students, and the priorities cite afterschool partners as essential partners in data sharing, along with parents, teachers and school leaders.

29 This is supported by ample research: Greg J. Duncan and Richard J. Murnane, Russell Sage Foundation, Whither Opportunity?: Rising Inequality, Schools, and Children’s Life Chances (2011).

30 Quoted from guest segment on the Kojo Nnamdi Show, DC Trust, D.C.’s 17-Year-Old Charitable Trust Bankrupts (May 3, 2016).