



220 Market Avenue S., Suite 350
Canton, Ohio 44702

330.452.0829
330.452.2009 fax
www.edpartner.org

Elements of a Quality After School Program:

Formulating a Stark County Vision

July 2002

Prepared For:

**Community Health Foundation
of Western Stark County**

The Deuble Foundation

The Herbert W. Hoover Foundation

The Hoover Foundation

Sisters of Charity Foundation of Canton

Stark Community Foundation

By:

Adrienne O'Neill, Ed.D. – *President, Stark Education Partnership*

Joseph Rochford, Ph.D. – *Vice President, Stark Education Partnership*

Jean Wales – *Communications/Operations Manager, Stark Education Partnership*

Graphic Design and Production:

Kimberly J. Ross – *Graphics Designer, Stark Education Partnership*

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Dr. Adrienne O’Neill, Ed.D., is the President of the Stark Education Partnership. She came to the Partnership from Canton City Schools where she served as the Chief Education Officer for the district and for the Timken Regional Campus project. Formerly she served as President for the Academy of Business College in Phoenix, Arizona, and established the Academy of Technology High School. Dr. O’Neill helped to design the Educational Leadership Doctoral Program at Johnson and Wales University in Providence, Rhode Island, and served as an Associate Professor. She served as an Assistant Professor of Education at Caldwell College and as the Director of Graduate Studies. Dr. O’Neill served as the Director of Leadership Institutes for Caldwell College. In that role she wrote the grant, cooperatively designed the instructional modules with professors, and coordinated the Newark Principals’ Leadership Institute for the Caldwell College cohort. She has served as an Assistant Professor in the Curriculum and Instruction Department and as the Acting Department Chair in the Educational Leadership Department at William Paterson University, New Jersey.

Previously, Dr. O’Neill served as a Superintendent of Schools for 16 years in New Jersey, and as an assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction, principal and teacher in New York for 13 years. Dr. O’Neill has written numerous articles, made many presentations at national conventions and is the co-author of three books. Dr. O’Neill received her B.A. and M.S. from Syracuse University and her Ed. D. from the State University of New York at Albany.

Joseph A. Rochford, Ph.D., is Vice-President of the Stark Education Partnership and currently serves as a member of the board of directors for Jobs for Ohio’s Graduates (J.O.G.S.) of Greater Canton and the AHEAD Foundation in Massillon as well as being an adjunct professor of graduate education at Walsh University. Prior to coming to Stark County, Dr. Rochford served as a University Fellow at Kent State University where he was part of a team conducting research on how organizations make decisions. While at Kent, he also worked extensively on several education improvement efforts, including the Administrative Preparation Program of the Cleveland Public Schools and the Canton City Schools Leadership Academy. He was a doctoral fellow with the Cleveland Clinic Foundation and served as research advisor to the Clinic’s Public Education Initiative with John Hay High School. Before going to Kent State, Dr. Rochford was general manager of Ameri-rents, Inc. (d.b.a. Taylor Rental Company) of Olmsted Falls, Ohio. He also spent several years at Baldwin-Wallace College in Berea, Ohio in administrative posts and was a consultant to the Ohio R-94 Federal Urban Renewal Project in Berea.

Jean Wales serves as the Partnership’s Communications and Operations Manager. She currently works with the Early Childhood programs in Stark County co-chairing the Stark County Early Childhood Collaborative (ECC), chairing the Help Me Grow Program Advisory Work Group, and co-chairing the Help Me Grow Steering Committee. Jean is also a member of the Kidlink Support Team for the ECC and serves on the Community Conversation Committee. Prior to working for the Partnership, Jean served for four years as the Director of Lake Senior Center in Lake Township. She has 15 years experience as a former paramedic and EMT with volunteer fire departments in Lake Township. She served as an adult vocational instructor with the State of Ohio teaching basic Emergency Medical Technician classes and coordinated the Akron Public Schools’ Fire, Law Enforcement, and EMT training program for seven years.

ABOUT THE FOCUS GROUP FACILITATORS

Amy Lane is the Director of The Office of Corporate and Community Services at Kent State University Stark Campus. This office offers business customized services, research and evaluation services, professional education programs, conferences and workshops, and houses the Stark County Small Business Development Center. Ms. Lane is responsible for the management and growth of the office and for creating partnerships with Stark County organizations to offer organization development consulting, customized training for employees, and research and evaluation services. She has led the formalized research projects for the Canton Area Business Trends Research, Welfare Reform Impact Study, the Leadership Stark County Alumni Survey, the Goodwill Assessment, the Austin-Bailey Health and Wellness Needs Assessment, the Workforce Development Grant Stark County training needs assessment, the Eaton Corporation training needs assessment, and the Portage Electric Products Inc. cultural assessment. She has worked with hundreds of organizations in this capacity in diagnosing and researching organizational challenges and planning for organizational changes and training.

Ms. Lane holds a B.B.A. and a M.Ed. in Organization Development from Kent State University, and has completed coursework toward a M.B.A. at Babson College in Wellesley, Massachusetts. She has consulted and conducted research projects in various positions for more than 15 years. As Managing Director of International Training Corporation, Ms. Lane led research projects dealing with training issues in corporations and developed and delivered various training programs for many national and international companies. A Staff Analyst for ARINC Research Corporation in Annapolis, Maryland, Ms. Lane conducted research analyses in many capacities for the Department of Defense and for the Federal Aviation Administration. Examples of the research conducted include cost/benefit analyses of Federal Aviation Regulation changes, and equipment engineering studies and cost analyses of Department of Defense National Airspace System equipment.

Harold Sargus is the Program Manager of Contract Services within The Office of Corporate and Community Services at Kent State Stark. Mr. Sargus partners with organizations in the Stark County area in an effort to analyze information and provide solutions for organizational issues. He has worked with organizations in manufacturing, professional services, health care and the public sector to manage research projects and develop training and organizational development interventions. In addition to project management of community and organizational research projects, he has been involved in technical training, safety and supervision development programs and strategic planning and team development initiatives. Mr. Sargus holds a B.S. in Industrial Management and an M.B.A. from The University of Akron.

He has worked as a Sales Representative and Operations Supervisor in the trucking industry, a Human Resources Manager in the profit and non-profit sectors, and an Assistant Dean for Continuing Education and Contract Training. Mr. Sargus has over 15 years of business management experience, seven of which were spent providing performance improvement consulting for area organizations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

About the Authors	ii
About the Focus Group Facilitators	iii
Preface	v
Executive Summary	vii
Introduction	1
Related Educational Literature	7
Methodology	17
Participants in the Study	17
Ranking Sheet	17
Tabulating the Returned Ranking Sheets	19
Focus Groups	19
Focus Group Protocol	20
Findings	21
After School Criteria As Ranked by School Personnel	21
School Personnel Focus Group	21
After School Criteria As Ranked by Parents	24
Parent Focus Groups	25
After School Criteria As Ranked by Providers	26
Provider Focus Groups	27
Conclusions	29
New Information	30
Recommendations	31
Appendix	32
I – Letter to Participants	32
II – After-School Provider and School Personnel Rosters	33
III – Focus Group Participants	34
IV – Focus Group Scripts	35
V – June 14 Letter from Secretary of Education, Rod Paige	39
Bibliography	44
Tables	
I – Examples of Foundation Funded Extended Day, Saturday or Summer Activities	1
II – School District Funded After-School Activities	5
III – Comparison of After-School Criteria from Four Major Reports	8

PREFACE

Extended learning or after school child care activities have greatly expanded in Stark County with federal, state, local and foundation funding. Much of the federal, state, local and foundation funding is aimed at students in high poverty areas with the intention of using extended learning or after school child care activities as one way to increase student achievement. As a result, most of the funded programs have at least a partial academic focus, often aimed at providing students with time to complete homework assignments or opportunities to receive tutoring or other forms of additional instruction. Most of the existing programs do not collect or assess improvements in student achievement resulting from the program.

Our purpose was to create a tool with criteria for the selection of programs to be funded by foundations and a tool for the validation of the effectiveness of those programs that are funded. These tools were to be derived from a survey using a synthesis of criteria from four major studies and focus groups with parents, providers and school personnel with experience in extended learning or after school child care activities. The intended outcome was to use the tools to collect effectiveness data and to use the analysis of that data to attract additional funding to Stark County. Future effectiveness was to be determined using the results of the survey and the focus groups.

After the focus groups, many of the participants told the authors that they enjoyed the opportunity to talk with other providers and asked that this opportunity be repeated. Many believed that they could improve the effectiveness of their programs by learning from others. For example, Project Ahead in Massillon is tracking student data to determine the impact of the program on student achievement. Canton City Schools personnel thought that the same strategy might be employed with the 21st Century and the REA grants, thus expanding on the current notion of collecting participation data. The parents would like opportunities to talk with other parents and the non-school providers would like to meet on a regular basis.

As the study neared completion, Dr. Rod Paige, The Secretary of Education, United States Department of Education issued a guidance document (June 14, 2002) under the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* for school districts with Title I schools that have not made “adequate yearly progress” as defined by the state (please see Appendix V). Many of the schools served by the federal, state, local and foundation funding in Stark County have been labeled in need of improvement and school districts must now use a portion of their Title I funds to provide supplemental education services for eligible students enrolled in those schools. Parents must choose the provider of the services from a list providers approved by the state. The state may only approve providers who have a demonstrated record of effectiveness defined as improvements in student achievement.

The implications of the guidance document are important to this study. If the purpose of an extended learning or after school child care activity was to provide an academic focus, and if the provider does not have a demonstrated record of effectiveness using evidence of academic improvement, the provider will now be in competition with approved providers. If, on the other hand, the provider has demonstrated effectiveness and is approved by the state, then the school district would have to pay that provider for services rendered. If the provider is already funded by a foundation, payment might be waived, or the foundation might choose to withdraw funding in lieu of payment by the school district. The problem becomes more complex in those cases where school districts do not have sufficient Title I funds to meet the needs of all of the eligible students. The foundation funded programs might serve as an alternative for students not judged to be the most needy using achievement and poverty as criteria, but those programs would now be well advised to collect and analyze student achievement data to determine the effectiveness of the program.

This study on the elements of a quality extended learning or after school child care program was prepared for the Community Health Foundation of Western Stark County, the Double Foundation, the Herbert W. Hoover Foundation, the Hoover Foundation, the Sisters of Charity Foundation of Canton, and the Stark Community Foundation. The study would not have been possible without the cooperation of the many participants: foundation executives, parents, school personnel, and foundation funded providers. Many thanks are extended to all.

Special thanks are due to the Stark Community Foundation and the Sisters of Charity of Canton who provided the funding for the focus group portion of the study. Special thanks to Cindy Lazor, Vice-President of the Stark Community Foundation, Vicki Conley, Executive Director of the Sisters of Charity Foundation of Canton, and Ellen Beidler, Executive Director of the Herbert W. Hoover Foundation for their helpful suggestions and guidance as the study progressed.

It should be noted that the conclusions and the recommendations presented in this study are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the conclusions or the recommendations of the foundations for whom the study was prepared.

Adrienne O’Neill, Ed.D
Joseph Rochford, Ph.D.
Jean Wales

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A study on the elements of a quality extended learning or after school child care program was prepared for the Community Health Foundation of Western Stark County, the Deuble Foundation, the Herbert W. Hoover Foundation, the Hoover Foundation, the Sisters of Charity Foundation of Canton, and the Stark Community Foundation.

The purpose of the study was to create a tool with criteria for the selection of programs to be funded by foundations and a tool for the validation of the effectiveness of those programs that are funded. These tools were to be derived from a survey using a synthesis of criteria from four major studies and focus groups with parents, providers and school personnel with experience in extended learning or after school child care activities. The intended outcome was to use the tools to collect effectiveness data and to use the analysis of that data to attract additional funding to Stark County. Future effectiveness was to be determined using the results of the survey and the focus groups.

The outcomes of the focus groups and the survey results are surprising when compared to the rankings determined through the Rand (2001) study. Staffing, an academic focus and parent involvement were all rated in the Rand study as moderate, but were rated as the top criteria in Stark County. Flexible programming and a variety of activities were rated as strong in the Rand study but were noticeably absent from the focus group rankings. The continued emphasis on student achievement that is present in all Stark County school districts may well account for the unique outcomes. Awareness that student achievement is necessary to decrease the drop out rate and increase the graduation rate is directly related to the standards based movement with accountability that is now present in Ohio.

The study contains a sampling of the programs provided by the school districts as compared to those provided through Foundation funding. The sampling raises some questions about program overlap and supply of programs related to demand. Further study or greater coordination might be investigated.

As the foundations consider future funding requests the school personnel, parent, and provider feedback on the surveys and in the focus groups needs to be considered. Funding requests that include adequate staffing that addresses the academic focus requested as well as an emphasis on academics should be assigned a higher priority than those projects that do not reflect those criteria. Provision for parental involvement needs to be a part of each application and the provider needs to show commitment to increasing parent involvement if the original participation is low.

School personnel, parents, and providers all commented to the authors about the value of extending the conversations so that best practices can be shared in Stark County. It is recommended that a conference be held to establish an After-School Council that would represent all three groups, share best practice and find a way to track the outcomes of the programs to student achievement—the natural outcome of a desired academic focus. As a help to all, the above-mentioned conference might include a discussion of the supplemental services requirements in the new *No Child Left Behind* legislation.

It should be noted that the conclusions and the recommendations presented in this study are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the conclusions or the recommendations of the foundations for whom the study was prepared.

INTRODUCTION

Extended school day, Saturday activities and summer activities lengthen the school day or school year for many students from pre-school to grade 12. Parents in Stark County, Ohio are fortunate to have many opportunities for students to engage in extended day, Saturday or summer school programs. Examples are listed in this section, but it should be noted that the examples are illustrative, not exhaustive.

These activities are funded from four sources: foundations, competitive federal or state grants to school districts, regular school district budgets and private agencies. Often the foundation funded and private agency activities serve students in the early childhood years and elementary grade levels whereas the school districts use available funds from local, state and federal sources to sponsor similar activities at the middle and high school grades.

The Stark Community Foundation, the Herbert W. Hoover Foundation, the Hoover Foundation, the Community Health Foundation of Western Stark County, the Deuble Foundation and the Sisters of Charity Foundation of Canton fund many of these activities, particularly in the urban centers of Alliance, Massillon, and Canton. Table I includes examples of foundation funded activities and Table II includes examples of school district funded after-school activities.

Table I
Examples of Foundation Funded Extended Day, Saturday, or Summer Activities

<i>Provider</i>	<i>Name of Activity or Purpose</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Grade Levels Served</i>	<i># of Children Served</i>	<i>Expected Outcome</i>	<i>Funder(s)</i>
32 Degree Masonic Learning Center for Children	Tutoring program for Dyslexic children	Canton	K-12 th	10 weekly	Improve academic skills	Previously funded by Sisters of Charity Foundation of Canton
Alliance Neighborhood Center	AppleSeed Project	Alliance	3 rd -6 th	50 (beginning July 2002)	*NA	Anointed Fountain & YWCA Sisters of
Canton Calvary Mission		Canton	3 rd -4 th	32 weekly	Tutoring	Charity Foundation of Canton Sisters of
Canton Urban League	Plato Software Program	Canton	K-12	150	Increase in proficiency test passage rate and # of students served	Charity of Canton & Stark Community Foundation
	Book Nook Children's Literacy Program	Canton	K-6	2,500 (Nov. 2001 – Aug. 2002)	Literacy	H.W. Hoover Foundation & Stark Community Foundation

<i>Provider</i>	<i>Name of Activity or Purpose</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Grade Levels Served</i>	<i># of Children Served</i>	<i>Expected Outcome</i>	<i>Funder(s)</i>
City of Canton Youth Development Department	Afterschool	Canton (SE)	7 th -8 th	20	Each One-Teach One computer exploring	Stark Community Foundation
J R Coleman Family Services Corp	Funding to build the new Coleman Care and Family Center	Canton (NE)	K-6 th	75	Afterschool care, summer reading programs, and school holiday activities	H.W. Hoover Foundation
Communities Ministries International Lighthouse	Children of Promise	Canton	PK-8 th	20 weekly	Tutoring	Sisters of Charity Foundation of Canton
Community Drop In Center	After-School Tutoring	Canton (SE)	1 st -6 th	30-35 weekly	Tutoring	Stark Community Foundation
	Young Boy/ Girls Program	Canton (SE)	1 st -6 th	15-25 weekly	*NA	Stark Community Foundation
Crystal Park United Methodist Church	Various afterschool activities	Canton (NE)	K-12 th	50-60	Care Program, recreation, tutoring	H.W. Hoover Foundation, Deuble Foundation, Sisters of Charity Foundation of Canton, Stark Community Foundation
Deliverance Christian Church	Deliverance Christian Church	Canton	K-8 th	32 daily	Increase in proficiency test passage rate	Sisters of Charity Foundation of Canton
Faith Evangelical Lutheran Church	Summer Math/ Reading Enrichment (2-week summer program)	Canal Fulton	1 st -5 th	70 on average	Summer Math/ Reading Enrichment	Sisters of Charity Foundation of Canton
First Mennonite Church	Lighthouse Ministries	Canton (NE) (Hartford Middle School area)	K-12 th (primarily 6 th -8 th)	280, 100 weekly	Tutoring	Stark Community Foundation & Sisters of Charity Foundation of Canton

<i>Provider</i>	<i>Name of Activity or Purpose</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Grade Levels Served</i>	<i># of Children Served</i>	<i>Expected Outcome</i>	<i>Funder(s)</i>
Grace Operation & Development Center	Afterschool & Summer program	Canton (NE)	K-8 th	15 - 144	Safe care, recreation, tutoring	Deuble Foundation & Stark County Foundation Neighborhood Program
Heartbeats to the City (also a match to Gear-Up, Canton)	Mentoring, violin lessons, art lessons	Minnie Hopkins Neighborhood Center - SE Canton	1 st -12 th	100	Increase in graduation and college going rates / enhancement activities	H.W. Hoover Foundation & Stark Community Foundation
Luntz Enterprises	Project Wheelbarrow	Downtown Canton	6 th -12 th	120	Mentoring	H.W. Hoover Foundation
Massillon Boys and Girls Club	Project Learn	Massillon	K-8 th	150 daily	Overall health/wellness and academic improvement	Community Health Foundation, Stark Community Foundation & Western Stark United Way
Minority Development Services of Stark County	LIFE Youth	Canton	2 nd -12 th	18 daily, 30-40 enrolled	Comprehensive activity program with academics	Central Stark United Way & H.W. Hoover Foundation
Salvation Army	The Learning Center	Canton	3 rd	25	Increase family ties and student academic outcomes	H.W. Hoover & Stark Community Foundation
Stark County Chess Foundation	Chess Club	Canton	K-12 th	1,000	Critical thinking skills	H.W. Hoover Foundation
Stark Metropolitan Housing Authority	Alliance Computer Learning Center	Alliance	K-12 th (primarily 3 rd -8 th)	400	*NA	Previously funded by Sisters of Charity Foundation
Stark Social Workers Network	Various afterschool programs	Canton	3 rd -8 th	15-25 plus 10 families	Safe program, tutoring enhancements	Deuble Foundation, H.W. Hoover Foundation & Stark Community Foundation
J Babe Stearn Community Center	Gear-Up (afterschool)	Canton	7 th -8 th	14	Tutoring	United States Department of Education
	Afterschool recreation	Canton	All grade levels	*NA	Health & wellness	United Way of Central Stark

<i>Provider</i>	<i>Name of Activity or Purpose</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Grade Levels Served</i>	<i># of Children Served</i>	<i>Expected Outcome</i>	<i>Funder(s)</i>
J Babe Stearn Community Center		Canton	4 th	20-35 2-days weekly	Bible study	*NA
		Canton	*NA	3	Tutoring & mentoring	*NA
Walsh University (Saturday school)	PAX-Project for Academic Excellence	North Canton (serves multiple districts)	1 st -8 th	30	Accident improvement	Stark Community Foundation
YMCA of Alliance	Afterschool activities for youth (free memberships for low income youth)	Alliance	*NA	*NA	Health/wellness & recreation of youth	Alliance United Way, Federal Government (per diem), & Stark Community Foundation
YMCA of Central Stark County • Canton South • Downtown Canton • Louisville • Lake • N. Canton	Middle School After School	*NA	6 th -8 th	200	Care giving, safe programs	Federal Government & United Way of Central Stark
	Afterschool activities for youth (free memberships for low income youth)	Stark County YMCA's (5)	K-12 th	17,644 (these youth were either YMCA members and/or program participants)	Health/wellness & recreation of youth	Stark Community Foundation
YMCA of Western Stark County	After school	Stark County YMCA's	K-8 th	*NA	Health/wellness & recreation of youth	Federal Government (per diem), Stark Community Foundation, & United Way of Western Stark
YWCA - Alliance	After school	Alliance	K-8 th	*NA	Health/wellness & recreation of youth	Alliance United Way, Federal Government (per diem), & Stark Community Foundation
	Girls' Space	Alliance Alliance	3 rd -12 th	151, 10-15 daily	Build self-confidence of at-risk girls	Sisters of Charity Foundation of Canton Sisters of

<i>Provider</i>	<i>Name of Activity or Purpose</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Grade Levels Served</i>	<i># of Children Served</i>	<i>Expected Outcome</i>	<i>Funder(s)</i>
YWCA - Alliance	Girls Together		6 th -8 th	25 yearly	Keep girls actively engaged in school and decrease teen pregnancy	Charity Foundation of Canton

* Information is unavailable.

Table II
Examples of School District Funded After-School Activities

<i>Provider</i>	<i>Name of Activity or Purpose</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Grade Levels Served</i>	<i># of Children Served</i>	<i>Expected Outcome</i>	<i>Funder(s)</i>
Canton City Schools	GEAR-UP	Hartford, Lehman, & Souers Middle Schools	Currently 7 th -8 th , designed to follow students through 12 th	1,360	Increase in college going rate.	United States Department of Education
	Homework Clubs (at many schools)	*NA	1 st -8 th	*NA	Literacy, Proficiency	Canton City Schools
	Reading Excellence Act	2 elementary schools, 1 middle school	K-8 th	450	Literacy	Ohio Department of Education
	Sails Up!	Canton	Grade 5-6	108	Successful transition to middle school	Canton City Schools <i>Previously funded by Sisters of Charity Foundation</i>
	21 st Century Grant	Canton	K-9 th	1,210	Increase in student achievement	United States Department of Education
Canton City Schools Alternative Programs	Connections Academy	Canton	K-12 th	70	Alternative to out-of-school suspension or expulsion	Ohio Department of Education
	Child Care Scholarships	Canton	K-12 th	35	Increase the graduation rate	Ohio Department of Education
	Expanding Mental Health Services	Canton	K-12 th	158	Decrease suspension/expulsion/drop-out rates	Ohio Department of Education

<i>Provider</i>	<i>Name of Activity or Purpose</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Grade Levels Served</i>	<i># of Children Served</i>	<i>Expected Outcome</i>	<i>Funder(s)</i>
Canton City Schools Alternative Programs	Passages High School	Canton	K-12 th	97	Increase graduation rate for expelled students	Ohio Department of Education
	Truancy Mediation	Canton	K-12 th	163	Increase attendance rate	Ohio Department of Education
	Twilight School (McKinley, Timken & Freshman Academy)	Canton	10 th -12 th	413	Decrease out-of-school suspension rate	Ohio Department of Education
Massillon City Schools	21 st Century Grant and Project AHEAD Pregnancy	Massillon	K-5 th	400	Increase student achievement	United States Department of Education, Stark Community Foundation
Provider network of multiple Stark County districts	prevention funds for in/out of school programs	Multiple	K-12 th	*NA	Decrease # of teen pregnancies	Ohio Department of Health Wellness Block Grant to Stark County Family Council Board

* Information is unavailable.

The sampling of the programs provided by the school districts as compared to those provided through Foundation funding raise some questions about program overlap. For example, the Herbert W. Hoover Foundation and the Stark Community Foundation provide funding to Heartbeats to the City for mentoring, while the Herbert W. Hoover foundation provides funding to Luntz Enterprises for mentoring. What is not known from the sampling is the degree to which the same students are tapped for both programs, nor is it known if the actual content of the programs is different. The same could be said about tutoring. A number of Foundation funded programs in Canton provide tutoring while the Canton City Schools provide homework clubs. Once again, are these the same students, different students, or are students making a choice? Probably the most salient questions are to what extent do the programs compete for the same students, or are the programs sufficient to meet the demand?

This study was not specifically designed to investigate overlap or demand related to supply, so further study or greater coordination of programs might be in order.

RELATED EDUCATIONAL LITERATURE

The number of reports and studies concerning after-school programs or elements of after-school care has been on the increase in recent years. Many of these are included in the Bibliography of this study. One recent example is [Building Effective Afterschool Programs](#) (2002) by Olatokubo Fashola. There are other sources as well. The Afterschool Alliance, for instance, issues numerous briefs and documents (www.afterschoolalliance.org/issue_br.cfm). Much of the literature is case study material, or deals with separate elements (such as extended day care) often associated with, or related to, afterschool programs.

Though the number of reports and studies have been on the rise, the major problem remains, as the Harvard Family Research Project's Out-of-School-Time Evaluation Database (www.gse.harvard.edu/%7Ehfrp/projects/afterschool/evaldatabase.html) states, "currently, ... there is little systematic and ongoing investigation of the overall picture of evaluation work in the field of out-of-school time nor is there a systematic way to investigate how different programs approach the evaluation task in order to support development of the field and its programs." The database is the first serious attempt to "provide the user with a variety of designs, methodologies, and findings to serve multiple stakeholder needs."

Joel Tolman and others in a recent report (*Moving an out-of-school agenda: Lessons and challenges across cities*: 2002) point out that while the range of providers has increased dramatically many players remain unknown and often have limited data collection capacity. Many collect data inconsistently or according to funder preferences and there has been little attempt to synthesize or build on available information. This study is a first attempt on a regional (Stark County, Ohio) level to address many of these concerns.

In recent years, a number of reports or studies have also been issued containing recommended components or standards for quality after-school programs. There is still limited empirical, scientific research on extended learning or after school child care activities. The research that does exist is mostly anecdotal or based on panel of expert recommendations.

Four of the most widely used reports are listed below. The methodology used to formulate each report is explained.

1. Beckett, M., Hawken, A., Jackowitz, A. (2001). Accountability for after-school care: Devising standards and measuring adherence to them. Rand. www.rand.org/publications/MR/MR1411/. Downloaded January 12, 2002.

Description of methodology: Model program features were identified by meta-analysis of all of the literature (25 studies).

2. Caplan, J., Calfee, C.S. (1999). Strengthening connections between schools and after school programs. North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. www.ncrel.org/21stccclc/connect/credit.htm. Downloaded January 8, 2002.

Description of methodology: The authors collected sample policies and information about after-school programs from ten large urban school districts. The results were synthesized into sixteen characteristics with indicators of quality programs. The document also includes copies of sample policies.

3. NSACA Standards www.nsaca.org/standards_glance.htm. Downloaded January 8, 2002.

Description of methodology: The NSACA created standards for determining accreditation.

4. U.S. Department of Education, U.S. Department of Justice. (2000). *Working for children and families: safe and smart after-school programs*. <http://www.ed.gov> or <http://www.ncjrs.org/ojjhome.htm>. Downloaded March 5, 2002.

Description of methodology: Synthesizes criteria from the observations of others in published studies and from visits to exemplary programs that are listed in the document.

Table III compares the recommended criteria, standards or program features from the foregoing four major reports.

Table III
Comparison of After-School Criteria from Four Major Reports

<p>NCREL www.ncrel.org/21stcc/c/connect/credit.htm</p>	<p>Characteristic: Coordination With the Regular School Day Learning Program and Community Partners Indicator: Comprehensive programs support classroom-based efforts with a strong academic focus for program planning and the delivery of services.</p> <p>Characteristic: Linkages Between After-School, Regular School, and Community Partner Personnel Indicator: Comprehensive programs build a foundation so that teachers and school staff know about and support programs and activities.</p>
<p>RAND www.rand.org/publications/MR/MR1411/</p>	<p>Maintaining continuity and complementarity with regular day school (ranking: moderate)</p>
<p>NSACA Standards www.nsaca.org/standards_glance.htm</p>	<p>Staff, families, and schools share important information to support the well-being of children and youth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program policies require that staff and family members communicate about the child’s well-being. • Staff, families, and schools work together as a team to set goals for each child; they work with outside specialists when necessary. • Staff and families share information about how to support children’s development. • Staff and families join together to communicate and work with the schools.
<p>US Dept of Ed US Dept of Justice http://www.ed.gov or http://www.ncjrs.org/ojjhome.htm</p>	<p>Linkages between school day and after-school personnel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning time to maximize children’s opportunities • Coordinated use of facilities and resources. <p>Enriching learning opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing engaging opportunities to grow and learn. • Challenging curriculum in an enriching environment.
<p>NCREL</p>	<p>Characteristic: Community Partnerships Indicator: Comprehensive programs form a variety of community partnerships with</p>

RAND	community-based organizations, related public agencies, businesses, or other appropriate organizations to meet the needs of children and families in the program. Using community-based organizations and facilities (ranking: moderate)
NSACA Standards	The program builds links to the community. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff provide information about community resources to meet the needs of children and their families. • The program develops a list of community resources. The staff draw from these resources to expand program offerings. • The staff plan activities to help children get to know the larger community. • The program offers community-service options, especially for older children.
US Dept of Ed US Dept of Justice	Effective partnerships with community-based organizations, juvenile justice agencies, law enforcement, and youth groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steps to building an after-school partnership • Using community resources effectively
NCREL	Characteristic: Recreational Programming Indicator: Comprehensive programs provide recreational activities that create (1) opportunities to demonstrate personal and social behavior,(2) promote inclusion and understanding of the abilities and cultural diversity of people, and (3) encourage participation in activities for enjoyment, challenge, self-expression, and communication.
RAND	Providing a sufficient variety of activities (ranking: strong)
NSACA Standards	
US Dept of Ed US Dept of Justice	
NCREL	Characteristic: Focus on At-Risk Students Indicator: Comprehensive programs are designed to meet the needs of students who are most at risk of academic and social failure in a community. Programs operate during the critical hours of need.
RAND	Maintaining a low child-to-staff ratio (ranking: moderate)
NSACA Standards	Staff-child ratios and group sizes permit the staff to meet the needs of children and youth. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff-child ratios vary according to the ages and abilities of children. The ratio is between 1:10 and 1:15 for groups of children age 6 and older. The ratio is between 1:8 and 1:12 for groups that include children under age 6. • Staff-child ratios and group sizes vary according to the type and complexity of the activity, but group sizes do not exceed thirty. • There is a plan to provide adequate staff coverage in case of emergencies. • Substitute staff are used to maintain ratios when regular staff are absent.
US Dept of Ed US Dept of Justice	Quality after-school staffing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role of the program administrator • Hiring and retaining qualified staff • Professional development for staff • Use of volunteers • Low staff-to-student ratio • Smaller group sizes
NCREL	
RAND	Ensure that programming is flexible (ranking: strong).
NSACA Standards	Children and youth can choose from a wide variety of activities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are regular opportunities for active, physical play. • There are regular opportunities for creative arts and dramatic play. • There are regular opportunities for quiet activities and socializing.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children have a chance to join enrichment activities that promote basic skills and higher-level thinking.
US Dept of Ed US Dept of Justice	
NCREL	
RAND	Establishing and maintaining a favorable emotional climate (ranking: strong)
NSACA Standards	<p>The daily schedule is flexible, and it offers enough security, independence, and stimulation to meet the needs of all children and youth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The routine provides stability without being rigid. Children meet their physical needs in a relaxed way. Individual children move smoothly from one activity to another, usually at their own pace. When it is necessary for children to move as a group, the transition is smooth. <p>Children and youth are supervised at all times.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children’s arrivals are supervised. Children’s departures are supervised. Staff has a system for knowing where the children are at all times. Staff plan for different levels of supervision according to the level of risk involved in an activity.
US Dept of Ed US Dept of Justice	
NCREL	
	<p>Characteristic: Climate for Inclusion</p> <p>Indicator: Comprehensive programs are inclusive of all students, regardless of their emotional, intellectual, social, or physical needs.</p>
RAND	<p>Activities reflect the mission of the program and promote the development of all the children and youth in the program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activities are in line with the styles, abilities and interests of the individuals in the program. Activities are well suited to the age range of children in the program. Activities reflect the languages and cultures of the families served. Activities reflect and support the program’s mission.
NSACA Standards	
US Dept of Ed US Dept of Justice	
NCREL	
	<p>Characteristic: Culturally Sensitive Climate</p> <p>Indicator: Comprehensive programs are respectful of home culture and offer opportunities for students to express their cultural heritage.</p>
RAND	
NSACA Standards	
US Dept of Ed US Dept of Justice	
NCREL	
	<p>Characteristic: Facilities Management</p> <p>Indicator: Comprehensive programs provide safe, clean facilities that are adequate for program needs.</p>
RAND	Providing adequate space (ranking: moderate)
NSACA Standards	<p>The program’s indoor space meets the needs of children and youth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is enough room for all program activities.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The space is arranged well for a range of activities: physical games and sports, creative arts, dramatic play, quiet games, enrichment offerings, eating, and socializing. • The space is arranged so that various activities can go on at the same time without much disruption. • There is adequate and convenient storage space for equipment, materials, and personal possessions of children and staff. <p>The indoor space allows children and youth to take initiative and explore their interests.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children can get materials out and put them away by themselves with ease. • Children can arrange materials and equipment to suit their activities. • The indoor space reflects the work and interests of the children. • Some areas have soft, comfortable furniture on which children can relax. <p>The outdoor play area meets the needs of children and youth, and the equipment allows them to be independent and creative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each child has a chance to play outdoors for at least 30 minutes out of every three-hour block of time at the program. • Children can use a variety of outdoor equipment and games for both active and quiet play. • Permanent playground equipment is suitable for the sizes and abilities of all children. • The outdoor space is suitable for a wide variety of activities. <p>The program’s indoor space meets the needs of staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is enough room in the indoor space for staff to plan various program activities. • Staff have access to adequate and convenient storage. • The indoor space meets or exceeds local health and safety codes. • Written guidelines are in place regarding the use and maintenance of the program facility. <p>The outdoor space is large enough to meet the needs of children, youth, and staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is enough room in the outdoor space for all program activities. • The outdoor space meets or exceeds local health and safety codes. • Staff use outdoor areas to provide new outdoor play experiences. • There is a procedure in place for regularly checking the safety and maintenance of the outdoor play space.
<p>US Dept of Ed US Dept of Justice</p>	
<p>NCREL</p>	<p>Characteristic: Funding Indicator: Comprehensive programs seek stable and adequate funding to ensure program success.</p>
<p>RAND</p>	<p>Providing enough quality materials (ranking: moderate) Providing age-appropriate activities and materials (ranking: moderate)</p>
<p>NSACA Standards</p>	<p>There are sufficient materials to support program activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Materials are complete and in good repair. • There are enough materials for the number of children in the program. • Materials are developmentally appropriate for the age range of the children in the program. • Materials promote the program’s mission. <p>The safety and security of children and youth are protected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no observable safety hazards in the program space. • Systems are in place to protect the children from harm, especially when they move from one place to another or use the rest room. • Equipment for active play is safe.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A system is in place to keep unauthorized people from taking children from the program. <p>The program provides an environment that protects and enhances the health of children and youth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The indoor and outdoor facilities are clean. • There are no observable health hazards in the indoor or outdoor space. • There are adequate supplies and facilities for hand washing. • The heat, ventilation, noise level, and light in the indoor space are comfortable. <p>The program staff tries to protect and enhance the health of children and youth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff is responsive to the individual health needs of the children. • Staff protects children from communicable disease by separating children who become ill during the program. • Staff protect children from potential hazards such as the following: caustic or toxic art materials and cleaning agents, medications, and hot liquids; overexposure to heat or cold. • Staff and children wash hands frequently, especially after using the toilet or before preparing food. <p>Children and youth are carefully supervised to maintain safety.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff note when children arrive, when they leave, and with whom they leave. • Staff knows where the children are and what they are doing. • Staff supervises children appropriately according to children’s ages, abilities, and needs. • Staff closely supervises activities that are potentially harmful. <p>The program serves foods and drinks that meet the needs of children and youth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program serves healthy foods. • Drinking water is readily available at all times. • The amount and type of food offered is appropriate for the ages and sizes of children. • Snacks and meals are timed appropriately for children.
<p>US Dept of Ed US Dept of Justice</p>	
<p>NCREL</p>	<p>Characteristic: Safe and Healthy Environment Indicator: Comprehensive programs pay special attention to creating safe and healthy environments where children can thrive.</p>
<p>RAND</p>	<p>Paying adequate attention to safety and health (ranking: moderate)</p>
<p>NSACA Standards</p>	<p>Program policies and procedures are in place to protect the safety of the children and youth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff and children know what to do in case of general emergency. • The program has established procedures to prevent accidents and manage emergencies. • The program has established policies to transport children safely; it complies with all legal requirements for vehicles and drivers. • A system is in place to prevent unauthorized people from taking children from the program. <p>Program policies exist to protect and enhance the health of all children and youth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is current documentation showing that the program has met the state and/or local health and safety guidelines and/or regulations. • There are written policies and procedures to ensure the health and safety of children. • No smoking is allowed in the program. • The staff are always prepared to respond to accidents and emergencies.
<p>US Dept of Ed US Dept of Justice</p>	<p>Attention to safety, health, and nutrition issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating safe places with adequate space and materials • Meeting nutritional needs

NCREL	Characteristic: Leadership and Governance Indicator: Comprehensive programs provide leadership opportunities for all levels of participants.
RAND	
NSACA Standards	Staff, children, and youth work together to plan and implement suitable activities, which are consistent with the program's philosophy. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff ask children to share their ideas for planning so that activities will reflect children's interests. • The program's daily activities are in line with its mission and philosophy. • Staff keep on file their records of activity planning. • Staff plan activities that will reflect the cultures of the families in the program and the broad diversity of human experience. <p>The administration provides sound management of the program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The financial management of the program supports the program's goals. • The administration oversees the recruitment and retention of program staff. • The director involves staff, board, families, and children in both long-term planning and daily decision making. • Administrators assist with ongoing evaluation. They aim for improvement in all areas of the program. <p>Program policies and procedures are responsive to the needs of children, youth, and families in the community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A written mission statement sets forth the program's philosophy and goals. • The program makes itself affordable to all families by using all possible community resources and sources of subsidy. • The program's hours of operation are based on families needs. • It is the program's policy to enroll children with special needs.
US Dept of Ed US Dept of Justice	
NCREL	Characteristic: Engaging the Public Indicator: Comprehensive programs have an organized, systematic approach for engaging the public with the school, home, and community.
RAND	
NSACA Standards	
US Dept of Ed US Dept of Justice	
NCREL	Characteristic: Parent Involvement Indicator: Parents are educational leaders and innovators in the comprehensive program.
RAND	
NSACA Standards	Involving families (ranking: moderate) Staff support families involvement in the program. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a policy that allows family members to visit anytime throughout the day. • Staff offer orientation sessions for new families. • Staff keep families informed about the program. • Staff encourage families to give input and to get involved in program events.
US Dept of Ed US Dept of Justice	Strong Involvement of families <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involving families and youth in program planning. • Attending to the needs of working parents.
NCREL	Characteristic: Evaluation Design

	Indicator: Comprehensive programs pay continuing attention to program evaluation and continuous improvement strategies to ensure that children benefit from and enjoy the comprehensive program.
RAND	Establishing clear goals and evaluating programs accordingly (ranking: moderate)
NSACA Standards	
US Dept of Ed US Dept of Justice	Goal setting, strong management, and sustainability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on goals of program • Solid organizational structure • Effective management and sustainability • Meeting legal requirement
NCREL	Characteristic: Volunteers Indicator: Comprehensive programs use volunteers in a variety of ways to enhance program activities.
RAND	Using volunteers (ranking: moderate)
NSACA Standards	
US Dept of Ed US Dept of Justice	
NCREL	Characteristic: Staffing, Staff Qualifications, and Training Indicator: Comprehensive programs provide for a low student-staff ratio, the hiring of highly qualified program staff, and the provision of ongoing training. This training (1) enables staff members to expand their knowledge, strengthen their skills, and move as far along a career path in the field as they desire; (2) promotes and supports diversity in all roles, ensuring that the program leadership mirrors the families being served; and (3) ties increased compensation to gains in knowledge, providing an incentive for staff to stay in the field and continue to grow as professionals.
RAND	Hiring and retaining educated staff (ranking: moderate) Providing attractive compensation (ranking: moderate) Training staff (ranking: moderate) Constraining Turnover rate (ranking: limited) Experienced Staff (ranking: limited)
NSACA Standards	All staff is professionally qualified to work with children and youth. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff meet the requirements for experience with school-age children in recreational settings. • Staff have received the recommended type and amount of preparation. They meet the requirements that are specific to school-age child care and relevant to their particular jobs. • Staff meet minimum age requirements. • Enough qualified staff are in place to meet all levels of responsibility. Qualified staff are hired in all areas: to administer the program, to oversee its daily operations, and to supervise children. <p>Staff (paid, volunteer, and substitute) are given an orientation to the job before working with children and youth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A written job description that outlines responsibilities to children, families, and the program is reviewed with each staff member. • Written personnel policies are reviewed with staff. • Written program policies and procedures, including emergency procedures and confidentiality policies, are reviewed with staff. • New staff are given a comprehensive orientation to the program philosophy, routines, and practices. They are personally introduced to the people with whom they will be working.

	<p>The training needs of the staff are assessed, and training is relevant to the responsibilities of each job. Assistant Group Leaders receive at least 15 hours of training annually. Group Leaders receive at least 18 hours of training annually. Senior Group Leaders receive at least 21 hours of training annually. Site Directors receive at least 24 hours of training annually Program Administrators receive at least 30 hours of training annually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff receive training in how to work with families and how to relate to children in ways that promote their development. • Program directors and administrators receive training in program management and staff supervision. • Staff receive training in how to set up space and design activities to support program goals. • Staff receive training in how to promote the safety, health and nutrition of children. <p>Staff receive appropriate support to make their work experience positive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program has a plan in place to offer the best possible wages and working conditions in an effort to reduce staff turnover. • Full-time staff receive benefits, including health insurance and paid leaves of absence. Staff are also given paid breaks and paid preparation time. • Staff are given ample time to discuss their own concerns regarding the program. • Staff receive continuous supervision and feedback. This includes written performance reviews on a timely basis.
<p>US Dept of Ed US Dept of Justice</p>	
<p>NCREL</p>	
<p>RAND</p>	
<p>NSACA Standards</p>	<p>Staff relates to all children and youth in positive ways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff treats children with respect and listens to what they say. • Staff makes children feel welcome and comfortable. • Staff responds to children with acceptance and appreciation. • Staff is engaged with children. <p>Staff responds appropriately to individual needs of children and youth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff knows that each child has special interests and talents • Staff recognizes the range of children’s abilities. • Staff can relate to a child’s cultural style & primary language. • Staff responds to the range of children’s feelings and temperaments. <p>Staff encourages children and youth to make choices and to become more responsible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff offers assistance in a way that supports a child’s initiative. • Staff assists children without taking control, and they encourage children to take leadership roles. • Staff give children many chances to choose what they will do, how they will do it, and with whom. • Staff helps children make informed and responsible choices. <p>Staff interacts with children and youth to help them learn.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff asks questions that encourage children to think for themselves. • Staff share skills and resources to help children gain information and solve problems. • Staff varies the approaches they use to help children learn. • Staff helps children use language skills through frequent conversations.

	<p>Staff use positive techniques to guide the behavior of children and youth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff gives attention to children when they cooperate, share, care for materials, or join in activities. • Staff set appropriate limits for children. • Staff uses no harsh discipline methods. • Staff encourages children to resolve their own conflicts. Staff steps in only if needed to discuss the issues and work out a solution. <p>Children and youth generally interact with one another in positive ways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children appear relaxed and involved with each other. • Children show respect for each other. • Children usually cooperate and work well together • When problems occur, children often try to discuss their differences and work out a solution. <p>Staff and families interact with each other in positive ways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff makes families feel welcome and comfortable. • Staff and families treat each other with respect. • Staff shares the languages and cultures of the families they serve, and the communities they live in. • Staff and families work together to make arrivals and departures between home and child care go smoothly. <p>Staff work well together to meet the needs of children and youth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff communicates with each other while the program is in session to ensure that the program flows smoothly. • Staff is cooperative with each other. • Staff is respectful of each other. • Staff provides role models of positive adult relationships.
<p>US Dept of Ed US Dept of Justice</p>	
NCREL	
RAND	
NSACA Standards	<p>The administration provides sound management of the program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The financial management of the program supports the program’s goals. • The administration oversees the recruitment and retention of program staff. • The director involves staff, board, families, and children in both long-term planning and daily decision making. • Administrators assist with ongoing evaluation. They aim for improvement in all areas of the program.
<p>US Dept of Ed US Dept of Justice</p>	

METHODOLOGY

Senior staff from the Herbert W. Hoover Foundation, the Sisters of Charity Foundation of Canton, the Stark Community Foundation, and the Stark Education Partnership formulated a strategy for developing Stark County elements of a quality after school program. The strategy included: identification of participants, use of a ranking sheet, focus groups with the participants with a report written by the focus group facilitator, and a final report containing the elements of a quality after school program synthesized from the ranking sheets and the focus groups. Staff from the Stark Education Partnership agreed to conduct the study and write the final report.

Participants in the Study

Three groups were identified as participants for the determination of the elements of effective after-school programs: providers of after-school child-care programs, school personnel who work with such programs and parents/guardians or caregivers of children enrolled in the programs. Each foundation provided the Partnership with names and addresses of the after-school child care programs funded by them so that the providers could be contacted by letter to solicit their participation in the survey. Letters were sent to 15 school personnel, 29 providers of after school care and 153 parents.

The letter sent to providers of after-school child care programs, school personnel who work with such programs and to the parents/guardians or caregivers of children enrolled in the programs asked for their help by completing the Ranking Sheets and informing them that they might be asked to participate in focus groups. Self-addressed, stamped return address envelopes were included to make it more convenient for participants in the survey to respond. (Please see Appendix I for copy of letter.)

Following the mailing of the surveys, after school care program providers were contacted by telephone and asked to provide names and addresses of parents whose children participate in their programs. In some cases, the names were provided directly to the Partnership, but for the most part the providers agreed to receive the letters and surveys and distribute them to parents. Providers who chose this method to deliver the surveys to parents believed that there would be a better chance for the surveys to be understood, completed and returned. Providers were encouraged to complete the survey and return it.

Appendix II contains a listing of After-School providers and school personnel. The parents names were not included to protect the confidentiality of the children.

Ranking Sheet

A Ranking Sheet was developed from the comparative characteristics, criteria or standards identified in the educational literature to determine what characteristics, criteria or standards respondents from each of the groups believe indicate or anticipate success for after-school or extended learning programs proposed for funding by local foundations and the characteristics or standards that should be used by providers to evaluate funded programs. The content of the ranking sheet follows:

RANKING SHEET

CRITERIA FOR FUNDING AND EVALUATING AFTER-SCHOOL OR EXTENDED LEARNING ACTIVITIES.

Please rank all of the following criteria in the order of importance that you think funders should consider when deciding to fund programs. Use number 1 as the item of most importance.

- Continuity with the school day program is evident.
- Clear, established links with extended learning activity provider and school personnel exist.
- An academic focus is present.
- Community partnerships are present.
- Recreational programming is included.
- A variety of activities are planned.
- The focus is on at-risk students.
- The facility is safe and clean.
- Flexible programming is present.
- Low child-to-staff ratio is planned.
- Favorable emotional climate is planned.
- All students are included.
- A culturally sensitive climate is planned.
- Sufficient age-appropriate materials are planned.
- Leadership opportunities are planned for all levels of participants.
- An organized systemic approach for engaging the public with the home, school and community is present.
- Parental involvement is planned.
- Clear goals and an evaluation system are present.
- Volunteers will be used in the program.
- Staff qualified to work with children will be hired.
- A plan is in place for staff training.
- There is a plan for administering and managing the program.
- Other: Please list and rank.

The Ranking Sheets (surveys) were color coded with a different color for each of the three groups of anticipated respondents to allow tabulation of the results by group—that is, provider, school personnel or parent/caregiver.

Tabulating the Returned Ranking Sheets

The survey instrument was composed of criteria from four specific sources (NCRL, RAND, NSACA, United States Department of Education). The instrument itself is a rank order scale (1= highest or most, 22= lowest or least). This specific scale was used to surface those factors on which the most agreement was evident among all parties.

Focus Groups

Background

The Stark Education Partnership asked The Office of Corporate and Community Services at Kent State University Stark Campus to propose a plan for conducting focus groups and compiling findings from the focus groups. Conducting focus groups and compiling the findings from focus groups is the final phase of this research. The objective of conducting the focus groups is to explore the rankings of the criteria for funding and evaluating after-school programming that each of three written survey respondent groups provided.

Kent State Stark was asked to complete the following tasks:

1. Establish the protocol for conducting the focus groups,
2. Facilitate six focus groups, two each with school personnel, parents and after-school program providers,
3. Compiling findings from the focus groups, and
4. Completing a written summary report of the focus group findings.

Kent State Stark:

1. Established and provided written documentation for the focus group protocol. This written report of the planned protocol included:
 - a. The number of, time, location and length of the focus groups,
 - b. The focus group script for each group, which includes the introduction and questions asked,
 - c. The manner in which comments are recorded and compiled,
 - d. The manner in which focus group participants are recruited, and
 - e. The number of participants in each group and a listing of the participants.
2. Facilitated six focus groups, two each with school personnel, parents and after-school program providers including:
 - a. Two professionals of the Office of Corporate and Community Services attended each focus group.
 - b. One professional facilitated the group and took notes. The second professional took notes and followed-up on some questioning.
 - c. Focus groups had a minimum of three participants and a maximum of twelve. Each lasted for up to 1.5 hours.
3. Professionals in the Office of Corporate and Community Services at Kent State Stark compiled and analyzed the information and provide a written summary report of the focus group findings.

The Stark Education Partnership:

1. Coordinated with Kent State Stark to schedule the times of the focus group meetings,
2. Secured a location(s) conducive to conducting focus group meetings,
3. Recruited and invited participants to the focus group meetings,
4. Took reservations and assured that each focus group includes from five to twelve participants,

-
5. Prepared name tents for all focus group participants,
 6. Provided refreshments for the focus group meetings, and
 7. Provided maps and directions to the focus group meeting locations.

Focus Group Protocol

Focus Group Logistics

The Stark Education Partnership contracted with The Office of Corporate and Community Services at Kent State University Stark Campus to conduct six focus groups in support of the Extended Learning Opportunities Criteria for Selecting and Evaluating Foundation Funded Programs project. The objective of conducting the focus groups is to explore the rankings of the criteria for funding and evaluating after-school programming that each of three written survey respondent groups provided.

Professionals in The Office of Corporate and Community Services recommended conducting six focus groups, two each with school personnel, parents and after school program providers. The length of each focus group is from one to one and one half-hour and each involves from five to twelve participants. The focus groups were held at a location that is convenient for the participants. The following focus groups were scheduled (because of the limited number of school personnel who completed the ranking sheet, only one focus group was planned for school personnel):

Provider Group 1	May 30, 2002	10:30 AM to 12:00 PM	Stark Education Partnership
Provider Group 2	May 30, 2002	1:00 to 2:30 PM	Stark Education Partnership
School Personnel	June 4, 2002	1:00 to 2:30 PM	Stark Education Partnership
Parent Group 1	June 4, 2002	4:00 to 5:30 PM	Massillon City Schools
Parent Group 2	June 5, 2002	2:30 to 4:00 PM	Canton Urban League

Focus Group Participants

Three groups were identified as participants for the *Extended Learning Opportunities Criteria for Selecting and Evaluating Foundation Funded Programs* project. They are providers of after-school child-care programs, school personnel who work with such programs and parents/guardians or care givers of children enrolled in the programs. Respondents in each of these groups completed the ranking sheet, and at the time of completing the survey were told that they might be asked to participate in a focus group.

Appendix III contains a listing of those who participated in a focus group. The parent names were not included to protect the confidentiality of the children.

Recruitment of Focus Group Participants

The Stark Education Partnership was responsible for the recruitment of participants for the focus groups. After-school program providers were contacted and asked to recruit parents who had received the ranking sheet to participate. The after-school program providers recommended particular times and locations for which they could recruit the number of parents who were required for the focus groups. Parent focus groups were held at locations convenient for parents with children participating in after-school programs. The Stark Education Partnership contacted after-school program provider personnel by phone and extended an invitation to participate in a focus group. The same procedure was used to contact school personnel who had received the ranking sheet.

Focus group scripts are included in Appendix IV.

Findings

After-School Criteria As Ranked by School Personnel

Responses: 10 of 15

Return Rate: 67%

	Ranking	*Score
An academic focus in present.	#1	32
Staff qualified to work with children will be hired.	#2	58
Clear, established links with extended learning activity provider and school personnel exist.	#3	60
Clear goals and an evaluation system are present.	#4	66
A variety of activities are planned.	#5	75
All students are included.	#6	81
Continuity with the school day program is evident.	#7	85
The facility is safe and clean.	#8	85
Parental involvement is planned.	#9	86
Community partnerships are present.	#10	96
A plan is in place for staff training.	#11	99
Favorable emotional climate is planned.	#12	109
An organized systemic approach for engaging the public with the home, school and community is present.	#13	110
Sufficient age-appropriate materials are planned.	#14	113
The focus is on at-risk students.	#15	114
There is a plan for administering and managing the program.	#16	115
Low child-to-staff ratio is planned.	#17	120
Flexible programming is present.	#18	127
Recreational programming is included.	#19	130
A culturally sensitive climate is planned.	#20	138
Volunteers will be used in the program.	#21	150
Leadership opportunities are planned for all levels of participants.	#22	172
Other: Please list. — A racially diverse staff who all students can relate with. — Snack program available for students. — Location of program(s); i.e. Is transportation needed? — Arts programming is included.		

* Criteria was ranked from 1 to 22 (with 1 being the most important); therefore, the lower the score, the more valuable it's deemed.

School Personnel Focus Group

Professionals facilitated only one focus group with school personnel because of the small population of school personnel to whom a ranking sheet was mailed. Six individuals representing two school districts participated in this focus group. These six individuals represent forty percent of the total school personnel population to which a ranking sheet was mailed.

School personnel participating in this focus group ranked the top five criteria on which to base funding as:

- The economics of the families being served,
- Student academic achievement,
- Parental involvement component,
- The needs of the community, and
- Accessibility to the program.

Only one of the top five funding criteria as listed by the participants in this focus group – academic achievement – appears in the list of top five criteria developed from the responses of school personnel to the ranking sheets. When asked why this may have occurred, participants in this focus group indicated that they assumed that the after-school program would be held in a school building (which is considered safe) and that they assumed that school personnel and the most qualified staff would be hired to teach in the after-school program. In addition, the focus group participants felt that “goals and an evaluation system” are not related to the need for the program and, therefore, should not be one of the top five criteria. The general input was that for funder’s consideration, goals and an evaluation system should not be considered a high priority. This group felt that this criterion is important, but does not belong among the top five criteria. This group specifically stated that they felt their top five rankings are “better” than the overall school personnel population that completed the ranking sheets.

When asked their opinions about why the parent group that completed the ranking sheets included two criteria in the top five that are not included in the rankings by school personnel - the facility is safe and clean and a low child-to-staff ratio is planned - the school personnel participating in the focus group indicated that they assumed that these two criteria were a given and therefore did not rank them in the top five criteria. They commented that they understand why parents would rank these two criteria more important than school personnel, as parents may not assume that the program would be held in a school building.

The school personnel focus group participants were asked to elaborate on the key criteria that they identified as important when making funding decisions. Participants in the provider focus groups offered additional meaning to the criteria listed below:

- Economics of the families – participants in the school personnel focus group described this as meaning families in need of a place where their children can get more structure than they get at home. The participants suggested that schools having a high percentage of students that qualify for free or reduced lunches might be included in this criterion. Child care scholarships might be given to families in need. Parents in poverty should be served because these parents do not take their children to other activities. Students from one-parent households may need to be in an after-school program due to the burdens a single parent might encounter.
- Student academic achievement - participants in the school personnel focus group defined this to mean performing well on proficiency tests and using remediation testing when necessary. Children must be given the opportunity to feel successful. The time and space to complete homework and tutoring are a part of this criterion.
- Parental involvement – this was defined by the school personnel focus group participants to include giving parents the opportunity to know what the children are doing in school. This criterion means assisting parents with parenting skills and offering programs on Saturdays when needed.
- Accessibility – locating a program on a Stark Area Regional Transit Authority (SARTA) route so that children can be given bus passes if appropriate.

The school personnel in this focus group identified the following programs as meeting the criteria that are important to them:

- Boys and Girls Club
- Canton Urban League
- Churches
- Cultural Arts Center
- Malone College
- Massillon Parks and Recreation
- Salvation Army
- J. Babe Stearn Community Center
- YMCA

The YMCA, Canton Urban League and Salvation Army were specifically noted for the tutoring services available to students in these programs.

The school personnel in this focus group mentioned the challenges of getting parents involved, needing more funding, offering non-urban activities for urban students, offering physical education opportunities to both children and parents and to establish parent resource centers in the facilities that house the after-school program.

When asked to describe how they interact with staff at after-school programs, the school personnel in this focus group offered a plethora of methods and frequencies with which they interact with after-school provider staff who work in a school building. School personnel interact with after-school child care providers on a broad spectrum of activities that encompasses daily face-to-face and telephone contacts to quarterly logistical meetings. These school personnel indicated that they plan curriculum, assign rooms, set schedules and generally just talk to staff in the after-school program.

It was agreed that, in general, little or no interaction exists with after-school providers located someplace other than a school building. There was consensus among the school personnel in this focus group that “educators need to make a better effort to coordinate with providers of after-school child care programs located at a facility other than a school.”

School personnel in these focus groups agreed generally that community input is important. One participant in this focus group indicated that the governing board created by her school district’s after-school program is comprised of outside community groups who often have ties with after-school programs located some place other than a school. Another participant in this focus group commented that his program is attempting to arrange business partnerships with individual school buildings whereby a business would “adopt” a school.

After-School Criteria
As Ranked by Parents

Responses: 20 of 153
 Return Rate: 13%

	Ranking	*Score
An academic focus in present.	#1	95
Clear, established links with extended learning activity provider and school personnel exist.	#2	139
The facility is safe and clean.	#3	145
A variety of activities are planned.	#4	180
Staff qualified to work with children will be hired.	#5	183
Low child-to-staff ratio is planned.	#6	184
Flexible programming is present.	#7	186
All students are included.	#8	189
Community partnerships are present.	#9	190
Recreational programming is included.	#10	197
Sufficient age-appropriate materials are planned.	#11	198
Continuity with the school day program is evident.	#12	203
Parental involvement is planned.	#13	210
A culturally sensitive climate is planned.	#14	213
There is a plan for administering and managing the program.	#15	214
Favorable emotional climate is planned.	#16	219
Clear goals and an evaluation system are present.	#17	221
The focus is on at-risk students.	#18	226
An organized systemic approach for engaging the public with the home, school and community is present.	#19	243
A plan is in place for staff training.	#20	253
Leadership opportunities are planned for all levels of participants.	#21	270
Volunteers will be used in the program.	#22	301
Other: Please list. — Listen to ideas from children. — Program’s successes (past) — Program’s length of establishment — Program offers students opportunities to expand their horizons (world view)		

* Criteria was ranked from 1 to 22 (with 1 being the most important); therefore, the lower the score, the more valuable it’s deemed.

Parent Focus Groups

Professionals of The Office of Corporate and Community Services facilitated two focus groups with parents and guardians whose children attend after-school child care programs. Five parents/guardians who have at least one child enrolled in an after-school program participated in the first focus group and three parents/guardians who have at least one child enrolled in an after-school program participated in the second focus group. These eight parents/guardians represent approximately five percent of the total parent/guardian population to which a ranking sheet was mailed.

Parents in both focus groups ranked “staffing” among the top five criteria on which to base funding decisions. In addition to the staffing standard, each focus group presented additional criteria that they felt are most important. These are:

First focus group:

- Academic focus
- Socialization opportunities
- Transportation

Second focus group:

- Facilities
- Discipline and structure
- Parental involvement

Comparing the responses of the parents/guardians in the two focus groups to the results from the ranking sheets completed by parents and guardians, three of the criteria listed by focus group parents/guardians - academic focus, variety of learning activities and safe and clean facilities - appear in the top five criteria as tallied from the ranking sheets completed by parents/guardians. Two criteria - links with provider and school personnel and low child to staff ratio – were ranked in the top five criteria as reported from parents completing ranking sheets, but not in the criteria identified by parents in the focus groups.

A parent with a child in the Canton Urban League after-school program stated that the link between school personnel and provider staff exists because it has to; she considered the link as a given. Another parent mentioned that her child’s principal sends home fact sheets containing information about after-school activities. A parent expressed a belief that some activities should be offered for parents, but not too many because they are parents and have other responsibilities.

The responses to the question, “Would you be willing to enroll your child(ren) in an after-school program that may not meet all five of these criteria?,” are varied. One parent said she would enroll her child and work with the provider to make improvements. Another parent indicated she would not enroll her child; that she would not take the chance. One parent indicated that the staffing “has to be right.” Another said that she might deal with a shortage of space and a location that could be more convenient, but that safety issues were an important factor. One parent requires an academic focus as a minimum condition.

Participants in the first parent focus group were asked to further define what they meant by the criteria that they feel should be considered when making funding decisions. Parents in the second focus group were not asked this question due to time constraints.

Parents in the first focus group offered additional meaning to the criteria listed below:

- Academic focus – includes an emphasis on reading and math. Children receive assistance with homework and with studying for proficiency tests. Children learn how to “get along with each other.”
- Enrichment activities – involves exposing children to new things and new cultures, bringing in guests to the program and keeping the children interested in the program.

- Staffing – this means that certified teachers who know the curriculum are hired . It includes keeping the child-to-staff ratio low and assuring good site management, as well as having counselors available for the children.
- Transportation – providing transportation to and from the after-school program so that children do not have to walk to and from the program in the dark, especially the younger children.

One of the parents in the second focus group mentioned that she chose the after-school program at Clarendon school because she felt it meets the top criteria. It has a diverse staff, an open door policy, accommodates special needs and maintains a respect for education and discipline that matches her home environment. In addition, the “student to teacher” ratio is low.

Another parent in the second focus group enrolled her child in an after-school program located in a school building and is pleased with the program. This program has specified recreation time, is well staffed and has a low child-to-staff ratio.

The parents in the focus group indicated that they communicate on a daily basis with staff in the after-school program whether in person, over the telephone or via written notes sent home with the child. These parents agreed that interactions with staff are a “two-way” process with both parties sharing responsibility for interacting and communicating with each other. “You can expect an after-school program to do only so much.” One parent voiced her concern about a situation in which interactions between she and two teachers did not satisfy her concerns. This parent felt that part of the reason for the awkwardness was due to the fact that the teachers, during the school day, taught older children than those they were working with in the after-school program. This parent felt that it was difficult for the teachers to “come down to the younger children’s level.” Parents in the focus groups also mentioned “effort (from the providers) is not put into a child that is gifted”.

**After-School Criteria
As Ranked by Providers**

**Responses: 20 of 37
Return Rate: 54%*

	Ranking	**Score
Staff qualified to work with children will be hired.	#1	112
The facility is safe and clean.	#2	130
Low child-to-staff ratio is planned.	#3	160
An academic focus in present.	#4	169
A culturally sensitive climate is planned.	#5	175
All students are included.	#6	181
Sufficient age-appropriate materials are planned.	#7	185
The focus is on at-risk students.	#8	202
Favorable emotional climate is planned.	#9	203
Clear, established links with extended learning activity provider and school personnel exist.	#10	211
A plan is in place for staff training.	#11	213
Parental involvement is planned.	#12	218
Clear goals and an evaluation system are present.	#13	218
Community partnerships are present.	#14	232
Continuity with the school day program is evident.	#15	234
There is a plan for administering and managing the program.	#16	235

Flexible programming is present.	#17	236
A variety of activities are planned.	#18	253
An organized systemic approach for engaging the public with the home, school and community is present.	#19	277
Recreational programming is included.	#20	283
Leadership opportunities are planned for all levels of participants.	#21	323
Volunteers will be used in the program.	#22	356
Other: Please list.		

* Although only 30 providers were approached, one provider surveyed 8 of their staff members and presented us with the results. These numbers have been included.

** Criteria was ranked from 1 to 22 (with 1 being the most important); therefore, the lower the score, the more valuable it's deemed.

Provider Focus Groups

Professionals of The Office of Corporate and Community Services at Kent State Stark facilitated two focus groups with personnel from after-school child care programs (providers). Nine providers participated in the first focus group and six providers participated in the second focus group. These 15 providers represent forty percent of the total provider population to which a ranking sheet was mailed.

Providers in both provider focus groups ranked the following factors among the top five criteria by which to make funding decisions:

- Academic value,
- Staffing (both quality and quantity),
- A safe and nurturing environment, and
- The fulfillment of an identified community need.

In addition to the four criteria above, providers in the first focus group felt that interactions between provider and parents and collaboration with other agencies were also very important. Providers in the second focus group responded that a program's goals and objectives is an important criterion to consider when making funding decisions.

Comparing the list of the top criteria established by the provider focus groups to the rankings compiled from the ranking sheets for this group, we see that the two lists contain four of five similar important criteria on which to base funding decisions.

The criterion "all students are included" was the fourth most important criterion as compiled from the ranking sheets completed by providers. The response from the providers in the focus groups as to why this was not mentioned in the focus groups was that we "don't understand what 'all students included' means" and that this criterion "depends on the program." More specifically, focus group participants responded that certain programs target "certain children with specific issues."

The parent group and the school personnel group who completed the ranking sheets included two criteria in the top five that are not included in the rankings by the providers in the focus groups:

- Clear, established links with extended learning activity provider and school personnel exists, and
- A variety of activities are planned.

When asked to comment on their perception as to why the providers might have ranked *clear, established links with extended learning activity provider and school personnel exists* and *a variety of activities is planned* lower than the parents and school personnel groups, they responded that from parents perspectives it is important to have a variety of planned activities because these activities address the different learning styles of the various children and prevent the children from “getting bored.” The providers in the focus groups also expressed that providers “look at the overall program and have more objectivity than parents.”

The providers in the focus groups believe that the link between providers and school personnel is essential because it is important to provide comprehensive services in the areas in which the children need support and because many children are in families that change addresses quite a bit. These providers also mentioned how some teachers “view provider programs as a place for kids to hang out.” These providers feel that “networking takes a lot of work” and that “a catalyst is needed to make linkages happen.”

The facilitators asked the provider focus group participants to elaborate on the key criteria that they identified as important when making funding decisions. Participants in the provider focus groups offered the additional meaning to the criteria listed below:

- Academic performance – this criterion was described to be directly related to student scores on the proficiency tests, especially the reading, math and science tests. An after-school program should assist students to do better on proficiency tests, SAT and ACT tests and should improve the study habits of students. The program should help students learn life skills, provide tutoring, build character, manage their anger and demonstrate self-respect.
- Adequate staff – providers commented that the definition of “adequate staff” depends on the nature of the program. This criterion was defined as qualified, experienced and well-trained staff with appropriate credentials and employed in sufficient numbers.
- Safe and nurturing environment – means that loving and caring staff are present, nutritional meals are served, the facility is secure and free from hazards. It also means that clear and consistent expectations are communicated to the students within appropriate physical, behavioral and site boundaries.
- Collaboration with other agencies – the provider focus group participants described this criterion as the kids seeing all of the resources with common goals available in the community and that duplication of services are minimized. This also refers to the students having a considerable selection of activities available to them.
- Focus on program goals and objectives – the provider focus group participants defined this criterion as strategically planned, measurable outcomes that were developed with parental input and based on the needs of the students. This criterion means that a curriculum is in place, which meets all state guidelines. It refers to developing suitable social behavior and academic performance within the students.

When asked to describe their interaction with the parents of the children who attend their programs, providers in the focus groups agreed that parent involvement is “down across the board.” They believe that some parents fear involvement, while many of the parents are very young themselves. Working parents find it hard to be involved in the programs. These providers recognize that parental involvement must be a structured component of the overall program. Some programs send staff to make home visits with the children to observe the children “in action” and to talk to the parents in their home environment.

The challenges that the providers in the focus groups face relate to meeting deadlines, completing monthly grant reporting requirements and running a program with inadequate funding and/or funding that is not guaranteed each year. These providers described difficulties in getting taxes done on time, compiling the data for the monthly reports, compiling reports for grants that have different funding cycles and finding the money to train staff on how to use the supplies and equipment funded by the grant.

CONCLUSIONS

Recurring Themes

The five focus groups facilitated by The Office of Community Services at Kent State University Stark Campus project provides additional insight into the results of the ranking sheets completed by after-school child care programs, school personnel who work with such programs and parents/guardians or care givers of children enrolled in the programs.

The two provider focus groups were basically in agreement with each other and with the results of the ranking sheets relative to the most important criteria to consider when making funding decisions. These are:

- Academic value,
- Quality of staff,
- Low child-to-staff ratio, and
- A safe and nurturing environment.

The providers in the focus groups expressed uncertainty over the meaning of “all students included.” The providers feel that since they look at the big picture, they maintain a more objective view than do parents.

The school personnel focus group seemed to look at the issue of funding criteria from a more global perspective. These school personnel mentioned family economics, community need and accessibility as key criteria to consider, in addition to student academic achievement and parental involvement.

Parents in the two focus groups registered two relatively different lists of the most important funding criteria, while simultaneously focused on specific child welfare criteria (socialization, discipline, safety, etc.). The parent focus groups identified the following as important criteria to consider:

- Staffing,
- Academic focus,
- Socialization opportunities,
- Transportation,
- Facilities,
- Discipline and structure, and
- Parental involvement.

Agreement among the three parties of focus group participants includes:

- All three groups agree that staffing, an academic focus and parent involvement are among the top five criteria to consider when making funding decisions.
- All three groups agree that parental involvement is an important aspect of any after-school program and that continued effort from all three groups is required to maintain parental involvement.

Unique Outcomes

The outcomes of the focus groups and the survey results are surprising when compared to the rankings determined through the Rand (2001) study. Staffing, an academic focus and parent involvement were all rated in the Rand study as moderate. Flexible programming and a variety of activities were rated as strong in the Rand study but were noticeably absent from the focus group rankings. The continued emphasis on student achievement that is present in all Stark County school districts may well account for the unique outcomes. Awareness that student achievement is necessary to decrease the drop out rate and increase the graduation rate is directly related to the standards based movement with accountability that is now present in Ohio.

NEW INFORMATION

As the study neared completion, Dr. Rod Paige, The Secretary of Education, United States Department of Education issued a guidance document (June 14, 2002) under the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* for school districts with Title I schools that have not made “adequate yearly progress” as defined by the state (please see Appendix V). Many of the schools served by the federal, state, local and foundation funding in Stark County have been labeled in need of improvement and school districts must now use a portion of their Title I funds to provide supplemental education services for eligible students enrolled in those schools. Parents must choose the provider of the services from a list of providers approved by the state. The state may only approve providers who have a demonstrated record of effectiveness defined as improvements in student achievement.

Also, as of this writing, Ohio is one of the first nine states to directly receive dollars under the new state administered 21st Century Community Learning Centers program.

Both the Canton City and Massillon City Schools currently serve between 1,500-1,600 students through these programs.

Prior to this time, districts applied directly to the Federal Government for these grants. Now Ohio will allocate future, or continuance, funds.

The FY 2002 appropriation for Ohio is \$9,763,093. This increases to \$17,138,329 in FY 2003.

Presumably, many of the same conditions mentioned in Secretary Paiges’s letter, including preferred providers, will also apply to these funds at the state level.

The implications of the guidance document are important to this study. If the purpose of an extended learning or after school child care activity was to provide an academic focus, and if the provider does not have a demonstrated record of effectiveness using evidence of academic improvement, the provider will now be in competition with approved providers. If, on the other hand, the provider has demonstrated effectiveness and is approved by the state, then the school district would have to pay that provider for services rendered. If the provider is already funded by a foundation, payment might be waived, or the foundation might choose to withdraw funding in lieu of payment by the school district. The problem becomes more complex in those cases where school districts do not have sufficient Title I funds to meet the needs of all of the eligible students. The foundation funded programs might serve as an alternative for students not judged to be the most needy using achievement and poverty as criteria, but those programs would now be well advised to collect and analyze student achievement data to determine the effectiveness of the program.

All of this is so new that neither the involved school districts nor the providers have sufficient experience to determine the appropriate immediate course of action.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Reflecting the school personnel, parent, and provider feedback in future funding requests: Using the elements locally determined as defining a quality extended learning or after-school program.

As the foundations consider future funding requests the school personnel, parent, and provider feedback on the surveys and in the focus groups needs to be considered. Funding requests that include adequate staffing that addresses the academic focus requested as well as an emphasis on academics should be assigned a higher priority than those projects that do not reflect those criteria. Provision for parental involvement needs to be a part of each application and the provider needs to show commitment to increasing parent involvement if the original participation is low.

Communicating Best Practices in Stark County

School personnel, parents, and providers all commented to the authors about the value of extending the conversations so that best practices can be shared in Stark County. It is recommended that a conference be held to establish an After-School Council that would represent all three groups, share best practice and find a way to track the outcomes of the programs to student achievement—the natural outcome of a desired academic focus.

Connecting the United States Department of Education supplemental services to extended learning opportunities and after school programs

As a help to all, it is recommended that the above-mentioned conference include a discussion of the supplemental services requirements in the new *No Child Left Behind* legislation.

Connecting state administered 21st Century Community Learning Centers grants to extended learning opportunities and after school programs

The above referenced conference should also include a discussion on securing such funds to continue existing (Canton-Massillon) programs and as a source of potential revenue for new programs.

Further Study/Greater Coordination

The study contains a sampling of the programs provided by the school districts as compared to those provided through Foundation funding. The sampling raises some questions about program overlap and supply of programs related to demand. Further study or greater coordination might be investigated.

APPENDIX I

220 Market Ave. S., Suite 350, Canton, Ohio 44702 • 330-452-0829 • fax 330-452-2009 • www.edpartner.org



Board of Directors

Chair

W. Don Reader
Ohio Court of Appeals
5th District

Vice Chair

Theodore V. Boyd
Beaverkettle Company

Treasurer

Robert F. Vail
Vail Industries

Secretary

James M. Gresh
Timken Company

Sarah M. Brown
Ohio Ethics Commission

Paralee W. Compton
Stark Community Foundation

Michael L. Howard
Stark County Family Court

Sheila M. Markley Black
Day, Ketterer, Raley, Wright
& Rybolt Ltd.

John J. McGrath, Ed.D.
Stark State College
of Technology

Richard S. Milligan
Howes, Daane, Milligan,
Kyhos, & Erwin LLP

Ward J. Timken
Timken Foundation

President

Adrienne O'Neill, Ed.D.

Vice President

Joseph A. Rochford, Ph.D.

March 8, 2002

In collaboration with local foundations, the Stark Education Partnership is doing a study to create a tool for validating after-school child care or extended day programs, enhancing their potential for impacting student learning and possibly leading to interest from national foundations.

You are invited to help with the study because you are either a school person with experience in after-school or extended day programs, a Herbert W. Hoover, Sisters of Charity or Stark Community Foundation funded provider of after-school or extended day programs, or a parent of a student currently enrolled in after-school or extended day programs.

We would like to know what characteristics or standards you believe indicate or anticipate success for after-school or extended learning programs proposed for funding by local foundations and the characteristics or standards that should be used by providers to evaluate funded programs. We have created a rating list from the characteristics or standards identified in the educational literature that needs to be particularized to Stark County with your input.

We need your help in two ways. First, you are invited to complete the attached rating sheet and return it in the enclosed envelope as soon as possible. Second, you will be invited to a focus group meeting in April 2002 to discuss the compiled ratings for Stark County.

Your responses, combined with those of others, will be the basis of a report containing the Stark County after-school or extended day program characteristics that will be given to the local foundations, national foundations, and local school districts. While the report may be published, please know that your individual responses will be held in confidence.

We appreciate your help and look forward to your responses.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Adrienne O'Neill".

Adrienne O'Neill, Ed.D.
President

APPENDIX II

After-School Provider Roster March 2002

Veronica Callahan– Director, Grace Operation and Development Center
Maureen Charles– Director, Jackson Friends Church
Pastor Warren Chavers– Deliverance Christian Church
Nate J. Cooks– Executive Director, City of Canton-Youth Development Dept
Mary Cox– Executive Director, Community Drop In Center
Nina Davidson– Director, PAX-Project for Academic Excellence
Gloria A. Dunnivan– Executive Director, Heartbeats to the City
Deborah L. Embry– President & CEO, Canton Urban League
John Engel– Co-Director, Canton Calvary Mission
Ed Frankovich– Stark Metropolitan Housing Authority
David Gotschall– Director, 32 Degree Masonic Learning Center for Children
Jeri Johnson– Director, Alliance Neighborhood Center
Beverly Jordan– Executive Director, Stark Social Workers Network
Donna Joseph– Director, 21st Century Grant Coordinator, Massillon City Schools
William L. Luntz– President, Luntz Enterprises
David M. Miday– Executive Director, J. Babe Stearn Community Center
Rev. Ann A. Murphy– Crystal Park United Methodist Church
Dyanna Myers– Executive Director, Anointed Fountain Outreach
Donna Nicholas– Coordinator, Faith Evangelical Lutheran Church
Darrin Nissley– First Mennonite Church
Vincent E. Pedro– Executive Director, Massillon Boys and Girls Club
Linda Phillips– Director, YMCA – Alliance
Susan Ross– Coordinator, Canton City Schools
Lawrence & JoAnn Shade– Corp Commanding Officers, Salvation Army
Timothy Shetzer– Executive Director, YMCA of Central Stark County
Betty M. Smith– Executive Director, Minority Development Services of Stark County
Shirley Smith– Director, PAX
Kathy Strong– Executive Director, J R Coleman Family Services Corp
Gloria Whitely-MaGrath– Director, Girlspace, Alliance YMCA
Wuyanbu Zutali– Founder, Stark County Chess Foundation

School Personnel Roster, March 2002

Barbara Armitage– Curriculum Director, Alliance City Schools
Richard Brown– Principal, Hartford Middle School, Canton City Schools
Paralee Compton– Director, Gear-Up, Canton City Schools
Art Garnes– Superintendent, Alliance City Schools
Xen Griveas– Administrative Assistant to Superintendent, Canton City Schools
Al Hennon– Superintendent, Massillon City Schools
Jim Irvin– Director of Government Programs, Canton City School
Kathy Kalleker– Curriculum Director, Massillon City Schools
Judy Kenney– Coordinator, Massillon City Schools
Ernie Leedy– Coordinator, 21st Century Grant, Canton City Schools
David McDermott– Principal, Gibbs Elementary School, Canton City Schools
Brenda Neel– Program Leader, Freshman Academy, Canton City Schools
Kim Redmond– Director of Innovative Programs, Canton City Schools
Robert Roden– Associate Superintendent, Canton City Schools
Robert Vero– Principal, Crenshaw Middle School, Canton City Schools

APPENDIX III

Focus Group Participants List

Thursday, May 30, 2002 at 10:30 for Providers

Mary Cox– Executive Director, Community Drop In Center
Deborah L. Embry– President & CEO, Canton Urban League
Donna Joseph– Director, 21st Century Grant Coordinator, Massillon City Schools
Frederick Poore– Youth Services Assistant, Stark Metropolitan Housing Authority
Susan Ross– Director, Canton City Schools
David Thompson– Youth Services Assistant, Stark Metropolitan Housing Authority
Leonard Washington– Youth Program Director, Minority Development Services of Stark County
Fonda Williams– Executive Director, Canton YMCA
Celia Wilson– After School Program Director, J.R. Coleman Family Services Corp.

Plus Amy Lane, Harold Sargus, and Jean Wales

Thursday, May 30, 2002 at 1:00 for Providers

Gloria A. Dunnivan– Executive Director, Heartbeats to the City
Shawnta Forester– Director, Aphasis Child Development Center at Deliverance Christian Church
David M. Miday– Executive Director, J. Babe Stearn Community Center
Darrin Nissley– Youth Director, First Mennonite Church
Ron Shultz– Youth Director, Crystal Park United Methodist Church
Tina Taylor– Youth Services Assistant, Stark Metropolitan Housing Authority

Plus Amy Lane, Harold Sargus, and Jean Wales

Thursday, June 4, 2002 at 1:00 for School Personnel

Xen Griveas– Administrative Assistant to Superintendent, Canton City Schools
Jim Irvin– Director of Government Programs, Canton City School
Judy Kenney– Coordinator, Massillon City Schools
Ernie Leedy– Coordinator, 21st Century Grant, Canton City Schools
David McDermott– Principal, Gibbs Elementary School, Canton City Schools
Robert Vero– Principal, Crenshaw Middle School, Canton City Schools

Plus Amy Lane, Harold Sargus, and Jean Wales

APPENDIX IV

Focus Group Scripts

The following script is used to facilitate the focus groups to ensure that the objective of exploring the rankings of the criteria for funding and evaluating after-school programming is met.

Introduction: Thank you for attending today! [*Facilitator introductions and description of relevant experience*]

Today we are here to talk about after-school programs and what these programs should include and the type of environment that they should provide to children. As you know, you completed a survey a while ago about what criteria foundations might use to determine funding levels for after-school programs. During this focus group, we'd like to explore the rankings that each group gave on that survey.

We appreciate your willingness to be part of this important project and hope that you will be candid in your remarks. In a focus group we want to ensure that all participants have the opportunity to express their viewpoint and we will facilitate this focus group so that you each have the opportunity to contribute to the dialog. We have a prepared set of open-ended questions and will present those to you and allow the dialog to develop based on your responses. We don't want to lead you in any way.

We are conducting five focus groups for this project. We will be taking notes as you speak so that we can be sure that we don't miss any of the comments. Upon conclusion of all the focus groups we will compile our notes and report on recurring themes and findings from the focus group dialog. We will not identify who made any comments and will only report an individual comment if it illustrates a recurring theme, but will not identify who said it. So, that means what you say today will be considered confidential.

Please help yourself to refreshments as we spend the next hour or so in this dialog. Also feel free to ask questions at any time. So before we ask our first question, do you have anything you'd like me to explain further?

[Go to questions for the appropriate group]

Conclusion: Thank you for your time today. We will compile our notes from today and from the other four focus groups and complete a report of the focus group findings for the Stark Education Partnership. They will in turn, complete a final report that contains the elements of a quality after-school program and deliver it to the funding organizations sponsoring this research. Thanks again!

Focus Group Scripts: Questions for Parents

1. Let's take a quick poll now. What do you think should be the top five criteria that a funding organization should consider when determining funding levels for an after-school program?
2. Now, let's explore your comments to the survey results from parent groups who took the written survey. According to the rankings compiled from the survey that you as parents completed, parents believe that the top five most important criteria for funding after-school programs are:
 - a. An academic focus is present
 - b. The facility is safe and clean
 - c. Clear, established links with extended learning activity provider and school personnel exists
 - d. Low child to staff ratio is planned
 - e. A variety of activities are planned

[Explore whether these match with what the poll results are.]

3. Would you be willing to enroll your child(ren) in an after-school program that may not meet all five of these criteria? Why or why not?
4. Let's further define what you mean by these topics that you feel should be considered when determining funding. Give us a picture of what each includes. [Go through each of their top five and any others that are raised during the discussion.][After this discussion it may be necessary to readdress the top five rankings based on the conversation]
5. Tell us about any after-school programs that you think meet the criteria we've discussed. [Explore their answers – ask them why they say the program is meeting the criteria. If none are meeting the criteria, explore what criteria they are not meeting]
6. Think about your experience with the personnel at the after-school program to which you send your child(ren). Describe how you interact with that provider and whether they understand what is important to you in an after-school program.
7. Just to help us keep note of your experience with after-school programs, have you enrolled your child(ren) in more than one? Have you looked at programs other than one your child(ren) are enrolled in?

Focus Group Scripts: Questions for School Personnel

1. Let's take a quick poll now. What do you think should be the top five criteria that a funding organization should consider when determining funding levels for an after-school program?
2. Now, let's explore your comments to the survey results from school personnel groups who took the written survey. According to the rankings compiled from the survey that you as school personnel completed, you as a group believe that the top five most important criteria for funding after-school programs are:
 - a. An academic focus is present
 - b. Staff qualified to work with children will be hired

-
- c. Clear, established links with extended learning activity provider and school personnel exists
 - d. Clear goals and an evaluation system are present
 - e. A variety of activities is planned

[Explore whether these match with what the poll results are.]

3. The parent group that completed the survey included two criteria in the top five that are not included in the rankings by school personnel. These are:
 - a. The facility is safe and clean
 - b. Low child to staff ratio is plannedPlease comment on your perception of why your school personnel group might have ranked these criteria lower than the parents.
4. Let's further define what you mean by these topics that you feel should be considered when determining funding. Give us a picture of what each includes. [Go through each of their top five and any others that are raised during the discussion.][After this discussion it may be necessary to readdress the top five rankings based on the conversation]
5. Tell us about any after-school programs that you think meet the criteria we've discussed. [Explore their answers – ask them why they say the program is meeting the criteria. If none are meeting the criteria, explore what criteria they are not meeting]
6. Think about your experience with the personnel at after-school programs. Describe how you interact with that provider.
7. Just to help us keep note of your experience with after-school programs, with how many are you familiar and are you directly involved with any?

Focus Group Scripts: Questions for Providers

1. Let's take a quick poll now. What do you think should be the top five criteria that a funding organization should consider when determining funding levels for an after-school program?
2. Now, let's explore your comments to the survey results from provider groups who took the written survey. According to the rankings compiled from the survey that you as providers completed, you as a group believe that the top five most important criteria for funding after-school programs are:
 - a. Staff qualified to work with children will be hired
 - b. The facility is safe and clean
 - c. Low child to staff ratio is planned
 - d. All students are included
 - e. An academic focus is present

[Explore whether these match with what the poll results are.]

3. The parent group and the school personnel group that completed the survey included two criteria in the top five that are not included in the rankings by your group. These are:

-
- a. Clear, established links with extended learning activity provider and school personnel exists
 - b. A variety of activities is planned

Please comment on your perception of why your provider group might have ranked these criteria lower than the parents and school personnel.

4. Let's further define what you mean by these topics that you feel should be considered when determining funding. Give us a picture of what each includes. [Go through each of their top five and any others that are raised during the discussion.][After this discussion it may be necessary to readdress the top five rankings based on the conversation]
5. Tell us about your interaction with the parents of the children who attend your program.
6. What are the challenges you face in providing an after-school program that meets all of the criteria a funding organization is looking for you to meet.
7. Just to help us keep note of your experience, with how many after-school programs have you been involved?

APPENDIX V



THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATION WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

June 14, 2002

Dear Colleague:

As you know, on January 8, 2002, President Bush signed into law the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLBA). I am excited about this landmark legislation, as I believe it provides a critical road map for bringing about real improvement in student achievement.

The NCLBA will substantially affect the 2002-2003 school year, and given our short timeline for implementation, I wanted to provide you with preliminary guidance on public school choice, supplemental education services, and collective bargaining agreements—three key issues that will affect your planning processes for this fall. This guidance is not exhaustive and does not cover every possible nuance of the law. Rather, it is intended to give initial direction to you as you proceed this summer with implementing these programs for the start of the school year, with the understanding that additional guidance and/or draft regulations on these matters, as well as on other matters, will be provided in the near future. Once again, because the law requires implementation of these programs to begin this coming school year, I want to reiterate that your planning processes for this should be underway.

The context for public school choice, supplemental education services, and collective bargaining agreements is the accountability provisions in the Title I program. Under the NCLBA, each state must establish a definition of “adequate yearly progress” to use each year to determine the achievement of each school district and school. School districts must identify for improvement any Title I school that fails to meet the state’s definition of adequate yearly progress for two consecutive years. Such schools, with technical assistance from their school districts, must develop and implement improvement plans incorporating various strategies to strengthen instruction in the core academic subjects in the school and addressing the specific issues that caused the school to fail. As discussed below, these schools must also provide public school choice and supplemental education services.

I. Public School Choice

In General. In the case of any Title I elementary or secondary school identified for school improvement, the school district is required to provide all students enrolled in the school with the option to transfer to another public school in the school district—which may include a public charter school—that has not been identified for improvement. This choice requirement applies unless state law specifically prohibits choice.

I recognize that some states and school districts have already begun planning for choice for the 2002-2003 school year. Indeed, *the new choice requirements must be implemented beginning this fall*. As you continue your planning, I strongly encourage you to provide several choice options for parents. Parents should be provided a reasonable amount of time to consider their options, be given concise but detailed information on the performance and overall quality of the receiving schools, and be provided an opportunity to visit potential schools of choice.

Schools Identified for Improvement Prior to Enactment. The NCLBA includes specific transition provisions governing schools that were identified for improvement under the prior law. With one exception stated under the law, choice must be provided at the beginning of the 2002-2003 school year to all students in schools that have been identified for improvement (based on adequate yearly progress under the pre-NCLBA) as of January 7, 2002. The exception is if a school that is in school improvement on January 7 makes its second year of adequate yearly progress based on its 2002 assessment results, the district is not required to provide choice to the students in that school. *School districts should begin planning now, if they have not begun already, to make choice available for students in any school that was in school improvement status as of January 7, 2002.*

Capacity. A school district is obligated to provide choice to all eligible students, subject to health and safety code requirements (regarding facility capacity). Transferring students should be treated as students who have moved into the receiving school's attendance zone and allowed to enroll in class and other activities on the same basis as other children in the school.

Priority for Low-Achieving Students in Low-Income Families. Among students exercising choice, school districts must give priority to the lowest-achieving students from low-income families. In other words, these students have priority among school options offered under the NCLBA and priority for transportation if funds for transportation are inadequate for that purpose. However, it would be inappropriate to remove students already accepted at a school to make room for those students exercising choice.

Magnet and Special Focus Schools. School districts need not disregard entrance requirements based on academic or other skills for schools for the gifted and talented, math or science schools, or other similar schools.

Transportation. If a student exercises the option to transfer to another public school, the school district has certain obligations to provide or pay for with federal funds the student's transportation to the new school. The school district's obligation for choice-related transportation and supplemental education services is equal to 20 percent of its Title I, Part A allocation. Within the 20 percent, a district must spend: (1) an amount equal to 5 percent for choice-related transportation; (2) an amount equal to 5 percent for supplemental education services; and (3) an amount equal to 10 percent for transportation or supplemental education services, or both, as the district determines. This obligation may be satisfied through use of regular Title I, Part A funds, school improvement funds under Section 1003, or Title V, Part A funds. Additionally, school districts may use funds transferred to Title I from other federal education programs under Section 6123 to pay such costs. Programs eligible for such transfers include Title II, Part A Improving Teacher Quality State Grants; Title II, Part D Educational Technology State Grants; Title IV, Part A Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants; and Title V, Part A State Grants for Innovative Programs. Nothing in the NCLBA prohibits a district from spending more for transportation. Furthermore, a school district is not prohibited from spending state or local funds, if it wishes, to assist in paying for transportation.

The school district's obligation to provide transportation for the student ends at the end of the school year if the school from which the student transferred is no longer identified by the school district for school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

Desegregation. A school district that is subject to a desegregation plan—whether voluntary, court ordered, or under an agreement with a federal or state administrative agency—is not exempt from the public school choice requirements. In determining how to provide students with the option to transfer to another school, the school district may take into account the requirements of the desegregation plan. If a desegregation plan forbids the school district from offering any transfer option, the school district should secure appropriate changes to the plan to permit compliance with the public school choice requirements.

Cooperative Agreements with Other School Districts. There may be very limited circumstances under which public school choice may not be possible, particularly in some sparsely populated areas. For example, school districts with only one school at a particular grade level, or districts in which all schools at a grade level are identified for improvement, will not be able to offer choice. In such cases, districts are encouraged to establish cooperative agreements with other nearby school districts to permit transfers. Furthermore, in the very limited circumstances where choice is not possible and in accordance with the spirit of the NCLBA, I strongly encourage school districts to consider offering supplemental education services or other choices in curriculum or instruction such as distance learning.

II. Supplemental Education Services

In General. In the case of a Title I school in the second year of school improvement, the school district is required to arrange for the provision of supplemental education services for eligible students enrolled in the school. The provider of the services must have a demonstrated record of effectiveness and be selected by parents from a list of providers approved by the state. These supplemental services must be provided beginning in the 2002-2003 school year. Supplemental education services are extra academic assistance for low-income students who are attending Title I schools that have failed to make adequate yearly progress for three or more years. The purpose of these services is to ensure that these students increase their academic achievement, particularly in reading, language arts, and mathematics. These academic services may include assistance such as tutoring, remediation, and academic intervention. Instruction must take place outside the regular school day, such as before or after school, on weekends, or during the summer. Supplemental education services must be of high quality, research based, and specifically designed to increase student academic achievement. Once again, I want to reiterate that the law requires that these opportunities be afforded to children beginning this fall.

Schools Identified for Improvement Prior to Enactment. Title I schools that have been identified for school improvement for two or more consecutive years as of January 7, 2002, *must* begin offering supplemental education services at the beginning of the 2002-2003 school year. As noted above, however, if a school in improvement on January 7 makes its second year of adequate yearly progress based on its 2002 assessment results, the district is not required to provide supplemental education services to eligible students in that school.

Parents. Parents choose the supplemental education services provider for their children from among the providers approved by the state for their school district. In general, the school district must work to ensure parents have good, easy-to-understand information about supplemental education services. School districts must provide parents with information on the availability of supplemental education services, the identity of approved service providers, and, at a minimum, a brief description of the services, qualifications, and demonstrated effectiveness of each provider. School districts may provide additional information, as appropriate. Such communications with parents must occur at least annually and must be in an understandable and uniform format. To the extent possible, communications must also be in a language parents can understand.

At the state level, parents should be consulted to promote participation by a greater variety of providers and to develop criteria for identifying high-quality providers. States, however, are ultimately responsible for identifying eligible providers from among which parents may choose.

At the provider level, parents, the school district, and the provider chosen by the parents must develop and identify specific academic achievement goals for the student, measures of student progress, and a timetable for improving achievement.

Eligible Children. Eligible children are those children from low-income families attending Title I schools that have failed to make adequate yearly progress for three consecutive years or more, as described above. In circumstances where more students request services than the school district can fund, the school district must place a priority on serving those low-income students who are the lowest achieving.

Per-Pupil Spending Limit. School districts are limited in how much they can spend to provide services for each child. The limit is what they receive in Title I funding per low-income child or the cost of the services themselves. Specifically, school districts must provide funding for supplemental education services for each participating child in an amount which is the lesser of the following: (1) the school district's Title I, Part A allocation, as determined by the state education agency, divided by the number of children from families below the poverty line (based on Census poverty data, not federal school lunch data) in the school district; or (2) the actual costs of the supplemental education services received by each child.

Identification by States of Supplemental Education Service Providers. State education agencies must develop and apply objective criteria for identifying supplemental education service providers. The state education agency must also consult with parents, teachers, school districts, and interested members of the public to identify a wide array of supplemental education service providers so that parents can have a wide variety of choices. The state education agency must update this state-level list of approved providers on at least an annual basis and must provide a list for school districts of those providers available in their geographic locations.

Criteria developed by the state education agency for identification of providers must include: (1) a demonstrated record of effectiveness in improving student academic achievement; (2) documentation that the instructional strategies used by the provider are high quality, based upon research, and designed to increase student academic achievement; (3) evidence that services are consistent with the instructional program of the school district and with state academic content standards; and (4) evidence that the provider is financially sound.

With respect to the first criterion, each state education agency is responsible for defining what would be acceptable evidence of effectiveness. Acceptable evidence may include significant improvement in student academic achievement, successful use of instructional practices based on sound research or of documented success by other providers, successful and sustained remediation of reading or math difficulties, or use of a program that others have successfully used to improve student academic achievement.

State education agencies may not require supplemental education service providers to hire only certified teachers in order to be eligible providers.

Providers shall not be disqualified on the grounds that their documentation of instructional strategies does not include "scientifically based research" (as such term is defined in the NCLBA).

Supplemental Education Service Providers. A school entity (public or private), an institution of higher education (public or private), or a nonprofit or for-profit organization can all be considered for inclusion on the state-approved list of supplemental education service providers. Faith-based organizations can also be considered for inclusion as state-approved providers. The state must apply all criteria consistently when selecting approved providers.

Distance-Learning Technology. Providers that utilize distance-learning technology do not have to meet different criteria; they are eligible if they meet the criteria established by the state education agency for all providers. The law states that providers must be within the school district or the providers' services must be reasonably available in neighboring education agencies. The provider of distance-learning

supplemental education services does not have to be located in the school district to meet this requirement; only the services need to be available. We would encourage the use of distance learning in rural areas and other areas where parents have a limited number of providers available in their district.

Charter Schools. If a charter school, as a part of a school district, receives Title I, Part A funds and meets the eligibility criterion of being identified as a school that fails to make adequate yearly progress for three or more years, the school district must offer supplemental education services, and the school district is responsible for funding such services, just as for the other public schools in the school district.

If the charter school is itself considered a school district under state law and receives Title I, Part A funds, it is responsible for ensuring that eligible students receive supplemental education services from approved providers and must fund such services.

Transportation. School districts may, at their discretion, use funds reserved for supplemental education services to transport students to and from approved providers.

III. Collective Bargaining Agreements

The Department has received many inquiries regarding the impact of the new law on existing collective bargaining unit agreements. The NCLBA provides that nothing in Section 1116 (academic assessment and local education agency and school improvement) shall be construed to alter or otherwise affect the rights, remedies, and procedures afforded school and school district employees under federal, state, or local laws or under the terms of collective bargaining agreements, memoranda of understanding, or other agreements between such employees and their employers. Section 1116 does not operate to invalidate employee protections that exist under current law and collective bargaining and similar labor agreements. However, it does not exempt state education agencies, local education agencies, and schools from compliance with Title I based on prospective collective bargaining or similar agreements or changes in state or local law. State and local education authorities, as well as state legislatures and local governing boards, need to ensure that changes in state and local laws are consistent with Title I requirements and that any changes to collective bargaining agreements or new agreements are also consistent with Title I.

With respect to the selection of supplemental education service providers, there is no requirement in the NCLBA that parents give preference to parties to the collective bargaining agreements. As you know, parents select the supplemental service provider, and parents are not parties to collective bargaining agreements.

Thank you again for your kind attention to these matters. Please let me reiterate that this letter is intended to provide preliminary guidance on public school choice, supplemental education services, and collective bargaining agreements. The Department will provide additional guidance and/or draft regulations on these matters, as well as other matters, in the near future. Please do not delay the planning process. I am hopeful that the new statute, together with this initial guidance, will enable you to promptly move ahead in preparation for the 2002-2003 school year.

Sincerely,



Rod Paige

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beckett, M., Hawken, A., Jackowitz, A. (2001). Accountability for after-school care: Devising standards and measuring adherence to them. Rand. www.rand.org/publications/MR/MR1411/. Downloaded January 12, 2002.
- Brooks, P. E. et al. (1995). Longitudinal study of LA's BEST after school education and enrichment program, 1992-1994. Los Angeles, California: UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation.
- Burness, P., ed. (1997). Learn and live. Nicasio, CA: The George Lucas Educational Foundation.
- Capizzano, J., Adams, G., and Sonenstein, F. (2000). Child care arrangements for children under five: Variation across states. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press. *Assessing the New Federalism* Policy Brief B-7.
- Caplan, J., Calfee, C.S. (1999). *Strengthening connections between schools and after school programs*. North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. www.ncrel.org/21stcccl/connect/credit.htm. Downloaded January 8, 2002.
- Cardenas, J.A. et al. "The Coca-Cola Valued Youth Program: Dropout Prevention Strategies for At-Risk Students." *Texas Researcher* 3 (111-130).
- Carlisi, A. M. (1996). The 3:00 Project program evaluation. Decatur, GA: Georgia School Age Care Association.
- Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development. (1994). A matter of time: Risk and opportunity in the out-of-school hours. New York: Carnegie Corporation.
- Casper, L.M. (1997). Who's minding our preschoolers? Current Population Reports P70-62 (fall 1994 update). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, Bureau of the Census.
- Chapin Hall Center for Children at the University of Chicago. The MOST initiative: An interim evaluation report. Chicago, IL: DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund, In press.
- Chicago Public Schools Office of Schools and Regions. (1998). The McPrep Lighthouse Program. Chicago: Chicago Public Schools.
- Clark, R. (1989). The role of parents in ensuring educational success in school restructuring efforts. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Coca-Cola Valued Youth Program. (1991). Proposal submitted to the Program Effectiveness Panel of the U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Cohen, P.A., Kulik, J. A., and Kulik, C.L.C., "Educational outcomes of tutoring: A meta-analysis of findings," *American Educational Research Journal* 19 (1982): 237-248.

Constock, G.A. and Paik, H.J. (1991). Television and the American child. San Diego, California: Academic Press.

Casper, L. M. (1997). “Who’s minding our preschoolers?” *Current Population Reports P70-62* (fall 1994 update). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, Bureau of the Census.

de Kanter, A. et al. (1997). Keeping schools open as community learning centers: Extending learning in a safe, drug-free environment before and after school. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Brick, D., et al, (1999). 1997 NSAF survey methods and data reliability. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute. *National Survey of America’s Families* Methodology Report No. 1.

Decker, L.E. and Boo, M.R. (1996). Community schools: Linking home, school, & community. Fairfax, VA: National Community Education Publication Series.

Decker, L.E. and Romney, V.A. (1990). Community education across America. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, National Community Education Association.

Drug Strategies. (1996). Making the grade: A guide to school drug prevention programs. Washington, DC: Author.

Dryfoos, J. (1994). Full-service schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Eccles, J. S. (1999). “The development of children Ages 6 to 14.” *The Future of Children* 9 (2): 30–44.

Edwards. P. and Biocchi, K. (1996). Community schools across America. Alexandria, VA: National Community Education Association.

Fashola, O. S. Review of extended day and after-school programs and their effectiveness. Baltimore, MD:

Fashola, O. (2002). Building effective after school programs. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk, In press.

Fiestier, L. and Marzke, C. (1996). Linking community health centers with schools serving low-income children: An idea book. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Finance Project. *Using Title I to support out of school time and community school initiatives: Strategy brief*. www.financeproject.org. Downloaded March 2002.

Fleming-McCormick, T., and Tushnet ,N.C. (1996). 4-H after school activity program. Los Angeles: Southwest Regional Education Laboratory and WestEd.

Fox, J.A., and Newman, S. (1998). After-school crime or after-school programs: Tuning into the prime time for violent juvenile crime and implications for national policy. Washington, D.C.: Fight Crime: Invest in Kids.

Funkhouser, J. et al. (1995). Extending learning time for disadvantaged students. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Gregory, P. J. (1996). Youth opportunities unlimited: Improving outcomes for youth through after school care. Manchester: University of New Hampshire.

Halpern, R. (2002). "A different kind of child development institution: The history of after-school programs for low-income children." *Teachers College Record* 104(2).

Harvard Family Research Project. *Out of School Time Evaluation Database*. www.gse.harvard.edu/hfrp/projects/afterschool/evaldatabase.html. Downloaded March 2002.

Hernandez, D. J. (1995). "Changing Demographics: Past and Future Demands for Early Childhood Programs." *The Future of Children* 5 (3): 145–60.

Hofferth, S. L., et. al. (1991). National child care survey, 1990. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute. Report 91-5.

Kerrebrock, N., and Lewit, E.M. (1999). "Children in self-care." *The Future of Children* 9 (2): 151–60.

Lawrence, F.C. and Woznaik, P.H. (1989). "Children's Television Viewing with Family Members." *Psychological Reports* 65: 396-400.

Lepper, M.R. and Chabay, R.W. (1988). Socializing the intelligent tutor: Bringing empathy to computer tutors. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Louisiana Department of Education. (1996). A capsule of the Louisiana church-based tutorial network. Baton Rouge, Louisiana: State Department of Education.

Madden, N.A. and Slavin, R.E., (1989). "Effective pullout programs for students at risk" in Slavin, R.E., Karweit, N.L., and Madden, N.A., ed. Effective programs for students at risk Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Marquette University. (1997). The City of Milwaukee Weed and Seed Program evaluation. Milwaukee, WI: Author.

McLennan Youth Collaboration, Inc. (1997). Communities in schools case management staff evaluation. Waco, TX: Lighted Schools.

Merrill, D.C. et al. (1995). "Tutoring: Guided learning by doing." *Cognition and Instruction* 13, no. 3: 315-372.

Miller, B. M. (1995). Out-of-school time: Effects on learning in the primary grades. Wellesley, MA: School Age Child Care Project.

Moore, M.T. and Funkhouser, J. (1990). More time to learn: Extended time strategies for Chapter 1 students. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

-
- Morris, D., Shaw, B. and Perney, J. (1990). "Helping low readers in grades 2 and 3: An after-school volunteer tutoring program." *Elementary School Journal* 91: 133-151.
- Muraskin, L. (1993). Understanding evaluation: The way to better prevention programs. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Education Commission on Time and Learning. (1994). Prisoners of time. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Federation of High School Associations. (1998). The case for high school activities. Kansas City, MO: Author.
- National PTA and Boys Town. (1992). Television and your family. Chicago, Illinois: National PTA.
- NSACA Standards www.nsaca.org/standards_glance.htm
- O'Connell, M., and Casper, L.M. (1995). Where have all the hours gone? Uncovering and resolving problems in questionnaire design: The case of estimating children's self-care. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Population Association of America, San Francisco, Calif.
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (1995). Juvenile offenders and victims: A national report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Peterson, L. (1989). "Latchkey children's preparation for self-care: Overestimated, underrehearsed, and unsafe." *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology* 18 (1): 36-43.
- Peterson, L. (1999). "After-school activities and the development of low-income urban children: A longitudinal study." *Developmental Psychology* 35 (3): 868-79.
- Posner, J. and Lowe Vandell, D. (1994). "Low-income children's after-school care: Are there beneficial effects of after-school programs?" *Child Development* 65: 440-456.
- Richardson, J., et. al., (1989). "Substance use among eighth-grade students who take care of themselves after school." *Pediatrics* 84 (3): 556-66.
- Riley, D., et. al., (1994). Preventing problem behavior and raising academic performance in the nation's youth: The impacts of 64 school-age child care programs in 15 states supported by the Cooperative Extension Service Youth-at-Risk Initiative. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin.
- Ringers, J., Jr. and Decker, L. E. (1995). School community centers: Guidelines for interagency planners. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, National Community Education Association.
- Robison, E. (1993). An interim evaluative report concerning a collaboration between the Children's Aid Society, New York City Board of Education, Community School District 6, and the I.S. 218 Salome Urena de Henriquez School. New York City: Fordham University.
- Robledo, M. del R. (1990). Partners for valued youth: Dropout prevention strategies for at-risk language minority students. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Roman, J., ed. (1998). The NSACA standards for quality school-age care. Boston, MA: National School-Age Care Alliance.

Ross, S.M., et. al., (1996). Evaluation of the extended-day tutoring program in Memphis County Schools: Final report to CRESPAR. Memphis, TN: Center for Research in Educational Policy, University of Memphis.

Salomon, G. (1993). "Television watching and mental effort: A social psychological view." in Bryant, J. and Anderson, D.R., ed. *Children's understanding of television: Research on attention and comprehension*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

School-Age Child Care Project and National Association of Elementary School Principals. (1993). The public school involvement in school-age child care project. Wellesley, MA: Authors.

Seligson & Fink. (1989). "*No time to waste: An action agenda for school-age child care.*" In Smith, Fairchild, & Grodinsky. (1995). *Early childhood care and education: An investment that works*. National Conference of State Legislatures.

Seligson, M. & Allenson, M. (1993) School-age child care: An action manual for the 90s and beyond. Westport, CN: Auburn House.

Seppanen, P., et. al., (1993). National study of before- and after-school programs. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Schinke, P., Orlandi, M., and Cole, K. (1992). "Boys and Girls Clubs in public housing developments: Prevention Services for Youth at Risk." *Journal of Community Psychology*. OSAP Special Issue.

School-Age Child Care Project. (1997). School-age care out-of-school time resource notebook. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Seppanen, P.S., et. al., (1993). National study of before and after school programs. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Smith, K.E., and Casper, L.M. (1999). Home alone: Reasons parents leave their children unsupervised. Unpublished paper presented at the annual meetings of the Population Association of America, New York, N.Y., March 25–27.

Snow, C.T. et al. (1998). Preventing reading difficulties in young children. Washington, D.C.: National Research Council and National Academy of Sciences.

Snyder, H., Sickmund, M., and Bilchik, S. (1999). Juvenile offenders and victims: 1999 national report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Snyder, H. and Sickmund, M. (1997). Juvenile offenders and victims: 1997 update on violence. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Steinberg, J., Riley, D., and Todd, C. (1993). Preventing problem behaviors and raising academic performance in the nation's youth: The impacts of 71 school-age child care programs supported by the CES Youth-At-Risk Initiative. Illinois: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and the University of Wisconsin Center for Action on the Family.

State of Maine. (1993). School-age child care technical assistance papers. Maine: Maine Department of Human Services, Office of Child Care and Head Start.

Suyapa, S.E., Thorne, J., and Tashjian, C.A., (1997). School-based drug prevention programs: A longitudinal study in selected school districts. Research Triangle Park, North Carolina: Research Triangle Institute and U.S. Department of Education.

Terao, K., (1997) *Rural Out-of-School Times Newsletter* 1, no. 1.

Tierney, J., Grossman, J. and Resch, N. (1995). "Making a difference: An impact study of Big Brothers/Big Sisters." Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Tolman, J., et.al. (2002). Moving an out-of-school agenda: Lessons and challenges across cities. Tacoma Park, Maryland: Forum for Youth Investment.

Topping, K. and Whitley, M. (1990). "Participant evaluation of parent-tutored and peer-tutored projects in reading," *Educational Research* 32: 14-32.

U.S. Department of Education. 21st Century Community Learning Centers. (2000). Providing quality afterschool learning opportunities for America's families. Washington, D.C.: Author.

U.S. Department of Education and National Endowment for the Arts. (2000). How the arts can enhance after-school programs. Washington, D.C.: Author.

U.S. Department of Education, U.S. Department of Justice. (2000). *Working for children and families: safe and smart after-school programs*. <http://www.ed.gov> or <http://www.ncjrs.org/ojjhome.htm> Downloaded March 5, 2002

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (1999). Bringing education to after-school programs. Washington, D.C.: Author.

U.S. Department of Education, Partnership for Family Involvement in Education, and the GTE Foundation based on data from the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago. (1998). Family involvement in education: A snapshot of out-of-school time. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (1995). Adolescent time use, risky behavior, and outcomes: An analysis of national data. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Vandell, D.L., and Ramanan, J. (1991). "Children of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth: Choices in After School Care and Child Development." *Developmental Psychology* 27: 637-43.

Vandell, D.L. (1995). "After-school programs vary in quality." *Wisconsin Center for Education Research Highlights* 7, no. 2.

Vandell, D.L., et al. Experiences in after-school programs and children's adjustment at school and at home. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, nd.

Our Mission

The mission of the Stark Education Partnership is to act as a reform support organization to mobilize private sector resources to help districts and schools build the capacity to initiate and sustain changes resulting in high student achievement.