

The Rochester After-School Plan

A Report to Mayor Robert Duffy and Superintendent Jean-Claude Brizard from the Working Group of the Rochester After-School Task Force

September 19, 2008

Rochester After-School Task Force Members

Mayor Robert Duffy, City of Rochester (City)
Superintendent Jean-Claude Brizard, Rochester City School District (RCSD)
Bill Ansbro, City
Luis Burgos, City Department of Recreation and Youth Services (DRYS)
Derrick Coley, Monroe County Libraries
Christina Dandino, Rochester-Monroe County Youth Bureau
Sarah DeLaus, Mayor's Youth Advisory Council
Bonnie C. DeVinney, Greater Rochester Health Foundation (GRHF)
Kim Dyce Faucette, RCSD
Stephanie Fitzgerald, United Way
Mary Kirkendale, City
Roger Gardner, Daisy Marquis Jones Foundation
Marilynn Paterson Grant, RCSD
Hazeldene Hercules, City
Cheryl McGruder Holloway, RCSD
Jeff Kaczorowski, The Children's Agenda
Sherri Lauver, University of Rochester
Carolyn Lee-Davis, The Children's Agenda
Dwayne Mahoney, Boys and Girls Club
Deasure Matthew, Principal in RCSD
Patty Malgieri, City
JudieLynn McAvinney, City DRYS
Caroline Merenda, Rochester Area Community Foundation
Gail Newton, GRHF
Tom Petronio, RCSD
Charles Reaves, City DRYS
Anna Brown Scott, Principal in RCSD
Linda Stagles, RCSD

The Working Group is a subcommittee of the Task Force; the members are:

Edgar Brown	Jeff Kaczorowski
Luis Burgos	Sherri Lauver
Derrick Coley	Carolyn Lee-Davis
Christina Dandino	Dwayne Mahoney
Sarah DeLaus	Deasure Matthew
Bonnie C. DeVinney	JudieLynn McAvinney
Stephanie Fitzgerald	Caroline Merenda
Mary Kirkendale	Gail Newton
Roger Gardner	Charles Reaves
Hazeldene Hercules	Anna Brown Scott
Cheryl McGruder Holloway	Linda Stagles

Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary..... 3
II. Background..... 4
III. The Rochester After-School Plan:An Overview..... 5
IV. The Rochester Program Model..... 6
V. Costs and Sources of Funding..... 8
VI. Anticipated Benefits..... 8
VII. A City-Wide System..... 10
VIII. Implementation Recommendations..... 11

Appendices:

- 1. Description of TASC
- 2. Rochester Cost Models
- 3. Harvard Report on After-School
- 3a. Chart showing outcomes and factors from Harvard Report
- 4. TASC Response to Q&A
- 5. Recreation Ways Chart
- 6. Logic Model

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In June 2008, Mayor Robert Duffy and Jean-Claude Brizard, Superintendent, Rochester City School District (RCSD), created a task force of public and private stakeholders to develop a plan to serve all children (K-12) living in Rochester who are in need of after-school programming. A work group composed of task force members formulated a vision for a system of after-school services, based on the goals set forth by the Mayor and Superintendent.

The working group recommends building a system that will deliver and sustain quality after-school programs through collaborations and efficient use of public and private resources. This reflects the important research done in other cities that shows the power of a system-building approach; it is also, importantly, in sync with the work of the Mayor's Youth Advisory Council, which recently released a report which includes a recommendation to 'save recreation and after-school programs'.¹

The proposed Rochester After-School Plan calls for a two-pronged program strategy (Rochester I/II) which incorporates effective, research-based policies and practices that increase school engagement and achievement. In combination, the critical core elements provide:

- access to and sustained participation in the program;
- structured, varied, and intentional programming that is aligned with, but different from, the school day;
- caring and well-trained staff that provide adequate supervision;
- strong partnerships between program operators and children's teachers, families, and other community organizations; and,
- **a program cost estimate of \$1,500-2,000 per participant, depending on scale and participant age.** Line item details and assumptions are provided within the report.

To ensure that this system be built on quality, the working group has studied effective programs in order to develop an after-school program model. This model, as described in the full report, includes structure and programming guidelines to follow during implementation. **Research suggests that, over time, this program model will:**

- **lead to increased high school graduation rates,**
- **lead to improved public safety;**
- **promote positive youth development; and**
- **help struggling families gain greater economic stability.**

The programs would be funded through a combination of public and private funds, about 50% of which could come from the RCSD. In order to implement and sustain these services at scale:

- **the Working Group recommends that the Mayor and City Council reinstate the DRYS programs through January 2009;**
- **the Working Group recommends that the Superintendent and Mayor support the creation of a city-wide system of after-school, financed and operated through a public/private partnership under the leadership of both the City and RCSD; and**
- **the Working Group recommends instituting an after-school intermediary to oversee the implementation of Rochester I/II at 5-11 schools in January 2009; after reviewing the criteria for an intermediary, recommends Rochester Area Community Foundation be chosen as the intermediary to perform the system building functions.**

II. Background

In June 2008, Mayor Robert Duffy and Superintendent Jean-Claude Brizard created a task force of public and private stakeholders and charged them with developing a plan to serve all of the city's public school students with quality after-school programs. The plan would be built on a partnership between the Mayor and the Superintendent and would reflect a shared belief that high quality after-school programs that are educationally challenging, enriching, and fun, can increase student achievement and promote public safety and economic development.

A work group composed of taskforce members was charged with developing a plan for serving all children (K-12) living in Rochester who are in need of after-school programming. The group was given responsibility for preparing a plan by the end of the summer; one that would first provide for the children served at 11 school-based programs currently operated by the Department of Recreation and Youth Services (DRYS). The After-School Corporation (TASC), a not-for-profit after-school intermediary providing national capacity building and technical assistance, facilitated the planning sessions. TASC is the first such organization to create a system of comprehensive after-school programs for grades K-12 in a large urban setting. Its policies and practices have been adopted by New York City and other jurisdictions throughout the country. (See Appendix 1 for description of TASC.)

Based on the ambitious and innovative goals set forth by the Mayor and Superintendent, the group formulated a vision for a system of after-school services that would deliver and sustain evidence-based, quality after-school services through collaborations and efficient use of public and private resources. The system would contribute to better outcomes in the following areas:

- increased high school graduation rates through academic enrichment and school engagement;
- improved public safety now and in the future by providing all of Rochester's youth with safe spaces and engaging and interactive activities;
- Rochester's children receiving the supports and experiences necessary to develop into healthy and successful adults; and
- Rochester's families receiving educationally rigorous and relevant after-school activities to support their economic stability and health.

The plan and its proposed program model would:

- respond to the educational, social, emotional, and physical needs of children and families;
- be informed by best practices and research from the field and build on existing and effective local models that meet the criteria outlined;
- be cost-effective and sustainable; and
- include measures of effectiveness.

The ambitious scale (establishing quality after-school that is accessible to all of the children in Rochester) and scope (programming that is comprehensive, i.e. varied educationally enriching and fun) envisioned by the Mayor and Superintendent meant that the working group needed to design both a coherent set of after-school program models and a plan for delivering these programs through a city-wide system of school-based (or in some cases, school-linked) services to be financed and operated through a public/private partnership under the leadership of the

Mayor and Superintendent.

This report, prepared by TASC and reviewed and edited by the Working Group, outlines their plans for both. It also sets forth the rationale for their recommendations in the form of a Theory of Change (See Appendix 6).

III. The Rochester After-School Plan: An Overview

The proposed plan is based on a theory of change, whose elements are grounded in research and local conditions, as follows:

- the groups targeted for services are children attending City funded after-school programs at 11 sites that were considered for closing, children attending Rochester City School District schools, and the families of participants.
- the resources that could be used to support programs include CFE, AIS, Title I, 21st Century Community Learning Centers, teachers, AmeriCorps, schools, libraries and recreation centers. (The human, brick and mortar and financial resources span many public and private agencies and point to the current fragmentation of existing services, but also great potential for growth.)
- these resources would be used to serve the target groups through two comprehensive high-quality and cost efficient service strategies: The Rochester I and II Program Models.

Students who participate in comprehensive programs for at least two years will demonstrate measurable improvement. The intermediary, as described on pages 10-12, will be responsible for coordinating the measurement of these successes. Individuals who attend 5 days a week will demonstrate improvement in the following areas:

- increased commitment to learning;
- increased school engagement and attendance;
- decreased behavioral problems;
- increased knowledge of nutrition and health and improved healthy habits, such as better food choices, increased physical activity, and improved body image;
- increased physical well-being, e.g. reduced incidence of obesity, diabetes, reduction in BMI, and improved blood pressure;
- improved social and communication skills; and
- improved relationships with peers, teachers, families and the community.

Based on the research that the working group reviewed, it is anticipated that a community-wide system of after-school will result in additional benefits for participants, families, and the community. Research suggests that participants will:

- be more likely to graduate from high school and be ready for college or a job;
- be healthier; and
- demonstrate increased academic success.

Research suggests that families will:

- become more broadly and deeply engaged with their children's education, family activities and the community; and

- will be better supported through quality child care to pursue work, educational, community and personal endeavors.

Research suggests that, if all school-aged children have access to quality after-school, across the city:

- high school graduation rates increase;
- families' economic health and stability increases;
- public safety increases because crime and violence decreases;
- programming is evaluated and demonstrates effectiveness in reaching goals; and
- public and private resources are used more efficiently to support youth.

IV. The Rochester Program Model

At the heart of the Rochester After-School Plan is the program strategy - the occurrences, plans, and day-to-day operations at a site serving children and families. Key components include people served, activities, staff, staff ratios, and location. Rochester I and II build on local resources and incorporate research-based policies and practices that have proven effective in increasing school engagement and achievement.

In combination, the critical core elements of these two models provide for:

- access to and sustained participation in the program;
- structured, varied, and intentional programming that is aligned with but different from the school day;
- caring and well trained staff that provide adequate supervision;
- strong partnerships between program operators and children's teachers, families, and other community organizations; and,
- a cost that is both reasonable and sustainable.

Rochester I (Elementary School Students)

Structure

- school-, center- or library-based
- OCFS certified
- operated by DRYS or community-based organizations (CBOs) in close collaboration with the school principal
- full-time coordinator located on site
- programs serve 100-300 students (Note: we expect pilots to run a minimum of 100 children per elementary site)
- low student to staff ratios (1:10)
- community-based partners
- open enrollment for children at the school with priority given to students identified by the school principal
- the goal is that each child participates in at least 5 hours of academic support and enrichment per week
- the goal is that each enrolled child participates for at least 5 days per week for 3 hours following the end of school. (The benefits listed above are expected when children

attend 4-5 days per week; children will not penalized or restricted from attending if they can not attend all five days.)

- open on some holidays, vacation days and Saturdays
- offer transportation at the end of the day from the site to child's home
- staff at programs receive youth development training

Programming

- program scheduling and content are evidence-based and developed in partnership with principal
- builds on and wraps around each school's extended day programming and Supplemental Educational Services
- healthy snack and nutritious meal
- literacy
- STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics)
- arts
- family involvement and services (on-site and through referrals)
- health, wellness, and physical fitness
- community service and leadership
- social/emotional learning programming
- family evening one night per week with family dinner until 8:00 p.m.

Rochester II (Secondary Students)

Structure

- school-, center- or library based (campus or multi-site models where appropriate)
- operated by DRYS or community-based organization in partnership with principals and/or libraries
- evidence-based curriculum and scheduling developed in partnership with principal
- city-wide open enrollment, focus on grades 7-9
- full-time coordinator located on site
- programs serve 60-100 students daily
- low student to staff ratios (1:10)
- participants are expected to attend at least three days a week
- programming available 20 hours per week
- open on some holidays, vacation days and Saturdays
- student choice and voice
- partnerships with community based organizations
- strong referral network linked to Student and Family Support Centers
- offer transportation at the end of the day from the site to child's home
- staff at programs receive youth development training

Programming

- participant engages in at least 4 hours of academic support and enrichment per week
- healthy snack and nutritious meal
- literacy
- STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics)
- arts

- life skills, mentoring and peer tutoring
- family involvement
- family evening one night per week with family dinner until 8:00 p.m.
- health, fitness and recreation
- youth voice, choice and leadership
- community service
- employment readiness

V. Cost and Sources of Funding

These models would cost an estimated \$1,500-2,000 on average per participant, depending on scale and participant age; this price does not include transportation costs.

Based on a review of both local and non-local after-school programs, these are a **best estimate for what the program costs** are – however, as the intermediary begins working with individual schools and providers (either the DRYS or CBOs), additional costs may occur and will have to be negotiated by the intermediary, school/after-school program, and CBO. Some assumptions that we have:

- Snacks and meals provided by Foodlink. There is not a line item in the budget for this because the associated costs are federally-reimbursable.
- It is our hope and assumption from preliminary conversations that facility and utility costs will be negotiated and whenever possible given as in-kind donations.
- There is **not a line item for transportation** in the budget. We believe 90% of transportation costs would be reimbursed by the State due to our formal link with AIS services. **10% of transportation, though, will need to be paid for.** RCSD is creating a cost estimate for this.
- There should be an annual cost attached to having an intermediary. We expect the **intermediary, when running at full capacity in 12-18 months would be a 1.5 FTE organization with staffing and overhead costs.** The intermediary will have to budget their costs and negotiate payment from community members and outside funders.

The unit costs here are in line with those of comparable quality programs and include funds for a full-time director, adequate levels of academic support, youth development workers, and specialists, administration, and training. Our recommendation is that the RCSD commit to 50% of these costs, while the other half come from the following sources: City, 21st CCLC, Advantage, private foundations, and matching funds from providers where applicable. Cost models with the line-by-line breakdowns can be found in Appendix 2.

These estimates do not provide for transportation for the large number of RCSD students who attend schools that are not within walking distance of their homes. In order to reap the benefits of its program investments and make them accessible and equitable, the City and RCSD need to revise transportation policies. It is our understanding that transportation can be financed in creative and cost-efficient ways, including through partnering with AIS/Extended Day programs, which may allow for a 90% reimbursement for transportation through NYS.

VI. Anticipated Benefits

A decade of research and evaluation studies, as well as large-scale, rigorously conducted syntheses looking across many research and evaluation studies, confirms that children and youth

who participate in after-school programs can reap a host of positive benefits in a number of interrelated outcome areas—academic, social/emotional, prevention, and health and wellness. Research and evaluation point to three primary and interrelated factors that are critical for creating positive settings that can achieve positive youth outcomes:

- access to and sustained participation in the program;
- quality programming and staffing; and
- promoting strong partnerships among the program and the other places where students are learning, such as their schools, their families, and other community institutions.

When these three factors are successfully addressed, after-school programs are most likely to be able to realize their goals and achieve successful outcomes for youth.ⁱⁱ

School Performance and High School Graduation - If implemented at the proposed funding levels, Rochester I and II can be expected to have a significant positive impact on participants' school performance, as evidenced by increased school day attendance, greater attachment to school, and higher academic achievement. A two year longitudinal study looking at effects on almost 3,000 children in 35 after-school programs in eight states found that elementary and middle school students participating in quality programs for two years demonstrated significant gains in standardized math test scores, when compared to peers who were regularly unsupervised after-school.ⁱⁱⁱ A 2006 meta-analysis of 35 experimental and quasi-experimental studies found that after-school programs demonstrated positive effects on both reading and math achievement.^{iv}

There is clear evidence that after-school programs increase school bonding and school grades, and reduce problem behaviors. Numerous longitudinal studies consistently show that after-school significantly boosts school attendance for participants. Programs have also been associated with these academic outcomes: better attitudes toward schools and higher educational aspirations; lower dropout rates; decreased school retention rates; improved homework completion; and engagement in learning. An independent longitudinal evaluation of TASC programs found that participants outperform similar non-participants on math test scores and high school Regents Examinations. TASC participants also earn more high school credits and have increased school attendance rates.^v

Given consistent research on quality after-school programs' positive impact on school attendance, behavior, and grades – all potential predictors of a child's path to high school graduation, the proposed Rochester I and II Models below are essential interventions in addressing the high school graduation crisis in the city. Evaluations of LA's BEST programs (comprehensive school-based elementary school programs, comparable to TASC programs) consistently find a positive impact on school day attendance. Moreover, a longitudinal study found that participation in an LA's BEST program for at least one year (while in grades 2 through 5) had a positive impact on high school dropout rates, and students who had attended the program for 3 years showed a "significantly" lower drop out rate (20% less likely to drop out) than the comparison group.^{vi} A follow-up study on participants in TASC middle school programs found positive outcomes in high school attendance and credit accumulation for former middle-grade TASC participants compared to students who attended the same middle schools but did not participate in after-school programs, and to students who attended similar middle schools that did not have TASC programs.^{vii}

Other anticipated benefits include:

Public safety - Participation in after-school programs has been associated with decreases in delinquency and violent behavior, avoidance of drug and alcohol use and reduction in juvenile crime. A 2007 study funded by the U.S. Department of Justice found that participants in LA's BEST after-school programs have significantly lower incidences of juvenile crime.

Economic development - Employers get a more productive workforce, as individual employees do not have to be distracted by child care and supervision concerns. Parents and families get structured and enriching activities for their children to participate in when the school day ends at 3:00 p.m. and invaluable child care. Parents in Policy Studies Associates' study of TASC said afterschool programs helped them balance work and family life, with 60 percent saying they missed less work than before their child was in the program, and 59 percent saying it supported them in keeping their job.

Positive youth development - Youth get exposure to a variety of learning experiences in different settings that provide social capital, building opportunities that their more affluent peers have. A recent meta-analysis of more than 70 after-school programs found that programs improved youth self-esteem and self-confidence, especially when programs intentionally focused on improving social and personal skills.^{viii}

School and social service delivery reform - Schools get additional support in the ambitious work of ensuring educational success and healthy development of every student. Community-based organizations get a more stable, sustainable source of funding. Policymakers and funders get a more rational system that allows them to track the impact of their investments and demonstrate results.

Overall these anticipated benefits outweigh their costs and utilize under-used public and private resources (i.e. school buildings, recreation centers, libraries). While cost-benefit studies on after-school have been limited, studies support the assertion that after-school programs ultimately save cities money in other costs. A 2004 study by the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation found that for every dollar spent on a TASC program, \$3.19 in benefits accrue in greater future earning power for participants. The USDOJ study on LA's BEST cited above revealed an average public saving of \$2.50 for each \$1.00 invested in the program.

Even in tough fiscal times, the outcomes an after-school system will generate are vital to stakeholders across the city. An after-school system can help support struggling families and communities and improve educational outcomes in a very cost-efficient way. The investment and system recommended here will provide a strong foundation of quality services for children and families when they need them most.

See Appendix 3 for a comprehensive research review from the Harvard Family Research Project.

VII. A City-wide System

In order to implement and sustain these services at more than a handful of sites, the relationships among the various stakeholders in these programs (i.e. providers, funders, regulators, public and private resource organizations, and families) need to be rationalized, coordinated, and managed, formally and informally.

The commitment of the Mayor and Superintendent to large scale change and impact provides an extraordinary opportunity to create a city-wide system in Rochester.

Rochester's system can build upon successes in Providence, New York City, Washington D.C., Los Angeles and San Diego while responding to Rochester's unique local conditions and needs.

Based on our review, Rochester has the resources and commitment of community members, including funders, providers, policymakers, and advocates, and we strongly encourage the Superintendent and Mayor to champion a community-wide system of after-school, financed and operated through a public/private partnership under the leadership of both the City and RCSD. As with health care and criminal justice, a publicly supported (although not necessarily directly controlled) after-school system will be stronger than the sum of its parts and help achieve important public benefits policymakers and citizens care about.

There is evidence from a number of cities that a system-building approach will lead to:

- greater availability of services, especially in disadvantaged school communities;
- greater equity;
- greater cost-efficiencies and sustainability, including through the identification and blending of new and/or under-used resources;
- more accountability;
- more accessibility and visibility of programs for families; and,
- greater quality and consistency in services and end fragmentation among providers, public and private funders, regulatory agencies and families

(For evidence, see Appendix 4, Shaping the Future of After-School: The Essential Role of Intermediaries in Bringing Quality After-School Systems to Scale.)

Rochester has the resources to build a robust city-wide system. Superintendent Brizard and his staff recognize the potential of the after-school hours to transform children's attitudes and interests as well as their skills. The Mayor and City agencies have signaled their commitment. DRYS has been creative in its after-school programming. Libraries and CBOs operate high-quality and educationally rich programs. Private foundations have demonstrated a strong interest in the field. **With adequate infrastructure, planning, and roll-out, the Rochester system could be a model for cities around the nation.**

VIII. Implementation Recommendations

1. Reinstate the DRYS programs through January 2009. The task force has made tremendous progress developing a high-quality program model that would result in improving educational outcomes for many more of Rochester's children. In order to adequately implement the model and system, a series of start-up steps will be required over the next few months. This reinstatement would prevent children from losing any opportunities in the meantime and would smooth the transition to a new model and system.

2. Identify an intermediary by October 2008. The working group has concluded that in order to build a quality system in Rochester an intermediary should be identified. After reviewing the approaches taken in other cities (as described in Appendix 4), the working group has determined an intermediary would be the necessary foundation for building the system discussed in this

memo. **Best practices show that an intermediary should meet the following criteria:**

- **be non-partisan;**
- **be a non-operating organization (i.e., not a provider);**
- **be able to braid and allocate funding for programs in a speedy, deliberate, and cost effective manner;**
- **be well-established organization who is trusted as neutral and collaborative;**
- **have experience in the after-school field;**
- **have access to local, state, and national networks of after-school systems; and**
- **be local and have appropriate capacity.**

The intermediary would undertake the following functions in its first few years:

- secure, bundle, and re-grant braided public and private funds to operating entities through thorough requests for proposal process;
- identify and develop new fund sources for sustainability;
- provide quality assurance;
- monitor grants, including program activities and fiscal expenditures;
- identify and respond to professional workforce development needs of after-school staff;
- collect and share data and best practices; and
- oversee an independent evaluation of the initiative.

3. Fund 5 to 11 schools to operate Rochester I/II Model programs serving a minimum of 100 students at each site in January, pending fundraising efforts by the intermediary. To facilitate this speedy implementation, the Superintendent would be invited to select up to 11 schools based on a variety of criteria to launch programs in January. Criteria might include student and family need, location, principal leadership, school capacity to undertake the pilot and data collection to track the pilot results. With support from the new intermediary, those up-to-11 principals will identify contractors, such as DRYS or community-based organizations, with the capacity and commitment to start the Rochester Model. Principals in partnership with the operators, and supported by the intermediary, would ensure timely implementation and fidelity to the program model.

ⁱ Mayor's Youth Advisory Council (2008). *Youth Priorities in Action*.

ⁱⁱ Harvard Family Research Project (2008). *After school programs in the 21st Century: Their Potential and What It Takes to Achieve It*. Boston: Harvard Family Research Project.

ⁱⁱⁱ Vandell, D., Reisner, E., & Pierce, K. (2007). *Outcomes linked to high quality afterschool programs: Longitudinal findings from the study of promising practices*. Irvine, CA: University of California and Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates.

^{iv} Lauer, P.A., Akiba, M., Wilerson, S.B., Apthorp, H.S., Snow, D. & Martin-Glenn, M.L. (2006). Out-of-School Time programs: A meta-analysis of effects for at-risk students. *Review of Educational Research*, 76, 275-313.

^v Reisner, E., White, R. N., Birmingham, J., & Welsh, M. (2001). *Building quality and supporting expansion of after-school projects: Evaluation results from the TASC After-School Program's second year*. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates. See also *Patterns of student-level change linked to TASC participation, based on TASC projects in Year 2*.

^{vi} Huang, D., Coordt, A., La Torre, D., Leon, S., Miyoshi, K., Perez, P., et al. (2007). *The afterschool hours: Examining the relationship between after-school staff-based social capital and student engagement in LA's BEST*. Los Angeles: UCLA/CRESST.

^{vii} Christina A. Russell, C., Mielke, M., Miller, T., and Johnson, J. (2007). *After-School Programs and High School Success*. Washington DC: Policy Studies Associates.

^{viii} Durlak, R., & Weissberg, R. (2007). *The impact of after-school programs that promote personal and social skills*. Chicago: CASEL.

Appendix 1: TASC Description

About TASC

The After-School Corporation (TASC) was established by the Open Society Institute in 1998 to enhance the quality and availability of after-school programming and to make after-school programs a public responsibility in New York. As an intermediary between schools and community-based organizations, TASC raises and re-grants funds to expand the availability of after-school programs; supports training, technical assistance and evaluation to enhance the quality of existing and future after-school programs; and advocates for continued and diversified funding for after-school.

During our first school year in 1999-2000, TASC funded and supported 25 after-school programs. Nine years later, TASC has provided direct support to 324 programs in New York City. TASC has also demonstrated what effective after-school looks like by developing a comprehensive program model where kids can do all the things they need to do beyond school and home: moving their bodies, experimenting with new interests, congregating with other kids and caring adults, and reinforcing and expanding upon what they learn during the school day.

In total, TASC has brought together 344 public schools with 146 community-based and cultural organizations, keeping children and teens safe, engaged, and actively learning during the very hours when so many kids have no adult supervision because their parents are at work. Of the programs we've supported, 264 continued to operate in the 2006-2007 school year. Of these 264, 106 programs have developed support sufficient to sustain their operations without funding from TASC.

TASC's influence on the field has been strengthened by the findings from Policy Studies Associates' (PSA) rigorous independent evaluation, which documents the benefits of the program model on children's school day attendance, achievement, and attachment to school. PSA found that TASC model programs helped strengthen parents' workforce attachment and reduce student mobility. The findings have also bolstered TASC's efforts to help other jurisdictions adapt its core program elements and funding models and create or strengthen intermediaries to operate the programs.

TASC has had a demonstrable influence on the structure, policies and practices of after-school initiatives in other jurisdictions, through its publications and its technical assistance. TASC has helped groups in 30 cities strengthen their systems. Its innovative use of public funding sources such as child care subsidies, AmeriCorps and the Workforce Investment Act are being emulated elsewhere. A prominent example of this influence is New Jersey After 3, a public/private statewide initiative, that closely follows TASC's intermediary structure, program and cost models. Other recent technical assistance clients include the Germantown, Hudson and Catskill School Districts and the Afterschool Partnership of Greater New Orleans.

Appendix 2: Rochester Cost Models

Rochester I Cost Model (Elementary Schools)

	<u>Total</u>	<u>RCSD</u>
1 Full-time Site Coordinator @40,000 + 25% fringe	50,000	25,000
20 Teachers x 4 hours a week x 30 weeks @ \$37/hr.	88,800	88,800
20 Group Leaders x 15 hours x 34 weeks @ \$10/hr.	102,000	
Arts and other specialist programming	5,000	5,000
Supplies / Equipment @50 per student	10,000	10,000
Training, capacity, building professional development	10,000	10,000
Family Fridays	10,000	5,000
	275,800	143,800
Admin. @ 10%	27,580	14,380
	303,380	158,180
Unit Costs	\$1,517	\$790

The Rochester I Cost model assumes:

- Programs serve **about 200 students**, who attend every day school is in session, 15 hours a week for **34 weeks**.
- Staffing includes a full-time site coordinator who is not a teacher but works at the school; teachers paid per session rates for academic support (about five hours/ week for each child); group leaders who work alongside the teachers and have primary responsibility for ten children.
- Funding for specialists such as arts educators, robotics.
- 10% administrative costs for CBO funded activities.
- Regular Friday evening activities with parents.
- **Snacks and meals** provided by Foodlink. There is not a line item in the budget for this because the associated costs are federally-reimbursable.
- It is our hope and assumption from preliminary table conversation that **facility and utility costs** will be negotiated and whenever possible given as in-kind donations.
- There is not a line item for transportation in the budget. We believe 90% of transportation costs would be reimbursed by the State due to our formal link with AIS services. **10% of transportation, though, will need to paid for.** RCSD is creating a cost estimate for this.
- There should be an annual cost attached to having an intermediary. We expect the **intermediary, when running at full capacity in 12-18 months would be a 1.5 FTE organization with staffing and overhead costs.** The intermediary will have to budget their costs and negotiate payment from community members and outside funders.

<u>Rochester II Cost Model (Secondary Schools)</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>RCSD</u>
Full-time Site Coordinator @40,000 + 25% fringe	50,000	25,000
8 Teachers @ \$37/hr. x 4 hrs. x 30 weeks	35,520	35,520
8 Group Leaders @ \$12 hr. x 20 hours x 34 weeks	65,280	
Art and other specialist programming	10,000	10,000
Supplies / Equipment @50 per student	5,000	5,000
Training, capacity, building professional development	10,000	10,000
	175,800	85,520
Admin. @ 10%	17,580	8,552
	193,380	94,072
Unit Costs	\$1,933	\$940

The Rochester II Cost model assumes:

- Programs for **at least 100 students**, who attend at least three days per week, 9-12 hours a week for **34 weeks**.
- Staffing includes a full-time site coordinator who is not a teacher but works at the school; teachers paid per session rates for academic support (about four hours/ week for each student); group leaders who work alongside the teachers and have primary responsibility for 12-14 youth.
- Funding for specialists such as arts educators, robotics, college prep, dance instructors.
- 10% administrative costs for CBO funded activities.
- **Snacks and meals** provided by Foodlink. There is not a line item in the budget for this because the associated costs are federally-reimbursable.
- It is our hope and assumption from preliminary table conversation that **facility and utility costs** will be negotiated and whenever possible given as in-kind donations.
- Please note that there is not a line item for transportation in the budget. We believe 90% of transportation costs would be reimbursed by the State due to our formal link with AIS services. **10% of transportation, though, will need to be paid for.** RCSD is creating a cost estimate for this.
- Based on a review of both local and non-local after-school programs, these are a **best estimate for what the program costs** are – however, as the intermediary begins working with individual schools and providers (either the DRYS or CBOs), additional costs may occur and will have to be negotiated by the intermediary.
- Please note that there should be an annual cost attached to having an intermediary. We expect the **intermediary, when running at full capacity in 12-18 months would be a 1.5 FTE organization with staffing and overhead costs.** The intermediary will have to budget their costs and negotiate payment from community members and outside funders.

Appendix 3a: After School Programs in the 21st Century: Their Potential and What It Takes to Achieve It: *Harvard Family Research Project, February 2008*

Outcomes that Can Be Produced by After-School Programs		
Academic Outcomes	Social/Emotional Outcomes	Health and Wellness Outcomes
<p>Academic outcomes associated with participation in after school programs include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better attitudes toward school and higher educational aspirations • Higher school attendance rates and less tardiness • Less disciplinary action (e.g., suspension) • Lower dropout rates • Better performance in school, as measured by achievement test scores and grades • Greater on-time promotion • Improved homework completion • Engagement in learning 	<p>Social/Emotional outcomes associated with participation in after school programs include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decreased behavioral problems • Improved social and communication skills and/or relationships with others (peers, parents, teachers) • Increased self-confidence, self-esteem, and self-efficacy • Lower levels of depression and anxiety • Development of initiative • Improved feeling and attitudes toward self and school 	<p>Health and wellness outcomes associated with participation in after school programs include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better food choices • Increased physical activity • Increased knowledge of nutrition and health practices • Reduction in BMI • Improved blood pressure • Improved body image

Critical Factors to Achieve Successful Outcomes		
Access to & sustained participation in programs	Quality Programming & Staffing	Strong Partnerships
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More days per week in program • More years in program • Tailoring programs to meet youth interests, needs and schedules • Provide wide variety of enriching, engaging and creative opportunities • Includes summer services <p>Key features of quality associated with sustained participation of youth in program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher director salaries • Advanced education credentials • Parent liaison on staff • Youth report greater sense of belonging • More positive interactions between youth and staff • higher academic self-esteem • strong academic or arts focus • improved academic performance through enrichment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate supervision and structure • Well prepared staff with advanced credentials • Intentional programming with opportunities for autonomy and choice • Develops, utilizes and leverage partnerships with a variety of stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With families, other community-based institutions and schools • Engage families in after-school programming • Community service opportunities • Tapping expertise of community residents and neighborhood adults as a resource • Partnership between after-school site and its partnering sponsor • Partnership with principals and school teachers • Opportunity for alignment with in-school learning needs • Vehicle for expanded learning opportunities with other community institutions • Referral source and linkages to other needed services and supports thru other community – based organizations

Appendix 4: TASC response to questions raised at the August 27th, 2008 meeting between the City of Rochester, the Rochester City School District, TASC, and Working Group representation

1. Some - if not all - system building functions be performed by a private not-for profit organization, such as Rochester Area Community Foundation or United Way, operating as an intermediary.

2. The private not-for-profit intermediary would play a lead role in helping the Mayor and the Superintendent build a quality after-school system, one that leverages the talents and resources of the entire City, while allowing DRYS to shift its focus to contract management. In the longer term (five years), the City and the Superintendent may wish to consider strategies for institutionalizing the system's operating functions. TASC has identified three scenarios Rochester could adapt for system delivery: The intermediary would remain entirely independent (Providence example below); some or all of its functions could be absorbed by a City agency such as DRYS (NYC example); or, it may become a public/private hybrid (Los Angeles example).

- A. Providence:** Providence After-School Alliance remains a separate 501(c)3 acting as the intermediary with mayoral support and guidance but external to a City agency.
- B. NYC:** In 2005, NYC Mayor established the Out-of-School Time initiative, managed by the Department of Youth and Community Development (DYCD). The project adopted the core elements of the TASC model program, and DYCD, or the City, became the administering intermediary. DYCD now performs all grants and contract management, monitoring and quality assurance functions. (It does not provide any direct services.)
- C. Los Angeles:** The executive staff of LA's BEST operates out of the Mayor's Office but is funded through a 501(c)3. It operates programs directly with significant community partnerships. These programs are managed by LA's BEST staff located in the Los Angeles School District and all program staff are employees of LAUSD. This hybrid model may be adapted by Rochester such that in the future the intermediary reduces its functions to include fundraising and new program development while a City agency, such as DRYS, adopts the contract management, monitoring and quality assurance functions.

Appendix 5: City DRYS, Bureau of Recreation Services *Ways Chart*

	OLD WAY	CURRENT WAY	FUTURE WAY
PURPOSE	Provide access and opportunity for organized and open play and crafts at Recreation Centers and parks for social, behavioral, and cultural development. Connect youth with positive role models and opportunities to develop healthy life-styles.	Provide access and opportunity for organized and open play and crafts at Recreation Centers and parks for social, behavioral, and cultural, leadership, and educational development. Connect youth with positive role models and opportunities to develop healthy life-styles. Provide safe havens for youth. Incorporate into organizational delivery systems research-based frameworks, such as Search Institute's 40 Developmental Assets and research on risk and protective factors, i.e. Hawkin and Catalano's and best practices of youth development i.e. Karen Pittman's Forum on Youth Investment	In partnership with the Rochester City School District, provide access and opportunity for organized and open play and crafts at Recreation Centers, parks, and schools for social, behavioral, and cultural, leadership, and educational development. Connect youth with positive role models and opportunities to develop healthy life-styles. Provide safe havens for youth. Incorporate into organizational delivery systems research-based frameworks, such as Search Institute's 40 Developmental Assets and research on risk and protective factors, i.e. Hawkin and Catalano's and best practices of youth development i.e. Karen Pittman's Forum on Youth Investment
PROGRAMS	Traditional programs: sports, crafts, events, oriented mostly to young males.	An array of traditional and non-traditional programs and services targeting youth 6-13 years of age situated within an organizational framework that promotes and sustains positive youth	An array of traditional and non-traditional programs and services targeting youth 6-13 years of age situated within an organizational framework that promotes and sustains positive youth development principles

<p>PROGRAMS (cont.)</p>		<p>development principles and practices.</p> <p>Focus on community needs, youth development/leadership, educational development, Literacy, new trends, and that are age-appropriate, culturally-sensitive, and gender-responsive programs, enrichment programming at RASA sites</p>	<p>and practices.</p> <p>Focus on community needs, youth development/leadership, educational development, Enhanced Literacy, new trends, and that are age-appropriate, culturally-sensitive, and gender-responsive programs, extensive enrichment programming</p>
<p>CUSTOMER INPUT</p>	<p>Complaint driven</p>	<p>Bi-annual Town Hall meetings, Youth Councils, surveys, EZ Rec Pass, CHOTR, SWOT analysis,</p>	<p>Bi-annual Town Hall meetings, Youth Councils, surveys, EZ Rec Pass, CHOTR, SWOT analysis, PTA meetings</p>
<p>CUSTOMER SERVICE</p>	<p>Family oriented</p>	<p>Family and community oriented. Informed, empowered staff that can answer customers questions and concerns, EZ Rec Pass</p>	<p>Family, School, and community oriented. Informed, empowered staff that can answer customers questions and concerns, EZ Rec Pass</p>
<p>STAFF</p>	<p>Civil Servants (including 12 APT), volunteers, and contractors</p>	<p>Civil Servants (including 7 APT), volunteers, contractors, AmeriCorps, Student Interns, Social Work Field Placements, Service-Learning partnerships and Collaborative Community Partners</p>	<p>Civil Servants (including 9 APT), volunteers, contractors, AmeriCorps, Student Interns, , Social Work Field Placements, Service-Learning partnerships, and Collaborative Community Partners</p>
<p>PROGRAM & STAFF DEVELOPMENT</p>	<p>Reactive based on community complaints, opportunities, or City leadership's discretion</p>	<p>Program Development Office established in 2000, Youth Development Infusion based up research-focused best practices process funded by the RCAF started in 2001, Program System Management (PSM) established in 2003, Town Hall meetings established in 2003, Staff SWOT analysis established in 2003, Youth Surveys, Recreation Employee Professional</p>	<p>Program Development Office, Youth Development Infusion based up research-focused best practices process, Program System Management (PSM), Town Hall meetings, Staff SWOT analysis, Youth Surveys, Recreation Employee Professional Development System (REPDS), EZ Rec Pass, Planning with RCSD</p>

		Development System (REPDS) established in 2004, EZ Rec Pass established in 2006	
FACILITY MANAGEMENT	<p>Stewardship of parks and buildings with management of a full complement of related resources and control (Parks Operations, Forestry, and Custodial Services).</p> <p>Buildings closed and used seasonally or for storage when programs/services are cut.</p>	<p>Stewardship of parks and buildings. Parks and buildings are viewed as assets that can counter blight in neighborhoods. Starting in 2003, buildings previously vacated or converted to seasonal or storage use due to program/service cuts (LRL, GVFH, NV, First St.) are improved and made available for public rental thereby generating revenue and greatly improving the community's access to parks</p> <p>Building Maintenance transferred to DES in 1994. Forestry transferred to DES in 2006. Park Operations transferred to DES in 2007. Custodial Services transferred to DES in 2007.</p>	<p>Stewardship of parks and buildings.</p> <p>Parks and buildings are viewed as assets that can counter blight in neighborhoods.</p> <p>LRL, GVFH, NV are available for public rental thereby generating revenue and maintaining the community's access to parks</p> <p>Numerous School sites are permitted for delivery of enriched services to enhance service accessibility</p>
SECURITY	Staff and volunteer background checks, staff vigilance	Staff and volunteer background checks, staff vigilance, Single Points of Entry, Sentries, CCTV, Alarm Systems, Radios, Speaker Systems, EZ Rec Pass, City Security, enhanced window screens, School Resource Officers, RPD Security Cameras	Staff and volunteer background checks, staff vigilance, Single Points of Entry, Sentries, CCTV, Alarm Systems, Radios, Speaker Systems, EZ Rec Pass, City Security, enhanced window screens, School Resource Officers, RPD Security Cameras
MEASURES OF SUCCESS	Registrations, and attendance	Registrations, attendance, EZ Rec Pass, Children's Institute Program Quality Assessments (PQA), grant funding/ evaluations, customer feedback, youth surveys, Unusual Incident Reports, Rec. Center Suspensions. Feedback from SWOTS and Town Meetings	Registrations, attendance, EZ Rec Pass, Children's Institute Program Quality Assessments (PQA), grant funding/ evaluations, customer feedback, Unusual Incident Reports, Rec. Center Suspensions, feedback from SWOTS and Town Meetings, school attendance/ behaviors, High School graduation rates. Monitored by the U of R and the RCSD.