



**THE IMPACT OF PROP. 49:
A PROFILE OF AFTER SCHOOL POLICY AND PRACTICE IN OAKLAND AND SAN FRANCISCO**

By Katie Brackenridge, Partnership for Children and Youth
Sandra Naughton, San Francisco Department of Children, Youth and Their Families

Executive Summary

In 2002, California voters approved \$550 million, the largest statewide investment in after school programming in the country, through a voter initiative called Proposition 49 (Prop. 49). When the funding began to flow to local communities in early 2007, the sudden influx of so many grants was chaotic, even for communities with an existing after school infrastructure. Based on interviews, focus groups and document review, this article analyzes how this influx of new state funding impacted well-established after school fields in two Bay Area cities – Oakland and San Francisco – with a focus on policy changes, programming and practice, and power dynamics between key stakeholders in the cities. The hope is to share the experiences and lessons learned for other states and communities considering creating new resources dedicated to after school programming.

Both Oakland and San Francisco have long histories of community-based organizations (CBOs) providing youth programming and millions of dollars of city funding dedicated to supporting youth services that pre-dated Prop. 49. When Prop. 49 funds became available to the school districts in each city, there were two main **policy** impacts: there were significantly more youth served citywide, and there was more funding for CBOs delivering afterschool programming in general but less funding for CBOs providing programming that focused on specialized or specific content areas like arts, recreation, or tutoring in school settings. Prop. 49 funding also had several impacts on **programming and practice** in each community. The new state funding increased the visibility of after school programming as a venue for supporting positive youth outcomes. With this visibility came more accountability for program quality and outcomes, which many stakeholders believe has led to increased program quality overall. With Prop. 49 funds being administered by the California Department of Education and by school districts in each city, there was also an increased focus on academics in after school programs.

Prop. 49 also impacted the relationships and **power dynamics** between the main after school stakeholders in each city - city agencies, school districts and CBOs. Since Prop. 49 funding flowed from the school district to school sites, principals in both cities were given increased control over program content and program providers. The funding also prompted increased coordination between staff at city and district offices in both cities. Competition between some community-based organizations also increased, especially between some larger CBOs that served as lead agencies and those that offered

more specialized programming. Despite some competition, CBOs formed alliances with each other in order to have a more influential voice in conversations and negotiations with the school districts, that had suddenly become funders of after school, and the city agencies they partnered with. Overall, schools and lead agency CBOs gained more control over after school program components and forged much closer working relationships than in the past. These closer relationships benefited lead agency CBOs by increasing their credibility within the district, access to information and decision-makers, support from district staff, and funding opportunities. School sites and school districts also benefited by gaining after school programming that is more aligned with their goals and visions.

The experiences of San Francisco and Oakland provide valuable information and perspective for other cities in California working through similar dynamics with Prop. 49 funding, and for other states or communities that may be considering creating dedicated after school investments. Oakland and San Francisco's experiences with Prop. 49 can also inform other collaborative, inter-agency efforts, for example those focused on community schools, summer, and other out of school time efforts.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

Methodology

Background on Prop. 49

Background on Out-of-School Time Systems in San Francisco and Oakland

Key Findings

Implications of these Findings

Conclusion

Appendices:

Appendix A: Glossary of Acronyms

Appendix B: Description of the SF Department of Children, Youth and their Families and the Partnership for Children and Youth

Appendix C: Acknowledgements

Introduction

In 2002, California voters approved the largest statewide investment in after school programming in the country through a voter initiative called Proposition 49 (Prop. 49). With \$550 million, hundreds of thousands of children would gain access to educational supports and enrichment activities after school. When the funding was triggered in early 2007, however, the sudden influx of money was chaotic and unsettling for many communities. Having applied through an abbreviated funding application, school districts across the state were challenged to start programming immediately after being awarded funding. For the next three years, everyone – districts, cities, county offices of education, community-based organizations, technical assistance providers, statewide networks, advocates, and funders – focused on developing the infrastructure at the local and state level to help programs start up and then to begin building their quality. By 2010, most programs had stabilized operations and had access to local and statewide systems to support their continuous improvement.

The influx of Prop. 49 funding brought more attention to after school programming as a field and movement than had ever existed before in California. As programs developed, local and statewide stakeholders in after school and education began raising questions and having conversations about the appropriate role for after school programming. Some stakeholders felt Prop 49 funding was invaluable in that after school programs could now provide educational and enrichment opportunities related to visual and performing arts, hands-on science, structured recreation, and other subjects that in many cases were no longer as available during the school day due to budget cuts. Others advocated for the role after school programs could play in offering more individualized attention to students due to lower youth to adult ratios, which could significantly support English language learners, students struggling academically and socially, and other such target populations. Some stakeholders stressed the value after school programs have to working parents who would otherwise not have a safe, productive place for their children in the after school hours. Many questions arose about after school programs' role in building academic skills - as shown through test scores or by some other measures, supporting children's social and emotional development, and fostering the 21st century skills that successful adults need. While these questions have always circled after school programming, the explosion of Prop. 49-funded programming across the state brought renewed vigor and focus to these conversations. While this article does not address these questions directly, they are part of the impetus for its writing as after school providers and advocates work to understand how Prop. 49 and other public investments in after school programming have shifted the role and content of after school programming.

Eight years after Prop. 49 passed, the San Francisco Department of Children, Youth and Their Families and the Partnership for Children and Youth were interested in exploring the progress of the after school field in the Bay Area and gathering some of the lessons learned. Oakland and San Francisco provided excellent case studies as they have similar structures in terms of urban areas with a long and rich tradition of community-based organizations (CBOs) providing youth programming and millions of dollars of city funding dedicated to supporting youth programming annually that pre-date Prop. 49. In both cities, the number of school-based after school programs expanded in 2007 with Prop. 49 grants to their school districts. While the after school landscape was similar in many ways in each city, there were marked differences in the way the stakeholders approached the implementation of Prop. 49 funding. Through interviews, focus groups and document review, this article documents the experience of these two communities, and identifies the implications for practitioners and policymakers in other communities and in other states considering after school resources and systems.

Methodology

Research Purpose and Questions

This research was conducted to explore the impact of an increase in state funding for school-based after school programs on the relationships, policies, programming and after school practices of school districts, cities and CBOs in two California communities - Oakland and San Francisco. This research intended to identify and clarify the changes in the youth programming landscape in these two communities - a space that had traditionally been formed and occupied by cities and CBOs - due to the increase in state after school funding and the related increased role of school districts in after school programming. Specifically, this article addresses the following research questions:

- How have local policies changed since Prop. 49 funding was released? Specifically:
 - o How have programming and practice at CBO-operated after school programs changed since Prop. 49 funding was released?
 - o What factors were responsible for these changes?

- How have the relationships between districts, cities and CBOs changed since Prop. 49 funding was released? Specifically,
 - o How has the Prop. 49 funding altered the power dynamics among these different entities' and how has that impacted programming and practice?
 - o What have been the benefits to CBOs of closer relationships with school districts and school sites and vice versa?

Description of methods

This qualitative research took place from January to December 2010. The research methods employed included: individual in-depth interviews, focus groups with CBO after school providers, and content analysis of related documentation.

A criterion-based sampling method was used to identify key informants for in-depth interviews. Three Oakland Unified School District (OUSD), 2 Oakland Fund for Children and Youth (OFCY), 2 San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD), 2 San Francisco Department of Children Youth and Their Families (DCYF), and 3 CBO representatives from Oakland, 2 from San Francisco and 3 providing services in both Oakland and San Francisco were interviewed.

Three focus groups were held with senior-level managers of CBOs – one with lead agencies from Oakland, one with specialized providers from Oakland, and one with lead agencies from San Francisco. On average, participants from the focus groups had worked with their current employers for 11 years and their current employers had been delivering youth services for an average of 25 years. They had received school district funding for after school for an average of 5 years, had received city funding for after school for an average of 8 years, and currently serve an average of 1,270 youth annually in after school programs in either city.

Documents analyzed included: funding guidelines, reporting requirements, contract/grant data, policy reports and memos, meeting notes/minutes, and other relevant information from city and district stakeholders in both communities.

Limitations

This research relies on a limited sample of local stakeholders and on those stakeholders' recollections of events that took place up to four years ago. Although attempts were made to include stakeholders who have been in their roles since the implementation of Prop. 49, that was not possible in many instances due to the high-turnover of the out-of-school time field and among staff in school district and city agencies. Also, most of the findings are based on individuals' perspectives, and often documentation and historical records were not available to substantiate individuals' perspectives.

Background on Prop. 49

In 2002, California voters passed Prop. 49, the After School Education and Safety Act (ASES), to secure ongoing funding for permanent, universal after school programs at elementary, middle, and junior high schools throughout the state. Prop. 49 was championed by then-citizen Arnold Schwarzenegger, who had been a longtime supporter of after school programs. Prop. 49 expanded California's existing after school grant program from \$122 million to a guaranteed \$550 million annually. Prop. 49 was written with a trigger mechanism, so that new funds would not be released until the first fiscal year when state general fund expenditures exceed 2000 levels by at least \$1.5 billion. That trigger occurred in 2006, which was also when after school advocates, together with then-state Senator Tom Torlakson, spearheaded a successful effort to make significant revisions to Prop. 49. Those revisions, accomplished through Senate Bill 638, included: prioritizing funding for schools serving high numbers of children from low-income families; increasing the daily per child rate and maximum grant amounts; and reforming the evaluation system so that developmental and social outcomes are valued alongside academic outcomes.

In the fall of 2006, the California Department of Education (CDE) issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for roughly \$428 million in after school program funding. School districts, county offices of education, and cities or counties partnering with a school district or county office of education were eligible for the funds. The application required signatures from the district superintendent and principals at each school site in the application. CBOs could partner with a school district or county office of education, but could not serve as the fiscal agent.

In terms of program requirements, funded programs must include an educational and literacy component to provide tutoring and/or homework assistance, and an educational enrichment component, which may include, but is not limited to, recreation and prevention activities. All staff members who directly supervise students must meet the minimum qualifications of an instructional aide as defined by their school district, and school site principals must approve after school site supervisors. The student-to-staff ratio must not exceed 20:1, and the programs must remain open until at least 6 p.m. and operate for at least 15 hours per week. Programs could be located at schools or approved alternate locations.

The CDE announced approximately 2,000 new grants awards in early 2007. All of the guaranteed \$428 million was awarded in this first release. (Since 2007, there have been two additional RFPs to allocate funding that resulted from grant reductions to grantees with attendance lower than stated in their original grant application.) The vast majority of grants went to school districts, with the district superintendent and principal signature requirement acting as a right-of-first-refusal. This influx of funding into school districts gave them sudden responsibility and accountability for a large number of after school programs. Awarded programs had to secure 33% of their grant amount in cash or in-kind matching funds, as defined in the legislation. In many communities, including San Francisco and

Oakland, the matching requirement invited a conversation about leveraging Prop. 49 funds with other community resources.

Background on Out-of-School Time Systems in San Francisco and Oakland

Well before Prop. 49, both Oakland and San Francisco had a strong tradition of CBO providers delivering school and community-based after school youth development programming, due in large part to voter-approved initiatives that set aside city funds for children and youth programming. When Prop. 49 funding arrived, these city funds adjusted their allocations, guidelines and requirements to respond to the influx of Prop. 49 funding.

San Francisco

In 1991, San Francisco voters passed a ballot initiative to create a set-aside of property tax, called the Children's Fund, to be dedicated to children, youth and family services, including after school programs. Since its inception, a significant proportion of the Children's Fund was allocated to after school and out-of-school time services. An existing city office – the Mayor's Office for Children, Youth and Their Families which later became the Department of Children, Youth and Their Families – was charged with administering the Children's Fund in 1992. Over the years, some of the city's discretionary general fund dollars have also been allocated to DCYF for children, youth and family services. Almost all of DCYF's budget has historically been awarded to CBOs (typically as three-year grants) through an RFP process. DCYF has always embedded its funding and support for after school programs in a youth development framework, and specifically around the following five supports and opportunities: emotional and physical safety, relationship building, youth participation, community involvement, and skill building. DCYF has offered a variety of trainings, conferences, and other capacity building efforts over time to enhance the CBO field's capacity to deliver strong youth development programming. In 2005, DCYF developed minimum and high quality standards for after school programs through a stakeholder process that involved CBOs, the school district, and other stakeholders. The new standards included indicators to help program staff and DCYF staff identify whether program practices were meeting expectations around quality – specifically related to the five supports and opportunities of the youth development framework.

In 2004-05, DCYF awarded \$15 million to 124 CBO-operated programs who served youth ages 6 to 18 in after school or out-of-school time programs. In 2007-10, DCYF altered its guidelines for funding after school programs to include specific strategies for programs that operated an average of 3 to 5 days per week, programs that operated 1 to 2 days per week, Beacon Center programs, and programs that primarily served teens. Grants in each of these strategies, which together totaled about \$20 million could be used for programming during the school year and/or in the summer, funded 151 CBO-operated programs and served about 33,000 youth annually. For its most recent 2010-13 funding cycle, DCYF again adjusted its funding strategies. DCYF created grants for the following categories:

- after school programs during the school year – both school-based and community-based strategies – serving K-8 youth
- specialized content (which could be year-round) programming serving K-8 youth ,
- summer or school break programming serving K-8 youth,
- specialized content programs (which could be year-round) serving teens ages 13 to 17,
- Beacon center programs serving K-12 youth, families and community members.

Altogether these 278 CBO-operated programs totaled \$20.5 million for 2010-11.

In 1997, SFUSD was one of the first agencies to be awarded a 21st Century Community Learning Centers grant directly from the U.S. Department of Education. Over time, the district continued to apply for and receive after school grants – from both the federal and state departments of education – and by 2006 had 78 after school programs. Since these early grants, SFUSD has relied primarily on CBOs to operate the after school programs, which is reflected in the name of the programs – Expanded Collaboratives for Excellence in Learning, or commonly referred to as ExCEL after school programs. SFUSD would contract with a CBO selected by a principal to run the after school program at their school site. SFUSD dedicated some central office staff to provide oversight to the programs, and guided programs to embed youth development principles into their programs that aimed to include an equal share of academic support, enrichment, and physical activity programming. ExCEL also convened regular district-wide meetings and professional development for site coordinators and program staff.

DCYF and SFUSD partnered on a variety of programmatic efforts since the mid 1990s, such as the SF Beacon Initiative and a literacy-based after school effort call SF Together Everyone Accomplishes More (SF TEAM). In fall 2006, DCYF and SFUSD agreed to initiate the first citywide policy and planning effort related to after school called Afterschool for All. This effort, with the support of the Mayor and Superintendent of schools as well as private foundations and CBOs, aimed to increase access to and quality of after school programs for all elementary and middle school youth who wanted to participate. Several task forces and committees were convened to initiate conversations about program quality, access, workforce, and communication to parents. This was the community's first attempt to gather a variety of after school stakeholders – from city agencies, the school district, private funders, elected officials, parent groups, and community groups -- to collaboratively discuss these issues. In preparation for Prop. 49, the Youth Development Funders Network – a coalition of foundations supporting San Francisco youth agencies – considered pooling resources to contribute to the Prop. 49 match, but ultimately chose to keep their grant-making separate. The group was, nonetheless, actively involved in supporting and advising the developing after school system. A formal Memorandum of Understanding between the city and school district, which jointly led the effort, and guiding principles for the effort were created.

During these early stages of the Afterschool for All effort, much of the planning revolved around how the anticipated Prop. 49 funds would help meet the citywide goal of after school for all. The city was interested in applying to serve as the fiscal agent for the new Prop. 49 funds (SFUSD already had at least 57 after school programs supported by the state after school program that pre-dated Prop. 49 and 4 programs supported by 21st Century Community Learning Centers) and offered to provide \$2 million in matching funds for those programs. When the school district stated it would prefer to administer the Prop. 49 funds, the city developed a one-year, one-time request for proposals, in partnership with stakeholders, to fund capacity building for afterschool staff citywide, after school programs' small equipment needs, and waiting lists at SFUSD-administered after school programs.

Since then, DCYF and SFUSD have continued to work together and with the Afterschool for All effort to try to further align their systems. In 2008, DCYF launched an online after school program locator with data on types of after school programs in the city, and published cost estimates for high quality after school programs. In 2009, the Afterschool for All effort adopted a set of citywide quality standards, endorsed the creation of two quality monitoring tools for school-based and community-based programs, developed a practice brief on school-after school integration, and helped launch the first regional after school conference for after school staff. In 2010, the Afterschool for All effort identified core competencies for after school line staff and supervisors and a complementary toolkit to help providers

adopt them. (To learn more about Afterschool for All's recent accomplishments, visit <http://sfafterschoolforall.blogspot.com>).

Since the early 1990s, some CBOs have received funding from both SFUSD and DCYF to operate their after school programs. However, that funding was not coordinated by either funder. For the first time, in July 2010, DCYF created a specific allocation of \$3.4 million to provide competitive matching grants to CBOs to operate SFUSD ExCEL after school programs. This funding can be used to match the ExCEL contract the CBOs receive from SFUSD and can be used as core funding to serve up to 25 elementary-age youth from their wait list. Grant amounts range from \$25,000 to \$136,000 depending on the number of youth served overall and the number of youth from high-needs neighborhoods. This intentional funding approach – that was developed through the Afterschool for All Advisory Council – has resulted in more DCYF grants to CBOs operating ExCEL after school programs. As part of this matching grants approach, SFUSD has agreed to share program outcome data with DCYF, and the two entities are exploring additional ways to share data to enhance accountability and program quality.

Oakland

In 1996, Oakland voters passed a ballot initiative - the Kids First! Initiative - to create a set-aside of the city's budget for direct services to children and youth under 21 years of age. Through several revisions to that legislation, the city of Oakland now sets aside 3 percent of its unrestricted General Purpose Funds for these services and requires a strategic plan to guide how the funds will be allocated. A program called the Oakland Fund for Children and Youth (OFCY), housed within Oakland's Department of Human Services, administers the funds, and all of the funds are awarded to CBOs (501 c 3 status) and public agencies through a request for proposals process. Since it was created, OFCY has emphasized funding for collaborative CBO programs, and youth development programming in a range of out-of school time and older youth services.

In 1998, the Oakland Unified School District (OUSD) applied for and received a \$310,000 21st Century Community Learning Centers grant directly from the U.S. Department of Education. Over time, the district continued to apply for and receive after school grants – from both the federal and state departments of education – and by 2006 had after school programs at 34 school sites. Similar to SFUSD, OUSD has relied primarily on CBOs to operate these after school programs since they were first funded. OUSD has traditionally had a small central staff to provide grant management, program planning support, and other technical assistance to the after school sites. OUSD provided monthly site coordinator meetings, annual trainings for after school staff, and other programmatic supports. OUSD after school staff also worked to integrate the after school programs into the district's infrastructure – such as using district-wide student assessment software – and into the school site's culture. For example, in 2005, OUSD required each site to designate a teacher as an academic coach/liaison to enhance connections to the school day and support intentional learning in the program design.

Around 2002, a coalition of CBOs called the Oakland Community After School Alliance (OCASA) formed. The group was created to help ensure CBOs had a collective voice and stronger representation in discussions with both the city and school district. OCASA initially formed to help resolve strained relationships between OUSD and CBOs in regard to the timeliness of invoice payments and other fiscal matters. Later, OCASA focused on how the city of Oakland calculated the funds for OFCY, and ongoing threats to OFCY's voter approved funding set aside.

In 2003, the Oakland After School Coordinating Team was created with members from city agencies, OUSD and CBOs. (OCASA designated CBO representatives for this Coordinating Team.) The purpose of

the Coordinating Team was to further develop the citywide infrastructure for after school and to develop a sustainability plan. The Team ultimately focused on the after school program model, the cost per child, quality standards, data integration, and gap analysis.

In 2004, the Oakland City Council passed a resolution that urged the city to create an after school system across the city that would ensure youth had universal access to after school programs by 2010, which provided strong policy direction to the OFCY's Planning and Oversight Committee. While previous RFPs had prioritized after school services, OFCY's 2004-05 RFP process separated out the "After School Initiative" for comprehensive after school programming. Information from the Oakland After School Coordinating Team helped to inform the development of the After School Initiative RFP. The RFP defined comprehensive after school programs as having both academic and enrichment/recreational components, and prioritized OFCY grants for the enrichment component as an intentional match to the state afterschool program that pre-dated Prop. 49 and 21st CCLC funding. For school-based programs, the RFP required applicants to apply as a collaborative of at least three organizations, a combination of CBO lead agency, the OUSD school site that had state or federal afterschool funding, and a third CBO as subcontractor. CBOs were required (with larger maximum grant amounts than the past which ranged in size from \$80,000 to \$200,000) to apply in this three-partner format, which provided opportunities for smaller CBOs to provide specialized services on school sites. OFCY awarded a total of \$3.3 million to 24 comprehensive after school programs. For non-school based programs, OFCY awarded a total of \$850,000 annually in 2004-05 and 2005-06. The goals of this citywide after school strategy were to leverage city, state and federal funding for after school, encourage partnership and coordination among providers, and expand the number of youth served in comprehensive after school programs.

A year-long planning process in 2005 resulted in OFCY's 2006-10 strategic plan which formalized the 50 to 55 percent allocation of OFCY funding for school based after school programming. Community-based after school was established as a separate category with a 7% allocation. The strategic plan's priorities and allocations were determined with extensive input from youth organizations and other community stakeholders.

In 2006, when OUSD decided to apply for Prop. 49 funds for every school in the district, after school became elevated within the district in terms of being viewed as a potential intervention for academic support. In preparation for the Prop. 49 funding, OUSD staff outlined three program models that new prospective sites could consider:

- Partnership Model: CBO serves as a lead agency with subcontractors for specialty activities to deliver a school-based after school program that complements the school day.
- Hybrid Model: CBO serves as a lead agency with subcontractors for specialty activities to deliver an extended school day for a portion of the students.
- Extended Day Model: OUSD operates an extended school day by adding 203 hours of instructional programming to the school day.

Most of the school sites chose the partnership model, which many attribute to the successes demonstrated by OFCY and OUSD's prior partnership efforts, and school leaders' satisfaction with existing CBO after school providers. Also in preparation for the Prop. 49 expansion, OUSD enhanced the professional development opportunities offered to CBO staff, including trainings on academic interventions, how to analyze academic outcome data, and other relevant topics.

Based on their past success in collaboration and citywide leadership in support of after school programming, OUSD and OFCY planned to expand their partnership due to the pending increase of Prop. 49 funding in Oakland. In its 2006-08 RFP, OFCY funded 36 school-based programs. The 2006-08 RFP

again required a collaboration of three partners to apply for school-based after school comprehensive programs so the funding could serve as a match to OUSD schools' state and federal afterschool grants.. The funds were awarded to the CBO lead agency for the collaboration. When Prop. 49 funding arrived in 2007, OFCY released another specific RFP that funded enrichment programming at 31 new Prop. 49-funded sites with \$50,000 grants , for a total of an additional \$1.55 million in 2007-08. Many of the new Prop. 49-funded sites were in East Oakland, and had not previously had after school services either through OUSD or OFCY-funded CBOs.

In planning for Prop. 49, OUSD and OFCY partnered with the East Bay Community Foundation and OCASA to convene after school stakeholders – including OCASA members, the local community college district and Laney College (a community college) – to create a Workforce Development Committee to develop recruitment and staff development strategies to support the anticipated expansion. Through collaborative planning processes, the stakeholders also provided feedback that was used to co-develop evaluation, outcomes, and data-tracking tools that are used jointly by OUSD and OFCY.

In 2008-09, OFCY continued to fund CBOs that were also receiving contracts from OUSD to operate school-based after school programs at \$6.6 million across 73 school sites. Elementary school sites were eligible for matching grants between \$75,000 and \$125,000, and middle school sites were eligible for matching grants between \$100,000 and \$150,000. For the first time, the 2008-09 RFP named the applicant for school-based after school as single lead agency CBO and did not specifically require subcontractor CBOs. The language requiring a collaboration of three-partners (including the school site) was omitted. By the 2008-09 RFP, the OFCY allocation for school-based after school was spread across the largest number of schools ever, and grant sizes were tied to number of students in the proposed programs. OFCY also funded community-based after school programs at a total of \$720,000, with grants ranging from \$25,000 to \$175,000, as well as other youth services, such as early childhood, older youth, health and summer programming.

However, as total city revenues dropped with the economic recession, so too did OFCY's overall budget. Facing 16% cuts across its entire budget in its 2009-10 funding cycle, OFCY allocated \$5.5 million to school-based after school programs and \$605,000 to community-based after school programs.

Currently, the city continues its commitment to school-based after school with emphasis on enrichment and applied learning, as well as other programming for older youth, children age 5 and under, wellness, summer, and community-based after school. These priorities are described in OFCY's 2010-13 Strategic Plan. For school-based after school, matching grants of \$65,000 are available to match Prop. 49 grants at each elementary school, and middle school sites could apply for \$100,000 in matching funds. In addition, OFCY applicants could apply for an additional \$7,000 in funds to augment physical fitness activities, \$7,000 for nutrition and gardening activities, and \$10,000 for family engagement activities. OFCY allowed both CBOs and OUSD to apply for these funds. The director of OFCY, however, was clear that the intention was to continue the strong CBO school-site partnerships and not to increase direct grants to OUSD.

Key Findings

Interviews with a broad array of district, city and CBO stakeholders and the review of a variety of funding proposals and guidelines provide interesting insight into the impact of Prop. 49 funding in these two cities. In many ways, the cities experienced similar shifts over time, in terms of program focus, city funding guidelines, and coordinated efforts to improve program quality. There are, however, some key

differences, particularly in the relationships between the three groups – city, district and CBO – that relate to decisions and leadership styles in the district after school offices and city funding agencies.

Impact of Prop. 49 funding on policies

- *More youth served across both cities.* Thirty-seven elementary and middle school sites in Oakland received new ASES grants, serving about 3,500 additional youth. Oakland more than doubled the number of state-funded sites and youth. These programs reached young people in areas of the city that had not traditionally had enough youth development programs. Fifteen elementary school sites in San Francisco received new ASES grants (an increase of about 26% in state-funded after school programs), serving about 1,200 additional youth. In addition to new resources, creating new programs, and expanding the capacity of existing programs, stakeholders in Oakland also reported that the school district's enhanced reporting mechanisms, including adopting a metric for Average Daily Attendance, resulted in programs doing a better job of reporting who they were serving and were more mindful of designing programs that increased participation rates. In both communities, these new afterschool programs helped support working families with afterschool programming that operated until at least 6pm and at no cost to families.

- *Perceived loss of funding for community-based organizations providing specialized enrichment programming.* CBOs focusing on specific content areas – arts, recreation, tutoring, for example – believe they have lost access to some city and state funding. With the level of data the authors were able to access and the year-to-year changes in funding priorities, it was impossible to track changes in the specific dollar amounts to specialized CBOs. This change seems to have been particularly significant in Oakland. In 2008-09, OFCY eliminated the collaborative requirement in its RFPs, allowing lead agencies to apply independently without subcontracting with a specialized CBO. The economic downturn decreased OFCY funding by 16% in 2009-10, putting more pressure on all budgets, including CBO lead agencies. In 2010-13 OFCY had two RFP processes - one for comprehensive school-based after school programming for CBO lead agencies and another, smaller RFP for youth programming that was happening off of school sites. This meant that specialized CBOs that were not lead agencies for comprehensive afterschool programs, but wanted to operate on school sites, could not apply for their own funding and became dependent on subcontracts from lead agencies at each school site. Lead agencies, facing their own struggles with funding have become less willing to subcontract with specialized CBOs. Some of the CBOs in Oakland who advocated to protect and even strengthen OFCY throughout the years when it was challenged by budget cuts and reauthorization felt betrayed by these changes that “shut them out” of applying for OFCY funds.

In San Francisco, SFUSD and DCYF have tried to ensure that programming remains balanced and focused on youth development, and that specialized CBOs' services have been spread across the city by giving contracts to these agencies – outside the lead agency process – to work in specific schools. DCYF has created specific funding strategies and allocations for these types of specialized providers in its last two three-year funding cycles.

A strong concern was repeatedly voiced that the decrease in funding would limit the variety of programming available, stifle creativity and new programming, and reduce overall quality in specialized enrichment programming. Rather than hire arts organizations, for example, lead agencies have started to use their own staff to do arts programming or have hired

individual contractors to do the work. Without the training or curriculum developed by the traditional arts organizations, the fear is that the quality of arts programming has decreased significantly.

To their credit, specialized community-based organizations have responded creatively by being flexible about their programming to meet new needs and funding levels – and reinventing their services to adapt to the new after school landscape. For example, some offer training and support for the staff of after school lead agencies while others now deliver their programming through partnerships with multiple ASES programs, rather than operating their own after school programs. It's not yet clear how effective these new initiatives will be in sustaining the CBOs or providing access to high quality enrichment programming at school sites in the long run.

Impact of Prop. 49 funding on programming and practice

- *Increased focus and commitment in both cities to quality after school programming as a venue for supporting positive youth outcomes.* Even before funding arrived, both cities had started planning for closer alignment between school district and city funding streams, including aligning funding priorities, reporting guidelines, and evaluation systems. In Oakland, the city and school district used the existing After School Coordinating Team – which had members from city agencies, OUSD, elected officials, and CBOs– to plan after school program models, quality standards, data integration and sustainability. The Team also informed conversations about creating a city matching grant focused on supporting enrichment for each of the new Prop. 49 sites. In San Francisco, Afterschool for All – a collaborative effort between DCYF, SFUSD, city agencies, private foundations, parent groups and CBOs – came together in late 2006 to collectively plan for the anticipated release of Prop. 49 funds. The Afterschool for All effort focused on defining citywide after school program quality standards, mapping where more after school capacity was needed, organizing staff trainings and coaching, and strategizing about sustainability.

Prop. 49 funding supported these collaborative efforts with the increased amount of funding available for administrative overhead that allowed for more staff capacity at the school districts' after school offices. Admittedly, staff time was stretched across more sites, particularly during the 2006-07 year when the districts and school sites were under pressure to get programs operating immediately. As things settled down, however, the district's aggregated administrative percentage allowed overall for greater capacity to plan and collaborate. In Oakland, key after school program support positions were upgraded to bring additional experience and expertise to the department and consultants were hired to further expand capacity. In San Francisco, 2 new staff were added when Prop. 49 funds were awarded.

Both communities attribute the increased focus and attention to after school to the scale and magnitude of the anticipated Prop. 49 resources. One key informant in Oakland emphasized that by virtue of the amount of funds available, planning for after school became a priority at the district-level for the first time. For example, before Prop. 49, school district staff struggled to garner the attention of principals and other administrators, whereas with the planning for Prop. 49 district staff were supported internally in scheduling meetings with all principals to discuss after school exclusively.

In both cities, the collaborative efforts between the city, district and CBOs have continued to develop, and have focused on supporting ongoing assessment and improvement of programming. In San Francisco, Afterschool for All, for example, has developed common quality standards, core competencies for line staff and supervisors in after school programs, and adapted the statewide quality self-assessment tool to create a tool specifically for San Francisco school-based programs and one for community-based programs across the city. The city has also relinquished programmatic monitoring of the SFUSD programs it funds to SFUSD to reduce the number of visits to sites placed on CBOs who receive both city and district funding, and DCYF and SFUSD are exploring systemic ways to share data about programs and participants. Notably, by 2009-10, OFCY and OUSD were using CitySpan to track participant data, and OFCY and OUSD were jointly funding an evaluation of the programs. In 2010, OUSD spearheaded an effort to pilot an intensive program observation tool and improvement process, and was joined by OFCY in adopting the tool as a common site visit protocol. While these efforts are still in development, the focus on quality is a result in large part to the state's increased investment in after school and the subsequent visibility of after school programming as an important support for young people.

Providers noted that this dynamic was present statewide as the influx of Prop. 49 funding created an industry for high-quality after school resources – such as curricula and training – that has helped CBOs enhance the quality of their services. These new resources have helped CBOs refine their use of intentional learning strategies such as project-based learning, service-learning, and other programmatic links to the school day.

- *More accountability for outcomes has led to a perception of increased program quality overall.* The increased citywide focus on after school resulted in clearer standards and higher expectations for program quality. Funding agencies – both districts and cities – have made it a priority to tighten programming requirements, improve systems for tracking attendance data, and make reporting forms more compatible between agencies. In response, programs have become more structured about their attendance tracking and reporting systems, and about ensuring that activities are intentionally designed to meet well-defined, outcomes. These largely administrative improvements have been matched with citywide initiatives around program quality. While both cities were certainly working on program quality before Prop. 49, the increased funding and volume of programs sparked new efforts to define and support program quality. In San Francisco, for example, DCYF funded a collaborative project between local capacity building entities and SFUSD's ExCEL office to create no-cost year-long professional development cohorts and mentoring experiences targeting any new Site Coordinators in after school programs across the city. DCYF also launched a pilot using the National Institute on Out of School Time's quality assessment system to increase community-based after school programs' capacity to assess their program using observation tools and surveys, the results of which lead to program improvement plans.. In Oakland, the district and city are piloting the Youth Program Quality Assessment (YPQA) tool from the Weikart Center for Youth Program Quality to gather data for program improvement and as a site visit protocol.

The benefits for program providers and youth are concrete. One respondent said that OUSD teachers now refer students who they feel need extra support to the after school programs because they have seen the impact these programs have on school attendance, social skills, homework completion and increased English fluency for English language learners. This

increased structure and accountability was seen as a benefit by most people interviewed, even when it resulted in some CBOs that were not able to meet the new standards being excluded from the school-based after school realm.

- *Increased academic focus.* While state after school funding has always had an academic requirement, the volume of money through the school district and the shift in awareness and control by the school districts and schools has resulted in greater pressure to provide academic programming integrated with the school day and measure academic achievement. For instance in Oakland, after school programs moved from the Department of Student, Families and Community Services to become a part of the district's Complementary Learning Department, which houses support services such as wellness, restorative justice, and summer school that OUSD sees as having an intentional connection to students' school success. One key informant reported that this re-organization increased after school programs' status within the district's hierarchy and increased staff's access to information and opportunities that significantly supported their efforts.

In both cities, this movement toward academic content initially raised concerns among program providers. Over time, however, providers have adjusted by reframing their youth development and enrichment programming for its value in the learning process and contribution to academic achievement. They have also become more intentional about enrichment activities and their link to academic content standards and academic skills. This shift is documented in San Francisco's Sunset Neighborhood Beacon Center's programming guide, *The Best of Both Worlds*, which details project-based activities and maps them to content standards. It's also illustrated in the San Francisco-based Performing Arts Workshop's programming guide, *The Workshop Out of School*, which outlines how to imbed critical thinking skills into arts education activities. Providers have also become more intentional and devote more energy to building working relationships with school staff so that they can be more effective in integrating school day learning into after school experiences.

Program providers also said this shift towards academics has impacted the qualifications and skill levels of the staff they hire. As one program provider stated, now the program focuses on hiring staff who can tutor its 5th graders in math and also lead enrichment activities. In the past, the skill sets might not have needed to be as intentionally academic or as inclusive.

In a different angle on this situation, the fact that Prop. 49 funding requires both enrichment and academic components has helped to ensure that principals cannot coopt the funding for solely homework help and academic intervention. The temptation is strong given the pressure on principals to increase test scores every year. CBO partners and district after school offices are able to cite Prop. 49 requirements to make sure enrichment and academic activities are balanced.

In addition to impacting school-based programming, Prop. 49 and the developments in the school-based after school field since Prop. 49 was implemented also influenced the nature of other after school funding by the city agencies. For instance, in San Francisco, DCYF focused on two educational attainment goals in its most recent funding cycle for all of the types of services it funds in an effort to increase alignment with SFUSD and enhance long-term outcomes for youth. In Oakland, while academic outcomes are not required, academic

program content is mentioned as a possible use in several of the funding categories in the 2010-2013 RFP where it was not mentioned at all in the 2005-2006 RFP. Although this increased academic focus in both communities was due to many factors (not solely Prop. 49), it has impacted the program requirements and outcome measures for even non-school based after school grants and grants for other youth services.

Impact of Prop. 49 funding on relationships between city agencies, school districts and CBOs

- *Increased role of school-site principals.* As funding flowed from the school district to school sites, principals in both cities were given increased control over program content and program providers. Some stakeholders noted that before Prop. 49, the involvement of principals depended on whether or not they had a vision for the after school program at their site. With Prop. 49 funds, the school districts urged principals to become more involved with after school, and the district after school offices enhanced the planning and accountability tools that required and documented principal participation. In the best case scenarios, this increased role has meant that principals are more committed to the after school program and work in true partnership with community organizations to define common priorities and provide tangible support. Less positively, some principals are dismissive of the value added by community partners and directive about staffing and programming. In the worst case scenarios, principals have inappropriately used after school funds for school day activities.

The principals' role has been particularly significant in Oakland where the district emphasized the principals' decision-making authority and control over the full site allocation of Prop. 49. This approach led to greater variability in programming and quality across the district and, in a few cases, required intensive support at sites that had not used funding correctly. OUSD has since clarified requirements and provided more support to school sites – for example, more frequent fiscal monitoring, attendance tracking, training and job descriptions for academic liaisons, and a resource manual with roles, requirements and timelines. SFUSD took a more centralized approach from the beginning, holding some of the sites' allocations at the district level to pay for specialized CBOs' services - such as arts and sciences providers – that were offered to multiple sites as services to supplement the base after school program. SFUSD also provided professional development and educational consultants. By taking some funding “off the top” before it reached the site, the district was able to fund its infrastructure and influence programming at the site-level.

A commonly-cited challenge is that principals tend to change every 2 to 5 years, leaving the CBO to educate the incoming principal about the after school program and hope for a smooth transition for the program. While this dynamic has always existed, the increased decision-making authority of the principal after Prop. 49 has increased the possibility of major disruptions. The flip side, of course, is that CBOs can offer some stability to parents and youth as a new school site administrator familiarizes him/herself with the site and community.

- *More coordination between staff at city and district offices in both cities.* As described earlier, staff have worked together to develop common policies and processes to leverage Prop. 49 resources effectively. In San Francisco, while much has been accomplished through

the collaborative work of the city, CBOs and the district through Afterschool for All, there has also been tension between DCYF and SFUSD. This tension existed before Prop. 49, but was exacerbated by the negotiations over which entity would apply for and administer Prop. 49 funding. There was a strong desire on both entities' part to control the funding and the on-going influence it would bring. SFUSD became the applicant because the RFP was structured to give districts' "first right of refusal." (The district Superintendent must sign off on the proposal.) The tension continued after the funding rolled out and became more intense as SFUSD's after school leadership made decisions and set policies without consulting their DCYF or CBO partners. As a consequence, the alliance between DCYF and CBOs became stronger to counter the district's autonomous decision-making. Staffing at SFUSD has recently changed, offering the opportunity for a more positive and effective working relationship.

In Oakland, OFCY and OUSD have worked well together to align data sharing, evaluation, and grant guidelines and have engaged stakeholder voice, despite there being fewer staff in the OUSD and OFCY offices than in the corresponding San Francisco offices. Notably, they have coordinated their data tracking system, with all grantees of OFCY and OUSD reporting participant attendance, staffing and programmatic information monthly in the CitySpan database which is jointly monitored by OUSD and OFCY staff. While DCYF also uses CitySpan, SFUSD has historically resisted using the database, citing privacy concerns, although new SFUSD leadership is now exploring a joint tracking system.

- *Increased competition between some community-based organizations.* With some - often the larger - CBOs serving as lead agencies and making decisions about programming at their school sites, there has been tension with the specialized CBOs that depend on lead agencies to subcontract Prop. 49 funding. As mentioned earlier, the lead agencies, in an effort to cut costs, have increasingly shifted from contracting with specialized CBOs to providing similar activities with their own staff or with individual contractors. Some specialized CBOs feel that lead agencies could be more efficient and save money for subcontracts. This dynamic is stronger in Oakland than in San Francisco, where city and district funding is still more readily accessible to specialized CBOs.

There has also been competition between lead agencies as principals have used their influence to have one lead agency CBO replaced with another. Also, when Prop. 49 funds were initially released and there was intense demand for lead agencies, some specialized CBOs in Oakland stretched their missions to serve as lead agencies. After several years, most of these specialized CBOs recognized that serving as lead agencies was stretching their capacity, and they gave up the lead agency role to return to their core missions.

- *Stronger alliances between community-based organizations in both cities, but for different reasons.* In Oakland, OCASA (Oakland Community After School Alliance) – which was originally formed around issues of CBOs not getting reimbursed by OUSD in a timely manner– was reinvigorated around the time of Prop. 49 implementation, in partnership with OUSD, to engage in citywide awareness-building around the role of CBOs in delivering after school services. This alliance reflects the positive working relationship between OUSD, OFCY and the CBOs. A small group of arts organizations – that felt OCASA was too focused on lead agency issues – also came together during the time of Prop. 49 to discuss how to

preserve funding and opportunities for specialized arts organizations. CBOs also reported that over the years they have worked together to advocate for preserving OFCY's funding when it has been threatened, and that such efforts have enhanced their alliances with each other. In stark contrast, San Francisco's loosely-formed coalition of CBOs has formally developed into the San Francisco Out-of-School Time Coalition (SFOSTC) over the last year in an effort to strengthen the CBO community's voice and influence over SFUSD policies and guidelines in after school. The SFOSTC is looking to OCASA as a model for its development and work with SFUSD.

Impact on power dynamics

- *Emergence of the school districts as major after school funders.* The dramatic and sudden increase of the districts' funding resources has changed power dynamics in both cities. Both cities have, however, adjusted to these changes and as described earlier, increasingly coordinated their efforts to maximize services.

Initially, the influx of funding created a significant capacity issue for both OUSD and SFUSD. This situation was exacerbated because the state funding was released with no planning time and the expectation that programming would begin immediately. As a result, school districts across the state, that had not managed budgets and contracts on such a large scale, were suddenly faced with a myriad of logistical and bureaucratic challenges. It took about 3 years for the Oakland and San Francisco school districts to set up systems and stabilize the situation. In this time, both districts faced resistance and frustration from the field trying to run programs with unclear and changing information.

Each city has experienced tensions related to the site-level power dynamics between principals and CBOs. While principals ultimately controlled the Prop. 49 funds, CBOs often controlled the city and other funds being used to support Prop. 49 seed funds. OUSD has given much more decision-making authority to principals than the district did in San Francisco, and has acted as a broker between principals and CBOs to support productive working relationships. SFUSD, which has historically had a larger staff in its district after school office than OUSD, has traditionally asserted more control over decision-making. While principals have more say now than they did before Prop. 49, the district's after school office still controls the overall flow of money to the school sites and to CBO lead agencies. SFUSD has historically been guarded about site-level decision-making, withholding, for example, information about actual grant amounts, state versus district grant requirements, and use of resources held by the district. In the past, this approach fostered tension and confusion among CBOs, principals and the district after school office, but these tensions may be mitigated by recent changes in the SFUSD after school office staff.

OUSD has been more transparent and pro-active about processes and challenges in its relationship with CBOs. Several CBOs said that OUSD recognizes CBOs as partners rather than "vendors" delivering services for them, and acknowledges OFCY and other resources that CBOs bring to OUSD after school programs. OUSD has been more likely to call on CBOs as partners in working through the challenges and barriers, and to respond to CBOs concerns. For example, before Prop. 49 was implemented CBOs raised concerns about the timeliness and procedures in place for paying CBOs' contracts. OUSD worked with CBOs to create a quicker, more transparent invoicing system. An example of working pro-actively with CBOs occurred in the last couple of years when the city's funding for after school

dropped. OUSD partnered with OCASA to bring the CBO community and city together to discuss sustainability. The Oakland Afterschool Sustainability Initiative includes CBOs, OFCY and the district and has been meeting around a variety of sustainability strategies, including raising the profile of after school in the district, in city government and broadly across the community, as well as identifying specific potential funding sources for after school services.

With the economic downturn, less city funding in Oakland and San Francisco has been available, making the district funding more essential to CBOs and giving them less flexibility in designing and implementing programs or activities that are not directly in line with ASES requirements or with a principal's request. In addition, city efforts to align funding with the districts have given the district even more influence on program content and steered funding for afterschool programming toward school site-based lead agencies. Both cities' efforts to align funding with Prop. 49 have also increased the number of CBOs that receive city funds to support school-based after school programs, but has generally reduced the grant sizes to some programs. As a result, city grants are smaller and more equally distributed across the city.

- *Increase in school and lead agency control over program components.* Before Prop. 49 funding, CBOs often had their own funding that they brought to schools, augmenting the schools resources and giving the CBO a location for classes and access to participants. Because they held the resources, CBOs had some authority – with principal input – to determine the content of the programs and ability to change locations if school sites were not supportive of their vision or strategies. With state funding tied to the school site, school site principals and in many cases, the lead agency CBOs, control the allocation of available funds and therefore have more power to determine program elements.

Benefits of closer relationships between CBOs and school districts and school sites

- *Lead agency CBOs gained credibility, access, better support, and increased funding opportunities in exchange for losing some control over programming and practice.* Overall most lead agency CBOs report that the influx of Prop. 49 funds was beneficial to their work and the local after school field. They gained more attention and access to key district and school site leaders, more funds were available from both the district and the city for school-based after school programs, and after school programming in general was more broadly recognized for its role in increasing youth outcomes (particularly those related to school success). However, lead agency CBOs did lose some control over the after school programs they had previously operated without much involvement from school districts or city agencies – particularly in terms of program design and content.
- *School sites and school districts gained after school programming that is more aligned with their goals and visions.* Prop. 49 funding allowed school districts and principals to gain much more control and district capacity to focus on the type of after school programming delivered on site to its students. The state funding allowed districts to embrace after school as an almost districtwide service that families and students could potentially access, and the increased scale of programming allowed them the resources to increase staff dedicated to carrying out the districts' after school goals.

Implications of these Findings

The experience of San Francisco and Oakland can provide valuable information and perspective for other cities in California working through similar dynamics with Prop. 49 funding. They also have implications for other states that may be (now or more likely in better economic times) considering statewide investment in after school programming. These findings are also relevant to broader statewide or citywide collaborative efforts focused on initiatives related to community schools, summer, and other out of school time efforts.

Implications for state initiatives:

- *Statewide funding can drive local commitment and investment in after school programming.* Local communities often respond by aligning their resources and planning efforts to leverage the new funding source. The Prop. 49 funding requirement helped to motivate these efforts, while also being flexible enough to allow communities without access to additional funding to meet the requirement with in-kind matching contributions.
- *Planning time is critical.* New funding initiatives should allow for at least six months of planning time once grants have been awarded before programs are required to open their doors. In Prop. 49 implementation, this time would have allowed for a smoother more effective collaboration and more systems in place to support the expansion. The rush to open programs had a negative impact on all of the stakeholders in Oakland and San Francisco from the site level (where youth, parents and teachers experienced the disorganization first-hand), to the community-based partners (that threw together services with poor information and new staff) to the district office (where staff struggled with frustrated contractors, lack of capacity, and the district's bureaucracy.) After three years, these issues are gradually getting resolved, but many missteps could have been avoided if planning time had been built into the grant term.
- *It is important to consider the content requirements and the funding agency.* With funding through the CDE and the academic programming requirement, after school services in communities across California – as in Oakland and San Francisco - have shifted to a more academic focus. Many, if not most, after school stakeholders see the benefits of this alignment and youth program providers have, by in large, organized and communicated their role in academic support effectively. It is worthwhile, however for a new initiative to consider the options. Had the funding been administered through the Recreation and Parks Department or Health and Human Services, for example, the impacts on programming and partnerships would have been different.
- *There are repercussions across communities and to services when funding and power shifts.* Anticipating these dynamics beforehand and ideally, allowing community-level stakeholders the time to work together to assess impacts and adjust appropriately would be helpful.

Implications for communities:

- *Community leaders should engage stakeholders to work together to assess the best way to deploy new resources.* There are now models from a variety of communities on ways to create such collaborative bodies. Beyond San Francisco's and Oakland's approaches, the

Wallace Foundation funded systems-building efforts in five large East Coast cities. The National League of Cities has been providing support to efforts that involve cities of all sizes, and an intermediary called Collaboratives for Building After School Systems has been created across five citywide after school systems. Foundations can play a role – as they did in Oakland and San Francisco - in supporting this work and encouraging advance, collaborative planning.

- *Open and transparent partnership really matters.* It can save money and time, and yield positive results. This opportunity is best evidenced in Oakland, where despite limited resources and infrastructure, the district after school office has engaged enthusiastically in citywide planning and has worked honestly and collaboratively to resolve challenges. San Francisco's experience also proves the point. The tense relationship between the district and city set the tone for on-going struggles over the Prop. 49 application and rollout. While the district put in place some excellent after school resources, its unwillingness to collaborate wasted time and energy and blocked progress.
- *CBOs organizing a collective voice for discussions and negotiations with city and school district funders can be very powerful.* This coordinated effort makes it more likely – with hard work and positive communication - that their perspectives are represented at the decision-making table. This strategy may be particularly helpful in communities with many small CBOs that individually do not have the ability to impact citywide policies.
- *Some level of centralized control is helpful in order to mitigate the unintended consequences of the shifting resources and power dynamics.* In San Francisco, the district and city both centrally controlled some money for specialized programming in order to ensure such programming was delivered and was deployed equitably across the city. In Oakland where school sites were given a lot of autonomy, there was great variability in program quality, and in a few cases, funds were not correctly allocated to after school. Recognizing the need for more district-wide control, the after school program office has put in place requirements, training and processes for monitoring sites more closely.
- *Principals need information and training about after school programs and CBOs.* If principals are given authority over after school resources at their sites, they need significant support in order to understand the contributions that after school programs can make; the strategies and structures that are most effective; the roles of CBOs, the site coordinator and teachers; and most importantly, their responsibility as advocates and leaders for the after school program at their site.

Conclusion

In researching this article, the authors were pleasantly surprised by many of the findings. The after school communities in San Francisco and Oakland are reaping significant benefits from Prop. 49 funding – not just in the number of youth served but also in the systems and infrastructure to support quality programming over the long run. While some CBOs have been challenged by shifting priorities and relationships, the CBO community in both cities is adapting to the opportunities offered by Prop. 49 and effectively asserting their voice and experience into the conversation about the appropriate role of after school programming in young people's development. This conversation – significantly impacted by stakeholders in San Francisco and Oakland – is well summarized through the *Learning in Afterschool* communications campaign (www.learninginafterschool.org) which defines after school as a place of learning and proposes five core learning principles that describe the unique contributions of the after

school field to children’s learning. In San Francisco and Oakland, the authors saw this consensus becoming reality as cities, school districts and CBOs work together to build the after school systems focused on meeting the diverse needs of children in their communities. Communities across California and in other parts of the country are similarly engaged in collaborative efforts around after school, and increasingly understanding how after school can play a key role in a community-wide effort to promote learning.

APPENDIX A: Glossary of Acronyms

ASES – After School Education and Safety Program

CBO – Community Based Organization

CDE – California Department of Education

DCYF – San Francisco Department of Children, Youth and Their Families

OFCY – Oakland Fund for Children and Youth

OST – Out-of-School Time

OUSD – Oakland Unified School District

SFUSD – San Francisco Unified School District

APPENDIX B: Description of the SF Department of Children, Youth and Their Families and the Partnership for Children and Youth

San Francisco Department of Children, Youth and Their Families

The Department of Children, Youth & Their Families works hard to ensure that families with children are a prominent and valued segment of San Francisco’s social fabric by supporting activities in every San Francisco neighborhood. One of the few city departments in the country dedicated exclusively to the needs of young people, DCYF enhances the lives and futures of San Francisco’s children and youth through innovative partnerships with families, community-based organizations, city departments, schools, funding organizations, and the private sector. DCYF’s goals to help ensure:

- Our city’s children and youth are healthy
- Our city’s children and youth are ready to learn and are succeeding in school
- Our city’s children and youth live in safe, supported families and safe, successful, supported communities
- Our city’s children and youth contribute to the growth, development, and vitality of San Francisco

DCYF administers approximately \$70 million in city funds each year in direct support of several services areas: Early Child Care and Education, Family Support, Health and Wellness, Out of School Time, School Partnerships, Violence Prevention & Intervention, Youth Employment, and Youth Empowerment. The funds are distributed based on an allocation plan that is developed as a result of an in-depth community needs assessment process, which takes place every three years. Often leveraging private,

For more information about DCYF and the work we do, please visit: www.dcyf.org

Partnership for Children and Youth (formerly, Bay Area Partnership) was formed in 1997 by government, philanthropy and business leaders who were concerned about the persistent poverty and ongoing difficulties faced by children and youth in specific Bay Area communities. An extensive analysis found that these poorest communities were vastly underutilizing funding streams which could cover the costs of critical support programs for children and youth. The Partnership was created to connect schools and their community partners in these underserved communities with available public and private resources, and to improve the effectiveness of funding streams serving poor children. The primary clients of our work are those institutions that provide critical support services to poor children – including schools and school districts, community-based agencies and local governments. The ultimate beneficiaries are the children and their families. The mission of the Partnership for Children and Youth is to ensure that school-age children and youth living in low-income communities have the support and the opportunities they need and deserve to be successful in school and in life. We help schools secure the resources necessary to provide after-school and summer programs, health care, and nutritious meals – the things we know children need to succeed and thrive.

For more information, visit www.partnerforchildren.org.

APPENDIX C: Acknowledgements

The Partnership for Children and Youth and the San Francisco Department of Children and Youth are grateful to the National Institute on Out-of-School Time and the Robert Bowne Foundation for making this paper possible.

We also appreciate the following people and organizations for their contributions to this article:

Tanya Avila, formerly with Oakland Unified School District, Oakland

Kasey Blackburn, Oakland Unified School District, Oakland

Margaret Brodtkin, San Francisco New Day for Learning (formerly with SF Department of Children, Youth and Their Families)

Nhi Chau, OASES, Oakland

Yashica Crawford, SF Unified School District, San Francisco

Tom DeCaigny, Performing Arts Workshop, San Francisco

Sharon Dolan, formerly with Oakland Youth Chorus, Oakland

Kelly Doyle, Museum of Children's Art, Oakland

Leah Fortin, AspiraNet, Oakland

Michael Funk, AspiraNet, Oakland/San Francisco

Tiffany Gibson, Higher Ground, Oakland

Judy Glenn, Girls Inc., Oakland

Edward Hannemann, Oakland Community After School Alliance, Oakland

Deedra Jackson, SF Department of Children, Youth and Their Families, San Francisco

Claudia Jasin, Jamestown Community Center, San Francisco

Aurora King, Performing Arts Workshop, San Francisco

Simon Lee, Growth and Learning Opportunities, San Francisco

Linda Lovelace, formerly with SF Unified School District, San Francisco

Julia Fong Ma, Oakland Unified School District, Oakland

Jessica Mele, Performing Arts Workshop, San Francisco

Ali Metzler, SF Beacons Initiative (formerly with SF Unified School District), San Francisco

Lina Morales, SF Department of Children, Youth and Their Families, San Francisco

Mike Mowery, Super Star Literacy, Oakland

Sandra Naughton, SF Department of Children, Youth and Their Families, San Francisco

Marisa Ramirez, Bay Area Community Resources, Oakland

Erin Reedy, Stonestown YMCA, San Francisco

Jason Riggs, Oakland Unified School District (formerly with SF Unified School District), Oakland/San Francisco

Karena Salmond, Performing Arts Workshop, San Francisco

Colin Schmidt, Bay Area SCORES, Oakland/San Francisco

Viviane Scott, Richmond Neighborhood Development Center, San Francisco

Al Smith, CalSAC (formerly with SF Department of Children, Youth and Their Families)

Sandra Taylor, Oakland Fund for Children and Youth, Department of Human Services, Oakland

Gianna Tran, East Bay Asian Youth Center, Oakland

Kim Turner, Attitudinal Healing, Oakland

Lisa Villareal, San Francisco Foundation, Oakland/San Francisco

Marty Weinstein, Bay Area Community Resources, Oakland/San Francisco