

# The State Legislative Task Force on Summer and Intersession Enrichment Findings and Recommendations 2010

## Executive Summary

Research demonstrates the critical role that summer youth programs play in addressing the educational and health needs of children and youth – particularly low-income youth. Low-income youth not engaged in quality summer programs demonstrate “summer slide” which is the measurable learning loss and significant achievement gaps between lower- and higher-income children that typically widen over the summer. Youth are also more likely to gain weight during the summer months than during the school year, with the largest gains among racial and ethnic minorities, although research shows that participation in structured summer programming can lead to lower rates of obesity among youth. Despite evidence that points to the positive impacts summer programming can have on youth, polling data shows that many parents in California cannot find high-quality summer programming for their children.

The State Legislative Task Force on Summer and Intersession Enrichment was designed to examine existing research and data and produce a set of recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature on what the state’s role should be in addressing the educational and health needs of children in the summertime.

## Findings

California lacks any systemic approach or plan to address the severe lack of summer learning and enrichment programs for disadvantaged children in our state. We must take steps to creatively invest and leverage existing public resources to address this enormous gap in the learning and support system for children. Estimates show that about 75 percent of children and youth in California may not have access to summer program options. This already low supply of summer options has been further reduced by recent budget cuts, such as deep cuts to summer school and most recently the elimination of CalWORKS Stage 3 subsidized, year-round child care which many families depend on during the summer. Hundreds of thousands of youth attend a disparate array of programs, many of which do not resemble the research-based characteristics of quality summer learning and enrichment programming. Given that research shows summer programs can be critical to students’ success in school – especially in terms of closing the achievement gap – this void in California’s education system needs to be addressed as a key component of any education reform discussions. This missed opportunity to engage more of California’s youth in quality programs results in a growing achievement gap, escalating rates of childhood obesity, and increasing pressure on working families during the summer months.

***California needs to take major short-term and long-term steps simultaneously to transform summer from a time of risk to a time of opportunity for all of its youth.*** California needs to find innovative ways to use its existing resources for summer school and summer youth programming to have a more strategic impact, while also creatively exploring how to increase funding and enhance partnerships that leverage resources for summer youth programs. Opportunities currently exist for California to build on innovations that communities have already tested and to expand the use of summer youth programs as laboratories of innovation that can also drive

school year reforms. California can also leverage its statewide afterschool infrastructure, as well as adopt innovative program designs and financing approaches that are emerging across the country. However, to make an impact on this critical issue, California needs to start taking bold steps *now*.

### **Recommendations**

- 1) The Governor and State Superintendent of Public Instruction should monitor and **weigh in on federal policy** discussions that provide a window of opportunity for creating new, or enhancing existing, funding streams that may be used for summer learning and enrichment programming, with a particular emphasis on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).
- 2) California should **reinvent its existing summer school funding** to align with the research-based characteristics of quality summer learning and enrichment programs.
  - 2a) The State Superintendent of Public Instruction should create a state-level work group of key education leaders to discuss ways to redesign the state's summer school program so that it aligns with the research-based characteristics of quality summer learning and enrichment programs.
  - 2b) The State Superintendent of Public Instruction should pilot an integrated model of enrichment and academic support programming through innovative public-private partnerships at the state and local level.
  - 2c) The State Superintendent of Public Instruction should track the fiscal resources used for summer programming across the various funding streams to ensure that investment in summer can be tracked over time and be linked to impact.
  - 2d) *Long-Term*: The Governor, Legislature and State Superintendent of Public Instruction should implement the recommendations from the newly created state work group on redesigning summer school and embed the "redesigned summer school" concepts into broader PreK-16 state education reform policy discussions.
- 3) California should **adjust other existing public funding streams** to emphasize quality summer learning and enrichment programming.
  - 3a) The Legislature should reform the state legislation relating to administration of the federal 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center funding stream to align the program with evidence-based practices for summer or year-round programming, and the California Department of Education should enhance its support to grantees that use this resource for summer programming.
  - 3b) The State Superintendent for Public Instruction and the State Board of Education should consider revising guidance to districts on all school improvement funds (Title I, School Improvement Grants) to strongly recommend that districts utilize at least 15 percent of these grants for summer programming.
  - 3c) The Governor should request that national service resources be used to enhance the availability and quality of summer learning and enrichment programs.
  - 3d) The Governor, California Department of Education and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction should expand ways to promote summer feeding programs and link them to other programming to increase the number of youth served healthy meals.

- 4) California should **establish local-level mechanisms for informing parents** of their summer options to meet the need for more centralized information.
  - 4a) State agencies should encourage local public-private partnerships at the regional level to create listings of summer options and leverage state outreach mechanisms to promote such listings.
  - 4b) *Long Term*: The California Department of Education should explore encouraging or requiring, as appropriate, publicly funded, county-level entities, such as county offices of education, local child care and development planning councils, or child care resource referral agencies, to share standardized information and conduct outreach to parents and families about summer options.

**Additional Possibilities to Explore**

- 1) The Legislature should create new public education, health, nutrition, parks and recreation, library, and/or human services funding streams that can provide dedicated, core operating support and technical assistance for quality summer learning and enrichment programming.
- 2) The Governor and the Legislature should task the California Postsecondary Education Commission to identify policies that will encourage public higher education institutions to play a more active role in providing and partnering with summer learning programs to improve high school graduation rates and promote college and career readiness.
- 3) The California Department of Education should explore how to expand affordable access to public buildings, such as schools and city or county buildings, during the summer months and how to incentivize new construction of such buildings to include “joint use” partnerships that would increase the availability of public space to house summer programming.

## Table of Contents

I. Introduction	p. 5
II. What We Know From Research	p. 5
Impact on Learning Loss and the Achievement Gap	p. 5
Impact on Weight Gain and Obesity	p. 6
Lack of Access to Summer Program Options in California	p. 7
Characteristics of Effective Summer Programs	p.8
III. California Current Policy Context	p. 11
Challenges	p. 11
Assets	p. 12
IV. Policy Recommendations	p. 13
Appendix A. Members, Speakers, and Advisors to the Legislative Task Force on Summer and Intersession Enrichment	p. 24
Appendix B. Matrix of Recommendations by Entity Responsible	p. 25
Appendix C. Presentations from Task Force Meetings	p. 26

## I. Introduction

The State Legislative Task Force on Summer and Intersession Enrichment was created through legislation in 2008 with the goal of building awareness about the lack of structured learning and enrichment opportunities for low-income children in the summertime. The Task Force, chaired by Senator DeSaulnier, was designed to examine existing research and data and produce a set of recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature on what the state's role should be in addressing the educational and health needs of children in the summertime. The Task Force was charged to recommend solutions that:

- Promote good health and combat obesity by increasing education and awareness of the benefits of good nutrition and regular physical exercise and activity
- Provide safe, supervised places for kids to be during the summer months
- Provide enrichment activities and experiential learning that complement the school year curriculum, but offer other opportunities not found in school
- Prevent summer learning loss among California's children; and
- Leverage health insurance programs and health care services.

For a list of Task Force members and presentations from meetings, please refer to Appendix A.

## II. What We Know From Research

Research indicates that the achievement gap widens during the summer months, especially for disadvantaged youth, due to learning loss. Studies have also found that youth who are not engaged in structured summer activities are at higher risk of obesity. Fortunately, the research also shows that quality summer learning and enrichment programs can address these issues. However, estimates indicate that only about 25 percent of youth participate in publicly-funded summer program options. This missed opportunity to engage more of California's youth in quality programs results in a growing achievement gap, escalating rates of childhood obesity, and increasing pressure on working families during the summer months.

### *Impact on Learning Loss and the Achievement Gap*

Research has found that low-income youth not engaged in quality summer programs demonstrate "summer slide" which is the measurable learning loss and significant achievement gaps between lower- and higher-income children that typically widen over the summer. A meta-analysis of 13 studies that examined the effects of summer vacation on standardized achievement test scores found that "on average, children's tests scores were at least one month lower when they returned to school in fall than scores were when students left in spring," with larger drops in scores among disadvantaged students than middle-class students.<sup>1</sup> The analysis found that students lose more skills and knowledge related to math than reading.

Specifically examining the achievement gap between students of higher and lower socioeconomic status, a study that compared academic achievement gains over the school year and gains over the summer months revealed that much of the achievement gap among students of low socioeconomic status originated over the summer among youth who were not participating in summer programming.<sup>2</sup> In addition, research also indicates that

"Virtually all the advantage that wealthy students have over poor students is the result of differences in the way privileged kids learn when they are not in school."

- Professor Karl Alexander, Johns Hopkins University, Summer & Intersession Enrichment Task Force Meeting transcript, November 17, 2009

learning loss builds over time, which can widen the achievement gap between students of higher and lower socioeconomic status. A 2007 study found that about two-thirds of the achievement gap between 9<sup>th</sup> grade students of high- and low-socioeconomic status was linked to differences in the students' learning over the summer months during their elementary school years. The students from low socioeconomic status experienced more learning loss in the early years and later demonstrated less favorable indicators of academic achievement, such as placement in college preparatory high school courses, competing high school and attending a four-year college, than their higher socioeconomic peers.<sup>3</sup>

In addition to contributing to the state's achievement gap, summer learning loss has fiscal implications. When youth lose learning over the summer, the first month or two of school can be spent just re-teaching them what they knew in June. A conservative estimate is that it costs more than \$1,500 per child per year, or more than \$18,000 from kindergarten through graduation, to re-teach youth the subjects they "lose" over summer.<sup>4</sup>

A national review of the current literature on summer learning programs concluded such programs "can be an important strategy for reducing summer learning loss and narrowing the achievement gap."<sup>5</sup> The review examined seven experimentally-evaluated summer learning programs that targeted reading achievement and found that six of the programs had positive impacts, such as improving reading test scores and decreasing the rate of reading comprehension loss. A 2006 study of one of the summer learning programs, BELL (Building Educated Leaders for Life), found that participating students improved their reading skills by approximately one month of grade equivalency.<sup>6</sup>

"We found that summer learning loss accounts for about two-thirds of the difference in the likelihood of pursuing a college preparatory path in high school. And that matters a great deal in terms of what happens later on. Forty percent of the children we picked up as first graders left high school without diplomas. It's a problem of monumental proportions. So these early patterns of out-of-school learning have profoundly important repercussions that echo throughout the years."

--Professor Karl Alexander, Johns Hopkins University in *National Summer Learning Association's Research in Brief: Summer Can Set Kids on the Right—or Wrong—Course: Study Links a Lack of Academic Achievement, High Dropout Rate, to Summertime Learning Loss*

### ***Impact on Weight Gain and Obesity***

While one might imagine that youth are more active and healthier during the summer months, research shows alarming trends in children's health and nutritional status during these months. Youth are more likely to gain weight during the summer months than during the school year, with the largest gains among racial and ethnic minorities and those already overweight. Researchers have found that generally children gain weight three times faster during the summer months, and can gain as much weight during the summer as they do during the entire school year.<sup>7</sup> For example, a longitudinal study of 5,380 children in 310 schools found that students' body mass index (BMI) typically grew faster and was more variable during summer vacation than during the school year, with gain rates especially large for three at-risk subgroups: African-American, Latino, and children who were already overweight at the beginning of kindergarten.<sup>8</sup> Another study found that among a group of overweight youth, two-thirds experienced statistically significant gains in percentage of body weight during summer months.<sup>9</sup> While weight gain increases rapidly for most youth during the summer, both national and California research indicate that youth's access to nutritional meals may be limited in the

summer. Among families with children in California, food insecurity is greater during the summer than in the spring, a trend echoed in national research.<sup>10</sup> Also, only about 20 percent of the youth in California who relied on the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)-funded school lunch program during the school year had access to the summer lunch program in the summer of 2009. Compounding the issue, when many school districts cancelled or reduced their summer school offerings they also drastically reduced the number of youth who could access a free summer meal at those school sites. From July 2008 to July 2009 alone, 10 percent fewer youth benefited from the USDA-funded summer lunch program.<sup>11</sup>

There is an emerging body of research that demonstrates how out of school time programs can impact obesity among youth. Out of school time programs, including summer programming, tend to limit eating, offer opportunities for physical recreation, and may encourage healthy lifestyles. A study examining 600 disadvantaged school children (ages 5 to 8) over several years found that those involved in afterschool programs showed significantly lower rates of obesity compared to similar children who did not participate in afterschool programs, even after controlling for earlier measures of BMI and demographic factors.<sup>12</sup> Similarly, a three-year evaluation of an afterschool program that included moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (in addition to academic enrichment) found that the program had a beneficial effect on participants' fitness and body composition. The study also found that the positive fitness effects made during the school year were lost over the summer when the afterschool program was not operating. The study's authors state, "This highlights the importance of year-round programs to promote healthy growth in youths."<sup>13</sup>

Although most summer programs include physical activity as part of their programming, there is currently less research on their impact on health or fitness outcomes. In a review of eleven experimentally-evaluated summer learning programs, none of them evaluated impacts on health despite many of the programs offering sports or other physical activities to its participants.<sup>14</sup> Another study of a nationally representative sample of more than 1,700 adolescents found that those who were regularly involved in organized summer activities showed significantly lower risks for obesity than other youth, particularly when compared to those youth who were regularly in their parents' care and not in any other summer activities.<sup>15</sup>

"I would say the main implications from the research are, first, we have to provide affordable and accessible opportunities for young people to participate in organized activities over the summer."

- Associate Professor Joseph L. Mahoney,  
University of California, Irvine, Summer &  
Intercession Enrichment Task Force  
Meeting transcript, November 17, 2009

### ***Lack of Access to Summer Program Options in California***

National research on out-of-school time consistently demonstrates the difficulties that families face in finding summer learning and enrichment programs that engage their children, provide safe supervision, are affordable, and accommodate work schedules. For example, a 2004 national public opinion survey found that parents, particularly low-income parents, consistently cited summer as the most difficult time to find quality programming for their children.<sup>16</sup> During the summer months, one in ten children regularly spends time in self-care, either alone or with a sibling younger than 13. Further, the number of hours children spend in self-care increases from 4.8 hours per week during the school year to more than 10 hours per week during the summer.<sup>17</sup>

California-specific data indicate there are not enough summer program options to meet the need. Given that California’s existing summer programs are administered by a variety of publicly and privately funded agencies, no centralized data about the supply of programs exist – a void also at the national level. A study examining investments in summer learning and enrichment programs in five California cities found that about 75 percent of school age youth in each city were not participating in a publicly-funded summer program.<sup>18</sup> Results from a survey of about 500 youth in Oakland and Los Angeles supported this estimate. The survey found that the majority of youth were not engaged in regular, organized activities such as summer school or summer camp.<sup>19</sup> In addition, the study found that summer school offered by school districts was the largest provider of programming in the five cities, yet most school districts continue to reduce their summer school offerings due to budget constraints. For example, when the Los Angeles Unified School District cancelled all summer school for 2009, “the number of youth without a free or low-cost summer program option more than doubled.”<sup>20</sup> This is an alarming trend across the nation which Secretary of Education Arne Duncan brought to Congress’ attention by sharing that one third of school administrators across the nation reported they may have to cut summer school.<sup>21</sup>

A recent poll of more than 1,000 California parents found that there is a gap between what parents want for their children during the summer and what children participate in. The majority of parents say that it is important for their child to take part in a variety of activities during the summer, yet three in 10 parents did not enroll their child in any summer program at all and 6 in 10 parents enrolled their child in a program for less than half of the summer. Also, 65 percent of parents in general said they would like to know more about quality, affordable summer program options, with even higher percentages among low-income, African-American and Latino parents.<sup>22</sup>

“Parents do say that the summertime is a difficult time to find things to do for their family...we found that lack of available programs and concerns about affordability seemed to be major reasons that prevent parents from enrolling their child.”

- Jonathan Rochkind, Director of Research,  
Public Agenda, Summer & Intersession  
Enrichment Task Force Meeting transcript,  
March 11, 2010

### ***Characteristics of Effective Summer Programs***

National experts have identified several characteristics of quality summer learning and enrichment programming, which include:

- Substantial duration of programming so that youth are engaged for full days for between 6 to 8 weeks
- Offering access to all youth, particularly those who demonstrate academic or socioeconomic need
- Coupling enrichment activities with academic support activities to enhance the impact of both
- Using partnerships between community-based organizations, schools, libraries, parks and recreation agencies, and other organizations in the community to leverage resources and provide well-rounded opportunities for children and youth
- Offering engaging and fun programming that attracts children and youth to attend and remain in the program for its duration, as well as access to other supports that may help overcome obstacles to participation (such as free transportation, free meals, etc.)

- Providing professional development for summer staff to foster their skills and competencies
- Providing sufficient resources, planning time, infrastructure, data collection systems, and quality monitoring to ensure programming is effective

Below is a summary of the rationale and data behind each characteristic.

### **Duration**

Research suggests that most high-quality summer learning and enrichment programs operate for at least six hours per day for between six to eight weeks.<sup>23</sup> Although research indicates that the relationship between the amount of time on task and learning is complex given variables related to the quality of additional time spent learning, some research indicates that increasing the amount of learning time could increase students' achievement.<sup>24</sup> With many school districts across California reducing the number of days in the school year due to budget cuts, the amount of learning time for students may become an increasing concern across the state.

### **Broad Participation**

Like most states, the majority of California's public education funding for summer programs focus on remediation for under-performing students or specialized enrichment programs that have disparate target populations. National experts support expanding narrow eligibility criteria for summer programs to expand participation to all youth, with a priority on those who demonstrate academic or socioeconomic need.<sup>25</sup>

### **Enrichment and Academic Support**

A national review of eleven experimentally-evaluated summer learning and enrichment programs identified integrating enjoyable enrichment activities with academic instruction as a best practice. Some examples of this approach to integration included "field trips, hip-hop dance, rap and spoken word, improvisational comedy, art, drama, and storytelling."<sup>26</sup> Another summary of research on well-designed summer programs states that high-quality programs combine "academic instruction with enrichment opportunities" and that such programs can help youth increase academic achievement, motivation to learn, engagement in learning, skill development, and their health and well-being.<sup>27</sup>

"...The primary goal of summer learning programs is to prevent learning losses that occur over the summer and or/encourage academic progress. But for most kids, the summer is a time to get a break from school and have fun. Summer learning programs can offer children and youth the opportunity to learn and have fun at the same time."

– "What Works for Summer Learning Programs for Low-Income Children and Youth: Preliminary Lessons from Experimental Evaluations of Social Interventions: Child Trends Fact Sheet," *Child Trends*, September 2009

### **Partnerships between Community Organizations, Schools, Parents, and Others**

The National Summer Learning Association identifies partnerships as a key element of quality for summer programs. Three of the association's quality standards relate to partnerships, including one standard that states that a quality program "builds and maintains strong linkages with partners, including community organizations, the public

school system and government agencies, that are supportive of its mission and have a vested interest in the program's success."<sup>28</sup> The association recommends such partnerships in California to also "align and leverage existing resources, identify and meet gaps in service, improve program quality, and develop shared outcomes for summer success."<sup>29</sup>

### **Ways to Attract and Retain Youth**

To reap the benefits of summer programs, youth must attend them. Research shows that sustained attendance can lead to increased likelihood of positive impacts.<sup>30</sup> Sustained participation involves not only attracting youth to the program, but also retaining them in the program from its beginning to end. National experts agree that making "activities interesting and enjoyable" and efforts to "include time for sports and recreational activities to offer students a chance to participate in the physical activities they enjoy," are effective methods to attract and retain youth.<sup>31</sup> In addition, providing other supports such as transportation and subsidized meals may help youth overcome other obstacles to participation.

### **Staff Training**

To maximize the impact of summer learning and enrichment programs, staff needs opportunities for professional development before, during and after the summer programs. Whether summer program staff is from community organizations, schools, or other public agencies, experts agree that they all need training and support to ensure summer activities are intentional and aligned to common goals. In addition, many summer programs rely heavily on college students, volunteers, or entry-level staff who may lack professional experience and training in out-of-school time. A nation-wide lack of professional standards for out-of-school time staff also "leaves most workers without the kind of comprehensive training and ongoing professional development they need to provide high quality experiences for young people."<sup>32</sup> Some experts believe that summer programs can also serve as valuable opportunities for school staff to enhance their skills and learn new instructional approaches that can also be used in the school year. For instance, Detroit Public Schools adjusted its summer academy program to match new teachers hired before the start of the summer with experienced teachers so they can observe and assist as a way to prepare them for the school year.<sup>33</sup>

### **Necessary Resources**

Experts also agree that summer programs need sufficient resources, planning time, infrastructure, data collection systems, and quality monitoring to ensure they are effective. Several of the National Summer Learning Association's quality standards relate to these elements, and many of the program planning and assessment tools they have developed through working with high-quality programs reflect these critical components.<sup>34</sup>

### **III. California Current Policy Context**

#### ***Challenges***

##### **Budget Crisis**

While California experienced major increases in revenues in 2004-05 and 2005-06, “both the U.S. and California economic expansions clearly slowed over the course of 2006.”<sup>35</sup> California was hit hard by the national 2007-2009 recession that national experts say was the longest of its kind since World War II and most severe downturn since the Great Depression. “Our economic forecast generally reflects the current consensus that the state and national economies will continue to recover slowly and sluggishly in the coming years,” reports the California Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO).<sup>36</sup>

For the last year, the LAO has forecasted annual state budget problems of about \$20 billion each year through 2015-16. The state’s ongoing budget deficits are due primarily to the structural issue of growing expenditures outpacing revenues, as well as the use over the past several years of temporary budget solutions to pass the state’s budget. For next fiscal year (2011-12) specifically, the LAO estimates the state will have a deficit of over \$25 billion due to expenditures exceeding revenues by \$19 billion and a \$6 billion deficit from the current 2010-11 fiscal year.<sup>37</sup>

While the economic downturn and correlated state budget shortfalls have impacted almost every sector and aspect of life in California, they have significantly impacted public funding for children’s services. Over the last several years, there have been cuts to children’s public education, health, dental, child care, foster care, and child welfare programs. These cuts and the recent 2010-11 budget cuts have exacerbated the already low supply of summer options for families. Budget shortfalls in public education have caused many school districts across the state to vastly reduce their summer school offerings. For example in 2009, Los Angeles Unified School District canceled all summer school which left an estimated 250,000 youth without a free or low-cost educational opportunity in the summer.<sup>38</sup> The recent elimination of CalWORKs Stage 3 year-round child care which was zeroed out in the state’s 2010-11 budget to save the state \$256 million. As reported by the state’s Legislative Analyst Office, “This will mean the loss of subsidized child care for approximately 55,000 children from low-income families who formerly received cash aid through the CalWORKs program.”<sup>39</sup> Unfortunately, forecasts for the future indicate that the cuts may become even deeper. For example, the LAO’s estimates that in 2011-12 the state will reduce funding to its Proposition 98 minimum guarantee. (Proposition 98 accounts for about 70 percent of funding for the state’s child care, preschool, K-12 education, and the community colleges.) This reduction will create a shortfall of \$5.2 billion in baseline K-14 costs. At the same time, school districts will face additional reductions as one-time federal funds are exhausted.<sup>40</sup>

##### **Lack of Statewide Approach & Dedicated Funding**

In California, multiple public funding streams can be used to support summer programming, but the lack of coordination across agencies and competing demands on those funds results in a lack of a systemic approach to address summer needs. A scan of public resources used for summer programs found that while state education funding is the largest investment in summer programs,

state parks and employment funds are also used for summer programs. Although at the community level each of these state-funded programs may be present, “there is no group, organization, or agency that works specifically to coordinate summer programs across these various groups.”<sup>41</sup> Despite this variety of funding streams, the report found “a huge gap still exists between the number of slots available for low-cost summer programs and the number of low-income school-age children.”<sup>42</sup> A national study found a similar lack of systemic approaches in several states. Many states have funding streams that can be used for summer administered by multiple agencies – such as a state department of education and a state department of human services– without much alignment around common goals, target populations, or how programs can be coordinated locally to maximize efficiencies and access.<sup>43</sup>

In addition to a lack of coordination across agencies, California does not have a dedicated funding source for summer programming that meets the research-based characteristics of a quality summer learning and enrichment program. Instead, the state has several, uncoordinated funding streams that do not meet the need for even the limited populations they target and which only provide for a portion of what research indicates is quality programming. Many of the funding streams in California that can be used for summer programming can also be used for other purposes. For example, California’s summer school, which typically focuses only on remediation for under-performing students, does not even have a dedicated funding stream. It is funded through Supplemental Instruction, which can also be used for remedial instruction during the school year. Other educational funding streams that are commonly used for summer programming include Title I and 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center Supplemental funds, all of which can also be used during the school year.<sup>44</sup>

Given the lack of state-level coordination and the lack of dedicated resources for summer programs, it is difficult to estimate the amount of public funding currently being used for summer programs in California. For example, while many assume that Supplemental Instruction, the funding typically used for summer school, is likely the largest public investment in summer programming, school districts are not required to report to the California Department of Education how much is used during the summer versus the school year. The amount of this funding that school districts use for summer programming can vary from year to year based on other needs during the school year. In addition, given the state’s budget cuts, the state legislature recently allowed school districts the flexibility of using this, and several other categorical funding streams, to meet “any educational purposes.” Many school districts have since significantly reduced or cancelled their summer school programs.<sup>45</sup> A national study of eleven states confirms that in “most states it is not possible to determine exactly how much states are spending on summer schools” for similar reasons.<sup>46</sup>

## *Assets*

### **Build on Existing Afterschool Infrastructure**

California is unique in that it has a significant afterschool infrastructure due to its \$550 million annual state commitment to afterschool programming through Proposition 49, the After School Education and Safety Program, which has resulted in qualified staff, local partnerships that garner resources, and evidence-based curricula embracing project-based learning and academic

enrichment. This infrastructure could be used as a foundation for a new, innovative statewide quality summer learning and enrichment programming system.

### **Pending Windows of Opportunity**

Budget crises and the pending reauthorization of several significant pieces of federal legislation provide a window of opportunity for bolstering summer learning and enrichment program options in the short-term that will help raise awareness and create broader support for larger public investments in the long-term once the economy recovers.

These possibilities are made more real by support at the federal level from President Obama and Education Secretary Arne Duncan who regularly speaks about the importance of summer learning. The U.S. Department of Education has included increased learning time - including summer - as a component of all its key policies, including Race to the Top, Investing in Innovation and the ESEA reauthorization blueprint.

“A lot of our summer programs around the country are getting results where kids are actually making gains over the summer, anywhere from two to five months in math and reading. So, instead of that loss, they’re actually making gains, which are clearly going to have a result on the achievement gap.”

- Jeff Smink, Vice President of Policy,  
National Summer Learning Association,  
Summer & Intersession Enrichment Task  
Force Meeting transcript, March 11, 2010

## **IV. Policy Recommendations**

Below are the Task Force’s short-term and long-term policy recommendations for helping California transform summer from a time of risk to a time of opportunity for all of its youth. In addition several policy ideas were surfaced that need further exploration, which are included at the end of this section. The Task Force recommends the state pursue these short-term and long-term steps simultaneously since the much-needed bold steps to create new resources will surely take time, yet thousands of youth can benefit from immediate changes to how existing resources can be used in more innovative ways.

**1) The Governor and State Superintendent of Public Instruction should monitor and weigh in on federal policy discussions that provide a window of opportunity for creating new or enhancing existing funding streams with emphasis on summer learning and enrichment programming.** To further the goals of the Task Force, the Governor, and State Superintendent of Public Instruction should partner with state-level advocacy groups to track, monitor and participate in discussions about:

- Reauthorization of the Elementary & Secondary Education Act, with particular attention to the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center program, Title 1, Full-Service Community Schools program, and other programs’ emphasis on summer or year-round programming, as well as the possibility of creating a new dedicated summer funding stream;
- Changes to nutrition programs such as the USDA Summer Food Service Program and National School Lunch Program that could require or incentivize more summer programs to serve healthy meals and/or snacks to more children and youth, or introduction of new nutrition programs or resources. Also efforts should be made to explore ways to link enrichment or other types of programming to

summer feeding sites, as many providers have found that more youth are likely to be attracted to the feeding site and to attend on a regular basis throughout the summer if engaging programming is also offered. For example, in Gilroy summer feeding sites used CalWORKS stimulus funds to provide enrichment programming at feeding sites, which attracted many more youth;

- U.S. Department of Education policies and programs, such as School Improvement Grants, Promise Neighborhoods, Investing in Innovation (i3) Fund, and Race to the Top, which provide potential opportunities for more resources to be used for summer learning and enrichment programming in California; and
- Reauthorization of the Workforce Investment Act, with particular attention to opportunities to increase funding for summer youth employment, pre-employment and apprenticeship programs.

**2) California should redesign its existing summer school funding (currently the Supplemental Instruction Program, also referred to as “hourly intervention funds” administered by the California Department of Education) to align with the research-based characteristics of quality summer learning and enrichment programs.** In the past, school districts and county offices of education have primarily accessed “hourly intervention” funds to provide remedial summer school and dropout prevention activities to students in need. This funding stream is commonly referred to as “hourly intervention,” but is technically called Supplemental Instruction Program’s “Core Academic” funds. Schools and school districts using this funding stream were reimbursed at an hourly rate per participant for delivering services to academically at-risk students, and the amount per pupil was capped. The California Department of Education, which administers the funds, did not attach specific program requirements to the funding so summer school could look different in each school district but was typically a half day program, focused on academic remediation, and targeted the highest need students. Since Supplemental Instruction funds could also be used for instructional services for targeted students during the school year, and given competing demands, some districts spent their per child allocation before the summer even started. This funding stream still exists, but because of the state’s budget crisis, the legislature has allowed school districts the flexibility to use these (and other categorical) funds to cover other budget gaps, which has resulted in many school districts completely eliminating or significantly scaling back on summer school. This includes the state’s larger school districts like Los Angeles, Long Beach, and San Francisco.

National experts on issues related to summer learning loss are collecting a growing body of research that demonstrates the key role well-designed summer learning programs can have in preventing summer learning loss, helping to close the achievement gap, and ensuring students stay in school. For example, the National Summer Learning Association has launched a “New Vision for Summer School” initiative to help national, state and local leaders re-envision summer from a remedial, punitive experience into one that offers hands-on, experiential academic and enrichment opportunities for all students, not just those who are underperforming. Based on research and evidence from several forward-looking school districts across the nation, the National Summer Learning Association has identified nine principles to help national, state and local leaders create the “New Vision for Summer School.”<sup>47</sup> Other national organizations, such as the National Academy of Education, echo the need for these types of approaches to re-invent

summer school based on emerging innovative approaches. In addition, local communities within California and other states are also demonstrating results from adopting innovative approaches to integrating summer school with enrichment programming.

### **Short-Term Recommendations**

***2a) The State Superintendent of Public Instruction should create a state-level work group of key education leaders to discuss ways to redesign the state's summer school program so that it aligns with the research-based characteristics of quality summer learning and enrichment programs.*** To further the goals of the Task Force and to extend the work of the state's P-16 Council to close the achievement gap, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction should lead the work group which would include a variety of stakeholders such as members of the Education Coalition, California Department of Education staff, and representatives from local education agencies, libraries, parks and recreation agencies, and other local public agencies, intermediaries and community-based organizations that deliver summer programming. The work group would utilize existing data, best practices, and research from local, state and national efforts to inform its work. The work group would present and advocate for its recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature. The work group would be charged with the following:

- Identifying possible approaches to re-structure the existing funding streams, including Supplemental Instruction, that can be used by local education agencies for summer programming and future possible funding streams, such as Race to the Top funds, to encourage partnership with other organizations, expand targeted eligibility, and offer enrichment in addition to academic support.
- Exploring ways to incentivize partnerships between summer school programs and local organizations, such as park and recreation departments, libraries, community-based organizations, museums and others, so that children and youth have access to enrichment and academic support opportunities for full days for six to eight weeks.
- Exploring ways to ensure summer school is engaging for children and youth so that they enroll and attend regularly, including creating systemic solutions to barriers to access (such as transportation, providing subsidized meals, etc.).
- Exploring mechanisms to provide summer school staff and partnering agency staff with professional development to foster their skills and competencies,
- Designing a statewide technical assistance system that supports the quality of summer programming on an ongoing basis. Such a statewide technical assistance system could build off the state's existing regional afterschool system or leverage other existing technical assistance systems.
- Exploring the cost of providing summer learning programs to all children and youth, including those in California Department of Education-funded child development programs, across the state, identifying possible funding

sources, and recommending policies that will allow those funding sources to support the work group's guidance.

***2b) The State Superintendent of Public Instruction should pilot an integrated model of enrichment and academic support programming through innovative public-private partnerships at the state and local level.*** To further the goals of the Task Force, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction should sponsor a pilot program to put into practice the research-based elements of quality summer learning programs, including integrated academic and enrichment activities and public-private partnerships. This pilot should build on existing innovative projects in the state, such as the Summer Practice Consortium (a David and Lucile Packard Foundation initiative aimed at creating summer learning programs and the technical assistance systems to support those programs). This project has brought together diverse public and private organizations – including the California Library Association, the California State Parks Foundation, school districts across the state, and numerous local nonprofit organizations – to create programs and systems for summer learning. Key elements of the pilot program might include:

- Full-day programming.
- Accessibility to diverse group of students, not just those identified as needing remediation.
- Thematic focuses such as science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), arts, literacy, health, etc.
- Transition strategies for entering K, 6<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> graders.
- Leveraging of private funds with funding streams administered by the California Department of Education, such as Supplemental Instruction, School Improvement Grants, Title I, 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers, After School Education and Safety, GEAR Up, Summer Food Service, National School Lunch Program Food Service, and others.
- Partnerships between school districts, local youth agencies, statewide organizations, and private funders.
- Technical assistance to support quality programming.

In terms of possible funders, the California Department of Education could connect with several regional, state, and national foundations that have made or are considering making commitments to summer youth programming.<sup>48</sup>

***2c) The State Superintendent of Public Instruction should track the fiscal resources used for summer programming across the various funding streams to ensure that investment in summer can be tracked over time.***

California has several, uncoordinated funding streams that can be used for summer programming. A study of five California cities found that while communities rely on a patchwork of federal, state and local funding sources, each community profiled relied most heavily on funds administered by the California Department of Education.<sup>49</sup> To further the goals of the Task Force, the California Department of Education should monitor and report on the amount of funds used to provide summer programming among at least the following funding streams: Supplemental

Instruction, Title I, 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center Supplemental, School Improvement Grants and Title V Child Development funds.

### **Long-Term Recommendation**

***2d) The Governor, Legislature and State Superintendent of Public Instruction should implement the recommendations from the newly created state work group on redesigning summer school and embed the “redesigned summer school” concepts into broader PreK-16 state education reform policy discussions.***

**3) California should adjust other existing public funding streams to emphasize quality summer learning and enrichment programming.** Several existing state funding streams and resources should be harnessed in more innovative ways to help meet the need for more summer programming in communities across the state. Given the mounting research that demonstrates that program quality makes a difference in fostering positive outcomes for children and youth, the state needs to ensure that these public funding streams include resources and supports that will promote quality programming. Training, technical assistance and capacity building for summer program staff is critical to enhancing the quality of summer programming.

### **Short-Term Recommendations**

***3a) The Legislature should reform the state legislation relating to administration of the federal 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center funding stream to align the program with evidence-based practices for summer or year-round programming, and the California Department of Education should enhance its support to grantees who use this resource for summer programming.*** California receives approximately \$140 million in federal funding for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center program, half of which is used to support afterschool programs for elementary- and middle-school students and half of which supports programs for high school students. A recent bill passed by the legislature and signed by the Governor (Senate Bill 798) redirects 15% of this federal funding to summer youth programs if and when California’s federal allocation is increased. This reform will help address some of the statewide need for more summer programming, but further changes to this program are still needed to maximize the impact of this resource.

To further the goals of the Task Force, the Legislature should amend the existing legislation to allow programs to serve youth during summer and non-school days for a minimum of 6 hours per day at double the daily rate. The current legislation for these 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center funds dedicated to programming that occurs on non-school days such as school breaks and summer (which are referred to as supplemental grants) has a minimum of 3 hours of programming per day at a rate of \$7.50 per day. Current research indicates that an essential characteristic of effective summer programs engage participants for a full day of at least 6 hours.<sup>50</sup> The Legislature should also increase the 3 hour per day rate to \$10 per day and the 6 hour per day rate to \$20 per day to more closely align with the costs of a quality program.

To further the goals of the Task Force, the California Department of Education should plan for how to make summer awards, support summer grantees with training, technical assistance, and program planning resources, project the number of youth to be served under various possible future increased federal allocations, and explore whether additional reforms to the federal funding stream are needed to meet summer programming needs.

***3b) The State Superintendent for Public Instruction and the State Board of Education should consider revising guidance to districts on all school improvement funds (Title I, School Improvement Grants) to strongly recommend that districts utilize at least 15% of these grants for summer programming.*** While summer programs can be provided with these funding streams, clear guidance from the state would encourage local districts to use the funding for summer and to provide programming that aligns with best practices in summer learning and enrichment.

***3c) The Governor should request that national service resources be used to enhance the availability and quality of summer learning and enrichment programs.***

CaliforniaVolunteers is the state office that manages programs and initiatives aimed at increasing the number of Californians engaged in service and volunteering. The CaliforniaVolunteers Commission determines the state's service-related priorities and how the state's more than \$30 million in federal service- and volunteering-related funding should be allocated to meet identified needs. One of the programs that CaliforniaVolunteers administers is AmeriCorps which is often referred to as the "domestic Peace Corps." Non-profit organizations and public agencies apply to CaliforniaVolunteers for funding to hire AmeriCorps members, who perform a year of service with a program that meets local community needs in return for a modest living allowance and education award. For the 2010-11 program year, CaliforniaVolunteers provided \$29 million in funding to 55 programs that will support more than 4,000 AmeriCorps members statewide.

To further the goals of the Task Force, the Governor should request the CaliforniaVolunteers Commission to allocate funds in the 2012-13 CaliforniaVolunteers' budget for a new Summer Learning and Enrichment Initiative, that would support innovative programs addressing the need for more accessible, quality summer programming.

***3d) The Governor, California Department of Education and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction should expand ways to promote summer feeding programs and link them to other programming to increase the number of youth served healthy meals.*** Only one-third of low-income California students who eat a free or reduced-price meal during the school year have access to a free meal during the summer. While all school districts must serve school meals to students enrolled in summer school, the number of school districts offering summer school has decreased. Aside from offering USDA-funded National School Lunch Program free meals at summer school locations, some school districts, local public agencies, and community organizations use the USDA-funded Summer Food Service Program to provide free summer meals to low-income youth at summer feeding sites. Feeding sites can include locations such as recreation centers, parks, public housing developments, and community centers. Operators of these feeding sites have found that more youth are likely to be attracted to the site and to attend on a regular basis throughout the

summer if the site also offers engaging programming such as summer camp, educational games, and other fun activities. For example, in Gilroy summer feeding sites used CalWORKS stimulus funds to provide enrichment programming at the sites, which attracted many more youth.

To further the goals of the Task Force, the California Department of Education should support and partner with the existing Summer Meal Program Coalition and Summer Food Service Program sponsors and feeding sites, and consult with national experts to explore innovative ways to link summer programming to summer feeding sites. For example, the Department should work to ensure more feeding sites also offer enrichment or other types of programming that attracts youth so as to increase the number of youth served healthy meals through the USDA-funded Summer Food Service Program and National School Lunch Programs. The Department should also share information about these summer feeding programs with entities using Title I, 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center Supplemental, or other funds administered by the Department.

To further the goals of the Task Force, the Governor and State Superintendent of Public Instruction should use their statewide leadership roles to promote the USDA-funded Summer Food Service Program and National School Lunch Programs. The number of youth fed during the summer through these programs largely depends on how many schools, local government agencies, and private nonprofits operate sites and on the effectiveness of outreach to families about available feeding sites. The Governor and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction promoting participation in the program could significantly increase the number of youth served healthy meals each summer.

**4) California should establish local-level mechanisms for informing parents of their summer options to meet the need for more centralized information.** Recent polling indicates that many families face challenges accessing information to help them understand their summer youth programming options. Nearly two-thirds of all parents (65 percent) responded that they wish they knew about more summer programs that fit their budget. In particular, minority parents, low-income parents and parents in rural areas reported more difficulties finding programs to meet their needs.<sup>51</sup> These local-level mechanisms with centralized information about summer program options could also provide information to families about other relevant services that would support the healthy development of their children. Given the research that demonstrates how children’s overall development and ability to learn is significantly impacted by their physical and emotional health, providing information about other services would further the goals of supporting children’s healthy development during the summer months.<sup>52</sup> For example, these local information mechanisms could also provide information about appropriate health care services, such as local clinics, wellness programs, and other such resources. Providing such information along with summer program options may be particularly important

“...I noticed that a lot of the programs are [available], and parents are not taking advantage of them for their kids because they don’t know about it. So, there needs to be another factor considered...outreach to the parents...”  
- Cesar Calderon, President & Chief Executive Officer, Soledad Enrichment Action, Summer & Intersession Enrichment Task Force Meeting transcript, November 17, 2009

for disconnected families who may rely primarily on trusted school staff for such information. During the summer months, those school staff may not be available to assist families.

### **Short-Term Recommendation**

***4a) State agencies should encourage local public/private partnerships at the regional level to create listings of summer options and leverage state outreach mechanisms to promote such listings.***

To further the goals of the Task Force, several state agencies should promote public-private partnerships at the county or regional level to disseminate information about summer program options and other relevant support services. For example, in the Bay Area a nonprofit organization has worked with public agencies in the region to create the SummerMatters.net campaign, which is a listing of local summer programs, referral agencies, and directories of such programs. State agencies should partner with such efforts to provide them with information about summer programs and other support services youth need during the summer months. For example, the California Department of Education should assist in gathering data on summer programs – from summer school to summer feeding sites - to be included in regional directories. The California State Library should also collect data on summer reading programs which could be included in the directories.

To further the goals of the Task Force, state and local agencies should also promote regional listings of summer program options and relevant services through available outreach mechanisms. For example, the California Department of Public Health's Network for a Healthy California awards funds to advertising and public relation agencies to develop and implement social marketing campaigns related to healthy behaviors and obesity prevention. The Network should devote resources to promote the development and dissemination of regional listings of summer program options and relevant services. United Way's 2-1-1 database and outreach could include information about available summer program options for families and have expressed interest in discussing this possibility. The California Department of Social Services should also promote regional listings of summer program options and relevant services through its CalWORKs Child Care Program and its Community Care Licensing Division (which has regional and county offices across the state that collect data about licensed summer youth programs). Family Resource Centers exist in most communities and on some school campuses, and could be a helpful base for disseminating summer program information. Both the California State Library and California Department of Education could also assist in promoting these regional listings through their existing outreach mechanisms.

### **Long-Term Recommendation**

***4b) The California Department of Education and the Department of Social Services should explore encouraging or requiring, as appropriate, publicly funded, county-level entities, such as county offices of education, local child care and development planning councils, or child care resource referral agencies, to share standardized information***

***and conduct outreach to parents and families about summer options.*** In addition to recent polling demonstrating that parents face challenges accessing information about summer options they could afford, many parents also reported sending their children to summer programs that did not offer academic programming despite stating that was a need for their children. A recent study examining summer learning programs in five California cities also found that multiple agencies typically offer summer programs in each city and no one agency coordinated information about all of the program options available to families.<sup>53</sup> This finding and anecdotal data from parents, suggests that parents would benefit from a centralized database of local summer youth programs that collected standardized information about their summer options, including the types of activities offered, cost, availability of financial assistance, youth eligibility, etc.

To further the goals of the Task Force, the California Department of Education should explore encouraging or requiring, as appropriate, county offices of education or local child care and development planning councils to create systems to collect standardized information about summer youth program options, conduct outreach to parents and families about those listings, and ensure that this information and outreach is available in multiple languages. Local child care and development planning councils (LPCs) are state entities in each county that serve as “a forum to address the child care needs of all families in the community for all types of child care.”<sup>54</sup>

To further the goals of the Task Force, the California Department of Social Services should explore the feasibility of adding the collection and marketing of such data to its CalWORKs Child Care Program’s county-level child care resource referral contracts. Any of these county-level approaches could provide a sustainable system to partner with school districts, city agencies, 2-1-1 efforts, parent organizations, and non-profit organizations to collect information from local summer youth providers and enhance outreach efforts to parents and youth.

## **Additional Possibilities to Explore**

***1) The Legislature should create new public education, health, nutrition, parks and recreation, library, and/or human services funding streams that can provide dedicated, core operating support and technical assistance for quality summer learning and enrichment programming.*** Given the scale of the need for summer programming in California and the costs we incur as a state due to the lack of sufficient summer options for youth in terms of cost pressures on our education, health care, and public safety systems, the state needs to recognize the need for summer programming as a public priority. When the economy begins to recover, a significant new investment of public funds is needed to address this public priority.

To further the goals of the Task Force, the Legislature and Governor should work together to introduce and pass legislation creating new dedicated state funding streams to support the core operating expenses of quality summer learning and enrichment programs, as well as complementary technical assistance systems to support those programs. This legislation for dedicated funding streams would build off or replace existing public funding that supports such

programs, and could include new revenue streams, such as a tax on sweetened beverages. These funding streams could be administered by the California Department of Education, the California Department of Public Health, the California Department of Social Services, the California Department of Parks and Recreation, or another appropriate state entity. These public investments would likely attract private partnerships with philanthropic organizations, business, and nonprofit organizations motivated to improve youth outcomes during the summer months.

**2) *The Governor and the Legislature should task the California Postsecondary Education Commission to identify policies that will encourage public higher education institutions to play a more active role in providing and partnering with summer learning programs to improve high school graduation rates and promote college and career readiness.*** Many campuses in the California Community College, California State University and the University of California systems operate or partner with summer programs for youth. However, given the enormous need for more summer youth programs across the state and the potential benefits to higher learning institutions in terms of student employment, internship opportunities, and outreach to future students and families, the legislature should create policies to encourage public colleges and universities to play a more active role.

To further the goals of the Task Force, the Governor and the Legislature could task the California Postsecondary Education Commission to identify policies that will encourage public higher education institutions to play a more active role in providing and partnering with summer learning programs. Given that the Commission's unique role of advising the Governor and Legislature on issues related to California's entire system of postsecondary education, which includes "identifying and recommending policies to meet the educational, research and public service needs of the State of California," the commission could identify ways to leverage any of the following resources that public higher institutions could contribute to summer learning programs for youth:

- Space on campuses – classrooms, libraries, sporting facilities, etc – since student enrollment traditionally drops during the summer term
- College students seeking internships and/or employment
- Federal work-study stipends for college students which underwrite the cost of summer learning staff.

**3) *The California Department of Education should explore how to expand affordable access to public buildings, such as schools and city or county buildings, during the summer months and how to incentivize new construction of such buildings to include "joint use" partnerships that would increase the availability of public space to house summer programming.*** In many communities, access to sufficient and affordable facilities impedes the amount of summer programming available. "Joint use" is a term used to describe a partnership in which multiple agencies either share a common space or jointly develop or renovate a space that will be used and maintained by multiple agencies. In terms of summer access to existing school facilities, many school districts use some of their buildings to offer summer programming and charge fees to outside agencies for use of their space, as is allowable under the state's Civic Center Act (Education Code 38130-38138).

To further the goals of the Task Force, the California Department of Education could provide guidance to school districts to make school facilities more accessible to summer youth programs through methods such as prioritizing their applications and creating sliding scale fees through which renters who are not serving youth pay higher fees than those serving youth.

In terms of developing new or renovating school facilities, California has identified an intense need for additional classrooms in the coming years. To further the goals of the Task Force, the California Department of Education could explore how to incentivize school districts to consider adopting joint use approaches that will help address local summer youth programming space needs in new school construction and renovation projects.

## **Appendix A. Members, Speakers, and Advisors to the Legislative Task Force on Summer and Intersession Enrichment**

### **Members of the Legislative Task Force on Summer and Intersession Enrichment**

Senator **Mark DeSaulnier**

Senator **Gilbert Cedillo**

Assembly Member **Tom Ammiano**

Assembly Member **Steven C. Bradford**

**Robert Matthew Cabeza**, Executive Director, YMCA of Greater Long Beach

**Cesar Calderon**, President & Chief Executive Officer, Soledad Enrichment Action

**Linda Davis-Alldritt**, Consultant, School Nurse, Health Services, California Department of Education

**Richard Groper**, Professor, California State University, Los Angeles

**Jennifer Peck**, Executive Director, Partnership for Children and Youth

**Yvette Radford**, Vice President of External and Community Affairs, Kaiser Permanente

**Elena Stern**, Vice President of Communications & External Affairs, Para Los Niños

### **Speakers and Advisors to the Legislative Task Force on Summer and Intersession Enrichment**

**Karl L. Alexander**, Professor of Sociology, Department of Sociology, Johns Hopkins University

**Katie Brackenridge**, Director of Out of School Time Initiatives, Partnership for Children and Youth

**Joseph L. Mahoney**, Associate Professor in the Department of Education, University of California, Irvine

**Rick Miller**, Deputy Superintendent, California Department of Education

**Sarah Pitcock**, Director of Program Quality, National Summer Learning Association

**Jonathan Rochkind**, Director of Research, Public Agenda

**Lois Salisbury**, Director of Children, Families and Communities, The David and Lucile Packard Foundation

**Jeff Smink**, Vice President of Policy, National Summer Learning Association

## Appendix B. Matrix of Recommendations by Entity Responsible

Recommendations	Entities Responsible for Next Steps			
	Governor	Legislature	SPI/ CDE	Other State Entities
1) Monitor and weigh in on federal policy discussions	X		X	
2) Reinvent California’s existing summer school funding				
2a) Create a state-level work group of key education leaders to redesign the state’s summer school funding			X	
2b) Pilot an integrated model of enrichment and academic support programming through innovative public-private partnerships at the state and local level			X	
2c) Track fiscal resources used for summer programming across the various funding streams			X	
2d) Implement the recommendations from the newly created state work group on redesigning summer school and embed the “redesigned summer school” concepts (LONG TERM)	X	X	X	
3) Adjust other existing public funding streams to emphasize quality summer learning and enrichment programming				
3a) Reform the state legislation relating to administration of the federal 21st Century Community Learning Center funding stream and adjust administration of these funds.		X	X	
3b) The State Superintendent for Public Instruction and the State Board of Education should consider revising guidance to districts on all school improvement funds (Title I, School Improvement Grants) to strongly recommend that districts utilize at least 15% of these grants for summer programming.			X	
3c) National service resources be allocated toward exploring how community service resources can be leveraged to enhance the availability and quality of summer learning and enrichment programs	X			
3d) Expand ways to promote summer feeding programs and link them to other programming to increase the number of youth served	X		X	
4) Establish local-level mechanisms for informing parents of their summer options to meet the need for more centralized information.				
4a) Encourage local public/private partnerships at the regional level to create listings of summer options and leverage state outreach mechanisms to promote such listings				X
4b) Explore requiring publicly funded, county-level entities, such as county offices of education, local child care and development planning councils, or child care resource referral agencies, to share standardized information and conduct outreach to parents and families about summer options. (LONG TERM)			X	
<b>Additional Possibilities to Explore</b>				
1) Create new public education, health, nutrition, parks and recreation, and/or human services funding streams that can provide dedicated, core operating support and technical assistance for quality summer learning and enrichment programming		X		
2) Task the California Postsecondary Education Commission to identify policies that will encourage public higher education institutions to play a more active role in providing and partnering with	X	X		
3) Explore how to expand affordable access to public buildings during the summer months and how to incentivize new construction of such buildings to include “joint use” partnerships that would increase the availability of public space to house			X	

## **Appendix C. Presentations from Task Force Meetings**

[presentations to be inserted here]

---

## ENDNOTES

- <sup>1</sup> Harris Cooper and others, "The Effects of Summer Vacation on Achievement Test Scores: A Narrative and Meta-analytic Review." *Review of Educational Research* 66 (3), (1996): 227-268, as cited in Harris Cooper, "Summer Learning Loss: The Problem and Some Solutions," Clearinghouse on Early Education and Parenting EDO-PS-03-5, May 2003, <http://ceep.crc.illinois.edu/eearchive/digests/2003/cooper03.html#cooper96>.
- <sup>2</sup> Karl L. Alexander, Doris R. Entwisle, and Linda Steffel Olson, "Summer Learning and Its Implications: Insights from Beginning School Study." *New Directions for Youth Development*, vol. 114, 2007, 11-32, as cited in Mary Terziana and Kristin Moore, "What Works for Summer Learning Programs for Low-Income Children and Youth: Preliminary Lessons from Experimental Evaluations of Social Interventions: Child Trends Fact Sheet," *Child Trends*, September 2009, 1.
- <sup>3</sup> Karl L. Alexander, Doris R. Entwisle, and Linda Steffel Olson, "Lasting Consequences of the Summer Learning Gap." *American Sociological Review* 72 (April 2007): 167-180.
- <sup>4</sup> From 2002 presentation by Ron and Matthew Boulay, communication with Sarah Pitcock, National Summer Learning Association, October 27, 2010.
- <sup>5</sup> Mary Terziana and Kristin Moore, "What Works for Summer Learning Programs for Low-Income Children and Youth: Preliminary Lessons from Experimental Evaluations of Social Interventions: Child Trends Fact Sheet," *Child Trends*, September 2009, 5- 6.
- <sup>6</sup> Duncan Chaplin and Jeffrey Capizzano, *Impacts of a Summer Learning Program: A Random Assignment Study of Building Educated Leaders for Life (BELL)* (Washington, DC: Urban Institute/Mathematica Policy Research, 2006), as cited in Ron Fairchild, Brenda McLaughlin, and Brendan P. Costigan, "How Did You Spend Your Summer Vacation?: What Public Policies Do (and Don't Do) to Support Summer Learning Opportunities for All Youth." *Afterschool Matters Occasional Paper Series* 8 (Spring 2007), <http://www.summerlearning.org/resource/resmgr/publications/2007.howdidyouspend.pdf>.
- <sup>7</sup> National Summer Learning Association, *Research in Brief: Summertime and Weight Gain*, [http://www.summerlearning.org/?page=research\\_brief](http://www.summerlearning.org/?page=research_brief).
- <sup>8</sup> Paul T. von Hippel, Brian Powell, Douglas B. Downey, and Nicholas J. Rowland, "The Effect of School on Overweight in Childhood: Gain in Body Mass Index During the School Year and During Summer Vacation," *American Journal of Public Health* 97 (4), April 2007: 696-702.
- <sup>9</sup> Linda Gillis, Melissa McDowell and Oded Bar-Or, "Relationship between Summer Vacation Weight Gain and Lack of Success in a Pediatric Weight Control Program," *Eating Behaviors* 6 (2) (February 2005): 137-143.
- <sup>10</sup> Matthew Sharp Kumar Chandran, and David Beller, *School's Out: Who Ate? A Report on Summer Nutrition in California* (Oakland: California Food Policy Advocates, 2008), <http://www.cfpa.net/press/sowa2008/SOWA2008.pdf>.
- <sup>11</sup> Matthew Sharp, and Tia Shimada, *School's Out: Who Ate? A Report on Summer Nutrition in California* (Oakland: California Food Policy Advocates, 2009), <http://cfpa.net/summerfood/sowa2009.pdf>.
- <sup>12</sup> Joseph L. Mahoney, Heather Lord, and Erica Carryl, "Afterschool Program Participation and the Development of Child Obesity and Peer Acceptance." *Applied Developmental Science* 9 (2005): 202-215.
- <sup>13</sup> Bernard Gutin and others, "Preliminary Findings of the Effect of a 3-year After-School Physical Activity Intervention on Fitness and Body Fat: The Medical College of Georgia Fitkid Project." *International Journal of Pediatric Obesity* 3, No. s1, (2008): 3-9.
- <sup>14</sup> Mary Terziana and Kristin Moore, "What Works for Summer Learning Programs for Low-Income Children and Youth: Preliminary Lessons from Experimental Evaluations of Social Interventions: Child Trends Fact Sheet," *Child Trends*, September 2009, 5.
- <sup>15</sup> Joseph L. Mahoney, "Adolescent Summer Care Arrangements and Risk for Obesity the Following School Year." *Journal of Adolescence* (Article in Press, 2010), [www.afterschoolalliance.org/Mahoney\\_2010\\_online\\_version.pdf](http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/Mahoney_2010_online_version.pdf).
- <sup>16</sup> Ann Duffett and others, *All Work and No Play: Listening to What Kids and Parents Really Want from Out-of-School Time*, Washington, DC: Public Agenda, 2004, as cited in Ron Fairchild, Brenda McLaughlin, and Brendan P. Costigan, "How Did You Spend Your Summer Vacation?: What Public Policies Do (and Don't Do) to Support Summer Learning Opportunities for All Youth." *Afterschool Matters Occasional Paper Series* 8 (Spring 2007), <http://www.summerlearning.org/resource/resmgr/publications/2007.howdidyouspend.pdf>.

- 
- <sup>17</sup> Jeffrey Capizzano, Sarah Adelman, and Matthew Stagner, *What Happens When the School Year is Over? The Use and Costs of Childcare for School-age Children during the Summer Months*, (Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute, 2002).
- <sup>18</sup> National Summer Learning Association and Cross and Joftus, LLC, *Investments in Summer Learning: A Scan of Public Funding for Summer Programming in California* (2008), 24, [http://www.summerlearning.org/resource/resmgr/publications/2008\\_ca\\_resource\\_scan.pdf](http://www.summerlearning.org/resource/resmgr/publications/2008_ca_resource_scan.pdf).
- <sup>19</sup> *Ibid*, 11.
- <sup>20</sup> *Ibid*, 8.
- <sup>21</sup> U.S. Department of Education Press Room, “Secretary Arne Duncan’s Testimony Before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Regarding the FY 2011 Education Budget, April 14, 2010” U.S. Department of Education, <http://www2.ed.gov/news/speeches/2010/04/04142010.html>.
- <sup>22</sup> Public Agenda, *A Time to Learn and Grow: California Parents Talk about Summertime and Summer Programs, Executive Summary* (2010), 2, available at <http://www.publicagenda.org/pages/Calif-summer-survey>.
- <sup>23</sup> Ron Fairchild, Brenda McLaughlin, and Brendan P. Costigan, “How Did You Spend Your Summer Vacation?: What Public Policies Do (and Don’t Do) to Support Summer Learning Opportunities for All Youth.” *Afterschool Matters Occasional Paper Series 8* (Spring 2007): 8.
- <sup>24</sup> Elena Silva, *On the Clock: Rethinking the Way Schools Use Time*, Education Sector, January 2007; <http://www.educationsector.org/publications/clock-rethinking-way-schools-use-time>.
- <sup>xxv</sup> National Summer Learning Association and Cross and Joftus, LLC, *Investments*, 29.
- <sup>26</sup> Mary Terziana and Kristin Moore, “What Works for Summer Learning Programs for Low-Income Children and Youth: Preliminary Lessons from Experimental Evaluations of Social Interventions: Child Trends Fact Sheet,” *Child Trends*, September 2009, 3.
- <sup>27</sup> Ron Fairchild, Brenda McLaughlin, and Brendan P. Costigan, “How Did You Spend Your Summer Vacation?: What Public Policies Do (and Don’t Do) to Support Summer Learning Opportunities for All Youth.” *Afterschool Matters Occasional Paper Series 8* (Spring 2007): 3, 8.
- <sup>28</sup> National Summer Learning Association, “Quality Standards,” National Summer Learning Association, [http://www.summerlearning.org/?page=quality\\_standards](http://www.summerlearning.org/?page=quality_standards).
- <sup>29</sup> National Summer Learning Association and Cross and Joftus, LLC, *Investments*, 29.
- <sup>30</sup> *Ibid*, 28.
- <sup>31</sup> Mary Terziana and Kristin Moore, “What Works for Summer Learning Programs for Low-Income Children and Youth: Preliminary Lessons from Experimental Evaluations of Social Interventions: Child Trends Fact Sheet,” *Child Trends*, September 2009, 3.
- <sup>32</sup> Brenda McLaughlin and Sarah Pitcock, *Building Quality in Summer Learning Programs: Approaches and Recommendations* (The Wallace Foundation/National Summer Learning Association, September 2009), 26, <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/KnowledgeCenter/KnowledgeTopics/CurrentAreasofFocus/Out-Of-SchoolLearning/Documents/Building-Quality-in-Summer-Learning-Programs.pdf>.
- <sup>33</sup> National Summer Learning Association, *A New Vision for Summer School* (2010), 21, <http://www.summerlearning.org/resource/resmgr/policy/2010.newvision.pdf>.
- <sup>34</sup> National Summer Learning Association, “Quality Standards,” National Summer Learning Association, [http://www.summerlearning.org/?page=quality\\_standards](http://www.summerlearning.org/?page=quality_standards).
- <sup>35</sup> California Legislative Analyst’s Office, *2007-08: Overview of the Governor’s Budget* (January 12, 2007), 5; <http://www.lao.ca.gov/laoapp/main.aspx?type=2&PubTypeID=2>.
- <sup>36</sup> California Legislative Analyst’s Office, *The 2011-12 Budget: California’s Fiscal Outlook* (November 2010), 13; <http://www.lao.ca.gov>.
- <sup>37</sup> *Ibid*.
- <sup>38</sup> Sara Pitcock, *Investments in Summer Learning: A Scan of Public Funding for Summer Programming in California*, presentation to the California Legislative Task Force on Summer and Intersession Enrichment, (National Summer Learning Association, November 2009).
- <sup>39</sup> California Legislative Analyst’s Office, *The Budget Package: 2010-11 California Spending Plan* (November 5, 2010), [http://www.lao.ca.gov/reports/2010/bud/spend\\_plan/spend\\_plan\\_110510.aspx](http://www.lao.ca.gov/reports/2010/bud/spend_plan/spend_plan_110510.aspx).
- <sup>40</sup> California Legislative Analyst’s Office, *California’s Fiscal Outlook: Proposition 98 Briefing* (November 10, 2010), <http://www.lao.ca.gov>.
- <sup>41</sup> National Summer Learning Association and Cross and Joftus, LLC, *Investment*, 5.
- <sup>42</sup> National Summer Learning Association and Cross and Joftus, LLC, *Investments*, 4.

- 
- <sup>43</sup> Ron Fairchild and others, *It's Time for Summer: An Analysis of Recent Policy and Funding Opportunities*, (National Summer Learning Association, September 2009).
- <sup>44</sup> Sandra Naughton, *Funding to Support Summer Program: Lessons from the Field* (Bay Area Partnership for Children & Youth, November 2009), [http://partnerforchildren.org/storage/documents/downloads/summer/reference\\_summer/funding\\_to\\_support\\_summer\\_programs\\_PFCAY.pdf](http://partnerforchildren.org/storage/documents/downloads/summer/reference_summer/funding_to_support_summer_programs_PFCAY.pdf).
- <sup>45</sup> National Summer Learning Association and Cross and Jofus, LLC, *Investments*, 17.
- <sup>46</sup> Michael Griffith & Kyle Zinth, "Issues in Funding Summer School Programs." *Education Commission of the States State Notes: Finance – Summer School* (April 2009), <http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/80/24/8024.doc>.
- <sup>47</sup> National Summer Learning Association, *A New Vision*, 19-24.
- <sup>48</sup> The David and Lucile Packard Foundation, Children, Families, and Communities Program, *Summer Enrichment Strategy* (December 2008), C-7, [http://www.packard.org/assets/files/children%20families%20communities/Summer\\_Strategy\\_12.2008.pdf](http://www.packard.org/assets/files/children%20families%20communities/Summer_Strategy_12.2008.pdf).
- <sup>49</sup> National Summer Learning Association and Cross and Jofus, LLC, *Investments*, 4.
- <sup>50</sup> National Summer Learning Association, "Frequently Asked Questions," <http://www.summerlearning.org/?page=faq#FAQ8>; Geoffrey D. Borman and others, *Halting the Summer Achievement Slide: The Evaluation of the 2006 Kindergarten Summer Camp* (University of Wisconsin, Madison and Johns Hopkins University Center for Summer Learning, 2006), <http://www.summerlearning.org/resource/resmgr/publications/2006.haltingthesummerachieve.pdf>.
- <sup>51</sup> Public Agenda, *A Time to Learn and Grow*, 2.
- <sup>52</sup> The National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion summarizes this national research base by stating, "The academic success of America's youth is strongly linked with their health. Health-related factors such as hunger, physical and emotional abuse, and chronic illness can lead to poor school performance. Health-risk behaviors such as substance use, violence, and physical inactivity are consistently linked to academic failure and often affect students' school attendance, grades, test scores, and ability to pay attention in class." National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Division of Adolescent and School Health, "Student Health and Academic Achievement" (October 19, 2010), [http://www.cdc.gov/HealthyYouth/health\\_and\\_academics/](http://www.cdc.gov/HealthyYouth/health_and_academics/). Also, California-specific research conducted by WestEd that found a significant relationship between high school students academic success and a variety of nonacademic factors, such as substance use, exposure to violence, exercise, nutrition, school climate, and safety, suggests "that policies and practices that address the health and developmental needs of youth are critical components of any comprehensive strategy for improving academic performance." WestEd, "WestEd Research Links School Academic Performance and Progress to Student Health and Resilience" (October 2, 2003), [http://www.wested.org/cs/we/view/rs\\_press/22](http://www.wested.org/cs/we/view/rs_press/22).
- <sup>53</sup> National Summer Learning Association and Cross and Jofus, LLC, *Investments*, 5.
- <sup>54</sup> California Department of Education, "Local Child Care and Development Planning Councils," <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/re/lpc.asp>.