

Provided further that notwithstanding Part I of Title X of ESEA of 1965 or any other provision of law, the Secretary shall reserve at least 15% of the funds appropriated to carry out Part I of Title X of that Act for grants to community based organizations that have experience in providing before and after-school services and shall consider them on the same basis as a school or consortium described in Sec. 10904 of that Act. Provided further that with respect to all funds appropriated to carry out Section 10901 et seq in this Act, the Secretary shall give priority to any application for such a grant that is submitted jointly by an LEA (or a consortium of LEAs) and a community based organization that has experience before and after-school services, and that applications submitted to the Secretary shall contain evidence that the project contains elements that are designed to assist students to meet or exceed state and local standards in core academic subjects, as appropriate to the needs of participating children.

Provided
further.

TO: Kathy

FROM: Barbara

x 54875

From: Constance J. Bowers on 02/08/2000 05:11:48 PM

Record Type: Record

To: justice.lrm@usdoj.gov @ inet, lrm@os.dhhs.gov @ inet, vince.ancell@usda.gov @ inet

cc: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

Subject: LRM CJB140 - - EDUCATION Testimony on 21st Century Community Learning Centers program

Attached is ED (Assistant Secretary Mike Cohen) testimony for a Feb. 10th House Early Childhood Education Subcommittee hearing. Please provide any comments by 1:00 p.m., Wed., February 9th. Thanks.

[click here for testimony:](#)



- MCTESTIMON_4.doc

----- Forwarded by Constance J. Bowers/OMB/EOP on 02/08/2000 05:06 PM -----
LRM ID: CJB140

**EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
Washington, D.C. 20503-0001**

Tuesday, February 8, 2000

LEGISLATIVE REFERRAL MEMORANDUM

TO: Legislative Liaison Officer - See Distribution below

FROM: Robert J. Pellicci (for) Assistant Director for Legislative Reference
OMB CONTACT: Constance J. Bowers
PHONE: (202)395-3803 FAX: (202)395-6148

SUBJECT: **EDUCATION Testimony on 21st Century Community Learning Centers program**

DEADLINE: **1:00 p.m. Wednesday, February 9, 2000**

In accordance with OMB Circular A-19, OMB requests the views of your agency on the above subject before advising on its relationship to the program of the President. **Please advise us if this item will affect direct spending or receipts for purposes of the "Pay-As-You-Go" provisions of Title XIII of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990.**

COMMENTS:

DISTRIBUTION LIST

AGENCIES:

61-JUSTICE - Robert Raben - (202) 514-2141
52-HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES - Sondra S. Wallace - (202) 690-7760
7-AGRICULTURE - Marvin Shapiro - (202) 720-1516

EOP:

Barbara Chow
Eric P. Liu
Andy Rotherham
Bethany Little
Kendra L. Brooks
John B. Buxton
Brian V. Kennedy
Ann O'Leary
Larry Matlack
Wayne Upshaw
Naomi Barry
Mary I. Cassell
Daniel I. Werfel
Howard Dendurent
Jack A. Smalligan
Jennifer E. Brown
Rosalyn J. Rettman
Robert J. Pellicci
James J. Jukes

SUBJECT: EDUCATION Testimony on 21st Century Community Learning

If your response to this request for views is short (e.g., concur/no comment), we prefer that you respond by e-mail or by faxing us this response sheet. If the response is short and you prefer to call, please call the branch-wide line shown below (NOT the analyst's line) to leave a message with a legislative assistant.

(1) calling the analyst/attorney's direct line (you will be connected to voice mail if the analyst does not answer); or

Please include the LRM number shown above, and the subject shown below.

FROM: _____ (Date)
 _____ (Name)
 _____ (Agency)
 _____ (Telephone)

_____ Concur

_____ No Objection

_____ No Comment

_____ See proposed edits on pages _____

_____ Other: _____

_____ FAX RETURN of _____ pages, attached to this response sheet

Message Copied To: _____

Barbara Chow/OMB/EOP@EOP
Eric P. Liu/OPD/EOP@EOP
Andy Rotherham/OPD/EOP@EOP
Bethany Little
Kendra L. Brooks/OPD/EOP@EOP
John B. Buxton/OPD/EOP@EOP
Brian V. Kennedy/OPD/EOP@EOP
Ann O'Leary/OPD/EOP@EOP
Larry Matlack
Wayne Upshaw/OMB/EOP@EOP
Naomi Barry/OMB/EOP@EOP
Mary I. Cassell/OMB/EOP@EOP
Daniel I. Werfel/OMB/EOP@EOP
Howard Dendurent/OMB/EOP@EOP
Jack A. Smalligan/OMB/EOP@EOP
Jennifer E. Brown/OMB/EOP@EOP
Rosalyn J. Rettman/OMB/EOP@EOP
Robert J. Pellicci/OMB/EOP@EOP
James J. Jukes/OMB/EOP@EOP
Constance J. Bowers/OMB/EOP@EOP

TESTIMONY
OF
MICHAEL COHEN
ASSISTANT SECRETARY
FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION
BEFORE
FEBRUARY 10, 2000

Good morning, Chairman Castle, and members of the Committee. It is a pleasure to speak with you today about the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program. Children and youth need a safe and enriching environment to learn and grow in their afterschool hours. Community members need a neighborhood center where they can learn new skills or work with neighborhood kids. 21st Century Community Learning Centers are places where children can thrive -- where learning, enrichment, and recreational activities complement the regular school day and where there is life-long learning for all members of the community. The 21st Century Community Learning Centers program provides grants to inner-city and rural schools and school districts, working in close cooperation with community organizations and other educational and youth development agencies, to provide expanded learning opportunities and other activities outside of the regular school hours for children and adults in a safe and healthy environment.

Demand for the Program

According to the new report, *Safe and Smart II*, soon to be published by the Departments of Education and Justice, 69 percent of all married-couple families with children ages 6-17 have both parents working outside the home; in 71 percent of single-mother families and 85 percent of single-father families with children ages

6-17 the custodial parent is working. The gap between parents' work schedules and their children's school schedules can amount to 20 to 25 hours per week.

According to statistics provided by the GAO, the National Institute on Out-of-School Time, and other surveys, the lack of affordable, accessible afterschool opportunities for school-age children means that an estimated 5 to 7 million, and up to as many as 15 million, "latchkey children" on any given day go home to an empty house after school. Forty-four percent of third graders spend at least a portion of their out-of-school time unsupervised, and about 35 percent of twelve-year-olds are left by themselves regularly while their parents are at work. In some urban areas, the current supply of afterschool programs for school-age children will meet as little as 20 percent of the demand. (GAO, 1997). As a result, millions of parents – and their children – worry anew each day about where their children will go, and what they will be doing.

The Administration's proposal for expansion of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program will help keep more of our young people and community members safe and free from drug use, gang involvement, and violence. Studies by the FBI and youth-advocacy groups have found that the peak hours for juvenile crime and victimization are from 2 p.m. to 8 p.m. -- hours when youth are most often without supervision. Yet we know that students who spend 1-4 hours per

week in extracurricular activities are 50 percent less likely to use drugs and one-third less likely to become teen parents.

In nearly 600 communities across the nation, children now have an alternative to unsupervised, unstructured and uninspiring afternoons – 21st Century Community Learning Centers. In 2,100 schools, new Centers are beginning to provide safe havens for youth, supervised activities, and services focusing on learning enhancement as well as on preventing crime, violence, and substance abuse. With the help of national partners, 21st Century Community Learning Centers are designing and implementing learning, cultural and developmental activities that are interesting and engaging for young people and their families.

By locating 21st Century Community Learning Centers within schools, we ensure that students receive educational services directly linked to their classroom needs. Principals have long seen a need for extended learning programs; in a 1989 survey, 84 percent of school principals agreed that there is a need for before- and afterschool programs. In December 1999, the National Association of Elementary School Principals updated an earlier publication for their membership on quality standards for afterschool programs entitled, *After-School Programs & The K-8 Principal*, recognizing that “an extraordinary opportunity exists for principals to bring their schools and communities together to plan and support after-school

programs.”

Current Operation of the Program

The 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program awards grants to rural and inner-city public schools, or consortia of such schools, to enable them to plan, implement, or expand projects that benefit the educational, health, social services, cultural and recreational needs of the community. Grants awarded under this program are used to establish or expand centers, located within the public schools, which offer a broad array of high-quality services to the children and to the neighborhood at large.

Rural or inner-city public elementary, middle, or secondary schools, consortia of such schools, or local educational agencies (LEAs, usually school districts) applying on behalf of their schools are eligible to receive a grant under the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program. The program is designed to serve high-need rural and urban communities that have low-achieving students and high rates of juvenile crime, school violence, and student drug abuse, but lack the resources to establish afterschool centers. Grants must be administered by the public schools, and 21st Century Community Learning Centers must be located in public schools. However, in designing and delivering services, schools *must* collaborate with public and nonprofit agencies and organizations, local businesses,

educational entities (such as vocational and adult education programs, school-to-work programs, community colleges, and universities), recreational, cultural, and other community and human service entities.

The 21st Century program is a competitive grant program in which schools and districts apply directly to the Department of Education for funding. All applications are reviewed by panels of experts and practitioners, and the highest-rated proposals are selected for funding. These ratings are based on criteria which include the community's need for the program, the quality of the project design, the effective use of resources to support program activities, and a strong evaluation and management plan. The rigorous, competitive nature of this program requires local educators to collaborate with a range of partners to identify the needs of the children and community members, and design high-quality programs to address those needs.

To ensure that districts can prepare high-quality applications, the Department of Education has worked for the past three years with the C.S. Mott Foundation, the National Center for Community Education, the National Community Education Association, and other regional and local organizations to provide numerous technical assistance and support opportunities for communities interesting in applying. Workshop attendance over the past two years has been remarkable –

13,000 representatives from families, schools, community and civic organizations, local governments, foundations, faith-based organizations, and businesses came together to find out what quality, extended learning programming is, how to collaborate, and what are some models of best practice. For this year's competition, at least one workshop is being provided in every State.

The investment in assisting local communities to plan afterschool and community education programs seems to be paying off. Last year, over 2,000 local communities applied for a 21st Century afterschool grant. In total, applicants requested almost \$900 million in assistance, despite the fact that only \$93 million was available for that competition. The Department was able to make awards to only a small percentage of the applications we received; hundreds of applications that were recommended for funding by reviewers could not be funded. We believe that this year we again will receive hundreds of high-quality applications beyond those 350-450 that we will be able to fund.

Current Status of the Program

Now, in roughly 600 communities, the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program is increasing the supply of high-quality, afterschool programs operated as part of community schools. This relationship is significant because it provides programming in a cost-effective manner, primarily by funding programs

that use public schools and their existing resources and that build partnerships with community-based and youth organizations. Community-based organizations can bring to an afterschool program their experience in administering youth-development services. Community coalitions have the flexibility to decide, with the school, their priorities for extended learning -- before-school programs, afterschool learning opportunities, weekend activities, or summer enrichment programs.

I would like to briefly describe the progress we have made in the last two years to provide high-quality, school-based afterschool programs to communities.

Of the \$453 million that has been appropriated this fiscal year:

- \$200 million provides continuation funding to about 1,600 afterschool programs operating in 468 communities;
- \$65 million has been committed to fund 125 high-quality grant applications that we could not fund last fiscal year. These communities will be starting new programs in about 500 schools this spring and summer; and
- a competition is now underway that will provide \$185 million in grants to an additional 350-450 communities to begin programs next school year.

These 2,100 Centers are located in 49 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and will be serving about 400,000 children and about

200,000 adults. Just over half the participating schools serve rural communities, and the remainder are serving inner-cities.

By surveying our grantees and by analyzing the applications submitted by communities we are funding, we know that 21st Century Community Learning Centers are providing services to the communities with the greatest needs: in over three-quarters of the participating schools, more than 50 percent of the children qualify for free or reduced-price lunch. In addition, the percentage of children who are Limited-English proficient are higher in the schools we have funded than in those that applied but did not receive funding.

In working with our private partners to provide technical assistance to schools and communities across the country, we have stressed the importance of community partnerships and of providing an array of high-quality services. If we examine the grantees' partners, and the services they are providing, it appears that these messages have been well received.

Looking across all of our 1998 and 1999 grantees:

- 88 percent in 1998 and 97 percent in 1999 have partnerships with community-based organizations (including organizations such as the YMCA, Boys and Girls Clubs, and 4-H as well as faith-based organizations); 71 percent with

other government agencies; 63 percent with businesses; 47 percent with local law enforcement agencies; and 34 percent with libraries and museums.

We also have early data that describe the kinds of services that programs are offering to children and other community members. The services being offered are very consistent with those that parents and children say they need and want, including:

- reading (85 percent), math (80 percent), science (66 percent), and tutoring and homework assistance (83 percent);
- recreational activities (89 percent), music (56 percent), art (68 percent); and nutrition and health (74 percent); and
- services to adult members of the community (80 percent), including but not limited to intergenerational literacy activities, English as a foreign language (ESL) programs, GED and vocational programs, technology training and access, and parenting classes.

Based on progress reports and survey data from all of our current grantees, we have learned that:

- The typical afterschool program operates for just over 17 hours per week.
- About two-thirds of the programs are offering summer services, which average just over 30 hours per week.

- Over one-half the grantees are using USDA food and nutrition programs to provide snacks or meals, and about 71 percent provide transportation for project participants.

Communities that have been participating in the program since its first year (1998) also report that:

- They are making significant progress toward meeting the program's performance indicators. In fact, three of the indicators – providing core educational services, providing enrichment and support activities, and student enjoyment of the programs – have been met by *all* of the grantees.
- Schools with committed community and higher education partners -- as opposed to those with only tenuous relationships -- appear to have implemented more exciting and innovative programs.
- Programs with thorough, well-planned goals and objectives appear to be making progress in a timely manner.
- Most programs are reporting improvements -- sometimes dramatic -- in student attendance and a decrease in participants' disciplinary problems.

These overall findings about the program can be illustrated by a closer look at what selected programs have been able to accomplish, even in such a short time.

For instance:

- ***Programs are delivering a range of services.*** In Tucson, Arizona, Project *Sano y Salvo* (Safe and Sound) exemplifies the range of services that 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CLC) can provide. Approximately 1,000 students in three middle schools participate in this program, receiving academic tutoring, enrichment in math, science, reading, writing, and technology, homework assistance, and expanded library and computer lab access. The program operates afternoons, evenings, weekends, and during the summer. At the Wayne State Charter School CLC in Detroit, Michigan, services include a mentoring program, tutoring, a ‘Saturday Academy’ (academic help), technological awareness for parents, drug awareness, conflict resolution, fine/performing arts appreciation, self-esteem development, health studies, and counseling services.
- ***Programs are beginning to document student achievement gains.*** For instance, in Hillsdale, Michigan, 36 percent of the math students, 37 percent of the English students, and 44 percent of students overall showed increases in turning in homework and class participation grades. In Three Rivers, Michigan, there was, according to the Three Rivers Police Department, a decrease in youth crime rates in 1999. The Community Learning Center there serves 117 students with academic and 4-H clubs, drug awareness programs, and one-on-one

tutoring program. At the Brethren, Michigan, Middle School CLC, all are considered to be “at-risk” students, but behavioral referrals have dropped significantly. The CLC offers a “Walk About” program in which students perform service projects for local nursing homes, the fire department, elementary schools, strawberry farms, and a local migrant center, and local businesses have contributed funds and supplies.

Who Is Involved in the Effort

The overwhelming success of this program is due in part to the unique public-private partnerships between the Department of Education and the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation. With the Department of Education providing funding for direct services, the Mott Foundation has pledged \$83 million over six years to provide “quality activities.” These activities include: technical assistance and training for the multi-year expansion of 21st Century Community Learning Centers, evaluation of community schools and afterschool programs, building public support, and encouraging access and equity in programming. This relationship has spawned many other partnerships at the national, State, and local levels such as the Afterschool Alliance, a unique afterschool partnership between government, foundations, the entertainment industry, media, and business.

For all these reasons and more, the Administration is requesting \$1 billion in

its fiscal year 2001 budget before Congress for Community Learning Centers. At this level of funding, a new competition would yield approximately 6,000 new centers, bringing the total number of centers to approximately 10,000. If Congress supports expanding the program from its current \$453 million in 2000 to \$1 billion in 2001, it will provide extended-hour school services for approximately 2.5 million children per year. This investment in 21st Century Community Learning Centers program would help ensure that every child in every failing school has extended learning opportunities in the afterschool and summer hours. The Administration's FY2001 budget will maintain the commitment to serving all children, but will target much of the increase to help those children most in need of academic assistance as part of a comprehensive approach to help low-achieving students meet high academic standards.

Our reauthorization proposal builds upon the strengths of the current program including the use of school facilities to benefit the entire community and the requirement to establish strong collaborations with community organizations while offering some revisions designed to better target resources and promote the sustainability of programs.

During the remainder of the reauthorization process, the Administration intends to work with Congress to obtain enactment of a bill that makes changes

along the following lines: (1) converting the authority to a formula grant program once it reaches an appropriate funding level (except that the Department would continue to administer the direct grants made prior to the conversion); (2) requiring States to distribute funds within the State through competitive subgrants, giving priority to applications from LEAs that are in Title I “corrective action” or “school improvement” status; (3) encouraging sustainable programs by extending the grant period to 5 years while requiring grantees to pay 50 percent of the cost of any project; and (4) allowing a percentage of awards to be made directly to community-based organizations.

By providing safe and enriching high-quality afterschool programs in community school settings, like those available through the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program, we can all help prepare our children for the 21st Century. We look forward to working with the Committee as reauthorization of the program moves forward.



Andy Rotherham
01/15/2000 02:51:25 PM

Record Type: Record

To: John B. Buxton/OPD/EOP@EOP, Ann O'Leary/OPD/EOP@EOP

cc:

Subject: after-school

Don't pass this on, but this is Bruce's take on the whole mini-revolt from the Hill and the Department:

"I'm sick of these poll-driven Democrats who are afraid to take a stand. But in any event, they're wrong. Americans strongly support turning around failing schools, and they're not going to suddenly decide to bail on after-school just because it's helping some poor kids."

So, please bear that in mind when you put together the paper. Frankly, the Department shot themselves in the foot by going to the Hill, it stiffened Bruce. The "poor kids aren't on message" argument made us all sick.

Andy

John B. Buxton

01/14/2000 07:05:05 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Ann O'Leary/OPD/EOP

cc:

Subject: email

jbbuxton@hotmail.com

Universal After-School

SOTU MESSAGE: EVERY CHILD WHO IS ATTENDING A FAILING SCHOOL WILL HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO PARTICIPATE IN QUALITY AFTERSCHOOL OR SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAMS.

Question I: The Universal After-School initiative pledges to make after-school or summer school available to every child in a failing school. What is the definition of failing schools that we want to use: all schools in school improvement (approximately 8,000 schools) or all schools in corrective action (560-4800 schools)?

Option A:

All children in failing schools, defined as schools identified under Title I as in need of improvement, will have access to after school and/or summer school.

\$1 billion in FY 01--\$453 million in continuation grants, \$547 new money of \$547 million would be targeted to schools in Title I school improvement. A requirement of a 50% match would be added to the new money to help extend the program to more students in failing schools.

Competitive priority would ~~be first~~ given to the approximately 8,000 schools in Title I school improvement. A competitive priority would not guarantee that all 8,000 schools received after-school funding, but it would help to drive quality whereas an absolute priority would be an assurance for funding with no guarantee that there would be a quality standard.

If every school came in with a quality application and 80% of students from each school were to participate, then the \$547 million would allow us to fund quality programs in every Title I school in school improvement. If not, which is more likely, there would be additional money available. In any event, funding would also be available to ~~non-Title I failing schools~~ ^{all summer}, they just would not have the benefit of a competitive priority. This would allow us to continue to ~~make the claim~~ ^{make the claim} that the program is not targeted only to failing schools. ^{primarily going to Title I schools}

The issue of CBOs would be addressed in the context of ESEA reauthorization – a proposal of 10% of the funds for CBOs as fiscal agents. If the authorization language were opened up in appropriations, we would relitigate the CBO issue by seeking to increase the percentage set-aside with a focus on quality and accountability to help best serve the children in the worst schools.

Option B: To be provided by the ED (focus on schools in corrective action)

Question II: Should the 21st Century CLC program be run as a competitive or formula program?

Option A: *Competitive*

The program could continue to be run as a competitive grant program from the feds to the LEAs. This makes some sense from a quality control and targeting perspective in the first year of sending money to failing schools. It also leaves us with a bargaining chip for negotiations—i.e., Republicans would like to make this a formula program anyway and it would constitute a “concession” with which we could live.

Option B: *Formula*

Make the 21st Century program a formula grant program to the states with the states running a competitive grants process to the districts. States could then create a priority for targeting failing schools (either school improvement or corrective action schools). The Department believes that given that we know Congress wants to turn this into a formula program, we would be in a better bargaining position to go to the Hill with this as part of the plan.

Question III: What should our “out-years” policy be on the continuation grant money (\$453 in FY2000)?

Option A: *Focused on failing schools*

This option would roll over current continuation money into the “failing schools pot” as that money became available. The 21st Century program would have a competitive priority for schools in school improvement or corrective action. The total amount available would be straightlined at \$1 billion. Under a formula grant to states, the program would require states to create a competitive priority for schools in school improvement or corrective action.

Option B: *Continue dual focus on failing schools and all schools*

This option would continue to focus the existing FY2000 money on “all schools” and the new money for FY2001 on “failing schools.” The failing schools pot would have a competitive priority for school improvement or corrective action schools. Under a formula program, states would receive two pots of money—failing schools and all schools.

Option For Competitive Priority For Low-Performing Schools

This proposal would promote high-quality extended learning programs and provide a competitive priority to low-performing schools, such as schools identified for corrective action or as in need of improvement under Title I.

Under this proposal:

The Department would reserve funds for the continuation awards and would continue to administer those grants.

Any funds not needed for continuation awards or national activities would be allocated to States by formula. Each State would receive the same share of 21st Century Community Learning Centers funds as they received under Part A of Title I in the previous fiscal year.

States would award funds competitively to LEAs, giving a priority to schools identified for corrective action. States would provide a smaller priority for schools identified as in need of improvement. In making awards, States would use a rigorous peer review process.

Each State would have to provide the Department with a plan for its awards process. States would have to describe: (1) its process for making awards, including which schools would receive a priority and how the priority would be provided; and (2) the steps it would take to ensure that programs supported with program funds provide students with high-quality extended learning opportunities. To help ensure quality, the Department would subject State plans to a peer-review process.

LEAs would apply on behalf of schools. Applications would have to demonstrate that the LEA and school had developed a plan for providing high-quality extended learning programs. Applications on behalf of schools receiving a priority would have to identify an entity with expertise in extended learning programs to serve as a partner in providing services. This entity would be responsible for operating the extended learning program at the center. Possible partners would include community-based organizations, IHEs, or high-performing districts.

The Department's proposal would allow States to use up to 10 percent of their allocations for subgrants to CBOs. To receive an award, a CBO would have to show that the affected LEAs concurred with the project and agree to conduct the program in public elementary or secondary school buildings.

Helping Children in America's Poorest, Most Underserved Communities



HOW WE BENEFIT CHILDREN IN THE UNITED STATES

Save the Children brings nearly 70 years of working in the United States to our new national out-of-school-time initiative. That solid track record includes:

- Targeting and working in the poorest communities in the United States, especially those with poverty rates of 40 percent or more and per-capita incomes of \$5,000 or less.
- Designing local innovations that become large-scale programs, such as Appalachia's school lunch program during the Great Depression that has been adopted as a national model today.
- Providing long-term solutions in rural, remote areas, including creating new community-based organizations that focus on children's basic needs for child care, day care, and after-school care.

The Need

In 1996, Save the Children increased our commitment to America's poorest families by focusing on a national crisis – children who are at risk when they are unsupervised during their nonschool hours:

- Nearly 14 million – 1 in 5 – American children under age 18 are growing up below the poverty line.
- At least 5 million children ages 5-14 are unsupervised after school.
- Some 20 percent of violent juvenile crime happens on school days between 2 and 6 p.m.
- The high school dropout rate exceeds 12 percent for all youth ages 16 and older.

Our Response

In 1997, our out-of-school-time program was piloted in 3 rural communities, serving 2,000 5-10-18-rural youth who live in dire poverty throughout Appalachia, the Mississippi Delta region, and Native American reservations. By 1999 – just two years later – the program had become so effective and the need for it so great that today it reaches over 100,000 children in 100 of America's poorest rural and urban communities.

The Benefits

By increasing children's access to caring adult mentors, safe places, and constructive activities during their high-risk unsupervised hours, Save the Children is helping America's poorest girls and boys:

- Do better in school.
- Make responsible life choices.
- Give back to their families, communities, and country.

(continued)



The Value We Add

Save the Children's out-of-school-time initiative benefits both the children and adult leaders in our programs. For children, activities include academic, cultural, and recreational enrichment, youth leadership development and internships, volunteer opportunities, computer and job skills training. For adults, activities are designed to strengthen their capacity to work with at-risk youth and acquire the training, skills, and networking to eventually manage their programs on their own so benefits to children continue over the long term. The value we add to these programs is delivered by:

- Partnering at the local level with overburdened organizations to strengthen their capacity to better serve disadvantaged youth.
- Providing training and assistance to community-based organizations to improve the quality of their programs and teach them how to get the resources they need.
- Using our reputation for high-quality, cost-effective programs for children to identify and provide gifts in kind, such as books, computer software, and pivotal resources from grants we attract.
- Offering leadership training, internships, and volunteer opportunities to help children develop an effective voice in their own future and learn how to give back to their communities and country.
- Conducting program outcome evaluation to measure make sure that programs' results match their goals and that the most children receive the maximum benefits.
- Linking organizations on a local level to expand a network of services to more children.
- Connecting youth and adult leaders on a national level by providing leadership training and technical expertise, sharing best practices, and creating a national voice on the needs of U.S. youth.
- Networking organizations through conferences and the internet for an information exchange in order to increase the quality and impact of their programs.

December 1999

Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall first reserve not more than 5 % of the amount appropriated for this part for national activities that are consistent with part I of title X of the ESEA, and then shall reserve an amount necessary to make continuation grants to existing grantees under part I: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall award to States by formula in accordance with the relative amount each State received under part A of Title I of such act for the previous fiscal year the amount by which the remainder of the appropriation for part I, after the reservations described in the preceding clause, exceeds the amount appropriated for part I for the preceding fiscal year: *Provided further*, That States shall award such funds competitively to local educational agencies in cooperation with community-based organizations on behalf of schools in communities that lack resources to establish or expand after-school centers that provide extended learning opportunities: *Provided further*: That in making such awards, States shall give a priority to applicants that intend to serve schools identified for corrective action under section 1116(c)(5) of such act and that have plans for their extended learning programs which, include the operation of that program by an entity with expertise in providing extended learning opportunities: *Provided further*, That States may reserve up to 10% of their allocations for this part to make grants to community-based organizations that provide evidence that the affected local educational agencies concur with the project, to carry out projects consistent with this part. *Provided further*, That programs under this part should be conducted primarily in a public elementary or secondary education building.

NOTE: As the reauthorization process continues, two issues that need to be addressed are: (1) how to ensure that, once States are making awards, programs are operated by high-quality providers; and (2) how to accommodate States that are contributing the same, or greater, amount of resources to supporting community learning centers (e.g., more flexibility, additional funds).

New unreleased data from a nationally representative survey of registered voters conducted by Lake Snell Perry & Associates and the Tarrance Group from December 18-21, 1999 found:

- When it comes to school based programs versus community based programs, voters see several advantages for schools—they think schools will do a better job providing a quality program (51 percent better to 16 percent better for community based, 31 percent the same); they think schools will do a better job reaching the most children (61 percent to 17 percent, 20 percent the same); and they think schools will be convenient for parents (61 percent to 11 percent, 24 percent the same).
- While voters are slightly less willing to use their tax dollars for community organizations, they do not want schools and community organizations competing for resources. Seventy percent of voters say schools and community organizations should share resources to provide afterschool programs in order to reach more children, while 16 percent say they should compete for resources in order to provide more options.

After School Part I: Making After-School Universal for Students in Failing Schools

Summary

This proposal calls for the President to pledge that all children in failing school will have access to after-school. To accomplish this goal, the President's FY2001 budget will invest \$1 billion in the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program—more than double the amount secured in the FY2000 budget. While the program will maintain its commitment to serve all students, the increase in funding will be targeted to provide after or summer school programming for all children in Title I schools identified as “in need of improvement.” This initiative recognizes the critical need of failing schools to provide children with more time to reach challenging academic standards and to do so through innovative and extended curricular activities. The initiative will also increase (from none at present) to 30%, the amount of funding that can be granted to community-based organizations running after-school programs at public school sites.

Background

The 21st Century Community Learning Centers grant program provides grants to public schools for after school, summer school and other extended learning programs. In FY2001, the program will provide \$453 million in grants. Under the President's ESEA reauthorization proposal, the program intends to provide a competitive priority in the 2000-01 grant cycle for Title I schools identified as in need of corrective action. At present, 8,000 Title I schools have been identified for “school improvement,” with somewhere between 100 and 1,000 in corrective action. These schools and their students need support and extended time to reach high academic standards and performance goals.

“Universal After-School” Proposal

For FY2001, the 21st Century Community Learning Centers grant program would provide new grants to Title I schools identified as in need of improvement for after-school or summer school programs. Grants would be available to each of the 8,000 schools currently identified. In addition, the program would continue to fund its current commitments to after school and other extended learning programs at other schools. The program would be operated as a competitive grant program from the federal level for both the existing grants and new grants for failing schools.

Under the new grant competition, the 21st Century program would have the flexibility to provide up to 30% of funding to community-based organizations operating extended learning programs in partnership with public schools at the school sites. This change would recognize the effective role that CBOs can play in delivering services to school, spurring innovative practices, and creating greater community involvement in the local school throughout the school year.

Cost Estimates

At present, about 7% of all Title I students are served by after-school programs. If we assume those numbers apply to the 8,000 Title I schools in need of improvement, then roughly 1.86 million kids are not served by after-school programs. Assuming that, at most, 80% of those students will participate and that programs receive \$700 per student, the additional outlay in FY2001 to cover students in failing schools is \$521 million (with a 50% match). Together with current commitments of \$453 million, the total outlay for universal after-school in FY2001

Christine A. Stanek/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP@EOP
David E. Kalbaugh/WHO/EOP@EOP
Cheryl D. Mills/WHO/EOP@EOP
G. Timothy Saunders/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Douglas B. Sosnik/WHO/EOP@EOP
Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dorian V. Weaver/WHO/EOP@EOP
Catherine T. Kitchen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dag Vega/WHO/EOP@EOP
Barbara D. Woolley/WHO/EOP@EOP
Cynthia M. Jasso-Rotunno/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP@EOP
Andrew J. Mayock/WHO/EOP@EOP
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laura S. Marcus/WHO/EOP@EOP
Thomas D. Janenda/WHO/EOP@EOP
Brian D. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OPD/EOP@EOP
Kim B. Widdess/WHO/EOP@EOP
BARBUSCHAK_K@A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
INFOMGT@A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
JOHNSON_WC@A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
SUNTUM_M@A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
WOZNIAC_N@A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
GRAY_W@A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
NAPLAN_S@A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
WEINER_R@A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
GRIBBEN_J@A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP@EOP
HEMMIG_M@A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
Douglas J. Band/WHO/EOP@EOP
Edwin R. Thomas III/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sherman A. Williams/WHO/EOP@EOP
William W. McCathran/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Nicole R. Rabner/WHO/EOP@EOP
June Shih/WHO/EOP@EOP
Brooks E. Scoville/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sarah S. Knight/WHO/EOP@EOP
Tracy F. Sisser/WHO/EOP@EOP
Woyneab M. Wondwossen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Patrick E. Briggs/WHO/EOP@EOP
Debra S. Wood/WHO/EOP@EOP
Daniel W. Burkhardt/WHO/EOP@EOP
Maureen A. Hudson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lana Dickey/WHO/EOP@EOP
Carmen B. Fowler/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lynn G. Cutler/WHO/EOP@EOP
Walker F. Bass/WHO/EOP@EOP
Elliot J. Diringer/CEQ/EOP@EOP
Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa M. Murray/WHO/EOP@EOP
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP@EOP
Eli G. Attie/OVP@OVP

would be \$974 million.

Outstanding Issues

1. **Competitive v. Formula Grants from the Federal Level.** The administration of this program can either continue handing out grants to LEAs on a competitive basis from the federal level or could transition to providing formula grants to the states to be handed out competitively to LEAs.
2. **Absolute v. Competitive Priority for Failing Schools.** The competition for new grants could include an absolute priority for schools in need of improvement or could provide a heavy competitive priority for schools so designated. The former would ensure that programs are targeted to failing schools. The latter approach would allow others to compete. A third approach could ensure that all applying failing schools receive funds, but that remaining funds available could be granted to other, non-failing schools.
3. **Community-Based Organizations.** While the current ESEA reauthorization proposal suggests allowing 10% of grant funds to be provided to CBOs, DPC advocates moving that number to 30%, provided that programs were run at the school site in partnership with the public school. Such an increase recognizes the high quality programs being run by CBOs and the need for failing schools to involve new approaches to raising student performance.

wh-outbox-distr@pub.pub.whitehouse.gov @ inet
Pubs_Backup
backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu @ inet
Sean P. Maloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Marsha Scott/WHO/EOP@EOP
Linda Ricci/OMB/EOP@EOP
Mark D. Neschis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey A. Shesol/WHO/EOP@EOP
Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP@EOP
McGavock D. Reed/OMB/EOP@EOP
Janelle E. Erickson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Delia A. Cohen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Maureen T. Shea/WHO/EOP@EOP
RUNDLET_P@A1 @ CD @ VAXGTWY
William C. Haymes/OA/EOP@EOP
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Marty J. Hoffmann/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dorinda A. Salcido/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sarah E. Gegenheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Thomas M. Rosshirt/OVP@OVP
Minyon Moore/WHO/EOP@EOP
Charles M. Brain/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dario J. Gomez/WHO/EOP@EOP
Carolyn T. Wu/WHO/EOP@EOP
Deborah B. Mohile/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sondra L. Seba/WHO/EOP@EOP
Tania I. Lopez/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jena V. Roscoe/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jocelyn A. Bucaro/WHO/EOP@EOP
Kelley L. O'Dell/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan M. Young/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jackson T. Dunn/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robert B. Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Charles H. Cole/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer Ferguson/OMB/EOP@EOP
Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Carrie A. Street/WHO/EOP@EOP
Paul D. Glastris/WHO/EOP@EOP
Maria E. Soto/WHO/EOP@EOP
Alejandro G. Cabrera/OVP@OVP
Christopher K. Scully/WHO/EOP@EOP
Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP@EOP
Skye S. Philbrick/WHO/EOP@EOP
Toby C. Graff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Samuel O. Spencer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Matt Gobush/NSC/EOP@EOP
Evan Ryan/WHO/EOP@EOP
Marty J. Hoffmann/WHO/EOP@EOP
Matthew W. Pitcher/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey M. Smith/OSTP/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey L. Farrow/WHO/EOP@EOP
Linda L. Moore/WHO/EOP@EOP
Orson C. Porter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Bridget T. Leininger/WHO/EOP@EOP
Craig Hughes/WHO/EOP@EOP
Simeona F. Pasquil/WHO/EOP@EOP
Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean P. O'Shea/WHO/EOP@EOP

John B. Buxton

01/12/2000 09:51:33 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Mary I. Cassell/OMB/EOP@EOP

cc: ann o'leary/opd/eop@eop, andy rotherham/opd/eop@eop, wayne upshaw/omb/eop@eop, naomi barry/omb/eop@eop

bcc:

Subject: Re: Outyear policy for After-school

Mary, thanks for pulling the numbers together on after-school. I want to suggest that we don't fold the existing \$453 million for after-school into a failing schools fund for after and summer school, but that we keep two separate programs: 1) the current style of 21st Century grants and 2) specifically for failing schools.

I would see us putting a trigger on the whole after-school pot at \$1 billion. When we get to that number, we would change the current 21st Century program into a formula grant to states for them to distribute competitively. I think this would be wise administratively and politically. As for the failing schools program, I think we should use the 8000 schools number and ramp the budget numbers up over 5 years to include the additional outlays for summer school over time. I don't think shooting up to a billion and then straightlining it will make sense to appropriators. I think they would be likely to see that and find a way to just step it up over time--but the reality is that we need the billion now to serve all failing schools with after-school.

Mary I. Cassell



Mary I. Cassell

01/11/2000 11:38:48 AM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc:

Subject: Outyear policy for After-school

Barbara had asked that we come up with a funding stream to ensure that we can support universal after-school and summer school in all failing schools by 2005. However, I believe that -- because the grants are for three years, or, under our reauthorization proposal, up to five years -- we don't need funds above the \$1 billion level to reach universal after-school and summer school by 2005. I would propose that we assume that as continuation grants come to an end, we apply those funds to failing schools. Therefore, by 2003 (if grants are for three years) or by 2005 (if grants are for five years), we would have more than enough funds to pay for universal after- and summer school for all failing schools -- even assuming the more recent numbers that there are about 8,000 schools in school improvement (you need

Two options
① 2002-03

1,000

01 750

05-06, 07 500

Matt Hamel - DASH

Ch F-River Pgs

Few more

Come Delonzo

Summary Dec 1, 2000

② 500 for > phase 2 volume 2000

10-07

250-0000
25-00
12-15
375 + 1,250
20

\$900 million to do that -- on top of continuation grants). **I propose that we simply straightline 21st Century at \$1 billion through FY 2005.** Let me know what you think as soon as possible so we can finalize the outyear policy. Thanks!

Here are some numbers explaining this position (I use the same assumptions as JB used in his paper, except that I assume 8,000 schools in school improvement):

Assumptions:

- 8,000 schools in school improvement
- 250 students per school, for a total of 2 million students
- 7% of those students are already being served, the remaining 1.86 million need services
- 80% would participate, for a total of a little under 1.5 million students (actually 1.488

million)

- \$350 per student for after-school (assuming 50% match)
- additional \$250 per student for summer school (assuming 50% match)
- \$600 per student for after school and summer school

\$600 x 1.5 million students = **\$900 million** needed to fund universal after-school and summer school for 8,000 failing schools (above any funds need for continuation grants).

1998: \$40 million in new grants, continued through 2000 (therefore these funds would be available in 2001 for new grants)

1999: \$160 million in new grants (of the \$200 million total appropriation), continued through 2001 (the \$160 M would be available in 2002 for new grants)

2000: \$250 million in new grants (of the \$453 total appropriation), continued through 2002 (the \$250 million would be available in 2003 for new grants)

If our ESEA proposal passes, and grants can be for up to five years, then add two years to when funds used for continuations are available for failing schools.

So, by either 2003 or 2005, we would have the full \$1 billion to provide universal after-school and summer school to all failing schools, \$100 million more than the estimated \$900 million needed.

Message Sent To:

Ann O'Leary/OPD/EOP@EOP
John B. Buxton/OPD/EOP@EOP
Andy Rotherham/OPD/EOP@EOP
Wayne Upshaw/OMB/EOP@EOP
Naomi Barry/OMB/EOP@EOP

After School Part I: Making After-School Universal for Students in Failing Schools

Summary

This proposal calls for the President to pledge that all children in failing school will have access to after-school and summer school. This can be accomplished by targeting the 21st Century Community Learning Centers grants to all Title I schools that have been identified as "in need of improvement." This recognizes the critical need of failing schools to provide children with more time to reach challenging academic standards and to do so through innovative and extended curricular activities. This initiative would be part of our Turning Around Failing Schools package and would undermine criticism that we aren't doing enough for students in these schools. While Republicans will likely criticize it as a "Washington knows best" initiative, it fits well in our education budget themes of "accountability and investment" and "strategic investments." Together with current commitments to the 21st century grantees, the estimate for the cost of such a pledge in FY2001 is \$1.27 billion (\$913 million for only after-school).

Background

At present, 7,000 Title I schools have been identified for "school improvement." These schools and their students need support to reach high academic standards and performance goals. Research shows that over the summer disadvantaged students often lose the gains they have made during the school year in academic skills and knowledge. In addition, numerous studies have found that after-school programs help increase achievement in areas such as math and reading.

The 21st Century Community Learning Centers grant program provides grants to public schools for after school, summer school and other extended learning programs. In FY2001, the program will provide \$453 million in grants. Under the ESEA reauthorization proposal, the program intends to provide a competitive priority in the 2000-01 grant cycle for Title I schools identified as in need of corrective action.

DPC Proposal and Cost Estimates

The redesigned 21st Century Community Learning Centers grant program would provide grants to all Title I schools identified as in need of improvement for both after-school and summer school programs. It would also continue to fund its current commitments to after school and other extended learning programs at other schools.

At present, about 7% of all Title I students are served by after-school programs. If we assume those numbers apply to Title I schools in need of improvement, then roughly 1.6 million kids are not served by after-school programs. Assuming that, at most, 80% of those students will participate and that programs receive \$700 per student, the additional outlay in FY2001 to cover students in failing schools is \$460 million (with a 50% match). Together with current commitments of \$453 million, the total outlay for universal after-school in FY2001 would be \$913 million.

To extend the investment to "universal summer school" would increase the cost per student by \$350 - \$700, according to the Department of Education. Assuming that 80% of kids in high-poverty schools participate in summer school at an additional cost to the government (given a 50% match) of \$250 per student, the additional outlay for summer school is \$352 million.

Together with current commitments (\$453) and after-school (\$460), the total package would run \$1.27 billion dollars.



Mary I. Cassell

01/11/2000 11:38:48 AM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc:

Subject: Outyear policy for After-school

Barbara had asked that we come up with a funding stream to ensure that we can support universal after-school and summer school in all failing schools by 2005. However, I believe that -- because the grants are for three years, or, under our reauthorization proposal, up to five years -- we don't need funds above the \$1 billion level to reach universal after-school and summer school by 2005. I would propose that we assume that as continuation grants come to an end, we apply those funds to failing schools. Therefore, by 2003 (if grants are for three years) or by 2005 (if grants are for five years), we would have more than enough funds to pay for universal after- and summer school for all failing schools -- even assuming the more recent numbers that there are about 8,000 schools in school improvement (you need \$900 million to do that -- on top of continuation grants). **I propose that we simply straightline 21st Century at \$1 billion through FY 2005.** Let me know what you think as soon as possible so we can finalize the outyear policy. Thanks!

Here are some numbers explaining this position (I use the same assumptions as JB used in his paper, except that I assume 8,000 schools in school improvement):

Assumptions:

- 8,000 schools in school improvement
- 250 students per school, for a total of 2 million students
- 7% of those students are already being served, the remaining 1.86 million need services
- 80% would participate, for a total of a little under 1.5 million students (actually 1.488 million)
- \$350 per student for after-school (assuming 50% match)
- additional \$250 per student for summer school (assuming 50% match)
- \$600 per student for after school and summer school

$\$600 \times 1.5 \text{ million students} = \text{\$900 million}$ needed to fund universal after-school and summer school for 8,000 failing schools (above any funds need for continuation grants).

1998: \$40 million in new grants, continued through 2000 (therefore these funds would be available in 2001 for new grants)

1999: \$160 million in new grants (of the \$200 million total appropriation), continued through 2001 (the \$160 M would be available in 2002 for new grants)

2000: \$250 million in new grants (of the \$453 total appropriation), continued through 2002 (the \$250 million would be available in 2003 for new grants)

If our ESEA proposal passes, and grants can be for up to five years, then add two years to when funds used for continuations are available for failing schools.

So, by either 2003 or 2005, we would have the full \$1 billion to provide universal after-school and summer school to all failing schools, \$100 million more than the estimated \$900 million needed.

Message Sent To:

Ann O'Leary/OPD/EOP@EOP
John B. Buxton/OPD/EOP@EOP
Andy Rotherham/OPD/EOP@EOP
Wayne Upshaw/OMB/EOP@EOP
Naomi Barry/OMB/EOP@EOP



Mary I. Cassell

01/11/2000 12:17:49 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Ann O'Leary/OPD/EOP@EOP

cc:

Subject: Question about after-school appropriations language

Have you heard about a meeting between Bruce and Frank Hollaman (sp?) last night, in which they decided to put a team together to work on After-school (or perhaps fixing failing schools in general)? Let me know if you know what is going on with that.

Meanwhile, I've recently been working with ED on some proposals for appropriations language. One idea is to provide all new money to the States based on Title I shares for them to award to schools in school improvement, or the lowest achieving schools if they don't have enough schools in school improvement (there's a bit of a distribution problem because some States have identified a lot of schools for school improvement, and some not so many). The \$453 M for continuation grants would still be administered from the Federal level. I think it's a good approach because it gets around the issue of whether we need to have a funding trigger, above which the program would be administered by the States and makes for a clean, clear policy. At \$1 billion, ED can't possibly administer a competitive grant program. What do you think about this option?

current vision
prepare to shift, use of cash to maintain & expand operations - ensure
all shares to existing shareholders & funds - not at hand
also demands - operations - special role for CEOs is
get common goals & vision
system & relationships

21st C - 9570 pages

$\frac{2}{3}$ Small units?

200 year - long term

Mary C.

27th

301-949-5349

disparate priority

↳ institutional priority

(disparate)

action to displace

↳ financial institution

change nature & pool of individuals

<discrete & distinctive>

→ financial power & social power

→ 3800-4800

2560, 900

CMS:

① Wendy Jones

from 21st

2000

- for years
overseas

all the do, papers, etc

① Qm

A Schuler is small unit
moving in smaller units

the T&I needs
shift at

② Qm

B common

5 types of
to expand power

③ option C T&I / 21st

Call 60

Calendar > minimum, appropriate

Helping Children in America's Poorest, Most Underserved Communities



WHAT WE HAVE ACCOMPLISHED FOR CHILDREN IN THE UNITED STATES

In early 1999, in partnership with Aguirre International, Inc., a leading national youth program evaluation organization, Save the Children conducted an assessment of the Web of Support's impact in the lives of children and youth following its first full year of operations. Encouraging, often dramatic, and across-the-board results such as the following have strengthened Save the Children's resolve to *continue* offering a program that helps children (1) *do better in school*, (2) *make responsible life choices*, and (3) *give back to their families, communities, and country*:

- In Bridgeport's South End in Connecticut, 46 percent of all youth in Save the Children's *Get Busy* program increased at least one full letter grade level in 1998, and 87 percent of all children demonstrated academic improvement.
- In San Francisco, California, 63 percent of the participating middle school students at Save the Children's *Sunset Youth Campaign* showed an increase in grades of one-half letter grade or higher on their report cards.
- In Marks, Mississippi, homework assistance and skill development were offered to children and youth three days each week in schools at which a high percentage of students are held back. Of those involved, 89 percent passed to the next grade level.
- In Carr Creek, Kentucky, 92 percent of the children who participate in Save the Children's *After-School Recreational Program* measurably improved such social skills as conflict resolution, sensitivity to other people's feelings, sharing, taking turns, and listening to directions.
- At the *Quitman County Development Organization*, also in Marks, Mississippi, Save the Children's *Youth Credit Union* focused on the children's future by teaching applied math and organizational skills, with youths' learning about the importance of savings, the way finances work, methods for balancing checkbooks, and the principles of basic accounting.
- At Save the Children's *Plne Manor Child Save Program* in Ft. Myers, Florida, 81 percent increased their reading activities and/or interest in education. This Web of Support partner also improved its ability to offer youth safe places during nonschool hours by adding an alarm system, exit and evacuation signs, food safety training, and a communication system with the local sheriff's department.
- In Madison, Arkansas, the percentage of children and youth in the Save the Children *Homework Help Program* who completed 81 to 100 percent of their homework assignments more than doubled. The number of children and youth who performed at or above the norm in academic subjects also increased from 76 percent to 96 percent.
- Of our seven programs in inner cities, 100 percent of our community partners stated an increase in volunteers and materials, and 88 percent reported an increase in technical assistance and/or funding. Of our 42 rural programs, 82 percent of our partners saw an increase in volunteers, 86 percent an increase in technical assistance, and 89 percent an increase in materials.

September 1999

Universal Access to 21st Century After-School Programs

Option A: Provide universal access to after-school and/or summer school for any student that attends a low-performing school.

Background:

Failing schools: Under Title I, approximately 7,000 schools have been identified for "school improvement." (Note: There are approximately 45,000 Title I schools overall, 16% have been identified under the Title I accountability system.) Of these 7,000 schools, 900 schools have been in school improvement for more than two years and 560 for more than three years for a total of 1,460 that are now eligible for "corrective action."

While we do not have an exact number of schools that have been identified under other accountability systems (state or local), we do know that most schools being identified are Title I schools and that States widely vary in how they identify schools in need of improvement. In Texas, for example, less than 1% of their schools have been identified as "low-performing" or "in need of improvement" while in both New Mexico and Washington, DC more than 80% of their schools have been identified as "low performing."

Of these schools, we know that based on a sample of schools that in school improvement, approximately 80% already run some type of extended learning program (before, after, or summer school). And, for schools that have been in school improvement for more than 2 years, 62% reported having some type of extended learning program. We do not have information on the quality of these programs, however.

*Widely
improvement*

21st C grantees: Of the current 21st Century grantees, we know that 75% of the grantees are in schools with 50% or more students in poverty, but that only 45% of the grantees are Title I schools. Of these Title I grantees, we do not, however, have an indication of the number of these grantees that have been identified under Title I as "in need of improvement."

We also know that in terms of a break-down of extended learning time services, 95% of the grantees are providing after-school programs, 12% before school programs, and 76% summer school programs.

Assumptions and Cost Estimates:

Scenario 1: Target 21st Century grants to all schools identified in Title I school improvement that do not currently have extended learning opportunities for their students.

Assumption 1:

Targeting those schools identified under Title I as "school improvement" schools: 7,000 schools.

The FY 1992 HHS appropriation (Pub. Law 102-170) moved the availability of CCDBG funds to the last day of the fiscal year, and the CCDBG funds continued to be paid on the last day of the fiscal year in subsequent years, until the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1997 (Pub. Law 104-208) again changed the date of the availability of these funds. The 1997 appropriation provides that, starting with the FY 1998 Discretionary Funds, Discretionary Funds will be made available on the first day of each fiscal year. The result of this change is that there now will be two full years to obligate Discretionary Funds. Further, the regulations at the former Sec. 98.60(h) would have been inappropriate to the new Mandatory and Matching Funds provided under PRWORA. The law, at section 418 of the Social Security Act, requires redistribution of the Matching Funds to other States, if the State to which they were granted does not use them in the fiscal year in which they are granted. Also, the Secretary must determine the amount of Matching Funds available for redistribution by the end of the first quarter of the fiscal year following the

[[Page 39969]]

year the grant was awarded. The law links use of Matching Funds to use of the Mandatory Funds--and, as provided in the regulations at Sec. 98.60, Mandatory Funds must be obligated in the year in which they are granted if a State requests Matching Funds. Unlike the Discretionary and Mandatory Funds, the Matching Funds are not 100 percent Federal funds, and there seems to be a greater possibility that some of these funds would be returned for redistribution. Thus, the former returned funds regulations would not have been workable for these funds, and were changed.

Comment: Although not addressed in the proposed regulations, many commenters objected to our policy of allocating Discretionary and Mandatory Funds on a quarterly basis, rather than as a single grant at the beginning of the fiscal year. They felt that such a policy should

60% already have extended learning programs, 40 in need of quality extended learning program: 2800 schools.

Program will serve between 150-500 students per year and will cost \$700/student making the range between \$105,000 and \$350,000 per grant.

Total Cost/year: \$294 - 980 million per year

Cost with Match (assume 50% local match): \$147-490 million

* FY 01 high-end budget request: \$453 million for continuation grants, \$490 million for "universal access" to students in low performing schools = \$943 million

Assumption 2:

Assume 80% already have extended learning programs, 20% in need of quality extended learning programs: 1400 schools

Program will serve between 150-500 students per year and will cost \$700/student making the range between \$105,000 and \$350,000 per grant.

Total Cost/year: \$147-490 million per year

Cost with Match (assume 50% local match): \$74-245 million

FY 01 budget request: \$453 million for continuation grants, \$245 million for "universal access" to students in low performing schools = \$698 million

Scenario 2: Provide 21st Century grants to all Title I schools in Title I corrective action.

* Assume that all schools in corrective action, need additional assistance to provide or improve their extended learning programs: 1400 schools.

Same cost assumptions as above for a total request of \$700 million.

Scenario 3: Provide 21st Century grants to any Title I school that has been identified under Title I, State, or local accountability system as "low-performing" or in "need of improvement."

Assume that of the 45,000 Title I schools, 25 percent of the schools have been identified under either Title I, State, or local accountability systems as "low-performing" or "in need of improvement." Total schools: 11,250

Assume 60% already have extended learning and 40% are in need: 4,500 schools

Same cost assumptions as above with match: \$236-790 million

7/11/15
250
45,000 Title I schools

be applicable to matching grant programs only, not to entitlements to the States, such as the Discretionary and Mandatory Funds.

Response: The Office of Management and Budget has determined that each of the individual CCDF funds are to be apportioned to the States quarterly. We note that other non-matching grant programs, such as title XX, are also subject to such quarterly apportionments.

Comment: Some commenters suggested that we allow unlimited obligation and expenditure periods for Tribal Mandatory funds, citing the unlimited periods for State Mandatory funds (if the State does not use Matching funds).

Response: We have kept the proposed obligation and liquidation time frames for Tribal Mandatory funds. Although there is a statutory exception for State Mandatory funds to the normal one-year obligation period (unless the State uses Matching funds), Tribal Mandatory funds are not analogous to State Mandatory funds and have no such statutory exception. Furthermore, in the past, a significant number of Tribes have returned funds to the Federal Treasury. Therefore, we believe that the required obligation/liquidation time frames are reasonable and necessary to ensure that funds are used in a timely manner.

Comment: Several commenters wanted us to revise Sec. 98.60(d)(5)(ii) to allow Interagency agreements and or contracts between government entities at the same level to constitute obligations.

Response: We had not proposed any change to this regulation which has been in effect since 1992. This issue is addressed in the preamble to the 1992 regulations at 57 FR 34395 and that discussion reflects our continued position.

As a practical matter, funds that are transferred to another part of State government, either at the same level, or at a lower level, simply do not reflect the same real fiscal commitment of funds to the CCDF program as occurs when funds are transferred to a third party.

Comment: One commenter observed that Sec. 98.60(d)(6)--regarding obligating funds using a certificate--is problematic because the amount

FY 01 Budget Request: \$453 for continuation + \$790 = \$1.25 Billion

Assume 80% already have extended learning and 20% are in need: 2,250 schools

Same cost assumptions as above with match: \$118-395 million

FY 01 Budget Request: \$453 for continuation + \$395 = \$848 million

Option B: Provide universal access to quality after-school programs for all students in need.

Background: According to a 1993 National Study of Before and After-School Programs, 15 million children are "latch-key" kids in need of after-school services

The goal of this option is to keep the after-school program as a program that serves both the needs of educationally and economically disadvantaged students, as well as a program that helps fill a gap in child-care and can provide enrichment and extracurricular activities for all children.

In FY 00, the 21st Century program expects to support 3,960 21st Century Community Learning Centers and serve 861,000 children.

[NOTE: 95% of grantees in FY99 report that they are serving "at-risk" students]

FY 01 Request: Assuming a 50% match and \$1 billion, the 21st Century Community Learning Centers could support 10,458 centers, 2.8 million children

Priority could be first to schools in Title I corrective action then to Title I school improvement schools and, finally, to any school identified under a state or local accountability system as low-performing.

Five-Ten year projections:

FY '01	\$1 billion	2.8 million children
FY '02	\$1.5 billion	4.2 million
FY '03	\$2 billion	5.6 million
FY '04	\$2.5 billion	7 million
FY '05	\$3 billion	8.4 million

of funds that may be actually used by the family cannot be known with certainty as the family may use fewer hours of care than was indicated on the certificate. The commenter wanted to eliminate the requirement to include the amount of funds on the certificate.

Response: This provision is unchanged from the 1992 final rule and this situation was addressed in the preamble at 57 FR 34395. Without an amount it is unclear how the commenter would determine how much was obligated.

Stating an amount on the certificate fulfills the obligation requirement, yet, as explained in the 1992 preamble, the Lead Agency can nevertheless make adjustments to reflect the actual use of funds, reobligating if within the obligation period, to ensure the liquidation of funds within the prescribed period.

Comment: One commenter, understanding the necessity to recover fraudulently received payments, suggested that Sec. 98.60(i) reflect a minimum threshold under which recovery would not be necessary. For example, if the administrative expense of recovery exceeded the amount fraudulently received.

Response: As we stated in the 1992 preamble at 57 FR 34397, any payments not made in accordance with the Act, regulation or approved State Plan may not be charged to the program and will be disallowed pursuant to Sec. 98.66. Should a State choose not to pursue fraudulent payments because to do so may not be cost-effective, the amount of that fraudulent payment may not be charged to the CCDF.

Allotments From the Discretionary Fund (Section 98.61)

The allotment formulas for the Discretionary Fund are unchanged from the original formulas for the CCDBG and are discussed in the 1992 preamble at 57 FR 34397.

In response to an amendment to section 658P(14) of the CCDBG Act, we have added a provision allowing for Discretionary Fund grants to a Native Hawaiian Organization and to a private nonprofit organization established for the purpose of serving Indian or Native Hawaiian youth.

Option: Provide universal access to after-school AND/OR? summer school for any student that is in a failing school.

Tagline: "We are going to ensure that any [elementary and/or middle school student] who is attends a failing school has the opportunity to participate in an afterschool program and/or summer school." [CRITICISM: WHY NOT GIVE THE CHILD THE OPPORTUNITY TO TRANSFER OUT AND ALSO ATTEND AFTERSCHOOL AND SUMMER SCHOOL TO CATCH UP??]

Background:

Failing schools: Under Title I, approximately 7,000 schools have been identified for "school improvement." (Note - there are approximately ?? Title I schools)

[CURRENT BREAKDOWN OF SCHOOLS IN IMPROVEMENT 1, 2, OR 3 YEARS - HOW MANY DO WE EXPECT IN CORRECTIVE ACTION?]

Of these schools, we know that based on a sample of schools that have been in school improvement for more than 2 years, 62% have a before, after or summer school program and 52% have at least an afterschool program.)

[PERCENTAGE OF (TITLE I) SCHOOLS NATIONWIDE IDENTIFIED UNDER ANY ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM AS "FAILING"??]

21st C grantees: Of the current 21st Century grantees, we know that 75% of the grantees are in schools with 50% or more students in poverty. We do not, however, have an indication of the number of these grantees that have been identified as "in need of improvement."

How many children expected to serve with \$453 million? (4.4. million in earmarks) -- does not include match

3,960 21st Century Centers - 861,000 children

Assuming 50% match and \$1 billion - how many children served?

10,458 centers, 2.8 million children

Summer school
2 78%

1.5 million

Set aside for

1250000
1190
11250000
12500000
125000000
148,750,000

150 - 400 million

Can-
Wendell
Kramer in
Texas & TMC
TX - 170
AM & KOL - 100

Val - update?
Pamela "this is his
school bus"
- D. A. W. 570

7,000
96-97 Title I part. num
1620
45,344

800
1190

45,000

↑

77% of schools
less than 40% - see small 75% match
11%

What is the breakdown of elementary and secondary students served?

35% elementary school programs	(560 - 3660)
50% middle school	(801 - 5229)
5% high school	(80 - 523)
10% multi-age?	

Note - 95% of grantees in FY99 report that they are serving "at-risk" students

Do we know the percentage of current grantees in school improvement?

School improvement - 7,000 in Title I, states/locals -- # of kids affected

Budget justification says only 2.6% of kids in need receive after-school help. How defined? Not by poverty.

7000

Assume 83% already have program
17% in need = 1190

Assume 62% are in plan
38% in need
2660
Assume 150-500 ind/yr

Assume serving 150-500 ind/yr

~~1000~~ \$200 ~~105,000~~ - 250,000 per program →
< 125 → 200

125 million - 400 million per year 200 million → 900 million

Assume 45,000 Title I sites

25% are "very" at risk

11,250
Assume 80%
2,250

234 million - 787 million

Assume 40%
4,500

472 million - 1.58 Billion

Options for After School Programs for Schools in Corrective Action

April 30, 1999

Data:

- In 1997-98, there were approximately 900 Title I schools in school improvement for more than 2 years, and 560 in school improvement for more than 3 years, identified from a nationally representative sample.
- More than half of the 900 schools already operated extended day programs, most of which include after school programs. This is about the same as for all Title I schools, but lower than for schools in school improvement for 1 to 2 years. [Based on a sample of schools, 62% of those in school improvement for more than 2 years had a before, after, or summer school program, and 52% had at least an afterschool program. Standard error ± 14 .]
- 74% of 21st Century grant winners in the latest competition have more than half their students eligible for free and reduced-price lunch, compared to an estimated 60% for the unfunded applications. 37% of the grant winners had more than 75% of their students eligible for the lunch programs.

Overview of Options:

Option 1: Give the Secretary authority to reserve a portion of 21st Century funds for school districts to apply on behalf of schools in corrective action.

Option 2: Require school districts with schools in corrective action to use a portion of their Title I funds to provide extended-day programs at these schools. The Department and the Mott Foundation could also provide additional technical assistance to help these schools design and implement high-quality programs.

Option 3 (does not require legislation): Give schools in corrective action extra points for 21st Century funding. This can be done without changing the statute. Mott could also do extra outreach to these schools to ensure they know of the technical assistance that Mott is providing all 21st Century applicants and grantees. This option could be done in addition to Option 2.

Option 1: Give the Secretary authority to reserve a portion of 21st Century funds for school districts to apply on behalf of schools in corrective action.

Pro:

- Provides additional supports from the district for kids at the most troubled schools.

Con:

- Would require reserving between \$100-\$300 million per year in funding to adequately support afterschool programs at schools in corrective action – perhaps all of next year's increase. [The lower estimate is based on \$125,000 per school at 900 schools, and the higher estimate assumes 500 kids at the 900 schools and \$700 per kid for services.]

105 - 350,000

- Could bring the voucher debate to the 21st Century program for the first time by leading to TAG proposals, similar to those we encountered with America Reads.
- Because some schools in corrective action may not have the physical space for an afterschool program, this option would likely require changing the 21st Century law to allow providing services off campus – further fueling the voucher debate.
- Will be opposed by the supporters of 21st Century – Foundations and Senator Jeffords.

Option 2: Require school districts with schools in corrective action to use a portion of their Title I funds to provide extended-day programs at these schools. The Department and the Mott Foundation could also provide additional technical assistance to help these schools design and implement high-quality programs.

Pro:

- Improves our current Title I proposal by requiring LEAs to use Title I for extended day programs in schools identified for corrective action, sending the message that something must be done in these schools immediately to help the children while more comprehensive corrective actions are being implemented. (Our current proposal requires schoolwides to provide interventions, *such as* extended day programs, for students needing extra help. 100% of schools in school improvement for 3 years or more are eligible for schoolwides, and all students at these schools are in need of extra help.)
- More than half of the 900 schools already have extended day programs, most of which include after school programs. This is about the same as for all Title I schools, but lower than for schools in school improvement for 1 to 2 years. *Thus, it would not be asking these schools to do something extraordinary. Most of them are already doing it with their Title I money and those who successfully get out of school improvement within 2 years rely heavily on afterschool programs to do it.*
- These school districts can also compete for 21st Century funding. 74% of 21st Century grant winners in the latest competition have more than half their students eligible for free and reduced-price lunch, compared to an estimated 60% for the unfunded applications. 37% of the grant winners had more than 75% of their students eligible for the lunch programs.

Con:

- Requires school districts to create extended learning programs without giving them any additional funding.
- May lead to afterschool programs that are exclusively academic.

Option 3 (does not require legislation): Give schools in corrective action extra points for 21st Century funding. This can be done without changing the statute. Mott could also do extra outreach to these schools to ensure they know of the technical assistance that Mott is providing all 21st Century applicants and grantees. This option could be done in addition to Option 2.

Pro:

- Gives schools in corrective action a leg up in the 21st Century competition without guaranteeing them funding. High-poverty schools are already being funded in 21st Century.
- Our 21st Century ESEA proposal already would require all new grantees to come up with a match, half of which could be other federal funds, such as Title I.
- Less likely to undermine support for the program. Not legislative.
- More likely to lead schools in corrective action developing high-quality afterschool programs than if they were simply required to use their Title I funds.

Con:

- Does this provide schools in school improvement for 1-2 years with an incentive not to create an afterschool program using their Title I funds? Probably not, because they could use the 21st Century program to serve more students and enhance the programming.
- The Hill may still object to our plan to use points to steer funds to schools in corrective action.

Universal Access to 21st Century After-School Programs

Option A: Provide universal access to after-school and/or summer school for any student that attends a low-performing school.

Background:

Failing schools: Under Title I, approximately 7,000 schools have been identified for “school improvement.” (Note: There are approximately 45,000 Title I schools overall, 16% have been identified under the Title I accountability system.) Of these 7,000 schools, 900 schools have been in school improvement for more than two years and 560 for more than three years for a total of 1,460 that are now eligible for “corrective action.”

While we do not have an exact number of schools that have been identified under other accountability systems (state or local), we do know that most schools being identified are Title I schools and that States widely vary in how they identify schools in need of improvement. In Texas, for example, less than 1% of their schools have been identified as “low-performing” or “in need of improvement” while in both New Mexico and Washington, DC more than 80% of their schools have been identified as “low performing.”

Of these schools, we know that based on a sample of schools that in school improvement, approximately 80% already run some type of extended learning program (before, after, or summer school). And, for schools that have been in school improvement for more than 2 years, 62% reported having some type of extended learning program. We do not have information on the quality of these programs, however.

21st C grantees: Of the current 21st Century grantees, we know that 75% of the grantees are in schools with 50% or more students in poverty, but that only 45% of the grantees are Title I schools. Of these Title I grantees, we do not, however, have an indication of the number of these grantees that have been identified under Title I as “in need of improvement.”

We also know that in terms of a break-down of extended learning time services, 95% of the grantees are providing after-school programs, 12% before school programs, and 76% summer school programs.

Assumptions and Cost Estimates:

Scenario 1: Target 21st Century grants to all schools identified in Title I school improvement that do not currently have extended learning opportunities for their students.

Assumption 1:

Targeting those schools identified under Title I as “school improvement” schools: 7,000 schools.

Congress intended for construction and renovation activities only to be in addition to direct services. Limiting the amount of CCDF funds that a new tribal grantee may spend on construction or renovation to the amount of the Tribal Mandatory allocation is consistent with Congressional intent.

Comment: One commenter objected to the definition for major renovation. Section 98.2 defines ``major renovation`` as: (1) Structural changes to the foundation, roof, floor, exterior or load-bearing walls of a facility, or the extension of a facility to increase its floor area; or (2) extensive alteration of a facility such as to significantly change its function and purpose, even if such renovation does not include any structural change. The commenter objected to the second part of this definition, arguing that some projects may change the function and purpose of a facility (e.g., from a community center to a child care center) but only involve small, non-structural renovations that should not require an application seeking Secretarial approval.

Response: We did not revise the definition--which has also been used by the Head Start program. Projects that involve extensive alteration that change the function and purpose of the facility are potentially large and expensive and should therefore be subject to Secretarial approval. However, in order for a project that does not involve structural change to be considered major renovation under the definition at Sec. 98.2, it must involve both: (1) Extensive alteration, and (2) a change in the function and purpose of the facility. Therefore, if a renovation project is not extensive (and does not involve structural change), the project would not be considered major renovation even if it changes the function and purpose of the facility.

Comment: We received a question as to whether non-exempt Tribal Lead Agencies could count construction and renovation costs as quality expenditures for purposes of meeting the four percent minimum quality requirement at Sec. 98.51(a).

60% already have extended learning programs, 40 in need of quality extended learning program: 2800 schools.

Program will serve between 150-500 students per year and will cost \$700/student making the range between \$105,000 and \$350,000 per grant.

Total Cost/year: \$294 - 980 million per year

Cost with Match (assume 50% local match): \$147-490 million

FY 01 high-end budget request: \$453 million for continuation grants, \$490 million for "universal access" to students in low performing schools = \$943 million

Assumption 2:

Assume 80% already have extended learning programs, 20% in need of quality extended learning programs: 1400 schools

Program will serve between 150-500 students per year and will cost \$700/student making the range between \$105,000 and \$350,000 per grant.

Total Cost/year: \$147-490 million per year

Cost with Match (assume 50% local match): \$74-245 million

FY 01 budget request: \$453 million for continuation grants, \$245 million for "universal access" to students in low performing schools = \$698 million

Scenario 2: Provide 21st Century grants to all Title I schools in Title I corrective action.

Assume that all schools in corrective action, need additional assistance to provide or improve their extended learning programs: 1400 schools.

Same cost assumptions as above for a total request of \$700 million.

Scenario 3: Provide 21st Century grants to any Title I school that has been identified under Title I, State, or local accountability system as "low-performing" or in "need of improvement."

Assume that of the 45,000 Title I schools, 25 percent of the schools have been identified under either Title I, State, or local accountability systems as "low-performing" or "in need of improvement." Total schools: 11,250

Assume 60% already have extended learning and 40% are in need: 4,500 schools

Same cost assumptions as above with match: \$236-790 million

Response: Construction and renovation costs cannot be counted as quality expenditures for purposes of the four percent minimum quality requirement. Quality activities such as those described at Sec. 98.51(a)(2) (resource and referral, provider loans, monitoring, training and technical assistance) are essential to the well-being of children in child care. The size of grant awards received by non-exempt Tribal Lead Agencies is sufficient to allow these Tribes to meet the four percent minimum quality requirement through activities other than construction or renovation.

Comment: We received a question regarding whether the costs of items such as parking lots, playground equipment, furniture, and kitchen equipment are considered to be construction/renovation costs?

Response: The regulations at Sec. 98.2 define ``construction`` and ``major renovation`` for purposes of determining what activities are allowable under the CCDF and when prior approval from the Secretary is necessary.

However, these definitions do not directly address the question of what costs should be considered as part of the construction and renovation project. This question is relevant in at least three circumstances: (1) When ensuring that construction and renovation costs will not result in a decrease in the level of child care services in accordance with Sec. 98.84(b)(3); (2) when providing an estimate of construction and renovation costs as required by the uniform procedures established by program instruction; and (3) when determining which costs should come from the separate grant award for construction and renovation.

For these three purposes, Sec. 98.84(h) provides that a construction and renovation project that requires and receives the approval of the Secretary must include as construction and renovation costs the following: (1) Planning costs as allowed at Sec. 98.84(c); (2) labor, materials and services necessary for the functioning of the facility; and (3) initial equipment, as discussed below, for the

Expanded 21st Century Community Learning Centers Estimates

Serving an estimated 5 million latch key children.

Samuel Angel Middle School Project 1997

After-school programs only at an average cost of \$700 per student.

Phased in over 5 and 10 years.

Federal share is 50 percent of the cost of the program.

5-year phase in costs.

	2001	2002	2003	2004
Kids served	1,000,000	2,000,000	3,000,000	4,000,000
Fed share w/o inflation	350,000,000	700,000,000	1,050,000,000	1,400,000,000
Fed share w/ inflation	350,000,000	714,700,000	1,094,563,050	1,490,065,165
5-year total w/o inflation=				5,250,000,000
5-year total w/inflation=				5,551,023,883

10-year phase in costs

	2001	2002	2003	2004
Kids Served	500,000	1,000,000	1,500,000	2,000,000
Annual Cost w/o inflation	175,000,000	350,000,000	525,000,000	700,000,000
Annual Cost w/inflation	175,000,000	357,350,000	547,281,525	745,032,583
10-year total w/o inflation=				9,625,000,000
10-year total w/inflation=				10,917,228,309

MLC →
 → Dnt #12
 → Driving

Synapse

Diagrammatic

Broomal-Tioyn-DOSES

Dnt #14

MLC #12

Wtorn, ny

4.4 corners → '01
 40 million '02
 200 million '03
 210

(e.g., purchase of equipment necessary to bring a facility into compliance with health and safety standards) that are not part of a larger construction or renovation project as defined at Sec. 98.2 should be considered quality improvement costs--not construction or renovation costs.

Subpart J--Monitoring, Non-compliance and Complaints

Penalties and Sanctions (Section 98.92)

We have amended paragraphs (1) and (2) of Sec. 98.92(a), because the statutory amendments changed the penalty for a Lead Agency found to have failed to substantially comply with the statute, the regulations, or its own Plan. We also have deleted the former Sec. 98.92(b) as redundant due to the statutory amendments. Section 658I(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act gives the Secretary the option to disallow improperly expended funds or to deduct an amount equal to or less than an improperly expended amount from the administrative portion of the Lead Agency's allotment for the following fiscal year. The Secretary can also impose a penalty that is a combination of these two options.

[[Page 39981]]

As proposed, we also added a new regulation at paragraph (b)(2) to establish a penalty on the Lead Agency for: (1) a failure to implement any part of the CCDF program in accordance with the Act or regulations or its Plan; or (2) a violation of the Act or regulations. Such penalty would be invoked when a failure or violation by the Lead Agency does not result in a clearly identifiable amount of improperly expended funds. For example, the failure to provide the reports required under subpart H or the inappropriate limitation of access to a particular type of provider in violation of the parental choice provisions of Subpart D do not result in a clearly identifiable amount of improperly expended funds. Hence, the penalties at paragraph (a) could not be applied. However, our stewardship of the program since its creation indicates the need for a more effective means of ensuring conformity with the statute and regulations than is offered by the existing

2005
5,000,000
1,750,000,000
1,901,695,667

2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
2,500,000	3,000,000	3,500,000	4,000,000	4,500,000	5,000,000
875,000,000	1,050,000,000	1,225,000,000	1,400,000,000	1,575,000,000	1,750,000,000
950,847,834	1,164,978,766	1,387,683,873	1,619,228,839	1,859,886,726	2,109,938,163

regulations. Section 658I(b)(2)(B) of the CCDBG Act provides for an ''additional sanction'' if the Secretary finds there has been non-compliance with the Plan or any requirement of the program.

Because a failure or violation which would cause the penalty under Sec. 98.92(b)(2) to be imposed may not have an amount of improperly expended funds associated with it, we needed to determine what amount of penalty should be imposed. We considered the range of TANF penalties found at section 409 of the Social Security Act and decided to use the TANF penalty provisions for failure to report at section 409(a)(2) as that was most analogous to the potential CCDF non-compliance.

Accordingly, Sec. 98.92(b)(2) provides that a penalty equal to four percent of the annual Discretionary allotment will be withheld no earlier than the second full quarter following the quarter in which the Lead Agency was notified of the potential penalty.

The TANF penalties include provisions for good cause and corrective action, and we have included similar provisions in Sec. 98.92(b)(2). We believe that both provisions are good policy as the goal of the new provision is to achieve compliance with CCDF requirements, not punishment. If there is sufficient reason for not complying, or if the Lead Agency will comply without a penalty, the purpose is met without the imposition of a penalty. The penalty will not be applied if the Lead Agency corrects the failure or violation before the penalty is to be applied or if it submits a plan for corrective action that is accepted by the Secretary. Waiting at least one full quarter before applying the penalty provides sufficient time to remedy the situations which we envision would cause the penalty to be invoked. The Lead Agency may, during that time, show cause to the Secretary why the amount of the penalty, if imposed, should be reduced.

The paragraphs formerly located at Sec. 98.92(d) and (e) are relocated at Sec. 98.92(c) and (d), respectively. We have added a new Sec. 98.92(e) providing that it is at the Secretary's sole discretion to choose the penalty to be imposed.

Comment: While a few comments supported the need for the new

Exapnded 21st Century Community Learning Centers Estimates

Serving an estimated 5 million latch key children, poor children only. (415,000)

After-school programs only at an average cost of \$700 per student.

Phased in over 5 and 10 years.

Federal share is 50 percent of the cost of the program.

Child poverty rate of 18.9 percent

5-year phase in costs.

	2001	2002	2003	2004
Kids served	189,000	378,000	567,000	756,000
Fed share w/o inflation	66,150,000	132,300,000	198,450,000	264,600,000
Fed share w/ inflation	66,150,000	135,078,300	206,872,416	281,622,316
		5-year total w/o inflation=		992,250,000
		5-year total w/inflation=		1,049,143,514

10-year phase in costs

	2001	2002	2003	2004
Kids Served	94,500	189,000	283,500	378,000
Annual Cost w/o inflation	33,075,000	66,150,000	99,225,000	132,300,000
Annual Cost w/inflation	33,075,000	67,539,150	103,436,208	140,811,158
		10-year total w/o inflation=		1,819,125,000
		10-year total w/inflation=		2,063,356,150

penalty at Sec. 98.92(b)(2), most opposed it stating that there is no basis for it in the PRWORA statute.

Response: As we stated in the preamble, the statutory basis for the penalty at Sec. 98.92(b)(2) is section 658I(b)(2)(B) of the original CCDBG Act which provides for an ``additional sanction`` if the Secretary finds there has been non-compliance with the Plan or any requirement of the program. Our experience since the beginning of the program indicated the need for such an additional sanction.

Comment: Many of the same commenters objected to the use of the phrase ``failed to properly implement`` in the regulation, saying that it made the entire process subjective with only the Secretary deciding what was ``proper``.

Response: We agree that the use of the word ``proper`` gave the appearance of a subjective process, and we have eliminated it. It is not the intent of the regulation to second-guess how Lead Agencies implement the program, especially in light of the enormous flexibility they have. Rather, this regulation is specifically designed for those clear-cut instances wherein the Act, regulations, or Plan have not been followed, but for which there is not an amount of funds that are ``misspent`` as a result.

Comment: One commenter objected to the provision which allows the Secretary not to apply the penalty if the Lead Agency corrects the failure or violation or submits an acceptable plan for corrective action. The commenter wanted the penalty to be applied in all cases.

Response: As our goal is compliance with the requirements and not punishment, we believe it is good policy to forgive a penalty if the Lead Agency corrects the non-compliance without a penalty through corrective action. We also believe that Lead Agencies should be able to demonstrate that special circumstances, such as natural disasters or other circumstances beyond their control, prevent compliance and thus the penalty should be reduced. We believe that such instances will be rare.

2005
945,000
330,750,000
359,420,481

2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
472,500	567,000	661,500	756,000	850,500	945,000
165,375,000	198,450,000	231,525,000	264,600,000	297,675,000	330,750,000
179,710,241	220,180,987	262,272,252	306,034,251	351,518,591	398,778,313

List of Subjects

45 CFR Part 98

Child care, Grant program--social programs, Parental choice, Reporting and record keeping requirements.

45 CFR Part 99

Administrative practice and procedure, Child care, Grant program--social programs.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Programs: 93.575, Child Care and Development Block Grant; 93.596, Child Care Mandatory and Matching Funds)

Dated: March 16, 1998.

Olivia A. Golden,

Assistant Secretary for Children and Families.

Approved: June 10, 1998.

Donna E. Shalala,

Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, Parts 98 and 99 of Subtitle A of Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations are amended as follows:

1. Part 98 is revised as follows:

PART 98--CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND

Subpart A--Goals, Purposes and Definitions

Sec.

98.1 Goals and purposes.

98.2 Definitions.

98.3 Effect on State law.

Subpart B--General Application Procedures

98.10 Lead Agency responsibilities.

98.11 Administration under contracts and agreements.

98.12 Coordination and consultation.

98.13 Applying for funds.

98.14 Plan process.

98.15 Assurances and certifications.

Exapnded 21st Century Community Learning Centers Estimates

Serving an estimated 5 million latch key children.

After-school and summer programs at an average cost of \$1400 per student.

Phased in over 5 and 10 years.

Federal share is 50 percent of the cost of the program.

5-year phase in costs.

	2001	2002	2003	2004
Kids served	1,000,000	2,000,000	3,000,000	4,000,000
Fed share w/o inflation	700,000,000	1,400,000,000	2,100,000,000	2,800,000,000
Fed share w/ inflation	700,000,000	1,429,400,000	2,189,126,100	2,980,130,331
			5-year total w/o inflation=	10,500,000,000
			5-year total w/inflation=	11,102,047,765

10-year phase in costs

	2001	2002	2003	2004
Kids Served	500,000	1,000,000	1,500,000	2,000,000
Annual Cost w/o inflation	350,000,000	700,000,000	1,050,000,000	1,400,000,000
Annual Cost w/inflation	350,000,000	714,700,000	1,094,563,050	1,490,065,165
			10-year total w/o inflation=	19,250,000,000
			10-year total w/inflation=	21,834,456,618

98.16 Plan provisions.

98.17 Period covered by plan.

98.18 Approval and disapproval of plans and plan amendments.

Subpart C--Eligibility for Services

98.20 A child's eligibility for child care services.

Subpart D--Program Operations (Child Care Services)--Parental Rights
and Responsibilities

98.30 Parental choice.

98.31 Parental access.

98.32 Parental complaints.

98.33 Consumer education.

98.34 Parental rights and responsibilities.

[[Page 39982]]

Subpart E--Program Operations (Child Care Services)--Lead Agency and
Provider Requirements

98.40 Compliance with applicable State and local regulatory
requirements.

98.41 Health and safety requirements.

98.42 Sliding fee scales.

98.43 Equal access.

98.44 Priority for child care services.

98.45 List of providers.

98.46 Nondiscrimination in admissions on the basis of religion.

98.47 Nondiscrimination in employment on the basis of religion.

Subpart F--Use of Child Care and Development Funds

98.50 Child care services.

98.51 Activities to improve the quality of child care.

98.52 Administrative costs.

98.53 Matching Fund requirements.

98.54 Restrictions on the use of funds.

98.55 Cost allocation.

Subpart G--Financial Management

2005

5,000,000

3,500,000,000

3,803,391,335

2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
2,500,000	3,000,000	3,500,000	4,000,000	4,500,000	5,000,000
1,750,000,000	2,100,000,000	2,450,000,000	2,800,000,000	3,150,000,000	3,500,000,000
1,901,695,667	2,329,957,532	2,775,367,746	3,238,457,679	3,719,773,452	4,219,876,327

98.60 Availability of funds.

98.61 Allotments from the discretionary fund.

98.62 Allotments from the mandatory fund.

98.63 Allotments from the matching fund.

98.64 Reallotment and redistribution of funds.

98.65 Audits and financial reporting

98.66 Disallowance procedures.

98.67 Fiscal requirements.

Subpart H--Program Reporting Requirements

98.70 Reporting requirements.

98.71 Content of reports.

Subpart I--Indian Tribes

98.80 General procedures and requirements.

98.81 Application and Plan procedures.

98.82 Coordination.

98.83 Requirements for tribal programs.

98.84 Construction and renovation of child care facilities.

Subpart J--Monitoring, Non-Compliance and Complaints

98.90 Monitoring.

98.91 Non-compliance.

98.92 Penalties and sanctions.

98.93 Complaints.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 618, 9858.

Subpart A--Goals, Purposes and Definitions

Sec. 98.1 Goals and purposes.

(a) The goals of the CCDF are to:

(1) Allow each State maximum flexibility in developing child care programs and policies that best suit the needs of children and parents within the State;

(2) Promote parental choice to empower working parents to make their own decisions on the child care that best suits their family's needs;

Exapnded 21st Century Community Learning Centers Estimates

Serving an estimated 5 million latch key children, poor children only.

After-school and summer programs at an average cost of \$1400 per student.

Phased in over 5 and 10 years.

Federal share is 50 percent of the cost of the program.

Child poverty rate of 18.9 percent

5-year phase in costs.

	2001	2002	2003	2004
Kids served	189,000	378,000	567,000	756,000
Fed share w/o inflation	132,300,000	264,600,000	396,900,000	529,200,000
Fed share w/ inflation	132,300,000	270,156,600	413,744,833	563,244,633
		5-year total w/o inflation=		1,984,500,000
		5-year total w/inflation=		2,098,287,028

10-year phase in costs

	2001	2002	2003	2004
Kids Served	94,500	189,000	283,500	378,000
Annual Cost w/o inflation	66,150,000	132,300,000	198,450,000	264,600,000
Annual Cost w/inflation	66,150,000	135,078,300	206,872,416	281,622,316
		10-year total w/o inflation=		3,638,250,000
		10-year total w/inflation=		4,126,712,301

(3) Encourage States to provide consumer education information to help parents make informed choices about child care;

(4) Assist States to provide child care to parents trying to achieve independence from public assistance; and

(5) Assist States in implementing the health, safety, licensing, and registration standards established in State regulations.

(b) The purpose of the CCDF is to increase the availability, affordability, and quality of child care services. The program offers Federal funding to States, Territories, Indian Tribes, and tribal organizations in order to:

(1) Provide low-income families with the financial resources to find and afford quality child care for their children;

(2) Enhance the quality and increase the supply of child care for all families, including those who receive no direct assistance under the CCDF;

(3) Provide parents with a broad range of options in addressing their child care needs;

(4) Strengthen the role of the family;

(5) Improve the quality of, and coordination among, child care programs and early childhood development programs; and

(6) Increase the availability of early childhood development and before- and after-school care services.

(c) The purpose of these regulations is to provide the basis for administration of the Fund. These regulations provide that Lead Agencies:

(1) Maximize parental choice through the use of certificates and through grants and contracts;

(2) Include in their programs a broad range of child care providers, including center-based care, family child care, in-home care, care provided by relatives and sectarian child care providers;

(3) Provide quality child care that meets applicable requirements;

(4) Coordinate planning and delivery of services at all levels;

2005
945,000
661,500,000
718,840,962

2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
472,500	567,000	661,500	756,000	850,500	945,000
330,750,000	396,900,000	463,050,000	529,200,000	595,350,000	661,500,000
359,420,481	440,361,973	524,544,504	612,068,501	703,037,182	797,556,626

- (5) Design flexible programs that provide for the changing needs of recipient families;
- (6) Administer the CCDF responsibly to ensure that statutory requirements are met and that adequate information regarding the use of public funds is provided; and
- (7) Design programs that provide uninterrupted service to families and providers, to the extent statutorily possible.

Sec. 98.2 Definitions.

For the purpose of this part and part 99:

The Act refers to the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, section 5082 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, Pub. L. 101-508, as amended and codified at 42 U.S.C. 9858 et seq.

ACF means the Administration for Children and Families;

Application is a request for funding that includes the information required at Sec. 98.13;

Assistant Secretary means the Assistant Secretary for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services;

Caregiver means an individual who provides child care services directly to an eligible child on a person-to-person basis;

Categories of care means center-based child care, group home child care, family child care and in-home care;

Center-based child care provider means a provider licensed or otherwise authorized to provide child care services for fewer than 24 hours per day per child in a non-residential setting, unless care in excess of 24 hours is due to the nature of the parent(s)' work;

Child care certificate means a certificate (that may be a check, or other disbursement) that is issued by a grantee directly to a parent who may use such certificate only as payment for child care services or as a deposit for child care services if such a deposit is required of other children being cared for by the provider, pursuant to Sec. 98.30.

Nothing in this part shall preclude the use of such certificate for sectarian child care services if freely chosen by the parent. For the

Exapnded 21st Century Community Learning Centers Estimates

Serving an estimated 5 million latch key children, poor children only.

After-school and summer programs at an average cost of \$1400 per student.

Phased in over 5 and 10 years.

Federal share is 50 percent of the cost of the program.

Child poverty rate of 18.9 percent.

5-year phase in costs.

	2001	2002	2003	2004
Kids served	189,000	378,000	567,000	756,000
Fed share w/o inflation	132,300,000	264,600,000	396,900,000	529,200,000
Fed share w/ inflation	132,300,000	270,156,600	413,744,833	563,244,633
5-year total w/o inflation=				1,984,500,000
5-year total w/inflation=				2,098,287,028

10-year phase in costs

	2001	2002	2003	2004
Kids Served	94,500	189,000	283,500	378,000
Annual Cost w/o inflation	66,150,000	132,300,000	198,450,000	264,600,000
Annual Cost w/inflation	66,150,000	135,078,300	206,872,416	281,622,316
10-year total w/o inflation=				3,638,250,000
10-year total w/inflation=				4,126,712,301

end of the second fiscal year following the fiscal year for which the grant is awarded. This gives Tribal Lead Agencies three years to liquidate funds approved by the Secretary for use on construction or major renovation with no separate obligation period. This separate obligation/liquidation requirement should allow sufficient time for construction and renovation projects.

Amounts used for construction and major renovation are not considered administrative costs for the purpose of the 15 percent administrative cost limit under Sec. 98.83(g). We do not believe that Congress intended for us to unnecessarily limit a Tribal Lead Agency's ability to use CCDF funds on construction and renovation projects which meet the requirements necessary for Secretarial approval.

The ACF will transfer funds to be used for construction and major renovation to a separate grant award to be used specifically for construction or renovation activities. This approach is necessary to track the exact amount of funds spent on construction or renovation. Finally, the new statutory provision allowing tribal construction with CCDF funds provides an opportunity for tribal grantees to leverage resources for quality facilities and services by coordinating with their Tribe's Head Start program.

Comment: We received comments objecting to the proposal at Sec. 98.84(c) that would have prohibited a Tribal Lead Agency from using CCDF funds to pay for the costs of an architect, engineer, or other consultant until after the Lead Agency's construction/renovation application was approved by the Secretary. The commenters argued that the application procedures require construction/renovation plans and specifications as part of an application, and, unless Tribes are allowed to use CCDF funds, many Tribes would be unable to pay for the costs of architects, engineers, or consultants necessary to develop these plans and specifications.

Response: We eliminated the prohibition against the use of CCDF funds to pay for consultants prior to application approval. As revised, Sec. 98.84(c) allows a Tribal Lead Agency to use CCDF funds to pay for

2005
945,000
661,500,000
718,840,962

2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
472,500	567,000	661,500	756,000	850,500	945,000
330,750,000	396,900,000	463,050,000	529,200,000	595,350,000	661,500,000
359,420,481	440,361,973	524,544,504	612,068,501	703,037,182	797,556,626

the costs of an architect, engineer, or other consultant for a project that is subsequently approved by the Secretary. If the project later fails to gain Secretarial approval, the Tribal Lead Agency must pay for the architectural, engineering or consultant costs using non-CCDF funds. This approach allows Tribes access to the expertise necessary to prepare an application and launch a construction/renovation project. At the same time, it protects the Federal government from paying for consultant costs on a project that is not approvable. This revised policy is consistent with program instruction ACYF-CC-PI-05, issued August 18, 1997. We strongly encourage Tribes to involve ACF Regional Office staff early in the development of their construction/renovation applications.

Comment: We received questions regarding how the requirement at Sec. 98.84(b)(3) would apply to new grantees. Under this provision (as well as the Act), use of funds for construction and renovation cannot result in a decrease in the Tribe's level of child care services compared to the preceding fiscal year. However, a new tribal grantee has no existing level of services to maintain.

Response: Since Sec. 98.84(b)(3) does not apply to a new grantee (i.e., one that did not receive CCDF funds the preceding fiscal year), we added Sec. 98.84(g) to address the amount of CCDF funds that a new grantee can use for construction or renovation. This section allows a new tribal grantee to spend no more than an amount equivalent to its Tribal Mandatory allocation on construction/renovation. A new tribal grantee must spend an amount equivalent to its Discretionary allocation on activities other than construction or renovation (i.e., direct services, quality activities, or administrative costs).

[[Page 39980]]

The CCDF program is primarily designed to provide direct child care services. Authority for construction and renovation was added as an amendment under the PRWORA. The statutory provision that prohibits a decrease in the level of child care services clearly indicates that

FY 01 Budget Request: \$453 for continuation + \$790 = \$1.25 Billion

Assume 80% already have extended learning and 20% are in need: 2,250 schools

Same cost assumptions as above with match: \$118-395 million

FY 01 Budget Request: \$453 for continuation + \$395 = \$848 million

Option B: Provide universal access to quality after-school programs for all students in need.

Background: According to a 1993 National Study of Before and After-School Programs, 15 million children are "latch-key" kids in need of after-school services

The goal of this option is to keep the after-school program as a program that serves both the needs of educationally and economically disadvantaged students, as well as a program that helps fill a gap in child-care and can provide enrichment and extracurricular activities for all children.

In FY 00, the 21st Century program expects to support 3,960 21st Century Community Learning Centers and serve 861,000 children.

[NOTE: 95% of grantees in FY99 report that they are serving "at-risk" students]

FY 01 Request: Assuming a 50% match and \$1 billion, the 21st Century Community Learning Centers could support 10,458 centers, 2.8 million children

Priority could be first to schools in Title I corrective action then to Title I school improvement schools and, finally, to any school identified under a state or local accountability system as low-performing.

**Five-Ten year
projections:**

FY '01	\$1 billion	2.8 million children
FY '02	\$1.5 billion	4.2 million
FY '03	\$2 billion	5.6 million
FY '04	\$2.5 billion	7 million
FY '05	\$3 billion	8.4 million

facility. All such costs must be identified in the Tribal Lead Agency's construction or renovation application to the Secretary and, to the extent that CCDF funds are used, must be paid for using the separate grant award for construction and renovation.

Under this framework, the cost of the construction or renovation project includes items which are not part of the actual facility itself, but which are necessary for the functioning of the facility (such as a parking lot or fence) when the item is part of a larger construction or renovation project that requires and receives approval by the Secretary.

Equipment, as used above, means items which are tangible, nonexpendable personal property having a useful life of more than five years. The intent of the five-year threshold is to include as construction and renovation costs only equipment that remains useful for an extended period of time, such as playground equipment, furniture, and kitchen equipment. Current operating expenses or items that are consumed in use (such as food, paper, books, toys or disposable housekeeping items) are not considered construction or renovation costs.

This relatively broad definition of construction and renovation costs emphasizes the importance of considering all costs when planning construction and renovation projects. The alternative approach, to exclude items such as playgrounds, parking lots and equipment from construction and renovation costs, would have underestimated the true costs of constructing or renovating a child care facility. A new or newly renovated facility requires the proper equipment to be operational. Furthermore, a facility must be constructed or renovated in a manner that ensures the health and safety of children in care, consistent with Sec. 98.41(a)(2) of the regulations.

Equipment and other costs are only considered part of the construction or renovation costs, however, if they are included as part of a larger construction or renovation project that requires and receives approval by the Secretary. Costs of allowable activities



Mary I. Cassell

12/14/99 04:58:23 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Ann O'Leary/OPD/EOP@EOP
cc: Naomi Barry/OMB/EOP@EOP
Subject: Re: Universal 21st Century

Here are a few thoughts on costing out Option C (Universal for all failing schools). If we both net out currently served kids and assume lower than 100% participation rates, I think we can get the cost of universal after-school down to anywhere from \$270-\$460 million above the FY 2000 level. Let me know what you think.

1) If possible, we should net out all students that currently receive after school services. I used the Study of Education Resources and Federal funding to get some information on the number of after-school instructional programs and found that, while there are a lot of after-school programs, they aren't serving that many kids. Nonetheless, this is what I came up with:

65% of all Title I schools have after-school programs, and within those, 11% of the schools' students are served (or about 7% of all Title I students). In 75+% poverty schools, 75% of the schools have after-school programs, and within those 16% of the students are being served (or about 12% of all students in high-poverty schools).

If we apply the 7% and 12% participation rates to the number of students in the 7,000 failing schools, then between 125,800 and 211,200 kids in failing schools are currently receiving after-school services out of the 1,760,000 million students in failing schools. **That means we would have to pay for services for the remaining 1,549,000-1,634,000 kids.**

2) We could also assume less than full participation. I don't think that every child in a school will participate in the after-school program, even if it is offered to everyone -- their parents may rather have them home, they may have other commitments, etc. Head Start uses an 80% take-up rate. While they aren't perfectly analogous programs, assuming the **80% rate** of participation for the currently unserved kids means that we would need to fund programs serving 1,239,200-1,307,200 kids. At \$350 per child, given the matching requirement, the cost above the current \$450 million (with the earmarks taken out) is about **\$430-\$460 million**. If we assume lower participation rates per school, then the funding level drops significantly. At a **50%** participation rate, which would serve about 125 students per center (fairly close to the 100 kids per center that ED assumes currently), the additional funding needed is **\$270-\$285 million**.

*new let #5
in my summary*

**U.S. Department of Education
Office of the Under Secretary
Planning and Evaluation Service
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Room 6W324, FOB6
Washington, DC 20202**

FAX COVER SHEET

(Fax Number: 202/401-3036)

TO :

Ann O'Leary

Fax Number: 456-2870

(Number of pages, including cover sheet: 4)

FROM :

ADRIANA de KANTER

Telephone Number: 401-3132

Here are actual phone calls to

Colect 1 + 2 to ask them questions

versus relying on application data.

WESTAT

An Employee-Owned Research Corporation

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bob Stonehill, OERI
Sara Napierala, OERI

July 21, 1999

FROM: Carin A. Celebuski

SUBJECT: 21st CCLC findings from phone calls to 1998 grantees

Below is some preliminary information Sara asked me to provide from the telephone interviews we conducted in May 1998 with 288 of the 290 1998 grantees to the 21st CCLC grant program. Findings for each topic she asked about are presented here along with information about the unit of analysis and number of cases with adequate data. Note that "currently functioning" means that in May of 1998, projects were providing services to students. In the next couple of weeks Westat will tabulate all of the information from the telephone survey and send it along to you.

Topics:

1. Number of learning centers operated
2. Eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch
3. Number of students served
4. Use of USDA Child Nutrition Program assistance
5. Hours of operation
6. Main academic focuses
7. Measurement of student academic improvement
8. Use of packaged or off-the-shelf programming or models
9. Provision of transportation

1. Number of learning centers operated through the grant

Number of cases with data: 264 grantees with currently functioning projects
Total number of learning centers: 834
Average number per project: 3.16
Maximum number reported by a project: 28

2. Eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch at schools with learning centers

Number of cases with data: 723 currently functioning learning centers
Average eligibility: 65 percent
Schools with over 50 percent eligible: 75 percent

3. Number of students served (unduplicated count)

Number of cases with data: 716 currently functioning learning centers
Total number of students served: 136,812
Average number of students per learning center: 191

4. Use of USDA Child Nutrition Program assistance in learning centers

Number of cases with data: 265 grantees with currently functioning projects

Projects that use USDA assistance in their learning centers: 53 percent

5. Hours of operation of learning centers

Academic year

Number of cases with data: 237 grantees with currently functioning projects

Hours of operation per week: average of 17.38 hours per project

Summer or intersession

Number of cases with data: 156 grantees with summer/intersession hours

Hours of operation per week: average of 31.44 hours per project

6. Main academic focuses of learning center program (projects could list multiple focuses)

Number of cases with data: 265 grantees with currently functioning projects

Projects with an academic focus: 94 percent

Average number of focuses reported: 2

Most common combination: reading and math

Projects listing:

Math (180) – 68 percent

Reading (164) – 62 percent

Science (60) – 23 percent

English/language arts (32) – 12 percent

Literacy (26) – 10 percent

Computers (14) – 5 percent

Technology (14) – 5 percent

Social studies (13) – 5 percent

“Core” subjects (12) – 5 percent

Arts (9) – 3 percent

Other focuses listed in smaller numbers were communication skills, physical education, music, history, and environmental studies

7. Measurement of student academic improvement as part of project evaluation

Number of cases with data: 265 grantees with currently functioning projects

Projects planning to do this: 97 percent

8. Use of packaged or off-the-shelf programming or models in learning centers

Number of cases with data: 265 grantees with currently functioning projects

Projects that currently do this: 86 in number or 32 percent

Projects using:

Voyager (22) – 8 percent

Lightspan (13) – 5 percent

Accelerated Reader (STAR) (5) – 2 percent

PLATO (5) – 2 percent

Reading Recovery (4) – 2 percent

Others listed include a variety of reading, math, science, ESL, career and personal counseling, drug and violence prevention, and GED programs

9. Provision of transportation for students attending program

Number of cases with data: 265 grantees with currently functioning projects

Projects that currently do this: 189 in number or 71 percent

**U.S. Department of Education
Office of the Under Secretary
Planning and Evaluation Service
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Room 6W324, FOB6
Washington, DC 20202**

FAX COVER SHEET

(Fax Number: 202/401-3036)

TO :

Ann O'Leary

Fax Number:

456-7870

(Number of pages, including cover sheet:)

FROM :

ADRIANA de KANTER

Telephone Number: 401-3132

Note - This roll up says 76% for summer
school (I was looking at an older version).

Also, is Mrs. Clinton interested in doing
after school events?

WESTAT

An Employee-Owned Research Corporation

MEMORANDUM

TO: Carol Mitchell, ED

December 2, 1999

FROM: Carin A. Celebuski

SUBJECT: 21st CCLC Analysis of grant applications – Combined 1998 and 1999 data for grantees

This memo contains tables with combined information on 1998 and 1999 21st CCLC grantees taken from their grant applications. I removed the rows where information was available for only one of the two years. Please call me if you have questions.

Table 1.

	All 1998 and 1999 grantees
Number of centers proposed	
Total number (sum)	1548
Average per site (mean)	3.50
Percent proposing	
One center	26
Two centers	16
Three centers	20
Four or more centers	33
Centers in elementary schools (sum)	687
Centers in middle schools (sum)	581
Centers in high schools (sum)	134

Table 2.

	All 1998 and 1999 grantees
Types of information provided in proposal	
Educational at-risk students (%)	88
Ethnic breakdown of population (%)	56
Low income area indicated (%)	83
Receive Title I funds (yes) (%)	44
Drug use and crime statistics (%)	64
State economic, social rankings (%)	54
Data appear adequate (%)	65

Table 3.

Partners proposed	All 1998 and 1999 grantees
Community based organizations (%)	89
Government agencies (%)	71
Local Law enforcement (%)	47
Local libraries (%)	23
Local museums (%)	11
Special interest clubs (%)	38
Local businesses (%)	63

Table 4.

Program elements proposed	All 1998 and 1999 grantees
Significant learning opportunity (%)	100
Safety and substance abuse (%)	77
Meet state academic standards (%)	67
Links to regular academic pgm (%)	41
Reading (%)	85
Math (%)	80
Science (%)	66
English (%)	47
Tutoring/homework assistance (%)	83
Recreational activities (%)	89
Music (%)	56
Art (%)	68
Advanced technology (%)	89
Nutrition and Health (%)	74
Computers (%)	76
Before school (%)	12
After school (%)	94
Concurrent with school day (%)	5
Weekends (%)	58
Summer (%)	76
New program (%)	42

Table 5.

Coordination proposed	All 1998 and 1999 grantees
Community centers (%)	34
Tutoring/mentoring programs (%)	35
Ethnic organization (%)	12
Youth services (%)	30
Special needs services (%)	11

Table 6.

Types of volunteers proposed	All 1998 and 1999 grantees
Parents (%)	36
College students (%)	37
Others (%)	60

Table 7.

Types of needs assessment	All 1998 and 1999 grantees
Focus groups (%)	21
Surveys/interviews (%)	59
Town meetings (%)	21
Teacher input (%)	21
Word of mouth (%)	15

Table 8.

Management procedures in place	All 1998 and 1999 grantees
Hiring and supervising staff (%)	72
Procedures for student selection (%)	36
Plan for monitoring performance (%)	75
Procedure for guiding program (%)	79
Acquire adequate space (%)	50

Table 9.

Types of staff (mean for those with that type of staff proposed)	All 1998 and 1999 grantees
# staff (mean)	31.47
# educators (mean)	16.63
# parents (mean)	10.47
# paraprofessionals (mean)	13.96
# college students (mean)	12.59
# other volunteers (mean)	42.68
# other professionals (mean)	12.11

Table 10.

Staff issues	All 1998 and 1999 grantees
Experience of staff (%)	40
Professional training planned (%)	57

Table 11.

	All 1998 and 1999 grantees
Propose to serve	
Infants and preschoolers (%)	15
Grades K-5 (%)	71
Grades 6-8 (%)	90
Grades 9-12 (%)	42
Adults (%)	69
Senior citizens (%)	14
People with disabilities (%)	27
# children served (mean)	1132.61
# others served (mean)	2467.82

Table 12.

	All 1998 and 1999 grantees
Plan for evaluation of effectiveness	
Meeting (%)	61
Written review/annual report (%)	54
Survey (%)	65
Focus group (%)	23
District level review (%)	18
Frequency of evaluation	
Weekly (%)	6
Monthly (%)	27
Quarterly (%)	18
Semi-annually (%)	3
Annually (%)	13

Table 13.

	All 1998 and 1999 grantees
Factors to monitor	
Community feedback (%)	44
Student outcomes (%)	49
Academic performance (%)	84
Behavior and attitude (%)	57
Attendance/dropout rates (%)	68

Table 14.

	All 1998 and 1999 grantees
Location of proposed project	
Rural area (%)	54
Inner city (%)	46
Empowerment zone or enterprise community (%)	28

EDUCATION REFORM

21st Century community learning centers

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title X, part I)

FY 2001 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined.¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$453,377	\$1,000,000	+\$546,623

¹ The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2000; new authorizing legislation is proposed.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

*main
sum
serve*

The 21st Century Community Learning Centers program supports grants to local educational agencies (LEAs), on behalf of public elementary or secondary schools that are located in inner cities and rural areas and serve communities that have a high proportion of low-achieving students, lack resources to establish effective after-school programs, or have other significant needs that are germane to this program. The grants made under this program enable communities to establish or expand community learning centers that provide activities offering significant expanded learning opportunities, such as before- and after-school programs, for children and youth in the community. These centers may also offer a variety of other services that benefit the educational, health, social service, cultural, and recreational needs of their communities.

Under the current law, the Department makes competitive grants directly to eligible LEAs. Assistance must be equitably distributed among the States and among urban and rural areas of the United States. Grants are for 3 years and must be made for at least \$35,000 annually, and priority must be given to projects that offer: 1) a broad selection of services that address the needs of the community; and 2) significant, expanded learning opportunities for children and youth in the community.

Aside from expanded learning opportunities, centers must also provide at least four of the following types of services: literacy education programs; senior citizen programs; children's day care services; integrated education, health, social service, recreational, or cultural programs; summer and weekend school programs in conjunction with recreation programs; expanded library service hours to serve community needs; telecommunications and technology education programs for individuals of all ages; parenting skills education programs; support and training for child day care providers; employment counseling, training, and placement; services for individuals who leave school before graduating from secondary school, regardless of the age of the individual; and services for individuals with disabilities.

EDUCATION REFORM

21st Century community learning centers

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
1996	\$750
1997	1,000
1998	40,000
1999	200,000
2000	453,377

FY 2001 BUDGET REQUEST

The Department requests \$1 billion for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program in fiscal year 2001, an increase of \$546.6 million over the 2000 level. At this level, the program would support about 10,000 centers serving 2.5 million students.

As in past years, the 21st Century program, in fiscal year 2001, would focus on provision of after-school learning opportunities, particularly for children most in need of a safe environment and supplemental academic assistance. The response to the expansion of the program beginning in fiscal year 1998 demonstrates the strong demand nationally for after-school programs. That year, the Department received 1,965 applications, requesting over \$540 million in funding and proposing \$331 million in matching funds. The significant increase in 1999 again garnered tremendous interest from schools, with over 2,000 applications received requesting almost \$900 million. Public opinion polls also demonstrate strong public support for programs of school-based enrichment programs during after-school hours.

This program is currently undergoing reauthorization. During the remainder of the reauthorization process, the Administration intends to work with Congress to obtain enactment of a bill that: (1) converts this authority to a formula grant program once it reaches an appropriate funding level (except that the Department would continue to administer the direct grants made prior to the conversion); (2) requires States to distribute funds within the State through competitive subgrants; (3) allows States to use up to 10 percent of their formula allocations to make awards to community-based organizations; (4) requires States, in making competitive grants, to give priority to applications from LEAs that are in Title I "corrective action" or "school improvement" status; (5) requires grantees to pay 50 percent of the cost of any project; (6) requires that local projects take place principally in a public elementary or secondary school building; and (7) provides the Secretary with the authority to reserve up to 2.5 percent of the appropriation for national activities such as evaluation and technical assistance.

The Administration's proposal to give a funding priority to schools in Title I corrective action or school improvement status would direct funds to schools that have the greatest need for extended learning services. Recent research has found that effective schools use extended learning time in reading and mathematics to improve student achievement. In a 1997 study of high- and low-performing elementary schools in Maryland, researchers found that the most successful schools were seeing consistent academic gains as a result of extended-day programs. The 1999 study by The Education Trust, *Dispelling the Myth: High-Poverty Schools Exceeding Expectations*,

EDUCATION REFORM

21st Century community learning centers

found that 86 percent of the high-performing, high-poverty schools offered extended instructional time in reading and 66 percent in mathematics.

Despite the proven effectiveness of extended learning time programs, few students in Title I schools are benefiting from such programs. The Department's 1999 report, *Promising Results, Continuing Challenges: The Final Report of the National Assessment of Title I*, found that only 11 percent of students in Title I schools were served by extended learning time programs during the school year. Summer programs served only 19 percent of Title I students. A survey of Title I school principals conducted during the 1997-98 school year found that the average after-school program in a Title I school operated for only an average of one hour per day; the average before-school program operated for less than one hour per day.

Centers are able to provide a wide range of academic services for students, particularly in the core subject areas, that are directly linked to students' classroom needs. Over three-quarters of the currently funded centers offer, or plan to offer, tutoring and homework assistance. Most offer a combination of after-school, before-school, summer, and weekend activities. For example, the Tucson Unified School District has created Project Sano y Salvo (Safe and Sound), which provides approximately 1,000 students in grades 6-8 with academic tutoring, enrichment in math, science, reading, writing, and technology, summer school, homework assistance, and expanded library and computer lab access. This project will provide services in three middle schools during afternoons, evenings, and weekends.

In addition to facilitating children's academic development, the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program provides a means by which the Department can address other problems that are critical for the well-being of our Nation's youth and communities:

- **Promoting healthier attitudes towards school and the community**

According to *Safe and Smart*, a publication of the Departments of Education and Justice, children who come home to an empty house are at a higher risk for drug, alcohol, and tobacco use; delinquent behavior; violent victimization; and injury than their peers who are supervised after school. Community learning centers can provide a wide range of mentoring and counseling services to help improve student behavior and attitudes, including providing services relating to violence prevention, conflict resolution, and improved self-esteem. Research clearly shows that positive and sustained interactions with adults contribute to the overall development of young people and their achievement in school.

An important benefit of this program is increasing student safety and reducing juvenile crime rates. According to the American Academy of Pediatrics, recent studies show that adolescents who are unsupervised after school are more likely to use alcohol and other drugs. Studies by the FBI and youth-advocacy groups have found that the peak hours for juvenile crime and victimization are from 2 to 6 p.m. on school days -- hours when youth are most often without supervision. Community learning centers provide a safe haven for youth, supervised activities, and services

EDUCATION REFORM

21st Century community learning centers

focusing on crime, violence, and substance abuse prevention. For example, the Lighted Middle Schools program in Salem, Oregon, is providing students with field trips, club and recreational activities, and after-school math, English as a second language, and computer classes. This summer, seventh-grade students participated in "BLAST (Bringing Law Enforcement and Students Together) Camp," a week-long program with activities such as gang resistance training and education in refusal skills.

Also, student motivation and interest in learning can be improved through enrichment activities in subjects such as music, art, and technology. Often, students are unable to take these subjects as electives and cannot afford activities outside the school, but the centers can provide these services. An analysis of grant applications found that 89 percent of applicants planned to offer students activities designed to increase their ability to use technology, and over half of applicants planned to include art and music activities in their programs.

- **Enhancing community involvement and support**

In addition to academic programs, centers are providing students and members of the community with comprehensive services such as recreational activities, technology training, parenting skills, and family literacy programs. Enhancing collaboration is an important objective of this program. The majority of current centers are already teaming up with community-based partners to deliver services. Partners include local libraries, museums, businesses, and special interest clubs. For example, the St. Louis Public Schools have teamed up with a large number of higher education institutions, government agencies, and community organizations such as the YMCA, YWCA, Boys and Girls Club, and Americorps. The program will provide after-school and Saturday programs for 650 students in seven schools to increase the academic performance of inner-city adolescents and develop responsible decision-making skills regarding drug use and violence.

The Administration proposes that States be able to use up to 10 percent of their allocations to make awards directly to CBOs, so long as their applications demonstrated the concurrence of the affected local school districts. This acknowledges the vital role that these organizations play in developing and maintaining healthy and safe communities. It also recognizes that, in some communities, CBOs may be better situated and equipped than schools to serve the interests of the community and the purposes of this program.

In 2001, the Department plans to reserve approximately \$10 million for national activities, including funds for an on-going evaluation of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program. While the need for intervention is clear, and there is strong evidence that after-school programs have a positive impact on student outcomes, there is a dearth of rigorous research and evaluation efforts in this area. For this reason, the Department is funding a multi-year national evaluation – using rigorous methodologies – to answer questions relating to program implementation, student access and participation, and student outcomes and impacts. The study will look at both in-school

EDUCATION REFORM

21st Century community learning centers

and out-of-school outcomes such as achievement, high school completion, crime, and drug use. A final report from this evaluation should be available in the fall of 2001.

SELECTED PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents selected program information, including goals; indicators; targets; and, where possible, an assessment of the progress made toward achieving and objectives and program results. Achievement of targets is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2001 and future years.

Other performance indicators and strategies for this program are included in the Department's Annual Performance Plan and Annual Program Performance Report.

Performance Goal: To enable rural and inner-city public elementary and secondary schools, or consortia of such schools, to plan, implement, or expand projects that benefit the educational, health, social service, cultural, and recreational needs of their communities.

Objective: Participants in 21st Century Community Learning Center programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>
Students regularly participating in the program will show continuous improvement in achievement through measures such as test scores, grades, and/or teacher reports. <i>Baseline will be established in 2000.</i>				

Because this program is still in its early stages, the Department will not have data on this indicator later in 2000. However, studies of similar programs reveal positive impacts on student behavior. For example, a study of New York City housing projects found that those with Boys and Girls Clubs on-site experienced a juvenile arrest rate that was 13 percent lower than housing projects without such programs. Annual grantee reports and an external evaluation will provide data for this indicator.

Objective: 21st Century Community Learning Centers will offer a range of high-quality educational, developmental, and recreational services.

EDUCATION REFORM

21st Century community learning centers

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>
More than 85 percent of centers will offer high-quality services in at least one core academic area, such as reading and literacy, mathematics, and science. <i>FY 1999 Baseline: 80.5 percent.</i>		85%	85%	85%

This indicator will be measured by individual project reports, beginning in 1999. In the 1998 and 1999 competitions, the Department established a competitive priority for projects providing services in core subject areas. As a result, virtually all grantees will offer services in reading and literacy, mathematics, and/or science. Based on a review of grantee applications in 1998, 87 percent of grantees proposed a reading component; 86 percent proposed a mathematics component; and 72 percent proposed a science component.

Preliminary research on after-school programs indicates an increase in student achievement when compared to past performance and to control groups made up of similar students not participating in the programs. Studies of individual programs have found positive impacts on grades, reading ability, attendance, homework completion, reduced grade retention and placement in special education, and increased graduation and enrollment in postsecondary education.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

<u>(\$000s)</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>
<u>Competitive Awards</u>			
New awards	\$153,127	\$253,030	0
Number of new awards	359	590	
Earmarked awards	\$4,600	\$4,107	0
Continuation awards	\$40,190	\$192,481	\$405,511
Number of continuation awards	99	468	959
Evaluation	\$1,000	\$2,268	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$1,083	\$1,491	0
Total funding	\$200,000	\$453,377	\$405,511
<u>New Awards</u>			
Amount for States	0	0	\$584,489
National activities	0	0	\$10,000
Total funding	0	0	\$594,489
<u>Program awards and impact</u>			
Total number of awards to districts	458	1,058	2,322
Total number of centers	1,601	3,961	10,045
Number of students served (estimate)	400,000	862,000	2,455,330