

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
--------------------------	---------------	------	-------------

001. paper	Universal After-School question paper (partial, page 2) (1 page)	n.d.	P6/b(6)
------------	--	------	---------

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Domestic Policy Council
Andrew Rotherham (Education)
OA/Box Number: 21294

FOLDER TITLE:

Universal After-School

2011-0103-S

rc150

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

⊙
Nae 2 lines

~~456 6777~~

456 6777
6299

2002

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

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, *Disproportionate 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

New Awards

Amount for States	0	0	\$584,489
National activities	0	0	\$10,000
Total funding	0	0	\$594,489

Program awards and impact

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

*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 Quiltman 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 *Pine 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

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)



Save the Children.

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

ENDING SOCIAL PROMOTION THROUGH ACADEMICALLY RICH EXTENDED LEARNING PROGRAMS

PREMISE:

- Ending social promotion is a top Administration Priority.
- Extended Learning Programs are a key component of the Administration's strategy to end social promotion.
- 21st Century Learning is the primary funding source for extended learning, but as currently written, it lacks the academic focus necessary to address social promotion effectively.
- **Consequently, 21st Century Community Learning Centers Policy Guidelines should be rewritten with a more rigorous academic focus.**

Ending the practice of social promotion has been identified by the White House and the U.S. Department of Education as a top education priority.

"That is why I have repeatedly challenged states and school districts to end social promotion—to require students to meet rigorous academic standards at key transition points in their schooling, and to end the practice of promoting students without regard to how much they have learned. As every parent knows, students must earn promotion through effort and achievement, not simply by accumulating time in school." (President Clinton, Memorandum to the Secretary of Education, February 1998).

"Social promotion is an unacceptable response to the concern we all feel about the problem of low achievement in our nation's schools. The U.S. Department of Education is committed to helping end social promotion by working with states, districts, and schools to devise effective alternatives. Truly embracing the idea that all children can learn—and making sure that all children do—requires that we all take responsibility for ending social promotion and help all students meet high expectations for learning." (Secretary Richard Riley, U.S. Department of Education, "Taking Responsibility for Ending Social Promotion,")

A key component in the Administration's plan to end social promotion is increased opportunities for extended learning.

"Along with ending the practice of ending social promotion we must provide extra help for children after school and in the summer so that we don't just identify children as failures, but instead say, 'We're going to give you more help until you succeed.'" (President Clinton, July 1998).

"By intervening early in a child's school career and targeting those students who need intensive and tailored assistance, extended learning programs can help prepare students academically and developmentally to move to the next grade." (U.S. Department of Education, "Taking Responsibility," 47)

Strategies for Ending Social Promotion

(U.S. Department of Education, "Taking Responsibility," 10)

- Set clear objectives for students to meet performance standards at key grades.
- Identify student needs early in order to apply appropriate instructional strategies.
- Focus on providing high-quality curriculum and instruction.
- Provide professional development that deepens teacher's content knowledge and improves instructional strategies to engage all children in learning.
- **Provide summer school for students who are not meeting high academic standards.**
- **Extended learning time through before-and after-school programs, tutoring, homework centers, and year-round schooling**

"After-School programs not only keep children safe and out of trouble, but they also provide a prime opportunity to increase learning. Young people attending formal after-school programs spend more time in academic activities and in enrichment lessons than do their peers left unsupervised after school. Students in after-school programs show better achievement in math, reading and other subject." (U.S. Department of Education "Safe and Smart: Making After-School Hours Work for Kids," 13).

The primary source of federal funds specifically targeted for extended learning is 21st Century Community Learning Centers.

Although other federal programs such as Title I, Gear Up, and the Reading Excellence Act provide funds that can be used for extended learning, 21st Century Community Learning is the only program explicitly designed for the creation of after-school and summer school opportunities.

Of the above federal initiatives, 21st Century Community Learning Centers offers one approach which policymakers support to ending social promotion— adding additional learning time to the end of the school day..

Analysis of 21st Century Learning Centers Application

Of the thirteen listed Program Activities, of which four are required for funding, only three provide the academic focus necessary to help children reach high standards.

Although Competitive Priority 1 directly addresses the need for academic-based extended learning, it is worth only five points out of a total of 105 for the full application.

Of the remaining selection criteria: Competitive Priority 2, Need for Project, Quality of Project Design, Adequacy of Resources, Quality of the Management Plan, and Quality of Project Evaluation, none require that grants are specifically targeted for academically rich extended learning programs.

Importance of Academic Focus

While custodial programs that keep children safe, supervised, active, and involved have had an important role to play in communities, they are not enough for the students we are losing. They do not provide support for students who need to meet academic standards. These programs do not address such standards; in fact, they choose to be and presently are allowed to be judged by other criteria.

Every federal, state, local, and private-sector dollar spent on extended day and summer programs that do not deliver the kind of academic help necessary to advance a student's chance at graduation, higher education, and competitive employment is a dollar spent but not invested – well intentioned, perhaps, but misdirected. **Extended day and summer programming will not be enough to reverse student failure unless it is directly and effectively targeted at learning standards that yield improved opportunity for American students.**

21st Century Community Learning Centers Policy Guidelines should be rewritten with a more rigorous academic focus. "New" 21st Century Community Learning Centers Guidelines should include one of the following recommendations:

- 1) Increase the weight given to Competitive Priority 1 by valuing it at 40 points. This would make it worth more than each of the other individual selection criteria. Or,
- 2) Elevate Competitive Priority 1 to an Absolute Priority for 50% of the increased FY 2000 appropriations.

Rewriting 21st Century Community Learning Centers Policy Guidelines makes sense. Adopting rigorous academic criteria more closely aligns 21st Century Community Learning Centers, a major funding source for extended learning programs, with the Administration's priority on ending social promotion.

BUDGET MESSAGE: ***WE ARE SIGNIFICANTLY EXPANDING THE 21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS TO PROVIDE MORE HIGH-QUALITY AFTER-SCHOOL OPPORTUNITIES FOR ALL CHILDREN AND TARGETING THOSE CHILDREN MOST IN NEED.***

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

21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS:

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.

With the \$1 billion allocated to 21st Century Community Learning Centers in FY 01:

- **Continuation Grants:** \$453 million would be reserved for continuation grants to support the ongoing work of grantees awarded in the first years of the programs. These grantees represent a wide-range of schools, but are currently serving a high proportion of high-poverty schools – 75% of the grants are in schools with 50% or more students on free or reduced-price lunch and 45% of the grants are in Title I schools. The Department of Education would continue to award and monitor these grants from the Federal level.
- **After-School focused on Turning Around Failing Schools:** \$547 million, all new money, would be first targeted through a competitive priority to failing schools (the approximately 8,000 schools identified under Title I school improvement including those schools that are in or are expected to be identified for corrective action). A competitive priority would not guarantee that all 8,000 schools receive 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. Funds would be allocated to states based on the Title I formula and would be competed from the state level to local districts applying on behalf of schools. States would be required to implement the competitive priority for Title I school improvement schools in the state grant competition. [NOTE: Another option is for states to demonstrate in their application how they will target schools in corrective action, Title I school improvement, state's accountability system, or furthest from state standards rather than specifying a competitive priority for schools in school improvement.]
- **A Continuing Focus on Providing After-School Opportunities for Children in All Schools:** A competitive priority would first be given to the approximately 8,000 schools in Title I school improvement. If every school came in with a quality application, the \$547 million (with a 50% match) would allow us to fund quality programs in every Title I school in school improvement, but it is very unlikely that all schools will have quality applications.

Therefore, the program will continue to serve all schools (including other high poverty schools) once the funding has first been awarded to the quality applicants of those schools most in need.

NOTE: A requirement of a 50% match would be added to the new money to help extend the program to more students in failing schools.

CBOs: 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 set-aside with a focus on quality and accountability to help best serve the children in the worst schools.

Outstanding questions:

- Set-aside for National activities?

TITLE I

Given that a competitive priority does not guarantee funding, all schools in school improvement will not receive grants and thus all children in failing schools will not have the opportunity to participate in quality after-school programming without another lever of assurance.

In order to ensure that all children attending failing schools have the opportunity to participate in after-school, we could require Title I school improvement schools to demonstrate in their “school plan” how they will provide quality after-school opportunities to their children (whether through 21st Century, Title I, or state/local funds).

NOTE: This requires that Title I school improvement schools demonstrate that they are implementing high-quality after-school programs, but it does not mandate that they spend their Title I funds on after-school.

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, they just would not have the benefit of a competitive priority. This would allow us to continue to make the claim that the program is not targeted only to failing 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: Competitive Priority For Low-Performing Schools on Corrective Action

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:

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. paper	Universal After-School question paper (partial, page 2) (1 page)	n.d.	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Domestic Policy Council
Andrew Rotherham (Education)
OA/Box Number: 21294

FOLDER TITLE:

Universal After-School

2011-0103-S

rc150

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

- ! 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.

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*

P6(b)(6)
P6(b)(6)
P6(b)(6)

2002
Email to Cohen
and Mike Cohen
@ yahoo

federal
level

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.

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 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.

9500 → 4. Definition of Failing Schools - Corrective v. School Improvement

9500 - school improvement schools

Invitational Priority

Less than 50% of Title I ~~improvement~~ schools in need of assistance, get it

Corrective Action : 3800 - 4800

→ 560

- (A) Original
- (B) Corrective Action
- (C) Title I + invitational priority

Key questions

- proportion of new \$
- Invitational v. competitive priority - States would give competitive edge
- Special role for CBOs. Need to require schools to not just partner but let programs be run ~~by~~ CBOs.

How to achieve equity in after-school.

Raising the CBO Limit in 21st Century Community Learning Centers

Summary

This proposal would allow 30% of funds to be granted directly to non-profit community-based organizations (CBOs)—including faith-based organizations—which operate programs in partnership with public schools at the public school building. At present, no funds can be granted to CBOs, although the President's ESEA reauthorization proposal would allow them to receive up to 10% of funds. This change would recognize the central 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. This change to the current program would incur no additional cost.

Background: Why Allow CBOs to run programs?

- **Experience.** CBOs are running after-school programs across the country. In fact, CBOs have more experience running after-school programs than do public schools.
- **Offer New Educational Approaches.** CBOs can provide a new vision for educational enrichment and change in schools that have difficulty looking beyond current practices.
- **Connections to the Community and Capital.** Nonprofits can bring connections to the business, philanthropic and nonprofit sector that many schools often lack.
- **Personnel Issues.** With CBOs as the grantees, the hiring of instructors for after-school will be more flexible and less tied to union bargaining agreements (where applicable).

The DPC also proposes that programs be run at the public school site. Doing so 1) creates a more solid connection between the regular day academic program and the after-school program, 2) ensures student access to the program, 3) uses existing and needed facilities and equipment, and 4) meets licensing requirements for child care and educational activities.

The Track Record with CBOs

Head Start provides a good track record for the capacity of CBOs to run educational programs for children. Head Start grantees may be public or private, for-profit or nonprofit organizations or public school systems. The grantees are accountable for certain administrative, fiscal and program expectations and requirements. In the area of after-school, CBOs are running programs for school-age children across the country. In New York City, CBOs are receiving public and private funding to run programs at schools. For example, The After-School Corporation provides funding for 85 programs that are run by CBOs at public schools and the Virtual Y program offers after-school programs at over 200 New York City schools.

DPC Proposal

A redesigned 21st Century Community Learning Centers grant program would operate as follows:

- The grant competition would be opened up to allow 30% of funds to be granted directly to CBOs, in partnership with public schools, with proven track records in education.
- To be eligible for a grant award, programs must be run at public school sites.
- CBOs awarded a grant would have to demonstrate administrative, financial and program accountability for funds received (much in the same way public school recipients do now).
- Private companies could be partners with CBOs or schools, but would not be eligible to receive direct grants.

- Grants would be required to have a clearer focus on academic achievement than in the current 21st Century program.

Political Considerations

1. The support for this will likely be soft, given that fiscal agent status is a little bit of inside baseball. That said, Republicans and New Democrats should support the proposal as a way to inject flexibility into the process and allow local communities to deploy best resources for the job. The Congressional Hispanic and Black Caucuses might line up behind this as their constituents will be likely to support and have confidence in CBOs and they are more likely to represent districts where schools need community help in developing new approaches to working with kids.
2. The proposal would run into politically rocky ground with the inclusion of private companies as eligible bidders and the contentious issue of firms making private profits from public funds. Private companies would be allowed to partner, however, with CBOs and/or public schools.

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} = \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.