

# Enhancing School Reform Through Expanded Learning

**January 2009**

**Robert M. Stonehill  
Learning Point Associates**

**Priscilla M. Little  
Harvard Family Research Project**

**Steven M. Ross  
Laura Neergaard  
Lynn Harrison  
James Ford  
Center for Research in Educational Policy**

**Sharon Deich  
Cross & Jofus, LLC**

**Emily Morgan  
Jessica Donner  
The Collaborative for Building After-School Systems**



THE COLLABORATIVE  
*for* BUILDING  
AFTER-SCHOOL  
SYSTEMS

1120 East Diehl Road, Suite 200  
Naperville, IL 60563-1486  
800-356-2735 • 630-649-6500  
[www.learningpt.org](http://www.learningpt.org)

Copyright © 2009 Learning Point Associates. All rights reserved.

3319\_01/09

## **Acknowledgments**

This work was made possible through the generous support of the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, and we would like to thank An-Me Chung, the program officer responsible both for supporting this initiative and A New Day for Learning. We also thank The Atlantic Philanthropies for its generous support of the Collaborative for Building After-School Systems.

We would also like to thank the people who provided extensive guidance throughout the development of this report: Carol McElvain, Gina Burkhardt, Paula Corrigan-Halpern, and Carol Chelemer at Learning Point Associates; Lucy Friedman at The Collaborative for Building After-School Systems; Mary Bleiberg at The After-School Corporation; David Sinski at After School Matters; and Millicent Williams at the D.C. Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation.

# Contents

	<b>Page</b>
Foreword.....	1
Introduction .....	4
Report Overview.....	6
Supporting Student Outcomes Through Expanded Learning Opportunities.....	9
A Brief History of Afterschool.....	10
What Are the Benefits of Participation in Afterschool and Summer Learning Programs? .....	10
Why Should Schools and Afterschool and Summer Learning Programs Partner to Support Learning? .....	13
How Can Schools Partner With Afterschool and Summer Learning Programs to Support Expanded Learning? Five Principles for Sustainable Partnerships.....	14
Features of Effective Expanded Learning Opportunity Programs at the Point of Service.....	17
The Promise of Expanded Learning Opportunities for Education Reform .....	19
References.....	20
Do Intervention Models Include Expanded Learning Time? .....	24
Conceptual Framework and Study Design .....	25
Results.....	26
Case Studies .....	27
References.....	34
Appendix A. Expanded Learning in Developed Intervention Strategies .....	36
Appendix B. Interview Questions .....	40
Using Expanded Learning to Support School Reforms: Funding Sources & Strategies .....	41
A Renewed Call for More Time and Learning .....	41
Resources to Support Expanded Learning.....	42
Expanded Learning in Practice—Examples From the Field.....	47
School-Community Partnerships: The Key to Success for Financing Expanded Learning .....	50
Conclusion .....	52
References.....	54
Case Studies.....	58
PS 78 Anne Hutchinson School, Bronx, New York.....	58
Lantana Elementary School, Palm Beach County, Florida.....	60
Wendell Phillips Academy High School, Chicago, Illinois.....	61
Roger Williams Middle School, Providence, Rhode Island .....	63
References.....	65



# Foreword

**Robert M. Stonehill**  
**Learning Point Associates**

For more than two decades, the U.S. Department of Education and a wide range of private funders—including the New American Schools Development Corporation, the Annenberg Foundation, and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation—have provided substantial investments to design, implement, and evaluate comprehensive school reform approaches in high-needs, low-performing districts and schools. And for the last decade, on a mostly parallel and nonoverlapping track, the federal government and a range of philanthropies—including the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, the Wallace Foundation, and The Atlantic Philanthropies—have invested substantial resources to promote a more constructive use of students’ time through afterschool programs.

Comprehensive school reform has its roots in the “effective schools” work of the early 1980s. During that decade, high-poverty schools were authorized to use federal funds to offer schoolwide projects rather than services targeted to specific low-performing students. However, it was not until the 1990s that Congress began making significant investments to incentivize schools to embrace the “whole-school” or comprehensive school reform concept. The major funding stream to support this work was the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) program (later shortened to the Comprehensive School Reform program, or CSR), which provided formula grants to states who, in turn, provided competitive awards to high-poverty schools to implement CSR models. Dedicated CSR funding for the state programs ended in 2006, although districts and schools may continue to use their Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I funds for this purpose.

Another hallmark of this period was the rise of charter schools and other public schools that were “under new management.” The charter school experiment began in Philadelphia in the late 1980s with a schools-within-schools structure. The first state charter school law was passed in Minnesota in 1991, around the same time that the comprehensive school reform movement was gaining momentum. According to the Center for Education Reform, over 4,000 charter schools currently operate in 42 states, a number that has remained consistent since 2004. During the last decade, the Education Department has invested roughly \$200 million per year in the Charter School Program to provide supports to states that operate charter schools.

As the charter school movement has matured, charter management organizations were established to scale up some of the more popular and effective models such as KIPP Academies and Green Dot. Similarly, education management organizations also emerged as market-based reform efforts in which a private organization would be contracted to take over the management of low-performing public schools, for example, Edison Schools and Mosaica Education.

As mentioned, during the past decade afterschool programs also started to gain traction as an effective strategy to support academic achievement, provide enrichment activities that were slowly disappearing from the regular school day (or had never been there), and keep students safe and supervised during hours that they may otherwise be left at risk. While federal funds from many different programs had historically been used to provide afterschool and summer

academic services and child care, it was the funding of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) program in 1998 that triggered a national interest in keeping students “safe and smart.” Starting with a \$40 million appropriation in fiscal year (FY) 1998, the 21st CCLC program was investing \$1.1 billion per year by 2007 to serve approximately 1.4 million children in nearly 10,000 centers across the country.

Despite the combination of these heroic and often innovative efforts, substantial numbers of schools have failed repeatedly to make the adequate yearly progress (AYP) required by the accountability provisions of the ESEA, as reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. According to the Center on Education Policy, approximately 3,000 districts (out of approximately 15,000 nationally) had one or more schools in that category in the 2005–06 school year. And the most recent figures are even more disheartening. Writing in *Education Week*, David Hoff (2008) reports that almost 30,000 schools failed to make AYP in 2007–08, a 28 percent increase over the previous year. Hoff goes on to note that half those schools—approximately one in five nationwide—missed AYP for two or more years, and that 3,559 of those schools are now facing the law’s most serious mandated interventions.

In considering which educational support or intervention strategies to implement, districts are guided—at least in theory—by the “local educational agency plans” they are required to submit for state approval as a condition of receiving federal ESEA Title I funds (Section 1112(a)(2)). For schools that do not make AYP for two consecutive years, the district plan is no longer sufficient; the schools must develop their own two-year improvement plans (see Section 1116(b)(3)). If the school continues to miss its AYP targets after implementing its plan for two years, it is designated for “corrective action.” Districts must provide additional support, guidance, and assistance to any school in corrective action. If after another year the school still does not make AYP, it faces “alternative governance” or “restructuring,” the most serious mandated intervention noted above.

At every improvement stage noted, districts and schools are required to consider—in addition to the nearly universal focus on curriculum upgrades and professional development and the statutorily required public school choice option and supplemental educational services—offering extended learning time, before-school or afterschool programs, or summer programs. Conversations with staff at the Education Department who monitor states and districts for compliance with these requirements confirm that most plans do, in fact, at least mention afterschool or tutoring programs, though questions remain about the extent to which these are fully implemented and to the quality of services offered (personal communication, December 2008).

Entering 2009, massive numbers of schools have been identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, and the ESEA requires that districts and schools must not only improve the quality of teaching but also the learning supports offered to students. To that end, Learning Point Associates and The Collaborative for Building After-School Systems, with generous support from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, have launched an initiative that seeks to strengthen collaboration between reform efforts that support the goal of increased student achievement by focusing on district- and school-centered improvement strategies (e.g., standards setting, curricula reviews, surveys of enacted curriculum, and professional development) and

those that seek similar outcomes but instead employ a wide range of student-focused interventions, including but not limited to extending time and expanding learning opportunities.

As a first step in this initiative, this report suggests ways in which school reform and improvement strategies can be complemented by activities designed to expand where, when, and how students can learn and grow.

In this report, a group of commissioned authors collaborate to make an evidence-based case that expanded learning time programs can be an effective strategy to promote student performance, that the more recent and innovative school improvement strategies incorporate additional time for learning as a key element of their philosophies, and that resources exist to enable districts and schools to build in expanded learning time activities as core components of their reform plans.

As a longer term goal of the Enhancing School Reform Through Expanded Learning initiative, we seek to engage with educational support organizations nationwide to design and implement a wide range of research-based school reform strategies that integrate the best practices of school reform and expanded learning. The organizations that are particularly well suited to collaborate in this work include, but are not limited to, the ESEA-required state systems of support, the federally funded networks of regional educational laboratories and comprehensive centers, education service agencies, and research and development organizations.

As expectations for educational attainment rise while funds to support that work shrink, it is incumbent on all of us involved in school improvement and youth development work to ensure that available resources—not just funding, but time itself—are strategically used to meet the critical needs of schools and teachers as well as those of students and their families.

## Reference

Hoff, D. J. (2008, December 19). Schools struggling to meet key goal on accountability. *Education Week*, 28(16), 1, 14–15. Retrieved January 09, 2009, from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2008/12/18/16ayp.h28.html?qs=David+Hoff>

## Introduction

In the first decade of the 21st century, schools in the United States have been challenged to increase their effectiveness in educating our nation's youth. The passage of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act signaled a new era of accountability by requiring schools to ensure that all children are at least proficient in the core academic subjects, with special measures required to prevent schools from disguising weak performance by the students most in need of attention. At a time when national, state, and local policymakers are learning just how many schools are in dire need of assistance, our country, as well as the rest of the world, is facing a crippling economic crisis. It is time to rethink how we harness our resources for education and learning in this county. This report does just that by exploring the potential promise of utilizing expanded learning time as a key feature of initiatives to improve academic performance.

In collaboration with commissioned expert authors, Learning Point Associates and The Collaborative for Building After-School Systems seek to make an evidence-based case for the following:

- Expanded learning time can be an effective strategy to promote student performance.
- The more effective school improvement strategies will be those that incorporate the key elements of expanded learning time.
- Resources exist to enable districts and schools to build in expanded learning time activities as core components of their reform plans.

In the long term, the Enhancing School Reform Through Expanded Learning initiative will foster new partnerships between the education and afterschool systems. Through this work, we will inform leaders in these communities of the opportunities and benefits of designing and implementing a wide range of research-based school reform strategies that integrate the best practices of expanded learning. It is only by rethinking how we operate, and by leveraging and sharing our resources, that we will truly leave no child behind.

As we prepare for a leadership transition in the United States, one of the most pressing education priorities for the new administration is the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The legislative debate and resulting law has the potential to move the education system in the United States to a higher level of excellence and impact—regaining our credibility in the competitive marketplace. Yet, we must face the sobering reality that the financial resources accompanying this new law will be limited for the foreseeable future.

Schools will struggle with how to best identify and implement tools, research, and practices that ensure they make the most of the available resources. We strongly believe there are simple yet powerful ways readily available and accessible to leaders who are able to be innovative and bold.

Afterschool programs and expanded learning opportunities are a prime mechanism that schools and districts can align with school reform efforts to increase the “bang for the buck.” At the time this report is being published, the following facts prevail:



- Over 30,000 schools in 3,000 districts throughout the country failed to meet the adequate yearly progress requirements under NCLB.
- At the same time, national studies estimate that from 6.5 million to 8 million students are being served in up to 40,000 afterschool programs throughout the country.

These numbers demonstrate the potential for greater academic impact. School leaders must find a way to effectively tap into that very valuable resource of *time*—additional hours that students spend outside of the traditional school day that can provide value-added opportunities.

The economic downturn will certainly affect local and state budgets, through which most school funding is provided. Budgets may be even further reduced, and school leaders will have to be willing to take calculated risks to move academic performance of their students forward.

Now is the time for education leaders to shine and embrace and demonstrate the innovative spirit that defines Americans across the globe. As a nation, we thrive on these types of challenges, but it is not without thoughtful collaboration focused on a common goal.

This is an opportune time to strategically consider how school improvement initiatives taking place in thousands of sites can be complemented by the educational and youth development practices that are the hallmark of effective expanded learning programs. This report convincingly illustrates, by summarizing the results of more than a decade of research and evaluation studies, that high-quality afterschool and summer programs can have positive impacts in three key areas of a students' development:

- Academic outcomes, including but not limited to grades, improved assessment results, and school attendance
- Developmental outcomes (e.g., improved behavior and self-esteem)
- Health outcomes (e.g., increased physical activity)

Imagine how the children of our nation could succeed if school leaders throughout this country embraced new partnerships with the afterschool providers in their community or supported efforts to restructure the school day. It's a small step, but one with tremendous implications for the success of our students.

## Report Overview

The proven effectiveness of well-implemented afterschool programs has stimulated several national initiatives, for example, A New Day for Learning funded by the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation and the widely endorsed Broader, Bolder Approach to Education. Such initiatives embrace the idea that the traditional school-day approach is not sufficient to meet the nation's educational challenges. Congressional leaders and key philanthropies are considering a range of additional strategies to promote the use of expanded learning time.

For instance, based on work being piloted in Massachusetts, Senator Edward Kennedy has introduced the Time for Innovation Matters in Education Act, which would authorize \$350 million next year and up to \$500 million by 2014 to redesign the school schedule to expand learning time for students by 30 percent. Senator Kennedy also proposed amending the ESEA to authorize \$50 million a year to recruit and train 20,000 teaching fellows to help coordinate and support expanded learning time programs. As a further example of philanthropic interest in this area, Bill Gates and Eli Broad have made expanded learning time initiatives (or programs) a key element of the education reform agenda they promoted during the presidential election campaign.

This confluence of additional resources and prominent interest presents a significant opportunity to strengthen the connections between school and afterschool systems. With the trajectory of districts and schools that do not meet their achievement goals continuing to increase, it is imperative for the school reform and afterschool communities, which have not always worked closely together at the national level, to join together to develop a shared vision of comprehensive school reform and improvement that is both school centered and student centered.

Learning Point Associates and The Collaborative for Building After-School Systems (CBASS), with generous support from the Mott Foundation, have launched an initiative to strengthen collaboration between reform efforts that support the goal of increased student achievement by focusing on district- and school-centered improvement strategies and those that seek similar outcomes but focus instead on student-focused interventions. By marrying traditional district and school reform efforts—including standards setting, curricula reviews, and professional development—with student-focused efforts, including community schools and expanded learning time programs, schools and districts have a powerful combination of tools to engage students and enact changes that can set a new direction for struggling schools.

As a first step in the initiative, this report aims to further the conversation of how school reform and improvement strategies can take full advantage of expanded learning opportunities to promote student learning, development, and engagement. Our guest authors examine this issue through their separate lenses of research, education policy, financial resources, and school-based exemplars.

- A key characteristic of effective, well-implemented afterschool programs is a strong partnership between school and afterschool personnel. Principals, superintendents, and

school board members can no longer view themselves as landlords while viewing afterschool programs as tenants in the school space.

In the first brief, Priscilla Little, associate director of the Harvard Family Research Project, reviews the latest research illustrating the positive impact that afterschool and extended learning programs have on the performance of students in school. She makes the case that afterschool programs are an important resource that can help schools address some of the educational inequities that exist and better position the schools to fulfill the vision of No Child Left Behind. Her brief identifies effective strategies that can help school leaders learn to work more effectively with the programs that serve their students after school.

- Since the early 1990s, thousands of schools and districts seeking to improve educational outcomes have implemented a range of research-based comprehensive school reform approaches. However, these approaches tended to address specific legislative requirements but did not, in general, incorporate expanded learning opportunities as a key component of their strategic design.

In the second brief, Steven Ross, Faudree professor and director of the Center for Research in Educational Policy at the University of Memphis, and his colleagues examine the most popular “designed interventions,” such as comprehensive school reform (CSR) models, charter and education management organizations, and trademarked school improvement processes and turnaround models. They report that nearly all early CSR models were inattentive to the issue of expanding time for learning. However, as more and more schools failed to meet the AYP requirements of NCLB, comprehensive programs—including charter school designs—were engineered to better manage school resources and expand learning time to improve student achievement. At least some educational innovators now seem to increasingly understand that expanded learning opportunities as a part of their formal design, when done well, are an effective strategy to enhance their ability to help children achieve academic success.

- The changes discussed in this report are neither easy nor simple. They require individuals to think differently and create partnerships that are not typical in their school environment or the way school leaders have traditionally approached the operation of their schools.

In the third brief, Sharon Deich, a vice president with Cross & Joftus, provides examples of how existing federal and nonfederal resources are now being used in innovative ways to support reform strategies that include expanded learning. Readers will benefit from the practical advice Deich shares that can help school and community leaders consider how best to use their existing resources.

- Finally, Emily Morgan, national policy coordinator for CBASS, and Jessica Donner, CBASS director, present four case studies of schools that have embraced expanded learning opportunities as a strategy for school improvement.

The afterschool movement began as a means to meet the needs of working parents who sought safe environments for their children when the school day ended. As the demands for improved academic achievement increased, visionary leaders in the afterschool community realized the powerful role that well-structured afterschool programs could play in improving the academic achievement of the students they served. By providing focused supports to children during out-of-school time, students, including those most at risk, have been able to receive the additional supports needed to reach their potential.

# Supporting Student Outcomes Through Expanded Learning Opportunities

Priscilla M. Little  
Harvard Family Research Project

From the education leaders of the New Day for Learning Task Force to the signatories to the Broader, Bolder Approach to Education statement to President-elect Barack Obama, there is growing momentum in the education policy arena to educate the children and youth of the United States in more intentional and aligned ways. This momentum is creating a range of increasingly integrated education approaches at multiple levels, including those that rethink the use of time across the school day and year, such as expanded learning opportunity models. At the same time, increased investments in afterschool and summer learning over the past decade have resulted in a substantial evidence base about the academic, social, health, and other benefits of afterschool programs and have created a strong case that they are important pathways to learning, particularly when they work with schools to support student success. Yet, too often, these supports continue to be seen as “add-ons,” not integral to in-school education efforts.

Afterschool-school integration is not new; in fact, it served as the impetus for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) program, which, for the past decade, has called for schools to work in partnership with community- and faith-based organizations. However, the past 10 years have witnessed tremendous growth in expanded learning opportunity programs and initiatives aimed specifically at intentional partnerships between afterschool programs and schools in order to support—but not replicate—in-school learning and development. The purpose of this brief is to shine a spotlight on the role of afterschool and summer learning programs in supporting student success and to help bridge the divide between afterschool and summer

## Rethinking Time and Learning\*

Many now agree that the traditional school day and calendar alone are not enough to produce continuous learning improvements and, as a result, believe that expanding the school day and the school year is a promising solution to support student success. But what does that expansion look like? Currently, there are several school-based and school-linked models being implemented and tested, all of which include schools as a core component of a larger education strategy.

Approaches to expanded learning include the following:

*Afterschool programs:* structured programs in out-of-school time that coordinate with schools and provide children and youth supervised and safe activities designed to promote learning across time, contexts, and developmental stages.

*Summer learning programs:* structured programs and enrichment activities designed to supplement academic learning and promote enrichment opportunities during the nonschool summer months.

*Extended day and year schools:* school models that expand the traditional school day and calendar in order to balance the core curriculum with enrichment opportunities, often including afterschool programs.

*Community schools:* comprehensive public schools that provide a range of services and supports for children, youth, and families across the day and throughout the year.

*School-community networks:* intentional connections between schools and community organizations for the purpose of promoting and supporting students’ learning needs.

*Online learning:* virtual courses and out-of-school-time programs that utilize the Internet and digital media to provide learning to students across time, geographic boundaries, and contexts.

\* For a complete review of new approaches to time and learning, see Malone, H., Weiss, H., & Little, P. (In press). *Rethinking time and learning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project.

programs and schools by offering some research-derived principles for effective expanded learning partnership efforts.<sup>1</sup>

## **A Brief History of Afterschool**

Afterschool programs have existed for over a century, responding at various times to the need for adult supervision, risk prevention, and skill building. The 1970s marked a resurgence of demand for afterschool programs in response to growth in maternal employment (Vandell & Shumow, 1999); afterschool, then called school-age child care, was seen as a solution to the “problem” of working mothers. The afterschool movement really took hold in 1998, with the U.S. Department of Education’s launch of the 21st CCLC program and its historic public-private partnership with the C.S. Mott Foundation to support the capacity of programs to deliver quality services. Not coincidentally, by 1998, voters reported seeing afterschool programs as venues where children could master skills, receive tutoring, and prepare for a productive future (Seligson, 1999).

The 2002 reauthorization of the 21st CCLC legislation narrowed the focus of these programs from a community learning center model, in which all members of the community benefited from access to school resources such as teachers, computer labs, gymnasiums, and classrooms, to an afterschool program model that provides academic enrichment and additional services to complement in-school learning, as well as literacy and related educational development services to families of children in the program.

Over time, then, the multiple benefits of participation in afterschool programs have become apparent. Adult supervision, risk prevention, and skill building have been coupled with an increased emphasis, especially in the past five years, on the role of afterschool and summer learning programs in addressing the problems of underperforming students and, more broadly, narrowing the learning gap. Today, afterschool programs are seen as a vital opportunity and resource for learning and development, with over 6.5 million children and youth participating (Afterschool Alliance, 2008) and many more families—especially from low-income and minority groups—reporting unmet demand for high-quality and accessible programming (Duffett, Johnson, Farkas, Kung, & Ott, 2004).

## **What Are the Benefits of Participation in Afterschool and Summer Learning Programs?**<sup>2</sup>

Afterschool programs can impact learning and academic success in a number of ways. Relative to participation in other afterschool arrangements (such as self-care or sibling care), participation

---

<sup>1</sup> Information for this brief is based, in part, on an ongoing evaluation of The Atlantic Philanthropies Disadvantaged Children and Youth Integrated Learning Cluster. Specifically, the Harvard Family Research Project (HFRP) evaluation team is conducting a study to better understand the development and sustainability of school-time/out-of-school-time nonprofit partnerships at the school and district levels. A full copy of the report will be available in March 2009 on the HFRP website ([www.hfrp.org](http://www.hfrp.org)).

<sup>2</sup> Adapted from Weiss, H., Little, P., Bouffard, S., Deschenes, S., & Malone, H. (2008). *The federal role in out-of-school learning: After-school, summer learning, and family involvement as critical learning supports*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project.

can result in less disciplinary action; lower dropout rates; better academic performance in school, including better grades and test scores; greater on-time promotion; improved homework completion; and improved work habits (Little, Wimer, & Weiss, 2008). Three studies in particular illustrate this point:

- In 2008, results from an **evaluation of enhanced academic instruction** in afterschool programs, a two-year intervention and random assignment evaluation of adapted models of regular school-day math and reading instruction in afterschool settings, commissioned by the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance at the U.S. Department of Education, were released (Black, Doolittle, Zhu, Unterman, & Grossman, 2008). First-year implementation findings revealed that students in the enhanced programs experienced more targeted instruction, which resulted overall in significant gains for math but not reading. These findings suggest that participation in an afterschool program that intentionally targets specific skills may lead to positive impacts on learning. However, the results of the second year of implementation are needed in order to make summary statements.
- A two-year longitudinal **study of promising afterschool programs** examined the long-term effects of participation in quality afterschool programs among almost 3,000 youth in 35 elementary and middle school afterschool programs located in 14 cities and 8 states (Vandell, Reisner, & Pierce, 2007). Findings for 2007 from that study indicate that, of the elementary and middle school students who participated in high-quality afterschool programs, the elementary school students who *regularly attended* the high-quality afterschool programs (alone or in combination with other activities) *across two years* demonstrated significant gains in standardized math test scores, compared to their peers who were routinely unsupervised after school hours. It is important to note that this study found regular participation in afterschool programs to be associated with improvements in work habits and task persistence, which, in turn, may have contributed to the academic gains.
- The national **study of the 21st CCLC program** is an older, but still important, study of the impact of afterschool. Released in 2003, that study, which employed both experimental and quasi-experimental designs, showed mixed findings related to an afterschool program's impact on student achievement as measured by grades and SAT-9 test scores, but it demonstrated some impact on school-related measures of success such as attendance and college aspirations (U.S. Department of Education, 2003). While the results were termed "disappointing" and used by the Administration as the rationale for a proposed \$400 million budget reduction in the program, the evaluation was nevertheless an important turning point in federal investments in research and evaluation because it led to the realization that evaluating program outcomes necessitates also evaluating and supporting higher quality program implementation.

Several other studies and meta-analyses confirm the same message: Afterschool programs *can* improve academic achievement. For example, Granger (2008) examined several narrative and empirical reviews of the effects of afterschool programs and concludes that "although reviews vary in their conclusions regarding academics, the most reliable reviews show that on average programs have positive impacts on important academic, social, and emotional outcomes" (p. 4). One of the studies Granger reviewed was a 2006 meta-analysis by Lauer, Akiba, Wilkerson,

Apthorp, Snow, and Martin-Glenn (2006), who found small but statistically significant effects on both reading and math across 35 studies of out-of-school-time educational interventions. Dozens of studies of afterschool programs and initiatives repeatedly underscore the powerful impact of supporting a range of positive learning outcomes, including academic achievement, by affording children and youth opportunities to learn and practice new skills through hands-on, experiential learning in project-based afterschool programs, which complement, but do not replicate, in-school learning.

The evidence for summer learning is equally compelling. When students actively participate in summer programs, and particularly when they are encouraged to participate by their families, they stand to improve their reading and math levels going into the next grade, as well as their standardized test scores (Learning Point Associates, 2005). A meta-analysis of 93 summer programs (Cooper, Nye, Charlton, Lindsay, & Greathouse, 1996) indicated that summer learning has a range of effects on academic achievement for both remedial and accelerated programs. Remedial programs can have a positive impact on skill and knowledge building, particularly with smaller class sizes. Similarly, findings from the Chicago Summer Bridge program and Teach Baltimore summer program show that summer education can help to supplement students' scholastic achievement in both reading and math (Denton, 2002). In addition, academically focused summer programs help students to successfully transition into the next grade level, a benefit attributable to smaller class size, individualized learning, and personal attention by teachers, all of which might not be available to students during the academic year (Cooper et al., 1996).

Participation in well-implemented afterschool and summer learning programs also can support the healthy development requisite for learning. In the United States, over 50 percent of school-aged children's waking hours are spent outside of school (Larson & Verma, 1999). Historically, how best to use this time has been the topic of debate, but the past decade has seen a convergence in opinion: Time out of school, such as that spent in afterschool and summer learning programs, offers opportunities to complement in-school learning and development and expose children to experiences to which they do not have access during the school day and year. Researchers and practitioners alike assert that, in addition to families, peers, and schools, high-quality, organized out-of-school-time activities have the potential to support and promote youth development, equipping students with the skills needed to be active learners in the classroom. Such activities have multiple benefits. They (1) situate youth in safe environments; (2) prevent youth from engaging in delinquent activities; (3) teach youth general and specific skills, beliefs, and behaviors; and (4) provide opportunities for youth to develop relationships with peers and mentors (National Research Council & Institute of Medicine, 2004). Thus, not only can afterschool and summer learning programs directly support academic success, but they also can equip students with the skills necessary to be effective learners and leaders.

In addition to demonstrating that afterschool and summer learning programs support specific academic skills and overall development, the past decade of research and evaluation makes it clear that participation in well-implemented afterschool and summer learning can address some of the educational challenges for children and youth living in poverty. Specifically, they can:

- Connect youth to quality learning opportunities and to learning itself and keep youth engaged in school.



- Help youth practice social and interpersonal skills and gain from positive youth development models.
- Give youth more access to environments that support academic achievement, particularly in the current higher stakes educational environment.

Summer programming, in particular, can help address the opportunity gap that occurs during this extended period when lower income children and youth have less access to enrichment opportunities than their more affluent and advantaged peers.

In sum, the evidence indicates, first, that afterschool and summer programs are important learning environments that can address some current educational inequities and, second, that participation in well-implemented programs can support academic and other developmental outcomes.

### **Why Should Schools and Afterschool and Summer Learning Programs Partner to Support Learning?**

Evidence is mounting that sustained participation in a quality afterschool program—one that has strong connections to schools and to families—yields the best gains for program participants (Little et al., 2008). In addition to better supporting student success as described above, afterschool-school partnerships can serve to strengthen, support, and even transform individual partners, resulting in improved program quality, more efficient use of resources, and better alignment of goals and curriculum. Effective partnerships are those in which there is a shared value proposition, with each partner seeing the value added by working with the other entity.

Specifically, partnerships with afterschool and summer learning *can help schools to:*

- Provide a wider range of services and activities, particularly enrichment and arts activities, that are not available during the school day.
- Support transitions from middle to high school.
- Reinforce concepts taught in school.
- Improve school culture and community image through exhibitions and performances.
- Gain access to mentors and afterschool staff to support in-school learning.

#### **Research Spotlight: Connections Matter**

The *Massachusetts Afterschool Research Study* found that afterschool programs with stronger relationships with school teachers and principals were more successful at improving students' homework completion, homework effort, positive behavior, and initiative. This may be because positive relationships with schools can foster high-quality, engaging, and challenging activities, and also promote staff engagement (Intercultural Center for Research in Education et al., 2005).

*Evaluation of Supplemental Educational Services (SES)* found that program quality suffered when there were not effective partnerships between schools and SES providers. School staff were needed to help coordinate SES and identify and recruit participants; without the partnerships, SES providers were less able to align their supplementary education with in-school learning needs (U.S. Department of Education, 2004).

Partnership is a two-way street, and afterschool and summer programs are also likely to benefit from partnerships with schools. Partnerships with schools *can help afterschool and summer programs to:*

- Gain access to and recruit groups of students most in need of support services.
- Improve program quality and staff engagement.
- Foster better alignment of programming to support a shared vision for learning.
- Maximize resource use such as facilities, staff, data, and curriculum.

Finally, strong school-afterschool/summer partnerships *benefit students in important ways* beyond academic support. They can:

- Provide continuity of services across the day and year.
- Facilitate access to a range of learning opportunities.
- Share information about specific students to best support individual learning.

Given that the evidence is clear on the benefits of participation in afterschool and summer learning programs, why don't more schools and districts engage in expanded learning efforts that include afterschool and summer programming? The answer is really very simple: Forging partnerships is hard work. It takes time, resources, and a commitment from both sides to make it work. The next part of this brief offers a set of principles to help schools and districts forge sustainable school-afterschool partnerships and then points to specific expanded learning program features that support positive learning outcomes in the out-of-school hours.

## **How Can Schools Partner With Afterschool and Summer Learning Programs to Support Expanded Learning? Five Principles for Sustainable Partnerships**

At the heart of successful expanded learning opportunities are sound, sustainable partnerships among afterschool and summer program providers and schools working together to support learning. Although partnership development does not happen overnight, over time, effective partnerships move from being transactional to transformative in nature (Enos & Morton, 2003). That is, partners move from operating as separate entities with separate goals and outcomes to working in conjunction with one another to create an expanded learning system with a shared vision, mission, and outcomes. Five principles support movement toward transformative, sustainable school-afterschool/summer partnerships:<sup>3</sup>

- A shared vision for learning and success, with explicit focus on supporting academics
- Blended staffing models that enable crossover among school, afterschool, and summer staff
- School-afterschool/summer partnerships at multiple levels within the school and district

---

<sup>3</sup> These principles were derived through interviews conducted by the HFRP evaluation team with senior leadership of 11 of Atlantic Philanthropies' direct service grantees. Data were augmented by a literature review on partnerships and collaboration.

- Regular and reciprocal collection and sharing of information about student progress
- Intentional and explicit contrast between school and afterschool environments

### **Shared Vision for Learning and Success, With Explicit Focus on Supporting Academics**

Successful expanded learning partnerships require a shared vision for learning, which acknowledges the roles of the school and the afterschool program in supporting and assessing student success. When school leaders share a vision for student success that considers students' physical, emotional, and social well-being in addition to academic outcomes, the partnership is more likely to be successful than when competing agendas operate during the extended day. A broader vision of learning helps schools to recognize nonschool supports as critical in redefining what students need to be successful; it also helps afterschool programs better understand what they need to provide to complement in-school classroom instruction.

Developing a shared vision needs to happen at the outset of a partnership effort. Partners need to establish shared expectations through such means as a Memorandum of Understanding or a purposeful, due-diligence meeting to determine the shared value proposition of the partnership. Other strategies include inviting key school and district partners to join afterschool program boards and having program staff participate in school leadership or governance teams.

### **Blended Staffing Models for Crossover Among School, Afterschool, and Summer Staff**

A critical component of the success of expanded learning opportunities is hiring the right staff. From an afterschool and summer perspective, this means hiring staff who have legitimacy in the school building and who are skilled at building relationships with school staff. One way to do this is to hire licensed teachers, who “speak the same language” as school-day teachers, can substitute and consult in classrooms, and can participate in professional development activities. Hiring licensed teachers who also teach at a host school facilitates information sharing and forges connections with other teachers who might not otherwise make time for “outside” programs or services. From a school perspective, it means encouraging school-day teachers to consider working as part of an afterschool or summer learning team, on which they bring their content expertise to bear to support and reinforce the development of critical learning skills.

Expanded learning opportunities benefit from having a staff member, either employed by the school or the afterschool program or shared across both, whose primary responsibilities are to coordinate resources among partners, create learning plans for students based on those resources, and facilitate communications and relationship building. In addition to a designated staff member, expanded learning opportunities should encourage school and program staff alike to participate in governance and leadership committees as well as grade-level and content-specific teams in order to be fully integrated partners.

### **School-Afterschool/Summer Partnerships at Multiple Levels in the School and District**

Relationships between schools and afterschool and summer programs are most effective when they occur at multiple levels and among multiple school personnel—with teachers, coaches, guidance counselors, secretaries, and janitors in addition to the principal. Multilevel partnerships

foster shared ownership of the partnership, help to ensure that the partnership is strong and sustainable, increase the program's visibility in the school building during the school day, and allow programs to be involved in the life of the school. Given staff and leadership turnover at the school level, relationships at the district level can be particularly crucial in maintaining sustainability.

### **Regular and Reciprocal Collection and Sharing of Information About Student Progress**

A consistently reported feature of a strong collaboration is the ability of partners to access information and data from each other, including, if possible, student-level academic data (e.g., test scores and grades). Afterschool and summer programs can use these data both to track and strengthen student performance and to demonstrate the impact of their services. This data-driven approach to student learning is sometimes difficult because of privacy concerns about sharing student-level data; however, getting data from districts by student ID number, rather than by name, can help overcome this obstacle.

In addition to getting data from schools, some programs provide their own data to schools to promote reciprocal data sharing. Another way to support reciprocity of data sharing is to offer to analyze the data regularly provided by schools and districts and feed the results back to them, highlighting any improvements that might be attributable to the program.

District-level support and connections greatly facilitate data sharing, either through a formal letter or Memorandum of Understanding or through informal relationships with key district staff. District support often can trickle down to school buildings and principals to help program staff get report cards, attendance data, and teacher reports on student progress. But, even if sharing official school data is not possible because of privacy and other concerns, it is still important for school and afterschool and summer staff to have some mechanisms in place for sharing information about students and curriculum to ensure that what happens during the school day is complemented and reinforced by what occurs during expanded learning time.

### **Intentional and Explicit Contrast Between School and Afterschool Environments**

Evidence developed over the past 10 years makes it clear that effective out-of-school learning environments, such as those proposed in expanded learning opportunities, complement rather than replicate in-school learning and development. In fact, a common thread among recent studies demonstrating the academic impact of afterschool programs is that the programs not only intentionally tried to improve academic performance by offering academic support but also combined this support with other enrichment activities to achieve positive academic outcomes. Thus, extra time for academics by itself may be necessary but not sufficient to improve academic outcomes. However, balancing academic support with a variety of engaging, fun, and structured extracurricular or cocurricular activities that promote youth development in a variety of real-world contexts appears to support and improve academic performance.

Because afterschool and summer programs are not regulated by time blocks and class schedules, they are able to go into greater depth on specific topics and skills, offering students options and choices to pursue individual interests, and thereby strike the balance that the research suggests is

necessary to achieve impact. But in addition to these structural differences, converging evidence suggests that afterschool and summer learning can and should “look and feel” fundamentally different from in-school learning environments and points to some specific aspects of effective out-of-school learning experiences. Accordingly, this paper concludes with evidence about three aspects that make a difference in getting to positive learning outcomes in afterschool and summer learning programs.

## **Features of Effective Expanded Learning Opportunity Programs at the Point of Service<sup>4</sup>**

When schools are considering partnering with afterschool and summer learning programs, it is important to attend to critical program features at the “point of service” in order to maximize the likelihood of attaining positive outcomes. Emerging research on these features and their relationship to outcomes indicates that, in addition to ensuring adequate physical and psychological safety and effective management practices, effective afterschool and summer programs also have appropriate supervision and structure, well-prepared staff, and intentional programming with opportunities for autonomy and choice.

### **Appropriate Supervision and Structure**

Without the structure and supervision of focused and intentional programming, participants in afterschool programs can, at best, fail to achieve positive outcomes and, at worst, begin to perform worse than their peers (Pearson, Russell, & Reisner, 2007; Vandell, et al., 2006). In fact, some research finds that when youth are concentrated together without appropriate structure and supervision, problematic behavior follows. This suggests that focused, intentional activities with appropriate structure and supervision are necessary to keep youth on an upward trajectory and out of trouble (Jacob & Lefgren, 2003). One of the primary conclusions of the *Study of Promising Afterschool Programs* was that, as compared to nonparticipants, children and youth benefit from an array of afterschool experiences that include quality afterschool programs *as well as* other structured school- and community-based activities supervised by adults. Specifically, researchers found that, in comparison to a less-supervised group, school-aged children who frequently attended high-quality afterschool programs, alone and in combination with other supervised activities, displayed better work habits, task persistence, social skills, prosocial behaviors, and academic performance, and less aggressive behavior at the end of the school year (Vandell et al., 2006).<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Adapted from Little, P., Wimer, C., & Weiss, H. (2007). *After school programs in the 21st century: Their potential and what it takes to achieve it*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project.

<sup>5</sup> Programs were rated using the Promising Practices rating scale, which assesses eight processes: (1) supportive relations with adults, (2) supportive relations with peers, (3) student engagement in activities, (4) opportunities for cognitive growth, (5) mastery orientation, (6) appropriate program structure, (7) setting chaos, and (8) staff overcontrol.

## Well-Prepared Staff

Time and again, the bottom line of many afterschool studies is that one of the most critical features of high-quality programs necessary for achieving positive outcomes is the quality of a program's staff. Youth are more likely to realize the benefits of programs if they develop positive relationships with the program's staff, and staff can only build these positive relationships through positive, quality interactions with youth. Research and evaluation efforts are beginning to identify how high-quality staffing and relationships can be achieved. A follow-up study of the TASC (The After-School Corporation) evaluation found that specific staff practices lent themselves to the development of positive relationships between staff and youth. Looking across program sites for middle schoolers, evaluators found that positive relationships were found in sites where staff (1) modeled positive behavior, (2) actively promoted student mastery of the skills or concepts presented in activities, (3) listened attentively to participants, (4) frequently provided individualized feedback and guidance during activities, and (5) established clear expectations for mature, respectful peer interactions (Birmingham, Pechman, Russell, & Mielke, 2005).

Staff and youth surveys and observations were recently conducted at five of Philadelphia's Beacon Centers (school-based community centers that include a range of afterschool opportunities) to understand three questions: (1) What conditions lead youth to want to attend an activity? (2) What aspects of an afterschool activity lead youth to be highly engaged? (3) What conditions lead youngsters to feel that they have learned in an activity? Based on the responses of 402 youth surveys, 45 staff surveys, and 50 activity observations, two staff practices emerge as critical to youth engagement: effective group management to ensure that youth feel respected by both the adults and the other youth, and positive support for youth and their learning processes (Grossman, Campbell, & Raley, 2007).

## Intentional Programming

In their meta-analysis of 73 afterschool programs' impacts, Durlak and Weissberg (2007) found that positive impacts on academic, prevention, and developmental outcomes were concentrated in the programs that utilized strategies characterized as *sequenced* (using a sequenced set of activities designed to achieve skill development objectives), *active* (using active forms of learning to help youth develop skills), *focused* (program components devoted to developing personal or social skills), and *explicit* (targeting of specific personal or social skills). Moreover, the researchers found that, as a group, programs missing any of these four characteristics did not achieve positive results. This points to the importance of targeting specific goals and intentionally designing activities around those goals.

Programs can better implement intentional, focused programming by promoting high levels of organization within program activities. For instance, in the evaluation of the CORAL Initiative, researchers at Public/Private Ventures found that the highest quality activities took place when staff provided youth with clear instructions, delivered organized lessons, employed specific strategies designed to motivate and challenge youth, and had activities prepared for youth who finished activities before others. Having systems in place to manage youth behavior also was key (Arbreton, Goldsmith, & Shelton, 2005).

Thus, when schools are looking to partner with afterschool and summer programs to expand learning opportunities, they should seek out programs that have these programmatic features and provide support to their expanded learning opportunity partners to develop and refine these critical point-of-service aspects.

## **The Promise of Expanded Learning Opportunities for Education Reform**

The research warrant for afterschool and summer learning programs is clear: Children and youth who participate in well-implemented programs and activities outside of school are poised to stay enrolled longer and perform better in school than their peers who do not attend such programs. Further, emerging research indicates that when schools and afterschool programs partner to support student success, all parties stand to benefit. Building on the 10-year tradition of 21st Century Community Learning Centers, the time is ripe to move afterschool and summer learning programs into the mainstream of education reform efforts, implementing and testing a variety of expanded learning opportunity models aimed at forging new and sustainable partnerships with schools in support of learning.

## References

- Afterschool Alliance. (2008). *Afterschool issues overview*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Arbreton, A. J. A., Goldsmith, J., & Sheldon, J. (2005). *Launching literacy in after-school programs: Early lessons from the CORAL Initiative*. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.
- Birmingham, J., Pechman, E. M., Russell, C. A., & Mielke, M. (2005). *Shared features of high-performing after-school programs: A follow-up to the TASC evaluation*. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates. Retrieved January 7, 2009, from <http://www.sedl.org/pubs/fam107/fam107.pdf>
- Black, A. R., Doolittle, F., Zhu, P., Unterman, R., & Grossman, J. B. (2008). *The evaluation of enhanced academic instruction in after-school programs: Findings after the first year of implementation* (NCEE 2008-4021). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
- Cooper, H., Nye, B., Charlton, K., Lindsay, J., & Greathouse, S. (1996). The effects of summer vacation on achievement test scores: A narrative and meta-analytic review. *Review of Educational Research*, 66(3), 227–268.
- Denton, D. R. (2002). *Summer school: Unfulfilled promise*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board. Retrieved January 7, 2009, from [http://www.sreb.org/programs/srr/pubs/Summer\\_School.pdf](http://www.sreb.org/programs/srr/pubs/Summer_School.pdf)
- Duffett, A., Johnson, J., Farkas, S., Kung, S., & Ott, A. (2004). *All work and no play? Listening to what kids and parents really want from out-of-school time*. New York: Public Agenda.
- Durlak, J. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2007). *The impact of after-school programs that promote personal and social skills*. Chicago: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning.
- Enos, S., & Morton, K. (2003). Developing a theory and practice of campus-community partnerships. In B. Jacoby (Ed.). *Building partnerships for service learning* (pp. 20–41). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Granger, R. T. (2008). After-school programs and academics: Implications for policy, practice, and research. *Social Policy Report*, 22(2). Retrieved January 7, 2009, from <http://www.srcd.org/documents/publications/spr/spr22-2.pdf>
- Grossman, J., Campbell, M., & Raley, B. (2007). *Quality time afterschool: What instructors can do to enhance learning*. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.



- Intercultural Center for Research in Education, & National Institute on Out-of-School Time (2005). *Pathways to success for youth: What works in afterschool: A report of the Massachusetts Afterschool Research Study (MARS)*. Boston: United Way of Massachusetts Bay.
- Jacob, B. A., & Lefgren, L. (2003). Are idle hands the devil's workshop? Incapacitation, concentration, and juvenile crime. *American Economic Review*, 93, 1560–1577.
- Larson, R. W., & Verma, S. (1999). How children and adolescents spend time across the world: Work, play, and developmental opportunities. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(6), 701–736.
- Lauer, P. A., Akiba, M., Wilkerson, S. B., Apthorp, H. S., Snow, D., & Martin-Glenn, M. L. (2006). Out-of-school-time programs: A meta-analysis of effects for at-risk students. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(2), 275–313.
- Learning Point Associates. (2005). *Ten years of research on adolescent literacy, 1994–2004: A review*. Naperville, IL: Author.
- Little, P., Wimer, C., & Weiss, H. B. (2008). *After school programs in the 21st century: Their potential and what it takes to achieve it*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project.
- National Research Council, & Institute of Medicine. (2004). *Community programs to promote youth development* (Report Brief). Washington, DC: National Academy Press. Retrieved January 7, 2009, from [http://www.bocyf.org/youth\\_development\\_brief.pdf](http://www.bocyf.org/youth_development_brief.pdf)
- Pearson, L. M., Russell, C. A., & Reisner, E. R. (2007). *Evaluation of OST programs for youth: Patterns of youth retention in OST programs, 2005–06 to 2006–07*. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates.
- Seligson, M. (1999). The policy climate for school-age child-care. *Future of Children*, 9(2), 135–139.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2003). *When schools stay open late: The national evaluation of the 21st-Century Community Learning Centers program, first year findings*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved January 7, 2009, from <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/21cent/firstyear>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2004). *Early implementation of supplemental educational services under the No Child Left Behind Act: Year one report*. Washington, DC: Office of the Under Secretary, Policy and Program Studies Service.
- Vandell, D., Pierce, K., Brown, B., Lee, D., Bolt, D., Dadisman, K., et al. (2006, March). *Developmental outcomes associated with the after-school contexts of low-income children and youth*. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Research on Adolescence, San Francisco, CA.

Vandell, D. L., Reisner, E., & Pierce, K. (2007). *Outcomes linked to high-quality afterschool programs: Longitudinal findings from the study of promising afterschool programs*. Irvine, CA: University of California & Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates. Retrieved January 7, 2009, from <http://www.gse.uci.edu/docs/PASP%20Final%20Report.pdf>

Vandell, D. L., & Shumow, L. (1999). After-school child care programs. *Future of Children*, 9(2), 64–80.

Weiss, H., Little, P., Bouffard, S., Deschenes, S., & Malone, H. (2008). *The federal role in out-of-school learning: After-school, summer learning, and family involvement as critical learning supports*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project.

## **Acknowledgements**

This brief was compiled by Priscilla Little, associate director of Harvard Family Research Project (HFRP), based on a number of prior HFRP publications and ongoing research and evaluation studies. As such, the author wishes to acknowledge the HFRP Out-of-School Time (OST) Research and Evaluation team, as well as the support of HFRP's OST project funders during the past decade: C.S. Mott Foundation, The Atlantic Philanthropies, Nellie Mae Education Foundation, W.T. Grant Foundation, The Wallace Foundation, and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

## **About HFRP**

Harvard Family Research Project researches, develops, and evaluates strategies to promote the well being of children, youth, families, and their communities. We work primarily within three areas that support children's learning and development: early childhood education, out-of-school-time programming, and family and community support in education. Underpinning all of our work is a commitment to evaluation for strategic decision making, learning, and accountability. Building on our knowledge that schools cannot do it alone, we also focus national attention on complementary learning. Complementary learning is the idea that a systemic approach, which integrates school and nonschool supports, can better ensure that all children have the skills they need to succeed. To learn more about how HFRP can support your work with children and families, visit our website ([www.hfrp.org](http://www.hfrp.org)).

# Do Intervention Models Include Expanded Learning Time?

Steven M. Ross  
Laura Neergaard  
Lynn Harrison  
James Ford

Center for Research in Educational Policy  
University of Memphis

Almost 50 years ago, in a highly influential article, John Carroll (1963) proposed that differences in students' academic achievement were less attributable to innate differences in ability or aptitude than to the amount of time needed by individuals to master material. This concept, later extended by Benjamin Bloom (1968; 1976) in his "mastery learning" model, emphasized usage of adaptive instructional strategies to increase the amount of learning time allocated for lower achieving students. Today, during an era when increasing numbers of Title I schools are being placed in corrective action (Dillon, 2008), there is extensive renewed interest in expanded learning time (ELT) as an educational intervention.

Although there is much descriptive and anecdotal information about particular schools or districts increasing learning opportunities via afterschool tutoring, weekend classes, or extended school days (e.g., Nesselrodt & Alger, 2005), the degree to which ELT is used as a formal design component of developed intervention strategies is much less clear (Black, Doolittle, Zhu, Unterman, & Grossman, 2008; Zief, Lauver, & Maynard, 2006). In using the term *developed intervention strategies* here, we generically refer to formal educational reform programs or models that target the whole school as the locus of change. To increase knowledge of existing practices and provide a foundation for suggesting improved practices, we will examine in this paper the prevalence and nature of ELT applications in three major categories of interventions: comprehensive school reform (CSR) models, charter and education management organizations, and trademarked school improvement processes and turnaround models.

We present our findings in four sections. In the first section, we further define the present treatment of ELT and describe the research strategies used to address the objectives of this paper. Specifically, those objectives are represented in the following questions:

1. To what degree is ELT incorporated as a formal design component in each major category of developed instructional strategies?
2. What are specific applications within each category, and how do they compare with regard to rationale, design features, and implementation processes?
3. For selected exemplary applications, what do the model or program developers view as the most successful components, barriers to effective implementation, and implications for refinement and scale-up?

In a second section, we present and discuss data related to the first two research questions concerning the incidence and nature of ELT integrated within developed intervention strategies. In the third section, the results of six "case studies" of exemplary ELT applications are presented

to address the final research question. In the fourth section, we present conclusions about ELT usage based on our findings.

## Conceptual Framework and Study Design

Although the basic meaning of ELT is straightforward, further operationalization is required to identify meaningful exemplars for our study. The Center for American Progress defines ELT as the “lengthening of the school day, school week, or school year in a given school by at least 30 percent—the equivalent of roughly two hours per day or 360 hours per year” (Rocha, 2008). However, our position is that a 360-hour dosage criterion would eliminate many formal uses of ELT in developed intervention strategies that serve targeted students on an as-needed basis. The most common form is afterschool tutoring offered to at-risk students for several hours a week until appropriate academic progress has been demonstrated. In identifying ELT in the present study, we looked for programs that expand the traditional school schedule for all students in a participating school or program as a primary feature of their design. When information was provided regarding other forms of expanded learning, such as tutoring for at-risk students, it was noted.

### Research Study Design

Our ELT study consisted of two primary components: (1) a descriptive survey of ELT usage as a primary design component of developed instructional strategies and (2) case studies of exemplary strategies. In examining the first component, it may be recalled that the three categories of programs examined included CSR models, charter and education management organizations, and traditional school improvement processes and turnaround models.

**CSR models** are typically research-based designs aimed at improving student academic achievement (Desimone, 2002; Ross & Gil, 2004). Schools purchasing CSR models are often provided with implementation assistance. The CSR models reviewed for this paper include those listed in the *Catalog of School Reform Models: Second Edition* (Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 2004) and in the 1998 Obey-Porter List (Clearinghouse on Educational Policy and Management, n.d.). **Charter and education management organizations** are nonprofit and for-profit organizations contracted by schools, school districts, or other authorizers to operate and manage public schools. Knowledge and resources are often shared among the member schools. The charter and education management organizations researched for this paper were listed in *Profiles of For-Profit Educational Management Organizations* (Molnar, Miron, & Urschel, 2008) and in *Expanded Learning Time in Action: Initiatives in High-Poverty and High-Minority Schools and Districts* (Rocha, 2008). **Trademarked school improvement processes and turnaround models** were defined as established intervention strategies for improving achievement that do not directly assume operational and management roles. For example, the National Academy Foundation (NAF) falls into this category because NAF provides its partner schools with structure and support but does not take over their everyday school processes. As we could not identify a specific list of improvement processes and turnaround models, we conducted a general Web search.

Once appropriate programs were identified in each category, we conducted online research to determine whether the identified intervention strategies included ELT as part of their model. This research is summarized in Appendix A (see Tables A-1, A-2, and A-3). If the program description on the website was unclear or incomplete, we conducted follow-up phone calls to obtain more information. Because ELT usage still remained uncertain in some of the overall program descriptions (e.g., some models are no longer operating), the results should be viewed as suggestive rather than conclusive.

In general, most of the websites for the intervention strategies noted central features of the models. If ELT was listed as a core component, the strategy was classified as including it. Some websites mentioned ELT as an optional element, and this feature was noted as well. For models including ELT, the following information, when available, was noted in Tables A-1 to A-3: ELT as an initial feature, the amount of ELT provided, and how the ELT is utilized.

At least three representative strategies from each of the three intervention categories were selected for further study as preliminary “cases” based on the initial online research. Those that agreed to participate ( $n = 6$ ) are included in this paper. Interviews were conducted with representatives from the organizations in order to obtain more detailed information regarding the implementation of ELT. The interviewees were asked about their strategies’ design features, implementation structure, and achievement results. For a complete listing of the interview questions, see Appendix B.

## **Results**

Two sets of results are reported in this section. The first addresses the prevalence of ELT usage in developed intervention strategies. The second describes the case studies of representative ELTs.

### **Prevalence of ELTs in Developed Intervention Strategies**

A summary of our survey findings of ELT usage in the three categories of interventions is provided in Tables A-1 to A-3. As can be seen, the overall finding is that formal incorporation of ELT in CSR models is minimal. Specifically, of 26 CSR models examined, none included ELT as a core component. In contrast, highly prevalent model components include data-driven decision making, innovative curricula, capacity building, increased professional development, leadership development, technology use, collaborative learning and planning, and small learning communities. Just one out of the 26 (4 percent) websites referred to ELT as an optional component. In these cases, the school may choose to incorporate ELT in its CSR model, but the cost of offering these services is added to the contract. Some of the CSR companies explicitly suggest that schools seek additional funding if they choose to add ELT. Rather than expand learning time, several models place an emphasis on raising the efficiency of the time within in the standard school day via strategies that increase time on task or restructure the traditional school schedule. One form of the latter is ensuring that teachers of the same subjects or grade levels have similar planning periods; another is using block periods in middle schools and high schools.

A much higher inclusion of ELT as a core intervention component is by education and charter management organizations. Of the 24 organizations reviewed in this study, 12 (50 percent) indicated inclusion of ELT as a core feature. As summarized in Table A-2, the types of ELT offered encompass afterschool hours, summer programs, and additional school days. Learning activities that take place during ELT include teaching core and supplemental subjects, character development, tutoring, extracurricular activities, and college visitation trips.

Of the six trademarked school improvement processes and turnaround models identified, four (67 percent) included ELT as a core feature. As summarized in Table A-3, use of the ELT time is directed to work study as preparation for work experience, earning credit toward college, completing paid internships, and conventional afterschool tutoring.

## **Case Studies**

### **Comprehensive School Reform Models**

**Success for All.** Success for All (SFA) is a nationally recognized, research-based, CSR model managed by the Success for All Foundation (SFAF). Due to widespread use of SFA programs both in the United States and abroad, program information, including model descriptions, evaluation results, and utilization patterns, is readily available through online sources.

Access to SFA program information, as well as the availability of program founder, Nancy Madden, to address SFA and how the model has adopted ELT components created the opportunity to include SFA as an illustration of how one CSR model is approaching the concept of increasing the learning time for students. Information gleaned through Internet sources, SFA literature, and responses from Dr. Madden to interview questions (personal communication, October 24, 2008) are summarized below.

SFA began in 1987 in Baltimore, Maryland, and has grown substantially over the years. As of 2005, the Success for All Foundation (SFAF) was serving approximately 1,300 schools in 46 states and also had projects in five other countries (SFAF, n.d.). Initially, SFA did not utilize an expanded day or other forms of ELT as a core model component. Tutoring has always been a central feature, but was generally offered during the regular school day. Over the past several years, SFAF has been providing assistance to program schools that are able and committed to extending their school day. Assistance from program developers and regional managers to expand learning time is provided to schools that wish to explore their options through programs that take place either before school begins or after the traditional school day. According to Dr. Madden, schools that choose to utilize the SFA model are not required to expand their days. No comparisons of these two types of schools have been conducted thus far, but anecdotal evidence suggests that offering ELT is beneficial to students.

There are two different SFA afterschool tutoring programs, *Alphie's Alley* and *Team Alphie*. Both programs incorporate computer technology. *Alphie's Alley* is one-to-one tutoring in which a student works with a paraprofessional on computer-based reading and comprehension activities. SFA also offers *Team Alphie*, in which a group of eight students work in pairs on the computer for 45 minutes after school.

SFA also has the Adventure Island program, which may be adopted by schools that have not elected to participate in the SFA reform model. Adventure Island is geared toward small groups of students who participate in a 45-minute reading block three times a week for six months. The Adventure Island program takes place after school, and the curriculum is based on principles of SFA reading instruction, although it is adaptable to the school's reading curriculum. Currently, MDRC is conducting a two-year evaluation that includes 25 Adventure Island centers. Preliminary results were mixed regarding implementation and the impact on achievement; a final report is due in 2009 (Black et al., 2008).

In general, Dr. Madden noted an increased interest in ELT among districts and schools served through SFA programs. However, there are barriers that must be overcome to make this extra time effective. Expanded days work best when certified teachers are providing the instruction—finding a qualified staff is often problematic. In addition, “getting the day right” in terms of scheduling, balancing, and scaffolding learning is crucial in leveraging the benefits of the extra time. Afterschool activities are most effective linked with those that have occurred during the traditional school day. Therefore, because of increased instructional coherency, Dr. Madden noted that SFA schools that incorporate ELT consistent with instructional strategies employed through the SFA model would most likely be more successful than schools opting to add a generic tutoring curriculum to their own program.

### **Education and Charter Management Organizations**

**Green Dot.** An interview was conducted with the chief academic officer from Green Dot to obtain further information about its offering of ELT (personal communication, November 4, 2008). Green Dot Public Schools is a private organization based in Los Angeles that both creates and operates public high schools as well as takes over failing high schools and transforms them into schools in which students receive an education focused on college preparation. Green Dot schools operate under the Six Tenets of High-Performing Schools model. These six tenets are (1) small, safe, personalized schools; (2) high expectations for all students; (3) locally managed schools; (4) increased parent participation; (5) maximum funding to the classroom; and (6) keep schools open later.

Although keeping schools open later is a core component of the model, ELT was not prioritized until the 2008–09 school year. Green Dot schools' days and hours of operation are similar to other public schools in Los Angeles. However, all schools are open from 3:30 p.m. to 6 p.m., Monday through Friday, to provide afterschool programs for students. These programs include clubs, SAT preparation, tutorials on how to access student loans, tutorials on learning successful study skills, and college preparation information. Green Dot's ELT programs are often led by mentors, staff, volunteers, and community members, rather than by the schools' teachers. Green Dot sees this approach as preferable because it prevents “teacher burnout.”

A lack of community resources has been noted by Green Dot as a challenge to implementing ELT. Green Dot has been working with the community to create resources that can be utilized in the afterschool programs. The chief academic officer reported that another challenge is ensuring that quality programs are employed during the afterschool hours because many of the afterschool



programs are outsourced to community organizations. Such quality control is viewed as highly challenging.

Green Dot has three schools that currently have graduating classes. According to the Green Dot website, these schools had 66 percent of their graduating seniors admitted to four-year universities, 25 percent to 30 percent went on to two-year colleges, and graduation rates exceeded other Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) high schools (81 percent versus 47 percent). Green Dot high schools also outperformed LAUSD high schools on the California Department of Education Academic Performance Indicator scores (Green Dot Public Schools, 2007).

**Knowledge Is Power Program (KIPP).** The assistant principal at KIPP Diamond Academy (KDA) in Memphis, Tennessee, was interviewed regarding the ELT component of KIPP (personal communication, November 7, 2008). This interview was conducted to gain information about how ELT is implemented at the school level.

KIPP is a national network of free, open-enrollment, college-preparatory public schools that aim to prepare students from underserved communities for success in college and in life. Currently, 66 KIPP schools in 19 states and the District of Columbia serve over 16,000 students. KIPP began in 1994 when two teachers, Mike Feinberg and Dave Levin, launched a fifth-grade public school program in inner-city Houston. KIPP schools share a core set of five operating principles: (1) high expectations, (2) choice and commitment, (3) more time, (4) power to lead, and (5) focus on results.

KIPP has utilized ELT since its inception. KIPP schools operate Monday through Thursday from 7:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. and Friday from 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m. KIPP students attend school every other Saturday from 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. In addition, the KIPP school year lasts two weeks longer than a traditional school year. According to the KIPP (2008) website, the goal of the ELT is to give students more time “to acquire the academic knowledge and skills that will prepare them for competitive high schools and colleges, as well as more opportunities to engage in diverse extracurricular experiences.”

KIPP Diamond Academy in Memphis opened in 2002 and serves students in Grades 5–8. According KDA’s assistant principal, the schedule adopted is based on the national KIPP model, and the national organization provides resources to assist with implementation. The assistant principal was very positive concerning the expanded day, indicating that the extra time allowed students the opportunity to “catch up and exceed expectations.” The schedule also provides students with the ability to participate in extracurricular activities including orchestra, performing arts, vocal and dance instruction, and athletics. She further reported that the expanded day encouraged students’ enthusiasm for learning (personal communication, November 7, 2008). In Memphis, KIPP students are often offered scholarships to private high schools due to their academic achievement. An achievement analyses conducted by the Center for Research in Educational Policy revealed positive outcomes, especially in math, for KIPP Diamond students relative to matched control students in 2006–07 (Qian, Zoblotsky, & McDonald, 2008).

The assistant principal did not note any barriers to implementing ELT at the school level, stating that KIPP staff members, students, and parents are committed to the extended day. The assistant principal compared her experiences at a high-performing school in the Memphis City Schools district without ELT to KIPP. She noted that although the city school dismissed students at 2:15 p.m., many stayed at school in aftercare until 6 p.m. even though the time was not used for organized instruction or activities. In contrast, she described the ELT at KIPP as productive and meaningful.

Although ELT is only one component of the KIPP program, it is noteworthy that while fewer than one in five low-income students attend college nationally, KIPP's national college matriculation rate is greater than 80 percent for students who complete the eighth grade at KIPP (KIPP, 2008). In 2007, nearly 95 percent of KIPP alumni went on to college-preparatory high schools (KIPP, 2008).

**Youth Engaged in Service Preparatory Public Schools.** Youth Engaged in Service (YES) Prep Public Schools is a free, open-enrollment public school system in Houston that serves 2,800 students in Grades 6–12 across five campuses. YES Prep's mission is to help students from low-income families graduate from a four-year college. YES founder Chris Barbic provided the information for this case study (personal communication, November 3, 2008).

ELT was an initial component of the YES Prep model when the first school opened 10 years ago. YES operates a longer school day (7:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.) and mandates that rising sixth-through ninth-grade students attend a three-week summer school. In addition, all YES students dedicate one Saturday each month to community service projects.

According to Barbic, ELT in the middle grades is necessary for remediation. Most YES Prep students enter at least one grade level behind in math and English, and YES Prep expects all of its students to be on grade level by the time they enter high school. Barbic said the extra time at the high school level is used for acceleration and enrichment. YES Prep schools also use the additional time to prepare students for applying to and entering a four-year college, as most YES students will be the first in their families to attend college.

The longer school hours are set, but the manner in which they are utilized is left up to each campus. Barbic said some schools choose to offer an activity block at the end of the day, whereas others implement a mid-day study hall or tutoring period. Barbic further reported teacher burnout and access to facilities and resources as barriers for implementing ELT. YES works to ensure teachers have adequate planning time (around 1½ hours per day) and to financially compensate its teachers for their extra hours. Some YES schools also bring in community members to teach enrichment blocks to reduce the teacher workload. YES uses fundraising efforts and Title I funds to finance the costs of the expanded learning time.

YES Prep schools have been ranked as “exemplary” and “recognized” by the Texas Education Agency for eight consecutive years. The schools have also been listed among top public schools in *Newsweek*, *U.S. News & World Report*, and the *Houston Chronicle*. In 2008, for the eighth consecutive year, 100 percent of graduating seniors were accepted into four-year colleges, including Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Rice, and Stanford (YES Prep Public Schools, 2006).

## **Trademarked School Improvement Processes and Turnaround Models**

**National Academy Foundation.** The National Academy Foundation (NAF) operates as a network of high school career academies based primarily in urban districts. The senior director of curriculum and academics was interviewed about NAF's use of ELT (personal communication, October 27, 2008). NAF serves more than 50,000 students in over 500 academies in 40 states and the District of Columbia through four career-themed academies: finance, engineering, hospitality and tourism, and information technology. Most NAF partnerships are with small learning communities within large high schools.

The ELT component of the NAF model is a paid internship that serves as an extension of the academy's curriculum. The schools partner with local businesses who hire academy students as interns. The internship typically takes place after school during the student's junior or senior year and lasts 6 to 10 weeks. The goals of the internship are for students to use the skills and information learned at the academy, obtain real-world work experience, and make connections with those in the business community who may serve as references or as future job contacts.

The NAF representative reported that the internship is the most challenging part of the model to implement because of the difficulty identifying viable opportunities. The foundation supports its partner schools by identifying internship opportunities and coaching the internship providers. NAF's record of success includes 90 percent graduation rates with more than 80 percent of these graduates going on to college (National Academy Foundation, n.d.).

**Say Yes to Education, Inc.** Say Yes to Education is a national, nonprofit education foundation that provides additional support to help disadvantaged, inner-city students succeed. Currently, Say Yes operates chapters in Philadelphia, Hartford, Cambridge, and Harlem. The Philadelphia chapter director provided the information for this case study (personal communication, October 20, 2008).

Say Yes begins when students enter kindergarten and continues through high school and beyond. Students are guaranteed college scholarships for completing high school, provided they and their families complete program participation requirements. Services include afterschool and summer programming, mentoring, tutoring, school-day academic support, family outreach, and social work/psychological services.

The use of ELT has always been a core component of the Say Yes model, although it has changed over time and varies by implementation site. In Philadelphia, Say Yes provides an afterschool program, a full-day summer program for six weeks, and Saturday school. The expanded time is used to provide social and academic support through tutoring in problem areas or by challenging students in areas in which they excel. Say Yes is staffed by part-time certified teachers. The summer program also employs college interns.

The Philadelphia chapter director explained that the traditional school day has become dominated by testing pressures, and that ELT is necessary to provide students with opportunities for creative expression through music and art and to expose them to new and different experiences. The Philadelphia chapter often brings in guest speakers and takes students on field

trips during the expanded time. The chapter director asserted that the students are so invested in the program that they are the ones who complain if time is cut back.

Access to facilities and student mobility are viewed as the primary challenges to implementing ELT as a program component. Because Say Yes partners with the school district for use of facilities, there are always concerns about being dislocated if the district reduces its open hours. Accordingly, Say Yes often partners with community- and faith-based organizations for facility access. As Say Yes is a long-term program, it faces the challenge of serving students who move to new schools in and out of the city during the course of their schooling.

The chapter director identified the most successful aspect of the program as student confidence in having the support needed to achieve. On average, students in Say Yes chapters have recorded much higher school graduation rates than the national average for students of a similar demographic. Say Yes 2000 high school seniors in Philadelphia demonstrated a graduation rate of 81.8 percent in comparison to an average of 54 percent for national graduation rates during the same year (Say Yes to Education, n.d.).

## **Conclusions**

Expanded learning time (ELT) provides a means of increasing opportunities for low-achieving students to master material that they were unable to learn successfully during regular school hours. It also provides a means of offering enrichment and socioemotional support to students at all achievement levels while reducing the hours that students spend in often-risky unsupervised afterschool activities. The purpose of this paper has been to examine the degree to which and how ELT is employed as a component of developed intervention strategies consisting of broader programs and models that target the whole school as the locus of change. Specifically, we examined three categories of developed interventions consisting of comprehensive school reform (CSR) models, educational management organizations, and trademarked school improvement processes.

Our findings indicated that ELT was much more likely to be represented as a core component of the latter two categories, but to be omitted entirely by virtually all CSR models. The likely explanation relates to the derivation of many CSR models from the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CRSD) program enacted by Congress in 1997. The legislation outlined nine criteria that each CSR program should meet, such as using research-based innovative strategies, providing high-quality professional development, establishing measurable student goals and benchmarks, and nurturing meaningful parent and community involvement. Although ELT certainly would be supportive of the underlying goal of raising student achievement, it was not explicitly identified or required. Given the extensive resources needed to address the nine criteria, CSR providers and schools likely would have been less open than the two other types of developed intervention strategies examined.

Not surprisingly, charter and educational management organizations exhibit fairly pervasive usage of ELT, as do trademarked school improvement processes. Several reasons for this trend as compared to CSR are suggested. First, in the case of charter schools and programs such as KIPP, there is usually much greater autonomy than in regular schools (the primary adopters of

CSR models) in recruiting school leaders and teachers, enrolling students, and implementing nontraditional schedules for learning, remediation, and enrichment (McDonald, Ross, Bol, & McSparrin-Gallagher, 2007; Ross, McDonald, Alberg, & Gallagher, 2007). That is, in selecting the school, teachers, students, and parents know at the front end that ELT is a core part of the program.

Similarly, the trademarked school processes that we examined are programs explicitly oriented to supporting at-risk or special student populations through supplementary tutoring, enrichment, or work-study activities that take place beyond school hours. A second factor concerns the era of program design and adoption. CSR originated prior to the high accountability imposed on schools by the No Child Left Behind Act for raising student achievement. Accordingly, many of the CSR models tended to focus primarily on developing engaging, higher-order learning activities via cooperative learning, projects, and experiential activities. In contrast, the more recently developed intervention strategies are much more likely to focus on bridging the gap for low performers and raising test scores in general. And, as Carroll (1963) and Bloom (1968) argued over 40 years ago, there is no purer intervention for ensuring mastery than providing low-achieving students additional time for learning.

## References

- Black, A. R., Doolittle, F., Zhu, P., Unterman, R., & Grossman, J. B. (2008). *The evaluation of enhanced academic instruction in after-school programs: Findings after the first year of implementation*. (NCEE 2008-4021). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
- Bloom, B. (1968). Learning for mastery. *Evaluation Comment*, 1(2), 1–12.
- Bloom, B. (1976). *Human characteristics and school learning*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Carroll, J. (1963). A model of school learning. *Teachers College Record*, 64, 722–733.
- Clearinghouse on Educational Policy and Management. (n.d.) *Comprehensive school reform demonstration program legislation: 1998 Obey-Porter list*. Retrieved January 8, 2009, from [http://eric.uoregon.edu/trends\\_issues/reform/programs.html](http://eric.uoregon.edu/trends_issues/reform/programs.html)
- Desimone, L. (2002). How can comprehensive school reform models be successfully implemented? *Review of Educational Research*, 72, 433–480.
- Dillon, S. (2008, October 13). Under “No Child” law, even solid schools falter. *New York Times*.
- Green Dot Public Schools. (2007). *School results*. Retrieved January 7, 2009, from <http://www.greendot.org/results>
- Knowledge Is Power Program. (2008). *About KIPP: Results of KIPP schools*. Retrieved January 8, 2009, from <http://www.kipp.org/01/resultsofkippsch.cfm>
- McDonald, A. J., Ross, S. M., Bol, L., & McSparrin-Gallagher, B. (2007). Charter school as a vehicle for education reform: Implementation and outcomes at three inner-city sites. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 12(3), 271–300.
- Molnar, A., Miron, G., & Urschel, J. (2008). *Profiles of for-profit educational management organizations: Tenth annual report*. Boulder, CO: University of Colorado, Education and the Public Interest Center & Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University, Commercialism in Education Research Unit.
- National Academy Foundation. (n.d.). *About the National Academy Foundation*. Retrieved January 8, 2009, from <http://www.naf.org/cps/rde/xchg>
- Nesselrodt, P. S., & Alger, C. L. (2005). Extending opportunity to learn for students placed at risk. *Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk*, 2, 207–224.

- Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. (2004). *Catalog of school reform models: Whole school models*. (2004). Portland, OR: Author. Retrieved January 7, 2009, from <http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/catalog/ModelDetails.asp?ModelID=49>
- Qian, H., Zoblotsky, T., & McDonald, T. (2008). *Analysis of year five (2006–2007) student achievement outcomes for the Memphis KIPP Diamond Academy*. Memphis, TN: Center for Research in Educational Policy, University of Memphis.
- Rocha, E. (2008). *Expanded learning time in action: Initiatives in high-poverty and high-minority schools and districts*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.
- Ross, S. M., & Gil, L. (2004). The past and future of comprehensive school reform: Perspectives from a researcher and practitioner. In C.T. Cross (Ed.), *Putting the pieces together: Lessons from comprehensive school reform research* (pp. 151–174). Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform.
- Ross, S. M., McDonald, A. J., Alberg, M., & Gallagher, B. (2007). Achievement and climate outcomes for the Knowledge is Power Program in an inner-city middle school. *Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk*, 12(2), 137–165.
- Say Yes to Education. (n.d.). *H.S. graduation rates statistics*. Retrieved January 8, 2009, from <http://sayyestoeducation.org/syte/content/blogcategory/19/33/>
- Success for All Foundation. *About SFAF—history*. (n.d.). Retrieved January 7, 2009, from [http://www.successforall.net/about/about\\_history.htm](http://www.successforall.net/about/about_history.htm)
- Yes Prep Public Schools. (2006). *About YES: Results*. Retrieved January 8, 2009, from <http://www.yesprep.org/about/results.htm>
- Zief, S. G., Lauer, S., & Maynard, R. A. (2006). *Impacts of after-school programs on student outcomes: A systematic review for the Campbell Collaboration*. Oslo, Norway: Campbell Collaboration. Retrieved January 7, 2009, from [http://db.c2admin.org/doc-pdf/zief\\_afterschool\\_review.pdf](http://db.c2admin.org/doc-pdf/zief_afterschool_review.pdf)

## Appendix A. Expanded Learning in Developed Intervention Strategies

**Table A-1. Comprehensive School Reform Models**

*Information reviewed did not list expanded learning as a core feature, but mentioned expanded learning as an optional element:*

Success for All
-----------------

*Information reviewed did not list expanded learning as a core feature:*

America’s Choice\*

Atlas Communities\*\*

Coalition of Essential Schools

Co-NECT Schools

Community for Learning

Core Knowledge (K-8)

Different Ways of Knowing

Direct Instruction

Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound\*\*\*

First Things First

High Schools That Work

High/Scope Primary Grades Approach to Education

Middle Start

Modern Red Schoolhouse

More Effective Schools

Onward to Excellence

Paideia

Quantum Learning

QuEST (K-12)

School Development Program

School Renaissance

Talent Development Middle School\*\*\*

Talent Development High School with Career Academies\*\*\*\*

Turning Points

Urban Learning Centers

\**Catalog of School Reform Models* mentions that this model may include after-hours programs.

\*\*Website mentions expanded professional development time for teachers.

\*\*\*Website mentions “double-dose” classes for students struggling with mathematics and/or reading.

\*\*\*\*Website mentions summer school, Saturday school, and after-hours credit school offered for students to recover course failures and missed credits.



**Table A-2. Education and Charter Management Organizations**

*Information reviewed listed expanded learning as a core feature:*

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Initial Feature</b>	<b>Amount of Time</b>	<b>How Time Is Used</b>
Achievement First	Yes	1.5 hours added to the school day	Core academic skills; programs in history, science, art, music, and physical education
Aspire	Yes	15% more time than the average California public school; 190 days in school year	Maximize in-depth learning
Edison Schools*	No	Varies; 25 schools have calendars that exceed average 180-day school year; majority also have a longer school day ranging from 7.5 hours to 9 hours a day (Rocha, 2008).	Afterschool program reinforces core curriculum. Summer program focuses on character development.
Green Dot	Yes	Schools stay open until 5:00 p.m.	After-school programs; allows community groups offering quality services to the neighborhood to use the facilities
Knowledge is Power Program (KIPP)	Yes	Extended school day (7:30 a.m. to 5 p.m.); Saturday and summer school	Extended class periods; extracurricular experiences
Leona Group, LLC***	NA	Some schools are open Mon–Fri from 8 a.m. to 7 p.m.	Instruction, tutoring, conferences and assessments
Lighthouse Academies**	Yes	8-hour school day; 190-day school year	Academic instruction
Mosaica Education, Inc.	Yes	One hour added to school day; 20 days added to school year	Academic skills and knowledge
Perspectives Charter Schools**	NA	7.5 hour long school day	Additional math and literacy instruction; enrichment and remediation
Pinnacle Education****	NA	Online instruction & campuses with varied times/courses	Accelerated graduation; credit recovery
Victory Schools, Inc.	NA	Varies	Increased time daily on the core subjects of reading and mathematics
YES College Preparatory Schools	Yes	Extended school day (7:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.); Saturday service work; summer school	Service projects, college research trips, tutoring

\*Edison also started Newton Learning, a supplemental educational services (SES) provider.

\*\*Some of the schools managed by these organizations are part of Chicago’s Renaissance 2010 initiative (Rocha, 2008).

\*\*\*Web site shows that schools are open extended hours, but it is unclear whether all students are receiving additional learning time.

\*\*\*\*Started as an alternative learning environment built on computer-assisted learning, personal and social skill development and workplace readiness.

*Information reviewed did not list expanded learning as a core feature:*

Benjamin Franklin Charter School	Educational Services of America, Inc.	Non-Public Educational Services, Inc.*
Charter School Administrative Services	Imagine Schools, Inc.	Romine Group, LLC
Charter Schools USA	K12, Inc. (online curriculum)	SABIS Educational Systems
Choice Schools Associates, LLC	National Heritage Academies	White Hat Management

\*Provides remedial tutoring program in some states.

**Table A-3. Trademarked School Improvement Processes and Turnaround Models**

*Information reviewed listed expanded learning as a core feature:*

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Initial Feature</b>	<b>Amount of Time</b>	<b>How Time Is Used</b>
Cristo Rey Network	Yes	NA*	Work study program to finance the cost of their education, help them gain confidence and real world job experience, and realize the relevance of their education
National Academy Foundation	Yes	6-10 weeks after school	Paid internship
Early College High Initiative	Yes	Summers for bridge courses and programming between semesters	To provide additional academic and enrichment support to students to order to accelerate their progress towards taking college-level courses in high school
Say Yes to Education, Inc.	Yes	Varies	After-school programs in reading and math; “Power Hour” tutoring for students most at risk of not advancing to the next grade level

\*Information was not available on the website, and the company did not return correspondence.

*Information reviewed did not list expanded learning as a core feature:*

McRel’s Success in Sight	WestEd’s Schools Moving Up
--------------------------	----------------------------

## Appendix B. Interview Questions

### Interview Questions

1. Was expanded learning an initial feature of the model or was it included later?
2. Why was expanded learning time chosen as a feature of this model?
3. When does the expanded learning time occur?
4. How is the expanded learning time utilized? Why is it utilized this way?
5. Do all schools that use your model use expanded learning time in the same way or are there some differences?
6. What resources are needed in order to implement expanded learning time?
7. What do you view as the most successful components of extended learning in your design?
8. What results has your model found from the implementation of expanded learning time?
9. What have been some barriers to effective implementation of expanded learning in your model?
10. Can you think of a particular school that utilizes your model that wouldn't mind answering a few questions about how expanded learning time works at their school?
11. Is there any other information on your model's use of expanded learning time that you would like to share?

### Specific School Interview

1. When did your school start using \_\_\_\_\_ (intervention strategy)?
2. Did your school start using expanded learning time right away?
3. Describe the implementation of expanded learning time at your school.

*(If not answered)*

4. When does the expanded learning time occur?
5. How is the expanded learning time utilized? Why is it utilized this way?
6. What do you view as the most successful components of extended learning in your design?
7. What results has your school experienced from the implementation of expanded learning time?
8. What have been some barriers to effective implementation of expanded learning in your model?
9. Is there any other information on your school's use of expanded learning time that you would like to share?

# **Using Expanded Learning to Support School Reforms: Funding Sources and Strategies**

**Sharon Deich  
Cross & Joftus, LLC**

Educators, policymakers, and community activists are all struggling to find new and better ways to prepare students for successful futures. One strategy for bolstering educational achievement that is gaining widespread acceptance focuses on adding more learning time into children's days. This idea is not new: Twenty-five years ago, *A Nation at Risk* argued that children need more time in school—longer days and longer years—if they were to succeed (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). What is new is that today's leaders are looking at a wider array of approaches for expanding learning time.

Further bolstering this strategy is a growing body of literature that shows that out-of-school learning plays a key role in educational achievement and school success. Based on a growing sense that schools cannot do this work alone, states, districts, and individual schools are seeking ways to tap the resources of community partners to help ensure that every child is ready for success (see also "Supporting Student Outcomes Through Expanded Learning Opportunities," by Priscilla Little, pp. 9–23). The strategy is consistent with a growing body of research indicating that what children and youth do in the nonschool hours is as important as what they do in school, and that nonschool supports for learning and development support school and life success. Finding ways to finance expanded learning opportunities by bringing together resources from the education sector and other state and community partners and by taking advantage of the flexibility built into many funding sources to support innovations is central to expanding this strategy.

The information presented in this paper builds on several research projects conducted by Cross & Joftus over the past 1½ years on the financing and design of programs that expand time and learning opportunities to support education reforms. Throughout this work, our definition of expanded learning has been intentionally broad and includes initiatives that expand the traditional school day and/or school year, provide afterschool and summer programs, support community and service learning projects, and support online learning and mentoring programs. Data to support this work were collected from telephone and in-person interviews with school and district leaders, interviews with operators of nonprofit organizations and local intermediaries, and from pertinent websites. Together, these data provide insights into the ways that states, cities, and districts are using their resources to expand learning in support of a wide variety of reform approaches.

## **A Renewed Call for More Time and Learning**

The introduction of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act in 2001 ushered in a new era of accountability. NCLB has emphasized the need for students to achieve proficiency in core academic subjects and has drawn attention to achievement gaps across races and socioeconomic backgrounds. Strategies for increasing time for learning have grown in popularity as more schools fail to demonstrate adequate progress toward education goals within the confines of the

typical school day and school year. Because all children spend more time out of school than in school, programs that support children in the out-of-school hours are viewed by many as a key strategy for helping to narrow the achievement gaps.

The recent addition of powerful and influential voices in the field has also helped to propel this agenda, as follows:

- In June of 2008, a coalition of prominent educators and activists introduced the Broader, Bolder Approach to Education. This agenda is based on the belief that schools alone cannot close the achievement gaps highlighted by NCLB. The new coalition is seeking “to build working relationships between schools and surrounding community institutions” (Economic Policy Institute Task Force, 2008, p. 2).
- In January 2007, the Time, Learning, and Afterschool (TLA) Task Force, supported by the C.S. Mott Foundation, released a report titled *A New Day for Learning*. Built on the belief that critical learning happens both within and outside the traditional school day and school building, the report’s authors laid out a vision for educating children and youth that relies on a collaborative effort by schools, families, and community partners to create a seamless learning day (TLA Task Force, 2007). In November of 2008, the Mott Foundation announced grants to support two cities, Providence, Rhode Island, and San Francisco, California, to implement local New Day for Learning initiatives.
- In May 2008, the United Way of America announced that it would focus its giving and advocacy toward a 10-year goal of cutting the national high school dropout rate in half. With over 1,200 recognized affiliates across the country, United Way has a unique ability to support family, community, and school partnerships that promote better student outcomes by connecting in-school and out-of school supports (United Way of America, 2008).

In addition to these noteworthy efforts, President-elect Obama has called for an expansion of high-quality afterschool opportunities by doubling funding for the main federal support for afterschool programs, the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program, to serve one million more children (“Education: Expand,” 2008).

The support of these powerful champions, coupled with a growing number of expanded learning programs in states, cities, and districts across the country, have focused a spotlight on the role expanded learning opportunities can play in helping to support educational reforms and improvements.

## **Resources to Support Expanded Learning**

Almost universally, communities are using a combination of public and private funding to support education reform efforts that connect learning inside and outside of the school day. For the most part, states, districts and individual schools that are expanding learning time have paid for these efforts by securing funding from public education budgets, a patchwork of other federal and state funds, local government programs, and by leveraging private resources from community partners and foundations (Deich, 2008).

## Federal Funds

Many of the public sources that reformers rely on for expanding learning come from federal sources, including the following:

- **Title I.** Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged), most recently reauthorized under the NCLB Act, is the largest federal education program that supports disadvantaged children and youth. Title I funds are distributed to states and localities by formula to improve the academic performance of students who are failing or at risk of failing state standardized tests. Both districts and individual schools have discretion in how Title I funds are being used, and many are using Title I funds to help support expanded learning time, both inside and outside of the school day. For instance in Providence, Rhode Island, some of the district's Title I funds are being used to fund a coordinator at each middle school to connect students with community organizations providing afterschool programs. Many districts are also using Title I funds for summer school or other summer learning programs for students at risk of educational failure. In 2008, funding for Title I was \$13.9 billion<sup>6</sup> (U.S. Department of Education, 2008a). It is not clear, however, how much of that funding supports expanded learning programs. In addition to funding through the basic Title I program (Part A), other Title I subparts also support expanded learning—most notably the Supplemental Education Services program.
- **Supplemental Educational Services.** The Supplemental Educational Services (SES) program, Section 1116e of the Title I program, provides additional academic instruction for eligible students in schools that have not met their goals with regard to state testing standards for three straight years. These services, which must be provided outside of the regular school day, include tutoring, remediation, and other educational interventions with the goal of helping more students to pass state tests. SES programs provide limited services to students—generally a few hours a week and rarely for the entire school year. Expanded learning programs are looking for ways to connect SES services to their initiatives. For instance, in Massachusetts several SES providers are working with Expanded Learning Time schools. This partnership allows schools and providers to take full advantage of the SES funding by aligning programming with other expanded learning activities. States can use up to 20 percent of Title I funds for SES and school choice, but it is likely that the amount spent on these services is much smaller due to low utilization of SES services (Zimmer, Gill, Razquin, Booker, & Lockwood, 2007).
- **Funding for School Improvement.** Section 1003(g) of the Title I program provides new funding for School Improvement grants. This funding enables states to support a variety of reform options for Title I schools that do not make adequate yearly progress for at least two consecutive years. States establish priorities for use of the funds and select which districts and schools will receive this funding. Authorized activities include the development and implementation of school improvement plans, professional development for teachers and staff, corrective actions such as instituting a new curriculum, and development and implementation of restructuring plans. These funds can support the integration of activities provided by community partners into the school day

---

<sup>6</sup> Funding for 2009 is currently under a continuing resolution.

and expanding the school day and school year. The fiscal year (FY) 2008 budget for the School Improvement program included almost \$500 million<sup>7</sup> (National Conference of State Legislatures, 2009). This funding is relatively new, and many districts are receiving their first grants for the 2008–09 school year. Given the flexibility in how these funds can be used, it is likely that they will become an important source for expanding learning and other school reforms.

- **21st Century Community Learning Centers.** The 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) program, authorized in Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, is the only federal education program dedicated to providing programming before and after-school and during the summer. This state formula grant program supports the creation of community learning centers that provide academic and enrichment opportunities for students who attend high-poverty and low-performing schools. Schools in every state have 21st CCLC grants that support important pieces of their expanded time and learning strategy. In FY 2008, funding for 21st CCLC program was just over \$1 billion<sup>8</sup> (U.S. Department of Education, 2008b).
- **National School Lunch Program: Afterschool Snacks.** This federal child nutrition program, one of the few remaining entitlement programs, provides funding for meals and snacks in afterschool, summer, and before-school programs.<sup>9</sup> The federally subsidized meals and snacks often help attract children to out-of-school-time programs. Programs receive reimbursements for the cost of a healthy snack according to a schedule set by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. It is estimated that afterschool programs receive approximately \$350 million annually in reimbursements from this program (“Estimated federal,” n.d.).
- **Americorps.** Administered by the Corporation for National Service, Americorps provides opportunities for 75,000 adults to serve through a network of partnerships with local and national nonprofit groups. Americorps volunteers address critical needs in education, the environment, public safety, homeland security and other areas. In some states, nearly half of the Americorps members are working in schools or afterschool programs. Many expanded learning time programs utilize Americorps members to help manage and staff programs and to connect in-school and out-of-school learning. The 2008 budget for Americorps was approximately \$260 million.
- **Full Service Community Schools Program.** In 2007, Congress set aside \$5 million from the Fund for Improvement of Education (Title V, Part D of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) to establish the Full Service Community Schools (FSCS) program. An FSCS is a public elementary or secondary school that coordinates with community-based organizations and public/private partnerships to provide students, their families, and the community access to comprehensive services. The funding is awarded on a competitive basis to local education agencies and one or more community-based organization, nonprofit organization, or other public or private entity to help public elementary or secondary schools function as an FSCS (U.S. Department of Education,

---

<sup>7</sup> Funding for FY 2009 is currently under a continuing resolution.

<sup>8</sup> Funding for FY 2009 is currently under a continuing resolution.

<sup>9</sup> Entitlement programs guarantee funding to every individual who meets established criteria.



2008c). In the fall of 2008, the first 10 grants were awarded to communities to expand and enhance community schools (U.S. Department of Education, 2008d).

- **The Summer Term Education Programs for Upward Performance Act.** The Summer Term Education Programs for Upward Progress (STEP UP) Act was authorized into law as part of the America COMPETES Act in the summer of 2007. STEP UP addresses the achievement gap among schoolchildren in Grades K–8 by establishing a pilot grant program to support high-quality summer learning opportunities for children in high-needs schools. This federal grant program supports six weeks of summer learning and enrichment, with curricula that emphasize mathematics, reading, and problem-solving skills aligned to the state’s academic content standards of school-year classes. State education agencies will be eligible to apply for funding under this program to provide summer learning grants for students in districts in their states. To date, no funds have been appropriated for this program.

In addition to the most commonly used federal funds identified above, many other federal sources can support programs in the out-of-school hours, including funding from the Child Care and Development Fund, the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program, Youth Opportunities grants, Social Services Block grants, Community Development Block grants, the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program, Juvenile Justice funds, Workforce Development funds, and funding for substance abuse prevention and obesity prevention. While districts and schools can use a variety of federal funds to support expanded learning, each program has its own purposes and comes with its own set of rules and requirements (Afterschool Investments, 2006). Aligning and coordinating multiple funds, where the original purpose was not expanded learning, generally make these funds harder to use effectively in the context of education reform.

## State Funds

A growing number of states are also providing funding to expand learning, generally through afterschool and summer programs usually focused on supporting low-income children. The following states provide examples of this trend:

- **California**, through its After School Education and Safety Program (Proposition 49), is providing \$550 million for afterschool programs for low-income children in kindergarten through eighth grades. Grants are awarded on a competitive basis to school districts and local partners (California Department of Education, 2008).
- **Kansas** is providing \$400,000 in grants for the Middle School Afterschool Activity Advancement Program that is designed to support academic enhancement and help middle school youth prepare for career and college opportunities during the school year and the summer. Grant funding is awarded on a competitive basis (Kansas State Department of Education, 2008).
- In **Connecticut**, the state provides approximately \$3 million to priority school districts for extended day programs (Afterschool Alliance, 2006).
- In **South Carolina**, the state is providing nearly \$7 million for Afterschool-School Program/Homework Centers to improve academic outcomes for children in schools that

are not making progress according to NCLB guidelines (South Carolina Department of Education, 2008).

- In **Oklahoma**, the state superintendent appointed a Time Reform Task Force (2007) that has proposed lengthening the school year by 15 instructional days to improve the quantity and quality of learning time.

In addition, lawmakers in Minnesota, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, Nebraska, Utah and Washington are considering proposals to expand learning time (Collaborative for Building After-School Systems, 2008).

### **Local Funding**

Many cities invest substantial amounts of local funds on programs that provide additional time for learning. These include efforts such as the Beacon program in New York City, a Saturday Scholars program in the District of Columbia, and a School-Age Child Care Program for elementary and middle school students in Palm Beach County, Florida. Most often, local funding comes from school district budgets, and city agencies. Not surprisingly, when funding comes through school districts, the main focus is supporting the academic needs of students. Programs supported with funding from city agencies such as Parks and Recreation, Community Development, or Police and Safety usually focus more on recreation and prevention activities, although a number of localities are working to infuse more academic content into city-sponsored programs. Local funds are also an important source of support for summer jobs programs for older children and youth. (Visit the National League of Cities website at [www.nlc.org/iyef/education/afterschool/index.aspx](http://www.nlc.org/iyef/education/afterschool/index.aspx) for more information on local funding.)

### **Private Funding**

In many communities, private funding is playing a critical role in supporting expanded learning. Private partners supply funding to encourage innovation; directly support programs; and help build systems to improve program quality, accessibility, and financing. This involves direct fundraising as well as providing essential direction through participation on boards and steering committees (Deich, 2008).

Private funding is also used to fuel innovation. Many initiatives, including New Hampshire's Supporting Student Success through Extended Learning Opportunities Program and Chicago's Community Schools (see Expanded Learning in Practice section) have relied on private money to support pilot sites and model development. After these new models have proven their value—often through evaluations funded with private donations—advocates have been able to seek additional funding, both public and private, to expand programming.

Likewise, private funding is also helping support program operations in many communities. Even in places where public funding is available to support expanded learning, program leaders indicate that available public money is usually not sufficient and that many programs also rely on private funding to help support programming. This is the case in the Massachusetts Expanded Learning Time (see Expanded Learning in Practice section) schools as well as in many charter schools (Deich, 2008).

Finally, private funding is also behind much of the system-building work in cities and states. For example, the Wallace Foundation is supporting local intermediary agencies in five cities. These intermediaries are helping connect schools with out-of-school time opportunities that enhance learning (Wallace Foundation, 2008). Likewise, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation is helping support statewide afterschool networks in 38 states (visit [www.statewideafterschoolnetwork.net](http://www.statewideafterschoolnetwork.net) for more information on the Mott-funded networks). These networks provide a state-level forum to advocate for additional funding to support more high-quality afterschool and summer programming. And private money from Atlantic Philanthropies is behind the Collaborative for Building After-School Systems (CBASS). This group of local intermediary organizations from New York, Chicago, Baltimore, Boston, Providence and Washington, D.C. is conducting research, sharing promising practices, and supporting a public policy agenda for more high quality afterschool opportunities (visit [www.afterschoolsystems.org](http://www.afterschoolsystems.org) for more information on CBASS).

## **Expanded Learning in Practice—Examples From the Field**

The rethinking of time and learning is at the center of many education reform efforts at the state, district and building level. This section discusses how education reform models at state, district, and building levels are being structured and financed.

### **State Departments of Education**

State departments of education have the ability to try out carefully crafted reform models at a scope and scale that can demonstrate effective practices. Through the design and funding of new models, they also have the ability to encourage partnerships with community organizations that help to blur the line between in-school and out-of-school learning. The following examples illustrate two different state approaches to education reforms that rely on expanded learning to improve opportunities and outcomes. While both of these initiatives are relatively new and serve only a small proportion of children in their respective states, they each hold the promise of more wide-scale reform.

- In 2005, the **Massachusetts** Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, in partnership with Massachusetts 2020, launched the Expanded Learning Time (ELT) initiative. Believing that children, especially those at risk, need more time to achieve proficiency in the standards-based curriculum and that all children deserve the opportunity to experience enrichment programs such as the arts, music, and sports, the ELT initiative provides state funding and technical assistance to schools that extend their school calendar by at least 300 hours per year (Massachusetts 2020, 2009). As of fall 2008, 26 schools were implementing ELT. ELT schools receive an additional \$1,300 per child to pay for the expanded day from funds provided by the State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.<sup>10</sup> This extra time is used to provide additional instruction in core subject areas, as well as more time for teachers to plan and learn. Schools partner with community-based organizations to provide enrichment and

---

<sup>10</sup> This does not include funding to support Massachusetts 2020 or other resources provided by community partners.

experiential learning opportunities. All ELT schools collaborate with partner organizations to bring additional programming into their schools. Partners help with programs that range from apprenticeships and mentoring to hands-on science and history lessons to athletic and arts classes. And the initiative is demonstrating results; the first cohort of schools participating in the ELT has made greater gains on state standardized tests than in past years (Annenberg Institute, 2008).

- In **New Hampshire**, the State Department of Education is changing its high school curriculum by introducing real-world learning as an integral part of students' experiences. Under the new program, *Vision for High School Redesign: Supporting Student Success through Extended Learning Opportunities (ELOs)*, high schools can voluntarily implement extended learning opportunities as an alternative way to earn credit toward graduation. The vision of this initiative is to expand the options of the traditional high school classroom. In ELO schools, students of all abilities will have the option to learn in rigorous and relevant real-world settings and gain high school credit for that learning, based on demonstrated mastery of predetermined course-level competencies (New Hampshire Department of Education, n.d.). In the fall of 2008, students from seven high schools started earning credit for ELOs. The initiative—a partnership of PlusTime NH, the New Hampshire Department of Education, and the Concord Area Center for Education Support and QED (a local business)—is funded primarily by the Nellie Mae Foundation.

## Local School Districts

Local districts are finding new and innovative ways to expand time for learning as part of education reform efforts. Sometimes reforms are districtwide, and sometimes they target particular schools or students. Many of these reforms are piloted at individual schools with the hope of scaling up successful practices to serve more students. Districts smooth the way for reforms at individual schools by garnering support and providing resources and technical assistance. The following examples highlight two different district approaches to expanding time for learning as a piece of their reform strategies:

- In the fall of 2008, the **Syracuse, New York**, school district began implementing a districtwide adoption of the Say Yes to Education (SYTE) model to increase the high school graduation rate and college entry of low-income students. The model supports students throughout their school careers by providing afterschool, summer school, tutoring, and mentoring for all children—“giving them whatever it takes,” in the words of one official. Students who graduate from a Syracuse High School are then eligible for fully paid college scholarships at a large group of participating postsecondary institutions. The program began this school year for kindergarten through third graders in six elementary schools. Additional grade levels and schools will join the program each year until all schools and students are covered. SYTE in Syracuse is a partnership between Syracuse University, the School District of Syracuse, and the Say Yes to Education Foundation. It is receiving new funding from the state, city, and the SYTE foundation to assist with start-up, but over time, as the initiative is expanded to more schools, the district will have to reallocate resources to expand and sustain the reform. (Visit [cnycf.org/cnycf//tabid/161/Default.aspx](http://cnycf.org/cnycf//tabid/161/Default.aspx) for more information.)

- The **Chicago** public school system has invested in several initiatives to expand learning time that focus on providing both additional academic support and more enrichment. These include:
  - **A large Community Schools initiative.** Chicago Public Schools now has one of the largest community schools initiatives in the nation with 150 campuses. These community schools are true neighborhood hubs connecting the resources of diverse community partners to a range of activities including before-school and afterschool enrichment opportunities for students. Schools partner with at least one nonprofit organization and employ a full-time site coordinator who not only oversees and coordinates programming but also serves as the liaison among parents, students, school personnel, and the community. A public-private partnership with the school district and private partners supports this growing effort. (Visit <http://cpsafterschool.org/program/> for more information.)
  - **A summer enrichment program: Keep Kids Learning.** This comprehensive summer school program affords students in Grades 2–12 opportunities for academic, recreational, and social enrichment. The program enables schools offering mandatory summer school to enrich and expand their offerings into the afternoon period as well as expand services to students not required to attend summer school. Younger students enjoy an array of afternoon activities and regular field trips; older students spend the afternoon as “counselors,” earning money for working at elementary schools with Keep Kids Learning programs. Keep Kids Learning also employs teaching fellows—college students majoring in education—to provide more attention to individual students. In 2008, the program was offered in 20 elementary schools and two high schools, serving more than 3,200 students. School district funds support this program. (Visit <http://cpsafterschool.org/program/> for more information.)
  - **A community-based afterschool program for teens: After School Matters.** After School Matters is a nonprofit organization that partners with the City of Chicago, the Chicago Public Schools, the Chicago Park District, the Chicago Public Library, the Chicago Department of Children and Youth Services, the Chicago Department of Cultural Affairs, and Community-Based Organizations to expand out-of-school opportunities for Chicago teens. Named for the original Block 37 arts program that was housed on a vacant city block, the city’s innovative gallery37, science37, sports37, tech37, and words37 programs provide Chicago teens with engaging activities that develop skills to help get them ready for the workplace. This program is funded by coordinating city resources from partner organizations, and by raising funds from private sources including business and philanthropy. (Visit [www.afterschoolmatters.org](http://www.afterschoolmatters.org) for more information.)

## Individual Schools

Schools are also finding creative ways to add more time for learning to help struggling students. The following examples highlight a variety of approaches that public schools are using to provide additional time:

- **Barcroft Elementary School** in Arlington, Virginia, began a whole-school reform designed to better meet the needs of its students, many of whom are low income and English language learners. With the backing of parents and teachers, an entrepreneurial principal was able to win over the district and school board on the idea of modifying the school calendar. By shifting the traditional calendar to a year-round schedule, school staff minimized summer learning loss for students and limited burnout for the many students who attended summer school. The new schedule includes the same number of school days with several breaks interspersed throughout the school year. During these intersessions, students can choose from a menu of enrichment camps that infuse math and literacy into the lessons. Intersession activities are led by community partners, parents, and other professionals in the community. And all this is being done using current funding. By combining their basic school funding, Title I money, summer school funding, and an exemplary-projects grant from the district, Barcroft leaders are able to manage this new schedule with their current funding. This includes most of the cost of intersession programming. If a family is able to pay it, a \$50 fee is collected for a student's three weeks of intersession programming. While the program is still too new to determine results, the teachers, who helped design the program, believe that the new schedule is helping to improve learning.
- **Achievable Dream Academy** in Newport News, Virginia, is a unique partnership between Newport News Public Schools, the City of Newport News, and the local business and military communities. Achievable Dream Academy provides at-risk students in kindergarten through 12th grade an expanded learning program that includes year-round school for 8 hours a day, 180 days a year. The schedule includes three mandatory, 10-day intersessions where students participate in enrichment and accelerated activities or remediation work if necessary. The curriculum at an Achievable Dream Academy raises the level of expectations students have for themselves; intensive reading programs, accelerated math courses, and mandatory etiquette classes are just a few examples of the varied approaches to learning that underlie the school's philosophy. The school receives its regular public school allotment that covers core expenses. Additional funding from other sources—mostly the business community—covers the costs of all of the expanded time activities. In 2007, the business community raised \$1.5 million to support expanded learning at Achievable Dream Academy.

## **School-Community Partnerships: The Key to Success for Financing Expanded Learning**

A growing body of research is pointing to the central role of partnerships between schools and community organizations in financing more time and learning. By pooling expertise and resources, schools and community partners are breaking down barriers between in-school and out-of-school learning and finding new ways to help students succeed at school and beyond. The following lessons and suggestions provide ideas for building or expanding school-community partnerships that support expanded time and learning initiatives.

**Partnerships Take Time.** Bringing schools and community partners together requires a significant time commitment both for start-up and for ongoing operations. Initiatives that had the luxury of a planning grant or a planning year indicated that it made a large difference for

implementation. Planning time allowed faculty, parents, and school administrators to work out a variety of details that could have hampered the transition to a new schedule or reform model. Partnerships also appear to benefit from time for joint training for school personnel and staff from community organizations. Finally, many expanded learning initiatives provide a staff person who allocates dedicated time for working with community partners. These partner liaisons ensure that all partners have what they need to work together in this new environment. A dedicated source of funding to support partnership development can help ensure success and lay the groundwork for securing additional resources down the road.

**Flexibility From All Partners Is Needed for Success.** Equally as important as dedicated time for working together is a willingness to learn about, and be respectful of, different organizational cultures. School districts are accustomed to being independent actors with a bureaucracy often separate from other public entities and community organizations. In addition to their own bureaucracies, many schools also must work closely with union representatives when making changes to school calendars and curricula. Community organizations are accustomed to their own rules and sometimes are frustrated by the slower action of schools or government agencies. For partnerships to work, each partner must come to understand and respect the others' strengths and limitations. When done right, these partnerships open new avenues for coordinating existing resources and provide access to a wider array of resources.

**A Pot of Flexible Funding—Even a Small One—Can Make All the Difference.** Almost universally, program leaders indicated that they could not do their work without some discretionary funding. Leaders indicated that these funds are needed to deal with “emergency” situations for individual children, urgent needs in particular classrooms, or time-sensitive opportunities that arise. One program leader reported a last minute invitation to take a group of students on a field trip to see a museum exhibit that would close in a few days. Museum staff would accompany the class and help make connections between the exhibit and the science curriculum at the school. The principal used his discretionary funds to pay for the bus for the field trip, indicating that he never would have been able to get approval from the district for a bus within the tight time frame.

**Successful Initiatives Rely on a Dedicated Entity to Coordinate the Work.** In many cases, districts and communities that are successfully expanding time and learning have an organization or entity that functions as the hub for expanded time and learning activity. The entity can act as the go-between for schools and community partners, as a vehicle to bring in the community and youth voices, and as a neutral party for convening community partners and stakeholders. In some cases, these entities also work to build public will and garner additional resources for expanded learning time programs. This role is often played by a local intermediary organization such as Mass 2020 in the case of the Massachusetts Expanded Learning Time initiative, or Afterschool Matters in Chicago. The role of coordinator also can be played by a school or school district, government organization, local foundation, or other entity (e.g., the mayor's office plays this role in many cities). Leaders of expanded time and learning initiatives have been clear about the need for this type of centralized support, which includes dedicated staff and resources to coordinate this work. States and communities seeking to expand time and learning will need to consider the best way to make sure resources are available to support these coordination tasks.

**Expanded Time and Learning Programs and Initiatives Benefit From a Shared Identity and a Common Language.** While many states and localities are interested in new ways to expand time for learning, few speak about their initiatives using similar terms. Is it *expanded learning*, *extended learning*, *summer learning*? Finding the right words to convey this work is critical for communicating with community partners, parents, and policymakers. One way to address this is by branding—a strategy that has worked well for the early-care field and for many of the initiatives highlighted in this paper. When a name and identity have been created for the work, parents, students, policymakers, and community partners understand exactly what is being offered.

## **Conclusion**

The reality that out-of-school learning plays a key role in student achievement and success is motivating states, districts, and schools to find ways to expand time for learning. Finding the resources necessary to support more time and learning is a key challenge in adopting this strategy. This paper shows that the states, districts, and schools currently expanding time and learning are doing so by utilizing resources from federal, state, and local funds, as well as from private sources. Most commonly, initiatives rely on education funds from federal, state, and district programs to implement reforms. The paper also shows that school districts can take advantage of a variety of current resources, such as Title I and 21st CCLC, to jumpstart expanded learning programs.

This paper also makes clear that school-community partnerships are a key to success for many expanded learning reforms. Community partners provide facilities, staff, know-how, and programming that can complement school curricula. They also provide an opportunity to engage students who are not succeeding during the traditional school day by offering a different type of learning experience. Furthermore, community partners can provide access to other sources of funding from libraries, arts councils, community development agencies, and parks and recreation departments to help support expanded learning reforms.

Finally, this paper illustrates a variety of reform approaches for states, districts, and schools that may serve to inspire others and lead the way for new efforts to expand time and learning.



## **NCLB Reauthorization—Potential Opportunities for Expanded Learning**

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act authorizes many of the federal programs that are supporting expanded learning, including Title I, SES, 21st CCLC, and School Improvement fund grants. NCLB was scheduled for reauthorization in 2007, but agreement on a new bill was never reached; the law will remain in its current form until it is reauthorized.

Reauthorization provides an important opportunity to modify the law and to improve, change, add, or eliminate programs or requirements. Several of the proposed changes in 2007 draft legislation provide insights into the kinds of changes being considered that could bring additional funding for expanded learning, including the following:

- **Proposed Expanded Learning Time Demonstration.** The 2007 House proposal to reauthorize NCLB contained language and funding to implement an expanded learning time demonstration similar to the program already underway in Massachusetts. The bill included funding for new competitive grants to state and local education agencies to develop expanded learning time schools. The proposal called on schools and local education agencies to form partnerships with community-based organizations and other community partners to help schools expand learning time by at least 30 percent. A version of this bill was reintroduced in 2008 as Senate Bill 3431, The Time for Innovation Matters in Education Act of 2008.
- **Proposed Teaching Fellows for Expanded Learning and After-School Act of 2007.** Also introduced in 2007 was legislation to establish a highly trained National Service Corps to support expanded day and afterschool learning opportunities. The bill called for partnerships with school districts and community-based organizations to recruit and retain new educators and leaders to support expanded learning. This program would provide funding for an important piece of the infrastructure for connecting in-school and out-of-school learning. This legislation was also reintroduced in 2008 as House Bill 7154 with the same name.
- **Changes to the Supplemental Educational Services Program.** The Supplemental Educational Services (SES) program came into being as part of NCLB's focus on accountability. The timing of reauthorization has reignited discussions about the program's structure and function. Although many proposals called for significantly changing or eliminating this program, one group of proposals is calling for better ways to integrate SES into school reform efforts. This could provide additional opportunities to support expanded learning.

## References

- Afterschool Alliance. (2006, October 10). *New research on afterschool in Connecticut* [Press release]. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved January 7, 2009, from [http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/press\\_archives/CT\\_After\\_3\\_NR.pdf](http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/press_archives/CT_After_3_NR.pdf)
- Afterschool Investments. (2006). *Making smart investments in afterschool: A policy primer for state and local leaders*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Retrieved January 6, 2009, from <http://www.nccic.org/afterschool/policyprimer.pdf>
- Annenberg Institute. (2008). *The Massachusetts Expanded Learning Time initiative*. Providence, RI: Author. Retrieved January 7, 2009, from [http://www.annenberginstitute.org/pdf/EKF08\\_Mass.pdf](http://www.annenberginstitute.org/pdf/EKF08_Mass.pdf)
- California Department of Education. (2008). *After School Education and Safety program (ASES): Description*. Retrieved January 7, 2009, from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/ba/as/pgmdescription.asp>
- Collaborative for Building After-School Systems. (2008). *More time for learning: ELT initiatives & enrichment opportunities*. New York: Author. Retrieved January 7, 2009, from <http://www.afterschoolsystems.org/content/document/detail/2124/>
- Deich, S. (with Heather Padgette, H.). (2008). *Dollars and sense: A first look at financing A New Day for Learning*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Economic Policy Institute Task Force. (2008). *Broader, bolder approach to education statement*. Retrieved January 6, 2009, from [http://www.boldapproach.org/bold\\_approach\\_full\\_statement.pdf](http://www.boldapproach.org/bold_approach_full_statement.pdf)
- Education: Expand high-quality afterschool opportunities*. (2008). Retrieved January 6, 2009, from <http://www.barackobama.com/issues/education/>
- Estimated federal investment in out-of-school time*. (n.d.) Retrieved January 6, 2009, from [http://76.12.61.196/publications/estimatedfederalOST\\_TFPflyer.pdf](http://76.12.61.196/publications/estimatedfederalOST_TFPflyer.pdf)
- Kansas State Department of Education. (2008). *Kansas middle school afterschool activity advancement grant (KMSA3)*.
- Massachusetts 2020. (2009). *ELT initiative*. Retrieved January 7, 2009, from <http://www.mass2020.org/node/3>
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- National Conference of State Legislatures. (2009). *Department of Education budget FY2009: Budget highlights: School Improvement grants*. Retrieved January 6, 2009, from <http://www.ncsl.org/standcomm/sceduc/EDBudgetFY09Summary.htm>
- New Hampshire Department of Education. (n.d.) *Supporting student success through extended learning opportunities*. Retrieved January 7, 2009, from <http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/adultlearning/SupportingStudentSuccessThroughExtendedLearningOpportunities.htm>
- South Carolina Department of Education. (2008). *After school program/homework centers*. Retrieved January 7, 2009, from [http://ed.sc.gov/agency/Innovation-and-Support/Youth-Services/old/ssys/youth\\_services/homework/index.html](http://ed.sc.gov/agency/Innovation-and-Support/Youth-Services/old/ssys/youth_services/homework/index.html)
- Time, Learning, and Afterschool Task Force. (2007). *A new day for learning*. Washington, DC: Collaborative Communications Group. Retrieved January 6, 2009, from <http://www.edutopia.org/pdfs/ANewDayforLearning.pdf>
- Time Reform Task Force. (2007). *Recommendations to the State Board of Education*. Oklahoma City, OK: Author. Retrieved January 7, 2009, from <http://www.sde.state.ok.us/Services/News/2007/TRTFRecomd.pdf>
- United Way of America. (2008). *Our work in education*. Retrieved January 6, 2009, from <http://www.liveunited.org/education/Index.cfm>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2008a). *Fiscal year 2009 budget summary—February 4, 2008: Title I grants to local education agencies*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved January 6, 2009, from <http://www.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/budget09/summary/edlite-section2a.html#title1lea>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2008b). *Fiscal year 2009 budget summary—February 4, 2008: 21st Century Learning Opportunities (21st Century Community Learning Centers)*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved January 6, 2009, from <http://www.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/budget09/summary/edlite-section2a.html#clcs>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2008c). *Full service community school program: Eligibility*. Retrieved January 6, 2009, from <http://www.ed.gov/programs/communityschools/eligibility.html>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2008d). *Full service community school program: 2008 awards*. Retrieved January 6, 2009, from <http://www.ed.gov/programs/communityschools/2008awards.html>

Wallace Foundation. (2008). *A place to grow and learn: A citywide approach to building and sustaining out-of-school time learning opportunities*. New York: Author. Retrieved January 7, 2009, from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/KnowledgeCenter/KnowledgeTopics/CurrentAreasofFocus/Out-Of-SchoolLearning/Pages/sustaining-ost-opportunities.aspx>

Zimmer, R., Gill, B., Razquin, P., Booker, K., & Lockwood, J. R. (2007). *State and local implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act: Volume I—Title I school choice, supplemental educational services, and student achievement*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved January 6, 2009, from <http://www.appam.org/conferences/fall/losangeles2008/sessions/downloads/10013.pdf>

**Acknowledgements**

The author would like to thank her funders and colleagues at the C.S. Mott Foundation, the National Center for Summer Learning, United Way of America, and the Say Yes to Education Foundation for supporting this work on financing and designing programs that expand time and learning opportunities. Special thanks also go to Heather Clapp Padgett who has provided research assistance with much of this work as well as being a reliable sounding board when it comes to pulling it all together.

## Case Studies

Emily Morgan  
Jessica Donner

### Collaborative for Building After-School Systems

#### PS 78 Anne Hutchinson School, Bronx, New York

##### Overview

PS 78 Anne Hutchinson School, located in the Bronx, New York, is a Title I elementary school serving 780 students in Grades K–5. The student body is 80 percent black, 17 percent Hispanic, and 3 percent white or other. Approximately 90 percent of students are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. Over the past four years, PS 78 has partnered with the national nonprofit Building Educated Leaders for Life (BELL) and The After-School Corporation (TASC) to provide afterschool services for 150 students. Principal Claudina Skerritt developed an afterschool program to provide students in need of academic supports with additional learning opportunities. Since 2004, PS 78 has made significant achievement gains on local and state assessments and has advanced from a school in need of improvement to one in good academic standing.

##### Partnership History

After PS 78 was designated as a school in need of improvement for failing to meet adequate yearly progress (AYP) two years in a row, Principal Skerritt partnered with BELL to operate an afterschool program as a strategy to boost student achievement. She targeted BELL because of its longstanding history providing high-quality literacy and math tutoring programs. Principal Skerritt also partnered with TASC to help support the afterschool program by identifying funding opportunities, expanding enrichment options for students, and providing professional development and site-based trainings for afterschool staff.

##### Program Design

The afterschool program operates five days a week from 2:15 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. and provides a breadth of academic and enrichment activities including homework help, tutoring, art, dance, and sports. PS 78 employs a full-time site coordinator who serves as a liaison between the school, BELL, and TASC to coordinate trainings, communicate results, and align afterschool programming to in-school instruction. Principal Skerritt meets regularly with the site coordinator to connect afterschool programming with current school initiatives in an effort, as she puts it, “to create continuity, where the boundary between the school-day and afterschool cannot be distinguished” (personal communication, December 16, 2008).

Multiple funding streams have supported the afterschool program at PS 78 over the past four years, as follows:

- As a school in need of improvement, PS 78 parents chose to dedicate Supplemental Educational Services (SES) funds to support afterschool programming.
- With support from The After-School Corporation, PS 78 received a 21st CCLC grant to expand the program to five days a week.

- Title I funds from the school budget mitigated the loss of SES funds when PS 78 was no longer in needs-improvement status.

In fall 2008, TASC, the New York City (NYC) Department of Education, and the NYC Department of Youth and Community Development selected PS 78 with BELL as a site for the Expanded Learning Time/ New York City (ELT/NYC) pilot initiative. ELT/NYC is testing the feasibility of expanding learning time by 30 percent at 10 New York City schools. Through ELT/NYC, PS 78 has expanded its afterschool programming, now serving 300 students, and is making more explicit connections between the learning before and after 3 p.m.

### **Impact**

The partnership among PS 78, BELL, and TASC has contributed to overall school improvement. According to Principal Skerritt, “Our afterschool program is a major asset to help students perform at grade level in reading and math.” Afterschool has also been incorporated into the school’s comprehensive educational plan as a strategy to improve student academic performance. Since the implementation of the afterschool program, PS 78 has made consistent academic gains on local and state assessments, as follows:

- Upgraded from a school in need of improvement to one in good standing in 2007 for making AYP in English language arts and math.
- Identified as one of the state’s “rapidly improving and recognized schools” in 2006–07 by the New York State Department of Education.
- Improved learning environment in the area of academic expectations. (NYC Department of Education, 2008).

### **Looking Forward**

The partnership with BELL and TASC has provided children at PS 78 with high-quality academic support and enrichment in their afterschool program. However, the challenge remains to broaden the reach of afterschool services. In the 2007–08 school year, the afterschool program had a waiting list of over 400 students, and there are over 150 students on the waiting list for this school year. “We constantly ask ourselves whether we are serving enough students,” David Inigo, the afterschool coordinator, explains, “but it is difficult to expand our program given the current budget limitations.”

Budget constraints, compounded by a reduction in resources as the school’s performance has improved, have required school administrators to think strategically about funding support. Principal Skerritt, committed to maintaining the momentum of afterschool programming over the past three years, has actively pursued diverse revenue streams identified by the School Grant Committee, which researches and applies for external funding opportunities. Principal Skerritt also has developed strategic partnerships with community-based organizations that complement the school’s mission and have the capacity to assist with grant writing. “We have been fortunate in bringing together multiple funding sources to support our after-school program,” she explains, “but that has meant making difficult budgetary decisions and working smarter to create these opportunities.”

## **Lantana Elementary School, Palm Beach County, Florida**

### **Overview**

Lantana is a K–5 elementary school located in Palm Beach County, Florida, with an afterschool program that serves nearly half of its 457 students. The school is 27 percent Hispanic, 38 percent black, and 35 percent white or other. Already a strong believer in the power of afterschool, Principal Elaine Persek was eager to capitalize on the existing Beacon program when she arrived at Lantana Elementary in 2005. Principal Persek has worked closely with her staff and forged a partnership with Prime Time Palm Beach County to expand afterschool services. Over the past three years, Lantana has made AYP and improved school climate.

### **Partnership History**

Principal Persek works closely with staff from the Beacon Center, Prime Time, and partnering community-based organizations to provide afterschool services and enrichments for students. This collaboration has contributed to improved sustainability and program quality. The Beacon Center, which promotes the school as a hub of the community for academic, social, recreational, and cultural activities, supports the cost of participation of approximately one third of the students in afterschool. Lantana’s partnership with Prime Time improves program quality through targeted technical assistance and professional development sessions for the Beacon and afterschool directors. Ensuring youth participate in engaging activities that provide exposure to new experiences, Prime Time also serves as a clearinghouse for enhancement enrichment activities, such as technology workshops, hands-on environmental science projects, and newspaper journalism operated by community-based organizations.

### **Program Design**

Lantana’s afterschool program serves approximately 200 students each year from 2 p.m. to 6 p.m., five days a week. The first 90 minutes are dedicated to academic support including homework help, individual tutoring, science and literacy enrichment, and a comprehensive academic enrichment program called Champs, funded through Prime Time. Following academic enrichments, through the partnership with Prime Time, youth participate in CADRE, an arts and cultural enhancement program run by the Center for Creative Education. CADRE provides high-quality creative arts experiences for students including line dancing, silk-screen painting, sculpting, yoga, and thematic end-of-program performances.

### **Impact**

Principal Persek believes the academic enrichment emphasis of the afterschool program and strong ties between in-school and out-of-school programs have contributed toward the following recent accomplishments by Lantana:

- Improved from a grade of a “C” to an “A” in 2006/07 and “B” in 2007/08, demonstrating increased numbers of students meeting reading and math standards (Florida Department of Education, 1999–2008).
- Made AYP in 2006–07 for the first time since 2002.
- Improved behavior and attitudes of students during the school day as well as increased teacher expectations for students (personal communication, November 24, 2008).



- Attendance during the school day improved, in part due to the Beacon parent liaison who calls parents when students are absent (personal communication, November 24, 2008).

### **Looking Forward**

Lantana has been successful in addressing a common challenge for afterschool programs: aligning afterschool programming with in-school instruction. According to Principal Persek, “We truly operate in a seamless environment—one that doesn’t look at afterschool as a separate piece, but rather as an integral part of the whole school experience.” A key aspect of this coordination is the full-time afterschool director, Denise Sasiain, who reports directly to the school principal and runs all aspects of the program, including budgeting, staffing, and programming. She meets with the principal and the Beacon director twice a month to discuss the program and ways to connect in-school and out-of-school time. As Principal Persek explains, “We want our afterschool program to remain distinct from, but build upon, what students learn during the school day through engaging and worthwhile activities” (personal communication, November 24, 2008).

In the future, Lantana would like to expand the reach of its afterschool program to involve all students who want to participate. Many of the parents at Lantana cannot afford to pay for the afterschool program. Family Central, a nonprofit organization, provides a strong model for cost-sharing, by subsidizing a portion of the program fees based on family income. “We would love to expand the number of children that we serve in our afterschool program,” explains Afterschool Director Sasiain, “but that means figuring out creative ways to subsidize the program fees.”

## **Wendell Phillips Academy High School, Chicago, Illinois**

### **Overview**

Wendell Phillips is a small neighborhood high school serving approximately 800 students in Chicago. Ninety-eight percent of students are African-American, and 90 percent are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. Through Principal Euel Bunton’s commitment to develop partnerships with After School Matters, Centers for New Horizons, and additional community-based organizations, the scope, quality and coordination of afterschool opportunities has improved over the past six years. Phillips was selected as a Transformation High School in 2007, and through this initiative, Arne Duncan, Chicago Public Schools Chief Executive Officer, identified the After School Matters program as a school improvement strategy.

### **Partnership History**

As a Community School and through its partnership with the nonprofit After School Matters, Phillips provides a wide range of afterschool programs to reach nearly one half of the student body. Since 2003, After School Matters has operated afterschool apprenticeships led by the Chicago Park District, independent instructors, and community-based organizations in which teens take part in engaging activities that provide skills that translate to the workplace. With additional funding from the Community Schools initiative, Centers for New Horizons serves as the lead community-based organization providing academic and social service programs.

## **Program Design**

The Phillips afterschool programs are specifically designed to meet the academic, social, and developmental needs of high school youth. Students choose from multiple program options that build career and college readiness skills and that complement Phillips' strong college preparation focus. After School Matters apprenticeship programs offer youth the opportunity to advance their mastery of skills by learning from experienced professionals and to investigate careers in the fields of technology, sports, arts, and communications. The 10-week apprenticeships are hands-on, interactive programs in which youth can explore different career paths and develop marketable skills in areas such as technology, lifeguarding, and documentary filmmaking.

Centers for New Horizons coordinates with other community partners to provide additional afterschool services. To support students' academic development and provide exposure to postsecondary options, Centers for New Horizons provides mentoring and tutoring services as well as college tours and job-shadowing opportunities. Students also participate in a wide range of services that support their social and emotional development including dance, art history courses, and leadership development workshops.

## **Impact**

According to Principal Bunton, afterschool programs have played a role in advancing overall school performance:

We started with changing the school culture to create an environment that puts a premium on education, with the belief that this would translate into improved student outcomes. Students now feel that they are engaged in worthwhile activities and that they are prepared for life after graduation. Our afterschool programs have really helped these students realize that obtaining a high school degree is essential.

As an indication of how afterschool services have contributed to improved school performance, over the past few years attendance rates have increased from 72 percent to 76 percent, and chronic truancy has decreased from 25 percent to 12 percent (Chicago Public Schools Office of Research, Evaluation, and Accountability, 2008). Graduation rates increased from 39 percent in 2001 to 70 percent in 2005, and college admissions have risen from fewer than 10 in 2001 to 68 in 2005 (Centers for New Horizons, 2006). In addition, student behavior has improved as fewer students have been suspended or expelled.

## **Looking Forward**

Principal Bunton is working to further connect afterschool to the school-day curriculum. Strategies to strengthen alignment between in-school and out-of-school time include the following:

- Holding monthly leadership meetings with school administrators, community-based-organization partners, and staff from After School Matters and Centers for New Horizons.
- Adapting afterschool programs to meet the needs of the school.

- Building on Phillips’ STEM (science, technology, engineering, and math) focus, ASM contracts with community organizations and city agencies to advance program options in information technology and health careers.
- Appointing teacher liaisons who identify needs of specific students and communicate them to afterschool staff.

Principal Bunton acknowledges that while the program has made significant progress in providing a broad range of enrichment experiences for youth, the school and its partners continue “to work hard to create a system of afterschool services that support students’ academic, social, and emotional growth and are available to all students from the day they arrive at Phillips to the day they graduate.”

## **Roger Williams Middle School, Providence, Rhode Island**

### **Overview**

Roger Williams is a Title I middle school in Providence, Rhode Island, with 744 students. As part of the Providence After School Alliance’s (PASA) citywide initiative to improve the quality, availability, and coordination of afterschool programming for school-age youth in Providence, Roger Williams is one of three anchor schools for a wide range of afterschool programs in the South Side/West End AfterZone.<sup>11</sup> While Roger Williams struggles to make AYP, its partnership with PASA, city agencies, and community-based organizations to expand afterschool services has contributed to improved school performance.

### **Partnership**

The partnership with PASA has played a critical role in improving the scale and quality of afterschool services at Roger Williams, currently reaching more than 360 youth in 45 different programs. Funding and staffing support from PASA has provided resources to expand academic and enrichment program options and double the number of participants. PASA also improves program quality by supporting partnerships with high-quality providers that include community-based organizations, individual instructors, the school district, and the local police department.

### **Program Design**

The program model at Roger Williams reflects the developmental needs of middle-grades youth as well as competing interests of teens. Activity choice is the keystone of the program. Students select from a wide range of programs presented in a manner that simulates a college course catalogue. The programs are based in experiential learning and take place at both school and community-based locations. Hands-on enrichment activities that help students make connections to their academic learning as well as the community and world around them include explorations of the bay, food and fitness, pets and vets, dancing and drums, woodworking, martial arts, ceramics, and others. To directly support academic growth, each student participates in Club AfterZone each day in addition to their enrichment activity. Club AfterZone is an hourlong

---

<sup>11</sup> AfterZones are neighborhood campuses that connect communities and afterschool providers to promote high-quality expanded learning time opportunities for middle-grades youth.

session in which students can receive homework help or take part in reading enrichment, academic games, and hands-on science and math activities.

Sustaining a high level of program quality is critical to maintaining student engagement. As one youth asserts, “I would walk a mile for a quality program, but I wouldn’t walk across the street for a bad one” (Wallace Foundation, 2008, p. 11). To this end, PASA oversees a quality improvement and capacity building agenda that includes use of a quality assessment tool, ongoing professional development, program observation, and customized technical assistance.

### **Impact**

Principal Moseley views the afterschool program as a key strategy to drive school improvement and gives credit to the program for improved student attendance and behavior. Accomplishments include the following:

- Improved school day attendance from 86 percent to 92 percent in part due to AfterZone policy requiring school-day attendance for participation in afterschool (personal communication, December 9, 2008).
- Improved on-time grade promotion (personal communication, December 9, 2008).
- Improved test scores, meeting 25 of 26 Rhode Island English language arts and math targets in 2008 compared to meeting 18 targets in 2005 (Rhode Island Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2008).

Demonstrating the principal’s commitment to high-quality expanded learning time, the after-school program has been incorporated into the school’s improvement plan. According to Principal Moseley, “Our students have shown tremendous growth over the past three years, so we want to recognize the impact of the AfterZone and work to institutionalize this type of comprehensive afterschool programming.”

### **Looking Forward**

Over the past three years, Principal Moseley has been working to strengthen the link between in-school and out-of-school learning. This goal has been supported at a district level by afterschool coordinators assigned to each middle school across the city who track attendance and communicate student-specific information from school-day staff to afterschool providers. Also furthering alignment citywide, support from the Mott Foundation as part of the New Day for Learning initiative will build stronger systemwide connections between the AfterZone and school day to create a more seamless day for learning at Roger Williams and the six other middle schools in Providence.

## References

- Centers for New Horizons. (2006). *Program: Youth and family development*. Retrieved January 7, 2009, from <http://www.cnh.org/?id=programs&pageid=61>
- Chicago Public Schools Office of Research, Evaluation, and Accountability. (2008). *CEO's school report for the 2007–08 school year: Phillips HS*. Retrieved January 7, 2009, from <http://research.cps.k12.il.us/resweb/SchoolProfile?unit=1510>
- Florida Department of Education. (1999–2008). *Florida school grades report*. Retrieved January 7, 2009, from <http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/default.asp>
- New York City Department of Education. (2008). *Learning environment survey report 2007–08: P.S. 078 Anne Hutchinson*. New York: Author. Retrieved January 7, 2009, from [http://schools.nyc.gov/OA/SchoolReports/2007-08/Survey\\_X078.pdf](http://schools.nyc.gov/OA/SchoolReports/2007-08/Survey_X078.pdf)
- Rhode Island Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2008). *School report cards*. Retrieved January 7, 2009, from <https://www.eride.ri.gov/reportcard/08/default.asp>
- Wallace Foundation. (2008). *A place to grow and learn: A citywide approach to building and sustaining out-of-school time learning opportunities*. New York: Author. Retrieved January 7, 2009, from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/SiteCollectionDocuments/WF/Knowledge%20Center/Attachments/PDF/APlacetoGrowandLearn.pdf>