


STEPPING UP!

*Out-of-School Time and Youth Development in Providence:
A School-Community Analysis*



January 2003

Prepared for:
The Providence School Department
and United Way of Rhode Island



United Way
of rhode island

Help us help. Here.

Andrew Bundy and Elaine Fersh, Community Matters

Foreword

Melody Johnson, Superintendent, Providence Public Schools

Dennis Murphy, President, United Way of Rhode Island

January 2003

Our two institutions share a vision of a community which ensures that its young people grow up healthy, learn successfully, and develop into capable, engaged members of society. What does it take for a community to realize such a vision? Across the country, there is a growing recognition that a big part of the answer to this question lies in better understanding what young people do with their time when they are not in school.

The Providence School Department and United Way of Rhode Island are working together to develop a clearer picture of current opportunities and future prospects for Providence's children and youth. Each of our institutions has a strong interest in better understanding the out-of-school time universe. This report is an attempt – co-sponsored by our two organizations – to learn more about out-of-school time in Providence, and to share the findings with a wide audience.

At the Providence School Department, we recognize that the academic success of our students is closely linked to their social, emotional, and physical development. What our students do during the time they are not in school has direct and serious consequences for how well they achieve academically. It is therefore of great interest to us.

At United Way of Rhode Island, we believe that success in school is perhaps the best indicator of bright future prospects for a child. From our vantage point, the non-profit, voluntary sector has a major responsibility to help children, families, and schools achieve success for all children in school.

This report, prepared by Elaine Fersh and Andrew Bundy of Community Matters, attempts to “take a snapshot” of the city's current out-of-school situation. It assembles new and existing data, studies implications, and makes some concrete recommendations. The intent is to challenge the reader *and* us, as the sponsors of the research, to think about how each of us will use this information to advance the fortunes of the children and youth in this community.

The Providence School Department and United Way look forward to an ongoing collaboration as Providence's work on these important issues continues to develop. Each of our institutions expects to continue to play active roles in the emergence of an increasingly dynamic out-of-school sector in Providence. We will be acting on many of the recommendations in this report.

At the same time that we look forward to future activity, we encourage all those with an interest in the future of out-of-school time and youth development in Providence to lend your expertise and leadership to this effort. Won't you join us in the work ahead?

Table of Contents

Foreword by Melody Johnson and Dennis Murphy	Page 3
Executive Summary.....	Page 5
Overview:	
I. United Way of Rhode Island and the Providence School Department	Page 12
II. The National Context.....	Page 13
III. Out-of-School Time Programs Work!.....	Page 13
IV. Purpose of the Report	Page 14
V. Key Questions and Methods.....	Page 14
Findings:	
I. Providence’s Assets.....	Page 16
II. Providence’s Children.....	Page 20
III. The Demand for Out-of-School Time Programs.....	Page 21
IV. A Diverse Supply of Programs.....	Page 24
V. School-Based Out-of-School Time Programs	Page 25
VI. Mapping Providence’s Out-of-School Time Programs	Page 29
VII. Transportation: A Major Barrier.....	Page 37
VIII. Public Safety and Police Relations.....	Page 37
IX. Program Impact	Page 38
X. Public Funding Sources.....	Page 38
XI. Private Funding Sources.....	Page 43
XII. Additional Sources of Revenue.....	Page 45
XIII. Scant Funds for Out-of-School Time "Infrastructure"	Page 45
XIV. Opportunities for Joint Local and State Planning	Page 46
XV. Rhode Island’s Under-utilized Funding Option.....	Page 46
XVI. Leadership Challenges.....	Page 49
Implications	Page 54
Recommendations.....	Page 56
Conclusion.....	Page 60
Endnotes.....	Page 61
Appendices:	
A. Methodology for the Research Project.....	Page 65
B. Sample School Profile and Program Profile Form.....	Page 67
C. Survey Data on Elementary, Middle, and High School Programming and Principal Demand ...	Page 69
D. Sample, Middle and High School Youth Survey Form.....	Page 79
E. Middle and High School Youth Survey Data	Page 81
F. An Experiment: Assessing Providence’s “Full-Time” Capacity	Page 86
G. Respondents: Providers, Educators, Policymakers, Funders, Agency Heads, Advocates, and Others	Page 87
H. Author Descriptions.....	Page 89
I. Acknowledgements.....	Page 90

Introduction

What are the out-of-school time opportunities for children and youth in Providence, and how might those opportunities become greater?¹ Over the past nine months, in response to a community research project sponsored by United Way of Rhode Island and the Providence School Department, hundreds of Providence youth, educators, youth workers, administrators, funders, advocates, and policy makers have tried to answer this question by reporting on their experience and offering their suggestions. This report chronicles and analyzes the findings of this community research effort, discusses implications, and makes recommendations for future action.

Context

Nationally, a surge of policies, funding, and programming designed to support out-of-school youth and children is sweeping the country. Mounting evidence suggests that such programs can contribute to children's social and emotional development, learning, and school success.

In Providence, out-of-school activity is a part of each day for tens of thousands of children and youth and their families. Dozens of agencies offer hundreds of programs serving every neighborhood of the city. Despite this extensive activity, some of which has been going on for decades, many fundamental questions exist about out-of-school time in Providence:

- Who needs and wants out-of-school time programming in the city?
- How much of it is there now, in which neighborhoods?
- How much more might be needed?
- What is known about its impact?
- How is it funded?
- What would make it stronger?
- What do those most affected – young people and the adults who serve them – think about it?
- Who might be involved in helping it to grow and improve?

The Providence School Department and United Way joined forces to commission this study in the late fall of 2001. Sensing that the time was right to try to establish some consensus about the opportunities and challenges of out-of-school time in the city, they began this project eager to understand the experience and insights of the youth who use these services and the adults who make them available. By sharing their findings with the wider community, they hope to continue an ongoing conversation that leads to collaborative action by the city's educational, youth-serving and community agencies.

Findings

A steady stream of generous community and civic feedback and insight leads the researchers to the following main findings:

Out-of-School Time Matters! Eighty percent of a child's waking life is spent outside the classroom.² National and local research confirms that the quality of children's lives – their capacity to learn, succeed in school, and develop into healthy and successful adults – is greatly affected by their experiences in out-of-school time. Communities and schools that offer children and youth high-quality programming and opportunities to learn and grow during their out-of-school time show significant improvement in critical child outcomes like school attendance, social behavior, academic achievement, youth leadership, and civic engagement. Locally, the most effective of Providence's after-school programs play a vital role in the social, emotional, and academic development of children and youth.

Providence Invests Significantly in the Out-of-School Lives of Children and Youth: Many assets support children, family, and youth in out-of-school time in Providence, including a wealth of experienced program providers, a large and vibrant arts community, numerous civic and philanthropic partners, significant public investments from the state of Rhode Island and City of Providence, perhaps the best ratio of college-age youth volunteers to children and youth of any city in the United States, and heartening evidence of emerging youth leadership. Recent developments include mounting interest of the public schools and the nonprofit sector in out-of-school time programming, a developing foundation of citywide data on youth, programs, communities, and the city as a whole, and large philanthropic investments in Providence as a laboratory for school reform.

Providence Children Face Significant Challenges and Possess Many Strengths: Two-fifths of Providence's children are growing up in poverty, constituting nearly half of all the poor children in the state of Rhode Island. Severe academic problems confront many children: large numbers of children enter the schools unprepared to learn, high rates of family transience and student mobility undermine academic progress, and the high schools of the city have an annual dropout rate of 36%. At the same time, the children and youth of the city possess many assets upon which to build: Providence youth leadership is well established in multiple neighborhoods, communities, and programs; many children are thriving, both academically and socially, in the city; youth crime and high-risk behaviors, while not declining rapidly, are not increasing substantially either. Perhaps most significantly, fully 75% of the children and youth of Providence are Hispanic, African-American, Asian, or of more than two ethnicities. This rapidly accelerating diversity among its young people, and the potential it represents, is one of the greatest assets of the city.

Many Programs Are Already Under Way in Providence Out-of-School Time: Providence invests significant community and institutional assets in the out-of-school time life of its children and youth. More than 150 agencies offer an estimated 6,000 children and youth some 300 programs, many of them staffed by culturally competent professionals with years of experience. Providence boasts special capacity in the areas of service learning, arts education, cultural programming, and youth leadership development. The state of Rhode Island plays a large and positive role in much of the city's child, education, and family support work.

Supply Does Not Meet Demand: Despite the breadth and volume of programming available, children, youth, and families in Providence do not currently have access to an adequate range of high-quality out-of-school time programs. Providence agencies, neighborhoods, and schools currently supply programming to a modest fraction – between 15% and 20% – of Providence's school-age children. Schools, families, agencies, and funders express a strong desire for more out-of-school time programming, as well as a high degree of confidence that such an expansion will produce positive effects.

The Providence School Department is A Key Partner in Out-of-School Time Programming...But Partnering is Hard for All Parties: The Providence School Department (PSD) is a major player in out-of-school time activity, especially in the hours immediately after school. The single largest provider of sites in which programs can operate, the Department hosts over 104 programs in the city's 42 schools, serving at least 3,899 children. These schools are partnered with more than 32 different nonprofit, community, city, and neighborhood agencies and organizations. Through its co-sponsorship of the community research venture that led to this paper, the Department is indicating its increasing willingness to expand its role, and to help frame and pursue a citywide agenda for out-of-school time.

As both educators and community youth workers report, however, organizing school-based out-of-school time programming can be difficult for all parties. In general, educators and school administrators often feel that community agencies do not understand or appreciate the urgency of the learning and educational agenda. In contrast, community agencies frequently report indifference and resistance to their presence in school buildings, and a tendency of some school personnel to regard the buildings as "theirs." Perhaps the most often cited difficulty of providers has been the absence of clear, consistent, well-publicized, and well-managed department policies and practices for

developing and maintaining out-of-school time programs in schools. The School Department is responding to this concern, and in July 2002, released a *Community Partnership Handbook: A User-Friendly Guide to Working with Providence Schools* at a Community Forum attended by nearly 70 organizations.

Government and Private Funding of Out-of-School Time Programming Is Diversified, Inadequate to the Need, and Rarely Aligned: A wide and complex array of government agencies and financing programs fund out-of-school time programming in the city. Parent fees, annual contributions to nonprofits, and grants from private agencies and foundations make up a large additional source of funding. Recent infusions of private foundation support, especially from regional and national foundations, are fostering some creative planning and new initiatives. There is a tendency, among both private and government grants, toward the creation of one-time pilot projects which lack credible plans for sustainability. In Providence, public and private sector organizations rarely coordinate their varied initiatives in out-of-school time. Opportunities often go unrealized: ironically, although Rhode Island law entitles families with youth up to 15 years old to a substantial annual subsidy for school-age care, few children older than 12 access such funding.

There is a Stark Contrast Between What is Working in the City and What is Not: The best of Providence's out-of-school time and youth-development work is very good indeed. Youth have demonstrated exceptional leadership capacity in several different programs in Providence; some agencies have forged powerful ties to children, youth, and families in specific neighborhoods or ethnic communities; a number of community- and school-based programs have developed strong partnerships and collaborations that draw on the diverse resources of the city. These and other successes contrast sharply with the limited vision and impact of other out-of-school programs in the city; the small number of programs with state licensing or national accreditation; the great disparities between neighborhoods in the amount and affordability of programming available; and the large number of programs engaged in little or no partnership, skills-sharing, or professional development activity.

The City Lacks a System – or Infrastructure – of Programs and Coordination: Providence boasts many strands of support for out-of-school time programming for children and youth – some of them are well-established, and others are under development. These include the 300+ programs serving children, the school and community sites hosting those programs, the funding agencies that pay for the programs, and a small cluster of agencies providing the programs with training, technical assistance, and other support. But with few exceptions, these strands are not well-connected, aligned, or even necessarily aware of one another. One example of a significant systemic gap is the absence of transportation options and resources for children, youth, and families, and the limited efforts of public and private sector agencies to coordinate such resources. Without a coordinated and intentional weaving together of these disparate enterprises, these individual institutional efforts – the best the city has to offer – have not yet been able to form a cohesive network of interconnected and effective support for children, youth, and families.

Champions are Needed: Despite the initiative of many individuals and institutions who provide out-of-school time programming, no individual or institution is acting as the city's champion of out-of-school time. Providence has neither strong institutional leadership, nor an organized constituency of parents, educators, providers, or advocates pressing for increases in out-of-school time programming, improvement in access or quality, or greater affordability or funding. The absence of such leadership is one factor in the historically low profile of out-of-school time issues in civic, political, and community dialogues throughout the city. It contrasts with the experience of other U.S. cities in the past decade, many of whose mayors, elected officials, civic, and business leaders have "stepped up" to create a wealth of new programming, advocacy, and resource development activity.

Implications

The following points arise out of an analysis of the findings, and build on prior knowledge to suggest key areas for action.

Providence Children and Youth Need More Out-Of-School Time Programming, and So Do Their Families and Communities: Despite the large number of programs in the city, the numbers of children and youth who would use additional programming if it were available and affordable is very high. Families and neighborhoods often lack access to programs which would increase children's safety, improve children's learning opportunities, enable parents to work or attend school during out-of-school time, and otherwise strengthen family and community capacity.

Better Data Will Help Providence to Understand, Organize, and Grow the Supply of Out-of-School Time Programs: While the number, variety, and scope of out-of-school time programs in Providence is large and impressive, the supply of data on them is not. Despite major headway made by the Swearer Center and its collaborators on profiling programs for youth 10-20 years old, and some new contributions made through the Stepping Up! report, good data on the actual citywide supply of programs for children 5 to 18 remains elusive, incompletely documented, and lacking in unifying principles or practices. As Providence deepens its understanding of what is already in place, future planning and development will be stronger and more substantive.

The Providence School Department Can Advance its Primary Goals Through Out-of-School Time: The findings of this study suggest that the top priority of the Department – “improving student achievement through a consistent and comprehensive focus on teaching and learning” – would be well-served by a continuation of the Department's increasing engagement in out-of-school time. Improved partnering practices with community-based organizations, a new emphasis of the Department, could lead directly to higher levels of alignment between after-school programming and in-school academic goals, curriculum, and teaching practices. Closer collaboration with providers of out-of-school time programming, particularly programs that are school-based, can be very effective in promoting improvements in school climate.

The Schools Cannot Do It Alone: Already the city's largest provider of program sites, and the co-sponsor of this community research project, the Providence School Department is a *de facto* leader of after-school programming in the city. However, the Providence School Department does not want, and should not attempt, on its own, to lead the process of enlarging the city's supply of out-of-school time programming and improving its quality. To effectively promote more high-quality out-of-school time programming, both as educators and as partners working with communities and agencies to support families and children, the public schools of Providence need the active leadership and assistance of many different community partners, including recreation, arts, cultural, prevention, public health, mental health, youth leadership, civic, city and state agencies, and organizations across the public and private sectors.

A Vacuum of Leadership Presents Challenges and Opportunities: Thus far, no single elected or appointed official, no constituency of parents, youth, or program providers, and no organization has taken up the task of leading a citywide effort to expand and improve out-of-school time and youth development in Providence. Providence suffers more from a failure of initiative than from turf battles over the content of a citywide agenda, or control its implementation. The challenge is to ensure that new leadership does emerge, and that it helps to shape a positive and substantial direction and momentum for out-of-school time programming in the city. The opportunity exists to nurture a diversity of leaders – from the largest public systems of education, literacy and human services in Rhode Island, to the well-established youth service agencies, to the grassroots neighborhood-based projects, to the parent, family and community constituencies who are most affected.

Inadequate, Unstable, and Uncoordinated Financing Limits the Growth of High- Quality, Sustainable Programs and System-Level Improvements to Support Existing Programming: There are inadequate resources at the local and state level to support a diverse supply of high-quality out-of-school programming; all of these diverse funding streams result in services for no more than one-fifth of the city’s school-age children. State agencies, responsible for administering much of the federal and state funding of out-of-school time care, have not yet managed to coordinate funding in ways that would foster long-term sustainability or the emergence of community-level delivery systems. The city of Providence provides little funding to support out-of-school time programs, and access to existing city-managed financing varies greatly among program providers. Few programs enjoy access to resources to support quality improvement, professional development, linkages between home, school, and out-of-school time programs, and program evaluation – all of them vital to a high-quality system of care for children and youth.

Providence Needs a Forum for Out-of-School Time and Youth Development: There is no one table in Providence around which program providers, representatives of the schools and other city agencies, parents, and youth gather to formulate and implement systemic strategies to address out-of-school time. The timing is right for creating such a forum: never before has the city enjoyed a better grasp of the needs to be met and opportunities to be addressed. Using its deepening understanding of the data, the obstacles to change, and the opportunities for improvement, Providence is poised to use such a forum to foster the expansion of an inter-connected, mutually supportive system of agencies and programs, focused on documenting, enhancing, and sustaining high-quality out-of-school time programming.

Recommendations

In response to the findings and implications detailed above, a vision for future leadership and activity in youth development and out-of-school time programming in Providence begins to emerge. More than 150 youth and adults informed the research that leads to these recommendations. Many of them articulated one or more of these specific ideas for next steps, which also build on local and national research, as well as the judgment of the authors.

Recognize the Importance of Out-of-School Time, and Promote its Expansion and Improvement:

Providence’s children and families will do better – as learners, members of the community, and contributors to the economy and society – when they and the institutions that exist to support and strengthen them share a clear consensus about the importance of out-of-school time in their lives. The leaders of Providence – the Superintendent of Schools, the Mayor, civic and government leaders at local and state levels, the leaders of the city’s many nonprofit and youth-serving organizations, and the youth and parent leaders of the city – must elevate the visibility of the issue, and concentrate their efforts on crafting and moving an ambitious out-of-school time agenda.

Create “The Providence Table” for Out-of-School Time and Youth Development: The city needs a forum in which action on out-of-school time is the central unifying focus, where citywide thinking and strategic work can be done, and in which many diverse voices and constituencies participate and contribute. The Providence Table must be big enough to accommodate the largest institutional players like the City of Providence, the Providence School Department, and various state agencies. It must also include a cross-section of representatives of all the affected sectors: education, public safety, child care, literacy, youth development, prevention, public health, health care, child welfare, mental health, juvenile justice, and others. Youth, parent, and program provider voices at the table will ensure the responsiveness and impact of the work.

Craft an Ambitious, Citywide Agenda: Those who sit at “The Providence Table” will set its agenda. The authors recommend that the following steps be included.

- ***Promote a Vision of Young People as Agents of Their Own Development:*** Youth are often excellent designers of youth development work. They learn from the content of the programming and the critical experience of exercising leadership. This research-based approach is achieving success in some Providence-based agencies, as well as in comparable urban contexts.
- ***Leverage Those Things That are Already Working:*** Recognize and promote the expansion or adaptation to new sites of existing, excellent work done by Providence schools, agencies, and community partners.
- ***Improve Communications and Alignment:*** Providence can make future work more effective if it ensures that all new planning, program development and funding initiatives begin, as a matter of routine practice, with a careful communication strategy, facilitated through “The Providence Table,” so that all those doing related work are aware of one another’s efforts. With this simple step, many potential allies can assist or contribute to new ventures, accelerate the impact of new work, and reduce duplication. This communication strategy also fosters alignment of related initiatives, and promotes the development of the kinds of public/private linkages and collaborations which are the hallmark of leading youth development efforts in the country.
- ***Support Neighborhood-Based Strategies:*** Evidence from across the country suggests that many of the strongest out-of-school time programs are those with firm roots in communities. Rather than centralizing for its own sake, the “Table” should aggressively seek out and support successful neighborhood – and community-based ventures, seek to sustain the work over time, and share and disseminate the lessons learned.
- ***Tackle the Transportation Challenge:*** Providence should set as a high priority the job of making transportation accessible to a larger number of students, later in the day, throughout the city. This would enable more children to participate in a greater array of programming, with enhanced impact. This task will require a careful study of the city’s multiple public and private modes of transit, as well as the particulars of Providence’s student assignment practices. It can also build upon the preliminary mapping of the school-based and neighborhood supply of programming. As has been true in other cities, leadership on this issue can positively affect programs and children.
- ***Increase Police Involvement in Out-of-School Time:*** Encourage greater collaboration among local and state public safety organizations and youth-serving agencies. Many cities are linking public safety practices with successful youth development approaches, garnering the support of public safety personnel and organizations in promoting the benefits of out-of-school time programming. Community policing and youth officers can strengthen consistent working relationships with youth, youth-serving organizations and out-of-school time programs throughout Providence’s neighborhoods.
- ***Pursue the Many Unanswered Questions Generated by This Research:*** Many kinds of data could help Providence to plan and act more effectively. Among them are more comprehensive documentation of existing programs, including the supply of programming during weekends, vacations, Saturdays, and summers; a deeper understanding of the experience of parents, youth, and teachers; lessons from other, similar communities; a more comprehensive analysis of public and private financing and policy; and evaluations of current programming.

Charge One Organization, or a Team of Organizations, with Specific Leadership and Intermediary Roles to Advance the Agenda of “The Providence Table”: To ensure that the work of the Providence Table moves from research and deliberation to action, the participants must work with existing organizations, or create a new entity, to advance and implement systemic approaches to expanding and enhancing out-of-school time and youth devel-

opment programming. Providence can draw from a wealth of models in cities and communities across the country to develop its own unique approach.

Focus on Increasing the Capacity and Improving the Quality of Out-of-School Time Programs: Providence needs a strategy for helping the people in the field to intensify, grow, and enrich their programs. To ensure the growth of more and better programming, people need help: program staff require substantial additional training and professional development; schools and community-based agencies need help working together more closely and effectively; program administrators seek assistance with planning, curriculum and evaluation improvements, and resource development; and funders must overcome particular challenges to increase their support of work in this sector.

Build a Public/Private System – or “Infrastructure” – that Can Grow and Support the Expanding Universe of Programming: All over the country, in many different forms, cities have created systems to organize, support, and ensure the quality of efforts on behalf of young people in out-of-school time. Concretely, these public/private networks offer professional and career development opportunities to program staff, accreditation and standards assistance to ensure program quality, grants and loans for facilities construction or rehabilitation, youth and parent leadership development opportunities, school-community collaboration assistance, financing support, evaluation and assessment, and many other benefits. No two city systems in the U.S. look exactly alike. While Providence needn't follow a mold, nor reinvent the wheel, there are distinct advantages to an approach that includes strong representation from both the public sector (city and state government, public schools, and other facilities and agencies) and the private sector (nonprofits, foundations, universities, and intermediary organizations).

Support Key Constituencies –Notably Parents, Youth, and Community-Based Providers – to Frame the Future of Out-of-School Time in Providence: The success of this work will depend on those most affected by it. The funders, policy-makers, administrators of intermediary agencies, and other leaders who are the most likely readers of this report cannot, on their own, successfully implement these ambitious recommendations. Such a success will require the active engagement and support of the children, parents, and program staff of the agencies doing the work. Only the last group – the providers working in neighborhoods, in school partnerships, or with specific populations of Providence residents – have already achieved a degree of active influence over the programming, policy, and financing of out-of-school time. Ensuring that the voices of youth and parents help to frame the city's work will require a deliberate strategy of public education, as well as leadership from one or more organizations ready to do the necessary organizing and constituency-building.

Identify Specific Leadership Roles for the Providence School Department: The Providence School Department is already a program site, host, or collaborator in over 100 programs throughout the city. While its leaders are reluctant to assume an expanded role as a major developer or provider of direct services, there are a series of other vital roles that the Department can embrace, immediately. The Providence School Department should:

- Recognize the importance of out-of-school time to its own mission of student achievement, and assume a public and highly visible role as an advocate for out-of-school time programming in schools and communities
- Through the “Providence Table,” play a leadership role in shaping citywide policies and practices
- Clarify and publicize existing Department policies and practices – and where necessary, develop and disseminate new ones – which spell out exactly what the Providence School Department seeks, values, and requires of its school-based partners and providers
- Implement and publicize Department policies to encourage and facilitate new and expanded out-of-school time programming in schools

Expand, Leverage, and Better Coordinate Public and Private Resources: To support increased funding for out-of-school time in this period of declining public spending, Providence and its allies must be creative. Where possible, the City should augment the federal funding it distributes to strengthen and expand programming. Those who administer federal and state funds locally should coordinate planning and allocations to better support individual programs and community-level delivery systems. Local and state administrators should pursue flexible licensing changes and a focused effort to increase use of existing subsidies. Local, regional, and national private funders should seed innovation in existing and new programming, support the development of systemic approaches, and develop parent and youth constituencies and leadership. All sectors must come together, and in a strong and insistent voice, speak up for the importance of this work: the long-term availability of public sector funding for out-of-school time depends, to a very great degree, on the successful growth and mobilization of constituencies who care about this issue.

Conclusion

Providence faces a challenge. On the one hand, it is a city with a history of successful, ambitious reforms and innovations as old as its founding as a center of religious freedom over 300 years ago, and as current as the recent revitalization of its civic center and riverfront areas. On the other hand, like many cities in the United States, Providence struggles with high dropout rates, low levels of student achievement, and the knowledge that many of its young people are denied the opportunity to reach their full potential. The evidence is clear that the multiple public and private sector institutions of Providence lack a coherent, commonly held agenda for the city's most diverse, promising, and vulnerable population – its children and youth.

The critical next step for Providence is for people and organizations to rise to the challenge, craft a vision that is widely shared and compelling, and take action. More research will help, as will better planning, increased investment, and strategic alignment of existing resources. In the end, however, leadership – by individuals and institutions alike – is the key. Each reader is urged to consider his or her own role in the next stage of the work. This report will have served its purpose if it is of use to those people and organizations who find themselves “stepping up” to this challenge in the months and years ahead.

Overview

I. United Way of Rhode Island and The Providence School Department: Partners for Children and Youth

In the fall of 2001, United Way of Rhode Island and the Providence School Department joined forces to commission a study of the out-of-school time opportunities and issues facing school-age children and their families.

Each of the partners approaches the issue from a particular perspective. United Way, which funds out-of-school time and youth development programs throughout the city and the state, combines a grant-making perspective with its long-term interest in children and youth. Based on its leadership efforts with programs focusing on young adolescents, it has a special interest in the experience and needs of middle school-age youth. Over the years, many of its constituents, including the business community, felt that United Way should be actively playing a role in improving schools. In the past decade, support for after-school programming has become an increasing emphasis of United Way, along with the promotion of academic achievement and the social and emotional development of youth.

Because of its extensive involvement with and commitment to community schools in Providence and around the state, United Way also brings a keen interest in multi-partner collaboration and public/private partnerships to this

research effort. In its increasingly frequent role as a convener of community leaders and promoter of dialogues and collaborative planning processes, United Way feels a strong desire to foster a set of conversations and collect some data that could then be usefully applied to future work by any of a variety of participating agencies and leaders throughout the city.

The Providence School Department comes to this project for reasons that are both visionary and practical. From a pedagogical and strategic point of view, the Providence School Department understands that the learning experiences of its students do not begin and end at the schoolhouse door: they are daily, continuous, and open-ended. The future success of students in achieving at high academic levels is directly linked to their successful social and emotional development. Students' experiences before, after, and out of school play a large role in that development.

On a simpler level, as a long-time collaborator with numerous community-based organizations offering programs inside schools, the Providence School Department seeks from this research something relatively simple and straightforward – an inventory of which programs, agencies, and community partners are currently at work in the schools, and an analysis of that network of programs.

II. The National Context

Out-of-school time programming and activity on behalf of children and youth has a long history in the U.S. In its earliest manifestations, in the nineteenth century, it often focused on ensuring the moral and ethical development of children and youth, and was frequently associated with agencies and institutions which were faith-based. In the twentieth century, cities and counties created a large public sector network of programming – through community centers, recreational facilities and parks, school-based athletic programming, libraries, and the like. The second half of the twentieth century saw a positive explosion of the nonprofit sector, and the creation and expansion of agencies and community-based organizations providing an ever-diversifying range of cultural, recreational, educational, athletic, and other programs. More recently, the entry of women in large numbers into the workforce and the reduced stability and coherence of neighborhoods has led to a huge demographic shift away from home- or neighborhood-based after-school care, and toward institutional approaches.

Over the past 30 years, expectations of out-of-school time programs have changed dramatically. In the 1970s and 1980s, advocates and researchers documented substantial unmet demand for programs for school-age children so that parents could work and be certain that their child was safely in the care of an adult. In recent years, in the face of mounting evidence that children and youth are at greater risk of preventable trauma and substance abuse during out-of-school hours, national programs and policies began to focus on after-school as a time to prevent problems, including youth crime. Finally, in the past five years particularly, there has been a surge in national and local interest in the role that after-school and out-of-school time programs can play in promoting the academic success of children and youth.

III. Out-of-School-Time Programs Work!

Over the past decade, researchers have been producing a wealth of increasingly convincing evidence that well-run out-of-school time programming can have powerful effects on children and youth. Studies show that students in after-school programs have better work habits, increased emotional adjustment and social competence, decreased behavior problems, and improved academic achievement compared to students with other care arrangements.³

In a finding that is especially important to Providence, with its growing immigrant and bilingual communities, after-school programs have proven particularly beneficial to traditionally underserved populations. Other studies

have found that the increased developmental supports offered by after-school programs are most significant for African-American males.⁴

After-school and out-of-school time programming has also shown itself especially useful in preventing youth involvement in and exposure to crime and other risky behaviors. Eighth graders who take care of themselves for 11 hours or more per week are twice as likely to use cigarettes, alcohol, or marijuana than their peers who did not spend any time in self-care. A study in New York found that public housing projects with Boys and Girls Clubs experienced 13% fewer juvenile crimes, 22% less drug activity and 25% less crack cocaine presence than projects without clubs.⁵

Most recently, research has begun to focus on the academic and learning benefits of after-school programs. An evaluation of an ambitious citywide after-school effort in Los Angeles, California, LA's BEST, revealed that, when compared with non-LA's BEST students, LA's BEST participants have fewer days of absences, show positive achievement on standardized tests in mathematics, reading, and language arts and have higher rates of English proficiency among bilingual students. A number of other evaluations have shown after-school programs can lead to an increase in standardized test scores, grades, and overall engagement in academics.⁶

IV. Purpose of the Report

The purpose of this report is to provide all of Providence with an 'environmental scan' of out-of-school time for children and youth ages 5 to 18 in the city, and to lay the foundations for future learning and action based on this preliminary study. It is "environmental" because it attempts to capture some aspects of Providence in their entirety; it is called a "scan" because of its modest capacity to document or report on the array of programming and activity already underway in Providence. The wealth of human and institutional work focusing on school-age children and youth in out-of-school time contexts in Providence is much too great to chronicle in a single text, or to research and document in an initial effort like this. But like many other cities trying to better understand the current status of out-of-school time for children and youth, Providence needs data and analysis. This report provides data and analysis, in order to inform dialog and spur further action.

The report is conceived and executed as a potential lever for future action by all the affected parties. It is hoped that the report and its contents will be useful to a broad array of youth, program administrators, advocates, policy makers and community leaders as they consider the next stages of their own work on behalf of Providence's children.

V. Key Questions and Methods

All over the country, cities are attempting, with modest success, to conduct meaningful inventories of the programming available to children and youth in out of school-time, and to understand the nature of the out-of-school time opportunities and challenges they face. This turns out to be a very large undertaking, and in most cities making an attempt at sound data collection, there is a frank acknowledgement that they have a long way to go. This is a long-term job for any community.⁷

Providence has already been the beneficiary of leadership by a number of individuals and organizations working to understand and enhance the experiences of children, youth, and families in out-of-school time. This study makes deliberate, strategic use of this prior work, which both forms a vital foundation upon which to build, and frees this research effort to concentrate on other challenges.

The Swearer Center for Public Service at Brown University, in partnership with the Providence School Department and Health and Education Leadership for Providence (HELP), produces the Providence Youth Opportunities Guide. Now in its second edition, it profiles 140 organizations offering programming in the city of Providence to children and youth aged 10-20 in after-school, weekend, summer and vacation periods.⁸ This citywide resource performs multiple functions: it is a consumer guide for youth, parents, educators, social workers, and others seeking possible program opportunities for themselves or others; it is a regularly updated reference for planners, policy makers and anyone with an interest in understanding the cityscape of programs and resources for young people; and it is a very effective marketing tool for the many agencies whose programs it profiles.

Similarly high-quality research on children and their experiences in Providence is conducted each year by Infoworks!, the Rhode Island Department of Education's School Accountability for Learning and Teaching (SALT) program, and Rhode Island Kids Count: each provides invaluable sources of data. Finally, and most vitally, the youth themselves, their parents and educators, and the providers of out-of-school time programming are living these lives and doing this work: their experience is often an excellent teacher, and their impressions and reporting form the greatest single influence on this report.

The way this research project has been conducted is illuminating. Beginning as a partnership venture between the state's largest urban school system and the state's United Way, it has become something of a collaborative enterprise, in which many of the interviewees and their institutions became collaborators, offering additional contacts, becoming the conveners of additional meetings, reading and commenting on draft texts. As a genuine community-based research venture – 95% of informants live and/or work in Providence – the report is driven by the perspectives of those who know the city's youth best.

A number of very practical questions helped to frame the research:

- How great is the demand for out-of-school time programming among families and youth in the city?
- What is the range of out-of-school time programming underway in the city of Providence, and in particular, in the Providence Public Schools?
- Which agencies and funding streams finance out-of-school time programs in Providence?
- Which public policies and private practices govern funding?

These and other issues were approached through three basic methods:

- Numerous interviews, focus groups, and group meetings with over 150 adult and youth informants provided a rich body of information, perspective and questions for further research. The research team spoke and corresponded with a wide array of young people, parents, educators, providers of services, non-profit administrators, leaders of faith-based communities, advocates for youth, elected officials, city and state agency staff, public and private sector funders, policymakers and journalists. Facts, insight, comments and analysis from these interviews proved invaluable. Interviews, meetings and discussions – tapping the experience and perspective of those who are most directly engaged in the out-of-school enterprise – have been the most productive information sources. For sample interview materials, see Appendices B and D.
- A review of existing literature as well as the collection of a body of reference, regulatory, finance, demographic, and educational data formed the second core element of the research. Multiple public and private sources contributed information and access to data, including the Providence School Department, RIDE, SALT, the City of Providence, the Swearer Center at Brown, the Rhode Island Compact, Rhode Island Kids Count, The Providence Plan, Infoworks!, and many others.

- Finally, the research team conducted three surveys and data analyses. The first is a system-wide survey of all Providence School Department schools – elementary, middle, and high – collecting current 2001-2002 data on before- and after-school programming under way in Providence School Department buildings. The second is a pair of surveys and related focus groups with middle and high-school-age youth involved in out-of-school time programming. The third, a mapping project conducted by Community Matters' Research Associate Dan Restuccia, examines the supply of licensed elementary school age child-care programming in Providence. This data set and the ensuing analysis produced a series of maps, which provide the first-ever visual presentation of out-of-school time care in the city, on a neighborhood-by-neighborhood and school-by-school basis.

Elaine Fersh and Andrew Bundy, authors of the report and principals of the firm Community Matters, led the research team. Dan Restuccia, Research Associate at Community Matters, and a team of Brown University students, Dena Aufseeser, Marissa Hewitt, Eli Miller, and Daniel Spring, assisted them. Peter Hocking and Kath Connolly of the Swearer Center for Public Service at Brown University made large contributions of planning time, and convened and facilitated several focus groups of providers. Overseeing the entire project for its primary institutional partners were Patricia Martinez of the Providence School Department and Allan Stein of United Way of Rhode Island. A complete set of acknowledgements can be found in Appendix I.

A final note on the text: scattered throughout are highlighted texts and quotes describing the work of a variety of different organizations and individuals in Providence. Often, they are doing work that is exemplary, from which the research team has learned lessons. They are profiled here so that their learning and innovation spread widely. The exclusion of many others doing excellent work reflects the limits of the space available and the authors' knowledge, and is in no way intended as a slight to the many hard-working and creative adults who run these vital community services for children and youth.

Findings

I. Providence Invests Significant Community and Institutional Resources in the Out-of-School Time Life of its Children and Youth

Six months of intensive community research has generated a long list of strengths and assets upon which the out-of-school time programs and participants of Providence can draw:

➤ A Foundation of Experienced Out-of-School Time Program Providers

Providence youth have access to as many as 300 out-of-school time programs, offered by 150 or more agencies and partnerships, supported by a staff presence that numbers in the hundreds and a volunteer contingent of hundreds more.⁹ By their own claims and some other very rough guesstimates, these projects serve upwards of 5,000 to 6,000 children in the Providence area, up to a fifth of the city's school-age children. Many of these providers have years, even decades of experience in this vital work; their expertise informs this report, and it also represents one of the largest pools of talent and potential leadership in the city on supporting children and youth in general and on improving and expanding out-of-school time programs in particular.

➤ An Extraordinary Concentration of Institutions of Higher Education

The higher education presence in Providence is a large, current asset to out-of-school time programming. Some 28,000 undergraduate students and thousands of faculty and staff work on just five of the largest campuses of Providence's 11 different institutions of higher education.¹⁰ This concentration of teaching, learning, and scholarly

capacity is heightened because this large population of people in higher education is paired with a relatively small population of school-age children and youth. Providence may in fact lead the nation with the highest ratio of college and graduate school students to school age-children. Across the country, current and recent college students represent a significant fraction of those who work or volunteer in out-of-school time programming. While no college or university in Providence is currently sorting its records on student community service or service learning activity to break out out-of-school time programs from other kinds of programming, it is a very safe and conservative estimate to say that upwards of 1,000 Providence-based college students serve in some out-of-school time program capacity now, many of them in tutoring, mentoring, and other vital supporting roles with significant impact on the children they are helping.

➤ **A Recent History of Commitment to Service Learning and Community Service**

Providence is also the beneficiary of a large concentration of service learning and community service initiatives within the higher education community, many of which support out-of-school time and youth development programming. Virtually all major higher education institutions have a Feinstein public service program or other service learning presence in the city. Many offer multiple programs, both for academic credit, as a requirement for graduation, or as a core learning and extracurricular opportunity for both undergraduates and graduates.

➤ **Large, Vibrant Arts and Arts Education Communities**

Providence ranks among a small number of top cities in the U.S. for its rich concentration of arts and cultural institutions and activities. Fueled by the presence of national leaders in arts education, community-based cultural programs, and visual and performance art, the city offers its residents and visitors a rich array of opportunities for teaching, learning, appreciating, and supporting arts and cultural activity across a wide spectrum of disciplines, traditions, and forms.

➤ **A Core of Engaged Youth Leaders**

Youth in Providence, some 16,147 adolescents between the ages of 13 and 18, have a huge abundance of ideas, energy, and largely untapped capacity to envision, plan, develop, and share high-quality youth development and out-of-school time programming. Their potential to lead and to contribute is one of the brightest lights in Providence's future, and several organizations are actively promoting their leadership in the planning and implementation of programming.

➤ **A Recent Wave of Philanthropic and Civic Initiatives Focused on Youth, Schools, and Out-of-School Time Challenges**

Over the past several years, a set of new projects has emerged, focusing significant local and national resources on some of the most pressing problems facing the city and the country. Organized by many of the city's leading public and nonprofit institutions, and funded by leading national funders like the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation, the Nellie Mae Education Foundation, the Annenberg Institute for School Reform, the Annie E. Casey Foundation, and others, these projects are convening a range of youth, community, and civic leaders to address the challenges of high school restructuring and school reform, youth development and leadership, and full-service or community schooling, among other issues.

➤ **The State of Rhode Island Plays a Leadership Role in the Life of the City**

Providence's 173,618 residents constitute 16.5% of the state population. Its 46,688 low-income residents represent 38.7 % of the poor in the state. It is also the state capital. These are three of the reasons that Providence benefits

from a visible and active state presence in both the daily lives of many of its residents and in the financing and administration of a number of the programs serving children and youth in the city.

New Urban Arts

New Urban Arts is one of Providence's most innovative approaches to youth development. While operating out of a storefront conveniently located near two of Providence's high schools, New Urban Arts attracts teenagers from high schools across the city to promote leadership, creative expression, and community service through the arts. Seventy percent of NUA's 100 youth participants attend at least twice a week, with the remaining 30% attending four to five days per week.

By pairing students with artist mentors and encouraging youth to explore a wide variety of art forms, including poetry, photography, painting, filming, and fashion design, New Urban puts into practice several key strategies critical to positive youth development:

- Young people determine the learning experience they choose to pursue by selecting the art media they want to explore through studios and workshops.
- Youth have an opportunity to develop their individual skills while applying them with other students in a group project.
- Young people's artwork and joint project work provide positive community impact through such creations as a public mural, exhibit, or performance.
- Through their expressions and accomplishments, NUA participants realize their potential to become leaders and actively engage in their environments.

"We're trying to create an environment that treats each student's learning as a resource, and where each student can choose their own pathway of learning and have their art work valued no matter what their perceived level of skill is," says Tyler Denmead, NUA Executive Director. *"Young people are allowed to take risks and fail with a freedom from personal fear of exposure, social pressure to conform, or fixed preconceptions and expectations of themselves or by others."*

In a recent survey conducted by Brown University students for New Urban Arts, 91% of the students surveyed reported that they have improved their personal lives and direction, including having more self-confidence and clearer ideas about what they want to pursue in the future. Perhaps the best testimony about the impact New Urban Arts is having comes from one student who recently reported at a NUA public event, *"I go to school everyday so that I can go to New Urban Arts after school, pursue my art, and be with friends and adults who care about me."*

➤ A Unique State Child-Care Entitlement

Rhode Island is the only state in the nation with a policy to fund out-of-school time care programming for children up through the age of 15 whose families are living at or below 225% of poverty level. This entitlement, though currently under-utilized, is a potentially meaningful source of support for Providence.

➤ **A Foundation for Good Data**

Thanks to the separate efforts of both public and private agencies, Providence has a head start on the challenging job of collecting, managing, and making good use of data on children, youth, schools, and youth development programs in the out-of-school context. Several Providence-based resources, cited throughout this report, are already producing very helpful data. These organizations include but are not limited to Infoworks!, the Providence Plan, the Providence School Department, the Providence Youth Opportunities Guide and related database managed by the Swearer Center for Public Service, the Rhode Island Department of Education/SALT, and Rhode Island Kids Count. It is hoped that the data and analysis generated for this report will contribute to the city's emerging capacity for the creative collection and use of data.

➤ **Providence's Demonstrated Capacity to Make Historic Changes**

Unlike many northern U.S. cities, which share a history of industrial and commercial decline in the 1970s and 1980s, Providence has demonstrated that it has the capacity to mobilize significant local, state, and national funding to achieve large new objectives. Few who are familiar with the redevelopment of the city center and its riverfront will argue with the observation that a large-scale aesthetic and economic transformation was successfully conceived and executed in the past 15 years. Many in the public and private sectors share credit for this phenomenon. Most importantly, this recent history is a clear reminder that such ambitious changes are within the city's grasp. They also present a challenge to the city and its citizens – does the political will exist to generate such gains beyond downtown, and extend them to the neighborhoods of the city?

➤ **A City on a Human Scale**

Like many of the country's large cities, Providence faces serious urban challenges that are not easily overcome. Unlike Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, or Miami, however, Providence is small enough, and the scale of the human and institutional challenges accessible enough, so that *Ken Goode at the West End Community Center* can actually know a very significant fraction of youth living in the West End neighborhood and *Eddie Phouthakoun of the Socio-Economic Development Center* can make real headway in his efforts to knit together the Cambodian youth of the city. Principals and administrators of nonprofit agencies can know families and siblings, neighborhood leaders, funders, policymakers, and city and state decision-makers. The scale of the city – and of the challenges it faces – is human. There is great potential in this.

➤ **The Strengths of the Providence School Department**

The Providence School Department brings many assets to the out-of-school time arena. In practical terms, much of the city's after-school programming relies on its use of Department buildings, and the schools remain the single largest provider of facilities for out-of-school programming in the city. Providence School Department educators staff many of these school-based programs. In 2001, senior management at the Department launched a set of efforts to attempt to collect accurate data on all school-based program activity involving out-of-school providers, and to regulate it. A number of principals have begun to pay special attention to the ways out-of-school time, partnering, and integrated program and educational activities can support improved student outcomes. During the tenure of Superintendent Lam, the Department attracted investment of substantial school reform funds from several national philanthropic leaders. This study is a further indication of the interest in and motivation within the Department to more deeply understand and more effectively engage with after-school and out-of-school time programming and development.

➤ **The Capacity of United Way**

United Way has long been a leader in statewide philanthropic investment in youth and children's programming. For the past four years, United Way has led an effort to develop increased school-community collaboration in the state of Rhode Island. After helping to launch this effort in Central Falls, United Way has recently created the Community Schools in Rhode Island project to expand to five additional sites, including Providence. Large investments from regional and national philanthropies support this statewide out-of-school time venture. In another recent development, as the result of an extended strategic planning process, United Way has determined to strengthen its role as a convener and facilitator of new and promising initiatives in Providence and throughout the state.

II. Providence's Children – the Future of the City – Face Major Hurdles, and Possess Many Strengths

Providence has a population of 173,618 people, of whom 56,317, or 32%, are under 20 years old.¹¹ As the fastest-growing city in the Northeast, Providence is also one of the most rapidly diversifying. More than a quarter (25.3%) of the overall city's residents are immigrants, almost half of whom have arrived in the country in the past decade.¹² In the 2000 U.S. Census, Providence became a "majority minority" city for the first time, and 10 of its 25 neighborhoods boast a population of more than 60% people of color. In the 10 ten years between 1990 and 2000, the city's non-Hispanic White population fell by almost 25%. In this same period, the city's Black or African-American, Asian, Pacific Islander, and Native American populations each grew by at least 5% citywide. Amazingly, the final decade of the century saw Providence's Hispanic/Latino population grow by more than 100%.

The children of Providence reflect the diversity of the city, and suggest the even greater diversity that is its likely future. Children under 18 are 45% Hispanic/Latino, 24% White, 17% African-American, 7% Asian, 5% two or more races, and 2% other.¹³ While the city as a whole is roughly a third Hispanic/Latino, its children are nearly half Hispanic/Latino.

Many of the children of the city live in poverty. By federal poverty guidelines, 39.5%, or 12,788 of Providence children aged 5-17 live in poverty. This compares with 15.6% of Rhode Island's general population.¹⁴ In fact, 45% of Rhode Island's poor children live in Providence. By another widely used measure, 38.5% of Providence public school students are eligible for free or reduced-price school meals.¹⁵ More than half, or 56%, of families led by female householders with children under 18 are living in poverty.¹⁶

The academic achievement and school success of Providence's children and youth is low. Citywide, the dropout rate from the city's public high schools is 36.1%. In academic year 2000-2001, 654 high school students dropped out of the city's eight major high schools, more than two-fifths of them 9th graders.¹⁷ The highest number was among Hispanic/Latino students, 315 of whom dropped out last year. Dropping out in the same period were 151 African American students, 117 White students, and 68 Asian students.¹⁸

At the same time, the children and youth of the city are also blessed with many assets upon which to build: Providence youth leadership is well-established in multiple neighborhoods, communities, and programs; many children are thriving, both academically and socially, in the city; youth crime and high-risk behaviors, while not declining rapidly, are not increasing substantially either. Perhaps most significantly, fully 75% of the children and youth of Providence are Hispanic, African-American, Asian or of more than two ethnicities. This diversity, and the potential it represents, is one of the greatest assets of the young people of Providence.

III. Demand is High for Out-of-School Time Programming

In Providence, as in virtually all communities in the U.S., it is very hard to pinpoint the extent to which children, youth, and families need and want additional out-of-school time programming. Few cities, Providence included, have developed a command of the needs and demands of families for services; fewer still have a way to keep current and easily updated data on the nature of demand.

Nevertheless, national trends strongly suggest that the demand among parents and children for out-of-school time activity is far greater than the supply. Seventy-one percent of voters report that it is difficult for parents to find after-school programs in America, and the U.S. General Accounting Office reports that supply meets as little as 25% of demand in some urban areas.¹⁹

➤ Many School-Age Children Live in Providence

Nearly 27,109 children and youth attend the Providence School Department; roughly 1,800 additional children and youth are dropouts; and an estimated 4,611 children live in the city and attend independent schools, are home-schooled, or are otherwise enrolled in school outside the Providence School Department. This is a total of 33,520 children and youth between 5 and 18.²⁰

In the following sections, through a series of very rough calculations based on the best data available, it is estimated that approximately 5,000 – 6,000 children and youth are regularly engaged in some form of routine, recurring out-of-school-time programming.²¹ Even if this number is raised to 8,000 to allow for the possibility that a very large group of children are regularly served in programs and activities that are not well-documented, this would mean that of the 33,520 school-age children in the city, 8,000, or 24%, are currently served, and 76% are not. (These figures do not reflect the much higher number of children who participate in some aspect of an agency or organization on an irregular or drop-in basis, or for short-term activities. The focus here is on children who are regularly engaged in programs in an ongoing way.)

How many of those not served in this ongoing way – some 25,000 – want and need out-of-school time programming? It is impossible to say with accuracy, absent additional surveying and study. How many of those 8,000 who are now served would seek more programming if they thought it was available? Again, we cannot be sure without further inquiry.

➤ Many Children in Providence Spend Significant Time with No Adult Supervision

Providence school-age children often spend time alone without adults. The following data, reported by the RI Department of Education, profiles the unsupervised life of Providence children:

- Many students spend time home alone three or more days a week:
30% of elementary school students,
37% of middle school students, and
51% of high school students.
- A sizable fraction of students spend three or more hours without adult supervision at least once a week:
17% of elementary students,
23% of middle school students, and
42% of high school students.

Fifty-two percent of elementary school students spend no time home alone without adult supervision. This is the case for 48% of middle school students and 29% of high school students.²²

Time spent alone increases for children in low-income families:

- Elementary school students not receiving free or reduced price lunch are 15% more likely to spend no time without supervision.
- Elementary school students receiving free or reduced-price lunch are 50% more likely to spend three or more hours without adult supervision at least one day per week.

There is ample evidence that children are spending large amounts of time outside of the company and supervision of adults. The annual SALT data (School Accountability for Learning and Teaching), produced by the Rhode Island Department of Education, documents that 43% of students in Providence public schools do not come home every day to a parent after their school day.²³

The nonprofit organization charged with providing Rhode Island families with information on child care and referrals to services, Options for Working Parents, reports that in the period from August 2001 to March 2002, 394 Providence parents called, most of them seeing help for placing pre-school-age children. A total of 45 children ages 5-8 and another 31 ages 9 and over were helped. Of the 76 licensed providers of family day care, child care center and school-age out-of-school time care in Providence, 41 of them are providing care for school-age children.²⁴ For single parents, child care is often a pre-requisite for working. Providence would appear to have a sizable population of people facing such circumstances: of the 20,175 Providence households with children under 18, some 44%, or 8,887, are headed by single women.²⁵

Some providers of programming reported during interviews and focus groups that they were unable to provide services to all those children and youth who were interested in it.²⁶ Others said that they believed that their programs would attract many more children if they were not forced to charge a fee to parents. A few note a dual phenomenon – that they have open slots for children, and know of children who need the program, but because they cannot subsidize the fee in a way that would make it affordable, they cannot offer the slot to the family or child in need. Providers experience great frustration knowing that dozens of children in a neighborhood and hundreds across the city would benefit from their program, but cannot participate for financial reasons.

Parents' struggle to pay for programming is a long-standing issue. In Providence, many families (including those whose income level is as high as 225% of the poverty level) have access to a state-funded subsidy of after-school care, which is structured as an entitlement. There is an ironic effect of this policy, however. In states where access is limited, waiting lists are constructed, which then serve as fairly accurate barometers of demand, at least among low-income families. A side effect of the entitlement policy of RI is that there is no such waiting list, and assessing the nature of demand is therefore more difficult.

In another trend whose precise impact is hard to discern, the RI Department of Education reports that in the period between 1997 and 2000, children's participation in out-of-school time programming in Providence fluctuated. Rates of participation in out-of-school time programs decreased for elementary and high school students, and increased for middle school students, between 97-98 and 99-00. Participation in "youth sports or recreation programs in the community" declined for every grade in Providence between 97-98 and 99-00.²⁷

The population of school-age dropouts in Providence – those 19 and under who are neither attending school nor pursuing a GED – poses a special challenge: all of their time is out-of-school time, and very little about that time is documented. In the 2000-2001 school year, at least 1,800 children in Providence between the ages of 14 and

19 were not attending school or GED programs, and were considered dropouts.²⁸ Experienced youth workers and advocates report that, while some modest fraction of these youth are engaged in out-of-school time programming, the majority of them are neither going to school nor participating in a regular out-of-school time program activity. Given the many obstacles that dropouts must overcome in order to experience positive educational, social, and economic outcomes, this is an area of great concern, not addressed in any detail in this report, and worthy of additional study and action.

➤ **Children Who are Home Alone Face Additional Challenges to Learning**

Leaving aside questions of student safety and prevention of high-risk behaviors, data from the RI Department of Education documents that there are significant academic risks associated with higher levels of alone time for children. In Providence, increased time home alone is associated with lower academic expectations from self, parents, and teachers among middle and high school students. Further, parents are more likely to be involved in their children's education when children spend more time supervised.²⁹

➤ **Needs and Aspirations Vary Among a Range of Stakeholders**

A survey of a group of 25 middle school-aged students in the Providence area revealed that even though all of them were engaged in strong and regular out-of-school time programs that occupied them for an average of 2.24 days per week, the students report that they would actually prefer, on average, to be enrolled in programming four days per week. Fully half of those responding indicated that their preference was for five days per week of program activity.³⁰ A similar survey of high school students, all of them members of the RI Children's Crusade High School Community Advisory Board, indicated that they were happy with the amount of out-of-school time programming they received. However, over 50% indicated that they would prefer additional opportunities in employment, college preparation, and sports, and 45% hoped for more opportunities in music, theatre, and dance.³¹

When asked whether there is any form of additional programming they would like to have in their school, principals in the Providence School Department make it very clear that they feel an acute need for additional out-of-school time programming in their buildings. Half of high school principals surveyed, two-thirds of elementary school principals, and fully 87% of middle school principals want additional programming to support homework help. Over 50% percent of all responding principals – at all grade levels – hoped for increased social services and home-school ties. Fifty percent or more responding elementary and high school principals supported additional fitness and the arts programming. Fifty percent of high school principals and 63% of middle school principals seek increased technology programming.³²

A final concern raised by Lauren Schechtman of the Rhode Island's Children's Crusade and expressed by several other program providers was about whether or not programs individually and collectively were reaching those children and youth who are most at risk, and who are likely to be the most disenfranchised from any service delivery system. Providers reported that many of their participants attend multiple programs each week, and that these more resourceful children and families may occupy "multiple slots" in a delivery system while others do not access any services. Program staff also reported that the high mobility of families within cities and across the state also makes it difficult to understand and respond to demand.

➤ **Measuring Demand Accurately is Difficult, but Worth the Effort**

There is no simple, accurate way to assess how much out-of-school-time programming is needed and wanted by the children and youth of Providence, their parents, or their teachers, educators, youth workers, and community organizations. A large-volume survey of parents, youth, and providers – a fairly elaborate and expensive undertak-

ing – would provide a wealth of data that could help to understand the current situation and frame future policy, and would be very valuable indeed. This is a problem with which many U.S. cities are currently engaged.

IV. Providence’s Current Out-of-School Time Programming Ranges Over a Wide Spectrum of Purposes, Ages, Interests, and Locales

➤ Providence Boasts A Broad Range of Out-of-School Time and Youth Development Programs

A panoply of diverse Providence-based agencies, community organizations and arts and cultural groups offer children and youth literally hundreds of opportunities to learn, play and develop in structured settings. Like other communities, Providence provides out-of-school time care in a wide range of configurations. For the most part, the programs studied for this report, and reported on by the many people interviewed have the following characteristics:

- **Structured, Enrolled Programs**

A structured program is a program or facility operated on a regular basis providing supervised, planned daily program activities to school-age children during specific blocks of time during the week. It can be based at a community agency, housing development, public or private school, or faith-based organization.

- **Academic and Cultural After-School Programs, Homework and Activity Clubs, Tutorial Programs, and Lessons**

These programs offer academic support to students in a wide variety of contexts and formats. Many homework – helping and tutoring programs are conducted in schools, church basements, and community centers.

- **Drop-in Programs**

A drop-in program is a program in a community center or agency that allows children to participate at any time during the hours it is open. Children come and go from the program at will. An example of a drop-in program is a recreational program at a Boys & Girls Club. (Boys & Girls Clubs may also have regulated programs.)

- **Full Services or Community Schools**

Full Services Schools, also known as Community Schools, promote healthy development and integrate in-school hours with out-of-school hours. Their mission is to align human services systems with public schooling so as to help children overcome non-academic barriers to learning in their lives. Activities and services are school-based, and may occur throughout the school day, into the evening, and on weekends and in the summer. They can include: educational enrichment, counseling, arts, recreation, parent support, career education, community service, leadership development, life skills, case management, health and mental health services, supplemental education, parent education, family life education, and medical and dental services.

Providence also offers a range of programming not profiled in this report, but common throughout the U.S. These forms of care are hard to document, track, and incorporate into a neighborhood of citywide network, and so were not featured in this preliminary study. This is not a reason to ignore these programs, however, and their future study is certainly warranted:

- **Family Child Care**

This is care provided by an adult – often a parent or grandparent – in his or her home.

- **Informal Care**

This category includes care by adult relatives; home-based paid or unpaid care by friends or neighbors; neighborhood co-ops, in which parents rotate the care of their children by sharing with one or more other families; elder sibling care, in which children are watched by older children; and a host of other arrangements.

The diversity of programs is impressive. In Providence, middle schoolers can participate in a 20-year-old, award-winning school-based dance program, or find a safe and supportive environment in which to do homework and visit with friends. Preschoolers and elementary age children can learn to swim, play games, and go to camp through more than a dozen different organizations. High school teens can participate in, help design and lead academic, arts, media, theatre, prevention, and community service programs.

V. Providence Public Schools Host a Large Portion of the City's Out-of-School Time Programming

➤ School-Based Programs in Providence Serve a Large Number of Children with a Wide Range of Services

At the special request of the Providence School Department, this research project featured a survey of principals in the Providence Schools to measure the range of out-of-school time programming underway in the city. While not designed to serve as a comprehensive database or an exhaustive catalogue of available services, this scan of Providence School Department programming was intended to give all parties – the schools and the multiple stakeholders – a better sense of how schools are used as a base for out-of-school time programming in the city, and some of their common program characteristics. Most data cited in the following sections is detailed in Appendix C.

All told, the survey documents the existence, in the fall and winter of 2001-2002, of some 104 school-based out-of-school time programs for Providence children from kindergarten to twelfth grade.³³ These programs – all of them housed in school facilities in the period of time following the regular school day – include programs developed and offered by small community based nonprofits, citywide affiliates of nationally franchised agencies, higher education, and the schools themselves. Principals report that these 104 programs offer services to 3,899 children and youth, cumulatively.

Accounting for the existence of programs and their likely enrollment is remarkably difficult, and can lead to errors of omission and of duplication. For instance, only 58% of the middle and high school-age programs profiled in this new survey of the Providence School Department are included in the Providence Youth Opportunities Guide data (which concentrates on children 10 and older). On the other hand, in both studies, it is impossible to discern the degree of duplication of children served by more than one program, as is often the case with such surveys and compilations. It is safe to say that the total number of individual children served by these 104 programs profiled in the school survey is certainly fewer than 3,899.

Program size varies significantly, with sizes tending to creep upward as children get older. At the elementary level, roughly half of all programs have 20 or fewer students. In middle school, half the programs reporting serve 28 children or more. At the high school level, this median figure is 34 students.³⁴

➤ Academic and Homework Help is the Most Common Focus in School-Based Programs

The content of programs shifts in response to the needs and interests of maturing children. Elementary-age programs focus, in order of frequency, on homework help, arts and cultural enrichment, and improved home-

school ties and prevention. In middle school, programs maintain a premium on academic and homework help, but peer leadership and prevention rise in frequency, and arts programming dwindles by two-thirds. By high school, programs focusing on prevention and conflict resolution top the list, along with academic clubs and homework help, followed by arts and cultural enrichment.

YMCA of Greater Providence

The YMCA of Greater Providence is one of the largest providers of out-of-school time programming for both younger school-age children and teens across the city. Through its branches and the programs it operates in several Providence public schools and public housing developments, the YMCA has embarked on an ambitious urban agenda to have a presence and provide a variety of services in every Providence neighborhood. As part of this plan, the YMCA is: strengthening and expanding its relationship with the Providence School Department; forming program partnerships with many of the Providence Recreation Centers, housing developments, and a wide variety of community-based organizations; and exploring new programming strategies to better serve and engage teens.

Over the past year, the YMCA and its staff are working to develop more “intentional approaches” in their after-school programs, which provide academic enrichment in theater arts, environmental science, and kids’ literature. According to Maryclaire Knight, responsible for the YMCA’s urban programming, the YMCA is hoping to demonstrate its commitment to being held more accountable for the academic outcomes it can help to produce for students in their programs. *“If we can show principals that our programs can make a difference in students’ abilities to perform at school, we are more likely to develop a stronger, shared vision and approach to successful youth development.”*

The YMCA has actively sought feedback from teens as they have begun to think about how to better serve older youth. Many teens have articulated their concern about safety and the need to have places where they can go to feel safe, socialize with other teens, and pursue interests and new skills. As Eula Coleman stated, *“Older youth have multiple needs. We need to provide a place where they can connect with other youth and adults who care about them, and an opportunity for them to learn and showcase the skills that they are anxious to acquire.”*

School Level	Programs	Community Organizations	Students Served
Elementary	50	12a	1821
Middle	31	14b	843
High	23	11c	1235
Total	104	32d	3899

a) Most common community organizations: RI Children’s Crusade (RICC) (9 sites), Brown (5), YMCA (4)

b) Most common community organizations: RICC (7 sites), Summerbridge (3), Mayor’s Council on Drug and Alcohol Abuse (3), Volunteers in the Providence Schools (VIPS) (3)

c) Most common community organizations: RI Educational Enrichment Program (3 sites), RICC (2)

d) Most common community organizations: RICC (18 sites), YMCA (5), Brown University (6)

How often do school-based programs meet? At the elementary and middle school levels, they meet an average of two-and-a-half-days each week. Interestingly, in high school, the frequency of the surveyed school-based programs increases to 3.5 days per week.³⁵

➤ **Many School-Based Programs are Staffed by Providence School Department Certified Teachers**

The staffing of out-of-school time programs in schools is of great interest. Nearly all are modestly staffed; most programs have one or two staff (45% of elementary programs, 61% of middle school programs, and fully 75% of high school programs). Interestingly, very high proportions of both elementary (68%) and high school (63%) program staff are certified Providence School Department teachers, compared with a mere 23% of program staff in middle school. The ratio of students to staff increases as children age, with elementary schools having the lowest, and high schools, which have both larger programs and smaller staffs, the highest.³⁶

School Level	Students: Staff Ratio
Elementary	12:1
Middle	16:1
High	25:1
Total	16:1

➤ **Strong School Leadership Can Emerge in Many Ways, and Can Lead to Meaningful Improvements**

School personnel lead many different forms of successful school-based programming, either alone or in partnership with community agencies or others. Eula Coleman and Margaret Royster of the Greater Providence YMCA report a great success: in one program, several of the school’s personnel serve on the after-school program staff. They play a linking role with the after-school program staff, perform outreach to parents, legitimize the program in the eyes of both parents and other school personnel, and assist in the professional development of program staff. These many “bridging” functions have the capacity to improve both program quality and student outcomes.

Another model of school leadership is the example set by a small number of highly entrepreneurial principals, who have energetically sought out and built relationships with multiple agencies and partners. These leaders use their institutional power to forge real relationships with others who have access to resources and capacities which the school lacks and to which the students would otherwise not gain access. Keith Morton, Director of the Feinstein Institute for Public Service at Providence College, says that the Feinstein Institute has developed a strong relationship over several years with the Principal and faculty of the Harry Kizerian (formerly Camden Avenue) School. According to Morton, a key strategy in building that strong relationship, which has resulted in a broad range of services to students, was to make sure that the school and its students did not feel isolated from the community. He also added that sometimes the best way to build and support this relationship is not to seek wider recognition or larger grants, but to “*operate under the radar screen.*”

A third recent example of school leadership is the recent Providence School Department policy change, which requires principals to remain active in the building until 4 p.m. each school day. This sends a signal that the out-of-school time period is important, and integral to the administrator’s role. It will also discourage past practices, in some schools, of requiring compensation for principals and other school personnel as a condition of siting a program in a building.

➤ **School-Based Programs, for the Most Part, Enjoy Limited Access to Providence School Department Buildings**

The programs' use of school buildings tells a story about the nature of staff and children's experiences. Schools are quite remarkable facilities, usually containing dozens of classrooms, a cafeteria for eating, meetings or performances, and a gymnasium. Schools often include a media center, computer/tech room, library, art or music center, playground and a parent or family center. The degree to which a program has access to these multiple facilities – while sometimes primarily a factor of the program's size and purpose – is often a useful indicator of the extent of its partnership with the school principal and faculty. It is also a very clear measure of the range of offerings and quality of programming that is possible through the program – if you do not have access to a playground or a gymnasium, your recreational options are limited; if you hope to provide technology or computer programming, you will have difficulty if you lack access to the computer lab.

Most programs use only one room – a classroom. The average number of rooms used, across the Providence School Department, is less than two. Just over a quarter of the programs use more than two rooms. Twenty percent of elementary and middle school programs enjoy access to technology through a library, computer/tech space or media center, compared to only 10% of high school programs reporting such access.

During the analysis of this data, the category of “room types” emerged as a way of reflecting the variety and significance of the different parts of a school building. For purposes of this discussion, each aspect of the building – classrooms, the gym, the cafeteria, the library, the computer lab, etc. – constitutes a different room type. Many programs are in a single room type – usually one or more classrooms. The degree to which programs used more than one room type serves as a partial indicator of the variety of its programming, as well as the extent of its partnership with the school.

Interestingly, the results were constant across the age groups – programs use an average of 1.7 room types. Programs appear to enjoy greater access and variety of room type in the high schools: only 14% of elementary program and 13% of middle school programs used more than two room types, as compared with fully 25% of high school programs.

➤ **Community Agencies and Students Often Experience School Buildings as Inhospitable**

Many providers reported difficulties and fluctuation in accessing and maintaining the use of PSD facilities, and many attributed this to a fundamental lack of communication and hospitality. In one reported incident, a disagreement between the administration or maintenance staff of a school building and the staff of the neighboring community agency resulted in the loss of access to the building space for a community-based provider which had no part in the dispute.

As both educators and community youth workers report, however, organizing school-based out-of-school time programming can be difficult for all parties. Providers and educators reported the negative effects of funding disruptions, changes in school and community agency leadership or staffing, and the many competing demands on the after school use of space in school buildings, among other challenges. In general, educators and school administrators often feel that community agencies do not understand or appreciate the urgency of the learning and educational agenda. In contrast, community agencies frequently report indifference and resistance to their presence in school buildings, and a tendency of some school personnel to regard the buildings as “theirs” and the organization's program as simply “babysitting.” One community funder and program developer put it this way: *“It is very difficult to get in touch with principals to get permission to use their space. There is no real policy, system, or mandate from central office to encourage use of building by outside vendors to provide after-school programs.”*

The School Department is responding to this concern, and in June 2002 released a *Community Partnership Handbook: A User-Friendly Guide to Working with Providence Schools* at a Community Forum attended by nearly 70 organizations. The School Department views this as a first step among many to develop stronger partnerships with programs serving Providence students during in-school and out-of-school time.³⁷

Students' concerns about overall school climate influenced their feelings about whether they would attend out-of-school activities located at the schools. When asked about placing a possible program in her school site, one student replied, "Why would we want to go back there? We can't wait to get out of there." Youth workers confirm a common feeling that the buildings do not feel welcoming or emotionally safe to the older youth with whom they work, and cite the frequent use of disparaging names to refer to school, such as "the Purple Prison," a reference to one of the high schools. It should be noted that this reporting about student negative feelings in buildings appears to be concentrated among older children, and although widespread, is hardly universal.

➤ **Community Agencies Play a Very Large Role in School-Based Middle School Programs**

Who runs out-of-school time programs based in schools? Principals were asked to characterize the organizational nature of each program: was it organized a) by the school alone, b) by the school and a partner agency, working together, or c) by a community agency which is running the program and using the building with limited school personnel involvement? Middle schools differ dramatically in this regard: they are far more likely to be run by a community organization and staffed by someone other than a teacher than either elementary or high school programs. Nearly half of all middle school programs are organized by community agencies with minimal involvement of the school, and an additional 38% are the result of a partnership between the school and the community agency. By contrast, 40% of both elementary and high school programs are organized by schools with no community partner, roughly half are joint ventures, and only 11% of elementary and 5% of high school programs are run by community agencies without school leadership. This reliance on external agencies is at least a partial explanation of the significantly lower proportion of middle school program staff who are certified schoolteachers.

VI. Mapping Access: Services Vary by Neighborhood and by School

Recognizing that a full-scale citywide survey of community-based out-of-school time programming in Providence was beyond its capacity, this project has often relied on the leadership of others to access good information about community-based programming. A wealth of data about community-based out-of-school-time programming is available in the Providence Youth Opportunities Guide – compiled and disseminated by the Swearer Center for Public Service at Brown University, with support from the Providence School Department and Health and Education Leadership for Providence. Thanks to the Swearer Center staff, which convened a series of focus group meetings with providers of youth services throughout the city, additional data was collected from practitioners, whose observations, critiques and vision for future work influence all aspects of this report. This professional experience and insight was supplemented with additional one-on-one interviews and site visits, as well as data from local and state agencies.

The project has also conducted some original research to begin a process of understanding the scope of out-of-school time resources available to children and youth, their distribution, and the relative capacity of the existing supply to meet demand. The sample conducted is a finite one – licensed school-age care programs only – and the results produced are preliminary. But the early findings and the trends they outline suggest that this kind of research could be very helpful to the city and its neighborhoods in future planning work.

By conducting an inventory of licensed care programs and combining it with the survey of principals and school-based programs, the project research team was able to develop an analysis of the levels of service for elementary

students by neighborhood and school. High and middle school students were not included in the licensed care study, in part because an adequate inventory of community-based programs was not available, and in part because so few middle and high school students participate in licensed programming. Though not inclusive of all programs or children served, licensed care programming makes up a large portion of the programs available for elementary school students, and is therefore a useful and substantial initial sample from which to learn some lessons. The following maps show the portion of students served in each neighborhood, an estimate of unserved students, and the portion of students potentially served at each school. Map 1 is a reference showing the names of each neighborhood in Providence.³⁸

The first analysis (Map 2) examines how well local after-school programs serve students in each neighborhood. Map 2 shows the proportion of elementary school students in each neighborhood who can be served by after-school programs within 1 mile of their home. This distance was selected because it corresponds to the Providence School Department's elementary school walk zone. Across the city, 15.2% of students are able to attend a licensed or school-based after-school programs within one mile of their home.

The southern portion of the East Side (Fox Point, Wayland, and College Hill) would appear from this data to be the area of the city that is best served by after-school programs. However, there are very few students who live in these neighborhoods (see Table 1). Treating Fox Point as an outlier, the area of the city that is best served becomes South Providence and the surrounding neighborhoods. The low-income residents of the city of Providence are concentrated in this area. This means that licensed care programs in these areas are able to draw more subsidies from the state, which is an important source of income. Higher income parents may be more likely to look to unlicensed options, such as sports leagues, music lessons and other activities, for their after-school care needs. These types of care are not included in this analysis, which may account for the low level of care in Blackstone and other higher-income neighborhoods.

Using an estimate of demand for after-school programs at 66% of all students, Map 3 shows the gap between the number of students able to find care and the number desiring care.³⁹ Although the West End/Elmwood/South Providence area has the highest percentage of students served, it also has the largest number of unserved students. Because these neighborhoods have the most students, they also have the greatest need for expanded program opportunities.

An alternative analysis was conducted, based on where children attend school, not where they reside (see Map 4). This is an attempt to acknowledge that many children go to schools in neighborhoods distant from their homes, and would, given the freedom and access to transportation, choose to attend an out-of-school time activity or program that was at or near their school. The proportion of each school's enrollment that can be served by after-schools programs at the school or within one mile of it was calculated. There is a large range of coverage among the schools. At three schools (Gregorian, Bailey, and Messer), over 30% of students can be served by an after-school program at or near the school. While at Windmill, Reservoir, and West, less than 10% of students can be served by local after-school programs.


Can a "big picture" be drawn, one that covers all out-of-school programming in Providence? The short answer is no, not yet: not with any pretense of inclusiveness or accuracy. In fact, it is important not to infer too much from this preliminary work, and to note that there is no effort here to ascertain actual participation in programming, or to assess program quality. It would also be a mistake to conclude that any neighborhood was particularly well-served, or not in need of additional out-of-school time programming.

As a start in the direction of greater understanding, however, Map 5, the last in the series, provides an initial reference for after-school programs and other youth-serving facilities in the city. It includes all licensed and unlicensed school-based programs, licensed community-based programs, recreation centers, libraries, and community centers


for which the research team has records. Not included are the large universe of unlicensed community-based programs, which make up a large fraction of programs overall, and serve thousands of children every week. For this reason, the map is of limited utility. But as a signal of an emerging set of data, and a spur to document more thoroughly the work underway, Map 5 is of some practical help.

Finally, the Project Research Team initiated an additional approach to better understand supply vs. demand for out-of-school time programming in Providence. Based on the hypothesis that many children and youth seeking regularized after-school programming might participate three hours per day, or 15 hours per week, the current supply of documented care would only serve 7% of Providence's school-age population. For a more complete explanation of this analysis, please see Appendix F.

Map 1: Neighborhood Reference



Map 2: Percentage of Students Served, by Neighborhood



Map 3: Number of Students with Unmet Demand, by Neighborhood






Table 1:	Elementary Students				Program Slots		% of Students Served		
Neighborhood	Pub. Sch	Pri. Sch	Total	% Private	All	Com Based	All	Com Based	Unmet Demand
<i>Providence</i>	16201	4576	20777	0.22	3165	1709	15.23	8.23	10548
<i>Mean Neighborhood</i>	648	183	831	0.22	127	68	15.23	8.23	422
Blackstone	128	636	764	0.83	72.77	34.60	9.52	4.53	431
Charles	465	145	610	0.24	68.59	35.15	11.24	5.76	334
College Hill	40	165	205	0.80	66.12	29.56	32.25	14.42	69
Downtown	14	6	20	0.30	4.47	2.56	22.35	12.80	9
Elmhurst	560	399	959	0.42	146.99	63.01	15.33	6.57	486
Elmwood	1514	237	1751	0.14	295.19	193.15	16.86	11.03	860
Federal Hill	552	150	702	0.21	125.55	82.39	17.88	11.74	338
Fox Point	115	52	167	0.31	63.57	37.20	38.07	22.28	47
Hartford	1096	130	1226	0.11	142.87	59.63	11.65	4.86	666
Hope	186	146	332	0.44	27.17	14.75	8.18	4.44	192
Lower S Providence	878	180	1058	0.17	189.78	129.56	17.94	12.25	509
Manton	238	72	310	0.23	50.14	5.77	16.17	1.86	154
Mount Hope	465	177	642	0.28	76.60	31.50	11.93	4.91	347
Mount Pleasant	1069	308	1377	0.22	232.81	74.66	16.91	5.42	676
Olneyville	630	70	700	0.10	101.92	50.53	14.56	7.22	360
Reservoir	299	96	395	0.24	24.20	17.04	6.13	4.31	237
Silver Lake	1304	247	1551	0.16	187.95	102.44	12.12	6.60	836
Smith Hill	615	144	759	0.19	100.55	41.80	13.25	5.51	400
South Elmwood	255	107	362	0.30	22.40	19.28	6.19	5.33	217
Upper S Providence	687	116	803	0.14	157.12	98.93	19.57	12.32	373
Valley	686	129	815	0.16	128.05	65.78	15.71	8.07	410
Wanskuck	1375	240	1615	0.15	260.50	131.18	16.13	8.12	805
Washington Park	740	197	937	0.21	72.19	58.53	7.70	6.25	546
Wayland	37	150	187	0.80	83.19	48.06	44.49	25.70	40
West End	2253	277	2530	0.11	464.29	281.97	18.35	11.15	1206

Map 4: Percentage of Students Served at Each School



School	% of Students Served
Alan Shawn Feinstein	17.10
Alfred Lima/ Charles Fortes	10.98
Asa Messer	30.28
Harry Kizarian	22.53
Carl Lauro	17.16
Martin Luther King	20.43
Edmund Flynn	23.63
George West	4.76
Laurel Hill Ave	24.46
Mandela Woods/ Cornel Young	26.05
Mary Fogarty	23.13
Pleasant View	28.35
Reservoir Ave	6.46
Robert Kennedy	10.77
Robert Bailey	31.57
Sackett Street	20.78
Springfield	12.74
Vartan Gregorian	40.90
Veazie St	21.40
Webster Ave	12.99
West Broadway	20.18
William D'Abate	20.51
Windmill St	7.28

Map 5: Youth Serving Facilities



VII. Children Who Lack Transportation Miss Opportunities

Getting to and from out-of-school time programming can be very hard for students and their parents. Over 60% of middle school students and over 70% of high school students surveyed by the research team rely on rides from parents for some of the transportation to and from out-of-school time programs. Less than 1/3 of the surveyed middle school students and none of the surveyed high school students use school bus transportation to and from out-of-school time programs. Roughly a third of both middle school and high school students walk to or from school. City buses and student-driven car transportation is important at the high school level.

Many providers reported that transportation is costly and difficult, and can severely impact program enrollment and participation. School buses, though available to return children to their neighborhoods, are rarely scheduled and coordinated to drop off children at agreed-upon after school sites, as happens in many cities. Principals, parents, youth and program providers all cite the lack of “late buses” as a major barrier to citing after-school programs at schools. Though frequently referred to as a citywide resource for transportation, the city-owned fleet of vans – the “blue buses” run by the Recreation Department – are apparently often in use, and are more available for field trips and special events than for ongoing daily transportation to and from programs. Many larger and multi-sited organizations invest their own resources to purchase or lease vehicles to transport students from schools to programs. Further study is needed to understand the timing and destinations of students, the current transportation capacity of the school system and the city, the potential fit between school transportation practices and after-school programs citywide, and the possibility of realigning school bus transportation to more effectively deploy existing resources.

VIII. Safety and Police Relations Can Be Pivotal in Program Success

Many youth and program staff interviewed indicated a concern about public safety. Youth often report that staying safe from street crime or gang activity is a major factor for them when considering how they get to and from after-school programs, or planning the hours of the day or evening they will attend an out-of-school time program. Several students at New Urban Arts knew exactly what time they have to leave the program to feel comfortable about getting home safely.

Joseph Le, Director of the Socio-Economic Development Center for Southeast Asians reported that many Southeast Asian families are greatly concerned about their children’s safety. *“Many of our families rely on their older children to take care of their younger children after school and in the evenings. Many parents, because of their limited English skills, feel that their authority over their children is diminished, and they are concerned about the amount of time their children may be spending hanging out on the street in the unsupervised company of other youth.”*

A few organizations reported that they had some success, usually as a result of a concerted effort by a program staff member, in cultivating a relationship with a particular police officer. In these instances, cooperation with the police officer had a positive impact on the overall program and helped to address the needs of individual youth. By and large, however, program staff reported that they did not know or work with specific police officers, and were unaware if there were particular youth officers or other members of public safety organizations who could help them to address public safety and youth-violence issues. Some youth reported that their first assumption was that a police officer was likely to hassle them, rather than help them.

Several program staff interviewed cited the work of the Mayor’s Council on Drug and Alcohol Abuse and the Attorney General’s Office in offering programming designed to address truancy, youth violence, and substance use. However, these programs were seen as discrete efforts targeted to specific schools or neighborhoods, and not as part of a larger effort to encourage greater participation in after-school programming as a prevention strategy.

IX. The Impact of Programs is Unclear

During the conduct of this research, no formal attempt has been made to assess the quality or impact of individual programs, either in the Providence School Department, or in the community. That important task is left to others. Over the eight-month period of data collection, analysis, and reporting, however, many people from a range of institutional contexts provided feedback on specific programs, approaches, and partnerships under way in the Providence School Department. Some of that feedback is reflected in other sections of the report.

Fifteen of the 104 programs profiled in the PSD survey report that they have conducted evaluations of their programs. The vast majority of programs are not evaluated in any formal way. Those that do produce evaluative material tend to be preparing internal reports, or reports to funders, with little or no external assessment or perspective. The few programs which have engaged in formal evaluative work with an evaluation partner tend to be those that are organized and sponsored by the larger community agencies, serving multiple sites, and supported by larger amounts of funding.

As discussed elsewhere in this report, there are inadequate resources to support program evaluation. Programs have difficulty accessing funds to support professional development, technical assistance for developing and implementing curricula, project-based and experiential learning techniques, and a stable workforce of program directors and program staff. Without these key ingredients for running a high-quality program, agencies and schools are unlikely to achieve the outcomes they want for the program and its youth participants.

Such program building blocks can only make a difference if a program – through training and discussion with its staff, parents, and youth – has a clear vision and concrete goals for what it is seeking to accomplish. In the course of interviews with many program staff across the city, only a handful of programs could articulate clear goals for their program, linked to strategies and activities designed for its participants. With few exceptions, notably the Providence Public Library, Youth In Action, New Urban Arts, and the YMCA, most staff interviewed did not express any particular “intentionality” about their program design, their activities and schedule, or how these activities and strategies would result in the impact they were hoping to have.

This phenomenon was even further borne out on a macro level, with few programs articulating a link between their program and a larger social agenda. While the libraries and other programs such as Volunteers in Providence Schools have a strong literacy-based approach, most programs did not articulate a strong connection to a “learning” agenda. (This should not be confused with programs providing time for homework completion.) Programs more apt to be connected with a particular focus or agenda were those programs funded by a specific grant, such as a substance abuse and prevention grant which mandated particular program designs and activities. Another program worthy of mention is the Perry Project, an after-school program operated by the Attorney General’s Office at the Perry Middle School in Olneyville. While the program’s primary focus is sports, John Reis, the Crime Prevention Specialist in charge of the program, has linked student’s eligibility to participate in the program to school performance, truancy, and student behavior, particularly students’ ability to develop better ways to communicate with each other and with adults.

X. A Diversity of Public Funding Sources Yields Mixed Results

➤ Following the Money Can Illuminate Public Policy and Shed Light on the Status of Individual Programs and Service–Delivery Systems

When trying to understand the status of out-of-school programming, whether at specific sites, in a neighborhood, or at a city or state level, nothing is as helpful as the practice of “following the money.” It is hard to overestimate

the impact of public policy, legislation and the availability of funds, particularly public financing, that organizations can access to support programs and related infrastructure costs. When one understands the sources of funding, the amounts of funding, and the purposes for which funding can be used, one can describe what is currently in place. In addition, such an analysis can also help to better explain what is not in place, either because of a shortage of funding overall, or because of limited access to the kinds of revenues necessary for the work.

➤ **Limited and Sometimes Under-utilized Resources**

Despite the many assets listed above, and the diverse range of resources that will soon be detailed, Providence faces a fundamental condition which distinguishes it from many other cities. As a city, it lacks the financial resources – in both its public and its private sectors – which comparably well-known cities, and many state capitals, enjoy. Though not without resources, Providence is not resource-rich. Neither is it a city with its resources particularly focused on children and youth.

The ironic finding reported here is that, in at least one case, Providence is in an unusually good position to access funding for out-of-school-time care, but is failing to do so. The state of Rhode Island's unique child care subsidy program underwrites out-of-school-time care for low-income children and youth up through the age of 15. Unfortunately, with few exceptions, older children whose families are eligible for this funding, and the programs who serve them, simply do not access it. Untold tens of thousands – perhaps hundreds of thousands of dollars – of annual state funding therefore does not flow to Providence (or to many other places elsewhere in the state). Providence faces fiscal difficulties beyond the familiar state and the city funding woes common across the region and the country: it is also the case that Providence providers and families do not always effectively access the resources of the state, which are, in this case, both available and generous.

➤ **Federal Funding for Out-of-School Time in Providence**

The following is a list of federal funds that are most often used to support out-of-school time programming. When available, spending information relevant to Providence and Rhode Island is included. Similar breakdowns of state and city funding follow.

- **Child Care Development Fund (CCDF)**

CCDF is the major federal program dedicated to subsidizing the cost of child care for low-income families who have children between the ages of 0 and 12. In Rhode Island, the bulk of CCDF funds, approximately \$14 million, are used for child care subsidies. CCDF funds are also used to support a wide range of quality-improvement strategies, including licensing, training and accreditation, resource and referral services, and other technical assistance. The Rhode Island Department of Human Services (DHS) administers the subsidies, and most of the quality-improvement initiatives. The Department of Children, Youth and Families (DCYF) oversees licensing for the state of Rhode Island.

- **Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF)**

TANF, formerly known as Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), is the federal government's income assistance program. While TANF dollars may be used by states to fund child-care subsidies, Rhode Island does not currently use any of its TANF funds to support its child-care subsidy program.

- **21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC)**

The purpose of this Department of Education program is to provide expanded learning opportunities for children in order to improve academic achievement (particularly standardized test scores), and to reduce drug use and violence. Up through 2002, the federal government made grants directly to qualifying school districts on a competitive basis. Grants were awarded in three-year cycles, and most districts either subcon-

tracted some or all of the direct services to community-based agencies and after-school programs. The Providence School Department won a 21st Century CLC grant in 1998 for \$586,739 over a three-year grant period. Other Rhode Island communities receiving 21st Century CLC funds include: Newport, Central Falls, Pawtucket, and Woonsocket. 21st Century CLC funding has grown to more than \$1 billion, nationwide. As part of the passage of the federal *Leave No Child Behind Act of 2001*, 21st Century CLC funds will now be awarded to states by formula, and state departments of education will distribute these funds through competitive grant cycles. Rhode Island is scheduled to receive a little more than \$2.8 million in FY 2003, although a significant portion of these funds are earmarked for those communities (Central Falls, Pawtucket, and Woonsocket) completing their three-year grant cycle for grants awarded in 2000.

- **Child and Adult Care Food Program and the National School Lunch Program**

These federal programs provide funding for meals, snacks, and nutrition education provided by child-care and after-school programs operating in low-income neighborhoods. In Rhode Island, the Department of Education (DOE) administers these funds. Participating programs submit required paperwork to local sponsoring agencies – often the school district. Information was not available for how many out-of-school time programs in Providence receive resources through this funding stream. However the Providence Recreation Department reported that they provide 7,000-10,000 meals per day during the summer to Providence children and youth across the city, and receive reimbursements for almost all of their costs through this federal program.

- **State Incentive Grant (SIG)**

The State Incentive Grant is a three-year, \$9 million grant awarded by the federal Center for Substance Abuse Prevention to the State of Rhode Island. Eighty-five percent of the annual \$3 million budget must be used to support programming in local communities, and a minimum of 50% of those programs must be science-based. The Governor's Children's Cabinet has oversight of the grant, and the Department of Mental Health, Retardation and Hospitals (MHRH) has been designated as the lead agency to manage the grant and program-operations. The SIG has three primary goals: to coordinate, leverage, and redirect all prevention funding streams "as appropriate and legally permissible" at a state level; to develop a comprehensive state prevention system; and to measure progress in reducing alcohol, tobacco, and other drug prevalence among 12-17-year-olds. A Statewide Prevention Planning Committee is developing a statewide prevention plan, and several Providence youth-serving organizations participate on the Planning Committee. MHRH anticipates releasing an RFP and awarding grants early in 2003. Local government entities, community coalitions, school districts, prevention organizations, tribal governments, and community-based organizations are all eligible to complete for funds.

- **Learn and Serve and AmeriCorps**

The Rhode Island Service Alliance administers many grants that promote national and community service programs in Providence and across the state. Since 1994, the Service Alliance has funded more than 40 local service initiatives and has awarded more than \$15 million in grants. Current annual figures were not available for the specific projects in Providence that support out-of-school time programming for children and youth. However, of the eight Learn and Serve projects administered by the Alliance for the period of 2001-2003, five projects serve approximately 300 Providence children and youth during out-of-school time. They do so by contracting with a diverse group of community-based organizations to offer programming in the arts, environmental education, and public health. Many of these programs train high school students to mentor and work with younger students to implement these activities. In addition, the Alliance supports several AmeriCorps projects sponsored by City Year Rhode Island, the Rhode Island Children's Crusade, Parents Making a Difference, and the Providence Children's Museum.

- **Gear-Up**

Rhode Island is the recipient of a five year federal Gear-Up grant designed to support low-income students, grades 7-12, in Providence, East Providence, Central Falls, Woonsocket, Pawtucket, West Warwick, and Newport. These projects provide high-quality, developmentally appropriate interventions which assist students to successfully complete high school and enter post secondary education. Awarded in 1999, the Gear-Up grant is administered by the Rhode Island Children's Crusade and provides just under \$9 million over the five-year grant period to implement these strategies. The Rhode Island Children's Crusade estimates that approximately \$600,000 is allocated for services in Providence annually, which includes some support for after-school programming. Because the Children's Crusade offers a range of services to its participants, including mentoring, tutoring and academic support, case management, and other out-of-school time programming, the exact amount of funding allocated to after-school programming for Providence students was not available.

➤ **State of Rhode Island Funding for Out-of-School Time in Providence**

- **Starting Right Entitlement**

Enacted in 1998, Rhode Island's Starting Right Legislation provides families with an entitlement to a child-care subsidy for children and youth up through the age of 15, when family income is up to 225% of the federal poverty level (\$39,317 for a family of four). Administered by DHS, the Child Care Assistance Program (CCAP) issues vouchers, and eligible families can obtain care at a licensed child-care center, a family child-care home, or from a relative or in-home caregiver. As of December 2001, more than 12,000 subsidies were being used by Rhode Island families, of which 35% were for school-age children between the ages of 6-11, 3% were for children between the ages of 12-14, and less than 1% were being used for 15-16-year-old youth. Of the 4,856 subsidies being utilized for school-age care, 2001 were for children and youth residing in Providence.⁴⁰ (Subsidies for children 13 and older are supported exclusively by Starting Right because CCDF funds may only be used for subsidies for children up through the age of 12.)

- **Article 31**

In 1998, the General Assembly authorized funding for after-school programs serving middle school and/or junior high-age students in East Providence, Pawtucket, Providence, West Warwick, and Woonsocket through an amendment to Article 31. These school districts were mandated to use a portion of their Article 31 funding to provide programs in or near school; funds may also be used for programs serving high school students. Funded programs can be offered by the school and/or through collaborative efforts with community-based organizations. Districts receiving funds must make them available to all middle/junior high schools in their district. Currently, each middle school in Providence receives \$10,000 of Article 31 funds to support after-school programming. In the past, principals have reported using Article 31 funds to support school-based and school-operated after-school activities, intramural sports, and late buses.

- **Rhode Island Justice Commission**

The Rhode Island Justice Commission, located in the state's Department of Administration, administers the federal Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP) grant, which provides funding for many purposes related to delinquency prevention and improvement of the juvenile justice system. The Commission, through its grant-making and other activities, has established the following priorities: creating conditions in Rhode Island communities that promote the positive development of youth; reducing youth-related problems, including teen pregnancy, substance abuse, and school drop-out; advocating for the development and implementation of projects for youth; and increasing collaboration among human service, business, law enforcement, and religious institutions to address youth problems. The Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee, which includes representatives of local communities from the public and private sector, establishes annual grant priorities based on the Commission's overarching priorities, and assists the

Commission and its grantees in leveraging funds to expand the grant-funding awarded through JDPA. In FY 2000, the most recent year for which information was available, a total of \$208,801 was awarded to six organizations in Providence offering a range of youth development and after-school programming. The annual grants varied in size from \$24,000 - \$60,000.

In addition, in collaboration with the Department of Children, Youth and Families, the Justice Commission co-administered a two-year federal grant in 1999 and 2000 entitled The Comprehensive Strategy for Serious Violent Juvenile Offenders. Providence, along with four other urban Rhode Island communities, received \$40,000 each year to develop community-based strategies, or a “blueprint,” for improving the quality of life for each community’s children, youth, and families. The Comprehensive Strategy grant awarded in Providence seeded the development of the Providence Children and Youth Cabinet. The Children and Youth Cabinet is a broad-based effort, spearheaded by Nickerson House, to convene organizations and stakeholders to promote effective youth programming citywide by providing training and technical assistance to programs and their staff. It is funded with a two-year grant from the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.

➤ **City of Providence Funding for Out-of-School Time**

- **Providence School Department (PSD)**

The Providence School Department receives a variety of state and federal funding to support after-school programming. As previously mentioned, middle schools have access to Article 31 funds from the state. The school department estimates that approximately \$342,000 of Providence’s Title I funding, federal funding targeted to low-income students, is used to support after-school activities in the District on an annual basis. A multi-year (2000-2003) U.S. Department of Education Arts in Education grant for \$311,889 supports a Media Smart after-school program at several schools. The PSD also receives \$320,000 of federal funding via the Rhode Island Department of Education to support after-school and summer literacy clinics at eight elementary schools as part of the Reading Excellence Act Tutorial Assistance Grant Program. Providence Safe and Smart, an after-school initiative currently operating at three elementary schools after school, receives a small amount of revenue from the Department of Human Services through its child-care subsidy program (CCAP) and some of these funds help to support wrap-around programming offered during the summer for students participating in summer school. The PSD also reports that a portion of funds awarded by the Carnegie Corporation and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation is used to support the District’s summer transition program for incoming ninth-graders. In addition, some schools may use a portion of the funds they receive from the Gates Foundation to support after-school activities related to literacy and numeracy. This summary does not include information about other grants that individual schools may receive from other private sources to support after-school activities.

Although the value of its contributions has yet to be calculated at this time, the Providence School Department offers in-kind support by offering space, utilities, and transportation following some after-school activities.

- **Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)**

In FY 2002, Providence received an overall federal CDBG award of \$7,087,000. These funds support many services, including housing-related programs. Of that total, roughly a fifth is allocated to Public Service Funds, of which nearly 28%, or \$454,104, went to programs providing out-of-school time programs. The City of Providence issues a Request for Proposals to community-based organizations, which may apply annually for these funds. The City’s Planning and Development Department oversees the proposal-review process and the Providence City Council approves final grant-award decisions. During the current fiscal year, the city awarded grants ranging between \$5,000 and just over \$60,000 to 13 youth-

serving organizations in the city. They provide a variety of programming for youth, including after-school, mentoring, recreation, tutoring, environmental education, and transportation services.

- **Mayor's Council on Drug and Alcohol Abuse**

The Mayor's Council on Drug and Alcohol Abuse, a city department started in 1991, addresses a broad range of substance abuse issues facing Providence adults and youth. The Council, largely through seeking state and federal grants, supports several after-school and summer programs for youth who are involved or at risk for becoming involved with tobacco, alcohol, and/or drugs. The Council receives City of Providence operating support for its facilities-related costs and for four administrative staff positions. The after-school programming it offers is supported with funds it has secured, and is targeted to middle school youth. The Council has worked at the Bridgham and Gilbert Stuart Middle Schools and at the West End and Elmwood Community Centers. Through a multi-year grant from the federal Office of Refugee Settlement, some programming has been specifically focused on Indochinese youth. When possible, the Council works in partnership with community-based agencies to offer these services, so that community-based programs can continue this programming, provided that other funding is available when the federal funds run out. Most of the federal grants secured by the Mayor's Council on Drug and Alcohol Abuse are multi-year grants, averaging between \$100,000 - \$200,000 per year, and many require matching funds to fully implement the project. Funding from the Office of Refugee Resettlement will end in September 2002, and the five-year grant from the federal Department of Justice Drug-Free Community Support Initiative will terminate in September 2003. The Council is currently seeking new grants from a variety of federal and state funding sources.

- **Providence Recreation Department**

The Providence Recreation Department has an annual budget of approximately \$2 million dollars, excluding the reimbursement the Department receives for the summer lunch program. It is estimated that approximately \$1.5 million of this annual allocation is used to support out-of-school time programming for Providence children and youth during the school year and summer. These funds support a range of athletic and recreational programs at the city's 10 recreation centers, six swimming pools, and six water parks. Funding is also used to support a fleet of buses and vans that the Recreation Department uses for its programs and makes available to other nonprofit youth-serving organizations.

XI. Private Philanthropic Investments Target Special Initiatives

Many of the private sector contributions and grants in Providence, and particularly the larger and more visible of such grants, go to support specific new initiatives or pilot projects. Funding from private individuals or smaller foundation or corporate grants to programs does not lend itself to reliable documentation.

- **United Way of Rhode Island, Annual Allocations**

In FY 2001, United Way awarded \$900,000 in grants to 10 organizations providing out-of-school time care to children and youth in Providence. These awards were made as a part of United Way's annual allocation process.

- **Community Schools in Rhode Island**

Building upon an initial effort in Central Falls, United Way has launched a statewide effort to support the creation of community schools, or extended-services schools, in Providence, Pawtucket, Woonsocket, West Warwick, and Newport. Community schools can offer expanded in-school and after-school programming for students and their families. The United Way effort seeks to align after-school and summer programming with the school's learning goals, while also supporting positive social/emotional development. A por-

tion of the funds secured for this initiative also supports training, professional development, and other capacity-building activities, public policy research and advocacy, and public engagement strategies. Over all, \$3.8 million has been secured for the multi-year initiative, including major multi-year grants from The Nellie Mae Foundation and Wallace Reader's Digest Fund, and a \$1 million commitment from United Way. The \$3.8 million also includes a portion of the 21st Century CLC funds described above, and a \$100,000 grant from the State Department of Human Services to address program policy and practices. Locally, a portion of United Way's Community Schools funding is supporting the creation of a community school at the Gilbert Stuart Middle School in the West End.

- **HELP: Health and Education Leadership for Providence**

This coalition of colleges, universities, and hospitals generates funding for many programs in Providence, and is a very active participant in community and school-reform planning ventures. In 2001-02, HELP invested \$100,000 in eight after-school literacy clinics in Providence, in partnership with the Rhode Island Department of Education and the Annenberg Institute. In 2002-03, this effort will be expanded, with other funding, to all Providence elementary schools. HELP also awarded a total of \$150,000 over a five-year period to the Providence College Feinstein Institute to support its after-school partnership with the Kizerian Elementary School. HELP is also a funder of the Youth Opportunities Guide, published by the Swearer Center at Brown University.

- **The Public Education Fund Schools and Community Initiative**

The Public Education Fund in Providence (PEF) has been awarded a \$500,000 grant over three years to promote greater accountability by and involvement of the Olneyville community and its residents in the William D'Abate Elementary School. With funding provided by the Annenberg Foundation through the national Public Education Network, the grant will support the creation of an extended services school at the D'Abate School that will provide after-school programming for students and encourage partnerships between the school and community-based organizations. Parents and community activists will promote and implement a variety of education reform strategies at the school, which will result in better educational and social outcomes for students. This grant must also leverage an additional cash match and in-kind services.

- **Carnegie Corporation of New York and Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation
*Schools for a New Society Initiative***

Providence is one of seven cities in the country to receive a five-year, \$8 million grant to "effect sweeping large-scale reform" of its high schools "based on new ideas for secondary education and new expectations of teachers, students, parents, administrators, and curricula." The grants in each of these cities support partnerships among the school district, community and youth-serving organizations, and business with the understanding that schools alone cannot accomplish the work necessary to transform the educational and positive social development of their youth. Locally, the Providence School Department is working in partnership with the Rhode Island Children's Crusade and other organizations to transform high schools into learning communities. In particular, their efforts "will restructure Providence's four large high schools, serving 6,000 students, into small personalized learning communities to improve instruction and nurture youth." The plans also call for the creation of new, small schools, including a "performance-based" school that will measure students' progress at their own pace as they meet achievement standards. An integral component of the planning process has been the creation of approximately 20 "study circles" comprised of Providence youth and adults. These short-term, facilitated community discussions focused on how to incorporate and support a youth-development focus in the schools, during out-of-school time, and by other organizations, including the police and other city and community agencies.

Approximately \$235,000 per year of these funds supports summer transition programs for incoming ninth-graders at each of the high schools. The summer programs, generally 3-4 weeks long, are designed to pro-

vide students with skill-building and literacy activities critical to improving their performance in high school, as well as to provide an orientation to the student's new school. In addition, approximately \$54,000 each year of the five-year grant will support a "credit recovery" program for students to receive targeted academic assistance before and after school from teachers.

- **The Rhode Island Foundation**

The city's largest private funder of programming for children, youth, and families, this community foundation provides a broad array of grants across a wide spectrum of interests. While a comprehensive accounting for funding of out-of-school time programming was unavailable, among the many grants provided in the past year were a \$20,000 award to the Rhode Island Organizing Project to organize a great parent constituency for after-school programs in Providence, a \$25,000 grant to New Urban Arts to support its Arts Mentoring and Civic Engagement work with youth, and a \$20,000 grant to Community Music Works for work with children and youth in the West and South Ends of Providence.

XII. Many Additional Sources of Revenue Are Hard to Track

Clearly the above funding sources do not represent the total investment of public and private revenues supporting after-school activities across the city. Individual programs may access public and private grants to support their programs from other sources than those listed above. Several programs reported that they receive grants from the State Department of Health and the Rhode Island Council for the Arts to implement specific activities as part of their out-of-school time programming. These revenue sources are not earmarked for after school per se, but after-school programs often use them to help support their ongoing operations in addition to the activities funded by the grant.

Donations and Operating Funds

Many programs conduct grassroots fundraising activities to support program activities, and in some instances, programs may tap general operating support from their parent organization, if they have one.

Fees

Parent fees are also not included in these revenue sources. Although parent fees constitute the main source of revenue for after-school programs serving more affluent children, they are only a modest source of revenue for programs serving low-income children.⁴¹ Families eligible for child-care subsidies through DHS may be required to provide a co-payment based on their family income, and some programs offer sliding scale fees or scholarships for those families whose income is above 225% of poverty but are financially unable to pay the market rate cost of care. Revenue from parent fees in both of these instances is relatively insignificant.

XIII. Few Public or Private Resources Support "Infrastructure"

Funders are so far supplying few dollars to build the support components needed to ensure the growth and quality of out-of-school time care. With the exception of some funding allocated by the Department of Human Services to support training, professional development and information and referral for early childhood and school-age care programs, and funding allocated to the Department of Children, Youth and Families for program licensing and monitoring, virtually no other public funding supports the infrastructure to develop and support an out-of-school time delivery system in Providence or across the state.

One notable example of private funds being used to support a system-level activity in Providence is the publication of the Youth Opportunities Guide. The Providence Youth Opportunities Guide is a comprehensive directory of after-school and summer programming for youth ages 10-20. The Howard R. Swearer Center for Public Service at

Brown University funded the publication of the 2001 edition, with help from the Health & Education Leadership for Providence (HELP) and the school department. When it was first published in 1998, public and private funds from the Swearer Center, Leadership Rhode Island, Mayor's Council on Drug and Alcohol Abuse (City of Providence), Providence League of Women Voters, The Rhode Island Foundation, and Textron, Inc. were secured to support the publication.

As mentioned previously, United Way, through its Community Schools in Rhode Island Initiative, is allocating a portion of its resources to address some infrastructure needs, although this is a statewide venture.

XIV. Opportunities Abound for Collaborative Planning and Funding

A window of opportunity exists over the coming years to look more closely at how these varied public and private resources might be used and combined more effectively to support high-quality programming in Providence and across the state. The shift in the administration of 21st Century Community Learning Center funding from the federal to the state level is one example. This change provides an opportunity for the Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) to assess a number of its federal and state revenue streams to see how portions of these revenues could be tapped for individual programs and system-level activities at the local and state level. Potential also exists for some joint planning and implementation between RIDE and the state department of Mental Health, Retardation and Hospitals (MHRH). RIDE and MHRH, the lead agency overseeing the development of the three-year State Incentive Grant, should be encouraged to plan so that Providence and other communities can make the best possible use of the new funding flowing from each of these revenue streams, and build the long-term capacity of programs.

Similarly, the Community Schools in Rhode Island Initiative also funds valuable technical assistance to individual sites in Woonsocket, Providence, Pawtucket, West Warwick, Newport and Central Falls. This funding enables the participating communities to explore policy, funding and programmatic strategies critical to the support of out-of-school time, whether as part of an overall community school approach or as independent out-of-school programs located in community and school locations.

Each of these funding sources alone is not substantial enough to provide the support necessary to sustain a broad range of high-quality programming in Providence. Communities will be able to tackle related systemic activities, including transportation, professional development, and other quality-improvement activities, only with additional resources. However, the initial efforts described above – to better align and coordinate resources locally – could build momentum to seek new public and private funding, or to reallocate resources which are not being used as effectively as possible.

XV. Rhode Island's Chief Funding Source is Largely Untapped

➤ The Child Care Assistance Program's Entitlement is Under-utilized

Rhode Island's creation of an entitlement to a subsidy for children up to age 15 is unusual when compared to other states' spending for child-care subsidies. The entitlement provision of Starting Right has created an enormous opportunity for increasing this revenue stream to support out-of-school time programs for elementary, middle, and high school students. To date, however, the entitlement has not caused a significant increase of families with older school-age youth accessing subsidies, nor has it expanded licensed out-of-school time programs, particularly serving youth between the ages of 11-15 in Providence or elsewhere across the state. While the *2002 Rhode Island Kids*

Count Factbook reports that there is a licensed capacity of 3,260 slots in 43 programs for school-age youth ages 5-12 in Providence, Kids Count also reports that only 2,001 subsidies for school-age care were awarded in 2001.⁴²

➤ **Program Licensing Affects Financing**

Licensing plays a large role in the under-utilization of the CCAP entitlement. The State of Rhode Island has been licensing after-school programs since 1993. Licensing regulations stipulate practices for center-based and family child-care homes on a range of safety, enrollment, staffing qualifications, child:staff ratios, and program-operating issues. In order for a program to become licensed, the facility must meet specific building requirements and pass inspections by the appropriate local authorities, and the program must provide adequate documentation on the issues mentioned above. The Department of Children, Youth and Families (DCYF) oversees the licensing of school-age programming of all family child-care homes and programs offering full-time care, including programs located in the schools. School-based programs offering “enrichment activities” after school are exempt. Licenses for center and school-based programs are issued for one year, and family child-care licenses are issued for two years. Center and school-based programs must seek a renewal annually; family child-care programs every two years; this continues as long as programs and homes are in compliance.

Prior to the passage of Starting Right in 1998, these regulations pertained to programs serving school-age children up through age 12. The passage of Starting Right enabled families to receive child-care subsidies through the age of 15, but no efforts were made to adapt the school-age regulations for programs serving older youth. Consequently, many families that might access subsidies do not do so. Families can only receive subsidies for care and services if their children are participating in licensed care, and nearly all programs for older youth are not licensed. According to DHS, as of late winter 2002, only 150 older youth, ages 13-15, were participating in a handful of licensed school-age programs across the state. Comparable figures for Providence were not available.

The 2002 *Rhode Island Kids Count Factbook* states that while the overall supply of licensed school-age care for children has increased dramatically over the past few years, growth in the urban core cities peaked in 1999 with 5,877 slots, and declined to 5,173 slots in 2001.⁴³ One-time funding was available shortly after the passage of Starting Right to assist current and/or new programs to become licensed. DCYF representatives report that many of these new programs operated for only a brief period of time. All but a few of the new programs failed to implement the ongoing procedures necessary to ensure that eligible families would apply and receive child-care subsidies through DHS. Lacking this primary source of revenue, these programs closed.

Beyond these one-time grants to attract programs to become licensed, there has been little effort to encourage youth-serving organizations to become licensed and seek out subsidies. Many youth-development programs would not necessarily view themselves as falling into the “licensed after-school program” arena, and therefore would not be likely to pursue a license, particularly if they were not aware of the potential program revenues involved. In addition, without modifications to the licensing standards making them more appropriate to programs serving middle and high school students, many programs would not be able to meet the requirements. Even if they could, many would see the licensing bureaucratic process as too burdensome. DCYF officials also report that some programs, particularly those located in Providence school buildings, have difficulty passing the required building inspections as part of the licensing process.

➤ **Increased Use of Entitlement Funds Will Benefit Children and Strengthen Programs**

Federal and state revenues allocated to the Starting Right Child Care Assistance Program (CCAP) represent the greatest source of public revenue supporting out-of-school time programs. Increasing access to licensed care for school-age youth through the age of 15 should be promoted because it helps a program to meet the minimal stan-

dards established by the state for safety and program quality, it provides access to care for low-income working families who cannot afford to pay the market rate cost of care, and it is the gateway to the largest pool of funds available to support school-age care. Although the subsidies provided by the state are fixed at 75% of the market rate, and often do not fully fund the cost of delivering high-quality care, the revenue through the child-care subsidy program can provide a substantial portion of the core funding needed by programs to operate.

There is currently an effort under way to review school-age licensing regulations and develop recommendations for modification appropriate to programs serving older youth. This effort is being led by United Way as part of the Community Schools in Rhode Island Initiative, in partnership with the Department of Human Services and the Youth Success Cluster of the Rhode Island Children's Cabinet, along with several school-age program providers. Those leading these efforts hope that the modification of these regulations, along with several other strategies, will promote participation in a greater number of programs serving older school-age youth.

➤ **Barriers Prevent Increased Licensing and Use of the Entitlement Funds**

Expanding the supply of licensed care and increasing the utilization of subsidies is not necessarily easily accomplished. The licensing process as well as the tasks associated with encouraging and assisting parents to apply for child-care subsidies are often challenging to many providers. In discussions with a broad range of out-of-school time and youth-development providers in Providence, many programs reported being unaware of the child-care entitlement and the requirements for licensing. Many youth-development programs operate in spaces that would require the programs to make facility improvements to meet licensing standards, employ staff who meet the licensing qualifications, or retain an adequate number of staff to meet the staff:child ratio requirements. Some efforts to make the process easier for programs are underway: DHS and DCYF have enacted policies which provide flexibility for out-of-school time programs to offer a broad range of activities, and relax requirements that children and youth participate five days a week in order for a program to be licensed or a family to receive a subsidy.

Many program providers, both licensed and unlicensed, are concerned about the difficulties associated with officially enrolling youth in their programs and/or getting parents to enroll in Starting Right. Out-of-school time programs that enroll children who were previously receiving a subsidy for pre-school care seem to be more successful in accessing subsidy revenue. Providers speculate that such families are familiar with the CCAP requirements and are not averse to providing their income and employment information to the state, a requirement for verifying eligibility. In addition, program providers report that parents who have relied on access to affordable child care so that they can work are more apt to enroll their children in out-of-school time programs for the same reason. Feedback from program staff also indicates that if youth are reluctant to be enrolled in a program that meets regularly and holds youth accountable for their attendance, they are less likely to ask their parents to complete the required paperwork to participate in the program and/or receive the subsidy.

Several providers reported that families who are employed and meet the income eligibility requirements are turned down for subsidies because their hours of employment do not overlap with after school hours. Many of these families want their children in school-age care so that they can access homework help, enrichment, and recreation opportunities, but they cannot afford to send them to programs without a subsidy.

Programs offering services to older youth also report other challenges to enrolling youth in their programs and in Starting Right. Older youth often have access to other programming that may be free and/or more specialized such as art classes or sports, and many older youth may need to work after school or be home to care for younger school-age siblings.

XVI. There is a Prevailing Lack of Focus and Leadership on this Issue

Despite the involvement of many fine leaders and institutions in local and targeted projects, Providence's citywide out-of-school time work lacks leadership.

➤ No Single Individual or Institution is Playing an Active, Visible Leadership Role on Out-of-School Time Issues in Providence

In most cities in the country in which out-of-school-time programming has emerged as a force for meaningful learning, prevention, youth development, or family support improvements, the issue has risen to a higher level of public awareness and institutional investment through the efforts of distinct leaders within the community. In some cities, the leader is the mayor; in others, it is the school superintendent; in still others, it is an entrepreneurial nonprofit agency; in an emerging trend, it is a consortium of agencies or funding partners.

With great respect to all the parties in Providence who are deeply engaged in the delivery of services to children and youth, no such distinctive leader has yet emerged in Providence. Many strong and articulate voices are heard, but no single team, institution, or collaborative body has established itself as a voice for the expansion, improvement, or adequate funding of after-school programming in Providence.

The philanthropic community of Providence is not particularly focused on out-of-school-time and youth-development issues. This is in part because there are a large number of competing demands and interests within Rhode Island's philanthropic community, and in part because much of the child- and youth-focused grant-making has been targeted at in-school, school reform-based programming and innovation. In some cities around the country, funders have come together to try to accomplish more in this out-of-school time arena; this does not appear to be an imminent development in Providence, to the degree that such changes can be anticipated.

Those working most closely with children in out-of-school time are doing some things very well. Whether established and large, like the Rhode Island Children's Crusade, the YMCA of Greater Providence, and the Providence Boys and Girls Club, or smaller and more focused, like New Urban Arts, Youth In Action, Socio-Economic Development Center, or the youth-outreach efforts of other smaller agencies, Providence providers of youth services are doing great work. Their hundreds of hard-working staff and volunteers are serving thousands of individual children, sometimes very well indeed.

However, neither these providers of services, nor children's advocates, nor any of the multiple related intermediary and organizing projects are working, together or separately, to frame up a case for the growth of the sector, or the adequate funding and long-term sustainability of their work. In the absence of such leadership, out-of-school time programming and youth-development work in Providence is in jeopardy.

When asked about those they saw as current or potential leaders in out-of-school time, providers offered a range of responses. Some saw the school district as the natural leader. Some saw funders of out-of-school time programming – public and private, including United Way – as leaders. A youth leadership development staff person said that she and the youth she worked with were leaders. One seasoned community center director characterized the City Councilors as leadership upon whom he relied for help and support. One provider took umbrage at the idea that people in out-of-school time needed paternalistic leaders, and cited the efforts of other providers to broker long-term relationships with partners, and to use the strength and effectiveness of those partnerships to leverage additional funding and programming.

Some people feel they are leaders by default, and that they are unsupported in their leadership work. This interesting perspective on leadership arose through a focus group of program providers. Unlike their executive directors

and others with more flexible or externally focused jobs, these program providers are the ones who shoulder responsibility for program management, staffing, content, quality, and service delivery. The talk turned to the many current Providence-based planning efforts, new school reform ventures, and other foundation-funded innovations, of which this very conversation was a part. Several program providers noted that they want very much to be “at the table” when such planning occurs, both to influence its direction and, in the words of one, “*I feel I have to come, so as not to miss out on any funding or other opportunities.*” But these colleagues went on to point out that they and their agencies are rarely compensated for their planning time, and that the welter of new initiatives overtaxes them. Several respondents reported that they were getting way too many requests “to help plan something new” in Providence.

➤ **No Organized Constituency Advocates for More or Better Services for Youth**

Thousands of parents and youth, hundreds of program staff, and dozens of agencies and program providers constitute a potential power in the articulation of a vision for children, youth, and families in out-of-school time in Providence. However, so far, no network of parents, youth, families, educators, providers, funders, or others exists right now in Providence to connect the many people who care about out-of-school time and youth development in the city. The *Rhode Island Organizing Project* and the *Ministerial Alliance*, organizations mobilizing individuals through faith-based communities, have identified after-school activities as a priority, but have yet to succeed in harnessing interest and additional resources for out-of-school time in Providence. The many supporters of the importance of this work are not organized; they do not have any affiliations that serve as a citywide communication or connecting mechanism. They are therefore working, raising children, engaging in schools and community agencies, or providing a range of services, all without having a way to link their interests, ideas, experience, and desires for the future.

This absence of constituencies is related to, but different than, the dearth of leadership on these issues. The nature of a constituency, or set of constituencies, has to do with the ideas, vision, and potential voices of disparate groups of people and entities. It is also about the larger group of people with whom leaders, and leading institutions, might interact, and by whom leading agents for change might be guided, supported, and held accountable.

➤ **Many Programs Lack a Strong Focus on Vision, Mission, and Results**

One of the surprises of the research was that on some issues, the providers, funders and advocates of Providence are relatively silent. Among the many subjects covered in the national discussion of out-of-school time, several were given short shrift by the Providence informants interviewed and surveyed for this report. Each instance of this silence is curious, and leaves a question in the balance:

- Issues of staffing, such as low salaries, high turnover of staff, difficulty in attracting trained and qualified staff – which are often dominant in discussions in other U.S. cities – were rarely discussed in the many interviews and focus groups involving providers.
- The paucity of safe, well-lit, fully-outfitted venues for youth and children to engage in recreational, athletic, and other activity – another enormous concern across the U.S. – received only modest attention from community informants, most often from the youth themselves.
- Concerns about the content and quality of programming, questions about whether children were receiving meaningful opportunities to learn, develop, and grow – arguably the most-discussed issue in national after-school and out-of-school time policy and program debates – also got little attention in the conversations with program providers, funders, educators, and youth.

It is hard to know the meaning of this relative lack of attention to these issues in Providence, and there is little merit to speculation. It is worth noting, however, and certainly warrants further inquiry to determine how much of this finding is a result of the limited survey and data collection approach, and how much a function of some genuine lack of awareness, interest, or focus among the people most involved in this work.

Providence Public Library

The Providence Public Library (PPL) has a long and distinguished career of providing after-school services to Providence school-age children and youth. School-age children flock to the 10 branch libraries across the city to receive assistance with homework, be exposed to a variety of books, and have access to technology, and to have a safe, stimulating place to be. This is particularly valuable if their parents are working or the children are not participating in another after-school program. The library often partners with other youth-serving organizations to provide additional services, including working with Volunteers in Providence Schools (VIPS) to provide individual academic tutoring to students.

Recognizing that the after-school hours can be a time to provide even greater services to school-age children, the PPL has developed several additional programs to enhance children's learning and literacy skills. Creating Readers, a program geared for 6-9-year-olds, pairs 120 students with 12 high school buddies at all of its branches to improve oral reading and engage in other related reading activities. Parents of participants in Creating Readers can also have access to kits and special parent/child workshops, providing them with information and tools to encourage reading and print-rich home environments. The PPL is involved in a number of collaborative program initiatives with the Providence School Department. This strong partnership with the schools assists the libraries in aligning their programs with the reading and writing standards and goals established by the PSD.

In addition to participating in the Creating Readers Program, teen buddies, who are high school juniors and seniors, are part of TeenPOWER, the library's innovative approach to engage youth leaders in a variety of library services. These high school youth also serve as "e.teens," assisting students in the libraries' computer labs across the city. Providing opportunities for teens to increase their skills and serve as role models and mentors to other students incorporates many of the best strategies associated with youth-development programming.

The innovative programming, vision, and leadership provided by the Providence Public Library stand out as a strong model of what a multi-sited organization can do systemically to serve children and youth across the city.

➤ Providence Lacks a System, or Network, of Interconnected Resources for Youth

In cities and states across the U.S., social services of many different kinds are often supported and structured through the use of reinforcing networks, systems, or infrastructures. In public schooling, for example, which is usually the largest publicly-funded service system in many communities, this infrastructure includes buildings, transportation systems, public governance bodies, employee associations, extensive professional development ladders and resources, renewable financing, and a great many other elements. By contrast with schools, or health care, or many other examples, out-of-school time programming usually lacks a strong infrastructure or support.

Providence's out-of-school time infrastructure is, to put it simply, limited. There exists no city or private nonprofit agency or organization which has been developed expressly to promote, support, improve, or regulate a range of out-of-school time programming. Such an entity, or team, has become a recognizable feature of many U.S. cities over the past half decade, often with more than one leading out-of-school time agency or organization active in a single city. Other than the School Department, Providence city government also lacks a department or agency dedicated to children or youth, a common feature of city government across the country. Opportunities are limited, and institutional support largely absent for program providers to access professional development training, academic opportunity, or professional and career advancement within the field. Similarly, while agencies such as the Providence Public Library and the Providence Recreation Centers offer programming throughout the city as part of their organization's "own system," these efforts do not add up to a "delivery system" for out-of-school time and youth development for Providence children.

A few examples of system-level activities include: the publication of the Youth Opportunities Guide, which provides free consumer-friendly information about youth programs in print and on the Internet. Another recently developed resource is the newly established Rhode Island Child Care Facilities Fund, which will soon begin to make funds and loans available for the renovation or construction of child-care and out-of-school time facilities. Other new elements of infrastructure may emerge through the current efforts of the many partners working on Youth Development Study Circles, High School Restructuring, and other major reform efforts.

Transportation is one of the largest logistical issues, a perfect example of the absence of infrastructural support, and a perennial challenge for schools and out-of-school time programs. In Providence, three resources of note are available, which, with the addition of resources and careful coordination, could emerge as a strong foundation for a transportation infrastructure or system. The first is the existing busing system for the Providence School Department, which delivers hundreds of children to out-of-school time programming every day. Second, there is the public transportation system, used extensively by older students, sometimes with student discount fares available. Finally, on a smaller scale but in a promising way, there is a fleet of city-owned vans and small buses run and managed by the Recreation Department of the city. These vehicles are available for public use, through an arrangement that enables local programs to access a valuable transportation resource for little or no money. Some providers report difficulty in actually gaining access to the buses, while others report successful use of this resource.

The final – or perhaps the first – local resource on out-of-school time in Providence is the Providence School Department. With more than a hundred programs under way in school buildings, the Department is without question the largest provider of facilities for out-of-school time activity in Providence. With dozens, perhaps hundreds of its staff and volunteers serving in some capacity in these and other community-based out-of-school time programs, the Providence School Department is also, unofficially and indirectly, a leading institutional source of staff for out-of-school time. Some schools in Providence also provide children and families with access to other services, such as counseling, parent education, and family support – in a few instances these resources are sometimes also available through out-of-school time arrangements.

The other major player in the development of an out-of-school time system or infrastructure is the State of Rhode Island. This is unusual but not surprising, given the size of the city, its economic and demographic dominance of state policies and practices affecting low and moderate-income people, and the fact that Providence is the state capital. Among the many resources of the state that are helping to provide and organize programs, these deserve special note:

- Childspan is the statewide agency providing professional development, technical assistance on start-up, licensing, and accreditation, and training on a wide variety of quality-improvement strategies for school-age and early-childhood programs

- Options for Working Parents is Rhode Island’s statewide resource and referral agency for all child care, both preschool and school-age
- The Rhode Island Department of Education provides Providence with a wealth of data about its children, their families and their schools, through the School Accountability for Learning and Teaching (SALT) database
- The many funding arms of the state, detailed in the preceding section

Also worthy of mention are these resources based in the nonprofit private sector, but working extensively with public institutions of all kinds:

- The Rhode Island Campus Compact is a statewide network of service learning and community service faculty and staff which networks colleges and universities, providing opportunities for collaboration
- The Rhode Island School Age Coalition is the statewide coalition of out-of-school time providers and advocates which addresses funding and policy issues
- The Rhode Island Service Alliance is a statewide network of service learning and community service programs

➤ **Providence’s Many New Initiatives Face an Uphill Struggle to Coordinate**

In the past three years, Providence has been the recipient of half a dozen major national grants from leading foundations, consortia and government agencies seeking to improve the well-being of children and youth through out-of-school time or related means.⁴⁴ Although some have involved more planning and coordination than others, all have been conceived as collaborative ventures in which more than one agency, and often more than one sector of society are intended participants and leaders. Good intentions notwithstanding, the clear implication of reports from participating providers, advocates, parents, youth, and funders is that these ventures generally have little to do with one another as projects. Indeed, their leaders – a discrete group of individuals and institutions, many with central roles in more than one of these new ventures – have not, as a rule, managed to align or coordinate these programs, many of which are very closely related in program content, participants, and affected communities.

In this way, Providence misses the opportunity to have its new, entrepreneurial efforts support, reinforce, and improve one another. Recognizing that such coordination and interaction is time-consuming, labor-intensive and difficult, it can still be fairly observed that a series of opportunities may be lost unless changes are made. Providence has a chance to use significant new revenue and resources to leverage a greater degree of communication and trust between different city factions and institutions, and to achieve better outcomes for children and youth in the bargain.

Implications

The following points arise out of an analysis of the findings, and build on prior knowledge to suggest key areas for action.

Providence Children and Youth Need More Out-Of-School Time Programming, and So Do Their Families and Communities: Despite the large number of programs in the city, the numbers of children and youth who would use additional programming if it were available and affordable is very high. Families and neighborhoods often lack access to programs which would increase children's safety, improve children's learning opportunities, enable parents to work or attend school during out-of-school time, and otherwise strengthen family and community capacity.

Better Data Will Help Providence to Understand, Organize, and Grow the Supply of Out-of-School Time Programs: While the number, variety and scope of out-of-school time programs in Providence is large and impressive, the supply of data on them is not. Despite major headway made by the Swearer Center and its collaborators on profiling programs for youth 10-20, and some new contributions made through this Stepping Up! report, good data on the actual citywide supply of programs for children 5 to 18 remains elusive, incompletely documented, and lacking in unifying principles or practices. As Providence deepens its understanding of what is already in place, future planning and development will become stronger and more substantive.

The Providence School Department Can Advance its Primary Goals Through Out-of-School Time: The findings of this study suggest that the top priority of the Department – improving student achievement through a comprehensive focus on teaching and learning – would be well-served by a continuation of the Department's increasing engagement in out-of-school time. Former Superintendent Diana Lam, who published a vision for the school system's future that involves comprehensive reform of schools, often articulated a strong belief in the importance of supporting young people in community contexts, and sought a better alignment of the work of schools and the work of community agencies.⁴⁵ Improved partnering practices with community-based organizations could lead directly to higher levels of alignment between after-school programming and in-school academic goals, curriculum, and practices. Closer collaboration with providers of out-of-school time programming, particularly programs that are school-based, can be very effective in promoting improvements in school climate.

Although The Schools Cannot Do It Alone, Genuine Partnership is Hard: Already the city's largest provider of program sites, and the co-sponsor of this community research project, the Providence School Department is a de facto leader of after-school programming in the city. However, the Providence School Department does not want, and should not attempt, to lead the process of enlarging the city's supply of out-of-school time programming and improving its quality on its own. To effectively promote more high-quality out-of-school time programming, both as educators and as partners working with communities and agencies to support families and children, the public schools of Providence need the active leadership and assistance of many different community partners, including recreation, arts, cultural, prevention, public health, mental health, youth leadership, civic, city and state agencies, and organizations across the public and private sectors.

A Vacuum of Leadership Presents Challenges and Opportunities: Thus far, no single elected or appointed official, constituency of parents, youth, or program providers, or organization has taken up the task of leading a city-wide effort to expand and improve out-of-school time and youth development in Providence. Providence suffers more from leaders and organizations "not stepping up to the plate" than from turf battles over an action agenda or its implementation. The challenge is to ensure that new leadership does emerge, and that it helps to shape a positive momentum for out-of-school time programming in the city. The opportunity exists to nurture a diversity of leaders – from the largest public systems of education, literacy, and human services in Rhode Island, to the well-

established youth service agencies, to the grassroots neighborhood-based projects, to the parent, family, and community constituencies who are most affected.

National League of Cities

After-School Programming is emerging as a key municipal issue in cities of all sizes across the United States. Recognizing the importance of expanding learning opportunities for children and youth in urban centers, and the potential for mayors and city councils to be champions for these efforts, the National League of Cities (NLC), through its Institute for Youth, Education, and Families, is working with cities to provide funding, technical assistance, and disseminate promising practices about how mayors and other elected officials are leading these efforts in small and large cities.

The experience of the eight cities (Charlotte, NC; Ft. Worth, TX; Fresno, CA; Grand Rapids, MI; Indianapolis, IN; Lincoln, NE; Spokane, WA; and Washington, DC) participating in the NLC Municipal Leadership for Expanded Learning Opportunities supported by the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation and from countless other cities participating in a Cross Cities Network, is simple and valuable – leadership matters! Mayors can use their “bully pulpit” to bring attention to the full-day, full-year needs of children and youth. Mayors can convene city departments and diverse stakeholders to address the needs of children and families. Mayors and city councils can coordinate and allocate funding – local, state, and federal dollars to expand and enhance services offered by city government and nonprofit organizations. Mayors and city councils, working with school superintendents, can implement policies and provide resources within the city and school budgets to keep school buildings open to offer a broad range of programming to students and their families.

The NLC’s evidence is also clear from cities such as Denver, Phoenix, Bridgeport, and Farmington Hills, Michigan that even with strong leadership, mayors and city councils cannot do it alone. They must develop strong partnerships with nonprofit organizations, the faith community, and private funders. The experience of Nashville, Tennessee, where *Tying Nashville Together (TNT)*, a grassroots multi-faith organization, researched and documented the need for more after-school activities and programs, also demonstrates the importance of mobilizing community residents to advocate for more services. *TNT’s Project for Neighborhood Aftercare* has its own line-item in the city budget, and has grown from four to 12 programs that provide before and after-school care across the city.

Inadequate, Unstable, and Uncoordinated Financing Limits the Growth of High Quality, Sustainable

Programs: There are inadequate resources at the local and state level to support a diverse supply of high-quality out-of-school programming; all of these diverse funding streams result in services for no more than one-fifth of the city’s school-age children. State agencies, responsible for administering much of the federal and state funding of out-of-school time care, have not yet managed to coordinate funding in ways that would foster long-term sustainability or the emergence of community-level delivery systems. The city of Providence provides little funding to support out-of-school time programs, and access to existing city-managed financing varies greatly among program providers. Few programs enjoy access to resources to support quality improvement, professional development, linkages between home, school, and out-of-school time programs, and program evaluation – all of them vital to a high-quality system of care for children and youth.

Providence Needs a Forum for Out-of-School Time and Youth Development: There is no one table in Providence around which program providers, representatives of the schools and other city agencies, parents, and youth gather to formulate and implement systemic strategies to address out-of-school time. The timing is right for creating such a forum: never before has the city enjoyed a better grasp of the needs to be met and opportunities to be addressed. Using its deepening understanding of the data, the obstacles to change, and the opportunities for improvement, Providence is poised to use such a forum to foster the expansion of an interconnected, mutually supportive system of agencies and programs, focused on documenting, enhancing, and sustaining high-quality out-of-school time programming.

Recommendations

In response to the findings and implications detailed above, a vision for future leadership and activity in youth development and out-of-school time programming in Providence begins to emerge. More than 150 youth and adults informed the research that leads to these recommendations. Many of them articulated one or more of these specific ideas for next steps, which also build on local and national research, as well as the judgment of the authors.

Recognize the Importance of Out-of-School Time, and Promote its Expansion and Improvement:

Providence's children, families, and communities will do better – as learners, members of the community, and contributors to the local economy and social fabric – when they and the institutions that exist to support and strengthen them share a clear consensus about the importance of out-of-school time in their lives. The leaders of Providence – the Superintendent of Schools, the mayor, civic and government leaders at local and state levels, the leaders of the city's many nonprofit and youth-serving organizations, and the youth and parent leaders of the city – must elevate the visibility of the issue, and concentrate their efforts on crafting and moving an ambitious out-of-school time agenda.

Create “The Providence Table” for Out-of-School Time and Youth Development: The city needs a forum in which action on out-of-school time is the central unifying focus, where citywide thinking and strategic work can be done, and in which many diverse voices and constituencies participate and contribute. The Providence Table must be big enough to accommodate the largest institutional players, like the City of Providence, the Providence School Department, and various state agencies. It must also include a cross-section of representatives of all the affected sectors: education, public safety, child care, literacy, youth development, prevention, public health, health care, child welfare, mental health, juvenile justice, and others. Youth, parent, and program-provider voices at the table will ensure the responsiveness and impact of the work.

Craft an Ambitious, Citywide Agenda: Those who sit at The Providence Table will set its agenda. The authors recommend the following steps as top priorities:

- ***Promote a Vision of Young People as Agents of Their Own Development:*** The best youth-development work is often designed and led by youth who are learning from the content of the programming and the experience of exercising leadership. This research-based approach is achieving success in some innovative Providence-based agencies, as well as in comparable urban contexts.
- ***Leverage Those Things That are Already Working:*** Recognize and promote the expansion or adaptation to new sites of existing, excellent work done by Providence schools, agencies, and community partners.
- ***Improve Communications and Alignment:*** Providence can make future work more effective if it ensures that all new planning, program development, and funding initiatives begin, as a matter of routine practice, with a careful communication strategy, facilitated through The Providence Table, so that all those doing related work are aware of one another's efforts. With this simple step, many potential allies can assist or

contribute to new ventures, accelerate the impact of new work, and reduce duplication. This communication strategy also fosters alignment of related initiatives, and promotes the development of the kinds of public/private linkages and collaborations which are the hallmark of leading youth-development efforts in the country.

- ***Support Neighborhood-Based Strategies:*** Evidence from across the country suggests that many of the strongest out-of-school time programs are those with firm roots in communities. Rather than centralizing for its own sake, the Table should aggressively seek out and support successful neighborhood- and community-based ventures, seek to sustain the work over time, and share and disseminate the lessons learned.
- ***Tackle the Transportation Challenge:*** Providence should set as a high priority the job of making transportation accessible to a larger number of students, later in the day, throughout the city. This would enable more children to participate in a greater array of programming, with enhanced impact. This task will require a careful study of the city's multiple public and private modes of transit, as well as the particulars of Providence's student assignment practices. It can also build upon the preliminary mapping of the school-based and neighborhood supply of programming. As has been true in other cities, leadership on this issue can positively affect programs and children.
- ***Increase Police Involvement in Out-of-School Time:*** Encourage greater collaboration among local and state public safety organizations and youth-serving agencies. Many cities are linking public safety practices with successful youth-development approaches, garnering the support of public safety personnel and organizations in promoting the benefits of out-of-school time programming. Community policing and youth officers can strengthen consistent working relationships with youth, youth-serving organizations, and out-of-school time programs throughout Providence's neighborhoods.
- ***Pursue the Many Unanswered Questions Generated by This Research:*** Many kinds of data could help Providence to plan and act more effectively. Among them are more comprehensive documentation of existing programs, including the supply of programming during weekends, vacations, Saturdays and summers; a deeper understanding of the experience of parents, youth, and teachers; lessons from other, similar communities; a more comprehensive analysis of public and private financing and policy; and evaluations of current programming.

Charge One Organization, or a Team of Organizations, with Specific Leadership and Intermediary Roles to Advance the Agenda of The Providence Table: To ensure that the work of The Providence Table moves from research and deliberation to action, the participants must work with existing organizations, or create a new entity, to advance and implement systemic approaches to expanding and enhancing out-of-school time and youth-development programming. Providence can draw from a wealth of models in cities and communities across the country to develop its own unique approach.

Focus on Increasing the Capacity and Improving the Quality of Out-of-School Time Programs: Providence needs a strategy for helping people in the field to step up the intensity, size, and quality of their work. To ensure the growth of more and better programming, people need help: program staff require substantial additional training and professional development; schools and community-based agencies need help working together more closely and effectively; program administrators seek assistance with planning, curriculum and evaluation improvements, and resource development; and funders must overcome particular challenges to increase their support of work in this sector.

Build a Public/Private System – or “Infrastructure” – that Can Grow and Support the Expanding Universe of Programming: All over the country, in many different forms, cities have created systems to organize, support,

and ensure the quality of efforts on behalf of young people in out-of-school time. Concretely, these public/private networks offer professional and career development opportunities to program staff, accreditation and standards assistance to ensure program quality, grants and loans for facilities construction or rehabilitation, youth and parent leadership development opportunities, school-community collaboration assistance, financing support, evaluation and assessment, and many other benefits. No two city systems in the U.S. look exactly alike. While Providence needn't follow a mold, nor reinvent the wheel, there are distinct advantages to an approach that includes strong representation and leadership from both the public sector (city and state government, public schools, and other facilities and agencies) and the private sector (nonprofits, foundations, universities, and intermediary organizations).

Youth In Action

Youth In Action's organizational fact sheet says it best: *"Youth in Action (YIA) began in October 1997 with four youth, one adult, and a dream."*

Their dream was to create an organization run and controlled by youth that could empower young people to play a pivotal role in building and strengthening the Providence community. Over the past five years, YIA has attracted hundreds of members across the city, ages 12-21, who have in turn reached out to thousands of youth through innovative programming and leadership training in: Youth Educating About Health (YEAH), the Community Action Team (CAT), and the Multi-Cultural Arts Team (MCAT). Youth coordinate the activities of the teams and receive training on violence prevention, STD and HIV prevention, and substance abuse. They in turn develop curricula for workshops and strategies for reaching out to other youth about these issues. Other YIA activities include weekly hip-hop classes and designing community arts projects.

Youth empowerment and leadership is evident in every aspect of the organization's programs and administration. Twenty diverse and strongly committed youth serve on YIA's Board of Directors, and youth regularly participate in meetings with elected officials and community leaders on policy and budget issues. Youth also share responsibility for the organization's fundraising, often helping to write and present grant requests to potential funders. YIA enables youth to mentor other youth through an active buddy system that encourages relationship-building, support, and leadership development. Cultivating youth leaders is a daily, weekly, and annual activity, and is taken seriously by YIA's participants and staff. As one YIA Leadership Team member put it, *"YIA helps kids to set the goals they want for themselves. As leaders in YIA, we try and identify the steps they will need to get there, and the skills they must learn to be successful."*

Who comes to Youth In Action? YIA draws from all of the neighborhoods of Providence, although primarily from the South Side and West End. Eighty-five percent of the youth are racial/ethnic minorities, 98% of youth receive free and/or reduced lunch, and 75% of the youth have earned a C- in four or more classes. Many have experienced a personal or family tragedy. Most youth stay involved in Youth In Action an average of two years. But the best news is that 95% of YIA students go on to college and receive an average of \$25,000 per year in scholarships.

Why do youth keep coming to YIA? Karen Feldman, YIA Executive Director, says, *"YIA gives youth the opportunity to identify a problem, create a solution, and feel powerful because they can see the impact of their actions. When they see that their actions can result in positive long-lasting outcomes, they can learn to take control over and succeed in other aspects of their lives."*

Support Key Constituencies – Notably Parents, Youth, and Community-Based Providers – to Frame the Future of Out-of-School Time in Providence: The success of this work will depend on those most affected by it. The funders, policy-makers, administrators of intermediary agencies and other leaders who are the most likely readers of this report cannot, on their own, successfully implement these ambitious recommendations. Such a success will require the active engagement and support of the children, parents, and program staff of the agencies doing the work. Only the last group – the providers working in neighborhoods, in school partnerships or with specific populations of Providence residents – have already achieved a degree of active influence over the programming, policy and financing of out-of-school time. Ensuring that the voices of youth and parents help to frame the city’s work will require a deliberate strategy of public education, as well as leadership from one or more organizations ready to do the necessary organizing and constituency-building.

Identify Specific Leadership Roles for the Providence School Department: The Providence School Department is already a program site, host, or collaborator in over a hundred programs throughout the city. While its leaders are reluctant to assume an expanded role as a major developer or provider of direct services, there are a series of other vital roles that the Department can embrace, immediately. The Providence School Department should:

- Recognize the importance of out-of-school time to the Providence Schools’ mission of student achievement, and assume a public and highly visible role as an advocate for out-of-school time programming in schools and communities
- Through The Providence Table, play a leadership role in shaping citywide policies and practices
- Continue to clarify and publicize existing Department policies and practices – and where necessary, develop and disseminate new ones – which spell out exactly what the Providence School Department seeks, values, and requires of its school-based partners and providers
- Develop, implement and publicize Department policies to encourage and facilitate the development of expanded or new out-of-school time programming in schools
- Establish, publicize, and put into regular use all the necessary protocols, templates for regularly-used memoranda of agreement between schools and community agencies, and other procedures necessary to facilitate the increased use of school buildings for out-of-school time programming by outside organizations
- Encourage and reward principals and administrators who form successful and productive partnerships with community agencies for out-of-school time programming; discourage the practice of payments to school system personnel who are not actively engaged in program delivery or administration
- Actively partner with organizations pursuing community schools approaches, so that schools and their partners can offer seamless educational and social services to students and their families during the school day, after school, in the evenings, and during school and summer vacations
- Extend, when appropriate, professional development opportunities to out-of-school time program staff to increase their capacity to address students’ non-academic challenges as well as their learning needs
- Encourage and provide increased opportunities for teachers and out-of-school time program staff to work together around individual student and family needs
- Plan for the more effective and strategic allocation of resources at individual schools and at the system level, so as to support out-of-school time programming

- Review transportation policies and issues to see if more school buses can be used to transport students from schools to off-site after-school programs
- Develop a process for facilitating and assisting community-based agencies to provide on-site programs that can become licensed, and therefore able to enroll, and receive payment for, students eligible for the Starting Right subsidies.

Expand, Leverage, and Better Coordinate Public and Private Resources: To support increased funding for out-of-school time in this period of declining public spending, Providence and its allies must be creative. Where possible, the City should augment the federal funding it distributes to strengthen and expand programming. Those who administer federal and state funds locally should coordinate planning and allocations to better support individual programs and community-level delivery systems. Local and state administrators should pursue flexible licensing changes and a focused effort to increase use of existing subsidies. Local, regional, and national private funders should seed innovation in existing and new programming, support the development of systemic approaches, and develop parent and youth constituencies and leadership. All sectors must come together, and in a strong and insistent voice, speak up for the importance of this work: the long-term availability of public sector funding for out-of-school time depends, to a very great degree, on the successful growth and mobilization of constituencies who care about and work for this issue.

Specifically, the Department of Human Services should offer contracts to programs serving youth who are eligible for the Child Care Assistance Program (CCAP), replacing the current voucher subsidy mechanism. This would make subsidies easier for families to obtain, and funding easier for programs to secure and rely on. Currently, the onus is on families to seek out a determination of their eligibility for CCAP; once they have the subsidy voucher, they must find a slot with a licensed out-of-school time provider. The licensed provider can then enroll the youth, if a space is available in the program. If the state were using a contract mechanism instead of a voucher system, the programs, particularly in core urban areas, would be able to make enrollment much easier for the youth and the parents, by minimizing the paperwork and steps parents have to take to participate in CCAP. Programs would likely have to gather income eligibility from families, but families may well be more likely to provide this through their stronger relationship with the program and its staff. Many other states already offer child-care subsidies through contracts with early-childhood and school-age programs.

Conclusion

Providence faces a challenge. On the one hand, it is a city with a history of successful, ambitious reforms and innovations which go back to its founding as a center of religious freedom over 300 years ago, and which are as current as the recent revitalization of its civic center and riverfront areas. On the other hand, like many cities in the United States, Providence struggles with high dropout rates, low levels of student achievement, and the knowledge that many of its young people are denied the opportunity to reach their full potential. The evidence is clear that the multiple public and private sector institutions of Providence lack a coherent, commonly-held agenda for the city's most diverse, promising and vulnerable population – its children.

The critical next step for children and youth in Providence is for people and organizations to rise to the challenge, craft a vision that is widely shared and compelling, and take action. More research will help, as will better planning, increased investment, and more strategic alignment of existing resources. But leadership – by individuals and institutions alike – is the key. Each reader is urged to consider his or her own role in this next stage of the work. This report will have served its purpose if it is of use to those people and organizations who find themselves “stepping up” to this challenge in the months and years ahead.

ENDNOTES

- ¹ This paper uses the term “out-of-school time,” rather than after school time, for two reasons: first, valuable programs for youth take place during many different non-school times, including evenings, weekends, early mornings, vacations and summers; second, a focus on the broader sphere of out-of-school time permits the researchers to be inclusive in their review of programs and people with expertise in a wide range of fields.
- ² This figure results from the following calculation: 180 days of school is multiplied by 6 hours of school per day. This total of school hours per year (1,080 hours) is divided by the total waking hours of a child in a year (365 days per year times 16 waking hours per day = 5,840), yielding 19.8% as the percentage of waking hours spent in school, with slightly over 80% of waking hours remaining as “out-of-school time.”
- ³ Vandell, Deborah Lowe and Lee Shumow, “After-school Childcare Programs,” *Future of Children* 9, no. 2 (Fall 1999): 64-80; Jill K. Posner and Deborah Lowe Vandell, “After-School Activities and the Development of Low Income Urban Children, A Longitudinal Study,” *Developmental Psychology* 35, no. 3 (May 1999): 868-879.
- ⁴ Marshall, Nancy, Cynthia Garcia-Coll, et al., “After-School Time and Children’s Behavioral Adjustment,” *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly* 43, no. 3 (July 1997): 497-514; and Kahne et al., “Assessing After-School Programs as Contexts for Youth Development,” *Youth and Society* 32, No. 4, June 2001, 421-446.
- ⁵ Richardson, Jean L., et al., “Substance Use Among 8th Grade Students Who Take Care of Themselves After-School,” *Pediatrics* 84, no. 3 (1989): 556-566; and Steven P. Shinke et al., “The Effects of Boys & Girls Clubs on Alcohol and Other Drug Use and Related Problems in Public Housing,” Boys and Girls Clubs of America: Office of Substance Abuse Prevention, 1991
- ⁶ Huang, Denise, et al. *A Decade of Results: The Impact of LA’s BEST After School Enrichment Program on Subsequent Student Achievement and Performance*, (Los Angeles Center for the Study of Evaluation, Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, University of California Los Angeles, June 2000). See also, United States Department of Education and United States Department of Justice. *Working with Children and Families: Safe and Smart After-School Programs*. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education, May 2000. Available at: <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/parents/SafeSmart/green-1.doc>.
- ⁷ Tolman, J. et al, *Moving an Out-of-School Agenda: Lessons and Challenges Across Cities*, GRASP: Greater Resources for After School Programming and The Forum for Youth Investment, May, 2002
- ⁸ Youth Opportunities Guide, 2001, Howard Swearer Center for Public Service, Brown University
- ⁹ This figure is a rough estimate based on the surveys conducted for this report, and many other sources, especially including the Providence Youth Opportunities Guide, 2001 Edition, Swearer Center for Public Service, Brown University.
- ¹⁰ Rhode Island Campus Compact 2000 and 2001 annual survey of member colleges and universities. The five Providence campuses making up this total are Brown: 5,500; Johnson & Wales: 8,354; Rhode Island School of Design: 2,100; Rhode Island College: 8,513; Providence College: 3,600. Thousands more college age students populate the city’s remaining six college and university campuses.
- ¹¹ Providence Plan Website, <http://www.provplan.org>. School-age, for purposes of this report, is generally considered to be between 5 and 19 years old.
- ¹² US Bureau of the Census, Table DP-2. Profile of Selected Social Characteristics: 2000. <http://www.provplan.org/cen2000/riprofiles/1604459000.pdf>. These figures do not include children born in the US to their immigrant parents.
- ¹³ RI Kids Count Factbook 2002, p. 11 (These proportions are extracted from analysis of those under 18.)
- ¹⁴ US Census 2000 Data, Providence Plan, <http://www.provplan.org>
- ¹⁵ RI Kids Count Factbook 2002, p. 27; Providence School Department
- ¹⁶ US Census Data, 2002, Providence Plan, <http://www.provplan.org>.
- ¹⁷ Dropout Report prepared by RI Dept of Education for Providence School Department, 2000-2001
- ¹⁸ Conversation with Tom Mezzanotte, Director of Student Support Services, PSD; also Dropout Report 2000-

2001, RIDE. Dropout data is available only in this form; dropout rate by ethnicity is not available.

¹⁹ National Institute on Out-of-School Time Fact Sheet, 2001; U.S. General Accounting Office. *Welfare Reform: Implications of Increased Work Participation on Child Care*. Report no. GA/HEHS-97-95. Washington D.C.: U.S. General Accounting Office, May 29, 1997.

²⁰ <http://www.provplan.org>. and RIDE Dropout Report.

²¹ These figures are very difficult to establish with any accuracy. They are also conservative, leaving a possibility that actual numbers are higher, but reducing the likelihood of an overestimation of supply. The low estimate guarantees no duplicates, and the high is the sum of students enrolled, which takes no account of very probable duplicates, whereby children attending more than one program could be counted twice. 7,000 is unjustifiably high, hence the 5,000-6,000 guesstimate:

	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>
Licensed		
(non-duplicate slots)	2486	2486
ES based	1005	2120
MS based	479	1045
HS based	1028	1564
Total	4998	7215

²² School Accountability for Learning and Teaching (SALT), RI Dept of Education, 1999-00, <http://www.infoworks.ride.uri.edu/2002/reports/salt.asp>

²³ SALT data, 1999-2000. <http://www.infoworks.ride.uri.edu/2002/reports/salt.asp> It is interesting that fully 57% of children are reported as coming home to parents after school. It is not clear how this is defined, or whether this arrangement is satisfactory to parents or children.

²⁴ Options for Working Parents, Patricia Nolin, March 14, 2002; Rhode Island Department of Children Youth and Families, Day Care Licensing, *Licensed Day Care Centers*, (Providence, RI: Rhode Island Department of Children Youth and Families, February 1, 2002).

²⁵ Providence Plan, <http://www.provplan.org>

²⁶ Focus groups of providers, co-facilitated by the Swearer Center and Community Matters, winter, 2002.

²⁷ SALT data, <http://www.infoworks.ride.uri.edu>.

²⁸ This figure (1,827) is derived from the total number of students in grade 9-12 who dropped out in 2000-2001 (654), plus those students who dropped out of grade 9-11 in 1999-2000 (578), those who dropped out of 9th or 10th grades in 1998-99 (351), and those who dropped out of 9th grade in 1997-98 (244). All of these students, had they not dropped out, would still have been enrolled in the PSD in the spring of 2001.

²⁹ SALT data, <http://www.infoworks.ride.uri.edu>

³⁰ Middle School Youth Survey Data, Appendix E. The students participating in this study were all members of the RI Children's Crusade, which accounts for the pre-existing, stable presence of out-of-school time programming in their days.

³¹ High School Youth Survey Data, Appendix E. Significant differences between the interests of high school boys and girls included the fact that 43% of girls wanted to do community service in out-of-school time time, compared to 0% of responding boys, and fully 83% of boys, compared to 50% of girls, sought additional sports programs. Students wanted 2.7 days per week of activity and were, on average, already enjoying 2.6 days – this is again a measure of the success of their involvement with RICC and affiliated programs.

³² See Principal Demand Table, at the end of Appendix C, for complete breakdown of survey results

³³ PSD Survey Database, Community Matters, June 2002. The survey was distributed to the principals of all Providence School Department schools in the fall of 2001. Responses were received from 34, or 81% of schools. Due to the response rate, this number (104 programs) is certain to be lower than the actual number of existing programs. Copies of the original survey are attached as Appendix B.

³⁴ PSD Survey Database, Community Matters, June 2002; see Appendix C.

³⁵ The presence of high school sporting programs requiring daily practice – and the dearth of similar daily sports offering in middle or elementary school – may account for this difference.

³⁶ PSD Survey Database, Community Matters, June 2002, Appendix C.

³⁷ The complete Handbook can be downloaded at: <http://www.providenceschools.org/partners>.

³⁸ All maps and related data derived from Restuccia, Daniel, *Building a System: An Assessment of Elementary Aged After-School Supply and Availability in Providence*, May 2002. Mr. Restuccia, this project's Research Associate, then built upon these earlier findings to refine his analysis for inclusion in this report.

³⁹ What fraction of parents of school age children would prefer to have access to a safe, affordable and well-run program for their child or children during out-of-school time? There is no way to know for certain, except perhaps with a costly poll or large random survey. While strong arguments can be made that the fraction is much higher, the authors have settled on 66% as a rough guesstimate of the proportion of such parents in Providence who would appreciate such access.

⁴⁰ RI Kids Count Factbook 2002, p. 97-99

⁴¹ Wechsler, Samantha, Kershaw, A., Fersh, E., & Bundy, A., *Meeting the Challenge: Financing Out of School Time Programming in Boston and Massachusetts*.

⁴² The figure for licensed supply may be somewhat overstated, since it probably includes some school-based sites which received licenses from DCYF in the past, but which either include slots only available for summer programs, or have ceased operations altogether.

⁴³ RI Kids Count 2002 Factbook

⁴⁴ A list of these major grants would include the 1998 21st Century Community Learning Center grant from the Department of Education, a 2001 Gates Foundation grant to support small high schools, a 2001 Carnegie Corporation grant for high school restructuring, funding for the Youth Study Circles initiative, recent Nellie Mae and Wallace Readers Digest funding for Community Schools in Rhode Island, and the 2002 Public Education Network grant to the Public Education Fund for a full service school effort.

⁴⁵ Diana Lam, *Rekindling the Dream: A Framework for Reform in the Providence Public Schools*, the vision for the Providence School Department, 1999

Appendices

- A. Methodology for the Research Project
- B. Sample School Profile and Program Profile Forms
- C. Survey Data on Elementary, Middle and High School Programming and Principal Demand
- D. Sample, Middle and High School Youth Survey Form
- E. Middle and High School Youth Survey Data
- F. An Experiment: Assessing Providence’s “Full-Time” Capacity
- G. Respondents: Providers, Educators, Policymakers, Funders, Agency Heads, Advocates and Others
- H. Author Descriptions
- I. Acknowledgements

Methodology

Providence is the beneficiary of leadership by a number of individuals and organizations working to understand and enhance the experiences of children, youth and families in out-of-school time. This study makes deliberate, strategic use of this prior work, which both forms a vital foundation upon which to build, and frees this research effort to concentrate on other challenges.

The main sources of information are the Swearer Center for Public Service at Brown University's Providence Youth Opportunities Guide, Infoworks!, the RI Department of Education's School Accountability for Learning and Teaching (SALT) program, and RI Kids Count: each provides invaluable sources of data.

Over 150 respondents – in meetings, focus groups, written surveys and telephone conversations – participated in this research. Many of the interviewees and their institutions became collaborators, offering additional contacts, becoming the conveners of additional meetings, reading and commenting on draft texts. As a genuine community-based research venture – 95% of informants were students, parents, program staff, educators, administrators, funders and policy makers who live and/or work in Providence – this report is driven by the perspectives of those who know the city's children and youth best.

These and other issues were approached through three basic methods:

- Numerous interviews, focus groups, and group meetings with over 150 adult and youth informants provided information, perspective and questions for further research. The research team spoke and corresponded with a wide array of young people, parents, educators, providers of services, non-profit administrators, leaders of faith-based communities, advocates for youth, elected officials, city and state agency staff, public and private sector funders, policymakers and journalists. Facts, insight, comments and analysis from these interviews proved invaluable. Interview and meeting discussions and notes – tapping the experience and perspective of those who are most directly engaged in the out of school enterprise -- have been the single most productive information source. For sample interview materials, see the appendices.
- A review of existing literature as well as the collection of a body of reference, regulatory, finance, demographic and educational data formed the second core element of the research. Multiple public and private sources contributed information and access to data, including the Providence School Department, RIDE, SALT, City of Providence, the Swearer Center at Brown, the Rhode Island Compact, Rhode Island Kids Count, the Providence Plan, Infoworks!, and many others.
- Finally, the research team conducted three surveys and data analyses. The first is a system-wide survey of all Providence School Department schools – elementary, middle and high – collecting 2001-2002 data on before- and after-school programming underway in Providence School Department buildings. The second is a pair of surveys and related focus groups with middle and high school age youth involved in out-of-school time programming. The third, a mapping project conducted by Community Matters Research Associate Dan Restuccia, examines the supply of licensed elementary school age child care programming in Providence. This data set and the ensuing analysis produced a series of maps which provide the first ever visual presentation of out-of-school time care in the city, on a neighborhood-by-neighborhood and school-by-school basis.

The process of data analysis included: analysis of collected data from Providence School Department and other sources; creation of a new database of the research team's Providence School Department data; collation of licensed program data by school walking zone and by neighborhood; analysis of interview data and ideas; and identification of core themes, strands of inquiry and discussion.

As a way to ensure clarity, accuracy and relevance, the research team did an initial draft of the report; distributed that draft to a sampling of school, community and civic informants, soliciting their critical feedback and input; incorporated community and school input and feedback on all aspects of the report; and completed this final draft. Wide circulation of the report is planned as a way to report back to all participants, with the hope and the expectation that a variety of people, from youth to policy leaders to program providers, will apply it to their ongoing work.

The research team was led by Elaine Fersh and Andrew Bundy, principals of the firm Community Matters, who are experienced planners and developers of out-of-school time programs, policies, funding initiatives and research ventures. Dan Restuccia, Research Associate at Community Matters, and a team of Brown University students, Dena Aufseeser, Marissa Hewitt, Eli Miller and Daniel Spring, assisted them. Peter Hocking and Kath Connolly of the Swearer Center for Public Service at Brown University made large contributions of planning, convening and facilitation time. Overseeing the entire project for its primary institutional partners were Patricia Martinez, of the Providence School Department and Allan Stein of the United Way of Rhode Island. A complete set of acknowledgements can be found in Appendix I.

Appendix B: Sample School Profile and Program Profile Forms

PROVIDENCE SCHOOL DEPARTMENT

School Profile on Out-of-School-Time Programming (sample, reduced format)

 To Be Filled Out by School Principal 

School: _____

School Contact Person for Out-of-School-Time Programs: _____

Telephone: _____ Email: _____

Please list the name, contact person and contact information for EACH out-of-school program based in your school (use other side of page if needed):

Program Name	Contact Name	Telephone/Email
--------------	--------------	-----------------

Program Name	Contact Name	Telephone/Email
--------------	--------------	-----------------

Given the needs of your student body, what, if any, additional activity or program design would you like to add to your school in out-of-school-time?

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Physical fitness, recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Arts, Cultural Enrichment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Homework Help, Academic Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Improved Home/School Ties |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Prevention of High Risk Behaviors | <input type="checkbox"/> Social Services, Family Support |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nutrition and Health | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Technology | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Please add any notes on what YOU, as Principal, feel is most needed:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME! PLEASE SIGN BELOW.

Principal

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME. WE WILL REPORT BACK TO YOU ON OUR FINDINGS!

Please return a signed copy of this form to Melody Johnson, Deputy Superintendent, PSD

Questions? Suggestions? Please call Elaine Fersh of Community Matters at 401-831-7013 or efersh@communitymatters.net

PROVIDENCE SCHOOL DEPARTMENT

Program Profile Form for Out-of-School Time (Sample, reduced format)

Please complete a Program Profile Form for EACH out-of-school-time program in your school. This form should be completed by the Principal, other School Personnel, or Program Director; signed by the Principal; and returned to Melody Johnson by 11/2/01.

School: _____ Program: _____

School Contact Person for This Program: _____

Telephone: _____ Fax: _____ Email: _____

Community Partner or Lead Agency: _____

Community Agency Contact Person for this Program: _____

Telephone: _____ Fax: _____ Email: _____

This program is organized by (choose one):

1. ___ the school alone
2. ___ the school and the partner agency listed above, working together
3. ___ the community agency above, using the building, with limited school personnel involvement

Purposes of the Program:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Physical fitness, recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Peer Leadership, Conflict Resolution |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Homework Help, Academic Support | <input type="checkbox"/> Arts, Cultural Enrichment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Prevention of High Risk Behaviors | <input type="checkbox"/> Improved Home/School Ties |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nutrition and Health | <input type="checkbox"/> Social Services, Family Support |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Technology | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Key Activities Offered, Special Program Characteristics, Comments:

Number of Children Served: _____ Ages or Grades of Children Served: _____

Particular Target Populations Served: _____

Days, Times, Duration of Program Activities (please CIRCLE all the apply):

1. DAYS: Mon Tues Weds Thurs Fri Sat Sun Vacations

2. HOURS: ___ TO ___

3. MONTHS: Jan Feb Mar Apr Jun Jul Aug Sep Oct Nov Dec

How many staff (FTE) does the Program have? _____ What are staff qualifications?

Parts of the School Building Used by the Program: Classrooms (number used: _____)

Gym Cafeteria Parent Center Auditorium Library Media Lab Computer Lab/Tech Center

Art/Music Center Playground Other _____

Program Annual Budget: \$ _____ Program Funding Sources (please enter \$ amounts spent, or percentages of annual budget):

Foundation Grants Corporate Grants City of Providence Safe & Smart Gear UP CDBG

Article 31 (State) PSD funding (please specify) _____

RIGht Care/Starting RIGht Other (please specify) _____

Has the program been evaluated? Yes No If yes, please attach any recent evaluation or other materials documenting participation and impact.

Principal _____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME. WE WILL REPORT BACK TO YOU ON OUR FINDINGS!

Please return a signed copy of this form to Melody Johnson, Deputy Superintendent, PSD

Questions? Suggestions? Please call Elaine Fersh of Community Matters at 401-831-7013 or efersh@communitymatters.net

Appendix C: Providence School Department Survey Data on Elementary, Middle and High School Programming and Principal Demand

Elementary School Analysis

N = 50, elementary school out-of-school time programs that meet out-of-school time.

Organized By	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
School	17	37.78	37.78
Sch and Com	23	51.11	88.89
Com Alone	5	11.11	100.00

Program Goal	Percent
Academic/Homework Help	57%
Arts, Cultural Enrichment	38%
Improved Home School Ties	17%
Prevention of High Risk Behavior	17%
Fitness	15%
Peer Leadership/Conflict Resolution	15%
Technology	11%
Nutrition and Health	6%
Other	6%
Social Services, Family Support	6%

Number of Children Served:

Mean: 42.4 Min: 7 Max: 280

Percentiles

25%: 12 50%: 20 75%: 50

Fully Served Children:

(>1.5 hours of care, 5 days per week, > 7 months per year = 1 Fully Served Child)

Mean: 20.1 Min: 0.4 Max: 123

Percentiles

25%: 2 50%: 7.1 75%: 22

Days per Week:

- Programs meet an average of 2.5 days per week.

Days/Week	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	16	38.10	38.10
2	11	26.19	64.29
3	4	9.52	73.81
4	4	9.52	83.33
5	7	16.67	100.00

Number of Program Staff:

- Certified teachers staff 68% of programs.
- 23% of programs have only 1 staff member

Mean: 3.67 Min: 1 Max: 14

Percentiles

25%: 2 50%: 3 75%: 5

Facilities:

- Programs use an average of 3.1 rooms. (1 room = 1 classroom or 1 other space)
- Half of programs use only 1 room.
- Programs average 1.77 Room types.
- 28% of programs use more than 2 rooms.
- 14% of programs use more than 2 room types.
- 20% of programs have access to technology facilities (media center, computer lab, library).
- 13% of programs use only the cafeteria.

Number of rooms used:

Rooms Used	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	22	51.16	51.16
2	9	20.93	72.09
3	3	6.98	79.07
4	1	2.33	81.40
5	1	2.33	83.72
6	2	4.65	88.37
9	1	2.33	90.70
10	1	2.33	93.02
12	1	2.33	95.35
14	1	2.33	97.67
18	1	2.33	100.00

Number of Room Types Used:

Room Types	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	28	63.64	63.64
2	10	22.73	86.36
3	3	6.82	93.18
4	1	2.27	95.45
7	1	2.27	97.73
10	1	2.27	100.00

Room Types:

Room Type	Percent with use
Classroom	61%
Cafeteria	36%
Gym	20%
Computer Lab	13%
Library	13%
Art/Music Center	11%
Playground	9%
Other	7%
Auditorium	4%
Media Center	4%
Parent Center	2%

Funding Sources*:

- Most programs 50% are funded by the City of Providence of the School Department.
- Only 5 programs report more than 1 funding source.

Funding Source	Number	Percent
City of Providence/ Providence School Dept.	17	50%
Foundation Grants	9	26%
Other	8	24%
Safe and Smart	3	9%
Gear Up	1	3%
Right Care/Starting Right	1	3%

*This data is weak and sketchy, due to the large number of missing responses.

Middle School Analysis

n = 31, middle school out-of-school time programs that meet out-of-school time.

- Middle school programs are much more likely to be run by a community organization and staffed by someone other than a teacher than elementary school programs.

Organized By	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
School	4	15.38	15.38
Sch and Com	10	38.46	53.85
Com Alone	12	46.15	100.00

Program Goal	Percent
Academic/Homework Help	60%
Peer Leadership/Conflict Resolution	30%
Prevention of High Risk Behavior	27%
Fitness	20%
Improved Home School Ties	20%
Arts, Cultural Enrichment	13%
Other	13%
Nutrition and Health	10%
Social Services, Family Support	10%
Technology	7%

Number of Children Served:

Mean: 33.7 Min: 5 Max: 150

Percentiles

25%: 20 50%: 28 75%: 40

Fully Served Children:

(>1.5 hours of care, 5 days per week, > 7 months per year = 1 Fully Served Child)

Mean: 14.5 Min: 1 Max: 90

Percentiles

25%: 3 50%: 9.6 75%: 16.8

Days per Week:

- Programs meet an average of 2.4 days per week.

Days/Week	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	5	19.23	19.23
2	13	50.00	69.23
3	3	11.54	80.77
4	3	11.54	92.31
5	2	7.69	100.00

Number of Program Staff:

- Certified teachers staff 23% of programs.
- 22% of programs have only 1 staff member.

Mean: 2.8 Min: 1 Max: 8

Percentiles

25%: 2 50%: 2 75%: 4

No of Staff	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	4	22.22	22.22
2	7	38.89	61.11
3	2	11.11	72.22
4	2	11.11	83.33
5	2	11.11	94.44
8	1	5.56	100.00

Facilities:

- Programs use an average of 2 rooms. (1 room = 1 classroom or 1 other space)
- Half of programs use only 1 room.
- Programs average 1.6 Room types.
- 28% of programs use more than 2 rooms.
- 13% of programs use more than 2 room types.
- 19% of programs have access to technology facilities (media center, computer lab, library).
- 8% of programs use only the cafeteria

Number of rooms used:

Rooms Used	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	12	50.00	50.00
2	6	25.00	75.00
3	3	12.50	87.50
4	2	8.33	95.83
8	1	4.17	100.00

Number of Room Types Used:

Rooms Types	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	14	58.33	58.33
2	7	29.17	87.50
3	2	8.33	95.83
4	1	4.17	100.00

Room Types:

Room Type	Percent with use
Classroom	71%
Cafeteria	25%
Gym	21%
Library	17%
Auditorium	13%
Computer Lab	8%
Other	8%
Playground	4%

Funding Sources:

Funding data here and in the High School data is incomplete and unreliable.

High School Analysis

n = 23, high school out-of-school time programs that meet out-of-school time.

Organized By	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
School	9	40.91	40.91
Sch and Com	12	54.55	95.45
Com Alone	1	4.55	100.00

- There is much less academic emphasis in program goals at the high school level.

Program Goal	Percent
Peer Leadership/Conflict Resolution	40%
Academic/Homework Help	36%
Other	32%
Arts, Cultural Enrichment	27%
Fitness	18%
Improved Home School Ties	13%
Prevention of High Risk Behavior	9%

Number of Children Served:

- High School Programs are much larger than elementary or middle school programs.

Mean: 68 Min: 6 Max: 265

Percentiles

25%: 25 50%: 34 75%: 137

Fully Served Children:

(>1.5 hours of care, 5 days per week, > 7 months per year = 1 Fully Served Child)

Mean: 44.7 Min: 1.1 Max: 150

Percentiles

25%: 4 50%: 26 75%: 70

Days per Week:

- Programs meet an average of 3.5 days per week.
- More programs meet every day at the high schools than elementary and middle schools.

DayPWk	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	5	23.81	23.81
2	3	14.29	38.10
3	1	4.76	42.86
4	1	4.76	47.62
5	11	52.38	100.00

Number of Program Staff:

- Certified teachers staff 62.5% of programs.
- 59% of programs have only 1 staff member.
- Although High School Programs tend to be larger the number of staff is smaller.

Mean: 3.2 Min: 1 Max: 13

Percentiles

25%: 1 50%: 1 75%: 5

Facilities:

- Programs use an average of 1.7 rooms. (1 room = 1 classroom or 1 other space)
- 65% of programs use only 1 room.
- Programs average 1.65 Room types.
- 25% of programs use more than 2 rooms.
- 25% of programs use more than 2 room types.
- 9% of programs have access to technology facilities (media center, computer lab, library).

Number of rooms used:

Rooms Used	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	13	65.00	65.00
2	2	10.00	75.00
3	4	20.00	95.00
5	1	5.00	100.00

Number of Room Types Used:

Rooms Used	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	13	65.00	65.00
2	2	10.00	75.00
3	4	20.00	95.00
4	1	5.00	100.00

Room Types:

Room Type	Percent with use
Classroom	55%
Other	35%
Auditorium	20%
Gym	20%
Playground	15%
Art/Music Center	10%
Library	10%
Computer Lab	5%

Principal Demand Tables

	Elementary	Middle	High	All Schools
Homework Help	67%	87%	50%	70%
Social Services	56%	50%	75%	57%
Home School Ties	50%	50%	75%	54%
Fitness	56%	38%	50%	50%
Technology	39%	63%	50%	47%
Arts	56%	13%	50%	44%
Prevention	39%	38%	25%	37%
Health/Nutrition	39%	13%	0%	27%
Other*	5%	0%	25%	7%
Responses	18	8	4	30

*The two other activities suggested were adult education and etiquette club.

School	Sch Lev	Fitness	Home Work Help	Prevention	Nutrition	Tech	Arts	Home School	Social Servs	Other
Alan Shawn Feinstein	E		✓✓							
Asa Messer	E	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Carl G Lauro	E	✓	✓							
Charles Fortes	E			✓						
Cornel Young	E	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
E.W. Flynn	E	✓					✓			
Harry Kizirian	E				✓			✓		
Laurel Hill Ave	E		✓					✓		
Mandela Woods	E	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Martin Luther King	E	✓	✓				✓			
Mary Fogarty	E		✓				✓			
Pleasant View	E	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Robert Bailey	E	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	
Robert Kennedy	E			✓					✓	
Sackett Street	E		✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	
Vartan Gregorian	E							✓	✓	Etiquette Club
Veazie St	E	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Windmill	E	✓		✓		✓			✓	
Esek Hopkins	M		✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	
Gilbert Stuart	M	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Nathan Bishop	M		✓			✓			✓	
Nathanael Greene	M	✓	✓			✓				
Oliver Perry	M	✓								
Roger Williams	M		✓							
S. Bridgham	M		✓	✓				✓	✓	
Springfield Middle	M		✓			✓		✓		
Central	H	✓				✓	✓		✓	
Classical	H							✓	✓	
Feinstein	H	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓	
Hope	H		✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Appendix D: Sample, Middle and High School Youth Survey Form

YOUTH SURVEY

Community Research on Out-of-School Time, Sponsored by the United Way of Rhode Island and the Providence School District, & Conducted by Community Matters

Thank you for taking part in this community research project to learn more about what young people are doing when you are not in school – and what you would like to be doing. Please take a moment to fill out this questionnaire. All answers will be confidential, and as you can see, no names are involved. So tell us what you REALLY think!

Some Information About You:

Your Age/School Grade _____ Male Female

City/Town/Neighborhood (circle one):

Central Falls East Providence Newport North Warwick
 Pawtucket Woonsocket Providence (Which Neighborhood? _____)

Your ethnicity:

African American Asian Hispanic White Other: _____

Some Information about Your Experience with Programs Before School, After School, on Weekends or in the Evenings:
Tell us about the type of programs/activities you have experience with (check as many as you need to answer each question – more than one answer is fine):

Type of Program/Activity	Programs I USED to Do	Programs I Go to NOW, and How Often I Go to Them					
		Once week	Twice week	3 X a Week	4 X a week	Every day	Week ends
RI Children's Crusade							
Homework Help/Tutoring							
Literacy/Reading/Writing Program							
Sports Teams (which one? _____)							
Career Education/Preparation							
Mentoring/Big Brother/Sister Program							
Work/Job (Describe your job: _____)							
City or Town Recreation Center							
Outdoors/Environmental/Wilderness							
YMCA/Boys and Girls Club							
Community Service/Volunteer							
Peer Helping/Substance Abuse Prevention							
Theater/Drama/Performance Program							
Arts Program							
Music Lessons/School Band							
College Prep Program/Activities							
Computer/Tech Club/Class							
Science Club							
Other (specify): _____							

How much time is there (how many hours) between when you get out of school and when you see an adult at home? (Please check one)

0 hrs less than 1 hr 1-2 hrs 2-3hrs 3-4hrs 4-5hrs more than 5 hrs

How often do you participate in before/after school, weekend or evening programs and activities now? (Please circle one)

Once/week Twice/Week Three times/week Four times/week Everyday Weekends

How do you get to and from these programs/activities? (Please circle one)

To get there: Walk city bus school bus ride from parent ride with friend carpool

To get home: Walk city bus school bus ride from parent ride with friend carpool

Some Ideas about Your Future:

What activities are of greatest interest to you, and would you like to do if you could during the before/after school hours, evenings or on weekends? (Circle any that apply)

Sports (any special sport? _____) Homework Help Tutoring Get a Job/Employment

College Prep Literacy Music Art Dance Drama Community Service Chess

Math Club Science Club Computer Club Other: _____

What keeps you from doing programs or activities now? (Check any that apply)

There is no such program in my neighborhood or at my school

The program is too expensive

I need a ride to get there or to get home

I have to work

I have to do homework

I don't know of any such program or activity

None of my friends are involved in the program/activity

If you were able to participate in any of these programs/activities that you are most interested in, how often would you participate in them? (Please circle one)

Once/week Twice/Week Three times/week Four times/week Everyday Weekends

This concludes the Youth Survey. THANK YOU for Participating!

Providence Youth Out-of-School Time Survey Analysis

Highlights from the Providence Youth Out-of-School Time Survey

- Currently, middle school students participate in out-of-school time programs an average of 2.24 days per week and high school students participate in programs an average of 2.7 days per week.
 - Middle school students desire programming an average of 4 days per week, with half of all students desiring programs every day.
 - Middle school students desire 1.7 more days per week of out-of-school time programming than they currently receive.
 - The high school students in this survey are well served. They desire 0.1 more days per week of programming than they are currently enrolled in.
 - Over 60% of middle school students rely on rides from parents for some of the transportation to and from out-of-school time programs. Less than 1/3 of students use school bus transportation to and from out-of-school time programs.
 - The need to do homework is the most commonly cited reason why middle school students do not enroll in out-of-school time programs (58%). High school students cite this reason as well as the need to employment as the main reasons they do not enroll in out-of-school time programs.
-

Demographic Summary

Middle School:

- 25 Students responded to the survey
- **Ages:** Range 12 to 15, mean = 12.84
- **Grade:** 9 Students were in 7th grade, 16 in 8th grade
- **Gender:** 14 Students (56%) were female, 11 students (44%) were male

High School:

- 20 Students responded to the survey
- **Gender:** 14 Students (70%) were female, 3 students (30%) were male
- **Ages:** Range 14 to 18, mean = 14.83
- **Grade:**

Grade	Freq.
9	4
10	6
11	4
12	5

• **City of residence:**

City	Middle School		High School	
	Freq.	Percent	Freq.	Percent
Central Falls	3	12.00	2	10.00
East Providence	0	0.00	2	10.00
Newport	1	4.00	1	5.00
Pawtucket	6	24.00	4	20.00
Providence	13	52.00	7	35.00
West Warwick	0	0.00	2	10.00
Woonsocket	2	8.00	2	10.00

• **Ethnicity:**

Ethnicity	Middle School		High School	
	Freq.	Percent	Freq.	Percent
Asian	5	20.00	3	15.00
African Am	2	8.00	1	5.00
Hispanic	13	52.00	9	45.00
White	1	4.00	4	20.00
Other	4	16.00	3	16.00

The Current Out-of-School Time Situation:

• **How Long Until an Adult Comes Home?**

Middle school students spend an average of 1.72 hours out-of-school time before they see an adult at home. High school students spend an average of 2.85 hours out-of-school time before they see an adult. (This statistic is derived using midpoint scoring with 5.5 as the maximum endpoint.)

Hours	Middle School		High School	
	Freq.	Percent	Freq.	Percent
0	8	32.00	2	10.00
<1	7	28.00	4	20.00
1-2	3	12.00	0	0.00
2-3	0	0.00	5	25.00
3-4	0	0.00	2	10.00
4-5	3	12.00	3	15.00
>5	1	4.00	4	20.00

• **How Often Do You Participate In Out-Of-School Time Activities?**

The average middle school student in this survey participates in out-of-school time care 2.24 days per week. The average high school student in this survey participates in out-of-school time care 2.7 days per week.

Days/week	Middle School		High School	
	Freq.	Percent	Freq.	Percent
0	4	16.00	1	5.00
1	5	20.00	3	15.00
2	5	20.00	6	30.00
3	3	12.00	5	25.00
4	2	8.00	1	5.00
5	4	16.00	4	20.00

This is the best measure of students’ overall engagement in out-of-school time Activities. However, any connections made between this measure and students reporting of which activities they enroll are extremely tenuous. The number of activities students reported they participated in, or the sum of the total days they claimed to participate in them bear no statistical correlation to the days per week they reported to be engaged in this question.

• **Membership in Activities:**

The quality data is inconsistent, with over-reporting being present in many cases. This data can reliably estimate which activities students either currently participate in or have participated in the past.

Percentage of Students Who Do or Used to Do the Following Activities:

	MS	HS
RICC	76%	80%
Literacy	48%	30%
Homework	28%	55%
Sports	44%	70%
Career Ed	16%	15%
Mentoring	8%	25%
Work/Job	20%	45%
City Rec Ctr	20%	15%
Outdoor	20%	15%
YMCA/BGC	36%	55%
Comm Service	20%	56%
Peer Helping	8%	25%
Theater/Drama	20%	35%
Arts	20%	25%
Music	48%	45%
College Prep	12%	40%
Science Club	0%	15%
Computer Club	24%	15%
Other	28%	25%

• **Transportation:**

	Middle Sch		High Sch	
	To	From	To	From
Walk	33%	24%	31%	27%
City Bus	5%	5%	19%	27%
School Bus	29%	33%	0%	0%
Ride from Parent	67%	62%	75%	73%
Ride from Friend	0%	5%	25%	40%
Carpool	0%	0%	10%	10%
Drive	0%	0%	10%	10%

The bulk of transportation is by rides from parents, with walking and school buses being the next most popular modes for middle school. City buses and student driven car transportation is important at the high school level. While further study about where students are traveling and at what time, increasing school bus transportation is one option that could be considered to help students more easily access programs. Middle students may not have understood the word carpool, accounting for its low reported use.

• **Barriers to Access:**

	MS	HS
No Programs in my school or neighborhood	25%	30%
Too expensive	0%	15%
Need a ride	8%	15%
Need to work	8%	35%
Need to do homework	58%	40%
Don't know about programs	33%	30%
No friends involved	25%	15%

Interest in Out-of-school time Programs

• **How often would you like to participate in Out-of-school time Programs**

Middle students desire an average of 4 days of programming per week and over half of students want to participate in out-of-school time programs every day. High school students desire an average of 2.8 days of programming per week.

Days/Week	Middle School		High School	
	Freq.	Percent	Freq.	Percent
0	0	0.00	2	10.00
1	0	0.00	2	10.00
2	3	13.04	2	10.00
3	8	34.78	9	45.00
4	0	0.00	2	10.00
5	12	52.17	3	15.00

• **What activities interest you most?**

The most popular activities among middle school students are sports, music and employment. Dance and theater are the most popular for girls. The most popular activities at the high school level are sports, college prep and employment. Arts activities and community services are much more popular among females than males.

	Middle Schools			High Schools		
	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total
Literacy	0%	7%	4%	0%	17%	5%
Homework	18%	21%	20%	29%	33%	30%
Tutoring	18%	21%	20%	14%	17%	15%
Sports	36%	64%	52%	50%	83%	60%
College Prep	18%	14%	16%	57%	67%	60%
Work/Job	18%	57%	40%	50%	67%	55%
Comm Service	0%	21%	12%	43%	0%	30%
Theater/Drama	45%	29%	36%	50%	33%	45%
Art	18%	21%	20%	36%	17%	30%
Music	45%	36%	40%	43%	50%	45%
Dance	64%	14%	36%	64%	0%	45%
Chess	0%	29%	16%	7%	0%	5%
Math Club	9%	14%	12%	7%	33%	15%
Science Club	9%	7%	8%	0%	17%	5%
Computer Club	18%	50%	36%	7%	33%	15%
Other	9%	14%	12%	7%	17%	10%

Comparison of Desired Program Dosage and Actual Program Dosage

Middle school students desire an average of 1.7 more days per week of out-of-school time activities than they are currently receiving. High school students desire an average of 0.1 more days per week of out-of-school time activities than they are currently receiving.

Days	Middle School		High School	
	Freq.	Percent	Freq.	Percent
-3	0	0.00	2	10.00
-2	2	9.52	4	20.00
-1	1	4.76	2	10.00
0	1	4.76	3	15.00
1	5	23.81	4	20.00
2	5	23.81	3	15.00
3	4	19.05	1	5.00
4	1	4.76	0	0.00
5	2	9.52	1	5.00

This statistic is calculated by subtracting the days of programming students desire from the days of care they are currently receiving.

An Experiment: Asking What Constitutes a “Full-Time Slot” or a “Well-Served Child,” and Assessing Providence’s Capacity to Provide Such Services

If the city’s goal were to create slots that served children with a certain minimum level of service, how many children could the current level of services in Providence serve in this “full-time” way?

No consensus exists at either a local or national level regarding the “right” amount of out-of-school time or care for children and youth. How much is enough in the realm of programming for out-of-school time? One way of considering the question is to ask what constitutes a “full-time” out-of-school time slot. Another would be to ask what would be needed for a child to be “well served” by his or her out-of-school time program or programs. Without weighing the merits of any particular program design or duration, but simply to establish some perspective on the question of how many children the currently available programs in Providence could serve at a standardized level, the research team devised the following method to provide at least one additional measure of the scope of the city’s current supply of programming.

First, for this experiment, the term “well-served” means that a child would be participating in programs for 3.0 hours per day, five days of the week, for seven months of the year. He or she might be in one program, or in a mix of two or more programs. This “full-time” allotment (15 hours per week, during the main body of the school year only), it is good for illustration purposes, since it roughly responds, at least during the school year, and if only to a limited degree, to the widespread familial need for child care for working parents. While not typical among current Providence program designs – it certainly is more than most provide – it represents a timeframe that is not uncommon nationally.

Next, the team asked, “For how many children could Providence currently provide such ‘full time’ care?” To make the calculation possible, one uses the existing data – from multiple sources – on the number of children and length of time that programs currently serve. Then, by calculating the total number of hours available, and dividing them up into imaginary “full-time” slots, one arrives at a number of children who could be “well served.” A 15-hour-per-week, 7 months per year increment, or slot, totals roughly 450 hours per year. If all available programming were parceled out in these 15 hour per week allocations to the maximum possible number of children, roughly 2,328 children would be served by the current output of out-of-school care in Providence.

So, by this test, Providence’s services are now adequate to serve about 2,300 children and youth “well” or “fully,” as defined by the terms of this experiment. Roughly 1,005 of those students could access this 5-day, three hours per day allotment of programming – some of them by participating in more than one program – through the city’s many school-based programs. Another 1,323 students could receive this level of support through community-based or unreported licensed programs, as well as through private schools. All told, this figure of 2,328 constitutes 7% of school-age children in Providence.

Advocates, parents and providers will argue, rightly, that this experimental approach could lead the discussion in the wrong direction, since for many families 15 hours per week, for less than the entire school year, and for *none* of the summer, is inadequate to their needs. This leads to a separate, larger and more substantive Providence conversation about what families require to successfully maintain an adequate income to sustain their families. While offering no argument in defense of this number of hours, the authors felt it worthwhile to conduct an experiment whose results serve to illustrate that even at this modest level of so-called “full-time” care, the degree of coverage possible in Providence if the current levels of service were directed solely at such slots – 7% – is very low indeed.

Appendix G Respondents: Providers, Educators, Policymakers, Funders, Agency Representatives, Advocates and Others

INTERVIEW AND FOCUS GROUP RESPONDENTS

The following people participated in interviews, phone calls, or other information-sharing activities, contributed insights, or commented on draft text. They generously gave their time and effort to this project. Many others – including dozens of principals and students in the Providence Public Schools – responded to surveys, or participated solely in focus groups. The authors and research team members extend their heartfelt thanks to one and all.

Terri Adelman, Volunteers in Providence Schools
Stephanie (Peaches) Alexander, Youth In Action
William Allen, United Way of Rhode Island
Dena Aufseeser, Brown University
Leanne Barrett, United Way of Rhode Island
Karen Ann Barros, Providence Strike Force
William Beatini, Boys & Girls Club of Providence
Rita Boie, Childspan
Ray Brown, Providence Recreation Department
Kathy Ellen Bullard, Providence Public Library
Michael Burk, State Department of Children, Youth, and Families
Mike Butts, Mayor's Council on Drug and Alcohol Abuse
Anna Cano-Morales, The Rhode Island Foundation
Valerie Case, Providence Community Action
John Chica, Rhode Island Children's Crusade
Eula Coleman, Greater Providence YMCA
Kathleen Connolly, Swearer Center for Public Service, Brown University
Susan Connery, Johnson & Wales University Feinstein Community Service Center
Marianne Cocchini, Aermac Consulting
Virginia DaMota, Rhode Island Department of Education
Tyler Denmead, New Urban Arts
Mark Dunham, Providence School Department
Pamela Elizabeth, Planned Parenthood of Rhode Island
William Formicola, Rhode Island Children's Crusade
Karen Feldman, Youth In Action
Andrea Ferreira, AVF Consulting
Joanne Floden, State Department of Children, Youth and Families
Princess Garrett, Youth In Action
Elizabeth Gilheeny, Rhode Island Justice Commission
Sara Goldreich, Providence School Department
Ken Goode, West End Community Center
Stephanie Goyette, Capital Hill Community Centers
Michael Grady, Annenberg Institute for School Reform
Bianca Gray, City of Providence
Maggie Grove, Rhode Island Campus Compact
Katherine Hackett, Providence School Department
Mary Sylvia Harrison, Rhode Island Children's Crusade
Owen Helene, Rhode Island Foundation
Elizabeth Henshaw, Rhode Island College
Marissa Hewitt, Brown University
Peter Hocking, Swearer Center for Public Service, Brown University
Laurie Horta, Johnson & Wales Feinstein Community Service Center
Ariel Jacobson, Youth In Action
Melody Johnson, Providence School Department
Linda Katz, The Poverty Institute
Maryclaire Knight, Greater Providence YMCA

May Kue, Socio-Economic Development Center
Barbara Langford, The Finance Project
Joseph Le, Socio-Economic Development Center
John Lombardi, President, Providence City Council
Susan Lusi, Providence School Department
Patricia Martinez, Providence School Department
Carrie Mauer, Providence School Department
Brian McCadden, Rhode Island College
George McDonough, Rhode Island Department of Education
Patrick McGuigan, The Providence Plan
Eli Miller, Brown University
Keith Morton, Feinstein Center for Public Service, Providence College
Patricia Nolin, Options for Working Parents
Sajda Nurridin, Youth In Action
Nina Pande, Nickerson Community Center
Steven Patriarca, Mayor's Council on Drug and Alcohol Abuse
Eddie Phouthakoun, Socio-Economic Development Center
Kate Pickle, Girl Scouts of Rhode Island
David Platt, Providence College
Tamica Ramos, Youth In Action
Alethea Frazier Raynor, Annenberg Institute for School Reform
John Reis, Office of the Attorney General
Tom Reinhart, Rhode Island Organizing Project
Greg Reinholt, Boys and Girls Clubs of Providence
Dan Restuccia, Brown University
Margaret Royster, Greater Providence YMCA
Pam Russo, Childspan
Hillary Salmons, Health and Education Leadership for Providence
Lauren Schechtman, Rhode Island Children's Crusade
Nicole Boothman-Shepherd, Rhode Island Service Alliance
Regis Shields, Providence School Department
Peter Simon, Rhode Island Department of Public Health
Susan Sklar, Girls Coalition of Rhode Island
Thomas Spann, Vincent Brown Recreation Center
Daniel Spring, Brown University
Amy St. Jean, Providence College
Monique St. Paul, Youth In Action
Allan Stein, United Way of Rhode Island
Julia Steiny, Information Works
Reeva Murphy Sullivan, State Department of Human Services
Dale Thompson, Providence Public Library
Karen Venturini, KBV Consulting
Judy Victor, Rhode Island Day Care Justice Coop
Karen Voci, Rhode Island Foundation
Shevaun Keough-Walker, Childspan
Rev. Marlowe Washington, Ministerial Alliance
Sheila Whalen, Rhode Island Department of Mental Health, Retardation and Hospitals
Judith Wills, South Providence Neighborhood Association
Misty Wilson, Youth In Action
Jennifer Wood, Rhode Island Department of Education

Appendix H: Author Descriptions

Elaine Fersh, the founding Executive Director of Parents United for Child Care in Boston, Massachusetts, has over 25 years of expertise in community development, program development, institutional leadership and policy and finance reform at the local, state and national levels.

Andrew Bundy, a former preschool teacher and social worker, has been an independent consultant to schools, cities, foundations and non-profits since 1987. He is the author of numerous reports and planning documents on out-of-school time, community schooling and public school improvement.

Ms. Fersh and Mr. Bundy have worked together on a wide range of projects over the past decade. In January of 2001, they formed Community Matters, a firm that helps increase the capacity of communities and schools to ensure the success of their children and youth.

They welcome comments on this paper and inquiries about the work of Community Matters.

Elaine Fersh
99 Lloyd Avenue Providence RI 02906
Tel & Fax: 401.831.7013
Email: efersh@communitymatters.net

Andrew Bundy
27 Winsor Ave Watertown MA 02472
Tel: 617.926.7312 Fax: 617.926.7317
Email: abundy@communitymatters.net

Appendix I: Acknowledgements

Several people played pivotal roles in the design and development of this report. Their contributions improved it immeasurably. Any flaws that remain are the responsibility of the authors.

Allan Stein and Patricia Martinez served as the leaders of the partnership between the United Way of Rhode Island and the Providence School Department. They led the planning effort which ultimately resulted in the unprecedented joint commitment – by the United Way and the Providence School Department – of the resources and funding to do this work. Since October, 2001, they have been the tireless eyes and ears of their respective organizations, framing the scope of work, ensuring the authors access to data, brokering contacts with potential informants, reading and commenting extensively on data and drafts, and contributing generously to the overall content and quality of the work. Without them, this work would simply not have been possible.

Kath Connolly and Peter Hocking of the Howard Swearer Center for Public Service at Brown University have been generous and energetic collaborators. They shared a wealth of data and experience from their work to create and keep current the Providence Youth Opportunities Guide. They convened and facilitated three different focus group conversations that attracted seventeen different organizations providing a broad range of youth development services and opportunities citywide. Most importantly, they provided a strong voice in support of the perspective of community-based youth development programs and agencies.

Dan Restuccia, an intern at the Providence School Department, member of the Class of 2002 at Brown University, and a Community Matters Research Associate, played a huge role in turning a large volume of amorphous data into a useful, well-organized series of reports from which extensive practical analysis and recommendations could be developed. He is responsible for many of the charts and tables in this text, and for all of the maps. His incisive thinking and extensive and cheerful labor have been of tremendous importance to the quality of this work.

Dena Aufseeser, Marissa Hewitt, Eli Miller and Daniel Spring, four undergraduate students in Patrick McGuigan's course, "Urban Revitalization: Lessons from the Providence Plan," at Brown, became invaluable research assistants, generating a large initial body of data. Their early work laid the foundation for much of the final product.

Finally, and most importantly, the research team wishes to acknowledge and thank the more than 150 individuals who met, spoke and corresponded with the team over a period of half a year. They have taught with patience and insight. They are the hard-working, often unsung educators and program staff from across the city, the many advocates, parents, funders and policymakers who work on behalf of children, and of course, the youth and children themselves.

