

September 2013

IS CITYWIDE AFTERSCHOOL COORDINATION GOING NATIONWIDE?

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY IN LARGE CITIES

Linda Simkin | Ivan Charner | Caitlin Dailey
Eric Watts | Hannah Taub | Abidemi Adelaja

**IS CITYWIDE AFTERSCHOOL COORDINATION GOING
NATIONWIDE?**

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY IN LARGE CITIES

**LINDA SIMKIN
IVAN CHARNER
CAITLIN DAILEY
ERIC WATTS
HANNAH TAUB
ABIDEMI ADELAJA**

FHI 360

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to acknowledge the contribution of the National League of Cities (NLC) to survey instrument development and NLC's assistance in helping identify individuals in the cities who were knowledgeable about afterschool coordination, and by enlisting the cooperation of statewide afterschool networks.

We would like to express our gratitude to the three leaders of afterschool systems whose feedback about drafts of the Afterschool Network Survey strengthened the instrument. We would also like to acknowledge the National Center for Children in Poverty for providing the data on child poverty for our study sample.

In addition, we would like to thank the many people in cities across the country who assisted in our challenging search for study participants. State contacts from the Afterschool Alliance were particularly helpful. Lastly, we would like to offer our thanks to the afterschool professionals who took the time to participate in interviews or complete the online survey despite busy work schedules. Their passion for the work and commitment to providing high-quality afterschool programs to the children in their cities was abundantly evident.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	i
1. Introduction	1
2. Methods.....	2
2.1 Sample.....	2
2.2 Respondents	2
2.3 Data Collection.....	2
2.4 Response	3
2.5 Survey Instrument.....	4
2.6 Analysis	5
3. Prevalence of Afterschool Coordination in Large Cities	7
3.1 Overall Coordination.....	7
3.2 Provider and Other Stakeholder Participants.....	8
3.3 Grade Levels Served.....	8
4. Implementation of Key Components of Afterschool Coordination.....	9
4.1 Overall Implementation of Coordination Components.....	9
4.2 Coordinating Entities.....	11
4.3 Common Data Systems.....	13
4.4 Quality Standards and Assessment.....	16
5. Other Aspects of Coordination—Commitment of City Leadership, Funding, and Resource-Sharing	18
5.1 Commitment of Mayors and City Managers to Coordination	18
5.2 Funding	19
5.3 Resource- and Information-Sharing between Schools and Afterschool Providers.....	21
6. Conclusions	22
6.1 Summary	22
6.2 Discussion.....	22
Endnotes	24

Appendix A: Appendix Tables

Appendix B: Afterschool Coordination Survey Instrument

Table of Tables

1. Sample by city size
2. Percentage of cities surveyed
3. Coordination status in cities that answered the screening question
4. Number and percentage of afterschool organizations or agencies in the city being coordinated
5. Percentage of cities in which coordination involved programs serving elementary, middle, and/or high school students
6. Cities implementing any of the three key coordinating components
7. Number of key coordination components by child poverty rate
8. Number and percentage of cities conducting selected coordination strategies and activities
9. Percentage of directors' time devoted to afterschool program coordination and improvement
10. Commitment of the mayor/city manager to afterschool coordination by the city having a common data system
11. Provider access to school information about individual students
12. Assessment of demand for afterschool programs across neighborhoods
13. Number and percentage of cities using a quality assessment tool
14. Number and percentage of cities using standards/framework and/or assessment tools
15. Commitment of the mayor/city manager to afterschool coordination by use of quality standards/framework
16. Level of commitment of current mayor or city manager to afterschool coordination
17. Number and percentage of cities where mayor or city manager appointee is active in the afterschool coordination effort
18. Number and percentage of cities with a representative from the office of the mayor or city manager and their selected roles
19. Number and percentage of cities with various levels of funding for coordination over the past 5 years

Table of Figures

1. Data collection and response results
2. Percentage of cities implementing key coordination components (n=69)
3. Organizational home of the coordinating entity (n=41)
4. Percentage of cities reporting selected responsibilities of the coordinating entity (n=41)
5. Percentage of data systems having specific types of data (n=23)
6. Data in common data system used a moderate amount or a great deal for selected purposes (n=23)
7. Percentage of cities using quality standards, frameworks or assessment tool for specific purposes (n=43)

8. Percentage of cities allocating public funds for afterschool programs and coordination (n=69)
9. Funding for afterschool coordination over the past five years by commitment level of city leadership

IS CITYWIDE AFTERSCHOOL COORDINATION GOING NATIONWIDE? AN EXPLORATORY STUDY IN LARGE CITIES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Historically, afterschool programs have functioned independently with little coordination among provider organizations or agencies, and public and private funders operating in isolation. Research conducted by the National League of Cities for The Wallace Foundation profiled 27 cities that were known to be taking steps to improve coordination among their afterschool providers, creating citywide systems designed to support high quality programs and increase access. This research prompted questions about the growth and characteristics of afterschool coordination nationwide.

What is the prevalence of afterschool coordination? To what extent have large cities adopted key afterschool coordination components? What are the roles of the mayor or city manager, city agencies, and other organizations in providing reliable information and affirming a commitment to quality? This exploratory study answers these and other questions and provides a first-ever look at afterschool coordination and system-building in large cities across country.

FHI 360's study of afterschool coordination was conducted in the Fall of 2012 using a stratified, random sample of cities with a population over 100,000. To answer the question about prevalence of afterschool coordination, researchers made telephone calls to 129 cities in an effort to find a person in each city who was the most knowledgeable about afterschool coordination. Knowledgeable respondents, identified in 100 of these cities, reported that afterschool coordination in 77 was already underway. Findings related to the two other study questions were based on data collected by interview or online surveys in 69 cities with coordination (excluding eight cities where respondents did not complete surveys).

Key findings are presented below by study question.

What is the prevalence of afterschool coordination?

- A majority of cities with populations of 100,000 or more in the study sample are implementing some strategies to coordinate afterschool programs. Prevalence estimates range from 77% of cities where researchers talked with persons who considered themselves to be knowledgeable about the status of afterschool coordination, to 59% if the assumption is made that no coordination was occurring in cities where such persons could not be found.
- The number of organizations and agencies participating in the coordination varied widely from city to city; the median was 20.

To what extent have large cities adopted key afterschool coordination components?

- Of the 69 cities reporting implementation of at least some coordinating strategies, 22% have implemented three key coordination components—1) a coordinating entity; 2) a common data system; and 3) quality standards or framework. Twenty-six percent have implemented two of the three strategies and 38% have implemented one. The remaining 15% have implemented none of these key coordination strategies.

- Almost twice as many cities have quality standards (62%) for afterschool programs or coordinating entities (60%) than have common data systems (34%).
- There is no statistically significant association between adoption of coordination components and either city size or child poverty rates.
- Sixty percent of cities have coordinating entities to facilitate afterschool program coordination for example by convening meetings, raising funds, addressing quality, and developing common data systems. Half of these (51%) are housed in intermediary or nonprofit organizations and another 15% of cities have multi-organization partnerships or collaborations; 27% of coordinating entities are part of the mayor's office or city agency. The school system is considered the coordinating entity in 7% of cities.

What are the roles of the mayor or city manager, city agencies, and other organizations in providing reliable information and affirming a commitment to quality?

- Mayors and city managers were reported to be highly committed to afterschool coordination in 39% of cities and moderately committed in 27%. Only 12% were reported to be not at all committed.
- Mayor and city manager commitment to afterschool coordination is positively associated with cities having a common data system and using quality standards or frameworks.
- Over the past five years funding for program coordination increased in 9% of cities, remained stable in 24%, and decreased in 34%. In 25% of cities, there is no city funding for afterschool coordination.
- Coordinating entities address funding issues by advocating for increased funding, providing professional development, and raising funding for grants to providers.
- There is a positive and statistically significant association between mayoral commitment to afterschool program coordination, in general, and level of funding for coordination over the past five years.
- While a majority of cities allocated funding for afterschool programs, fewer provided funding for coordination of providers, intermediaries, or data systems.

1. INTRODUCTION

Young people can benefit academically, socially and emotionally from high-quality afterschool programs. Historically the afterschool field has been decentralized and uncoordinated, with different types of programs—and the government agencies and private groups that fund them—operating in isolation from one another. The result is often a lack of access to quality programs in U.S. cities, particularly for those young people most in need.¹

In response, The Wallace Foundation sponsored an initiative in 2003 to help five cities (Providence, New York, Boston, Chicago, and Washington, D.C.) improve coordination among its afterschool providers, creating citywide systems that could support high-quality programs and increase access. In late 2010, a RAND evaluation of the initiative concluded that the cities' work in afterschool system-building holds promise.²

The five cities participating in the initiative were not the only ones taking steps to establish citywide afterschool systems. A 2011 Wallace Foundation-commissioned report by The National League of Cities (NLC) included 27 others.³ The Wallace Foundation provided nine of them (Baltimore, Denver, Fort Worth, Grand Rapids, Jacksonville, Louisville, Nashville, Philadelphia, and St. Paul) with “next generation” grants to further develop their coordination systems.

While the NLC report identified cities in the vanguard of afterschool coordination and noted that this approach was spreading across the country, there had been no systematic effort to determine how many cities in the U.S. were building afterschool systems. So, in 2012, Wallace pursued answers to the following questions about afterschool system-building:

- What is the prevalence of afterschool coordination?
- To what extent have large cities adopted key afterschool coordination components?
- What are the roles of the mayor, city agencies, and other organizations in providing reliable information and affirming a commitment to quality?

The Wallace Foundation asked FHI 360 to conduct an exploratory study to answer these and other questions and provide a first-ever look at afterschool coordination and system-building in large cities across country. In addition to answering questions about the proportion of large cities that currently have three key components of an afterschool system—a coordinating entity, a common data system, and quality standards or framework—the study also sought to determine whether coordination was associated with city size or the proportion of children living in poverty. The study was designed to serve as a baseline for measuring system-building in large cities over time.

2. METHODS

2.1 Sample

For this study, large cities were defined as those with populations of 100,000 or more. In order to ensure that the sample of cities with afterschool coordination had sufficient numbers for analysis by city size, it was necessary to oversample the cities with the highest populations. Accordingly, the first step in sample selection was to stratify cities with populations above 100,000 into the following four groups: 100,000-249,999; 250,000-499,999; 500,000-749,999; and 750,000 and over.⁴ (See Table 1.) The research team, with The Wallace Foundation guidance, set a target of identifying 76 cities that were currently coordinating afterschool programs with roughly equal numbers of cities in each population group. These 76 cities represented 28% of the 275 cities with populations above 100,000. Because a purposive sampling strategy was employed, findings cannot be generalized to all 275 large cities. An electronic random number generator was used to select the targeted number of cities within each population group. In anticipation of difficulties with recruitment to the study, a set of alternate cities was also randomly selected for each population group.⁵

Table 1. Sample by city size

Population group	Total number of cities according to 2010 census	Sampling target number	Percent of target cities in the population group
100,000-249,999	201	30	15%
250,000-499,999	41	20	49%
500,000-749,000	18	15	83%
750,000 and over	15	11	73%
Total	275	76	28%

2.2 Respondents

The study sought to survey only one respondent per city—the person who self-identified as the most knowledgeable about whether or not any efforts were currently underway to coordinate afterschool programs in their cities. Identifying this person proved quite challenging so multiple methods were used to find them.⁶

2.3 Data Collection

Researchers asked a screening question to respondents who self-identified as the most knowledgeable about afterschool coordination in their city to assess the prevalence of afterschool coordination and to meet our target of recruiting respondents from 76 cities where coordination was occurring for the subsequent survey. The question was as follows:

As you probably are aware, cities are at various stages of coordinating afterschool programs ranging from those that are not currently planning to coordinate services to those that are

implementing coordinated efforts. Strategies for achieving coordination among providers might include a needs assessment, strategies to increase student participation and attendance, establishing standards to improve quality, and implementing data systems to improve decision making.

What statement best characterizes your city's status in terms of coordinating afterschool programs?

- 1. My city is not coordinating afterschool programs nor is it currently planning to do so.*
- 2. My city is in the initial process of planning to coordinate afterschool programs but has not begun to implement any of the coordination strategies just mentioned. (These are the strategies listed as examples in the paragraph above.)*
- 3. My city has implemented some of the coordination strategies.*
- 4. My city has a highly coordinated approach to afterschool programs.*


Responses of (1) or (2) excluded the city from the survey; respondents answering (3) or (4) were asked if they were willing to participate in the survey.

Data collection began in October 2012 and continued through mid-January 2013. Research staff ultimately contacted potential respondents in 129 cities by telephone and e-mail. The number of contacts to identify the appropriate respondent ranged from one to 23 with an average of four per respondent. Of the 129 cities contacted, research staff were able to ask the screening question of knowledgeable respondents in 100 cities. (See Figure 1.) Researchers had most difficulty finding appropriate contacts in cities with populations under 500,000 (i.e., 27 of the 29 cities where respondents could not be identified).^{7,8}

2.4 Response

As displayed in Figure 1, 100 knowledgeable respondents answered the screening question allowing the study to assess prevalence of afterschool coordination in large cities. Of the 100 cities, 23 reported no afterschool coordination had been implemented and 77 reported that their city had implemented some coordination strategies (n=38) or they had a highly coordinated approach to afterschool programming (n=39).

These 77 became eligible to participate in the survey. Although all agreed to participate, eight did not complete the survey despite several follow-up calls by staff to encourage participation or address any concerns or problems they may have encountered. Surveys or interviews were completed by 69 of the 77 respondents, or 91% of the study's 76-city target sample size.



As an incentive to participate, respondents were informed that FHI 360 would make an anonymous contribution of \$100 to one of five charities serving children and youth that they would have a chance to select at the end of the survey.

Of the final survey sample (n=69), 23 (33%) were cities between 100,000 and 249,999; 21 (30%) were cities with population between 250,000 and 499,999; 15 (22%) were cities with populations between 500,000 and 749,999; and 10 (14%) were from cities with populations above 750,000. (See Table 2.) Cities in the final sample were from 34 states. All analyses are based on survey responses from individuals from 69 cities unless otherwise noted in the tables.

Table 2. Percentage of cities surveyed

Population group	Target number	Completed surveys and Interviews	Percent of goal reached
100,000-249,999	30	23	77%
250,000-499,999	20	21	105%
500,000-749,000	15	15	100%
750,000 and over	11	10	91%
Total	76	69	91%

2.5 Survey Instrument

Depending on respondents' preferences, data were collected either through an online survey hosted on SurveyMonkey.com or through an interview using a protocol that was identical to the online survey

except instructions were adapted for the interview format. In total, 50 respondents completed the online survey and 19 were interviewed.

The survey instrument (see Appendix 2) contained 30 questions in fixed-response format that addressed the following system characteristics:

- types of stakeholders
- number of participating provider organizations or agencies being coordinated and the percentage of citywide providers this represents
- student grade levels served
- types of coordination strategies and activities implemented
- coordinating entity and its responsibilities
- common data systems and data collected
- quality standards and assessment
- leadership and funding

The instrument was created by FHI 360 researchers with substantial input from The Wallace Foundation staff and the National League of Cities (NLC). The survey was pilot tested in three cities that were not invited to participate in the study.

2.6 Analysis

Data from the online and interview surveys were combined and uploaded into an SPSS file. Descriptive statistics were generated for the survey items. Sub-analyses were conducted by city size, coordination status, mayor/city manager commitment to afterschool coordination, and child poverty rate (a measure of need). City size was obtained from the U.S. Census. Poverty data, also from the 2010 Census, were obtained with assistance from the National Center for Children in Poverty. No correlation was found in a crosstabulation of city size and child poverty for the 69 cities in the sample, indicating that these variables were measuring different factors ($p=.390$).

The number of key coordination components a city had—a coordinating entity, a common data system, and/or a common set of quality standards or a quality framework—ranging from zero to three, was used as a measure of coordination strength. Chi square tests of significance were performed for each crosstabulation. Tables displaying data where Chi square tests of significance resulted in p values of $\leq .1$ are included in the main body of this report. Tables showing findings that were not significant at this level are included in Appendix 1 and not referenced in the body of this report. Appendix 1 also includes additional descriptive tables related to coordination status and key coordination components that are referenced by number in the body of this report.

Findings reported for cities are based on the perceptions of a single person who self-identified as the person most knowledgeable about afterschool coordination in that city. Their responses were not verified for this study and findings should be understood as preliminary.

Survey findings also should be interpreted with caution because in most cases the cell sizes are small. In addition, it is important to understand that the survey findings (other than those related to prevalence) are for cities that have implemented some coordination strategies, and therefore the findings cannot be generalized to all cities of 100,000 or larger.

3. PREVALENCE OF AFTERSCHOOL COORDINATION IN LARGE CITIES

3.1 Overall Coordination

How many large cities are currently coordinating afterschool programs? This question can be most confidently answered if the analysis is based on responses from 100 cities where professionals who considered themselves to be knowledgeable about afterschool coordination were asked about their city's afterschool coordination status. As displayed in Table 3, a total of 77% cities were reported to be currently engaged in afterschool coordination. Thirty-nine percent had a highly coordinated approach to afterschool programs and 38% were implementing some coordination strategies. Twenty-three percent of cities were not coordinating their afterschool programs. However, 13% reported they were engaged in an initial planning process. Only 10% were neither coordinating afterschool programs nor planning to do so. (Table A-2 displays coordination status by city size.)

Table 3. Coordination status in cities that answered the screening question

City's Coordination Status	Number	Percent
1. Neither coordinating afterschool programs nor planning to do so	10	10%
2. In the initial process of planning to coordinate afterschool programs but no coordination strategies have been implemented	13	13%
3. Some coordination strategies have been implemented	38	38%
4. City has a highly coordinated approach to afterschool programs	39	39%
Total	100	100%

What would the prevalence be if we considered the 29 cities where, despite multiple calls to offices where stakeholders were likely to be found, no contact could be made with anyone who could assess whether or not there were any efforts to coordinate afterschool programs? If one assumes that the reason a knowledgeable respondent could not be found was because there were no afterschool coordination efforts in those 29 cities, then the answer to the question about prevalence is different. In this case, 40% of cities are not currently coordinating afterschool programs; 30% (n=39) of cities would have no coordination and 10% (n=13) would be in the planning process. Fifty-nine percent would be engaged in afterschool coordination; 29% (n=38) would have implemented some coordination strategies, and 30% of cities (n=39) would consider themselves to have highly coordinated approaches to afterschool programs. (See Table A-3.)

Because we can be more confident of coordination status in the 100 cities where we were able to interview a knowledgeable respondent—and we cannot really be sure of the coordination status in the 29 cities where we could not locate a respondent—it is probably safest to conclude that somewhere between 59% and 77% of large cities contacted for the study are currently implementing some afterschool coordination strategies. Interestingly, between 30% and 39% of the cities already consider their afterschool programs to be highly coordinated.

3.2 Provider and Other Stakeholder Participants

The median number of afterschool provider organizations or agencies that are being coordinated in a city was 20.⁹ Respondents were instructed to count organizations and agencies rather than the multiple sites they may have. In 49% of the cities, the number of organizations or agencies being coordinated represented more than half of the afterschool organizations or agencies in the city. (See Table 4.)

Table 4. Number and percentage of afterschool organizations or agencies in the city being coordinated

Percentage of agencies	Number	Percent
0-25%	20	31%
26-50%	13	20%
51-75%	21	32%
76-100%	11	17%
Total	65	100%

Stakeholder groups (including providers) most likely to be participating in the coordination of afterschool programs included nonprofit organizations (94%), afterschool providers (94%), school leadership (88%), city agencies (86%), and local philanthropy (78%). In somewhat fewer cities, mayors or city managers (66%) were named as stakeholders and the public library was involved in coordination in 59% of the cities. (See Table A-6.)

3.3 Grade Levels Served

The majority (61%) of cities with coordinated programs had providers that served students at all grade levels. In almost all of the cities (98%), coordinated afterschool programs included providers serving elementary school children. Similarly, in 92% of cities, coordinated afterschool programs included providers serving middle school students. (See Table 5.)

Table 5. Percentage of cities in which coordination involved programs serving elementary, middle, and/or high school students

Grade levels served	Number	Percent
All levels	42	61%
Elementary and middle school	19	28%
Elementary only	6	9%
Middle only	2	3%
High school only	0	0%
Total	69	101%

In addition to afterschool programs, summer programs are provided by agencies and organizations in almost all cities (96%) with coordination efforts. In 65% of cities, some of the organizations or agencies being coordinated offered other expanded learning opportunities (e.g., Saturday or vacation programs).

4. IMPLEMENTATION OF KEY COMPONENTS OF AFTERSCHOOL COORDINATION

In this section, we seek to answer the question: To what extent have large cities adopted key afterschool coordination components? Accordingly, these findings are based on information provided by knowledgeable respondents in the 69 cities that participated in the online survey or interviews.

4.1 Overall Implementation of Coordination Components


The current study considered three components to be fundamental to system-building—a coordinating entity to facilitate afterschool program coordination, a common data system to collect data about children’s participation, and a common set of quality standards or a quality framework. Table 6 displays the number of cities reported to have each of these coordination components. A majority of cities (60%) appear to have a designated coordinating entity, and 62% use quality standards or a quality framework. Fewer (34%) have a common data system.

Table 6. Cities implementing any of the three key coordinating components

	Coordinating entity	Common data system	Quality standards or framework
Coordinating strategies			
Yes	41 (60%)	23 (34%)	43 (62%)
No	27 (40%)	40 (59%)	25 (36%)
Don’t know	0 (0%)	5 (7%)	1 (1%)
Total	68 (100%)	68 (100%)	69 (99%)¹⁰

Twenty-two percent of cities (n=15) had implemented all three of the key coordination components; 26% (n=38) had implemented two; and 37% (n=26) had implemented one. (See Figure 2.) Fifteen percent of cities had none of three key coordination components. It should be noted that when respondents from these 10 cities answered the screening question, they said their city had implemented at least some coordination strategies. While they had not implemented the three coordination strategies considered key in this report, these cities had implemented some of the coordination strategies and activities listed in Table 8.¹¹

Figure 2. Percentage of cities implementing key coordination components (n=69)



Cities with a higher percentage of children in poverty appear to have stronger coordination compared with other cities. In cities with 30% or more of children living in poverty, 62% had two or more coordination components; in cities with less than 30% of their children in poverty, 34% had two or more coordination components. (See Table 7.)

Table 7. Number of key coordination components by child poverty rate

Number of coordination components	Child poverty	Child poverty
	<30%	≥ 30%
None	8 (23%)	2 (6%)
1	15 (42%)	11 (32%)
2	6 (17%)	12 (35%)
3	6 (17%)	9 (27%)
Total	35 (99%)	34 (100%)

p=.078


A large majority of cities conducted selected organizational activities to strengthen coordination, for example by convening stakeholders, forming a task force or steering committee, articulating a goal or mission statement, and implementing cross-sector leadership. A majority of cities also conducted activities related to service delivery, for example, improving quality, assessing need, increasing student participation, and program accessibility. Fewer developed a common data system or conducted market research. (See Table 8.)

Table 8. Number and percentage of cities conducting selected coordination strategies and activities

	Number	Percent
Convened stakeholders to address access, student participation, or quality (n=66)	63	96%
Worked to improve quality (n=66)	60	91%
Formed a task force or steering committee (n=64)	55	86%
Worked to increase student participation (i.e., frequency or duration) (n=64)	54	84%
Worked to make programs more accessible (e.g., location or transportation) (n=64)	49	77%
Conducted a needs assessment (n=62)	44	71%
Implemented cross-sector leadership (n=64)	44	69%
Developed a goal or mission statement about afterschool coordination (n=63)	40	64%
Developed a common data system for afterschool programs (n=61)	27	44%
Conducted or used market research (n=60)	24	40%

4.2 Coordinating Entities

As previously noted, 60% of respondents reported that their cities had a coordinating entity. (See Table 6). Half of these entities (51%) are housed in intermediary or other nonprofit organizations. As displayed in Figure 3, mayors’ offices and other city agencies account for another 27%; and multi-organizational partnerships for 15%. School systems, active and important stakeholders in 88% of cities, were much less likely to be the coordinating entity. (See Section 3.2.)




In 18% of cities with coordinating entities, the directors devoted more than three-quarters of their time to specific responsibilities for afterschool program coordination and improvement. The majority of coordinating entities in cities did not have a director who devoted a majority of time to afterschool coordination and improvement. (See Table 9.)

Table 9. Percentage of directors' time devoted to afterschool program coordination and improvement

Percentage of director's time	Number	Percent
76-100%	7	18%
51-75%	8	20%
26-50%	6	15%
1-25%	14	35%
There is no director	5	13%
Total	40	101%

The coordinating entities conducted a variety of activities for the afterschool providers. As displayed in Figure 4, almost all respondents (95%) from cities with coordinating entities reported advocating for funding to deliver afterschool services and working to build public will to increase public attention and support (93%). In addition, a large majority facilitated system-building by developing a shared vision and goals for afterschool access, attendance and/or quality (85%), and set short-term objectives (85%). In many cities, the coordinating entity developed or adopted quality standards and frameworks (88%), and monitored adherence to them (70%). Other services to members included information-sharing about afterschool providers in the network, best practices, and training and/or funding opportunities (93%). Many offered professional development to improve program quality (90%). Fewer coordinating entities raised funds (51%), re-granted funds to providers (58%), or offered technical assistance to help afterschool programs develop and diversity funding (65%).

Consistent with findings that more cities had implemented quality standards or frameworks than had developed data systems (Table 6), more coordinating entities (88%) developed and/or adopted quality standards or frameworks than collected and reviewed attendance data (54%). (See Figure 4.)



4.3 Common Data Systems

As shown in Table 6, approximately one-third of respondents (34%) reported that their city or coordinating entity either has or managed a common data system for collecting data about children’s participation in afterschool programs.

There is a statistically significant association between mayor/city manager commitment to coordination and having a common data system. Forty-four percent of cities with moderate or high mayoral commitment to coordination had a common data system compared to 20% of cities with no or low mayoral commitment. (See Table 10.)


Table 10. Commitment of the mayor/city manager to afterschool coordination by the city having a common data system

Common data system	Not at all or slightly committed	Moderately or highly committed
Yes	4 (20%)	18 (44%)
No	16 (80%)	23 (56%)
Total	20 (100%)	41 (100%)

Note: Five “don’t know” responses were excluded from the analysis. (p=.068)


Types of Data Collected

As shown in Figure 5, in cities with common data systems (n=23) more than 80% have data that include attendance, enrollment, demographics (e.g., age, sex, income, or neighborhood) and/or children and youth outcomes. School data are integrated into the system in 68% of these systems and program categories offered by the provider (e.g., science, art, tutoring, recreation) are collected in 65% of these systems. Data about program quality are collected by 52% of these systems.



Ways Data are Used

Figure 6 displays the percentage of cities that use data collected in the common data system a “moderate amount” or a “great deal” for selected purposes. The largest percent (74%) use these data for provider evaluation or self-assessment, however, fewer (52%) report using these data for program quality improvement. Sixty-one percent reported that they use the data a moderate amount or a great deal for advocacy purposes. Data are used to promote policy change in 41% of cities. (All frequencies are presented in Table A-4.)



Other Data Collected and Shared

Close to two-thirds of all survey respondents (63%) reported that public schools give afterschool providers information about individual students such as grades and school attendance. (See Table 11.) Thus even when there may be no coordinated data system, public schools share student information with afterschool providers.

Table 11. Provider access to school information about individual students

Data provided by school	Number	Percent
Yes	42	63%
No	20	30%
Don't know	5	8%
Total	67	101%

Almost half of cities and/or coordinating entities (46%) had assessed demand for afterschool programs across neighborhoods in the past five years. (See Table 12.)

Table 12. Assessment of demand for afterschool programs across neighborhoods

Assessment conducted	Number	Percent
Yes	32	46%
No	29	42%
Don't know	8	12%
Total	69	100%

Almost two-thirds (64%) of cities or coordinating entities compile lists of all afterschool programs and make such information available to the public in either written form or on the internet; 36% do not have

such lists. Of the 59 respondents who answered both questions about the format of the lists, 42% have both written and electronic lists, 10% have only electronic lists, and 8% have only written lists for consumers. Two respondents (3%) had written lists but did not know whether the city had an electronic list.

Program locators are online tools that facilitate searches for afterschool programs. In addition to information about location, these tools can also provide information about the current availability of open slots, fees, and program quality. Thirty-eight percent of all respondents reported that their cities maintained an online program locator, 52% did not have an online program locator, and 10% did not know. Of the 26 cities with a program locator, in 81% of cities, these tools provide families with information about costs; in 46% of cities, program locators provide information about availability (e.g., open slots); and in 19% of cities, the tools offer information about program quality.

4.4 Quality Standards and Assessment

As noted earlier, 62% of cities that coordinate afterschool programs use a common set of quality standards or a quality framework for afterschool programs. (See Table 6). Fifty-nine percent of respondents reported that their city or a coordinating entity uses a quality assessment tool. (See Table 13.)

Table 13. Number and percentage of cities using a quality assessment tool

City uses quality assessment tool	Number	Percent
Yes	41	59%
No	27	39%
Don't know	1	1%
Total	69	100%

Fifty-seven percent of cities used both a common set of quality standards or framework and a quality assessment tool.¹² (See Table 14.)

Table 14. Number and percentage of cities using standards/framework and/or a quality assessment tool

Combinations involving use of standards/frameworks and assessment tools	Number	Percent
Both quality standards/framework and assessment tool	39	57%
Standards/framework, only	4	6%
Quality assessment tool, only	2	3%
No standards, framework or tool	23	34%
Total	68	100%

Note: One respondent who answered “don’t know” to both questions is excluded from this analysis.


Mayor/city manager commitment to coordination is significantly associated with using quality standards or a quality framework. Eighty-one percent of cities with mayors/city managers who were perceived as highly committed to afterschool coordination have quality standards or frameworks. (See Table 15.) A smaller percentage of cities where leadership was moderately committed (44%), slightly committed (62%), or not at all committed (50%) have quality frameworks.

Table 15. Commitment of the mayor/city manager to afterschool coordination by use of quality standards or a quality framework

Quality standards or quality framework	Not at all committed	Slightly committed	Moderately committed	Highly committed
Yes	4 (50%)	8 (62%)	8 (44%)	21 (81%)
No	4 (50%)	5 (39%)	10 (56%)	5 (19%)
Total	8 (100%)	13 (101%)	18 (100%)	26 (100%)

Note: One “don’t know” response was excluded from the analysis.
($p=.079$)

As shown in Figure 7, 84% or more of the cities that have standards, frameworks, or assessment tools use them for multiple purposes including identifying areas where providers can improve program quality, planning, building consensus about program quality, identifying priority areas for professional development, and measuring program improvement. Fewer respondents reported using quality standards, frameworks or assessment tools to make funding decisions or to inform parents about the quality of programs.



5. OTHER ASPECTS OF COORDINATION—COMMITMENT OF CITY LEADERSHIP, FUNDING, AND RESOURCE-SHARING

5.1 Commitment of Mayors and City Managers to Coordination

Two-thirds of cities had mayors or city managers thought to be moderately or highly committed to afterschool program coordination. City leadership was characterized as slightly committed in one-fifth (21%) of cities and not at all committed in 12%. (See Table 16.)

Table 16. Level of commitment of current mayor or city manager to afterschool coordination

Level of commitment	Number	Percent
Not at all committed	8	12%
Slightly committed	14	21%
Moderately committed	18	27%
Highly committed	26	39%
Total	66	99%

In 50% of cities, a representative from the office of the mayor or city manager, or their appointee, was active in the afterschool coordination effort. (See Table 17.)

Table 17. Number and percentage of cities where mayor or city manager appointee is active in the afterschool coordination effort

Active in coordination effort	Number	Percent
Yes	34	50%
No	25	37%
Don't know	6	9%
Not Applicable	3	4%
Total	68	100%


Representatives participated on afterschool coordination steering committees (77%); served as liaisons between the coordinating entity and other community partners (64%); and provided staff support to its coordinating entity or its board (47%). (See Table 18.)

Table 18. Number and percentage of cities with a representative from the office of the mayor or city manager and their selected roles

Representative's role	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Participate in steering or advisory committee	26 (77%)	5 (15%)	3 (9%)	34 (101%)
Provide support to its coordinating entity or its board	16 (47%)	14 (41%)	4 (12%)	34 (100%)
Serve as liaison between the coordinating entity and other community partners	21 (64%)	8 (24%)	4 (12%)	33 (100%)

5.2 Funding

As displayed in Figure 8, 76% of cities allocated public funding for afterschool programs and transportation for afterschool programs (25%), both of direct benefit to children. Forty-one percent of cities used public funding for professional development. Fewer cities provided funding for coordination (29%), and for two key components of coordinated systems—developing or strengthening a common data system (21%) and supporting an intermediary (20%). In 32% of cities, public funding was used for marketing and communications and in 31% of cities, public funding was allocated for research and evaluation. (See also Table A-5.)




A small percentage of cities that have intermediaries and common data systems receive city funding to support them. Twenty-six percent of cities with an intermediary allocate public funds for intermediary organizations and 32% of cities that have a common data system allocate funding for that purpose.

Regarding availability of city funding specifically for afterschool coordination over the past five years, respondents reported there has been no city funding for afterschool coordination in 25% of cities. A third of cities (34%) experienced city funding decreases and in another 24% levels have remained steady. City funding for coordination increased in nine percent of cities. (See Table 19.)

Table 19. Number and percentage of cities with various levels of funding for coordination over the past 5 years

Funding levels	Number	Percent
Decreased	23	34%
Remained the same	16	24%
Increased	6	9%
Don't know	5	8%
No city funding for coordination	17	25%
Total	67	100%

There is a statistically significant correlation between mayoral commitment to afterschool program coordination and funding levels for coordination over the past five years. In two-thirds (67%) of the cities where mayors were characterized as highly committed, funding had remained stable or increased. In all but one of the cities where mayors were characterized as moderately committed, funding had generally decreased over the past five years. In cities with mayors that were characterized as not at all or slightly committed, city funding was not allocated, had decreased, or remained the same. (See Figure 9.)



$p=.000$

5.3 Resource- and Information-Sharing between Schools and Afterschool Providers

Almost all of the respondents (96%) reported that schools and afterschool providers share buildings. Sixty-two percent of respondents indicated that school and afterschool programs plan jointly and 52% share staff. Forty-nine percent of respondents indicated that school and afterschool providers share data as specified in data sharing agreements. As previously noted, schools also share information about individual students (e.g., school attendance or grades) directly with afterschool providers. (See Table 11.)

6. CONCLUSIONS

6.1 Summary

Afterschool programs offer children opportunities for growth, learning, and fun. To improve these programs and build sustainability, The Wallace Foundation has embarked on work to help cities coordinate government agencies, funders, afterschool providers and other stakeholders seeking to improve the quality and availability of afterschool programs.¹³ This first-ever examination of afterschool coordination and system-building answers a set of questions about the prevalence of coordination, the three key components of afterschool systems, and leadership and funding. The findings offer insights into whether and how large cities across the United States are implementing strategies to coordinate afterschool programs and if there are any differences among cities of different sizes and with different proportions of children living in poverty.

This study found that citywide coordination of afterschool is going nationwide. A majority of large cities have taken steps to coordinate afterschool programs administered by different auspices. It is estimated that between 59% and 77% of cities are coordinating afterschool programs. However, the coordination is not always comprehensive. Less than one-quarter of the cities implemented all three of the components considered to be fundamental to coordination and two-thirds implemented one or two components. Sixty-two percent of cities used quality standards or frameworks and 60% had a coordinating entity. Half as many cities (34%) implemented a common data system. Mayoral support and commitment is an important factor associated with having a common data system and quality standards but support does not necessarily mean that the city provides funding for implementation of these components. City size does not appear to be associated with overall coordination or implementation of the three key components. A higher percentage of cities with high rates of children living in poverty had two or three of the key components compared with cities having lower child poverty rates.

6.2 Discussion

While citywide afterschool coordination is going nationwide, there are still many cities that either have no coordination or, if there is coordination, individuals whom one would expect to know about coordination are unaware of it. Support and encouragement from afterschool organizations and funders have the potential to increase the number of cities that undertake coordination strategies, particularly three key components identified by The Wallace Foundation as essential to building sustainable, coordinated afterschool systems.

Of the three key components, implementing common data systems that can measure access and participation appears to be the most challenging. Finding ways to garner the support of city leadership and following up with technical support, funding, and other resources to cities may be a useful strategy.

The absence of an association between city size and implementation of coordination components suggests that coordination can happen in large cities of various sizes and complexity; data from this study's sample indicate that size need not be a barrier to afterschool coordination and smaller cities do not necessarily have an advantage. It is important to note in considering these findings that of the 29 cities where a knowledgeable contact could not be identified, 27 were from cities with populations under 500,000.

Afterschool programming is especially important for children in low income families. Afterschool coordination is considered to be a strategy that promotes increased participation of children in high-quality programs. The positive association between coordination and high child poverty rates suggests that system-building is occurring where there is high need. Support and technical assistance should continue to be targeted to cities with high child poverty levels.

The findings of this study, especially those on prevalence of coordination and implementation of the three key coordination components, can serve as baseline against which future achievements in citywide afterschool coordination can be compared. If the study is repeated in five years, it will be important to see if citywide coordination is continuing to grow and interesting to see if the 13% of large cities that are in the initial process of planning to coordinate afterschool programs have taken steps to implement their plans. It will also be interesting to learn if a higher percentage of cities are implementing all three of the key components and how they are functioning. In sum, this study found that solid steps have been undertaken in large cities to coordinate programs across sectors. If this trend continues and afterschool coordination truly goes nationwide, more children will have access to and participate in high-quality afterschool programs.

ENDNOTES

¹ Susan J. Bodilly, Jennifer Sloan McCombs et al., *Hours of Opportunity: Lessons from Five Cities on Building Systems to Improve After-School, Summer School, and Other Out-Of-School Time Programs*, 2010, iii. Available on www.wallacefoundation.org

² *ibid.*, 74.

³ Spooner, B.S., Russell, L., et al. *Municipal Leadership for Afterschool: Citywide Approaches Spreading Across the Country*. National League of Cities: Washington, DC 2011. Available on <http://www.nlc.org/find-city-solutions/institute-for-youth-education-and-families/afterschool/municipal-leadership-for-afterschool-citywide-approaches-spreading-across-the-country>

⁴ Population size obtained from the 2010 U.S. Census

⁵ Alternate cities were contacted in the order in which they were drawn.

⁶ The Wallace Foundation provided a list of grantees funded by the second round of the Citywide OST System-Building Initiative. The National League of Cities (NLC) provided a list of members of the Afterschool Policy Advisors Network (APAN) as well as contact information for other members they thought could be of assistance identifying a potential respondent. The Principal Associate of the NLC's Institute for Youth, Education and Families sent an e-mail to APAN members and contacts from states with cities in the sample, informing them about the study and encouraging their assistance identifying respondents if researchers called with requests for help. Additionally, FHI 360 research staff conducted internet searches for sample cities using keywords such as "afterschool coordination," "afterschool services," and "afterschool programs." Staff also reached out to state contacts listed on the Afterschool Alliance website. When these sources failed to provide useful leads, staff contacted the local United Way and city or county school districts.

⁷ If researchers were unsuccessful in contacting a knowledgeable respondent for the city in the target sample of 76 or if a knowledgeable respondent reported that the city did not coordinate afterschool programs, cities on the list of alternates were contacted in the order they were randomly drawn. The team of researchers worked simultaneously calling city representatives. When the target of 76 cities with coordination was reached, the team stopped making calls. A respondent in one city returned our phone call after recruiting ended and they were included in the sample bringing the total who reported coordination to 77.

⁸ Table A-1 in Appendix 1 displays the number of cities that were in the original sample and number of alternates, by city size.

⁹ The number of organizations or agencies being coordinated ranged from 1-700.

¹⁰ Throughout the report, totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

¹¹ Of the 10 cities where no key coordination component was reported: 8 worked to improve program quality; 7 worked to increase student participation; 7 brought key stakeholders together to address improved access, student participation, and/or quality; 6 formed a task force or steering committee to increase coordination and supports; 5 worked to make afterschool programs more accessible to students; 4 developed a goal or mission statement; 3 implemented cross-sector leadership; 2 conducted a needs assessment; 1 conducted or used market research; and 1 reported developing a common data system.

¹² The term "quality standards" refers to an afterschool system's formal definition of the elements that constitute quality afterschool programming. The term "quality framework" refers to the set of policies and practices an afterschool system puts in place to ensure quality afterschool programming. The term "quality assessment tool" refers to an instrument a city, funder, intermediary, or provider uses to measure the quality of an afterschool program. Quality assessment tools can be used to: evaluate program features; determine the extent to which a program demonstrates the elements of quality or adheres to established quality standards; and/or identify the improvement needs of program providers.

¹³ <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/after-school/Pages/default.aspx>

APPENDIX A: Appendix Tables

Tables referenced in the report

- A-1. Number and percentage of cities with afterschool coordination drawn in the original sample and list of alternates
- A-2. Afterschool coordination status by city size (N=100)
- A-3. Afterschool coordination status in all cities where contacts were attempted
- A-4. Extent to which data were used for selected purposes
- A-5. Number and percentage of cities that allocated public funding for afterschool program and coordination
- A-6. Mayor/city manager considered a stakeholder by city size

Tables not referenced in the report

- A-7. Afterschool coordination status by child poverty rate
- A-8. Number of key coordination components by city size
- A-9. Number of key coordination components by commitment of mayor/city manager to afterschool coordination
- A-10. Mayor/city manager considered a stakeholder by child poverty rate
- A-11. Number and percentage of cities having a coordinating entity by city size
- A-12. Number and percentage of cities having a coordinating entity by child poverty rate
- A-13. Number and percentage of cities having a coordinating entity by mayor/city manager commitment to coordination
- A-14. Number and percentage of cities having a common data system by city size
- A-15. Number and percentage of cities having a common data system by child poverty rate
- A-16. Number and percentage of cities with quality standards or frameworks by city size
- A-17. Number and percentage of cities with quality standards or frameworks by child poverty rate
- A-18. Level of commitment of current mayor/city manager to afterschool coordination by city size
- A-19. Level of commitment of current mayor/city manager to afterschool coordination by child poverty rate

Table A-1. Number and percentage of cities with afterschool coordination drawn in the original sample and list of alternates

	Sample	Alternate	Total
Population group			
100,000-249,999	16 (59%)	11 (41%)	27(100%)
250,000-499,999	12 (55%)	10 (45%)	22 (100%)
500,000-749,000	13 (87%)	2 (13%)	15 (100%)
750,000 and over	9 (69%)	4 (31%)	13 (100%)
Total	50 (65%)	27 (35%)	77 (100%)

Table A-2. Afterschool coordination status by city size (N=100)

Coordination status	100,000 – 249,999	250,000 – 499,999	500,000 – 749,999	750,000 and above
1. Neither coordinating afterschool programs nor planning to do so	6 (15%)	3 (10%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)
2. In the initial process of planning to coordinate afterschool programs but no coordination strategies have been implemented	6 (15%)	5 (17%)	2 (11%)	0 (0%)
3. Some coordination strategies have been implemented	11 (28%)	12 (40%)	8 (44%)	7 (54%)
4. City has a highly coordinated approach to afterschool programs	16 (41%)	10 (33%)	7 (39%)	6 (46%)
Total	39 (99%)	30 (100%)	18 (100%)	13 (100%)

$p=.581$

Table A-3. Afterschool coordination status in all cities where contacts were attempted

Coordination status	Number	Percent
1. Neither coordinating afterschool programs nor planning to do so	39	30%
2. In the initial process of planning to coordinate afterschool programs but no coordination strategies have been implemented	13	10%
3. Some coordination strategies have been implemented	38	29%
4. City has a highly coordinated approach to afterschool programs	39	30%
Total	129	(99%)

Table A-4. Extent to which data were used for selected purposes

Purposes	Not at all	A little	Moderate amount	A great deal	Total
Planning	3 (13%)	7 (30%)	0 (0%)	13 (57%)	23 (100%)
Daily program management	3 (13%)	7 (30%)	3 (13%)	10 (44%)	23 (100%)
Quality improvement	4 (17%)	7 (30%)	0 (0%)	12 (52%)	23 (99%)
Program funding	5 (23%)	4 (18%)	4 (18%)	9 (41%)	22 (100%)
Provider evaluation or self-assessment	4 (17%)	2 (9%)	3 (13%)	14 (61%)	23 (100%)
Policy change	4 (17%)	10 (44%)	6 (26%)	3 (13%)	23 (100%)
Advocacy	2 (9%)	7 (30%)	6 (26%)	8 (35%)	23 (100%)

Table A-5. Number and percentage of cities that allocated public funding for afterschool programs and coordination

Purposes	Yes	No	Don't know	Not applicable	Total
Afterschool programs for children	51 (76%)	13 (19%)	3 (5%)	0 (0%)	67 (100%)
Professional development & other support and improvement efforts	27 (41%)	33 (50%)	4 (6%)	2 (3%)	66 (100%)
Marketing and communications	21 (32%)	35 (53%)	9 (14%)	1 (2%)	66 (101%)
Research and evaluation	20 (31%)	37 (57%)	7 (11%)	1 (2%)	65 (101%)
Coordination of providers	19 (29%)	39 (59%)	6 (9%)	2 (3%)	66 (100%)
Transportation for afterschool programs	17 (25%)	41 (61%)	7 (10%)	2 (3%)	67 (99%)
Developing/strengthening common data system	14 (21%)	47 (71%)	4 (6%)	1 (2%)	66 (100%)
Intermediary organization	13 (20%)	43 (65%)	7 (11%)	3 (5%)	66 (101%)

Table A-6. Mayor/city manager considered a stakeholder by city size

Mayor/city manager considered a stakeholder	100,000 – 249,999	250,000 – 499,999	500,000 – 749,999	750,000 and above	Total
Yes	13 (72%)	10 (53%)	12 (80%)	5 (56%)	40 (66%)
No	5 (28%)	9 (47%)	3 (20%)	4 (44%)	21 (34%)
Total	18 (100%)	19 (100%)	15 (100%)	9 (100%)	61(100%)

$p=.315$

Table A-7. Afterschool coordination status by child poverty rate

Coordination status	Child poverty <30%	Child poverty ≥ 30%
1. Neither coordinating afterschool programs nor planning to do so	7 (13%)	3 (7%)
2. In the initial process of planning to coordinate afterschool programs but no coordination strategies have been implemented	9 (16%)	4 (9%)
3. Some coordination strategies have been implemented	20 (36%)	18 (41%)
4. City has a highly coordinated approach to afterschool programs	20 (36%)	19 (43%)
Total	56 (101%)	44 (100%)

p=.523

Table A-8. Number of key coordination components by city size

Number of coordination components	100,000 – 249,999	250,000 – 499,999	500,000 – 749,999	750,000 and above
None	4 (17%)	4 (19%)	1 (7%)	1 (10%)
1	10 (44%)	6 (29%)	6 (40%)	4 (40%)
2	5 (22%)	6 (29%)	4 (27%)	3 (30%)
3	4 (17%)	5 (24%)	4 (27%)	2 (20%)
Total	23 (100%)	21 (100%)	15 (101%)	10 (100%)

p=.978

Table A-9. Number of key coordination components by commitment of mayor/city manager to afterschool coordination

Number of coordination components	Not at all committed	Slightly committed	Moderately committed	Highly committed
None	2 (25%)	2 (14%)	4 (22%)	2 (8%)
1	4 (50%)	7 (50%)	6 (33%)	7 (27%)
2	2 (25%)	2 (14%)	5 (28%)	8 (31%)
3	0 (0%)	3 (21%)	3 (17%)	9 (35%)
Total	8 (100%)	14 (99%)	18 (100%)	26 (101%)

p=.474

Table A-10. Mayor/city manager considered a stakeholder by child poverty rate

Mayor/city manager is a stakeholder	Child poverty <30%	Child poverty ≥ 30%
Yes	20 (71%)	20 (61%)
No	8 (29%)	13 (39%)
Total	28 (100%)	33(100%)

p=.375

Table A-11. Number and percentage of cities having a coordinating entity by city size

Coordinating entity	100,000 – 249,999	250,000 – 499,999	500,000 – 749,999	750,000 and above
Yes	13 (59%)	12 (57%)	11 (73%)	5 (50%)
No	9 (41%)	9 (43%)	4 (26%)	5 (50%)
Total	22 (100%)	21 (100%)	15 (99%)	10 (100%)

$p = .658$

Table A-12. Number and percentage of cities having a coordinating entity by child poverty rate

Coordinating entity	Child poverty <30%	Child poverty ≥ 30%
Yes	18 (53%)	23 (68%)
No	16 (47%)	11 (32%)
Total	34 (100%)	34 (100%)

$p = .215$

Table A-13. Number and percentage of cities having a coordinating entity by mayor/city manager commitment to coordination

Coordinating entity	Not at all committed	Slightly committed	Moderately committed	Highly committed
Yes	4 (50%)	8 (57%)	12 (67%)	16 (62%)
No	4 (50%)	6 (43%)	6 (33%)	10 (39%)
Total	8 (100%)	14 (100%)	18 (100%)	26 (101%)

$p = .865$

Table A-14. Number and percentage of cities having a common data system by city size

Common data system	100,000 – 249,999	250,000 – 499,999	500,000 – 749,999	750,000 and above
Yes	6 (27%)	8 (38%)	6 (40%)	3 (30%)
No	15 (68%)	11 (52%)	9 (60%)	5 (50%)
Don't know	1 (4%)	2 (10%)	0 (0%)	2 (20%)
Total	22 (99%)	21 (100%)	15 (100%)	10 (100%)

$p = .561$

Table A-15. Number and percentage of cities having a common data system by child poverty rate

Common data system	Child poverty <30%	Child poverty ≥ 30%
Yes	9 (27%)	14 (42%)
No	21 (62%)	19 (56%)
Don't know	4 (12%)	1 (3%)
Total	34 (101%)	34 (101%)

$p = .225$

Table A-16. Number and percentage of cities with quality standards or frameworks by city size

Quality standards	100,000 – 249,999	250,000 – 499,999	500,000 – 749,999	750,000 and above
Yes	13 (57%)	13 (62%)	9 (60%)	8 (80%)
No	10 (44%)	8 (38%)	6 (40%)	1 (10%)
Don't know	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)
Total	23 (101%)	21 (100%)	15 (100%)	10 (100%)

p=.182

Table A-17. Number and percentage of cities with quality standards or frameworks by child poverty rate

Quality standards or frameworks	Child poverty <30%	Child poverty ≥ 30%
Yes	18 (51%)	25 (73%)
No	16 (46%)	9 (27%)
Don't know	1 (3%)	0 (0%)
Total	35 (100%)	34 (100%)

p=.130

Table A-18. Level of commitment of current mayor or city manager to afterschool coordination by city size

Level of commitment	100,000 – 249,999	250,000 – 499,999	500,000 – 749,999	750,000 and above
Not at all committed	2 (9%)	2 (10%)	3 (21%)	1 (10%)
Slightly committed	5 (23%)	4 (20%)	1 (7%)	4 (40%)
Moderately committed	7 (32%)	6 (30%)	3 (21%)	2 (20%)
Highly committed	8 (36%)	8 (40%)	7 (50%)	3 (30%)
Total	22 (100%)	20 (100%)	14 (99%)	10 (100%)

p=.784

Table A-19. Level of commitment of current mayor or city manager to afterschool coordination by child poverty rate

Level of commitment	Child poverty <30%	Child poverty ≥ 30%
Not at all committed	6 (18%)	2 (6%)
Slightly committed	4 (12%)	10 (30%)
Moderately committed	11 (33%)	7 (21%)
Highly committed	12 (36%)	14 (42%)
Total	33 (99%)	33 (99%)

p=.132

APPENDIX B: AFTERSCHOOL COORDINATION SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Wallace Afterschool Survey - Online Version

Introductory statement

The Wallace Foundation, in partnership with the National League of Cities, has asked FHI 360 to conduct a telephone survey of city leaders and administrators who may be knowledgeable about citywide afterschool program coordination. Because afterschool coordination (system building) is receiving increasing national attention, this survey is designed to gather information about efforts large cities are making to improve quality and increase coordination and supports among public and/or private afterschool providers. The study findings will help give cities around the nation crucial information on whether and how to invest in strengthening afterschool coordination. The findings will also serve as a baseline for a follow-up study in 3-5 years.

Your city is one of 75 cities with populations over 100,000 that was randomly selected into our sample. Your participation is voluntary and all of your responses will be kept in strictest confidence. Only the research team will know your individual responses, as well as whether or not you participated.

At the end of this survey, we will provide a list of five charities serving children and youth. You can select one that will receive an anonymous \$100 donation in appreciation for your participation in this study.

To minimize the risk of breach of confidentiality, your information will be kept in a secure location. Findings will be reported only in aggregate and no individual cities will be identified. If you do not choose to participate, you will not be penalized in any way.

There are no right or wrong answers to the questions and you may skip any questions you do not want to answer. If you do not complete the survey in one sitting, you can return to it as long as you do not click the "done" button at the end of the survey. However, you must complete the survey on the same computer you used to start it, or your responses will not be saved.

If you have any questions before you begin the survey, please e-mail the study director, Ivan Charner, at icharner@fhi360.org.

* 1. Are you willing to participate?

- Yes
- No: Thank you for your time.

2. What is the name of your city and state?

City:

State:

Section 1

This section of the survey contains some general questions about afterschool program coordination in your city.

Wallace Afterschool Survey - Online Version

3. Who are the stakeholders participating in the coordination of afterschool programs in your city? Please answer "yes," or "no" for each type of stakeholder on the following list.

	Yes	No
a. mayor or city manager	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. city agency(ies)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. school superintendent or designated school administrator	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. local philanthropy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. nonprofit organization(s)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. afterschool provider(s)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. public library	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4. Which of the following coordination strategies and activities have happened in your city? Again, please answer "yes" or "no" for each.

	Yes	No
a. formed a task force or steering committee to increase coordination and supports	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. brought key stakeholders together to address improved access, student participation and/or quality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. implemented cross-sector leadership	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. developed a goal or mission statement about afterschool program coordination	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. conducted a needs assessment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. conducted or used market research	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. worked to make afterschool programs more accessible to students (e.g., program location or transportation)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h. worked to increase student participation (i.e., frequency or duration)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i. worked to improve program quality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
j. developed a common data system for afterschool programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

5. Which of the following school grade levels are served by afterschool programs run by providers that are being coordinated in your city? (Check all that apply.)

- a. elementary
- b. middle grades
- c. high school

6. Do schools and other afterschool providers in your city coordinate afterschool programs in any of the following ways? (Check all that apply.)

- a. share buildings
- b. share staff
- c. plan jointly
- d. share data as specified in data sharing agreements

Wallace Afterschool Survey - Online Version

7. In addition to afterschool programs, does your city's coordination efforts include organizations or agencies that provide: (Check all that apply.)

- a. summer programs
- b. other expanded learning opportunities (e.g., Saturday or vacation programs)

8. In total, approximately how many afterschool provider organizations or agencies are being coordinated in the city? [I am only referring to organizations and agencies, rather than the multiple sites they may have.]

of organizations or agencies

9. Approximately what percentage of afterschool organizations or agencies in your city does this represent?

- 0-25%
- 26-50%
- 51-75%
- 76-100%

Section 2. Organizational Entity

The next set of questions are about the coordinating entity responsible for afterschool coordination in your city.

10. Some cities identify a coordinating entity to facilitate afterschool program coordination, for example, by convening meetings, raising funds, addressing quality, and developing common data systems. Does your city have a coordinating entity to facilitate the work of afterschool program coordination?

- a. Yes
- b. No

11. What is the name of the coordinating entity?

Wallace Afterschool Survey - Online Version

12. Where is the organizational home of this coordinating entity?

- a. mayor's office
- b. city agency or agencies (What are the agency names?)
- c. school system
- d. intermediary organization or other nonprofit
- e. a multi-organization partnership or collaboration

City agency name(s) per response "b."

13. What percentage of the director's time is officially devoted to specific responsibilities for afterschool program coordination and improvement?

- none
- 1-25%
- 26-50%
- 51-75%
- 76-100%
- There is no director.

Wallace Afterschool Survey - Online Version

14. We would like to know more about the responsibilities of the coordinating entity. Is it the responsibility of the coordinating entity to do any of the following tasks? (Please answer "yes," "no," or "don't know" for each.)

	Yes	No	Don't Know
a. develop a shared vision and goals for afterschool access, attendance, and/or quality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. set short-term objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. share information about afterschool providers in the network, best practice, training and/or funding opportunities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. collect and review attendance data	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. develop or adopt quality standards or a quality framework	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. monitor adherence to quality standards or a quality framework	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. conduct professional development for program providers to improve program quality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h. provide technical assistance to help afterschool programs develop and diversify funding	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i. raise funds for providing grants to afterschool providers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
j. provide grants to afterschool providers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
k. develop multi-year plans	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
l. plan for organizational and financial sustainability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
m. increase public attention and support	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
n. advocate for program funding	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section 3. Common Data Systems

This next set of questions is about common data systems where data about children's participation in afterschool programs are collected from multiple providers and managed collectively. There are also questions about the use of data collected through these systems.

15. Does your city or the coordinating entity have (or manage) a common data system for collecting data about children's participation in afterschool programs?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Wallace Afterschool Survey - Online Version

16. Does the common data system provide information about any of the following? (Please answer "yes," "no," or "don't know" for each.)

	Yes	No	Don't Know
a. attendance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. enrollment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. demographics (e.g., age, sex, income, neighborhood)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. children and youth outcomes (e.g., participation or retention)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. program categories (e.g., science, art, tutoring, or recreation)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. program quality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. school data	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

17. There are many purposes for which data can be used. Please rank the extent to which data collected by the common data system are used for each of the following purposes.

	not at all	a little	a moderate amount	a great deal
a. planning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. daily program management (e.g., slots or bus transportation)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. program quality improvement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. decisions about which afterschool programs will receive funding	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. provider evaluation or self assessment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. policy change	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. advocacy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other (please explain)

18. Do public schools give afterschool providers information about individual students (e.g., school attendance or grades)?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Wallace Afterschool Survey - Online Version

19. Within the last 5 years, has your city or the coordinating entity, assessed the demand for afterschool programs across neighborhoods?

- Yes
 No
 Don't Know

20. Does your city or the coordinating entity compile a list of all afterschool programs and their locations and make it available to the public:

	Yes	No	Don't Know
a. in written form?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. on the internet?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

21. Does your city or the coordinating entity maintain an on-line afterschool program locator?

- Yes
 No
 Don't Know

22. Does the program locator provide families with information about:

- a. program availability (e.g., open slots)
 b. costs
 c. program quality

4. Quality Standards and Assessment

The next few questions are about quality standards, quality frameworks and/or assessment used by your city or the coordinating entity.

23. Does your city or the coordinating entity use a common set of quality standards or a quality framework for afterschool programs?

- Yes
 No
 Don't Know

Wallace Afterschool Survey - Online Version

24. Does your city or the coordinating entity use a quality assessment tool?

- Yes
 No
 Don't Know

25. [If your city or the coordinating agency do not use quality standards, framework or assessment tools - i.e., you answered "no" or "don't know" to the last two question, leave this question blank and skip to the next question.]

How are these standards, frameworks or assessment tools used? Please answer "yes," "no," or "don't know" to each of the following possible uses.)

	Yes	No	Don't Know
a. to build consensus among providers about program quality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. to inform planning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. to identify areas where providers can improve program quality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. to identify priority areas for professional development	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. to measure program improvement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. to make funding decisions based on current program quality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. to provide information to parents	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

5. Leadership and Funding

The final questions on this survey concern leadership and funding related to coordination.

26. How committed to afterschool program coordination is the current mayor or city manager?

- a. not at all committed
 b. slightly committed
 c. moderately committed
 d. highly committed

Wallace Afterschool Survey - Online Version

27. Is a representative from the Office of the Mayor or City Manager or their appointee active in the afterschool coordination effort?

- Yes
 No
 Don't Know
 Not Applicable

28. Does the representative from the Office of the Mayor or City Manager or their appointee do any of the following. (Please answer "yes," "no," or "don't know.")

	Yes	No	Don't Know
a. participate on an afterschool coordination steering committee or advisory committee	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. provide staff support to the afterschool Board or coordinating entity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. serve as liaison between the coordinating entity and other community partners	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

29. Does the city government currently allocate funding for any of the following? (Please answer "yes," "no," "don't know," or "not applicable.")

	Yes	No	Don't Know	NA
a. an intermediary	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. afterschool programs for children	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. transportation for afterschool programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. coordination of providers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. developing or strengthening a common data system	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. professional development and other support and improvement efforts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. research and evaluation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h. marketing and communications	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

30. Over the past 5 years, has city funding for afterschool program coordination:

- a. decreased
 b. remained the same
 c. increased
 d. don't know
 e. The city has not funded afterschool coordination in the last 5 years.

Wallace Afterschool Survey - Online Version

Charity Contribution

31. Thank you very much for taking the time to provide us with information about your city's afterschool program coordination efforts. As we mentioned earlier, in appreciation for your time, we would like to make a \$100 contribution to one of 5 charities serving children and youth. Please let me know which of the following charities you would like the donation to support.

- a. **Afterschool Alliance** - engages public will to increase public and private investment in quality afterschool program initiatives at the national, state, and local levels.
- b. **Reading is Fundamental** - motivates children (0-8) to read by engaging children, parents and community.
- c. **Dana Farber Cancer Center** - provides treatment and conducts research to eradicate cancer in children and adults
- d. **Big Brothers/Big Sisters** - a mentoring network providing children facing adversity with strong, professionally supported one-on-one relationships with adults.
- e. **National Center for Children in Poverty** - a public policy center dedicated to promoting the economic security, health, and well-being of America's low-income families and children.
- f. No contribution

32. Do you have any questions or comments for me?

If you have questions later, please feel free to e-mail the study director, Ivan Charner, at icharner@fhi360.org.