BUILDING QUALITY IN SUMMER LEARNING PROGRAMS: APPROACHES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Brenda McLaughlin
Sarah Pitcock
*National Summer
Learning Association*

A white paper commissioned by
The Wallace Foundation

NATIONAL
SUMMER
LEARNING
ASSOCIATION

The Wallace Foundation®

Supporting ideas.
Sharing solutions.
Expanding opportunities.®

Building Quality in Summer Learning Programs:

Approaches and Recommendations

Brenda McLaughlin and Sarah Pitcock
National Summer Learning Association

September 2009

Executive Summary

As a field, summer programs vary widely on a number of dimensions, including the settings in which they take place, the operators of the programs, the content or focus of the activities and the target population. Although diversity can be viewed positively because it allows families to individualize the summer experiences of their children, it also has some drawbacks. Most significantly, the range in summer options often means a deep inequality in the daily experiences of higher- and lower-income youth. While some youth spend the summer studying abroad entrenched in cultural learning experiences, others may pass the time watching television or simply hanging out.

For low-income, urban families, cost and proximity are frequently cited as primary considerations in selecting a summer program for their children. These considerations often narrow the realistic options for summer programming. In addition, information about summer programs is rarely aggregated at the community level, making programs difficult to find. Four types of operators: schools, parks and recreation agencies, child care centers and community-based and faith-based organizations, typically offer summer programming targeted to disadvantaged youth. Among these four operator types, access to quality supports—for curriculum, staffing, standards of practice and tools to assess quality—varies based on conditions of funding, the focus of the program, and whether or not the program is connected to an intermediary or national umbrella organization .

For example, schools may run summer programs that have different purposes and funding streams. A remedial summer school program funded through federal Title I dollars probably relies on school-year quality supports to inform its programming (e.g. traditional curriculum, teacher training provided during the school year, state education standards). However, a school-run summer enrichment program that includes community partners and is funded through the federal 21st Century Community Learning Centers program is more likely to seek quality supports both within the school and from the community (e.g. curriculum developed for out-of-school time programming, targeted joint training for teachers and youth development professionals, afterschool standards of practice). This example illustrates that, even within a specific operator type, access to quality supports varies.

There is also significant variation among operators in how they access resources and support staff to achieve quality. For example:

- In some Parks and Recreation programs, an organizational focus on sports and play leads to hiring younger staff that may be skilled in their sport but who generally lack an education or youth development background.
- Community-based organizations (CBOs) and faith-based organizations (FBOs) that are connected to national umbrella organizations or local intermediaries often have better access to quality supports (standards, professional development) through that connection, while other "disconnected" CBOs may struggle to fund and self-select quality supports in the marketplace.
- Although child care agencies are regulated by the state in order to receive and maintain licensure, it is difficult to determine access to quality supports. This is due primarily to the fact that childcare vouchers – a primary mechanism for low-income families to purchase summer care – can be used widely in settings ranging from home care to faith-based organizations to large national agencies (e.g. YMCAs).

Analysis of quality supports by operator type, focus of the program and connectivity identifies areas of need and logical entry points for improvement. More importantly, it reveals an overall dearth of quality supports focused specifically on programs that operate in the summer. Whereas the afterschool field has benefited from a dedicated research and funding focus for over a decade, the summer learning field is only recently emerging as distinct in out-of-school time. As such, the field has yet to embrace a unified vision for quality across diverse settings. Work is needed to document the indicators of quality in summer programs and to design and entrench professional and programmatic standards and tools that fit the vision for quality summer learning.

The authors recommend several action steps to help program operators access resources and achieve quality programming:

1. Adapt out-of-school time curriculum for summer
2. Identify and validate baseline quality standards for summer
3. Promote and disseminate quality assessment tools specific to summer
4. Connect summer programs to intermediaries
5. Develop an online clearinghouse of quality supports for summer programming
6. Professionalize staff in the field of out-of-school time and summer learning
7. Communicate a new vision for summer school

An Introduction to Summer Programming

Few nationally representative databases collect any information on summer programs or activities. Those that do use varying terminology (for example, "summer activities" vs. "summer camp") and lack critical information on the focus and intensity of the programs and activities. One estimate suggests that one in four kids participates in some type of summer program[i], though some experts in the field think this may be low as it is likely not inclusive of all types of summer programs. Another estimate focusing solely on schools suggests that about 10% of public school children – or six million kids –attend school-operated programs each summer.[ii] And the American Camp Association estimates that over 11 million youth benefit from a summer camp experience.[iii] [iv] With a school age population (ages 5 – 19) of roughly 63 million,[v] the numbers of youth participating in summer programs is significant.

As a field, summer programs vary widely on a number of dimensions, including the settings in which they take place, the operators of the programs, and the content or focus of the activities. There are many possible explanations for why the summer landscape is so diverse, including: 1) the flexibility afforded by the absence of any structured schooling during the summer months; 2) the assorted needs, preferences, and resources of kids and families; and 3) a complex history that has required summer programs to adapt to contrasting political, ideological and social views about what purpose summers should serve. Although diversity can be viewed positively because it allows families to individualize the summer experiences of their children to meet their specific needs and circumstances, it also has some drawbacks; the most significant being the exacerbated inequality in the daily experiences of higher- and lower-income youth.[vi]

The purpose of this paper is to review broadly the landscape of summer programs while focusing specifically on the resources available to support quality in the types of programs that typically serve youth living in high-poverty urban centers. As you will see, variability in programming is great, access to quality supports differs and more work must be done to identify summer quality standards.

The paper begins by defining what we mean by *summer program*. We then offer a framework, or typology, for understanding the diversity in the field of summer programming. The typology is organized by the dimensions on which summer programs vary most significantly, including operator, programmatic focus, duration, target population, primary funding source, and connections. Finally, we delve more deeply into the resources available to support quality among the program operators who tend to serve large numbers of low-income, urban youth. Schools, child care providers, parks and recreation centers, and community- and faith-based organizations meet this criterion. Based on our exploration of these four types of operators, we put forth recommendations for strengthening summer program quality across diverse settings.

Defining Summer Programs

As stated above, the variability in summer programming is significant. Even defining what a summer program is can be challenging.[vii] At a rudimentary level, a *summer program* can be described as a set of organized activities, taking place during the summer months, designed to meet a specific need or offer youth the opportunity to achieve a specific goal. Yet this definition lacks information about the

parameters that typically set a summer <u>program</u> apart from just a summer <u>activity</u>. To be classified as a *summer program*, the parameters outlined below must be in place:

1. Has an operator responsible for administration, implementation, and finances;
2. Is supported by revenue and employs paid staff (in other words, is *not* an entirely voluntary effort);
3. Operates during the summer months;
4. Targets a specific group of youth to participate;
5. Meets a specific youth or community need;
6. Has one or more youth-centered goals;
7. Has a specific starting and ending time for activities (or, if not, has a rationale for why starting and ending times need to vary in order to meet the need or achieve the goal);[viii] and
8. Offers youth enough exposure to the activities to meet the need or make the goal attainable.

While it is hard to define how much exposure is "enough," we know from the field that present-day summer programs last anywhere from one week to twelve weeks, or the entire length of summer break. And in some cases, summer programs are just one component of a year-round service delivery model. Based on our experience, summer programs that have gone the extra step to evaluate whether or not they have had an impact on youth typically offer 80 hours or more of programming to each young person per summer.

An emerging interest in *summer learning programs,* as a specific subset of summer programs, compels us to define this unique group of summer programs. A *summer learning program* meets all of the above parameters, but is also intentional about building skills, knowledge, attitudes and behaviors that promote academic achievement and healthy development. In areas with high rates of poverty, summer learning programs exist to narrow the achievement gap and increase rates of high school graduation, college entrance, and college completion among low-income and minority youth.

Although the above definitions provide guidance on what constitutes a summer program, there are still many types of programs that meet these parameters. There is also a great variability in the quality of summer programs.

Defining Quality in Summer Programming

To date, research on indicators of quality in out-of-school time has focused primarily on afterschool programs and has borrowed from research in youth development, education and school-age care more broadly.[ix] While the field of summer learning will benefit in the future from an increasing research focus on quality, we are still able to cull features of high quality summer programs from existing research and evaluation data.

Regular attendance in high-quality afterschool and summer programs is associated with a range of positive academic and social developmental outcomes, including improved literacy skills,[x] self esteem and leadership.[xi] Literature on the shared features of effective afterschool programs has pointed to several key components that form the foundation for quality indicators in afterschool and in summer. These features can be divided into two primary categories: process features and structural features[xii]. Process features include an intentional focus on learning;[xiii] a broad array of enrichment opportunities; intentional relationship building;[xiv] opportunities for skill-building and mastery; inclusion of youth voice;[xv] and support for sustainability. Structural indicators of quality include staff to youth ratio,

participation levels, experienced and trained management and staff and years of operation.[xvi] Finally, research in the afterschool field shows us that indicators of quality may vary to meet the needs of diverse programs serving diverse youth.[xvii]

There is also an emerging focus in OST research and practice on strategic partnerships that link school, community and family resources.[xviii] This is a particularly important area of study for summer programs, since the absence of the traditional school day affords community partners the opportunity to collaborate with schools and other agencies in a different way. Anecdotal evidence from providers suggests that meaningful summer partnerships give programs:

- Better access to information about youth and families,
- Greater alignment in content and curriculum,
- More and varied enrichment offerings,
- Unique, yet complementary, staff skill sets and expertise,
- Greater variation in instructional delivery methods, and
- Increased likelihood of positive relationships with youth and families.[xix]

A strong research and funding focus on afterschool in the past decade has led to curriculum and quality assessment tools that fit a fairly widely held vision for what an afterschool program should look like and deliver.[xx] Moreover, some states and cities have the infrastructure to connect afterschool providers and improve quality systemically.[xxi] In comparison, the field of summer programming lacks a unified vision for quality across settings, and accordingly, has fewer resources to support quality in the areas of curriculum, quality assessment, staffing and standards. Research has yet to document the difference between quality in afterschool and quality in the summer, but years of working with programs has shown us that the summer space is distinct from afterschool in areas that directly affect quality, including staff experience and training, program duration and intensity, and management structure.

The National Summer Learning Association is working to unite the spectrum of summer program providers around a common vision for high-quality summer programming, and there are many opportunities for building the capacity of the field to support high quality programs across diverse settings. The Association is currently engaged in a redesign of its quality assessment tools and is drafting National Standards for Summer Learning, aimed to provide diverse programs with a variety of avenues to improve program quality.

A Framework for Understanding Summer Programming

So what does the spectrum of summer programs look like? Below we offer a typology. Summer programs comprise vastly different programs that vary most significantly along the following dimensions:

A. **Operator:** the organization that runs the program (administrative and fiscal authority)
B. **Programmatic focus:** the primary goals and activities offered through the program
C. **Duration:** the average amount of programming available to the typical participant over one summer; also whether the program is designed to serve youth one-time (one summer); or over multiple summers (cohort model; year-round model)
D. **Target population:** the youth served through the program, and whether participation is mandatory or voluntary

E. **Primary Funding Source:** the primary source of revenue for program operations (public or private)
F. **Connections:** whether or not the program is connected to a larger network that influences its quality

All of these dimensions serve as organizing features for a summer program typology. The final dimension – connections – is extraordinarily important to this paper, because it helps us understand how a program conceptualizes quality and how it accesses resources that support quality. *Connections* refers to whether or not a program is connected to or affiliated with a larger network that influences its quality. For example, a local branch of the YMCA is connected to or affiliated with the YMCA of the USA. Similarly, a local summer school is connected to the larger school district, and may be connected to an even larger network of like programs because of its funding stream (for example, summer migrant education programs). These larger networks tend to provide a common core of resources to support quality; and they may also provide the standard for what high quality programming looks like.

Figure 1 provides a typology of the landscape of summer programs. Programs are described using information about what is typical for that type of operator (see footnote below Figure 1 for more information).

Figure 1. TYPOLOGY OF SUMMER PROGRAMS*

Operator	Programmatic Focus	Duration	Target Population	Primary Funding Source**	Examples of Connections that Influence Quality
Schools	Academic development	4-6 weeks	Low-performing students	Government funds (formula and discretionary grants)	21st Century Community Learning Center funding
Community Organizations	Youth and social development	1-12 weeks	Youth in the surrounding community	Private philanthropy	City intermediary, statewide afterschool network
Faith-Based Organizations	Spiritual development; youth and social development	1-12 weeks	Youth in the surrounding community	Individual contributions and private philanthropy	City intermediary, local funding collaborative
Libraries	Literacy development	All summer	Youth in surrounding community	Private philanthropy	Collaborative Summer Reading Program (national consortium of library systems)
Cultural Institutions	Artistic and cultural development	1-6 weeks	Youth in surrounding community	Parent fees	N/A
Colleges and Universities	Athletics; college preparation; academic specialties	1-6 weeks	Varies	Parent fees	N/A
Camps	Outdoor education; youth and social development	1-12 weeks	Varies	Parent fees	American Camp Association Accreditation
Parks & Recreation Centers	Athletics; play; social, artistic and youth development	1-12 weeks	Youth in surrounding community	Parent fees	N/A
Child care Centers	Child development; play; academic and social development	All summer	Youth in surrounding community	Parent fees	National Early Childhood Accreditation Commission
National Youth-Serving Agencies	Youth and social development	1-12 weeks	Varies	Parent fees	YMCA of the USA, Boys and Girls Clubs of America
Other Public Agencies	Varies by agency type (e.g. workforce development; risk prevention)	4-12 weeks	Youth in surrounding community; high-risk youth	Government funds (targeted discretionary grant programs)	National Youth Employment Coalition

*In this typology, we present Operator as the primary organizing feature. All other dimensions (programmatic focus, duration, etc.) are described in terms of what is typical for that type of operator based on the Center's experience and a review of available information. For example, in programmatic focus we use broad generalizations to classify summer programs, and do not include focus areas that diverge from the norm, such as leadership development and service learning; yet these are significant parts of many summer programs.

**For primary funding source, we relied on first-hand knowledge of summer funding collected by the Association for forthcoming publications, and the recently published Wallace Foundation report, *The Cost of Quality Out of School Time*

Programs. Even though in-kind contributions are a large part of nearly every summer program's portfolio, we did not include in-kind resources as a source for this typology.

It's clear that the landscape of summer programs is quite diverse. Much like the programs themselves, supports for program quality – including curriculum, standards, professional development, and quality assessment tools – have also evolved in unequal ways. In some types of summer programs, very clearly defined standards for programming and systems for accountability and quality improvement exist. In other cases, the conversation of program quality has just begun. The remainder of this paper delves into the resources that support program quality for four types of operators who tend to serve large numbers of low-income, urban youth.

Resources to Support Program Quality for Four Types of Operators:
Schools, Parks and Recreation Centers, Child Care Centers, CBOs and FBOs

For young people living in poverty in large urban settings, the considerations of cost and proximity narrow the realistic options for summer programming. In addition, information about summer programs is rarely aggregated at the community level, making programs difficult to find. Typically, four types of operators offer free or low-cost summer programs targeted toward disadvantaged youth[1]:

- o Schools (summer school and other school-run models)
- o Parks and Recreation Centers
- o Child Care Centers (through child care vouchers)
- o Community-based and faith-based organizations

While it is important to understand the resources and opportunities available to support quality programming across these operators, there is a great lack of research focusing on quality in summer programs specifically. What are the characteristics of high quality summer program staff? Who makes decisions regarding curriculum, staff development and quality assessment? What resources (financial, human) are needed to access quality supports across diverse sites?

The Association has combined existing research with years of on-the-ground experience with programs throughout the country to assemble a broad first look at how summer program quality may vary across these four operators. There is still a great deal of knowledge building and field building left to do to define the summer space and its place within communities. However, examining quality illuminates some important opportunities for immediate action.

To begin with, resources to support quality vary among our four program operators. The infrastructure supporting these programs has a definite impact on quality supports, as do institutional/organizational culture (or the lack thereof). Conditions of funding, programmatic focus, and availability of an intermediary or national umbrella for programs also have a great impact on quality supports. For example, programs that focus on academic development are more likely to access supports for program quality than those that focus solely on recreation.

---

[1] We should mention here that libraries also serve large numbers of children in high-poverty areas. We did not include libraries in this paper because summer library reading programs tend to be drop-in programs with fewer overall hours, rather than programs that run every day, several hours per day for a defined number of weeks. The four operators we do discuss sometimes partner with the public libraries to promote summer reading.

We organize our analysis of quality supports among program operators into four broad categories: 1) Staffing/Professional Development, 2) Curriculum, 3) Standards, and 4) Quality Assessment. These categories capture the resources that programs most commonly access to support quality improvement. Throughout the paper, curriculum and quality assessment "snapshots" and staff development case studies will highlight examples of quality resources in the field. The snapshots are research-based resources available to the field. Case studies of specific programs and localities were chosen to draw comparisons of access to quality supports among diverse operators, funding sources and levels of connectivity.

Operator #1: Schools

School-operated summer programs vary in their access to quality supports based on their primary funding source, programmatic focus and connection to a larger network of programs or sites. Across all types of school-operated programs, the trend toward half-day, 4-week programs also influences commitment to quality in the summer. Along these lines, school-operated programs that serve low-income youth generally fall into two primary categories: Traditional Summer School and School-Provider Partnerships.

In general, "traditional" summer school programs, which are largely focused on academic remediation for grade promotion, are a carryover of school year staff, instructional practices and training. Today, most traditional summer school programs operate 4 hours a day for 4-6 weeks and serve only low-performing or special needs students.[xxii] Whether funded by district, state or federal dollars, remedial summer school programs adhere to state standards in reading, language arts and mathematics to inform content and use state assessments to measure achievement. The concept of quality in traditional summer school programs is not different from quality in classrooms during the school year, although there is a growing movement for a new direction in what we consider to be traditional summer school.

When compared to traditional summer school programs, school-operated summer programs that include strong partnerships with outside providers or operators are more likely to focus on summer program quality as distinct from the school year. These partnerships can be based on funding, such as 21st Century Community Learning Centers that operate in the summer; on programmatic focus, such as partnership with a youth development agency or national youth serving organization to provide afternoon enrichment; or both, such as a foundation investment in creating school-community partnerships. These school operated programs tend to have a broader conceptualization of summer quality than traditional summer school programs because of their blended approach to learning and social development, and their connection to a structured network of programs and quality supports.

Staffing/Professional Development
Traditional summer school programs primarily employ certified teachers in the summer and rely on the professional development teachers received during the school year to inform summer instruction. For schools using Title I funding for their summer program, there may be some professional development around the assessments teachers are instructed to use during the session. Any additional orientation for teachers in the summer tends to focus on summer school logistics such as transportation, food and safety.

School-provider partnerships that are connected to a larger network of programs are more likely to access staff training and ongoing professional development to support their summer program. For networks of school-operated programs connected by a common funder, whether public or private,

specific evaluation and quality components proscribed in grants may require specialized training and technical assistance to complete. Perhaps more significantly, school-provider partnerships are often bolstered by connections to state-level administrators or intermediaries who coordinate professional development.

For example, the National Summer Learning Association provides professional development and training through state 21st Century Community Learning Center coordinators and Mott statewide afterschool networks. Training begins with a two-day introductory summer learning institute in the winter or spring that provides program directors with the framework and tools to design a high quality summer program. This session focuses on indicators of quality in summer programs, designing a thematic unit, tying program goals to data collection and planning for evaluation and sustainability of the program. Further training also includes an advanced institute designed to guide reflection on the past summer and plan for program improvement. The Association also customizes and trains staff on its quality assessment tools for use as self-assessment or external quality assessment.

Curriculum

There is a wide variety of quality research-based OST curriculum for schools to implement in the summer. However, the degree to which school-operated programs access OST curriculum depends largely on their goals for summer school. For remedial summer school, curriculum is developed at a central office or school level based on grade level standards. Modified school year curriculum is often used to meet remedial needs. Curriculum may also focus on test preparation (SummerBridge in Chicago or LEAP in Baton Rouge), especially for high school students at risk of failing high school exit examinations. Another common practice in traditional school-based programs is to use leftover curriculum from the school year that was not adopted by teachers. Because Title I school principals often feel pressure to spend their full grant amount each year or face reductions, they may end up purchasing more curriculum than they can practicably use during the school year.

School-provider partnerships may be more likely than traditional summer school programs to access OST curriculum in the marketplace because of a more flexible approach to learning. While there is a great deal of existing research-based OST curriculum, it is mainly designed for afterschool settings and has a primarily academic focus. Few OST curricula incorporate field trips, character development, or sports, which are key components of what parents and kids want in the summer.[xxiii,xxiv] However, the challenge of implementing afterschool curriculum in a summer program is not so much in the content, but rather the coaching and professional development needed to develop additional programming that is complementary to the 1-2 hours per day spent using curriculum. The search for curriculum that fills 4 to 6 hours a day leads to summer programs that closely resemble traditional classrooms, because many programs do not have the resources or expertise to develop comprehensive programming to wrap around an afterschool curriculum in the summer.

Summer Curriculum Snapshots

Summer Success Math and Reading (Great Source Education Group)
(Baltimore City Public Schools, BELL)
Summer Success curriculums are subject matter focused materials recommended for a six week summer program for grades K-8. Curriculum contains hands-on activities intermittently, but primarily focuses on instructor-led lessons and worksheets around a weekly theme. The daily activities in Summer Success take about two hours to complete, and the curriculum includes pre and post tests, observation checklists and a student self evaluation.

Kidz Lit and Kidz Math (Developmental Studies Center)
Kidz Lit and Kidz Math build both subject matter and cooperative learning skills for students in grades K-6. The curriculum includes a game kit and a story guide kit with many hands on activities for youth to explore math and literacy concepts as well as social development with peers. Curriculum guides for staff include key concepts, questions to anticipate and strategies for teaching. Additional professional development tools are also available to complement the curriculum.

Athletes and Authors Academy & All Over the World (National Summer Learning Association)
The National Summer Learning Association has two curriculum packages for comprehensive summer programs that are in the initial piloting phase. Athletes and Authors Summer Academy is a 4-week, six hour per day curriculum that provides middle school-age students with an invigorating learning experience that emphasizes values necessary for success in academics and athletics. Participants foster skills in athletics and language arts, and also gain a firm understanding of how to use the values taught at the Academy to live healthy, successful lives. All Over the World is the Center's new global literacy curriculum for upper elementary and middle school age youth. The program is designed to engage youth in a variety of issues through the eyes of young people outside of the United States. Participants complete experiential learning activities, collaborative research, and an interactive culminating event.

Standards
Traditional summer school adheres to state academic standards and assessments as a means to promote youth to the next grade upon completion. Similarly, summer school programs funded by Title I must also align with state standards and school-wide or targeted goals for meeting Adequate Yearly Progress. There are standards of practice in the education and youth development fields that can apply to school-based programs, but are not specifically targeted to summer. The 21st CCLC guidelines recommend After-School Program Standards. Other standards include the K-8 Principal, developed by the National Association for Elementary School Principals (NAESP), and The National Afterschool Association's (NAA) Standards for Quality School-Age Care to grantees. These standards are proposed as guides for grantees, but are far from universally adopted in school-operated programs.

QA Tools
Quality Assessment tools used in school-operated programs can vary widely. The most basic form of quality assessment comes in the way of classroom observation tools – often the same tools that are used during the school year. These tools are either developed by a district or purchased from a national vendor and generally assess classroom set-up, instruction and behavior management. There are numerous classroom observation tools on the market, and many are broken down to assess specific subject matter and grade levels.

To support programs in meeting the requirements of 21st CCLC funding, many states have developed their own self assessment and observation tools. The Virginia Department of Education developed a voluntary self assessment tool that combines elements of other research-based QA tools to measure indicators of effective programming including: academic focus, compliance with 21st CCLC regulations, youth development, safety, school and community partnerships, professional development and management and governance. Grantees identify areas where they need technical assistance or professional development and then provide suggestions to the DOE for an action plan to improve. Similarly, the New York State Afterschool Network developed a Program Quality Self-Assessment Tool (QSA) for OST programs. Much like Virginia's tool, the QSA guides programs in identifying areas that need improvement and prioritizing them in an action plan. However, the QSA takes a more holistic approach in program improvement through detailed instructions for facilitators, guided reflections for staff and best practices that programs can implement immediately. The QSA also helps programs engage key stakeholders, such as families and youth in the program improvement process.

School Operated Program Case Studies (By Funder)

Title I- Oakland

Virtually all schools in urban centers receive Title I funding.[xxv] Title I provides schools and LEAs with a degree of autonomy over their funding in exchange for accountability to state academic standards. While many schools use Title I, Part A funding to provide summer programming, the law makes no distinctions between summer quality and school year quality and provides little to no support for quality summer programming. The lack of a coordinating body at the district or state level for Title I schools may also have implications for quality supports.

In 2008, Oakland Unified School District operated its Summer Intervention program at 76 school sites, serving grades K-12 with $2.3 million in Title I funding. The program is not credit bearing, but is meant to provide four weeks of academic assistance to youth in the summer. The program serves two primary purposes for OUSD: 1) it allows principals to spend their remaining Title I grant on summer programming before it rolls over into a central fund at the end of the fiscal year, and 2) it gives the district an additional four weeks to focus on preparation for state assessments.

In the spring of each year, the district's curriculum and assessment offices work together to indentify the subject areas where students achieved lowest in mid-year benchmarks. They then develop two or three "power standards" for summer and align the content of summer curriculum and pre- and post-tests to those key competencies. The alignment of curriculum and assessments to state standards is the primary connection between Title I funding and quality supports in Oakland. The program is four weeks long, and content and instruction are meant to reinforce school year instruction. [xxvi]

The majority of the professional development requirements in the Title I legislation are for recruitment and preparation of high quality teachers with subject matter competency. Teachers need a bachelor's degree and full state certification to work in Title I schools, but beyond that, requirements for professional development and coaching are extremely vague. For out-of-school time, they are nonexistent. Because the end goal of the funding is to achieve state academic standards in reading and math, it follows that there is little incentive in Title I schools to introduce new professional development for the summer months around youth development or innovative instructional practices.

21st Century Community Learning Centers- Kentucky

Twenty-First Century Community Learning Center funding is different from Title I in a number of ways that impact quality supports to grantees. To begin with, 21st CCLC grants are meant to support programs that address the academic, physical, social and emotional needs of the participants, not just academic needs. Second, grants are for afterschool and summer programs only, generally promoting instruction that is different from the traditional classroom. Next, grants are competitive and include specific requirements for evaluation that are important for programs and states vying to maintain or increase funding. Finally, 21st CCLC grants are administered through the state, instead of the district, and statewide coordinators play an important role in facilitating quality improvement among grantees.

Quality is discussed much more explicitly in the 21st CCLC legislation than in Title I and addresses program infrastructure and operations as well as evaluation. Both individual grantees and SEAs have responsibility for evaluation components, but the onus is placed on SEAs to ensure that grantees have the infrastructure and training to fulfill the evaluation requirements. Thus, technical assistance is the primary quality driver for 21st CCLC sites.

In Kentucky, the statewide 21st CCLC coordinator organizes a series of training institutes throughout the year for grantees. The state Fall Institute dedicates an extensive portion of training to summer programming, and a tri-state institute (Kentucky, West Virginia and Tennessee) in the fall also focuses on summer programming. The state provides five days of mandatory training over the course of the year for new grantees that primarily focuses on program management and administration. Kentucky also contracts with consultants to provide mandatory training institutes in the spring for all grantees. Finally, the state conducts site visits/audits of each grantee each year.

The state 21st CCLC coordinator also provides support for assessment. Kentucky contracts with Cayen Systems to provide the A Plus data tracking system and technical assistance for all grantees. The A Plus system is used year-round to track attendance, staff data, registration, financial accounting and assessment and survey data, and summer information can be disaggregated from the year. The Corbin Redhound Enrichment program in Corbin, KY uses A Plus to collect school test score, grade, discipline and attendance data for all youth enrolled in their programs twice a year – at the end of the school year and again at the end of the first quarter. Corbin then compares the two sets of data to gauge the effectiveness of its summer program.

Kentucky 21st CCLC grantees are not required to use a particular curriculum in their programs; instead, they submit a summer learning plan to the state prior to the summer to determine if it's aligned with the state's core content for assessment. The state coordinator also selects high quality curriculum and invites developers to present to grantees at regional meetings. Corbin learned about KidzLit and KidzMath at a regional meeting and adopted it for the next summer.

While many state 21st CCLC networks are developing their own quality assessment tools, Kentucky is piloting the Youth Program Quality Assessment in their school-year programs and is considering making it a mandatory component for grantees year-round. Kentucky currently also uses the National Summer Learning Association's self assessment tool.[xxvii]

School-CBO partnerships are becoming increasingly common in the landscape of summer programs. Such partnerships are seen as an effective way to leverage resources as well as provide both an academic and youth development component to the program each day. These partnerships also have a notable impact on summer program quality because they are often the result of a foundation investment in building such linkages. As with other funder-program relationships, private foundations place emphasis on ensuring the quality and success of their investments.

Through funding from the Nellie Mae Education Foundation, the Rhode Island After School Plus Alliance (RIASPA) coordinated pilot summer programs in three Rhode Island communities during summer 2008. The goal of the RIASPA pilot is to mitigate summer learning loss of underserved learners by providing programming that connects the best aspects of in-school summer programs with the best aspects of community based enrichment and experiential summer learning. The school programs are credit bearing and seek to integrate traditional academic learning objectives with thematic, project-based learning that incorporates a variety of topics, including arts, music, theater, athletics, etc. The programs are designed to deliver academics (taught by district teachers) in the morning and youth development activities (through a CBO) in the afternoon. One of the key advantages of the RIASPA funding is that programs are able to offer services to all students in a school, not just those in need of credit recovery.

RIASPA established a broad-based Summer Learning Working Group to oversee the initiative and provide guidance on best practices of high quality summer learning programs. Evaluation was a condition of the funding, and RIASPA also contracted with a consultant with experience evaluating after-school programs to conduct an evaluation of the summer 2008 initiative.

Operator #2: Parks and Recreation Centers

Parks and Recreation programs are a staple of working families because of the full day of supervision and activities they generally provide for a reasonable cost. Most parks and recreation summer programs operate for 8 to 10 hours a day, five days a week in sessions ranging from 1 to 12 weeks. While the diversity of programming may vary based on the level of fees charged to participate, in general, parks and recreation operated programs are focused on athletics; artistic, social and youth development; and play with little to no intentional academic learning. Moreover, parks and recreation programs currently have few accountability requirements other than parent satisfaction, as parent fees often provide the largest source of revenue for programming. It is not surprising, then, that quality supports for parks and recreation programs tend to be the weakest of the four summer operators we examine. In the field, there is a general lack of curriculum and professional development tailored to recreational programs; there may also be a lack of buy-in from agency administrators on the need for a focus on program quality and academic learning. There are many opportunities for increasing the quality of parks and recreation summer programs. Parks programs that partner with other providers (schools, community organizations) are currently leading the way in accessing appropriate quality supports.

Curriculum
While there is a great deal of existing OST curriculum focusing on literacy and STEM[xxviii] there is a deficiency of curriculum that focuses on sports, physical development, artistic and cultural development and social and personal development. Moreover, the curriculum that does exist for these content areas is not structured to take advantage of the rich opportunity for learning and development afforded by

Nature Based and Health/Nutrition Curriculum Snapshots

LifeKnowledge Youth Leadership Curriculum (National FFA Organization)
Currently in development, The LifeKnowledge Youth Leadership Curriculum is a collection of more than 200 lesson plans for developing the "soft skills" of leadership, personal growth, and career success. The curriculum includes instructional strategies and tools and is designed to allow any youth worker, regardless of prior experience, to effectively teach. The curriculum is being incorporated in the nature based activities of 35 American Camp Association Accredited sites through a pilot test in summer 2009.

CATCH Kids Club (National Heart, Blood and Lung Institute)
The Child and Adolescent Trial for Cardiovascular Health (CATCH) was a study funded by the National Heart Lung and Blood Institute to create a school health curriculum designed to motivate heart healthy behavior in children in grades K-5 in afterschool and summer settings. The curriculum was tested at 11 sites nationwide, which were primarily Parks and Recreation sites, and was found to increase moderate to vigorous physical activity and improve eating and physical activity habits of youth.[1] The school curriculum was expanded into the CATCH Kids Club, which is designed for use in OST programs. CATCH has also been incorporated into the National Parks and Recreation Association's Hearts N' Parks program, which seeks to infuse education on heart healthy practices into all parks and recreation programs.

Media Smart Youth (National Institutes of Health)
Media Smart Youth is an interactive after-school education program for middle school youth designed to help teach them about the media world around them and how it can affect their health-especially in the areas of nutrition and physical activity. The curriculum includes media awareness, nutrition, physical activity and media production over the course of 10, 90 minute sessions.

the summer months. At a time when childhood obesity is of growing concern and "green" jobs are of growing importance, parks and recreation programs present one of the most logical entry points for strong curriculum that focuses on health and nutrition and nature/ecology. There is also an opportunity to introduce more intentional academic learning into parks and recreation programs, although that might require a paradigm shift in the field. There are a few curriculum packages currently available that are suitable for a parks and recreation setting. The above text box describes three of these.

Staffing/Professional Development
Parks and Recreation staff tend to have the greatest diversity of experience among the four operator types and point to the field's current lack of an identity[xxix] or professional standards for OST workers. Parks and recreation summer staff are generally a mix of high school students, community college graduates and college students. Staff are not likely to have an education background, although they may have a youth development certificate or associate's degree. Many have backgrounds in athletics.

In focus groups, we have received feedback from parents that parks and recreation staff are often not perceived to be qualified to work with youth.[xxx] While parks and recreation staff may have great potential as youth workers, the standard professional development offered to them does not generally equip them with the skills needed to help youth progress academically, socially and developmentally. Rather, professional development for Parks and Recreation summer staff most often covers safety issues and protocol. Staff will likely be certified in First Aid and CPR and may also be trained in playground safety.

The National Parks and Recreation Association offers certification as a Parks and Recreation Professional, but this certification seems targeted to directors and other higher level managers. Individuals must meet certain requirements for education, work experience or a combination of the two to qualify for certification. The certification is exam-based and requires continuing education units for renewal. Many parks and recreation agencies require certification when hiring for certain positions, but not for line staff who have direct interaction with young people. The exam covers general administration, programming and operations, and the NPRA sells an exam prep book that serves as the primary teaching tool.

Standards
The National Recreation and Park Association has developed national standards that are tied to its Parks and Recreation Agency accreditation. Accreditation is a 17-month process that includes self assessment and peer review to promote the quality of agency services and delivery systems. Accreditation is voluntary and there doesn't appear to be any direct financial incentive, although it may be viewed favorably by members of the community. The accreditation self assessment manual includes commentary and suggested evidence of compliance for the 155 standards. Because accreditation is for the entire agency, it's not clear if it has any direct impact on summer program quality.

QA Tools
We currently know of very few instances of Parks and Recreation agencies accessing QA tools for their summer programs. Parks programs that do access quality assessment tools are generally those that partner with other agencies or organizations (schools, community-based organizations). For the typical city-funded parks and recreation summer camp, comprehensive quality assessment is not a priority. Rather parent satisfaction is a primary indicator of quality because parent fees tend to provide the largest source of revenue for programs.

However, parks and recreation departments often seek additional grant funding to keep some of their programs free or low cost, and those outside funder relationships often result in partnerships with other agencies and a sharper focus on quality. In Baltimore, traditional parks and recreation sites are not supported with quality assessment tools from the City. However, parks and recreation sites that receive funding from the Baltimore Safe and Sound campaign for programming are provided with a QA tool developed by Policy Studies Associates specifically for the campaign's funded sites. Similarly, in Oakland, the six parks and recreation sites funded by the Oakland Fund for Children and Youth receive more quality supports because the OFCY requires evaluation as a condition of funding.

There is a tool in development that may prove promising for parks and recreation programs in the future. The American Camp Association is currently working with the Center for Youth Program Quality to develop a version of the Youth Program Quality Assessment that is tailored to outdoor and nature-based camp settings.

Operator #3: CBO/FBO

CBOs/FBOs as a group have perhaps the most leeway, and the greatest need, for self selecting quality supports. This stems from the great diversity among providers with regard to programmatic focus, funding and connection to a larger network of support. For example, while subsidiaries of national youth serving organizations or multi-site programs often have access to curriculum, standards, quality assessment and staff training from their national headquarters (e.g. YMCA of the USA, Boys and Girls

Clubs of America), single-site CBOs often must seek out the same resources through Internet searches or a variety of vendors. Many CBOs/FBOs do not have an umbrella organization to provide quality supports or set standards. However, like programs operated by schools and parks and recreation agencies, smaller CBOs can benefit from networks created by accountability to a specific funder, or by connections to an intermediary. Funders, like the Prudential Foundation, may outline expected outcomes for summer grantees; or they may provide professional development around a specific priority, such as STEM or delinquency prevention. Local and state intermediary organizations, such as School's Out Washington, Boston After School & Beyond, The After School Corporation, and Providence After School Alliance, also provide single-site CBOs/FBOs with quality resources and supports, and connections to peers.

Curriculum
CBOs frequently develop their own summer curriculum or recycle their afterschool curriculum for their summer programs. CBOs frequently cite difficulty in obtaining funding as a primary driver for curriculum selection; rather than diverting funding from direct services, CBOs may choose to develop curriculum in-house or recycle afterschool curriculum in order to serve more youth. CBOs that have funding available for curriculum typically contract with non-profit organizations like Foundations, Inc., or hire "education specialists" or certified teachers to write curriculum for the program. CBOs are also likely to access curriculum in the marketplace, like Summer Success or Lego Robotics. National youth serving organizations, like the Boys and Girls Club of America and YMCA, generally develop their own curriculum that affiliates can adopt into their programs.

Staffing/Professional Development

CBOs/FBOs are often staffed by youth development workers, teachers, and volunteers with widely divergent levels of experience. CBOs generally offer a few days of training prior to the summer session, with the strongest programs offering a full week or more of targeted staff training and collaborative planning. The subject matter and depth of training can vary widely. In some cases, CBOs may use the same training modules they offer to staff in their year-round youth programs for their summer program. While some of the modules provided to year-round staff may be appropriate for summer staff, CBO leaders need to understand how their summer staff and programs differ from what they do year-round, and adapt the training accordingly (for example, summer staff typically include more college-age interns who require different training than year-round staff that have more of a background in youth services).

One of the more developed systems of training for youth development workers – sometimes offered through local intermediary organizations – is called Advancing Youth Development, or AYD. AYD is not specific to summer programs, but is widely recognized as providing youth workers with foundational youth development principles and skills. AYD was developed by the National Training Institute for Community Youth Work at the Academy for Educational Development. It is a seven-session, 28-hour curriculum that has four broad learning goals for participants: 1) gain familiarity with the youth development approach; 2) strengthen their ability to communicate their ideas, expertise and experience to their constituencies; 3) discuss practical strategies for integrated a youth development approach into their programs; and 4) form an informal network and become a resource to colleagues. Ninety percent of youth workers completing the post survey reported that the training had an impact on their practice of identifying their own strengths and areas needing improvement.[xxxi]

CBO / FBO Case Studies

BELL (Building Educated Leaders for Life) Training

BELL (Building Educated Leaders for Life) is a nonprofit organization that operates afterschool and summer programs in several cities across the country. BELL's staff training program is exceptional in its depth and breadth and makes innovative use of technology. Orientation training is offered to accommodate four types of staff: new instructional staff, returning instructional staff, enrichment specialists, and lunch monitors with modules tailored to meet their diverse needs. BELL Summer staff members participate in 32 total hours of orientation and training provided by experienced educators and trainers. The sessions include topics such as teaching literacy and mathematics, child development, differentiating instruction, behavior management and efficacy. Site Managers participate in approximately 60 hours of training throughout the summer planning period, December through June. Prior to 2008, BELL delivered virtually all of its staff training in-person, in a classroom. However, in order to deliver high quality in-depth training in a cost effective manner as the program expanded to new regions of the country, BELL's new training combines one day of interactive classroom training with an e-learning suite made up of 13 modules. The e-learning modules are a pre-requisite to the classroom training and can be completed at flexible intervals anywhere staff members are. The e-learning modules include scenarios and quizzes based on actual events that have taken place in BELL's summer programs and video and audio of actual BELL scholars and staff to model best practices.

Village Learning Place Training

Village Learning Place is a single site community-based library learning program in Baltimore. VLP is funded by 21st CCLC and The After School Institute and participates in staff training that is mandated by those funders. VLP holds an annual fundraiser and collects donations throughout the year in order to pay for staff to be CPR and First Aid certified every year. VLP does not have the resources to develop customized staff training.

Standards
There currently are no widely acknowledged national standards for CBO-operated summer programs. Instead, CBOs access a number of standards designed for afterschool or school-age care settings that generally address the domains of relationships, environment, activities, health and safety and administration of programs. CBOs may adopt youth development standards such as the Search Institute's 40 Developmental Assets or the National Afterschool Association's Standards for Quality School Age Care. Funders can also provide standards for their grantees to follow in the summer, such as the Summer Youth Program Fund in Indianapolis. However, the standards most frequently adopted by funders and programs are designed with afterschool programs in mind. While these afterschool standards are research-based and provide a strong foundation for integrating youth development practices into all youth programs, they lack a key focus on intentional learning and on program infrastructure and design. Because summer is fundamentally different from afterschool in a number of ways, including schedule and staffing, there is a need for summer standards that reflect the unique opportunities and challenges the summer months bring.

QA Tools
Because most existing standards are designed for afterschool programs, it follows that most quality assessment tools in the field are also designed for afterschool programs. There are numerous tools in

the field that combine program self assessment with activity observation and are primarily focused on youth development. CBOs/FBOs can seek out a variety of QA tools designed for afterschool programs,

Summary Quality Assessment Snapshot

Youth Program Quality Assessment (Center for Youth Program Quality)
The YPQA is a comprehensive, research-based and research-tested quality assessment tool designed for youth programs. The YPQA is divided into two main sections- Program Offering Items and Organization Items and two versions differentiate between programs for younger youth (Pre-K -3) and older youth (4-12 grade). The YPQA's primary focus is capturing program quality at the point-of-service, but the tool also facilitates quality assessment of program leadership and staff development. One of the strengths of the tool lies in its discrete measures of quality on a three-point scale across indicators. Measures are defined by observable program characteristics that strengthen the tool's reliability among assessors.

The Program Improvement System (National Summer Learning Association)
The Program Improvement System, the Association's forthcoming quality assessment tool suite, centers on standards of summer program quality in eight primary categories. Domains falling into the category of Program Infrastructure include: Purpose, Planning, People, Professional Development and Partnerships; and domains in the Point of Service section include: Individualized, Intentional and Integrated. Indicators in each category are described by program level traits on a continuum of quality, ranging from a score of "1" for an undeveloped program to a score of "4" for a program that meets the standard for a particular measure. Tools in development include a program self assessment, activity observation guide, family and youth focus group guide, document review and interview guides for program leaders, staff, partners and board members.

American Camp Association Accreditation
Accreditation by the ACA is a highly regarded distinction for outdoor and nature-based summer camps. Accreditation is based on ACA's standards, which are a comprehensive guidebook for program operations and health and safety policies. Accreditation is a multi-stage process that includes training, self assessment, written documentation and site visits by accreditation staff.

but few that are designed specifically for summer. As with standards, quality assessment tools currently lack a focus on intentional learning and program infrastructure and design that are unique to summer programs. The above text box offers a snapshot of a few quality assessment tools in the field.

For CBOs that are connected to a national umbrella organization or an intermediary, accessing quality standards and quality assessment tools is often much easier, as the national offices regularly disseminate information to local affiliates and require a certain level of participation.

CBO / FBO Case Studies

Boys and Girls Clubs

In 2004, The Boys and Girls Clubs of America transitioned its Commitment to Quality into the Impact Assessment- a set of 55 statements of quality that all clubhouses assess themselves on annually. To develop the statements, the BGCA contracted with the Search Institute to visit 25 clubhouses throughout the country that were considered to be high achieving. The best practices gleaned from

those visits fall into the Five Key Elements of the Impact Assessment: Safe, Positive Environment; Fun; Supportive Relationships; Opportunities and Expectations; and Recognition. The quality statements provide the framework for an online quality assessment tool that every clubhouse must complete each year. The tool generates a score report that clubhouses and organizational level chief professional officers can use to develop an action plan for program improvement. Score reports include examples of practices that support each quality statement.

Providence After School Alliance (PASA)

As a city intermediary for afterschool programs, PASA was in the unique position to bring together 25 providers from the city to define a set of standards and indicators for quality afterschool programming. PASA culled existing standards and indicators from around the country and facilitated the workgroup of providers as they customized the standards to fit the needs and context of Providence. Drafts of the standards and indicators were circulated to parents, youth leaders and funders for review and feedback, and state-level intermediary RIASPA contributed to the development and dissemination of the standards. PASA and RIASPA then partnered with the Center for Youth Program Quality to produce a modified YPQA tool that fit the specific priorities of afterschool providers in Rhode Island.

Operator #4: Child Care Centers

Unlike the three other operators featured in this report, child care programs may be distinct in their access to quality supports because mandatory requirements for licensing dictate at least a baseline of quality in all publicly-funded child care programs. Certain standards for facilities, staffing and programming must be met in order to do business and/or receive certain public funding. Not only do industry regulations separate child care programs from our three other operator types, but the year-round program cycle also makes improving the quality of summer child care programs a unique challenge.

In the Center's ongoing investigations of public resources supporting summer programs, child care vouchers – provided through the federal Child Care and Development Fund – are consistently cited as resources that provide for summer care for school-age children. Families with income at or below 85% of the State Median Income are eligible to receive funding, though eligibility requirements vary across states. The total number of youth who take advantage of child care vouchers to pay for their summer care is unknown; we suspect, however, that child care vouchers support a very small proportion of the population of school-age kids in accessing summer opportunities. In a review of four counties in Maryland, for example, vouchers supported between 1 – 2% of the school-age population in obtaining summer care.[xxxii]

Nevertheless, child care centers are one of the four major operators that provide summer care to low-income youth for free or at a significantly reduced cost. For this reason, we included them in this report. Still, several gaps in knowledge hamper our ability to assess the quality supports available to child care centers providing summer care, specifically:

- Whether summer is a priority time of service for eligible kids and families is not clear, and we suspect this varies from state to state. We know from a 2008-2009 Report of State and Territory Plans[xxxiii] that some states do try to coordinate child care services with programs such as Head

Start, prekindergarten, and afterschool programs. Seven states, in particular, contract with before and afterschool programs to promote seamless coverage.

- The settings in which child care vouchers can be used vary widely. Because setting has a clear relationship to the types of available quality supports, it is difficult to summarize what supports are available to providers. Child care vouchers can be used to purchase center-based care, group home care, family child care, and in-home care – although the exact definition of who is included in each category varies across States and Territories.

Despite these limitations, we do summarize some of our general findings for quality supports available to support summer child care.

Curriculum
Most child care programs focus on child development, academic and social development, and play year-round. Because most child care providers operate year-round, they are not likely to differentiate curriculum for the summer session.

Staffing/Professional Development
Staff in child care facilities are more likely to have an education background (early learning) than in parks and recreation programs or CBOs; however, most frontline staff generally do not have four-year degrees. Instead, a high school degree and a certain number of hours of approved pre-employment training and documented experience working with youth are required to become a certified child care teacher. In addition, child care teachers and assistants are required to complete continuing education credits each year.

Standards
State child care regulations outline standards of care across many domains including capacity, supervision, indoor/outdoor space, staffing, professional development and training and activities.

QA Tools
Both licensing and accreditation processes consider the child care center's operations year-round, not just in the summer. The National Early Childhood Accreditation Commission conducts voluntary accreditation of programs.

Gaps in Knowledge and Support and Recommendations for Action

Our analysis shows that, while supports for summer program quality do exist, there are still many gaps to be filled. Parks and recreation programs and CBOs/FBOs without a larger network of support may have the most difficulty accessing quality supports, given what currently exists. However, there is a much larger deficit in the field – the lack of quality supports focused specifically on programs that operate in the summer.

Quality supports for afterschool programs, including curriculum, standards and quality assessment tools, are better established and more readily available than for summer programs. As research and practice shifts to a stronger focus on summer programs as distinct from school-year and afterschool programs, we think that establishing baseline, or universal, quality supports across diverse types of summer programs is a logical first step. With that goal in mind, most of our recommendations would improve the quality of summer programs across operator types, programmatic foci and levels of connectivity.

However, we acknowledge that some recommendations may have a larger impact on specific program types when implemented widely.

By nature, the professional and quality standards that govern a field must be universally accepted in order to be effective. To that end, and because the field of summer learning lacks a unified vision for quality, the following recommendations for action are primarily national in scope. That's not to say there aren't significant roles for states, localities and individual providers to play in realizing these advances in the field. Rather, state OST networks, intermediaries and departments of education will provide the structure for action and the local context, as well as the critical mass of expertise needed to validate new norms and tools in the field. Additionally, summer program providers will pilot test and drive development of quality resources. The Association has begun to work on many of the recommendations suggested this report; however, the additional support of peer organizations, funders, researchers and practitioners is needed to realize full implementation of each recommendation.

This section is organized to highlight the gaps brought to light in this paper and specific recommendations that may help to address those gaps.

Gap: Existing Curriculum, Standards and Quality Assessment are either designed for school-year or afterschool programs and do not take into consideration the unique needs of summer programs.

While summer program providers share many overarching goals with providers in afterschool and year-round programs, the seasonal, flexible nature of summer programming truly sets it apart from youth programming in other settings. Summer programs require planning, staffing and structure that are wholly different from afterschool or year-round programs; quality standards that drive the vision for the field should reflect those variations. Moreover, while there is a great deal of research-based school and afterschool curriculum available to programs, the existing curriculum is not tailored to or ideal for summer programs because it is designed to fit into a school day or a 2-3 hour afterschool time slot. As a result, the lack of curriculum for comprehensive, enriching summer programs often leads to programs that are repetitive, remedial or unfocused. Across diverse settings, there is a need for hands-on curriculum designed for summer goals and summer staff.

Recommendation 1:

Develop a framework for adapting existing curriculum for summer.

With a great deal of high-quality OST and school-year curriculum in the marketplace, there is no need at this time to develop new curriculum for summer. Rather, we recommend contracting with a curriculum developer and third party evaluator on a study to answer the following questions:

- What curriculum works best in the summer?
- How can existing curriculum be adapted for summer?
- How does existing curriculum align with summer standards?

Ultimately, the study would produce a framework that programs and curriculum developers could use to select/develop curriculum that aligns with best practice and the national summer learning standards. A professional development strategy, which could also be developed through the study, would then help

programs adapt their chosen curriculum to fit their unique summer program. This work would help programs across operator types and programmatic foci to improve the quality of their programming and the capability of their staff, presumably at a reasonable cost.

Recommendation 2:

Identify and validate baseline quality standards for summer programs across settings.

Existing research on quality in afterschool settings, combined with our experiences in diverse summer programs, leads us to believe that a universal baseline of quality can and should be established for summer programs as a distinct group. An advisory group of national experts would inform the development of universal standards for summer learning programs. The summer standards would take into consideration the areas previously validated by research in afterschool settings, such as staff to youth ratio and participation rates, as well as indicators of quality that have specific meaning in summer programs, such as partnerships, and blended academic and development programming. A validation study for these standards would help to create buy-in from the field.

Because intermediaries and others currently promote specific standards for school and afterschool programs, it would also be important to distill a set of supplemental "summer only" standards that could wrap-around existing afterschool or youth program standards. Supplemental summer standards would allow programs that are already subject to specific standards to add items that address summer program quality, specifically. Some providers in the field have also suggested that there is a need for supplemental standards geared toward a particular programmatic focus or youth population. Youth with special needs or incarcerated youth, for example, may require standards uniquely tailored to their population and goals. Similarly, a programmatic focus on nature education, sports, arts, workforce development, etc. could also benefit from standards that address the topic specifically.

Recommendation 3:

Promote and disseminate QA tools with an explicit focus on summer.

Existing QA tools lack a focus on:

- o Design, planning and implementation of a seasonal program
- o Blended youth development and education goals
- o Program infrastructure and leadership
- o Intentional linkages/complementary learning
- o Career/vocational programs
- o Health and fitness programs

We recommend an outreach strategy both to assessment developers and program providers about the importance of assessing summer programs based on summer standards and summer goals. Much like curriculum, there exist a variety of after school quality assessment tools that could be adapted for use in the summer. However, these tools focus primarily on youth development objectives, point of service interaction, and safety. There is a need to develop new QA tools that focus on the unique planning cycle and staffing of a summer program, as well as on emerging topics in the field, such as complementary learning, health and fitness and blended youth development and academic goals.

Gap: Many summer programs lack a connection to a coordinating entity or intermediary at the city or state level. Disconnected programs must self-select all quality supports and lack adequate staff training and access to QA.

Because the afterschool movement preceded the summer movement, existing intermediaries often prioritize afterschool and consider summer to be an extension of those programs. It is imperative for networks to place distinct focus on summer because the outreach strategies, partnerships and support that are necessary to maintain a systemic level of support for youth in the summer are different in many ways than those necessary during the school year. (For example, public funding for education drops dramatically in the summer with only a fraction of kids attending school-based programs. Families are responsible for seeking out appropriate learning and developmental opportunities for their children during the summer months. While schools may be a logical place for outreach to kids and families during the traditional school year, outreach strategies and coordination of programs must necessarily look different in the summer.)

Recommendation 4:

Connect Summer Programs to Intermediaries that Strengthen Systems of Support for Summer Programs

Few would disagree that afterschool programs benefit when they have strong political leadership, sustainable funding, and coordinated opportunities for professional development and sharing best practices. Summer programs also need political leadership, sustainable funding, and coordinated resources. Intermediaries can broker the relationships that allow summer program providers to prosper, while providing single-site programs with the connections they need to improve their quality.

The goal for intermediaries is to bring attention to summer programs as a vital strategy for supporting the needs of youth and families, while connecting and aligning services and the resources invested in summer programs. Over the past several years, the Center has developed a theory of change to guide our own work with local communities.[2] Many of the strategies we theorize will strengthen community support for summer programs have a direct impact on a program's quality. These strategies are regularly used by intermediaries that work to strengthen out-of-school time programming.

Some of the strategies related to program quality include:

- Partnership building
- Dissemination of summer learning quality standards and assessment tools
- Targeted professional and organizational development
- Policy development, replication, and dissemination

Appendix A provides an overview of the Association's Local Community Initiatives Theory of Change, with more detail on other strategies and tactics intermediaries might use to support summer programs.

Recommendation 5:

Develop an Online Clearinghouse of Quality Supports for Summer

---

[2] See Appendix A.

A national "one stop" resource center for summer programs would offer immediate access to quality supports, but could also help programs find / connect to local, state and national intermediaries. This national resource center could be used as a tool by intermediaries to support programs or could be accessed by summer programs still lacking a network of support via a simple Internet search. The site would provide a one-stop shop for providers of all sizes and resources to access quality supports. The site would contain:

- online toolkits and tip sheets for program design;
- a warehouse of assessment tools suitable for summer programs;
- webinars and training videos with examples of best practices in instruction;
- a social networking function to connect OST providers and administrators;
- a compendium of OST curriculum;
- syntheses of summer research studies and evaluations;
- a partnership toolkit;
- National Standards for Summer Learning; and
- links to local and state intermediaries and resources.

Gap: OST staff have diverse backgrounds and skills, and there are no professional standards for OST programs.

Many summer program staff are college students, volunteers, or entry-level youth workers without an education background and with a greater need to rely on curriculum and professional development to provide them with the skills needed to do their job. The lack of professional standards for out-of-school time or summer staff leaves most workers without the kind of comprehensive training and ongoing professional development they need to provide high quality experiences for young people. Moreover, the field currently lacks an incentive structure to encourage OST staff to pursue additional education and training, as salaries are generally low and there is not a clearly defined career ladder.

Recommendation 6:

Professionalize Staff in the Field of Out-of-School Time

The lack of professional standards for OST workers, as well as few opportunities for higher education in the field, has created a workforce that delivers services varying widely in quality. However, increasing attention is being focused on the lack of identity for OST workers. The Mott Foundation, for example, funded the development of professional standards for OST workers. If clarified and adopted, these standards could help to professionalize the OST workforce – and may spark interest in establishing a professional association for OST workers.

Although it is a large undertaking, the OST field must eventually standardize community college and university OST courses, certificates and degrees to align with an agreed upon set of core competencies. Then, OST education must be accredited by a national body, like the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, so that its value can be recognized by the education and youth development fields. Career ladders are needed to reflect expected training and experience required to advance in the field and to outline financial incentives for continued training and education. Yet for summer providers, specifically, the need for seasonal staff will always remain and their needs must be considered in the development of professional standards.

Gap: The field lacks unity around a vision for summer break.

Summer break serves many purposes, and stakeholders do not yet agree on the best mix of activities for youth. Program providers, researchers and policymakers need to reexamine the purpose of summer for youth, and agree upon a common vision that embraces choice, flexibility, fun, and learning.

Recommendation 7:

Communicate a New Vision for Summer School

In recent scans of public investments in summer programming, schools are still the largest operators of summer programs using public dollars. Because of this, schools need to play a strong role in communicating a vision for how children and youth spend their time during summer break. However, if schools continue to offer traditional, remedial summer school programs as their primary summer offerings, it is doubtful that they will be able to engender broad-based community support for their vision of summer programming.

 Funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act has created an immediate opportunity for school districts to rethink their own summer programming, and to develop a new vision that is broad enough to appeal to other summer program operators, and to youth and families. In April 2009, we convened a group of school district leaders, community providers, intermediaries and funders to discuss the creation of a New Vision for Summer School. Below are several of the recommendations for how traditional, remedial summer school programs could begin to change in order to embrace a new vision and engender additional support from community partners:

1. Increase the duration and intensity of the traditional summer school model to a comprehensive research-based, 6-week, full-day model.
2. Expand participation from only those students struggling academically to all students in school-wide Title I programs to address the issue of summer learning loss.
3. Change the focus from narrow remediation and test preparation to a blended approach of both academic learning in core subject areas AND hands-on activities that foster critical 21st century competitiveness skills like collaboration, innovation, creativity , communication, and data analysis.
4. Strengthen and expand partnerships with community-based organizations and public agencies that provide summer activities to align and leverage existing resources, identify and meet gaps in service, improve program quality, and develop shared outcomes for summer success.
5. Provide incentives to students that improve attendance and engagement by making enrichment activities such as arts, music, sports, and free breakfast and lunch through the federal Summer Food program an essential component of summer programs.
6. Provide innovative professional development for educators and ensure summer programs offer teachers a chance to test new models of teaching and gain valuable leadership experience.
7. Move summer programming from the periphery to the center of school reform strategies through better planning, infrastructure, data collection, and accountability.

Conclusion

While this paper provides an overview of the field of summer programming and a review of resources to support quality in four key operator types, there is much work to be done to better understand how we can support quality across diverse summer program settings. Encouragingly, we have many assets on which we can build; particularly those quality resources developed to support school and afterschool programs. We can take what's already been done to improve the quality of school and afterschool programs and adapt those resources to create a common core of quality standards and resources for programs that operate in the summer.

If we invest in: 1) creating quality standards and assessments for summer programs specifically; 2) adapting existing OST curriculum for summer; 3) strengthening programs' connections to local intermediaries; 4) connecting intermediaries to a common set of summer resources; 5) professionalizing the field of OST; and 6) developing consensus around a new vision for summer, we could have a dramatic impact on the field of summer programming. At a minimum, we would begin to fill the gaps in knowledge and support for today's summer programs.

Appendix A. Local Community Initiatives Theory of Change					
Overarching Goal: *A comprehensive system of summer programming that is part of a community's web of supports for its children and families*					
Vision	**Assumptions**	**Strategies**	**Tactics**	**Determinants of Change**	**Outcomes**
• Universal access to summer learning opportunities • High standards of program quality • A broad array of program offerings • Organizational collaboration across the community • Accessible and shared data • Sustainable resources • Stakeholder engagement and demand (Systems Research)	• Youth and families <u>need</u> and <u>want</u> summer opportunities, particularly families living in high poverty communities • High quality programs lead to better outcomes for youth and families • Variety and choice are important to youth and families • Collaboration among varying organizations and agencies strengthens service delivery • Data-driven decision making leads to better services • High quality programs are predicated upon adequate and sustained resources (Interviews and Focus Groups)	• Strategic consulting and thought leadership in systems-building efforts • Assessment of summer landscape at the community, state, and national levels • Alignment and leveraging of local, state and national resources • Partnership building • Dissemination of national summer learning quality standards and assessment tools • Outreach and communication aligned to the vision • Targeted professional and organizational development • Policy development, replication, and dissemination (Project Implementation)	• Legislative Task Force or Workgroup formation, coordination, participation • Strategic meetings / presentations / presence • Strategic planning facilitation • Stakeholder surveys, interviews and focus groups • Policy templates, statements, recommendations • Summits and briefings • Lobbying, testimony • Resource scan • Demand assessment • Best practices review / identification/ dissemination • Resource Fairs • Technical assistance to programs • Summer program model review, development, dissemination • Onsite quality assessment and improvement • Partnership building	Level of: • Current services • Expertise in provider community • Collaboration among providers • Infrastructure at the community, state and national levels • Dedicated funding (types and trajectory) • Support from high-profile champions, including private philanthropy • Political will and sense of urgency • Demand for programming (Policy and Advocacy Work)	• Increased access to quality summer opportunities • Increased numbers of summer learning program providers • Improved quality of programming • Demonstrated growth in academic, social, emotional, and behavioral outcomes for children and youth during summer months • Improved quality of life outcomes for families • Increased collaboration among providers • Increased numbers of key champions • Stronger infrastructural support • Improved policy development and implementation • Increased sustainable summer funding

			• National conference placement • Program Evaluation (Project Implementation)		

Appendix B- History of Summer Learning

Following we discuss three factors that have influenced the development of summer programs: the absence of school, family circumstances, and shifts in thinking about what purpose summers should serve. In the final section of the paper we provide information about the shared features of high quality programs and offer a new vision for summer program quality.

<u>The Absence of School</u>

During the school year, compensatory funding for education provides a baseline standard for what young people between the ages of five and 18 can expect each day. At best, youth attend a school where they are guided by caring adults, challenged and engaged by rigorous academic content, and encouraged to think critically. They have opportunities to learn about music and the arts, and to take on leadership roles, in class, in clubs, and in athletics. They interact with peers and adults, both formally while in class and informally during lunch and other unstructured times, helping them to develop social skills and navigate friendships. At worst, youth attend a school that offers them exposure to academic content, consistency in routine, interaction with peers, at least one meal, and adequate supervision. Although the schools described above are drastically different experiences for the youth enrolled, there are certain guarantees that young people can expect. During the summer, however, guarantees are scarce. The inequality in the daily experiences of kids from lower-income and higher-income families during the summer is far greater than during the school year. Access to safe places to be, educational opportunities, caring adults, and meals is largely dependent upon family circumstances.

<u>Family Circumstances</u>

While most families base their summer program decisions upon the same factors – personal preference, needs of their children, available resources, and convenience – the considerations of cost and proximity significantly limit the opportunities available to youth living in poverty. Whereas middle- and upper-class families may choose among a variety of specialty day and residential camp opportunities that often include small youth to staff ratios, specialized staff, strong nature components, athletic training, preparation for college, and exposure to new places, lower-class families often have limited options. The providers typically offering free or low-cost programs in large urban centers include schools, parks and recreation centers, child care centers, and a smattering of community-based and faith-based organizations. Contrast, for example, the experience of a teenager who travels to Mexico for a residential summer study abroad experience to a teenager attending a credit-recovery program at his or her local high school. The first exposes young people to new cultures, places, people and food; provides high-quality language instruction from native speakers; and fosters independence and social skills. The second provides kids with computer-based instruction in standard academic subjects, typically under the guidance of teachers responsible for overseeing large groups of youth in a computer-lab setting. The difference is palpable.

Based on a series of focus groups conducted with youth and families in high poverty neighborhoods in Chicago, Illinois and Oakland, California, even accessing opportunities through the four typical operators can be challenging for the following reasons:

- Schools only offer summer programming at a limited number of sites;

- Parks and recreation center programs are largely unadvertised, are sometimes located in areas perceived as unsafe, and can be thought of as difficult to get into; and
- Community-based and faith-based program availability is neighborhood dependent and reliant on word-of-mouth advertising.

<u>The Purpose of Summer</u>

Although convenience and resources explain much about why access to programming varies, history provides some insights into why so many different types of summer programs evolved. Over the years, shifts in thinking about the *purpose* of summer have influenced the development of programs. Take summer school as one example. Since the early 1800s, summer school has transformed in the following ways[3]:

- Early 1800s – summers were simply part of the school year, with young people attending schools primarily during the winter and the summer.
- Mid- to Late 1800s – school calendars were lengthened yet rearranged to eliminate schooling in the summer completely. Summers were thought of as a time for family vacations and a break from the mental taxation of school.
- Early 1900s – vacation schools dominated urban areas. Their purposes were "to decongest and decriminalize crowded neighborhoods, assimilate immigrant children, and provide practical skills and a natural environment to urban children that lacked them. In addition, vacation school advocates aimed to establish ideal classroom settings for experimentation in pedagogy and curricula[4]." Vacation schools were largely nonacademic, nonpublic, unregimented, and prioritized enrichment and the pursuit of interests over core curriculum.
- After the 1920s – vacation schools slowly morphed into summer schools. Since then, summer schools have primarily served to remediate for academic credit or advancement to the next grade.

The vacation schools that developed from the late 1800s to the early 1900s prompted the proliferation of summer camps. Initially available only to a wealthy few, vacation schools opened the doors for kids of lesser means. A primary purpose of camps was to increase participants' health through exposure to the outdoors[5], with YWCAs, YMCAs, Boys' Clubs, Boy Scouts, and Camp Fire Girls among the early providers.

In more recent history, concerns over the welfare of children, changes in family structure that includes both parents working outside of the home, declines in teen employment, the recognition of *adolescence* as a distinct period of child development, and a resurgence of interest in research on *summer learning loss[6]* and its impact on youth have all contributed to increased demand for summer programming[7].

---

[3] Gold, Kenneth, "School's In: A History of Summer Education in American Public Schools." Peter Lang Publishing (2002).
[4] Ibid.
[5] Retrieved from http://www.acacamps.org/media_center/about_aca/history.php.
[6] Summer learning loss is a term commonly used to describe the academic setbacks that result from a lack of educational experiences during the summer months. Summer learning loss is far more pronounced among youth living in poverty, particularly losses in reading skills. See Alexander, Entwisle and Olsen (2007) and Cooper…meta-analysis.

These trends continue to influence the evolution of summer programming today. Combined with a convergence of several events that have increased national attention on summer, we are once again challenged to examine the purpose of summer[8]. This challenge obliges us to understand the assets on which we have to build.

---

[7] Ward, Russell, "From 'Social Science in' to 'Social Science of' Summer Youth Camps: A Review of the Organized Camping Literature." *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Marriott Hotel, Loews Philadelphia Hotel, Philadelphia, PA,* August 12, 2005. Retrieved from http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/0/2/0/7/8/p20783_index.html
[8] Strong support within the Obama administration for summer learning opportunities; a growing national dialogue around time and learning; heightened interest among public officials and national advocates in what happens to low-income youth during the summer months; and an economic downturn that makes affordable summer care even more important have all contributed to increased national attention on summer, particularly among educators and policymakers.

Appendix C

The National Summer Learning Association is drafting National Standards for Summer Learning. The Standards are grouped as follows:

<u>Program Infrastructure</u>

<u>Purpose</u>

I-A. Program has a clearly stated mission and vision and current strategic plan.

I-B. Program has a framework for continuous program improvement that is linked to strategic goals and objectives.

<u>Planning</u>

I-C. Program has a clear plan for sustainable and cost-effective operations.

I-D. Program has a comprehensive structure in place for all programming throughout the summer, in advance of the session.

<u>People</u>

I-E. Program leader makes data-driven decisions to design programming that advances the mission and goals of the organization.

I-F. Program leader is a strong advocate for out-of-school time programs and engaged member of the community served.

I-G. Recruitment and staffing process intentionally yields diverse, committed and qualified staff.

I-H. Program staff are empowered to manage the program and have a voice in organizational decisions.

<u>Professional Development</u>

I-I. Program provides extensive opportunities for staff development and advancement.

<u>Partnerships</u>

I- J. Program builds and maintains strong linkages with partners, including community organizations and the public school system, that are supportive of its mission and have a vested interest in the program's success.

I-I. Program has a formal structure for communication and data sharing with all key external partners.

I-K. Program builds and maintains strong linkages with families.

Approach to Learning

<u>Individualized</u>

II-A. Program assesses young people's needs and sets appropriate goals and objectives for academic, developmental and social learning.

<u>Intentional</u>

II-B. Program creates a "summer culture" that is different from the school year and promotes a sense of community

II-C. Activity planning and execution shows intentional focus on meeting learning goals.

<u>Integrated</u>

II-D. Programming builds skills, knowledge and behaviors that promote academic success and healthy development.

The standards are currently undergoing an external review, and new quality assessment tools based on the standards are being piloted in several communities in summer 2009.

While the standards and tools are still in draft form, we hope to engage in a more formal process with leaders in the field to review, adopt and disseminate resources to support summer program quality, specifically. In the next section, we revisit this notion as we present gaps in knowledge and recommendations for action.

Endnotes

[i] Wimer, C., Bouffard, S., Caronongan, P, Dearing, E., Simpkins, S., Little, P., and Weiss, H. (2006). What are kids getting into these days? Demographic differences in youth out-of-school time participation. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project.

[ii] Borman, G.D., Summers are For Learning. *Principal*, 2001:80(3), 26-29.

[iii] Retrieved from http://www.acacamps.org/2020/. Brutal truths (PowerPoint presentation), American Camp Association.

[iv] The American Camp Association estimates that there are about 12,000 camps in the United States. Only 2,700 of them are registered with the ACA.

[v] Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/international/Intlindicators/index.asp?SectionNumber=1&SubSectionNumber=1&IndicatorNumber=104 . National Center for Education Statistics 2006 report.

[vi] School quality and the variation in quality among and between schools is an issue that has been long debated. Yet a discussion about equality in summer experiences is just beginning to emerge.

[vii] This paper is part of a series of three white papers on summer learning commissioned by the Wallace Foundation. In two of the white papers (this paper and a forthcoming paper written by *Child Trends*), the authors offer definitions of what they term "summer learning programs." While there are similarities among the definitions, there are also significant differences. For example, the National Center for Summer Learning promotes a definition that focuses on the intention and content of the programming: *A summer learning program is intentional about building skills, knowledge, attitudes and behaviors that promote academic achievement and healthy development. In areas with high rates of poverty, summer learning programs exist to narrow the achievement gap and increase rates of high school graduation, college entrance, and college completion among low-income and minority youth.* This definition does not exclude any types of operators, and summer school fits within these parameters. *Child Trends*, however, offers a different definition. This definition also has a focus on what happens within the program and the program's intention; but it does not include summer school. Instead of defining a summer learning program broadly, *Child Trends* defines five "types" of summer learning programs: Educational/Cognitive, Youth Development, Career Development, Health and Fitness, and Multi-element. While it is common for an emerging field to have varying definitions of terminology, this example is illustrative of the need for more discussion about a common vision for summer learning, and for summer program quality.

[viii] For example, it is common for programs serving at-risk, older youth, particularly youth who have already dropped out of school, to design programming on a flexible schedule to accommodate the needs of the participants.

[ix] Bodilly, S.,Beckett, M. (2005). Making Out-of-School Time Matter: Evidence for an Action-Based Agenda. Santa Monica, CA, RAND Corporation.

[x] Chaplin, D,, Capizzano, J. (2006). Impacts of a Summer Learning Program: A Random Assignment Study of Building Educated Leaders for Life (BELL). Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

[xi] Bialeschki, M.D., Henderson, K.A., & James, P.A. (2007). Camp experiences and developmental outcomes for youth. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America, 16:* 769-788.

[xii] Little, P., (2007). The Quality of School-Age Care in After-School Settings. The Harvard Family Research Project.

[xiii] McLaughlin, M. (2000). Community Counts: How Youth Organizations Matter for Youth Development. Washington, DC: Public Education Fund Network.

[xiv] Birmingham, J.,Pechman, E., Russell, C., Mielke, M.,. (2005) Shared Features of High Performing Afterschool Programs: A Follow-Up to the TASC Evaluation. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates.

[xv] Miller, B. M. (2003). "Critical Hours: Afterschool Programs and Educational Success". Quincy, MA.: Nellie Mae Education Foundation.

[xvi] Grossman, J.,Lind, C., Hayes, C., McMaken, J., Gersick, A. (2009). The Cost of Quality Out-of-School Time Programs. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.

[xvii] For example, it is common for programs serving at-risk older youth, particularly youth who have already dropped out of school, to design programming on a flexible schedule to accommodate the needs of the participants.

[xviii] Eccles, J. & Gootman, J. (2003). *Community Programs to Promote Youth Development*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. {Also see Bodilly and Beckett (ix) and McLaughlin and Phillips (xix)}

[xix] McLaughlin, B. and Phillips, T.L. (2009). Meaningful linkages between summer programs, schools, and community partners: Conditions and strategies for success. Baltimore, MD: National Center for Summer Learning.

[xx] Yohalem, N., Wilson-Ahlstrom, A., Fischer, S., Shinn, M. (2009). Measuring youth program quality: A guide to assessment tools, Second edition*. Washington DC: The Forum for Youth Investment.

[xxi] The Wallace Foundation (2008). A place to grow and learn: A citywide approach to building and sustaining out-of-school time learning opportunities.

[xxii] Zinth, K. (2006) Summer Remediation Policies. Education Commission of the States.

[xxiii] Duffet, A., Johnson, J., Farkas, S., Kung, S., Ott, A. (2004). All work and no play? Listening to what kids and parents really want from out-of-school time. New York, NY: Public Agenda.

[xxiv] Le Menestrel, S., In the Good Old Summertime: What do Parents Want for Their Kids? Academy for Educational Development (2003).

[xxv] According to www.ed.gov/programs/titleiparta/index.html, "The Title I, Part A program provides financial assistance to LEAs and schools with high numbers or high percentages of poor children to help ensure that all children meet challenging state academic standards. Federal funds are currently allocated through four statutory formulas that are based primarily on census poverty estimates and the cost of education in each state."

[xxvi] Jane O'Brien, (director of complementary learning for Oakland Unified School District), in a phone interview with Sarah Pitcock from the National Center for Summer Learning, Baltimore, MD, 2009.

[xxvii] Karen West, (director of assessment for Corbin Redhounds Enrichment 21st CCLC program). In an interview with Sarah Pitcock from the National Center for Summer Learning, Baltimore, MD, 2009

[xxviii] See SEDL National Center for Quality Afterschool curriculum database: http://www.sedl.org/afterschool/resources/curriculum.html

[xxix] Miller, B., Gannett, E., (Winter 2005-2006) Who is the After School Workforce? *Evaluation Exchange:* Vol. XI No. 4. P16., Harvard Family Research Project

[xxx] Information from focus groups with parents in Oakland, CA.

[xxxi] Fancsali, C., (2002). BEST strengthens youth worker practice: An evaluation of building exemplary systems for training youth workers. Washington, DC. Academy for Educational Development

[xxxii] Padgette, H.C., Deich, S., (2008). Funding summer learning programs: A scan of public investments in Maryland. Baltimore, MD. National Center for Summer Learning.

[xxxiii] Child Care and Development Fund, Report of State and Territory Plans (2008 – 2009). Retrieved from http://Nccic.acf.hhs.gov/pubs/stateplan2008-09/part3.pdf