DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 313 131 PS 018 399

AUTHOR Seligson, Michelle; Fink, Dale B.
TITLE No Time to Waste: An Action Agenda for School-Age Child Care.
INSTITUTION Wellesley Coll., Mass. Center for Research on Women.
SPONS AGENCY Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.; General Mills Foundation, Wayzata, Minn.; Grant (W.T.) Foundation, New York, N.Y.; Levi Strauss Foundation, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 104p.
AVAILABLE FROM School-Age Child Care Project, Wellesley College, Center for Research on Women, Wellesley, MA 02181 ($6.00, plus $2.50 shipping and handling).
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Childhood Needs; *Cooperation; Definitions; *Educational Quality; Elementary Education; *Financial Support; Government Role; Guidelines; *Institutional Role; Latchkey Children; Models; *Program Development; *School Age Day Care
IDENTIFIERS *Program Characteristics

ABSTRACT

This book for persons interested in setting up high quality school-age child care (SACC) programs: (1) provides background information and a rationale; (2) describes a collaborative model of program development; (3) discusses program funding and resources; (4) considers approaches to recognizing high quality school-age child care; and (5) offers conclusions and 15 action recommendations. Chapter 1 delineates the severity of the problem. Chapter 2 describes the roles of such institutions and groups as schools, custodians, youth service organizations, public housing, and day care centers and homes in providing SACC. Chapter 3, on funding, discusses the Federal Dependent Care Block Grant Program, state welfare reform as a source of start-up finding, local public support for construction or renovation, and the possible contribution of operating funds by school districts, local governments, private charities, and other sources. Chapter 4 provides capsule descriptions of appropriate approaches for programs serving children of various ages, and offers more detailed discussion of accreditation, evaluation, on-site consultation, technical assistance, and model demonstration sites. Twenty-six references are cited. A list of programs, by state, and a list of related organizations are also included. (RH)

No Time To Waste

An Action Agenda for School-Age Child Care

Michelle Seligson ■ Dale B. Fink

School-Age Child Care Project
Wellesley College Center for Research on Women

Since 1979 our funders have included: Carnegie Corporation of New York, Levi Strauss Foundation, General Mills Foundation, William T. Grant Foundation, Smith Richardson Foundation, A.L. Mailman Family Foundation, the National Institute of Education, Ford Foundation, Boston Globe Foundation, and Digital Equipment Corporation.

Contents

Preface

Why We Wrote This Book, and Why We Titled it No Time To Waste

The hours that school-age children spend outside school are in every way as meaningful as the hours they spend within it. When adults think back on their own childhoods, many remember their classrooms, their teachers, and a variety of school-day activities. They also recall out-of-school experiences: riding a bike, reading a book, practicing a musical instrument, playing on a sports team or being part of a scout troop. These activities were done alone, or in small or large groups. They were planned in advance or they were spontaneous. Some required adult leadership or supervision; others did not. Many were passing fancies but others were the beginning stages of lifelong pursuits. What was common to them all was the environment in which these children of only a few decades ago could plan and experience these activities. Often an adult was home, or one was home next door. Of course some mothers worked outside the home and some children were in supervised settings. But entire neighborhoods did not empty out at 8 a.m., not to be inhabited by adults again until 6 or 7 p.m.

Today the neighborhood environment has altered so drastically that it is now the exception for children to have any adult available when school is not in session. In three-quarters of all families with school-age children, adults are working outside the home. It is not only the numerical increase in families with working parents, however, that has changed. So have our perceptions of the safety of neighborhoods, of our trust in the kindness of strangers and of our satisfaction with many other qualities of life we once were able to assume as givens.

The concept of the latchkey child was familiar mainly to social workers and child welfare specialists until just a few years ago. Now, at the dawn of the 1990s, it is so familiar that it is used in television commercials — for instance, to promote the sale of brownies that can be made in a microwave oven by school-age children who have no adult around to help fix them a snack.

These hours before and after school and during the days when schools are not in session are times to be savored, to be treasured. They are, literally, "no time to waste." Counting the hours and minutes till a parent or other family member gets home makes these out-of-school hours a burden instead of a privilege. And there are potentially a lot of hours to count: elementary schoolchildren are in school 1,032 hours a year; parents who are employed full-time spend about 2,025 hours a year at work or getting to and from work. This leaves about 1,100 hours when these children are neither in school nor with parents. Kindergartners spend less time in traditional kindergartens (450 hours a year) and might need over 1,700 hours of care a year.

There is a great deal of concern among a wide range of professionals about the children who are on their own after school, or for whom appropriate relationships with other children and with adults other than family members are no longer a "given" in the process of growing up. How will the lack of out-of-school opportunities associated in the past with healthy childhood experiences affect this generation of school-agers? What effect will the "premature granting of responsibility" that James Garbarino described have on the development of curiosity, self-esteem, mental and physical health, and school performance? How much self-care is appropriate, and at what age? Are children on their own at greater risk for too-early sexual experimentation and pregnancy, or drug and alcohol use? Should we congratulate a child on being "autonomous," a necessary characteristic of well-functioning adults, but a characteristic that young children could well wait to attain until they are developmentally ready? Will we have fewer well-functioning adults in our labor force, our communities, our citizenry, because of inadequate supervision, lack of challenging after-school activities, and inability to concentrate during school because of preoccupation with fear about the hours after school? These are questions researchers have only begun to explore. But even in the absence of definitive empirical research, they are questions that are motivating people all over the country to take action.

Polls have demonstrated that parents share these concerns. It is not only the parents of latchkey children who are interested in ex-

panded opportunities for before- and after-school programs. Parents of school-age children in general, regardless of their present child care arrangements, want more and better programs. Given the importance of the time children spend outside of school, it is unacceptable that parents in this country today are making day-to-day arrangements which they do not honestly feel are in the best interest of their children.

We believe that children are often happier in the hours after school if they can be with others instead of being alone. Children feel safer in secure and nurturing environments. Latchkey arrangements on a day-in, day-out basis do not meet the developmental needs of school-age children as they navigate the passage from early childhood to adolescence. These needs include opportunities to make friends, to play, to explore new talents and skills, to develop initiative, to see finished products of that initiative, and to receive attention and appreciation from caring adults. Because the vast majority of parents utilizing the latchkey arrangement do so because they lack alternatives, not because they prefer it for their children, it is important not to institutionalize this practice or rationalize it as being good for all children.

Our society must address the scarcity of affordable, quality programs for children during the out-of-school hours. If it does not, the latchkey arrangement may soon be accepted as the normal state of affai this age group. We have written this book because we believe there is No Time To Waste in remedying the current situation.

School-Age Child Care Project

Foreword

This book is about the problem of the lack of adequate care for school-age children during their hours and days outside school. It is also about the creation of greater and more appropriate options than self-care for them.

Today three-quarters of all school-age children live in families where adults are working, many of them full-time. As the number of single-parent and dual-worker families has soared, it is now the exceptional child between age five and fourteen who has a parent available to provide companionship, supervision and guidance during the hours and days that schools are closed. This trend is unlikely to abate.

The hours before and after school are important hours that could be fruitful. Instead, in many cases they are empty. Our children's needs are not being met, and their isolation and lack of adequate supervision places some of them in jeopardy. Professionals and parents have been expressing their concern for what has become an urgent national problem. They are aware that action must be taken.

Since 1979 the School-Age Child Care Project (SACC) has tracked policies and programs that have developed in response to the growing demand for alternatives to school-age children's self-care. Our research and consultation with parents, policy-makers, citizen groups and educators provide evidence that the demand for these alternatives far exceeds the supply. Many more parents would use after-school programs if they were available. Cost is an obstacle for low- and moderate-income families. Although quality is improving, it is uneven: staff/child ratios and other elements that constitute good programs vary widely from state to state. Only fourteen states have

enacted special school-age child care legislation and funding programs. Too few cities provide the kind of recreational opportunities for children that they need. The corporate sector has invested only minimally in school-age child care. Training programs and curriculums must be made available at community colleges and other undergraduate and graduate institutions.

We have written a book celebrating the energy of many people around this country, energy that has been applied to solve the latchkey problem. We are still far from finished, and there is **No Time To Waste.**

Highlights from *No Time To Waste*

On the Numbers of Latchkey Children:

- The U.S. Bureau of the Census in 1987 released the most conservative estimate to date of the number of latchkey children nationwide: seven percent of 5 to 13 year olds, or 2.1 million children, based on interviews with a scientifically developed sample.
- The Louis Harris organization, conducting a national survey for the Metropolitan Life Study of American teachers in 1987, sampled parents and found that 12% of parents of elementary school children and 30% of parents of those in middle school or junior high acknowledged leaving their children alone at home.
- Based on projections from local studies conducted in communities as varied as Columbus, Ohio; Madison, Wisconsin and Los Angeles, California, estimates of the incidence of latchkey arrangements nationally have ranged up to 10 million and higher.

On the Significance and Impact of Latchkey Experience or School-Age Child Care:

- Research on the consequences for children of being in a latchkey situation and on the effects of participation in organized school-age child care have been neither very extensive nor very conclusive. But when asked to rank seven possible causes of students having difficulty in school, 51% of teachers interviewed for the Louis Harris opinion poll in 1987 singled out "children who are left on

their own after school" as the number one factor.[1] The Harris survey found that 59% of parents in randomly selected households across the country believe they leave their children on their own too much after school.

- The *Communicator,* published by the National Association of Elementary School Principals, reported in February, 1988 that 37% of principals sampled believe children would perform better in school if they weren't left unsupervised so long out of school.[2] The survey found that 22% of the respondents had before- and/or after-school programs in their buildings already, and 84% agreed such programs were needed.
- The few studies of the effects of participation in school-age child care on school performance show enhanced self-esteem and school performance. Carollee Howes and two associates found that kindergarten-age children participating in a school-based after-school child care program were more advanced in social skills than children attending only the school program.[3] (*Elementary School Journal,* September 1987.) Two other studies showed elementary-aged participants in after-school programs improving their reading and math scores.[4,5] (Mayesky, Raleigh, North Carolina, 1980; and Entwisle, Baltimore, Maryland, 1975.)

On the Prevalence of School-Age Child Care Across the Country:

- Day care centers which in earlier years served mostly preschoolers have become increasingly involved in school-age child care. The state of Michigan, for instance, reported to the School-Age Child Care Project in 1988 that approximately 600 day care centers were licensed for both preschool and school-age services, along with another 50 centers that were licensed exclusively for school-age.
- The National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS) now estimates that at least one-half, or approximately 300, of its 604 schools that serve elementary students have active extended day programs.
- The YMCA of the USA reported in 1987 that 962 of its 2,200 branches had school-age child care programs. Other youth-serving agencies have also increased their school-age services: The Boys Clubs of America found that as early as 1984, 18%, or

approximately 200, of its 1,100 Clubs had switched over from a traditional drop-in format to more formalized school-age child care for at least some part of its service population.

On the Prevalence of Public School Involvement in School-Age Child Care:

- Percentages of school districts involved in school-age child care—either as direct providers of services, or as partners who make their space available to provider agencies (such as Ys)—were reported to be as low as 0% in some states (Idaho, 0 out of 116; Montana, 0 out of 546) and as high as 83.5% (Florida, 56 out of 67) based on a national survey conducted by the School-Age Child Care Project. School-based programs made up the majority of all programs licensed exclusively for school-age children. The public school role is much greater as a provider of space to other organizations than as a provider of school-age child care services. There appears to be a direct correlation between the designation of the Education Department as the recipient of federal funds (such as the Dependent Care Grant funds) and selection of local Boards of Education as the direct providers of services. Most school districts that have gotten involved in school-age child care have done so with the explicit understanding that such programs would be self-funding and that there would be no use of educational dollars for the child care programs.
- A greater number of school-age children, however, attend programs which are licensed to serve them in addition to preschoolers rather than those licensed exclusively for school-agers. Sometimes they are physically mixed in with preschoolers and other times they have their own space, curriculum and staff. Most of these programs are operating in day care centers outside the schools.

On Funding for School-Age Child Care Programs:

- Budgets for most SACC programs are based on the pay-as-you-go model, with parent fees providing the funds to support the operation. A SACC Project national survey conducted in 1988 showed that unsubsidized parent fees averaged $26.00 a week for five days of after-school care for children in the first grade and up.

Although it is difficult for low- and moderate-income families to pay any fees at all, the low salaries paid to caregivers are what keep the fees from being even higher and more unaffordable.

- The major support for low-income families needing child care for school-age children is the pool of "Title XX" funds, formally called the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG), which comes from the federal government to the states.
- The federal Dependent Care Block Grant has been the source of start-up monies for school-age child care since 1985. It is authorized to spend up to $20 million annually through fiscal 1990, with 60% for SACC and 40% for Resource and Referral services for children, elders and disabled persons.
- At least fourteen states have put their own dollars into SACC, ranging from $125,000 in Maine to $17 million in California. Approximately half of these states do not restrict the use of the funds, permitting them to be used for start-up, expansion, subsidy and operating costs.
- Local government has become an important source of support for school-age child care in some communities. This ranges from city or county contributions to building renovation, construction, operating costs and subsidies.

On Recognizing and Achieving Quality School-age Child Care

- Quality care exists when:
  - it is carefully planned;
  - it is different from the regular school day;
  - it provides a variety of activities and opportunities suited to the age group involved in them;
  - it emphasizes whole-child development (physical, social-cultural, emotional and intellectual);
  - staff are chosen for their abilities as care-givers and are then provided with time for on-going training and development.

- Quality care is achieved through:
  - implementation of a system of accreditation;
  - evaluation;
  - on-site consultation, technical assistance and use of demonstration sites.

Our Action Agenda

We summarize below fifteen recommendations which, if implemented, will have an impact on the development of the field of school-age child care. The rationale for each recommendation is explained in further detail in Chapter 5, "Conclusion and Action Recommendations."

ACTION RECOMMENDATION ONE

The Congress and the President of the United States should pass, sign and fully fund **Comprehensive Child Care Legislation,** addressing the need of American families for an adequately-functioning system of quality child care for children from infancy through early adolescence.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION TWO

The Dependent Care Grant program, initially authorized in 1984 to be funded at $20 million but never funded above $12 million, should have its $20 million funding re-authorized. It should be extended for another four years, and fully funded with the $20 million. The floor-level appropriation for states with small populations should be raised from $50,000 to $100,000 whenever the appropriation exceeds $10 million.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION THREE

State legislatures and governors should incorporate funding for school-age child care into state budgets, either by inclusion in regular appropriations packages or by the passage of special legislation. This funding should not be restricted to start-up purposes but should also be used to subsidize low- and moderate-income families, and to increase staff salaries and benefits to adequate levels. It should be disseminated not only to assist school districts or municipalities but also to strengthen the broad range of institutions which are involved in service delivery in this field.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION FOUR

State agencies and funding sources must coordinate their efforts to ensure that there is money for operation, as well as start-up, so that programs can survive beyond the start-up phase, and staff can be adequately compensated.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION FIVE

States and local school districts should examine policies regarding the transportation of school pupils between home and school. They should amend policies, statutes, and practices where needed to ensure that a range of parental choices regarding where children will be picked up or dropped off will be respected.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION SIX

State agencies responsible for licensing child care should review existing regulations and determine how to modify them so that they are appropriate for school-age child care. Some categories of programs currently exempt from licensure should be subject to licensure. Programs administered under the jurisdiction of public school districts, if exempt from licensure, should be subject to comparable guidelines administered by the state departments of education.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION SEVEN

The state agencies responsible for child care licensing and the state departments of education should improve their ability to obtain accurate data regarding the existing systems that are delivering school age child care.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION EIGHT

Local governments should adopt the "broker" model of school-age child care management, hiring or designating at least one individual whose primary task it is to monitor and communicate with the diverse organizations, public and private, that are involved in this field, and to act as a broker between and among them by matching expertise and sources of funding with documented needs.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION NINE

School boards should establish clear school-age child care policies.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION TEN

State and local agencies serving the needs of families with developmentally-disabled members should review their policies with an eye to broadening their understanding of respite care so that it includes school-age child care.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION ELEVEN

The development of SACC requires the full partnership of corporate America through its direct financial contributions, its active involvement in coalitions and other collaborative efforts in local communities.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION TWELVE

Local recreation and park agencies should evaluate the extent to which the needs of the youth population they have traditionally served have changed as a result of the altered structure of American families, and get involved in addressing those changed needs.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION THIRTEEN

More research is needed on several key issues: the extent to which the lack of dependable and affordable care affects maternal educational and employment patterns; the impact of the latchkey experience on children and which groups of children may be most affected; the effect on children of participation in SACC programs and other forms of supervised care; and a cost-benefit analysis that could document the long-range savings to society made possible by expenditures in quality school-age child care.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION FOURTEEN

Universities, colleges, and other training institutions, with the help of practitioners and professionals in related fields, need to create an agreed-upon body of knowledge and training curriculum that can be widely adopted. Staff training (both pre-service and in-service) must become widely available to caregivers and administrators in school-age child care.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION FIFTEEN

Public education campaigns should be undertaken so that parents and communities are more aware of the hazards of self-care and the benefits of quality school-age child care programs to children.

Acknowledgments

We thank Peter Fellenz of Haviland Associates for contributing his creative vision to the organization and focus of this book, and for many hours of fact-finding and preparation of material in the early stages. Our colleagues Ellen Gannett and Fern Marx were as usual full of ideas and resources, and we valued their contributions of both fact and editorial suggestions. Ruth Kramer Baden rejoined the School-Age Child Care Project briefly for an excellent editing stint, for which we are deeply grateful. Lynn Hatch managed many pre- and post-publication details with typical purpose and skill. Copenhaver Cumpston designed the book and its cover and also led us in our choice of a production team; we were fortunate to have her work with us. None of our work during the past ten years would have been possible without Shelby Miller of the Ford Foundation, who funded the National Policy Seminar from which this publication subsequently resulted. We also want to thank the Digital Equipment Corporation (DEC) for making a grant to the School-Age Child Care Project for the publication and dissemination of this book. Lastly but perhaps most important of all, we thank our colleagues in the field of school-age child care for their extraordinary energy and initiative—demonstrated over and over again by the programs and policies we have selected to write about here, and in the thousands of before- and after-school programs that are now available to America's school-age children.

MS and DF
July 1989

The sun did not shine.
It was too wet to play.
So we sat in the house
All that cold, cold wet day.

I sat there with Sally.
We sat there, we two.
And I said, "How I wish
We had something to do!"

Too wet to go out
And too cold to play ball.
So we sat in the house.
We did nothing at all.

So all we could do was to
Sit!
    Sit!
        Sit!
            Sit!
And we did not like it.
Not one little bit.

CHAPTER 1

Why Worry About Latchkey Children?

Almost every American who reads a newspaper now knows the meaning of the term "latchkey children"—young children left on their own during the hours when school is out. This is an important change in public awareness, for as recently as ten years ago, few but specialists in nineteenth-century child welfare would have recognized the archaic-sounding term.

How old are these children who are going home with housekeys hidden in their lunchboxes or dangling on strings inside their shirts? How many of them are there? What are the effects on children of spending their out-of-school hours as "latchkey children?"

How many latchkey children?

If being in a latchkey situation exposes children to certain risks (a proposition we'll examine later in this chapter), then it is important to know how many children are undergoing the latchkey experience. While not every child exposed to risks actually suffers bad consequences from them, the fewer the number of children left to fend for themselves, the fewer we can expect to suffer from that experience.

Unfortunately, the numbers of American children placed in latchkey arrangements at present are vast by any standard. There are so many school-age children taking care of themselves that even if only a fraction, say one-fifth of them, ends up doing worse in school, or has developmental, health or other problems as a result of the experience with self-care, this fraction will translate into a huge number of children.

The exact number of latchkey children is hard to determine. One reason is that there is no commonly accepted definition. How old does a child have to be to go home alone and not be considered a latchkey child? How many days a week or hours per day does a child have to be in self-care to be counted? If a six-year-old and his twelve-year-old sibling go home together and remain unsupervised for one hour every day, do we count them both, just the six-year-old, or neither?

The U.S. Bureau of the Census in 1987 released the most conservative estimate to date of the number of latchkey children nationwide based on interviews with a scientifically developed sample: 7% of 5- to 13-year-olds, or 2.1 million children.[1] Even using our hypothetical one-fifth measure on that "low-ball" estimate would yield 420,000 children harmed in some way by the latchkey experience. But many have doubted the accuracy of the Census Bureau's numbers—numbers which the Bureau itself acknowledged could be thrown off by issues such as whether parents would honestly tell the federal government that they leave their children on their own, since to do so is a violation of the law in many states.

These doubts were confirmed when the Louis Harris organization, conducting a national survey for the Metropolitan Life Study of American teachers in 1987, sampled parents and found the percentage that acknowledged leaving their children alone at home much higher: 12% of parents of elementary schoolchildren and 30% of parents of those in middle school or junior high.[2]

Local studies in a wide variety of communities have yielded estimates of self-care and sibling-care in the 15% to 25% range for children in the lower elementary grades, with the percentages rising sharply after grade four or five.

Surveying 500 families in Columbus, Ohio, for example, Action for Children, an advocacy group, found in 1987 that in 15% of households schoolchildren under age 12 were being left alone.[3] Almost half of the parents surveyed had "mixed feelings" or were "not very happy" about their present arrangements. Most thought that children should be in the fifth or sixth grade before being left alone.

In Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, the Council for Children, a United Way Agency, surveyed children in 85 selected classrooms across the school system in 1984.[4] The survey showed that 6% of kindergarten children and 10% of first graders were being left alone; this increased to 84% by grade six. Two-thirds of parents expressed concern or uncertainty about their current arrangements.

The city of Madison, Wisconsin, contracted with Community

Coordinated Child Care (4-C) in 1983 for a survey of care arrangements.[5] Four-C found that one-sixth (16%) of the elementary schoolchildren were going home alone and caring for themselves after school. That percentage did not include those going home with a sibling.

Estimates of the national incidence of school-age children who care for themselves are based on projections from such local studies. Those estimates range up to 10 million and even higher. Without knowing the risks, if any, of being a latchkey child, it is hard to determine the significance of an arrangement which at least 2 million and maybe closer to 10 million children are using on a day-to-day basis. Let's look next, then, at what researchers are saying about the effects on children of being left on their own.

Research on effects of self-care on children

Research on the consequences for children of being in a latchkey situation and on the effects of participation in organized school-age child care have been neither very extensive nor very conclusive. There have been two recent research studies that have concluded that the effects of the latchkey experience are insignificant, and several others which have come to the opposite conclusion.

Psychologist Hyman Rodman and colleagues at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro conducted a study involving 96 fourth and seventh graders, half of them in self-care after school and half in adult care.[6] They found no statistically significant differences between the matched samples in regard to two psychological scales measuring self-esteem and sense of personal efficacy (or locus of control). Researchers Deborah Vandell and Mary Anne Corasiniti of the University of Texas at Dallas conducted a study of a sample of 349 third graders, and found that children going home to a parent and children going home alone will do about equally well.[7] Their questions covered peer relations, work/study skills, and independence.

Other than the Rodman and Vandell studies, most research to date shows harmful effects from lack of supervision and beneficial results from participation in organized after-school programs. Psychologist Laurence Steinberg of the University of Wisconsin, for instance, studied a sample of 865 ten- to fifteen-year-olds in Madison, Wisconsin.[8] Steinberg's study started by replicating Rodman, et al's findings on measures of self-esteem and locus of control, and like Rodman, found no differences on these personality measures. But it went on to find a major difference in another area—namely, reported sus-

ceptibility to peer pressure to engage in undesirable behavior. "That children with different after-school experiences differed on the susceptibility indicator, but not on the personality measures," he states, "suggests that further research on latchkey children should focus more on consequences in the domain of behavior than in the domain of personality."[9]

Steinberg also concluded that it wasn't enough to categorize children as latchkey or non-latchkey in order to predict their behavior. Rather, one had to know the specific circumstances of the self-care arrangement. Latchkey children "hanging out" in the neighborhood without a structure of parental rules faced greater risks, he found, than those going home and following a consistent set of agreed-upon practices. Steinberg also found that the family's overall approach to child-rearing prior to the self-care experience was a major factor in determining how children responded when placed in a self-care situation.

Other researchers who have found negative consequences for children in latchkey arrangements include Thomas and Lynette Long, authors of *The Handbook for Latchkey Children and Their Parents,* who studied 85 elementary-aged children attending parochial schools in Washington, D.C.[10] Among their key findings were that one out of three children going home alone and one out of five children going home with a younger sibling experienced higher levels of fear than their counterparts who had adult supervision. The self-care and sibling-care group also reported greater numbers of troubling dreams at night than did the adult-care group.

In the domain of the effects of participation in organized after-school programs, there are just a few studies. Carollee Howes, Michael Olenick, and Tagoush Der-Kiureghian studied kindergarten-age children participating in a school-based after-school child care program and determined that the children participating in the program were more advanced in social skills (and more often sought out as friends) than children attending only the school program.[11] Two other studies showed elementary-aged participants in after-school programs improving their reading and math scores (Mayesky[12] and Entwisle[13]).

Some of the most significant research may be yet to come. For instance, Dr. Deborah Belle, a psychologist at Boston University, is tracking a small sample of adult-care, sibling-care, and self-care children over a period of four years. The focus of this research is on the issue of "social supports": to what extent do the out-of-school care arrangements of school-age children determine their perception of social support?

Of course, the potential problems associated with inadequate supervision and care of school-age children between the ages of 5 and 14 cannot be seen as dissociated from the problems older children experience as they make their way into adulthood. Even if we accept the conclusions of the Rodman and Vandell studies and take as a given that children do not show harmful effects of the latchkey experience during their elementary school years, it is still possible that there is a toll being taken on the child that only appears in later years. If energy is expended in being vigilant about safety, for instance, instead of being invested in sports, art, music, and other free time activities, does the child end up paying a price in terms of later development? No one has really begun to measure this.

The lack of strong data on the effects of being a latchkey child is a critical gap in the research on child development. That is why we have called for more research in this area in our **Action Recommendations.** But even while awaiting further research, in our opinion it flies in the face of common sense to believe that children's development will be unaffected by consistent use of self-care over a number of years as the predominant after-school arrangement. When we think about the opportunities, from sports to arts to jobs to informal play, that have traditionally been available to children in the middle years of childhood during the out-of-school hours, it is hard to imagine how the total loss of such opportunities could not have at least a covert impact on the overall development of personality, intellectual inquiry, and social relations.

If one wished to consider the consequences from a purely pragmatic viewpoint, it should be noted that if inadequately supervised youngsters are at greater risk than others of falling prey to drugs, alcohol abuse and early pregnancy, failure to address the problem will result in the waste of a vital natural resource. There will be fewer children who grow up to be competent, productive members of our society, of our labor pool, and every other pool or organization that depends for its proper functioning on responsible, healthy adults.

Not waiting for research

While new research findings will no doubt continue to be assimilated into discussions of the latchkey issue, leaders across the country at the state and community level have looked at the rising numbers of latchkey children and decided that something must be done now. For regardless of whether it is 25% or 7% of children that are being left

regularly to fend for themselves, and even assuming that the majority of these children will come out of the experience unharmed, that still leaves an enormous number who are at risk. Those responsible for the education, guidance, and well-being of the younger generation are unwilling to wait and see just how many fall prey to these risks. These conclusions may be verified by future research but they are rooted in personal observations and professional instincts.

Principals of elementary schools see children who seem to prefer hanging around aimlessly to going home. PTA presidents receive late-night phone calls from panic-stricken parents who don't want to quit their jobs but who fear for their children, because they are left without appropriate support or supervision. Librarians see children spending endless hours trying to keep themselves amused in an atmosphere of enforced quiet because their parents have told them to stay there until closing time. Boys' and Girls' Club directors see children dropping in not just a couple of times a week, but five times a week, from the time school is out until six or seven in the evening, and all day long on school holidays. Employers observe a drop in productivity around three in the afternoon, because of the number of phone calls employed parents and their latchkey children make to each other. On snow days and other times when employment schedules are out of synch with school schedules, it's even worse, with some parents wanting the day off and others bringing children with them to the workplace.

Most children who are on their own accept their latchkey arrangements as a solemn obligation. They often take pride in themselves, knowing they are helping parents meet their own employment commitments. These children try their very best to do what is expected of them without complaining. But where are their childhoods going? James Garbarino, President of the Erikson Institute, discussed this question in a paper, "Can American Families Afford the Luxury of Childhood?"

> Play and developing competence go together, of course. Comparative biologist Karl Groos led the way in arguing that play is "preparation for life" (Groos, 1901). For the child, play and the development of competence are at the top of life's agenda (White, 1959). For the family they are the goal of socialization. For the community, protecting them is an important part of the social contract. This is childhood in the modern sense of the term, and it is a very worthwhile cultural innovation, one that should not be discarded casually ... While few observers conclude that parents are casually discarding childhood, Elkind (1981), Packard (1983), and others do conclude that many parents are acting

> as if they believe they cannot afford childhood for their children. These observers cite as evidence the premature granting of responsibility for self-care to young children and the extensive involvement of children in formal activities that mimic adult work, play, and sexuality, and make extreme maturity demands.[14]

It is thoughts like these that have driven many leaders to develop child care options for school-age children. They are not simply saying, "Here our children will be safe from harm," but rather, "here our children will have all the opportunities for play, socializing and informal learning that have always been such a valuable part of their development."

Parents, teachers, educational leaders, many others joining the chorus for school-age child care

"The schools, after all, do have a stake in what Johnny does after school," proclaimed Dr. Verne A. Duncan, Oregon's State Superintendent of Public Instruction, in his "State of the Schools" address in 1987. "He brings it with him to class the next day." His words may take on even greater significance because Dr. Duncan held the post of President of the Council of Chief State School Officers for 1988-1989. Embellishing his opinions in an interview with the SACC *Newsletter,* Dr. Duncan stated:

> The schools must become more involved. We certainly don't want to duplicate the good programs already in our neighborhoods. Instead, we should become partners. I know there are legal issues like insurance, but when all is said and done, I would open up the schools for programs in the non-school hours. I'm not saying our teachers should take on this responsibility. However we should collaborate, coordinate our efforts, or at least, make it possible for high quality children's program providers to come in and use our facilities, like the gyms. Children need this time to get away from the formal classroom; we should be exposing them to all kinds of informal opportunities for enrichment.[15]

In its February, 1988 issue the *Communicator,* published by the National Association of Elementary School Principals, announced the results of its recent survey in a cover article, "Principals Nationwide Respond: Should K-8 Schools Provide On-Site Child-Care Programs?" An impressive 37% of the principals sampled believed children would perform better in school if they weren't left unsupervised so

long out of school. The survey found that 22% of the respondents had before- and/or after-school programs in their buildings already, and 84% agreed such programs were needed.

According to the Louis Harris Survey, which polled teachers as well as parents, teachers said that the latchkey problem is the number one cause of poor performance in school. When asked to rank seven possible causes of students having difficulty in school, 51% of the 1,002 teachers interviewed chose "children who are left on their own after school" as the number one factor (before "poverty in the student's home" [47%], "automatic promotion" [44%], "teachers not adapting to individual student needs" [43%], and "single parent families" [42%]).

By interviewing more than 2,000 parents of school children in randomly selected households across the country, the Harris survey also found that most parents shared the major concern expressed by teachers. "Yes," 59% of the 2,011 parents surveyed said, "we do leave our children alone too much after school." According to the survey, 12% of parents of elementary school students and 30% of parents of junior high students leave their children alone "almost every day" from the end of school to 5:30 p.m.

Indeed, parents more than any other force have pushed for more options for the out-of-school care of school-age children — and for the idea that public schools should be a part of the solution to this problem. Starting in the early 1970s, in places as disparate as Brookline, Massachusetts; Nashville, Tennessee; San Francisco, California; Washington, D.C.; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; and Teaneck, New Jersey, parent groups have formed their own nonprofit corporations and worked with school officials to organize and run school-age child care programs in public school facilities. On the heels of a decade and a half of parental involvement in this issue at the grass roots, the national Parent-Teacher Association has declared the latchkey problem a national crisis and since 1985 has published and disseminated a series of guides to encourage local affiliates to get involved in school-age child care.

In addition to worrying about the effects on children of being left alone, some school boards have also found that the provision of extended hours of services can be supportive of other goals of the school district, while meeting the needs of employed parents. Two of the most widely-publicized examples of the use of before- and after-school care as a tool in voluntary desegregation have been the Phillips Magnet School in Raleigh, North Carolina, and the Gilpin School in Denver, Colorado. The Phillips School was designated as a magnet in 1977, with children from outside its neighborhood boundaries accepted only

if they were enrolled in the extended hours program. The result was that the population of a school located in a black neighborhood, turned from primarily black children to a majority of white children in a very short span of time. The Board of Education in Denver followed a similar path; in 1982 they inaugurated the old Gilpin, a school located in a low-income, high-crime downtown neighborhood, and with only a 3% "Anglo" (white native English speaking) enrollment, as the Gilpin Extended Day School. As at the Phillips, applicants from outside the neighborhood had to be utilizing the extended hours program in order to register for regular school and (also as in the Phillips model) they paid fees to defray some of the costs of the extended hours program, just as the neighborhood children did. The Gilpin's Anglo enrollment shot up quickly to 14%. The histories of both of these schools demonstrate that parental needs for quality child care are in many cases great enough to overcome anxieties that have sometimes been barriers to voluntary desegregation, such as fears about sending their children to school in neighborhoods other than their own.

It is not only members of the education profession who have taken on this issue. The National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) and the American Library Association (ALA) are both becoming actively involved in promoting more and better child care for school-age children and a closer relationship between the child care field and their respective professions. The NRPA convened a special session on this topic at its 1988 national convention, showcasing the work of local recreation and park agencies that are running school-age child care programs (more on this in Chapter 2, "A Round-Up of the Partners"). The ALA, which held similar special convention sessions on this topic starting in 1986, issued a detailed guide to librarians in 1988. The guide laid out strategies to make sure that unattended school-age children do not inappropriately interfere with the traditional functions of the library, and strategies to involve librarians in creating new opportunities for these children—perhaps in tandem with other concerned community institutions.

The voices of children are heard as well

While the latchkey problem is now on the front page and the evening news, children themselves have long been expressing their fears of being alone, whenever they have been given a chance to do so. For example, in 1984 the editors of SPRINT, a language arts newsletter for grades 4 to 6, published by Scholastic, Inc., invited its readers to re-

spond to the theme, "Think of a situation that is scary to you. How do you handle your fears?" The editors were amazed when 70% of all respondents—more than 5,000 children—wrote in that they were afraid of being home alone.[16] These letters outpaced by a landslide the second and third most frequent fears—standing in front of the class to give a report, and animals such as dogs and snakes.

To gain the direct insight of young children, Earl Grollman and Geri Sweder invited 641 youngsters from 20 school districts in 11 states to share their own thoughts and feelings.[17] Two-thirds said they were afraid to be home alone; many worried about their parents: "What if my mother doesn't come home! Maybe the building burned down or a speeding car knocked her over!" Most said they spent their after-school time "glued" to the television set.

This latter observation comports with an informal survey conducted by *Working Mother* magazine in 1984.[18] Among the children who responded to that survey, television was the preferred activity.

School-age child care—so that the latchkey arrangement is not the only option for families

A growing consensus has emerged among parents, educators, other professionals who work with children outside school hours, and even children. The consensus is that there is a need for action to see to it that children of employed parents are not left with the latchkey arrangement as the only option. While it may work for some, and while there may be no validated research proving it is harmful, clearly it is not at present being selected from a multiplicity of choices. Rather, its widespread prevalence is the result of a lack of choices. The balance of this book looks at school-age child care—an option many communities are creating so that the latchkey arrangement is not the only alternative available.

Role of leadership

One impression that may come through in reading the chapters that follow is the seemingly haphazard manner in which the field of school-age child care has been developing. Here a school district has gotten involved, there it's a housing project; elsewhere it's a church, a parent group, a county government, or a family day care system that organizes a program. One state passes legislation to support school-age child care; the state next door there is silent about the problem.

The impression of haphazard growth would not be inaccurate; still, it would overlook the crucial role that state and local leadership has played in this field. If one state has something and the state next door has nothing, if one school district has programs, and the one next to it has none, the difference probably has less to do with the community's needs or its demographics than it does with the presence or absence of leadership.

Because there has been no successful national legislation on the latchkey issue, except for the dependent care block grant (to be discussed in Chapter 3), leaders at the local or state level have made all the difference. Sometimes an elected official plays the key role; in Houston, the mayor decided to convene public hearings on the question of school-age child care; in New York, the governor placed the previously unrecognized issue of school-age child care squarely on the legislative agenda by talking about it in his state of the state address; in California, a state senate leader wouldn't let the governor have his welfare reform package unless he in turn approved a school-age child care bill he had previously vetoed.

At times the media galvanizes public action, as in South Carolina and Georgia, where the deaths of school-age children home alone during after-school hours have garnered headlines and brought a response. In other communities it is parents who make the issue a compelling one: in Boston, an organization called Parents United for Child Care brought out enough of a crowd demanding school-age child care at a City Council hearing to inspire editorials in local newspapers.

Other programs for children introduced in the recent past, such as special education or Head Start, have been backed by federal legislative mandates. These mandates have to a large degree defined the mission, prescribed the institutional base, and supplied the funding. We shall make quite clear in our narrative that no such sweeping national mandate has brought us to the present point in the development of school-age child care. Consequently this field has no clearly and consistently articulated mission, no reliable institutional base, and precious little funding other than what parents pay out of their pockets. Many of *No Time To Waste*'s Action Recommendations were written with the aim of changing this reality and placing the field onto a more secure and consistent base.

While we wish to overcome the shortcomings of the field as it has thus far developed, we do not wish to minimize the significance of the leadership that has brought us to the present point. The fact that thou-

sands of school-age child care programs do exist across our country today is a tribute to the efforts of parents, educators, child care professionals, public officials, entrepreneurs, and many others who have acted—in the absence of national policy—to fill perceived needs in their own local communities. They should be honored for that.

CHAPTER 2

A Round-Up of the Partners

School-age child care is not identified with any one organization or any single profession. Many groups have been involved for decades, even generations; others have come forth in the 1980s, in response to the recent attention to the issue of latchkey children. Collaboration across professional and organizational boundaries is one of the strengths of the field. But the plethora of models of service delivery can be bewildering to those who are newly involved in it.

On what premises are these programs taking place? Under whose auspices are they being administered? If they are located in schools, is the school district hiring the staff and running the programs, or is there some other arrangement? And if increasing numbers of parents are enrolling their children in programs that run every day, all afternoon, then what has become of the other kinds of youth-oriented recreational programming that used to be available for young people after school, through organizations such as community centers, YMCAs, YWCAs, Boys' and Girls' Clubs, recreation and park departments, the 4-H, and others.

Changing families, changing missions

An answer to the questions above must begin with the recognition that child care for school-age children in this country, like child care for younger children, has been accurately characterized as a patchwork quilt. It is not a service that is "owned," uniquely or even primarily, by any one institution. Public schools, private schools, churches, preschool day care centers, and every one of the youth-oriented recrea-

tional institutions referred to above have been part of the development of school-age child care in the United States.

"Owing to a variety of factors, many of the elementary-aged children are left unsupervised during the after-school hours ..." begins a manual for after-school programs developed by the Dade County Public Schools in Miami, Florida.[1] In the case of Dade County, which is a very large school district, the decision was made to develop several models of school-age child care: some programs operate under the direct administration of the district, others are run by the assistant principals for community education, and still others are located in the school facilities but are operated by independent not-for-profit agencies.

"Our country currently is facing a child care crisis due to the lack of affordable, quality child care," reads a position paper from the national office of Camp Fire, Inc.[2] In recent years this office has begun urging its local Camp Fire Councils to consider offering daily before- and after-school child care programs in addition to the weekly Bluebird and Camp Fire activities for which they have long been known. A similar evolution has taken place within almost every organization which has historically served American school-age children during their out-of-school hours. As the culture and lifestyle of American families has changed, these organizations have adapted their missions in order to continue to be able to meet the needs of their populations. These new efforts have frequently pointed toward school-age child care.

One program that captures the spirit of this evolution in an unusually clear manner is the KARE-4 program in Sioux Falls, South Dakota. There, a United Way study found that the four local recreational organizations—YMCA, YWCA, Boys' Club and Girls' Club—were all greatly under-utilized. A survey of families showed that children and parents were interested in the programs, but unable to use them because of lack of transportation after school while parents were still at work. With the support of a grant from the Gannett Foundation, KARE-4 was conceived as a collaborative school-age child care program. Children could attend any one of the four sites or create a weekly schedule in which they attended different sites on different days of the week. There were still other children using these places for "drop-in" recreation, but the parents of those enrolled in KARE-4 school-age child care were assured that their children would have a safe, secure, stimulating place to spend their time, and that the program would take full responsibility for making sure they arrived each day at their scheduled destination.

Why collaboration?

There are a great many institutions that are making a significant contribution to school-age child care, and this is likely to remain true for the foreseeable future. There are not always multiple partners involved with a single program, as in KARE-4. But collaborative models provide many of the best examples of quality school-age child care. This is so for several reasons. First, it is logical for organizations and agencies which have developed expertise in addressing the out-of-school recreational and social needs of children to continue to deliver those services. School-age child care may pose new challenges to such agencies—challenges that they cannot meet without help from other institutions. Second, the scarcity of resources within this field, which will be discussed more freely in Chapter 3, gives rise to collaboration as a way of sharing costs. Third, the wide range of ages and developmental needs within what we call the school-age child care population, from kindergarten entry through age fourteen or fifteen, demands widely varying opportunities for the youngsters involved.

Of course, the culture of a particular community ultimately is a determining factor in where and by whom programs will be developed, and to what extent collaboration will exist. In some places, there literally are no other resources geared to school-age children other than the public school; in such communities the school needs to become a key partner, if not the sole provider of services, or there simply will be no program. In other places, there are a host of potential partners for collaborative program development.

SACC at public schools

Perhaps the greatest expansion of school-age child care has been fueled by the question and its answer: why not have before- and after-school programs right at the schools? Children are already there, classrooms are vacant, parents often live nearby and can conveniently pick up their children after work.

How significant a role are the schools playing?

In order to learn how significant a role the public schools are playing, the School-Age Child Care Project asked for data from the education departments and the child care licensing units of every state. We wanted the education departments to tell us how many schools and

school districts were operating their own school-age child care programs, and how many were involved in school-age child care through partnerships with other public or private organizations We also asked them for estimates of enrollment capacity (the number of children they could accept) or current attendance in these programs. We asked the agencies responsible for licensing child care how many programs were licensed exclusively to provide school-age child care, how many were licensed to serve school-agers in conjunction with preschoolers, and what the respective capacities were for enrollment of school-age children in these two types of licensed programs.

There were only seven states in which both the education department and the agency in charge of licensing child care were able to supply us with reasonably comprehensive data. This allowed us to look at school district involvement in school-age child care and to weigh its significance in the context of the development of other licensed school-age child care programs outside the schools (excluding family day care, about which few states had any data). We were also able to examine the relative numbers of school-run, as opposed to partnership models within the schools. Those seven states—Utah, Ohio, Tennessee, Kentucky, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Delaware—are the subject of this discussion.

The data show that in the seven states, school-based programs presently make up the lion's share of all programs that are licensed exclusively for school-age children. In Vermont, for example, it appears that in 1988 the 2 schools with school-run programs and the 22 schools with partnership programs accounted for half or more of all the programs in that state that were licensed exclusively for the care of school-agers. In Tennessee, similarly, it appears that in programs licensed only for school-age child care, out of a total enrollment capacity of over 12,000 the majority of that capacity was located in the schools—either in the 26 schools with district-run programs or in the 132 schools that ran programs in partnership with other organizations. To the extent that these states are able to produce the relevant data, it appears that the same pattern holds for all seven states.

That is not the end of our picture, however. A far greater number of school-age children continue to attend programs that are licensed to serve them in conjunction with preschoolers. At some programs they are mixed in with preschoolers; at others they are not, and have their own separate space, curriculum and staff. State data do not differentiate between these two modes of service. What is clear is that in spite of the recent increase in the number of organizations operating pro-

grams exclusively for the school-age population, there are still far more school-age children attending programs licensed for both age groups. And when we take the large numbers of these children into account, and recognize that the vast majority of them are attending programs that are operating outside the schools, we see that school-based programs do not yet provide anywhere near the majority of all school-age child care.

In Ohio, for example, while there were approximately 123 public schools with SACC programs, statewide there were 1,600 programs licensed to care for preschool and school-age children. According to the Education Department, the total capacity of the school-based programs was approximately 3,600, while the Bureau of Child Care Services reported that the capacity for enrollment in all centers licensed to accept school-agers was over 27,000. Similarly, Vermont had nearly 700 children in its school-based SACC programs, but it had a licensed capacity for school-age child care of 1,856, of which nearly 1,000 spaces were in organizations that were serving preschoolers along with school-agers.

More school districts are making space available than are running programs

In these seven states, school districts are playing varying roles in the delivery of school-age child care services. In five of the seven their role is much greater as a provider of space to other organizations than as a provider of school-age child care services themselves. In Utah, Vermont, Delaware, New Hampshire, and Tennessee, the percentage of school-based school-age child care programs run by the districts themselves ranges from 3% to 22%. Utah, for example, reported only one public school in the entire state with a district-run SACC program, while 28 schools in 4 other districts were the sites of partnership programs. Tennessee reported 26 schools in 11 districts with school-run SACC programs, while another 132 schools in 10 districts had partnership SACC programs.

In Kentucky and Ohio the reported picture was dramatically different from that in the other five states: here, 63% and 92% of the programs in the schools were run by the districts themselves. The Ohio Department of Education, for instance, said its best guess was that there were approximately 10 schools in 5 districts with SACC partnerships, while it reported that 113 schools in 77 districts were operating SACC programs themselves.

Some states, including Arizona, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, Ohio, and Oregon, have amended their laws and ordinances to encourage placing these programs at public schools. Wisconsin's legislation goes the farthest: principals in that state are mandated to allow use of school facilities by community organizations for school-age child care unless those schools are already offering before- and after-school child care themselves or they can demonstrate that there is no available space for a program.

Many high-quality public school-based school-age child care programs in the country have been allocated dedicated space—specific space dedicated to the exclusive use of the SACC programs. In Brookline, Massachusetts, each of the eight grammar schools has a parent-run, independently incorporated Extended Day Program. The programs receive space, custodial care and utilities as an in-kind contribution from the school district. In Robbinsdale, Minnesota, the district runs its own program, using two school buildings which have been completely converted to centers for early childhood education and school-age child care. The Fairfax County, Virginia, school system also makes dedicated space available—and even in some cases builds dedicated space for the purpose of school-age child care. In this instance, the partner agency that runs the programs is the Office for Children, a county agency. A fourth example is the Latchkey Programs in the Juneau, Alaska, public schools, where the programs are under the administration of the community education division of the school district. While most of Juneau's programs reside in shared space, a few sites that have had an opportunity to cultivate their relationships with principals and others over the years have received their own space.

More often than not, shared space is the reality for school-age child care programs in the public schools, regardless of whether the program is school-run or is a partnership. Having their own dedicated space gives programs a strong identity within the school, a place to decorate and furnish in their own way, and to have ongoing projects that do not have to be put away every day. However, programs can be of high quality even if they must operate in shared space. The Hephzibah Children's Center of Oak Park, Illinois, received a grant from the state of Illinois to develop a model school-age child care program in a shared multi-purpose room in a public school. Staff from other programs are able to come and observe how the Hephzibah deals creatively and effectively with this challenge by developing activity centers that are easily set up and dismantled, and by choosing furniture and storage with an eye to their particular uses.

Custodians may play key role in making space available

Sometimes, particularly in major cities, unions representing custodians in the public schools become obstacles to the use of public school space for SACC, because of contractual terms which makes it prohibitively expensive for outside groups to conduct programs during out-of-school hours. (For example, some of these contracts required that custodians be paid fees on an hourly basis, even if they were not actually working any more hours than usual, simply because the building was being used by an outside group.) In New York City, this issue necessitated action by the Board of Education in order to facilitate the use of the schools for school-age child care. The Board negotiated a new contract with school custodians in 1985 at a cost to the city of $5.6 million per year, in order to have 950 schools open from 3 to 6 p.m., as well as in summers. Prior to that, the "opening" and "closing" costs that were required to be paid each day a facility was open for a non-instructional activity prohibited most use of school space by community agencies. This new appropriation did not contribute one cent for any programs; it simply opened the doors to groups that might now be able to raise enough money, from grants or parent fees, to run programs. Since that time, an increasing number of groups are using the schools, paying rent on the basis of the numbers of classrooms, large activity rooms (gyms and cafeterias), and bathrooms that they require.

Of course, no one should impose new maintenance responsibilities on custodians without some equitable increase in staffing or budgeting, unless it's included in collective bargaining agreements. But those contracts specifying extra compensation for use of the schools during non-school hours were most often based in the past on occasional special events, such as parents' nights and open houses, which involved large numbers of adults and children travelling throughout the building, and which required major amounts of maintenance both before and after the event. Current use of a small number of rooms every day for school-age child care programs is in no way comparable to a school-wide open house, and should create a fresh basis for negotiating mutually acceptable solutions.

Where these and other roadblocks have been overcome (or not encountered in the first place), an enormous range of organizations are utilizing school space to operate school-age child care around the country. It includes the PTA and other parent and parent-teacher groups, Camp Fire Councils, Girl Scout Councils, YMCAs, YWCAs, Boys' and Girls' Clubs, preschool day care centers, cultural and ethnic

organizations, and independent organizations founded expressly for the purpose of operating school-age child care programs. Many school board members, superintendents and principals have found that in the absence of financing from local, state or federal education sources, partnerships with such organizations produce the best result: a good quality program located in the school which does not tax the staff and finances of the school department itself. Other school leaders, however, prefer to operate SACC programs under their own jurisdiction.

Why does the practice of school districts vary so dramatically from one state to another? The presence or absence of strongly established organizations that began delivering school-age child care services before the schools got involved is certainly a factor at the local level. But from an examination of the data on a statewide basis, it appears that the key factor is the locus of funding for new program development. Since 1985, each governor's office has been asked by the federal Department of Health and Human Services to designate one state agency for the receipt of Dependent Care Grant funds, 60% of which are to be targeted toward the start-up, expansion and improvement of school-age child care. (There is a discussion of these funds in Chapter 3, "Who Pays for School-Age Child Care?") There appears to be a direct correlation between the designation of the Education Department as the recipient of those federal funds and the selection of local Boards of Education as the direct providers of services.

Ohio and Kentucky are the only two of the seven states supplying comprehensive data in which the Departments of Education have been designated to receive these grants since 1985. As we have discussed, most of the SACC programs in those states' schools are run by the school districts. In the other five states, these grants have been administered by Departments of Health and Human Services (New Hampshire), Human Services (Vermont and Tennessee), Social Services (Utah), and Health and Social Services (Delaware). These departments have encouraged the collaboration of other agencies with the schools, as opposed to direct administration of SACC by the schools.

SACC at private and religious schools

The logic for locating school-age child care at private and religious schools is the same as for public schools: the children are already there; the environment was designed for their age group; the facilities are not fully utilized once school is out, or before it begins; so why not develop

programs right there? Increasingly, school-age child care has been added to the agendas of such institutions.

When programs are located in private and religious schools, they are almost always run by the school administration, with families paying extra for the extended hours of care. An example is the St. Thomas PreCare-AfterCare-KinderCare, at St. Thomas the Apostle School in Peoria Heights, Illinois. There, approximately 65 children attend each day, with parents paying $20.00 a week for the first child in the family, and an extra $1.00 a day for each additional child. Fees are waived for those who cannot afford to pay anything. The program takes place in the school's classrooms, gym, computer lab, library, and hallways. The principal of the school is the administrator of the program. Families whose children have social adjustment problems in school are requested to send their children to AfterCare, so that they will have a greater opportunity to make friends and learn to interact with others during the nonacademic part of the day. The program is considered a model and has been copied throughout central Illinois.

Sometimes, even in private and religious schools, the partnership model, rather than the school-run model, is preferred. An example of this is the ADESTE program in Los Angeles and Ventura Counties in California, where the independent, nonprofit Catholic Charities agency is the administering authority for a program that operated at 80 Catholic school sites as of the fall of 1988. These programs are supported by parent fees of $50.00 a month for the first child in the family and $10.00 a month for each additional child. The schools make all the space available without charge. Like many public school-based programs, but unlike most private and religious school SACC programs, enrollment is not limited to those attending the school during the day. ADESTE's policy is to allow up to 15% enrollment from families in the area whose children do not attend that school.

SACC at or operated by youth service organizations

Many youth-serving organizations use their own facilities to offer school-age child care programs. Others operate programs at selected schools.

The CHAPS, Inc. program of Hudson, Mass. is a partnership of youth-serving agencies and the public schools. The Girls' Club, the Boys' Club, the Recreation Department, and the public school system now work together through the nonprofit CHAPS Board of Directors. The school district provides a director and the high school serves as a

staging area. Tutoring is school-based but other activities are not. The Recreation Department handles all the fees and provides the transportation to the Girls' Club, the Boys' Club and its own programs. The Boys' and Girls' Clubs offer activity choices on a quarterly basis. (Fees were $120 a month for the core program in 1988, with a $50 annual fee for membership in the partnership organizations.) A local anti-poverty agency subsidizes the fees for low-income families. The program also receives funding from the local United Way and from Digital Equipment Corporation.

Because of the burgeoning need for care for school-agers, it is becoming commonplace for YMCAs and YWCAs to offer child care both in their own facilities and in public schools. In Anderson, South Carolina, the Anderson Family YMCA has access to shared space in two school buildings for its school-age child care programs. It also arranges to pick up children from 18 other district schools and transport them either to those two sites or to its larger school-age child care program at its own facility. Similarly, the YMCA of Collier County, Florida, runs after-school programs at four of the local elementary schools, and transports students from three other schools to the Y facility.

SACC through associations serving children with special needs

Across America, organizations such as the Easter Seal Society, United Cerebral Palsy (UCP), and Associations for Retarded Citizens (ARCs) are working with school-age child care programs or operating preschool and school-age child care programs themselves. For them, the rationale is not much different from that of youth-serving and other organizations that have adapted to the changing profile of the American family. They have moved into this area of service as the population they serve has increasingly articulated a need for it. "Easter Seal buildings, which were bulging with clients in the '50s, are being underutilized in the '80s," states the foreword to an Easter Seal Publication titled, *Mainstream Child Care ... A Guide.* It continues, "Mainstream child care is a program requiring minimal to moderate start-up costs, relatively simple planning, and easy entry and exit." Fortunately for the families of children with disabilities, the entrances into this area of service have been more frequent than the exits, because these families are often desperate for school-age child care.

In Austin, Texas, the Capital Area Easter Seal Rehabilitation

Center runs an After-School Recreation Program for children with special needs from ages 3 to 13. In Rochester, New York, the United Cerebral Palsy Association's DISCOVERY Child Care Center began in 1983 by providing preschool care for children of UCP staff and for children with handicapping conditions. Soon the program added a before- and after-school care component for school-age children as well. In Fitchburg, Massachusetts, the Association for Retarded Citizens formed an after-school program for developmentally disabled teenagers. All three of these organizations have created additional models in other sites around the country.

SACC at playgrounds, gyms, and city parks

San Francisco voters overwhelmingly passed a resolution to fund after-school and weekend supervised programs at school playgrounds and gyms throughout the city in 1986. This network of SACC programs is being developed and administered under the guidance of a task force made up of community leaders, the PTA, library trustees, and police officials, working with the San Francisco Park and Recreation Department. A similar measure that would have accomplished the same objective statewide was narrowly defeated in a 1988 ballot referendum. Meanwhile, in 1988 the city of Los Angeles began paying to extend supervision at 300 playgrounds, located mostly at public schools, until 6 p.m. daily, and to provide weekend coverage as well. Seattle similarly extended the hours of the Park Department's summer day camp and community recreation centers to better match the needs of employed parents. In addition, that city increased staffing at many playgrounds and reopened eight that had been closed.

Formal involvement in school-age child care by local recreation and park departments is increasing. In Pacifica, California, a city south of San Francisco, the Children's Services Department is run by the Department of Parks, Beaches, and Recreation. It administers both preschool and school-age child care in the public schools, including services for children with special needs. Additional Recreation and Park Department sponsored programs are found in such diverse communities as Cincinnati, Ohio; Indianapolis, Indiana; Largo, Florida; and Aurora, Colorado. Like their counterparts in the private, nonprofit sector, these public agencies are widening their involvement in school-age child care both by expanding use of their own facilities and by gaining access to space within selected public schools.

SACC in public housing or by public housing agencies

The population of public housing typically includes many families with young children. Since subsidized housing is offered on the basis of income, it is not surprising that many of the parents are not able to pay much for child care. In light of the lack of safety and security in housing developments, particularly in larger cities, their reluctance to use self-care and their need for organized programs is even more compelling than that of other parents.

A number of cities, including Dover, Delaware; Baltimore, Maryland; and Minneapolis, Minnesota; now have SACC programs within housing projects. The Dover program operates from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m., serving the half-day kindergarten children from five elementary schools. Activities include dramatic play, field trips, and academic help, in addition to meals. The Housing Authority donates the space and utilities; funds for program operation come from parent fees, Title XX, and subsidies provided to parents who are enrolled in a state-administered work incentive program.

The "Family Development Center" in Baltimore, Maryland, is a new project administered by the local Department of Public Housing and based at the Lafayette Court Housing Project. SACC is just one of the comprehensive services it offers; others are health services, parenting education, alcohol and drug prevention and rehabilitation, job placement, elder services, and preschool child care. The school-age child care portion of this project is run by the Parks and Recreation Department, uses the third floor of a public school building, and is able to serve up to 150 children.

At Minneapolis' Glendale Child Development Center, the staff was not satisfied that it was doing all it could to meet the needs of school-age children. In fact, relations between the preschool day care center, located in the housing project, and the school-agers hanging around the project were becoming very strained. Seeking to reach this population without requiring full-fledged, formal enrollment, the Child Development Center initiated the "Community Kid" program with United Way funding. The school-age children now have a staff person who meets them at the preschool center and takes them to a variety of community resources, such as a gym, a YWCA, and an Arts Council.

SACC at day care centers

Thousands of preschool day care centers across the country have extended their services to include school-age children. This includes both for-profit and not-for-profit centers. While important developmental issues arise when a caregiver seeks to span a greater age range, the provision of SACC services by a day care center may be especially important in providing continuity for children and families who have used the program during the children's younger years.

Typical of this evolution is the Wesley Day Care Center in Glenview, Illinois. Wesley, a private, nonsectarian, not-for-profit group, was founded in 1972 as a preschool day care center. At that time it was housed in a church and served 35 children. It added a small school-age component in 1977. By 1988, it had grown to serve more than 150 children. This enrollment included over 70 school-agers from first grade and up who attended a site housed in the Rugen Community Center, a facility owned by the Department of Parks and Recreation. In addition, kindergartners continued to be served at the original site, along with infants, toddlers and preschoolers. Wesley was one of the first centers in the United States to receive accreditation by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC). The fee in 1988 for five days a week of after-school care was $90.00 a month.

SACC at family day care homes

Family day care, as the care of small numbers of children in private homes is called, is the most widely used form of child care in the United States. Increasingly, systems and networks of family day care providers are paying attention to the specific needs of the older children who attend these homes before and after school. The needs or interests of older children are different from those of younger children who may be in attendance all day long.

The Reston, Virginia, Children's Center has a school-age child care program as part of its regular center-based operation. It also includes 18 homes for school-agers in its Family Satellite Program. The family day care providers become employees of the Center and receive employee benefits, sick leave, paid holidays, and access to workshops and a resource center. Satellite homes provide a diversity of activities, including cooking, crafts, and visits to the library and local playgrounds.

The United Methodist Mid-City Parish in San Diego, California, launched an organization called "Gather the Children" to serve school-age children before and after school in newly licensed neighborhood homes. Many of the providers were recruited through area churches. The group helps providers go through the licensing process, aids them in designing appropriate activities and refers families to them for enrollment.

A tally of SACC providers, fall 1988

Public Schools

Elsewhere in this chapter we discussed the significance of public school involvement in school-age child care, using data from a national study conducted in 1988 by the School-Age Child Care Project. In that discussion we used data from those seven states that provided us with the most detailed information. Some additional information from that study is: percentages of school districts involved in school-age child care (either as providers or as partners with provider agencies) were as low as 0% in some states (Idaho, 0 out of 116; Montana, 0 out of 546); and as high as 83.5% (Florida, 56 out of 67). Examples of states that fell between the extremes were Alabama, with 35% of school districts involved, (46 out of 130); New Hampshire, with 22% (34 of 154); and Oregon, 6% (17 out of 281). Thirty state education departments were able to answer our questions with some degree of authority (labelling their answers in some cases as "best guesses"). The total percentage of school districts they reported to be involved in school-age child care—out of over 8000 districts in those states—was just under 8%.

Moving from district to school involvement, 22% of elementary and middle school principals responding to a recent National Association of Elementary School Principals survey said their schools now offer school-age child care (either under their own auspices or through the partnership approach). An earlier estimate in 1970 was only 8%. Since the survey focused solely on the subject of child care, without breaking the care into separate categories of school-age and preschool, the response may have been somewhat higher among principals whose schools were involved in school-age child care. We believe that by 1988 the actual number of schools involved fell somewhere below the 22% figure.

Independent Schools

The National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS) now estimates that at least one-half, or approximately 300, of its 604 schools that serve elementary students have active extended day programs. In 1984, a NAIS survey reported that 164 schools offer extended day programs.

The YMCA of the USA

In 1987, 962 of the organization's 2,200 local YMCAs reported having school-age child care programs. Based on the average number of sites each of these programs, used, YMCA national staff estimate they may now have around 2,600 school-age sites. Four years ago, national staff estimated that 500 to 600 YMCAs were operating 1,000 sites.

The YWCA of the USA

Fifty-four of its 400 YWCAs now serve between 30,000 and 35,000 elementary schoolchildren through the organization's school-age child care programs, an increase from 45 YWs in 1983.

The Boys' Clubs of America

The national organization has now completed its four-year cycle of information gathering on local programs, but at the time this book went to press had not yet reported its data. Previous data in 1984 indicated that approximately 200 of its 1,100 Clubs, or 18%, were then offering after-school care.

The Girls' Clubs of America

In a 1987 survey of its 112 organizations, 50% esponded affirmatively when asked, "Does your club provide extended day services - that is, services before or after regular club program hours?" (While a number of these clubs may not be providing school-age child care programming in the full sense of the term, this does mean, according to national staff interviewed, that a responsible, accountable leader was "providing something for children" who might be dropped off as early as 7:30 a.m. or who might have to await a parent pickup until as late as 5 or 6 p.m.)

Camp Fire, Inc

National staff reports that 17 of its 300 Councils now operate full before-school/after-school programs, another 10 operate drop-in programs and 10 more provide vacation-time care. The total, 37, is 10 more than reported in 1983.

United Neighborhood Center Association

Estimates are that 60%–70% of its 200 centers offer structured, purposeful, after-school group activities that are "developmental—more than recreation." Perhaps 30% of the 200 offer traditional child care for school-age children.

Religious Organizations

The Ecumenical Child Care Network of the National Council, a program of the National Council of Churches, links over 12,000 church-housed child care providers, early childhood educators, advocates and church leaders in a partnership to insure high quality, equitable child care for all children. According to a 1984 survey, one-third of churches that responded had some child care on their premises; 28.5% of these churches had before- and after-school programs. Based on anecdotal information, Network staff estimate that "a large number of our churches with day care now serve after-school [needs]."

Interviews with specific denominations—the United Methodist Church and the Roman Catholic Church—produced further information. The United Methodist General Board of Discipleship's Education for Young Children staff informed us of its survey of 2,000 churches that sponsored weekly programs for children. More than one-fifth of the respondents (119 of 509) reported that they had some kind of SACC program: 2,478 children were being served, from kindergarten through eighth grade.

A National Catholic Education Association report states that interest in early childhood education is very high and that, for example, preschool programming has increased 200% in the last five years. Although they have no hard data on school-age child care, staff observed, "These programs are starting to mushroom." It has recently been reported that Philadelphia's parochial schools have adopted a policy of offering school-age child care in every school.

SACC at day care centers

A national survey of state child care licensing agencies conducted in 1988 by the School-Age Child Care Project made it clear that the expansion of preschool day care centers to serve school-age children has been proceeding quite rapidly. Although many states did not have data-collection procedures that allowed them to break out numbers of licensed centers by age group served, some data was available for analysis. The state of Michigan reported that approximately 600 preschool day care centers had school-age components, along with another 50 centers that were licensed exclusively for school-age children. New Hampshire reported that approximately 252 school-age slots were combined with preschool day care in programs licensed for both pre-school and school-age children, while another 544 slots were found in 16 programs licensed exclusively for school-age. Ohio reported that out of a total of 2,450 licensed child care centers, 1,074, or 43.8%, cared for school-age children. Of these, 60 were exclusively for school-agers, while the other 1,014 were serving school-age children in conjunction with younger age groups. Ohio was one of the few states that reported the total licensed capacity for school-age children: as o. the spring of 1988, it was slightly over 27,000.

SACC at for-profit day care center chains

A major provider, KinderCare USA, has over 1,100 centers, licensed to serve 120,000 children ages six weeks to 12 years. KinderCare's KLUBMATES program serves 20,000 school-age children during the summer, and provides other SACC services during the school year.

It is clear from the preceding list and from this chapter as a whole that there are a great many different organizations getting involved in school-age child care from one end of the country to the other. In the next two chapters we shall examine where these programs are obtaining their funding and just what it is that children spend their time doing while in school-age child care.

CHAPTER 3

Who Pays for School-Age Child Care?

There was a time in this country, before the movement for universal free public education, when it was thought that only those families who had the means to pay for it should get an education for their youngsters. Though Americans are by no means universally satisfied with the education available to their children in the public schools, at least by now they consider it a birthright: parents with children of school age can relocate to any city or town and, virtually overnight, expect to have their children placed in a school with a staff of trained, certified professionals. Regardless of the current enrollment, there are no waiting lists; regardless of family income, there are no fees. Without having any prior experience in that community, parents know exactly where to call to find out where the schools are, when and where to register, and so forth: the local school board.

How different is the situation when parents seek care for their children during those other hours and days when schools are not open. They often don't know where to call for information and may have a hard time even finding out if school-age child care programs exist. If programs do exist, there are often waiting lists. The staff may or may not be trained in the field in which they are working. And then there are parent fees.

Budgets for most SACC programs are based on the pay-as-you-go model, with parent fees providing the revenues to support the operation. Some programs charge by the hour, some by the week, others by the month or by the year. Most offer a variety of options for care, such as before-school, after-school, or both; two, three, four, or five days a week; care during no-school days, vacation weeks, and before- and

after-kindergarten. Because of the diversity in the ways various services are designed and priced, it is hard to compare fees across different programs. Nor is there a "typical" fee for a particular service; there are huge disparities in price, which may or may not reflect disparities in program quality.

The School-Age Child Care Project conducted a survey in 1988 of 130 programs in six different geographical sections of the United States. It showed that the average unsubsidized fee was $26.00 a week for five days a week of after-school care for the first child in grade one and up in a family. Fees were substantially lower for parents who were eligible for subsidies. Most programs offered a discount if there was more than one child from the same family attending. Fees were higher for kindergarten children who needed more hours of care, and most programs, but not all, charged additional fees for before-school care.

As hard as it already is for many families to pay school-age child care fees, the costs would be even greater if it were not for the unusually low salary and benefit packages paid to caregivers in this field. It has been said of the child care industry as a whole, and it is certainly true of school-age child care, that the main source of subsidy for the service is the low wages accepted by those who are employed by these programs. The national survey referred to above determined that the average pay of senior-level caregivers in this field was $6.30 an hour. (To ascertain this figure, we used whatever job title was listed just below the level of program director — or, in the case of multiple-site organizations, the one just below site director. This position was sometimes called "teacher," sometimes "group leader," or other titles were used. Then we noted the wages paid to a person holding that position.) The average pay of all caregivers, of course, would be considerably lower than $6.30 an hour.

Programs relying solely, or at least very heavily, upon fees paid by parents face the following limitations:

(1) Lacking start-up money, many proposed initiatives either are never begun or cannot survive long enough to reach the break-even point.

(2) Programs serve only those who can pay, leaving many low-income families with latchkey or other arrangements.

(3) Programs cut down on quality (mostly in the form of low wages and/or high child/staff ratios) in order to keep costs low. They may thus meet the minimal needs of parents to have a place to send their children while working, but they fail to meet the true needs of children.

Because of programs' widespread reliance on parent fees, the development of school-age child care in urban centers and other areas with high concentrations of low-income families has lagged behind their development in more affluent areas. The news, however, is not all bad. A variety of sources of revenue besides parent fees has begun to open up at the local, state, and national levels. Some of this funding is for start-up only. Such funding can play a very useful role in stimulating expansion of the field, but unless it is used to leverage other monies, it fails to help families unable to pay for quality care. Other public measures and private contributions that we shall discuss have made possible the direct subsidy of program operation. In this chapter we shall examine the growing development of resources for both start-up and operation.

Start-up funding

Providers of quality school-age child care, whether they are privately owned or have public or nonprofit status, are, in effect, small businesses. Like other businesses, they need to attract consumers to use their services. Their programs may not be fully enrolled at the start.

During the time that the service is beginning to be available but is underutilized, there will be financial losses. In this business as in any other, these losses are expected and normal and should be considered part of the cost of getting off the ground. Outlays that are necessary to get the operation off the ground and that are not expected to be covered by incoming revenue may be termed "start-up costs." In school-age child care, there are several typical kinds of start-up costs that can be expected for at least the first six months:

- Salary for one coordinator or program director, at minimum, for at least two or three months prior to the enrollment of children in the program.
- Bills for legal services for drawing up contracts, for licensing, incorporation and application for tax-exempt status if needed, etc.
- Initial costs of liability and other types of insurance.
- Renovation of space; purchase of furniture, equipment, toys, materials and supplies, and initial payments for leasing or purchase of vans or other types of transportation.
- Staff salaries during, at minimum, several days of pre-service training for all caregivers before the doors open for children.

Some SACC operators, enthusiastic about opening SACC programs to the public as soon as possible, have been hopeful of simply starting small and bringing in enough revenue from parent fees alone to keep the program afloat, and then expanding capacity as a larger market takes shape. While sometimes successful, this approach will more likely lead to cutting corners on quality, which in turn leads to a lack of enthusiasm among the initial users of the program, which further slows the rate of new enrollment, which further strains the budget and causes even more need to cut corners on quality. The result: a program that has to fold within the first two years, or a program that struggles along, tolerating high staff turnover, low employee morale, and lack of appreciation by parents and the community at large—not to mention the morale, appreciation and welfare of the children who have to spend their precious out-of-school hours there.

Clearly, the need for start-up funding is as imperative for school-age child care as it is for any other business seeking to bring a new product or service to the marketplace. Fortunately, a number of public policymakers and private organizations in this country have seen the necessity of allocating investment capital for the start-up and expansion of school-age child care.

The Federal Dependent Care Block Grant Program

The most widely available start-up funds are derived from an act passed in 1984. Congress passed and the President signed legislation authorizing a new grant of up to $20 million annually, with 60% for SACC and 40% for Resource and Referral services for children, elders and disabled persons. Although no funds were appropriated in the first year of the authorization, subsequent years have seen a slow growth from $4.8 million to over $11 million in appropriations. The measure is currently authorized through fiscal 1990.

All states receive at least $50,000, with larger states getting an amount in proportion to their population. Each state government designates an agency of its choice to dispense the funds: these have included state departments of education, state departments of social services or public welfare, and other state agencies responsible for children, youth, and family policy.

Use of the school-age child care portion of the grant is limited to start-up, expansion or improvement. It may not be used to support ongoing operations, to make capital improvements or renovations, or to subsidize care for families unable to pay. States have employed these

federal funds in many ways to stimulate the development of new programs. They have developed "how-to" materials, provided technical assistance to local groups, held conferences for educators, parents and providers, and given out "seed grants" to organizations that need some initial operating capital to get off the ground or to expand to new sites.

State start-up grants

At least fourteen states have put their own dollars into SACC. Approximately half of these, like the federal dependent care grant, have limited the use of the funds to start-up. But they have taken a number of different approaches to the issue of start-up funding.

New York is a case in point. In his January, 1983, Message to the Legislature address, newly inaugurated Governor Mario Cuomo said, "The state must assist families ... to develop local after-school services." Acting upon a subsequent report, a bipartisan legislative coalition set aside $300,000 in the 1984-85 budget for start-up and expansion of SACC programs. After two years, the appropriation was doubled to $600,000. These grants have been limited to a maximum of $10,000 and have gone strictly to aid start-up or expansion. They are awarded based on a request-for-proposal (RFP) process developed by an interagency task force. Since 1984, more than 200 programs proposing to create over 10,000 new slots for school-age child care in New York have been funded through this grant program.

The state of Maine passed legislation in 1986 which explicitly recognized the need of new school-age child care centers to be able to operate at a loss during the first year without cutting corners on quality. A fund was created beginning with just $50,000, but in fiscal year 1989 it had grown to $125,000. Money was available to reimburse of up to 25% of the first-year costs of running a program, with a cap of $10,000. Eligible organizations were day care centers, recreation departments, public schools, nonprofits, and youth-serving organizations.

The state of Delaware has taken a different and unique approach to the question of start-up costs. Based on surveys of school administrators, policymakers recognized one of the barriers to opening up the schools to community agencies that wanted to operate child care programs within their space. This barrier was the fear of hidden costs that these administrators believed would be associated with the use of their facilities. These costs could be for anything from time the school secretary might spend on phone calls relating to the school-age child care program, to increased use of paper supplies in school bathrooms. As

an inducement to reluctant school superintendents, to principals and to other administrators, the state agreed to pay the school districts $50.00 per year for each child enrolled in a before- and after-school child care program in their facilities. Thus a school district with three school sites serving 40 children apiece before-and/or after-school would be entitled to receive a $6,000 payment, which the district could spend however it wanted. The legislature appropriated $200,000 for this fund.

State welfare reform as a source of start-up funding

One area of legislative activity with the potential for enormous impact on the supply of school-age child care is that of welfare reform. California's GAIN (Greater Avenues for Independence) bill is a case in point. Participation in remedial education, training, and other activities associated with GAIN (with the ultimate goal of full-time employment) is mandated by law for able-bodied welfare recipients whose youngest children are six and over, it is voluntary for recipients with younger children. GAIN was passed in 1985 but did not go "on line" in many large counties until 1988. Participants are required to place their children in a child care setting of their choice while they are involved in any of the GAIN-related services or activities. Since most participants will have school-age children, this will obviously create a huge demand for an expanded supply of quality school-age child care.

In order to prepare to serve future GAIN recipients, county Departments of Social Services are receiving funds to support start-up and expansion efforts in school-age child care. For example, the DSS office in San Mateo County conducted an inventory of available school-age child care and found that the three sections of the county with the greatest number of likely future GAIN clients had the least amount of school-age child care. It therefore issued a request for a proposal (RFP) for organizations that could develop additional capacity for at least 200 more slots in the three communities. Two organizations, the San Mateo 4-Cs and the Redwood City Consortium for School-Age Child Care, were selected as recipients of funds. As a result, they have staff, funded through state dollars, working in those communities to get new programs off the ground. These programs are expanding the supply of quality school-age child care not only for anticipated clients of GAIN, but for all residents of those neighborhoods.

Local public support for construction, renovation

In recent years, the County Board of Supervisors in Fairfax, Virginia, has been funding major renovation and new construction of classroom space for the Fairfax County Office for Children SACC program. This is one of the nation's largest school-age child care programs. Initially, $4 million was allocated for this purpose, and that amount was expected to increase. The purpose of this allocation was to include dedicated space for school-age child care in 11 newly constructed school buildings, and to build new dedicated space onto 13 other existing schools. This partnership between the county government and the school department quite obviously enabled program quality to much higher than it would have been if parent fees were the sole source of revenue.

In 1986, the voters of Seattle approved a $17 million school levy for repairs and renovations on school buildings that included the construction of dedicated space for school-age and preschool child care in 14 elementary schools. This levy added to the tax burden of homeowners for two years but did not become a permanent part of the property tax. It was easily approved by the electorate, with over 70% voting for it. The levy was needed in part for basic structural repairs of school buildings; thus it was not seen as solely a referendum on child care as an entity unto itself. This may point the way for other communities to gain public support for child care measures. When child care becomes part of the fabric of the community's responsibilities, along with removing asbestos or repairing roofs, it ceases to be controversial.

Foundations and corporations are also providing some start-up funding

In Houston, Texas, a study commissioned by the mayor found that 20,000 to 30,000 young schoolchildren were without after-school supervision. These findings gave rise to the Houston After School Partnership, an outgrowth of the Houston Committee for Private Sector Initiatives (PSI). Made up of many of the leading organizations in the business community, including a number of oil companies, the PSI worked with the Houston Independent School District (HISD) to develop and implement 26 public school-based school-age child care programs. The programs are run by a variety of different nonprofit

community agencies. These agencies were able to draw on a fund of over $285,000, donated by members of the PSI to help programs get off the ground. The programs were also able to draw on the expertise of the PSI members, because each company adopted one of the sites as its own and provided executives for consultation and technical support.

The Adolph Coors Brewery in Golden, Colorado, is another corporation that has offered start-up support for school-age child care programs. After a survey of the beer company's employees determined that 52% had a need for before- or after-school care of 6- to 12-year-olds, the company teamed up with the local PTA to try to do something about the problem. As in Houston, the effort involved a multiplicity of different agencies that are running the sites. Most of them were already operating some sites before the corporate initiative began; with the new initiative, the number of schools involved has been expanding—from 20 to 36 within the first year of the initiative. (There are 82 elementary schools in the district.) While the company has contributed some money, its major contribution has been to give visibility and urgency to the issue of school-age child care. The company hosted a conference to kick off the new initiative, assigned a staff person to work on the project, agreed to pay the costs of any surveys that needed to be done at individual school sites, and offered the corporate headquarters as a site for school-age child care training. As a direct result of the new visibility given to the issue by the Coors initiative, the County Commissioners decided to earmark $150,000 of state lottery revenues for school-age child care in Jefferson County. At the time of the writing of this book, these funds were to be used by the park and recreation district to hire specialists who would be available to work and lead activities in the various sites all over the county.

In the early to mid 1980s, Hallmark Education Foundation, along with several local foundations, provided funding for a comprehensive, citywide SACC advocacy and development project in the metropolitan area in and around Kansas City, Missouri and Kansas City, Kansas. The funds were channelled through a social service agency, which played a coordinating role in working with school districts, public and private agencies, churches and others to expand the supply of school-age child care. Seed grants of up to a few thousand dollars were made available to help organizations get programs off the ground. The private grants allowed two professional positions to be funded at the lead agency, Family and Children's Services, for several years, so that providers could continue to call for technical assistance, information and moral support. In addition to the new school-age

child care programs, the project also went into a partnership with a local television station, KCTV, by operating a telephone reassurance line for children feeling lonely, scared, or bored while staying home alone.

The Gannett Foundation's Community Priorities Program has provided help for many cities to start-up or expand their SACC programs. In Sioux Falls, South Dakota, a $40,000 grant from Gannett enabled KARE-4, a program described in Chapter 2, to acquire buses and hire a coordinator. In Wilmington, Delaware, $70,000 helped get SACC started initially at two, and at then four public schools. Another $42,000 Gannett grant enabled Chittenden County in northern Vermont to coordinate resources and start up new SACC programs for more than 200 children. Foundation spokespersons indicated that Gannett's national office had no plan to combat the latchkey problem; rather, the Foundation was simply approving a number of separate requests from CEOs of local Gannett-owned newspapers, TV and radio stations for support of school-age child care. In any case, the range of Gannett Foundation-supported projects in this area has been impressive. Besides those already mentioned, the Foundation has awarded grants for school-age child care in Saratoga Springs, New York; Bellingham, Washington; Iowa City, Iowa; Chillicothe, Ohio; Freemont, Nebraska; and others.

The Whirlpool Foundation has donated $734,000 over a three year period, beginning in 1987, to a project of the American Home Economics Association. Project HOME SAFE is designed to have national impact on the latchkey problem. It aims to train 20–30 home economists in each of five demonstration sites per year. Once trained, some of these AHEA members are expected to play a role in helping to stimulate community-based efforts to build the supply of school-age child care. Others may focus more on teaching children how to operate home appliances safely and to conduct themselves generally in a safe and productive manner during their hours alone at home.

Funding for subsidy and operating costs

Start-up funds and technical support are critical factors in assisting programs to get off the ground. Nevertheless, if those are the only kinds of support that are available besides parent fees, programs are still left with the limitations described above: they either do not serve most low-income families, cut down on quality to keep fees low, or find themselves going out of business. To avoid those limitations, access to sup-

port, not just to pay for the start-up period but to cover operating costs and subsidies is crucial. We next examine the developments in this area. They exist mostly in the public sphere or in the sphere of private charities: the private corporations and foundations have shown very little interest in paying for ongoing operations, other than for an occasional pilot project.

Federal support for low-income subsidies

The major support for low-income families needing child care for any age, from infants through school age, comes from what some continue to call "Title XX" funds (from the name of an amendment passed in the 1970s), but which is now formally called the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG). SSBG funds are given as a lump sum to states are available for states to use as they see fit to support a range of social services to families that meet state-determined income and employment guidelines. Child care is one service for which states have the option of applying SSBG funds; most, but not all, choose to do this. The states that do include child care as one of the services they support with SSBG funds generally allow those funds to be spent on school-age slots for children in low-income families, as well as on slots in infant, toddler, or preschool day care. However, very few states have refined their record collection procedures to the point where they know how many of their SSBG funds are currently subsidizing clients with children in school-age, as distinct from other forms of child care. Hence, while we can say with assurance that SSBG funds provide the largest current outlay of federal dollars for school-age child care, there is no way to develop an estimate of just how much federal support is actually involved.

State support for operating costs and low-income subsidies

Several states have included direct subsidies to programs for children from low-income families in the legislation they have passed. Four that have taken different approaches are New Jersey, Indiana, Pennsylvania, and California.

New Jersey has made $500,000 available to support start-up efforts and the subsidization of low-income families, through the development of sliding fee scales in school-age child care centers. Each of the 21 county offices of the Division of Youth and Family Services (DYFS)

conducts a request-for-proposal (RFP) process. Acceptance or rejection of the proposals is determined by local Human Services Advisory Councils, which include citizens and providers as well as state agency representatives. Grants have ranged from $10,000 to $94,000 since the program was initiated in 1988.

What is most unique about Indiana's approach is source of revenue. An additional one-half cent per pack was added to the cigarette tax in 1987 to generate revenue for maternal and child health care, local public health centers, and school-age child care. The SACC portion of the funding amounts to $400,000 annually, and is used to subsidize participation in programs by children from low-income families. It is guaranteed for seven years, and then, in accordance with the "sunset" provision of the amendment which brought it to life, it will be evaluated in 1992. At that time it will either be eliminated or made permanent. The state allows for a great deal of flexibility in terms of which providers of school-age child care may be supported with the subsidies. Individuals and family day care providers are eligible as well as center-based programs, as long as they meet a set of standards developed explicitly for this legislation. They do not have to be licensed, though some aspects of the standards are equivalent to licensing regulations.

Pennsylvania has taken a creative approach to the funding of start-up, expansion and ongoing support for SACC programs. Its Department of Public Welfare has been given approximately $750,000 per year since 1985 to allocate to school-age child care. The department decided from the beginning not to disburse the funds itself, but to use four subcontractors, one in each of the four sections of the state. The first year, there was competition for the contracts; since then, the same four agencies have continued to receive the funds and disseminate them within their regions. The four contractors include one school district, one YMCA, one child care resource-and-referral agency, and one school-age child care provider. Each receives funds from DPW in accordance with the population of its designated geographical area, and each has a certain degree of autonomy to determine the needs and priorities within its area. For example, one contractor may offer seed grants to programs within its area that will expand service to older school-age children, while another may spend more of its DPW dollars on training caregivers and on upgrading the quality of programs. Each of the four contractors has developed its own RFP processes. All have awarded a variety of grants, some of which are strictly for start-up and others for ongoing operations.

In California, more than $16 million is provided annually

through the State Department of Education to public and private agencies that deliver "extended day care services." This money is paid out through contracts for specific numbers of slots, for children whose families meet designated low-income guidelines. For every slot contracted through S.B. 303, the "latchkey bill," the program is supposed to have one full fee-paying child enrolled. Since the bill was passed in 1985, there have been a number of "clean-up" amendments introduced by sympathetic legislators to make it more workable. particularly for communities with high concentrations of low-income families, where full fee-paying families are hard to find. Some of these amendments have become law, while others have been vetoed by the governor or derailed within the state assembly. It is clear that other states have much to learn from California's experience, since its commitment of resources is by far the greatest in the country to date.

School district dollars as a source of support for operating costs

Most school districts that have gotten involved in school-age child care have done so with the explicit understanding that such programs would be self-funding and that there would be no use of educational dollars for the child care programs. Their contributions have usually been limited to free or inexpensive space, custodial care, utilities, and payroll and accounting support. However, in a very small number of districts, school boards and school administrators have elected to use part of their regular funds or special allocations to reduce the costs of school-age child care to parents, or to ensure that children with special needs or handicapping conditions are not denied access.

In Houston, Texas, the school district pays for the cost of one certified teacher in each site where a school-age child care program takes place; that allows programs to offer homework assistance and tutoring without having to hire extra staff to take charge of it. Among those districts that have paid for extra staffing to ensure that children with special needs are not excluded from programs are Dade County, Florida; Brookline, Massachusetts; and Robbinsdale, Minnesota.

Local government as a source of operating funds and subsidies

A number of local governments have developed their own scholarship or subsidy programs for families who need, but cannot afford to pay for

school-age child care. Madison, Wisconsin, is one such community. As of 1987, 42 school-age child care slots were paid for by the city government's Tuition Assistance Program. In Seattle, the subsidy program for low-income city residents is called the Comprehensive Child Care Program. (Data on the specific dollar amount or number of vouchers going to parents in need of school-age child care is not tracked.) A more dramatic example of local government support for SACC is Arlington, Virginia, where the county school district has operated a large, multiple-site program for many years. In order to offer a sliding fee scale for low- to moderate-income families, the difference between the actual cost and the revenues collected from parents is made up by annual county appropriations. For the 1988-89 school year, the revenues brought in by parent fees were expected to total approximately $1.022 million; the County appropriation was $407 000, or slightly more than 28% of the annual operating budget.

In Los Angeles, California, the city is tapping a source of public funding not previously used in this field, and is paying for more school-age child care slots than any other local government. The funding source is a local community redevelopment fund which received revenue from a property tax increment generated by downtown redevelopment. This fund had accrued $4.25 billion by the fall of 1988. In that year, Mayor Tom Bradley proposed spending a significant portion of this money on a school-age child care and education program over a period of twenty years. He called his proposal "L.A.'s BEST: Better Educated Students for Tomorrow." He presented it in the context of the need to place L.A.'s children into constructive after-school activities and get them away from drugs and gangs.

In the initial pilot phase of the program, 10 after-school sites were opened at public schools in the 1988-89 school year serving a total of 2,000 children. The children were all totally subsidized by the city redevelopment funds: No fees were charged to parents, regardless of their income. At the time of this writing it is anticipated that if the pilot phase is successful, some kind of sliding-fee scale will be designed, so that the subsidy will be targeted to where they are most needed. The program is projected to open eventually at more than 400 schools.

In Cincinnati, Ohio, the Recreation Commission is the main local government provider of school-age child care. It has found an innovative approach to the provision of services to families who cannot pay for quality care during out-of-school time. While it charges fees to parents who enroll their children in the before-school, after-school, and summer programs at the recreation sites in the more affluent areas

of the city, it charges no fees at the sites located in areas of the city with high concentrations of poverty. Since the basic operations of the Commission are supported through tax dollars, it simply allocates a higher proportion of those staff positions that are supported by tax dollars to the poorer sections of Cincinnati. Other areas are able to fund the positions they need out of the parent fees they collect. This is an approach to the issue which may bear study by other communities around the country.

In some Florida counties, local dollars for school-age child care and other children's services are raised through a special tax levy authorized by the state government. This method of funding has been used to subsidize low-income children in Pinellas County's school-age child care programs since 1945, when a Juvenile Welfare Board was created by a special state statute. That county currently raises over $9 million annually, through an assessment of $.50 on every $1,000 of property value. Of this, $700,000 went to school-age child care in 1987. In 1986, new legislation permitted other counties to impose similar levies to pay for children's services, if approved by a referendum. In the first year of the new legislation, voters in Polk and Sarasota Counties defeated the new measure, but those in Palm Beach County passed it overwhelmingly.

Private charitable dollars support operation and subsidy

United Way stands out nationally as the greatest private donor of both dollars and expertise to the development of the school-age child care field. United Way in many communities has provided the initial impetus to the recognition of the issue of latchkey children. In numerous communities, it is the United Way which has surveyed parents or employers to determine the extent of unmet need for services. Often, chapters of the United Way have been instrumental in pulling together task forces or in holding conferences to develop solutions to the latchkey problem. And unlike some other contributors to this field, local United Ways have not shied away from making direct contributions to the operating costs of programs. This has been especially true if the need was obvious because of the presence of families living in poverty who would not be able to pay the full cost of quality care.

Because of the method the United Way uses to collect data from its local chapters, it is not possible to determine precisely how many

United Way dollars may be currently supporting school-age child care operations. Nationally, United Way campaigns raise approximately $2.5 billion. Roughly one-fourth of this amount is allocated to organizations that fall into the children/youth services area. Many of these dollars go to programs such as Big Brothers/Big Sisters which are involved with school-age child care. However, some of these dollars support a range of other organizations—for instance, 150 Camp Fire Councils, 400 Boys'/Girls' Clubs, 700 day care centers, 930 YM/YWCAs—many of whom do include school-age child care among their services. It seems fair to conclude that $10 to $20 million would be a conservative estimate of what United Ways are contributing annually to school-age child care programs across the country. Developing programs should certainly cultivate a relationship with the local United Way and look to them as a potential source of both expertise and funding.

Some other donors of charitable dollars for school-age child care operations are chapters of national religiously-affiliated organizations, such as the Catholic Charities. Others are local charitable groups of either religious or secular origin. Examples are the Soroptimist Club, which has supported school-age child care in Zanesville, Ohio, and the United Methodist Urban Ministries, which has helped establish a family day care network for schoolagers in San Diego, California.

A rare example of private business providing support for operations is the local association of bar owners in Nome, Alaska. In 1988 the association pledged $10,000 per month for one year to support community education in their city. The community education department decided that the best use of the money would be to subsidize the latchkey child care programs in the schools. Thus the bar owners' contribution allowed enrollment of many children who would otherwise have been latchkey children. These Alaskan children face not just the boredom and loneliness children all over the United States have to contend with, but the darkness and cold, during many months of the school year, that far exceeds what is experienced in most of the country.

Special populations may draw support for operating funds

Operators of school-age child care programs may have a tendency to shy away from serving children who are considered to be in high-risk populations (for school failure and other problems) or who have special

needs or other exceptional characteristics. Such providers may have the best of intentions, thinking perhaps that they should not include these vulnerable populations because their staffs or facilities are not suitably prepared or adapted to respond appropriately to their needs. However, many children who attend special education classes or who are considered for some other reason to have special needs can be included in school-age child care without any extra provision of equipment, staffing, or other significant adaptations. To deny these children access to programs, therefore, purely on the grounds of disability or vulnerability, may raise serious issues of equity and legality. On the other hand, some children with special needs do require extra staffing and other forms of support to enable them to be in school-age child care programs. The good news is that funding from a variety of sources is becoming available for this purpose.

The Youth Enrichment Program (YEP) of Shreveport, Louisiana, received a grant of nearly $90,000 from the federal government in 1988, under the School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Program. This is a before- and after-school program administered by YEP, a nonprofit agency, using public school facilities. The criteria for receiving the grant were that a large percentage of the student population be eligible for free or reduced lunches, and/or at least one of the following: participate in Chapter 1 programs (academic enrichment for at-risk students) in school; have been retained in kindergarten, first or second grade; be reading below grade level.

While the purpose of the grant was to bring up students' reading levels, as measured on designated achievement tests, in no way was it required that the children's time in YEP be converted to a tutorial or remedial experience. A certified teacher was made available for daily work with language kits, but much of the grant was requested to support participants' involvement in cultural arts, drama, music, dance, etc.—the kinds of activities to which the YEP program was already devoted. A daily ten minute period for free reading was also set aside, thus accentuating reading as a pleasurable leisure activity.

In Delmar, New York, the School's Out Program applied for and received a grant in 1986 from the Office of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities (OMRDD). This grant allowed the program to hire a half-time special needs coordinator and fund five slots for special education students; previously it had served only regular education children. The consequent increase in staff and funding enabled the organization to rent an additional classroom space from the church in which it was housed, and to increase its enrollment of regular educa-

tion students by ten (by using the new parent fees to hire another classroom aide). Thus the special needs funding allowed the program not only to serve children with handicapping conditions but to expand the supply of quality care for all children.

In Maricopa County, Arizona, (the Phoenix area), the Department of Developmental Disabilities (DDD), a state agency, has paid for aide positions in a number of school-age child care settings, including summer camps and before- and after-school programs administered by YMCAs and YWCAs. The aides sometimes work with one child who has handicapping conditions, sometimes with two or more, depending on the severity of the disabilities. The availability of these extra staff people, who are funded by the state, relieves these organizations of the burden of trying to give a great deal of one-to-one attention to those children who need it. At the same time, it raises the quality of the program for all children because it allows all children to get more attention from adults: the DDD-funded aides do not spend all their time "hovering over" the children with special needs, but are often able to be involved in activities with other children, while keeping a watchful eye on those to whom they are specifically assigned. From the point of view of the DDD, this form of respite care is extremely cost-effective: it is much less expensive than funding the same special needs children to attend respite centers or to receive in-home respite. From the point of view of the parents and special needs children, it is far superior, as it gives children who would otherwise seldom get the chance long periods of time to be in recreational activities with non-disabled peers.

It may be very worthwhile for those who are developing school-age child care programs to investigate the possibility receiving of special grants from agencies dealing with mental retardation and other special needs, as in the example of Delmar, New York, and/or to investigate whether staff positions might be funded by state agencies dealing with special needs populations, as in the example of Maricopa County, Arizona.

Is quality school-age child care beyond our means?

We titled this chapter, "Who Pays for School-Age Child Care?" We have answered by pointing out that, on the one hand, most program fees are coming out of the pockets of parents, and that as a result, some program fees can be high, thus excluding less affluent families; in other

places, because of the commitment to keep the fees affordable, quality suffers. On the other hand, there are important funding sources that have come on line in recent years to support both the start-up phase and the operational support phase of program development. These exist in both the private and public sectors, at the local, state, and national levels.

Is the need for start-up and operational support being met? The answer is a resounding No. While we have dwelt on the positive, we had to look far and wide to find many of the examples of support we have cited. For that reason, we have included in our **Action Recommendations** several recommendations for expansion of funding from both the public and private sectors. In order for policymakers to make these appropriations and to monitor the results, they need a better understanding of the current inventory of supply in their respective geographical areas. As an example, we pointed out that there is now no way to know how much funding is going toward school-age child care from such federal programs as the Social Services Block Grant. For this reason, we have also included recommendations regarding improved data collection and we have identified specific states that have already implemented good data collection procedures.

We have made reference several times in this chapter to the issue of the quality of programs. But if it is so hard to find funding to pay for programs at all, some may wonder why we are even talking about paying for quality. Don't we just need a place to keep these latchkey children from harming themselves and others, where they can be off the street corners and out of the malls and have something to do besides watch the soap operas and raid their refrigerators? A place where they can do some homework and spend some time reading, and maybe draw with paper and crayons, and have a few sets of checkers and other quiet table activities?

Unfortunately, we could fill this book with descriptions of existing programs which don't do a whole lot more than that. They herd children into one large room, put ditto worksheets before them, offer them little chance for individual initiative or small group activities, or expect school-agers to be satisfied with a curriculum, not to mention furniture, designed for preschoolers.

Are these programs providing some protection to children who would otherwise be at risk, whether alone at home or on the streets? Yes. But they are only trading the physical and psychological risks of the latchkey arrangement for a new set of risks: risks to self-esteem, to social and intellectual development. These may arise from the daily ex-

posure to an environment that disrespects school-age children's developmental needs. Such an environment deprives children of opportunities for industry, autonomy, and peer relations that are recognized as critical to optimal human development in the middle years of childhood.

It is for this reason that the kind of school-age child care we are interested in promoting is quality care. By that we mean care which addresses children's developmental needs.

CHAPTER 4

Recognizing Quality School-Age Child Care

The previous chapter ended with an appeal for quality programs, and an acknowledgement that programs have not achieved an acceptable level of quality. They have the best of intentions—to keep costs low so that parents can afford the service. But in settling for untrained staff, in maintaining high child:. ratios, and in tolerating the constant staff turnover that results fro... the low wages and benefits they offer, they do a d.service to children.

Ten years of research at the School-Age Child Care Project leads us to declare loudly that there is no point in taking children out of latchkey arrangements, only to dump them into inappropriate child care settings that do not address their true needs. We may not be at the point in this coun.y where there is a consensus about how to pay for quality, but at least we have come far enough to begin to recognize it when we see it.

The numerous illustrations presented in this chapter will demonstrate that quality school-age child care programs in no way resemble "organized baby-sitting." Neither do they attempt to continue the regular school-day curriculum and structure for another two or three hours a day. It should also be evident that quality school-age child care programs cannot be thrown together on a shoestring but require careful planning, creative curriculum development and thoughtful approaches to staff training and development.

It will be helpful to begin by turning our attention briefly to another part of the world, where the substantial emphasis and financial support the field of SACC has received has permitted the development of excellent models of practice and high standards of quality.

Scandinavian children attend "free time homes"

In Scandinavian countries, programs designed for school-age children are called *friditshem,* which translated literally means "free time homes." Many of these programs are located in apartments or houses renovated for child care purposes and are often situated on wooded lots with room for tree-climbing and outdoor games. Indoors there are separate rooms for such activities as carpentry, art, housekeeping, dolls, with kitchens large enough to hold family-style meals. The group size is kept to about 20 and the ratio of staff to children is approximately 1:8. The staff are trained in three-year college-level institutes called *fritidshem pedogog seminaria;* here they learn many of the activities, such as music-making, sports, dramatics, and pottery, with which they will later be expected to engage the interest of their young charges.

As is evident from this description, as well as from the very meaning of the word *fritidshem,* these Scandinavian programs are not designed to offer a continuation of the school day, with its emphasis on cognitive tasks and formal, structured education. Nor are they merely a way of "baby-sitting" the children of employed parents, keeping them out of harm's way until the parents can pick them up. Rather, they are places where children love to go to explore new interests, to express themselves through art, drama, and active play, and to develop friendships with peers and staff in a cozy, home-like environment. They are places where school-age children's developmental needs for challenge, mastery, and a secure environment are appropriately addressed.

Quality SACC is neither babysitting nor more school

Quality school-age child care programs in America embody the same spirit of "free time home" as do the Swedish and Danish programs. Don Hudson, principal of the Eakin Public School in Nashville, Tennessee, which houses a parent-run program initiated in the early 1970s, describes the Eakin Care Program:

> The parents who formed the Board of Directors had a good understanding of what was appropriate. I didn't and they didn't want this program to be an extension of the school day. Nor a babysitting service. It was to be instead a place where stimulating activities would take place, and where part of what the kids were learning was how to make choices. When school lets out, one kid want to flop down and do

> nothing for a while; another wants to go to a quiet place and do homework. Later on, maybe they both want to get involved in a structured activity or learn a new skill.

A similar spirit underscores this appeal for donations from the Before and After School Care Program of the Hacienda La Puente School District in La Puente, California:

> One of the important things we will be doing in BASC is setting up indoor and outdoor environments that are comfortable, interesting, and homey. At the moment we have a limited supply of materials and equipment and would appreciate any items from you that are in good condition such as: tables (various sizes and shapes), chairs, sofas, cushions, games (complete with all pieces), records, children's books, area rugs or carpets, cooking equipment, garden tools, etc.

From the "Philosophy & Objectives" of the Hephzibah Children's Association in Oak Park, Illinois, comes this paragraph:

> We are here first and most importantly to provide a warm, loving, growing, and stimulating atmosphere for children. Based on respect for the child as an individual, Hephzibah hopes to help children enjoy life and learn to accept themselves as well as others. To fulfill our hopes, we need not only the consent of but participation from the parents.

Even though these three programs are located not in renovated houses on wooded hills, but inside public elementary schools and community-based centers, they nevertheless accept as their mission the development of a staff, an environment, a schedule, and a curriculum that makes their programs distinctively different from the regular school day.

Funds for the construction of buildings and for renovations to accommodate child care programs are rarely available here as they have been in the Scandinavian countries. Thus it is this challenge that faces providers of school-age child care in this country: to create an experience that feels like "free time home" even in institutional settings not expressly designed for this purpose.

The good news is that quality programs are developing in this country, providing some American school-age children with an experience that can be as satisfying to them as are the *fritidshem* for Danish and Swedish children. Below we describe thematically some of the elements that can be found in quality school-age child care programs.

Making choices

Quality school-age child care programs offer many choices, including the option of declining to join in large group activities. The Fargo, ND, Youth Commission and its business community provides elementary children with a variety of places to go after school; for instance, skating, bowling and the movies. Older children enjoy a palette of recreational options in "Junktion Funktion," a separate SACC program designed for preteens. The Youth Commission handles transportation and snacks and provides the adult supervision.

Informal learning

Quality SACC programs do not require children to focus on cognitive or academic tasks; this doesn't mean that they aren't learning or that the SACC program doesn't contribute to their cognitive and intellectual development. On the contrary, some children actually gravitate toward intellectual tasks more readily in the atmosphere of a nonacademic program without tests, grades, or report cards. Public television station WNET/13 and the New York City Agency for Child Development collaborated in a program in which enrollees of SACC sites located in low-income neighborhoods had access to special reading corners. This corner was filled with new books that had been featured on the PBS show, "Reading Rainbow." It also included writing areas with materials where children were encouraged to make up their own stories. Children could curl up on a soft pillow in a quiet corner and read for the pleasure of it as an alternative to other program activities. Research showed that as time passed, participants increased the amount of free time they spent reading.

Clubs and themes

Quality SACC programs offer children opportunities to focus in greater depth on something that interests them than might be possible in a classroom. Just as school-age children in another age might have had informal after-school clubs in the neighborhood, children today in a good school-age child care program may have clubs that form and reform periodically around different interest areas and with different members. In Dumont, New Jersey, SACC participants have become

enthusiastically involved in studying Newton's laws of motion, and in building and launching their own rockets. Other themes have included karate, cross country skiing and bicycle repair.

Caring for animals and plants

Helping out on the farm or in the garden, or taking care of the house pets or the animals in the barn are time-honored activities of school-age children during their days and hours outside the classroom. Such activities are incorporated into quality SACC programs. Many local 4-H programs are ready to work with school-age child care providers to grow seeds or even to hatch chicks. Others make visits to commercial or university-based greenhouses In Martha's Vineyard, Massachusetts, a staff person for an after-school program developed what she called "pet therapy" Children went to the local animal shelter one day each week to learn how to care for and handle pets. Some also brought a kitten or puppy on a visit to elderly long-term patients in the local hospital. Some participants later convinced their parents to come to the shelter, adopt one of the abandoned animals and take it home.

Work, responsibility and entrepreneurship

The lemonade stand, the newspaper route, the groceries carried for patrons of the supermarket, helping out in the family business... many of today's adults look back fondly on the opportunities they had in their middle years of childhood to earn money and be responsible for a job during their out-of-school hours. Quality school-age child care programs do not overlook these experiences. The Girls Club of Dallas, Texas, offers its teen members a Young Women's Company. During school vacations enrollees are paired with adult mentors in private firms where they help out in a real job for four hours a day. They also run small enterprises during the summer, such as a Sno-Cone stand at the annual Shakespeare Festival.

Expanding cultural horizons

The hours and days out of school have been a time when children could be exposed to art, music, theater, museums and other cultural experiences. Quality SACC programs build such exposure into their sched-

ules on a regular basis. Shreveport, Louisiana's Youth Enrichment Program (YEP), a nonprofit program that served 600 children in the public schools in 1988 and is still growing, has incorporated cultural activities through private contributions. The Regional Arts Council provides individual artists who perform and teach at each of 19 sites, while local sports stars, writers, and members of the business community also make visits to the sites. And in New York state, the Onandaga Child Development Council in Syracuse wrote a grant to a state arts council to support the work of a local theater group. The theater group had created an original play specifically for six- to twelve-year-old audiences. The performances were scheduled so that participants in all the school-age child care centers in the area could attend. The actors gave workshops on mask-making and theater games for staff of local SACC programs.

Moving between the SACC program and other community activities

Children who went home in the past did not necessarily stay home during their out-of-school hours. They may have taken music or dance lessons, enrolled in an enrichment class, played sports, or joined scout troops. Attending a quality SACC program does not mean foregoing the other opportunities available in a child's community. Children can move back and forth, with supervision or independently with parental permission, between the SACC activities and the other activities. At the Providence Day School, a private school in Charlotte, North Carolina, children attending the SACC program may also sign up for special once a week, sixty- to ninety-minute enrichment classes on special interest subjects. These have included archeology, Greek mythology, and "Monsters and Mysteries" such as Big Foot and the Loch Ness monster. Children who attend the Extended Day program gain half-price admission to these courses, which are available to all students in grades one through six. In other communities, music and dance studios have made lessons available at discounted prices to children in school-age child care programs. Where Girl Scout or Camp Fire Councils have begun to run their own SACC programs, they integrate the participants into the regular after-school activities of their troops.

Young adolescents need programs geared specifically to their age group and interests

Between the ages of 10 and 15, boys and girls pass through puberty and become physically mature. They begin to establish an identity apart from their families. They wrestle with values and ideas as never before. Where are the young people in this age group spending their valuable out-of-school hours and days?

Lynette and Thomas Long, leading researchers on latchkey issues and authors of *The Handbook for Latchkey Children and Their Parents,*[1] find that "... there are fewer and fewer resources available to kids beyond the sixth grade level, and in fact the number of such resources and extracurricular activities are being cut back."[2]

The Children's Defense Fund raises its concerns about this age group and its hopes in *Opportunities for Prevention: Building After-School and Summer Programs for Young Adolescents:*

> Helping children in the after-school and summer hours is too often seen as a growing burden on a community's resources. In fact, it is an opportunity for community programs, working together with families and schools and with the help of public resources, to begin to provide young adolescents with the skills and personal competencies necessary to make a successful transition to adulthood.[3]

Meeting the after-school needs of young teenagers presents an enormous challenge. At least 30%–50% of preteens and young teens—perhaps as many as 75% according to the Los Angeles Country Inventory—are left to care for themselves during non-school hours. Furthermore, programs for this age group need not cater only to latchkey populations. Even those who have a parent at home will be drawn to participate in quality programs. Surveys show that parents, regardless of their employment schedules, would like these youngsters to be in more supervised programs.

Most young teenagers—and even children as young as nine years old—want nothing to do with anything that sounds like "day care." Nor do they want to be confined to classrooms, cafeterias, or any place that feels like a continuation of the school experience. What they are drawn to are opportunities that go beyond those they can get in either the home or the school.

Community service

From visiting nursing homes to cleaning up playgrounds, there are many ways that older school-agers can be involved in service projects through their after-school programs. Students aged 11 to 16 in New York State did such things as refurbish the cannons in a public park, put together and distribute food baskets, and reorganize the basement of a public library. These projects were organized by the Cooperative Extension Department at Cornell University. In the WAVES program in New York City, 10- to 18-year-olds spend their after-school hours researching their own community and family histories, including conducting interviews with older people.

Working with younger children

Some SACC programs have older, preteen children work with younger children. The Broome County (N.Y.) Child Development Council gave teens 36 hours of training and then once-a-week follow-up sessions while they worked two afternoons a week. They received a state-subsidized stipend for their work and training.

The SACC program located in the Winnebago (Illinois) High School involves 25 students in the active care of 30 children ages 6 to 10. The program has had overwhelming success for several years. At the conclusion of the program year, most students voice a desire to work with children after high school graduation.

The Early Adolescent Helper Project involves 10- to 14-year-olds in caring for preschool-aged children. It also engages them in a curriculum that helps them clarify their own values and vocational interests. This project was developed at the City University of New York and has been disseminated to a number of communities across the country.

Jobs and money

In pm Pursuit in Fairfax County, Virginia, seventh and eighth graders have a chance to deliver newspapers and receive Red Cross training for baby-sitting. In Dorchester, Massachusetts, the Dorchester Youth Collaborative Common Ground and Urban Expressions Clubs have a job achievement component. Teens receive stipends for yard work, small carpentry and repair jobs. Stepping Stones Growth Center in

Oakland, California, gives teens with developmental disabilities opportunities to earn money through a variety of enterprises, including recycling, catering, and repairing of sails and other canvas items.

Recognition of peer culture

Much as many adults would prefer to see young teens studying classical piano or reading Nathaniel Hawthorne novels during their off-hours, the children themselves might be more excited about rock music and comic books. Organizations that run successful programs for the 10- to 15-year-old age group have found that they cannot expect to cut young people off from the peer culture in which they are living. Instead they are incorporating the peer culture into the programs, with special classes in rapping, break dancing, hair care, cosmetics, graffiti art, lip synching to popular songs, martial arts, and production of rock and rap videos. Such ventures into peer culture need not be devoid of community-minded spirit: In the Urban Expressions program in Dorchester, Massachusetts, the rap group Young Nation, made up of adolescents, has written and performed programs on such subjects as AIDS, sickle cell anemia, and drugs in the community. The Massachusetts Department of Public Health reproduced "Stop the Madness," their rap program on AIDS and how to prevent its spread, and distributed it statewide.

Greater independence

Family Day Care Check-In uses a concept first piloted by the Fairfax County School-Age Child Care Program: to balance independence with supervision for the young teens In this program, 10- to 14-year-olds go to a family day care provider after school but they do not necessarily remain there. After touching base with the provider they then choose from a list of previously approved options that have been written on a contract signed by their parent(s). For example, they might be permitted to go to the library, to a sports practice event, to the home of a specific friend, or to just play in the local park until a certain hour.

What kind of staff for school-age child care?

America does not yet have its *fritidshem pedagog seminaria.* A small number of universities and community colleges are beginning to generate

courses and curricula appropriate for the preparation of professional staff involved in school-age child care. There is, however, a consensus today among those operating many of the best programs that staff for these programs should be drawn from a diversity of educational backgrounds and professional experience. While some individuals with elementary school teaching credentials may make excellent school-age child care teachers and directors, this is only the case if they are flexible enough and willing to adapt some of their teacher training and move in the direction that the school-age child care setting requires: more child-centered activities, more choice-making, more involvement in the community, more emphasis on whole-child development (physical, social-cultural, emotional and intellectual) rather than solely on the formal tasks and skills that develop academic proficiency.

Many providers have found that teachers with a background in early childhood education are able to transfer their skills to the school-age child care setting. This is because they are already familiar with the child-centered concept and because they know how to create an environment containing multiple learning centers, where children move freely between art and craft areas, nature and science, block-building and manipulatives, sand or water play, housekeeping and dramatic play, and other areas. Even with this background, however, staff have to be prepared to make some changes. Much more than preschoolers, school-agers need teachers who have "real-world" skills (other than classroom management) and who will guide them in making "real" things, rather than in just enjoying the process of artistic expression or sensory exploration. School-agers have much longer attention spans than preschoolers and are ready for intensive and prolonged involvement in activities that interest them; they look ahead to something that happens "every Tuesday," in contrast to four-year-olds who aren't quite sure how often Tuesday comes around. Teachers with a background in early childhood education also need to be prepared for the reality that some school-agers will be heavier and taller than they are.

Other potentially valuable backgrounds for staff of school-age child care programs are. recreation and therapeutic recreation; work in summer camps, scouting organizations, outdoor education, and in cultural arenas such as performing arts, music, and theater. Below we look at examples of programs that have approached the selection and development of staff in innovative ways.

Job applicants play Jam-A-Quacks in Vero Beach, Florida

Rarely does a prospective employer introduce the job interview process to applicants by referring to it as "an equal opportunity to be humiliated." But that's what happened in Vero Beach, Florida, when the YMCA program decided to fill eight positions by asking all applicants to arrive at the same time, to wear their school-age child care attire and to play a game called Jam-A-Quacks. Later, each was given a chance to lead half of the others in ten minutes of games, songs, or other spontaneous activities. When not leading, everyone was asked to respond (as much as possible) like eight-year-olds. The Y understood that the wages it offered weren't high enough to attract individuals with broad professional experience. Instead, it decided to use the hiring process primarily to screen for enthusiasm, sense of humor, energy and personality, and then to give candidates with those characteristics a strong dose of information and training on the needs of school-age children and introduce them to a range of developmentally appropriate activities.

This process produced more excellent candidates than the director needed, so he hired 12 instead of 8 people and expanded his program from 80 to 120 participants. Forty hours of training for the newly-hired staff—ranging in age from high school seniors to a retired teacher in her 60s—involved sleep-overs with workshops and presentations as well as swimming, pizza, movies and instruction on New Games.

Older adults make a difference in rural North Carolina

AgeLink an intergenerational project of Western Carolina University's Center for Improving Mountain Living, has given older people who wish to work as caregivers with school-age children several choices: group care of the children in a community center or school, care of one or several children in an older adult's home, providing transportation for activities the child would otherwise miss, and maintaining telephone contact with children.

The older volunteers have more than just time on their hands; they share an enormous variety of skills and experiences, such as traditional crafts, music, and story-telling. One of the first caregivers was a

woman in her 80s who heard from her grandson that children weren't reciting poems in school anymore; she taught them how. Another volunteer taught children how to make biscuits. Equally important, AgeLink organizers are seeing benefits for the volunteers: they tend to remain physically and mentally healthier than others of their generation, who withdraw from social activity.

Routes to quality school-age child care: accreditation, evaluation, on-site consultation, technical assistance and model demonstration sites

The development of school-age child care has proceeded haphazardly in most communities—at least during its early years. There were no organized or systematic attempts to measure its quality or to bring less-than-adequate programs up to an agreed-upon standard. However, as the field has become more established and more professional, a number of strategies have been implemented in order to define quality and develop consistent standards for it. These criteria then can be recognized, promulgated and applied to programs across the board, despite differences in regions, administration, ages, and geographical and demographic characteristics of particular programs. Among the strategies that are being pursued are accreditation, evaluation, technical assistance, on-site consultation, and the development of model or demonstration sites.

ACCREDITATION

In 1985, the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), a voluntary association of professionals in child care, child development, and early childhood education, started an offshoot, the National Academy of Early Childhood Programs. The Academy's purpose was to offer a wide range of programs the opportunity to, in effect, test themselves against a national standard of quality. It designed a set of criteria and a process by which programs could become accredited, with accreditation valid for three years. The ten categories covered in the accreditation criteria range from quality of staff-child interaction and relations with parents to administration and nutrition.

The accreditation procedure requires a program to undergo a comprehensive self-study that usually takes a minimum of six months, involving caregiving staff, administration and parents. All caregivers

must observe their own programs and critique their own performances, as well analyze the organization of the physical environment and other aspects of the program. A written self-evaluation is required. The self-study and evaluation are followed by a site visit by a team of trained "validators" whose purpose it is to verify that the self-descriptions submitted to NAEYC are accurate.

The accreditation credential is symbolized by the Academy's logo, a flaming torch bearing the words "Accredited by the National Academy of Early Childhood Programs." It is added to the letterhead or parent handbook of an organization that has received it. It has rapidly become the most sought-after symbol of quality in child care and early childhood education in the country. All varieties of programs in the school-age child care field are applying for it—church-run, school district-run, parent-run, community education, youth-serving agencies, nonprofit and for-profit preschool day care centers with school-age components. A recent analysis by the NAEYC of the programs that have received accreditation reveals that of the first several hundred programs that received accreditation, only 1% were solely for school-age children; another 29%, however, served school-age children in combination with preschoolers.

EVALUATION

Many programs evaluate themselves on an annual or semi-annual basis by soliciting parent feedback through printed forms. A few programs have designed evaluations for children to complete. Recently, however some have gone beyond these beginning forms of evaluation to examine their services in a more objective and systematic manner.

Community Services for Children (CSC), in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, became involved as a subcontractor to the state Department of Public Welfare. In 1985 it gave out state grants for the start-up and expansion of school-age child care. By 1988, CSC decided it was important to evaluate the quality of the new programs that had been started or expanded with its funding and technical assistance. It wanted to use the NAEYC criteria as a framework for its own evaluation efforts, but to narrow the scope of its inquiry so that it could get a quicker look at the quality of programs than would be possible if programs underwent the full NAEYC evaluation process. With the Academy's permission, CSC prepared a shortened version of the self-study materials, focusing mainly on the programs' curriculum, and with a particular emphasis on learning the extent to which the school-

age children and their parents were being consulted and included in the process of curriculum development in local SACC programs. CSC added an inducement: $500 would be paid to any program that agreed to participate in the evaluation.

Nearly all programs agreed to participate, and the evaluation was very helpful in identifying the strengths and weaknesses in the activities they offered. Many programs, for instance, were strong on treating children with respect and being flexible in meeting their individual needs. On the other hand, most were weak on offering a wide variety of activities that appealed to both the oldest and youngest of their children, given the wide age range covered in school-age programs. Also, many lacked materials that encouraged and developed the use of children's fine motor skills and that supported multi-cultu· and nonsexist attitudes. Activities in which children could lea· ience or use problem-solving skills were not commonly available. As a result of the evaluation, CSC was planning to assist these programs by providing them with resource lists, training, and technical assistance to strengthen these areas of curriculum in which they fell short of the ..andards.

A different approach to evaluating program quality has been designed by the school district of Escambia County, Florida. There, the school-age child care system is a rather elaborate one; numerous private providers (both nonprofit and for-profit) play a part in running before- and after-school programs at the various school sites. Methods have been systematized for evaluating currently operating programs and also for bidding for the provision of future services.

A provider who already has charge of a particular school site is assured of only two years' commitment (based on a satisfactory evaluation at the end of the first year) and then must re-bid for the site along with any other competing bidders. Thus the expectation of a high standard of performance is built right into the system, with no organization able to rest on its past laurels. Some of the criteria that are considered in evaluating proposals for continued (or new) program operation are management, staff qualifications, daily and weekly program plans, adult/child ratios, volunteer screening procedures, an applicant's performance record in respect to any licensing violations or other history. A point system incorporating the criteria is used to score each proposal. The scoring for a given bid is done by a committee of five, consisting of principals and parents from sites other than the one being examined, and school district administrators.

Across the country, in the southern California community of Ir-

vine, there is another well-developed evaluation model. A Program Application Review Committee (PARC) studies providers' applications to operate school-based sites, and assesses the quality of existing programs. The PARC operates under the umbrella of the Joint Powers Authority (JPA), a quasi-public agency made up of representatives from the city and the Irvine School District. The JPA purchases portable classrooms (or "relocatables," as they are called in California) and places them on school grounds for use by nonprofit agencies offering child care. The PARC committee is comprised of two city representatives, one school district employee, two providers, two community members, and the Irvine Child Care Coordinator, the latter a full time position the city created in 1984 as part of its Office of Child Care Coordination. PARC members visit sites, using a checklist for observation. They are trained in how to observe and evaluate a site before they conduct the visits. The committee's assessments are used to determine which organizations will gain access to new sites and also serve as an annual review of existing sites.

ON-SITE CONSULTATION, TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, AND MODEL DEMONSTRATION SITES

Additional methods of upgrading quality include providing organized forms of technical assistance and direct consultation by those with expertise in the field, and the development of model sites in which students and practitioners can observe and receive hands-on training. These model sites are regular, on-going programs of high quality. Often an organization that is conducting a model or demonstration site may do so in combination with courses, workshops, and other forms of consultation, training and technical assistance. Organizations, both public and private, with such capabilities have begun to become more widespread in the school-age child care field in recent years.

A new and quite interesting approach to a demonstration site is located at Mid-Florida Technical Institute (MFT) in Orlando, Florida. MFT is a county-funded, post-secondary school that provides vocational training for adults. It has a child care lab site that has been training preschool day care providers for a number of years, in conjunction with the 4C—a United Way and state-supported resource-and-referral service. With a grant from the Florida Department of Education, MFT and 4C set up a new lab site for training SACC teachers.

Participant observation is the key to the MFT training program.

Personnel from school-age sites not only observe the MFT staff at work, they also participate in many of the activities—and they do so with children from the programs in which they work. Children and staff from a given SACC program come to MFT for eight consecutive school days, instead of operating in their regular space. For the first four days, the SACC staff observe while the MFT staff do activities with the children. The SACC staff then begin to participate and take a more active role; in the last few days, the MFT staff are observing while the SACC teachers are taking charge. This model gives many staff their first opportunity to sit down and reflect upon their professional interaction with children, to think through their communication styles, their activities, their approaches to discipline and to problem-solving.

In Houston, Texas, where the citywide Private Sector Initiatives (PSI) group has spearheaded the expansion of school-age child care, there has also been a focus on upgrading of quality; a demonstration site has been one part of that effort. A private consulting and management firm has contracted with PSI to conduct twice-annual comprehensive program evaluations of the various sites. In 1988 there were 26 sites under the management of five different nonprofit organizations. The management firm maintains one of the sites as a model center. Here new staff hired to work in any of the various programs spend one week becoming oriented before undertaking their regular site assignments.

The Kentucky Department of Education has used some of its dependent care grant funds to develop a capacity for on-site consultation, as well as one of the most systematic approaches to training anywhere in the country. Through the Department, an experienced school-age child care professional has been made available to visit sites, to observe programs, and to follow-up with both informal feedback and written reports and recommendations that are sent to the staff at the site.

VIDEOTAPES, NEWSLETTERS

Among the early work of the Wellesley College School-Age Child Care Project was Demonstration Site and Technical Assistance Project (in 1981 to 1983). The Project awarded funding to eight organizations around the country so that they could showcase models of service delivery and offer start-up assistance to groups in their regions wanting to learn about quality school-age child care. While the funding and the project formally ended after two years, some of its fruits continue to be

disseminated: videotapes produced by the Fairfax County (Virginia) Office for Children School Age Child Care Project and the Santa Monica (California) Children's Centers continue to be viewed by people all over the country; School-Age Notes, a newsletter produced by the coordinator of one demonstration site in Nashville, Tennessee, has thousands of school-age child care subscribers all over the United States; and some of the other "technical assistance affiliates," as they were called, continue to be recognized as leaders in the development of quality and innovation. We have referred elsewhere to a model site developed by the Hephzibah Children's Center in Oak Park, Illinois: Hephzibah was one of the Wellesley technical assistance affiliates. (See the resource list at the end of this book for addresses of the technical assistance affiliates and other organizations able to provide information and support for operating programs.)

Conclusion and Action Recommendations

School-age child care has grown rapidly within the past decade. It appears that our nation has begun to take seriously concerns about the quality of life and the safety of children ages 5–14 during their out of school hours. As we have seen, the impetus to develop solutions to the latchkey problem comes from many directions: parents, educational leaders, librarians, recreation and child care professionals, welfare reform advocates, and even from children. While some debate the relative merits of supervised activities versus the latchkey experience (some believe the latter fosters independence) there is a growing constituency demanding quality programs. The initial efforts to serve children in the lower elementary grades during their out-of-school hours have been increasingly supplemented by an interest in providing programs for 10- to 15-year-olds, in light of rising risks to young adolescents of drug and alcohol abuse and of early sexual experimentation. This book has offered a "bird's eye" view of the landscape of solutions that communities and governmental agencies have developed. The following **Action Recommendations** reflect our best judgment of the directions we think the field should take in order to prepare to meet the challenge of serving children and families in the decades to come.

We want to call special attention to one recommendation, **Action Recommendation Eight.** This is that at the local level, governments adopt what we call the "broker" model of school-age child care coordination and development. In too many places, school-age child care has simply fallen between the cracks. Because it has not fitted into one neat, existing category, and is not seen either as education or as social service or as recreation (though it belongs in part to all of these), it has

generally had no one to advocate for it within city, town or county halls. In the absence of major federal and state allocations for school-age child care, communities need at least one individual, operating within the municipal government, who can look at funding sources in community development, social services, parks and recreation, public health, developmental disabilities, public housing, business and industry and see that each of those sources is directed in part toward school-age child care. When state or federal help does become available, such brokers are needed even more to ensure that the dollars flow to where they are most needed and can be deployed most effectively. We salute communities such as Irvine, California; Madison, Wisconsin; and Seattle, Washington, which have pioneered this concept. We hope this book will help ensure that hundreds of communities follow their example.

Our Action Recommendations

ACTION RECOMMENDATION ONE

The Congress and the President of the United States should pass, sign and fully fund *Comprehensive Child Care Legislation,* addressing the need of American families for an adequately functioning system of quality child care for children from infancy through early adolescence.

A good model for this type of federal legislation is The Act For Better Child Care, known as the ABC Bill, which was introduced with bipartisan support and eventually tabled without a vote in the 1988 session of Congress. ABC was reintroduced in the 1989 session. Any federal child care initiative that is seriously considered by Congress should not exclude school-age child care. This bill covered children through age 14. We need this kind of legislation, which places care for school-age children in the context of a broader attempt to improve American child care in general as it presently exists. The effects of a bill like this on the school-age child care delivery system would be significant: even if only 10% of the authorization proposed in 1988 ($2.5 billion) went into school-age child care, this amount would dwarf the combined totals of all local, state, and national appropriations in this field.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION TWO

The Dependent Care Grant program, initially authorized in 1984 to be funded at $20 million but never funded above $12 million, should have funding for $20 million re-authorized. It should be extended for another four years, and fully funded at the $20 million level. The floor-level appropriation states with small populations should be raised from $50,000 to $100,000 whenever the appropriation exceeds $10 million.

This program has proven to be an extremely cost-effective federal initiative, succeeding beyond the hopes of its original proponents. It gives each state a block grant of $50,000 or more, depending on population, of which 60% is allocated for expansion and improvement of school-age child care services and 40% for upgrading of resource-and-referral systems. In many states, this has been the first funding stream specifically earmarked for school-age child care. It has been particularly successful in aiding start-up efforts by parent and community groups and school boards who can run self-supporting, fee-based programs, and merely need help getting off the ground. Full appropriation of the program at $20 million annually (with legislative reauthorization through fiscal 1994), with the floor fixed at $100,000 for small-population states, would boost the states' ability to continue these start-up efforts. Large population states would see most of the increase, but small-population states would have greatly enhanced flexibility as well: with the floor raised to $100,000, they would have $60,000 for school-age child care instead of the $30,000 they currently receive.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION THREE

State legislatures and governors should incorporate funding for school-age child care into state budgets, either by inclusion in regular appropriations packages or by the passage of special legislation. This funding should not be restricted to start-up purposes but should also be used to subsidize low- and moderate-income families, and to increase staff salaries and benefits to adequate levels. It should be disseminated not only to assist school districts or municipalities but also to strengthen the broad range of institutions which are involved in service delivery in this field.

There are approximately 15 states that have made state dollars available for the support of school-age child care. However, several of them follow the example of the federal dependent care grant in disal-

lowing use of funds for operational expenses; others target funds solely to school districts or municipalities. In the former case, communities with large numbers of low-income families have a hard time making use of the funds. In the latter instance, only one branch of a multi-faceted delivery system is being singled out for support. California, Indiana, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania represent four divergent approaches to the expenditure of state-initiated school-age child care funds that avoid both of these pitfalls.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION FOUR

State agencies and funding sources must coordinate their efforts to ensure that there is money for operation, as well as start-up, so that programs can survive beyond the start-up phase, and staff can be properly compensated.

Collaboration at the local level between public schools and other community organizations and institutions should be encouraged. One means of doing this is to require grant applications to show school system/community agency collaboration. Funding resources can be maximized by issuing joint Requests for Proposals; this allows one agency with start-up funds to coordinate with another agency that has operating funds. This allows groups, especially those in low income areas, to apply for both start-up and operating money at the same time.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION FIVE

States and local school districts should examine policies regarding the transportation of school pupils between home and school. They should amend policies, statutes, and practices where needed to ensure that a range of parental choices regarding where children will be picked up or dropped off will be respected.

For the purpose of computing cost-reimbursements by states and local school districts, pick-up from or drop-off to licensed school-age child care facilities should be treated no differently from pick-ups or drop-offs to the child's home. In some states, including Massachusetts and New York, amendments to existing laws have been passed in recent years to facilitate the use of school bus transportation to and from school-age child care. School boards and city and town councils have in some cases had to revise existing local codes as well.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION SIX

State agencies responsible for licensing child care should review existing regulations and determine how to modify so that they are appropriate for school-age child care. Some categories of programs currently exempt from licensure should be subject to licensure. Programs administered under the jurisdiction of public school districts, if exempt from licensure, should be subject to comparable guidelines administered by the state departments of education.

Five states have wholly separate sets of regulations for school-age child care. Approximately 20 others have made some adaptations of their group day care regulations that relate to the enrollment of school-age children, but these attempts are still clearly inadequate. The other half of the states, which have written little or nothing into their regulations to address the special issues raised by school-age child care, clearly need to move forward with this task. They would do well to look at the work of a few of the states, such as Massachusetts and Minnesota, that have recently created or revised school-age regulations.

The most frequent exemptions from licensure are for programs administered by the local educational authorities. We see no reason to challenge this practice, although more than ten states, including Virginia, Maine, Wisconsin and Colorado, have licensed public school-run programs with no reported problems. But there is every good reason to see to it that school-run school-age child care programs are subject to rules and regulations comparable to those that regulate other programs. The state of Minnesota is a good example. Its Department of Education has drafted regulations to monitor the quality of programs run by the public school districts. The state will, in effect, have two parallel monitoring and regulatory systems, but all providers of before- and after-school day care will be complying with substantially similar standards. The state of Tennessee has made plans to convert to a similar practice.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION SEVEN

The state agencies responsible for child care licensing and the state departments of education should improve their ability to obtain accurate data regarding the existing systems that are delivering school age child care.

The collection of accurate data on the available supply of school-age child care in a given state or locale is a necessity for policy makers at-

tempting to improve the supply and the quality. However, most states have very poor access to such data on school-age child care. In 1988, when the School-Age Child Care Project asked all 50 states to tell us the number of licensed programs (exclusive of family day care) serving school-age children, only 20 were able to give us an (numeral) answer. Only 14 were able to estimate licensed capacity for school-age child care. The vast majority of licensing agencies do not break out the programs they license by categories of age groups served.

Correspondingly, many state education departments are not aware of which or how many of their school districts either host or run before- and after-school child care. While in 1988 approximately 31 states were able to give some information on the number of their school districts and schools involved in SACC, those with little or no information included some of the most populous states in the country: New York, New Jersey, Michigan, and California, for example

As discussed in Chapter 2, in 1988 we found that there were seven states in which both the child care licensing departments and the state departments of education had ready access to data on the numbers of programs and school-age children served. They were New Hampshire, Vermont, Delaware, Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Utah. We urge policymakers from other states to look at the methods of data collection and monitoring used by these seven, and to strive to gain equally good access to information concerning their own school-age child care.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION EIGHT

Local governments should adopt the "broker" model of school-age child care development, hiring or designating at least one individual whose primary task it is to monitor and communicate with the diverse organizations, public and private, that are involved in this field, and to act as a broker between and among them by matching expertise and sources of funding with documented needs.

A promising development in school-age child care is the emergence of local models of coordination. These are offices and individuals employed by municipal or county government. Local governments designate or hire one individual whose primary responsibility is to act as the broker for the development, improvement and expansion of school-age child care. This individual, who may be in city, town or county government, in a park and recreation department, in the mayor's office, or in the department of human services, is assigned to

monitor and support and act as the liaison with private and public agencies and groups. With the appointment of such a person, the capacity is in place to better match needs to sources; funding streams are more intelligently brought together. Parents, child care organizations, schools, recreation departments, social service agencies, public safety and juvenile justice officials and others can thus easily identify and make contact with a source of information and technical assistance.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION NINE

School boards should establish clear school-age child care policies.

Schools are better able to operate quality SACC programs or play supportive roles as partners when their governing boards have established clear, well thought-through policies on school-age child care. The lack of clear policies, on the other hand, can seriously retard the initiation of needed programs, preclude consideration of alternative models of school-age care, jeopardize access for low-income and special needs populations, and, at times, produce public friction and private frustration among and between various parties.

Policies should, at a minimum, address the following: the relationship of SACC to the organization's mission and/or legislative authority; the goals, scope, and purpose of the program; the level of responsibility of the organization and other parties involved; the governance of the program (e.g. by a parent board); eligibility for enrollment/access for low-income families and populations with special needs.

If a school or community organization is to play only a supporting role, such as by providing space, it should set policies on the use of this space; access to the space; the extent and limitation on its own accountability/responsibility for the program and whom it enrolls; liability in case of injury to child or staff; its role in licensing, etc.

Transportation of children to and from community-based school-age child care sites is a key issue. Local school boards need to be responsive by setting policies that facilitate transport to and from SACC.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION TEN

State and local agencies serving the needs of families with developmentally disabled members should review their policies with an eye to broadening their understanding of respite care to include school-age child care.

In Arizona, the Department of Developmental Disabilities, through some of its county offices, pays for aides so that YMCAs, YWCAs and other agencies can include children with disabilities in their before-and after-school programs and summer camps. New York's Office of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities has begun to fund school-age child care as part of its Family Support grants. Both states have found parental satisfaction extremely high: the extra staff, which their contributions are financing, give the children the full benefit of close supervision, while enrollment in school-age child care, as opposed to other types of in-home or out-of-home respite, offers the benefit of mainstreaming in a normal recreational environment. It is also extremely cost-effective, as the costs of additional staff and training funds in school-age child care tend to be far less than the costs of other forms of respite care.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION ELEVEN

The development of SACC requires the full partnership of Corporate America through its direct financial contributions, its active involvement in coalitions and other collaborative efforts in local communities.

We have discussed the efforts of a few companies to ameliorate the problem of inadequate care. The Houston Committee for Private Sector Initiatives is perhaps the most elaborate and sustained example to date of a community-wide effort undertaken by the corporate community. Other companies have taken their own initiatives. The Hewlett Packard Corporation put one of its salaried executives on loan to work on re-designing a public school classroom for school-age child care in East Palo Alto, California. The Coors Brewery helped galvanize the growth of public school-based SACC in Jefferson County, Colorado, by sponsoring meetings, paying for needs surveys, and orchestrating a public awareness campaign. The American Bankers Insurance Group, responding to an invitation from the public school superintendent, spent $300,000 to construct a school on its grounds in Miami, Florida for the grades K to 2 children of its employees; this school included a section for school-age child care. Telephone Marketing Resources, a recently established firm in Oakland, New Jersey, decided to pay the hourly fees for employees' children to attend the Center for Caring and Sharing, a nearby SACC program. These examples illustrate that with a bit of imagination, any company can find some way to become a part of the solution.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION TWELVE

Local recreation and park agencies should evaluate the extent to which the needs of the youth population they have traditionally served have changed as a result of the changed structure of American families, and get involved in addressing those changed needs.

To the extent that local recreation and park departments discover that there is a need for school-age child care, they should become involved, either as partners and collaborators or as the lead agencies, in providing this service. We have pointed in Chapter 2 to a number of communities where this is taking place, and there are a great many others. We have also highlighted cities such as San Francisco, where extended supervision of playgrounds during afternoon evening and weekend hours acts as a complement to efforts in school-age child care. While many families need formal and accountable programs, others either do not need them or are unable to pay for them. Thus municipal recreation and park agencies can fill an important gap by offering increased amounts of adult supervision in public spaces.

Since many local recreation and park agencies have staff members trained in therapeutic recreation, such agencies are also ideally suited to ensure that programs in which they become involved serve school-agers with handicapping conditions along with their peers. In Albuquerque, New Mexico, for example, the city's Parks and Recreation Department offers school-age child care to a mixed population of special education and regular education students at one of the public schools, with a reduced ratio of one staff to four children, in order to enable all to participate.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION THIRTEEN

More research is needed on several key issues: the extent to which the lack of dependable and affordable care affects maternal educational and employment patterns; the impact of the latchkey experience on children and which groups of children may be most affected; the effect on children of participation in SACC programs and other forms of supervised care; and a cost-benefit analysis that could document the long-range savings to society made possible by expenditures in quality school-age child care.

In terms of outcomes of years of latchkey arrangements or participation in programs, we need research that permits us to look at children over time. Without such longitudinal data, we have no idea of the cumulative effects of either the latchkey experience, the experience of

participation in different types of programs, or of experience along the continuum of the child care practices used by families of school-age children. Without cost-benefit analysis, it is difficult to convince school leaders and other policy makers that a dollar spent on quality school-age child care is a dollar (or more) saved later somewhere else.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION FOURTEEN

Universities, colleges, and other training institutions, with the help of practitioners and professionals in related fields, need to create an agreed-upon body of knowledge and training curriculum that can be widely adopted. Staff training (both pre-service and in-service) must become widely available to caregivers and administrators in school-age child care.

Community colleges and many other institutions have begun to create and refine a body of coursework and training approaches, both for credit and not for credit. The field needs formal courses, hands-on workshops, and alternative training opportunities such as on-site observation and consultation to programs.

School-age child care is a rapidly growing field, and it deserves to have the training needs of its employees taken as seriously as those of workers in computer science or other relatively new fields of endeavor. Part of the task here will be to dispel ambiguity about the ways in which school-age child care crosses the boundaries of education, recreation, and other related fields. After this is accomplished, a consensus needs to be reached as to what skills are needed and what courses should receive highest priority. Credentialling systems such as the Child Development Associate (CDA) and the NAEYC Accreditation process should also be given greater attention.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION FIFTEEN

Public education campaigns should be undertaken so that parents and communities are more aware of the hazards of self care and the benefits of quality school-age child care programs to children.

Such campaigns should not simply stress the unfortunate consequences of lost opportunities on very young school-agers, but should be sure to include information about the consequences for middle-school-age children too, and the benefits to be gained by all ages through enrollment in quality school-age child care. Specific educational campaigns may need to be targeted to specific audiences, including legislators, educators, and other policy makers.

Notes

Foreword and Highlights

1. *The Metropolitan Life Survey of the American Teacher 1987,* by Louis Harris & Associates, pp. 61–63.
2. *Communicator,* Vol. 11, No. 6, February 1986, p. 1.
3. "After-School Child Care in an Elementary School. Social Development and Continuity and Coaplementarity of Programs," by Carollee Howes, Michael Olenick, and Tagoush Der-Kiureghian. In Elementary School Journal, Vol. 88, No. 1.
4. "Extended Day Program in a Public Elementary School," by Mary E. Mayesky. In Children Today, May–June 1979.
5. "Evaluation of Baltimore City's School Age Day Care Program. Results of a Pilot Study," Barbara Entwisle, unpublished paper submitted to Brown University and presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, New York, 1976.

Chapter 1

1. *After-School Care of School-Age Children. December 1984,* Bureau of the Census, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, p. 3.
2. The Metropolitan Life Survey of the American Teacher 1987, by Louis Harris & Associates, p. 64.
3. "Child Care in Greater Columbus," January 1987, from Action for Children, Columbus, Ohio, p. 3.
4. Taking Action for Latchkey Children, from the Latchkey Study Task Force of the Council for Children, Charlotte, North Carolina, 1984 pp. 9–15.
5. Final Report, School Age Child Care Parent Survey, Madison, Wisconsin, 1984, Table 2.
6. Developmental Psychology, 1985, Vol. 21, No. 3, pp. 413–418.

7. Deborah Lowe Vandell and Mary Anne Corasiniti (1985), "The Relation Between Third Graders' After School Care and Social, Academic, and Emotional Functioning," presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.
8. Developmental Psychology, 1986, Vol. 22, No. 4. "Latchkey children and susceptibility to peer pressure: an ecological analysis."
9. Ibid.
10. Lynette Long and Thomas Long. *The Handbook for Latchkey Children and their Parents.* 1983.
11. "After-School Child Care in an Elementary School: Social Development and Continuity and Complementarity of Programs," by Carollee Howes, Michael Olenick, and Tagoush Der-Kiureghian. In *Elementary School Journal,* Vol. 88, No. 1.
12. "Extended Day Program in a Public Elementary School," by Mary E. Mayesky. In *Children Today,* May-June 1979.
13. "Evaluation of Baltimore City's School Age Day Care Program: Results of a Pilot Study," Barbara Entwisle, unpublished paper submitted to Brown University.
14. "Can American Families Afford the Luxury of Childhood?" an unpublished paper by James Garbarino, President, Erikson Institute, Chicago.
15. *SACC Newsletter,* Vol. 5, No. 2, April 1988, p. 2.
16. Dale B. Fink, editor of *SACC Newsletter,* telephone interview with editor of *Sprint,* August 1984.
17. *The Working Parent Dilemma. How to Balance the Responsibility of Children and Careers,* by Earl A. Grollman and Gerri L. Sweder, Beacon Press, Boston, 1986.
18. Working Mother, February 1984, pp. 78-85.

Chapter 2

1. After School Care Programs *Activities Manual,* Dade County Public Schools, Office of Vocational, Adult, and Community Education, Miami, Florida. Issued March 1987, p. 1.
2. "Camp Fire Kids School-Age Care," a memorandum from the national headquarters of Camp Fire, Inc., Kansas City, Missouri.

Chapter 4

1. Lynette Long and Thomas Long. *The Handbook for Latchkey Children and their Parents.* 1983.
2. *SACC Newsletter,* Vol. 3, No. 3, June 1986, p. 8.
3 *Opportunities for Prevention. Building After-School and Summer Programs for Young Adolescents,* issued July 1987 by Children's Defense Fund, Washington, D.C.

Bibliography

Sources cited

The Metropolitan Life Survey of the American Teacher 1987, by Louis Harris & Associates, with Program Planners, Inc. Available from Metropolitan Life and Affiliated Companies, One Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10010-3690.

Taking Action for Latchkey Children, from the Latchkey Study Task Force of the Council for Children, 301 South Brevard St., Charlotte, North Carolina 28202. Released 1984.

Final Report, School Age Child Care Parent Survey, Madison, Wisconsin, 1984. By Diane Adams, Community Coordinated Child Care (4-C) and Rhea Strupp, Office of Community Services, City of Madison.

Deborah Lowe Vandell and Mary Anne Corasiniti, 1985, "The Relation Between Third Graders' After School Care and Social, Academic, and Emotional Functioning," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Earl A. Grollman and Gerri L. Sweder, *The Working Parent Dilemma: How to Balance the Responsibility of Children and Careers,* by Beacon Press, Boston, 1986.

After School Care Programs *Activities Manual,* Dade County Public Schools, Office of Vocational, Adult, and Community Education, 1450 Northeast Second Avenue, Miami, Florida 33132. Issued March 1987.

Working Mother, February 1984, Vol. VII, No. 2, by The McCall Publishing Company, 3807 Wilshire Blvd., Los Angeles, CA 90010.

After-School Care of School-Age Children: December 1984, Current Population Reports, Special Studies, Series P-23, No. 149, Bureau of the Census, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, by Rosalind R. Bruno. Issued January 1987.

Opportunities for Prevention: Building After-School and Summer Programs for Young Adolescents. Issued July 1987 by Children's Defense Fund, Washington, D.C.

"Child Care in Greater Columbus," January 1987, from Action for Children, 62 Jefferson Ave., Columbus, Ohio 43215.

Lynette Long and Thomas Long. *The Handbook for Latchkey Children and their Parents.* 1983 by Arbor House, New York.

Additional recommended sources

Ruth Baden, Andrea Genser, James Levine, and Michelle Seligson, *School-Age Child Care: An Action Manual.* 1982 by Auburn House Publishing Company, Boston.

Nancy Beaver, *Somebody Cares: Eight Model Child-Care Programs for School-Age Children in Texas.* 1987 from Corporate Child Development Fund for Texas, 510 South Congress Ave., Suite 122, Austin, TX 78704.

Joan Bergstrom, *School's Out—Now What?* Creative choices for your child's time. 1984 by Ten Speed Press, Berkeley, CA.

Center for Public Advocacy Research, 12 West 37th St., New York, NY 10018, *Day Care's Unfair Burden: How Low Wages Subsidize a Public Service.*

Abby J. Cohen, *School-Age Child Care: A Legal Manual for Public School Administrators.* 1985 by Wellesley College School-Age Child Care Project, Wellesley, MA.

Trudy K. Dana, *Safe and Sound/A Parents' Guide to the Care of Children Home Alone.* 1988 by McGraw-Hill, New York.

Sally DeCicco, *School Age Child Care Begins in Vermont: A Guide for Rural Communities.* Issued 1988 by Vermont College Early Childhood Programs, Chittenden County Resource and Referral Center and Vermont Social and Rehabilitation Services.

Dale Borman Fink, *School-Age Children With Special Needs: What Do They Do When School Is Out?* 1988 by The Exceptional Parent Press, Boston.

Graduate Center of the City University of New York, 33 W. 42nd St., New York, NY 10036, *Children's Environments Quarterly,* fall 1986 theme issue on "Latchkey Children in Their Communities."

Susan Nall and Stephen Switzer, *Extended Day Programs in Independent Schools.* 1984 by National Association of Independent Schools, Boston.

New York State Council on Children and Families, "Between Home Time and School Time: A Look at Quality SACC Programs." (1989) A videotape.

Dolly Rainhart, *Planning Manual for School-Age Child Care in New Mexico.* Prepared 1988 for New Mexico Human Services Department, P.O. Box 2348, Santa Fe, NM 87504-2348.

Bryan E. Robinson, Bobbie H. Rowland, and Mick Coleman, *Latchkey Kids: Unlocking Doors for Children and Their Families.* 1986 by D.C. Heath and Co., Lexington, MA.

School Board of Alachua County, 620 East University Ave., Gainesville, FL 32601, *School-Age Child Care Programs Operated by Florida School Districts: Program Status and Costs, Licensing Desirability and Costs.* Prepared 1988 for the Florida Department of Education.

Southeastern Pennsylvania School Age Child Care Project, *School Age Child Care Bibliography,* 4 volumes, 1988, 601 Knight Rd., Ambler, PA 19002.

Resources

Programs Identified in *No Time To Waste* (alphabetical by state)

ALASKA

Latchkey Programs, c/o Juneau School District, Community Schools Coordinator, 10014 Crazy Horse Dr., Juneau, AK 99801 (907)586-2303

CALIFORNIA

ADESTE, c/o Catholic Charities, 1400 W.9th St. P.O. Box 15095, Los Angelos, CA 90015-0095 (213)251-3438

Before & After School Care Program, c/o Hacienda La Puente Unified School District, 1234 Valencia, Hacienda Heights, CA 91745 (818)330-5017

Gather the Children, United Methodist Urban Ministry, 5380 El Cajon Blvd., San Diego, CA 92115 (619)582-7071/234-3158

Irvine Child Care Project, Dept. of Community Services, P.O. Box 19575, Irvine, CA 92713 (714)660-3995

LA's B.E.S.T. (Better Educated Students for Tomorrow), City of Los Angeles, 200 N.Main St. Rm.1474, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Santa Monica Children's Centers, Ocean Park Center, 2526 6th St., Santa Monica, CA 90405 (213)399-5865

Pacifica Children's Services, City Hall, 170 Santa Maria Ave., Pacifica, CA 94004 (415)895-7380

Stepping Stones Growth Center, 1720 Adeline St., Oakland, CA 94607 (415)834-3990

COLORADO

Gilpin School Extended Day Program, c/o Denver Public Schools, 900 Grant St., Denver, CO 80203 (303)297-0315

DELAWARE

School Age Child Care, 744 River Rd., Dover, DE 19901 (302)674-0839

FLORIDA

Child Care Programs, c/o School District of Escambia County, 30 E.Texar Dr., Pensacola, FL 32503-2902 (904)432-6121

YMCA of Collier County, 5450 YMCA Rd., Naples, FL 33942 (813)597-3148

ILLINOIS

Hephzibah Children's Center, 946 N.Blvd., Oak Park, IL 60302 (312)386-8417

St. Thomas Pre-Care/After-Care/Kinder-Care, St. Thomas the Apostle School, 4229 N.Monroe, Peoria Heights, IL 61614 (309)685-2539

Wesley Day Care Center, 727 Harlem Ave., Glenview, IL 60025 (312)729-0184

LOUISIANA

Youth Enrichment Program, 910 Pierremont Rd., Suite 230 P.O. Box 36788, Shreveport, LA 71133-6788 (318)861-7954

MASSACHUSETTS

CHAPS (Children's Afterschool Programs), 155 Apsley St., Hudson, MA 01749 (508)562-6554

Dorchester Youth Collaborative, Center for Urban Expressions, 1514A Dorchester Ave., Dorchester, MA 02122 (617)288-1748

Extended Day Programs, c/o Adult and Community Education, P.O. Box 150, Brookline, MA 02146 (617)730-2700

MINNESOTA

Community Kid Program, Glendale Child Development Center, 92 St.Mary's Ave. SE, Minneapolis, MN 55414 (612)331-7700

NORTH CAROLINA

Y.A.L.E. (Youngsters Advanced Learning Experiences), Providence Day School, 5800 Sardis Rd., Charlotte, NC 28226 (704)364 6848

NEW JERSEY

Dumont School Age Child Care, 219 Washington Ave., Dumont, NJ 07628 (201)384-1220

NEW YORK

School's Out, Inc., 428 Kenwood Ave., Delmar, NY 12054 (518)439-9300

Discovery Child Care Center, United Cerebral Palsy Association, 2035 Monroe Ave., Rochester, NY 14618 (716)442- 8580

The North Area YWCA, 2844 Delaware Ave., Kenmore, NY 14217 (716)875-3111

OHIO

Cincinnati Recreation Commission, 644 Linn St., Cincinnati, OH 45203 (513)352-4031

OREGON

Eugene Latch Key, Inc., 317 W.Broadway, Rm.11 Box 10625, Eugene, OR 97401 (503)683-7291

SOUTH CAROLINA

Anderson Family YMCA, 705 E.Greenville St., Anderson, SC 29621 (803)224-0263

SOUTH DAKOTA

KARE-4 Program, 304 S. Phillip #310, Sioux Falls, SD 57102 (605)334-6645

TENNESSEE

Eakin Care Program, c/o Eakin Public School, 1706 26th Ave. S, Nashville, TN 37212 (615)298-4049

TEXAS

After School Partnership, c/o Houston Committee for Private Sector Initiatives, P.O. Box 2511, Houston, TX 77001 (713)951-1291/659-1712

Capital Area Easter Seal Rehabilitation Center, 919 West 28 1/2 St., Austin, TX 78705 (512)478-2581

Girls Club, 5415 Maple St. Suite 222, Dallas, TX 75232 (214)630-5213

VIRGINIA

Children's Center, 11825 Olde Crafts Dr., Reston, VA 22091 (703)476-8150

Fairfax County School Age Child Care Program, 11212 Waples Mill Rd., Fairfax, VA 22030 (703)691-3175

National Organizations (alphabetical by name)

American Library Association, 50 E.Huron St., Chicago, IL 60611 (312)944-6780

Association for Retarded Citizens of the United States, Department of Research and Program Services, 2501 Ave. J, Arlington, TX 76006 (817)640-0204

Boys Clubs of America, 771 First Ave., New York, NY 10017 (212)557-7758

Camp Fire, Inc., 4601 Madison Ave., Kansas City, MO 64112 (816)756-1950

Center for Early Adolescence, Dept. of Maternal & Child Health, School of Public Health, Suite 223 Carr Mill Mall, Carrboro, NC 27510 (919)966-1148

Child Care Action Campaign, 99 Hudson St., Suite 1233, New York, NY 10013 (212)334-9595

Child Care Law Center, 22 Second St., Fifth Floor, San Francisco, CA 94105 (415)495-5498

Children's Defense Fund, 122 C St. NW, Washington D.C. 20001 (202)628-8787

Early Adolescent Helper Project, c/o Center for Advanced Study in Education, Graduate School & University Center, 33 W.42 St., New York, NY 10036 (212)719-9066

Ecumenical Child Care Network of the National Council of Churches, 475 Riverside Dr. Rm.572, New York, NY 10115 (212)870-3342

Girls Clubs of America, Inc., 205 Lexington Ave., New York, NY 10016 (212)689-3700

Girl Scouts of America, 830 Third Ave., New York, NY 10022 (212)940-7500

HOME SAFE, American Home Economics Association, Whirlpool Foundation, Whirlpool Corporation, 2000 U.S. 33 N.Benton, Harbor, MI 49022 (616)926-3461

Kinder Care USA (including KLUBMATES Program), Kinder-Care Learning Centers, Inc., 4505 Executive Park Dr. Box 2151, Montgomery, AL 36103 (205)277-5090

NCEA (National Catholic Education Association), 1077 30th St. NW, Suite 100, Washington D.C. 20007 (202)337-6232

NAEYC (National Association for the Education of Young Children) & NAECP (National Academy of Early Childhood Programs), 1834 Connecticut Ave. NW, Washington D.C. 20009 (800)424-2460

NAESP (National Association of Elementary School Principals), 1615 Duke St., Alexandria, VA 22314 (703)684- 3345

NAIS (National Association for Independent Schools), 18 Tremont St., Boston, MA 02108 (617)723-6900

National Easter Seal Society, 2023 W.Ogden Ave., Chicago, IL 60612 (312)243-8400 (voice); 243-8880 (TDD)

National Park & Recreation Association, 3101 Park Center Dr., Alexandria, VA 22302 (703)820-4940

National PTA (Parent-Teacher Association), 700 N.Rush St., Chicago, IL 60611-2571 (312)787-0977

PhoneFriend, State College Branch, P.0. Box 735, State College, PA 16801 (814)865-1751

School-Age Child Care Project, Wellesley College, Center for Research on Women, Wellesley, MA 02181 (617)431-1453

School-Age Notes, P.0. Box 120674, Nashville, TN 37212 (615)292-4957

United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Community Services Division, 1522 K St. NW, Washington D.C. 20005 (202)842-1266

United Neighborhood Centers of America, 1319 F St. NW, Suite 603, Washington D.C. 20004 (202)393-3929

United Way Planning Division, 621 S.Virgil Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90005 (213)736-1300

YMCA of the USA, 101 N.Wacker Dr., Chicago, IL 60606 (312)977-0031

YWCA of the USA, 135 W.50 St., New York, NY 10020 (212)621-5115

Other Resources Identified in *No Time To Waste* (alphabetical by name)

Action for Children, 92 Jefferson Ave., Columbus, OH 43209 (614)224-0222

Adolph Coors Co., Employee Communication & Services, Brewery Division, Golden, CO 80401 (303)277-3848

AgeLink, c/o Center for Improving Mountain Living, Western Carolina University, Cullowhee, NC 28723 (704)227-7492

American Bankers Insurance Group, 11222 Quail Roost Dr., Miami, FL 33157 (305)253-2244

Carino Child Care Resource & Referral, P.O. Box 27748, Albuquerque, NM 87125 (505)266-9922/262-2273

Child Care Resource & Referral, Inc., 2116 SE Campus Dr., Rochester, MN 55904 (507)287-2020/287-2022

Community Services for Children, Inc., 431 E.Locust St., Bethlehem, PA 18018 (215)691-1819

Juvenile Welfare Board of Pinellas County, 4140 49th St. N, St.Petersburg, FL 33709 (813)521-1853

Kentucky Dept. of Education, 1727 Capital Plaza Tower, Frankfort, KY 40601 (502)564-3678

Mid-Florida Technical Institute, 2900 W.Oak Ridge Rd., Orlando, FL 32809 (305)855-5880

Onondaga County Child Care Council, Inc., 215 Bassett St., Syracuse, NY 13210 (315)472-6919

Parents United for Child Care, 25 West St. 2nd fl., Boston, MA 02111 (617)426-8288

School-Age Child Care Project
Wellesley College
Center for Research on Women
Wellesley, Massachusetts 02181

Photograph by Jim Robertson
Design by Copenhaver Cumpston