



Frequently Asked Questions

1. Would the ASES increase come from Prop. 98, and if so, wouldn't it be taking money from schools?

While the additional funding for ASES programs would come out Proposition 98 (Prop. 98), it is an incredibly tiny amount of Prop. 98 funding, the funding goes to schools rather than taking money from schools, and it benefits schools in helping disadvantaged students succeed.

ASES is an extremely small slice of the large Prop. 98 pie. The actual increase in ASES funds called for represents less than 1/6th of 1% of the \$71 billion in total Prop. 98 K-12 funding proposed for 2019-20. Adding together the increase and existing ASES funding would account for just 1% of Prop. 98 funding for K-12 – which is still less than the 1.12% of total Prop. 98 K-12 funding that ASES represented when ASES began (2007). If ASES had the same percentage of Prop. 98 that it did in 2007, ASES would need \$87 million *on top* of the \$112.8 million that we are requesting this year. Since 2007, ASES has only received a 9% increase in funding, while Prop. 98 K-12 funding has risen 45%.

Increasing ASES funding will not take funding away from schools. ASES grantees are virtually always school districts, charter schools or county offices of education (and even in the rare instances where the grantee is a city, the funding still flows to schools). In fact, this bill will actually increase resources to the highest poverty school sites. Unlike Prop. 98 dollars in general, this funding will directly serve the lowest income students in the state and expand their learning opportunities between the hours of 3 to 6.

Increased ASES funding will also benefit schools because when high quality programs work in tandem with the school day – as is happening all over the state – school officials see improvements in student attendance, behavior and academic performance.

2. What will the impact be if there isn't a budget increase for ASES?

Without a budget increase, California's top-rated afterschool system is on the brink of collapse. Currently, programs are making cuts that reduce academic supports and enrichment activities for students, keep waiting lists long, and employ fewer qualified, stable and adequately-trained staff. Nearly 1 in 4 ASES programs expect to close their doors in 2020, without additional state funding, which would result in 91,000 students losing their afterschool program. This problem will only get worse as the minimum wage and cost of living continue to rise and the state does not act.

When California's most vulnerable children and families lose their afterschool program, we will see more dropouts, higher crime, more of our most vulnerable students being left behind, and the elimination of jobs for individuals that minimum wage and paid leave laws are supposed to benefit.

3. Why can't we leave it to districts to use their Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) funding to provide more funding for afterschool?

ASES programs have tried to access LCFF each year, but very few are successful. As an example, in 2017, of the 65 Boys & Girls Clubs that ran ASES programs in California, only 1 received some LCFF funding, and that funding couldn't be used to backfill deficits caused by the increased state minimum wage. New investments from LCFF are often focused on expanding access and services, which are critical needs, but they add weight to an already strained infrastructure.

Afterschool programs are at a disadvantage competing for limited LCFF funds because districts are far more inclined to prioritize programs with district employees, including district-operated categorical programs eliminated under LCFF, than ASES programs that are typically operated by community-based organizations. Additionally, districts are grappling with rising pensions costs.

The State needs to take responsibility for the ASES program because it is a protected state categorical program that was not eliminated to help create the Local Control Funding Formula. In addition, the State increased the minimum wage and bears responsibility for helping state programs address the increase, just as it enacted similar increases for child care and preschool programs to help sustain program quality.

4. Early education and child care are a priority for the Legislature, so why should legislators care about afterschool programs?

Afterschool and summer learning programs and early learning help achieve the same—both academic and child care—goals. Early childhood educators have smartly taken on the goal of kindergarten readiness, with the longer term goal that kids are reading on grade level by third grade, a critical early indicator for future success. Afterschool and summer programs have invested heavily in reading support and literacy enrichment with the same goal - that kids love to read, and can do so proficiently, on grade-level. The investment in early childhood is crucial but not sufficient. We cannot end this investment when the child turns 5, as if we have completely prepared the child for successful outcomes. An equal investment in high quality afterschool programs gives children the continuum of engagement they need to truly succeed. In fact, the national grade-level reading campaign has three core strategies: kindergarten readiness, reducing chronic absenteeism, and reducing summer learning loss. Expanded learning programs are integral resources and supports for both increasing attendance and reducing summer learning loss.

Also, like the child care system, afterschool programs meet the child care needs of low-income working families. Afterschool programs help working parents keep their jobs, and keep students safe and out of trouble during the peak hours for juvenile crime. Afterschool programs also keep students from going hungry by receiving a free and nutritious meal each afternoon.

5. How did you determine that the needed increase for ASES is \$112.8 million?

Experts estimate that for every \$1 increase in the state minimum wage, a \$0.50 increase per student is needed to adjust wages for afterschool staff. The \$112.8 million increase addresses the \$5 phased-in increase in the state minimum wage since 2014, which raised the minimum wage from \$8 to \$13 effective January 1, 2020.

The \$112.8 million reflects 1) a \$1.31 increase from \$8.19 to \$9.50 per student per day for the first half of the 2019-20 school year when the state minimum wage is \$12; and 2) a \$1.81 increase to \$10.00 per student for the second half of the 2019-20 school year when the minimum wage becomes \$13. This averages out to a daily rate of \$9.75 per student.

As program costs increase, fueled by increases in the state minimum wage and cost of living, ASES will need more funding. That is why tying future funding to increases in the state minimum wage and cost of living is also important.

6. Didn't ASES get a funding increase recently?

In 2017, ASES received its first increase in a decade, from \$7.50 to \$8.19 per student per day. This 9% increase was half of what was requested and needed by ASES programs to keep up with the rising program costs at that time. Since then, the state minimum wage has continued to grow along with program deficits.

Today, the state minimum wage has increased 50% since 2007, when ASES was implemented, and funding for ASES has only grown that 9%. The positive impact of the funding increase has been virtually erased by the annual rising state minimum wage.

In 2018, Assembly Member McCarty secured \$15 million in the budget for the ASES Kids Code Grant Pilot Program. This pilot program is designed to expand access to coding for students at participating ASES sites. The Kids Code program helps address access issues for students, particularly in STEM-related subjects. This funding cannot be used to pay backfill deficits due to rising costs at ASES sites.

7. Why do you need AB 1725 (Carrillo) and the budget request?

The budget request would provide \$112.8 million, starting in 2019-20, to raise the ASES funding from \$8.19 to \$9.75 per student per day, which reflects the state's share of the market cost of quality afterschool programs and would keep pace with the 2019-20 state minimum wage.

AB 1725 (Carrillo) provides ongoing protection for the state's investment in ASES by setting the ASES funding rate at \$9.75 and creating a funding mechanism to provide additional funding with future state minimum wage increases and rising cost of living.

8. How is California affected by President Trump's proposals to eliminate federal funding for after school?

For the past three years, President Trump's budget has called for the complete elimination of 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) funding, asserting the program lacks evidence of improving student success despite overwhelming research to the contrary. If approved, nearly 108,000 children and families would lose their afterschool and summer programs.

The elimination of the 21st CCLC would mean a loss of funding for over 1000 of California's Expanded Learning program sites including almost 300 high school ASSETs program sites, and would reduce the ability to provide year around learning opportunities through summer programs. A recent poll found that 70% of voters oppose President Trump's proposed cut to afterschool funding, including 62% of Republican voters and 79% of Democrat voters.

California has successfully leveraged state and federal investments to build a system serving more than half a million students from low-income communities every single school day. The state and federal programs have been intentionally blended to maximize training, technical assistance and evaluation resources and maximize the number of children served at the local level. So the dual threat of dramatically under-resourced state-funded programs, together with the possible elimination of federally funded programs could have exponential negative impacts on hundreds of thousands of children and their families in California.

9. How are ASES programs affected by minimum wage increases, if programs are often already paying entry-level staff more than \$12 per hour?

Increases in the minimum wage impact ASES personnel costs in at least two ways. First, as the minimum wage increases, this creates pressure to increase the wages of entry-level positions that are paid in a similar range. For example, a job paying \$12 per hour is relatively attractive for entry-level workers when the minimum wage is \$8, but not so when it is \$12. Managing a group of 20 students in an afterschool program is not a simple task that can be accomplished by an employee with limited skills and training. In order to attract qualified candidates to entry-level positions, programs must offer competitive wages. If unable to do so, positions are difficult to fill and candidates are less likely to meet minimum qualifications. Because programs are strictly bound to a 20:1 supervision ratio, vacancies lead to fewer students being served, and because ASES program revenue is based on ADA, this can result in reductions to grant awards, exacerbating the problem.

Second, the increase in the minimum wage also impacts the ability to employ full-time Site Coordinators, which are called for in statute and who are critical to operating a high-quality program. While not commonly known, employees who are classified as full-time "exempt" (which means exempt from overtime compensation due to the professional nature of their work) are required to be paid a salary equivalent to twice the minimum wage, in accordance with California Labor Code §515. A number of ASES providers employ full-time exempt Site Coordinators who were paid a minimum annual salary of \$33,280 when the minimum wage was \$8. Now, with the minimum wage at \$12, this

minimum annual salary is \$49,920, and it will grow when the minimum wage increases to \$13 on January 1, 2020. Without commensurate increases in revenue, it is nearly impossible to accommodate this salary increase, and programs have been forced to re-classify salaried employees to hourly. This practice limits employees' availability to participate in any activity that falls outside a normal 8-hour work day (i.e., early morning staff meetings, parent open house nights, etc.), impedes their ability to align after school services with the regular school day and generally depreciates the nature of their work.

10. Why not instead increase the match or increase the 1:20 student/staff ratio?

To keep quality ASES programs going, there is no realistic alternative to increased ASES funding. Increasing the match requirement would not work. There is already a sizable 33 percent match (i.e., \$50,000 for a typical \$150,000 middle school grant). Being difficult for programs to generate cash matches, the match is usually "in kind" rather than the cash contribution needed to raise staff salaries to address minimum wage increases. Increasing the existing 20:1 student to staff is also not viable. The 20:1 staff ratio is already significantly greater than the 14:1 maximum ratio in school-age child care programs. Increasing the number of students per staff would make it even more difficult to provide high-quality programs, and also would likely result in increased insurance costs that offset any savings from needing fewer staff.

11. Given that the most pressing issue in California education policy is the growing opportunity and achievement gap, how does ASES impact the growing disparities between students?

Students spend more time out of school than in and how this time is spent is critical to closing the opportunity and achievement gap. Research has shown that:

- Unequal summer learning opportunities, for example, are responsible for about two-thirds of the ninth-grade achievement gap between lower- and higher-income youth;
- Higher income youth are twice as likely than their lower income peers to access enrichment and after school skill-building activities such as sports, music, and art; and
- By the time they reach 6th grade, middle class kids have likely spent 6,000 more hours learning than kids born into poverty.

Expanded learning programs (afterschool and summer) are essential to closing this gap because the majority of students served in publicly-funded programs are low-income students of color. Students that are actively engaged in these programs can gain 115 additional days of learning that directly impacts the opportunity inequities. High-quality programs have proven effective in a myriad of ways which are necessary for student success including: student engagement (attendance, youth voice, community involvement); achievement – math and literacy; social-emotional skill development such as

confidence, self-efficacy, persistence, resilience, etc.; and reduction in risky behaviors – juvenile crime, dropout, drug/alcohol.

12. Would all afterschool programs be eligible to receive Prop. 64 tax revenue with AB 1085 (McCarty)?

AB 1085 expressly supports funding for After School Education and Safety (ASES), 21st Century Community Learning (21st CCLC), or 21st Century High School After School Safety and Enrichment for Teens (ASSETs) programs. Current grantees would be eligible and encouraged to apply for funding, and funding could be available to establish more of these programs. These programs target high-need communities, which are among those most impacted by the war on drugs.

Afterschool programs would not need to create a new program to qualify, only continue to offer the same broad array of academic and enrichment activities, including activities that prevent and reduce substance use, and improve school retention and performance.

Other afterschool programs would likely be eligible for funding under the more general provisions or Prop. 64.

13. How much will afterschool programs receive?

AB 1085 does not guarantee a specific amount of funding for afterschool programs; it only specifies afterschool programs as an eligible use of Prop. 64 tax revenue from the Youth Education, Prevention, Early Intervention and Treatment account (Youth Account).

The Legislative Analyst's Office estimated that Prop. 64 could generate additional state and local tax revenues in the range of high hundreds of millions of dollars to over \$1 billion annually. However, the Youth Account is set to receive 60% of state tax revenue, and only after funding is set aside for several other costs (e.g., implementation, research, community reinvestment, California Highway Patrol).

14. Why do you need a budget augmentation for ASES in 2019-20 if AB 1085 (McCarty) becomes law?

Proposition 64 (Prop. 64) and AB 1085 have great potential to support and increase access to thousands of quality afterschool programs for children and youth in grades K-12, but substantial funding in the Prop. 64 Youth Account is at best a year away and, even with AB 1085, there is no guarantee afterschool programs will receive any Prop. 64 funding.

The budget request for ASES will help ensure high-quality programming and keep program doors open for children in grades K-9. Prop. 64 funds eventually can and should help support ASES, as well as afterschool programs for high school youth and programs in the summer (21st CCLC and ASSETs), but immediate support through the 2019-20 budget is necessary to keep ASES program doors open.