

**Illinois After-school Partnership  
Policy Work Group  
Compiled Meeting Minutes 2003**

**April 28 meeting**

**Participants at April 28 meeting** Jerry Andrews, IDPH; Derrick Brownlee, CDHS; Deena Dailey, Juvenile Justice Initiative; Carole Franke, I-KAN Regional Office of Education; Doris Garrett, IDHS; Gaylord Gieseke, Voices for Illinois Children; Greg Graham, MOST; Lanita Koster, Illinois Federation of Teachers; Cindy Wahl, IDHS.

***Commitment of the Policy Work Group***

The Policy Work Group committed to increasing the funding available for out-of-school-time. The Policy Work Group will focus on developing a financing plan to improve the quality of existing programs and to expand the number of programs available to reach the estimated 1.6 million children and youth potentially in need of out-of-school-time services. The plan will increase funding over several years. The group agreed this funding must come from a variety of sources.

***Fact Finding***

- Need more detailed information on the requirements of state, federal and local funding;
- Need to understand the different financial resources available to regions across the state (i.e. foundation funding for specific areas, etc.);
- Need to compare available funding and current program availability with a region's demographics (i.e. youth in poverty, number of working parents, stated need for out-of-school-time activities, etc.)
- Need to understand the needs of communities and parents and youth (a consumer demand survey).

***Policy Questions***

The questions below have important cost and policy implications and need to be considered as the group develops a financing plan:

- What level of service do we expect programs to provide – are we developing prevention or intervention programs?
- What percent of the youth population need intervention programs, what percent need more general?
- How do we define quality programming?

***The Information and Action Needed by the Policy Work Group***

The Policy Work Group reviewed the complete strategic plan created to implement the five sets of policy recommendations set forth by the Illinois After-school Initiative Task Force. The group agreed on the steps outlined in the funding section of the strategic plan. The group also highlighted the activities and action steps under the other sets of recommendations related to accomplishing the specific goal of the Policy Work Group. This gave the Policy Group an understanding of how the work of the three groups – Policy, Outcomes and Capacity Building – relate to one another.

The next step of the group will be to prioritize the activities. Below are the actions that are related to the development of a financing plan to improve quality and expand services:

***State Pre-Work***

- Create ongoing *ISBE-only* Work Group to examine funding, program requirements, service areas objectives of ISBE programs to find gaps and overlaps
- Create ongoing *IDHS-only* Work Group to examine funding, program requirements, service areas and objectives of IDHS programs to find gaps and overlaps

***Best Practices***

- Document from a community level perspective examples and effects of different state program agendas, funding restrictions and data collection requirements
- Inventory the training, credentialing, fiscal and program requirements and evaluation occurring among divisions in ISBE and IDHS and other state agencies
- Public funders and localities join program minimum discussion

**Illinois After-school Partnership  
Policy Work Group  
Compiled Meeting Minutes 2003**

***Joint State Work***

- Discuss what it looks like when agencies coordinate funding – how that differs from supplantation of funds
- Monitor OST resources available in community-link to avoid duplication
- State agencies agree on a range of outcomes will meet the full needs of school-age children and youth
- State agencies describe the federal requirements they must meet
- Joint funded ISBE and IDHS RFP

***Evaluation***

- Identify current program outcomes and then discuss across IDHS and ISBE
- Interview agency administrators separately about outcome measures used by Dept.

***Mapping***

- Map service gaps, overlaps and funding streams
- Determine type of evaluations private funders require
- Determine program capacity for collecting and reporting data
- Determine readiness of funded and non-publicly funded programs to meet evaluation standards
- Current workforce surveyed on training level, salary, retention levels
- Training inventory of public sources support ost
- Show examples of federal policies conflicting with state policies

***Policy***

- Enact action-oriented plan based on information gathered to collaborate among state agencies around fiscal/program requirements
- Work with state agencies to identify opportunities and barriers to interagency collaboration
- Explore cost-benefits-results of different types of evaluation (internal vs. external)
- Determine targets for incrementally expanding funding for programs
- ***Ultimate goal:*** Statewide finance plan developed

***Outcomes***

- Identify common outcomes to be attained by programs
- Understand importance of flexible approach for programs to meet outcomes

***Local Work***

- Identify groups of providers to discuss how state policies impact local programs

***Business***

- Interview business – what do they need from local groups around ost
- Understand Workforce Investment Act

***Consumers***

- Educating parents and communities on the cost of programs
- Interview parents youth – what do they need

***Targets from their own page –***

- Interview programs – what else if \$ needed for (capacity building)
- Determine targets for incrementally expanding funding for programs

**Illinois After-school Partnership  
Policy Work Group  
Compiled Meeting Minutes 2003**

**June 19, 2003**

**Work Group Co-Chairs:** Gaylord Gieseke, *Voices for Illinois Children*; Carol McElvain, *NCREL*

**Members in attendance:** Miller Anderson, *Chicago Youth Centers*; Matt Bauers, *Voices for Illinois Children*; Deb Bretag, *ICVP*; Fran Calvert, *YWCA of Lake County CCR&R*; Tim Carpenter, *ICVP-FCIK*; Ann Potter Francis, *ICVP-FCIK*; Doris Garrett, *IDHS, Community and Youth Programs*; Greg Graham, *DCACI/Illinois MOST*; Cindy Roope, *Adams County Health Department*

After-School Partnership Staff Present: **Jennifer Becker Mouhcine; Paula Corrigan-Halpern**

**Welcome & Introductions:**

The goals for the meeting were presented, which were to select the final products the group would work to achieve, to determine the key actions needed to reach those products, and to place those actions on a timeline to determine next steps for the work of the group.

The work group was reminded that while funding was our primary focus, other advocacy and policy issues may be developed out of the work of the group, and a process for addressing those issues will be developed.

The meeting materials included working documents listing preliminary products, actions, and timeline along with the Policy Work Group Commitment, which reads:

*We are committed to developing a financing plan that expands funding over several years to expand programs and enhance the quality of currently available programs. We are agreed that funding must come from a variety of sources, including public and private sources and parental fees.*

The commitment includes the following Funding Outcomes:

- *Increase in federal dollars to Illinois for out-of-school-time*
- *Increase state dollars to out-of-school-time*
- *Increase in private dollars (foundation and corporate) to out-of-school-time (supporting both service provision and system building)*

In reviewing the materials for the meeting, there was some discussion about the funding outcomes highlighted with the work group commitment and the following points were made and will be added/revised on future documents:

- County and Local dollars need to be increased as well as state and federal.
- Make sure that other private sources besides foundations and corporations are included when talking about increased private support (such as faith-based institutions, parents, private donors, etc.
- An additional outcome should be a clearer understanding of parent role in financial support of programs (fees, donations, in-kind time, volunteering, etc.)

**Products/ Key Actions/Timeline**

The group discussed the products to create, refining suggestions made prior to the meeting. The group then brainstormed the actions it would take to reach the products that were discussed. The actions were then placed in order of what needs to be done first, second, etc. The attached chart is an overview of that work.

**Structure: How we do our work?**

When looking at the actions, the group determined that the best place to start is to educate ourselves on model financing plans to learn about the product we are trying to achieve, and learn about the process of putting together a plan and lessons learned by others who have done this work. The whole group will be involved in the initial actions, keeping committees or sub groups as options for getting work done as we get further down the road.

**Illinois After-school Partnership  
Policy Work Group  
Compiled Meeting Minutes 2003**

**NEXT STEPS/RESOURCES:**

- We discussed inviting Andi Fletcher from CA and someone from the Finance Project to call in to the meeting so the group can ask questions and get feedback on the development of our plan.
- The group assigned itself to read “Financing After-School Programs” a report done for the Finance Project. Jennifer will get this out to members.
- Staff will see what other resources may be good background reading for the meeting and get that out to members.
- Members of the group will provide questions to Jennifer so she can compile them for use at the next meeting with our guests.

**NEXT MEETING: July 15<sup>th</sup> 1:00 – 3:00, ICVP Office in Chicago, 220 S. State #1215,  
with telephone conference option: 1-800-346-6205, Participant Code 103062#**

**Illinois After-school Partnership  
Policy Work Group  
Compiled Meeting Minutes 2003**

**July 15, 2003 Meeting Summary**

**Work Group Members in Attendance:** Gaylord Gieseke, (co-chair), *Voices for Illinois Children*; Carol McElvain, (co-chair) *North Central Regional Educational Laboratory/Learning Point Associates*; Miller Anderson, *Chicago Youth Centers*; Matt Bauers, *Voices for Illinois Children*; Deb Bretag, *ICVP*; Tim Carpenter, *ICVP-FCIK*; Deena Dailey, *Juvenile Justice Initiative*; Ann Potter Francis, *ICVP-FCIK*; Carole Franke, *Teen Reach/I-KAN ROE*; Doris Garrett, *IDHS, Community and Youth Programs*; Greg Graham, *DCACI/Illinois MOST*; Tracy Johnson, *Martin Luther King Jr. Community Services*; Sonia Kennedy, *Chicago Department of Human Services*; Rachel Klein, *After School Matters*; Kay Pangle, *I-KAN ROE*; Cindy Roope, *Adams County Health Department*; Mandy Rosenthal, *Chicago Public Schools*; Susan Shea, *Illinois Education Association*; Cindy Wall, *IDHS*

**Special Guests:** Heather Padgette and Sharon Deich—*The Finance Project*; Andi Fletcher, *The California Afterschool Partnership*

*After-School Partnership Staff Present: Jennifer Becker Mouhcine; Paula Corrigan-Halpern*

### **GUESTS PRESENTATION**

The guests worked from a list of questions that had been compiled in advance of the meeting in their presentation and question and answer session for the group. It was determined in advance that the specific questions around funding streams and local funding sources, etc. would only be covered time permitting, which would allow for a discussion focused on the process and next steps the group needs to take in developing the plan. A future conversation can be centered more specifically on funding strategies, once our financing costs have been determined.

The Finance Project presented first, with Andi Fletcher from CA providing additional input as the discussion progressed. After the Finance Project completed its section, Andi answered the questions that remained pertaining to California's experience. The discussion is summarized below, grouped by the topics/questions discussed.

#### **Basic steps in creating a financing plan**

- What do you want to finance? **Be really clear about this. What types of programs (ages, components, hours, location) and what quality level?**
- What does it cost? **This includes both direct service costs (which should include the costs at the level of quality you hope to have) and infrastructure costs, at the program-level, and possible at a system level.**
- What do we have already? **Determine what money is already in the system**
- What is the funding gap? **Determine what else we need**
- What are our strategies for filling this gap? **Consider strategies for maximizing current funding (streamlining services, collaboration, etc) and generating new funding (private sector, public sector advocacy, etc.)**

#### **Additional things to consider when starting a financing plan**

- What level of intensity and precision do you want to have in developing your plan? **This determines what information you use and how you use it (i.e. Sampling versus system-wide surveys)**
- Who else do you need to involve? **Are all stakeholders represented?**
- What has already been done in this area? By the Partnership? By organizations within the group? By others? **The point was made that the Partnership has done some groundwork that should be brought to these meetings, such as the landscape of what programs and funding is out there in out-of-school time, as well as the elements/best practices for out-of-school time programs, etc.**

#### **Cost-per-child amounts and System-wide costs**

- A system-wide cost number can be daunting, and care should be taken in how that is presented to the public and to funders. There was a discussion regarding the political implications of having a huge after-school cost out there, and the need to be very explicit about what we funds we would be asking for from state funders, private funders, parent fees, versus what resources are already in the system and can be provided in kind.
- The system-wide costs gives us the big picture goal for what it would take to reach our goal in Illinois, and target dates can be pinpointed for progress towards that goal.
- A cost-per-child amount possibly provides a more tangible number for people to relate to and use in advocacy messages.

**Illinois After-school Partnership  
Policy Work Group  
Compiled Meeting Minutes 2003**

- California uses a cost-per-child amount for their statewide program. They determined a rate that was less than sufficient, but what they considered a good core starting place that would be required to be supplemented by a local match. They were able to use that number in their advocacy efforts. Their per-child number did not include the statewide system infrastructure costs, or transportation.

Strategies for arriving at cost amounts given the range of programming in OST.

- Start with program components that contain basic quality parameters. The Task Force report outlines best practice components that we can start from.
- Set up 2 or 3 kinds of generic, sample programs that reflect main categories
- Allow for add-ons and take aways to account for additional program variety
- Determine how to arrive at those costs—survey sampling, existing sources of research, etc.
- Create a range of costs that take into account ages, location, components etc. Andi pointed out that urban costs compared to rural might sometimes equal out since while fewer resources may be available in rural areas, sometimes the resources go further.
- Ensure that costs include desired level of program quality.
- Look at numbers/percentages of types of programs and youth attending each type to come to larger system costs
- Andi made the point that we should try to keep this simple enough that we can get a message across about need in a clear way. She said it would be easier to get funding using a simple, scaled-down message, and to think about starting the plan in the context of a gateway for advocacy.

In-kind costs

- Determine the value of in-kind contributions by figuring out their monetary value. Create costs for categories of in-kind, and factor them in to the total costs, reflecting the variations between program.
- While they are factored into the total cost, it should be kept in mind that in-kind donations should always be looked to as a piece of the funding puzzle, rather than being included the funding gap needing to be filled.
- In-kind contributions should be maximized, and programs may need to assess if they are utilized as well as they could be.
- Andi also mentioned that legislators like to see in-kind as a piece of any funding package and it helps win their support.
- The point was made, that while in-kind costs play a role, the biggest priority expense is payroll, which in-kind can't help with.

Estimating Demand

- This can be a really tough area, and people have done this in a wide variety of ways, including making up a reasonable percentage of population, looking at where there is a surplus of programs and seeing who takes advantage of them, basing need on targeted populations (i.e. free & reduced lunch programs), etc.
- Differences in take up-rates based on age need to be taken into account
- To get a universal number, the entire demand needs to be reflected. Free & reduced lunch numbers put a focus on low-income, and may not reflect older kids.
- Andi suggested starting with a smaller target and rolling out to reach the universal goal. Strategies for reaching that goal could be to set targets based on income, districts, ages, etc. California started with need based on 50% of free & reduced lunch numbers, and had a roll out plan from low income, to middle income, to all.
- The point was made that we could collect data on this for a long time but we should keep our eye on the bigger target. We should look at the urgency of the information: find something that is timely, responsive, making sure we are able to defend our rationale. We can also assess the need we determine in the context of its persuasiveness
- There was a discussion about how to coordinate political strategies with determining our universal needs rationale. There were questions from the group about the timing of the political discussion and staying universal in scope. The group will need to determine strategy for staying true to our recommendations that all youth have access, while working in context of political realities.

**CALIFORNIA SPECIFIC QUESTIONS**

How did you begin the process of developing the finance plan? What are the essential “must haves” that needed to be in place in order to move forward with their state plan?

**Illinois After-school Partnership  
Policy Work Group  
Compiled Meeting Minutes 2003**

- 2 after-school programs for elementary age youth came together to obtain more funding, and worked with the Foundation Consortium, the Department of Education, and the Deputy Director of Education.
- Had demonstrated value of their programs, their impact, and used their per/child cost (based on their existing programs)
- They used advocacy & legislation to reach their goals. Their message included that funding after-school was not just the responsibility of the state, but included a need for a local match

How did you determine “need” in factoring costs to take it to scale statewide?

- Focus is on elementary and middle school, and used percentages of free & reduced lunch numbers First stage was to reach 2 out of 5 kids in poverty, after Prop 49, hope to reach 4 of 5 kids in poverty.

California After-school Financing

- CA, through the After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnership Act, provides funding for school based programming for elementary and middle school aged children
- Once grants are given, any program that meets its outcomes (Academic Performance, Social Behavior and Skills, and School Attendance) to have their funding renewed. This really helps address the sustainability of programs.
- Prop 49’s passage will increase funding in CA for this program to 550 million
- The California After-school Partnership’s role is to build quality programs who can sustain funding by meeting their outcomes, and their regionally based system of support is funded by the CA Department of Education

Funding Mix

- Funding for these programs is blended (ATOD, 21stCCLC, Parent Participation Title 1 Supplemental) and is separate from some other out of school time programs such as childcare. Schools may receive childcare money and blend it at the local level but use funds for different kids.
- All grantees are required to have a 50% local match, which creates sustainability, and serves to maximize state resources.
- Local match can be reached by blending local sources (county funds, school districts, etc.)

Lessons Learned

- Building a public private partnership was much more difficult that they thought. They are currently writing a guide about the process. It was harder to bring everyone together for a shared vision than they thought it would be, but it was a critical step.
- “Doing” versus “meeting” found it was easy to get things done faster by not spending so much time meeting as getting tasks done, but it was also easy to alienate people by not having meetings as opportunities to include others in the process. It’s a delicate balance between getting thing done quickly and being inclusive.
- A challenge for them was turnover in the Regional lead levels, which made them almost have to start over each time with the new staff person.
- Andi also mentioned that an important piece of their project that really has helped them is their Regional Learning Teams. These teams played the important role of inspirers, T.A. providers, and trainers. She went on to say that the goal has been to develop these into Regional Learning Centers for program staff to come to them and learn. The cost for this would be in the range of \$100,000 to \$400,000 per year per region. This TA is one way their partnership has helped ensure quality and help programs meet outcomes for continued funding.

**RECOMMENDED NEXT STEPS FOR IASP FROM PRESENTERS:**

- Read “Meeting the Challenge” --the Boston, MA After-school Financing Plan
- List the parameters of what you are financing
- Build off of the work that has already been done for the task force report (best practices, mapping, etc.)
- Determine cost components from the work done already in best practices
- Create sample template programs that cover the range of programs you want to include in the plan
- Take desired outcomes into account when determining costs

**Illinois After-school Partnership  
Policy Work Group  
Compiled Meeting Minutes 2003**

**Final Questions/Thoughts on Presentation**

**After the presentation, the group offered some thought about the discussion. Some recurring themes/questions were:**

- We need to keep in mind that CA is a different state with different systems.
- We can find ways to keep our process simple enough to accomplish rather quickly, but with enough data and rationale to defend it.
- We need to make sure our costs are based on real program costs, with information from providers
- We need to think about how our financial plan relates to an advocacy message and strategy.
- We need to make sure our plan addresses the full range of programs, ages served etc. according to the Partnership's goals
- When we are factoring in the costs of achieving outcomes, they need to be beyond academic, and address learning with broad definitions.
- We could talk to the people who worked on the early-care financing report to talk about their process
- We need to remember that we have done a lot of work already that will shape our work and we need to bring those resources to the table

**Next Steps**

**Additional Resources/Research**

- The group decided that while there are a lot of other things we could study and review, the main one to tackle is "Meeting the Challenge". The group came to a consensus that they are ready to start working on the plan.
- Andi will send us overview of their work with organizations, their RFP, and outline of how the childcare dollars are blended in the schools, and a copy of their legislation
- At the next meeting, we will look at the best practice components and the four goals of out-of-school time, etc. from the report and begin to outline the program types and program components to include in our plan. We will work to create sample programs to develop cost ranges for programs, based on information in the report

**Next Meeting Date: August 26<sup>th</sup>, from 11:00 – 1:00  
ICVP--220 S. State Street, Suite 1215, Chicago IL**

**Illinois After-school Partnership  
Policy Work Group  
Compiled Meeting Minutes 2003**

**August 26, 2003 Meeting Summary**

**Work Group Members in Attendance:** Miller Anderson, *Chicago Youth Centers*; Jerry Andrews, *Illinois Association of Public Health Adm.*; Deb Bretag, *ICVP*; Fran Calvert, *YWCA of Lake County CCR&R*; Ann Potter Francis, *ICVP-FCIK*; Carole Franke, *Teen Reach/I-KAN ROE*; Gaylord Gieseke, (co-chair), *Voices for Illinois Children*; Greg Graham, *DCACI/Illinois MOST*; Stephanie Holifield, *IVPA*; Rachel Klein, *After School Matters*; Carol McCue, *ISBE*; Tony Stahl, *Sycamore School District*; Chris Walczak, *ISBE*, Cindy Wall, *IDHS*

*After-School Partnership Staff Present: Jennifer Becker Mouhcine*

#### MEETING GOALS AND PURPOSE

The goals for the meeting were to begin to set the templates of sample programs to use to determine costs for a range of programs. A range of questions will be discussed determine on which templates to base our costs to ensure representation of the variety of programs in out of school time.

#### REVIEW OF MEETING THE CHALLENGE

The group had been given the report “Meeting the Challenge” completed by Parents United for Child Care in Boston, which is a financing plan for out of school time for Boston and Massachusetts. The group talked about the report and made the following points.

- This report shows how resources need to be combined and their plan to leverage resources
- It contains some good templates for use to use as we move forward in our work
- They have only provided one “program type” and determined costs for school year vs. year round. We are looking for a broader range of types, but can build from their costs elements
- When we assess the resources that are in the system, we need to be mindful of the changing funding landscape and reductions in resources that are occurring, as well the costs and barriers to collaboration.
- The report does not assign costs to the infrastructure needs outlined, and doesn’t necessarily address the full costs of reaching quality programming
- The ages in this report only go up to 12, and we will need to look at all ages up to 18. Afterschool Matters has done work in costing out services to teens and they will be able to share those with the group.
- This report used the number of 66% of children currently unserved who are in working parent families for their needs rationale.
- This report is something we can refer to in the future as we plan our advocacy needs and possible funding strategies.

#### DEVELOPING PROGRAM TYPE TEMPLATES

The group is using the worksheets “Defining the System” provided by the Finance Project to begin to list out what will be included in our program type templates and to help us determine the sample templates to use. We began to address questions in the Outcomes area and the Scope of Supports and Services.

#### Outcomes

##### **First Question: “What results are you trying to achieve?”**

The point was made that the Outcomes group will be able to provide us with this answer in much more specificity as they do their work, but for now, the workgroup decided to do a “first run” answer to this question. The group looked at the needs and goals stated in the Task Force Report. The needs and goals taken from the report are listed below, with comments/additions/revisions made in italics. These will be the results the group keeps in mind.

#### Needs Addressed by Out-of-School Time

- Safety
- Developmentally Appropriate Activities
- Extended Learning Opportunities (*Creative Activities*)
- Children & Youth Support and Health Services

**Illinois After-school Partnership  
Policy Work Group  
Compiled Meeting Minutes 2003**

- Child Care
- Address at-risk populations

Goals

- Participate in Rewarding (*and Creative*) activities
- Improve Academic Performance
- Develop Positive Relationships with Peers and Adults
- Gain Self-Confidence
- Enhance the Quality of Life of Youth and Their Families
- Family Involvement
- Adequate Infrastructure at State/Local Levels
- Maximize Integration and Coordination

Scope Of Supports And Services

**First Question:** *What Types of Services?*

The group spent a lot of time on this question to identify the range of services to be included. The group decided to look at services by age categories, and the following chart was created. Each of these categories will be further broken down when examining what those specific services look like for each of these age groups, knowing they will be different and have different cost implications. It was also noted that age is only one way to break out services, and we may look at different break-outs (such as by structure, licensing level, location) as we progress.

<b>Age Group</b>	<b>5 – 9</b>	<b>10 – 13</b>	<b>14 - 18</b>
<b>Service Components</b>	Academic Enrichment	Academic Enrichment	Academic Enrichment
	Arts & Music/Cultural	Arts & Music/Cultural	Arts & Music/Cultural
	Recreation/Sports	Recreation/Sports	Recreation/Sports
	Food/Snacks/Nutrition	Food/Snacks/Nutrition	Food/Snacks/Nutrition
	Social-Emotional (Includes Substance Abuse, Violence Prevention, Risk Reduction)	Social-Emotional (Includes Substance Abuse, Violence Prevention, Risk Reduction)	Social-Emotional (Includes Substance Abuse, Violence Prevention, Risk Reduction)
	Special Needs	Special Needs	Special Needs
	Health Services & Education	Health Services & Education	Health Services & Education
	Community Service	Community Service	Community Service
	Parent/Guardian/Community Leader Involvement	Parent/Guardian/Community Leader Involvement	Parent/Guardian/Community Leader Involvement
	Social Services, Resource & Referrals	Social Services, Resource & Referrals	Social Services, Resource & Referrals
	Positive Youth Development	Positive Youth Development	<b>Positive Youth Development</b>
	Safety	Safety	<b>Safety</b>
	Positive Relationships	Positive Relationships	Positive Relationships
	Child Care	Child Care	
		Mentoring	Mentoring
		Technology	Technology
		Career/Vocational	Career/Vocational
	Leadership	Leadership	

**Second Question:** “Serving What Population?”

The group discussed the fact that the Partnership has a universal goal to serve all children and youth, both in terms of universal access and universal quality. The question was raised of how to cost out for varying family income, taking into account co-pays etc. This will be addressed when examining need and funding for the system.

**Third Question:** “Over What Time Frame”?

The group decided we would cost out the templates at a year round amount, but break out costs for school-year and summer, as we made need those numbers for the full finance plan, advocacy, etc.

**Illinois After-school Partnership  
Policy Work Group  
Compiled Meeting Minutes 2003**

The question was raised about before –school services, weekends, extended hours, etc. In discussing the before-school services, the group described the services offered typically in before-school services as being less comprehensive than after-school and are often not offered due to obstacles to transportation and facility costs. After discussion about whether to include them in our cost estimates, the group decided to include them, using a standard typical cost, and to also do some research as to need for this particular service. The Lake County R&R will try to get numbers regarding percentages of kids in before –school programs, and there may be other resources for these numbers as well, such as schools that open early. The issue of weekends and late night hours still needs to be addressed.

***NEXT STEPS***

*The group decided that to continue going through these questions was a good way to proceed, to make sure everything was being covered. In an effort to get all the information out in a timely manner, each work group member will be asked to go through the remaining questions on the worksheet to fill out ahead of time, and pass along to Jennifer to compile, and that will be discussed and revised at the next meeting.*

**Next Meeting Date: September 29, from 11:00 – 1:00  
ICVP--220 S. State Street, Suite 1215, Chicago IL**

**Illinois After-school Partnership  
Policy Work Group  
Compiled Meeting Minutes 2003**

**Meeting Summary September 29, 2003**

**Members in Attendance:** Jerry Andrews, Illinois Assn. Of Public Health Professionals, Greg Graham, Day Care Action Council/Illinois MOST, Gaylord Gieseke, Voices for Illinois Children, Ann Francis, FCIK/ICVP, Debbie Bretag, ICVP, Kay Pangle, I-KAN ROE, Carole Franke, I-KAN ROE, Tim Carpenter, FCKIK/ICVP, Colleen Jones, Metropolitan Family Services, Stephanie Holifield, IVPA, Carol McElvain, Learning Point Associates, Tony Stahl, Sycamore School District

**Partnership Staff:** Jennifer Becker Mouhcine, ICVP

**Overview**

There was a brief review of the context of this workgroup's work in relation to the rest of the project, and a review of the progress completed at the last meeting. At the last meeting, the group decided to continue working through the worksheets provided by the Finance Project, in order to have the variety of answers laid out to develop a few program templates to estimate costs.

**"Defining the System" Worksheets**

***"In What Settings"***

We started with the "In What Settings" question.

We developed a list of possible settings:

- School Based
- Community Based
  - Faith Based Organizations
  - YMCA/YWCA
  - Family Service Centers
  - Extra-Curricular Activities/Vocational Programs
- Social Service Organizations
- 4-H, Extension
- Arts & Cultural Organizations
- Libraries
- Parks and Recreation
- Conservation Districts
- Child Care
  - Subsidized
  - Formal and Informal

When discussing Home Based Child Care, it was recommended that this be an addendum with costs listed-rates are easier to determine because of the nature of the funding stream. The question of informal care was also discussed. The group determined that this would not be included in the cost estimates, but may be considered when we determine numbers needing after-school opportunities.

The group, after reviewing the range of settings above, decided on the following four categories that settings could fall under for our purposes. They are:

- **Child Care**
- **Community Based Organizations/Not-For-Profit**
- **School Based**
- **Other Governmental (i.e. Park Districts, Libraries, etc.)**

***"What Level of Staff Quality"***

In discussing this question, the following points were made:

**Illinois After-school Partnership  
Policy Work Group  
Compiled Meeting Minutes 2003**

- Levels of staff quality for kids 12 and under could be determined by the NSACA standards
- DCFS licensing standards may also play a role in the 12 and under programs
- The CCR&R survey on compensation, etc. may be able to provide some cost information for school age.
- For expectations of staff quality for programs serving youth above 12, we can possibly get input from
  - CDHS
  - Higher Ed Resources
    - Concordia B.A. and MA in school age child care
    - National Louis
- Teen Reach-Uses the NSACA recommendations for their programs, but not required
- 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Director needs an MA in Education or Social Service, Teachers need a BA and certification, Aides need a HS Diploma
- Staff can collect existing workforce standards for the group.
- Benefits are all over the map
- Cost elements need to address staff turnover and retention needs and need to include cost of volunteers/paid volunteers/AmeriCorps, etc.
- The Capacity Work group is looking at how to gather information about the after-school workforce and the following list of questions can be funneled to them to consider in any surveying they undertake.
  - Required Trainings (program and agency (OSHA, etc.)
  - Conference Costs
  - Resources being put toward this
  - Needed Resources
  - Dollar amount spent toward professional development by programs
  - Cost of logistics
  - Internally provided/External Free/External Costs
- The point was made that in the finance plan we could make recommendations about how to be cost effective (i.e. internet trainings, etc.)

In general, these questions were hard to answer not having enough information about current staffing requirements, staffing levels, and staffing standards.

***Proceeding through the worksheet***

The group raised several issues that made answering subsequent questions in the worksheet challenging.

- Question of what we are gathering: Current practice, standards baseline, or quality goal? Members pointed out that we need to know what the costs are in current practice, set costs using baseline standards, and eventually costing out the cost of program to reach higher quality levels. It is hard for the group to answer questions about levels of quality, when baseline standards are not equal across programs, and programs vary so much in their offerings and staffing needs.
- Questions to Possibly Add: When looking through the questions to be covered, it was noted that several program elements might be missing in the infrastructure piece, if these are to be at the program level.
  - Fiscal and Accounting
  - Program Reporting
  - Grant Writing/Development
- The work group found it difficult to answer the infrastructure questions at the program level, because there are so many variables among programs, and it was hard to define many of the components.
- The group discussed options of how best to move forward
  - Sample Budgets - One suggestion was to gather some sample budgets of programs to have to help us determine some real cost elements. It was unclear how we would determine whose budgets to ask for, and if they would be willing to share their detailed budget information with us.

**Illinois After-school Partnership  
Policy Work Group  
Compiled Meeting Minutes 2003**

- Finance Project—The group agreed that a good next step is to enlist further help from the Finance Project. Co-chairs and staff will talk to them to get advice on how to proceed and to see if they can join our meetings.
- The workforce related cost questions will be passed along to the Capacity Building Work Group to include in their data collection efforts.

Next Meeting: **The next meeting was set tentatively for Oct. 15<sup>th</sup> 10 – 12, pending further discussion with the Finance Project**

**Illinois After-school Partnership  
Policy Work Group  
Compiled Meeting Minutes 2003**

**November 4, 2003**

**Members in Attendance:** Deb Bretag, ICVP, Loomis Mayfield, Illinois After-school Alliance/ICVP, Paul Kren, ISBE, Carol Franke, I-KAN ROE, Gaylord Gieseke, Voices for Illinois Children, Carol McElvain, Learning Point Associates, Tony Stahl, Sycamore School District, Tawa Jogunosimi, Chicago Public Schools

**Technical Assistance Providers:** Sharon Deich and Heather Padgette, the Finance Project

**Staff:** Jennifer Becker Mouhcine

### **Overview of Progress**

*Jennifer gave an overview of the last meeting. At that meeting, we worked through some more questions on the "Financing for What" worksheets provided by the Finance Project, and some questions were raised about how best to move forward. The group was able to determine some categories of programs based on settings, but it was challenging to answer many of the workforce related and infrastructure costs without a specific program or template to work from, given the variety of program types, structures, components etc. The group decided to turn to the Finance Project for assistance.*

### **Update on Meeting with The Finance Project**

Co-chairs and staff held a phone meeting with Sharon and Heather from the Finance Project to discuss our progress and arising questions. They pointed out that the infrastructure questions could be addressed by seeing what the state-level agencies arrive at for infrastructure costs, and use a percentage of that for program/community level infrastructure. Given the variety of programs and the challenges that poses for answering some cost element questions, they suggested that we work within some framework we've created thus far, and pick sample programs the group feels are of high quality, and begin by using their actual costs elements. Other variations can come from the first example in order to have the range of cost templates the group would like to reflect a range of programming in out-of-school time. We talked about using the four settings discussed at the last meeting as a starting point and identifying sample programs in each area. We also discussed using the core elements from the Task Force report to use when identifying quality programs to represent each area. The Finance Project agreed to join the next work group meeting to provide additional support and assistance.

### **Suggested Framework**

The work group discussed the proposal to choose existing quality program examples from each of the following four settings. **(1) Child Care; (2) Community Based Organizations/Not-For-Profit; (3) School Based; and (4) Other Governmental (i.e. Park Districts, Libraries, etc.)** Example programs in each setting could provide their cost details for all the identified program components. The group could use those cost estimates for the foundation of the financial plan, and determine any needed variation of costs to reflect the range of program costs. The group agreed this should be the way we proceed. In determining examples of quality programs in each setting, the group reviewed the core elements document and possible programs were assessed against those elements.

### **Determining Examples from Each Setting**

*For all of these examples, it was raised that we will need to look at transportation costs (if offered), age ranges, days/times of operation, urban, rural settings, etc. and consider those when doing cost comparisons and variations. The group discussed the following organizations under each setting as possibilities to get cost information from. They are listed below with related discussion points.*

#### **Child Care**

The group determined that we need to further define this category to determine whether we are discussing center based or home-based, for-profit, not-for profit, etc. There also may be some existing cost analysis in this area. The group held this for further discussion.

#### **Community Based Organizations**

- Outreach Community Ministries: Chris Ellerman

**Illinois After-school Partnership  
Policy Work Group  
Compiled Meeting Minutes 2003**

- Comprehensive program with a number of activities
- Collaborations are in place
- Strives to meet social/emotional development areas
- Has done some work considering financing issues, including in-kind & volunteerism costs
- Suburban Setting
- Teen Reach program, along with a range of other sources
- Child Care Component
- Has a history with our work
- Erie Neighborhood House
  - Chicago Organization-Urban Setting
  - High level of organization with variety of services that should be able to provide information
- 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Schools/Tazewell County Health Department: Amy Tippey
  - 21<sup>st</sup> Century and Teen Reach
  - Various sites and settings
  - Child Care Component
  - Also connected to other governmental agency, as a health department, and school based
  - On Leadership Team
- Martin Luther King Jr. Service Center, Freeport—Tracy Johnson
  - Comprehensive services
  - Transportation services
  - Teen Reach site
  - On Leadership Team
- Boys and Girls Club--The group discussed that we might be able to work with the state-wide association to get their average program costs in urban, suburban, and rural settings

**School Based**

- Bureau, Henry/Stark County Program: Angela Conrad (Carol/Paul's Contact)
- Proviso-Maywood: Karen Brown (Paul's Contact)--Good school partnerships
- Lawndale—Steans funded program
- Columbia College 21<sup>st</sup> Century Programs: JoAnn Vena
- Other CCIS efforts (Benito Juarez, Little Village, NettleHearst)
- CPS programs--Programs tend to be specific to one element such as technology, rather than offering a full comprehensive program. The group discussed that knowing costs for those components will be helpful down the line, but for now, looking for costs for a comprehensive program
- Southern Illinois-Full Service Community Schools: Dan Anderson may know of some

**Other Governmental**

- Park Districts—Talk to Ted Flickinger to identify programs, Evanston Park District, McFetridge Park District in Chicago-many programs etc.
- National Guard-connected to base run programs, Peoria Area National Guard, Curtis Peace and Amy Tippey have contacts
- The After-school Matters program was suggested but the group determined it is such a unique model, that it may not work as a starting place. They do have some costs related to older youth programming we could factor in at a later date.

**Illinois After-school Partnership  
Policy Work Group  
Compiled Meeting Minutes 2003**

Other Notes: Information was shared that it costs about 130,000 per community school, which includes infrastructure costs and the costs to all in the community school partnership arrangement. This may not include in-kind contributions of each partner.

**Next Steps**

The group determined that we should start by looking at costs for one program, and build from there to capture the variation of costs by settings, ages, components, etc. The group determined that we should work with someone who is already involved in our work so we can do our first step “in-house” and learn from the process. Amy Tippey’s program in Creve Coeur was selected as a place to start. Jennifer will work with the Finance Project to get the cost information we need from Amy’s program

**Next Meeting: Tuesday, January 13<sup>th</sup> 10:30 – 12:00, at ICVP 220 S. State Street, #1215**