

\$73 Million for After-School — Why the State Should Act



www.CA3Advocacy.org

Protecting Quality After-School Programs Is a State Responsibility

- **The State of California, together with the voters who overwhelmingly approved Proposition 49 in 2002, made a long-term commitment to after-school programs: It needs to protect its \$5 billion decade-long investment and the vast infrastructure of over 4,000 after-school programs.** The State relies on these programs to deliver low-income students needed enrichment, physical activity, academic support, and STEM learning and to leverage hundreds of millions of federal dollars for healthy snacks and meals.
- **While funding for the After School Education and Safety (ASES) program has remained static for a decade, the State has increased funding for other protected State categorical education programs that were not eliminated to create the Local Control Funding Formula.** Over just the past two years the State enacted increases in child care and preschool rates (11-12%) to help sustain program quality, similar to the increase sought for ASES. In 2015, the State increased funding for the Foster Youth Services program by 67%.
- **The Governor said in his recent budget proposal that “the state must shoulder higher wages in its programs” resulting from the minimum wage increase.** The State mandated the minimum wage increase and paid sick leave to meet important needs, and it has a responsibility to make the adjustments needed for after-school programs consistent with minimum wage adjustments made for other state-funded programs. We should ensure that the same workers these policies seek to benefit do not lose work hours, benefits, and even jobs because the programs are not funded to meet the new mandates. After-school programs cannot simply pass along these costs to their overwhelmingly low-income customers.

The Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) is Not the Solution

- **LCFF is not intended to maintain the status quo for underserved students and simply sustain existing programs like ASES.** In fact, it is questionable whether LCFF Supplemental & Concentration funds can be used to provide the same level of services in existing ASES programs because by law they must be used to “increase or improve” services for high-need students.
- **Few districts are investing LCFF dollars in ASES programs, and even those few investments don’t address increased personnel costs** resulting from increases in the minimum wage and cost of living. New investments are often focused on expanding access and services, which is a critical need, but is adding weight to an already strained infrastructure.
- **After-school programs generally find it difficult to compete for limited LCFF funds.** 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.
- **Relying on LCFF funds alone would result in unequal treatment of students.** Without uniform State action, many at-risk kids will be left with lower quality programs or no programs at all.
- **Consistent with LCFF equity goals, increasing State funding for existing ASES grants would target low-income students more effectively than directing funds generally to LCFF.** ASES serves almost exclusively schools with predominantly low-income populations, while LCFF, although it provides more funding for high-need than other students, still spreads funding across all schools and all students.

For additional information visit our webpage at www.saveafterschool.com or email us at info@ca3advocacy.org