

# A VISION FOR EXPANDED LEARNING IN CALIFORNIA

---

DEFINING EQUITY COMMITTEE

Recommendations for  
creating equity in state  
and federally funded  
Expanded Learning  
programs in California

NOVEMBER 2015

## Acknowledgements

*This document represents the culmination of the time, dedication, hard work, and resources of many individuals and organizations. The California Department of Education (CDE), After School Division (ASD) would like to acknowledge their contributions and express our deepest gratitude to all of those involved in this process.*

### Co-Chairs

Susie Morikawa (Region 6) – Education Programs Consultant, After School Division  
Allyson Harris (Region 2) – Director of After School Programs, Shasta County Office of Education  
Lisa McClung, PhD – Education Programs Consultant, After School Division

### Committee Members

Donna Frey (Region 9) – Program Director, Anaheim YMCA  
Fred Sharp (Region 11) – Associate Governmental Program Analyst, After School Division  
Harry Talbot, EdD (Region 11) – Administrative Coordinator, Beyond the Bell Division  
James Hall (Region 2) – Director, Lassen County Office of Education, After School Programs  
Jennifer Lynch (Region 4) – District Coordinator of Extended Learning PreK-12, San Rafael City School Districts  
Johannes Troost (Region 7) – Education Programs Consultant, After School Division  
Joshua Brady, M. Ed (Region 9) – Education Programs Consultant, After School Division  
Julie Boesch, EdD (Region 8) – Superintendent/Principal, Maple Elementary School District  
Julie Jarrett (Region 2) – Director, Butte County Office of Education Expanded Learning Department  
Lincoln Ellis (Region 6) – President/Chief Professional Officer, Boys & Girls Club of Stanislaus County  
Lisa Dornback (Region 3) – Grant Writer, Elk Grove Unified School District  
Michael Nicholson (Region 6) – Consortium Lead, Stanislaus County Office of Education

### Leadership and Support

Michael Funk – Director, After School Division  
Don Taylor, EdD – Education Administrator, After School Division  
Heather Ashly Williams – Strategic Initiatives Coordinator, After School Division

### This work has been supported by the ongoing generous funding support from

David and Lucile Packard Foundation  
S.D. Bechtel, Jr. Foundation

*For questions related to this document and its recommendations please contact Susie Morikawa at [smorikawa@cde.ca.gov](mailto:smorikawa@cde.ca.gov), Lisa McClung at [lmccclung@cde.ca.gov](mailto:lmccclung@cde.ca.gov), or Don Taylor at [dtaylor@cde.ca.gov](mailto:dtaylor@cde.ca.gov).*

## Contents

- 2 Acknowledgements
- 4 Background
- 6 Committee's Outcomes
- 7 Recommendations & Next Steps
- 9 Attachment A: Detailed Recommendations for “Process” Equity Indicators
- 13 Attachment B: Notes for “Needs” & “Parking Lot” Equity Indicators

## Background

### Strategic Planning Background

In January 2014, the release of the strategic plan, *A Vision for Expanded Learning in California*, formally kicked off the strategic planning implementation process. High priority objectives were identified for each of the four initiatives identified in the strategic plan and a collaborative process was developed to meet each of the corresponding objectives. In most instances collaborative work groups were formed to address these objectives, including the Defining Equity Committee.

### Defining Equity Committee Purpose

The Defining Equity Committee was formed to address Objectives 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 (see below) from the Grant Administration and Policy Initiative of the strategic plan. The committee was a collaborative, co-led group consisting of field representatives and ASD staff, responsible for defining equity in grant eligibility and award distribution to ensure equitable funding distribution for state After School Education & Safety (ASES) and federal 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) programs. The committee built on the work of the Grants Administration and Policy Strategic Implementation Team of the California Expanded Learning Strategic Planning Process. The committee's work also built on more current policy changes, including recently enacted 2015 legislation.

#### **Grant Administration and Policy Initiative**

*Goal 2.3: ASD ensures timely, efficient, and equitable grant award processes that support quality programs.*

*Objective 2.3.1: Define equity in grant eligibility and award distribution for state ASES and federal 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs.*

*Objective 2.3.2: Develop and implement a collaborative process for review and gather feedback on state (ASES) and federal (21<sup>st</sup> CCLC) equitable funding distribution processes.*

### Defining Equity Process & Timeline

The process began in May 2014 with the identification of Susie Morikawa, Education Programs Consultant, as the After School Division Co-Lead for the committee. In July 2014, Allyson Harris, Director of After School Programs with the Shasta County Office of Education, was recruited and selected to serve as the field Co-Lead. Later in December 2014, Lisa McClung, Education Programs Consultant, was identified as the back-up After School Division Co-Lead.

An open application was distributed broadly to the field in August 2014 and twelve committee members were selected in September 2014. These selected committee members were comprised of a diverse group of representatives from after school programs throughout Northern, Central, and Southern California, including rural locations. Members also represented various stakeholder groups including Regional Leads, Community Based Organizations (CBOs), and ASD staff. Selected members were required to commit 10 hours of work per month for the duration of one year. Participation included attending alternating in-person and conference call meetings each month and additional time performing individual planning and preparation work in between meetings. Subsequently, the committee voted unanimously to hold monthly meetings in-person and the requirements and expectation for participation was adjusted accordingly.

The committee's initial meeting took place in November 2014. Meeting formats, scheduling and timeline, and the committee's meeting agreements were developed collaboratively during this meeting. Subsequent meetings took place throughout 2014-2015 to meet the outcomes identified for the Defining Equity Committee. The last meeting was held on September 25, 2015 with this document representing the culmination of the committee's work as well as the final recommendations to the After School Division.

The following report contains **recommendations** for consideration by the After School Division. If the After School Division pursues implementation of any of these recommendations there will be additional opportunities for public input.

## Committee's Outcomes

### Defining Equity

As opposed to identifying any particular sentence or paragraph definition of what equity means for the ASES and 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grant award processes, it was the committee members' general consensus to define equity through a list of equity indicators. Committee members consulted with their local stakeholders to identify an extensive list of equity indicators which would serve as guiding topics for discussions. These Equity Indicators were subsequently categorized and prioritized into two subgroups. The two categories were defined as:

1. **“Process” Equity Indicators:** Indicators defined as topic areas in which equitable access to grants administration and funding distribution processes may currently be an issue.
2. **“Needs” Equity Indicators:** Indicators defined as topic areas in which demographics or other identified needs may be a barrier to equitable access.

In addition, several other indicators were identified as “Parking Lot” Equity Indicators and were recorded for future discussions.

## Recommendations & Next Steps

Below is a summary of the recommendations for the **“Process” Equity Indicators**. Not all recommendations represent a complete consensus from the group as there were varying opinions from committee members. They do, however, represent a decision agreed upon by a significant majority of the committee. In some instances concerns/dissenting opinions are reflected in Attachment A as additional items for the After School Division to consider while reviewing the recommendations. In addition and where noted, it was strongly encouraged to provide Technical Assistance (TA) through the System of Support that aligns with implemented recommendations.

For more specific detail on the recommendations, see Attachment A.

| Indicator   | Summary of Recommendation  |
|---|--|
| Elimination of Dual Funded Sites  | A school site currently receiving ASES funds is not eligible to receive 21st CCLC after school funds.  |
| Use of Free and Reduced-priced Meal (FRPM) percentage or Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) unduplicated count to determine ASES and 21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC eligibility. | Maintain current practice of using FRPM percentage.  |
| Additional Good Standing Indicators   | Add Federal Program Monitoring (FPM) and Audit findings to determine grantee's "Good Standing" status.   |
| Periodic evaluation of FRPM percentage to determine eligibility during ASES renewal process.  | Recalculate program funding in schools with less than 50% FRPM as their three year funding cycle is renewed.   |
| Geographic Funding Distribution   | Develop a process for distribution of after school program funding based on the percentage of FRPM-eligible students in specific geographic regions.   |
| Request For Applications (RFA) Priority   | Priority for funding will be given to 21 <sup>st</sup> CCLC applicants with schools that are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) In Program Improvement and are submitted jointly with a community based organization or other public or private entity</li> <li>2) Proposing to operate a summer year round program</li> <li>3) Renewing a previously funded program</li> <li>4) Expanding the program (applies to After School Safety and Enrichment for Teens (ASSETS) only).</li> </ol> |

## **“Needs” and “Parking Lot” Equity Indicators**

Due to time constraints and extensive discussions and considerations by the committee members on the “Process” Equity Indicators, the committee did not have formal recommendations for the “Needs” and “Parking Lot” Equity Indicators. These indicators remain as outstanding work for the After School Division to address in the future, in a yet to be determined process. For more specific detail on these indicators, see Attachment B.

## **Next Steps**

The committee’s recommendations were presented to the After School Advisory Committee on August 25, 2015. ASD will take into account the feedback from the Advisory Committee, as well as prioritization and feasibility when determining implementation of these recommendations. Implementation of most of the recommendations made by the Defining Equity Committee would require changes to existing RFAs and California Education Code, or the potential development of regulations. If these recommendations are pursued, most would require further engagement and discussion with the field.

Current ASD efforts including the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI)<sup>2</sup> and the Quality Standards for Expanded Learning may provide data and other context for the ASD to consider when deciding how to address “Needs” and “Parking Lot” Indicators.



## Attachment A: Detailed Recommendations for “Process” Equity Indicators

### Elimination of Dual Funded Sites

#### Recommendation:

A school site currently receiving ASES funds is not eligible to receive 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC after school funds.

#### Rationale:

Provide greater distribution of after school funding.

#### Potential Edits to Education Code, RFA, and/or Regulations:

Education Code 8484.8(b)(3)

#### Additional Comments & Impact

- Note: This would not restrict an ASES base program site from applying for a 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC summer grant.
- Ineligibility for dual-funding will apply only to future grant awards, not current grantees.
- Applies to 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC.
- The restriction of eligibility to apply for 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC funds is based upon the possibility of supplanting of federal 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC funds.

### Use of FRPM percentage or LCFF unduplicated count to determine ASES and 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC eligibility.

#### Recommendation:

No amendment should be made to current law with respect to the use of FRPM percentage.

#### Rationale:

Analysis of students eligible for FRPM as compared with LCFF unduplicated count of students, which includes students designated as socioeconomically disadvantaged, English Learners, and foster children, yielded only a 2% variation. The committee determined there would be no significant change in how funds are geographically distributed if the law were amended to use LCFF instead of FRPM.

#### Potential Edits to Education Code, RFA, and/or Regulations:

N/A

#### Additional Comments & Impact

N/A

## Additional Good Standing Indicators

### Recommendation:

**Change California Education Code** for 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grants by adding to the “Good Standing” Section that:

- All annual audit findings have been found by the ASD to be resolved or in the process of being resolved
- All FPM findings have been found by the ASD to be resolved or in the process of being resolved

### Rationale:

Grantees must be accountable for the funding they receive. These additional “Good Standing” requirements will allow for the distribution of after school funds to the most responsible and reliable applicants.

### Potential Edits to Education Code, RFA, and/or Regulations:

- Education Code 8483.7[a][1][A][vi], Education Code 8483.7[a][1][A][vii], Education Code 8484, Education Code 8427(d)
- Changes to Current RFA Language Regarding “Good Standing”

### Additional Comments & Impact

- Applies to 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC, ASSETS & ASES
- These changes should align with the After School Division Quality Standards
- Technical Assistance (TA) is provided to grantees to resolve all findings.

## Periodic evaluation of FRPM percentage to determine eligibility during ASES renewal process.

### Recommendation:

**Change California Education Code** to recalculate the school funding level if the school site has 50% or less FRPM-eligible students when the ASES three year renewal funding cycles come up for approval.

The committee members recommended the following specifics:

1. If the school site is at 40-50% FRPM (based on a 3 year average) then the program funding is reduced to 80% of current grant.
2. If the school site is at 30-40% FRPM (based on a 3 year average) then the program funding is reduced on a sliding scale, to be determined by the ASD.
3. If the school site is at less than 30% FRPM (based on a 3 year average) then the program funding is reduced to zero.

**Rationale:**

- Frees up resources (\$) for sites in greater need (money goes to serve students with the greatest need).
- Increases the number of sites served by after school program funds with students in greatest need, based on FRPM.
- Schools would be notified of the new policy and should have time to sustain their program if they choose to do so from other funds (Title I, LCAP, etc.)

**Potential Edits to Education Code, RFA, and/or Regulations:**

Education Code 8482.5.(a), Education Code 8482.3. (g) (1), Education Code 8482.4. (c), Education Code 8482.55. (c), Education Code 8483.75. (a) (1) (A), Education Code 8484

**Additional Comments & Impact**

Applies to ASES grantees.

**Geographic Funding Distribution****Recommendation:**

Distribute funding based on the percentage of FRPM-eligible student population in the nine geographic “buckets” as follows:

- The CDE will determine geographic designations for the North, Central, and South.
- Within the North, Central, and South buckets, determine the urban, suburban and rural areas resulting in nine funding buckets as follows:
  - North CA Urban, North CA Suburban, North CA Rural
  - Central CA Urban, Central CA Suburban, Central CA Rural
  - South CA Urban, South CA Suburban, South CA Rural

**NOTE:**

1. This model may decrease to six buckets of funding if the CDE is unable to find an objective definition of “Suburban” areas.
2. The committee is proposing that the CDE consider regulations or statutory changes for this recommendation.

**Rationale:**

- Equitable geographic distribution of funds ensures better alignment with state and federal requirements that govern distribution of ASES<sup>1</sup> and 21st CCLC funds<sup>2</sup>.
- The North, Central, and South recommendation will require regulations or statutory changes.

<sup>1</sup>Ed Code 8483.3(a) To the extent possible, the selection of applicants by the State Department of Education shall result in an equitable distribution of grant awards pursuant to Section 8483.7 to applicants in northern, southern, and central California, and in urban, suburban, and rural areas of California.

<sup>2</sup> Sect. 4204(f) (f) GEOGRAPHIC DIVERSITY- To the extent practicable, a State educational agency shall distribute funds under this part equitably among geographic areas within the State, including urban and rural communities.

**Potential Edits to Education Code, RFA, and/or Regulations:**

USC Section 4204(f), Education Code 8483.3(a)

**Additional Comments & Impact**

Applies to ASES, 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC and ASSETS grantees.

**Request for Application (RFA) Priority****Recommendation:**

Priority for funding will be given to quality applicants that are:

- 1) In Program Improvement and are submitting jointly with a community based organization or other public or private entity
- 2) Proposing to operate a summer year round program
- 3) Renewing a previously funded program or
- 4) Expanding the program (ASSETS only).

**NOTE:**

- Highest priority would be given to applicants with all three components (four in the case of ASSETS) and descending priority thereafter.
- In the event of a tie, the CDE will award funds based on highest application score, then highest FRPM if a further tiebreaker is needed.
- Funds will be redistributed to other geographic areas within similar buckets if there aren't any quality applications in a particular bucket (refer to nine buckets funding distribution under "Geographic Funding Distribution" recommendation).  
Example: If there aren't any quality applications within the Northern rural bucket, funds will be redistributed to Central rural and Southern rural buckets.

**Rationale:**

- In the past several 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC and ASSETS funding cycles, less than 50% of applicants were granted renewals.
- Ensures better alignment with state and federal requirements that govern distribution of 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC funds.

**Potential Edits to Education Code, RFA, and/or Regulations:**

USC Section 4204(i), Education Code 8422(a); 8484.8(e)

**Additional Comments & Impact**

- Under current law, applicants are eligible to apply based on Title I Schoolwide or high percent of poverty and must have Good Standing status.
- Applications meeting a predetermined scoring threshold (i.e. 70 or higher points) will be considered "quality applications" and will then be eligible for priority points.
- Applies to 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC and ASSETS grantees.

## Attachment B: Notes for “Needs” & “Parking Lot” Equity Indicators

Attachment B includes potential data sources and notes/comments from the committee with regard to the “Needs” and “Parking Lot” equity indicators in order to provide framing for future discussions.

One of the main challenges in addressing these indicators was a lack of standardized data to draw from, thereby making the development of standard method(s) of assessment virtually impossible. There were also a disparity of opinions on whether these indicators should be addressed within the confines of this committee and therefore, it was the consensus of the group not to address these indicators at this time.

### “Needs” Equity Indicators

| Indicator   | Potential Data Sources  | Notes/Comments <sup>1</sup>   |
|---|---|---|
| Availability of affordable, community-based expanded learning programs  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community asset-mapping data</li> <li>County/city data</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some urban communities have many options while some rural and isolated areas don't have any.</li> <li>Providing funding opportunities for areas without options would be more equitable.</li> </ul>  |
| Standardized assessments of the social, emotional and mental health of general education students (within the confines of funding.) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>California Healthy Kids Survey data.</li> </ul> <p><i>NOTE: There was support from the equity committee members for the use of the CHKS; however, the CHKS is an optional survey for program sites. The ASD has added several questions to the CHKS in the last year that ask about current participation in after school programs, but until the survey is required of all program sites, these data cannot be standardized. The committee recommended future discussions about incorporating the CHKS into available data if it becomes required of all program sites to complete.</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More money for these students to cover 1:1 aides.</li> <li>Most sites already serve these populations of students. We stretch the dollars as far as they will go. There does not need to be a limit on what an after school program is legally required to do. Small rural sites are unable to stretch their dollars to provide one-to-one aides, etc.</li> <li>Lower ratios for special needs students – more money per child.</li> </ul> |

| Indicator   | Potential Data Sources   | Notes/Comments <sup>1</sup>  |
|---|--|--|
| Local crime rates, especially juvenile crime rates (i.e. truancy, referrals, etc.)                              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local law enforcement and/or probation data</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need more statistical data, require grantees to conduct surveys.</li> </ul>   |
| Family need for expanded learning programs based on a standardized survey conducted by the CDE                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parent/family survey data that is collected by applicant schools.</li> <li>Survey could be standardized by CDE for use among all applicants.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What survey would capture this?</li> <li>What questions would you ask?</li> <li>This could be an excellent method for addressing need that goes beyond straight poverty indicators. CDE should really consider implementing this.</li> </ul>  |
| Community health and wellness factors   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>California Physical Fitness test data</li> <li>County/city data</li> <li>Percentage of homeless youth at the school or district</li> </ul>              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are not serving enough of this population.</li> </ul>  |
| Academic performance data based on ethnic and gender groups (i.e. African American males and children of color) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local school performance reports</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would this then lead to providing additional services to select groups? This should be addressed or at least considered. What is our goal for this?</li> <li>The achievement gap is so pervasive and universal, it almost shouldn't be considered as an indicator. Any school can demonstrate this problem. A better indicator is the number or percentage of African American males and children of color.</li> <li>Rural and isolated programs also deal with children of generational poverty who are Caucasian. I am not comfortable highlighting two groups and excluding so many</li> </ul> |

| Indicator                           | Potential Data Sources   | Notes/Comments <sup>1</sup>  |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|
|                                     |  | others. It needs to be a broad blanket statement.  |
| Availability of community partners. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>County/city data</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I support my rural programs in their concern that this be given lower priority.</li> <li>Rural and isolated communities often times have very few community partner options, making community partnerships very difficult.</li> <li>Sharing information on various types of partnerships and acceptable guidelines may help some identify partnerships they already have but may not think they “qualify.”</li> </ul> |

### “Parking Lot” Equity Indicators

| Indicator   | Notes/Comments*   |
|---|---|
| More flexibility within district to allocate funding based on need at each site | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funds transferred between sites</li> <li>Dollars follow the students</li> <li>The CDE considers districts’ overall funding picture when determining awards</li> <li>Districts getting a lot of funding through different funding streams vs. some don’t get any at all (e.g., LCFF, Title I, Title III, ASES/21<sup>st</sup> CCLC)</li> <li>Indicator on survey</li> <li>Wouldn’t a good needs assessment capture this? Isn’t flexibility there already?</li> <li>Funding is currently distributed by school, not district. I don’t support making ASES or 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC funds district-wide grants.</li> <li>Districts would still need to describe, define and request this flexibility.</li> </ul> |
| Sharing the burden, asking for documentation of partnerships/                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engage community around program</li> <li>Action around partnerships (includes parents, community members)</li> <li>Compliance vs. equity</li> </ul>  |

| Indicator  | Notes/Comments*  |
|--|--|
| parents/community members/CBO                                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is a great point that we should really advocate for. We have some programs that do an exceptional job of this already and many that could be doing so much more.</li> </ul>  |
| Limitation of funding to 15% of student population in urban areas. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allow Dollars to be distributed equitably to all students in a region.</li> <li>Place a cap of the statutory funding limit and a floor of 60 students per funded schools.</li> <li>This would address the issue of large and small schools having funding for a different percentage of students.</li> <li>This would increase the number of schools with a minimum amount of funding</li> <li>This would allow all students an equal opportunity to participate in Out of School Time (OST) activities.</li> </ul> |

---

<sup>i</sup> The notes/comments are varying opinions from individual committee members that were collected and copied verbatim from a feedback survey and do not represent a group consensus.