

\$72 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 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 to comply with these mandates. 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

- **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, 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.

ASES Increase Effectively Targets

Disadvantaged Students, Consistent with LCFF Equity Goals

- **Increasing State funding for existing ASES grants—which serve almost exclusively schools with predominantly low-income populations—would target low-income students** more effectively than directing funds generally to LCFF. While LCFF provides more funding for high-need than other students, it still spreads funding across all schools and all students.

For additional information visit our web page at www.CA3Advocacy.org or email us at info@ca3advocacy.org