NIOST

National Institute on Out-of-School Time Wellesley Centers for Women at Wellesley College

Making the Case: A 2008 Fact Sheet on Children and Youth In Out-of-School Time

Benefits from Afterschool Program Participation

Data shows that children who have access to out-ofschool-time activities which are of high quality, designed and staffed by professionals, and are based on youth development research enjoy a wide variety of positive outcomes ranging from school success to better health. [1]

Participation in various structured out-of-school time activities has been shown to have the greatest impact and most positive effect on those who are most at risk. Research suggests that out-of-school time programs can benefit youth socially, emotionally and academically, however those who participate more frequently and for longer periods of time are most likely to benefit from out-of-school time opportunities. [2]

Afterschool programs both supplement the school day by offering much-needed activities like college and career counseling and character education, and also provide activities that are decreasingly available in schools, such as art, physical education, music, and civics. They also offer a unique opportunity to provide less traditional learning experiences such as hands-on learning, group projects, and service-learning. [3]

Community schools (integrated focus on academics, health, social service, youth and community development) offer positive out-of-school time opportunities for youth and can make a difference for students in four ways: (1) Improve student learning by addressing the needs of the whole child; (2) Promote family engagement with students and schools by providing families with access to services and opportunities to participate as leaders and learners; (3) Help schools function more efficiently by working together to support learning; and (4) Add vitality to communities through engagement with the schools and resources that works both ways. [4]

Research suggests youth who participate in afterschool programs improve significantly in three major areas:

(1) Feelings and attitudes; (2) Increased indicators of behavior adjustment which includes positive social behaviors and reduction in aggression, conduct problems, and drug use; and (3) Increased school and achievement test scores. One study concludes that programs that used evidence-based skill training approaches were consistently successful in producing multiple benefits for youth, while those that did not use such procedures were not successful in any outcome area. [5]

Research from an eight state study known as the Promising Afterschool Programs study suggests that disadvantaged elementary and middle school students who regularly attend high quality afterschool for at least two years are academically further ahead of peers who spend more out-of school time in unsupervised activities. The researchers found, over the course of the three-year project, that the more engaged students were in supervised afterschool activities, the better they did on a range of academic, social, and behavioral outcomes. [6]

The afterschool field continues to expand because parents and others believe the field will deliver on several diverse goals: improvement in the safety and health of our communities and our youth; improvement of students' academic performance; development of their civic, artistic, and other skills; and provision of care for young people wile parents work [7].

Afterschool programs offer children and youth opportunities to learn new skills such as conflict resolution, prepare for a successful career, improve grades and develop relationships with caring adults. These skills can be critical in helping youth develop in positive ways and to avoid behavior problems and conflict. Studies show that afterschool programs benefit youth at all levels, from elementary to high school. In fact, middle and high school students may often benefit most from these programs. [8]

Evidence suggests a correlation between frequent attendance in out-of-school time activities and positive outcomes, including an increase in academic achievement, school attendance, time spent on homework, extracurricular activities, improved effort in school, and better student behavior. Out-of-school time programs offer supportive contexts for youth development and offer excellent opportunities for youth to develop skills in supervised, safe, and engaging environments. [9]

Afterschool programs can increase engagement in learning by providing middle school students with opportunities to meet needs that schools often can't, e.g., personal attention from adults, a positive peer group, and activities that hold their interest and build their self-esteem (Vandell, et al. 1996; Garmezy, 1991; Rutter, 1987; Clark, 1987; Masten, et al. 1990; Comer, et al., 1984; Werner, 1993; Halpern, 1992; As reported in Miller, 2003). [10]

Engagement in the arts whether the visual arts, dance, music, theatre or other disciplines, nurtures the development of cognitive, social, and personal competencies. Arts focused afterschool programs can increase academic achievement, decrease youth involvement in delinquent behavior and improve youth attitudes towards themselves and others and their futures. [11]

A new study of Chicago's After School Matters program which offers paid internships in the arts, technology, sports, and communications to teenagers in several underserved schools has found a relationship between participating in afterschool activities and higher class attendance, lower course failures and higher graduation rates. [12]

Adolescent mental and emotional well-being is associated with teens' environments. Links have been found consistently between teens' well-being and environments that are emotionally positive and warm and that provide support for developing adolescent Some research suggests that positive autonomy. experiences in one area (for example, in the family, among peers, at school, through youth community service...) may lessen the effect of negative experiences in other areas. Adolescents who spend time in communities that are rich in developmental opportunities for them experience less risk and show evidence of higher rates of positive development. [13-14]

Continued Need for Out-of-School Time Opportunities

Young people build skills, acquire passions, come to understandings and take on responsibilities for changing their worlds as they grow, learn and develop. Practice suggests that young people are most likely to develop these strengths when they are connected to programs and organizations that have effective youth engagement strategies explicitly designed to address these core needs. [15]

The Harvard Family Research Project has reported on several evaluations of afterschool programs focused on increasing the physical activity levels of children and youth. These evaluation results showed that the afterschool programs did increase levels of physical activity in participants. [16, 17]

In 2006, there were 73.7 million children ages 0–17 in the United States, or 25 % of the population, down from a peak of 36 % at the end of the "baby boom" (1964). Children are projected to compose 24 % of the population in 2020. [18]

A 2006 survey of over 600 California 12-17 year-olds found that kids left unsupervised three or more days per week were twice as likely to hang out with gang members and three times as likely to be engaged in criminal behavior, and more than three times as likely to use illegal drugs. [19]

The racial and ethnic diversity of America's children and youth (18 or younger) continues to grow. According to the 2005 American Community Survey published by the Census Bureau 68.5% are white, 14.8% are Black or African American, 19.6% Hispanic are origin, 7.9% report "other" 3.8% report two or more races, 4% Asian and less than one percent report American Indian. [20]

The parents of more than 28 million school-age children work outside the home. As many as 14 million "latchkey children" go to an empty house on any given afternoon. [21]

A recent survey by the Afterschool Alliance found that in 2005/2006, three in four afterschool programs were full or overcrowded and 86% of the providers surveyed said that children in their communities who need afterschool programs do not have access to them. [22]

Research demonstrates demographic differences in participation in out-of-school time programs. Children

from lower income families were more likely to participate in tutoring programs and children from higher income families participated in virtually all outof-school time programs. [23]

In the hours after the school bell rings, violent juvenile crime soars and the prime time for juvenile crime begins. The peak hours for such crime are from 3:00 to 6:00 PM. These are also the hours when children are most likely to become victims of crime, be in an automobile accident, smoke, drink alcohol, or use drugs. A recent poll shows that the number one concern of working parents is the safety of their children during the afterschool hours. Afterschool programs that connect children to caring adults and provide constructive activities during these hours are among the most powerful tools for preventing crime. [24]

Researchers from Brandies University have identified a level of stress that parents experience regarding their children's afterschool arrangements. This parent stress is costing companies between \$50-\$300 billion in healthcare and lost job productivity each year. [25]

Findings from selected cost studies of out-of-school time programs suggest a wide variation in costs - from \$449 to \$7,160 per child per year- more than a fifteen-fold range. Much of this variation can be attributed to program characteristics and methodological differences in sample sizes, how costs are calculated, whether in-kind resources are taken into account, and whether start-up, operating, and system-building costs are included. [26]

Children and Youth Spend Time After School in a Variety of Ways

America After 3 PM reports that 11% (6.5 million) of the nation's youth are in afterschool programs and 25% (14.3 million) care for themselves in the afternoons. [27]

Nearly a million school-age children participate in afterschool academic enrichment programs and other youth development and support activities under the auspices of the federal 21st Century Community Learning Center Program. [28]

A study by Public Agenda showed that nearly 36% of kids report that they spend time home alone after school at least once a week. Sixteen percent (16%) spend at least three to four days a week alone and 13% spend five days a week alone at home after school. This same study reported that 57% of middle and high school

students participate in some organized activity every day, or almost every day, after school. When surveyed, 85% of students say that kids who participate in organized activities during the after school hours are better off than those who do not. [29]

More than half of teens say they would not watch so much TV or play video games if they had other things to do after school. [30]

When asked what they desire from afterschool programming parent reactions are mixed: 54% of parents feel that children need a break from academics during the afterschool hours while 38% of parents feel that children need afterschool programs that are focused on academic skills. [31]

Health and Well-being

Over the past few decades, a steady and dramatic increase in obesity has occurred throughout the entire U.S. population, particularly among children and youth. Currently, one third of American children and youth are either obese or at-risk of becoming obese. Over the past 30 years, the obesity rate has nearly tripled for children ages 2-5 years (from 5 to 14%) and youth ages 12-19 (from 5 to 17%) and quadrupled for children ages 6-11 years (from 4 to 19%). [32]

In 2005 only 20% of youth ate the recommended five or more servings of fruits and vegetables per day. [33]

The National School Lunch Program (NLSP) offers cash reimbursement to help schools serve snacks to children after their regular school day ends. Afterschool snacks can help to ensure that children receive the nutrition they need to learn, play, and grow. [34]

Children who are overweight are at greater risk for heart disease, such as high cholesterol or high blood pressure, Type II diabetes, bone and joint problems, sleep apnea, asthma, and social and psychological problems such as stigmatization and poor self-esteem. [35]

Rates of participation in physical activity have declined in the past 30 years for both children and youth. According to the Centers for Disease Control 61.5% of children ages 9-13 do not participate in any organized physical activity outside of school hours, and 22.6 % do not engage in any type of physical activity during their free time. Participation rates are even lower for urban children. [36]

© 2008 National Institute on Out-of-School Time at Wellesley Centers for Women, Wellesley College

A recent study assessed the physical-fitness levels of 239 3^{rd} and 5^{th} graders from four Illinois elementary schools. Findings show that children who got good marks on two measures of physical fitness – those that gauge aerobic fitness and body-mass index – tended also to have higher scores on state exams in reading and mathematics. That relationship also held true regardless of children's gender or socioeconomic differences. [37]

Eleven out of fourteen published studies analyzing data from approximately 58,000 students between 1967 and 2006 have found that regular participation in physical activity is associated with improved academic performance. [38]

Students with Special Needs

Afterschool programs can play a vital role by providing children with disabilities central opportunities that will help to increase their skills while building on their potential and can facilitate relationships among youth of all abilities. [39]

Historically, persons with disabilities have been isolated from mainstream youth development programs, including afterschool programs. Afterschool programs have not been well-equipped or willing to incorporate children with special needs in their programs for fear that students with disabilities would require exhaustive attention and may require costly renovations. Both the civil rights movement and the efforts of parents of children with disabilities contributed to the passage of legislation that ensure that students with disabilities have rights to participate and be accommodated in public and private programs. [39]

The goal of the American Disabilities Act (ADA) regulations is not to put strain on afterschool programs, but rather to encourage programs to "make reasonable accommodations" for individuals with disabilities in order to integrate them into the program to the degree possible. [40]

Out-of-School Time for Middle and High School-Age Youth

A study of The After School Corporation (TASC) programs found that participation by middle school students is associated with positive outcomes for youth, particularly as measured by greater attachment to school. The study found that participation in afterschool programming over a two year period was linked to improvements in academic performance

especially in mathematics. The TASC evaluation found that the school attendance rates of TASC middle school participants declined significantly less than that of nonpartcipants between the fifth and seventh grades. Further, school attendance rates increased between seventh and eighth grades for participants, while they declined for nonparticipants. [41]

Research involving youth who participated in LA's BEST found that the short-term benefits of afterschool participation by middle school youth were maintained into high school. In particular, students who had participated in LA's BEST posted higher academic achievement and lower engagement in crime. [42]

The non-school hours are an unused tool in supporting older youth in their transition to adulthood. Late adolescents and the period following, often referred to as emerging adulthood, have been noted as particularly important for setting the stage for continued development through the life span as individuals begin to make choices and engage in a variety of activities that are influential for the rest of their lives. [43, 44]

The challenges facing youth who are disconnected from our nation's employment and education systems are expansive. Research has suggested that youth services and supports offered during out-of-school time, that are grounded in a developmental approach, not only help young people avoid self-destructive behavior, but also enable them to acquire the academic and workforcereadiness skills and personal attributes that employers seek. [45]

Out-of-school time programs for older youth need to look very different than the middle or high schools young people attend. To retain older youth, out-ofschool time programs must offer high interest programs and employ staff who can develop strong partnerships with and want to work with adolescents. [46]

Research has identified key components for quality middle school afterschool programming include: (1) allowing middle school youth to be creators of their own afterschool experiences; (2) quality standards that are asset-based; (3) staff who are credible and trained to work with middle school youth; and (4) programs that balance a connection to and are independent from school and maintain family connections. [47]

The physical space for teen programming needs to reflect their activity interests. Research on designing program spaces suggests that the "design and layout of the physical environment which includes interior

© 2008 National Institute on Out-of-School Time at Wellesley Centers for Women, Wellesley College

finishes, outdoor spaces, room arrangement and selection of equipment can have a profound impact on how young people interact in the space. Teens will interact with space by arranging it, personalizing it, and readjusting it to meet their needs. Well-designed space will allow for flexibility and creativity. [48]

The delivery of program activities and opportunities to high school-age youth during out-of-school time would be enhanced by a systemic approach with infrastructure elements, such as (1) Funding collaborations; (2) Planning and cooperation among stakeholders; (3) Formal linkages between high schools, community, and local government organizations; (4) High school age program standards; (5) An agreed upon set of objectives; and (6) Designated citywide leadership. [49]

Bringing 21st century skills to youth requires a commitment from the community. It also requires a strong sense of cooperation between school day institutions and afterschool and youth development programs. Afterschool programs can play a significant role in providing students with the skills they need to succeed in today's globally interconnected society and workforce. [50]

The Growing Need for 21st Century Skills

There remains a profound gap between the knowledge and skills most students learn in school and the knowledge and skills demanded for the 21st Century. Students need to learn academic content through realworld examples, applications and experiences both inside and outside of school. [51]

Afterschool programs can serve as an entry-point for many children and youth to both develop 21st Century skills and expand their exposure to and increase their ability to navigate new forms of technology. [52]

Kugler [53] notes that afterschool computer clubs are often the most popular after-school activities and can serve as an entry point to other academic learning experiences. Other research suggests that applications focused on multimedia projects, which are often highly attractive to teens, can lead to success in high-order thinking, problem solving, and synthesizing different points of view. [54]

Youth tend to be more engaged in technology-oriented programs when they are given choices in activities, when program staff provide technological support, and when they are given opportunities for reflection, discussion, and interaction. [55]

The use of technology in afterschool programs can facilitate skill building that may lead to higher academic achievement, while being engaged in projects that seem very different from their school day activities. Technology can benefit afterschool programs whether through utilizing technology for homework help, skills training, web development, or job searching for older youths. [56]

The Out-of-School Time Workforce

Youth workers who staff afterschool and communitybased programs play a critical role in providing a bridge of vital supports and opportunities for children and youth during the after-school hours, however many leave the profession after a few years. The results from a recent survey found that nearly 80% of youth workers are satisfied with their jobs, but low wages significantly impact the high turn over rate in this field. Increases in wages and access to benefits could stabilize the workforce and advance the profession. Salary is the number one factor that influences people's decision to leave a job over demographics, status, job satisfaction, or place of employment. [57]

The out-of-school time field lacks a national professional development system. However, several statewide initiatives are in pursuit of building components for a statewide system. Alaska, California, Connecticut. Indiana. Georgia, Massachusetts. Michigan, Missouri, and New York are at various states of developing core competencies, career lattices, and school-age credentials. Indiana and Missouri have launched a combined school-age and youth development credential. Local efforts are also underway Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Kansas City, in Philadelphia, San Francisco, and Washington, DC. [58]

The characteristics and capabilities of the youth worker are paramount to program success, and programs for youth are most successful when youth workers are creative, well trained, skilled at building relationships, and can make long-term commitments to programs. Finding and retaining the right staff is critical to helping youth participants develop and sustain an interest in program participation. [59]

The Massachusetts Afterschool Research Study (MARS) found that programs with more highly educated staff, both at the program director level and direct service levels, were rated significantly higher on

^{© 2008} National Institute on Out-of-School Time at Wellesley Centers for Women, Wellesley College

elements of program quality, such as staff engagement, youth engagement, activities, and homework assistance. Additionally, the study found that higher wages were linked with higher quality programming while high staff turnover was linked with lower quality ratings in both youth engagement and homework assistance. [60]

In a national survey of afterschool programs (n= 273), California Tomorrow found that 56% of responding programs enroll youth from more than one language group, and one in four serve English Language Learners (ELL). Very few program directors reported having enough bilingual staff to work with these youth in their home languages, and even fewer have staff that are trained to effectively serve youth who speak little English. Half the programs that enroll a significant number of English learners do not have any staff who speaks the home languages of the participants and their families. [61]

Research in the out-of-school time and early childhood education fields demonstrates that high-quality services improve future outcomes for children and that the key to quality programming is a high-quality, skilled, stable, educated, and motivated workforce. The positive benefits of youth development credentialing can be significant, particularly in terms of forming workers' identities as professionals. Credentials not only provide an opportunity for adults working with children and youth to gain professional recognition for demonstrating competence on the job, but they also offer the opportunity to increase program quality and positive outcomes for youth. [62]

The results of the National Afterschool Association's (NAA) survey of the afterschool workforce (4.346 afterschool workers) included the following results: About two-thirds (67 percent) have a two-year degree or higher, and over half (55.2 percent) have a bachelor's degree or higher. Forty percent (40%) of respondents in urban settings and 38% in suburban settings had access to paid time for training, while only 23% of their rural colleagues reported similar access. About 60% of respondents described themselves as full-time. The average hourly wage is \$10.75. The average salary is \$25,000. Twenty-one percent (21%) of respondents do not receive any benefits. A large portion of the workforce has relatively few years in the afterschool field. This indication of significant turnover suggests the constant need for programs to recruit, orient, and train staff. [63]

Trends in Public Support and Public Funding

In a recent national phone survey, the Afterschool Alliance reported that seven in ten voters want the new congress to increase afterschool funding. Voters across party lines see that afterschool programs are necessary for their communities and would support increase funding to afterschool programs even it if leads to a tax increase. [64]

A recent review of thirty governors' State of the State speeches in 2006 indicates several policy trends that support afterschool including stronger state revenues, an interest in investing in education, and concern about children's health and safety. [65]

For fiscal year 2008, 100,000 more children in this country will have access to the afterschool programs that keep them safe, inspire them to learn and help working families because Congress passed and President Bush signed a \$100 million increase for 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC), the chief federal funding stream for afterschool programs. [66]

Among the most common uses of school-age targeted funds in FY06-07 were practitioner training (30 states); technical assistance grants for school-age programs (22 states); and funding grants to improve the quality of school-age child care services (14 states). [67]

Finding and sustaining funding to support out-of-school time programs is critical to developing and continuing promising afterschool efforts over the long-term. Financing strategies include making better use of existing funds; maximizing available federal dollars; creating more flexibility in funding streams; developing new dedicated revenue sources for afterschool programs; gaining access to additional resources; and creating partnerships between public and private-sector organizations and funding sources.[68]

Despite increased funding, disparities in access and quality still persist. Programs in affluent or middle class neighborhoods were more likely to include direct instruction in the arts, enrichment activities, and sports, and are more likely to provide snacks or meals than programs in poorer neighborhoods. Wealthier communities are also more likely to have computer labs, playing fields, and gyms, open enrollment slots, and resources for art and enrichment materials. Programs in low-income areas have much tighter budgets, more facilities in need of repair, longer wait lists to get into the program, and higher staff-to-youth ratios. [69]

Strengthening Out-of-School Time Program Quality

High quality afterschool programs can have significant, positive effects on student outcomes, whereas low quality programs can fail to show positive effects or even have negative impacts. States are seeking to support high quality programs by developing definitions of quality embodied in program standards, creating measures of afterschool quality, and improving quality at the program level through licensing and accreditation, professional development, and incentives for reaching higher quality levels. [70]

Research shows that afterschool programs that use intentional and cohesive activities can deliver results. The afterschool field has also begun reaching consensus on a set of core practices, and has developed instruments to measure these practices. [71]

A recent research finding on quality afterschool programs is that connections matter. Relationships among staff, schools, families, youth, and communities are crucial and many after school programs link with schools by aligning curricula and sharing resources. Complementary learning initiatives are growing—and so is the evidence that they have tangible benefits for youth, families, and communities. [72]

Nature Education

Recent research shows that children are losing their connection with the natural environment. Children's well-being and environmental quality are inextricably linked. The worse a local environment looks, the less able children are to play freely, and develop the habits and commitments that will enable them to address environmental problems in the future. [73]

A study released by the California Department of Education found that students in outdoor classrooms improved their science grades and gained selfconfidence in comparison to other non-participating students. The study involved 255 fifth-and sixth-graders attending weeklong environmental science courses in San Diego, Los Angeles and Fresno. These students increased their science scores by 27 %, compared to a control group of students in traditional classrooms. This study repeated other findings that suggest children who play in natural settings are more cooperative and more creative than those who play on flat turf or asphalt playgrounds. [74]

References

- The McKnight Foundation (2007). Closer look: Youth enrichment during the out-of-school time. Retrieved August 15, 2007 from http://www.mcknight.org/feature/yeost.aspx.
- Harvard Family Research Project. (2006). Study of predictors of participation in out-of-school time activities. Retrieved January 20, 2008 from http://www.gse.harvard.edu /hfrp/projects/ost_participation.html.
- American Youth Policy Forum. (2007). Strengthening afterschool for older youth through policy and practice: A policy brief. Retrieved January 10, 2008 from http://www.aypf.org/programs/briefs/AfterschoolPolicyBrief 2007.pdf
- Coalition for Community Schools. (2004). Making the difference: Research and practice in community schools. Retrieved January 10, 2007 from http://www.community schools.org /mtdhomepage.html.
- Durlak, J.A., & Weissberg, R.P. (2007). The impact of after-school programs that promote personal and social skills. Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning. Retrieved January 17, 2007 from http://www.casel.org/ downloads/ ASP-Full.pdf.
- Vandell, D., Reisner, E., & Pierce, K. (2007). Outcomes linked to highquality afterschool programs: Longitudinal findings from the study of promising afterschool programs. Retrieved February 1, 2008 from http://www.policystudies.com/.
- Granger, R., Durlak, J. A., Yohalem, N., & Reisner, E. (2007). Improving after-school program quality. New York, N.Y.: William T. Grant Foundation.
- National Youth Violence Prevention. (2005). Afterschool fact sheet. Retrieved February 1, 2007 from http://www.safeyouth.org/scripts/facts/ afterschool.asp.
- American Youth Policy Forum. (2006). Helping youth succeed through out-of-school time programs. Retrieved January 4, 2007 from http://www.aypf.org/publications /HelpingYouth OST2006.pdf.
- 10. Miller, B. (2003). Critical hours. Boston, MA: Nellie Mae Foundation.
- Arts Educational Partnership. (1999). The arts and afterschool programs. Retrieved January 25, 2007 from http://www.arts.gov/pub/ArtsAfterSchool /artsedpub.html.
- Goerge, Robert M., Cusick, Gretchen Ruth, Wasserman, Miriam, Gladden, Robert Matthew. (2007). After-school programs and academic impact: A study of Chicago's after school matters. Chicago: IL University of Chicago, Center for Children.
- Zaff, J., Calkins, J., Bridges, L., & Margie, N. (2003). Promoting positive mental and emotional health in teens: Some lessons from research. Washington, DC: Child Trends.
- 14. National Research Council and Institute of Medicine. (2002). Community programs to promote youth development. Committee on Community-Level Programs for Youth. Jacquelynne Eccles and Jennifer A. Gootman, (Eds.), Board on Children, Youth, and Families, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Pittman, K., Martin, S., & Williams, A. (2007). Core principles for engaging young people in community change. Washington, DC: The Forum for Youth Investment, Impact Strategies, Inc.
- Harvard Family Research Project. (2004). A profile of the evaluation of the Kids on the Move program. Cambridge, MA: Author. Retrieved from: http://www.gse.harvard.edu/ hfrp/projects/afterschool/mott.kotm.html.
- Harvard Family Research Project. (2004). A profile of the evaluation of the NikeGO After School Program. Cambridge, MA: Author. Retrieved from: http://www.gse.harvard.edu/ hfrp/projects/afterschool/mott.nikego.html.
- The Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics. (2007). America's children: Key national indicators of well-being. Retrieved January 20, 2008 from http://www.childstats.gov/americaschildren/ highlights.asp.
- 19. Fight Crime: Invest in Kids. (2007). After-school programs prevent crime. Oakland, CA: Author.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2005). American fact finder 2005: Children characteristics. Retrieved January 4, 2007 from http://factfinder.census.gov.
- Afterschool Alliance. (2007). Afterschool advocate: More state funding afterschool. Retrieved January 10, 2007 from http://www.afterschool alliance.org/.
- Afterschool Alliance. (2007). Afterschool advocate: More state funding afterschool. Retrieved January 10, 2007 from http://www.afterschool alliance.org/.
- 23. Harvard Family Research Project. (2006). What are kids getting into these days? Demographic differences in youth out-of-school time participation. Retrieved January 17, 2007 from http://www.gse.harvard.edu/hfrp/eval/ issue33/index.html.
- 24. Fight Crime: Invest in Kids. (2006). Retrieved January 24, 2007 from http://www.fightcrime.org/.

© 2008 National Institute on Out-of-School Time at Wellesley Centers for Women, Wellesley College

- Catalyst. (2006). Afterschool worries: Tough on parents, bad for business. Retrieved January 31, 2007 from http://www.catalyst.org/files/full/PCAST %20report.pdf.
- 26. The Finance Project and Public/Private Ventures. (2006). The costs of outof-school time programs: A review of the available evidence. New York, NY: Author.
- Afterschool Alliance. Working families and afterschool. A special report from America After 3 PM. Retrieved fromhttp://www.afterschoolalliance. org/america_3pm.cfm.
- U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved at http://www.ed.gov/ programs/21stcclc/ 21stcclmonitoringrpt.pdf.
- Duffett, A. & Johnson, J. (2004). All work and no play? Listening to what kids and parents really want from out-of-school time. New York, NY: Public Agenda.
- Penn, Shoen & Berland Assocates. (2001). Telephone interviews with a national sample of 500 teen, 14-17 years of age. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from: http://www.ymca.net/pdf/executive Summary.PDF.
- Duffett, A. & Johnson, J. (2004). All work and no play? Listening to what kids and parents really want from out-of-school time. New York, NY: Public Agenda.
- 32. Institute of Medicine of the National Academies. (2006). Progress in preventing childhood obesity. Retrieved January 4, 2007 from http://books.nap.edu/openbook. php?recordid=11722&page=R1.
- Centers for Disease Control U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2006). Retrieved January 17, 2007 fromhttp://www.cdc.gov/ healthyyouth/index.htm.
- 34. United States Department of Agriculture Food and Nutrition Services. (2006). Afterschool snacks in the national school lunch program. Retrieved January 10, 2007 fromhttp://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/Afterschool/factsheet. htm.
- 35. Centers for Disease Control U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2006). Childhood overweight. Retrieved January 17, 2007 from http://www.cdc.gov/ healthyyouth/ index.htm.
- 36. Findings from a report published by the Centers for Disease Control in 2002 on the physical activity levels of U.S. children between the ages of 9 and 13. This report was published in a 2003 issue of Mortality and Morbidity Weekly Report.
- Viadero, Debra. (2008). Exercise seen as priming pump for students' academic strides. Education Week, 27, 14-15.
- Active Living Research (2007). Active education. Physical education, physical activity and academic performance. Research brief. Retrieved January 10, 2008 fromhttp://www.activelivingresearch.org/alr/alr/files/ Active_Ed.pdf.
- National Institute on Out-of-School Time. (2007). Afterschool programs and students with special needs. Research Brief. Available at www.niost.org.
- U.S. Department of Justice. (n.d.). Access for all: Five years of progress. Retrieved January 10, 2007 from http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/ada/5yearadarpt /fiveyearada.pdf.
- Russell, C., Meike, M., Miller, T., & Johnson, J. (2007). After-school programs and high school success. Analysis of post-program education patterns of former middle-grades TASC participants. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.
- 42. Goldsmidt, P., Huang, D., & Chinen, M. (2007). The long-term effects of after-school programming on educational adjustment and juvenile crime: A study of the LA's BEST after-school program. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- 43. Yohalem, N., Wilson-Ahlstrom, A., Ferber, T., & Gaines, E. (2006). Supporting older youth: What's policy got to do with it. New Directions for Youth Development, 111, 117-129.
- Zarrett, N., & Eccles, J. (2006). The passage to adulthood: Challenges of late adolescents. New Directions for Youth Development. 111, 13-28.
- Brown, D.& Thakur, M. (2006). Workforce development for older youth. New Directions for Youth Development, 111, 91-104.
- American Youth Policy Forum. (2006). Helping youth succeed through out-of-school time programs. Retrieved February 1, 2007 from http://www.aypf.org/ publications/ HelpingYouthOST2006.pdf.
- Westmoreland, H. & Little, P. (2006). Exploring quality in afterschool programs for middle-age youth. The Harvard Family Research Project. Retrieved January 17, 2007 fromhttp://www.gse.harvard.edu/hfrp/eval/ issue33/theory.html.
- 48. Stoecklin, V.L. (1999). Designing for all children. White Hutchinson Leisure & Learning Group. Retrieved [April, 2006] from http://www.whitehutchinson. com/children/articles/designforall.shtml; Additional text from National Institute on Out-of-School Time unpublished findings.
- Hall, G., L. Israel, & Shortt, J. (2004). It's about time: A look at out-ofschool time for urban teens. Wellesley, MA: National Institute on Out-of-School Time.
- Peterson, T., & Fix, S. (Eds.).(2007). Afterschool advantage. Powerful new learning opportunities. Moorestown, NJ: Foundations Inc.

- **51.** Partnership for 21st Century Skills. (2003). Learning for the 21st century. A report and mile guide for 21st century skills. Washington, DC: Author.
- 52. Hall, G. & Israel, L. (2004). Using technology to support academic achievement for high school-age youth during the out-of-school time hours: A review of the current literature and research. A report for America Connects Consortium of the U.S. Department of Education. Wellesley, MA: National Institute on Out-of-School Time.
- Kugler, M. R. (2001). After-school programs are making a difference. NASSP Bulletin, 85(626), 3-11.
- American Youth Policy Forum. (2005). Engaging adolescents in out-ofschool time (OST) programs: Learning what works. Retrieved at http://www.aypf.org/ forumbriefs/ 2005/fb100705.htm.
- Alexander, P. A., & Wade, S. E. (2000). Contexts that promote interest, self-determination, and learning: Lasting impressions and lingering questions. Computers in Human Behavior, 16, 349-358.
- California Community Technology Policy Group. (2002). After-school and community technology agendas for youth: Preliminary thoughts about our shared interests. Retrieved March 5, 2004, from http://www.techpolicybank .org/ cctpg.html.
- 57. Yohalem, N. & Pittman, K. (2006). Putting youth work on the map: Key findings and implications from two major workforce studies. Retrieved January 3, 2007 fromhttp://www.forumfyi.org/Files//Putting_Youth_Work _ on_the_Map.pdf.
- 58. National Institute on Out-of-School Time. (2003). Unpublished findings.
- Hall, G., L. Israel, & Shortt, J. (2004). It's about time: A look at out-ofschool time for urban teens. Wellesley, MA: National Institute on Out-of-School Time.
- 60. Intercultural Center for Research in Education and National Institute on Out-of-School Time. (2005). Pathways to success for youth: What counts in afterschool. Massachusetts After-School Research Study (MARS). Boston: Author.
- **61.** California Tomorrow. (2003). Pursuing the promise. Addressing equity, access, and diversity in after school and youth programs. Oakland, CA: Author.
- 62. Dennehy, J., Gannett, E., & Robbins, R. (2006). Setting the stage for a youth development associate credential: A national review of professional development credentials for the out-of-school time workforce. Wellesley, MA: National Institute on Out-of-School Time.
- 63. National Institute on Out-of-School Time. (2006). Unpublished findings.
- 64. National Afterschool Association. (2006). The human services workforce initiative. Understanding the afterschool workforce: Opportunities and challenges for an emerging profession. Houston, TX: Cornerstone For Kids.
- Afterschool Alliance. (2006). News release: Voters see afterschool programs as necessity for their community. Retrieved January 24, 2007 from http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/press_archives/06_ Poll_NR_FINAL.pdf.
- Afterschool Alliance Afterschool. (2007). Funding increase most welcome & long overdue, nation's leading afterschool advocate says. Retrieved February 2, 2008 fromhttp://www.afterschoolalliance.org/press_archives/ Bush_122707.pdf.
- **67.** Afterschool Investments Project. (2006). State profile series, national profile. Washington, DC: Author.
- **68.** Afterschool Investments Project. (2006). State profile series, national profile. Washington, DC: Author.
- 69. California Tomorrow. (2003). Pursuing the promise. Addressing equity, access, and diversity in after school and youth programs. Oakland, CA: Author.
- Afterschool Investments Project. (2006). State profile series, national profile. Washington, DC: Author.
- Granger, R., Durlak, J. A., Yohalem, N., & Reisner, E. (2007). Improving after-school program quality. New York, NY: William T. Grant Foundation.
- 72. Harvard Family Research Project. (2006). Building and evaluating out-ofschool time connections. Cambridge, MA: Author.
- 73. Thomas, G., & Thompson, G. (2004). A Childs Place: Why environment matters to children. Retrieved online February 11, 2008 from http://www.greenalliance.org.uk/uploadedFiles/Our_Work/ AChildsPlace.pdf.
- 74. Louv, R. (2006). A 'no child left inside' approach. The San-Diego Union Tribune. Retrieved online February 11, 2008 from http://www.signons andiego.com/news/ metro/louv/20060207-9999-lz1e7louv.html.

© 2008 National Institute on Out-of-School Time at Wellesley Centers for Women, Wellesley College www.NIOST.org