School-Age Child Care: Keeping Children Safe and Helping Them Learn While Their Families Work

The majority of school-age children have parents who work. These children need safe places to go during their out-of-school hours. Research has repeatedly demonstrated that good activities for school-age children after school can help children's development, safety, and school performance as well as reduce risk-taking behaviors such as the use of drugs, alcohol, and tobacco. Yet, far too many children are left to care for themselves, which places them at greater risk of a range of problems. Low-income children, who have the greatest need for after-school programs, are less likely to have access to constructive activities during their out-of-school time.

Many school-age children have parents who work. These children may need constructive activities during at least some of the many hours that they are not at school.

- In 2001, four out of five (80 percent) women with children ages six to 17 were in the labor force, and the majority of these women worked full time. Nearly 31.5 million children between the ages of six and 17 had a mother in the labor force.[1]
- In 79 percent of single-mother families and 85 percent of single-father families with children ages six to 17, the custodial parent works outside the home.[2]
- Children spend less than 20 percent of their waking hours in school. Schools typically are open for less than half the days of the year, and the school day only lasts until mid-afternoon. What happens in the remaining hours when they are not in school is critical to children's development.
- Half of children in kindergarten through eighth grade are in nonparental care before and after school on a regular basis.[3] This is about 19 million children in home-based care, center-based care, or self-care.[4]

Good school-age care can have a major positive impact on children's development, safety, and school achievement.

- Research indicates that what children do during non-school hours has a critical impact on school achievement and long-term success, whether or not their mother is employed. The activities in which children are engaged, as well as the quality of adult supervision they receive, are as important as family income and parents' education in determining academic success.
- Research shows that children who spend 20 to 35 hours per week engaged in constructive learning activities are significantly more likely to succeed in school. Children's out-of-school hours represent a substantial, ongoing opportunity for them to learn through play, to learn how to get along with other children, and to form enduring and supportive relationships with adults.[5]

- Several studies have found that school-age children's academic performance is enhanced by attending formal child care programs of at least adequate quality. Children attending such programs have better work habits and relationships with peers, and they are better adjusted and less anti-social than children who spend their out-of-school hours alone, with their mothers, or informally supervised by other adults. Other studies have found that how well a child gets along with other children is a better predictor of adult adjustment than academic performance or classroom behavior.[6]
- Teenagers who participate in after-school, extracurricular activities—such as bands, sports teams, clubs, and community groups—are more likely to graduate from high school than those who spend their afternoon hours without adult supervision, according to a 2001 study. The study, based on a survey of 24,000 students in eighth through twelfth grades from 1,000 schools nationwide, found that 90 percent of those who were involved in an organized program after school graduated from high school. In comparison, 84 percent of those who were not involved in such programs and spent three or more hours alone after school graduated. Participation in after-school activities had an impact even after considering other factors such as family income and prior academic performance.[7]
- A 2001 study found that teens who engage in activities after school are five times less likely to be "D" students than those who do not. Furthermore, the study reported that teens who are supervised every day of the school week are less likely to drink alcohol, smoke cigarettes, use drugs, or engage in sex than teens who are unsupervised.[8]

Evaluations of various national, state, and local school-age programs demonstrate that these programs help children succeed in school, get along better with others, and reduce their chances of getting into trouble.

- A three-year study of four after-school programs that were offered free of charge to children living in targeted high-crime neighborhoods determined that children in these programs had fewer school absences, better conflict management strategies, and better work habits at school than did their school classmates who lived in the same neighborhoods but did not attend the programs. In addition, children who attended the programs for more days demonstrated larger beneficial effects than did children who attended fewer days. Children who participated more frequently had better work habits, displayed better interpersonal skills, engaged in less misconduct in their neighborhoods and at school, and missed less school.[9]
- Statewide and local evaluations of California's Before and After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnerships Program show positive results on student achievement, attendance, behavior, and reductions in grade retention. There were particularly notable improvements in scores on reading and math achievement tests among students with the lowest initial scores and among English Language Learners. The largest gains in attendance and achievement were typically among students with the highest levels of participation in the after-school program. Participating students also expressed more positive attitudes toward school, enhanced confidence about learning, and increased educational aspirations.[10]

- Los Angeles' Better Educated Students for Tomorrow (LA's BEST) initiative, which supports after-school opportunities, has helped children achieve in school and stay safe during out-of-school time, according to 10 years of research on the program. Higher levels of participation in the program led to better school attendance, which in turn related to higher academic achievement on math, reading, and language arts tests. Parents reported that they worried less about their children's safety and felt that the program was much safer than their neighborhood. Children reported that they liked regular school more since participating in the after-school program. Participating children also said they had higher aspirations about finishing high school and going to college.[11]
- Children participating in the New York City Beacons Initiative, which was launched in 1991 and seeks to link community-based organizations and schools, report that they benefit from the program in several ways. Four-fifths (80 percent) of young people who were interviewed said the program helped them avoid drug use. Three-quarters (74 percent) of those interviewed said that the program helped them avoid fighting.[12]
- Programs supported by The After-School Corporation (TASC), a New York City-based nonprofit organization, have demonstrated several benefits, according to an evaluation of the project:[13]

  Staff, students, and parents noted a number of improvements in students' social skills, including the ability to maintain self-control, make constructive choices about their behavior, and avoid fights.

  Eighty-six percent of parents said their children benefited academically from their after-school program.

  Eighty-four percent of principals surveyed said that the after-school project had improved the overall effectiveness of their schools, 81 percent reported it boosted their students' motivation to learn, 81 percent said their students had better attitudes toward school, and 77 percent reported increased student attendance.

  Parents recognized that having reliable after-school care benefited themselves—60 percent said they missed less work than before because of the program, 59 percent said the program helped them keep their job, and 54 percent said it enabled them to work more hours.
- Extended-Service Schools, after-school programs sponsored by the Wallace-Reader's Digest Funds in 17 communities across the country, help youths avoid risk-taking behaviors, improve their attitude toward school, and increase their self-confidence, according to an evaluation of the initiative. Sixty-five percent of youths reported that the program helped them stay out of trouble. The same percentage of youths said the program helped them do better in school, and 82 percent of their parents said the program helped their children try harder in school. Nearly three-quarters (74 percent) of participating youths said they saw choices and possibilities in life that they had not realized they had. Knowing their children had a good place to go after school also reduced parents' stress levels and enabled them to better balance their responsibilities for work and family. Eight out of 10 parents said they were less worried about their children's safety after school, 57 percent said their children's participation helped them manage their own work schedule, and 45 percent said it helped them get a better job or do better at their job.[14]

- Students who participated in the Boys and Girls' Clubs of America's national educational enhancement program, Project Learn, increased their grade averages and improved their school attendance and study skills, according to an evaluation by Columbia University.[15]
- A Public/Private Ventures study of Big Brothers/Big Sisters' carefully designed mentoring program showed that young people randomly assigned to receive a trained mentor were about half as likely to begin illegal drug use or to hit someone as those randomly assigned to the control group.[16]
- The Cooperative Extension Service studied the effects of 64 programs that had received Extension assistance in 15 states. Teachers said that the programs had helped the children to become more cooperative (34 percent), learn to handle conflicts better (37 percent), develop an interest in recreational reading (33 percent), and improve their grades (33 percent). Over one-third of the school principals stated that vandalism in their schools had decreased as a result of the programs. In addition, the study estimated that 16 percent of the program children had avoided being retained in grade due to program participation, resulting in an estimated savings of over $1 million.[17]
- The 21st Century Community Learning Centers program, an after-school initiative supported by the U.S. Department of Education, is having positive impacts in communities across the country.[18] For example:

  Highland Park, Michigan, reported a 40 percent drop in juvenile crime in the neighborhood surrounding the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program.

  In rural McCormick, South Carolina, 120 students would have been retained in grade without the after-school program.

  Brooklyn, New York's Cypress Hills center reported that 72 percent of program participants improved their grades by five points on a 100-point scale in one or more of their classes.

  Participants in Chattanooga, Tennessee, increased their school attendance. At one school, absentee days declined from 568 to 135; at another school absent days were reduced from 148 to 23.

  Preliminary findings from the program in Palm Beach County, Florida, indicate that participating students have improved their reading and math scores, as well as their interpersonal skills.
- Fourth-graders who participated in the Ohio Hunger Task Force's urban after-school initiative exceeded the statewide percentage of students meeting proficiency standards in math, writing, reading, citizenship, and science.[19]
- A study compared juvenile arrests in a public housing project that started an after-school skills development program with those in another housing project that provided only minimal recreational services. The number of juvenile arrests declined by 75 percent after the start of the after-school program, while the number increased by 67 percent in the comparison project.[20]
- In the first year after the Baltimore Police Department opened an after-school program in a high-crime area, crime in that neighborhood dropped 42 percent.[21]
- Low-income third-graders attending more formal after-school programs in Milwaukee were determined to have higher grades in reading, math, and conduct, and they were rated by their teachers as having better work habits and peer relations than children who were informally supervised after school.[22]

- Participants randomly assigned to a high school Quantum Opportunities Program of counseling, academic and life skills support, community service, and financial incentives were 50 percent more likely to graduate high school and two-and-a-half times as likely to attend postsecondary schooling. Participants were also less likely to be arrested or become teen parents.[23]

Yet, far too many school-age children are caring for themselves rather than participating in constructive activities in safe environments. "Self-care" can place children at greater risk of a range of problems, including school failure, crime, and alcohol and drug use.

- Over 7 million children ages five to 14 care for themselves on a regular basis, according to Census data. Nearly one in 10 (9 percent) children ages five to 11 went home to an empty house during some part of the week, while more then four out of 10 (42 percent) children ages 12 to 14 spent time unsupervised.[24]
- Many children are in self-care for a significant amount of time during the summer months when school is out. An Urban Institute study found that during the summer, 11 percent of children ages six to 12 care for themselves while their parents work. This is similar to the 14 percent of children in self-care on a regular basis during the school-year. Yet, children are in self-care for longer hours during the summer months—an average of 10.3 hours a week versus 4.8 hours a week during the school year.[25]
- A survey of children ages 12 to 17 found that the majority are not involved in constructive activities when they are not in school. Seventy percent of respondents said that they do not belong to any clubs or organizations outside of school such as the Scouts or the YMCA, 74 percent said they usually get together with friends to hang out without anything specific to do, and 42 percent said they feel bored every day or almost every day.[26]
- Children left to care for themselves are at risk of getting involved in crime or being crime victims. Juvenile crime rates are high, particularly in the hours after school lets out:

  Juveniles make up 12 percent of all crime victims and 22 percent (nearly one-quarter) of violent crime victims reported to police.[27] Overall, juveniles are twice as likely as adults to be victims of serious violent crime and three times as likely to be victims of simple assault.[28]

  Juveniles accounted for 17 percent of all criminal arrests and 16 percent of arrests for serious violent crime in 2000.[29]

  The rate of juvenile violence is highest in the after-school hours between 3:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. During this time, the rate is four times as great as the rate during the standard juvenile curfew hours between 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m.[30]

  Juveniles are more likely to be the victims of violent crime in the hour after the end of the school day than at any other hour of the day.[31]
- Teens left unsupervised at least three days a week after school were two to four times more likely than other teens to say they had committed crimes, used drugs, and had sex, according to a 2001 survey. They were also four times more likely to have been a victim of crime.[32]

- In a survey of teens ages 12 to 17, the teenagers reported feeling least safe home alone or in their neighborhoods. Meanwhile, they said they felt safe in after-school programs. In fact, after-school programs were rated by respondents as slightly safer than school.[33]
- Self-care is associated with fearfulness and anxiety,[34] and unsupervised boys and girls show more anti-social behavior than supervised children.[35]
- Children who begin taking care of themselves in elementary school are significantly more likely to report higher use of alcohol by eighth grade. Regardless of when they begin taking care of themselves, eighth-graders left home alone for 11 or more hours a week report much greater use of cigarettes, alcohol, and marijuana than children who are not left home alone.[36]
- A 1999 study that examined the effects of self-care among urban children in low-income families found that children who spent more time home alone in third grade displayed more behavior problems both in third grade and later when they reached fifth grade.[37]
- Children in self-care spend more time watching television and less time under adult supervision—factors that correlate with anti-social behaviors—than children in other types of arrangements, according to one study. Children in formal programs spend more time in enrichment activities and less time watching TV and pursuing unstructured activity. They are also exposed to more learning opportunities. Researchers attribute the better emotional adjustment and work habits of children in formal care to these differences in time expenditure.[38] As it is, more of children's discretionary time is spent watching television than any other activity. On average, children spend 13½ hours a week or 27 percent of their discretionary time watching television.[39] Increasing the availability of school-age programs would help reduce the amount of time children spend in front of the TV set.

Many school-age children are home alone because there are not enough before- and after-school opportunities available.

- An assessment of school-age opportunities in four cities—Chicago, Kansas City, Little Rock, and Sacramento—found serious gaps in supply.[40]

  None of the four cities has saturated its neighborhoods with school-age opportunities. Kansas City can account for more of its young people than any other community, but still has only 40 percent of children and youths ages six through 18 enrolled in out-of-school programs or activities. In Little Rock, the average daily attendance of all school-year programs reporting is less than a third of the city's total population of young people.

  Out-of-school opportunities are unevenly distributed throughout each city. For example, in the Kansas City metropolitan region, the percentage of six- to 11-year-olds engaged in daily programs varies from less than 3 percent in some areas to 12 percent in others.

  Programming in evening and morning hours is scarce. In Chicago, 80 percent fewer programs operate in the evening than in the afternoon, and morning programs are even more limited. In Little Rock, only 16 percent of school-year programs operate more than three hours a day, and only one of the programs surveyed operates more than four hours a day.

Weekend programs are in extremely short supply. In Sacramento, only 13 percent of the organizations surveyed operate programs on the weekend. Little Rock has no program operating seven days a week during the school year, and only one open six days a week.

Only a small percentage of young people are enrolled in consistent, daily school-age programs. In Kansas City, just 11 percent of six- to 18-year-olds are enrolled in daily supervised programs.

- In California, an estimated 2.25 million slots in after-school programs are needed, but the total licensed supply—758,000—is only sufficient to meet about one-third of the need.[41]
- Difficulties attracting and retaining staff pose a barrier to expanding the supply of school-age programs. For example, a survey of youth workers in Indiana found that low salaries and limited benefits, a lack of resources, and the frustration of juggling administrative demands discouraged workers from remaining in the field.[42]

  Nearly 45 percent of respondents reported that they either were uncertain about being or would definitely not be in the field in five years.

  Nearly seven out of 10 full-time youth workers surveyed were earning less than $30,000 a year, including two out of 10 earning less than $20,000 a year. Yet, 44 percent were their family's primary wage earner.

  Although 80 percent had health insurance, the majority described it as "substandard."
- Not enough funds are invested to ensure an adequate supply of good after-school options. In a survey of principals of elementary schools with after-school programs, 35 percent said funding was a major obstacle preventing them from expanding their program. Only 8 percent reported a lack of demand as a primary reason for not expanding.[43]
- In 2001, only 11 percent of the requests for funding through the U.S. Department of Education's 21st Century Community Learning Centers after-school program could be filled.[44]

Low-income children have particular difficulty gaining access to school-age care or constructive activities after school.

- School-age children living in families below the poverty line are one-third as likely as children living in families at or above 200 percent of the poverty line to participate in at least one enrichment activity after school.[45]
- Research indicates that children from low-income homes tend to be more isolated from peers during out-of-school time than middle-income children.[46]
- Two-fifths of low-income working parents have significant problems finding care beyond school hours (after school, summer, vacations, or other school closing days) for their school-age children.[47]
- Many low-income working parents who have school-age children with educational and behavioral problems lack the flexibility they need in their jobs to be available to help their children. Among working mothers who had a child scoring in the bottom quartile on reading tests and who were living in poverty, 37 percent

lacked paid leave, according to one study. A similar percentage of poor mothers with a child scoring in the bottom quartile on math tests lacked paid leave. Paid leave was not available to 46 percent of poor mothers who had children with the most serious behavioral problems.[48]

- School-age children in families receiving welfare need greater opportunities to participate in safe, constructive activities after school. The 1996 welfare law requires more parents to work, and as a result parents are less likely to be there for their children when they get home from school. Initial evidence suggests that this may be having negative impacts, including increases in school problems and risky behavior, among adolescents in welfare families.[49]
- With limited access to constructive after-school options, children in low-income households spend an estimated 50 percent more time watching television than their more affluent peers.[50]
- Lack of transportation can be a major obstacle to school-age care for many low-income parents.[51]

The high cost of school-age care can prevent low-income families from participating. Many families have difficulty affording the care on their own and cannot get help paying for it.

- Even part-time care for school-age children can total $3,500 or more per year. School-age children with working parents do not need full-time care, but they often do need care before and after school and during holidays and vacations. The hours spent in care as well as the costs quickly add up. In a study of child care costs, the average annual cost for school-age care in a center was above $3,000 per year in two-thirds of the urban areas surveyed and over $3,500 per year in one-third of the areas.[52]
- For many low-income families, school-age care costs consume a substantial proportion of their budget, according to an Urban Institute study. During the school year, 37 percent of low-income (incomes below 200 percent of poverty) working families who have children ages six to 12 pay for school-age care. These families pay an average of $224 a month, which is 14 percent of income. During the summer months, more low-income families rely on relative care, which may help limit costs, but many families continue to pay a significant amount for school-age care. Forty-four percent of low-income working families pay for school-age care during the summer, spending an average of $170 a month (11 percent of income).[53]
- A study of out-of-school time in low-income communities found that among the 16 percent of families who did pay for after-school child care, the mean payment was $24 weekly, or 19 percent of total family income.[54]
- Many programs rely heavily on parent fees to cover their costs, placing a burden on low-income parents and effectively denying their access to care. Half of elementary schools with after-school programs require some fee or tuition; 33 percent of the schools rely on fees and tuition as their major source of funding, according to a survey of principals of these schools. Thirty-eight percent of elementary school principals with after-school programs reported that they receive federal funding, and 37 percent receive state funding for their programs. Only 12 percent receive funding from corporations and businesses.[55]
- In California, a subsidized after-school program is available to less than half of all five- to 14-year-olds living in low-income families who could benefit from this type of program. An estimated 1.24 million children need subsidized after-school care, but only about 608,000 are receiving it—leaving about

632,000 without access to this crucial resource. The sites within the state's Before and After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnerships Program alone have waiting lists of approximately 42,000 students.[56]

Many low-income parents would prefer to have their children in lessons or other organized after-school activities, but are unable to do so because of the cost or unavailability of programs.

- Over half (54 percent) of low-income parents in one study stated that they would change their current out-of-school time arrangements if they could. Many parents reported that they would like to enroll their children in lessons and other organized activities but were prevented from doing so by prohibitive cost, transportation difficulties, worries about neighborhood safety, and a shortage of available options.[57]
- Many of the low-income parents interviewed were not happy about the role of television in their children's lives, and over half wanted their children to spend less time watching television. Most wished their children could spend more time on academically related activities, enrichment activities such as hobbies and lessons, and community activities. In focus groups, parents often became excited and energized when they had an opportunity to share ideas and experiences about alternatives to television, both at home and in the community. Overall, many of these parents felt that the barriers to finding safe and affordable alternatives were overwhelming.[58]
- Low-income parents whose children spent time alone or in the care of siblings were significantly less satisfied than those whose children spent all of their time under adult supervision.[59]

A broad range of individuals—from school-age children and teens to police chiefs and school principals—are interested in creating better options for children during after-school time.

- A majority of teens believe there are too few after-school programs in their community, according to a 2001 survey. Sixty-five percent of the teens said they would likely participate in an after-school program that offered activities that interested them.[60]
- In one survey, 86 percent of teens said that they wanted to take part in crime prevention programs, which often have an after-school component. The most popular options were tutoring, mentoring, and peer leadership programs. Among those teens surveyed, 71 percent said they wanted to participate in a tutoring or mentoring program. Sixty-two percent were willing to join programs to prevent violence or drug use.[61]
- Nine out of 10 voters agree that there should be some type of organized activity or place for children to go every day after school that provides opportunities for them to learn, according to a 2002 poll. Nearly three-quarters (72 percent) of voters feel that after-school programs are an absolute necessity for their communities, and more than three-quarters (78 percent) feel that these programs are very or somewhat effective in keeping children safe from crime. Recognizing the importance of investments in after-school programs, 59 percent of voters disagree with the President's decision not to include any new funding for these programs in his proposed budget for 2003.[62]

- The 2002 poll found that parents whose children attend after-school programs see these programs as having many benefits. Ninety-two percent of parents whose children are in after-school programs say that since attending the program their children do better in reading, writing, and math. Eighty-nine percent of these parents say their children have learned to get along with other children and behave better in school, and 87 percent say their children are more likely to avoid drugs and alcohol. Ninety-five percent say their children are safer and less likely to be involved in juvenile crime than children who are not attending the programs. In addition, 90 percent say their family life is less stressful because they know their children have a structured, safe place to go after school.[63]
- In a 2001 poll, 86 of the general public agreed that "America could sharply reduce crime if government invested more in programs to help children and youth get a good start, such as Head Start and child care."[64]
- In a poll conducted in February 2001, two-thirds of those surveyed felt that providing access to after-school programs and early childhood development programs such as Head Start was more important than cutting taxes.[65]
- A poll of police chiefs, sheriffs, and prosecutors from across the country found that more than three-quarters (78 percent) think that expanding after-school programs would significantly reduce youth crime and violence. Law enforcement officials ranked providing more after-school and educational child care programs as the most effective strategy for reducing youth violence *nearly five times as often* as "hiring more police officers to investigate juvenile crimes" and *nearly six times as often* as "prosecuting and jailing more juveniles as adults."[66]
- In a survey of elementary school principals, more than three-quarters (77 percent) of those who had after-school programs in their schools said it was "extremely important" to maintain these programs. Eighty-seven percent of the principals credited the programs with helping to connect their schools with parents, and 79 percent said that the programs had helped improve students' academic performance. Yet 56 percent said that funding was a barrier to expanding their after-school program, and 49 percent said staffing was a barrier.[67]

To address the need for school-age care, some states and local communities have invested in efforts to increase families' access to care.

- In Hawaii, the A+ program for after-school activities makes affordable, enriching experiences available for all children in kindergarten through sixth grade. The program is available on a sliding fee basis to all families who need it.
- Rhode Island allows families to receive help paying for before- and after-school care until their children are 16, giving parents of older school-age children access to constructive activities for their adolescents. Since states may only use federal Child Care and Development Block Grant funds to provide assistance to families with children under age 13 (children who have disabilities or other special needs are eligible up to age 19), Rhode Island must use its own separate state funds to extend assistance to families with older school-age children.
- Los Angeles has made a major commitment to after-school care through its LA's BEST (Better Educated Students for Tomorrow) program. The program was established in 1988 to address an alarming rise in street gangs, school dropouts, and drug use in communities where children lacked adequate adult supervision

during the critical hours between 3:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. The program offers after-school educational, enrichment, and recreational opportunities for children ages five to 12 at no cost to parents. From its original 10 sites, LA's BEST has grown to serve over 18,000 students in 104 elementary schools. It is supported through a partnership involving the City of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles Unified School District, and the private sector.[68] Ten years of independent evaluations of the program have demonstrated its effectiveness in keeping children safe and helping them succeed in school.[69]

- San Diego has created an exemplary model for quality after-school care. The city's "6 to 6" before- and after-school initiative reaches over 25,000 students in 202 schools. The programs offer both educational and enrichment activities, including homework help, sports, and arts and crafts. Both the mayor and school superintendent were instrumental in the effort to establish this initiative. It is supported by local, state, and federal resources, with the majority of funding coming from the California State Department of Education's Before and After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnerships Program. The total budget for the initiative in FY 2002 was $18 million. This includes $6.1 million ($4 million from general funds and $2 million from tobacco settlement funds) from the City of San Diego, $9.55 million from the state's before- and after-school program, and $2.35 million from the U.S. Department of Education's 21st Century Community Learning Centers program.[70]
- Boston invests $12.5 million each year in after-school programming through the city's community centers, schools, human service agencies, nonprofit organizations, and police department. This includes city general funds as well as some state and federal funding. By supporting partnerships between youth-serving organizations and public schools, the city has encouraged the opening of 50 new full-time after-school programs in school buildings. As of September 2002, a total of 75 schools—more than two-thirds of the city's elementary and middle schools—were hosting after-school programs. There have been 4,300 new spaces for children in after-school programs created across the city since 1998. In addition to increasing the supply of after-school care, the city has also worked to improve the quality of care by expanding training opportunities for program staff. To help support its various school-age projects, the city has developed partnerships with the private sector. The mayor's 2:00-to-6:00 After-School Initiative provides an infrastructure for the city's after-school efforts, with staff contributing advocacy, fundraising, organizational, and administrative support.[71]

Source Notes

[1] "In the labor force" includes mothers who are employed as well as mothers who are looking for work. Unpublished data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, March 2001 Current Population Survey.

[2] U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. (March 2002). "Families with Own Children: Employment Status of Parents by Age of Youngest Child and Family Type, 2000-01 Annual Averages. Table 4." Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved from the Internet at http://www.bls.gov/news.release/famee.t04.html.

[3] Data from the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Household Education Survey, as cited in Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics. (2002). *America's Children: Key National Indicators of Well-Being, 2002*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Table POP7.C. Retrieved from the Internet at http://www.childstats.gov/americaschildren/.

[4] Children's Defense Fund calculations based on data from the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Household Education Survey, as cited in Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics. (2002). *America's Children: Key National Indicators of Well-Being, 2002*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Table POP7.C. Retrieved from the Internet at http://www.childstats.gov/americaschildren/; and U.S. Census Bureau. (June 2001). *School Enrollment—Social and Economic Characteristics of Students: October 2000* (Current Population Reports P20-533). Retrieved from the Internet at http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/school.html.

[5] B. M. Miller, S. O'Connor, S. W. Sirignano, and P. Joshi. (1996). *"I Wish the Kids Didn't Watch So Much TV": Out-of-School Time in Three Low Income Communities*. Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College, Center for Research on Women, School-Age Child Care Project.

[6] B. M. Miller, S. O'Connor, S. W. Sirignano, and P. Joshi. (1996). *"I Wish the Kids Didn't Watch So Much TV": Out-of-School Time in Three Low Income Communities*. Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College, Center for Research on Women, School-Age Child Care Project.

[7] E. Hunter. (August 31, 2001). "UF Researcher: After-School Activities Help Kids Stay in School; Study Suggests Even Good Students May Be At Risk Without Adult Supervision" (University of Florida press release). Retrieved from the Internet at http://www.napa.ufl.edu/2001news/afterschool.htm.

[8] YMCA of the USA. (March 2001). *After School for America's Teens: A National Survey of Teen Attitudes and Behaviors in the Hours After School, Executive Summary*. Washington, DC: YMCA of the USA.

[9] D. L. Vandell and K. M. Pierce. (April 1999). "Can After-School Programs Benefit Children Who Live in High-Crime Neighborhoods?" Presentation at the Poster Symposium, Children's Out-of-School Time: The Next Generation of Research, Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

[10] University of California at Irvine, Department of Education, in cooperation with California Department of Education, Healthy Start and After School Partnerships Office. (February 2002). *Evaluation of California's After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnerships Program: 1999-2001 (Preliminary Report)*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

[11] D. Huang, B. Gribbons, K. S. Kim, C. Lee, and E. L. Baker. (June 2000). *A Decade of Results: The Impact of the LA's BEST After School Enrichment Program on Subsequent Student Achievement and Performance*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California at Los Angeles, Center for the Study of Evaluation.

[12] C. Warren with P. Brown and N. Freudenberg. (1999). *Evaluation of the New York City Beacons: Summary of Phase I Findings*. New York, NY: Academy for Educational Development.

[13] Policy Studies Associates, Inc. (February 2001). *Building Quality and Supporting Expansion of After-School Projects, Summary of Findings: Evaluation Results from the TASC After-School Program's Second Year*. New York, NY: The After-School Corporation.

[14] J. B. Grossman, M. L. Price, V. Fellerath, L. Z. Jucovy, L. J. Kotloff, R. Raley, and K. E. Walker. (June 2002). *Multiple Choices After School: Findings from the Extended-Service Schools Initiative*. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures and New York, NY: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

[15] S. Schinke. (1999). *Evaluation of Boys and Girls' Club of America's Educational Enhancement Program*. Atlanta, GA, as cited in U.S. Department of Education. (September 2000). *21st Century Community Learning Centers: Providing Quality Afterschool Learning Opportunities for America's Families*. Retrieved from the Internet at http://www.ed.gov/pubs/Providing_Quality_Afterschool_Learning/.

[16] J. Tierney, J. Grossman, and N. Resch. (November 1995). "Making a Difference: An Impact Study of Big Brothers/Big Sisters," *Public/Private Ventures*. p. 33.

[17] D. Riley, J. Steinberg, C. Todd, S. Junge, and I. McClain. (1994). *Preventing Problem Behaviors and Raising Academic Performance in the Nation's Youth: The Impacts of 64 School-Age Child Care Programs in 15 States Supported by the Cooperative Extension Service Youth At-Risk Initiative*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin.

[18] U.S. Department of Education. (September 2000). *21st Century Community Learning Centers: Providing Quality Afterschool Learning Opportunities for America's Families*. Retrieved from the Internet at http://www.ed.gov/pubs/Providing_Quality_Afterschool_Learning/.

[19] Partners Investing in Our Community of Kids and Ohio Hunger Task Force. (1999). *Urban School Initiative School-Age Care Project: 1998-99 School Year Evaluation Report*. Columbus, OH, as cited in U.S. Department of Education. (September 2000). *21st Century Community Learning Centers: Providing Quality Afterschool Learning Opportunities for America's Families*. Retrieved from the Internet at http://www.ed.gov/pubs/Providing_Quality_Afterschool_Learning/.

[20] M. A. Jones and D. R. Offord. (1989). "Reduction of Antisocial Behavior in Poor Children by Nonschool Skill Development," *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, Vol. 30. pp. 737-750.

[21] Fight Crime: Invest in Kids interview with Baltimore Police Commissioner Thomas Frazier, January 12, 1998.

[22] J. K. Posner and D. L. Vandell. (1994). "Low-Income Children's After-School Care: Are There Beneficial Effects of After-School Programs?" *Child Development*, Vol. 65. pp. 440-456.

[23] Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence. "Blueprints Model Programs: Quantum Opportunities Program (QOP)" (Fact sheet), excerpted from C. B. Lattimore, S. F. Mihalic, J. K. Grotpeter, and R. Taggart. (1998). *Blueprints for Violence Prevention, Book Four: The Quantum Opportunities Program*. Boulder, CO: Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence. Retrieved from the Internet at http://www.colorado.edu/cspv/blueprints/model/programs/QOP.html.

[24] K. Smith. (July 2002). *Who's Minding the Kids? Child Care Arrangements: Spring 1997* (Current Population Reports P70-86). Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.

[25] J. Capizzano, S. Adelman, and M. Stagner. (June 2002). *What Happens When the School Year Is Over? The Use and Costs of Child Care for School-Age Children During the Summer Months* (Assessing the New Federalism, Occasional Paper Number 48). Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

[26] Public Agenda. (1999). *Kids These Days '99: What Americans Really Think About the Next Generation*. New York, NY: Public Agenda.

[27] D. Finkelhor and R. Ormrod. (June 2000). *Characteristics of Crimes Against Juveniles*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Data from the 1997 National Incident-Based Reporting System, Federal Bureau of Investigation.

[28] H. Snyder and M. Sickmund. (September 1999). *Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 1999 National Report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Programs.

[29] U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. (October 2001). *Crime Reports in the United States, 2000: Uniform Crime Reports*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

[30] H. Snyder and M. Sickmund. (September 1999). *Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 1999 National Report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Programs.

[31] H. Snyder and M. Sickmund. (September 1999). *Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 1999 National Report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Programs.

[32] Fight Crime: Invest in Kids. (September 4, 2001). "As School Begins, Polls Show Adults Top Worry Is Crime and Violence; Teens Unsupervised After School More than Twice as Likely to Commit Crimes" (Press release).

[33] National Crime Prevention Council and ADT Security Services, Inc. (2002). *Are We Safe? Focus on Teens*. Washington, DC: National Crime Prevention Council. Survey conducted by Christopher J. Moessner at Wirthlin Worldwide.

[34] J. K. Posner and D. L. Vandell. (1994). "Low-Income Children's After-School Care: Are There Beneficial Effects of After-School Programs?" *Child Development*, Vol. 65. pp. 440-456.

[35] K. M. Dwyer, J. L. Richardson, K. L. Danley, W. B. Hansen, S. Y. Sussman, B. Brannon, C. W. Dent, C. A. Johnson, and B. R. Flay. (1990). "Characteristics of Eighth-Grade Students Who Initiate Self-Care in Elementary and Junior High School," *Pediatrics*, Vol. 86, No. 3. pp. 448-454.

[36] K. M. Dwyer, J. L. Richardson, K. L. Danley, W. B. Hansen, S. Y. Sussman, B. Brannon, C. W. Dent, C. A. Johnson, and B. R. Flay. (1990). "Characteristics of Eighth-Grade Students Who Initiate Self-Care in Elementary and Junior High School," *Pediatrics*, Vol. 86, No. 3. pp. 448-454.

[37] D. L. Vandell and J. Posner. (1999). "Conceptualization and Measurement of Children's After-School Environments," in S. L. Friedman and T. D. Wachs. Eds. *Assessment of the Environment Across the Lifespan*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Press.

[38] J. K. Posner and D. L. Vandell. (1994). "Low-Income Children's After-School Care: Are There Beneficial Effects of After-School Programs?" *Child Development*, Vol. 65. pp. 440-456.

[39] S. L. Hofferth and J. F. Sandberg. (September 2000). *Changes in American Children's Time, 1981-1997* (CEEL Working Paper 013-00). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Center for the Ethnography of Everyday Life.

[40] J. Tolman, K. Pittman, N. Yohalem, J. Thomases, and M. Trammel. (2002). *Moving an Out-of-School Agenda: Lessons and Challenges Across Cities*. Takoma Park, MD: The Forum for Youth Investment.

[41] Children Now. (April 2001). *After School Care for Children: Challenges for California*. Los Angeles and Oakland, CA: Children Now.

[42] M. Watkins, et al. (2001). *Youth Work: More Than Child's Play*. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana Youth Institute.

[43] Belden Russonello and Stewart Research and Communications. (August 2001). *Principals and After-School Programs: A Survey of PreK - 8 Principals*. Washington, DC: National Association of Elementary School Principals.

[44] Afterschool Alliance. (July 2001). "America's Afterschool Funding Gap Grows" (Fact sheet). Washington, DC: Afterschool Alliance.

[45] K. Smith. (July 2002). *Who's Minding the Kids: Child Care Arrangements: Spring 1997* (Current Population Reports P70-86). Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.

[46] B. M. Miller, S. O'Connor, S. W. Sirignano, and P. Joshi. (1996). *"I Wish the Kids Didn't Watch So Much TV": Out-of-School Time in Three Low Income Communities*. Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College, Center for Research on Women, School-Age Child Care Project.

[47] J. Heymann. (2000). "What Happens During and After School: Conditions Faced by Working Parents Living in Poverty and Their School-Aged Children," *Journal of Children and Poverty*, Vol. 6, No. 1. pp. 5-20.

[48] S. J. Heymann and A. Earle. (Winter 2000). "Low-Income Parents: How Do Working Conditions Affect Their Opportunity to Help School-Age Children At Risk?" *American Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 37, No. 4. pp. 833-848.

[49] G. J. Duncan and P. L. Chase-Lansdale. (December 2000). "Welfare Reform and Child Well-Being." Paper prepared for the New World of Welfare Reform Conference in Washington, DC, February 1 and 2, 2001.

[50] D. E. Levin and N. Carlsson-Paige. (1994). "Developmentally Appropriate Television: Putting Children First," *Young Children*, Vol. 49, No. 5. pp. 38-44.

[51] B. M. Miller, S. O'Connor, S. W. Sirignano, and P. Joshi. (1996). *"I Wish the Kids Didn't Watch So Much TV": Out-of-School Time in Three Low Income Communities*. Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College, Center for Research on Women, School-Age Child Care Project.

[52] K. Schulman. (2000). *The High Cost of Child Care Puts Quality Care Out of Reach for Many Families*. Washington, DC: Children's Defense Fund.

[53] J. Capizzano, S. Adelman, and M. Stagner. (June 2002). *What Happens When the School Year Is Over? The Use and Costs of Child Care for School-Age Children During the Summer Months* (Assessing the New Federalism, Occasional Paper Number 48). Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

[54] B. M. Miller, S. O'Connor, S. W. Sirignano, and P. Joshi. (1996). *"I Wish the Kids Didn't Watch So Much TV": Out-of-School Time in Three Low Income Communities*. Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College, Center for Research on Women, School-Age Child Care Project.

[55] Belden Russonello and Stewart Research and Communications. (August 2001). *Principals and After-School Programs: A Survey of PreK - 8 Principals*. Washington, DC: National Association of Elementary School Principals.

[56] J. Richards and A. Dominguez-Arms. (2001). *California Report Card 2001*. Oakland, CA: Children Now. Retrieved from the Internet at http://www.childrennow.org/california/rc-2001/reportcard-2001.htm; and Children Now. (April 2001). *After School Care for Children: Challenges for California*. Los Angeles and Oakland, CA: Children Now.

[57] B. M. Miller, S. O'Connor, S. W. Sirignano, and P. Joshi. (1996). *"I Wish the Kids Didn't Watch So Much TV": Out-of-School Time in Three Low Income Communities*. Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College, Center for Research on Women, School-Age Child Care Project.

[58] B. M. Miller, S. O'Connor, S. W. Sirignano, and P. Joshi. (1996). *"I Wish the Kids Didn't Watch So Much TV": Out-of-School Time in Three Low Income Communities*. Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College, Center for Research on Women, School-Age Child Care Project.

[59] B. M. Miller, S. O'Connor, S. W. Sirignano, and P. Joshi. (1996). *"I Wish the Kids Didn't Watch So Much TV": Out-of-School Time in Three Low Income Communities*. Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College, Center for Research on Women, School-Age Child Care Project.

[60] Fight Crime: Invest in Kids. (September 4, 2001). "As School Begins, Polls Show Adults Top Worry Is Crime and Violence; Teens Unsupervised After School More than Twice as Likely to Commit Crimes" (Press release).

[61] National Crime Prevention Council. (January 24, 1996). "Teens, Crime and the Community," *Report of Preschool Programs*. Washington, DC: National Crime Prevention Council. p. 13.

[62] Afterschool Alliance. (October 9, 2002). "New Poll: Voters See Afterschool Programs as Key to Keeping Kids Safe, Helping Them Learn" (Press release). Poll conducted by Lake Snell Perry and Associates and the Tarrance Group, August 13-21. Sponsored by JCPenney Afterschool and the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation.

[63] Afterschool Alliance. (October 9, 2002). "New Poll: Voters See Afterschool Programs as Key to Keeping Kids Safe, Helping Them Learn" (Press release). Poll conducted by Lake Snell Perry and Associates and the Tarrance Group, August 13-21. Sponsored by JCPenney Afterschool and the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation.

[64] Fight Crime: Invest in Kids. (September 4, 2001). "As School Begins, Polls Show Adults Top Worry Is Crime and Violence; Teens Unsupervised After School More than Twice as Likely to Commit Crimes" (Press release).

[65] Fight Crime: Invest in Kids. (February 2001). "More Than Two-Thirds of Public Say Boosting Investments in Kids Is Higher Priority Than Tax Cuts" (Press release).

[66] Fight Crime: Invest in Kids. (August 2002). "National Law Enforcement Leadership Survey." Poll conducted by Mason-Dixon Polling and Research, Columbia, Maryland.

[67] Belden Russonello and Stewart Research and Communications. (August 2001). *Principals and After-School Programs: A Survey of PreK - 8 Principals*. Washington, DC: National Association of Elementary School Principals.

[68] Information retrieved from the Internet at http://www.lasbest.org/about/about.html.

[69] D. Huang, B. Gribbons, K. S. Kim, C. Lee, and E. L. Baker. (June 2000). *A Decade of Results: The Impact of the LA's BEST After School Enrichment Program on Subsequent Student Achievement and Performance*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California at Los Angeles, Center for the Study of Evaluation.

[70] Personal communication from Steven Amick, Program Coordinator for the City of San Diego's "6 to 6" Extended School Day Program and information retrieved from the Internet at http://www.sannet.gov/6to6/index.shtml.

[71] Information provided by the City of Boston, Centers for Youth and Families, Boston 2:00-to-6:00 After-School Initiative, 2002.