



**NCLB Reauthorization:
Prospects and
Opportunities for the
Afterschool Field**
Perspectives of 20 Key Interviewees

September 2007

Prepared for: The Atlantic Philanthropies
Prepared by: Ami Nagle & Sarah Griffiths

The
ATLANTIC
Philanthropies
(USA) Inc.

About Nagle & Associates Consulting

Nagle & Associates Consulting works with charitable foundations, non-profit organizations, and state and local government to identify areas of concern, conduct research, and collaborate with stakeholders to create solutions. Nagle & Associates Consulting works on a range of topics, including early childhood and K-12 education, out-of-school opportunities for youth, access to health care, family economic security, state and tax and budget policy, and community engagement.

Nagle & Associates Consulting

2704 Sevier St.

Durham, NC 27705

Tel: 919-493-4393

Fax: 919-493-4569

Email: aminagle@aol.com

About The Atlantic Philanthropies

The Atlantic Philanthropies are dedicated to bringing about lasting changes in the lives of disadvantaged and vulnerable people. Atlantic focuses on four critical social problems: Aging, Disadvantaged Children & Youth, Population Health, and Reconciliation & Human Rights. Programs funded by Atlantic operate in Australia, Bermuda, Northern Ireland, the Republic of Ireland, South Africa, the United States and Viet Nam. To learn more, please visit: www.atlanticphilanthropies.org.

About the Disadvantaged Children & Youth Program

Believing that all young people deserve the opportunity to fulfill their dreams, regardless of economic circumstances, the Disadvantaged Children & Youth Program seeks to make lasting changes in the lives of disadvantaged children and youth through policies and programs that keep them engaged in learning, healthy, and connected to nurturing adults and family supports.

Marisha Wignaraja

Program Executive, Disadvantaged Children & Youth Program

The Atlantic Philanthropies

125 Park Avenue, 21st floor

New York, NY 10017

Tel: 212-916-7320

Fax: 212-922-0360

Email: m.wignaraja@atlanticphilanthropies.org

September 4, 2007

Dear Colleagues,

The Disadvantaged Children & Youth Program (DCY) of The Atlantic Philanthropies (Atlantic) is pleased to share with you the results of our scan on efforts to refine and reauthorize the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) and the legislation's impact on the afterschool field. *NCLB Reauthorization: Prospects and Opportunities for the Afterschool Field* is a result of research and interviews conducted in the winter and spring of 2007 by Nagle & Associates Consulting.

The report is meant for organizations interested in a quick introduction to NCLB legislation and its links to afterschool policy. It also highlights some key players in this arena and opportunities for advocacy. The information presented is a snapshot of the early discussion around afterschool and NCLB reauthorization and shows some consensus among the organizations interviewed. While opinions may shift and the political climate may change, we hope this information is as useful to you as it is to us.

We would like to thank authors Ami Nagle and Sarah Griffiths for putting together a very comprehensive report and Atlantic staff and consultants, Diana Benton, Nicole Gallant, Susan Gurewitsch, Reinaldo Perez, Tricia Rosensohn, Stuart Schear and Eyal Yerushalmi who worked on this report. Thank you especially to the 20 organizations who shared their time and opinions with us:

Afterschool Alliance
America's Promise Alliance
Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation
BELL
Citizen Schools
Council of Chief State School Officers
Edna McConnell Clark Foundation
The Education Trust
Fight Crime: Invest in Kids
First Focus

Food Research and Action Center
Higher Achievement Program
Hunt Institute
National Afterschool Association
National Education Association
National Governors Association
National PTA
Public Education Network
The After-school Corporation
Wallace Foundation

Please feel free to share this report with others. Contact Marisha at (212) 916-7320 with questions and for further information.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Charles Roussel
Program Director

Marisha Wignaraja
Program Executive

Contents

Executive Summary	1
Introduction	7
Background and Environment.....	8
Summary of Findings	14
Recommendations.....	23
Appendix A: Overview of Organizations Interviewed.....	26
Appendix B: Other Organizations Mentioned in Interviews	34
Appendix C: Summary of Organizational Activities	38

Executive Summary

The Atlantic Philanthropies supports the efforts of groups across the country to create high-quality out-of-school programs and capitalize on opportunities to raise awareness of their importance to academic achievement and youth development, especially for children of middle-school age. As the reauthorization of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) may have direct impact on the afterschool field, Atlantic is placing special emphasis on supporting successful reauthorization efforts.

To help inform these efforts, Atlantic engaged Nagle & Associates to conduct a scan of NCLB reauthorization prospects, including analyses of the potential impact on afterschool programs and potential investments by the field and philanthropy. Nagle & Associates interviewed representatives of 20 key groups, including Atlantic grantees, advocates, service providers, funders, and associations.

With an estimated 14.3 million children home alone after school¹ and increasing pressure on schools and communities to provide additional learning opportunities, parents, policymakers, and the public are very concerned with what happens after school hours—and how it relates to in-school goals and activities. A well-crafted NCLB reauthorization could create significant opportunities for high-quality afterschool programs.

NCLB Background

Signed into law in January 2002, NCLB arose from frustrations with a struggling public education system and received strong bi-partisan support in Congress. Authorizing legislation for NCLB is set to expire on September 30, 2007.

The main goal of the law is to improve academic achievement of children in low-performing schools, eradicating the achievement gap. While NCLB embodies many important ideas, a critical feature of the law is Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). According to NCLB, every school district and each individual school must make "adequate yearly progress" toward the goal of 100% proficiency by the 2013-14 school year. To this end, NCLB focuses on²:

¹ The Afterschool Alliance. http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/america_3pm.cfm

² "NCLB Action Brief," Public Education Network.

- Development of state standards, assessment systems, and accountability measures
- Highly qualified teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals
- Rewards for schools that meet or exceed academic expectations
- Identification of schools that fall behind in progress toward state standards
- Funding for schools that need special assistance to meet NCLB requirements
- Parental and community involvement
- Parental choice and supplemental services.

NCLB creates two primary afterschool program opportunities:

- ***21st Century Community Learning Centers (21CCLC)***. The 21CCLC initiative is the largest and only federal funding source dedicated exclusively to afterschool programs. 21CCLC provides services to students attending low-performing schools in high-poverty areas. In 2007, an estimated \$981 million will go to 21CCLC programs across the nation.
- ***Supplemental Education Funding (SES)***. The legislation creating NCLB set aside additional funding for SES to help struggling schools improve student achievement. In 2005-2006, nearly all school districts and approximately half the public schools nationwide shared \$12.7 billion in federal Title I funding to improve the education of low-income students.³

But SES funds remain—only about 19% was used in the 2004-2005 school year.⁴ SES funding can support tutoring, afterschool services, and summer programs in schools designated as “failing.” SES services must be delivered outside of the school day but can include remedial programs to help children achieve in school.⁵

Summary of Findings

The interviews provide insight into thinking in the spring of 2007 about what appeared to be the likely course of the NCLB reauthorization debate, its impact on afterschool opportunities, the activities organizations might undertake, and gaps they perceive in knowledge or capacity needed to move the field forward. Since that time, the speed of

³ U.S. Government Accountability Office, Report to Congressional Requesters, No Child Left Behind, Education Actions Needed to Improve Local Implementation and State Evaluation of Supplemental Educational, August 2006.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ The Afterschool Alliance. http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/supp_main.cfm

the reauthorization process has appeared to slow down, yet the policy insights from the spring of 2007 remain valuable.

Opportunities to Advance the Afterschool Agenda. The interviewees agreed that several factors make reauthorization a forum for addressing afterschool opportunities:

- *Issue integral to NCLB.* Reauthorization stands to raise the profile of afterschool programs as those in the field have opportunities to talk about their efforts, program impact on the most at-risk students, relevance to NCLB goals, and the importance of quality.
- *Political support.* Afterschool issues enjoy the support of key members of Congress, including Senator Ted Kennedy (D-MA). His chairmanship and stated interest in afterschool hours lead interviewees to expect to see afterschool issues raised as part of the NCLB debate.

Key Components of the Agenda. Because the elements of NCLB that most directly affect afterschool programs are 21CCLC and SES funds, interviewees would focus reauthorization efforts there, specifically on:

- *Coordinating funding streams.* Reauthorization provides a great opportunity to look at how afterschool funding streams—21CCLC, SES, and Child Care and Development Fund, for example—work together or against each other.
- *Revising funding structure.* SES is a reimbursement program—requiring programs to deliver and be reimbursed for the costs later. This self-financing requirement limits the ability of non-profit organizations to provide SES-funded afterschool services and limits the impact that SES funding could have on the field.
- *Increasing eligibility of Community-Based Organizations (CBOs).* If NCLB reauthorization made CBOs more eligible to access SES resources strategically and systemically, this could facilitate the field's ability to serve families and coordinate services.
- *Integrating in-school/out-of-school hours.* Drawing attention to the potential of afterschool programs to improve student achievement could encourage dialogue about integrating in-school and out-of-school activities.
- *Improving quality and accountability.* Many questions have been raised about the quality of SES-funded programs. Accountability has been limited and quality has

been inconsistent. Reauthorization provides an opportunity to encourage educators to recognize the potential impact of afterschool programs on achievement and efforts by the afterschool field to improve quality and accountability.

- *Building the field to incorporate summer programs.* SES includes summer programs, but interviewees report that this element of the program has been significantly underutilized.
- *Reframing program content.* Interviewees see reauthorization as an opportunity to revise NCLB language—allowing the law to recognize a variety of strategies that support learning and broadening the purely academic focus of SES funding.

Recommendations

While these recommendations are divided into shorter- and longer-term opportunities, short-term activities could have long-term implications.

Shorter-term Opportunities

- *Stimulate conversations about use of SES funds.* The afterschool community should develop guidelines for improved use and oversight of SES funding. The community should engage with K-12 education on productive uses of SES funds and craft a plan to work together for changes under NCLB reauthorization.
- *Raise awareness of the afterschool field.* While the field has done much in recent years to raise awareness of high-quality afterschool programming, many opinion leaders and education officials remain unaware of the potential of afterschool hours, especially to enhance academic achievement. More aggressive framing, messaging, and public awareness campaigns are needed to make the case for connecting afterschool and K-12 goals and activities.
- *Align afterschool funding streams.* Policy work is needed to better align these funds and ways for communities to link funding to support quality afterschool programs.
- *Bolster NCLB coalitions.* Coalitions can bring groups together to work toward shared goals and avoid duplication of efforts. Many interviewees noted little coalitional activity around NCLB reauthorization, but opportunities do exist. Existing coalition efforts should be bolstered to ensure that they are linking the

most effective players, creating broad awareness of efforts, and advancing an agenda that promotes afterschool opportunities.

- *Engage parents.* Few efforts concentrate on bringing the voice of parents into the reauthorization debate. This calls for greater public awareness-building and advocacy, as well as efforts to inform parents about education reform (including NCLB) and solicit their input. Finally, parents need training and support to engage effectively in education policy discussions at the national, state, and local levels.

Longer-term Opportunities

- *Connect K-12 and afterschool groups.* Interviewees expressed much interest in creating partnerships between K-12 entities and afterschool groups. This requires conducting case study research, engaging national afterschool groups and groups that address K-12 issues in dialogue, and creating ways to build awareness of the power of afterschool programs in specific sectors (governors, legislators, teachers, school administrators, afterschool program providers, etc.).
- *Connect grantmakers.* Bringing afterschool funders and traditional K-12 funders together to share information and strategies would be a critical step toward creating greater connections in the field.
- *Increase research in the afterschool field.* Most interviewees noted that too little research is available and that existing research is not widely known. The afterschool community needs to agree on the most pressing questions and develop a more systematic, broad-based communications campaign to identify key findings, frame the debate, raise awareness of the research, and help the field integrate research findings into programs and communications.
- *Support state activity.* Interviewees expressed great interest in documenting models, connecting local efforts, and bolstering support for state funding of afterschool programs. While the network of afterschool programs in states is growing, greater connections among national groups, their state counterparts, and state education support and advocacy efforts could accelerate the growth.
- *Connect grantees.* Several interviewees noted they would welcome increased opportunities for foundation grantees to share successes and frustrations and explore collaboration.

- *Invest in workforce development.* Provider interviewees called for further professionalization of the field by supporting organizations implementing workforce development strategies, including developing a credential and enhancing the development and retention of high-level staff.
- *Increase field accountability.* While the field has become more professional, it would benefit from developing common criteria for an excellent afterschool program. Some provider interviewees also called for standardized performance measures for afterschool programs.

Introduction

The Atlantic Philanthropies supports the efforts of groups across the country to create high-quality out-of-school programs and capitalize on opportunities to raise awareness of their importance to academic achievement and youth development, especially for children of middle-school age. As the reauthorization of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) may have direct impact on the afterschool field, Atlantic is placing special emphasis on supporting successful reauthorization efforts.

To help inform these efforts, in the spring of 2007 Atlantic engaged Nagle & Associates to conduct a scan of NCLB reauthorization prospects, including analyses of potential impact on afterschool programs and potential investments by the field and philanthropy. Nagle & Associates interviewed representatives of 20 key groups, including grantees, advocates, service providers, funders, and associations:

Afterschool Alliance	Food Research and Action Center
America's Promise Alliance	Higher Achievement Program
Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation	Hunt Institute
BELL	National Afterschool Association
Citizen Schools	National Education Association
Council of Chief State School Officers	National Governors Association
Edna McConnell Clark Foundation	National PTA
The Education Trust	Public Education Network
Fight Crime: Invest in Kids	The After-school Corporation
First Focus	Wallace Foundation

Organizational overviews can be found in Appendix A.

The Research

The interviews explored four critical NCLB reauthorization and afterschool issues:

- Prospects for NCLB reauthorization
- Potential impact of reauthorization on afterschool opportunities
- NCLB work planned by each organization
- Needs of the afterschool field

Not intended to be exhaustive, this scan provides a snapshot of how reauthorization looked to representatives of key organizations at the start of the public debate. Opinions may shift. The political environment will certainly change. But the interviews show significant consensus on the political environment, likely progression of reauthorization, activities needed to inform the debate, and support requirements.

Background and Environment

This section provides context for NCLB and afterschool programming issues.

NCLB Background

Signed into law in January 2002, NCLB arose from frustrations with a struggling public education system and received strong bi-partisan support in Congress. The law touches virtually every aspect of the education system, covers nine Titles and over 50 programs, and is more than 1,000 pages long.⁶ Authorizing legislation for NCLB is set to expire on September 30, 2007.

The main goal of the law is to improve academic achievement of children in low-performing schools, eradicating the achievement gap. While NCLB embodies many important ideas, a critical concept is Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). According to NCLB, every school district and each individual school must make "adequate yearly progress" toward the goal of 100% proficiency by the 2013-14 school year. To this end, NCLB focuses on⁷:

- Development of state standards, assessment systems, and accountability measures
- Highly qualified teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals
- Rewards for schools that meet or exceed academic expectations
- Identification of schools that fall behind in progress toward state standards
- Funding for schools that need special assistance to meet NCLB requirements
- Parental and community involvement
- Parental choice and supplemental services.

While judged largely on student test scores, high schools face evaluation on their graduation rate, and elementary and middle schools on at least one other academic indicator. In order to assess AYP, each state set English and math baselines in the 2001-2002 school year and designated required performance levels for subsequent years. Each year, individual schools must meet or exceed state objectives, and at least 95% of students in each demographic subgroup must be tested.⁸

⁶ "Beyond NCLB: Fulfilling the Promise to Our Nation's Children," The Commission on No Child Left Behind, The Aspen Institute, 2007.

⁷ "NCLB Action Brief," Public Education Network.

⁸ "The Promises and Challenges of NCLB," ACCESS, Wendy Lecker, September 2005, http://www.schoolfunding.info/federal/NCLB/nclb_brief.php3#ayp.

NCLB reauthorization is best understood within the context of public education in America. Key facts include:

- **Students.** Public elementary and secondary schools educate 88% of the nation's 54.9 million students, while private schools educate 12%. Total enrollment is projected to reach 56.7 million in 2014, with the public and private school shares expected to stay about the same.⁹ In 2003-2004, 36% of public school students were eligible for free or reduced-price school lunches, and 10% percent of them were English language learners. English language learners now constitute the fastest-growing population in US schools, with a 65% percent increase between 1993-94 and 2003-04. In 2000, the parents of 19% percent of school-age children were immigrants (legal or undocumented).¹⁰
- **Funding.** More than 90% of funding for public education comes from state and local sources.¹¹ Eighty percent of the nation's 14,063 local school districts report NCLB activities that are not covered by federal funds.¹²
- **Achievement.** Long-term trend data show some improvements. Average reading and math scores at ages 9 and 13 improved. But average reading and math scores at age 17 showed no measurable changes between 1994 and 2004.¹³ Furthermore, "The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reading assessment found African American 17-year-olds reading at the same level as white 13-year-olds. Only 13% of African American and 19% of Hispanic fourth graders scored at or above the proficient level on NAEP mathematics tests, compared with 47% of their white peers."¹⁴
- **Adequate Yearly Progress.** 25.8% of all public schools did not make AYP in the 2005-2006 school year.¹⁵

⁹ "Basic (and Sometimes Surprising) Facts about the U.S. Education System: A Public Education Primer," Center on Education Policy, Nancy Kober, July 2006.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² "From the Capitol to the Classroom: Year 4 of NCLB," Center on Education Policy, March 2006.

¹³ U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2006). *Digest of Education Statistics, 2005* (NCES 2006-030).

¹⁴ Aspen Institute, "Beyond NCLB: Fulfilling the Promise to Our Nation's Children."

¹⁵ "More Schools Are Failing NCLB Law's Adequate Yearly Progress Requirements," National Education Association.

Afterschool Opportunities

With an estimated 14.3 million children home alone after school¹⁶ and pressure on schools and communities to provide additional learning opportunities increasing, parents, policymakers, and the public are very concerned with what happens after school hours—and how it relates to in-school goals and activities. NCLB could create significant afterschool opportunities.

- **21st Century Community Learning Centers (21CCLC).** The 21CCLC initiative is the largest and only federal funding source dedicated exclusively to afterschool programs. It provides services to students attending low-performing schools in high-poverty areas. In 2002 the first 21CCLC grants were awarded through the Department of Education as part of NCLB, with \$1 billion distributed in the 50 states and US territories. In 2007, an estimated \$981 million will go to 21CCLC programs across the nation.

21CCLC services include academic enrichment activities to help students meet state and local achievement standards; services to reinforce and complement the regular academic program, such as drug and violence prevention, counseling, art, music, and recreation programs; technology education; character education; and literacy and related educational development services to the families of children in the program.¹⁷

- **Supplemental Education Funding (SES).** The legislation creating NCLB set aside additional funding for SES to help struggling schools improve student achievement. “When a Title I school does not meet state performance goals for 3 or more years, the district must offer SES to all of the low-income students enrolled in the school. Districts with schools required to offer school choice and SES must set aside an amount equal to 20% of their Title I funds to provide choice-related transportation and SES for eligible students in these schools. In 2005-2006, nearly all school districts and approximately half the public schools nationwide shared \$12.7 billion in federal Title I funding to improve the education of low-income students.¹⁸ More than 6,500 schools were required to offer Supplemental Education Services.

¹⁶ The Afterschool Alliance. http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/america_3pm.cfm

¹⁷ The Afterschool Alliance. <http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/21stcclc.cfm>

¹⁸ United States Government Accountability Office, Report to Congressional Requesters, No Child Left Behind, page 1.

But SES funds remain—only about 19% was used in the 2004-2005 school year.¹⁹ SES funding can support tutoring, after-school services, and summer programs in schools designated as “failing.” SES services must be delivered outside of the school day but can include remedial programs to help children achieve in school.²⁰

Many other federal, state, and local funding sources combine to support the patchwork of afterschool programs for America’s youth. According to a Finance Project report, out-of-school programs can tap at least 116 federal funding sources. Key federal sources include:

- ***Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF)***. CCDF funds can subsidize child care for children under 13 (or, at the option of the grantee, up to 19 if the child is disabled or under court supervision), including afterschool care. Subsidized services are available to eligible families through certificates or contracts with providers. Parents may select any legally operating child care provider. Providers must meet basic health and safety requirements set by states, territories, and tribes.²¹ An estimated \$1.2 billion of CCDF funds supported school-age children in 2002.²²
- ***Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP)***. CACFP provides funds that enable states to reimburse institutions for meals and snacks served. Reimbursement is made at a per snack or meal rate, including snacks and meals at afterschool programs.²³

Other federal funding sources include Carol White Physical Education Grants (Department of Education) to encourage health and physical activity programs and numerous Department of Justice programs, such as Drug-Free Communities Support Program, Gang-Free Communities and Schools, and Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention grants.

¹⁹ United States Government Accountability Office, Report to Congressional Requesters, No Child Left Behind Act, Education Actions Needed to Improve Local Implementation and State Evaluation of Supplemental Educational, August 2006.

²⁰ The Afterschool Alliance. http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/supp_main.cfm

²¹ The Afterschool Alliance. http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/funding_data3.cfm?Program_ID=14

²² “Finding Funding: A Guide to Federal Sources for Out-of-School Time and Community School Initiatives,” The Finance Project, January 2003.

²³ The Afterschool Alliance. http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/funding_data3.cfm?Program_ID=12

States are increasingly dedicating funds to expand afterschool programs. Most notably, California's Proposition 49, the After School Education & Safety Program Act of 2002, provides funding for afterschool programs and gives priority to schools serving low-income students. California schools with at least 50% of students eligible for the free or reduced-price meal program receive top priority for afterschool program grants.²⁴ But all schools can apply. Illinois is expected to double state funding for afterschool programs from \$12 million to \$24 million in FY2007.²⁵

Federal Policy Environment

Here are some key factors:

- ***Fiscal crisis.*** A growing deficit (\$260 billion in 2006) fueled by tax cuts and the Iraq war has led to deep reductions in discretionary programs. Congressional Budget Office projections show that, if the President's tax cuts become permanent and relief from the alternative minimum tax is extended, deficits will total nearly \$3.5 trillion over the next 10 years (2007-2016), averaging \$349 billion a year. This fiscal crisis and the need to cut expenditures to reduce the deficit will influence the NCLB reauthorization debate.²⁶
- ***Competing priorities.*** Congress is facing competing priorities for attention in spring 2007. Measures likely to take priority over NCLB include immigration reform, Head Start reauthorization, SCHIP, Workforce Investment Act reauthorization, and the war in Iraq.
- ***New Congress.*** The 2006 national election brought many new members to Congress and a change in leadership. New members need time to get up to speed on key issues, including NCLB.
- ***Looming national election.*** The lead up to the 2008 Presidential election has already begun. Increasing focus on the election will distract Congress from the decisions needed in the next 6-8 months.
- ***High-profile legislation.*** Because NCLB touches schools and children across the country and has been fairly controversial, it enjoys greater name recognition than most federal legislation and has spurred national and local groups to begin

²⁴ The Afterschool Alliance. <http://www.afterschoolalliance.org>

²⁵ National Child Care Information Center. <http://www.nccic.org/afterschool/newstatedev.html>

²⁶ "Don't Pop the Corks: CBO Outlook for the Federal Budget is Still Bleak," Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, August 2006.

NCLB planning. As a result, a number of political reports are already suggesting changes.

Finally, it is important to remember that the political environment is highly unpredictable. A number of unforeseen forces could affect NCLB reauthorization. For example, little is known about how the US commitment in Iraq and Afghanistan will unfold in the next few years, and even less can be known about any natural disasters that might occur. Events like 9/11, the war in Afghanistan, the Iraq war, and Hurricane Katrina have all had enormous impact on entitlement programs and emergency spending at the national and state levels.

Summary of Findings

The interviews provide insight into thinking in the spring of 2007 on the likely course of the NCLB reauthorization debate, its impact on afterschool opportunities, activities organizations might undertake, and gaps in the knowledge and capacity needed to advance the field. The interviews found considerable consensus on many of these topics, as well as significant variations.

Nature of Debate

The NCLB reauthorization debate will be a complex and significant policy event. The original act was contentious, with many high-profile organizations lined up in support and opposition. While Congress and the Bush administration reached resolution on NCLB, it was never fully funded. For example, NCLB Title I received a Congressional appropriation of \$13.6 billion—almost \$10 billion below its “authorized” level.²⁷ The original disagreements and substantial underfunding have kept NCLB a very controversial public policy.

While the reauthorization debate will be complicated, the key issues seem clear:

- **Assessment.** As assessment is at the core of NCLB, debate will focus on assessment tools, use of information (Adequate Yearly Progress), and children to include in testing (for example, should schools test Limited English Proficient and Special Needs students). Some interviewees expressed interest in creating growth models to assess student achievement, others in using NCLB as a platform for national assessment standards.
- **Supplemental Education Services.** The debate will probe what support is available for schools that are struggling, who controls this support, what programs SES can fund, who is accountable for what, and what the timing and structure of support will be. Afterschool opportunities will figure prominently in the SES debate.
- **Teaching workforce.** How to define highly qualified teachers, how to get more of them in the hardest-to-serve areas, and how to prepare them will be key debate issues. In addition, there will be discussion about how to define “highly effective” teachers and efforts to include this concept in NCLB.

²⁷ American Federation of Teachers. www.aft.org/topics/nclb/funding.htm

- *High school reform.* Since the original NCLB act concentrated on younger students, some expect a new focus on high schools in the reauthorization debate, especially because high schools have yet to see substantial improvements from NCLB. Likely issues include test scores, math and English proficiency, graduation rates, and alignment with work and post-secondary education opportunities.
- *Carrots and sticks.* The debate will address incentives for schools to help more children achieve and penalties for schools where children do not improve. This is a very contentious issue. Interviewees noted numerous problems with current NCLB implementation: it is punitive; vouchers are ineffective in school districts with uniformly bad schools; SES funds would be more useful earlier, before a school failed; and community accountability is lacking.
- *Curriculum narrowing.* NCLB has encouraged narrowing the curriculum, creating an environment where some teachers “teach to the test.” As one interviewee noted, “It’s all skill and drill.” Although this is not likely to be a major point of debate, about half the interviewees called it an issue with the current law.

Few interviewees expect the basic funding level of NCLB to be an issue. While most recognize that the bill is underfunded by about \$17 billion (over three years), they also acknowledge that the US fiscal climate will not allow substantial funding increases or even debate on “full funding.” But, as one interviewee noted, “If funding did increase up to the authorized \$2.5 billion, it could really invigorate the afterschool field and generate new programs and energy.”

Also, while NCLB has been contentious since its introduction, very few interviewees foresee any organized or effective effort to block reauthorization. The underlying principles of the law are considered sound, and NCLB has highlighted the widening achievement gap. As one interviewee commented, “It’s been powerful for children of color. It doesn’t allow any excuses for their failing.”

While interviewees’ agendas differ, they generally agree on what would make the best outcome of the reauthorization debate: thorough discussion of NCLB, regardless of how long that took, with all interested groups at the table. The worst scenario would be very rapid reauthorization, with little discussion and refinement of NCLB.

Timing

NCLB is due for reauthorization in 2007. But interviewees called this timetable challenging, despite the fact that political leaders—including President George Bush, Senator Ted Kennedy (D-MA), and Representative George Miller (D-CA)—have signaled strong desire for reauthorization this year. The complexity of the measure, interest in having an informed debate, and other issues on the Congressional agenda make 2007 reauthorization unlikely.

While probable timing is unclear, a few scenarios seem possible. The House will hold hearings on NCLB in spring 2007. The content and contentiousness of these hearings will signal the measure's likely progress: Can it move forward expeditiously or not? If so, some interviewees expect NCLB reauthorization in the fall. But others are less optimistic and believe that the complexities of the law and the many competing factors will postpone full debate until 2008.

Some believe that if NCLB has not been reauthorized by 2008, it will be ignored until a new President is elected. This new President will then want to put his/her own mark on the legislation, delaying it even further.

Perceptions of likely timing differ with interview timing. Those interviewed early in the project were much more pessimistic about reauthorization happening this year. By the end of the interviews, many were more optimistic about 2007 reauthorization.

Key Players

Interviewees identified five categories of organizations and individuals they believe will substantially influence NCLB reauthorization:

- **Members of Congress.** As chairmen of the committees of jurisdiction, Senator Ted Kennedy (D-MA) and Representative George Miller (D-CA) would have the most influence on the timing, content, and structure of the NCLB debate. Other key members of Congress include Representative Michael Castle (R-DE), Representative Dale Kildee (D-MI), Representative Buck McKeon (R-CA), Senator Lamar Alexander (R-TN), Senator Christopher Dodd (D-CT), Senator Mike Enzi (R-WY), Senator Lisa Murkowski (R-AK), and Senator Jack Reed (D-RI).
- **President Bush.** As President Bush was the driver of NCLB, and some say that he has staked his legacy on it, the President and his administration will push for reauthorization before he leaves office.

- **Unions.** Interviewees believe that the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers will be active in NCLB reauthorization. Both groups have established positions and begun public awareness-building and lobbying.
- **Associations of state education entities.** A number of groups associated with the education system will participate actively in the debate—the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National Association of Elementary School Principals, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, and the School Board Association, Business and Industry Roundtable.
- **Governors.** Most interviewees expect governors to be very active in the debate, both individually and through the National Association of Governors.

Few interviewees see specific non-profit education advocacy groups as influential players in NCLB reauthorization. Few non-profit education advocacy efforts tackle the full range of NCLB issues, as most focus on specific topics, such as special education students or community and parent involvement. Interviewees speculated that these groups might be influential on specific aspects of NCLB relevant to their particular interest. More than one interviewee noted that public will has been excluded from the debate, leaving the voice of parents largely unheard.

See Appendix B for brief summaries of organizations mentioned in the interviews.

Impediments to Integrating School and Afterschool Time

By focusing attention on the potential of afterschool hours to improve student achievement, NCLB reauthorization presents an opportunity to explore integration of in-school and out-of-school programs. Asked to comment on existing barriers to such integration, most interviewees acknowledged considerable progress that has removed some historic barriers, but barriers remain. Interestingly, these barriers are cultural, rather than financial, and point to lack of communication and understanding between the two communities. The most frequently mentioned barriers were:

- **Lack of understanding.** Key stakeholders—mostly principals and teachers—remain unconvinced of the value of afterschool programs. Awareness of the research that has established the impact of high-quality afterschool programming on student achievement is limited, and the perception that every dollar spent on afterschool programming is a dollar taken away from in-school activities is prevalent.

- ***In-school staff failure to see out-of-school hours as their responsibility.*** Some interviewees observed that principals and teachers do not see out-of-school-time programs as part of their job. They are missing key opportunities, including integrating afterschool staff in school professional development, aligning afterschool and school curricula, and developing afterschool programs aligned with the mission and principles of a school.
- ***Resource challenges.*** Resource challenges like space, funding, scalability, and even competition over students keep school and afterschool groups from working together.

However, as interviewees noted, integration discussions are already benefiting the field: providing legitimacy, helping to professionalize it, creating opportunities to share staff, and building knowledge of the impact of quality afterschool programs.

The Afterschool Agenda

Interviewees agreed that NCLB reauthorization represents a natural and important forum for addressing afterschool opportunities, for two main reasons:

- ***Issue integral to NCLB.*** SES funds can (and do) support afterschool programs. But the SES issues of school districts not having spent all the available funds and the lack of oversight on use of SES funding will certainly arise in the debate around failing schools and support for them. This discussion will offer an opportunity for those in the afterschool field to talk about their programs, impact on the most at-risk students, relevance to NCLB, and the importance of quality.

Interviewees less knowledgeable about afterschool programming did not talk about the opportunity to change 21CCLC as part of NCLB reauthorization. According to interviewees 21CCLC, while an important program, does not seem to be a reauthorization priority. However, some noted that it will be important to ensure that 21CCLC's support remains strong and is potentially strengthened during reauthorization.

- ***Political support.*** Afterschool issues seem to enjoy the support of key members of Congress, including Senator Ted Kennedy (D-MA). His chairmanship and stated interest in afterschool programs lead the interviewees most involved with afterschool programs to believe that afterschool issues will surface in the NCLB debate.

Key Components of the Agenda

Two components of NCLB relate directly to afterschool programs: 21CCLC and SES funds.

The reputation of 21CCLC is solid. Over the last five years, the program has grown rapidly. It is maturing, with more high-quality models that better balance academic and social interest components. Key relationships between school districts and community-based organizations have been forged.

SES occupies a less positive position—underutilized, funds distributed to programs of disparate quality, and inadequate accountability measures. But one interviewee called SES an untapped oil well that could infuse the field with important resources.

Other NCLB Opportunities

Interviewees see other opportunities in NCLB reauthorization to strengthen the afterschool field, including:

- ***Coordinate funding streams.*** The debate provides a great opportunity to look at how afterschool funding streams work together or against each other in the afterschool field. Coordinating the language of funding streams—21CCLC, SES, and CCDF—could be a significant step. For example, 21CCLC and SES put afterschool care in the teaching realm, while CCDF puts afterschool care in childcare. Because funding for these programs comes from separate sources and is not coordinated, programs can duplicate services, compete for students, and increase administrative burdens.
- ***Revise funding structure.*** SES is a reimbursement program—an entity pays for expenses and is reimbursed. Few non-profits have the financing capacity to handle this arrangement so most providers are school districts and for-profit entities.
- ***Increase Community-Based Organization (CBO) eligibility.*** NCLB reauthorization that increased CBO eligibility to access SES resources strategically could further the field significantly. Current funding requires parents to be knowledgeable about student needs and availability of services. Relying on parents creates a barrier to connecting the funding with children who need the services. As one interviewee said, “How do you motivate kids and families to take advantage? How do you help parents access the resources? The program needs to be more appealing and less remedial.” In many communities, for-profit service providers, like the Sylvan Learning Center, have been the most successful

at navigating the system. But such entities are not connected to any school district and, essentially, operate independently.

- ***Integrate in-school/out-of-school hours.*** By drawing attention to the potential of the afterschool hours to improve student achievement, the reauthorization debate presents an opportunity for discussion of integrating in-school and out-of-school time.
- ***Improve quality and accountability.*** Many questions have been raised about the quality of programs funded through SES. The reauthorization debate provides an opportunity to encourage educators to recognize the potential impact of afterschool programs on learning and achievement. But too few educators think about the afterschool hours this way. SES providers have little program guidance, too few links to school objectives, and no nationally consistent outcome measures. This limits the field's ability to measure impact.
- ***Incorporate summer programs.*** SES language includes summer programs. But interviewees consider this element of the program significantly underutilized.
- ***Reframe program content.*** While some interviewees disagreed, most agreed that forcing afterschool programs to be purely academic will lead to a two-tier system—with students who reach academic benchmarks offered a broad range of afterschool experiences and students not reaching academic benchmarks forced into strictly remedial afterschool programs. Interviewees see the reauthorization debate as an opportunity to revise NCLB language—allowing the law to recognize that various strategies support learning and limiting the purely academic focus of SES funding.

This would in turn attract more middle- and high-school students to afterschool programs that offered more interesting options. As one interviewee noted, “Either we get in the fight by opening up the language and working to integrate in-school and out-of-school time, or down the road we face a longer school day. NCLB is an opportunity to get it right.” The dissenting voices here argued for more academics in 21CCLC and more opportunities for school districts to partner with CBOs that have a proven track record.

Other Opportunities to Address Afterschool Issues

Interviewees were quick to note that NCLB is just *one* policy opportunity. Other opportunities include:

- **Federal policy.** Several interviewees noted that other reauthorizations, including Head Start, Higher Education, and Workforce Investment Act, also present opportunities for the afterschool field to discuss the role of programs and their integration into larger systems of education and support for children and families. Several interviewees pointed to the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) as another major source of funding for afterschool programs. CCDF's annual appropriation debate could provide a platform for discussion of greater coordination among funds and the programs they support.
- **State policy.** Some interviewees noted the importance of state policy developments to the afterschool field, seeing very fertile ground for innovation, change, and expansion at the state level.

Work Plans

In anticipation of NCLB reauthorization, some interviewee organizations have been working over the past year (or more) to develop position papers and awareness campaigns (see Appendix C for a summary chart). While the timing of NCLB reauthorization remains unknown, most groups are pushing ahead with core activities and plan to adjust strategies as necessary. Core activities include:

- **Developing position papers.** Many have spent the last few months (if not the last few years) developing position papers on how NCLB should be reauthorized. Interviewees described a period of data collection, gathering the opinions of constituents (teachers, parents, governors, advocates, etc.) on changes needed. This information fed the position papers that provide the basis for awareness-raising and media activities. Some groups have not yet finalized their position papers but anticipate doing so soon.
- **Engaging constituents.** Interviewees outlined plans to help constituents—members or key partners in the field—better understand NCLB and the decisions before Congress so they have enough background to reach out to members of Congress “back home” and interact with local media.
- **Engaging members of Congress.** Interviewees talked about reaching out directly to members of Congress to share information and viewpoints on NCLB reauthorization. A few mentioned working directly with members of Congress on drafting legislation.
- **Raising awareness.** Most interviewees want to work with national and local media to raise awareness of issues. Interviewees plan to provide press briefings,

write op-eds and letters to the editor, and organize local events for the media to cover, especially in target states, but few have developed a specific target list.

- ***Collaborating and building coalitions.*** Few interviewees mentioned participating in large scale collaborations or coalitions. The Afterschool Alliance has created a working group of about 80 collaborators, representing youth-serving organizations, community-based groups, summer programs, parks and recreation departments, education groups, corporations, cities, etc., and has launched the Coalition of Afterschool in NCLB.

In addition, the Forum on Educational Accountability—a group of national education, civic rights, religious, children’s, and disability organizations working together on NCLB reauthorization—has formed, and a few interviewees see that as an opportunity to collaborate on the broader issues of NCLB. However, broad-based coalition efforts appear to be a lower priority than might be expected.

Recommendations

The interviews established opportunities to bolster the efforts being made to further the afterschool agenda during the NCLB reauthorization debate. Furthermore, the interviewees highlighted areas of needed change that go well beyond NCLB and would fill more general gaps in the afterschool field. While the following recommendations to address these opportunities are divided into shorter- and longer-term activities, short-term activities could have long-term implications.

Shorter-Term Opportunities

- *Stimulate conversations about use of SES funds.* The debate will certainly address SES funds. Decisions could have substantial impact on afterschool programs and the improvement of our public primary and secondary education system.

The afterschool community should develop guidelines for improved use and oversight of SES funding. Best practice indicates that afterschool tutoring (the mainstay of SES funding) is most effective when implemented as part of a program that addresses other social and emotional needs and is fun for youth. The community should engage with K-12 education on productive uses of SES funds and craft a plan to work together for changes under NCLB reauthorization.

- *Raise awareness of the afterschool field.* While the field has done much in recent years to raise awareness of high-quality afterschool programming, many opinion leaders and education officials remain unaware of the potential of afterschool hours, especially to enhance academic achievement. More aggressive framing, messaging, and public awareness campaign are needed to help afterschool advocates and their non-traditional allies make the case for connecting afterschool and K-12 goals and activities.
- *Align afterschool funding streams.* Policy work is needed to better align these funds and ways for communities to link funding to support quality afterschool programs. This could have direct impact on NCLB reauthorization and broader impact on non-educational afterschool funding streams.
- *Bolster NCLB coalitions.* Coalitions can bring groups together to work toward shared goals and avoid duplication of efforts. Many interviewees noted little

coalitional activity around NCLB reauthorization, but opportunities do exist. A general education coalition is forming (Forum on Educational Accountability), as is an afterschool-NCLB-specific coalition (Coalition for Afterschool in NCLB).

Existing coalition efforts should be bolstered to ensure that they are linking the most effective players, creating broad awareness of efforts, and advancing an agenda that promotes afterschool opportunities.

- ***Engage parents.*** Few efforts concentrate on bringing the voice of parents—a key constituency much interested in NCLB and education reform—into the reauthorization debate. This calls for greater public awareness-building and advocacy to strengthen the parent engagement language of NCLB, as well as efforts to inform parents about education reform (including NCLB) and solicit their input. Finally, parents need training and other support to engage effectively in education policy discussions at the national, state, and local levels. Unlike teachers and other education professionals, parents have few “professional development” opportunities on education policy reform.

Longer-Term Opportunities

- ***Connect K-12 and afterschool groups.*** Interviewees expressed much interest in creating partnerships between K-12 entities and afterschool groups. This requires much work at the national and state levels to better understand the contributions of different communities and ways these partners can work together.

More specifically, creating partnerships requires conducting case study research on effective models of collaboration, engaging national afterschool groups and groups that address K-12 issues in dialogue, and creating ways to build awareness of the power of afterschool programs in specific sectors (governors, legislators, teachers, school administrators, afterschool program providers, etc.).

- ***Connect grantmakers.*** Bringing afterschool funders and traditional K-12 funders together to share information and strategies would be a critical step toward creating greater connections in the field. The foundations that support the afterschool field are intimately familiar with its goals, strengths, and weaknesses. But the foundations that support K-12 education reform and advocacy may be less familiar with the emerging research on afterschool programs and positive connections between in-school and out-of-school programs.

- ***Increase research in the afterschool field.*** Most interviewees noted that too little research is available and that existing research is not widely known. The afterschool community needs to agree on the most pressing questions (cost-benefit and impact on academic achievement were two cited by interviewees) and develop a more systematic, broad-based communications campaign to identify key findings, frame the debate, raise awareness of the research, and help the field integrate research findings into programmes and communications.
- ***Support state activity.*** Interviewees expressed great interest in documenting models, connecting local efforts, and bolstering support for state funding of afterschool programs. While the network of afterschool programs in states is growing, greater connections among national groups, their state counterparts, and state education support and advocacy efforts could accelerate the growth.
- ***Connect grantees.*** Several interviewees noted that they would support increased opportunities for foundation grantees to share successes and frustrations and explore collaboration. These conversations could also connect policy groups with more locally focused service providers.
- ***Invest in workforce development.*** Provider interviewees called for further professionalization of the field, including developing a credential and supporting organizations implementing workforce development and enhancing the development and retention of high-level staff.
- ***Increase field accountability.*** While the field has become more professional, quality still varies significantly. The field would benefit from having common criteria for an excellent afterschool program. Some provider interviewees also called for standardized performance measures for afterschool programs to ensure quality and collect the data necessary for further research.

Appendix A: Overview of Organizations Interviewed

The Afterschool Alliance

www.afterschoolalliance.org

Key Interviewees: Jodi Grant, Executive Director; Erika Argersinger, Policy Director

The Afterschool Alliance is a nonprofit organization dedicated to raising awareness of the importance of afterschool programs and advocating for quality, affordable programs for all children. The Alliance is supported by public, private, and nonprofit organizations that share its vision of ensuring that all children have access to quality, affordable, afterschool programs. The Alliance provides a voice for afterschool in efforts to expand quality programs; serves as an information source on afterschool programs and resources; encourages development of local, state, and national afterschool constituencies and systems; and communicates the impact of afterschool programs on children, families, and communities.

America's Promise Alliance

www.americaspromise.org

Key Interviewee: Charles Hiteshew, Chief Operating Officer

America's Promise—The Alliance for Youth works to forge multi-sector partnerships to ensure the well-being of young people. These partnerships include nonprofit groups, corporations, community leaders, youth-focused organizations, foundations, faith-based organizations, and individuals of all ages. Through America's Promise, partners magnify their voice; gain leverage and new synergies; improve the quality and reach of programs; accomplish more with finite resources; gain new resources; and inform and influence public policy more effectively. America's Promise is based on the premise that all children need more of the five promises: caring adults, safe places, healthy start, effective education, and opportunities to help others.

Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation

www.gatesfoundation.org

Key Interviewee: Stefanie Sanford, Senior Policy Officer for Education

Believing that every life has equal value, Bill and Melinda Gates created the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation in 2000 to help reduce inequities in the US and around the world. In the US, the Foundation seeks to ensure that all people have access to an

excellent education and technology in public libraries. In its local region, the Foundation focuses on improving the lives of low-income families. In developing countries, the Foundation focuses on improving health, reducing extreme poverty, and increasing access to technology in public libraries. In 2005, the Foundation donated some \$1.55 billion across three program areas: Global Development, Global Health, and the United States.

BELL

www.bellnational.org

Key Interviewee: Earl Martin Phalen, Co-Founder & CEO

BELL was founded in 1992 by a group of Black and Latino students at Harvard Law School. BELL currently educates more than 8,000 students in 40 public schools in Boston, Baltimore and New York City. BELL operates summer and after school learning programs — both dedicated to increasing the academic achievement, self-esteem, and life opportunities of children in low-income, urban communities. These programs include tutoring in literacy and math; mentoring; staff of committed, certified teachers and trained college-age tutors; small-group instruction; experiential learning; support for parents; and rigorous evaluation.

Citizen Schools

www.citizenschools.org

Key Interviewee: Eric Schwarz, President & CEO

Citizen Schools was founded in 1995 to bring new solutions to the challenge of young adult education: more time, more relevance, and more caring adults. Now a growing national network of afterschool programs for students in the middle grades (6-8), these programs complement classroom learning by engaging students in hands-on learning projects led by adult volunteers and supported by a staff of professional educators.

Council of Chief State School Officers

www.ccsso.org

Key Interviewee: Gene Wilhoit, Executive Director

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) is a nonpartisan, nationwide, nonprofit organization of public officials who head departments of elementary and

secondary education in the states, the District of Columbia, the Department of Defense Education Activity, and five other US jurisdictions. CCSSO provides leadership, advocacy, and technical assistance on major educational issues. The Council facilitates member consensus on major educational issues and expresses members' views to civic and professional organizations, federal agencies, Congress, and the public.

The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation

www.emcf.org

Key Interviewee: Woody McCutchen, Portfolio Manager

Founded in 1969, the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation (EMCF) seeks to help young people from low-income backgrounds make a successful transition to independent adulthood. To achieve this goal, the Foundation works with selected high-performing organizations that serve young people during the non-school hours to help these organizations grow stronger, better able to serve more youth, and better able to help youth achieve at least one of the following outcomes: improved educational skills, achievement, and attainment; preparation for the world of work and successful transition to employment and self-sufficiency; and success in avoiding high-risk behaviors, such as drug abuse and teen pregnancy.

The Education Trust

www.edtrust.org

Key Interviewee: Kati Haycock, President

The Education Trust works for high academic achievement by all students at all levels, pre-kindergarten through college, and elimination of the achievement gaps that separate low-income students and students of color from other youth. The Education Trust believes that all children will learn at high levels when they are taught to high levels. The Trust advances its mission in several ways, from raising its voice in national and state policy debates to helping teachers improve classroom instruction.

Fight Crime: Invest in Kids

www.fightcrime.org

Key Interviewee: Miriam Rollin, Vice President

Fight Crime: Invest in Kids is a national, bipartisan, nonprofit anti-crime organization of more than 3,000 police chiefs, sheriffs, prosecutors, other law enforcement leaders, and violence survivors. Members include the law enforcement leaders in the country, including presidents of many state and national law enforcement associations. Fight Crime: Invest in Kids examines crime prevention strategies, informs the public and policymakers about those findings, and urges investment in programs proven effective by research. The organization focuses on high-quality early education programs, prevention of child abuse and neglect, afterschool programs for children and teens, and interventions to get troubled kids back on track.

First Focus

www.firstfocus.net

Key Interviewee: Phillip Lovell, Education Director

First Focus is a bipartisan advocacy organization launched by America's Promise to help make children and their families a priority in federal policy and budget decisions. First Focus promotes bipartisan policy solutions for children's health, education, and family economic issues. Hallmarks of the First Focus approach to children's advocacy include bipartisanship, new partnerships, research for results, and engagement with state leaders.

The Food Research and Action Center

www.frac.org

Key Interviewee: Jim Weill, President

The Food Research and Action Center (FRAC) works to improve public policies and public/private partnerships to eradicate hunger and undernutrition. FRAC works with national, state, and local nonprofit organizations, public agencies, and corporations to address hunger and its root cause, poverty. FRAC conducts research to document the extent of hunger, its impact, and effective solutions, and seeks public policies that will reduce hunger and undernutrition. It monitors the implementation of laws and serves as a watchdog of regulations and policies affecting the poor. FRAC provides coordination, training, and support to a nationwide network of advocates, food banks,

program administrators and participants, and policymakers. It also conducts public information campaigns to promote changes in attitudes and policies.

Higher Achievement Program

www.higherachievement.org

Key Interviewee: Richard Tagle, Executive Director

Founded in 1975, Higher Achievement operates achievement centers that serve hundreds of students in the Washington, DC area each year. The mission of Higher Achievement is to develop academic skills, behaviors, and attitudes in academically motivated and underserved middle-school youth to improve their grades, test scores, attendance, and acceptance into top high-school programs. In order to fulfill its mission, Higher Achievement provides year-round academic enrichment programs and preparation for top high-school placement to middle-school youngsters in underserved areas.

Hunt Institute

www.hunt-institute.org

Key Interviewees: Judith Rizzo, Executive Director; William Ewell, Program Director

The Hunt Institute works with leaders to secure America's future through quality education. The Institute fulfills this mission by convening leaders in sessions led by experts in policy and practice to share and develop educational leadership ideas and practices and convert ideas into action. The Institute also provides consulting services to help clients, primarily governors, propose or implement specific policies. Recognizing that governors alone can not effect change, the Institute also works with lieutenant governors, legislators, mayors, business leaders, and PK-16 education leaders.

National AfterSchool Association

www.naaweb.org

Key Interviewee: Judy Nee, President & CEO

The National AfterSchool Association (NAA), formerly the National School-Age Care Alliance, was founded in 1987. It is dedicated to the development, education, and care of children and youth during their out-of-school hours. The NAA is a professional

association with a membership of more than 9,000 practitioners, policymakers, and administrators. Its members represent public, private, and community-based sectors of out-of-school time programs, as well as school-age and after-school programs both domestic and international.

National Education Association

www.nea.org

Key Interviewee: Kim Anderson, Lobbyist

The National Education Association (NEA), the nation's largest professional employee organization, is committed to advancing the cause of public education. NEA's 3.2 million members work at every level of education — from pre-school to university graduate programs. NEA has affiliate organizations in every state and in more than 14,000 communities across the United States. NEA believes that every child in America, regardless of family income or place of residence, deserves a quality education. In pursuing its mission, NEA focuses on improving the quality of teaching, increasing student achievement, and making schools safer, better places to learn.

National Governors Association

www.nga.org

Key Interviewee: Joan Wodiska, Director, Education, Early Childhood, and Workforce Committee

Founded in 1908, the National Governors Association is the collective voice of the nation's governors and one of Washington, DC's most respected public policy organizations. NGA provides governors and their senior staff with services ranging from representing states on Capitol Hill and before the administration on key federal issues, to developing policy reports on innovative state programs and hosting networking seminars for state executive branch officials. The NGA Center for Best Practices focuses on state innovation and best practices on issues ranging from education and health to technology, welfare reform, and the environment. NGA also provides management and technical assistance to both new and incumbent governors.

National Parent Teacher Association

www.pta.org

Key Interviewee: Craig Stevens, Public Policy Specialist

The National Parent Teacher Association (PTA) speaks on behalf of children and youth in schools, in the community, and before governmental bodies and other organizations that make decisions affecting children. The PTA helps parents develop the skills they need to raise and protect their children and encourages parent and public involvement in US public schools. The PTA at the local level is linked to the state PTA and national PTA, forming a nationwide network of members working on behalf of children and youth. The PTA seeks to raise the standards of home life; secure adequate laws for the care and protection of children and youth; link home and school more closely; and develop collaborative efforts by educators and the general public to secure the best education for all children and youth.

Public Education Network

www.publiceducation.org

Key Interviewees: Amanda Broun, Senior Vice President; William Miles, Director of Policy; Arnold Fege, Director of Public Engagement and Advocacy

The Public Education Network (PEN) is a national association of local education funds and individuals working to advance public school reform in low-income communities across the country. PEN believes that a national constituency of local education funds and individuals is the key to ensuring that every child in every community benefits from a quality public education. PEN seeks to build public demand and mobilize resources for quality public education for all children through such initiatives as standards and accountability, schools and community, teacher quality, middle school “Skills for Life,” and NCLB. PEN also works to revitalize high-school libraries in New York and increase public engagement.

The After-School Corporation

www.tascorp.org

Key Interviewee: Lucy Friedman, President

Since 1998, The After-School Corporation (TASC) has grown from 25 programs in New York City to more than 200 programs serving over 35,000 children. As part of ongoing efforts to support and sustain quality after-school programs, TASC is a partner in

"After School for All: Project 2010." This national partnership includes more than 1,000 regional, state, and city organizations, businesses, elected officials, police chiefs, after-school providers and other leaders with the shared mission of ensuring that all children and youth have access to quality, safe, and enriching after-school programs by the year 2010. Key components of the work include the Center for After-School Excellence, a new nonprofit initiative dedicated to ensuring that the best-trained, best-equipped staff possible serve youngsters in after-school programs; building a quality afterschool program that includes 10 essential categories defining a quality after-school program; and conducting research and evaluation.

The Wallace Foundation

www.wallacefoundation.org

Key Interviewee: Sheila Murphy, Senior Program Officer, Communities Program

The Wallace Foundation's mission is to enable institutions to expand learning and enrichment opportunities for all people. To this end the Foundation supports and shares ideas and practices that will strengthen education leadership, arts participation, and out-of-school learning. The Foundation has three objectives. It seeks to strengthen education leadership to enhance student achievement, improve learning opportunities outside of school, and expand participation in arts and culture. The Foundation takes an integrated, team-based approach involving research and communication, as well as grant-making, to extend its influence beyond direct grantees. This approach reflects the recognition that significant and sustainable change in our educational and cultural systems requires information and insight.

Appendix B: Other Organizations Mentioned in Interviews

While the interviewees represent a broad mix of groups, they are certainly not the only players in the NCLB reauthorization debate. The interviewees mentioned other groups likely to be involved. These groups are summarized below.

- **Achieve** was created by the nation's governors and business leaders in 1996 to help states raise academic standards and achievement so all students graduate ready for success in college, work, and citizenship. <http://www.achieve.org>
- **After-School Institute** is a Baltimore-based capacity-building organization. Its mission is to provide after-school programs with the training and support they need to offer children and youth quality after-school and out-of-school opportunities. <http://www.afterschoolinstitute.org>
- **Alliance for Excellent Education (AEE)** promotes high-school transformation so every child can graduate prepared for postsecondary education and success in life. The Alliance for Excellent Education conducts public education activities and research on four main areas: adolescent literacy; teacher and principal quality; college preparation; and small learning communities. To inform the national debate about education policies and options, AEE produces reports and other materials, makes presentations at meetings and conferences, briefs policymakers and the press, and provides timely information to a wide audience. <http://www.all4ed.org>
- **American Association of School Administrators**, founded in 1865, is the professional organization for more than 13,000 educational leaders across America and in many other countries. AASA members are chief executive officers and senior administrators in school districts in rural, urban, and suburban settings. AASA supports and develops effective school system leaders who are dedicated to the highest-quality public education for all children. <http://www.aasa.org>
- **American Federation of Teachers** was founded in 1916 to represent the economic, social, and professional interests of classroom teachers. This affiliated international union of the AFL-CIO has more than 3,000 local affiliates nationwide, 43 state affiliates, and more than 1.3 million members. Its mission is to improve the lives of members and their families; give voice to their legitimate professional, economic, and social aspirations; strengthen the institutions in

which they work; improve the quality of services provided; bring together all members to assist and support one another and promote democracy, human rights, and freedom in the union, in the nation, and throughout the world.

<http://www.aft.org>

- **Business Roundtable** is an association of chief executive officers of leading US companies with \$4.5 trillion in annual revenues and more than 10 million employees. Member companies comprise nearly a third of the total value of the US stock markets and represent over 40% of all corporate income taxes paid. The Roundtable is committed to advocating for public policies that ensure vigorous economic growth, a dynamic global economy, and the well-trained and productive US workforce essential for future competitiveness. The Roundtable believes that its potential for effectiveness is based on the fact that it draws on CEOs directly and personally and presents government with reasoned alternatives and positive suggestions. <http://www.summerlearning.org>
- **Center for Summer Learning** seeks to create high-quality summer learning opportunities for all young people. The Center is committed to expanding summer learning opportunities for disadvantaged children and youth as a strategy for closing the achievement gap. <http://www.summerlearning.org>
- **Coalition for Community Schools** is an alliance of national, state, and local organizations in K-16 education, youth development, community planning and development, family support, health and human services, government, and philanthropy, as well as national, state, and local school networks. The Coalition advocates for community schools as the vehicle for strengthening schools, families, and communities so that together they can improve student learning. The Coalition mobilizes resources and capacity across sectors and institutions to create a united movement for community schools. <http://www.communityschools.org>
- **Communities In Schools** is the nation's leading community-based organization helping young people stay in school and prepare for life. For more than 25 years, CIS has positioned students for success by ensuring their access to a one-on-one relationship with a caring adult, a safe place to learn and grow, a healthy start and healthy future, a marketable skill to use upon graduation, and a chance to give back to peers and community. <http://www.cisnet.org>
- **Council of Great City Schools** works to support urban public schools in their mission of educating the nation's diverse student body to the highest academic

standards and preparing them to contribute to the US democracy and the global community; leading, governing, and managing urban public schools in ways that advance the education of children and inspire public confidence; and engaging parents to build a confident, committed, and supportive urban community for raising the achievement of urban public school children.

<http://www.cgcs.org>

- **Education Industry Association** is a broad-based organization that represents the collective strengths and contributions of the multi-faceted education industry. With over 800 corporate and individual members, EIA is the leading professional association for private providers of education services, suppliers, and other private organizations that are stakeholders in education. EIA believes in an ongoing process of constructive engagement, honest dialogue, and mutual respect to create common positions that advance the movement.
<http://www.educationindustry.org>
- **National Association of Elementary School Principals** was founded in 1921 by a group of principals who sought to promote their profession and provide a national forum for their ideas. The NAESP's mission is to lead advocacy and support for elementary and middle-level principals and other education leaders in their commitment to all children. <http://www.naesp.org>
- **National Collaboration for Youth** is a coalition of National Human Services Assembly member organizations that have significant interest in youth development. Members include more than 50 national, non-profit, and youth development organizations committed to providing a united voice as advocates to improve the conditions of young people in America and help them reach their full potential. <http://www.nydic.org/nydic>
- **National Conference of State Legislatures** was founded in 1975 with the conviction that legislative service is one of democracy's worthiest pursuits. NCSL is a bipartisan organization that serves the legislators and staffs of all 50 states, commonwealths, and territories. NCSL provides research, technical assistance, and opportunities for policymakers to exchange ideas on the most pressing state issues. NCSL is an effective and respected advocate for state governments before Congress and federal agencies. <http://www.ncsl.org>
- **National Council of La Raza**, the largest national Hispanic civil rights and advocacy organization in the US, works to improve opportunities for Hispanic Americans. Through its network of nearly 300 affiliated community-based

organizations, NCLR reaches millions of Hispanics each year in 41 states, Puerto Rico, and Washington, DC. NCLR conducts applied research, policy analysis, and advocacy, providing a Latino perspective in five key areas: assets/investments, civil rights/immigration, education, employment and economic status, and health. NCLR also provides capacity-building assistance to affiliates working at the state and local levels to advance opportunities for individuals and families. <http://www.nclr.org>

- **National League of Cities** is the oldest and largest national organization representing municipal governments throughout the United States. Its mission is to strengthen and promote cities as centers of opportunity, leadership, and governance. Working in partnership with the 49 state municipal leagues, the National League of Cities serves as a resource to and an advocate for the more than 19,000 cities, villages, and towns it represents. <http://www.nlc.org>
- **National School Boards Association** is a nonprofit federation of state associations of school boards across the US seeking to foster excellence and equity in public education through school board leadership. Founded in 1940, NSBA represents the school board perspective before federal government agencies and to national organizations that affect education and provides information and services to state associations of school boards and local school boards across the nation. Through the Federation of State Associations NSBA represents 95,000 local school board members, virtually all of whom are elected. <http://www.nsba.org>
- **US Chamber of Commerce** is the world's largest business federation, representing more than three million businesses of all sizes, sectors, and regions. It includes hundreds of associations, thousands of local chambers, and more than 100 American Chambers of Commerce in 91 countries. The US Chamber of Commerce seeks to advance human progress through an economic, political, and social system based on individual freedom, incentive, initiative, opportunity, and responsibility. <http://www.uschamber.com>
- **US Conference of Mayors** is the official nonpartisan organization of cities with populations of 30,000 or more—today 1,139 cities, each represented by its chief elected official, the mayor. The primary roles of the Conference are to promote development of effective national urban/suburban policy, strengthen federal-city relationships, ensure that federal policy meets urban needs, provide mayors with leadership and management tools, and create a forum where mayors can share ideas and information. <http://usmayors.org>

Appendix C: Summary of Organizational Activities

The information in this table *only reflects activities highlighted in interviews* conducted in early 2007. The chart does not include information from foundations, as they are more likely to support the organizations listed below (and others) than to work independently.

	Research/ Write Position Papers	Engage Constituents	Educate Members of Congress	Raise Awareness (broad)	Collaborate and Build Coalitions
Afterschool Alliance	X	X	X	X	X
America's Promise Alliance	X		X	X	X
BELL	X		X		X
Citizen Schools			X	X	X
Council of Chief State School Officers	X	X	X		X
The Education Trust	X	X	X		X
Fight Crime: Invest in Kids		X	X	X	X
First Focus	X	X	X	X	X
Food Research and Action Center	X	X	X	X	X
Higher Achievement Program		X			X
Hunt Institute	X	X			X
National Afterschool Association		X			X
National Education Association	X	X	X		X
National Governors Association	X	X	X		X
National PTA	X	X			X
Public Education Network	X	X			X
The After-school Corporation		X			X