**ELO Defined:** Opportunities provided to public school students during an extended school day, an extended school year, or a structured learning program that occurs before school, after school, or during summer hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory Topics</th>
<th>Council-added Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Safe places</td>
<td>• Extended day and year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic success</td>
<td>• Financial topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Working families</td>
<td>• Health and social well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Best practices</td>
<td>• Special education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unmet needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Business incentives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Charitable support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• STEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Workforce needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- 3 council workgroups
- 12 workgroup webinars
- 2 informational webinar presentations
- Literature research and resources
- Professional consultation
- Public input
- 3 full council meetings

PLAN DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES
High quality ELO programs provide safe places, economic impact, close the academic achievement gap

Program standards that are tied to funding provide a framework for high quality ELO programs

Many Texas students do not have access to high quality ELO programming

Non-academic components or programs are important

Texas currently has no state funding stream dedicated to ELO programs
Federal education funding dedicated to afterschool programs

Texas receives about $100 million annually

In FY 2014 served nearly 190,000 students in 174 ISDs

Program quality and consistent participation matter

Some programs have been sustained locally
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Program Measure</th>
<th>Average Cost per Pupil Enrolled</th>
<th>Average Cost per Day per Pupil Enrolled</th>
<th>Average Cost per Pupil Attending</th>
<th>Average Cost per Day per Pupil Attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Texas ACE</strong></td>
<td>Annual per pupil maximum</td>
<td>$1,851</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Out-of-School Time Programs National Study (Grossman, et al, 2009)</strong></td>
<td>School year (K-8)</td>
<td>$4,320</td>
<td>$24</td>
<td>$3,620</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer (K-8)</td>
<td>$1,150</td>
<td>$32</td>
<td>$1,330</td>
<td>$27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Year (Teen)</td>
<td>$1,880</td>
<td>$33</td>
<td>$4,580</td>
<td>$27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer (Teen)</td>
<td>$790</td>
<td>$44</td>
<td>$1,420</td>
<td>$37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extended Learning Time Programs National Study (Kaplan, et al, 2013)</strong></td>
<td>Longer day (132 - 540 hours)</td>
<td>$290 - $1,695</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EXAMPLES: OTHER STATES’ FUNDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
<th>State Funds (in millions)</th>
<th>21st CCLC (in millions)</th>
<th>State:Fed Ratio (rounded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Formula grants - new OST</td>
<td>$550.0</td>
<td>$124.9</td>
<td>4:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Competitive grants - new OST and enrichment to reduce school violence</td>
<td>$57.0</td>
<td>$84.5</td>
<td>1:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Formula grants - new OST</td>
<td>$16.5</td>
<td>$5.6</td>
<td>3:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Competitive grants - CBOs serving at-risk teens</td>
<td>$8.8</td>
<td>$52.1</td>
<td>1:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Competitive grants - new STEM-focused OST</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>$7.2</td>
<td>1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Competitive grants - OST</td>
<td>$4.5</td>
<td>$9.1</td>
<td>1:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Formula grants- supplemental family services in existing OST</td>
<td>$2.5</td>
<td>$22.2</td>
<td>1:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Competitive grants - supplemental to existing OST</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
<td>$16.8</td>
<td>1:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Competitive grants - new OST</td>
<td>$1.1</td>
<td>$8.8</td>
<td>1:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>State match - private foundation funding for summer learning</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$5.6</td>
<td>1:22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Essential for high quality programs

- Address safety, nutrition, interactions, programming, diversity, family engagement, community partnerships, school partnerships, staff development, evaluation, sustainability

- Texas ACE standards are in the grant agreement

- TXPOST standards for OST

HIGH QUALITY PROGRAM STANDARDS
Dedicate funds via rider in the Texas Education Agency’s appropriation for the purpose of implementing the components of the Texas ELO Initiative

1. Pilot Competitive Grant Program
2. Training and Technical Assistance
3. Statewide Leadership and Coordination
4. Program Evaluation

OVERARCHING RECOMMENDATION
High quality programs that agree to meet minimum standards including:
- Soft skills development
- Health and nutrition
- Family involvement

Expand access
ELT and OST allowed
Demonstrate partnerships with community and employer based programs
Supplemental academics
Program guidance statewide and program-specific

Texas ELO Initiative Blueprint

High quality resources brought to scale

Annual summit and networking opportunities

Repository for program-related information and reports
STATEWIDE LEADERSHIP AND COORDINATION

- Maintain current data on ELO programs statewide
- Develop, modify and adopt quality standards for ELT and OST programs in Texas
- Designation process
- Conduct an economic impact analysis useful for attracting and retaining businesses
- Professional ELO certificate program
Evaluate the design, implementation and outcomes of the Texas ELO Initiative

Collect and analyze data

Report results

Explore aligning Texas ACE data collection and analysis for comparison and full impact
CATEGORIES FOR PUBLIC INPUT DISCUSSION

1. Addressed – Edits or already covered
2. Future – Will be addressed by the Council
3. Clarification – Additions or Improvements
4. Out of Scope – Not in council directive
**Explaining Need and Definitions**

- Explain with more emphasis what the critical needs are and how programs address these needs.
- Elaborate on the statistics showing the increasing demand for ELO.
- Define “at-risk” - not only poverty.
- Consider submitting another report as an addendum to highlight the impact of programs on families, especially working families and families that cannot afford enrichment programs.
- Explain more about how HB5 addresses STEM.
- Include the initial results of the Texas A&M study.

PUBLIC INPUT: NEED AND DEFINITIONS
High Quality Programs

- Use the quality standards currently being established by TXPOST
- Make the adoption of TXPOST standards clearer in the goals section
- Add “relationships” to the elements of high-quality programs
- Review “Afterschool Programs: Helping Students to Become 21st Century Lifelong Learners” by Denise Huang
- Make the importance of program quality a central theme of the report
### Grant Program

- Emphasize parent involvement, family engagement, healthy lifestyles, and social/emotional skills
- Change “soft skills” to “work-life skills” or “21st century skills”
- Prioritize funding for programs that demonstrate an overall body of evidence for their program’s effectiveness and demonstrate results
- Incentivize STEM by awarding additional points in the grant application
- Allow parent fees to build sustainable programs up front
- Include flexibility on whether instructors need to be certified teachers
- Ensure equitable distribution of resources
### Cost and Administration

- Add comparisons of other state-funded ELO examples in addition to California
- Set criteria to select providers, including standards for organizations receiving state contracts
- Consider a minimum cost baseline rather than an average cost baseline to ensure that programs made available to Texas students are of a certain level of quality
- Note that additional staffing will be required at the Texas Education Agency to implement a grant program in addition to the funding
Program Evaluation

- Make performance measures more specific
- Explore the feasibility of measuring longitudinal student data or even cohort data to see if student outcomes are improving over time and the overall impact of the ELO initiative
- Add an activity to Goal 4: Utilize current Texas ACE 21stCCLC findings to inform future ELO program designs, establish program performance standards, and identify programs demonstrating best practices
Infrastructure

- Note more intentionally that programs need to be supported by the proposed ELO infrastructure
- Demonstrate a commitment to partnerships that increase access to existing high quality initiatives
- Encourage and pursue private investments from both foundations and corporations
- Make available high quality materials and resources on sustainability and funding flexibility
- Build a coordinated database system for programs to share data about students they are serving so a strong referral and follow-up system can ensure that students are accessing the supports they need the most
- Consider adding a link to the Texas ACE website
QUESTIONS?
1. Addressed – Edits or already covered
2. Future – Will be addressed by the Council
3. Clarification – Additions or Improvements
4. Out of Scope – Not in council directive