



Using Proposition 64 to Increase Access to High-Quality After-School Programs

Proposition 64—the Control, Regulate and Tax Adult Use of Marijuana Act of 2016—provides an important opportunity to increase access to high-quality after-school programs for youth in California’s most underserved communities. The initiative is expected to generate up to \$1 billion annually in tax revenue from the legal sale of marijuana, and 60% of Prop. 64 revenues are dedicated to youth education, prevention, and treatment. The Prop. 64 campaign clearly articulated its intent for after-school programs to be a prime beneficiary of these the new revenues and it is critical that laws and regulations developed during the implementation phase honor this intent.

Prop. 64 Campaign focused on after-school programs

The Yes on Prop. 64 ballot argument in the official Secretary of State voter guide led with after-school programs as an example of programs the initiative would fund: “Prop. 64 creates a safe, legal system for adult use of marijuana. It controls, regulates and taxes marijuana use, and has the nation's strictest protections for children. It provides billions for **afterschool programs**, job training, drug treatment, and cracking down on impaired driving. Fix our approach to marijuana.”

After-school programs were also prominently featured in campaign commercials. The ad “Revenue” stated “Proposition 64 generates a billion in new tax revenues for California to fund **after-school programs** and job training and placement initiatives, and the ad “Sense” states “64 taxes marijuana to fund priorities like **after-school programs**.”



Prop 64 - "Revenue"

After-school programs are a compelling use of Prop. 64’s youth education, prevention, and treatment funding

With a proven track record of preventing substance use (see below) and dropouts,¹ after-school programs are a compelling use of Prop. 64 funds. Prop. 64 provides that—after funds are set aside for reasonable costs of implementation plus \$25 to \$65 million for research, community reinvestment, and the California Highway Patrol—“Sixty percent (60%) shall be deposited in the Youth Education, Prevention, Early Intervention and Treatment Account ... for programs for youth that are designed to educate about and to prevent substance use disorders and to prevent harm from substance use.” These programs may include, but are not limited to, “Grants to schools to develop and support Student Assistance Programs, or other similar programs, designed to prevent and reduce substance use, and improve school retention and performance, by supporting students who are at risk of dropping out of school....”

After-school programs are proven to reduce substance use

Drug use increases in the unsupervised after-school hours

According to the RAND Corporation, “The likelihood of youth exposure to drug use and other criminal behavior increases dramatically in the hours after school ends.”² The National Crime and Prevention Council provides that “Latchkey children are particularly vulnerable to alcohol or other drug use because they are unsupervised by their parents or other responsible adults before and after school.”³

This is confirmed by research and student surveys. One study found that being unsupervised after school doubles the risk that an eighth grader will smoke, drink, or abuse drugs.⁴ A YMCA survey found that teens who do not participate in after-school programs are nearly three times more likely to use marijuana or other drugs.⁵

After-school program participation decreases drug use

The Rand Corporation found that the availability of quality after-school activities can reduce participation in, and victimization as a result of, illicit activities and boost academic performance.⁶ For example, a study of Boys & Girls Clubs found that housing projects without clubs had 30% more drug activity than those with new clubs.⁷ Another study of after-school programs focused on positive youth development found that program participants exhibited significantly lower increases in alcohol, marijuana, other drug use, and any drug use one year after beginning the program, compared to a control group.⁸ And a meta-analysis reviewing dozens of studies found that students who participated in high-quality after-school programs exhibited significant reductions in drug use and other problem behaviors.⁹

After-school programs help prevent substance use by not only keeping kids supervised, but also building protective factors making them less likely to use drugs

The more protective factors present in a young person's life, the more likely it is that they will engage in healthy behaviors. After-school programs reduce substance use through the development of protective or resiliency factors such as school connectedness, self-control, self-confidence, and quality peer relationships.¹⁰ Protective factors also include increasing academic skills and positive school behaviors; research on high-quality after-school has been shown to improve school attendance and academic success.

California needs more investments in after-school programs

California has a robust, though underfunded, system of after-school programs. Even with the nation's largest commitment to after-school programs— state and federally funded programs support over 4,500 programs that serve nearly 500,000 K-12 students daily¹¹ — California still needs to invest more to sustain high-quality programs and reach all the students who need them.

More funding is needed to sustain thousands of quality programs, through increased reimbursement rates

Having sufficient funding for programming and to attract and retain effective staff is critical to program quality and prevention efforts. While the costs and responsibilities of the After School Education and Safety (ASES) programs have consistently increased, the state's investment in after-school has not kept pace for over a decade. Since ASES was implemented in 2007, the state minimum wage will have increased 62% (as of January 2020), but funding for ASES will have only increased 17%, from \$7.50 to \$8.88 per student per day (far lower than the 61% increase for preschool and child care rates over the same period of time)¹². With the state minimum wage set to increase to \$15 by 2022, the need for increased salaries will continue to rise. Without sufficient funding, programs are forced to cut back academic and enrichment activities, face high staff turnover, and many will eventually shut down altogether¹³.

For the last three years, President Trump has called for the elimination of funding for 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) in his budget blueprint. Hundreds of programs in California depend on this funding, particularly summer learning programs and programming for high school students, for which this is the only public funding source. Bipartisan support for 21st CCLC remains strong in Congress.

Ensure more students have access, by expanding funding to add new programs for all grade levels

Even with current state and federal funding, more than 2,500 of California's low-income schools do not receive any public funding for after-school programs. At the high school level, which is only funded through federally-funded After School Safety and Enrichment for Teens (ASSETs) grants, only 24% of low-income schools receive these grants. In the recent round of state and federal after-school funding applications, more than \$145 million was requested than was available, leaving over 100,000 students and their families without an after-school or summer program, which only accounts for the programs that applied. 2.4 million more children across California would be enrolled in a program if one were available¹⁴.

Additionally, even schools with publicly-funded programs often have a long waiting list of students and families without access to the program.

Funding after-school programs with Prop. 64 revenues will mean targeted, effective investment in communities most impacted by the war on drugs

An investment of Prop. 64 dollars into after-school programs would translate into funding that goes directly to positive impacts at the community and student level. California's publicly-funded after-school programs target low-income communities, which are among those most disproportionately harmed by the war on drugs. California's after-school and summer programs prioritize schools serving low-income communities – 84% of students enrolled in these programs are socio-economically disadvantaged.¹⁵

After-school programs are most often operated by community-based organizations, with high percentages of staff coming from the same communities and backgrounds as the students served.¹⁶

After-school programs are cost-effective, saving up to \$9 for every \$1 invested.¹⁷

¹ Huang, D., Kim, K.S., Marshall, A., & Perez, P. (2005). Keeping kids in school: An LA's BEST example. Los Angeles, CA: National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards and Student Testing, University of California, Los Angeles. Retrieved on January 25, 2010 from https://static1.squarespace.com/static/57d1b198d2b857cb880000f2/t/5c7da28dc830258ac74cd1f7/1551737485842/Keeping_Kids_in_School_LA%27s+BEST.pdf; LA's BEST After School Enrichment Program. (2006). Annual Report 2005-2006. Caught up in the act ... of success. Retrieved from <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/57d1b198d2b857cb880000f2/t/5c7da27fb208fc997715282e/1551737477758/Caught-in-the-act-of-success--LA%27s+BEST.pdf> (In a 20-year UCLA longitudinal study, researchers found that LA's BEST elementary school afterschool students who participated for three or more years were about 20 percent less likely to drop out years later than similar students who did not attend LA's BEST)

² <http://www.rand.org/topics/after-school-programs.html>

³ <http://archive.ncpc.org/topics/school-safety/strategies/strategy-before-and-after-school-programs.html>

⁴ Richardson, J.L., Relationship Between After-School Care of Adolescents and Substance Use, Risk Taking, Depressed Mood, and Academic Achievement, *Pediatrics*, v. 92, no. 1, July 1993; Richardson, J.L. et al., "Substance Use Among Eighth Grade Students Who Take Care of Themselves After School," *Pediatrics* 84(3), pp. 556-566. See also Gottfredson, D.C., et al. *Prevention Science*, Vol. 5, No. 4, December 2004. Do After School Programs Reduce Delinquency? Retrieved from <https://ccjs.umd.edu/sites/ccjs.umd.edu/files/pubs/GottfredsonWeismanSoule.pdf> (Children and adolescents who are not supervised by an adult for extended periods of time are at elevated risk for engaging in problem behavior.... Their statistical model implied that the higher levels of drug use among the unsupervised teens might be explained in large part by their greater association with delinquent peers. This finding is consistent with the broader literature on family risk and protective factors which has shown repeatedly that parental supervision is related to lower levels of delinquent behavior, substance use, and high risk sexual behavior (Biglan et al., 1990; Block et al., 1988; Cernkovich & Giordano, 1987; Dishion et al., 1991; Gottfredson & Gottfredson, 1999; McCord, 1979)).

⁵ YMCA of the USA. (March 2001). After School for America's Teens: A National Survey of Teen Attitudes and Behaviors in the Hours After School, Executive Summary. Cited in Office Of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Fact Sheet <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/fs200114.pdf> and Progressive Policy Institute Policy Report

-
- <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED491206.pdf>. See also Opinion Research Corporation. (2006). Fight Crime Invest in Kids California, California Survey of Teens. Retrieved from <http://sparkaction.org/node/33411> (A 2006 survey of over 600 California 12- to 17-year-olds found that kids left unsupervised three or more days per week are three times as likely to smoke marijuana.)
- ⁶ <http://www.rand.org/topics/after-school-programs.html>
- ⁷ Schinke, S.P., Orlandi, M.A., Cole, K.C., Boys & Girls Clubs in Public Housing Developments: Prevention Services for Youth at Risk, Journal of Community Psychology, OSAP Special Issue, 1992.
- ⁸ Tebes, J.K., et al. Impact of a positive youth development program in urban after-school settings on the prevention of adolescent substance use. Journal of Adolescent Health (2007 Sept.) 41(3):239-47.
- ⁹ Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., & Pachan, M. (2010). A Meta-Analysis of After-School Programs That Seek to Promote Personal and Social Skills in Children and Adolescents. American Journal of Community Psychology. 45:294-309. Retrieved from http://www.flume.com.br/pdf/Durlak_A_meta-analysisof_after_school.pdf
- ¹⁰ SAMHSA's Center for the Application of Prevention Technologies. (2014). CAPT Decision Support Tools—Strategies and Interventions to Prevent Youth Marijuana Use: An At-a-Glance Resource Tool Using Prevention Research to Guide Prevention Practice. SAMHSA's Center for the Application of Prevention Technologies
- St. Pierre, T.L. & Kaltreider, D.L. Reflections on implementing a community agency–school prevention program. Journal of Community Psychology (2001, March). 29(2): 107-116; Morrison, G. M., et al. The protective function of after-school programming and parent education and support for students at risk for substance abuse. Evaluation and Program Planning. (2000). 23: 365–371. Retrieved from http://www.viriya.net/jabref/the_protective_function_of_after-school_programming_and_parent_education_and_support_for_students_at_risk_for_substance_abuse.pdf
- McDowell Group, Inc. (2018). Protective factors for youth substance abuse and delinquency: The role of afterschool programs. Anchorage, AK: Alaska Afterschool Network. Retrieved from <https://www.akafterschool.org/research-data/>
- ¹¹ California Afterschool Network. (2018). State of the state of expanded learning in California—2017-2018; California Afterschool Network. (2018). State of the state of expanded learning in California—2017-2018. Retrieved from <http://www.afterschoolnetwork.org/post/state-state-expanded-learning-california-2017-18>
- ¹² From \$3.7054 billion 2006-07 to \$5.972 billion in the enacted 2019-20 budget. <http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/2019-20/pdf/Enacted/BudgetSummary/FullBudgetSummary.pdf>; https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/technical_reports/2007/RAND_TR538.pdf. <https://lao.ca.gov/Publications/Report/4083>;
- ¹³ Partnership for Children & Youth. 2017-18 After School Statewide Survey Results. <https://www.partnerforchildren.org/resources/2018/3/22/2017-18-after-school-statewide-survey-results>
- ¹⁴ Afterschool Alliance. (2018) This is Afterschool. <http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/documents/CA-afterschool-facts.pdf>
- ¹⁵ California Afterschool Network. (2018). State of the state of expanded learning in California—2017-2018; California Afterschool Network. (2018). State of the state of expanded learning in California—2017-2018. Retrieved from <http://www.afterschoolnetwork.org/post/state-state-expanded-learning-california-2017-18>
- ¹⁶ Brackenridge, K., Gunderson, J. & Perry, M. (2017, October). Expanded learning: a powerful strategy for equity. (Stanford, CA: Policy Analysis for California Education). Retrieved from https://www.partnerforchildren.org/resources/2017/11/8/expanded-learning-a-powerful-strategy-for-equity?mc_cid=bd56f90a0d&mc_eid=cee75a9e09
- ¹⁷ Brown, W.O., Frates, S.B., Rudge, I.S., Tradewell, R.L. (2002). The Costs and Benefits of After School Programs: The Estimated Effects of the After School Education and Safety Program Act of 2002. Claremont, CA: The Rose Institute of Claremont-McKenna College. Retrieved from http://s10294.pcdn.co/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Costs_Benefits_After_School_Programs.pdf; Goldschmidt, P., & Huang, D. (2007). The Long-Term Effects of After-School Programming on Educational Adjustment and Juvenile Crime: A Study of the LA's BEST After-School Program. Los Angeles, CA: Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards and Student Testing, University of California, Los Angeles. Retrieved from http://lasbest.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/CRESST-2007-LASBEST_DOJ_Final-Report.pdf

The California Afterschool Advocacy Alliance (CA3) is the statewide voice for expanded learning (afterschool and summer) programs. Our coalition represents the interests of the children, youth, and their families that rely on publicly-funded expanded learning programs throughout California. It was formed in 2009 for the purpose of strengthening and protecting California's publicly funded after-school programs. For more information, contact Jen Dietrich at jdietrich@partnerforchildren.org or visit www.saveafterschool.com.