

Budget Increase for Afterschool — Why the State Should Act



www.saveafterschool.com

Protecting Quality Afterschool Programs Is a State Responsibility

- **The Governor’s January Budget Proposal for 2019-20 provides cost of living increases for some categorical programs that have remained outside of the local control funding formula (LCFF).** Additionally, the budget proposal provides increased funding to specifically address wage increases due to the rising state minimum wage. ASES remains outside of LCFF and has shouldered the state’s 50% increase in minimum wage since ASES was implemented, but ASES has only received a 9% increase in that same period of time.
- **The State mandated the minimum wage increase and paid sick leave to meet important needs, and it has a responsibility to make the adjustments needed for afterschool programs** consistent with minimum wage adjustments made for other state funded programs, such as child care and preschool. We should ensure that the same workers these policies seek to benefit do not lose work hours, benefits, and even jobs because the programs are not funded to meet the new mandates. Also, afterschool programs cannot simply pass along these increased costs to the overwhelmingly low-income families they serve each day.
- **The State of California, together with the voters who overwhelmingly approved Proposition 49 in 2002, made a long-term commitment to afterschool programs: It needs to protect its \$5 billion decade-long investment and the vast infrastructure of over 4,200 afterschool programs.** The State relies on these programs to deliver low-income students needed enrichment, physical activity, academic support, STEM learning, crime and substance use prevention, and to leverage hundreds of millions of federal dollars for healthy snacks and meals. The also provide critical child care to help working parents keep their jobs.

The Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) is Not the Solution

- **Few districts are investing LCFF dollars in ASES programs, and even those few investments don’t address increased personnel costs** resulting from increases in the minimum wage and cost of living. New investments are often focused on expanding access and services, which is a critical need, but is adding weight to an already strained infrastructure.
- **Afterschool programs generally find it difficult to compete for limited LCFF funds.** Districts are far more inclined to prioritize programs with district employees, including district-operated categorical programs eliminated under LCFF, than ASES programs that are typically operated by community-based organizations. Additionally, teacher pension debt is furthering lowering the odds of receiving LCFF funds.
- **LCFF is not intended to maintain the status quo for underserved students and simply sustain existing programs like ASES.** In fact, it is questionable whether LCFF Supplemental & Concentration funds can be used to provide the same level of services in existing ASES programs because by law they must be used to “increase or improve” services for high-need students.
- **Relying on LCFF funds alone would result in unequal treatment of students.** Without uniform State action, many at-risk kids will be left with lower quality programs or no programs at all.
- **Consistent with LCFF equity goals, increasing State funding for existing ASES grants would target low-income students more effectively than directing funds generally to LCFF.** ASES serves almost exclusively schools with predominantly low-income populations, while LCFF, although it provides more funding for high-need than other students, still spreads funding across all schools and all students.