

ASES Sustainability: Exploring Alternative Revenue Sources

Jessica Gunderson,
Senior Director of Policy and Communications



Connecting Communities and Schools to Resources
So Every Child Can Thrive.



About PCY

- Bay Area-based non-profit organization
- Focused on local, state, and national education policy impacting low-income youth
- Grounded in field experience in after school, summer, and community schools
- Emphasizing partnerships to find the best solutions



Presentation Goals

- To share findings on family fees and LCFF as alternative revenue sources for ASES programs.
- To get input from the field on priorities and next steps.

Background

- Cost of quality = 2 to 3 X
ASES Daily Rate
- 2016 & 17 ASES financing
survey results
- Unsuccessful legislative
attempts



Methodology

Family Fees	LCFF
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 ASES programs • Geographic diversity • Range from 3 – 47 sites • Average FRPM range: 50 – 86% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 17 ASES programs • Geographic diversity • Range from 5 – 58 sites • Average FRPM range: 43 – 89%

Findings: Family Fees

Key Findings	Family Fees
Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 46% charge registration fee only • 40% charge monthly fee only • Monthly: \$10 – \$200 • Registration: \$40 – \$100 • Revenue: wide-ranging
Use of Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All (except charter) go directly to after school operating costs • Half of revenues stay at site level

Findings: Family Fees

Benefits:

1. Buy-in from parents (50%)
2. Ability to maintain quality staff (33%)

Challenges:

1. The paperwork and collection process
2. Financial strain for parents
3. Getting parents on board

Findings: Family Fees

Administration:

- Parental verification
- Systems/resources



Advice:

- Strategies to increase parental buy-in
- Simplification & upfront investments

Findings: LCFF

Key Findings	LCFF
Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Received funding in 2015-16 and/or 2016-17 Range: \$45,000 – \$3.2 million 80% received from district 20% received from principals
Use of Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50% used funding to increase students served 64% for staff costs 41% to expand services

Findings: LCFF



Findings: LCFF

Keys to Success/Advice:

- Long-standing relationships
- More than just “after school”
- Evidence of high-quality/data



11

Implications

Key Findings	Family Fees	LCFF
Sustainability Option?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 87% said Yes, BUT... 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately 69% said No/Not Sure/Maybe • Approximately 31% said Yes
Key Takeaways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicable to support existing costs • Providers have more control of fee revenue • Limitations on revenue • Longer-term strategy • Parent buy-in is more essential 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicable for expanding services • Depends on district priorities • Greater levels of revenue • Short-term strategy • District buy-in is more essential
<p>Foundational:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Need to have high quality programming 2. Relationships with school day leaders and parents are essential 		



12

Table Discussion

- How are these findings on family fees/LCFF aligned to your experience? Inconsistent?
- What key ideas/strategies are missing or need more emphasis?

Survey Question #1

Which **one** area should be prioritized first for increased technical assistance/training/resources:

- A. Family Fees**
- B. LCFF**
- C. Neither**

Survey Question #2

What are your top 3 priorities for next steps to support family fee efforts?

- a) Parent engagement templates/materials/best practices – presentations, handbooks, orientations.
- b) Key messaging – breakdown of budget gap, why it’s shifting, and options to deal with it; talking points for different audiences.
- c) Updated guidance and outreach from CDE – clarifying that fees are a viable option for ASES programs and support engagement with LEAs, staff, and families.
- d) Trainings - sustainability workshops, fiscal trainings for site coordinators, peer-to-peer learning (guidance on collection process, best practices, templates).
- e) Landscape analyses of regional and comparable childcare costs – multiple providers/LEAs began with market analysis of comparable services to engage stakeholders and set costs.
- f) Other

15

Survey Question #3

What are your top 3 priorities for next steps to support LCFF efforts?

- a) Comprehensive analysis and case studies of LCFF investment into ASES programs – which districts, how much, and for what. This analysis could facilitate peer learning and pressure between districts.
- b) Identify best practices, trainings, and support for providers to develop effective relationships with district leadership.
- c) Messaging on how to clearly link ASES to LCAP goals, including sample Board presentations.
- d) CDE/Regional Leads/Advocates need to advocate directly to school boards and education leaders/associations to invest in ASES funding crisis.
- e) Increase general advocacy trainings and resources for ASES programs.
- f) Operate statewide campaign similar to Summer Matters – high profile leaders, identify K-12 champions statewide tours, peer-to-peer influence.
- g) Other

16

Next Steps



17

THANK YOU!

Jessica Gunderson

jessica@partnerforchildren.org



partnerforchildren.org

18