

Series on **Funding Initiatives** from the National Summer Learning Association



Investments in Summer Learning Programs:

A Scan of Resources for Summer Programming in Indianapolis and Marion County, 2008



Introduction	1
Purpose and Methods	4
Indianapolis and Marion County: Community Context	7
Analysis and Findings	8
Findings: Provider, Participant and Funding Data	9
Findings: By Provider Type	12
Schools	12
Parks and Recreation Department	13
Childcare	14
Nonprofits	16
Other investments in summer	18
Summary and Implications for Moving Forward in Marion County	20
Appendix	25

Acknowledgments This study would not have been possible without the generous support of the Lilly Endowment, Lumina Foundation for Education, and the Summer Youth Program Fund. We also thank Heather Padgett and Sharon Deich of Cross and Jofus, LLC, for their work on this report. Finally, we thank all agency administrators, school district representatives, and community partners who contributed such rich information to this report.

The National Summer Learning Association is a 501(c)3 organization, that serves as a network hub for thousands of summer learning program providers and stakeholders across the country, working to connect and equip schools and community organizations to deliver quality summer learning opportunities to our nation’s students.

ISBN: 978-0-9778319-6-8

H. Clapp Padgett, S. Deich, B. McLaughlin, S. Sparks, and H. Hardt. Investments in Summer Learning Programs: A Scan of Resources for Summer Programming in Marion County and Indianapolis, 2008. National Summer Learning Association, 2010: Series on Funding Initiatives



T INTRODUCTION

Expanding time for learning has recently emerged as a national policy priority. Summer is a logical time of year when strategic investments in learning can be used to help narrow the achievement gap between less- and more-advantaged young people. There is growing support for summer learning at the national, state, and local level, with unprecedented opportunities for funding programs through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (federal economic stimulus package).

Summers are indeed opportunities for children and youth to hone skills learned the previous year, explore new hobbies and interests, develop talents, and prepare for the next school year. For children and youth from low-income families, however, summer marks a season of huge risks and developmental regression. These well-documented setbacks build, year after year, with the result that kids from low-income families increasingly and significantly underperform their more affluent peers. Summertime presents a clear case where the growth in the

...CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

the achievement gap is the direct result of a gap in resources, choices, and opportunities. Lacking access to affordable, high-quality summer learning opportunities, many young people fall behind between school sessions, derailing not only their academic progress, but also their quality of nutrition and overall development.

Research from Johns Hopkins University underscores the importance of summer learning for school-age children. Differences in children's academic success can be explained largely by their summer experiences. In fact, a study by Alexander and colleagues found that two-thirds of the achievement gap between lower- and higher-income youth can be explained by unequal access to summer learning opportunities during the elementary school years.¹ Better-off children in the study were more likely to go to the library over the summer and take books home. They were more likely to engage in enrichment experiences, such as attending concerts, museums, and field trips. They were more likely to take out-of-town vacations, be involved in organized sports activities, or take swimming or gymnastics lessons. Overall, they had a more expansive realm of experiences. "The (summer learning) gap accumulates over the years and, once students get to high school, it results in unequal placements in college preparatory tracks and increases the likelihood that children from low socioeconomic families will drop out."²

Summer programs afford a critical opportunity to level the playing field. Little is known, however, about the kinds of programs that are available to lower-income children during the summer months, what these programs cost, and how they are funded. Given the growing recognition of the importance of summertime activities, the National Summer Learning Association is working in partnership with the Summer Youth Program Fund (SYPF) to strengthen the quality of summer learning programs available to low- and moderate-income families in Indianapolis, Indiana, and to increase knowledge about effective practices and available resources. As part of the overall effort, the National Summer Learning Association and Cross & Joftus partnered to conduct a countywide resource scan on summer programming. The scan gathered and analyzed information about a wide set of available resources for summer programs in Marion County, the nucleus of the Indianapolis metropolitan area, to provide a better understanding of the magnitude and nature of investments. This information can be used to support improved policies and to make better use of resources devoted to summer learning.

Section II of this resource scan describes the goal of the scan, explains the data sources and methods, and offers some limitations of the study; section III provides some basic demographic information to help place the findings within the community context; section IV describes the analysis and presents the findings; section V provides a summary discussion and highlights some implications for moving forward. ■

About The Summer Youth Program Fund in Indianapolis

The Summer Youth Program Fund is a collaborative effort of 10 foundations and the city of Indianapolis to provide funding for summer programs in Marion County. The fund began in 1995 when the Indianapolis Foundation and the Lilly Endowment came together to better coordinate each foundation's efforts to respond to emergency requests from summer programs that were facing program disruptions due to funding problems. The two founding partners quickly expanded general financial support for summer programs and, over time, have recruited additional national and local funding partners, as well as the city of Indianapolis. The fund uses a single SYPF application form, but each of the funding partners makes its own grant decisions based on its priorities. Applicants may receive a grant from a single funding partner or grants from multiple funders.^{III}

SYPF grantmaking focuses on providing safe and positive experiences for children and teens ages 4- to 19-years-old at little or no cost. Grants are given to organizations that offer daily programming, enhancement programs, youth employment, and residential (overnight) camps. Recipients include organizations ranging from churches and area community centers to theaters and parks, from large public agencies to small grassroots organizations. Offerings include recreation, social development, sports, community

service, environmental education, academic enrichment, college exploration, and arts and culture.

The SYPF eases reporting requirements by using a shared final report that many of the partners accept in lieu of their own paperwork. Based on evaluation and community needs, the SYPF supports regular training opportunities for summer program staff. Visits to a limited number of sites are coordinated each summer, with partners reporting their findings to the full collaborative in the fall.

In 2006, the Lilly Endowment began offering special project grants for capital projects and equipment. These grants were designed to enhance the quality of summer programs by funding projects such as playground and safety equipment, computer equipment, vans, Internet wiring, books, musical instruments, security fences, cooling equipment, and minor building and grounds improvements, including kitchen and room renovations.

The partners and grantees of the SYPF supported the data collection and analysis presented in this report. The unique collaboration among this group of funders allowed the authors to examine not only the available public funding for summer programs serving low-income youth, but also a large segment of private philanthropic funding dedicated to that purpose.

MEMBERS OF THE SUMMER YOUTH PROGRAM FUND

Christel DeHaan Family Foundation

City of Indianapolis/Department of Metropolitan Development

Clowes Fund, Inc.

Eli Lilly and Company Foundation

Hoover Family Foundation

The Indianapolis Foundation—a Central Indiana Community Foundation Affiliate

The Indianapolis Foundation—Library Fund

JP Morgan Chase Foundation

Lilly Endowment Inc.

Lumina Foundation for Education

Nina Mason Pulliam Charitable Foundation

II PURPOSE AND METHODS

This resource scan aims to provide a first look at resources devoted to summer program opportunities for school-age, low-income children and youth in Marion County, Indiana, and to provide basic information for comparison across programs. For summer 2008, we collected information on the types of programs offered across Marion County, demographic data on who is served, characteristics and operating schedules of programs, and information on program funding and the types of resources used to support those programs (including public and private sources). This scan builds on the National Summer Learning Association's work in several other communities and states by including data on national nonprofits and, with information provided by the Summer Youth Program Fund, on community and faith-based organizations.^{IV} The ultimate goal is to repeat this type of data collection across multiple summers to understand how resources fluctuate from one year to the next.

LIMITATIONS OF THE SCAN

It is important to note that this scan is an initial attempt to collect data on investments in summer programming in Marion County. Summer learning data had not been previously collected or aggregated in this way.

This section and the Analysis and Findings section both describe the limitations of the study in more detail. However, it is important to recognize here that an ideal scan of summer funding would be repeated over multiple years. Anecdotal evidence suggests that summer funding fluctuates significantly from one year to the next and the authors have access to some data showing significant funding differences during summer 2009. Therefore, it is not appropriate to think of this scan as "typical" of summer funding in Marion County, but rather as a snapshot in time.

Programmatic Funding

The main focus of this resource scan was to examine a broad range of program opportunities for low-income, school-age children in the summer months when school is not in session. For purposes of this study, a summer program was defined as a set of organized activities for school-age children that take place during the summer months. The program is designed to meet a specific need or offer participants the opportunity to attain a defined goal. It has a specific schedule, requires that participants be enrolled in the program (i.e. not a "drop-in" program), and operates a minimum of 10 hours over the course of the summer.^V This may include summer school and other programs offered by local school districts, recreation and

...CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

camp programs offered by public agencies and nonprofit providers, traditional childcare arrangements and summer jobs programs. The study includes information on both public and private programs.

The study team identified six types of program sponsors^{VI} that typically offer summer programs to low-income children and youth including:

- 1. Public Schools**
- 2. Parks and Recreation Departments**
- 3. Childcare Centers**
- 4. Local Workforce Investments Boards**
- 5. National, Nonprofit Providers**
- 6. Small, Nonprofit Providers**

Within the offerings of these sponsors, the scan attempted to identify those programs that served large segments of low-income youth or were accessible to low-income youth (i.e. programs that were free or low-cost or were otherwise specifically designed to serve low-income youth).^{VII} Summer programs without a clear focus on serving low-income youth were not examined. Some of the sponsors collected data in such a way that it was relatively simple to cull out the programs and funding associated with serving low-income children; however, in some cases it was more difficult to isolate. See Table 1 (next page) for details on the extent to which the programs reported serving low-income youth.

Because of the definition of a summer program outlined above, a number of programs were not included in this analysis. “Enhancement” programs that provide specialized content to other summer programs were not included to avoid double-counting of participants. These programs typically serve youth for a more limited amount of time and many of these youth are already “counted” in this analysis in their regular camp program. Also excluded were programs offered for a very short amount of time (for example, swimming lessons offered one half-hour per week for eight weeks) and programs offered on a drop-in basis. Residential camps were excluded because their program schedules and cost structures are not comparable to day camps.



With the exception of the information on the public schools and the small, nonprofit providers, most of the data were gathered via conference call and/or in-person meetings, with follow-up via email. An online survey was used to gather data from the eleven school districts. For the data on small nonprofit providers, the research team relied on information provided by the Summer Youth Program Fund. Table 1 provides a detailed summary of the source of the data for each program sponsor as well as details on what was included and excluded for each sponsor and the extent to which the data represents programs that serve low-income children and youth.

Other Significant Investments

The programs included in the analysis of programmatic funding outlined above represent a large and important subset of summer investments. However, focusing only on structured programs leaves out a sizable portion of summer spending in Marion County. In order to capture the additional spending, basic information on other substantial investments is provided in the scan. One such program is the federal Summer Food Service Program, which provides summer meals to low-income children and is a resource for many of the programs included in the analysis above but isn't typically captured in individual program budgets. Another set of programs includes “enhancements” that provide specialized content support to other summer programs. A third type are residential camps and other programs that were excluded because of their schedule or because they were offered on a drop-in basis.

**TABLE 1:
PROGRAMMATIC FUNDING: DATA SOURCES, INCLUSIONS/EXCLUSIONS, LOW-INCOME**

Program Sponsor	Data Source/Notes
<p>Public Schools (9 out of 11 districts)</p>	<p>Included: Data on individual programs was provided via online survey.</p> <p>Excluded: Special education programs because the higher cost structure does not allow for comparison with other programs in the study.</p>
<p>Parks and Recreation Department</p>	<p>Included: Structured, daily programs that were particularly oriented to serving low-income families.</p> <p>Excluded: Drop-in programs and other less formal programs, including those characterized as “supervised play.”</p> <p>Excluded: Therapeutic and special needs programs because cost structure was not comparable to other programs in the study.</p>
<p>Childcare Centers</p>	<p><i>The Indiana Dept of Family and Child Services provided information on children, ages 5-12, whose families received state childcare assistance during the summer months.</i></p> <p>Included: Children who attended center-based programs and programs offered by state-designated religious ministries.</p> <p>Excluded: Children in in-home care settings.</p>
<p>Local Workforce Investment Board</p>	<p><i>The Indianapolis Private Industry Council did not operate or fund a summer youth employment program in 2008.</i></p>
<p>National Nonprofit Providers</p>	<p>Included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • YMCAs (all county branches) • Boys and Girls Clubs, Inc. • Girls, Inc. <p><i>These nonprofit providers were identified as the largest agency sponsors of summer programs, and were contacted individually for this study.</i></p>
<p>Small, Nonprofit Providers</p>	<p>Included: Data on programs funded through the Summer Youth Program Fund (SYPF) in summer 2008. The majority of funds go to small community-based, faith-based, or other nonprofit organizations. However, many of the public and large nonprofit providers above also receive some funding from the SYPF.</p> <p>Excluded: SYPF-funded programs operated by parks and recreation departments, school districts, and the national nonprofits outlined above to avoid double counting of participants and program dollars.</p> <p>Excluded: Residential camps and programs defined as “enhancements” because their cost and program structure do not compare to the daily programs provided by the other providers examined.</p>

III INDIANAPOLIS AND MARION COUNTY: COMMUNITY CONTEXT

Marion County and its county seat, Indianapolis, sit in the geographic center of the state of Indiana. A predominantly urban and suburban jurisdiction, Marion County’s population is approximately 877,000, with 65 percent white (not Hispanic), 26 percent African-American and seven percent Hispanic. Indianapolis is the most populous city in Marion County—91 percent of the county’s residents are counted in Indianapolis.^{IX} The city of Indianapolis and the three smaller cities within Marion County are part of a consolidated city–county government structure.

While the percentage of Marion County’s children who are living in families with incomes below the federal poverty rate is somewhat higher than that of the state of Indiana, the number of children eligible for free- and reduced-price lunches is substantially higher.^{VIII} Marion County students score significantly below the statewide average on the Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress-Plus (ISTEP +) state assessment. The county’s four-year graduation rate is 17 percentage points lower than the state average.^{XI}

TABLE 2: DEMOGRAPHICS: MARION COUNTY AND THE STATE OF INDIANA

	Marion County	Indiana
Population	876,804	6,345,289
Race/Ethnicity ^{IX}	64.5% White (non Hispanic) 26.1% African American 6.6% Hispanic or Latino	83.9% White (non Hispanic) 8.9% African American 4.8% Hispanic or Latino
Total School Enrollment ^X	171,295	1,154,826
% of children under 18 in poverty (2007)	22.8%	17.1%
% receiving Free and Reduced Lunch (2007)	52%	37.7%
Percent passing ISTEP+ English/Language Arts test (2007) ^{XI}	63.8%	72.1%
% of HS freshman graduation in 4 years (2007)	54%	71%

Source (except where noted): KidsCount, Indiana and Marion County Profiles, via Community Level Information on Kids (CLIKs), accessed at <http://www.kidscount.org/cgi-bin/cliiks.cgi?action=profile>, February 2009.

IV

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Data gathered for this study relied on the voluntary participation of staff at the various agencies and organizations. The following caveats are important to bear in mind regarding the data and findings:



Data Caveats

- **Incomplete/Estimated Data.** Not all program sponsors provided complete data for varying reasons. First, in many agencies, responsibility or oversight of summer programming is not centralized, and key data were often kept by several staff members. Though challenging, the study team made every attempt to identify the many programs and the staff who kept summer program data. Second, agency staff may have interpreted our definition of summer program differently. For example, in schools, staff tended to report on traditional summer school programs and did not include some programs—like sports programs—in their data. Third, some agencies could not easily isolate some or all summer data from the rest of the year. Fourth, for unknown reasons, some agencies simply did not respond to the study team’s requests. Additionally, information on total costs and funding was often a best estimate. When taken as a whole, it is likely that incomplete and estimated data may have led to an underestimate of total enrollment and spending.
- **Double-counting.** Both within and across providers there is the potential for double-counting of program participants and program dollars. Program staff provided counts of enrolled participants, but across the range of individual programs within an agency, most were not able to provide unduplicated counts. There may also be duplication of students across sponsors as some children may attend more than a single program offered by a single provider type. Moreover, because there is some overlap of programs included in the various sponsor groups, particularly among grantees of the Summer Youth Program Fund, there is likely some double counting of dollars. The research team attempted to eliminate obvious instances of double counting in the analysis, but not all instances could be identified.

- **Funding vs. Cost.** Very few of the programs included in this scan provided budget information that included all the cost elements associated with operating a summer program. For example, in most, if not all cases, the cost of facilities was not included and in other cases only the “seasonal” costs of providing summer programming were included, leaving out the overall administrative costs associated with operating the programs. Given this situation, whenever possible, we tried to refer to program “funding,” rather than costs, to highlight that full costs are not represented.
- **Snapshot in time.** Data collected was for the summer of 2008 and represent a snapshot in time. Many providers reported that the extent to which they are able to offer programs and the size of those programs varies from year to year, sometimes substantially, based on funding availability. Many school districts, for example, reported offering fewer programs in the summer of 2008 because of budget cuts. Two factors may have significantly altered the landscape of school-based programs for summer 2009: the economic downturn, and the potential of stimulus funds to be used for summer programming.^{xii}
- **Projected vs. Actual.** Data was collected retrospectively from key informants following the summer of 2008. However, one source of data used to estimate funding and numbers of youth served included projections made by the programs prior to the summer of 2008, rather than the actual figures. Because of this, some of the estimates of numbers of youth and resources invested may be slightly inflated.
- **In-kind contributions.** This study did not attempt to collect information on donated goods and services, commonly referred to as “in-kind” resources. Although in-kind contributions are in some cases an important source of revenue for summer programs, collecting reliable information on the value of in-kind resources requires that programs track and value a host of different contributions, from volunteer staff, to supplies and complimentary admission fees for field trips.

As data gathering for this study focused on public sources and private grant funding, information on in-kind contributions could not readily be obtained.

Because of the limitations described above, the authors have made every attempt to avoid conveying an undue sense of precision in the figures reported herein (e.g. raw data and calculations are always rounded). These figures are estimates and due caution must be exercised in interpretation and extrapolation.

Findings: Providers, Participants, and Funding Data

Table 3 on page 10 shows program enrollment and funding for each of the six sponsor groups. In terms of scope and scale of summer programming, the public schools and the diverse pool of small, mainly nonprofit and faith-based providers receiving grant funds through the Summer Youth Program Fund reach the largest numbers of low-income youth, collectively serving over 68 percent of total children served by the providers included in this analysis. The table shows a total investment of approximately \$18 million for approximately 39,000 participants. The number of children served in programs that met the scan’s criteria (outlined above) varies from 14,000 in programs sponsored by the public schools to 600 served by the parks and recreation department. The table also shows that program funding per participant varies significantly among the sponsors from \$320 per participant in programs offered by the public schools, to the \$880 per participant received as reimbursement by childcare providers for children receiving childcare subsidies. Some of this variation is due to differences in program schedule. The average program length varied from 96 hours for school programs (the shortest of all the programs listed) to 435 hours for subsidized childcare programs.^{xiii} However, funding per participant per hour of programming also varies widely, from \$3.49 spent on average in public school programs to \$1.08 spent on average in programs operated by the national nonprofit providers. The wide difference in funding is likely due to several

factors, including the costs associated with staff, facilities, adult/student ratios, and activities. To some extent, it may also be due to differences in how information was calculated and reported.

Missing from the table is information from the local Workforce Investment Board (WIB) on summer jobs programs for youth. Sources indicated that the Indianapolis Private Industry Council (the local WIB) did not operate or fund a summer jobs program in Marion County in 2008.

TABLE 3: SUMMER 2008 PROGRAM ENROLLMENT AND FUNDING BY SPONSOR

Program Provider	Reported Summer Program Enrollment**	Program Enrollment as % of county school enrollment	Total Reported Funding	Average Program Length (hours) [†]	Reported Funding per participant	Reported Funding per participant per hour
Public Schools	14,000***	8.2%	\$4.2 million	96 [§]	\$320 [§]	\$3.49 [§]
Parks & Recreation	600	0.3%	\$505,000	415	\$870	\$2.09
Subsidized Childcare	2300	1.4%	\$2.04 million [#]	435	\$880	\$2.01
Large/National Nonprofit Providers	9700	5.6%	\$3.93 million	379	\$410	\$1.08
Small, Nonprofit Providers	12,100	7.1%	\$7.00 million	341	\$580	\$1.71
TOTALS/AVERAGES	38,700	22.6%	\$17.68 million	\$333 (avg) \$269 (weighted for program size)	\$585 (avg) \$460 (weighted for program size)	\$2.08 (avg) \$2.22 (weighted for program size)

All figures are rounded. See Table 2 for data sources, and explanation of excluded programs.

** All figures in this table represent only the programs reported to the study team, and only those programs that met criteria for inclusion. Some providers, most notably the public schools, did not provide complete data, and thus these figures underestimate enrollment and total funding.

***The reported enrollment figure for public schools includes participant information for programs that did not provide corresponding funding information. We excluded these programs from the funding per participant and per hour calculations.

[#] The dollar figures for childcare listed here represent the reimbursement that providers receive from the state for serving children who pay for services using state childcare vouchers. This figure does not equal the total spending for these childcare programs since programs likely serve children besides those receiving vouchers. It also does not necessarily equal the total program costs for serving voucher children, as it represents merely the amount the state provides in reimbursement.

[†] Throughout this scan, in cases where calculating a simple average would not accurately represent the true “average” because of widely varying differences in program sizes, this scan used a weighting methodology. For example, most of the sponsors reported information on multiple programs of different sizes and with varying schedules. Average program length for each sponsor was calculated using program enrollment to weight each program’s length to account for disparate program size. This provides a more reasonable estimate of the average length of programming that an individual participant received. This same methodology was used when calculating averages across program sponsors as well.

[§] For some individual programs, sufficient detail was not available to allow inclusion in this calculation.

COMPARISON TO NATIONAL ESTIMATES: COST OF QUALITY OUT-OF-SCHOOL TIME PROGRAMS

A recent study commissioned by the Wallace Foundation provides an in-depth look at the cost of quality out-of-school-time programs, including a subset of programs that operate in the summer. This study looked both at out-of-pocket expenses (goods or services purchased with cash), as well as the full costs of programming (including non-cash contributions). Findings from that study indicate that out-of-pocket expenses for summer programs for elementary and middle school students are about \$3.50 per hour, significantly higher than the \$2.08 average (\$2.22 weighted average) found in the scan. The national numbers are likely higher for several reasons. First, the national study focused on a subset of programs that demonstrated a set of quality features that tend to be associated with higher costs.^{xiv}

Second, the national estimates include programs that were offered year round; summer costs were “culled out” of total costs. This, too, could account for some of the difference. Third, the national study’s estimates of programs for older youth included a variety of programs that offered stipends for summer jobs or internships, which greatly increased costs. Lastly, the national estimates may be higher because they are calculated on a per slot basis, rather than on a per participant basis, as was the case in this scan. Typically, there are fewer slots than actual participants—programs tend to over-enroll knowing that each child will attend some portion of the days and weeks (e.g., one child might attend the program for half the summer, another child for the remainder of the summer; likewise average daily attendance may only be 80 percent leaving room for over-enrollment.)

AVERAGE COST PER SLOT FOR PROGRAMS OPERATING IN THE SUMMER: NATIONAL ESTIMATES

Program Age Groups	Average Hourly Out-of-pocket Expenditures ^{xv}	Average Hourly Full Cost	Mid-point (Median) Hourly Cost
Elementary/Middle School Programs	\$3.50	\$4.10	\$2.80
Teen Programs	\$6.90	\$8.40	\$6.30

Source: J. Grossman, et. al. The Cost of Quality Out-of-School Time Programs, “Executive Summary”, Table 1 page iv. Retrieved from:<http://www.wallacefoundation.org/KnowledgeCenter/KnowledgeTopics/AreasOfContinuingInterest/PhilanthropicIssues/Documents/The-Cost-of-Quality-OST-Programs.pdf>

Findings: By Provider Type

Schools

The public schools are the largest individual providers of summer programs in Marion County, serving approximately 14,000 students with nine out of 11 districts in the county reporting information.^{xvi} The two districts not reporting (see Table 2) account for 18 percent of the county's students, so the true summer enrollment may approach 16,500 students. The largest share of enrollment in summer programs reported by schools are traditional summer school programs that focus on remediation and credit recovery—accounting for approximately 11,800 students, or 85 percent of the 14,000 served. Across the nine districts, school staff provided data on 27 separate programs. Thirteen of these programs served high school students, nine served middle school students, and 13 served elementary school students.^{xvii}

Program Characteristics: Summer school programs in the sample tend to operate from 2-to-5 hours per day, for anywhere from 2-to-6 weeks (those that operate for fewer weeks tend to have longer days, and vice versa). The total hours for summer school programs offered ranged from a low of 45 to a high of 125 hours. Some individual districts reported offering summer programs only for high school students, but most offered some type of program for elementary, middle, and high schoolers. The average enrichment program was 54 hours in length, but a few of the enrichment programs were relatively short—some operating for just an hour a day for 2-3 weeks (band and choral programs in one district, for example).

Funding: Twenty-five of the 27 programs reported funding information that totaled \$4.2 million, or about \$320 per program participant. This falls substantially below the study average of \$460 per participant. Funding per participant ranged from \$25 for a one-hour-per-week band program to \$720 for a remedial program^{xviii} that focused on preparation for the state achievement test. When taking into account the number of total hours the programs operated, schools had the highest funding at an average of

\$3.49 per participant per hour (the average is \$2.08/\$2.22 weighted for program size). Across the districts, about 44 percent of the funds used to support summer programs are covered by local district funds and another 40 percent are met with state education funds. The remainder is covered by a combination of small federal and private grants and parent fees.

Summer School: Five out of the nine districts reported operating only traditional summer school programs. School districts in Indiana can receive reimbursement from the state for certain costs associated with operating their summer school programs, but schools are prohibited from charging fees for programs for which they are seeking state reimbursement. One district reported that the state reimbursement typically covers about 60 percent of the total costs of the summer school program, but the actual reimbursement rate varies from year-to-year. Because school districts don't know until after the completion of the summer term how much of their expenses will be covered by the state, budgetary planning is difficult. All school districts reported that they use local school district funds to cover all or part of the remaining costs. Three districts reported using federal dollars (Title 1 and Reading First) to fund a portion of their summer school program. Federal dollars amounted to approximately four percent of total spending on summer programs.

Other enrichment programs: Four districts reported offering enrichment programs in addition to traditional summer school. These programs include music classes (band/chorus/orchestra), and other programs geared towards key grade-to-grade transitions or special populations. One district with the largest and most diverse set of offerings ran a program targeting ESL students, a program for 9th graders transitioning to high school, and a continuation of their regular school year afterschool program. Although it was reported as a separate program in our survey, one district reported offering summer school courses online for high school students seeking to gain extra credits or take more advanced coursework. Enrichment programs tended to be shorter in duration compared

with other summer programs, but one enrichment program that ran 160 hours offered the most total contact hours of any school program in our sample. Enrichment programs were largely funded by local school districts, although one district reported accessing federal 21st Century Community Learning Center funds and several programs charged parent fees. Only two districts reported receiving a Summer Youth Program Fund Grant.^{xix} Four districts reported that an outside organization—like the YMCA, the parks department, and other community organizations—operated one or more programs in school district facilities during the summer months.

Sports Programs: Anecdotal information indicates that several districts offer summer sports programs, but for some reason, these were not reported via the online survey. This may be due to the fact that these programs are operated out of the athletics department (rather than the departments responsible for summer school) or because

the district may provide financial or other resources but does not directly operate the programs. Because of this, staff reporting on summer school programs may not have even been aware of the existence of summer sports programs or know whom to contact. In at least one district, these programs are quite extensive, and are offered free-of-charge. More information on these programs would provide a more complete picture of the array of summer programs sponsored by the school system.

Parks and Recreation

The Indianapolis Parks and Recreation Department provides a number of low-cost programs for children and youth during the summer months. IndyParks serves almost 600 children per week in programs that met the criteria for inclusion in this analysis (see Table 1 for more details). Programs include traditional day camps (operated at parks' facilities and schools), a lifeguard training program, and two other specialty programs.

TABLE 4: INDIANAPOLIS DEPT OF PARKS AND RECREATION SUMMER PROGRAMS, 2008

Program Type	Average Weekly Attendance*	Average Program Length (hours)	Primary Focus Area	Reported Program Funding	Reported Funding per Participant	Reported Funding per Participant per Hour
Day Camps	305	473	Enrichment/Recreation	\$310,000	\$1,000	\$2.15
School-based Day Camps	90	360	Academics and Enrichment/Recreation	\$64,000	\$710	\$1.98
Lifeguard/Junior Lifeguard Training	110	545	Job Training, Fitness	\$90,000**	\$820	\$1.51
Specialty Programs	78	130	College Access; Arts	\$41,000***	\$530	\$3.96
Totals/Averages	583	415 (wtd. avg)		\$505,000	\$870 (wtd. avg)	\$2.09 (wtd. avg)

All figures are rounded.

* Average weekly attendance is the simplest way to consider how many children are served in parks' programs at any given time. These are not necessarily the same children each week—families can register for programs by the week, so the same child may not attend each week.

** Budget does not include wages paid once trainees are employed by the parks' department as lifeguards.

*** One of the two specialty programs, an arts camp, included costs that were not directly associated with providing the daily camp program. These figures are likely to slightly overstate the cost per participant and per hour for specialty programs.

Program Characteristics. The parks' programs included in the resource scan tended to offer longer days and operate for more weeks of the summer than summer school programs, potentially providing greater support to working families. The day camp program is IndyParks' largest program and is offered at 10 sites across the city. These camps offer a traditional set of activities, including enrichment and recreation. Day camp programs run for eight-to-10½ hours per day for eight-to-nine weeks of the summer. Two sites have an environmental education theme. Another two of the 10 sites serve special needs children and were excluded from this analysis because of their significantly different cost structure. In addition to the day camps offered at parks facilities, IndyParks operates two other day camps at school facilities^{xx} where it also operates school-year afterschool programs. These programs are open to children who attend the schools and have more of an emphasis on academics than other Parks' programs.

In addition to the day camps, the parks and recreation department operated two other types of programs that met the criteria for inclusion. The first, a lifeguard training program, provided intensive training for older high school students to become certified lifeguards with a paid position at one of the county's public pools. The program started in the spring with significant pool and classroom training time for participants—a total of 545 hours. The program also trained 11- to 15-year-olds as junior lifeguards. Sixty percent of the youth served by the program are low income. IndyParks also reported offering specialty programs, including an arts camp and a college exploration program called the Indy Youth Achievers. Each of these programs is geared towards low-income youth.

Funding: The parks' department reports that, in 2008, these 13 programs cost \$505,000. This amounts to \$870 per participant, which is the second highest of the five provider groups. However, when taking into account the extensive summer coverage, the per participant per hour amount is \$2.09, which is slightly less than the \$2.22 average cost per participant per hour (weighted by program size). Although each of these programs charges

parent fees that are established with the goal of covering the projected cost of the programs, programs were not fully supported by the revenues generated from fees. In addition to fee revenue, parks' programs received some grant funding (for example, from the Summer Youth Program Fund) to help offset its costs and support scholarships for low-income children. In cases where program costs exceeded fee and grant revenues, general funds made up the difference. Parks' staff also report that these figures systematically underestimated the true cost of operating these programs, as administrative and facilities costs are not included.

Studied programs charged fees ranging from \$15 per week for the school-based day camps, which serve a very high percentage of low-income children,^{xxi} to \$70-\$90 per week for the day camps offered at parks' facilities. Fees collected for parks' day camp programs (not including school-based day camps) cover approximately 66 percent of the reported costs. Scholarships to defray fees are available for children whose families meet income eligibility criteria. Approximately eight percent of the 2008 budget for day camps goes for scholarships to qualified campers. IndyParks also received grant funding (for example from the Summer Youth Program Fund) to offset costs for scholarships.

Childcare

Traditional childcare providers serve a large number of school-age children during the summer months. While there is no complete data on the number of families who choose to send their children to private childcare facilities during the summer months, the state childcare agency collects data on those children receiving state childcare subsidies. According to the Indiana Family and Social Service Administration, in 2008, approximately 2,300 school-age children in Marion County (ages 5-12) received state childcare subsidies to spend their summer months in traditional licensed childcare centers or license-exempt, religiously-affiliated centers (referred to as "registered ministries").^{xxii, xxiii} Interestingly, of the 2,300 school-age children receiving subsidies to attend center-based programs in the summer, 50 percent are in programs

offered by license-exempt, registered ministries. This is much higher than the approximately 20 percent of all subsidy children statewide (ages birth through 12) that are cared for in religious ministries throughout the year.^{xxiv} There are many possible reasons for this disparity. Marion County does have a higher concentration of registered ministries compared to the rest of the state, which may contribute to the higher percentage of children served by these entities in Marion County. In addition, it may be that it is easier for registered ministries to expand in the summer months as they are unlicensed and, thus, not required to observe caregiver/child ratio requirements or group size limitations.

Program Characteristics. On average, a school-age child receiving a childcare subsidy is in care for 39.5 hours per week for the 11 weeks that school is out of session. While many of the programs offered by other agencies and organizations offer 40 hours or more of care during the week, with a few exceptions, they typically cover only 6-8 weeks of the summer. In Marion County, there is a waiting list to receive childcare vouchers—as of December 2008, over 2,500 families were on the waiting list. To qualify for childcare assistance, families must meet state income and work participation requirements. At 123 percent of the federal poverty level, Indiana’s maximum income eligibility level is very low, allowing only the poorest families access to subsidized childcare.^{xxv} Even so, there are not enough vouchers for eligible families.

Funding: Approximately \$2.04 million was disbursed to center-based providers in the summer of 2008 for care of school-age children, an average of about \$880 per child. This is substantially higher than the average cost figures for each of the other provider types, but it accounts for significantly more time in care on average than many, if not all, of the other programs. Childcare reimbursements average \$2.01 per child per hour, a figure that falls right in the middle of the five sponsor groups. It is notable that the license-exempt religious ministries that are serving half of these children do not receive subsidy funding in

proportion to the number of children that they serve —



Summer programs afford a critical opportunity to level the playing field. Little is known, however, about the kinds of programs that are available to lower-income children during the summer months, what these programs cost, and how they are funded.

these centers receive a lower reimbursement rate because they are not fully licensed.^{xvi}

National Nonprofits

In discussions with community leaders in Marion County, the YMCA, the Boys & Girls Clubs, and Girls, Inc. were identified as the main national, nonprofit providers of summer programming. These three providers collectively serve over 9,600 children in the summer months, with the YMCA serving 7,600 of those children at 127 different sites across the city. The total funding for the three organizations' summer programs is \$3.9 million, which averages \$410 per participant and \$1.08 per participant per hour.

YMCA: The YMCA provides a vast array of options for children and youth with enrichment, sports, and arts programs, as well as traditional day camps offered at YMCA facilities and other sites (including some schools) throughout the county. Programs range from one week to a few weeks, and there is programming to cover the entire summer. The YMCA does not focus primarily on serving disadvantaged communities but does offer programs in some less-advantaged parts of the county at a lower cost to families. The YMCA receives the bulk of its operating revenue from parent fees. However, it does provide scholarship opportunities for income-eligible children and youth. Program fees vary from program to program, but for elementary and middle school-age children in full-day programs, fees range from \$150 to \$200 per week (with a few programs in the \$120 per week range). Of the YMCA's \$3.3 million program budget for summer 2008, \$2.7 million (about 81 percent) was raised from fees. The remaining revenue, collected as grants from private and public sources (including the Summer Youth Program Fund), allows them to provide about \$600,000 in scholarship funds to help a large number of low-income children attend programs.

Boys and Girls Clubs: As part of its mission, the Boys and Girls Clubs of Indianapolis (BGCI) seeks to provide affordable and accessible high-quality opportunities for youth. In the summer of 2008, BGCI served almost 2,000

youth in "club programs" at their four facilities, as well as operating a summer camp at a school and a teen-oriented program. Eighty-five percent of club participants are eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunch. BGCI seeks to keep its fees low, receiving only eight percent of its \$491,000 summer budget from fees—the remainder comes from other sources, including the United Way, other foundations, and individual donations. BGCI also receives funding from the Department of Agriculture and in-kind contributions from other organizations, such as the Police Athletic League. BGCI spends about \$250 per participant in the summer months. The per participant per hour figure is less than \$1 dollar and is the lowest of all programs included in the resource scan, which is likely due, in part, to the large amount of donated and in-kind contributions.

Girls Inc: Girls, Inc. operates a relatively small summer program, serving about 90 girls in two programs costing a total of \$142,000. Like BGCI, Girls, Inc. relies primarily on fundraising from foundations and individuals to cover the cost of its program, with fees only making up 18 percent of operating revenue. However, Girls, Inc. programs are relatively expensive, costing almost \$1,600 per participant. The Girls Inc. curriculum is multi-disciplinary, including physical activity, intellectual challenges, and self-esteem building. These programs have a very high retention rate with many participants returning year after year and even serving as counselors upon graduation from high school.

Small Nonprofits

In many cities, it is difficult to learn much about the diverse group of smaller nonprofits and faith-based organizations that provide a wide range of summer learning opportunities for school-age youth. However, in Marion County, the Summer Youth Program Fund provides a unique lens into the provision of summer programs through its support of a diverse group of smaller organizations in the county. While SYPF does provide funding to programs sponsored by many of the larger public and nonprofit providers outlined above, a large portion of its funding goes to smaller, grassroots organizations.

TABLE 5: SMALL NONPROFIT SYPF GRANTEE SUMMER PROGRAMS

Sponsor Type	Number of Programs	Projected Attendance	Avg. Program Hours	Total Program Budget	Total SYPF Grants	Avg. grant size
Community-Based Organization	35	3,300	357	\$3.2 million	\$675,800	\$19,300
Faith-based organization	41	4,650	354	\$2.7 million	\$454,500	\$11,000
Other	11	4,200	313	\$1.1 million	\$121,750	\$11,000
Totals/Averages	87	12,150	341	\$7 million	\$1.25 million	\$14,400

Programmatic and budget data for this scan were culled from the applications of successful SYPF grantees.^{xvii} In order to focus the analysis on the smaller providers, programs sponsored by the national nonprofits (YMCA, Boys and Girls Clubs, and Girls, Inc.), the parks and recreation department, and the public school systems were excluded from this analysis as they were already discussed above.^{xviii} In addition, to ensure a fair comparison with the other programs in the study, researchers only included programs categorized as day camps and youth employment programs, excluding residential camps and a category of programs SYPF calls “enhancements or special projects.” (for a description of the types of programs SYPF funds, see the box on page 18.)^{xxix}

In their initial applications to SYPF, the 77 day camps and 10 youth employment programs included in this scan expected to serve approximately 12,150 youth. Faith-based organizations sponsored almost half of these programs, while another 40 percent were sponsored by community-based organizations. Community-based organizations included a wide range of civic and neighborhood organizations, organizations devoted to children with disabilities, social service agencies, and arts organizations. The remaining sponsors included cultural institutions, colleges and universities, and private schools.

Program characteristics. To qualify as a day camp program under SYPF’s definition, programs must operate a minimum of four hours per day for five weeks of the summer. Programs operated, on average, for eight out of the 11

weeks of summer, 4.9 days per week, and were open for 8.3 hours per day. Program locations included schools and community facilities (including faith-based locations), with many programs reporting multiple sites. Eighty-five to 90 percent of programs reported their activities included academics and social/personal development. Seventy-five to 80 percent of programs offered enrichment and sports activities.

Funding: The total projected spending on these programs was approximately \$7 million, which amounts to about \$580 per projected participant, a figure that falls squarely in the middle of the five provider groups included in the resource scan (see Table 3). On average, SYPF programs projected spending \$1.71 per child per hour, which falls towards the low end of the five provider groups (average is \$2.08). SYPF funders granted these organizations a total of \$1.25 million, which amounted to an average of 18 percent of grantees’ total projected program budget. Grantees reported plans to access funding or resources from many additional sources. The most frequently cited public funding source was the federal Summer Food Service Program (for meals). Other sources included the parks and recreation department (for meals, facilities or other resources), the federal Child Care and Development Fund, the federal work-study program, Medicaid, USA funds (a local corporate foundation), and other city agencies. In addition, grantees received private funding through the local United Way, service clubs, businesses and corporations, faith-based organizations, and individual donors.

Summer Youth Program Fund Grantees

The Summer Youth Program Fund provides support for many more summer programs than the 86 programs included in our comparative analysis (see “Small Nonprofits” section on page six for rationale on programs included and excluded). In summer 2008, the fund provided a total of \$2.3 million in grants to 173 different summer programs. The average grant was \$11,000. Awards ranged in size from \$1,500 to \$65,000. The fund provides support for programs in four categories:

- 1) **Daily programs** that seek to serve the same children every day for at least five weeks, four hours per day
- 2) **Enhancement or special project programs** that are more limited in their length and duration (e.g., a one week science, art, or music program), or that may provide specialized content to existing daily summer programs (such as the Algebra Project)
- 3) **Residential** (traditional sleep-away) camps
- 4) **Youth employment programs** that provide jobs skills training and, in some cases, summer jobs to older youth.

Analysis of 2008 grantees culled from information provided in their initial applications shows that 56 percent or \$1.3 million of the \$2.3 million in total funding went to 95 daily programs, another 26 percent of funds went to 48 enhancement programs, and the remaining 17 percent went to 30 residential camps and 11 youth employment programs. On average, SYPF grants represent 14 percent of an individual program’s total budget, but depending upon a variety of factors, it ranges from a high of 65 percent to a low of only one percent.

Thirty-nine percent of the 173 day camp and youth employment program applicants were local community-based organizations (including civic and neighborhood organizations, organizations for children with special needs or health concerns, sports and arts organizations), with another 29 percent consisting of faith-based organizations. The remaining third is made up of national youth-serving organizations (like the YMCA, the Girl Scouts, etc.), public agencies (schools, parks and recreation department), cultural institutions, child-care centers, and universities.

C. Other Investments in Summer

In addition to the types of programs highlighted above, there are other substantial summer investments that didn’t meet the criteria outlined for inclusion in the programmatic analysis (see page six for a discussion and rationale of the programs that were included and excluded in the programmatic funding analysis). They are highlighted here to draw attention to some of the larger funding streams that are not a part of the analysis. These additional investments include:

The Summer Food Service Program

In the summer of 2008, approximately 13,540 children a day received a lunch through the federal Summer Food Service Program at 243 sites throughout Marion County.^{xxx} These sites were overseen by 36 summer meals sponsors,

who range from school districts to churches to community-based organizations. Sponsors received over \$2 million dollars in reimbursements in 2008, mostly for providing lunches (although some provided breakfast and/or dinner). The 13,540 youth represent only about 15 percent of Marion County children who are eligible for free and reduced-price lunch during the school year. The total number of children receiving meals during the summer may be somewhat higher, however, as this figure does not include students served through the National School Lunch Program.^{xxxi} As a state, Indiana serves only 13.6 out of 100 eligible youth and ranks 30th out of the 50 states and the District of Columbia in total summer nutrition program participation.^{xxxi} While Marion County serves a slightly higher proportion of eligible children than the state average, there is clearly significant room to improve the reach of this program.

The Indianapolis Department of Parks and Recreation serves the greatest number of meals in Marion County—both at its facilities and at other sites it supervises—and they recognize the opportunity that the food program provides for getting more children and youth involved in positive activities during the summer. The department is planning to expand to serving breakfast next year and incorporating programming to keep youth at its facilities from breakfast through lunch.

SYPF Grantees: Residential Camps and Enhancements/Special Projects

In addition to the day camp and youth employment programs included in the SYPF analysis above, the Summer Youth Program Fund provided funding to a number of other programs for youth in Marion County. SYPF provided funding to 19 residential camps, two-thirds of which are for children with special health concerns. SYPF also funds a category of programs it calls “enhancements or special projects.” By SYPF’s definition, these programs provide specialized content to other summer programs, or they are offered for a shorter duration than a daily camp.^{xxxiii}

Because the programs often have a single focus, it should be noted that they often offer substantial summer learning opportunities. SYPF provided funding to 42 “enhancement/ special projects” in 2008. The summer program budget for these residential camps and enhancement/special projects as reported in proposals to the Summer Youth Program Fund totals \$7.4 million.

Parks and Recreation Department: Supervised Play

The parks and recreation department plays an important role in providing supervision to children and youth not enrolled in a particular program, but who spend time in parks’ facilities.

In fact, IndyParks serves many more children—approximately 2,500 more—in these unstructured settings during the summer months than it serves in organized programs. A parks’ staff person at each facility provides supervision to youth using the gymnasiums, basketball and other playing courts, and other facilities. Additionally, many parks’ facilities are used as meal centers for the Summer Food Service Program, and participating children are encouraged to join in loosely structured fitness and health education programs. The parks and recreation department is expanding its summer meals program to include breakfast in summer 2009 and plans to create programming to bridge the two meals. The study team does not have information on costs or funding for the parks department’s provision of supervised play in the summer months.

The table below shows the estimated total investment in programmatic funding and then shows the additional investments highlighted in this section. When adding the “other investments,” the estimated total spending is increased by more than \$9 million for a total of more than \$27 million.^{xxxiv}

TABLE 6: TOTAL SUMMER INVESTMENT, 2008

Sponsor/Program	Total dollars (in millions)
Programmatic Funding	
Public Schools	\$4.2
Parks and Recreation	\$0.505
Subsidized Childcare	\$2.04
National nonprofit providers	\$3.93
Small nonprofit providers	\$7.0
Estimated total investment in daily programs available to low income youth	\$17.68
Other programs and supports	
Summer Food Service Program	\$2.02
Other SYPF-funded programs (including enhancements and residential camps) ^{xxxv}	\$7.4
IndyParks Supervised Play	N/A
Total additional summer investment	\$9.42
ESTIMATED GRAND TOTAL	\$27.10

V

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS FOR MOVING FORWARD IN MARION COUNTY

The resource scan found that children and youth in Marion County benefit from a diverse set of summer programs that are funded by a variety of public and private organizations. Overall investments in summer programs in the county top \$27 million. The scan also highlighted the following findings:

- **Public funding for summer programs comes largely from state and local sources.** In Marion County, as in many other jurisdictions, public investments for summer programs come in large part from state and local funding. Of the programs included in this scan, the largest investments in structured summer programming came from the public schools (approximately \$4.4 million), childcare subsidies (approximately \$2 million), and the parks and recreation department (approximately \$570,000). Local public funds provide a large share of these investments. State education funds help support remedial programs for students at risk of educational failure. In addition, federal dollars provide some of the funding for childcare subsidies, and other federal education sources, like Title I, are used for a very small portion of the overall funding for summer programs

- **SYPF and its grantees collectively devote the largest amount of resources to summer programs.** In 2008, the SYPF invested \$2.2 million, and its grantees spent approximately \$14 million on summer programs in Marion County. When it comes to private investments in summer programs, Marion County children and youth benefit greatly from the support of the SYPF. The SYPF provides crucial financial support to many local non-profit organizations, expanding the capacity of these organizations to provide summer programming. Moreover, the existence of the fund has raised the profile of summer learning and has likely provided incentives for more sponsors to consider offering programs.

- **The supply of low-cost summer programs is limited relative to the number of low-income children.**

While many children in Marion County are benefiting from summer programs, a sizable gap still exists between the number of slots available for low-cost summer programs and the number of low-income, school-age children. There are approximately 89,000 children receiving free and reduced-price meals in Marion County. This scan tallied approximately 38,700 children served in the summer months by the main public and private providers—a figure which is known to include a sizable number of children and youth who are not low-income.^{xxxvi} Even with the significant investments being made by these providers, our rough estimates indicate that there is still a sizable gap between the number of low-income children in the county, and the opportunities provided by the largest public and private providers seeking to serve low-income youth. While this count is not fully inclusive of summer opportunities in Indianapolis, it is likely that many low-income children are not participat-

ing in regular, organized activities during the summer—a chunk of time that represents about 20 percent of the year.^{xxxvii} Furthermore, with only a few exceptions, a single slot does not provide programming for the entire summer, or even most weeks, with many programs operating on a limited schedule. This means that families seeking programs for more than a couple of weeks must patch together offerings from various agencies and providers, taking up multiple slots. In addition, school-sponsored educational programs are often limited to those children at risk of educational failure, further constraining options for many children. However, this scan does not sufficiently address the demand for programs. Among those programs that were asked about family demand for their services, less than half reported they had more applicants than slots or that they maintained a waiting list. Anecdotally, some indicated that they don't widely publicize the availability of their programs because of their limited resources to provide services.

- **Program funding varied significantly across the various types of providers.** The analysis of reported funding per participant on an hourly basis showed that school programs are the most costly, at approximately \$3.49, followed by parks and recreation at \$2.09, subsidized childcare at \$2.01, smaller nonprofits at \$1.71, and the affiliates of national nonprofits at \$1.08. This is likely due to differences in staffing structure and costs among programs, as well as differences in how program sponsors calculated and reported costs.
- **Most summer programs, even those sponsored by public agencies, charge fees.** With the exception of summer school programs receiving state funding that are prohibited from charging fees, the large majority of programs in the scan charged fees. Subsidized childcare programs, all the national nonprofits, the parks and recreation departments, and almost 60 percent of the small nonprofits reported charging fees for their programs. In some of these programs, the fees cover

only a small portion of program expenses. However, in many programs, fees make up a large percentage of program funding. Some programs, like those sponsored by IndyParks, rely on a combination of public funding, grants, and fees to cover the full cost of programming. Of the programs that charge fees, many offer fee reductions or waivers to help offset costs to families. Others, like many of the nonprofit providers, seek grants from a wide variety of sources to cover the difference between fee revenue and their total costs.

- **There are few options for older children and youth.** In Marion County, outside of summer school for those who are at risk of failure, options for summer programs for older youth are limited—especially those designed to serve low-income youth. The Summer Youth Program encourages programs to hire teens to work in camps and provides resources to a small number of organizations sponsoring relatively small-scale jobs skills training and youth employment programs. Outside of these efforts, there was no citywide public-private summer jobs program in Indianapolis in 2008 providing older youth with paid work experience and career-related educational opportunities.^{xxxviii}
- **Coordination of summer programming in Marion County presents a significant challenge.** Summer programs are run by multiple entities in the county, including the school system, the parks and recreation department, and a variety of large and small nonprofit agencies. Yet there is no group, organization, or agency that works specifically to coordinate summer programs across these various groups. Even within some of the larger agencies, such as the school districts or the parks and recreation department, information on summer programs did not reside in a specific office, nor did any one person have a full understanding of the range of summer offerings. Information had to be gathered from multiple offices to gain a complete picture of investments in summer programming. ■

Implications for Policy and Funding

Considering the findings above and the suggestions the research team heard from those in the field, this scan points to several ways that advocates of expanded and improved summer programs in Marion County can use the information gathered in the scan to both take better advantage of current investments and leverage new resources.

Make better use of federal funds. Increased federal funding through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 presents several options for tapping new resources that can be used to support summer learning opportunities. Over \$30 billion dollars in stimulus funds can be used to support summer learning programs, including the following streams: Title I School Improvement; Title I, Part A; Workforce Investment Act; Race to the Top, and the Investing in Innovation Fund. Increased funding for Title I and Workforce Investment Act programs can support programs directly, and some recipients are making smart investments in program infrastructure and improvement that will endure beyond the two years of funding. Expanded funding for the Summer Food Service Program, when used strategically, can help expand and coordinate program offerings. The competitive funds, Race to the Top and Innovation Fund, seek to invest in technical assistance through intermediary organizations, with an emphasis on improving data systems, providing investments in professional development, and implementing program improvement based on quality standards.^{XXXXX} The National Summer Learning Association has produced and is continuing to develop a variety of print and online resources to help communities take advantage of this new funding.

Leverage private investments. SYPF members can leverage their investment to take better advantage of the various funding streams supporting summer learning opportunities. Fund members are also leaders in the community with the ability to get the attention of local and district officials. When it comes to improving the coordination of resources and expanding public support for programming, SYPF funders can speak with a powerful voice because of their significant investment in the

overall summer landscape. SYPF leaders should consider ways to leverage change, as well as make use of additional resources. One recommended area of focus for SYPF leaders is on better coordination of summer resources. With improved coordination, program sponsors could be more responsive to the needs of families by adapting schedules (covering more hours per day or weeks over the summer), coordinating program offerings (for example, offering an afternoon enrichment program as a complement to morning summer school), and presenting parents with a consolidated single listing of program offerings that facilitate summer planning. The lack of coordination points to an opportunity for policymakers and funders to provide some structure for collecting and disseminating information on summer programming, which could pay off in many ways. Another key and timely way that SYPF partners can leverage change is to advocate for the inclusion of summer learning as a strategy for school turn-around in the state Race to the Top application; facilitate the creation and coordination of proposals for the Innovation Fund; and to advocate for the state and district allocation of expanded Title I and Workforce Investment Act to support summer learning programs.

Expand summer jobs programs for older youth. A missing piece from the array of summer program offerings in Marion County is that of a strong and consistent summer jobs program. Many summer jobs programs are funded, in part, using federal Workforce Investment Act dollars reserved for youth programs. In many communities, the local Workforce Investment Board helps to fund—and in some cases, provides oversight to—a summer youth employment program for high school-age youth. Typically, these are partnerships in which the organizer, such as a city agency, recruits both employers and participants. Students are then employed full-time for eight-10 weeks during the summer in both public and private sector jobs. In addition, there is frequently an educational component as part of the summer job that focuses on basic work skills, post-secondary exploration, or remedial academic skills.

For example, the Workforce Investment Board in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, established a program called Work Ready Philadelphia in 2003 to provide thousands of young people with summer employment, training, and education opportunities. In summer 2009, the Work Ready program served approximately 9,000 youth with funding from employers and foundations as well as government grants, including the Workforce Investment Act, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF).

The City of Oakland, CA, operates the mayor's Summer Jobs Program every year, supporting approximately 1,000 subsidized jobs for youth each summer. The Youth Employment Partnership (YEP), a community-based organization, is the primary service provider responsible for training and placing youth in summer jobs throughout Oakland. A variety of other funding sources enable Oakland agencies to offer more targeted summer youth employment programs for specific groups of youth. With state and city juvenile justice/violence prevention funding, YEP operates some summer and year-round youth employment programs specifically for court-involved youth, truant youth, or youth that have been affected by gun violence. YEP's Team Oakland program is funded through city public works dollars and provides on-the-job training in landscaping, mural painting, urban gardening, and litter abatement.

Although there did not appear to be any significant public funding for summer youth employment in Marion County in 2008, it should be noted that during 2009, the city of Indianapolis provided a special allocation of community crime prevention funding for summer camps to hire youth ages 16-to-22. The 2009 federal stimulus package also provided the Indianapolis Private Industry Council (IPIC) with an opportunity to serve an estimated 645 young adults ranging in age between 16- and 24-years-old in its first Indy Youth Works summer job program during the summer of 2009. The program primarily served youth who were currently enrolled in high school, and some young adults requiring credentials such as GEDs, with summer employment and work readiness education. The majority of the stimulus funds dedicated to this program have

been exhausted and the future of its funding viability is therefore unknown, although IPIC is currently researching alternative funding sources. The summer jobs programs for youth could be a key target for Marion County leaders seeking to expand services for older youth, and provides a further investment in averting the negative consequences posed by lack of opportunity for low-income youth during the economic recession.^{XL}

Improve data to inform policies and program strategies.

This scan brought to light the fact many of the organizations included in the research—particularly those that rely on fees to help defray the costs of a program—do not have a good understanding of the costs of the services they provide. Fees and fee schedules are determined by history and a sense of what families can pay rather than by the true cost of the program. It is likely that the cost structure and design of these programs are organized to “fit” what the agencies expect they will be able to collect in fees rather than what the programs cost. When informants were asked about the full cost of their programs, many were not able to articulate the value of organizational resources (like facilities and overall administrative costs) that were used by summer programs. In fact, several organizations indicated that data were not kept in a way that allowed the isolation of summer costs. Better data on the costs (revenues and expenditure) for summer programs could help with coordinating existing funds, leveraging new funds, and making strategic investments.

In addition, better data systems would allow programs to collect and coordinate important youth data across programs. For example, shared youth demographic and outcome data would not only provide a baseline and method by which programs could assess individual growth, but it would also allow summer providers, in particular, to better understand the youth they serve outside of the short time they spend with them over the summer months. The Indianapolis public school system developed and implemented a student data warehouse in January 2010. The new data warehouse presents an opportunity for further discussions between community partners and the school district to create a data sharing system to help

track attendance, academic outcomes, graduation, workforce participation, and—potentially—funding at the student level.

Invest in infrastructure, as well as programs. Few of the public and private entities currently providing services have the capacity (space, qualified personnel, and content knowledge) to expand programming, especially high-quality opportunities, to larger numbers of students or different age groups. Any significant expansion will require additional investments in program infrastructure and capacity, as well as funding for additional slots. Because of the variety of providers and funding sources supporting summer programming, infrastructure investments should be targeted to both programs and interagency coordination. Investments in interagency coordination might focus on aligning data collection systems, supporting a dedicated staff member or organization to regularly convene, coordinate, and advocate on behalf of summer providers, or piloting new partnership models that make better use of existing funds.

Conclusion

This resource scan provides a systematic assessment of public and private investments in summer programming in Marion County, Indiana. While public and private investments are significant—approximately \$27 million—a sizable percentage of low-income children and youth are not currently served. Moreover, the scan clearly shows that, while there are significant investments in summer programs, there is very little planning and coordination of summer programming across the agencies that provide services.

It is also clear that expanding summer learning programming to more low-income children and youth in Marion County will require investments in infrastructure, as well as more funds for programs. Many current providers lack the capacity (space, personnel, and content knowledge) to expand programming to larger numbers of students or to children of different ages. Any significant expansion will require additional investments in program infrastructure or capacity as well as funding for additional slots. The federal stimulus package offers a narrow window of opportunity to pursue lasting investments in the local summer learning infrastructure, including an emphasis on improving data systems, providing investments in professional development, and implementing program improvement based on quality standards.

Finally, most children and youth will want a say in the types of summer programs in which they participate. This is especially true for older youth who have greater decision-making power over their participation in summer programs versus other alternatives. Although policymakers and funders may be tempted to fund programs that focus on traditional educational approaches, gathering information from students and parents about their needs and desires for summer programs can help ensure that children and youth have the motivation to attend programs and have access to the complete and competitive education so needed in the 21st century. ■

APPENDIX

States and localities can use the following tips to plan for and implement a resource scan of summer programs. The scan can be limited to public sources or can be expanded to include privately funded programs.

1. Consider local governing structures when selecting the jurisdictions where data will be collected. Invariably you will want to collect data from school districts, so consider how school district boundaries overlap with those of other jurisdictions.

- ✓ How well do the city/county structures align with school district boundaries?
- ✓ If there are multiple school districts to be considered, is there a regional structure or an intermediate or unified school district that can provide data for several districts?
- ✓ Will the mayor or county government be able to gain cooperation from school district administrators who can provide the needed data? What is the relationship between the mayor or county superintendent and the school board?

2. Figure out who the largest providers are in the jurisdiction and begin by asking about their programs.

In the first round of interviews, be sure to ask about other programs that are receiving public funding.

- ✓ Be sure to include school districts, parks and recreation departments, and workforce investment offices. You may also want to include private providers, such as YMCAs or Boys and Girls Clubs that often run large programs with public funding, county extension programs, and local health departments.

- ✓ Determine whether the jurisdictions in which you are interested have already put together a compendium of summer programs that can be helpful in identifying agencies and organizations providing summer programs. Many of the programs included in these documents may be private fee-based programs, but some publicly funded programs may be included.

3. Send an introductory letter or e-mail to agency personnel indicating that you will be contacting them for data and explaining the purpose of your data gathering. Hopefully, this letter or e-mail will come from a public official with enough clout to encourage participation.

- ✓ Clearly identify what the data will be used for and whether the information will allow for identification of individual programs or districts.
- ✓ Indicate the name of the person or organization that will be following up to collect the data.
- ✓ Consider a kick-off meeting to solicit buy-in, explain the purposes of the data gathering, and explain what the final product will look like. This will give participants an opportunity to ask questions and gain a better understanding of what you are trying to accomplish.

APPENDIX

4. Decide which programs will be included in this resource scan. This process can be tricky.

- ✓ Do you want to include all programs from particular agencies?
- ✓ Do you want to include only programs that operate for a minimum specified number of hours (e.g., X hours per day, Y days per week, or Z weeks per year) or that serve a minimum number of students?
- ✓ Do you want to focus on a particular age group?
- ✓ Do you want to focus on a particular set of activities?

5. Determine how you want to account for fees and fee waivers.

- ✓ Keep in mind that some programs offered by public agencies may be largely fee-supported, and sometimes staff may not be fully aware that programs do not have any net public investment.
- ✓ Many agencies can easily provide budget information but may have to research the amount of total fees collected. Sometimes the calculation to determine total fees is as simple as multiplying the number of participants by the program fee amount, but other times it is more complex when fee schedules vary based on income.

6. Think clearly about the information you want to collect. You may want to collect information on:

- ✓ sources of the public funding
- ✓ total funding and total public funding
- ✓ total fees collected
- ✓ number of youth served
- ✓ ages and grades of youth served
- ✓ where programs took place
- ✓ primary program activities (academic, enrichment, sports, etc.)
- ✓ program schedules (hours, days, and weeks of operation)
- ✓ whether or not the program is a continuation of a school-year program
- ✓ the percentage of students in the program who qualify for free or reduced-price lunches
- ✓ the presence of a waiting list
- ✓ whether or not transportation is provided
- ✓ information on summer programs run by other organizations on behalf of the agency (i.e., subcontracts)

This list should be considered a roadmap rather than a blueprint. Each locale will want to customize this list to collect the data it needs to enhance summer programming.

7. Ask respondents about any challenges they face in administering summer programs. Anecdotal information can be helpful in understanding some of the findings from the data and in framing the analysis and planning subsequent steps.

ENDNOTES

- ^I L. Alexander, K. Entwisle, and L. S. Olsen, "Lasting Consequences of the Summer Learning Gap," *American Sociological Review* 72 (2007).
- ^{II} Ibid.
- ^{III} See the website of the Central Indiana Community Foundation at www.cicf.org for more information about the Summer Youth Program Fund, including a list of funding partners.
- ^{IV} For more information on the National Summer Learning Association's similar work in other states and communities, see <http://www.summerlearning.org/investment>.
- ^V This threshold is not based in research on what constitutes an appropriate "dosage" to be an effective program. Rather, it is an attempt to eliminate activities with very limited duration.
- ^{VI} Throughout this Resource Scan the term "sponsor" is used as a generic reference to organizations that serve as administrative and fiscal agents for summer programs.
- ^{VII} It is important to reiterate that the Scan did not attempt to examine the wide variety of fee-based programs without a clear focus on serving low-income children.
- ^{VIII} Children whose families earn up to 130 percent of the federal poverty level (\$26, 560 for a family of four) are eligible for free lunch. Children in families earning up to 185 percent of the federal poverty level (\$39, 220 for a family of four) are eligible for reduced-price lunch.
- ^{IX} U.S. Census Bureau, State and County Quick Facts, Marion County and Indiana, race/ethnicity data from 2006 estimates; accessed January 2009 at <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/>.
- ^X Ibid.
- ^{XI} From Indiana Dept of Education, School Data 2007-08, "Compare Corporations" function accessed at www.doe.in.gov.
- ^{XII} The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 provides an unprecedented amount of funding for education. While none of the funds are explicitly reserved for summer, nearly all have the potential for use in summer learning programs. This includes additional funds for Title I programs, youth training and employment through the Workforce Investment Act, Child Care and Development Block Grant funds, among several others. See www.summerlearning.org for more information on ARRA funds and how they can be used to support and expand summer opportunities for youth.
- ^{XIII} For comparison purposes, a program offered each day of the summer break for a full day would have an estimated program length of 550 hours (11 weeks, 5 days per week, 10 hours per day).
- ^{XIV} These features included: operating at least three days a week for at least eight months in a year; having been in operation for at least two years; having 75 percent of youth attend most or all of the time they were scheduled to attend; employing at least one paid staff member; having a staff/youth ratio of no higher than 1:20 for EM/MS programs or 1:25 for teen programs; and having a maximum group size of fewer than 50 participants.
- ^{XV} The Wallace Foundation uses "out-of-pocket expenditures" to refer to any cash expenditure used to purchase goods and services. The "full cost" includes the value of in-kind contributions.
- ^{XVI} In order to promote school district participation in the Resource Scan, researchers assured school districts that school data would be reported at the county level and that data on specific school districts would be kept confidential.
- ^{XVII} Districts accounted for their summer programs differently. For example, one district counted summer school for rising first through twelfth-grade students as a single program, while others split it into two or three separate programs.
- ^{XVIII} Data provided to the study team on this program includes funding for a "Homebound" component. The study team was not able to clarify whether this component includes special education services, and could not isolate it with the data provided. If so, this figure may be overstated when compared to other programs in this analysis. As indicated in Table 1 above, this study sought to exclude special education programs from the analysis because of their higher cost structure.
- ^{XIX} Data provided by the Summer Youth Program Fund indicate that at least three of the reporting districts received SYPF funding in Summer 2008.
- ^{XX} IndyParks operated day camps and afterschool programs at School 51 and School 63.
- ^{XXI} Eight-seven percent of children at school-based day camps were eligible for free or reduced price lunch in 2008.
- ^{XXII} The state defines "religious day care ministries" as churches or other tax-exempt religious organizations that provide childcare as an extension of their ministry. Religious ministries are unlicensed but are registered with the state board of health and the state fire marshal and must meet basic health and safety requirements.
- ^{XXIII} In addition, 982 school-age children received subsidy for care at in-home daycares in summer 2008. The purpose of this study is to increase the understanding of participation and costs of organized summer programs, and thus home-based care was not included in our analysis.
- ^{XXIV} Data on total number of children served by provider type from the Indiana Bureau of Child Care 2008 Annual Report, p. 5, accessed at http://www.in.gov/fssa/files/BCC_Annual_Report_08.pdf
- ^{XXV} Indiana Early Childhood Profile, updated October 2008, National Center for Children in Poverty, Columbia University. Accessed at http://www.nccp.org/profiles/pdf/profile_early_childhood_IN.pdf. According to this profile, Indiana state income requirements are the 2nd lowest in the country.
- ^{XXVI} Bear in mind that these reimbursements are not based on the actual costs incurred by a specific provider. The value of a child care voucher is based on a community market rate survey and set so that families can access 75% of the child care providers in a given market.
- ^{XXVII} The SYPF database was created based on projected enrollment, and total program budget figures are estimates. These figures may differ from the final enrollment and budgets. Data collected on a small subset of 15 SYPF grantees as part of an evaluation indicate that these grantees raised an average of 70% of their projected budgets.
- ^{XXVIII} For the most part, these programs were already included in the analysis of programs offered by the national nonprofits, the public schools and the parks and recreation Department.
- ^{XXIX} Residential camps were excluded because they have different costs than the daily summer programs that are offered by the other providers included in the analysis. Enhancements were excluded because of their more limited impact (by definition, they are offered for significantly less time than daily programs), and because many enhancements are offered to children at summer programs that are already included in the analysis.
- ^{XXX} The figure for Marion County Summer Food Service participation is calculated by summing the number of lunches served in July 2008 and dividing by the number of weekdays in July (minus the July 4th holiday.) This methodology was developed by the Food Research Action Center (www.frac.org) as the best way to calculate comparable figures across jurisdictions. July is used as it provides a snapshot of the highest participation month, since many programs do not operate for a full month in June or August. Information on sites, sponsors, participation and reimbursement amounts for summer 2008 provided by the Indiana Department of Education, Office of School and Community Nutrition on October 31, 2008.
- ^{XXXI} According to the Food Research Action Center, schools or districts may elect to provide meals in the summer using the National School Lunch Program instead of the Summer Food Service Program.
- ^{XXXII} Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation: Summer Nutrition Status Report 2008, "Table 1: Summer Nutrition Participation in July 2006 and July 2007 by State" Food Research and Action Center, Washington, DC: 2008; Accessed at http://www.frac.org/pdf/summer_report_2008.pdf
- ^{XXXIII} SYPF's definition of a daily camp is 4 hours per day for 5 weeks. Some SYPF programs are categorized as enhancements because they are offered for less than 4 hours per day for 5 weeks. While some of these shorter programs may have met this scan's criteria for inclusion in the programmatic funding analysis (see criteria on page 5), the study team did not have sufficient information to cull them out.
- ^{XXXIV} Bear in mind that, as stated above, the estimates for programmatic spending do not include all programs targeted for inclusion in this scan—for example, two out of eleven school districts did not submit data and in other cases programs were excluded because staff did not submit key information. Thus, the totals here underestimate the total investment to some degree.

ENDNOTES cont.

- ^{xxxv} In addition to these program expenditures, the Lilly Endowment provided \$400,000 in funding to summer programs for modest capital expenditures on items like vans, computers, and kitchen upgrades. This represents a critical investment for individual programs, but the figure was not included in the scan because other sponsors were not asked to report information on capital expenditures for their summer programs.
- ^{xxxvi} As explained, while the scan attempts to isolate programs that serve or have the potential to serve significant numbers of low-income children, most program sponsors, including the sponsor reporting the largest number of participants (public schools) only provided total participant counts and did not cull out low-income participants.
- ^{xxxvii} U.S. students spend about 1,150 waking hours a year in school versus about 4,700 more waking hours per year in their families and neighborhoods. Berliner, David C. (2009). Poverty and Potential: Out-of-School Factors and School Success. Boulder and Tempe: Education and the Public Interest Center & Education Policy Research Unit. Retrieved May 7, 2009 from <http://epicpolicy.org/publication/poverty-and-potential>
- ^{xxxviii} According to the Indianapolis Private Industry Council, the county has never used WIA funds to support a youth employment program, and does not currently fund or operate any summer employment program using funds from any other sources. However, in summer 2009, the city of Indianapolis is planning to invest a small amount of crime prevention funds to support summer employment opportunities for older youth.
- ^{xxxix} U.S. Department of Education, American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009: Using ARRA Funds to Drive School Reform and Improvement. Retrieved-September 2009, www.ed.gov/policy/gen/leg/recovery/guidance/uses.doc
- ^{xl} U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Unemployment Among Youth Summary, retrieved September 2009 at <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/youth.nr0.htm>. According to this economic news release, 2009 marked the lowest youth unemployment rate on record, starting in 1948.



The National Summer Learning Association's mission is...

To connect and equip schools and community organizations to deliver quality summer learning programs to our nation's youth to help close the achievement gap and support healthy development.

NATIONAL SUMMER LEARNING ASSOCIATION

800 Wyman Park Drive

Suite 110

Baltimore, MD 21211-2837

Phone: (410) 856-1370

www.summerlearning.org