



Harvard Family  
Research Project



---

# Supporting Student Outcomes Through Expanded Learning Opportunities

Priscilla M. Little

January 2009

For questions or comments about this paper,  
email [hfrp\\_pubs@gse.harvard.edu](mailto:hfrp_pubs@gse.harvard.edu)

---

© 2009 President and Fellows of Harvard College. All rights reserved. May not be reproduced whole or in part  
without written permission from Harvard Family Research Project.

Harvard Family Research Project • Harvard Graduate School of Education • 3 Garden Street • Cambridge, MA • 02138  
[www.hfrp.org](http://www.hfrp.org) • Email: [hfrp\\_pubs@gse.harvard.edu](mailto:hfrp_pubs@gse.harvard.edu) • Tel: 617-495-9108 • Fax: 617-495-8594

From the education leaders of the *New Day for Learning Task Force*, to the signatories to the “Broader, Bolder Approach to Education” statement, to President-elect Barack Obama, there is growing momentum in the education policy arena to educate the children and youth of the United States in more intentional and aligned ways. This momentum is creating a range of increasingly integrated education approaches at multiple levels, including those that rethink the use of time across the school day and year, such as expanded learning opportunity (ELO) models. At the same time, increased investments in afterschool and summer learning over the past decade have resulted in a substantial evidence base about the academic, social, health, and other benefits of afterschool and have created a strong case that they are important pathways to learning, particularly when they work with schools to support student success. Yet, too often, these supports continue to be seen as “add-ons,” not integral to in-school education efforts.

Afterschool–school integration is not new; in fact, it served as the impetus for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) program, which, for the past decade, has called for schools to work in partnership with community- and faith-based organizations. However, the past 10 years have witnessed tremendous growth in ELO programs and initiatives aimed specifically at intentional partnerships between afterschool programs and schools in order to support—but not replicate—in-school learning and development. The purpose of this brief is to shine a spotlight on the role of afterschool and summer learning programs in supporting student success and to help bridge the divide between afterschool and summer programs and schools by offering some research-derived principles for effective expanded learning partnership efforts.<sup>1</sup>

## A Brief History of Afterschool

---

Afterschool programs have existed for over a century, responding at various times to the need for adult supervision, risk prevention, and skill building. The 1970s marked a resurgence of demand for afterschool programs in response to growth in maternal employment (Vandell & Shumow, 1999); afterschool, then called school-age child care, was seen as a solution to the “problem” of working mothers. The afterschool movement really took hold in 1998, with the U.S. Department of Education’s launch of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers and its historic public–private partnership with the C.S. Mott Foundation to support the capacity of programs to deliver quality services. Not coincidentally, by 1998, voters reported seeing afterschool programs as venues where children could master skills, receive tutoring, and prepare for a productive future (Seligson, 1999).

---

<sup>1</sup> Information for this brief is based, in part, on an ongoing evaluation of The Atlantic Philanthropies Disadvantaged Children and Youth Integrated Learning Cluster. Specifically, the HFRP evaluation team is conducting a study to better understand the development and sustainability of school–out-of-school time nonprofit partnerships at the school and district level. A full copy of the report will be available in March 2009 on the HFRP website, [www.hfrp.org](http://www.hfrp.org).

The 2002 reauthorization of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC legislation narrowed the focus of these programs from a community learning center model, in which all members of the community benefited from access to school resources such as teachers, computer labs, gymnasiums and classrooms, to an afterschool program model that provides academic enrichment and additional services to complement in-school learning, as well as literacy and related educational development services to families of children in the program.

### **Rethinking Time and Learning<sup>1</sup>**

Many now agree that the traditional school day and calendar alone are not enough to produce continuous learning improvements and, as a result, believe that expanding the school day and the school year is a promising solution to support student success. But what does that expansion look like? Currently, there are several school-based and school-linked models being implemented and tested, all of which include schools as a core component of a larger education strategy.

Approaches to expanded learning include:

*Afterschool programs:* structured programs in out-of-school time that coordinate with schools and provide children and youth supervised and safe activities designed to promote learning across time, contexts, and developmental stages.

*Summer learning programs:* structured programs and enrichment activities designed to supplement academic learning and promote enrichment opportunities during the nonschool summer months.

*Extended day and year schools:* school models that expand the traditional school day and calendar in order to balance the core curriculum with enrichment opportunities, often including afterschool programs.

*Community schools:* comprehensive public schools that provide a range of services and supports for children, youth, and families across the day and throughout the year.

*School–community networks:* intentional connections between schools and community organizations for the purpose of promoting and supporting students' learning needs.

*Online learning:* virtual courses and out-of-school time programs that utilize the Internet and digital media to provide learning to students across time, geographic boundaries, and contexts.

For a complete review of new approaches to time and learning, see, Malone, H., Weiss, H., & Little, P. (In press). *Rethinking time and learning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project.

Over time, then, the multiple benefits of participation in afterschool programs have become apparent. Adult supervision, risk prevention, and skill building have been coupled with an increased emphasis, especially in the past five years, on the role of afterschool and summer learning programs in addressing the problems of underperforming students and, more broadly, narrowing the learning gap. Today, afterschool programs are seen as a vital opportunity and resource for learning and development, with over 6.5 million children and youth participating

(Afterschool Alliance, 2004, updated 2008) and many more families—especially from low-income and minority groups—reporting unmet demand for high-quality and accessible programming (Duffet et al., 2004).

## What Are the Benefits of Participation in Afterschool and Summer Learning Programs?<sup>2</sup>

---

Afterschool programs can impact learning and academic success in a number of ways. Relative to participation in other afterschool arrangements (such as self-care or sibling care), participation can result in less disciplinary action; lower dropout rates; better academic performance in school, including better grades and test scores; greater on-time promotion; improved homework completion; and improved work habits (Little, Wimer, & Weiss, 2008). Three studies in particular illustrate this point:

1. In 2008, results from the *Evaluation of Enhanced Academic Instruction in After-School Programs*, a two-year intervention and random assignment evaluation of adapted models of regular school-day math and reading instruction in afterschool settings, commissioned by the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance at the U.S. Department of Education, was released (Black, Doolittle, Zhu, Unterman, & Grossman, 2008). First-year implementation findings revealed that students in the enhanced programs experience more targeted instruction, which resulted overall in significant gains for math but not reading. These findings suggest that participation in an afterschool program that intentionally targets specific skills may lead to positive impacts on learning. However, the results of the second year of implementation are needed in order to make summary statements.
2. A two-year longitudinal *Study of Promising After-School Programs* examined the long-term effects of participation in quality afterschool programs among almost 3,000 youth in 35 elementary and middle school afterschool programs located in 14 cities and 8 states (Vandell, Reisner, & Pierce, 2007). Findings for 2007 from that study indicate that, of the elementary and middle school students who participated in high-quality afterschool programs, the elementary school students who *regularly attended* the high-quality afterschool programs (alone or in combination with other activities) *across two years* demonstrated significant gains in standardized math test scores, compared to their peers who were routinely unsupervised after school hours. It is important to note that this study found regular participation in afterschool programs to be associated with improvements in work habits and task persistence, which, in turn, may have contributed to the academic gains.

---

<sup>2</sup> Adapted from Weiss, H., Little, P., Bouffard, S., Deschenes, S., & Malone, H. (2008). *The federal role in out-of-school learning: After-school, summer learning, and family involvement as critical learning supports*. A paper commissioned by the Center for Education Policy. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project.

3. The national study of the *21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers program* is an older, but still important, study of the impact of afterschool. Released in 2003, that study, which employed both experimental and quasi-experimental designs, showed mixed findings related to an afterschool program's impact on student achievement as measured by grades and SAT-9 test scores, but it demonstrated some impact on school-related measures of success such as attendance and college aspirations (U.S. Department of Education, 2003). While the results were termed "disappointing" and used by the Administration as the rationale for a proposed \$400 million budget reduction in the program, the evaluation was an important turning point in federal investments in research and evaluation, since it led to the realization that evaluating program outcomes necessitates also evaluating and supporting higher quality program implementation.

Several other studies and meta-analyses confirm the same message: Afterschool programs *can* improve academic achievement. For example, Granger (2008) reviewed several narrative and empirical review of the effects of afterschool programs and concludes that "although reviews vary in their conclusions regarding academics, the most reliable reviews show that on average programs have positive impacts on important academic, social, and emotional outcomes" (p. 4). One of the studies he reviewed was a 2006 meta-analysis by Lauer and colleagues (2006), who found small but statistically significant effects on both reading and math across the 35 studies of out-of-school time educational interventions. Dozens of studies of afterschool programs and initiatives repeatedly underscore the powerful impact of supporting a range of positive learning outcomes, including academic achievement, by affording children and youth opportunities to learn and practice new skills through hands-on, experiential learning in project-based afterschool programs, which complement, but do not replicate, in-school learning.

The evidence for summer learning is equally compelling. When students actively participate in summer programs, and particularly when they are encouraged to participate by their families, they stand to improve their reading and math levels going into the next grade, as well as their standardized test scores (Learning Point Associates, 2005). A meta-analysis of 93 summer programs (Cooper et al., 1996) indicated that summer learning has a range of effects on academic achievement for both remedial and accelerated programs. Remedial programs can have a positive impact on skill and knowledge building, particularly with smaller class sizes. Similarly, findings from the Chicago Summer Bridge program and Teach Baltimore summer program show that summer education can help to supplement students' scholastic achievement in both reading and math (Denton, 2002). In addition, academically focused summer programs help students to successfully transition into the next grade level, a benefit attributable to smaller class size, individualized learning, and personal attention by teachers, all of which might not be available to students during the academic year (Cooper et al., 1996).

Participation in well-implemented afterschool and summer learning programs can also support the healthy development requisite for learning. In the United States, over 50 percent of school-aged children’s waking hours are spent outside of school (Larson & Verma, 1999). Historically, how best to use this time has been the topic of debate, but the past decade has seen a convergence in opinion: Time out of school, such as that spent in afterschool and summer learning programs, offers opportunities to complement in-school learning and development and expose children to experiences to which they do not have access during the school day and year. Researchers and practitioners alike assert that, in addition to families, peers, and schools, high-quality, organized out-of-school time activities have the potential to support and promote youth development, equipping students with the skills needed to be “active learners” in the classroom. Such activities have multiple benefits. They (a) situate youth in safe environments; (b) prevent youth from engaging in delinquent activities; (c) teach youth general and specific skills, beliefs, and behaviors; and (d) provide opportunities for youth to develop relationships with peers and mentors (National Research Council & Institute of Medicine, 2002). Thus, not only can afterschool and summer learning programs directly support academic success, but they can also equip students with the skills necessary to be effective learners and leaders.

### **Research Spotlight: Connections Matter**

The *Massachusetts Afterschool Research Study* found that afterschool programs with stronger relationships with school teachers and principals were more successful at improving students’ homework completion, homework effort, positive behavior, and initiative. This may be because positive relationships with schools can foster high-quality, engaging, and challenging activities, and also promote staff engagement (Intercultural Center for Research in Education et al., 2005).

An *evaluation of Supplemental Educational Services (SES)* found that program quality suffered when there were not effective partnerships between schools and SES providers. School staff were needed to help coordinate SES and identify and recruit participants; without the partnerships, SES providers were less able to align their supplementary education with in-school learning needs (U.S. Department of Education, 2004a).

In addition to demonstrating that afterschool and summer learning programs support specific academic skills and overall development, the past decade of research and evaluation makes it clear that participation in well-implemented afterschool and summer learning programs can address some of the educational challenges for children and youth living in poverty. Specifically they can:

- Connect youth to quality learning opportunities and to learning itself and keep youth engaged in school
- Help youth practice social and interpersonal skills and gain from positive youth development models

Give youth more access to environments that support academic achievement, particularly in the current higher stakes educational environment

Summer programming, in particular, can help address the opportunity gap that occurs during this extended period when lower income children and youth have less access to enrichment opportunities than their more affluent and advantaged peers.

In sum, the evidence indicates, first, that afterschool and summer programs are important learning environments that can address some current educational inequities and, second, that participation in well-implemented programs can support academic and other developmental outcomes.

## Why Should Schools and Afterschool and Summer Learning Programs Partner to Support Learning?

---

Evidence is mounting that sustained participation in a quality afterschool program, one which has strong connections to schools and to families, yields the best gains for program participants (Little, Wimer, & Weiss, 2008). In addition to better supporting student success as described above, afterschool–school partnerships can serve to strengthen, support, and even transform individual partners, resulting in improved program quality, more efficient use of resources, and better alignment of goals and curriculum. Effective partnerships are those in which there is a shared value proposition, with each partner seeing the value-added of working with the other entity.

Specifically, partnerships with afterschool and summer learning *can help schools to:*

Provide a wider range of services and activities, particularly enrichment and arts activities, that are not available during the school day  
Support transitions from middle to high school

- Reinforce concepts taught in school
- Improve school culture and community image through exhibitions and performances
- Gain access to mentors and afterschool staff to support in-school learning

Partnership is a two-way street, and afterschool and summer programs are also likely to benefit from partnerships with schools. Partnerships with schools *can help afterschool and summer programs to:*

- Gain access to and recruit groups of students most in need of support services
- Improve program quality and staff engagement
- Foster better alignment of programming to support a shared vision for learning
- Maximize resource use such as facilities, staff, data, and curriculum

Finally, strong school–afterschool/summer partnerships *benefit students in important ways* beyond academic support. They can:

- Provide continuity of services across the day and year
- Facilitate access to a range of learning opportunities
- Share information about specific students to best support individual learning

Given that the evidence is clear on the benefits of participation in afterschool and summer learning programs, why don't more schools and districts engage in expanded learning efforts that include afterschool and summer programming? The answer is really very simple: Forging partnerships is hard work. It takes time, resources, and a commitment from both sides to making it work. The next part of this brief offers a set of principles to help schools and districts forge sustainable school–afterschool partnerships and then points to specific expanded learning program features that support positive learning outcomes in the out-of-school hours.

## **How Can Schools Partner With Afterschool and Summer Learning Programs to Support Expanded Learning?: Five Principles for Sustainable Partnerships**

---

At the heart of successful expanded learning opportunities are sound, sustainable partnerships among afterschool and summer program providers and schools working together to support learning. While partnership development does not happen over night, over time, effective partnerships move from being transactional to transformative in nature (Enos & Morton, 2003). That is, partners move from operating as separate entities with separate goals and outcomes to working in conjunction with one another to create an expanded learning system with a shared vision, mission, and outcomes. Five principles support movement toward transformative, sustainable school–afterschool/summer partnerships:<sup>3</sup>

1. A shared vision for learning and success, with explicit focus on supporting academics
2. Blended staffing models that enable crossover between school and afterschool and summer staff
3. School–afterschool/summer partnerships at multiple levels within the school and district
4. Regular and reciprocal collection and sharing of information about student progress
5. Intentional and explicit contrast between school and afterschool environments

### **A shared vision for learning and success, with explicit focus on supporting academics.**

Successful expanded learning partnerships require a shared vision for learning, which acknowledges the roles of the school and the afterschool program in supporting and assessing student success. When school leaders share a vision for student success that considers students'

---

<sup>3</sup> These principles were derived through interviews conducted by the HFRP evaluation team with senior leadership of 11 of Atlantic Philanthropies' direct service grantees. Data was augmented by a literature review on partnerships and collaboration.

physical, emotional, and social well-being in addition to academic outcomes, the partnership is more likely to be successful than when competing agendas operate during the extended day. A broader vision of learning helps schools to recognize nonschool supports as critical in redefining what students need to be successful; it also helps afterschool programs better understand what they need to provide to complement in-school classroom instruction.

Developing a shared vision needs to happen at the outset of a partnership effort. Partners need to establish shared expectations through such means as a Memorandum of Understanding or a purposeful “due diligence” meeting to determine the shared value proposition of the partnership. Other strategies include inviting key school and district partners to join afterschool program boards and having program staff participate in school leadership or governance teams.

### **Blended staffing models that enable crossover between school and afterschool and summer staff**

A critical component of the success of expanded learning opportunities is hiring the right staff. From an afterschool and summer perspective, this means hiring staff who have legitimacy in the school building and who are skilled at building relationships with school staff. One way to do this is to hire licensed teachers, who “speak the same language” as school-day teachers, can substitute and consult in classrooms, and can participate in professional development activities. Hiring licensed teachers who also teach at a host school facilitates information-sharing and forges connections with other teachers who might not otherwise make time for “outside” programs or services. From a school perspective, it means encouraging school-day teachers to consider working as part of an afterschool or summer learning team, on which they bring their content expertise to bear to support and reinforce the development critical learning skills.

Expanded learning opportunities benefit from having a staff member, either employed by the school or the afterschool program or shared across both, whose primary responsibility is to coordinate resources among partners, create learning plans for students based on those resources, and facilitate communications and relationship-building. In addition to a designated staff member, expanded learning opportunities should encourage school and program staff alike to participate in governance and leadership committees as well as grade-level and content-specific teams in order to be fully integrated partners.

### **School–afterschool/summer partnerships at multiple levels within the school and district**

Relationships between schools and afterschool and summer programs are most effective when they occur at multiple levels and among multiple school personnel—with teachers, coaches, guidance counselors, secretaries, and janitors in addition to the principal. Multilevel partnerships foster shared ownership of the partnership, help to ensure that the partnership is strong and sustainable, increase the program’s visibility in the school building during the school day, and allow programs to be involved in the life of the school. Given staff and leadership turnover at the school level, relationships at the district level can be particularly crucial in maintaining sustainability.

## Regular and reciprocal collection and sharing of information about student progress

A consistently reported feature of a strong collaboration is the ability of partners to access information and data from each other, including, if possible, student-level academic data (e.g., test scores and grades). Afterschool and summer programs can use these data both to track and strengthen student performance and to demonstrate the impact of their services. This data-driven approach to student learning is sometimes difficult due to privacy concerns about sharing student-level data; however, getting data from districts by student ID number, rather than by name, can help overcome this obstacle

In addition to getting data from schools, some programs provide their own data to schools to promote reciprocal data sharing. Another way to support reciprocity of data sharing is to offer to analyze the data regularly provided by schools and districts and feed them back the results, highlighting any improvements that might be attributable to the program.

District-level support and connections greatly facilitate data-sharing, either through a formal letter or Memorandum of Understanding or through informal relationships with key district staff. District support can often trickle down to school buildings and principals to help program staff get report cards, attendance data, and teacher reports on student progress. But, even if sharing official school data is not possible due to privacy and other concerns, it is still important for school and afterschool and summer staff to have some mechanisms in place for sharing information about students and curriculum to ensure that what happens during the school day is complemented and reinforced by what occurs during expanded learning time.

## Intentional and explicit contrast between school and afterschool environments

Evidence developed over the past 10 years makes it clear that effective out-of-school learning environments, such as those proposed in ELOs, complement, rather than replicate, in-school learning and development. In fact, a common thread among recent studies demonstrating the academic impact of afterschool programs is that the programs not only intentionally tried to improve academic performance by offering academic support but combined this support with other enrichment activities to achieve positive academic outcomes. Thus, extra time for academics by itself may be necessary but not sufficient to improve academic outcomes. However, balancing academic support with a variety of engaging, fun, and structured extracurricular or cocurricular activities that promote youth development in a variety of real-world contexts appears to support and improve academic performance.

Because afterschool and summer programs are not regulated by time blocks and class schedules, they are able to go into greater depth on specific topics and skills, offering students options and choices to pursue individual interests, and thereby strike the balance that the research suggests is necessary to achieve impact. But in addition to these structural differences, converging evidence suggests that afterschool and summer learning can and should “look and feel” fundamentally different from in-school learning environments and points to some specific aspects of effective out-of-school learning experiences. Accordingly, this paper concludes with evidence about three aspects that make a difference in getting to positive learning outcomes in afterschool and summer learning programs.

## Features of Effective ELO Programs at the “Point of Service”<sup>4</sup>

---

When schools are considering partnering with afterschool and summer learning programs, it is important to attend to critical program features at the “point of service” in order to maximize the likelihood of attaining positive outcomes. Emerging research on these features and their relationship to outcomes indicates that, in addition to ensuring adequate physical and psychological safety and effective management practices, effective afterschool and summer programs also have appropriate supervision and structure, well-prepared staff, and intentional programming with opportunities for autonomy and choice.

### Appropriate supervision and structure

Without the structure and supervision of focused and intentional programming, participants in afterschool programs can, at best, fail to achieve positive outcomes and, at worst, begin to perform worse than their peers (Vandell, et al., 2006; Pearson, Russell, & Reisner, 2007). In fact, some research finds that when youth are concentrated together without appropriate structure and supervision, problematic behavior follows. This suggests that focused, intentional activities with appropriate structure and supervision are necessary to keep youth on an upward trajectory and out of trouble (Jacob & Lefgren, 2003). One of the primary conclusions of the *Study of Promising Afterschool Programs* was that, as compared to nonparticipants, children and youth benefit from an array of afterschool experiences that include quality afterschool programs *as well as* other structured school- and community-based activities supervised by adults. Specifically, researchers found that, in comparison to a less-supervised group, school-age children who frequently attended high-quality afterschool programs, alone and in combination with other supervised activities, displayed better work habits, task persistence, social skills, prosocial behaviors, and academic performance, and less aggressive behavior at the end of the school year (Vandell et al., 2006).<sup>5</sup>

### Well-prepared staff

Time and again, the bottom line of many afterschool studies is that one of the most critical features of high-quality programs necessary for achieving positive outcomes is the quality of a program’s staff. Youth are more likely to realize the benefits of programs if they develop positive relationships with the program’s staff, and staff can only build these positive relationships through positive, quality interactions with youth. Research and evaluation efforts are beginning to identify how high-quality staffing and relationships can be achieved. A follow-up study of the TASC evaluation found that specific staff practices lent themselves to the development of positive

---

<sup>4</sup> Adapted from Little, P., Wimer, C., & Weiss, H. (2007). *After school programs in the 21st century: Their potential and what it takes to achieve it*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project.

<sup>5</sup> Programs were rated using the Promising Practices Rating Scale, which assesses eight processes: 1) supportive relations with adults, 2) supportive relations with peers, 3) student engagement in activities, 4) opportunities for cognitive growth, 5) mastery orientation, 6) appropriate program structure, 7) setting chaos, and 8) staff overcontrol.

relationships between staff and youth. Looking across program sites for middle schoolers, evaluators found that positive relationships were found in sites where staff a) modeled positive behavior, b) actively promoted student mastery of the skills or concepts presented in activities, c) listened attentively to participants, d) frequently provided individualized feedback and guidance during activities, and e) established clear expectations for mature, respectful peer interactions (Birmingham, Russell, Pechman, & Mielke, 2005).

Staff and youth surveys and observations were recently conducted at five of *Philadelphia's Beacon Centers* (school-based community centers that include a range of afterschool opportunities) to understand three questions: a) What conditions lead youth to want to attend an activity, b) what aspects of an afterschool activity lead youth to be highly engaged, and c) what conditions lead youngsters to feel that they have learned in an activity? Based on the responses of 402 youth surveys, 45 staff surveys and 50 activity observations, two staff practices emerge as critical to youth engagement: *effective group management* to ensure that youth feel respected by both the adults and the other youth and *positive support for youth* and their learning processes (Grossman, Campbell, & Raley, 2007).

## Intentional programming

In their *meta-analysis of 73 afterschool programs' impacts*, Durlak and Weissberg (2007) found that positive impacts on academic, prevention, and developmental outcomes were concentrated in the programs that utilized strategies characterized as *sequenced* (using a sequenced set of activities designed to achieve skill development objectives), *active* (using active forms of learning to help youth develop skills), *focused* (program components devoted to developing personal or social skills), and *explicit* (targeting of specific personal or social skills). Moreover, the researchers found that, as a group, programs missing *any* of these four characteristics did not achieve positive results. This points to the importance of targeting specific goals and designing activities around those goals intentionally.

Programs can better implement intentional, focused programming by promoting high levels of organization within program activities. For instance, in the evaluation of the *CORAL Initiative*, researchers at Public/Private Ventures found that the highest quality activities took place when staff provided youth with clear instructions, delivered organized lessons, employed specific strategies designed to motivate and challenge youth, and had activities prepared for youth who finished activities before others. Having systems in place to manage youth behavior was also key (Arbreton, Goldsmith, & Shelton, 2005).

Thus, when schools are looking to partner with afterschool and summer programs to expand learning opportunities, they should seek out programs that have these programmatic features and provide support to their ELO partners to develop and refine these critical “point of service” aspects.

---

## The Promise of Expanded Learning Opportunities for Education Reform

---

The research warrant for afterschool and summer learning programs is clear: Children and youth who participate in well-implemented programs and activities outside of school are poised

to stay enrolled longer and perform better in school than their peers who do not attend such programs. Further, emerging research indicates that when schools and afterschool programs partner to support student success, all parties stand to benefit. Building on the 10-year tradition of 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers, the time is ripe to move afterschool and summer learning programs into the mainstream of education reform efforts, implementing and testing a variety of expanded learning opportunity models aimed at forging new and sustainable partnerships with schools in support of learning.

## Acknowledgments

---

This brief was compiled by Priscilla Little, Associate Director of Harvard Family Research Project (HFRP), based on a number of prior HFRP publications and ongoing research and evaluation studies. As such, the author wishes to acknowledge the HFRP Out-of-School Time (OST) Research and Evaluation team, as well as the support of HFRP's OST project funders during the past decade—C.S. Mott Foundation, The Atlantic Philanthropies, Nellie Mae Education Foundation, W.T. Grant Foundation, The Wallace Foundation, and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

## About Harvard Family Research Project

---

Harvard Family Research Project researches, develops, and evaluates strategies to promote the well being of children, youth, families, and their communities. We work primarily within three areas that support children's learning and development—early childhood education, out-of-school time programming, and family and community support in education. Underpinning all of our work is a commitment to evaluation for strategic decision making, learning, and accountability. Building on our knowledge that schools cannot do it alone, we also focus national attention on complementary learning. Complementary learning is the idea that a systemic approach, which integrates school and nonschool supports, can better ensure that all children have the skills they need to succeed. To learn more about how HFRP can support your work with children and families, visit our website at [www.hfrp.org](http://www.hfrp.org).

## References

---

- Afterschool Alliance. (2004, updated 2008). *Afterschool issue overview*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Arbreton, A. J. A., Goldsmith, J., & Sheldon, J. (2005). *Launching literacy in after-school programs: Early lessons from the CORAL Initiative*. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.
- Birmingham, J., Pechman, E. M., Russell, C. A., & Mielke, M. (2005). *Shared features of high performing after-school programs: A follow-up to the TASC evaluation*. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates.

- Black, A. R., Doolittle, F., Zhu, P., Unterman, R., & Grossman, J. B. (2008). *The evaluation of enhanced academic instruction in after-school programs: Findings after the first year of implementation*. (NCEE 2008-4021). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
- Cooper, H., Nye, B., Charlton, K., Lindsay, J., & Greathouse, S. (1996). The effects of summer vacation on achievement test scores: A narrative and meta-analytic review. *Review of Educational Research*, 66(3), 227–268.
- Denton, D. R. (2002). *Summer school: Unfulfilled promise*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board. Retrieved September 12, 2008 from [http://www.sreb.org/programs/srr/pubs/Summer\\_School.pdf](http://www.sreb.org/programs/srr/pubs/Summer_School.pdf)
- Duffett, A., Johnson, J., Farkas, S., Kung, S., & Ott, A. (2004). *All work and no play? Listening to what kids and parents really want from out-of-school time*. New York: Public Agenda.
- Durlak, J. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2007). *The impact of after-school programs that promote personal and social skills*. Chicago: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning.
- Enos, S., and Morton, K. (2003). Developing a theory and practice of campus-community partnerships. In B. Jacoby (Ed.). *Building Partnerships for Service Learning* (pp. 20-41). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Granger, R. T., & William T. Grant Foundation. (2008). After-school programs and academics: Implications for policy, practice, and research. *Social Policy Report*, XXII(2).
- Grossman, J., Campbell, M. & Raley, B. (2007). *Quality time afterschool: What instructors can do to enhance learning*. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.
- Intercultural Center for Research in Education, & National Institute on Out-of-School Time (2005). *Pathways to success for youth: What works in afterschool: A report of the Massachusetts afterschool research study (MARS)*. Boston, MA: United Way of Massachusetts Bay.
- Jacob, B. A., & Lefgren, L. (2003, December). Are idle hands the devil's workshop? Incapacitation, concentration, and juvenile crime. *American Economic Review*, 93, 1560–1577.

- Larson, R. W., & Verma, S. (1999). How children and adolescents spend time across the world: work, play, and developmental opportunities. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(6), 701–736.
- Lauer, P. A., Akiba, M., Wilkerson, S. B., Apthorp, H. S., Snow, D., & Martin-Glenn, M. L. (2006). Out-of-school-time programs: A meta-analysis of effects for at-risk students. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(2), 275–313.
- Learning Point Associates. (2005). *Ten years of research on adolescent literacy, 1994-2004: A review*. Naperville, IL: Author.
- Little, P., Wimer, C., & Weiss, H. B. (2008). *After school programs in the 21st century: Their potential and what it takes to achieve it*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project.
- National Research Council & Institute of Medicine. (2002). *Community programs to promote youth development*. Committee on Community-Level Programs for Youth. Eccles, J., & Gootman, J. E. (Eds.). Board on Children, Youth, and Families, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Pearson, L. M., Russell, C. A., & Reisner, E. R. (2007). *Evaluation of OST programs for youth: Patterns of youth retention in OST programs, 2005–06 to 2006–07*. Washington DC: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.
- Seligson, M. (1999). The policy climate for school-age child-care. *Future of Children*, 9(2), 135–139.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2003). *When schools stay open late: The national evaluation of the 21st-century learning centers program, first year findings*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved September 9, 2008, from <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/21cent/firstyear>.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2004a). *Early implementation of supplemental educational services under the No Child Left Behind Act: Year one report*. Washington, DC: Office of the Under Secretary, Policy and Program Studies Service.
- Vandell, D., Pierce, K., Brown, B., Lee, D., Bolt, D., Dadisman, K., et al. (2006). *Developmental outcomes associated with the after-school contexts of low income children and adolescents*. A paper presented at the Society for Research on Adolescence Annual Meeting, March 23–26.

- Vandell, D. L., Reisner, E., & Pierce, K. (2007). *Outcomes linked to high-quality afterschool programs: Longitudinal findings from the study of promising practices*. Irvine, CA: University of California and Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates. Retrieved September 8, 2008, from <http://www.gse.uci.edu/docs/PASP%20Final%20Report.pdf>
- Vandell, D. L., & Shumow, L. (1999). After-school child care programs. *Future of Children*, 9(2), 64-80.
- Weiss, H., Little, P., Bouffard, S., Deschenes, S., & Malone, H. (2008). *The federal role in out-of-school learning: After-school, summer learning, and family involvement as critical learning supports*. A paper commissioned by the Center for Education Policy. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project.