

UC Berkeley

IURD Working Paper Series

Title

Beepers or Boy Scouts? Increasing Services for School-Age Children in Oakland During Non-School Hours

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4t74p1gh>

Author

Robinson, Dale

Publication Date

1990

Peer reviewed

Working Paper 88-03

(formerly Studio Report 005)

Beepers or Boy Scouts? Increasing Services for School-Age Children in Oakland During Non- School Hours

Dale Robinson



The University-Oakland Metropolitan Forum is a partnership of the University of California at Berkeley; California State University, Hayward; Mills College; Holy Names College; the Peralta Community College District; and the Oakland community.

University of California at Berkeley
Institute of Urban and Regional Development

The author conducted this study as a part of the program of professional education at the Graduate School of Public Policy, University of California at Berkeley. This paper is submitted in partial fulfillment of the course requirements for the Master of Public Policy degree. The judgements and conclusions are solely those of the author, and are not necessarily endorsed by the Graduate School of Public Policy, by the University of California or by any other agency.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION: THE 3-6PM ISSUE.....	3
BACKGROUND.....	5
A. How are school-age childcare and afterschool programs defined in general?.....	5
B. How has the need for these services grown?.....	8
C. Why are services important during these hours?.....	10
D. Who funds school-age childcare and afterschool programs?.....	13
1. The Private Sector and Parent Fees.....	13
2. The State of California.....	14
3. The Federal Government.....	16
4. Corporations.....	17
A PICTURE OF OAKLAND'S PRESENT SCHOOL-AGE CHILDCARE AND AFTERSCHOOL PROGRAMS.....	17
A. Poverty and children in Oakland.....	17
B. The need for school-age childcare in Oakland.....	19
C. Oakland Task Forces.....	22
D. Current Programs/Services.....	23
1. The Oakland Unified School District.....	24
2. Oakland Parks and Recreation Department.....	27
3. The Oakland YMCA.....	29
4. Examples of neighborhood programs	
a. Jubilee West.....	30
b. East Oakland Youth Development Center.....	31
E. New or future services/projects	
1. The Castlemont Corridor Coordinating Council project.....	32
2. Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN).....	33
3. Self-care.....	35
OAKLAND'S NEXT STEP.....	36
A. Objectives: Increasing Supply.....	37
1. Increasing the number of slots in current programs	
2. Increasing the number of programs/facilities	
3. Limitations to any alternatives	
a. financial	
b. serving low income vs. middle income children	

B.	Important Policy Issues	
1.	Operating Agencies/Organization.....	38
2.	Funding/Affordability.....	38
3.	Reaching Low-Income Children.....	39
4.	Licensing/Monitoring.....	40
5.	Scheduling/Housing.....	41
6.	The "coolness" Factor.....	41
7.	Residential vs. Downtown.....	42

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....42

A.	Youth as a public good? Framing the issues for policymakers and the community	
1.	Safety	
2.	Youth as resources	
3.	Economic self-interest	
B.	Experimentation.....	44
	(using one or two neighborhoods as experiments)	
C.	Options that need to be pursued.....	45
1.	Funding.....	45
2.	Utilizing existing resources/programs.....	46
3.	Other questions/ideas.....	46

REFERENCES.....47

APPENDICES

A.	Children with Mothers in the Labor Force
B.	Potential Number of Children Needing Child Care in Oakland, 1987
C.	Oakland Population and Employment, 1990-2000
D.	Total Child Care Supply, Oakland
E.	Subsidized vs. Nonsubsidized Child Care Supply in Oakland
F.	Percentage of Income that Low Income Parents Would Have to Pay for Child Care

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Oakland's children are in desperate need of childcare and other services during nonschool hours. Traditionally, these services are divided into school-age childcare for children ages 6-10, and afterschool programs for children ages 10-14. The lack of these programs leaves children unsupervised for long periods of time which can lead to involvement in a number of activities often detrimental to them and their communities. This shortage of services has become exacerbated as more families have two working parents or are headed by a single, and more often female, working parent.

Two groups of children--low-income and older children aged 10-14--are particularly in need of these services. Low-income families rely on these services disproportionately more than other families, and have less options when these services are cut. The older children are easily influenced, and are often on their way to becoming dropouts or drug addicts. Others are simply underutilizing a time that could have them involved in more productive activities.

Several policy issues arise in discussing solutions to the school-age childcare problem, but funding and reaching low-income and older children should be of primary concern to the people reading this analysis. Unlike some cities, Oakland already has a range of organizations that work on some aspect of the childcare issue. Many of these serve as models for other states. However, the one group that is not represented by any particular organization are the older children aged 10-14 who present unique problems when providing them with services.

In regards to funding, Oakland's Community Development Office has given out grants in the past to providers for start-up costs, and to supplement parent fees. Most of this money has dried up and new sources of funding for starting centers, and making services available to low-income parents in particular must be found.

In discussing these different issues, there are several approaches organizations can take. The idea of promoting a civic agenda based on children's needs is not a new one, but this analysis takes that idea one step further and presents the idea of youth as a public good. Although few groups are willing to deal with these children, it must be understood that everyone (businesses, government and communities) has some stake in their welfare and therefore should share the

cost of providing services. City leaders need to hear this and realize that although money must be spent to fight drugs and deal with youths selling crack, in the long term the city will face even worse times if they do not create programs for youth who are not yet involved in these activities.

Although children all over the city need these services, maybe organizations can pool energies and resources and concentrate on one neighborhood as a starting point. An example of this method as it applies to a substance abuse prevention program is mentioned in the paper. Furthermore, GAIN, California's new workfare program, and the Oakland YMCA are beginning and/or expanding their childcare programs and may need help from organizations. The YMCA in particular has some expertise in dealing with the issue and could probably be of value in thinking through new programs. Also, professional organizations may be a source of volunteers or project sponsors.

It is hoped that this analysis will serve as the background material for people who know little about the issue, and as an assessment of policy issues critical to finding a solution for Oakland. It does not make final recommendations, but presents several options and areas that can be pursued in beginning to solve the problem. Although the task ahead is a great one, for the sake of the children it must be undertaken.

INTRODUCTION: The 3-6 PM Issue

Oakland needs to mobilize its resources as a community and search for creative ways to increase childcare services for children ages 6-14 during nonschool hours. Services for children before and after school, and during school holidays are often termed school-age childcare (ages 6-10) and afterschool programs (ages 10-14). This traditional categorization is based on the very different needs of children at the lower and upper ends of the 6-14 age range.

The supply of childcare in Oakland is currently insufficient to meet the city's need as documented by the Oakland Child-Care Advisory Task Force.¹

- * They estimate a need for an additional 13,900 school-age childcare slots. Moreover, the need promises to grow faster than supply.

- * ~~In addition~~, afterschool programs for older children are also at a low level.

In addition, programs and services for low-income families are at a critically low level. There are waiting lists for subsidized slots and even programs that are relatively inexpensive (\$20-50) are beyond the financial reach of many parents. The lack of services for all of these families results in children who have no structured activity or supervision for a large amount of time and threatens the employment security of working parents, and the potential employability of nonworking parents.

1. Oakland Child Care Advisory Task Force. Assessing the Need for Child Care in Oakland. Oakland Dept. of Social Services. October 30, 1987, p.7.

While this analysis is concerned with making life easier for parents, it is also concerned with making life better for children, and low-income children in particular. Better use of the afterschool hours can contribute significantly to the emotional and cognitive development of these children.

Although this report addresses the 6-10 age group the plight of older children and low-income children will be highlighted. The older group (10-14) may not need intense supervision nor want "childcare", but they do need programs to build skills and expand opportunities. Their pre-adolescent stage makes them especially difficult to deal with, and leads them into exploration without realization of all the consequences. At-risk youth--those from low-income families, who have a history of doing poorly in school, or who live in particularly poor or high-crime neighborhoods--are also particularly susceptible. Oakland has a large problem with youth idleness, as do many major urban areas, and expanding afterschool programs/services would be one way of addressing this problem.

Organization of the Report

This report has several components. The first part frames the problem. How are school-age childcare and afterschool programs defined? Why are these programs important? What responsibilities do the government and private sector have when it comes to these programs? Often when "childcare" is mentioned, thoughts of preschool children come to mind. Government and employer concerns for school-age childcare have only surfaced in the past five years. (Although it has been a significant issue in the childcare field for at least 10

years.) This can be attributed to several factors: the increasing number of children with working mothers; a growing concern with reaching potentially at-risk children at the earliest possible age; and finding new ways of dealing with youth idleness, which often leads to destructive behavior towards the community and themselves, and dead-end opportunities and experiences.

The second part of this analysis deals with the current situation in Oakland, looking at the actions being taken to address these problems within the government and the community. It examines a variety of programs already available to families in Oakland, and highlights some neighborhood programs that are or can be models for future city programs.

The third part of this analysis looks at policy issues around childcare and afterschool programs including: strategies around organization, funding/affordability, reaching low-income children, licensing/quality, and scheduling. It identifies objectives for the city, and outlines the issues most important for Oakland. Finally it makes recommendations as to what the Oakland community and government can do to help youth during these crucial hours, and what limitations any policy decisions face.

1. BACKGROUND

A. How are school-age childcare and afterschool programs defined and how are they currently provided?

The times before school begins (7-9am) and after school ends (3-6pm), are times when children are often unsupervised. The term

"childcare" usually refers to locations that children can go to during this time. There are many other programs during this time which do not consider their main function that of "childcare" but for all intents and purposes can be seen as providing a safe environment for children. For example, boy scouts, parks and recreation departments, and some YMCA programs would vehemently deny that they are childcare providers but the fact that they offer programs with even a minimum of supervision for children means they serve the childcare needs of many families. United Way's Impact 90 study puts it best:²

Child care is . . . not simply a cluster of programs for children with employed mothers, but a broad way of conceptualizing all kinds of support that different types of families need. Public acceptance of this broader definition of child care is important if the diverse services needed by families in an area such as Northern Alameda County are to be provided.

Childcare for the purposes of this paper will include all kinds of care children receive when they are not with their parents. This includes licensed care, and more unstructured, informal services such as recreational, tutorial and academic programs.

School-age childcare (usually for children age 6-10) and afterschool programs (ages 10-14) are thought of as different types of services each having separate advocates or constituents. There are reasons for targeting both groups of children. The older group has a smaller constituency and is a prime target for negative influences. There is also increased stigma for older children in attending such programs. The Oakland YMCA has operated afterschool programs for years and their programs show a marked drop in

2. United Way of the Bay Area. Impact 90: Northern Alameda County Future Focus. June 1986, p.26.

attendance at 4th or 5th grades (10 years old).³ Moreover, this group's unique problems require special attention and carefully constructed programs. So while school-age childcare is of major concern to a growing number of people, this older group must not be left out. However, concentrating on the older children leaves out a group who are not included in the preschool group. Furthermore, programs for both age groups often fail to reach low income children who are most in need. They often serve middle- to high-income children who's families have the time and resources to access quality services. A comprehensive policy on children must take into account the needs of both groups.

Traditionally, school-age childcare services can be defined as either in-home or center-based. In-home settings consist of either the 1) child's own home, 2) family day-care home; or 3) small group day-care homes. The primary purpose of these facilities is care, and may include child development.

The four major sub-categories of of center-based care facilities are 1) nonprofit multi-service agencies serving youth, such as the YMCA, Boys' and Girls' Clubs, churches, and public park and recreation facilities, 2) profit and day-care centers, 3) public schools, and 4) employer sponsored facilities.

3. Interview. Equoya Thomas. Executive Director Greater Oakland YMCA.

B. How has the need for these programs grown?

The House of Representatives Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families estimates there are two to seven million school-age children left alone nationwide after 3pm. The California Senate Office of Research estimated California had 620,000 to 815,000 latchkey children in 1984.⁴ In Oakland, 45,165 children (ages 5-14) are estimated as being latchkey children.⁵ These numbers are only increasing as more families either have two parents that work or are headed by single parents who must work.

In the past 15 years the number of women entering the labor force has increased steadily. By 1990, 60% of American women will be employed with the increase accompanying a similar increase in the proportion of families supported solely by women. This revolution in family structure over the past 25 years has been caused by: the doubling divorce rate, the tripling of birth rates for unmarried women; and the increasing trend for single mothers to set up their own homes rather than live with relatives.

Also by 1990 one in ten parents will be a single parent and two-thirds of two-parent families will have both parents working. The number of working mothers of school-age children 6-17 years has more than doubled from over one-quarter in 1947 to almost two-thirds in

4. California Senate Office of Research. Who's Watching Our Children? The Latchkey Child Phenomenon, November 1983.

5. Assessing the Need For Child Care. p. 3

1980. The Children's Defense Fund reports these figures: 6

- * By 1995, two-thirds of all preschool children will have mothers in the work force. However four out of five school age children will have working mothers by 1995.
- * In 1985, 84% of black working mothers, 79% of Hispanic working mothers, and 69% of white working mothers worked full time.
- * Mothers work out of economic necessity. A 1983 New York Times poll reported that "for 71% of mothers who work the primary reason was not for something interesting to do but to support their families."

(See Appendix A for graph on number of children with mothers in the labor force.)

An increasing number of parents therefore need and want care for their children between the hours when they are able to be at home and when their children are not in school. In most communities, including Oakland, there are waiting lists for many childcare centers. This is especially the case for publicly subsidized slots. Parents with school-age children seek programs most suited to their child's level of maturity, independence and need for adult supervision. In a Bay Area survey on reasons for wanting childcare 78% of the parents stated working or seeking work. (Only 3% stated child development as one of the reasons.) Childcare has become the fourth highest expense for families after shelter, food and taxes.

6. Children's Defense Fund, Child Care: The Time is Now, Washington, D.C. 1987, p.2.

C. Why are services for children important during these hours?

It was found in a 1983 study of area employers in Washington, D.C. that single parents tended to miss work because of childcare responsibilities more often than married parents, and that employed parents frequently expected children to care for themselves before and after school (24% of these youngsters were 11 years old or younger). Similar studies in urban areas have confirmed the fact that some 15-30% of all children under 14 years of age take care of themselves or are cared for by siblings during nonschool hours. Such arrangements constitute the second most common childcare situation for children under 14; only care by parents is used more frequently. It was also found that parents with lower than average incomes tend more often to expect children to take care of themselves or be cared for by a sibling.⁷

Several major studies have documented the effects of self-care on children's academic and social activities, on their fears, and on rates of accidents and child abuse. It has been found children with employed parents often do worse academically and are more fearful than those who receive adult supervision, with urban settings producing the most fear among children. It is obvious therefore, that the need for care and supervision during these hours extends beyond parents' work-schedule issues. Two important aspects emerge in examining the need for services during these crucial hours. First, there is safety (which parents often mention as their first priority) which is especially a concern in an urban environment like

7. Strother, Deborah Burnett, "Latchkey Children: THE Fastest-Growing Special Interest Group in the Schools," Phi Delta Kappan. December 1984. p. 291-292.

Oakland where the serious crime rate is nearly double the statewide rate.⁸ Preventing children from becoming involved in activities that could be harmful to them and/or their communities is important. Places that provide some amount of supervision, and keep kids off the streets constitute the traditional childcare providers.

Many youth this age are easily susceptible to negative influences--becoming involved in crime, drugs or teenage pregnancy creates problems for both young men and women.

In a rural area that is relatively crime-free, latchkey children are not any more or less socially and academically adjusted and fearful than children who are regularly supervised by an adult. . . In contrast, negative experiences for latchkey children have been demonstrated in inner-city areas. Thus there appear to be community differences with respect to a latchkey child's response to the situation.⁹

For example, in Oakland 60% of arson was committed by children between the close of school and the return home of parents.¹⁰ In 1983, 6,748 children under 18 years of age were arrested. In addition, in Alameda County (which includes Oakland) one in ten teenage girls become pregnant, and seven in ten teenagers who become pregnant have abortions. (13-17 year old teens constitute 5% of all births in Northern Alameda County).¹¹ Although many of these youth are in need of more than simple supervision, the lack of it can compound other personal and social problems.

8. Ibid, p.23

9. Setting Policy for Young Adolescents in the Afterschool Hours: Proceedings from a Conference, 1984, p.15.

10. United Way. Impact 90, p.24-25

11. Ibid, p.25

There are more alarming statistics:

- * females under 15 are the only group of women in this country for whom the birth rate is not declining
- * 7th grade boys in junior high schools are the most victimized students in our schools
- * 20-30% of 8th graders drink excessively
- * heavy drinkers among older adolescents report initiation to alcohol at age 12.12

Secondly, these programs help minimize the misuse of a crucial time period that could contribute to a child's mental and emotional growth.

Good child care and meaningful recreation and cultural activities not only provide a safe environment, they make a major contributions to young people's cognitive, emotional and social development. The absence of good care contributes to a plethora of family and community problems.¹³

For children of lower income households, and who are exposed to negative elements (unemployment, drugs, crime) every moment spent supplementing academic work is important. Afterschool programs could help support the work of teachers during regular school hours. ¹⁴

12. Leah Lefstein, et.al. 3:00 to 6:00: Young Adolescents at Home and in the Community. Center for Early Adolescence. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. 1982, p.1-2.

13. United Way, Impact 90, p.24

14. Footnote on evidence for lack of these programs leading to negative affects on kids.

D. Who funds school-age childcare and afterschool programs?

The Private Sector and Parent Fees

In addition to parent fees, public and private funds contribute to providing school-age childcare and afterschool programs. Although the state government provides some programs, the overwhelming majority of California's children who receive care receive it in the private sector. In 1986, about 581,000 children age 5-10 were in paid family care or center-based care in the state.¹⁵ However, these private sector caregivers do receive some state money to subsidize lower income families. (Children cared for in unlicensed homes are included in this private category since they receive no state funding.)¹⁶ Conversely, on the order of 6% of the youth in this state are served in the governmental sector.¹⁷ Ways to help and expand these private sector care givers is of utmost importance, and local policies need to take this factor into account.

In addition, employer-supported childcare is on the rise although they are definitely not keeping up with employee demand for these services. Of the nation's 44,000 companies with over 100 employees, less than one-half of one percent have opened corporate-

15. Note California in 1984 estimated a high of 815,000 latchkey kids (6-12) in total in the state. Add the number of preschool children in care and the 581,000 while a large number in terms of the number of kids in private care, is a small portion of the children who need care in general.

16. BANANAS estimates of # of unlicensed homes in Oakland.

17. Grubb, Norton, "The Conundrums of Early Childhood and Child Care Programs", Unpublished paper. December 1987, p.29.

sponsored child care centers. Out of 6 million U.S. businesses, only 2500 supported employee child care.¹⁸

State of California

California has the best developed childcare policy of any state in the country. Its programs primarily serve poor families and at-risk children who have been referred by CDS or the Department of Social Services (DSS). The State has taken on the majority of costs involved in providing programs to these children with less than 1.5% of California's childcare budget coming from the federal government. The State currently spends about \$320 million in direct funds for child care for low income families (Compared to Texas -\$36 million, New York - \$20 million, Illinois- \$12 million).¹⁹ It services a great number of children in various programs many of which are models for other states. The State programs include subsidies to providers serving low-income children, alternative payment programs, money to refurbish and improve current centers, etc. However, the state programs still leave much room for improvement, and fall short of meeting the expectations of parents and child advocates.

Supply remains inadequate; resources (including state support) are generally considered inadequate; variations in quality are too great; and many substandard child care facilities exist; and there is little consensus on some basic issues of purpose and method.²⁰

18. Popejoy, William. "Good Child Care is Good Business" in California Women. California Commission of the Status of Women. Issue II, 1987. p.1.

19. Grubb, "Conundrums", p. 29.

20. Ibid, p.30.

The recent Little Hoover Commission Study and the previous Caring for Tomorrow Report agree that the delivery of children's services is fragmented in California. Currently, the State Department of Education (SDE) and the State Department of Social Services (DSS) administer various parts of a California's child care program. There is some debate between the more developmentally focused SDE and the more care-focused DSS, and that debate affects the delivery of services.²¹

In 1985 SB 303 (The School Age Community Child Care Program-SACCC) allocated money for school-age childcare, and required that programs operate in or around school sites. One of its main problems was a requirement that providers enroll a fee-paying unsubsidized child for each low-income child subsidized by the state. The purpose of this 50-50 match was to increase the number of slots available to middle-income families. Though the concept was good, the implementation became a nightmare, primarily because demography made it extremely difficult for one group to enroll enough of the other group. A technical bill was passed to correct for these and other implementation problems in SB 303.²²

21. For more on the roles of SDE and DSS see Grubb, "Conundrums"; Caring for Tomorrow; and MPR's Evaluation of SB 303.

22. MPR Associates, Evaluation of the SB 303 School-Age Community Child Care Program: Final Report. December 1, 1987, p. 6

The Federal Government

Partially due to increasing political pressure on the federal government, Democrats in Congress have proposed The Act for Better Childcare (ABC), the most promising bill out of at least 100 bills introduced in total in Congress in the past year. Drafted by a 107 member coalition of childcare providers and advocates, this bill would give matching grants to states for expanded childcare services to families earning no more than 115% of the median income. A two and a half billion dollar appropriation is authorized for the first year with future amounts as yet unspecified. Although proponents of the bill expect opposition from conservative Republicans, in fact some conservatives have also embraced the bill. They recognize the potential loss of support from middle-class women supporters.²³

On the Republican side, the Child Care Services Improvement Act would provide about \$300 million a year to expand day care programs, give tax breaks to firms providing childcare services for employees, and set up insurance pools to lower liability costs. "A compromise between the Dodd-Kildee (Dem.) and Hatch-Johnson (Rep.) camps could ensure a virtually veto-proof bill."²⁴

Much of the debate centers on how far the government should go in providing childcare, and who should pay the future costs. Some advocates favor a system resembling the public school system, but this large a program frightens many who say the government cannot afford such a system financially or deliver if successfully bureaucratically. Other proponents argue that the government should

23. Article yet to be included in bilio on ABC bill

24. Ibid.

target its monies to low-income families and much of the current proposed legislation fails to do that.

Corporations

Many people argue that there should be more reliance on private sources and less pressure on already financially strapped governments to provide funds for services. In reality, as of 1984 foundations gave an annual sum of \$2.1 billion and corporations \$2.3 billion to a variety of charities and programs. Though many foundations and corporations do fund programs for youth, a review of the 500 foundations (of the total 22,000) that control 91 percent of the foundation funds show relatively little focus on youth.²⁵ Therefore, it must be up to government if not to provide funds, then to convince the private sector of the need for such programs and how they would benefit from them. Ideally public-private partnerships would be one solution.

2.OAKLAND'S PRESENT SCHOOL-AGE CHILD CARE SITUATION

A. Poverty and Children in Oakland

In examining the status of school-age childcare and afterschool programs in Oakland, there are some strategies from other communities in California and the country that can be used as potential alternatives. However, Oakland does have some characteristics that make its problems unique and solutions more elusive.

25. 3:00 to 6:00, p. 52.

While the percentage of people living below poverty in Oakland is less than that of other comparably sized cities (i.e. Atlanta, Baltimore and Cleveland), it is higher than that of other East Bay cities.²⁶ Although Oakland's population represents only 30% of the East Bay total, 60% of the high poverty census tracts are in Oakland.²⁷ The number of children in Oakland who are poor is also quite startling. According to the 1980 Census there are 10,559 families with children under 18 years in Oakland living below the poverty level. Out of every 100 children, 37 live in poverty, with over 30,000 children growing up poor.²⁸ Alameda County which includes Oakland also has the lowest median income for single mothers in 1980 (\$11,073); and the largest proportion of 1982-83 allocation for subsidized childcare from the State Department of Education (40% of the total budget).²⁹

In addition, the diversity of Oakland's population presents special problems in trying to accommodate children from a variety of backgrounds. Oakland's population was 47% black, 10% Hispanic, and 8% Asian and Pacific Islander, and 35% white in 1980. In the Bay Area over one in five children 5-17 years old speak a language other than English at home.

26. The population and percent of people 16-65 who are impoverished in these cities are as follows; Atlanta-425,072 (23%); Baltimore-796,775 (20%); Cleveland-573,822 (19%); Oakland-339,337 (17%). This data is from the 1980 census.

27. 1984 report or Assessing?, p.

28. Urban Strategies Council, A Chance for Every Child, p. 16

29. BANANAS County Child Care Profiles, 1985.

B. The Need for School-Age Childcare in Oakland

There were approximately 69,250 children of day-care age (0-14) in Oakland in 1987 (See Appendix B for breakdown of children in need of services by age). This figure is likely to grow by at least 11% over the 1980 population by the year 2000, with a higher peak (about 20% higher than 1980) occurring by 1990. In addition, the job growth of downtown Oakland is expected to double the present size of the downtown labor force by the year 2000. About half of the added jobs (approximately 20,000) are likely to be filled by women.³⁰ (See Appendix C for Oakland's projected population and employment growth). These increases will lead to a greater need for children's services in general.

In early 1987, there were 12,172 child care slots of all types in Oakland. (Of these only 210 were located in the downtown area.) The Child Care Task Advisory Committee estimated 13,982 spaces were needed for school-age children, compared to 1,687 slots needed for infants and an oversupply of 4,078 preschool (See Appendix D & E). Moreover, they reported that the demand for school-age care will increase significantly during the latter half of this decade.³¹ BANANAS Childcare Resource and Referral Service calculates that as many as 41,000 children ages 6-9 years old could not be served in existing Bay Area programs by 1985. That number has only increased in the past 3 years. They estimate the problem to be especially acute for young school-age children (kindergarten-7 years old) who

29. Assessing the Need For Child Care in Oakland, p.V

31. Ibid, p. V

are more likely than older school-age children to use a formal afterschool program.³²

To further illustrate the unmet need for programs and services for school age children, MPR Associates, an educational consulting firm produced an evaluation of SB 303 which calculated a rough estimate of unmet need for school-age childcare in California. Almost three-quarters (71.4%) of the agencies they studied maintained waiting lists. (In fact families eligible for state subsidies of their child care costs wait for an average of one year before space is available .³³) And these lists are an estimate of the minimum number of children who would be ready to enroll if the program were expanded. The waiting list data showed that the unmet need is great enough that the majority of the SACCC (School Age Community Child Care Act) programs could increase the number of spaces immediately 10-50 percent and still be enrolled to capacity. Statewide, the number of children enrolled could be expanded in the areas already being served by at least 4,500 or about 30%. There are obviously many more children who need care in districts that do not have SACCC programs.³⁴

The availability of childcare is usually assessed in terms of the number of slots available, not their location, cost or quality. Adding accessibility and affordability complicates availability. Although there are in actuality excess preschool slots in Oakland,

32. Ibid, p.VI

33. United Way, Impact 90, p.

34. Interview with Bill Buchanan, Chief Administrator, Oakland Unified School District Child Development Centers.

certain areas do not have enough slots. And the slots that are available are often not affordable to the parents who need them, or of quality that gives parents a viable choice. For example, BANANAS calculates that in East Oakland there are extra unsubsidized school-age childcare slots that parents in the area cannot afford, and all the subsidized slots are full. Conversely, in West Oakland there are very few slots for families who need and/or can afford them.

The Oakland Task Force determined that the weekly cost of school-age childcare in Oakland is \$49 a week, with parents generally preferring care at or near the school (See Appendix F for percentage of income that low income parents would have to pay for childcare). The greatest supply of school-age care is in the North Hills area, and fewest spaces in the Chinatown/Central Community Development District. 35

Of the number of active homes on file with the Childcare Resource and Referral agencies, 33% were family day-care homes, 38% were private childcare centers, and 29% were publicly subsidized childcare facilities.³⁶ Among Oakland city workers, a higher number use care in homes other than their own, rather than care in a licensed center. More than half of these family day-care homes care for children of more than one family. Choice based on quality of service for families with an income of under \$25,000 is questionable, given that, 43% said that they were forced to take whatever care they could find. For these families in particular but also for most

35. Interview with Angela Johnson, Oakland Child Care Coordinator.

36. BANANAS, County Child Care Profiles Of Alameda County.

families there are not enough options to choose from. (See Appendix G for County Child Care Report of Alameda County).

C. Oakland Task Forces

The City of Oakland has actively addressed the need for child care. In October, 1984 the Oakland Community Child Care Impact Committee completed an analysis of Oakland's downtown child care needs and presented their findings to the City Council in the Oakland Child Care Impact Committee Report. Out of that report came a Child Care Coordinator staff position and the Child Care Advisory Committee. Comprised of private providers, childcare information and referral agency staff, school board members and city officials, the Advisory committee produced Assessing the Need for Child Care in Oakland on October 30, 1987. This new report concentrated more on residential needs for childcare and calculated the number of spaces needed for infant, preschool, and school-age child care. It did not focus on strategies for increasing the number of slots.

The Advisory Committee has evolved into a Commission and will receive new appointments in the near future. In the meantime, the coordinator and her staff have been working on a number of issues and offer a range of services for providers and other people interested in the childcare issue.³⁷ For childcare providers they offer referral services, technical advice on licensing issues, and access to loans available through the city to help with costs. They also promote options for employer-supported child-care with businesses, and supply information and technical advice on operating childcare

37. Interview , Angela Johnson, Oakland Child Care Coordinator

facilities to city departments who are involved in new city developments. Furthermore, the office tries to help community organizations interested in collaborative childcare efforts. They offer advice on how to help the childcare situation in a particular neighborhood, and inform them about other organizations doing similar work.

Once the Commission is appointed the office will begin working on a number of projects. These include fundraising strategies for financing centers and making care more affordable for families; developing a project in the central downtown district (which will include building a facility); and establishing some formal partnerships with the Oakland Unified School District and the Parks and Recreation Department, in hopes of increasing the supply of childcare.

D. Current local programs/services

Previously the City of Oakland provided money for child care providers through its Community Block Grants. This included funding to help defray potential providers' start-up costs, money for renovation and the total funding of some new centers. In 1987 the office gave grants totalling \$167,000. However, most of the money for this endeavor has dried up with the last actual center receiving money in . In addition, more money went to setting up pre-school childcare than school-age.³⁸

38. Oakland has delineated seven areas below the I-580 Freeway that have been targeted for renewal funds. These are Community Development Districts. They are West Oakland, Chinatown/Central, North Oakland, San Antonio, Fruitvate, Central East Oakland, & Elmhurst. What does this entail?

There are several organizations in Oakland or the Bay Area that address the issue of childcare and provide services. For example, the United Way of Alameda County produced Impact 90 in 1986, an analysis of many issues that were of importance to Northern Alameda County. Childcare was one of these issues, and the task force outlined some of the problems in the County specific to childcare and ways in which cities could help the situation. BANANAS, the state designated Resource and Referral Agency for Northern Alameda County, and the California School Age Consortium (CSAC) are some examples of other agencies.

1. The Oakland Unified School District and SB 303

The Oakland Unified School District's (OUSD) school-age childcare programs account for a portion of the childcare provided in Oakland.³⁹ The District runs two programs: The Child Development Centers sponsor a general childcare program for children age 3-8 years old (3rd grade), which currently serves about 2000 children at 22 sites. (About half are pre-school and half school-age). These centers have actually been in operation since World War II, and were the only state funded child care centers maintained in the country after the War. These programs have experienced some problem with funding due to school-age children only using the program half-days, and a center not being able to utilize that slot when the child is not there.

39. Information on the Child Development Centers can be found in the following: James Levine, Day Care and the Public Schools: Five Community Profiles, Education Development Center, Inc, p.31-47; Interview with Bill Buchanan; and MPR, Evaluation of SB 303 Legislation.

The Expanded School-Age Project is funded through SB 303 (properly known in California as the School Age Community Child Care Program [SACCC]) and was first implemented in 1986. Oakland's program is funded for \$199,998 with the cost to parents being \$2 per child per hour. Through SB 303 Oakland currently runs six sites serving 28-32 kids in each center, kindergarten-3rd grades (approximately 192 children). Although private providers could use OUSD school facilities, the Oakland Unified School District was the only applicant for SACCC funds. This was largely due to the short filing period for applicants and OUSD's immediate and less cumbersome access to use of school facilities. Consequently, while there are privately run SB 303 programs in other cities operating in schools, none exist in Oakland.⁴⁰

SB 303 requires that providers match each state dollar put into programs with parent fees and/or private grants. Oakland however, has been unable to meet those demands and was granted a waiver from the state for the 1986-87 and 1987-88 operating years. The District had hoped that the sites in the wealthier neighborhoods would generate those matching funds, but due to dramatically reduced enrollment during the summer this was not the case. In the summers parents have to pay for more hours as children are out of school all day and many parents cannot afford to pay the higher amounts. Moreover, children who pay enroll for fewer hours in general than those who are subsidized.

40. For example, the Los Angeles YMCA runs programs for latchkey children using school facilities in the city. (MPR Report on SB 303)

In addition, not all children are given equal priority in SACCC. First priority is given to children who have been identified as neglected, abused, or at risk of abuse or neglect. Second priority is given to children in kindergarten and 1-3rd grades, and to their school-age siblings under 13 years of age. Third priority goes to children in 4-9th grades, and within each age-group priority children from the lowest income families are admitted first.⁴¹ The MPR evaluation also notes that the SACCC program appears to be serving a higher income population than other CDD programs even in the subsidized component.⁴² They noted that except for those expecting to attract large numbers of children whose mothers participated in the state's new workfare program (Greater Avenues for Independence [GAIN]), SACCC programs may have avoided the low income areas served by many state-subsidized programs.

The District currently has no plans to expand the Expanded School-Age Project. Given their difficulty in finding empty classrooms in which to place the programs. In addition, no formal evaluation of the program has been done by the District. Other barriers to expansion include lack of state money and too small an administration to handle expansion.⁴³

41. In fact, MPR Associates calculated in their study of the programs that 1/4 were in kindergarten, little over half were in 1-3rd grades, 18.3% were in 4-6th grades, and less than 1% were in higher grades.

42. In the SACCC programs, 44.1 percent of the subsidized children paid some fees (that is, were partially subsidized), compared to 32 percent in other CDD center-based programs.

43. Currently only classrooms that are not used at all during the day are utilized. The District does not use classrooms that are used by children during the regular school day, even though they are empty after 3pm. Some concern about disturbing classrooms for regular

2. The Oakland Parks and Recreation Department

Better known as Parks and Rec, the Oakland Parks and Recreation Department is a major source of programs for school-age children in Oakland.⁴⁴ The Department's Recreation Services Division runs programs in schools, and in 23 separate Neighborhood Recreation Centers. Programs are offered year round, (with fewer offered in the winter and more in the summer) to school-age children and some adults. The schools serve as sites for afterschool programs only while the Recreation Centers are often open all day from 8:30 to 5pm, and service a wider variety of ages.

Though programs are not run in every school, Parks and Rec says its programs are accessible to all schools, meaning they are at least in most neighborhoods. Program categories include Dance and Music, sports, cultural enrichment, academic support, etc. While many of the programs are free, and the playgrounds can be used by anyone, some programs, like dance classes, require a fee.

In 1987-88 the Department appropriated \$6 million dollars (37%) of its total \$16 million budget to recreation, with \$744,040 (12% of the \$6 million) appropriated to afterschool programs (which includes playgrounds and recreation centers. They estimate that 1,837,863 children/persons use their programs (with the recreation centers

teachers and students drives this policy. Shared space also affects the quality of the childcare program some believe.

44. Information on the Oakland Parks and Rec department is taken from The department's Fun Times; Interview with Pat Holston; and Ceda Floyd.

serving the most people and high school programs serving the least.)⁴⁵ [In the past few years their budget for such programming has decreased by [?]%]. Whenever any city faces budget cuts, afterschool programs are usually one of the first things cut because they are seen as luxuries. Ironically, whenever communities start trying to help idle youth they immediately point to a lack of programs available for them after school.

45. For a better breakdown: recreation centers serve 1,555,874; playgrounds serve 124,855; drama programs serve 77,000; junior high programs serve 78,963; and high school programs serve 1,171. The \$6 million budget also includes camps and any other special programs.

3. The YMCA

The YMCA began its licensed school-age childcare programs in the late 1970's with money from the now defunct CETA program.⁴⁶ They are primarily located in communities where no state funded childcare programs exist, and currently service about 400 children in 6 programs. Their programs are primarily supported through parent fees, and some United Way Funds, and serve mostly middle-income children. However, there are full and partial scholarships for approximately 5 children per facility, and the YMCA tries to make arrangements with parents who have trouble paying.

In the summer two Fun Clubs (in Northwest and East Oakland), serve 40-50 low-income kids each for \$35-\$45 a week, and are almost totally subsidized by parent fees from the other programs. The YMCA has offered these clubs for the past 5 or 6 years and although they are not licensed and are more recreational, they offer the same quality of services.

The National YMCA Task Force has recently developed a supplement programs for older kids, which they are just now starting to implement. They are trying to make those more specialized programs. The YMCA has found a definite drop in program participation at the 4th grade. Therefore new programming must be developed for the 4th, 5th, and 6th graders whom the YMCA is also committed to serving. In fact, some current Oakland programs are trying out new programs to recruit older children.

Most importantly, the Oakland YMCA is in the process of expanding its services. They are looking into the possibilities of

46. Interview with Equoya Thomas, Executive Director, Greater Oakland YMCA.

buying portables at public schools, and if there is enough parent interest, providing school-age childcare programs at as many sites as possible.

4. Neighborhood Program Examples

a. Jubilee West

Jubilee West, a housing rehabilitation program in West Oakland started a youth program in 1987.⁴⁷ The new program offers year-round afterschool programs for children ages 6-18 (though in reality only those 6-13 take advantage of the program) which operates Monday through Friday from 3-6pm and may soon be operational on Saturdays. In addition its children are mostly low-income. The staff is comprised of 3 adults and 3 junior counselors with the current director, Glenn Barnes, on-board since February 1987. Located across from Prescott Elementary school, their enrollment of 72 reaches 10% of the 700 students at Prescott. The afterschool program emphasizes academic achievement and monitors children's progress in school by talking with teachers, counselors and parents to inform the latter on the child's activities in the program.⁴⁸

47. Interview with Glenn Barnes. They had been financing a program run by the Boys Club for the past 2 years previous to starting their own program.

50. The programs offers several activities:
 1). Cultural trivia--5-10 minute history pieces every day.
 2). Community service--includes outreach to kids and seniors with teens adopting seniors (soon to be operational). Sweeping streets and writing letters to donors, city officials and others about things that bother the kids. Encourage older kids to write support letters to youth in shelters and jails. Also pen pals with kids in

b. East Oakland Youth Development Center (EOYDC)

Since 1978 EOYDC has provided services in four major areas to youth, aged 8-24. The largest program is Project J.O.Y. where youth receive pre-employment training, GED preparation, and job placement.⁴⁹ The center has programs in art, family counseling, and remediation through homework assistance and tutoring for elementary and junior high students. It was started by the Clorox Corporation 10 years ago and has won recognition for its programs.

The Center cost \$3 million to build and start programming, and it is 60% privately funded through donations from corporate sponsors, The East Oakland Youth Development Center Foundation, and grants from the United Way (JOY) and the State of California.⁵⁰ The Center leases space to other programs, namely Headstart, OPS, and the Oakland Public Schools. The Center also sends about 1500 newsletters to patrons each quarter to garner support (monetary and volunteers).

other countries. Future recycling project- will be used as an entrepreneur project.

3). Field trips--every day the staff try to take the kids on field trips. They have been to the Mayors Office, monuments, the Dance Theatre of Harlem, and Alcatraz.

4). The youth program also has a junior council with kids 6-12 who are involved in fundraising for future trips, and help plan the center's program.

49. Interview with Connie Dyer, Director East Oakland Youth Development Center. In four years the center has served 1600-1700 youth and placed them in jobs. They do follow-up job placement for a year but that will expand to a 18-24 month follow-up soon.

50. Robert Shetterly, the head of Clorox who helped raise the initial money for the Center also founded a Foundation in their name whose sole purpose was to raise money for the Center. Shetterly retired in 1979. The endowment raises about \$350,00 to 400,000 a year for the Center.

They receive good community support from Allen Temple Baptist Church, and ARMS (Allen Temple's Senior center).

Future projects include: a skills training project (end of 1988); and a single parents program for young minority women- providing legal aid, welfare services, and housing help (1989). The Center staff and director are also examining what role the center should play in the drug issue and child care. Though they do provide support for people through their counselors, they have no treatment or prevention programs. They are questioning whether they want to include this type of service in their formal programming. Funding availability may well determine the extent of the expansion.

5. New or future services/projects

a. The Castlemont Corridor Coordinating Council (CCCC)

Supervisor Perata and members of the Elmhurst community, after much directing attention to Oakland's out-of-control drug problem, organized the Castlemont Corridor Substance Abuse Prevention Project in 1987.⁵¹ They realized that the Elmhurst area had a higher concentration of AFDC children and mothers than any other Oakland neighborhood and needed creative ways of dealing with drug abuse.

The project combines the resources of existing agencies (drug counseling prevention people, treatment people, school counselors, parks and rec, East Oakland Mental Health, Oakland Community Counseling) that deal with at-risk children and all their problems but especially the serious drug problem in the neighborhood. Its five components include: school intervention, after school

51. Interview with Frank Gilbert.

recreation, community support, special juvenile probation units, and tracking and evaluation of children it services. It currently reaches children in feeder schools (5 elementary and 2 middle) to Castlemont High School.

The project involves opening or expanding afterschool services at some of the neighborhood schools. Presently only Sobrante Park has actually opened with these new services. The directors of the project are presently trying to find money for the other programs. The program also has 2 corporations working with it. Their main job is to encourage employers to donate money to the project. The project is trying to get businesses and churches to adopt a school and provide money and services (e.g. volunteers) for that one school. The Project usually has monthly meetings of all involved to identify what children are using particular services, and coordinate the programs that are providing services in the community.

The SAPP is a pilot program, and its directors hope that if they can do well this first year, the State will provide money for expansion to other neighborhoods. Currently, several neighborhoods are clamoring for such services in their area. Recently a group from Sacramento, the OJSCP fund, led by Patty Oran, came down to take a look at the project.

b. GAIN

In 1986 California enacted the Greater Avenues for Independence Legislation, better known as the GAIN Program or "workfare", for AFDC recipients. It is essentially a program that provides education, job

training and employment services to eligible persons on welfare.⁵² In return for receiving welfare, the recipients must try to find a job with the help of agencies set up to provide employment-finding services. While in a training programs or seeking employment, the program will pay for childcare for children up to the age of 12. (It can be in a formal licensed center, in-home care, or a neighbor or relative's house.)

The State Department of Social Services which administers GAIN through the Alameda County Social Services Agency has contracted with area R&Rs to implement the bill's childcare component. The R&R's receive money from the State to help mothers find childcare in their neighborhoods, or near their workplaces. Payment for the services can be handled directly by the R&R or provider, or through either reimbursement to the parent. R&Rs have also been funded to actively recruit childcare providers, and help develop additional childcare slots.

Although the actual contract with the county's R&Rs has not been approved the following allocations are being requested for the program set to start in September 1988:

1. \$85,000 to develop additional child-care slots
2. \$281,000 to pay for administration of the program
3. \$1.2 million in total allocated to serve approximately 400-500 persons for the first year of the program. GAIN staff estimate that 61% of all recipients will need child-care, but for some reason only 65% of those people will actually request it. Therefore, they expect to serve about 45% of the total number of participants in the GAIN program.

52. Interview with Tammy Grahm, Alameda County GAIN Program Specialist.

(Only two local counties have already begun their programs--San Mateo and Santa Clara).

What does this mean for Oakland's families? In 1986, according to Alameda County welfare statistics, 49,872 persons in Alameda County were on AFDC, 75% of whom were single mothers. That's an increase of 11% since 1980. Many of these women will participate in the GAIN program over the next few years. (What % of AFDC mothers have kids over 6?)

3. Self-Care

a. Project phone friend

Several cities and communities have tried to deal with the fact that some children will be at home alone during non-school hours. Although Oakland has no such project currently it might want to consider these types of programs. For example in Houston, Texas Neighborhood Centers, Inc has established a telephone counseling program for children called CHATTERS (Children Home Alone Telephone Reassurance Service). It provides counseling from 2-6pm on schooldays assisting children with emergencies as well as helping them deal with loneliness. A monthly CHATTERS newsletter is sent to members (\$5 per year).

b. Neighborhood checks

The United Way suggests having one parent who is home before and after school as a check-in point for children on their way to their own home. Children can be monitored and can return to the neighbor's house in case of an emergency or fear.

3. OAKLAND'S NEXT STEP

While the City of Oakland has responded to the demand for childcare and afterschool programs, the scope of their accomplishments has not kept up with the magnitude of the need for such services. Reliance on the city government is important and they can provide leadership in the area, but greater involvement of the Oakland community is needed. Oakland organizations that have access to a wide variety of resources should promote the need for such services, and become a major voice in removing barriers to expansion and creation of new programs. Furthermore, community mobilization around these issues can spur community spirit and activism. This type of action along with leadership from the city government makes for better policy implementation and ultimately help for Oakland's children and youth.

One barrier has been recommendations from reports on Oakland or Northern Alameda County's childcare and afterschool problem that are either not implemented for various reasons, or forgotten. For example, the United Way's Impact 90 report contained a number of good recommendations but their task force was not well linked with the funding policies within the Agency.⁵³ Consequently, the agency has

53. United Way's goals included: improve staff training and skill development opportunities; strengthen consultation available to professionals; promote economic integration and linking of subsidized/unsubsidized programs; assist with child care start up costs through special resource strategies; improve data system and access; and make child care a public education priority.

not taken into account the reports's recommendations which would involve changing the manner in which the Agency funds projects. Oakland's 1984 "downtown needs report" was fairly comprehensive, and out of it came an Advisory Committee and a staff position. However, few of the other recommendations were implemented. The Advisory Committee's 1987 residentially-focused report did not analyze residential needs as comprehensively as the 1984 report did downtown needs. It is unclear which old or new recommendations they intend to move on upon appointment of the new Commission.

A. Objectives: Increasing Supply

The ultimate objective of any policy that addresses the shortage of school-age childcare and afterschool programs is to increase the number of spaces for children. That increase can be accomplished in two ways or some combination of both: 1) Increase the number of slots in current programs by changing staff:child ratios and researching better ways of using current space. 2) Increase the actual number of programs or facilities that offer programs.

The new regulations determining space usage and staff:child ratios that went into effect within the past 2 months may help address the first method. However, no analysis has been done on the actual impact these new regulations may have in general, and definitely not specific to Oakland.

The second method leads to some debates about who can ultimately finance these new programs or who they should serve given limited resources. Although communities across the country have found innovative ways of financing projects these methods differ greatly,

and often seem to require some great initiative on the part of a particular community. Given that it is often hard to stimulate such initiative, and the fact that most of these model programs serve a small number of the children in need of them, how will Oakland's rapidly increasing need for these programs be met? To better answer that question an informed childcare discussion of policy issues relevant to the Oakland community must take place. These policy issues stem from problems common to childcare in general, although some of the issues are more of a problem for Oakland than others, and that will be indicated.

B. Policy Issues

1. Operating agencies/Organization

This issue is less of a problem for Oakland. Unlike many cities in California, and especially outside of California, Oakland has a number of organizations who concentrate on the childcare issue. These agencies or groups include: the city government (through the Child Care Coordinator position), R&Rs, providers, some businesses, schools, parks and rec, churches, advocacy organizations, community groups, and some consortiums of groups. Mechanisms also exist for these organizations and agencies to talk to one another, and although more of this may be needed, the basic structure exists.

2. Funding/Affordability

This is one of the main problems for Oakland. Financial policy issues in school-age childcare take on two forms--funding for providers, and affordability for families. Currently in California

there are multiple sources of funding for these programs: federal, state, city funds, school district funds (both in-kind and direct cash contributions), parent fees (including cash payments at both a flat fee rate and on a sliding scale), and contributions by consortiums of businesses. The frustrating aspect of funding is everyone seems to be financially strapped. One question that Oakland must be aware of is: what does Oakland have in its power to do and what ultimately must be in the hands of Sacramento or Washington, D.C.?

The other main issue is how to make services affordable for families, and what proportion should be subsidized vs. non subsidized. Many programs provide sliding scales for the benefit of low-income parents. Other programs for these families are subsidized by government (usually state). However, as the demand as well the cost of providing these programs increases and pressure mounts for the state to provide more subsidies, the dilemma over which groups the government should help intensifies. Some politicians say the state should concentrate its efforts on the poorest families only, and leave low to middle income families to private sector care, while pressuring businesses to provide more funding for services.

3. Reaching low-income children

It has been documented that low-income families use afterschool services for their children more frequently than other families. Consequently they are disproportionately affected when these services are cut, because they cannot afford to pay for alternate services if available, or transport their children to services in other

neighborhoods. Oakland experiences the lack of an ongoing fundraising stream to help low-income parents pay for weekly fees. For example, in East Oakland the services that are available are beyond the financial reach of the low-income parents. Although some of these centers charge \$30-\$50 a week, which is relatively inexpensive parents can't afford the services. Consequently, centers cannot find children for their spaces although there are children in the neighborhood who need the services. (See Appendix F for percentage of income that low income parents would pay for childcare). Conversely, in West Oakland there are not enough childcare services even for those parents who could afford them. These differing needs among neighborhoods are very important in devising solutions to the problem. Lack of funds for transportation is another problem.⁵⁴

4. Licensing

Licensing guidelines that school-age childcare providers have faced were originally intended for preschool childcare providers. For example, appropriate staff qualifications need to be different for preschool and school-age programs but recent guidelines only included preschool considerations. Space requirements per child were also inappropriate for school-age programs. A big hurdle was getting

54. California's SB 303 bill originally required that a school district or a subcontractor of a school district had to be the sole-provider of transportation to and from school-age child care programs. This ruled out many non-profit groups. A new provision will allow programs to provide their own transportation so long as they do not violate health and safety standards.

regulations passed that more aptly applied to school-age centers. Those new regulations recently were approved, and are just now going into effect. It is unclear what effects the new regulations will have upon the system. Some believe that the new regulations may not be a total blessing, for they may price some well-qualified childcare providers out of the market, by requiring them to hire more experienced staff, or preventing potential providers with knowledge of children's needs but not proper academic experience from starting centers.

5. Scheduling

Children not only need care after school, but also before school, during school holidays, and during extended vacations. While there is a shortage of school-age childcare between 3 and 6 pm there is even less childcare during these other time periods. Often centers that provide care open at 7am but most do not. However, this problem needs to be addressed after the shortage in the afternoon has been worked out.

6. The "coolness" factor

One main problem in discussing school-age childcare and afterschool programs is the immediate dismissal of ~~and by~~ older children. Often providers judge these youth as a low priority because they do not take advantage of such services. From the youths' perspectives these programs are sometimes seen as pseudo-babysitters which they feel is not needed. However, rather than writing these children off, more creative programs need to be

designed for them. They especially need programs that keep them off the streets and channel their creative energies. The Oakland YMCA is in the process of developing such programming.

7. Residential vs. downtown

Downtown Oakland promises to grow dramatically, as will its employees' need and demand for childcare. Policies that put pressure on employers to provide for such services can and should be designed. However, not all the focus should be on downtown. Although their employees have childcare, those services are usually close to the employees home and/or neighborhood school. There seems to be little room for more childcare spaces in the downtown area although that can be explored more.

Given that most childcare spaces are in residential neighborhoods, policies that concentrate on expanding residential programs not only help the downtown workers, but also Oakland residents who do not work downtown.

4. CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Youth as a public good?

So what can an organizations like the Urban Strategies Council and the University-Oakland Metropolitan Forum do to motivate these groups to tackle this important issue? Which groups, if any, perceive some stake and are willing to take responsibility? Although it seems like each of these players should be doing their part, in

reality it is much easier to let someone else take the responsibility. For example, employers are more easily persuaded of the necessity for care for infant and pre-school children. For them school-age children are not yet a priority. (Even though many are beginning to realize that taking an interest in the youth in their neighborhoods may ultimately be in the company's best interest.)

As everyone says the problem should be left up to someone else it becomes clear that these children are a public good. Everyone should have some stake and therefore share cost in providing services for them. This argument needs to be put forth in many different ways to make people realize the need for school-age childcare and afterschool programs. There are three issues that probably need to be emphasized for policymakers and the community:

- * safety
- * youth as resources
- * economic self-interest

One issue that should be important to parents and the community is safety. Parents want to keep their children safe, and the community wants to keep itself safe. More longterm studies need to be done on the damage children who have nothing to do after school do to a community and themselves.

Another issue is one of youth as resources. Several programs, like the now defunct federal CETA program put youth to work cleaning the community, or ^{as ~~in~~} volunteer programs with elders. Children, especially the older ones age 10-15, have a wealth of energy and creativity. They could be used in any number of ways to help a community, or business. Internships that show them the value of working and type of work ~~done~~ need to be explored more. Perhaps they

could be used to help the younger children. Such an experience (tutoring or mentoring) would benefit both parties involved.

Yet another issue is economic self-interest for businesses and communities. Many of these children instead of being in programs are now involved in drugs (and using beepers to make their drug deals), which costs the community a great deal in trying to stop the flow of drugs. Given the large outcry in Oakland about drugs and crime, some of the energy that is going into complaining needs to be channeled into programming for these children. That is exactly what the Castlemont people are doing.

B. Experimentation

One way to address the issue might be to do as the Castlemont people have done and concentrate intensely on a particular neighborhood. For example, West Oakland could be the target of efforts by local churches, a few businesses, and the city. Maybe these people could discuss ways of using church or other vacant facilities, and helping to finance several programs (one for both groups of children). Then they could also institute a phone friend or neighborhood check-in program. Also the media could be involved in publicizing these experimental efforts.

Or maybe efforts could be made in East Oakland to help families pay for childcare. (See appendix for three school-age childcare models). Low-income children in particular need special help/services that could be publicized by the city government.

C. Options that need to be pursued

1. Funding

In the very near future, one of the many childcare bills pending in Congress will be most likely pass, leading to an influx of money for many states, including California. There is no telling how much of this money will make its way to Oakland, but it is hoped that Oakland will receive some of it given the city's current limited resources. ~~The city probably realizes~~ ^{It needs the money} that ultimately, and especially in the case of low-income families subsidies must be provided and that means state and federal monies. However, limited resources leads one to the conclusion that not everyone can be helped by governmental money. Therefore, only the low-income families should be targeted for governmental funds.

Other problems in providing childcare for low-income families include the lack of special outreach programs for low-income families. ~~Some~~ families do not even know of the few services available to them. Some key factors Indiana grantees identified that are helpful for reaching low-income children include:

- * using an agency with a history of providing services to low-income families in the neighborhood
- * intensive outreach techniques such as door to door contact with low-income families.

In Austin, Texas they reach families through tenant councils, low income housing projects and schools.

2. Utilizing existing resources

Certain agencies or groups work best at providing certain services. For example, Parks and Rec is already involved in providing afterschool recreation. However, they could probably reach even more low-income children than they are presently serving. Some examination of where these programs are located is needed in relationship to unmet school-age childcare needs. Other agencies that need to be tapped more include churches, and businesses. In addition, can school sites be utilized in a different way to provide more slots? For school-age children, on-site programs are important due to transportation difficulties. At the moment there seems to be no one in charge of the childcare issue in the Oakland Unified School District. Bill Buchanan is the administrator but does not have the authority to make policy decisions. Some discussion with the School Board and School Superintendent may be in order.

3. Other questions/ideas:

* In considering subsidies for low-income families--What is low-income? What should the cut-off be? 84% or 115% of the median income level?

* Studies of the savings of reducing drug and keeping kids off the street in schools need to be done (Supplementing the United Way's arson data in Impact 90 might be a place to start.)

* Working with the Oakland YMCA in financing ^{or - site} childcare portables and mobilizing parents could be a project for a group.

* The Bay Area Black Professionals are a social organization for black professionals who sponsor some projects with children. Maybe groups like these could be tapped to provide more role models for children.

→ In conclusion, Oakland as a community needs to decide on its long term goals. Although they are currently battling a vicious war on crack and other drugs, often fighting with children, they must address the children who are not yet involved in these and similar activities. Creating services during nonschool hours now can prevent problems later. Addressing the issue helps the parents, the community, and most of all the children themselves.

REFERENCES

"A Target for Anti-Drug Efforts." Editorial. The Oakland Tribune. January 12, 1988, p. 10.

Advisory Committee on Child Development Programs. "Approaches to School Age Child Care"

Baden, Genser, Leving & Seligson. School-Age Childcare: An Action Manual. Auburn House Publishing Company. Boston, MA, 1982.

BANANAS Childcare and Information Referral. BANANAS Choosing Childcare Handbook.

Bates, Thomas. The Changing Family to the Year 2000: Planning For Our Children's Future. Assembly Human Services Committee. Fall 1987.

Berkeley Planning Associates & Fremont Child Care Task Force. City of Fremont: Child Care Report. October 3, 1987.

_____. Local Strategies for Improving Child Care. February 23, 1987.

Bergstrom, Joan & Donna Dreher. "The Evaluation of Existing Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements: Day Care for the School-Age Child." in Policy Issues in Day Care: Summaries of 21 Papers. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1977.

Bruno, Rosalind. "After School Care of School-Age Children." December 1984. (Bureau of the Census)

California Assembly Office of Research. Caring for Tomorrow: A Local Government Guide to Child Care. Lynn Depapp. Project Manager. December 1985.

California School Age Child Care Review. (CSAC) Vol.1. No.1. Summer 1986

California Department of Social Services. "Notification of Approved Regulations on School-Age Child Care". March 11, 1988.

CSAC-- 4th Annual School Age Child Care and Recreation Conference. Meeting the After School Needs of Children and Youth 5-18: Agenda. Feb. 1, 1986.

California Senate Office of Research. Who's Watching Our Children? The Latchkey Child Phenomenon. November 1983.

_____. Facts About Child Care. February 1988.

California Women. California Commission on the Status of Women. Issue II, 1987.

Center for Early Adolescence. 3:00-6:00: Programs for Young Adolescents. National Survey of 24 Youth Serving Agencies. University of North Carolina At Chapel Hill. August 1983.

Children's Defense Fund. "CDF Reports: Child Care Programs for School-age Children Encounter Difficulties in Serving Low-Income Families." October 1986.

Children's Defense Fund. Child Care: The Time Is Now. Washington, D.C. 1987.

Commission on California State Government and Economy. The Children's Services Delivery System in California. Final Report. 1987.

Coolsen, Peter, Michelle Seligson & James Gabarino. When Schools Out and Nobody's Home. National Committee for the Prevention of Child Abuse. 1985.

Day Care USA Newsletter. "Tips on Day Care-School Agreements. Vol. 13, No.10, May 7, 1984

"Finances Are Key to After-School Child Care." New York Times. September 16, 1985. p. 1.

Galambos, Nancy and James Garabino. "Identifying the Missing Links in the Study of Latchkey Children." Children Today. July-August 1983. p. 2-4.

Galinsky, Ellen. Investing in Quality Child Care: A Report for AT&T. November 1986.

Gannett, Ellen. "State Initiatives on School-Age Child Care" School Age Child Care Project: Wellesley College Center for Research on Women. October 1985.

Gold, Deborah. "Advocates Highlighting Economic Benefits of Child Care." Chronicle of Higher Education. March 1988.

Gray, Ellen. "The Modern Dilemma of Latchkey Children: A Report of the Balancing Work and Family Project. National Committee for the Prevention of Child Abuse. 1986.

Grubb, W. Norton. "The Conundrums of Early Childhood and Child Care Programs" December 1987. (Prepared for The Conditions of Children in California, Policy Analysis for California Education)

Halcrow, Allan. "Child Care: The Latchkey Option." Personnel Journal. July 1986, p.12-13

Horowitz, Sandra. Final Evaluation of the 1985-86 After School Program. New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn Office of Educational Assessment. June 1986.

Kantrowitz, Barbara & Wingert, Pat. "The Clamor to Save the Family." Newsweek. February 29, 1988. p.60-61.

Lefstein, Leah; William Kerewsky; Elliot Medrich; & Carol Frank. 3:00-6:00: Young Adolescents at Home and in the Community. Center for Early Adolescence. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. 1982.

Levine, James. Day Care and the Public Schools: Profiles of Five Communities. Education Development Center, Inc.: Newton, MA, 1978.

Massey, Steve. "Child Care Finally at the Top of Lawmakers Agenda in '88." San Francisco Chronicle. February 8, 1988.

Medrich, Elliot, Judith Rozien, Victor Rubin, & Stuart Buckley. The Serious Business of Growing Up: A Study of Children's Lives Outside of School. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1982.

McNairy, Marion. "School-Age Child Care: Program and Policy Issues." in Current Issues in Day Care: Readings and Resources. ed. Carol H. Thomas. Oryx Press 1986. p. 22-24.

MPR Associates. Evaluation of the SB 303 School-Age Community Child Care Program: Final Report. December 1, 1987.

New York State Council on Children & Families. School-Age Child Care Technical Assistance Papers Nos. 1 & 2. May 1986.

Nieting, Peggy Lewis. "School-Age Child Care: In Support of Development and Learning." in Current Issues in Day Care: Readings and Resources. ed. Carol H. Thomas. Oryx Press, 1986, p. 25-29.

Noble, Kenneth. "Library as Day Care: New Curbs and Concerns." New York Times. February 15, 1988. p. 1.

Nover, Aimee and Ann Segal. "Day Care and Community: The Necessary Partnership." in Current Issues in Day Care: Readings and Resources. ed. Carol H. Thomas. Oryx Press, 1986. p. 33-35.

Oakland Child Care Advisory Task Force. Assessing the Need for Child Care in Oakland. Oakland Department of Social Services. October 30, 1987.

Oakland Community Child Care Impact Committee. Report. October 1984.

Oakland Office of Parks and Recreation. Fun Times. Summer 1987.

Powell, Douglas. "After School Child Care." Young Children. March 1987. p.62-66.

Project Interface. Annual Report. 1986-87 Academic Term.

San Francisco Chronicle. "Child Care Crisis." Editorial. February 21, 1988.

School Age Child Care Project Newsletter. (SACC). Vols.2, 3 & 4. Fall 1984, April 1985 & March 1987.

School Age Child Care Project: School Age Child Care: A Policy Report. Wellesley Center for Research on Women, December 1983.

Seligson, Michelle. "Child Care for The School-Age Child." Phi Delta Kappan. May 1986. p. 637-640.

Setting Policy for Young Adolescents in the After School Hours: Proceedings From a Conference. ERIC

Storer, Danielle. "Youth Given Athletic Alternatives to Drugs." The Daily Californian. April 4, 1988 p. 3.

Strother, Deborah Burnett. "Latchkey Children: The Fastest Growing Special Interest Group in the Schools." Phi Delta Kappan. December 1984. p. 290-293.

United Way of the Bay Area. Impact 90: Northern Alameda County Future Focus. June 1986.

United Way School Age Child Care Report. School's Out in LA. County: An Inventory Report. May 1986.

Urban Strategies Council, A Chance for Every Child: Oakland's Infants, Children, and Youth at Risk for Persistent Poverty, February 1988.

Interviews

1. Glenn Barnes, Youth Coordinator, Jubilee West

2. Bill Buchanan, Chief Administrator, Oakland Unified School District Child Development Centers
3. Arliss Currie, BANANAS Resource and Referral Agency
4. Connie Dyer, Director, East Oakland Youth Development Center
5. Ceda Floyd, Recreation Services Manager Assistant, Parks and Recreation Department, Oakland, California

6. Rev. Frank Gilbert, Coordinator, Castlemont Corridor Substance Abuse Prevention Project
7. Tammy Grahm, Alameda County GAIN Program Specialist
8. Angela Johnson, Oakland Child Care Coordinator
9. Pat Holston, Oakland Parks And Recreation Department
10. Ann Bouie Wilson, Director, Project Interface

INTERVIEWS AND PRESENTATIONS

Cashman, Pat and Jeffrey Chu. (Office of Economic Development and Employment.) Tour of downtown including major development sites. February 10, 1987.

Chu Jeffrey. Interview. March 18, 1987.

Christensen, William. (Oakland Chamber of Commerce)

Conley, Denise. (Kaiser-Marsten & Associates) CP 228 Presentation on downtown's retail future. March 23, 1987.

Dowell, David (Professor of City and Regional Planning, U.C.B.) Presentation to CP 228. February 17, 1987.

Issacson, Glen. (Vice President, Bramlea Pacific) Discussion and media presentation on City Center project for CP 228. February 10, 1987.

Lee, Lynette. (Executive Director, East Bay Local Development Corporation) Presentation to CP 228 on Oakland's Chinatown and downtown development. April 7, 1987.

Leshin, Maryann. (OCCUR) Interview, April 2, 1987.

Noble, Leanna. (Plant Closures Project) April 8, 1987.

Planner's Network Forum. "Oakland's Future: Renaissance or Ripoff?" A roundtable discussion with Leanna Noble (Plant Closures Project), Jeffrey Levin (Oakland Office of Community Development) James Vann (Oakland Progressive Political Association), and Maryann Leshin (OCCUR). April 29, 1987

Rubin, Victor, (Co-ordinator, Oakland Metropolitan Forum) April 1987.

