In 2014, 10.2 million school-age children (18 percent) participated in after school programs, an increase from 2009, when 8.4 million children (15 percent) participated. Of the nearly 1.4 million children served by the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) in 2014, 627,000 were of school age and used subsidies to pay for after school and other out-of-school time programs. The federal 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program, administered by the U.S. Department of Education, served an additional 1.6 million children in 2014. Children in after school programs are cared for in a variety of settings, including school-based programs, child care centers, and home-based settings.

A number of meta-analytic research reviews have examined the impact of after school programs on children’s outcomes. These reviews show after school programs have positive effects on personal and social skills, reading and math, and academic achievement for at-risk students. Additionally, these reviews, as well as other reviews and studies, have helped to identify specific aspects of after school programs associated with positive child outcomes.

These promising findings on the role of after school programs and their particular features in supporting children’s development have encouraged a number of stakeholders to invest in after school systems. The National Center on Afterschool and Summer Enrichment, funded by the U.S. Office of Child Care, is part of the U.S. Administration for Children and Families Early Childhood Training and Technical Assistance System. The Center assists CCDF lead agencies in ensuring that school-age children in low-income families have increased access to high-quality after school experiences. Municipalities and philanthropies have also partnered in initiatives to build the supply of after school programs, improve program quality, and support the after school workforce.

This Research-to-Policy Resource List focuses on resources in the Research Connections collection published in the past ten years that focus on building high-quality after schools systems. The resources on this list have been assigned to the following categories: building systems, improving quality, supporting the workforce, and sustaining program finances.
Building Systems
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Improving Quality
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Minnesota
Moore, D., Grant, S., McLaughlin, C., Walker, K., & Shafer, B. (2010). Preliminary findings from the Minnesota 4-H quality improvement study: Using youth and adult volunteer assessors to take quality improvement to scale. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Youth Development.

Nashville, Tennessee
David P. Weikart Center for Youth Program Quality. (2012). Nashville After Zone Alliance quality improvement intervention: 2011-2012 findings from the Northeast and South Central Zones. Ypsilanti, MI: David P. Weikart Center for Youth Program Quality.

David P. Weikart Center for Youth Program Quality. (2013). Nashville After Zone Alliance quality improvement intervention: 2012-2013 findings from the Northeast, South Central and Northwest Zones: Report to the Nashville After Zone Alliance. Ypsilanti, MI: David P. Weikart Center for Youth Program Quality.

David P. Weikart Center for Youth Program Quality. (2014). Nashville After Zone Alliance quality improvement intervention: 2013-2014 findings from the Northeast, South Central, Northwest and Southeast Zones: Report to the Nashville After Zone Alliance. Ypsilanti, MI: David P. Weikart Center for Youth Program Quality.
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Supporting the Workforce
*Multisite*


New York, New York

Oregon and Washington State

Palm Beach County, Florida


Sustaining Program Finances

**Multisite**

**Chicago, Illinois**
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