



# SURVEY RESULTS

Section 1001 of Michigan Public Act (PA) 87

November 2022



**Public Policy Associates** is a public policy research, development, and evaluation firm headquartered in Lansing, Michigan. We serve clients in the public, private, and nonprofit sectors at the national, state, and local levels by conducting research, analysis, and evaluation that supports informed strategic decision-making.



---

**Prepared for**

Michigan Afterschool Partnership  
Lansing, Michigan  
[www.miafterschool.org](http://www.miafterschool.org)

**With funding provided by**

Charles Stewart Mott Foundation  
Skillman Foundation  
Ralph C. Wilson, Jr. Foundation

**Prepared by**

Public Policy Associates  
Lansing, Michigan  
[www.publicpolicy.com](http://www.publicpolicy.com)

**Authors**

William J. Bushaw, Ph.D.  
Daniel J. Quinn, Ph.D.  
Craig Van Vliet  
Dirk Zuschlag, Ph.D.

---

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

- Executive Summary.....1**
- Overall Survey Results ..... 2**
  - Site Characteristics.....2*
  - Youth Demographics .....3*
  - Program Components .....5*
- Methodology ..... 6**
- Limitations ..... 6**

---

*“Thank you for this support, making it possible for us to provide essential services and enrichment to improve the lives of youth in our county!”*

*– Grant Recipient Comment*

---

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Under Section 1001 of Michigan Public Act (PA) 87 of 2021, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) provided grants to community-based organization (CBO) providers of before- and afterschool and summer out-of-school time (OST) programs to children in kindergarten through eighth grade.

The Michigan Afterschool Partnership (MASP), in cooperation with MDE and the Michigan Association of YMCAs, oversaw a survey of the programs and related services funded under PA 87. Public Policy Associates (PPA), a research firm based in Lansing, Michigan conducted the survey on behalf of MASP.

There were several key takeaways from the survey responses.

- Almost 25,000 youths were served by 56 CBOs, which provided OST programming at 155 unique sites.
- Nearly 80% (77%) of the children served were in kindergarten through grade 5—with the remainder (23%) from grades six through eight.<sup>1</sup>
- Over half of the sites reported having a waitlist of youths that they were unable to serve. The combined total of these waitlists from the awardees was over 4,000 youths.
- There is significant stability among these providers with almost 50% of the programs indicating that they have operated for more than 10 years.

Eighty-six percent of the programs provided services to youths who were academically at risk. Additionally, 71% of providers supported youths who qualified for special education services, possessed special or physical needs (73%), and/or were from low-income families (73%) separately.

---

<sup>1</sup> This percentage reflects the 21,463 youths that were identified *by grade level* and not the total reported.

# OVERALL SURVEY RESULTS

## Site Characteristics

**Characteristics.** Programs awarded funding were required to be CBOs exempt from federal income tax under section 501(c)(3) of the internal revenue code, 26 USC 501. This report includes survey information from 56 grant awardees that delivered OST programming through 155 unique sites. These results consider YMCAs across all regions. The data presented for this report are based on site information and are not aggregated at the program or awardee level.

Most program awardees were relatively small with 40 of the 56 awardees providing programming at just one or two sites. Two large awardees operated ten or more sites, including the Grand Rapids YMCAs (44 sites) and the Detroit Metro YMCA (19 sites).

Survey respondents spanned the state with at least one awardee operating in 43 of Michigan's 83 counties. The top five counties represented included:

1. Wayne (25 sites)
2. Oakland (20 sites)
3. Kent (18 sites)
4. Kalamazoo (11 sites)
5. Washtenaw (10 sites)

Many awardees are community or civic nonprofits while five others indicated that they were faith-based organizations. Most awardees reported having been in operation for extended periods with over 63% reporting operating at the same site for over six years and nearly half (48%) doing so for over 10 years.

**Application Plan vs. Implementation.** Awardees reported using PA 87 funding as they had proposed in their applications. In fact, over 90% reported no differences between their application plan and actual implementation in all key areas including: ages/grades of youths served; number of days, weeks, or the days per week programming was delivered; hours per day of programming; the program's licensing status; and the building, facility, or other physical location at which any in-person programming occurred.

**Site Summary Comments.** The last question of the survey was open-ended and provided respondents an opportunity to make summary comments connected to the receipt of the PA 87 funding. Of the 36 comments at the end of the survey, none contained complaints about the funding or were otherwise negative. To the contrary, most survey respondents expressed gratitude for the PA 87 funding, and more than 30 explained in detail how the funding had helped them expand existing programming or improve program quality to meet the growing needs of youths in their communities.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Five additional comments principally presented information about staff credentialing and professional development needs.

---

*“The OST program was very beneficial in the growth of our [before- and afterschool and summer school] program and supported many of our families. The academic achievement of our students was highly recognized by parents and teachers. Overall, the program was very effective[,] and the results are evident in the lives of young children...”*

*– Grant Recipient Comment*

---

## Youth Demographics

**Number of Youths Served.** Table 1 (below) summarizes the estimated number of youths served by grade span as reported by awardees.

**Table 1. Number of Youths Served<sup>3</sup>**

<b>Grade Level</b>	<b>Total</b>
Early Elementary (≤ Grade 3)	7,922
Upper Elementary (Grades 4-5)	8,613
Middle School (Grades 6-8)	4,928

While the reporting of youths served by grade range totaled 21,463, respondents indicated that they served a total of 24,845 youths. An analysis of the data confirmed that not all OST programs separate youths served by grade, thus leading to this discrepancy.

The average number of youths served at each of the reporting sites varied with larger averages in grades K-5, slightly over 50 individuals, as compared to 35 youths in grades 6-8.

**Race/Ethnicity.**<sup>4</sup> The two largest racial/ethnic groups served were white at 65% and Black/African American at 27%. Other racial/ethnic groups served were reported at much smaller percentages including Hispanic at 7%, multi-racial at 7%, Asian at 4%, Arab/Middle Eastern at 3%, and Native American at 1%. Some sites were highly segregated, serving 100% of one or the other of the two largest racial/ethnic groups.

**At-Risk and Special Needs Youths Served.** As presented in Table 2 (below), survey respondents reported if they served youths categorized as at-risk or having special needs. For example, 86% of the programs indicated that they served academically at-risk youths, while only

---

<sup>3</sup> Program coordinators reported total program participation, which resulted in a total of 24,845 (also reported above), as well as by grade level. In Table 1, PPA only reports on the total for youths reported in grades K-8 by grade span. The difference could be due to an error in self-reporting these data. Program coordinators were not required to track attendance by grade span. In at least one case, a program reported totals but did not do so by grade span.

<sup>4</sup> Response percentages may exceed 100% if the question allows respondents to select multiple options.



10% of the programs indicated they served homeless youths. Additionally, most programs served multiple at-risk and special needs youths.

**Table 2. Percentage of At-Risk and Special Needs Youths Served**

<b>Categories of At-Risk &amp; Special Needs Youths</b>	<b>Percentage of Programs Providing Services</b>
Academically at-risk	86%
Special and/or physical needs	73%
Low income	73%
Special education eligible	71%
Foster youths	40%
English learners	18%
Homeless youths	10%
Adjudicated youths	3%

**Economically Disadvantaged Youths.** Survey respondents reported the percentage of economically disadvantaged youths that they served, defined as youths who qualify for a free or reduced-priced lunch program. At one end of the economic spectrum, 28% of program sites reported that the population they served included high percentages (76%–100%) of youths from economically disadvantaged homes. At the other end, 33% of the respondents reported that their program sites served a relatively low percentage (0%–25%) of economically disadvantaged youths. The third and fourth highest percentages of program sites were 22% where 26%–50% of youths were economically disadvantaged, and 17% where the economically disadvantaged youths served comprised 51%–75% of participants.

**Waitlists and Unserved Youths.** Survey respondents were asked if they maintain waitlists for youths who could not be served due to site limitations, and the responses indicated that many youths across the state are unserved by current OST programming. Over one-half (56%) of program sites reported having a waitlist, and the total number of youths on waitlists was 4,092.

---

*Considering only program sites with a waitlist, the average number of youths not served was 48.<sup>5</sup>*

---

<sup>5</sup> This number drops to 26, if all PA-87-funded program respondents are included in the computation. In either case, the longest waitlist reported extended to 442.

# Program Components

**Programming.** Survey respondents provided information regarding the categories of programming that were provided to youths at their sites. Table 3 (below) lists the programming, recognizing that most programs provided multiple programming to their enrolled youths.

**Table 3. Categories of Programming Offered at OST Program Sites**

Categories of Programming	Percentage of Programs Offered at OST Sites
Recreation/sports	94%
Science, technology, engineering, & math (stem) instruction	92%
Arts & crafts	92%
Social-emotional well-being & counseling	89%
Health & nutrition	73%
Academic enrichment	61%
Cultural enrichment	60%
Life skills	60%
Homework help	59%

More specialized activities such as music, theater, and drama; community service; leadership; and career guidance were less popular.

**Evaluation of Program Quality.** All but 14 responding sites claimed some form of program evaluation in response to an open-ended question.

Almost one-third of the sites reported using widely accepted evaluation approaches including the Weikert Center for Program Quality, the Youth Program Quality Assessment (YPQA) Tool, and the Michigan Out-of-School Time (MOST) Quality Standards. Other locally devised evaluation approaches sometimes named the above listed standards, and added locally developed parent surveys, pre- and post-program testing, and staff observations.

Several other evaluation models were independently developed and disseminated by affiliated regional organizations. The form and content of such evaluations varied widely across programs.

**Food Services.** Most program sites provided meals and snacks to participating youths, financed through various means. Of the almost 80% that provided nutrition, just over half (almost equal proportions) relied on funding through the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) or the Summer Food Source Program. Other funding sources included cash, grant funds, and tuition and fees.

**Staffing.** On average, program sites employed twice as many part-time employees (10) compared to full time (5). The largest full-time workforce numbered 79, and 99 for part-time employees. The number of volunteers reported also indicated variability among sites.

The percentage of program site staff who held a relevant postsecondary degree or certificate was about 20%. Yet again, there was a wide dispersion among the reporting.



# METHODOLOGY

No state or federal funding was provided for an evaluation of the PA 87 grant program. The statewide survey and accompanying report were funded in part by the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, the Skillman Foundation, and the Ralph C. Wilson, Jr. Foundation. All grant funding recipients provided an assurance in their applications to cooperate with MDE and MASP, and the designated evaluation contractor, PPA.

The goal of the survey was to identify more detailed demographic information about the youths served, and to better understand the variety of OST programming provided by the PA 87 grant funding. With feedback from MDE, Michigan Association of YMCAs, and MASP, PPA developed the survey to gather information not available in the grant applications. The survey asked questions about PA-87-funded programs including characteristics of the providers; need for waitlisting unserved youths; demographic data of the youths served; provisions for nutrition; description of the offered programming; use of evaluation models; and staffing/qualifications.

The survey was conducted between August 15, 2022, and September 19, 2022. In all, 155 sites funded under PA 87 participated in the survey. These data were analyzed on an aggregate level using descriptive statistics. The respondents were not limited to one entry. In cases of multiple entries, the first entry was selected, and all others were deleted. In situations where additional data provided more information, that information was retained and added to the record.

# LIMITATIONS

All information provided in the survey was self-reported and has not been confirmed by analysis of administrative data or other records. Self-reported data regarding educational programming always carries the risk of unintentional errors and bias, and numbers and characteristics of youths served should be treated as estimates.

Many sites that benefited from PA 87 grant funding were administered by the Michigan Association of YMCAs. This was not considered problematic, but for research purposes, it could lead to a structural bias to the type of information collected and the way it was recorded. For instance, there could be a bias if an organization did not record certain information or store it in a manner that is retrievable or congruent with how the question was asked. Additionally, there are cases where one administrator would answer the survey for various locations, which could also lead to a similar reporting bias.

In addition, there can be differences in sensemaking of survey questions (i.e., respondent interpretation of questions can have subtle differences from the intentions of the survey designer). For example, the interpretation of “other special or physical needs” can vary widely among respondents.

Finally, the results of this survey should not be treated as representative of all OST programming in Michigan. Successful applicants could have quite different organizational and

programmatic features compared with other CBOs or providers within Michigan that did not receive PA 87 funding, and the information provided should be understood as a snapshot in time.



119 Pere Marquette Drive, Suite 1C | Lansing, MI 48912-1231