

Thinking Broadly: Financing Strategies for Youth Programs



January 2007



Thinking Broadly: Financing Strategies for Youth Programs



Prepared by Sharon G. Deich and Cheryl D. Hayes

January 2007



Foreword



Growing up today, youth face challenges and opportunities very different from those of past generations. Supporting the healthy growth and development of youth, as well as providing them with the services and experiences they need to mature into productive adults, are growing concerns in many communities. Pressure to raise student achievement, the need for safe and enriching environments for youth during out-of-school time, a focus on building the skills and competencies of young people, and an emphasis on preventing risky behaviors are all fueling the demand for quality youth programs. In many communities, however, leaders are challenged to find and coordinate adequate funding for youth programs and to access resources for program capacity and quality enhancements.

For youth programs to succeed, policymakers, program leaders, and intermediary organizations need resources and strategies to support quality programs over time. *Thinking Broadly: Financing Strategies for Youth Programs* is an important addition to The Finance Project's research on financing and sustaining supports and services for children, youth, and families. This strategy brief presents a typology of approaches for financing youth programs. It suggests general principles to guide the selection of financing strategies based on the complexities and unique aspects of youth programs. It also provides considerations to help state and local leaders develop financing plans that closely align with their program goals, available resources, and the political and economic environments in which they work.

This publication is part of a new series of products from The Finance Project. The series focuses on tools, strategies, and resources to support and sustain effective youth programs and policies. Each product will present options for financing and sustaining, or for governing and managing, youth initiatives. Each will illustrate these options with examples of initiatives and highlight considerations to help leaders weigh the alternatives. This body of work also includes an online clearinghouse of information and other resources for supporting and sustaining youth programs and policies. Our hope is that these products and the clearinghouse, in adding to The Finance Project's extensive resources on financing and sustaining promising initiatives for children, youth, and families, will prove useful to policymakers, program and community leaders, and others concerned with supporting vital youth initiatives.

A handwritten signature in black ink, which reads "Cheryl D. Hayes". The signature is fluid and cursive.

Cheryl D. Hayes
Executive Director



Introduction

The past several decades have witnessed a rapid growth in youth programs. Pressure to raise student achievement, the increasing participation of women in the labor market, a focus on healthy growth and development, and an emphasis on preventing risky behaviors are all contributing to this growth. Many of these new youth programs embrace the principles of positive youth development. They seek to provide young people with services that support their physical and emotional needs and their need to be safe and feel valued. They also aim to help youth develop the skills and competencies needed to succeed as adults.¹

To meet the unique and varying needs of youth, programs use multiple approaches. Some youth programs are comprehensive; they aim to provide the full range of developmental supports—civic, physical, vocational, educational, and socio-emotional connections. Others focus on a particular aspect of development (e.g., health promotion), on a particular need (e.g., educational supports), or on a particular age group (e.g., high school students). Regardless of the focus, addressing the multiple needs of youth requires partnerships that cut across service domains and providers.

Not surprisingly, funding for youth programs, like most human services programs, is fragmented; funding fluctuates with economic trends and can lose ground to new priority activities.² The Tom Osborne Federal Youth Coordination Act was enacted in 2006 to improve youth services by enhancing collaboration among the 12 federal departments and agencies that support youth programs. Many of these programs have different purposes and target different services. They all have their own eligibility requirements, application processes, and reporting procedures. This same situation is mirrored at the state and local levels, where numerous departments and agencies are funding, administering, and monitoring youth programs.

In addition to a lack of coordination, many youth programs suffer from a lack of sustainable resources; there are very few long-term funding sources for youth programs. One of the largest federal programs supporting youth, the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program, focuses on starting new programs but provides few resources to sustain promising efforts. Likewise, state and local efforts have focused on program development and quality improvements rather than on sustainability.³

¹ Visit the website of the Academy for Educational Development at <http://cyd.aed.org/whatis.html>.

² C. Hayes, *Thinking Broadly: Financing Strategies for Comprehensive Child and Family Initiatives* (Washington, D.C.: The Finance Project, 1997), at <http://www.financeproject.org/Publications/ThinkingBroadly.pdf>.

³ H. C. Padgette, *Finding Funding: A Guide to Federal Sources for Out-of-School Time and Community School Initiatives* (Washington, D.C.: The Finance Project, 2003), at <http://www.financeproject.org/Publications/FundingGuide2003.pdf>.

Finally, many public funding sources tend to focus on remediation (e.g., juvenile justice and foster care) rather than supporting healthy development and preparation—the cornerstones of positive youth development. For youth programs to succeed, program leaders, intermediary organizations, and policy-makers need resources and strategies to support quality programs over time.

Accordingly, this strategy brief presents different approaches to financing youth programs. It suggests general principles to guide the selection of financing strategies based on the complexities and unique aspects of youth programs. It also provides considerations to help state and local leaders develop financing plans that closely align with their program goals, available resources, and the political and economic environments in which they work. Although the specific applications may vary somewhat from one policy or program area to another and from one jurisdiction to another, the broad principles, strategies, and considerations outlined in this brief are relevant to a wide array of youth-serving initiatives in states and communities nationwide.

Youth Programs and Positive Youth Development

Throughout this brief, the term “youth programs” is used to describe a wide range of services and activities for youth. Youth programs include prevention, intervention, and developmental programs across multiple domains, including academics, workforce preparation, leadership and civic engagement, and health and well-being. These programs are provided by large and small and public and private organizations in diverse settings such as schools, workplaces, and community facilities. Examples of youth program activities include counseling, mentoring, career exploration, summer employment, dropout prevention, financial literacy, academic assistance, and sports and recreation.

During the past few decades, the positive youth development approach to programming has had a considerable impact on the field and on those who care about outcomes for youth. This approach orients providers and programs to develop the skills, assets, and competencies of the youth they serve in order to help young people experience a healthy adolescence and successful transition to a productive adulthood. Programs that incorporate elements of positive youth development can be effective in building youth skills, assets, and competencies. They can also help reduce specific problem behaviors, such as smoking, misbehaving in school, and using drugs and alcohol.⁴ The positive youth development approach encourages broad community engagement and collaboration to provide young people with the supports, services, and opportunities they need to grow and thrive.

⁴ For more information on research findings, see R. Catalano et al., *Positive Youth Development in the United States: Research Findings on Evaluations of Positive Youth Development Programs* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, November 1998), at <http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/PositiveYouthDev99/>.



Principles For Effective Financing



For promising youth programs to succeed, resources must be integrated in new, creative, and strategic ways. As programs, intermediaries, and policymakers work together to tackle issues of financing for youth programs, it is useful to ground the approaches in clear principles. Effective financing strategies for youth programs should:

1. **Be driven by a compelling and well-conceived policy and program agenda;**
2. **Be aligned with the programs and services they aim to support;**
3. **Take account of changing fiscal needs over a program's life cycle;**
4. **Incorporate multiple funding sources that cut across programs and services;**
5. **Maximize the use of resources already in the system;**
6. **Use new funding to leverage other public-and private-sector resources; and**
7. **Contribute to a positive return on investment.**

I. Be Driven by a Compelling and Well-Conceived Policy and Program Agenda

There is a growing consensus that helping youth gain access to the resources they need requires attention to physical, emotional, educational, and employment needs as well as opportunities for leadership and engagement. Successful programs incorporate these needs and opportunities. Often, however, the financing and sustainability of programs is impeded by categorical funding streams that provide support only in response to narrowly defined problems or to specific populations of youth. Moreover, many funding streams are available only when problems become chronic or severe. As program leaders, intermediary organizations, and policymakers work to improve the financing of youth programs, these tenets should guide their work.

- Every initiative should be based on a clear plan that articulates goals, strategies, activities, and outcomes.
- Youth have multiple needs that are best met in a coordinated and flexible manner.
- Programs and services should give their clients—youth—a clear say in the design, governance, operation, and evaluation of programs and services.
- Investment strategies should balance prevention and remediation and consider the importance of imparting to youth the skills, opportunities, and connections they need to succeed in life.
- Family and neighborhood influences shape individual outcomes; therefore, decision-making authority should reside at the community level.
- Those who serve youth should be accountable for improving outcomes for their clients and their clients' communities.



2. Be Aligned with the Programs and Services They Aim to Support

Every funding source and proposed financing strategies must meet the needs and conditions of the initiative. Short-term, time-limited grants are not a long-term financing solution for ongoing programs and services. Highly restricted categorical funding may not support the coordination, collaboration, and administrative capacity needed to create effective youth programs and systems. To make the most of available resources, financing strategies must be closely aligned with the funding purposes.

3. Take Account of Changing Fiscal Needs Over a Program's Life Cycle

Effective financing requires strategic decisions about which funding sources and strategies to pursue. These decisions should be based on a careful analysis of short- and long-term funding needs over the life cycle of an initiative. For example, if an initiative begins as a single-site operation but then is expected to serve a growing number of youth in multiple places, then the costs and expenditures can be expected to rise over time. Understanding and projecting cash-flow needs is an important step in designing financing strategies that keep pace with changing fiscal needs.

4. Incorporate Multiple Funding Sources That Cut Across Programs and Services

Making the most of available funds requires combining public- and private-sector resources in innovative ways to create a funding portfolio that meets the needs of youth. This will likely include short-term and long-term funding, some of which is flexible and some of which is dedicated to certain activities or services. For programs, this may mean a combination of public funding and grant support. For policymakers, this may mean a combination of startup and ongoing funding, with at least some funds that can be used flexibly to meet programs' unique needs and circumstances.

5. Maximize the Use of Resources Already in the System

One of the most important principles of effective financing is to recognize that the resources necessary to build and sustain youth programs may come in various forms and from many sources. Every program needs some basic operating funds. However, in-kind resources, such as volunteer staff, technical support, and donated space and equipment, also are significant resources for many youth programs. Determining how to attract and make effective use of these resources is critical. Just as important is making the best use of funding already being expended for youth programs. For policymakers, this may require the difficult and politically sensitive job of reallocating funds from less-effective to more effective programs and services and/or from higher-cost to lower-cost approaches. It may also require shifting funds from lower-priority to higher-priority investments or from specialized treatment to more prevention-oriented services. For programs, this may mean applying for new grants or working in partnership with other public and private agencies to tap existing funding.

6. Use New Funding to Leverage Other Public- and Private-Sector Resources

Federal and state programs often require matching funds from other sources. States and communities can significantly increase their resources by raising the match to draw down available federal or state dollars and private funds. The underlying concept is that shared funding and a mutual commitment among contributing partners—federal, state, and local governments and the private sector—will help ensure the success and sustainability of promising initiatives. Intermediaries and policymakers can seek new ways to pool resources from several sources that can then be used to leverage other funding through matching programs, challenge grants, or other similar mechanisms. This new funding can support and sustain various youth programs.

7. Contribute to a Positive Return on Investment

In business, investors expect to receive a positive return on their investment. In a similar way, public and private supporters of youth programs want assurances that their investments will pay off in meaningful and measurable ways. For youth, successfully transitioning to adulthood means economic as well as personal success. Failure poses a high cost to individuals and society. Financing strategies must be tied to approaches that can demonstrate how investments are improving outcomes for youth and limiting the need for outlays for other expensive services in the future.



Financing Strategies and Considerations

Five financing strategies can be used to support youth programs:

1. **making better use of existing resources that agencies and organizations already control;**
2. **maximizing public revenue that is in the system but has not been tapped;**
3. **building partnerships between public- and private-sector organizations;**
4. **creating more flexibility in existing funding streams to better meet programs' needs; and**
5. **developing new dedicated revenue sources.**



Taken together, the five strategies provide a clear roadmap for addressing financing issues for youth programs. As with any strategy or set of strategies, the challenge lies in determining how to use each strategy to its fullest and how to combine the strategies to create both short- and long-term financing plans. As program leaders, intermediary organizations, and policymakers begin to explore the financing strategies and make plans to use them, they may want to consider these thoughts and observations.

- Programs, intermediaries, and policymakers all have roles to play in implementing the various funding strategies, but the roles and contributions of each will differ for each strategy and across strategies.
- The strategies increase in difficulty and complexity as one moves from the first to the fifth; it is much easier to make better use of existing resources than to develop new dedicated revenue sources. The strategies also build on and complement one another. For example, those seeking new revenues will likely have to prove that they are already taking full advantage of the resources they have as evidence of the need for new funds.
- Decisions about which strategy or combination of strategies is most appropriate will depend on the nature and scope of the initiative. Smaller programs and those that have been in operation for only a short time are more likely to focus on the first three strategies, while programs that are larger and/or have been operational for a longer period may be ready to work with intermediaries and policymakers to tackle the fourth and fifth strategies.
- The right set of financing strategies is unique to programs and communities. There is no one recipe for success; program leaders, intermediary organizations, and policymakers must determine the right combination of strategies given the resources available to programs.



- Financing strategies must be flexible. Programs operate in a dynamic environment where political leaders change, champions come and go, and local circumstances and priorities change in response to larger social, economic, and political issues. Those seeking to improve financing for youth programs must be ready to adapt and take advantage of changing situations.

The following table on page 12 (Summary of Five Key Financing Strategies and Approaches for Youth Programs) summarizes the five financing strategies and how program leaders, intermediary organizations, and policymakers can work together to implement these strategies.

Key Players in Financing Youth Programs

Throughout this brief, program leaders, intermediary organizations, and policymakers are deemed agents of change able to improve the financing of youth programs.

Program leaders include executive directors, board members, local champions, volunteers, and youth who are taking responsibility for the financing and sustainability of youth programs.

Intermediary organizations come in many forms. Some refer to themselves as local intermediaries. Others act as intermediaries without the official title, including local nonprofit organizations, statewide and local networks, community foundations, and city or state offices.

Policymakers at all levels of government have a role to play in improving the financing of youth programs. They include state and local officials (e.g., governors, legislators, mayors, council members, and agency personnel), education officials (superintendents and principals), law enforcement personnel, and other persons or organizations representing the public sector.



Summary of Five Key Financing Strategies and

	Strategy 1	Strategy 2
	<i>Making Better Use of Existing Resources</i>	<i>Maximizing Public Revenue</i>
PROGRAMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Operating more efficiently by cutting costs. ■ Maximizing volunteer contributions and enhancing access to people, services, and in-kind support. ■ Improving internal management systems by collecting and using data to guide decisionmaking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Responding to grant announcements from public agencies. ■ Leveraging public funds by providing resources to meet matching or challenge grants.
INTERMEDIARIES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Implementing systems that enable programs to cut costs, such as purchasing pools. ■ Providing administrative support for data collection and analysis. ■ Administering grants by acting as a fiscal agent or helping funders pass grants through to programs. ■ Providing technical assistance to improve program operations and quality. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Identifying and monitoring potential funding sources for programs. ■ Providing grant-writing support. ■ Brokering relationships among potential partners and between programs and public officials. ■ Providing technical assistance on grants management and data collection. ■ Identifying opportunities to leverage funds by using existing community resources.
POLICYMAKERS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Reviewing policies and procedures to streamline processes for preparing grant applications, reporting, and evaluating programs. ■ Supporting intermediary organizations that build program capacity on management and quality issues. ■ Funding technical assistance and evaluations for programs to improve quality and ensure accountability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Leveraging public dollars by ensuring that required matching funds are available. ■ Educating peers and other policymakers about ways various funds can support particular youth or particular services.

Approaches for Youth Programs

Strategy 3	Strategy 4	Strategy 5
Building Partnerships	Creating More Flexibility in Existing Funding	Developing New Revenue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Joining forces with other local providers that share common interests or that provide complementary services for youth. ■ Building public will by supporting advocacy and public engagement activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Providing information and ideas to policymakers to modify rules and regulations in order to improve the funding climate. ■ Supporting advocacy efforts for youth by joining local advocacy groups or commissions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Pursuing fundraising activities to raise money from community members and bolster support for youth programs. ■ Charging user fees to help cover program costs. ■ Generating business income through the sale of products related to the work of the program or organization or generating revenue through unrelated business practices.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Convening partners to create a shared vision for youth in the community. ■ Providing leadership to support effective collaborations. ■ Convening potential partners to support joint grant-writing efforts. ■ Linking partners with funders interested in youth programs. ■ Providing and coordinating technical assistance that meets community needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Providing policymakers with funding ideas and innovations from other states and communities. ■ Convening meetings of policymakers and community providers to develop solutions to financing challenges. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Working with policymakers to develop new proposals for public funding. ■ Working with program leaders to organize community-wide events that benefit many programs. ■ Supporting advocates to ensure youth voices are represented in discussions on new funding opportunities.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Encouraging partnerships in proposal requests and through legislation and regulations. ■ Creating state-local planning groups to improve the coordination of resources for youth programs. ■ Creating a youth budget and funding resource mapping and supply and demand analyses to show the need for investments in youth programs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Including youth programs in new funding by ensuring youth programs are qualified recipients for funds. ■ Pooling resources from several agencies to create a unified funding stream that reduces reporting and paperwork burdens. ■ Aligning program requirements to support more integrated service delivery. ■ Amending regulatory practices to expand eligibility or rules governing the use of particular funds. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Creating new public revenues through legislation and executive branch initiatives. ■ Supporting new ballot initiatives to increase revenues for youth programs. ■ Implementing fees on particular goods or services to generate revenues that can be used for youth programming. ■ Using other revenue sources, such as lottery and gaming proceeds and income tax checkoffs, to support youth programs.



Strategy I: Making Better Use of Existing Resources

For program leaders, intermediary organizations, and policymakers, targeting existing funding is often the first step in implementing strategic financing improvements. Efforts to make better use of existing resources frequently focus on reducing service and administrative costs through operational efficiencies, so scarce dollars can be stretched further. This may involve exploring approaches to cut costs for individual program elements, finding ways to achieve economies of scale across programs, and changing rules and regulations to make it easier for programs to access and blend available funding.

Programs

Programs can pursue different options to make better use of existing resources. Every program will benefit from a regular review of its practices and policies to ensure that costs are kept to a minimum.

Programs can consider:

- outsourcing administrative functions, such as payroll and accounting;
- maximizing the use of volunteers and in-kind contributions; and
- developing data and management systems that support strategic decisionmaking.

Taking Advantage of Existing Community Resources

Heads Up in Washington, D.C., seeks to advance the leadership and community service skills of the young people who serve as program tutors and mentors. The initiative provides children from low-income neighborhoods with afterschool tutoring and mentoring and a summer learning program. In 2006, Heads Up served more than 1,300 children by enlisting more than 300 part-time staff from local colleges and universities, teachers from neighborhood schools, and parents. The program pays for the undergraduates to live in the communities they serve during the summer program so they are more accessible to parents, students, and other residents. Heads Up takes full advantage of existing revenues through various innovative strategies. One strategy is to operate in unused or underused classrooms in neighborhood schools, enabling the program to reduce overhead costs. Another strategy is to tap into youth employment funds, such as the federal Work-Study program and the District of Columbia's summer employment initiatives, to help subsidize tutor wages. The program is also able to earn subsidies for eligible students, now that it is an approved supplemental education service provider in the District of Columbia. For more information, see <http://www.headsup-dc.org/about.html>.

Increasing Operational Efficiency

Composed of six youth-serving nonprofit organizations, Boston TeamWorks provides its members with the opportunity to increase their operating efficiency and reduce their overhead costs. The formal nonprofit center is in Dorchester, Massachusetts, and offers a shared meeting and common space and centralized office functions; the member organizations still retain their private offices and independent program development efforts. The cost of running the Boston TeamWorks facility is partially funded by the Boston Youth Sports Initiative and the Amelia Peabody Foundation. By streamlining basic operational tasks, the organizations are able to concentrate their efforts on the more important aspects of delivering youth sports and education services. Directors also report increased collaboration among the organizations as a result of this innovative partnership model. For more information, visit http://www.metrolacrosse.com/about/news/documents/Teamworks_release_final.doc.

Intermediaries

Nationwide, intermediary organizations are helping local programs provide services in a more effective and efficient manner.⁵ This includes:

- helping programs find ways to share costs, thereby creating economies of scale where they did not exist before;
- supporting the administrative needs of youth-serving organizations, especially smaller ones;
- sharing knowledge, expertise, and computer resources to support various program needs; and
- providing critical information and technical assistance to grantees to improve program operation and management.

⁵ M. J. Blank et al., *Local Intermediary Organizations: Connecting the Dots for Children, Youth, and Families* (Washington, D.C.: The Finance Project, 2003), 1, at <http://www.aypf.org/publications/intermediaries.pdf>.



Streamlining Management and Fundraising Activities

The North Carolina Northwest Three Afterschool Consortium (NC NW 3) provides comprehensive afterschool programs for low-income and rurally isolated youth. Acting as a local intermediary for three Appalachian school systems in Alexander County, Alleghany County, and Caldwell County and for other local partners, NC NW 3 supports afterschool programs that integrate academic enrichment, diversity appreciation, cultural arts opportunities, fitness-focused resiliency building, and family involvement services for third through eighth graders. The consortium was initially established as a way for seven rural Appalachian counties to pool their resources and successfully apply for a federal 21st Century Community Learning Centers grant in 1999. Since then, NC NW 3 has worked to consolidate the management of afterschool programming so all three counties can make more efficient use of limited resources. The consortium, for example, helps the counties prioritize program areas for which they will seek funding, and it helps the counties prepare grant applications. For each grant application, consortium staff members determine which partner is most appropriate to act as a fiscal agent. The consortium also pools local resources and talents, and it arranges for the counties to share management, administration, staff development, and evaluation tasks required by each grant. For more information, visit <http://www.financeproject.org/publications/ncnw3.pdf>.

Policymakers

Policymakers also have an important role in helping programs make better use of existing resources. They can:

- streamline and align policies and procedures for grant applications, reporting, and program evaluation; simple steps such as using a single program year or requiring the same evaluative information can greatly reduce the administrative costs programs bear for reporting;
- provide funding to intermediary organizations, which, in turn, provide necessary support and guidance to programs to operate more efficiently and improve the quality of their services; and
- ensure that public funding is spent on cost-effective programming by requiring and funding program evaluations.



Combining Resources to Support Diverse Programming

In Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, school district leaders are working together with principals and other community partners to address the multiple needs of youth in the Oklahoma City Public Schools by making efficient use of numerous federal, state, and local resources. By combining resources, the district can offer a broad array of programs and services during school hours as well as during out-of-school time. Joint planning ensures that the district makes the most efficient use of all funding. Title I funding covers the costs of services that are not met by other funding sources, including part of the funding for afterschool staff, parent liaisons, and program supplies. For example, Title I, Title III and Title IV funding are combined to support adult English as a Second Language (ESL) classes as well as afterschool tutoring programs for youth. For more information, visit <http://www.okcps.org/>.

Considerations for Using Strategy I

Program leaders can consider:

- Does it make financial sense for the program to outsource payroll, accounting, or other functions?
- Can the program establish or join a purchasing pool with other local organizations to reduce the costs of food, supplies, materials, etc.?
- Is the program taking advantage of volunteers? Can the program get skilled volunteers from VISTA, AmeriCorps, or community programs to help with administration and program operations?
- Are there ways to improve internal data management systems to help program leaders and staff make better decisions?

Intermediary organizations can consider:

- Are there ways to establish a purchasing pool to help programs reduce the costs for supplies, health benefits, or other program costs?
- Are there ways to help programs collect administrative data for federal and state grant reporting? How can this capacity be made available to programs?
- Is training in financial management or program evaluation available to programs? What are effective ways to provide this training to youth program directors and staff?

Policymakers can consider:

- Do policymakers have strategies for communicating with programs and intermediaries to gain the information needed to ease paperwork and reporting burdens?
- Are required program evaluations structured in ways that enable programs to continuously improve their services and outcomes as well as ensure that public investments are well placed?



Strategy 2: Maximizing Public Revenue

For many youth-serving programs, federal and state resources are an important part of a diverse funding portfolio. Maximizing federal and state funding is a financing strategy that enables community leaders to identify relevant public funding sources and draw down the maximum amount that can be obtained from each source. These efforts can substantially expand the funding base for programs, provide stable revenues, and free up local funds for other purposes. Some approaches are more relevant at the program level, where providers match the needs of families and youth with available resources. Other strategies are best accomplished at the intermediary or state level, where program funding is administered.

Youth-serving programs can consider several federal sources including: entitlement programs, formula (or block) grants, discretionary grants, contracts, and demonstration grants.

- **Entitlement programs** guarantee that all individuals who meet the eligibility requirements are served. They include Title XIX-Medicaid and the federal child nutrition programs. Some federal entitlements go directly to state agencies that operate programs. Others go to individuals or public or private nonprofit agencies.

For more information on federal funding see *Finding Funding: A Guide to Federal Sources for Youth Programs* at www.financeproject.org/irc/yp.asp or visit www.financeproject.org/irc/funding.asp to use the on-line federal funding database.

- **Formula (or block) grants** provide states or localities with a fixed amount of funding based on an established formula that is usually tied to some measure of a state’s need for the funding (e.g., the percentage of children in poverty or state per-capita income). States regularly develop a general plan describing the broad functions and populations to be served by the grant. They can distribute these funds directly or pass them through to localities. Funds can be disbursed based on eligibility or following a competitive selection process. State and local governments set targets and priorities for these funds, so it is important to become familiar with program requirements for individual states. The 21st Century Community Learning Center grants and the Child Care and Development Fund are two examples of formula grants that support youth programs.
- **Discretionary grants** are awarded for specific projects on the basis of competitive applications. These grants fund a wide range of efforts, from preventing juvenile delinquency to improving child health outcomes. They are most often time-limited and are very competitive. Depending on the provisions of the program, applicants may be a state or local, public or private entity. A growing number of discretionary grant programs require collaborative efforts by a consortium of community agencies and organizations. Gang Resistance Education and Training is an example of a discretionary grant program.
- **Contracts** are agreements between agencies—often public and private—for the provision of specified services. Contractors almost always have to meet specific performance standards. Examples of contracts include the U.S. Department of Labor’s Job Corps program and the U.S. Department of Education’s Inexpensive Book Distribution Program.
- **Demonstration grants** are pilot projects generally involving a small number of sites in an effort to learn about the effectiveness of a new program or approach. An effective demonstration grant program may lead to further funding in the form of a discretionary grant. Demonstration grants are awarded on a competitive basis, generally to state or local governments or community-based organizations, depending on the program’s eligibility requirements. Many demonstration projects have evaluation components and require more data collection and analysis than other forms of public funding. An example of a demonstration program that has been funded in the past is the Reduction and Prevention of Children’s Exposure to Violence (Safe Start) initiative.



Matching Requirements

Many public programs require recipients to “match” their funding, usually on a percentage basis. Most often, matching requirements must be fulfilled with a commitment of dollars from public or private entities. In-kind contributions can sometimes be used to meet matching requirements. For example, the Child Care and Development Fund grant program has its own formula to determine the state match. Likewise, many discretionary grant programs, such as the Learn and Serve America program that provides grants for school and community-based initiatives, require the applicant to provide a certain percentage of the project’s annual funding. As youth programs begin to explore ways to tap public funding sources, they will need to become familiar with the various types of grants and their specific requirements, including any requirements for matching funds.

Reporting Requirements

Although public grants can provide significant and, in some cases, long-term stable funding, they also come with myriad reporting requirements. Some grants require regular information on program services; others require evaluative information in addition to basic program information. When assessing the viability of public funding sources, it is important to understand reporting and other requirements for public funding and the costs of complying with those requirements.

Maximizing public revenues is a multi-step process that involves identifying relevant funding sources, understanding how a particular funding source is distributed, learning who in the state or community makes decisions about how the funds are allocated, and implementing a plan to access the funds. Moreover, time and other resources are required to identify potential funds and to write grant or contract proposals.

Programs

Public revenues can provide resources to improve, expand, or sustain youth programs. Programs can seek to maximize public funding by responding to grant or proposal announcements and using existing funds as leverage to secure new funds.

- **Responding to grant or proposal announcements.** Programs interested in applying for public funding through the grants process must develop systems to identify and track grant or proposal announcements. They must also set aside time and other resources to enable staff or consultants to respond to these announcements.
- **Using existing funds as leverage to secure new funds.** Leveraging can occur at the program, intermediary, or state level. It involves using existing funds to attract additional funds. For example, if a program is responding to a federal grant that requires a match, it may be able to use funds from other public sources or local foundations to meet the needed requirements. In this case, the investments by public or private sources are doing double duty—helping to provide needed services and helping to bring in new resources by being counted toward the match.

Using Public Revenue to Expand Programming

Sponsored and administered by a nonprofit organization called Pro-Youth, the HEART (Homework, Enrichment, Acceleration, Recreation, Teamwork) After-School Program is building opportunities for success in the lives of youth in Tulare County, California, by providing a safe and supportive environment during afterschool hours. From the inception of the program in 1998, community leaders recognized the need for enrichment and academic assistance programs that engage youth in lifelong learning. The programs are offered free of charge to all children at HEART schools.

Funding for the HEART program comes from different public and private sources, including federal, state, and local funds. A partnership with the Tulare County Office of Education resulted in the receipt of an After School Education and Safety grant from the California Department of Education. The grants require a 33-percent match, which is being funded by individuals, businesses, community organizations, school districts, the city of Visalia, and Tulare County. In addition, Pro-Youth will use new funding from the state to expand the HEART After-School Program to include 15 additional schools. HEART also accesses federal funding for the reimbursement of snacks through the U.S. Department of Agriculture's National School Lunch Program, and it has received funding from the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program to expand programming to serve additional children. For more information, visit <http://www.financeproject.org/osthome.htm> or <http://www.proyouthheart.org>.

Intermediaries

In states and communities across the nation, intermediary organizations are helping local programs identify and apply for public revenues. Intermediary organizations can offer these forms of assistance.



- Identifying relevant grant opportunities for programs and helping broker relationships among organizations that can collaborate on grant applications.
- Providing grant-writing support in numerous ways. Intermediaries can work directly with program staff to complete grant applications, they can identify consultants or volunteers to help develop proposals, or they can conduct workshops to help build the capacity of program staff to develop proposals.
- Providing technical assistance on grants management and data collection for grant reporting.
- Leveraging new funding for states and communities. In their work with various youth programs, intermediaries can help youth program leaders seeking funds that require a match to identify potential partners able to provide matching support. This creates a win-win situation for all the organizations.



Creating Efficiencies in Accessing Public Funds

The Hampshire Educational Collaborative (HEC) operates as a local intermediary agency for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers in western Massachusetts that serve approximately 1,280 students per year. Programs offer skill development, homework assistance, arts and recreational activities, and prevention and mental health services to all students in seven middle schools and three elementary schools. HEC supports program development and serves as the primary fiscal agent for the 10 afterschool sites. These programs also benefit from a region-wide governance structure, enabling site administrators to share resources and forge partnerships outside their own communities.

Due, in large part, to its collaborative structure, the Hampshire Educational Collaborative's 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21CCLC) have been extremely successful in accessing federal funds. Program officials initially secured a three-year 21CCLC grant for the first seven sites. Two years later, they were able to repeat this success by securing a second 21CCLC grant to add five new sites. In addition, the programs draw down approximately \$12,000 from the U.S. Department of Agriculture in snack reimbursements. HEC's success in drawing down federal dollars helped attract additional funds from the Massachusetts Department of Education to partially offset costs for academic support and additional activities for students with disabilities. For more information, visit <http://www.collaborative.org/>.

Policymakers

Policymakers play an important role in developing and supporting systems for disbursing public funds to programs in ways that maximize the effectiveness of funding while minimizing bureaucracy and ensuring accountability. This can happen in several ways.

- State and local governments can ensure that enough funds are available to meet the matching requirements for federal programs. When state budgets are tight, federal officials can work with intermediary organizations and program staff to use other public and private funds that are coming in to the state to meet matching requirements.
- Policymakers can educate their peers on the benefits of youth programs. Peers are often the most effective messengers when it comes to advocating for funds for a particular cause.
- Policymakers can also ensure that youth programs are a top priority when revenues become available.

Directing Federal Funds to Youth Programming

State officials in Georgia are using surplus Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funding to provide additional resources for various causes, including programs for youth in the afterschool hours. In 2006 \$14 million in TANF funds have been used to expand programming to "high-need" school districts, defined as high-poverty and low-performing districts. Funds support programs for students in middle school and were distributed through a competitive grant process.

Considerations for Using Strategy 2

Program leaders can consider:

- Is there someone on staff who can track relevant grant or proposal announcements? Remember, there may be a state or local intermediary that can help with this effort. Likewise, is there someone on staff or resources to hire someone with the time and expertise to respond to grant proposals and prepare any necessary accompanying documents?
- Does the organization have the capacity to manage the particular grant? Are systems in place to meet reporting requirements? Are any required matching funds available?
- How does the potential payoff from the grant compare with the amount of time required to respond to the proposal and carry out its requirements? How does the program assess whether the investment in the grant proposal is worth the possible payoff?



Intermediary organizations can consider:

- Can the intermediary organization track grant and proposal announcements for youth programs and help get information to programs on a timely basis?
- Do intermediary organizations regularly poll programs about technical assistance needs that include grant writing and grants management?
- Are there ways the intermediary can centralize data systems or management reporting to eliminate the burden on programs? Can economies of scale be achieved by assisting programs with data collection and reporting?

Policymakers can consider:

- Do policymakers have up-to-date information on the state's efforts to maximize all available federal resources? Do policymakers know staff at intermediary organizations who can help them identify potential resources to meet any matching requirements?
- Do policymakers have information (e.g., one-pagers, bulletins, updates on new programs, or evaluation data) to share with their peers to make the case for investments in youth programs? Do policymakers know who they can ask for this information?



Strategy 3: Building Partnerships

Creating partnerships between and within the public and private sectors can extend the reach of funds for youth programs. A recent study on the sustainability of 21st Century Community Learning Centers highlighted the significant role that partnerships are playing in sustaining these programs once initial grant funding expires.⁶ Partnerships are an especially important strategy when it comes to financing and sustaining programs that focus on positive youth development. Meeting the multiple needs of youth—physical, emotional, and educational—often requires resources and expertise from multiple agencies and organizations. For example, youth programs that focus on preparing youth for the workforce can benefit from partnerships with the business community. Likewise, programs that focus on physical health can benefit from partnerships with the medical community. Building, nurturing, and sustaining partnerships takes a regular investment of time but, over the long run, partnerships can mean the difference between program success and program failure.

Partnerships come in many varieties. They range from informal community collaborations among several youth-serving organizations to highly structured groups that can be created by executive order or legislative mandate. Partnerships can be created for a limited time or a discrete purpose, or they can focus on longer term goals and objectives. In all cases, the overriding goal is to improve program operations by creating efficiencies in the structure and delivery of services. Partnerships need to be clear about the value they add; marriages of convenience and busy work tend to distract from the important work of youth programs rather than support efficiencies and improvements.

⁶ See A. Szekely and H. C. Padgett, *Sustaining 21st Century Community Learning Centers: What Works for Programs and How Policymakers Can Help* (Washington, D.C., The Finance Project, September 2006), at http://www.financeproject.org/publications/sustaining_21cclc.pdf.

All successful partnerships for youth programs share several key characteristics.

- Representatives from the public and private sectors—businesses, parent associations, philanthropic groups, community organizations, and federal, state, or local government entities—coalesce around an agenda of common concern.
- The partners contribute time, money, expertise, or other resources to the partnership and find opportunities to gain from the joint endeavor.
- The partners work together toward common goals or objectives for youth.
- The partners share decision-making and management responsibilities.

Participation in a partnership typically goes well beyond financial contributions and often includes assuming leadership roles, providing technical support to build the capacity of programs, and championing the successes of programs to bring new attention and resources.⁷

For more information on building and sustaining partnerships see *A Guide to Successful Public-Private Partnerships for Youth Programs* at www.financeproject.org/irc/yp.asp.

Programs

Many youth programs rely on partnerships with public and private organizations to provide daily services. Schools, businesses, religious organizations, health care providers, and recreation center staff help support numerous youth programs through direct contributions and in-kind donations. The challenge is for youth program leaders to use partnerships strategically—with the ultimate goal of improving the quality and ensuring the sustainability of their programs. To make the most of partnerships, program leaders or their designees can take these steps.

- Identify potential partners, including those from agencies and organizations that have a stake in the success of youth programs. Partners could include obvious choices, such as education officials and business and community leaders, as well as less obvious choices, such as representatives of housing authorities, economic development organizations, juvenile justice agencies, and health and mental health providers.
- Nurture the partnership by remaining attuned to partners' needs and focusing on what the partners will gain by working with the program. By seeking win-win approaches and giving partners public recognition and praise whenever possible, program leaders will be able to develop a group of supporters that can assist with operations, management, fundraising, and community engagement activities.
- Be a good partner. Youth program leaders can join local planning groups and/or participate in local advocacy or public engagement activities. In this way, they can lend their voices to activities that draw attention to the need for and successes of all youth programs, not just their own program.

⁷ See S. Deich, *A Guide to Successful Public-Private Partnerships for Out-of-School Time and Community School Initiatives* (Washington, D.C.: The Finance Project, January 2001), at <http://www.financeproject.org/Publications/ostpartnershipguide.pdf>.



Building Community Support through Partnerships

The Ella J. Baker House is a nationally recognized faith-based youth services agency in the Four Corners neighborhood of Dorchester, Massachusetts, a predominately low-income area in Boston. The Baker House operates different programs as part of its larger mission to reduce youth violence and to help at-risk youth with literacy and job placement. During the past decade, through a partnership with local police, the Baker House has effectively contributed to a reduction of youth violence in Four Corners and continues to help youth avoid risky behaviors. The agency's proven results have helped it develop a strong base of community support and to cultivate media attention and key champions who support its programs. This has brought continued resources to the program. For more information, visit <http://www.thebakerhouse.org>.

Intermediaries

Intermediary organizations are uniquely positioned to bring together public and private partners who are interested in youth programs. They can convene partners that share a common vision for youth and help link these partners to specific programs or to policymakers interested in similar issues. In this way, intermediary organizations can keep interested stakeholders invested by helping all partners. Intermediary organizations can support partnerships by:

- identifying and bringing together potential partners in grant-writing efforts;
- encouraging investments that build on other investments through challenge grants or other similar efforts; and
- working with policymakers to ensure that matching funds are available to draw down all available federal dollars and working with advocates to support new or enhanced funding for youth programs.

Another important role for intermediary organizations is helping build partnerships to support the delivery of technical assistance (TA) to youth programs. This assistance can take various forms, including:

- working collaboratively with a range of TA providers to develop and circulate training calendars that identify the resources of different organizations;
- supporting local TA providers to identify gaps in training capacity and to find the resources and knowledge to fill those gaps; and
- helping connect programs and TA providers to promote economies in the delivery of technical assistance and creating a learning network of program leaders to share strategies on, for example, implementation and management issues.



Linking Partners to Improve Programs and Increase Funding

New Ways to Work, based in California, helps create strong partnerships among schools, employers, government, community organizations, and social services agencies to ensure better access to quality educational and career opportunities for youth. The project pioneered the All Youth—One System framework to help communities build comprehensive youth-serving systems. Using this framework and related tools, New Ways has worked with many communities and organizations on initiatives to coordinate education, employment and training, youth development, and youth leadership efforts. Through this work, the project looks to support the development of sustainable systems that leverage and align local resources through coordination, partnerships, and system-building.

New Ways also provides technical assistance to programs and initiatives on strategic planning, community resource mapping, and program and evaluation design. In addition, the project develops and supports peer learning networks for program leaders and others. These include the Youth Council Institute (YCi) and the Intermediary Network, both national peer learning networks. YCi, for example, has supported local youth councils and providers in building local youth-serving systems and in leveraging youth-service funding streams. For more information, visit <http://www.newwaystowork.org/>.



Policymakers

Policymakers have many opportunities to support partnerships that benefit youth programs. For example, they can take these steps.

- Encourage formation by including partnership requirements in proposals, legislation, and regulations. A specific call for collaboration sends a strong signal about the value of partnerships.
- Create or support state or local planning groups for youth. By convening key stakeholders from the many domains that touch youth—health, education, human services, juvenile justice, etc.—policymakers send a strong message about their desire to see a coordinated approach to supporting youth.
- Promote partnerships to strengthen youth programs and services by creating a youth budget or a family and children’s budget for the state or community. Youth budgets look at all the resources that are supporting youth, across agencies and program areas, as a starting point for better collaboration. These budgets can also help track the results of various investments. Development of a youth budget requires various stakeholders to provide needed data. Once developed, a youth budget can support partnerships by showing where scarce resources can be used more efficiently or effectively.

Using Youth Budgets to Promote Collaboration

Youth budgets are an innovative mechanism for documenting and understanding a state’s total investment in youth.⁸ Unlike program- or agency-specific budgets, youth budgets focus on young people served and on the types of services and supports funded across programs and agencies. This orientation facilitates analysis of the amount and allocation of spending on youth globally. State leaders are using youth budgets, in conjunction with other data tools such as need assessments and program evaluations, to help coordinate services and align investments for youth.

The Kentucky Youth Policy Assessment, an expanded youth budget, provides state and local leaders with a single source of information on statewide resources, supports, and services available for youth ages 8 to 24.⁹ The assessment draws on data collected by Kentucky Child Now!, in conjunction with the Kentucky Youth Development Partnership, on the number, outcomes, budgets, and governance of youth development programs in the state. The Kentucky Youth Development Partnership, a public-private coalition of state and local youth-serving organizations, is using the assessment to help develop a coordinated approach to youth services that connects health, workforce, education, juvenile justice, and other systems. The findings and recommendations of the assessment led to the recent enactment of a state senate joint resolution that calls on the health and family services cabinet to establish the Kentucky Youth Development Coordinating Council. The council, which is now being implemented, will promote collaboration among state youth-serving agencies and programs.

For guidance on developing a youth budget, see *Adding It Up: A Guide to Developing A Children, Youth and Families Budget*, at <http://www.forumfyi.org/Files/cyfguide.pdf>.

⁸ Drawn from M. Flynn-Khan et al., *Adding It Up: A Rationale for Developing a Children, Youth and Families Budget* (Washington, D.C.: The Forum for Youth Investment, Impact Strategies, Inc., March 2006), at <http://www.forumfyi.org/Files/cyfrationale.pdf>.

⁹ For more information, visit <http://www.kychildnow.org/development/policy.html>.

Partnerships: An Essential Element for Fundraising

Many federal and state grant programs now look for a partnership between local agencies and organizations that are working toward similar goals as a criterion for award. For example, many 21st Century Community Learning Center grants encourage partnerships between community-based organizations and school districts. Identifying potential partners and strategies for developing joint proposals can help programs apply for a wider range of grants.

Considerations for Using Strategy 3

Program leaders can consider:

- What is the best way to identify potential partners that have demonstrated an interest in youth programming? Are there businesses that provide internships to high school students? Which principals support youth programs? How are local law enforcement officials promoting juvenile crime prevention? If potential partners are already interested in youth programs, there may be a natural fit for building a partnership.
- What is the best way for youth program leaders to approach potential partners? If the program has a board of directors, can a board member provide introductions? Are there intermediary organizations that can help broker relationships?
- Are there opportunities for joining forces with other local youth-serving organizations when it comes to fundraising? Writing joint grant proposals or hosting neighborhood events sponsored by several organizations can raise visibility for youth programs in general as well as provide needed resources for a specific program.

Intermediary organizations can consider:

- Partnerships take time and attention. How can intermediary agencies help ensure that partnerships run as smoothly as possible? Is there a role for the intermediary in supporting the often unrecognized, behind-the-scenes work of planning and communicating regularly with partners?
- In some communities, several organizations provide technical assistance from which youth program staff could benefit. How can intermediary organizations facilitate partnerships among technical assistance providers to enable resources to reach more youth program leaders?
- How can intermediary organizations best facilitate partnerships to support grants development? In addition to monitoring new grant announcements, how can intermediary organizations best broker partnerships to meet the needs of specific grant requests? How can intermediary organizations work with policymakers to ensure that funds coming to programs can leverage all possible dollars for the state or community?



Policymakers can consider:

- Are there existing partnerships of policymakers that focus on youth and/or youth programs? Is there a children's cabinet, special executive commission, or other group appointed by policymakers to address issues related to children and youth? If so, it is best to begin by understanding their agenda and looking for ways to support the work of this group. Once credibility is built, there may be opportunities to shape that agenda.
- In many states and communities, public policymakers and private business leaders have a long history of working together on commissions and planning groups to fund initiatives that are important to both sectors. Find out whether there have been successful public-private partnerships in the state or community and build on the successes of past initiatives.
- Partnerships take time and other resources. How can policymakers structure and contribute to partnerships that produce results?

Establishing a Youth Bureau to Support Programs

Public officials in Rockland County, New York, recognized a need to better coordinate programs and resources for youth. They created a youth bureau to support public planning, funding, advocacy, and coordination for youth and family programs in the county. The bureau is responsible for maintaining current information on youth needs, helping enhance communication and collaboration among youth service agencies, and allocating state funds. Through various partnerships, the bureau provides technical assistance to organizations and municipalities on program development, program management, monitoring and evaluation, financial planning, and ways to access public and private funding. Since 1994, the youth bureau also has administered the county-funded Youth Employment Program. Through this program, private, public, not-for-profit, and municipal agencies are offered the unique opportunity to reduce their annual labor costs by providing employment opportunities for eligible Rockland County youth between the ages of 14 and 21. For more information, visit <http://www.co.rockland.ny.us/Budget/Budget/details/agencydetails.php?fund=A&org=YB>.



Strategy 4: Creating More Flexibility in Existing Categorical Funding Streams

Most public funding streams are categorical. They tend to support programs and services with narrowly defined purposes that provide specific types of assistance to special categories of children and youth as outlined in laws and regulations. The result at the community level has been programs and services that are disconnected and duplicative and that often make it difficult to coordinate resources to address young people's multiple needs. Creating more flexibility in existing categorical funding streams can be key to supporting positive youth development efforts; this strategy encourages funding for an array of needed services when one funding stream cannot do the job alone.

In large part, creating more flexibility in existing categorical funding is a strategy that must be pursued by policymakers and intermediary organizations on behalf of programs. The role of programs is to support policy changes by informing policy decisions and supporting the work of advocates.

Programs

Program leaders can help create more flexibility in funding streams in two important ways. First, they can provide intermediary organizations and policymakers with information on the barriers to using available funding to support youth programs. This information can then be used to adjust rules and regulations in order to alleviate those barriers. Without good information from youth program leaders, policymakers will not know when programs are working efficiently or when there is a need for a change. Second, program leaders can add their voices to those who are heralding youth programs. Advocacy efforts are most effective when a consistent message is carried to policymakers from many quarters.



Consolidating Funding for Youth Programming

The Door strives to empower young people ages 12 to 21 to reach their potential by providing them with accessible, comprehensive services—education, counseling, recreation, health care, legal services, and arts education—in a diverse and supportive environment. Since its founding in 1972 by a visionary group of young professionals, the Door’s comprehensive youth development model program has expanded dramatically. It now serves more than 8,000 youth from all five boroughs of New York City at one central location. This tremendous growth can be attributed to the entrepreneurial approach the Door’s leaders have pursued to create more flexibility in existing funding streams.

After nearly a decade of providing comprehensive youth services that were funded by multiple state contracts, program leaders approached state agency staff to discuss the possibility of consolidating their funding into a single “master contract.” In 1991, after 18 months of negotiations, state agency representatives agreed to consolidate into one contract several funding sources that do not have income eligibility requirements. Under this new system, the Door negotiates a master contract with multiple state agencies every five years, resulting in a single, bundled funding allocation. The new master contract has eliminated the administrative burden of negotiating multiple contracts and has greatly reduced reporting requirements. It has also given Door program managers increased flexibility to offer services that are tailored to the needs of the youth they serve. For more information, visit <http://www.door.org>.

Intermediaries

When it comes to creating more flexibility in existing funding streams, intermediary organizations often act as the pipeline of information from youth program leaders to policymakers. Many intermediary organizations find themselves managing in many directions as they work to connect programs and policymakers. Intermediary organizations are taking these steps.

- Helping policymakers understand the needs of the many different youth-serving organizations and how changes to rules and regulations might affect programs. Armed with examples of the real-life challenges that youth programs face in accessing certain funding streams, intermediary organizations can share how other similarly situated states or communities have overcome these challenges. By providing knowledge and solutions, intermediaries are helping frame new policy approaches to support youth programs.
- Educating policymakers on the needs and challenges that youth programs face in accessing certain funding sources. This could include providing policymakers with up-to-date information on how other similar districts are addressing issues; sharing copies of new reports or studies that describe potential reforms; and scheduling time for policymakers from one jurisdiction to visit their peers in another jurisdiction to learn firsthand how changes in rules or regulations can better support youth programs.
- Convening meetings of policymakers and program leaders. These meetings can provide a forum for sharing information and developing solutions to financing challenges.
- Acting as fiscal agents by receiving and allocating funding from multiple sources. Intermediary organizations are working closely with policymakers to find ways to better coordinate funding and to make distributing funds to programs and reporting back to policymakers more efficient and less costly for all concerned.

Working with Local and State Leaders to Increase Flexibility

The Local Investment Commission (LINC) is a citizen-driven community collaborative involving efforts by Missouri to work with neighborhood leaders, citizens, and civic, labor, and business leaders to improve the lives of children and families in Kansas City and Jackson County. For the past 20 years, LINC has been looking for ways to improve the flow of funds between public agencies and program providers by establishing systems that provide more flexibility to programs while ensuring accountability to state agencies.

For example LINC has worked successfully with the school district to gain access to child care subsidy funds for eligible children and youth in programs before and after school hours. The challenge of qualifying each student in the program for this subsidy was daunting. In response, LINC staff consulted with community leaders to examine eligibility for school meals and child care subsidies and found that the two programs' requirements were almost identical; all those eligible for free meals were also eligible for child care subsidies. Community leaders then began discussions with state agency officials and the school district's food service director to determine how to streamline the application process for families eligible for both programs. After many conversations, state agency representatives agreed to attach a one-page waiver of the confidentiality agreement for the National School Lunch Program application so that once children qualify for the free lunch program, they automatically qualify for a child care subsidy provided their parents meet the program requirements.

This streamlined application process has helped LINC secure \$4,607,000 in child care subsidy funds as well as \$426,000 in U.S. Department of Agriculture food and nutrition program funds for reimbursement to schools for snacks. To better manage the administrative process and track required reporting data, LINC implemented a standard electronic management system at each site. For more information, visit <http://www.kclinc.org/>.



Policymakers

Support from policymakers is essential to creating more flexibility in existing funding streams. These individuals can implement changes that range from relaxing a regulation to creating a new system for funding programs. Policymakers can pursue a few key strategies to improve funding for youth programs.

- **Include youth programs in new funding.** The landscape for funding youth programs, especially those that support positive youth development, is dynamic. Each year, federal, state, and local priorities, along with economic circumstances, create new windows of opportunity for supporting youth programs. Policymakers who are educated about the value and benefits of youth programs will find ways to support these programs through legislative and programmatic changes that cut across service areas, including education, juvenile justice, and health and human services. New state funds such as tobacco settlement dollars, revisions to education finance formulas, and shifts in programs from discretionary grants to block grants provide other opportunities for crafting rules and regulations that improve the funding climate for youth programs.
- **Pool funds.** Pooling combines a portion of funds from several agencies and programs into a single, unified funding stream. Typically, it is accomplished at the state level. For example, state officials may combine a portion of funds from federal block grants and other state programs into block grants to counties and other local entities. Pooling enables programs to use several funding streams in a coordinated way and reduces reporting and paperwork requirements for local grantees and state agencies. An intermediary organization often acts as the fiscal agent for the pooled resources to help ensure that rules and regulations are met and to minimize the program's administrative burden.

■ **Coordinate categorical funding.**

In contrast to pooling, which occurs at the state level, coordination is a local strategy for aligning categorical funding from several agencies and funding streams to support more integrated and coordinated service delivery. Categorical funding streams can be tapped and used in combination to support individual components of comprehensive initiatives. This usually requires the presence of a strong intermediary organization that can develop, implement, track, and report on several funding sources.



■ **Decategorize categorical funding.**

Decategorization creates more flexibility in categorical funding streams by removing narrow eligibility requirements and rules governing allocations from existing funding streams. This approach usually requires state legislative action. In some cases, legislative action comes at the beginning of the reform process and creates the public mandate and impetus for changing the service delivery system. In other cases, legislative action occurs after a long period of experimentation and institutionalizes new ways of doing business that have developed quietly over several years.

Improving Data Collection and Coordination

The mayoral-led Providence After School Alliance (PASA) is a public-private venture that is building a network of afterschool supports called AfterZones. This initiative in Rhode Island aims to afford the city's youth access to high-quality afterschool programs and learning opportunities. AfterZones link parks, libraries, museums, recreation centers, and community-based afterschool organizations to provide activities for youth.

One important way that PASA has worked to create more funding flexibility is by developing a data collection and management reporting tool that all AfterZones can use. This new tool simplifies reporting for programs while providing the city with more comparable, up-to-date information. The data tracking system has led to improvements in communication among providers and greater coordination of programs and services for youth. Connecting every institution and program in the system, providers centrally enroll participants at any one of 40 participating organizations, enabling program leaders to see the average daily attendance and retention for all AfterZone programs and to be accountable to one another to improve youth recruitment and discuss program effectiveness. The system also helps strengthen communication among schools, families, and providers, because partnering organizations retain parent contact information and other records on youth, such as special medical needs. For more information, visit <http://www.mypasa.org>.



Considerations for Using Strategy 4

Program leaders can consider:

- States have to develop plans for most block grant programs on a biannual basis. In most instances, the public is invited to comment on a draft of the plan. Responding in writing during the public comment period or attending a meeting on the topic is an easy and effective way for program leaders to let policymakers know what is working and how changes could improve the effectiveness of federal and state programs aimed at youth.
- Successfully exploring opportunities for creating more flexibility in categorical funding usually involves local leaders working closely with state administrators and program managers, because this strategy often requires state approval and, in some cases, state administration. Local leaders are likely to be most successful if they approach state officials as a coalition and work in cooperation with other community-based collaborations to demonstrate the broad applicability and benefit of more flexible funding.

Intermediary organizations can consider:

- Can intermediary organizations suggest ways to improve the financing of youth programs by acting as the fiscal agent on behalf of many programs? Policymakers are more likely to entertain changes to rules or regulations if they are provided with sensible solutions. This includes examples of how similar strategies have been carried out in other states or communities as well as information on the costs and benefits of proposed changes.
- Policymakers will be more open to proposals for creating more flexibility in funding when they also benefit from the changes. Remember to consider how state or local program administration, reporting, and monitoring may be affected by proposed changes to funding.

Policymakers can consider:

- Have there been other successful efforts in the state or community to improve the flexibility of categorical funding? How can policymakers use those past successes to make similar changes for funds that support youth programs?
- Are there examples of strategies used by other states and communities that are models for improving the flexibility of funding for youth programs? How can policymakers best educate their peers on successful strategies in other jurisdictions? Reports, hearings, conference calls, and peer-to-peer exchange visits are several ways that policymakers can learn about innovative approaches.
- How can policymakers best use the resources of intermediary organizations to support improved financing for youth programs? How can policymakers foster and support needed partnerships? When is it time for policymakers to take a back seat and let programs and intermediary organizations test potential solutions?



Strategy 5: Developing New Dedicated Revenues

The first four strategies focus on finding ways to make better use of existing revenues to support youth programs. This final strategy focuses on developing new dedicated revenues. New revenues can be generated at the program level by fundraising, charging fees, and taking advantage of opportunities for related or unrelated business income. Alternately, new revenues can be generated publicly by state and local governments by developing new programs, increasing resources for existing programs, authorizing ballot initiatives, or enacting other special fees or taxes. Whether the new resources are generated at the program level or through public systems, intermediary organizations can be a driving force in seeing that efforts to raise new revenue succeed and that new revenues ultimately reach youth programs.

Programs

Programs can use various means to develop new revenue sources, including fundraising in the community, charging fees for service, and generating business income or unrelated business income.

- **Fundraising in the community.** Programs often conduct organized community fundraising campaigns to generate support for their initiatives. Fundraising can take different forms, from direct mail solicitations to special community social events that entail contributions as a part of the price of admission (e.g., awards dinners and charity balls and auctions). Funds that are raised through these kinds of efforts provide flexible dollars that programs can use for various purposes.



Members of the community are often engaged as volunteers in planning, organizing, and implementing fundraising campaigns and special events. Programs frequently find that these activities are an effective way to generate not only revenue, but also good will and a broad base of community ownership and support. Fundraising is typically part of a diverse funding strategy; rarely do these activities provide enough funds to sustain programs over time.

- **Charging fees for service.** Another strategy for programs seeking to develop new resources is to charge fees for their services to help cover their costs. Fees for youth programs may be as little as a few dollars per year or as much as the market rate for services. To be effective, however, fee structures must reflect the community's ability and willingness to pay. Of the youth programs that charge fees, many set fees according to a sliding scale based on an individual family's ability to pay. In addition to helping cover costs, some youth program leaders believe that families making a financial contribution place a higher value on the services and that youth are more likely to attend on a regular and consistent basis.
- **Generating business income or unrelated business income.** Another strategy for programs that want to develop new revenues is to generate business income that is related (i.e., tied to the work of the program or organization) or unrelated (i.e., generated by an activity not directly related to the mission of the program or organization). Business income may result from a program developing and selling a product. Unrelated business income may include rental income from leasing property or facilities, or profits from the sale of items or other goods unrelated to the direct purposes of the program or organization. To use this strategy, program leaders must evaluate their organization's resources and determine whether any business opportunities exist and whether they are worthwhile pursuing. Although nonprofit organizations do not owe income taxes on revenue that is directly related to their mission, they are liable for taxes on unrelated business income and are taxed at regular corporate rates. Accordingly, before pursuing opportunities to generate additional funding in these ways, program leaders must thoroughly understand the tax implications and assess the organizational and administrative burden of the activities they are considering.

Engaging Youth in Generating Business Income

Through the building and use of wooden boats, the Alexandria Seaport Foundation (ASF) in Virginia helps young people turn their lives around and provides schools, families, and community groups with meaningful social, educational, and recreational experiences. ASF's apprentice program started in 1992, providing workshops and classroom-based studies in boat-building for at-risk youth. In addition, the program also helps youth develop a strong work ethic, build their self confidence, and obtain workshop skills. At the end of the program, the goal is for each apprentice to have a positive, work-ready attitude, earn a General Educational Development certificate, obtain a driver's license and a car, and establish a career-pathway job where they can earn a decent living and receive additional training. The finished boats are then sold to help support the next cohort of program participants. For more information, visit <http://www.alexandriaseaport.org>.

Intermediaries

Intermediary organizations that support youth programs are often involved in state and local policy development. They are practiced at educating policymakers and elected officials about ways to provide more effective services and get better results for youth.¹⁰ Their staff often has expertise to support increased revenues at the program level as well as to help develop new public funding streams. Intermediary organizations are well poised to help programs identify the most effective strategies for raising local funds; they can help organize community events that cut down on competition and raise the visibility of all youth programs. Intermediary organizations can help garner new revenues for programs by taking these steps.

- Helping provider organizations speak with one voice when it comes to advocating for new funding.
- Acting as the fiscal intermediary to receive and allocate new funding from a variety of sources.
- Assisting both advocates and policymakers to implement strategies for new revenue generation by supporting legislative initiatives and working with advocates to ensure that public voices are available when needed. These same staff members will also be present during the drafting of regulations and implementing of programs to ensure that any issues are resolved quickly.

Organizing Community Fundraising

In 2006, the Education and Workforce Development Committee of the chamber of commerce in Arlington, Virginia, collaborated with the Upton Hill Regional Park to organize a Scholar Cup Miniature Golf Tournament. This effort is the first major fundraising event to raise money for the chamber's scholarship fund. Eighty participants took part in the family-friendly miniature-golf competition, raising approximately \$4,000 to help Arlington students attend college. The chamber distributes about four scholarships per year through the fund and looks to expand this number in the future with the help of community sponsors.

¹⁰ Blank et al., 5.



Policymakers

The past decade has seen a rapid rise in new funding for youth programs. Much of this funding is in response to education reform initiatives designed to improve outcomes for students who are having trouble passing standardized tests or who are at risk of dropping out of school. Most notably, the federal government launched the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program in 1997. Funding for that program is now just below \$1 billion per year, providing the largest single infusion of new dollars to support youth programs in recent times. States and communities, too, have invested resources to support youth programs. To successfully create new revenues in the public arena, the public needs a compelling reason for investing scarce resources,

policymakers need to be convinced of the value of a new program, and the economic climate needs to be supportive of increased expenditures. Several tools can be used to generate new revenues for youth programs.

New legislation and executive branch initiatives. New federal, state, and local programs often are the result of interest and action by legislators, governors, and mayors. New programs can evolve from campaign promises, from emerging needs in states and communities, or in response to emergency situations. They often grow out of demonstration projects that were started with public or private funding. New programs can be universal or targeted, temporary or permanent, or designed to work

A Partnership Approach to Generating Revenue

The Illinois After-school Partnership is co-chaired by the Illinois Department of Human Services and the Illinois State Board of Education. It is coordinated by the Illinois Center for Violence Prevention. The partnership strives to create a statewide infrastructure that builds, supports, and sustains high-quality out-of-school-time programs for all interested school-age children and youth. During its early years of operation, the partnership supported a variety of legislative initiatives that generated \$12 million in funding. Currently, the partnership is working on a strategic financing plan to raise enough funding to provide afterschool programs for all interested youth. This involves developing cost estimates and mapping funding sources for afterschool programs across the state. For more information, contact the Illinois After-school Partnership or visit <http://www.illinoisafterschool.net/about.asp>.

Funding a Youth Center Through a Capital Campaign

Self Enhancement, Inc. (SEI) helps inner-city youth realize their full potential by providing opportunities for personal and academic success. Working in partnership with schools, families, community organizations, and numerous local social services providers, SEI provides intensive services to neighborhood families. These services have been instrumental in helping many youth graduate from school. Founded in 1981 in Portland, Oregon, SEI's comprehensive service model has grown from serving a few youth for one week during the summer to serving more than 2,000 youth, ages 8 to 25, throughout the entire year. As SEI grew, its leaders determined that its services could be provided better at one central location rather than in several locations throughout the city.

To this end, leaders of SEI embarked on a multimillion-dollar capital campaign to build a 62,000-square-foot youth center. Key to the success of the capital campaign was SEI's established track record in providing quality programming for youth. SEI took prospective donors on a bus tour through low-income neighborhoods, ending the tour at SEI's in-school program where donors-to-be met children who would benefit from the new facility. Early support by a local bank opened the door to other donors. In addition, by building on donated, deteriorating city park land, SEI was able to garner the support of the state legislature, which contributed some state lottery funding. By building on its solid reputation, SEI successfully raised the funds needed to build its new youth center. For more information, visit <http://www.selfenhancement.org/>.

alone or in concert with other existing programs. The creation of new programs, either through legislative mandate or executive order, is a long and complicated process that usually requires the development of new legislation and accompanying regulations. It often takes years for the process to be completed.

Increased funding for existing programs. Policymakers can support new revenues for youth programs by increasing funding for existing programs. Providing additional resources to expand existing programs requires adoption of a new budget, rather than passage of new legislation and implementation of accompanying regulations, and it minimizes administrative and reporting burdens for programs and agency staff.

Ballot initiatives. In many states, new funding for youth programs comes from ballot initiatives that enable voters to decide whether a program should be funded. Ballot initiatives can support a new program, such as the recently passed Proposition 49 in California. This initiative will increase funding for afterschool programs from \$121 million to \$550 million through a new After School Education and Safety (ASES) program. Existing afterschool programs and 21st Century Community Learning Centers that meet ASES guidelines will be grandfathered into the new ASES program.

Ballot initiatives also sometimes focus on providing revenues that can support programs for children and youth, as exemplified by the Seattle Families and Education Levy. For the past nine years, this levy has provided funding for different programs serving children and families. The special tax levies are add-ons to an existing tax, such as sales, property, business, or personal income taxes, and result in an increase in the existing tax rate. New revenue generated from the tax increase is then earmarked for specific programs or services.



Special Taxing Districts

Special taxing districts are a particular form of ballot initiative. Local governments create them to generate revenue from property taxes for special purposes. Special taxing districts are independent units of local government, separate from county or municipal government. Generally, the creation of special taxing districts requires state authorization and, in some cases, approval by local voters. Revenue generated by levying additional increments to property taxes through a special taxing district is dedicated to a specific purpose. Although special taxing districts are very common, they typically provide funds for public education; in only a few locations have these districts been established to fund other services for children and youth.

For more information on dedicated revenues see *Creating Dedicated Local and State Revenue Sources for Youth Programs* at www.financeproject.org/irc/yp.asp.

User fees. In addition to broad-based taxes that cover a wide range of economic activity, state and local governments can assess fees that are targeted to specific segments of economic activity. Fees can take several forms and can be assessed for a public service, such as water, or for the use of a public facility, such as a park. Fees can also be assessed for granting licenses, such as a marriage or fishing license or a license to practice certain occupations, including child care. Governments can also charge fees for special services or

goods. Fees are typically charged to cover the operating or capital costs of a public service or public facility. For example, fees for driver's licenses typically cover costs such as administering driving tests and processing license applications. Sometimes fees are used to supplement general revenues or support unrelated purposes. However, it is often politically and legally advantageous to link the fee to the service that it funds.

Still other more targeted strategies can be used to generate public revenues for youth programs.

- **Narrowly based taxes.** Narrowly based taxes, such as taxes on cigarettes and ticket sales, place the burden only on certain businesses or consumers. Revenue generated from taxes on one type of good or service may, but need not, be used to fund related programs and services. For example, taxes on the purchase of alcoholic beverages can be used to fund alcohol abuse prevention programs. The amount of revenue generated from fees and narrowly based taxes will depend on the continued use of the good, service, and/or facility. For nonessential services and facilities, as the fee or tax increases, the use of that service and/or facility will likely decline. Because fees and narrowly based taxes target a smaller segment of economic activity than broad-based taxes, they typically generate smaller amounts of revenue. Consequently, fees and narrowly based taxes may be a better option to fund discrete programs, such as training programs or a facilities fund, rather than universal or broad-based services or subsidies.
- **Lotteries and gaming.** State governments can use lottery and gaming proceeds to generate new dedicated revenue in order to support programs and initiatives for youth. Thirty-nine states and the District of Columbia operate lottery programs; 17 of these jurisdictions earmark the lottery funds for education.¹¹ Depending on the goals and scope of the initiative, all or some of the lottery and gaming proceeds may be earmarked for the designated purposes. Using lottery and gaming proceeds to fund initiatives for youth requires state law to detail what percentage of funds will be earmarked and how these funds will be allocated. Like fees and narrowly based taxes, the

¹¹ National Conference of State Legislatures, *Economic and Tourism Development: Lotteries in the United States* (Denver, Colo.: National Conference of State Legislatures, updated January 2004), at <http://www.ncsl.org/programs/econ/lotto.htm>.

amount of revenue generated from lottery and gaming proceeds depends on the continued use of the service. Also, because it is a nonessential service, participation and proceeds generated may vary significantly according to economic conditions.

- **Income tax checkoffs.** In 1972, the federal government began using checkoffs on income tax returns to enable taxpayers to designate \$1.00 of their tax liability to a special presidential campaign fund. States soon followed with their own checkoffs, offering taxpayers the option to contribute to several charitable and social programs. Every state with a broad-based income tax has at least one checkoff. Checkoffs can be structured in two ways. First, the checkoff can be used to redirect a portion of the taxpayer's tax liability to specific services. In this case, the taxpayer's liability remains the same and he or she directs a portion of the tax payment to selected programs. Second, state governments can create checkoffs to allow taxpayers to decrease their refunds through donations. A significant consideration is that checkoff participation rates tend to be low, so they generate relatively little revenue. Income tax checkoffs may be more politically palatable than other strategies to increase taxes, because contributions are purely voluntary and require little taxpayer effort. Local circumstances will dictate the feasibility of using checkoffs.

Increasing Funding through New Legislation

The Connecticut After School Network has successfully worked with advocates, policymakers, and program providers to increase funding for afterschool programs through new legislation. In May 2006, \$4.4 million in new funding for afterschool programs was included in the state budget as a result of the network's three-year effort to educate policymakers and to mobilize parents, program providers, and other key stakeholders to promote proposed legislation. The new funding will be used primarily to support new and existing programs, with a small amount to provide funding for planning, coordination and training and technical assistance on afterschool issues.

In addition, the network lent its voice and clout to two other successful legislative efforts. One effort yielded an additional \$4 million to provide summer youth employment programs for teenagers. The other, while it did not provide any funding for programs this year, revolutionizes the state's approach to spending on children by turning the focus toward prevention programs and away from more costly crisis spending. The new law requires the governor to report on how state funds are being used for prevention services for children, youth, and families, and it sets the goal of increasing spending on prevention services from less than 3 percent to 10 percent of total state spending by 2020. For more information, contact the Connecticut After School Network at 203.483.1846; or visit http://www.csaca.org/ctafterschoolnetwork/About_us_main.html.



Considerations for Using Strategy 5

Program leaders can consider:

- Fundraisers are extremely labor-intensive and often do not generate a lot of revenue. Program leaders need to ensure that the amount of money raised exceeds the cost of the activity. Volunteer assistance can help defray some costs so programs realize more “profit” from fundraising events.



- Fundraising and solicitation are often vulnerable to the ups and downs of local economic conditions and also may be affected by competition for volunteers and contributions from other community organizations and special causes. When planning for annual events, program leaders must take into account the ever-changing environment in which they operate.

- Charging fees for programs can produce ancillary benefits. For example, in the case of youth programs, the contributions may encourage more parent engagement and more consistent program attendance by youth. In addition, charging fees for child care may make more

providers eligible to receive limited child care subsidy payments.

- Youth programs are especially well poised to consider business income. These programs can consider ways that youth can help generate business income while attaining important work experience and workplace skills.

Intermediary organizations can consider:

- Intermediary organizations, like programs, are often working hard to find funding to support their services. Intermediaries can be a resource to policymakers engaged in developing and implementing new programs. This puts intermediary organizations in a stronger position to advocate for their own funding.

Policymakers can consider:

- Generating new revenues is always a long and complicated process. Oftentimes proposed legislation or ballot initiatives take several years to pass. These strategies entail a concerted and sustained effort by advocates and policymakers.



Dedicated public revenue strategies are attractive to youth advocates and others who want to create services and programs that will be part of the community’s fabric for a long period, because these financing sources tend to yield stable and predictable funding. Moreover, because dedicated revenue sources tend to be difficult to cut or eliminate, they also afford some protection during annual appropriations battles.

With the initiation of dedicated revenue funding, there is a risk that the new dollars will supplant existing state spending. Although the authorizing legislation may specifically prohibit using the new funds to offset existing investments, new funding may result in a reduction in appropriations if policymakers believe that youth services are already sufficiently supported through these new sources. If the new revenue stream is used to pay for a broad range of services, an oversight board will likely be needed to determine the allocation of resources across programs and activities.

When considering whether to use a special tax levy or fees or narrowly based taxes, it is important to assess whether the funding stream is fair and equitable. Taxes or fees that are regressive (i.e., that place the largest burden on those least able to pay, who are the intended beneficiaries of the new spending) are often politically unpopular. This is particularly true for revenue-generating strategies such as lotteries and gaming.



Conclusion

Nationwide, youth programs are working to support the healthy development of youth while helping them avoid risky behaviors. Successful financing strategies are required to scale up and sustain the growing number of youth programs. Program leaders, intermediary organizations, and policymakers all have important roles to play in improving the financing climate for youth programs. The strategies presented in this brief, and the examples of how the strategies are being pursued in communities across the nation, can inform and inspire youth program leaders and supporters as they address on-going financing challenges.

References



Blank, M.J., B. Brand, S. Deich, R. Kazis, B. Politz, and S. Trippe. *Local Intermediary Organizations: Connecting the Dots for Children, Youth, and Families*. Washington, D.C.:The Finance Project, 2003. Available at <http://www.aypf.org/publications/intermediaries.pdf>.

Catalano, R., M. Berglund, J. Ryan, H. Lonczak, and J. Hawkins. *Positive Youth Development in the United States: Research Findings on Evaluations of Positive Youth Development Programs*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, November 1998. Available at <http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/PositiveYouthDev99/>.

Deich, S. *A Guide to Successful Public-Private Partnerships for Out-of-School Time and Community School Initiatives*. Washington, D.C.:The Finance Project, January 2001. Available at <http://www.financeproject.org/Publications/ostpartnershipguide.pdf>.

Dobbins-Harper, D., and S. Bhat. *Finding Funding: A Guide to Federal Sources for Youth Programs*. Washington, D.C.:The Finance Project, January 2007. Available at <http://www.financeproject.org/irc/yp.asp>.

Flynn-Khan, M., T. Ferber, E. Gaines, and K. Pittman. *Adding It Up: A Guide to Developing a Children, Youth and Families Budget*. Washington, D.C.:The Forum for Youth Investment, Impact Strategies, Inc., June 2006. Available at <http://www.forumfyi.org/Files/cyfguide.pdf>.

Flynn-Khan, M., T. Ferber, E. Gaines, and K. Pittman. *Adding It Up: A Rationale for Developing a Children, Youth and Families Budget*. Washington, D.C.:The Forum for Youth Investment, Impact Strategies, Inc., March 2006. Available at <http://www.forumfyi.org/Files/cyfrationale.pdf>.

Hayes, C. *Thinking Broadly: Financing Strategies for Comprehensive Child and Family Initiatives*. Washington, D.C.:The Finance Project, 1997. Available at <http://www.financeproject.org/Publications/Thinking-Broadly.pdf>.

National Conference of State Legislatures. *Economic and Tourism Development: Lotteries in the United States*. Denver, Colo.: National Conference of State Legislatures, updated January 2004. Available at <http://www.ncsl.org/programs/econ/lotto.htm>.

Padgett, H. C. *Finding Funding: A Guide to Federal Sources for Out-of-School Time and Community School Initiatives*. Washington, D.C.:The Finance Project, 2003. Available at <http://www.financeproject.org/Publications/FundingGuide2003.pdf>.

Relave, N., and S. Deich. *A Guide to Successful Public-Private Partnerships for Youth Programs*. Washington, D.C.:The Finance Project, January 2007. Available at <http://www.financeproject.org/irc/yp.asp>.

Sherman, R.H., S.G. Deich, and B. Hanson Langford. *Creating Dedicated Local and State Revenue Sources for Youth Programs*. Washington, D.C.:The Finance Project, January 2007. Available at <http://www.financeproject.org/irc/yp.asp>.

Szekely, A., and H. C. Padgett. *Sustaining 21st Century Community Learning Centers: What Works for Programs and How Policymakers Can Help*. Washington, D.C.:The Finance Project, September 2006. Available at http://www.financeproject.org/publications/sustaining_21cclc.pdf.



Organizations

Afterschool Alliance

1616 H Street NW, Suite 820
Washington, D.C. 20006
202-347-2030
www.afterschoolalliance.org

America's Promise: The Alliance for Youth

909 North Washington Street, Suite 400
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1556
703-684-4500
www.americaspromise.org

American Youth Policy Forum

1836 Jefferson Place NW
Washington, D.C. 20036
202-775-9731
www.aypf.org

Center for Community Partnerships

University of Pennsylvania
133 South 36th Street, Suite 519
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104
215-898-5351
www.upenn.edu/ccp

Center for Youth Development and Policy Research

Academy for Educational Development
1825 Connecticut Avenue NW
Washington, D.C. 20009
202-884-8000
www.aed.org

Coalition of Community Foundations for Youth

1055 Broadway, Suite 130
Kansas City, Missouri 64105
800-292-6149
www.ccfy.org

Fight Crime: Invest in Kids

1212 New York Avenue NW, Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
202-776-0027
www.fightcrime.org

The Finance Project

1401 New York Avenue NW, Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20005
202-628-4200
www.financeproject.org

The Forum for Youth Investment

The Cady-Lee House
7064 Eastern Avenue NW
Washington, D.C. 20012
202-207-3333
www.forumforyouthinvestment.org

National Clearinghouse on Families and Youth

Family and Youth Services Bureau
Administration on Children, Youth and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
P.O. Box 13505
Silver Spring, Maryland 20911
301-608-8098
www.ncfy.com

National Collaboration for Youth

National Human Services Assembly
1319 F Street NW, Suite 402
Washington, D.C. 20004
202-347-2080
www.collab4youth.org

**National Governors Association,
Center for Best Practices**

Hall of the States
444 North Capitol Street NW, Suite 267
Washington, D.C. 20001-1512
202-624-5300
www.nga.org

**National League of Cities,
Institute for Youth, Education, and Families**

1301 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 550
Washington, D.C. 20004
202-626-3000
www.nlc.org

**National Youth Development
Information Center**

National Collaboration for Youth
1319 F Street NW, Suite 402
Washington, D.C. 20004
202-347-2080
www.nydic.org

United States Department of Education

Get the latest news about national education issues, review education-related publications and statistics, and learn about the department's offices and programs.
www.ed.gov

**United States Department of
Health and Human Services**

The many resources available through this federal agency are featured on its websites. www.hhs.gov and www.afterschool.gov

**United States Department of Justice,
Justice for Kids and Youth**

Youth can learn about safety, crime prevention, volunteer and community service opportunities and the criminal justice system on this website.
www.usdoj.gov/kidspage

**United States Department of Labor,
Division of Youth Services**

Find information and resources on youth investments, partnerships, and employment and training programs.
www.doleta.gov/youth_services

United Way of America

701 North Fairfax Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
703-836-7112
www.unitedway.org



Acknowledgments

The financing strategies framework described herein was developed by The Finance Project staff under the direction of Executive Director Cheryl D. Hayes. This brief was authored by Associate Director Sharon Deich and Ms. Hayes. The Finance Project would like to thank the many program developers, policymakers, and community leaders who shared their experiences with various financing strategies as well as Philip Morris USA Youth Smoking Prevention for its generous support enabling the development and publication of this brief.

About the Finance Project

Helping leaders finance and sustain initiatives that lead to better futures for children, families, and communities.

The Finance Project is an independent nonprofit research, consulting, technical assistance, and training firm for public- and private-sector leaders nationwide. It specializes in helping leaders plan and implement financing and sustainability strategies for initiatives that benefit children, families, and communities. Through a broad array of tools, products, and services, The Finance Project helps leaders make smart investment decisions, develop sound financing strategies, and build solid partnerships. To learn more, visit www.financeproject.org.

Sustaining and Expanding Youth Programs and Policies

This publication is part of a series of tools and resources on financing and sustaining youth programming developed by The Finance Project with support from Philip Morris USA Youth Smoking Prevention. These tools and resources are intended to help policymakers, program developers, and community leaders develop innovative strategies for implementing, financing, and sustaining effective programs and policies. To access these resources and for more information on this project, visit www.financeproject.org/jrc/yp.asp.



The **FINANCE**
PROJECT

1401 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 800

Washington, D.C. 20005

T: 202.587.1000

F: 202.628.4205

www.financeproject.org