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The Forum for Youth Investment is a nonprofit, nonpartisan “action tank” dedicated to helping communities and the nation make sure all young people are Ready by 21 -- ready for college, work and life.

Working in partnership with government, business, education and nonprofits, we provide a framework, coaching and tools for leaders who care about youth and care about change.
Ready by 21 Theory of Change

LEADERS ACCOUNTABILITY

FAMILY, COMMUNITY & SCHOOL SUPPORTS

CHILDREN & YOUTH OUTCOMES

children and youth
Child and youth well being trends in the U.S.

Economic well being:
• Teens not in school and not working
  – 32 states got worse

Education:
• Youth not graduating on time
  – 19 states got worse or stayed the same

Health:
• Low birth weight babies
  – 25 states got worse
• Young Adult Male Obesity Rate
  – 28 states got worse

Family and Community:
• Children living in high poverty areas
  – 40 states got worse
• Young Adults 18-24 poverty rate
  – 18 states got worse
• Teen births
  – 23 states got worse

National Kids Count 2013 data
Thinking Outside of the Box

At its best, school only fills a portion of developmental space.
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Communities Supporting Youth

Reducing Youth Problems
Preventing Youth Problems
Promoting Youth Preparation
Promoting Youth Participation
Engaging Youth as Problem Solvers

Youth Supporting Communities
The Readiness Target
A Tangled Set of Services

**Education**
- Public Schools
- ESEA, Title I
- School Lunch & Breakfast
- Head Start
- IDEA
- After-School Programs
- Textbook Funding
- Tests & Achievement
- Teacher Issues
- GED

**Health & Food**
- Medi-Cal – EPSDT
- Healthy Families Parent Expansion
- Child Health & Disability Program
- Expanded Access Primary Care
- Trauma Case Funding
- Co-payments for ER Services
- Child Lead Poisoning Prevention Program
- HIV/AIDS Prevention & Education
- Breast Cancer Screening
- Food Stamps
- WIC

**Social Services**
- TANF
- GAIN, Cal Learn, Cal WORKS
- Child Care – CCDBG, SSBG, Cal WORKS
- Child Care, etc.
- After School Programs – 21st Century Learning Centers, etc.
- Promoting Safe & Stable Families
- Child Abuse & Neglect Programs
- Foster Care – Transition, Independent Living, Housing, etc.
- Adoption Assistance, Adoption Opportunities

**Child & Family Services**
- Child Care for Medi-Cal Kids
- Probation Officers in Schools
- Cardenas-Schiff Legislation
- Health Care Through Probation
- Mental Health Evaluations
- Juvenile Halls

**Mental Health & Probation**
- School-Based MH Services for Medi-Cal Kids

Insulated Education Pipeline

BASIC SERVICES

LEARNING & ENGAGEMENT SUPPORTS

EDUCATION PIPELINE

© 2009, Forum for Youth Investment
Age Appropriate Supports
Taking Bolder Action to:

• Improve and coordinate existing programs and supports across systems and settings.

• Align existing policies and resources.

• Engage youth and families in ongoing opportunities for leadership and participation.

• Increase public, political, bureaucratic demand for improved outcomes.
Ready by 21 Theory of Change

Moving the small gear makes a big difference

Broad Partnerships
Big Goals
Better Data
Bold Actions

Coordinated
Accessible
Well-Attended
High Quality

Developmentally On Track
Productive
Connected
Healthy & Safe

LEADERS ACCOUNTABILITY
FAMILY, COMMUNITY & SCHOOL SUPPORTS
CHILDREN & YOUTH OUTCOMES
The Typical Government Centered Approach: what portion of our funds are spent on young people?

Allocation of Funds by City Department

Source: www.dcyf.org/Pubs/csap/CSAP_final_1125.pdf (November 2003)
Expenditures by Outcome Area

How diversified are the funding streams by outcome area?

Gross Expenditures $573,319,080

- Communities Safe - 8%
- Children Ready for School - 31%
- Children Healthy - 4%
- Families Self-Sufficient - 40%
- Families Safe - 17%
Identify and align spending with priorities:

How is the budget spent on young people distributed by segment (i.e. spending on youth development, prevention or treatment)?

- **Positive Youth Development**
  - 11%
  - $30,507,975

- **Prevention**
  - 25%
  - $71,449,147

- **Treatment**
  - 64%
  - $179,564,313

Missouri’s Youth Development Policy Handbook 2003
Discretion over Funding Sources

Which funding sources are flexible and in what area(s)?

Discretion Level by Community Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Discretionary (%)</th>
<th>Some Discretion (%)</th>
<th>Limited Discretion (%)</th>
<th>No Discretion (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children Ready for School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Healthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families Self-Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families Safe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities Safe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Disconnected Funding to Back End
Funding for Disconnected Young People

- Incarceration and Probation
  - 65%
  - $11 million

- Other Funding for Disconnected Young People
  - 35%
  - $6 million

Note: Funding includes detention services, which is not included in the rest of the survey due to late submission.
Public Funding for 14-to-24 year-olds Dwarfs Philanthropy
Comparing philanthropic funding to public programs

Note: Public Funding includes 8-12 Grade Instructional Services
Expenditures for Children in Tennessee
Information from TCCY's Resource Mapping Project 2014

Expenditures by Primary Outcome Area
FY 2012-13

- Engaged: 0.4%
- Safe: 3.0%
- Healthy: 28.2%
- Educated: 50.1%
- Nurtured and Supported: 18.4%

Resource Mapping Statewide Overview
Fiscal Year 2012-2013

- Number of Agencies: 23
- Number of Data Records: 3,235
- Number of Children Served: 18,153,769
- Total Expenditures: $9,346,346,355

Source: Tennessee Commission on Children and Youth Resource Mapping Project

Resource Mapping 2014 Recommendations

- Resource mapping reveals prevention and early intervention services cost significantly less per child than more intensive intervention. But these less expensive, more cost-effective programs often do not receive the resources necessary to prevent poor outcomes that eventually require more intensive intervention at a higher cost to taxpayers.

- The easiest and most beneficial way for Tennessee to infuse substantial additional federal dollars into the state’s economy would be to accept Medicaid expansion funding for TennCare. The multiplier effect of additional TennCare expenditures is substantial. The benefits would accrue to children and families, the state’s health care system (especially rural hospitals whose survival is in jeopardy) and the state’s economy as a whole.

- This report presents the very heavy reliance on federal funding for the provision of essential services and supports for children and families. The state must continue to take advantage of all possible sources of federal funding.
We set off to understand how public policy could support collective impact on child and youth outcomes.

Making Public Policy Collective Impact Friendly
Stanford Social Innovation Review
August 2014

How Public Policy Can Support Collective Impact
Collective Impact Forum
November 2014
http://collectiveimpactforum.org/resources/how-public-policy-can-support-collective-impact

Collective Impact for Policymakers: Working Together for Children and Youth
September 2014
Public policy can enable a community’s collective impact efforts – or disable them

What do we mean by public policymakers?
• An elected government official
• An appointed government official
• A career civil servant

What do we mean by public policies?
• Legislation at any level
• Guidelines in procurement such as RFPs
• Program requirements
• Regulations that govern programs
• Cross-agency initiatives
• Mayoral or gubernatorial initiatives

Championing the need for a collective impact initiative: In King County, Washington, County Executive Dow Constantine and Council member Rod Dembowski called for making better coordination of youth programs, services, and funding in the County a top priority.

Serving as backbone support: Alexandria’s Child and Youth Master Plan is supported by City and School leadership and advised by a broader group of community stakeholders on a Commission on Children, Youth and Families.

Collecting data for a state or community: The Maryland Governor’s Office for Children has tracked the Results for Child Well-Being for 15 years. The data, which depict trends over time, are used by advocates, legislators, local coordinating bodies, and various state agencies.

Acting as a member of a partnership convened outside of government: The various Durham, NC city and county public agencies participate alongside business and other leaders as part of the collective impact partnership known as Made in Durham.

Policies…

Inhibiting Collective Impact

**PROHIBITING**
Partnerships from taking actions necessary to achieve collective impact

*Example*
The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act

**NOT PROHIBITING**
Partnerships from taking actions necessary to achieve collective impact

*Example*
Drug Free Communities Support Program

**EXPLICITLY ALLOWING**
Partnerships to take actions necessary to achieve collective impact

*Example*
Performance Partnership Pilots

**INCENTIVIZING**
Partnerships to take actions necessary to achieve collective impact

*Example*
Promise Neighborhoods

Enhancing Collective Impact
“Schools, school districts, and state education agencies see more risks than benefits in doing business differently...Their concern about unforeseen consequences creates a culture of timidity that constrains educators at all levels from doing things differently.”

-Institute for Educational Leadership
Focus on services delivered, not results achieved

“Most government social service funding today is dedicated to purchasing slots in programs. Programs are managed to deliver a defined set of services to a fixed number of people rather than to achieve any particular outcome...

Rather than managing programs based on the quantity of services provided, government agencies need to track outcomes for specific target populations and manage their programs to achieve outcome goals.”

- former White House Office of Management and Budget Chief Economist Jeffrey Liebmann
State Positive Youth Development efforts

- Colorado Youth Development Plan
- Iowa Collaboration for Youth Development
- Oregon Youth Development Council
- Virginia Children’s Cabinet
- Florida Children and Youth Cabinet
- Tennessee Children’s Cabinet
Does your state...

- Have a way to coordinate across committees, branches of government and levels of government to support children and youth?
- Have a common set of outcomes it is working towards?
- Clearly define the age groups of focus?
- Ask for budget reports based on the outcomes you are driving toward?