



Creative Youth Development Toolkit

Landscape Analysis

Funding, Sustainability and Partnerships

by Meredith Eppel Jylkka

About Americans for the Arts and Our Commitment to Arts Education

Founded in 1960, Americans for the Arts is the nation's leading nonprofit organization for advancing the arts and arts education. From offices in Washington, D.C. and New York City, we provide a rich array of programs that meet the needs of more than 150,000 members and stakeholders annually. We are dedicated to representing and serving local communities and to creating opportunities for every American to participate in and appreciate all forms of the arts.

Americans for the Arts envisions an America where every child has access to—and takes part in—high quality and lifelong learning experiences in the arts, both in school and in the community. Through our Arts Education Program, Americans for the Arts provides leadership development, networking, research, and tools designed to empower individuals and organizations to create equitable systems and strong policies which strengthen the arts education ecosystem. For more information, visit <http://www.americansforthearts.org/ArtsEducation>.

About this Paper

Americans for the Arts is proud to be one of the leaders of the **Creative Youth Development National Partnership**, which is working to advance the field of creative youth development (CYD), the intentional integration of arts learning and youth development principles. As part of this collective initiative, Americans for the Arts commissioned field experts to produce a set of seven landscape analyses about key topics within youth development. These papers identify trends in creative youth development, share recommendations for CYD practitioners, and suggest areas for future exploration. The areas of focus of these papers are:

- 1) Trends in CYD Programs
- 2) Advocacy and Policy
- 3) Working in Social Justice
- 4) Program Evaluation
- 5) Preparing Artists & Educators
- 6) Working with Youth
- 7) Funding, Sustainability, and Partnerships

These landscape analyses are one part of a larger project led by Americans for the Arts to create a new, first-of-its-kind **Creative Youth Development Toolkit** that will aggregate the most effective tools and resources from exemplary creative youth development programs throughout the country. The CYD Toolkit will build upon the success and longevity of the Youth Arts Toolkit (2003), a landmark study of arts programs serving at-risk youth that can be found at <http://youtharts.artsusa.org/>.

Acknowledgments

Americans for the Arts extends our thanks to the Deutsche Bank Americas Foundation for its generous support of the Creative Youth Development Toolkit project.



Deutsche Bank

Funding, Sustainability and Partnerships

By Meredith Eppel Jylkka

INTRODUCTION

Youth development programs are grounded in the assumption that all youth pass through a development process to adulthood and may be at risk for problems. They are characterized by an asset-based approach to meeting needs and building competencies to ensure successful transition to adulthood and take a holistic approach involving community-wide support and participation.¹ With myriad purposes and goals, these programs exist outside of the confines of the school day in a range of settings, from small school- and community-based programs to those tied to large national organizations such as Boys & Girls Clubs, Girl/Boy Scouts, YMCA/YWCA, 4-H, and more. Drawing from afterschool and out-of-school time (OST), we can glean a great deal about the sustainability of youth-serving programs that may have implications for Creative Youth Development (CYD).

HISTORICAL FOUNDATION

A first-time national study of public and private investments in afterschool programs was initiated by the Afterschool Alliance (AA) in 2009. The report indicated high demand for programming with 6.5 million children and youth participating and 14.3 million youth on the sidelines whose parents reported they would attend if a program was available to them.²

The research found that families bore the brunt of program costs regardless of income bracket. At \$3,190 per participant, families were covering more than three-quarters of cost with low-income families covering more than half of cost. Federal grants represented the secondary source of funding at 11 percent, a relatively low percentage considering that 29 percent of participating children met federal guidelines for low-income and in need of federal assistance. See the chart on the next page for funding source breakdown alongside AA's projections for meeting full demand.

¹ *Youth Development Programs—Historical Development of Youth Development Programs, Youth Development Programs in the Early Twenty-First Century*, <http://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/2557/Youth-Development-Programs.html>

² Afterschool Alliance, *America After 3 PM Survey*, 2004. <http://afterschoolalliance.org/AA3PM>

| Funding Source | 2009 Funding Levels, % | 2009 Funding Levels, \$ | Projected Funding Levels to Meet Demand, % | Projected Funding Levels to Meet Demand, \$ |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|--|---|
| Tuition, fees | 76.3% | \$15,820,805,000 | 44.4% | \$30,898,557,500 |
| Federal Grants | 11.0% | \$2,280,850,000 | 25.8% | \$17,935,775,000 |
| State Grants | 3.1% | \$642,785,000 | 7.3% | \$5,054,627,500 |
| Foundations | 2.5% | \$518,375,000 | 5.9% | \$4,076,312,500 |
| Local Grants | 2.4% | \$497,640,000 | 5.6% | \$3,913,260,000 |
| Individual Donors | 1.9% | \$393,965,000 | 4.5% | \$3,097,997,500 |
| Other Sources, Businesses, Religious | 2.8% | \$580,580,000 | 6.1% | \$4,565,470,000 |

The report called for major investment, collective action, and an orchestrated cross-sector partnership to ease the tuition burden and to meet demand for those wanting to enroll but were prohibited by barriers such as tuition, transportation, etc. In meeting demand, the AA called for a near 8 percent increase for all funding sources except tuition.

While program demand increased by half for the decade beginning 2004,³ the only federal funding stream for afterschool—21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC)—has not kept pace, growing just 16 percent. Federal funding of afterschool at the time of the report at \$2.280 billion was a long way from the \$18 billion called for by the AA.

Other primary federal sources of funds include the Child Care and Development Block Grant⁴ for low-income working families and the Corporation for National and Community Service’s support for AmeriCorps and VISTA used to staff many youth-serving programs. Below is a sampling of federal funds from an array of agencies that afterschool programs draw from.

| Funding Source | Purpose |
|--|---|
| <i>21st Century Community Learning Centers</i> , U.S. Department of Education | Only dedicated federal funding stream for afterschool programs with a primary focus on low-income youth. |
| <i>Child Care and Development Block Grant</i> , U.S. Department of Health and Human Services | Grant program to support low-income working families by providing access to affordable, high quality early care and OST time program for children up to age 13. |
| <i>Corporation for National and Community Service</i> | Includes AmeriCorps and VISTA volunteers that are partially subsidized by positions that often staff afterschool programs. |

³ Afterschool Alliance, *America After 3 PM: Afterschool Programs in Demand*, 2014. http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/documents/AA3PM-2014/AA3PM_National_Report.pdf

⁴ National Center of Afterschool and Summer Enrichment (NCASE), *Coordinating Child Care and Development Fund and 21st Century Community Learning Center Services*, May 2017. <https://childcareta.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/public/coordinating-ccdf-21stccclc-services.pdf>

| Funding Source | Purpose |
|---|--|
| <i>Perkins Career and Technical Education (CTE)</i> , ⁵ Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education | Career and workforce readiness and explorations for afterschool and summer programs beginning in fifth grade. |
| <i>Full Service Community Schools</i> , U.S. Department of Education | Community schools, which can leverage afterschool and summer learning supports. |
| <i>Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)</i> , U.S. Department of Education | Title I: School district-provided afterschool and summer learning programs. Title II: Effective instruction state grants, teacher/educator training and professional development. Title IV: Student Support Academic Enrichment Grants (Afterschool STEM, physical education, community school coordinators, mental health supports, and education technology) |
| <i>National Science Foundation</i> | A number of priorities, including informal STEM learning. |
| <i>Youth Mentoring Initiative</i> , U.S. Department of Justice | Mentoring initiatives for young people in and out of school. |
| <i>CDC School Health</i> | Staff professional development and training for obesity prevention and health in both school and OST. |
| <i>Opioid Abuse Treatment and Reduction</i> , U.S. Department of Health and Human Services | Increased opioid overdose surveillance and prevention with additional focus on rural communities and research. |

KEY TRENDS

Vis-à-vis the funding and sustainability of youth-serving programs, a number of trends have emerged, which are outlined below.

TREND #1: DRAWING FROM A RANGE OF FUNDING SOURCES

Many examples exist of youth-serving programs successfully accessing funds through a range of federal agencies. For example, 4-H and Girls Inc. received funding from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention’s mentoring initiative, using positive youth development principals to address factors that can lead to or serve as a catalyst for delinquency or other problem behaviors, and to empower girls and young women to avoid violence, victimization, and sexual assault, respectively. Through its Next Generation of Conservationists initiative, the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation supports environmental literacy and mentorship opportunities to underserved youth. For example, last year the initiative employed two dozen youth to care for parks and housing communities in the city of Baltimore.

Additionally, macro-forces, changing priorities, and new developments influence available funds. Programs with goals tied to priorities like social-emotional learning, summer learning, STEM

⁵ http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/afterschoolSnack/New-House-bill-gives-career-and-technical-education-a-modern_06-30-2016.cfm

education, workforce development, entrepreneurship, for example, have experienced heightened interest and investment among funders of all kinds.

TREND #2: STATE-LEVEL LEGISLATION AND BUDGETING

Some states, like California, have passed legislation to support afterschool programs. In 2002, voters passed Proposition 49, which has supported elementary and middle afterschool programs infusing \$600 million in 2017 alone.⁶ Other creative state funding mechanisms include the use of unclaimed lottery funds in Tennessee (\$13.5 million in 2017) and family tax breaks for OST program costs in Arizona (\$400 tax credit). The state budgeting process has also presented a mechanism for dedicated funding. Massachusetts policymakers have made annual appropriations since 2012 for quality afterschool and summer programs through the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's Afterschool and Out-of-School Time (ASOST) grant. Last year, \$1.9 million supported 89 grants providing programs for 10,000 students and training for 1,000 educators.

TREND #3: THE INFLUENCE OF PRIVATE PHILANTHROPIES

While the AA reported that foundations accounted for just 2.5 percent of afterschool funding in 2009, private philanthropies have had significant impact on youth-serving programs and the structures that support them. With relatively modest resources in comparison to federal sources, private foundations have targeted their dollars for concentrated and specific impact, such as influencing policy through public-private partnership, developing broad support networks, researching program impact, codifying best practices, and uplifting innovative programs from which others can learn.

The Charles S. Mott Foundation has invested in the afterschool sector for decades through a comprehensive national strategy to take programs to scale while influencing policy along the way. Mott has been a funding partner in the federal government's CCLC initiative, having invested \$158 million in the public-private partnership as of 2013. As an external partner, Mott's support has allowed for the funding of activities better suited for private dollars, such as technical assistance, generating public will, seeding evaluation, and identifying promising practices.⁷ Mott has also helped to establish intermediary organizations to support a growing field, such as the AA, which works to engage public will to increase public and private investment in quality afterschool initiatives at national, state, and local levels. A major contribution of Mott has been the establishment of a statewide national network to carry a collective message to local or state policymakers. Networks have focused on establishing quality standards for programs; sharing learning, curriculums, and best practices; creating new state policies; and generating additional funding. For example, the Massachusetts Afterschool Partnership acts as the primary advocate

⁶ Susan Bodily and Megan K. Beckett, *Making Out-of-School Time Matter: Evidence for an Action Agenda*. Prepared for the Wallace Foundation. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2005.

https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2005/RAND_MG242.sum.pdf

⁷ Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, *Picturing Success: The Transformative Power of Afterschool*, 2011 Annual Report

for OST programs seeking funding increases, leading state policy initiatives, and providing professional development for the sector.

The Wallace Foundation has been another major player supporting the growth and maturity of the OST landscape. Among its many contributions to the field is its effort to build city-wide systems for OST programs. Research⁸ on the project indicated that partners can work together to coordinate services with positive results; four of five participating cities reported an increase in the number of youth served and spurred efforts to improve program quality.⁹ Wallace identified critical components of successful system-building efforts, including effective use of data that may involve the creation of a central data management system, an approach to quality that involves developing shared standards and participation in continuous improvement processes, and partnerships with other fields and sectors to strengthen the system and to engage in persistent and creative funding practices. Highlighted funding practices included developing program-specific line items in city budgets, voter-approved legislation such as a sales tax levy, a membership structure with fees and benefits, and ways to stretch a dollar such as training volunteers to implement aspects of programming.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A SUSTAINABLE CREATIVE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SECTOR

Take a Field-Building Approach to Gain Strength and Collective Voice

While the work has deep roots, CYD is just beginning the process of coalescing as a field of practice. A primary sustainability strategy for nonprofits engaged in systemic reform is that of building and strengthening a field of practice. To inform its youth program strategy, The James Irvine Foundation and The Bridgespan Group developed The Strong Field Framework (SFF) to assist nonprofits engaged in social change efforts (and their funders) in building a more robust field by assessing strengths and needs of the field.¹⁰ Components of the SFF include: 1) shared identity; 2) standards of practice that are codified; 3) knowledge base, e.g., extent to which there is research confirming efficacy of the field; 4) leadership and grassroots support; and 5) funding and supporting policy. Such an approach can enable CYD to gain strength through a collective voice for greater impact and visibility, important in helping the funding community see the value of CYD programs.

⁸ Susan J. Bodilly, Jennifer Sloan McCombs et al. *Hours of Opportunity: Lessons from Five Cities on Building Systems to Improve After-School, Summer, and Other Out-of-School-Time Programs (Volumes I, II and III)*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2010. <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/pages/hours-of-opportunity-volumes-i-ii-iii.aspx>

⁹ Daniel Browne, *Growing Together, Learning Together: What Cities Have Discovered About Building Afterschool Systems*, Prepared for The Wallace Foundation, July 2015. <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/Documents/Growing-Together-Learning-Together.pdf>

¹⁰ The Bridgespan Group. *The Strong Field Framework: A Guide and Toolkit for Funders and Nonprofits Committed to Large-Scale Impact*. Prepared for The James Irvine Foundation. July 2009.

Develop a National Recognition Program

For decades, artists and community-based organizations have been engaging youth in transformative experiences at the intersection of the arts and creativity, positive youth development, and community building. Rich examples exist in the literature and have been uplifted through national awards such as the Coming Up Taller, launched in 1998 and later named the National Arts and Humanities Youth Program Awards. Over nearly two decades these awards recognized nearly 1,000 OST youth arts programs. With leadership from the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), and the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS), this recognition and accompanying financial awards helped programs leverage additional support and resources in their communities. Lead CYD partners should advocate for a CYD-focused national awards program, which could again involve national agencies such as the NEA, NEH, and IMLS, along with CYD lead partners.

Support the Development of State CYD Networks

Using the Mott's strategic approach to supporting the afterschool sector, the CYD field would benefit from the establishment of state CYD networks. As the Massachusetts Cultural Council (MCC) has taken central leadership in the Commonwealth as a grantmaker, offering funds, technical assistance, learning opportunities, and more, other states would benefit from similar entities to build the field, support program quality, and raise visibility among potential supporters. Having National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, the organizing body for state arts agencies like MCC among its partners, could facilitate this function.

Invest in Mechanisms to Collect CYD Data and Support Research

A major benefit of leadership by a grantmaking entity is in its ability to request financial and programmatic data from applicants through the grant process. For example, for many years MCC has required its applicants to complete the DataArts' Cultural Data Profile. While DataArts focuses primarily on Arts & Culture organizations, it already includes "youth" and "arts education" categories. National partners and funders could play a critical role in supporting DataArts making modifications to allow for better articulation of CYD programs and organizations. An expanding pool of CYD data could better identify programmatic characteristics, strengths, and weaknesses, offering a tool for monitoring the health of the sector, which could then be mined for research and advocacy purposes.

Support Intermediary Entities that Take a Lead on Advocacy and Offer Technical Assistance

Non-governmental intermediary entities can play a critical role in the health and wellness of the sector. As AA supports the afterschool sector, a similar entity would benefit CYD by advocating in ways that a government entity could not. Such an intermediary could be found among CYD partners such as the National Guild for Community Arts Education, or within a university setting with established leadership in positive youth development, arts and community, social justice, nonprofit management, and/or other related areas of inquiry.

Embrace Public-Private Partnerships and Opportunities for Collective Impact

CYD must encompass public-private partnerships and count among its lead partners national and/or regional funders that have embraced funding strategies focused on decades of youth arts investment and those leading a path in funding CYD programs. Such partnerships have led to impressive innovations and disruptions to traditional funding norms, as evidenced in Mott's leadership in launching and providing ongoing support to the only federal grant program for afterschool and the Wallace Foundation's investment in city-wide partnerships to support OST programs and infrastructure. Another example, EdVestors' Boston Public Schools Arts Expansion Initiative, brought national and local funders together, alongside community foundations, individual donors, and other partners to address equitable access to arts instruction for students through a shared vision, explicit goals, and a pooled funding structure of engaged supporters.

Draw from a Range of Funding Sources

Though they share a focus on positive youth development tenets and utilization of the arts and creativity as mechanisms for self-exploration and community connection, CYD programs can look across sectors for funding because of their varied goals. This is especially pertinent for federal and state funding sources as programs can involve violence prevention, substance abuse, juvenile justice, workforce development, housing, and more. State networks and intermediary organizations can play a role in identifying and sharing the plethora, and oftentimes hard to find, funding opportunities.

While Supporting CYD Programs Implement Funder Best Practices

There has been an increasing awareness among funders that under-capitalized organizations and those with the wrong kinds of capital at different points in time are challenged to fulfill their mission. The Nonprofit Finance Fund has been at the forefront of these developments, as has Grantmakers in the Arts (GIA) with its National Capitalization Project, initiated to address research that indicated the norm for Arts and Culture organizations was to be poorly capitalized.¹¹ Focusing its message on the funding community, GIA recommended shifting from a focus on encouraging break-even operations, underfunding overhead in project budgets, and funding projects without consideration of how an entire organization would be impacted, to encouraging surpluses and reserves, offering general operating over project support, ensuring projects are fully funded, and more. Bridgespan and Ford Foundation developed a new "grantmaking pyramid" that builds on some of these concerns. The pyramid suggests that investment in organizational capacity and financial resilience, very often neglected, provides a crucial foundation to nonprofits to advance their missions.¹² As awareness of CYD as a sector grows, funders should keep these best practices in mind, and others, such as the critical nature

¹¹ Elizabeth Cabral Curtis, TDC, National Capitalization Project 2010 Summary. September 2010. Prepared for Grantmakers in the Arts.

¹² Michael Etzel and Hilary Penning, *Time to Reboot Grantmaking*. Stanford Social Innovation Review, June 27, 2017. https://ssir.org/articles/entry/time_to_reboot_grantmaking

of multi-year funding and the impact of engaging grantees in capacity building activities that focus on addressing both programmatic and broader organizational health.

CONCLUSION

Borrowing from field-building strategies and adjacent sectors, CYD can work to develop a range of funding strategies by uplifting innovative programs, developing broad support networks, researching program impact and codifying best practices, creating public-private partnership, and more. With the highest income families spending nearly seven times more on enrichment activities,¹³ the opportunity is growing, denying especially low-income youth important “development experiences” that foster skills, and develop self-management strategies such as self-regulation, mindsets, and values.¹⁴ With total charitable giving having grown over each of the last six years, reaching its highest rate in history (\$410.02 billion in 2017,¹⁵ although giving by individuals dropped in 2018) and with CYD’s capacity to tie positive youth development to a multitude of cross-sector goals, we are optimistic that there will be greater benefits for young people and for their communities.

¹³ McCombs, Jennifer Sloan, Anamarie Whitaker, and Paul Youngmin Yoo, *The Value of Out-of-School Time Programs*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2017. <https://www.rand.org/pubs/perspectives/PE267.html>

¹⁴ <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/Documents/Foundations-for-Young-Adult-Success.pdf>

¹⁵ Giving USA. *Giving USA 2018: Americans Gave \$410.02 Billion to Charity in 2017, Crossing the \$400 Billion Mark for the First Time*. June 12, 2018. <https://givingusa.org/giving-usa-2018-americans-gave-410-02-billion-to-charity-in-2017-crossing-the-400-billion-mark-for-the-first-time/>