



Funding Strategies For Out-of-School Time

As states and local communities expand efforts to generate resources needed for the provision of Out-of-School time (OST) supports and opportunities, obtaining long-term funding is an on-going challenge. In most cases, funding streams from a variety of public and private sources at federal, state, and local levels are combined to finance OST programs. The types and sources of funding are influenced by state and local demographic, economic, and political characteristics, as well as funding-source requirements. Currently, most public and private funding is narrowly targeted to special populations, uncoordinated, and short term. This non-systematic approach results frequently in a disconnected array of programs driven by multiple agendas of respective funding sources.

In response to this situation, many states and localities are ramping up efforts to improve OST program delivery. A growing number of states and communities are working toward financing strategies that are creatively combined and driven by over-arching goals for the children, youth, and families they serve. As efforts to integrate OST resources for youth increase, stakeholders at state and community levels are coming together, united in the realization that sharing scarce resources can improve the quality of programs and strengthen the infrastructure for programs during non-school hours. Despite the challenges to program development and improvement in the current OST "non-system," states and communities are seizing this lack of coordination as an opportunity to create rational, youth-focused OST infrastructures. Through these efforts, it has become clear that funding sources must be brought together in new ways, and youth policies that provide funding need to embrace a broader vision for ensuring the positive growth and development of young people.

This brief provides an overview of funding strategies that have been used by selected states, counties, and municipalities in improving systems that provide OST supports and opportunities for youth.

Overview of OST Funding Strategies

The first four funding strategies described in this brief are adapted from *Thinking Broadly: Financing Strategies for Comprehensive Child and Fam-*

ily Initiatives (Hayes 2003). The fifth is adapted from *Creating Dedicated Local Revenue Sources for Out-of-School Time Initiatives*, a strategy brief developed by the Washington D.C.-based Finance Project.

Strategy One: Making Better Use of Existing Resources

Reinvestment

Reinvestment is a useful example of a funding strategy that reshapes the way in which resources are spent. Redeploying funds from costly intervention and treatment services to services or supports that seek to avoid the need for remediation, can lead to cost savings that can in

tern be reinvested in positive initiatives. In order to be effective, this strategy requires evidence that savings are indeed recouped by providing more front-end supports in place of services that become available after problems requiring intervention have been recognized. The success of the approach ultimately depends on partners

who are willing to make deals and convincing cases (often based on limited information) that a shift in how funds are expended can deliver expenses below current levels (Foundation Consortium 1998).

The Los Angeles Unified School District has, as described in the story below, successfully used reinvestment to increase the level of funding available for students in need of mental health services (Hayes 2003).

Reinvestment Leads to a Win-Win Situation

For years, the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) spent its general funds on mandated mental health services to children. In 1992, the Los Angeles (LA) County Department of Mental Health approached LAUSD about partnering to increase services to the community. By becoming a contract agency through a partnership with the LA County Department of Mental Health, LAUSD became a certified Medicaid provider. The school district can now claim Medicaid reimbursement for services to children it previously funded from its general funds. In turn, LAUSD now uses the reimbursement fund dollars to extend services to students who are not Medi-caid-eligible. The net result: a win-win situation for both organizations,

with expanded resources to provide a larger number of children with increased services. Officials of the school system point out that Medicaid has improved the overall quality of services through its stringent quality assurance standards, exacting clinical expectations, and requirements for clear therapeutic objectives. In a recent year, some \$2 million in general fund expenditures by the LAUSD leveraged an additional \$850,000 in EPSDT Medicaid reimbursements, serving a total of 10,000 children. A hallmark of this effort is that LAUSD has maintained or increased its level of general fund spending. Such “maintenance of effort” is a key element in ensuring that a large pool of children is served or that additional and better services are delivered.

Strategy Two: Maximizing Federal and State Revenue

More than 100 federal funding streams support programs for school-age children and their families (Reder 2000). Types of federal programs that typically provide support for OST initiatives are identified in the Fact Sheet entitled *Overview of OST Funding Streams* prepared for the May 2004 meeting of the Minnesota Commission on Out-of-School Time.

Although federal funds are accessible through a variety of different departments and are focused on a broad range of needs, they can be helpful to OST program leaders—particularly those targeting low-income families. Federal funds can also be used to support the work of coalitions or partnerships engaged in developing comprehensive systems of community support for children, youth, and families. Some federal programs have direct applications for use in funding OST efforts, while others have less direct connections to OST goals. Those with less direct links to OST are often broad enough in scope to provide support for OST elements

within a larger context of objectives for children, youth and families. Grant writing and leveraging are two strategies that have been used successfully to maximize public and private revenues.

Grant Writing to Access Public and Private Funds

Discretionary grants can be used to obtain short term funding for pilot or experimental programs, and can be especially beneficial when organizations develop partnerships that result in larger revenues to reach related goals. One advantage of forming collaborative partnerships to seek grant funding is that they can be implemented across several different types of programs and systems that would otherwise be limited to respective categorical funding streams. The HEART After-School program in California provides an interesting illustration of this approach (The Finance Project 2003).

HEART: Broad Community Support Brings Public Dollar

The HEART (Homework, Enrichment, Acceleration, Recreation and Teamwork) After-School Program receives support from community stakeholders as well as from foundations and the federal and state governments. Established and administered by Pro-Youth, a local non-profit organization, HEART serves more than 1,500 children in ten area schools. Pro-Youth/HEART leaders sought early on to establish a governing board that represents different community perspectives, including business, education, human services and health care. Fiscal and in-kind support comes from local champions that include Kaweah Delta Health Care District, which provides donated office space and utilities for administrative offices; the Visalia Times-Delta, a Gannett Company, Inc, newspaper, which provides funds in addition to regular news coverage to communicate program activities to the communities; the College of the Sequoias, a local community college, which offers up to four units of col-

lege credit to HEART staff who complete employment training requirements; the city government; the local school district; and many individuals. A partnership with the Tulare, California Department of Education helped Pro-Youth/HEART leaders access partnership funds from the California Department of Education, in addition to a federal 21st Century Community Learning program grant. (HEART received 21st Century funds during the last year the grant program was a federal discretionary program.) Community donations covered the required match for the state and federal programs. Building on its successes, Pro-Youth/HEART was recently recognized as one of the top after-school programs in the state by the California After-School Partnership and asked to participate in a "Promising Practices" initiative funded by the California Department of Education and the Foundation Consortium. As part of the initiative, HEART became a regional training center in 2003, receiving mentoring and other resources from the state. It will serve as a model for after-school programs throughout the Central Valley of California.

Leveraging

Leveraging is a strategy for maximizing federal revenue by taking advantage of programs that provide funding contingent on state, local, or private funding. Existing or new expenditures must meet federal criteria to draw down additional federal funding. New Hampshire's Plus Time NH demonstrates how a public-private partnership has leveraged additional funding for OST programs (Reder 2000).

Partnering to Leverage and Coordinate Funding in New Hampshire

PlusTime NH is a private non-profit organization that was established in 1990 through a grant from the New Hampshire Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) using federal childcare dollars. As an intermediary, PlusTime does not provide direct services, but provides technical support, training, information, and funding assistance to out-of-school programs across the state. From its beginning, as a DHHS grant-funded agency, PlusTime has developed partnerships with other public agencies, as well as with private corporations and foundations. Providian Financial Bank, Jefferson Pilot and Nellie Mae Education Foundation, and other corporations and foundations have

provided PlusTime with funding to start and expand out-of-school programs. In the public sector, the State Department of Education has recently chosen to build on PlusTime's work by housing the program officer for the new state-level 21st Century Community Learning Center's program at PlusTime's offices. As a result of this decision and their close working relationship, PlusTime and the state are using a shared RFP to issue both 21st Century and other grants administered by PlusTime, thus lessening the burden on programs trying to access funds to support their work. By partnering with both public and private entities, PlusTime has been able to help leverage additional funding for out-of-school time programs, and bring more coherence and coordination to existing programs.

Strategy Three: Creating More Flexibility in Existing Categorical Funding

Strategies that promote more flexibility in funding streams involve coordination of funding sources and aligning program requirements to streamline qualification of recipients as well as fund tracking and reporting. This strategy can be used at the state or federal level, but is most commonly used at a community level.

Coordination

Categorical funding streams can be used in combination to support individual components of comprehensive initiatives. If a community governance entity and individual program managers can develop a comprehensive plan for supports and services that are needed in the community, they can usually access funding from a variety of sources at federal, state, and local levels. Funds are then bundled to extend the reach of any one collaborator. The Maryland Child Care Administration has creatively utilized Child Care Development Fund (CCDF) dollars earmarked within the program for “service” in fulfilling CCDF’s mandate to increase the supply and quality of care, while extending benefits to more school-age children and families. The District of Columbia, Illinois, Massachusetts, and Nevada also use CCDF service funds to extend care capacity by contracting with school-age providers (The Finance Project 2002).

The Maryland Child Care Administration

Recognizing the urgent need for summer care options for school-age children, especially those in low-income neighborhoods, the Maryland Child Care Administration uses a portion of its service funding to operate summer programs in conjunction with local departments of social services throughout the state. For example, Baltimore County’s Department of Social Services contracts with the YMCA to provide summer care to 300 children. The contracts are awarded to providers in low-income neighborhoods that lack summer programs. The contracts provide enough funding to support all costs of operating the programs. Additionally, these summer programs are open to all children—not just children who are eligible for subsidies. By awarding these contracts, the State of Maryland is fulfilling the CCDF mandate to increase the supply and quality of care, while extending the benefits of CCDF to a wide range of children and families.

Strategy Four: Building Public-Private Partnerships

Building partnerships within communities can dramatically expand the support base for programs, provide leadership and technical resources, and leverage new funding opportunities. Effective partnerships between government, community nonprofit organizations, charitable foundations, corporations, and the faith community provide a valuable base for increasing financial support for community-based initiatives. Effective partnerships share some key characteristics in common (The Child Care Partnership project 1999):

- Cross sector representation;
- Contributions of time, money, or expertise;
- Shared goals for children, youth, and families; and
- Shared decision making and responsibilities.

The Oyster Public-Private Partnership in Washington, D.C., offers an innovative example of the “power in partnerships” (Hayes 2002).

ENGAGING PRIVATE PARTNERS TO BUILD A NEW SCHOOL

The Oyster Public/Private Development Partnership in Washington, D.C., is a project in which a private developer agreed to pay for the construction of a new elementary school in exchange for the opportunity to develop a portion of the school site. In the early 1990s, parents and children attending the Oyster Elementary School, a model bilingual program, began campaigning for capital investments in the school. The 72-year-old Oyster School facility was crumbling and one-quarter of the school's students were housed in portable classrooms that were ten to twenty years old and deteriorating. Oyster's principal and parents were

told by city school administrators there were no capital funds to invest in the school. Accordingly, it was put on a list of forty D.C. public schools to be considered for closure or consolidation.

Mobilized by the threat of closing, the Oyster School community began to seek creative solutions to their facilities needs. The 21st Century School Fund, a local nonprofit organization focused on school facility financing, recognized that the Oyster School's location on prime real estate in an affluent area of D.C., was an asset that might attract private investors. The fund played an intermediary role between the public and private sectors and engaged the school and surrounding community in the planning efforts. Supported by a

Strategy Five: Creating New Dedicated Revenue Streams

Out-of-School Time programs and services tend to be non-traditional in that they cut across many public agencies, such as education, health, social services, youth development, juvenile justice, and parks/recreation. Finding and coordinating funding to support such a large array of both services and delivery systems, presents challenges that can be at least partially addressed through the use of dedicated funding streams. These sources of funding can be used more flexibly, since they have fewer funding stipulations.

Dedicated funding streams raise and direct public funds for specific purposes. Dedicated local revenues offer the advantage of being difficult to eliminate because referenda are usually required to put them in place. Also, because they represent new public funds, they can be used as matching dollars to obtain additional private funding. Theoretically, dedicated revenue generation can be implemented at state, county, and municipal levels.

Special Taxing Districts

Special Taxing Districts are independent units of local government. They generally require state authorization and sometimes approval by

local voters. Apart from their use in providing public education funds, they have not typically been created to fund other services for children and youth. Florida's Children's Services Special Taxing Districts provides a long-standing example of this approach to generating revenues for children and youth services (The Finance Project 1999).

FLORIDA'S CHILDREN'S SERVICES SPECIAL TAXING DISTRICTS

The first special taxing district to support children's services was created in Pinellas County, Florida, in 1946. The Pinellas County district was authorized by a local bill passed by the state legislature and approved by voters in a county referendum. In 1986, the Florida state legislature passed broad legislation to enable any county to create special taxing districts for children's services. According to legislative guidelines, the local board of county commissioners must officially create the district. The boundaries of the district must coincide with the boundaries of the county and it must be governed by a district board. Voters in the county must approve a referendum granting the board taxing authority. The board can then levy property taxes not to exceed 50 cents per \$1,000 of

assessed valuation. As of 1995, more than two-thirds of Florida counties have such taxing district boards. However, only six of those boards have been granted taxing authority by voters. In fiscal year 1995, those six counties generated almost \$63 million in revenue. In general, 30 percent of revenue is used for training for community residents and service providers, community outreach programs, and council administration. The remaining 70 percent of those funds are spent on programs providing direct services for children, including child care. Some of the district boards allocate funds for youth development and delinquency prevention programs. For example, the district board in Palm Beach County allocates 19 percent of funds to out-of-school time activities for children ages six through twelve.

While local district boards may be more responsive to local needs, the creation of new taxing districts may result in a reduction of appropriations at the state legislative level. However, district boards may provide an effective motivator for improving collaboration and coordination of programs and services and for allocating public resources more efficiently.

Special Tax Levies

Local governments can also increase existing taxes through the creation of special tax levies. Special taxes are tacked onto existing taxes, like property, income, sales or business taxes, increasing existing rates. Revenues produced from tax increases are earmarked for specific programs or services, such as out-of-school time programs. Seattle, Washington, passed a Family

Education Tax Levy, which is an excellent example of the tax levy approach. Ames, Iowa, instituted a local options sales tax, giving localities the choice to add a one percent tax in addition to a five percent sales tax. In this instance, local voters must approve both the levy amount and the purpose for which generated funds can be spent (The Finance Project 1999).

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON: FAMILIES AND EDUCATION LEVY

Seattle voters passed the Families and Education Levy in 1990 and renewed the levy in 1997. The levy sets a property tax rate (also known as a mileage rate) of .23 per \$1000 of assessed valuation. The levy is projected to generate \$70 million over seven years. Revenue generated by the levy will fluctuate over time as property values change. For example, revenues increased from \$8.5 million in 1990 to \$10 million in 1997. Levy funds are administered by various agencies in Seattle city government. A Levy Oversight Committee makes budget and program recommendations and issues reports on the effectiveness of levy-funded programs. Funds generated by the levy support early childhood development, school-based student and family services, comprehensive student health services, and out-of-school time programs.

AMES, IOWA: LOCAL OPTION SALES TAX

In 1986, the state of Iowa created a local option sales tax, allowing localities to levy a one percent tax in addition to the five percent state sales tax. Local voters must approve the tax as well as the specific purposes for which funds generated by the levy can be spent. Voters in Ames, a city of approximately 48,000, approved a local option tax referendum in 1987. The local tax option generates over \$3.2 million annually. Sixty percent of revenue is earmarked for property tax relief, 20 percent for community betterment, and 20 percent for arts and human services. In fiscal year 1995, \$450,000 generated by the levy was allocated for human services, which included childcare services. A county team recommends an allocation plan to the city council each budget cycle. The city council approves the distribution of revenue generated by the local option tax. The sales tax will remain in place unless the city council proposes a referendum to repeal it and the referendum is approved by local voters.

Guaranteed Expenditure Minimums

A guaranteed expenditure minimum sets a floor below which spending for designated services or programs cannot fall. The minimum dollar benchmark can be set as an amount to be spent in a particular area, such as out-of-school time programming, or a more common approach is to set aside or earmark a portion of funds for a specific purpose. Policy makers can earmark either

a direct revenue stream such as tax revenue from sales or income, or a budget stream from local departments, such as education or health. In this strategy, funds from existing revenue are redirected or earmarked rather than added on to specific taxes. San Francisco's Proposition J and Oakland's Measure K are examples of this strategy (The Finance Project 1999).

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA: MEASURE K

Oakland voters overwhelmingly approved Measure K—the Kids First Children's Initiative—in 1996. Measure K requires the city to set aside 2.5 percent of unrestricted general revenues in a children's fund for programs directly serving children and youth. A 19-member Kids First Planning and Oversight Committee directs the distribution of funds to city agencies and nonprofit organizations. In fiscal year 1998, Measure K generated \$5.2 million. During the first grant period, the city council mandated that \$1 million of Kids First funds be set aside for special youth development grants.

SAN FRANCISCO CALIFORNIA: Proposition J

In 1991, voters in San Francisco passed Proposition J, a referendum that amended the city charter and created both a budget floor and an earmarked revenue stream to fund children's services. As of 1995, the budget floor was set at \$44.7 million. Funds allocated to children's services cannot fall below that floor unless there is a decrease in aggregate city appropriations. In addition to the budget floor, Proposition J also mandated that 2.5 percent of property tax revenue be set aside for children's services. During fiscal year 1995, the set-aside requirement generated \$13.8 million. Set-aside funds are placed in a Children's Fund and are allocated equally among four service categories: 1) child care; 2) health and social services; 3) job readiness; and 4) delinquency prevention, education, libraries, and recreation. Funds provide services for young children, ages zero to five, as well as school-age children and youth from 6 to 18 years old. The Children's Fund is administered by the Mayor's Office of Children, Youth, and Their Families. Both the budget floor and the property tax set-aside will remain in effect for ten years; voter reauthorization will be required in 2002.

Children's Trust Funds

A trust fund is a separate, designated account in the public treasury that has special rules for managing the funds allocated to it. Local governments have used this strategy to set aside funds for special community projects, such as preserving historical landmarks, or to fund on-going programs, like housing or transportation. States have also used trust funds to maintain funding for specific programmatic goals, such as preventing child abuse, or as a repository for tobacco settlement monies dedicated to specific child and youth services.

Trust fund monies are disbursed according to a set of guiding principles that direct fund expenditure and describe fund management goals and processes. A state treasurer may handle disbursement of trust fund assets, or an appointed commission or board may be established for this purpose. State legislatures may also direct annual appropriations to trust funds through the legislative process.

Contingent on the structure of the fund, monies may be contributed from one or a variety of

sources. In some cases, public funds from several agencies may be contributed to a trust fund for use in creating and supporting comprehensive service systems within a collaborative process. New Mexico created a trust fund for tobacco settlement monies, as did Florida, Kansas, and Alabama. Described below are the ways New Mexico and Kansas have used this strategy (The Finance Project 1999).

NEW MEXICO TOBACCO SETTLEMENT INCOME FUND

During the 1999 legislative session, the New Mexico legislature created a special trust fund, the Tobacco Settlement Income Fund, which will consist of a portion of the funds that the state receives from the national tobacco settlement. Funds from the trust fund may be appropriated for health and educational purposes, including public school programs. Under legislative guidelines, funds can be used to support extracurricular and after-school programs designed to involve students in athletic, academic, musical, cultural, civic, mentoring, and similar types activities.

KANSAS CHILDREN'S INITIATIVE FUND

During the 1999 legislative session, the Kansas legislature created a special trust fund, the Kansas Endowment for Youth Fund, which will consist of all of the state's funds received from the national tobacco settlement. Investment earnings from the Endowment for Youth Fund will provide ongoing financial support for the Children's Initiative Fund. Monies transferred to the Children's Initiative Fund will be used to provide additional funding for programs, projects, improvements, services, and other purposes directly or indirectly beneficial to the physical and mental health, welfare, safety, and overall well-being of children. In appropriating funds from the Children's Initiative Fund, the legislature is directed to emphasize programs and services that are outcome based and that are designed to prevent or stop children from being involved in or with tobacco, drugs, alcohol, juvenile delinquency, or violence.

Fees and Narrowly Based Taxes

Fees referenced in this funding strategy refer to strategies for creating local public revenue sources to fund services, rather than fees as private contributions of parents. In this context, they are structured as payments for specific services or goods. Fees can be charged for the use of public facilities, like parks or stadiums, or for public services, such as water or sewage services. Local governments can also charge fees for granting different types of licenses, as with marriage licenses or licenses to practice certain occupations. Fees have also been attached to special goods or services. The State of Washington uses this approach to charge consumers for ornate, heirloom birth certificates. Profits from these

sales are transferred to the state's Children's Trust Fund. It is often politically advantageous to link fees to related services that receive revenues, as in using alcohol tax revenues to sponsor substance abuse prevention activities, but they may also be used for unrelated programs or services.

The Virginia legislature established a fee on licensed childcare centers, with funds directed toward quality improvements. Massachusetts authorized a special "Invest in Children" license plate to generate income for a Child Care Quality Fund. Nine other states employ this strategy to raise money for similar investments in children and youth (The Finance Project 1999).

MASSACHUSETTS “INVEST IN CHILDREN” LICENSE PLATE FEES

The Massachusetts state legislature authorized a specialty “Invest in Children” license plate in 1996. The sale of the license plates generates approximately \$125,000 per year. Revenues support a Child Care Quality Fund. The state Office for Children administers the fund and offers grants to child care organizations. The Fund provides financial support for parent/consumer education, equipment and materials, multicultural training and curricula, and technical assistance for program accreditation. Nine other states collect specialty license plate fees that support children’s services.

VIRGINIA CHILD CARE LICENSING FEES

In 1983, the Virginia legislature established the assessment of annual fees on licensed childcare centers and family childcare homes. Annual fees are based on licensed capacity, and range from \$200 for a large childcare center to \$14 for a licensed family childcare home. Family childcare networks pay an annual combined fee of \$70. Short-term programs, such as summer programs, pay \$25 per year if they serve up to 50 children and \$50 a year if they serve more than that number. Licensing fees from approximately 2,300 centers and 1,200 family childcare homes generate \$250,000 per year. Fees are used to support quality improvement efforts, including training workshops and technical assistance materials for licensed child care providers.

Lotteries and Gaming

State governments can use lottery and gaming revenues to generate funds for programs to support children, youth, and their families. At least thirty-seven states and the District of Columbia operate lottery programs, thirteen of which have funds directed to education (National Conference of State Legislatures 2004). Using lottery and gaming proceeds to fund initiatives for programs directed to children, youth, and families requires a stipulation indicating the portion of funds that will be allocated to this specific purpose. The potential for revenue generation through a lottery or gaming tax is influenced by the stability of contributions through participants in these activities. Georgia’s lottery for education serves as a creative example of a lottery whose proceeds are dedicated to education enhancements (Hayes 2002).

THE GEORGIA LOTTERY FOR EDUCATION

In 1993, Georgia implemented the Georgia Lottery for Education that provides funds to support the cost of pre-kindergarten and college education for Georgia and their families. The lottery proceeds may also be used to fund capital projects related to education, such as computers and technology for classrooms. The legislation also requires the lottery funds be used to supplement, not supplant, existing funding for education.

In fiscal year 2000, the lottery proceeds generated \$224 million in funding for pre-kindergarten education, \$235 million for HOPE college scholarships and \$82 million for capital projects.

Income Tax Check Offs

Check-off boxes on income tax returns designate dollar amounts to be used for specific purposes, such as campaign contributions or a charitable organization. They have been in use since authorized by the federal government in 1972. Every state with a broad-based tax structure now has a check-off program.

At least twenty states use this revenue source to fund programs benefiting children, youth, and their families. Check-off programs can be structured in one of two ways: 1) To redirect a portion of the taxpayer’s liability to a specific purpose. In this approach, the taxpayer’s liability remains the same, with a portion of their tax payment directed to selected programs. 2) The second

COLORADO QUALITY CHILD CARE INCOME TAX CHECK-OFF

In 1996, the Colorado state legislature authorized a state income tax check-off to fund quality enhancements in childcare programs. Taxpayers can make unlimited contributions to the program through either decreasing their refund or increasing their tax liability. The check-off program generated approximately \$237,000 last year. Check-off funds are funneled into the Quality Child Care Improvement Fund. The Fund awards grants of up to \$1,000 to family child care homes and up to \$2,000 to child care centers and school age care facilities. Grants can be used for training and education of staff, accreditation, and supplies and equipment related to the pursuit of accreditation. The statute allows up to \$10,000 of funds generated to be used for marketing purposes. The Fund is administered by the Colorado Resource and Referral Agency.

check-off method is allowing taxpayers to decrease the amount of their refund through a donation. States often limit the amount of the donation to the total amount of the refund. A few states offer the option of increasing their tax payments to include check-off donations. Some states have found the success of these strategies requires consistent marketing campaigns to ensure public support. Colorado is the only state that has instituted a check-off program to fund childcare services (The Finance Project 1999).

Conclusion

The many options for funding Out-of-School Time supports and opportunities for youth illustrate the complexity of weaving these strategies into an effective coherent, comprehensive system. However, with greater emphasis on creatively structuring funding through collaborative efforts, the chances of success are increasing for the many states and localities undertaking these endeavors.

Research Brief Author: Ann Lochner

References

- Farrow, Frank, and Charles Bruner. 1993. *Getting to the Bottom Line: State and Community Strategies for Financing Comprehensive, Community Service Systems*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Service.
- Hayes, Cheryl D. 2002. *Thinking Broadly: Financing Strategies for Comprehensive Child and Family Initiatives*. Washington D.C.: The Finance Project.
- Langford, Barbara Hanson. 1999. *Creating Dedicated Local Revenue Sources for Out-of-School Time Initiatives*. Washington D.C.: The Finance Project.
- National Conference of State Legislatures. 2004. *Economic and Tourism Development in the United States*. Denver: www.ncsl.org/programs/econ/lotto.htm.
- Reder, Nancy. 2000. *Financing Out-of-School Time and Community School Initiatives: A Guide to Federal Funding Sources and Strategies*. Washington D.C.: The Finance Project.
- Rosenblatt, Abram, Marty Giffin, Nancy Mills, and Mark Friedman. 1998. *Capturing Cash for Kids: A Workbook for Reinvesting in Community-Based Prevention Approaches for Children and Families*. Sacramento, CA: Foundation Consortium for Community Approaches.
- Wright, Elisabeth. 2003. *Finding Resources to Support Rural OST Initiatives*. Washington, D.C.: The Finance Project.
- Deich, Sharon with Erika Bryant, and Elisabeth Wright. 2001. *Using CCDF to Finance Out-of-School Time and Community School Initiatives*. Washington, D.C.: The Finance Project.

The Minnesota Commission on Out-of-School Time (MnCOST) is an action project of the University of Minnesota Presidential Initiative on Children, Youth and Families. The Commission convenes in January 2004 and will meet five times over the next year.

MnCOST is funded by the McKnight Foundation, the Minnesota Department of Education, and the University of Minnesota Extension Service. It is also supported and informed by the Minnesota Out-of-School Time Partnership, a group of organizations and associations dedicated to youth learning and development.

