



Funding Structures for Citywide Afterschool Work

Introduction

There has been growing interest nationally in organizing the delivery of after school programs into coordinated citywide initiatives. In many cities, initiatives led by mayor's offices, departments of health and human services, school districts and intermediary organizations have been launched, with intentions to provide after school programs that are safe, engaging and foster the positive development of children and youth. Whether built with the help of a private foundation or developed independently, there is a wide range of approaches that cities have used to meet their after-school needs. Some provide direct services to children, and others are focused on technical assistance and/or management. All provide overall leadership and system design with a goal of creating institutional and broad infrastructure support for activities and programs that contribute to the development of children and youth in the afterschool hours.

HIGHLIGHTS OF SUCCESSFUL CITYWIDE AFTERSCHOOL EFFORTS

San Francisco: San Francisco Beacon Centers

While it is difficult to compare any California citywide initiative to other states, due to the passing of Proposition 49 and the funding received through ASES as a result, the San Francisco Beacon Centers have an interesting structure. Instead of focusing on traditional after school programs, the San Francisco Beacons are youth and family centers located in 8 San Francisco Public Schools. The initiative began in 1994 as a result of the collaboration of a broad-based group of San Francisco leaders brought together by the Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund. The first center opened in 1996. The centers are managed by community –based agencies, called lead agencies, and focus on five core program areas: education, leadership, arts and recreation, health and career development. A Beacon center serves as a gathering place for the community. The lead agency CBO (community-based organization) works with the designated school to manage and coordinate the center's operations and partners with many local community and public agencies to offer the activities that occur at each center. The Community Network for Youth Development (CNYD) serves as the ASO to the Beacons, and provides management, training, coordination and facilitation to help Beacon Centers achieve their objectives. There are three areas of responsibility for CNYD related to the Beacon Centers:

(1) Assessing capacity, resources and needs;

- (2) Arranging customized technical assistance; and
- (3) Partnering with sites to assess progress in meeting goals

The actual Centers are governed by a steering committee. Perhaps the thing that makes the Beacons so unique, is that a funder was the driving force behind the initiative. The Haas, Jr. Fund began a funding partnership for the Beacons and continues to invest in the CNYD and other supports. Much like in Boston, a group of 16 foundations, under the leadership of Haas, Jr., came together to fund: 15% of the Beacons core operating budgets; capacity-building grants to the Beacon centers; and, 100% of the CNYD intermediary, public support campaign and evaluation. The San Francisco Department of Children, Youth and their Families provides the remaining 85% of core dollars, almost solely from the Children's Fund which is a voter-approved initiative that sets aside a portion of tax revenue for children's services. There are several unique aspects about this initiative. One is that it is funder-driven. Second, it relies on a dedicated revenue stream (tax levy), as a permanent source of funding. Third, the intermediary's role is well defined, and funded solely through the pool of private funders so that 100% of the tax levy pays for direct services.

The total population in the city of San Francisco is 776,733. The racial breakdown is 37% Asian, 31% White, 12% African American, 1% Hawaiian, and 11% other.

St. Louis: St. Louis Public Schools Community Education Initiative

Community education has been the basis of many afterschool programs, particularly those that are school-based. A concept that became popular in the 1960's, community education departments began opening community centers in schools. In St. Louis, there are 16 comprehensive centers currently operating. All have afterschool programs. Their mission is to create and support a nurturing educational environment through which children, families, and other neighborhood residents will experience success.

The centers are all funded with a combination of school system funds (Title funding) and city government funds (CDBG). Each center has its own community council, which consists of local residents, parents, service providers, elected officials, clergy and youth. It's very similar, in concept, to the 21st CCLC Advisory Groups.

In 1996, a group corporations, educators, non-profits and local government came together and started the St. Louis for Kids initiative. The initiative strives to ensure that every child in the St. Louis region has access to high quality afterschool programs in their neighborhoods. They have worked closely with the Community Education Office to write quality standards and organize an annual afterschool conference and provider network.

The strengths of the St. Louis network are easy to note: the St. Louis for Kids group brings enormous public support and visibility to afterschool, which might otherwise be overshadowed by competing public interests; and, the extensive involvement from the school system and the city make long-term sustainability relatively simple. While St. Louis is quick to acknowledge that there are other afterschool providers, this particular citywide initiative has always provided a strong citywide base of afterschool activity to expand upon.

The population in the City of St. Louis is 348,189. The racial breakdown is 65.8% African-American, 28.5% White, 1.5% Asian and 1.0% other.

Boston: Boston After School and Beyond

The City of Boston has created a well-funded partnership that has expanded afterschool access so that for the first time, half of all Boston children have somewhere to go after school. Boston has spent nearly two decades developing its after-school capacity. As early as the 1980's, local organizations like Parent United for Child Care (PUCC) began to make afterschool programs a priority in Boston. In the early 1990's, Boston was selected as one of three sites nationwide for the MOST initiative (Making the Most of Out-of-School Time). This seven year initiative funded by the Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund was designed to improve the quality and availability of afterschool programs in the city. Mayor Thomas Menino was a strong supporter of MOST, and in 1998 inaugurated the Boston 2:00 – 6:00 Initiative to institutionalize the work of MOST. In 1999, the mayor convened the Task Force on After-school Time, which consisted of representatives from the nonprofit, business, religious, education and philanthropic sectors. The Task Force was charged with developing a unified vision of expanding and improving Boston's out-of-school time system. In May 2000, the taskforce recommended, among other things, that a "private funding collaborative be convened to develop and implement a coordinated strategy to support after-school programming in Boston."

Eventually, the Boston 2:00-6:00 initiative and Boston's After School for All initiative became Boston After School and Beyond, which continues to expand afterschool programs by brokering relationships between the public schools and program providers and by providing technical assistance to the programs. By 2006, the Partnership had distributed \$24.1 million in new funds to about 115 out-of-school time programs in Boston. The three goals of the partnership are to expand the availability of after-school programs, to improve their quality and to secure sustainable funding for these programs. Under this model, the funders pool resources and collaborate on projects, but each retains its own identity and ultimately chooses how it will invest its funds.

The Boston model is an excellent example of funders working together with the city government and afterchool providers to create an integrated plan to fund and provide after-school services. Boston Afterschool and Beyond's ability to create a

unified vision while respecting the individuality of its individual members is impressive. Boston's experience is also typical of the role that a mayor can play in developing the after-school system. By making the issue a priority within his administration, Mayor Menino gave the after-school cause an urgency and priority that an intermediary organization would not have been able to develop alone.

Although New Orleans is not home to as many potential major funders of a city wide afterschool system, there are many lessons to be learned from Boston. First, the mayor, in concert with the school system, created a successful pilot program which allowed him to eventually attract private funding. Then, the private funders joined in.

The demographics of the Boston school-aged population are similar to New Orleans' pre-storm population. The City of Boston has a population of 589,141 with 116,559 under the age of 18. There are 61,428 households with children. Among the children, 40% are African-American and 32% are white. 25.9% of children live in poverty.

Fort Worth: Fort Worth After School

Fort Worth After School (FWAS) was initiated in 1999 when increased gang activity prompted the Fort Worth Police Department to approach city officials about setting aside dedicated tax dollars to support crime prevention efforts. An Afterschool Task Force was established, with 23 representatives from a variety of local organizations including the police department, parks and recreation, school athletics, fine arts and Tarrant County Juvenile Services. After careful research on the benefits of afterschool programs, the task force made the case to the city council. In response, the public approved a dedicated source of revenue for crime prevention that supports afterschool programs.

A board was formed and two program coordinators were hired to oversee the day-to-day operations. The board was representative of the diverse organizations involved in the task force, including the Fort Worth Independent School District, the City of Fort Worth, Our City Our Children Crime Prevention Resource Center, and Tarrant County Juvenile Services. Each of the representatives on the board came from a high level within their respective organizations and had the authority to represent their organization.

In 2000, Fort Worth Independent School District won its first 21st CCLC grant for \$875,000 for each of five years. In 2005, FWAS and the 21st CCLC programs merged under the umbrella of FWAS. Currently, FWAS operates 74 afterschool program sites with a budget of \$7.15 million. While only \$1.4 million comes from the crime prevention tax each year, it is a permanent and stable source of revenue for FWAS. The school board agreed to match the tax revenue each year, and the remainder of their budget comes from 21st CCLC grants. In 2005, with a steady decrease in crime since the tax was passed, voters agreed to re-approve the tax through 2010.

This model is of particular interest to New Orleans because the impetus for obtaining the dedicated revenue stream was crime, and more specifically, juvenile crime. The majority of FWAS funding comes from the crime tax and 21st CCLC grants, with FWAS acting as both the ASO and the intermediary. FWAS contracts with CBOs at all of its sites to actually run the programs. However, similar to TASC, it has established its own program model and set of standards that the CBOs must follow to ensure consistency and quality among programs.

Somewhat like Boston, the city of Fort Worth has population demographics similar to those of pre-storm New Orleans. The Fort Worth Independent School District enrolls approximately 80,000 students. 48.2% are Hispanic, 29.8% African-American, 19.9% white and 2.1% other. The population of the City of Fort Worth is 653,320.

Wautoma, Wisconsin: A+ After School Programs

Although this initiative is comprised of almost completely rural communities, their creativity in setting up a dedicated revenue stream is one we can learn from in New Orleans. In Wisconsin, the school boards created a Community Service Fund, often referred to as Fund 80, and introduce an additional local property tax to support programs that serve the community and are outside the regular school curriculum or extracurricular programs for students. As their 5-year 21st CCLC grant came to a close, a one-half cent property tax increase was added to Fund 80 to support their afterschool programs. In addition, they actively sought parent fees in their communities. Their annual budget is \$284,000.

Once again, key strategies include a dedicated revenue stream and parent fees.

Little Rock, Arkansas: Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment (PIT)

The PIT initiative's focus is to reduce crime levels over time while encouraging the potential of local youth. In the early 1990's, citizens who were concerned about crime created a planning process called FUTURE-Little Rock. This 18 month planning effort was extensive, and included community-wide meetings, steering committees, issue-based task forces, and a telephone survey of 400 residents. Out of this process emerged a list of recommendations to improve education and economic opportunities for local youth to be funded by a tax initiative. In 1994, a dedicated permanent funding stream for PIT was passed through a half-cent sales tax increase. The open forum created by FUTURE Little Rock fostered an environment where the community understood the value of allocating funds toward public safety and recognized the link between positive youth programming and future improvements. Improved youth outcomes were also documented as evidence of the effectiveness of PIT between 1994 and 2004, with a 62% decline in juvenile arrests and a 75% decrease for juvenile arrests for violent crimes.

Two organizations were funded to oversee the PIT initiative. Fight Back was funded by Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and focused on substance abuse treatment options. New Futures for Little Rock Youth was funded by Annie E. Casey Foundation and serves as the intermediary for the afterschool programs.

The sales tax passed in Little Rock generates \$3.5 million annually for PIT programs, and also now supports the intermediary, New Futures for Little Rock Youth. Little Rock is currently trying to expand PIT to the county level, which would require increasing the amount generated from the tax and supplemental funding.

Once again, Little Rock provides an example of a citywide, and perhaps soon to be countywide, afterschool initiative funded most exclusively with a tax increase. Many of these initiatives, like the ones in Little, Fort Worth, and others, began with a task force or planning effort that recommended afterschool be a community priority to municipalities and the public.

The census population for Little Rock is 183,043. The racial breakdown of the population is 55% white, 40% African American, 3% Hispanic or Latino, and 2% Asian.

Madison, Wisconsin: Safe Haven

The Madison School & Community Recreation (MSCR), which is a department of the Madison Metropolitan School District (MMSD), offers afterschool programs at 12 school sites. These Safe Haven sites were initially funded in 1993 with Weed and Seed money. Recognizing early on that the Weed and Seed grant would only last 3 years, leaders from the school district and community began, immediately, looking at a longer-term strategy to fund afterschool. After a few years of operation, Safe Haven was able to secure a MMSD tax levy via the MSCR's budget. Revenue from this property tax covers 70% of Safe Haven's annual budget. Safe Haven has also tapped heavily into Dane County child care subsidy funds (TANF), and workforce development dollars. While Safe Haven continues to pursue 21st CCLC grants, United Way funding, and other competitive grant programs, they have found it's much easier to raise 30% of your operating budget than 100%.

Because the Madison sites grew from a project funded through Weed and Seed, with a focus on prevention, it is a community that New Orleans should research and consider. It's also important because this citywide initiative, unlike many of the others, accessed Workforce Investment Act (WIA) funds.

The census population for Madison is 218,432. The racial breakdown is 80% white, 6% African American, 6% Asian, and 4% Hispanic/Latino.

New York City: The Door

Although The Door does not focus solely on afterschool programming, and actually serves as an intermediary for comprehensive youth community services, the mechanism by which it has been able to sustain itself is unique. In 1972, a group of young professionals were concerned about the fragmentation of community services for youth. The inspiration for The Door was that young people could come to one location and reach their full potential. The Door offers healthcare and health education; career counseling and job placement; GED and ESOL courses; creative and physical arts; nutrition counseling; prenatal care; substance abuse prevention; civil legal counseling; and, recreation.

The financing strategy that is so unique is referred to as a Master Contract. The Door began discussions, after a decade of providing services by piecing together grants, with state agency officials and the Governor's office to consolidate the numerous contracts they received. In 1991, after 18 months of negotiation, state agency representatives agreed to consolidate several funding sources into one Master Contract. Under this new system, The Door negotiates the Master Contract with multiple state agencies once every five years, instead of annually. The current \$1.6 million Master Contract has completely eliminated the administrative burden of negotiating and reporting requirements with numerous government agencies for each service or program. The result is that The Door management team has been able to dedicate its time and attention to the creation of strong programmatic infrastructure, instead of chasing contracts and generating multiple reports.

Detroit: Mayor's Time

Detroit Mayor Kwame M. Kilpatrick initiated Mayor's Time as a comprehensive, collaborative afterschool campaign to develop Detroit's youth. The program focuses on the hours of 3:00 PM to 8:00 PM and has set a goal of participation among 50% of Detroit's school-aged youth in after-school programs. Mayor's Time aims to engage the community in afterschool opportunities through information, education and collaboration. Mayor's Time has identified six core areas of childhood development that afterschool opportunities should fall under: enrichment, culture, social, technology, recreation and environment.

Mayor's Time is a long-term campaign designed to (1) inform and educate the community about the importance of afterschool programs (2) build and maintain partnerships with afterschool program providers and organizations, and (3) help expand existing afterschool programs and create new opportunities for programming where needed.

Mayor's Time boasts a wide variety of partners. Every city department and agency identified how they would support the Mayor's Kids Cops and Clean Initiative. Detroit Public Schools is an integral partner with Mayor's Time. They formed the After-

School Programming Task Force to increase after-school participation to 50% in schools and to develop clear guidelines on after-school programs operated by the District or which utilized District facilities. Detroit Public Schools in collaboration with Mayor's Time Public Safety Academy, Detroit Police Department, Detroit Fire Department, Department of Emergency Medical Services, and the Community, will successfully educate its students in a clean, safe healthy learning environment to be productive citizens in a global society. Coca-Cola Bottling Company of Michigan, a Detroit-based business, has donated \$50,000 to support after-school programming. Additionally, they have pledged to donate \$25,000 per year for two more years to local youth programs through the Mayor's Time network.

Detroit officially launched Mayor's Time with an after-school fair designed to educate citizens about quality after-school programs offered in their neighborhoods.

The population of Detroit is 951,270. The population is 82% African American, 12% White, 1% Asian and 5% Hispanic.

Akron, Ohio

In Akron, as a response to citizens' forceful expression for extended learning opportunities, the City and its public schools partnered in the Fall of 2001 to create the Akron After School program (AAS). Mayor Don Plusquelic of Akron, Ohio used his 2001 state-of-the-city address to ask the school district to work with city government in expanding opportunities for community use of public school buildings. The mayor then joined with the school board, teachers, and school administrators to resolve thorny contract issues involving the local custodians union. As a result of a final contract agreement between the union and the school district, the city is now able to operate after-school recreation and learning programs in a greater number of public school buildings throughout the community.

Akron After School conducts expanded opportunities for youngsters in a number of the district's highest poverty, lowest performing elementary schools. The collaboration provides funds to 10 public schools that conduct high quality youth development activities in school buildings during the non-school hours.

The cooperative agreement is intended to ensure that all Akron schools become Community Learning Centers. The Mayor's Office was intimately involved in the development of the Akron After School program and he has assigned a member of his cabinet to actively participate in the planning and implementation of the project.

The population of Akron is 211,000, with metropolitan Akron's population being 657,575. The racial demographics are as follows: 67% White, 29% African American, 2% Asian, 2% other.

Baltimore, Maryland: The After School Strategy and The After School Institute

Critical early support for the After School Strategy came from private sources and from The Family League of Baltimore City. From 2000 to 2002 the Strategy also used federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) money through an arrangement with the Maryland Department of Human Resources. In subsequent years, this start-up funding has been augmented and sustained by a combination of public and private resources for program implementation, infrastructure development and evaluation.

Currently, the bulk of available funding for the Strategy's programs and The After School Institute - more than \$7 million dollars - comes from the City of Baltimore. The Baltimore City Public School System has invested \$900,000, the state of Maryland \$700,000, and the federal government, through the efforts of Senator Barbara Mikulski, \$1,000,000. After-school programs that receive money from the Strategy must contribute a 20% match, which represents additional private funding. A small portion of the public dollars raised goes to fund The After School Institute TASI (\$200,000) and the Family League of Baltimore City (\$300,000).

Current and Former Investors in Baltimore's After School Strategy include:

- Baltimore City Department of Social Services/ TANF Savings (federal)
- Community Development Block Grant (federal)
- Baltimore City General Fund (city)
- Maryland After School Opportunity Fund (state)
- Maryland Subcabinet After School Fund (state)
- U.S. Department of Education / 21st Century Community Learning Centers (federal)
- Department of Justice/ Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (federal)
- Aaron and Lillie Straus Foundation
- Allison and Arnold Richman
- The Annie E. Casey Foundation
- Associated Black Charities
- Baltimore Community Foundation
- Coalition of Community Foundations for Youth
- The Family League of Baltimore City
- The Fund for Populations at Risk of the Baltimore Community Foundation
- The Harry and Jeanette Weinberg Foundation
- Morris Goldseker Foundation
- Metlife
- Open Society Institute – Baltimore
- Reason to Believe

- W. T. Grant Foundation

Each year representatives from The After School Strategy work to increase the "pot" of funds available for after school by building relationships and advocating for increased investments in the public and private arenas. The Safe and Sound Campaign recently convened its second 7,000-person summit to raise awareness about the need for increased opportunities for youth.

The After School Strategy now provides direct services to approximately 9,000 children and youth in 99 programs, with an average cost of \$1,100 per child. The Strategy directed \$10,100,000 to programs in 2007.

The population for the city of Baltimore is 628,670. The ethnicity breakout is as follows: 64% African American, 32% white, 1.5% Asian and 2.5% other.

New York: The After-School Corporation (TASC)

The After School Corporation (TASC) was founded in 1998 with a challenge grant from the Open Society Institute (OSI), which pledged \$125 million on the condition that TASC raise three dollars for every dollar OSI contributed. To fulfill this commitment, TASC developed a four-part strategy, which included requiring program sites to raise matching funds, using a strict cost model, creating and enforcing requirements around student attendance, and securing a diverse blend of public and private funding sources. Using this approach to fundraising, TASC has raised and leveraged more than \$490 million to date.

In its early years, TASC established a fundraising requirement for its program sites, asking providers to contribute a 10 percent match to their TASC funding. The match requirement increased incrementally each year, up to 40 percent. This strategy helped to build a commitment to the TASC model from funders, because programs learned to raise their own money in order to be sustainable in the long-term. In 2001, TASC renewed its commitment to sustainability by funding new programs only if they or TASC could cover at least 75% of program costs with sustainable funds. TASC was also strategic with its OSI money, using those funds as the last dollar in and the first dollar out, and replacing OSI dollars with public funds whenever possible.

TASC developed a program cost model of \$1,000 per child per year and implemented strict program attendance requirements as a condition of funding, which helped to keep costs low. Elementary sites are required to maintain an average daily

attendance of 70 percent, middle school sites need to average 60 percent, and high school sites must average 50 percent. Programs that did not meet these benchmarks had their funding reduced the following semester. In addition to lowering operating costs, this system helped TASC to gain greater investor confidence, as funders knew that TASC invested its grants prudently on students who were regularly attending program.

Since its founding in 1998, TASC has significantly shifted its funding structure to utilize more public sources. In 2008, TASC anticipates that 75 percent of its budget will be publicly funded, 22 percent will come from private sources, and three percent will come from contracted work.

Anticipated Funders in 2008

- 21st Century Community Learning Centers (federal)
- AmeriCorps (federal)
- OST (city)
- City Council (city)
- The Atlantic Philanthropies
- Citigroup Foundation
- Robert Sterling Clarke Foundation
- Lois M. Collier
- The Educational Foundation of America
- Charles Stewart Mott Foundation
- The New York Times Neediest Cases Fund
- The Carroll and Milton Petrie Foundation
- Time Warner

TASC has had a profound impact on the quality and availability of after-school programs in New York. During its nine years of operation, public funding for comprehensive after-school programs in New York City has increased from \$60 million to \$150 million per year, and the number of youth served annually in New York City increased from 10,000 to 140,000. TASC's model of blending public and private funding is a key component toward ensuring programs' long-term sustainability.

The Washington DC Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation

The District of Columbia Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation (The Trust) was founded in 1999 with a \$12 million Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) allocation from the DC City Council. Since its founding, The Trust has raised and leveraged over \$100 million for after-school and out-of-school time programs in DC. Its

strategies for increasing revenue have included securing a mix of public and private funds and implementing a cost model for programs.

The creation of The Trust represented the first time that city government used city funds to support youth activities provided by community-based organizations. The DC City budget requires Congressional approval, adding another layer to The Trust's local fundraising process.

During its first year, The Trust disbursed more than \$8 million to 49 programs in DC. The budget for The Trust's fundraising and re-granting program increased over the years. The Trust disbursed \$12 million in 2002 and 2003, \$10.9 million in 2004, \$16.6 million in 2005, and \$14.7 million in 2006. So far in 2007, The Trust has allocated \$16 million directly to programs. To assure sustainability, The Trust relies on a blend of public and private funding sources. The following are current and former investors in The Trust.

- Children and Youth Investment Fund (city)
- DC Child and Family Services Agency (city)
- DC Department of Health, Child and Maternal Health (city)
- DC Department of Health, Addiction Prevention and Recovery Administration (city)
- DC Department of Mental Health (city)
- DC Department of Rehabilitation Services (city)
- State Education Office of the District of Columbia (city)
- City Build (federal)
- The Wallace Foundation
- Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation
- The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation
- Carter and Melissa Cafritz Charitable Trust
- Capitol One
- The Community Foundation for the National Capital Region
- Diane and Norman Bernstein Foundation
- Hattie Strong Foundation
- Fannie Mae Foundation
- Freddie Mac Foundation
- IBM
- Louis and Richard England Family Foundation
- Meyer Foundation
- The Moriah Fund
- Morningstar Foundation

- The Morris and Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation
- National Association of Community Foundations
- PNC Foundation
- The World Bank
- Individual donations

In 2007, The Trust's organizational budget was \$30 million. The DC Trust has expanded programming to serve 20,000 youth and young adults in the city. Programs operate using a cost-model of \$2500 per youth.

HOW ARE CURRENT CITYWIDE AFTERSCHOOL PROGRAMS FUNDED?

In researching common funding structures for afterschool intermediaries, the researcher began with the members of the Cross Cities Network (CCN). See Appendix “A.” With 13 “active” members, it is the largest coalition of citywide intermediaries in the country. Due to the larger number, there was wide variety in the size and composition of their annual budgets. The smallest intermediary had an annual budget of \$1,000,000, and others boasted annual budgets of over \$80 million.

Sources of funding included the ones you would expect to see, such as:

- 1) 21st Century Community Learning Center grants
- 2) Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF)
- 3) Community Development Block Grant Funds
- 4) Local and national foundation support
- 5) Corporate foundation support
- 6) Safe and Drug Free Schools
- 7) State Child Care Block Grants
- 8) School District/Title I, Title III

There were also some surprises when looking across the spectrum at the CCN citywide intermediaries which are listed below:

- 1) Almost all received funding from either the mayor’s discretionary fund or City General Funds.
- 2) Parks and recreation departments were frequent funders, even to those not directly tied to city government
- 3) Parent fees were a substantial source of revenue for those that provided direct service
- 4) Dedicated Revenue Streams (see recommendations)
- 5) Housing Authorities, even to those not directly tied to city government
- 6) United Ways
- 7) Fundraisers

Often times the funding source varied based on the core functions of the particular intermediary. For example, if the intermediary provided direct service, they were more likely to receive Title I and other LEA streams of funding, as well as child care reimbursements. Those intermediaries that did not provide direct service tended to rely more heavily on private funding.

Also, the type of funding received typically depended on the governance structure of the intermediary, as one would expect. For example, if the intermediary was part of a mayor's office, they usually received allocations from the city's budget. If the intermediary was based within the LEA, they were more likely to receive Title funding and Safe and Drug Free Schools funding. If the intermediary was its own 501(c)(3), it relied more heavily on corporate and foundation support, as well as competitive grants.

The level of municipal and city support to these citywide intermediaries was an interesting finding in this research. Almost all of the intermediaries, even when they were not directly tied to an arm of traditional city/municipal government, received some type of city support. This was the case regardless of the actual size of the city or the intermediary. Whether it was TASC in New York City, or rural communities in Wisconsin, cities recognized that keeping youth safe and enriched during non-school hours was partially their responsibility.

Also, in the Recommendations section below, Dedicated Revenue Streams are discussed. This is an important option for ASP to consider, as it seems particularly successful in communities with similar economic demographics to New Orleans.