

Collective Impact Policy Summit 2016

Aligning Policies for Children and Youth

Summit Memorandum

Overview

The Forum for Youth Investment remains committed to supporting leaders who are focusing on children and youth. The Forum's goal is to ensure that all young people are ready by 21 for college, work and life. Policies that provide support for children through adulthood (cradle to career) and allow communities to tackle broader problems together (collective impact) have become increasingly popular throughout the country. These innovative policies, however, cannot happen without strong leadership and community engagement, effective use of data and evidence and availability and the proper alignment of financial resources.

The 2016 Collective Impact Policy Summit on July 27 and 28, a collaboration between multiple national organizations, brought together federal, state and local leaders to:

- 1) Exchange ideas and innovations to build on each other's progress;
- 2) Harness the collective power of the participants; and
- 3) Provide a venue to discuss vertical alignment across levels of government.

This memorandum builds on the 2015 Summit and provides a summary of the dialogues that took place. It includes key themes that arose from the summit, examples of innovative strategies happening around the country and a list of resources and tools that participants and other policymakers could find useful for their own work.

We would like to thank the following organizations for their partnership in supporting this meeting and the collective impact policy movement: the Actionable Intelligence for Social Policy, the American Public Human Services Association, the Brookings Institute, the Children's Cabinet Network, the Harvard Graduate School of Education, the Kresge Foundation, the National Association of Counties, National Association of State Budget Officers, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the National Governors Association, the National League of Cities, and the Pew Charitable Trusts.

We must give a special thanks to the Annie E. Casey Foundation for their strong leadership and generous support.

People, Data, Evidence and Money

In line with previous summits, the Forum has continued to focus on areas that policymakers are identifying as important. The summit focused on themes related to: **People** and the collaboration, partnerships, structure, backbone support and engagement that make *collective* impact happen; **Data and evidence** - the proof that is needed to know we are actually achieving the *collective impact* that we set out to at the system, program, population and individual levels; and **Money** because without a fresh look at how we fund things we will just continue to support business as usual, running the risk of redundancies and even worse, gaps. In each of these areas, we heard some common concerns and innovative solutions. The following are some of the themes discussed that are worth further exploration.

People

Collaboration must be modeled at the top and the conditions must be created for collective impact to occur locally. Attendees frequently discussed the need for engagement from leaders throughout their public agencies. One of the most effective strategies for increasing engagement is clearly communicating how a collective impact approach will help individual leaders achieve their own goals. Participants also discussed how organizational structures can lead to greater engagement. One key area of growth for leaders is to take the time to understand the context that each of the varying sectors are operating in and the best way to involve them. Engaging business leaders requires a different approach than involving health or education organizations. If collective impact leaders look at collaboration as a chance to understand people and what is important to them, then the collective impact effort is more likely to truly reflect the needs and the goals of the stakeholders.

No need to recreate the wheel. It is important to recognize that new entities do not always need to form, but can instead come under the umbrella of an existing body, in order to promote alignment and coordination among a range of partners. For example, when the Tennessee Children's Cabinet Executive Director, Jude White, wanted to deepen their parent engagement, she reached out to Child Abuse Tennessee, who already had strong parent engagement. As Jude said, "I don't need to build it myself, but I do need to know where this will come from."

Stay neutral. It is important for the organizational home and staff of a partnership or children's cabinet to be seen as a neutral broker and convener. Minnesota chose to restructure their children's cabinet which had been housed in their education agency and move it into the Governor's Office to increase cross-agency buy-in and improve communication with their legislature.

Create intentional connection points. Agencies don't always have ways to talk to each other and it takes a lot of follow-through, patience and planning. Although technology can play a part in connecting people, it isn't the silver bullet. Interpersonal relationships are still the most powerful. Often times the conversation that takes place after the meeting adjourns has the biggest impact. As one presenter from a state level agency put it, "our authority and influence to make change is based on the time we can give, the credibility we have and the relationships we have."

Community engagement is the 'holy grail' of the work. Summit participants engage their members in a range of ways, including community conversations, surveys, focus groups, online communication and advocacy opportunities. Participant members reflected that it is a "challenge to really get input at the policy level and to make sure that we are reaching out to all populations represented." Collective impact efforts should prioritize engagement with youth and their families and see their efforts as an opportunity to improve services. As one policymaker reported, a constituent early on told him, "I don't need a civics lesson, I need some help." Another local official noted that it was important for leaders to ask, "Well, what do the kids say?" and to provide youth with an active seat at the table.

Build authentic, lasting relationships. Community, youth and parent engagement still boils down to relationships. You will not be able to truly engage families and communities if you don't have relationships. Collective impact structures are still in development and often rely on the traditional leadership structures of the community or the 'likely suspects.' However, to truly understand the root causes, needs and assets of a community, a deeper ongoing dialogue has to take place. Organizations can leverage key connections to ensure they are getting fresh perspectives and to nurture partners who are already at the table. Leaders should ensure that they have external accountability for looping information back to the community and not just asking them for input as well. Relationships are also useful for vertical alignment between levels of government. When

counties in Ohio expressed a need for greater flexibility of funding, the state was able to create a workgroup that allowed counties to pool administrative resources to achieve more efficient results.

Support local collective impact partnerships. The Obama administration has invested a large amount of resources into place-based initiatives. These initiatives, such as Promise Neighborhoods, Choice Neighborhoods, Performance Partnership Pilots and Promise Zones, provide funding, flexibility, technical assistance, and other supports to local communities that wish to align their efforts across programs, departments and policy silos. These initiatives are often locally led, involve long term planning, utilize data and evidence and streamline the efforts of federal agencies. Local officials should consider how these place based initiatives can help them deal with burdensome regulations or align their efforts in new and innovative ways. Many of these initiatives can provide a first step towards reexamining and improving alignment efforts already occurring at the local level. States, counties and cities are also feeling the need to pilot work in smaller geographies and are supporting collective impact in certain cities, zip codes and neighborhoods of need.

Data

Need to build capacity to use data. Very few programs, agencies and partnerships are internally armed with the resources and staff to fully utilize the power of data. Programs, partnerships and other coordinating bodies need staff that understand the importance of data and how to integrate it into the entity's work – from identifying indicators, creating measures, making mid-course corrections, evaluating work, etc. Research and data terminology and methodology can be difficult for practitioners, policy leaders, community members and families alike to follow. It often takes a lot of time for leaders to explain to stakeholders what the data means and how it is relevant.

Maintaining data is an ongoing task. Local agencies and partnerships often struggle to sustain data collection and analysis for decision-making processes. Leaders are frequently turning to data systems, dashboards and outcomes frameworks in order to make better informed choices relating to funding, community engagement or program evaluation. By using a consistent framework or dashboard, agencies can begin to build a better picture of what is happening in their communities over time. Governments can also use these dashboards to reach out to their community organization and philanthropic industry partners. These partners can be engaged in the data collection process or can use new data sources to update their own work. One participant, through a data mapping initiative, was able to show a gap in early childhood education opportunities within their county and connect with businesses to fill that gap.

Agencies should strive for common language when using data. Many agencies at the state or local level are often involved with the data collection process. This overlap causes confusion when these agencies lack a common language. Agencies might collect information on populations that are defined in different ways, making it difficult for agencies to combine datasets and collaborate. For example, one agency might define youth as all teenagers while another agency might define youth more broadly to include younger individuals. Other agencies might define treatments, such as counseling, in different ways and only count some youth as receiving certain supports. Agencies should coordinate a common language to increase their ability to use data in decision-making processes.

Data sharing agreements can help. Coalitions often seek to use data from existing government sources to track progress and learn. Policymakers can support this process by entering into data sharing agreements to share internal databases across agencies with agreed upon entities acting in partnership. It is also important to engage with the community so that they are informed about how

and why their data is being used as well as when their data is being given to new partners as a result of these agreements.

The solutions are more adaptive than they are technical. There is a common misperception that integrating data systems is a technology infused process that requires IT experts. Although there are technological aspects and experts that have to be folded into the process, a bulk of the work requires culture and attitude shifts, and identifying and engaging the right partners. A system not only has to be built but those using it have to believe in it and actually use it. Reaching out to partners in the legislative branch to make them more comfortable can also lead to funding changes to support those data systems.

Evidence

Focus on continuous improvement. One of the biggest concerns with this emphasis on evidence is the fear that if results show less than promising outcomes, programs will lose their funding and will be eliminated. A culture shift is needed to allow leaders the space to take risks and find out what works, balanced by ways to maintain accountability. Cultivating trust, regular feedback, mutual accountability and capacity building can ensure that partners do not feel threatened by evaluations. Instead, it should be viewed as a method to help practitioners get to the outcomes we all want to see. As one participant noted, evidence can be used to consider, “How do we pick what’s right for us? How do we implement it effectively?”

Context matters. In the past, leaders often skipped right over looking at research and evidence before creating policies. It seems now we have gone to the other extreme of the spectrum and everyone has jumped on the evidence bandwagon. There has been a clear shift in desire at the state and local level to finance evidence-based programs, but evidence-based is a very new discipline for a lot of leaders in the field. While the increased use of evidence in policy is encouraging, you cannot drop a program into a community just because it was successful in a randomized control trial. You have to have buy-in from the community and it has to be relevant for the particular community context. Policymakers need to consider the populations a specific program is designed to address and look at ways to change their home-grown programs so that they meet new standards as the evidence-base for certain approaches grows.

Utilize a broader definition of evidence. Leaders at all levels of government are beginning to recognize the need to use a range of evidence types in their decision-making processes. Public officials mentioned their use of evaluations, statistics, administrative or survey data, performance improvement data and behavioral analytics. The federal government is also using a tiered evidence approach that focuses more funding for programs backed by a RCT, but encourages other experimental analyses as well. The federal government also uses behavioral insights to improve program efficiency and save taxpayer dollars. Local governments also recognize that much of the data they collect can be used to improve programs or tie funding decisions for homegrown programs to outcomes when expensive RCTs are unavailable.

Capacity-building remains a priority. Local and state agencies spend a large amount of their time building their own capacity and the capacity of their partners to use evidence when making policy choices or setting priorities. Officials in places like New York City have started using protocols to allow multiple agencies to share data, question methodologies and clean their data sets. This allows agencies to have the most up to date and useful evidence when reforming programs. Other local agencies work with their grantees to increase their capacity for evaluation. This allows agencies to focus on improving the work of their grantees and shift funding to more effective evidence-based programs or practices.

Money

Fiscal mapping starts new conversations. It can be difficult for communities to understand where resources are coming from and where they go. In any state or community there are federal, state, local or private funding streams supporting youth. Without purposefully mapping those funding streams it is hard to know how to coordinate them most effectively. Fiscal mapping all of the resources coming into a given geography based on goals and targets can help make sense of the big picture of funding. Policymakers can use this information to make budget decisions, fill gaps in services, drive toward particular shared outcomes or blend and braid funding for greater impact. Many officials find it illuminating to see the overall investment in an area and understand what type of resources are available. It is generally even more worthwhile to institutionalize the process so that informed decisions are made on an annual basis.

Fiscal mapping is art not science. The task of identifying and understanding the purpose of funding streams is less of a science and more of an art. Communities must grapple not only with what “counts” as an investment in children and youth, but also which metrics will help them know whether those investments are working. Convening the players and verbalizing the questions, as Denver’s Children’s Cabinet has learned, in itself is an extremely valuable exercise. Engaging key stakeholders in discussion about their common desired outcomes for children and youth and common ways of reporting on budgets and investments, looks different and serves distinct purposes in every community.

Dedicated funding streams are untapped opportunities. Many participants were interested in ways to move past federal and state cuts on funding streams that focused on children and youth. These cuts can have huge implications and local leaders often need to increase their support for these services in response. More than two dozen communities have put together dedicated funding streams and it appears that voters have a much higher tolerance for local tax increases to pay for children when it is in their own community. In addition, some elected officials are making this a priority, as did Philadelphia’s Mayor, making it the first city to pass a soda tax after a campaign that focused on what the money could be used for to support kids, rather than the potential public health benefits of this tax.

Blending and Braiding funds can lead to new solutions. Blending and braiding funding streams involves pooling public resources together to fund programs that cut across policy silos. Many participants were interested in how they could move funding decisions beyond simple measures of compliance and into an outcome-focused space. Participants can start small and demonstrate the value of braiding different funding streams to meet a bigger goal or outcome as a first step, eventually moving toward blending. This allows local providers to have a more flexible, less bureaucratic and larger pool of funding to meet the diverse needs of a population.

Equity and Collective Impact

The 2016 Summit was unique for its focus on equity as it relates to collective impact efforts. The following is a summary of the participant's thoughts on how equity can be embedded into collective impact work.

The Importance of Mapping

Participants emphasized the need for an accurate and whole picture of what was happening in their communities. In order to focus on equity, policymakers need to have timely and reliable data on any gaps among youth in their community. Through conversations at the 2016 summit, mapping emerged as a valuable tool for demonstrating the concentrations of gaps in services and needs within a community. Mapping allows public officials to pool data from multiple agencies and present it in a way that showcases needs within a geographic area. Public officials should drill down into the neighborhood or community in order to further understand inequities such as lack of services in specific neighborhoods or whether certain residents are facing risks at disproportionate levels. State and local leaders must intentionally use cross-agency data to begin understanding equity in their community.

Leadership is Key

Participants noted that there are siloed efforts underway to tackle equity in specific areas such as health or education. It is important that officials begin utilizing a cross agency approach. State and local officials need to bring numerous stakeholders together in order to focus on equity issues. While officials may be working on equity issues in afterschool programming or with early childhood systems, it is rare for officials to be tackling this work in a cross agency way. Leaders need to be engaged if equity is going to make it onto the agenda in a meaningful way.

Prioritizing Equity: An Example from the County Level

Fairfax County's Board of Supervisors recently passed a resolution adopting the [One Fairfax](#) plan. The resolution directs the county to focus on racial and social equity policy and consider how public policies promote or encourage equity. Focusing on racial and social equity, the county will work with schools, businesses, nonprofits, faith-based organizations and other partners to improve policy and institutional frameworks. Equity has previously been a key focus for the county's Strategic Plan to Facilitate Economic Success and the Successful Children and Youth Policy Team. One Fairfax gives public officials the incentive to focus on equity and affords them the new opportunity to engage with their community on equity issues.

For more information on the Collective Impact Policy Summit planned for 2017 please contact

Sara Matthew, sara@forumfyi.org.

Appendix I: Examples & Resources

Overview

The 2016 Collective Impact Policy Summit attendees were fortunate to hear from many leading voices from across the country. Policymakers at the federal, state and local level are pursuing innovative reforms that utilize a collective impact approach. Here are some of the best examples and useful resources that came out of the 2015 and 2016 summits.

People

2015 Examples:

[Alexandria's Children, Youth and Families Collaborative Commission](#) is putting in place more staff support and infrastructure to implement their child and youth master plan. The city has also focused on improving engagement. The master plan gathered input from over 300 community members and youth, including young people who are often hard to engage. One way that the commission sustains this engagement is through the [Parent Leadership Training Institute](#) – a formalized program teaching parents how to be engaged and involved.

The [Minneapolis Youth Coordinating Board](#) is a long standing coordinating structure at the city level.

[Montgomery County Collaboration Council](#) has two model collective impact initiatives going - one on workforce, and the other on community health.

[The Fairfax County Successful Child and Youth Policy Team](#) did not have the policy decision-makers at the table in previous iterations of their collaborative work, and are gaining more traction now with the school board, and their county board of supervisors are participating more fully.

[Maryland's Children's Cabinet](#), one of the longest standing bodies of this type, and their Governor's Office for Children, has incorporated their new governor's economic agenda around ending childhood hunger, youth homelessness, incarceration and disconnected youth into their work for a smoother transition to a new administration.

The Tennessee Children's Cabinet has incorporated family voice at the state level through parent focus groups and surveys and a partnership with one organization who had already engaged parents. In partnership with ChildAbuseTN, they have developed [KidcentralTN](#) as a way for families to access services, thereby keeping them connected in ways that meet their immediate needs.

At the federal level, there is not one federal coordinating structure for children and youth issues, but there is a concerted effort by the administration to support collective impact efforts at the local level with [Place Based Initiatives](#) like the Promise Neighborhoods, Promise Zones, Choice Neighborhoods, etc.

2016 Examples:

New York City started a [children's cabinet](#) in 2014. The cabinet runs a place-based initiative in certain neighborhoods to increase data collection, targeted program investment and city government collaboration.

The [By All Means](#) initiative out of the Harvard Graduate School of Education is also providing support to 6 cities to create Children's Cabinets through their Education Redesign Lab focused on system building, specifically targeting poverty.

In Hampton, Virginia, the city pooled service money to create [Family Assessment and Planning Teams](#). These teams were able to engage with families and improve residential treatment and education outcomes for foster care children.

In Oakland, the city, county and school district came together to create [Oakland Youth Ventures Joint Powers Authority](#). The organization started with city and county leaders coming together to formalize their relationship. The organization received approval from the state government and created a joint powers authority to promote a cross-sector collective impact partnership.

Fairfax County established an [Opportunity Neighborhood](#) Model similar to the Harlem Children's Zone and it emphasizes improving outcomes for youth with a two generation approach. The model focuses on family community engagement, early childhood education, service access and workforce readiness.

Broward County's [Children's Services Council](#) used a 2014 reauthorization to promote their successes and build a broader community coalition by partnering with business groups.

The [Minnesota Children's Cabinet](#) began in 2011 and advises the governor, lobbies legislators and focuses on community engagement.

[New York's Council on Children and Families](#) created a multiple systems navigator to help families navigate the various services that the state provides. The navigator was created through a process of agency collaboration and community engagement to ensure it was easy to use and had accessible, regularly updated information from various public agencies.

[The Iowa Collaboration for Youth Development Council](#) focused on youth engagement by creating an informal network for youth to provide input into agency proposals.

Tools and Resources:

- [The Children's Cabinet Network](#)
- [Children's Cabinets' Structural Options](#)
- [The Forum's training on a Big Picture Approach to Collective Impact](#)
- [America's Promise Parent Engagement Toolkit](#)
- [Core Principles for Engaging Young People in Community Change](#)
- Hampton, Virginia's [Systems of Care Approach PPT](#)
- Hampton, Virginia's [Youth Engagement Issue Brief](#)
- Fairfax County [Opportunity Neighborhood Model Infographic](#)
- Oakland Promise [Overview](#)
- Oakland Promise [Opportunities for Impact Presentation](#)
- Iowa's [Youth Advisory Council](#)
- Ready by 21's ["From Program Performance to Collective Impact" Framework](#)
- Tamarack Institute's [Collective Impact 3.0: An Evolving Framework for Community Change Issue Brief](#)

Data

2015 Examples:

Providence has been able to use data at the individual level to target intervention and improve outcomes. For example, they have been able to use data to identify the specific students at each school that have not filled out a FAFSA and in one year have been able to significantly increase the city's FAFSA completion rates.

Montgomery County has memoranda of understandings (MOUs) between each program that is part of its Children's Opportunity Fund and their local school. The county is working on developing a master MOU between the school district and the department of Health and Human Services.

San Diego has a master MOU between the 42 different school districts and their child welfare system.

The [Kansas Children's Cabinet and Trust Fund](#) provides investments to communities throughout Kansas using a RFP process. The Cabinet partnered with Kansas University to create the Common, an effort to align measures across early-childhood programs all over the state.

Virginia's health and Human resources Secretariat created a database that merged Title IV-E, Medicaid and other program information and is now attempting to merge more with the Children's Cabinet.

[Actionable Intelligence for Social Policy \(AISP\)](#) is committed to helping places improve education, health and human services related policies and practices through quality integrated data systems. AISP is working closely with Broward County, and many other places, to help them develop an integrated data system.

2016 Examples:

Oakland utilized juvenile justice data to create unique IDs so that new data about each child can be integrated into the juvenile justice data even when a child leaves the juvenile justice system.

Denver is utilizing mapping tools to guide their funding allocations by documenting opportunity gaps. The Mayor is also utilizing a child-wellbeing index that incentivizes investments in needed areas in order to reduce disparities.

New York City began using data from seven different local agencies to target youth who are involved in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems simultaneously.

Philadelphia created an early childhood risk model that utilizes seven risk indicators related to early health and education outcomes. The city then uses this information to find available high quality services that can support at-risk children and youth.

Allegheny County created a data warehouse with 29 different internal and external data sources shared from a variety of community partners. The data is then made available to their human service provider's network.

[Kansas Children's Cabinet and Trust Fund](#) created the Blueprint for Early Childhood, a toolkit to guide early childhood education partners on measuring their progress.

Florida's Children and Youth Cabinet has created data sharing agreements through their [technology work](#) group to improve agency collaboration and communication between systems.

The U.S. Government, in an effort to breakdown siloes and allow localities, tribes and states the ability to work across departments to more effectively and efficiently serve youth, has selected two cohorts for their [Performance Partnership Pilots \(P3\)](#). Applications for the third cohort are due on October 31, 2016. The federal government is also focusing on using tiered-evidence grant designs and behavioral insights to further encourage the use of data, research and evidence in policymaking.

Tools and Resources:

[Actionable Intelligence for Social Policy \(AISP\)](#)

- [AISP Best Practices Paper on Data Integration](#)
- [AISP: Integrated Data Brief](#)
- [AISP Best Practices Paper on Legal Issues](#)
- [Network Site Case Studies](#): The case studies examine the different ways in which AISP's Network sites use and sustain their integrated data systems. They also provide background information on how each sites' IDS originated, and address the five AISP best practices areas—legal issues, data integration, ethics, data quality, and benefit cost analysis.

The Forum for Youth Investment's [Performance Partnership Pilots \(P3\) Hub](#): This hub includes information about applications for the third cohort.

[Sharing Data for Better Results: A Guide to Building Integrated Data Systems Compatible with Federal Privacy Laws.](#)

- Data Quality Campaign's [Local Data Use resources](#)
- Philadelphia's ["Examining Multiple Early Childhood Risks" Brief](#)
- Philadelphia [Pre-K Recommendations Report](#)
- Andrew Feldman (Brookings) [Presentation on Federal Use of Data and Evidence](#)
- Florida Children and Youth Cabinet [Technology Workgroup Presentation](#)
- Maryland's [Results for Child Well-Being Presentation](#)

Evidence

2015 Examples:

[Providence Child and Youth Cabinet](#) is using data and evidence in innovative ways as a member of the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Evidence2Success initiative. The Cabinet, a coalition of 60 organizations, established an Evidence2Success [action plan](#) through 2018. The Evidence2Success Prevention Framework emphasizes data from local youth and the evidence-based programs.

Broward County's Children's Services Council uses what they call "relational contracting" as a means of allowing program providers to use evidence for continuous improvement. As a funder they provide support to providers and encourage them to share the barriers and problems they come across as opposed to threatening pulling their funding. This has been a cultural shift for their community stakeholders who have not been funded in this way before. The Council believes they don't succeed unless the grantees succeed – so they work in partnership and provide technical assistance to help them get to the agreed upon outcomes.

Connecticut's legislature is at the forefront of using [results based accountability](#) in their appropriations committee.

Illinois' Governor's Office of Management and Budget has developed [Budgeting for Results](#) a publicly transparent and accessible site created by a Commission responsible for advising the Governor in setting outcomes and goals and timelines associated with the budget.

Congress has established an [Evidence-Based Policymaking Commission](#) charged with conducting a comprehensive study of the data inventory, data infrastructure and statistical protocols related to federal policymaking and the statistical and programmatic agencies responsible for maintaining that data.

The White House Office of Management and Budget has placed significant emphasis on [evidence and evaluation](#), including in the FY16 President Budget, and other federal programs.

2016 Examples:

Rhode Island updated their procurement process so that partners were demonstrating evidence that procured items would get a specific outcome and not take up valuable resources.

The [Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative](#) is working to build inventories of programs and how much they cost in a number of jurisdictions. This helps localities understand what the return on investment is for various evidence-based programs. The organization has also developed a clearinghouse of clearinghouses in order to make evidence more accessible to local partners.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation's [Evidence2Success](#) framework helps jurisdictions use evidence-based policies through a youth survey that demonstrates local needs. This information can be used by policymakers to understand risk factors in their communities and identify programs that mitigate those risks.

Tools and Resources:

- [Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative](#)
 - [Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative Fact Sheet](#)
 - [Evidence-Based Policymaking: A Guide for Effective Government](#)
- [Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab](#)
- [Harvard Kennedy School Government Performance Lab](#)
- [Annie E. Casey Foundation, Evidence2Success Initiative](#)
- [Evidence-Based Policymaking Collaborative](#)

Money

2015 Examples:

The Baltimore Mayor's Youth Cabinet which brings together the critical agency heads in the city completed two annual [Baltimore Children's Budget](#) documents that prioritizes investments in a collective set of outcomes for children and youth.

Hennepin County, Minn. recently conducted a [Fiscal Map of Hennepin County Youth Supports](#) and will conduct a follow up in the next year.

Montgomery County's Office of Management and Budget compiled a [Positive Youth Development Budget](#) for their county.

[St. Louis County Children's Fund](#) shared their experiences in the passage in 2008 of a special county sales tax to support children's mental health services which now generates approximately \$40 million a year for these services and is managed by an independent board.

In 2000 voters in Broward County approved the creation of the [Broward Children's Services Fund](#) an independent taxing district which now generates approximately \$65 million a year for a full range of supports from early childhood through young adulthood.

[Cuyahoga County's Social Impact Bond](#) is worth mentioning as the first county to create one of these types of agreements focused on youth in foster care. The group will continue to watch as this SIB experiment unfolds.

At the state level, there are a number of children's budget analyses or fiscal maps worth tracking, to include: [New Mexico Children's Cabinet Report Card and Budget](#); [the Tennessee Resource Map of Expenditures for Children and Youth](#); and [Mass Budget's Children's Budget](#).

Dedicated public funding for broad child and youth services is less common at the state level. However, the [Virginia Comprehensive Services Act](#) is a good model to look to that allows for local determination of the best use of the funds.

At the federal level, [Performance Partnership Pilots](#) allow sites to blend and braid funding and get rid of policy barriers that stand in the way of achieving outcomes for disconnected youth.

2016 Examples:

The [Denver Mayor's Office for Children](#) conducted a fiscal mapping project to collect information from 22 city agencies and determine which programs aligned to the mayor's goals for children and youth.

Philadelphia has developed a new [soda tax](#) after a long public campaign that will provide funds for new children and youth services.

The Berea, Kentucky region utilizes the Promise Zone and Promise Neighborhood programs to access federal funding, but also better manage the funding they already have. The rural community has utilized these initiatives to support back end infrastructure and align community organizations.

Tennessee's **Commission on Children and Youth** undertook a [resource mapping project](#) that outlines spending in all state agencies on children by source, outcomes, service type, age group, etc. The state can then reference this big picture view on spending when allocating its next budget.

The Children's Cabinet and Trust Fund in Kansas created a new [sustainability tool box](#) for its community partners on finding and maintaining funding. The organization also reorganized its RFP process to incentivize matching funds at the community level.

Rhode Island worked to incorporate Medicaid funding into their child welfare programming in order to improve service capabilities.

Ohio's Family and Children First Council is experimenting with allowing local counterparts to pool funding resources as a means to increasing funding flexibility.

Tools and Resources:

- Fiscal Mapping:
 - A Guide: [Adding It Up: Mapping Public Resources for Children, Youth and Families](#)
- Dedicated Funding:
 - Blog: [Taking Bold Action to Fund What Matters](#)
 - Webinar: [Developing A Public Local Dedicated Funding Stream for Children and Youth](#)
 - Website: [Funding the Next Generation](#)

- Website: [Oakland Fund for Children and Youth](#)
- Blending and Braiding Funds:
 - Website: [Performance Partnership Pilots Hub](#)
 - Guide: [Colorado's Guide to blending and braiding funds](#)
 - Framework: [APHSA's Framework for Alternative Human Services Financing](#)
- Social Impact Bonds
 - Blog: [Early thoughts on the value of SIBs](#)
 - Webinar: [Using SIBs to Support a Bundle of Youth Interventions](#)
 - Learning Hub: [Pay for Success Learning Hub](#)
 - Technical assistance: [SIB Lab](#)
- For general expertise on budgeting in states visit the [National Association of State Budget Officers](#)