

MAY 2017

From Research to Reality: A Report on Investing in Children



PREPARED BY

Richard Cockrell Terryn Liljedahl Destiny Pletsch



**FUNDING THE
NEXT GENERATION**



**SAN FRANCISCO
STATE UNIVERSITY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	3
Investing in Children at a Glance	4
Introduction	5
Reshaping History:	6
Moving Toward a Social Good	
Areas of Priority Need	8
Turning Research to Reality	14
Conclusion	16
References	17
Appendix A	21
Appendix B	22



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Children are the greatest hope for the future; an investment in them is an investment in our collective prosperity. Funding for the Next Generation (FNG), is an advocacy organization dedicated to helping local communities make a financial commitment to their children and transfer resources toward prevention. Leader in children's advocacy, and Director of FNG, Margaret Brodtkin, presented an opportunity to students of San Francisco State University's Public Administration Program to engage in the FNG policy campaign. *From Research to Reality: A Report on Investing in Children* was created by students to assist in developing effective strategies for policy change.

From Research to Reality: A Report on Investing in Children is intended to inform change agents advocating for a local children's fund policy. It is focused on the power of channeling funds in children through synthesized research of seven services areas. The highlighted research can be utilized by advocates to persuade stakeholders. The report also contains an analysis of stakeholders as it relates to a proposed local children's fund policy, and offers suggestions on how change agents may engage with identified stakeholders. Additionally, a one-page handout gives change makers marketing material to support their advocacy interactions. *From Research to Reality: A Report on Investing in Children* elevates emerging local advocates' abilities to communicate the importance of investing in children to their communities.

INVESTING IN CHILDREN AT A GLANCE

	AREA OF PRIORITY NEEDED	AMOUNT INVESTED	RETURN ON INVESTMENT (ROI)	EXPLANATION
	Childcare	\$1	\$8.60	Quality childcare is early education. It is the head start to assure the skills necessary for a child's future success in school and life. Children in stimulating early education programs are more likely to be academically successful and less likely to need adult social services.
	Preschool	\$1	\$8.60 or 13% growth per year	Evidence strongly supports the return of investment in early childhood education programs. Studies show that preschool participation can help children avoid special education, grade repetition, early parenthood and incarceration-all outcomes which can carry costs to taxpayers. Furthermore preschool increases the likelihood of employment for both parent and child (later in life), contributing to the economy.
	Afterschool	\$1	\$9.00 - \$12.00	The academic outcomes of afterschool programs are pressing. They include improvement in school attendance and engagement in learning, test scores, great gains for at-risk youth, safety, and behavior.
	Career Development & Summer Jobs	\$1	\$4.69	Career development and summer jobs assist youth to raise their earning potential and the course of increases their lifetime contributions to the economy. The value of benefits of investing in career development for youth exceed the costs.
	Mental Health Services	\$1	\$4.00	Untreated or unresolved mental health issues in children can result in enduring consequences. Only 6% spent on mental health services is directed towards children and adolescents despite strong evidence that 50% of lifetime mental illnesses start by the age of 14. If we want to make sure our children are taken care of, the time to invest is now.
	Health Prevention Services	\$1	\$9.00	Evidence demonstrates that early intervention and prevention services improve outcomes for children and families that have lasting impacts on their lives, and the health and economic well-being of their communities and our community. These programs are far more likely to be effective and less costly because they address problems before they begin, rather than mitigating complex health, development and social problems after they have occurred.
	Family Support	NA	NA	Two-generation strategies are focusing on both parent and child simultaneously. This is an understudied area that is worthy research.

INTRODUCTION

All children should have the opportunity to thrive, grow up safe, healthy and turn into productive members of the community. However, the income of the family a child is born into is very likely to determine their future opportunities. With 19.7% of America's children living under the poverty line (Procter, Semega, Koller, 2016), an achievement gap exists, which impacts taxpayers through a child's future participation in the workforce economy, public health care, and criminal justice systems. Communities save in the long term when they invest funds in children services.

An investment in human capital is essential to a nation's economic growth and prosperity. As one of the most important conventions of economics, investment or the use of resources to increase future production of output or income to finance future consumption (Steuerle, Reynolds & Carasso, 2007) applies to how funding is prioritized for the most integral and defining asset of the future—children. Today, the United States (U.S.) population is comprised of 73.8 million children, and by 2050 that number is projected to rise to 79.9 million (Child Stats, 2017). This generation will one day be parents, teachers, doctors, scientists, artists, armed forces members, educators, and legislators. Our future will be in their hands and we will rely on them, not only as caretakers of our generation and stewards of the environment, but as society's visionaries.

It is our responsibility to construct a strong foundation for their future, starting today. They are the strongest indicators of society's future success and it is our shared duty to work to find solutions amidst the current challenges faced in local communities and across the nation. Investments in children are increasingly seen as one of best and most valuable long-term investments we can make (Unicef, 2017). There are many examples of effective interventions that improve the quality of life of children, their families, and, ultimately, society. Quality education is recognized as a key determinant of future income, deterrent from involvement in the criminal justice system, and improved health outcomes. The dividends of these outcomes are shared by society in the long run, otherwise known as a "social good."

The Funding the Next Generation (FNG) campaign is "the nation's only initiative to promote local public funding streams dedicated to services for children, youth and their families" (FNG, 2017). Nationally recognized pioneer, Margaret Brodtkin and her team are currently working throughout the State of California to assist local governments in creating measures that support children services, such as youth development, early childhood education, after-school and summer programs, health care, violence prevention, career readiness, and parental support. FNG believes that by putting money in a dedicated children's fund at the local level, it secures positive resources that support children earlier in life and reduces the taxpayer's contribution to punitive systems & institutionalism.

THE GOALS OF THE CAMPAIGN ARE TWO-FOLD:

- Strengthen and leverage local capacity and commitment for investing in children, youth, and families so that the next generation becomes an ongoing community priority
- Develop new dedicated revenue streams

RESHAPING HISTORY: MOVING TOWARD A SOCIAL GOOD

Most benefits for children are administered through private markets and considered “private goods.” Accessibility to these markets, such as preschool, healthcare, and career development programs are reserved to the select few who can afford them. The U.S. has historically left the provision of services for children to the private sector. This is not the case in other developed countries where they provide universal services such as health and education regardless of income. The U.S. ranks 31 out of 33 developed countries in public spending in early childcare and education (OECD, 2015). America cannot afford to overlook its children, a secured dedicated funding stream will help support children most in need.

Prior to World War II, private child services were funded through private charities or elite women’s living groups, and aimed mostly at low-income and unemployed parents as a way to help them find work (Covert, 2014). Public funding for child services in the 20th century was overshadowed by other social issues like unemployment, war, racism, etc. In most regions, public systems and resource-strained nonprofits have limited ability to provide high quality children services that are proven to support lifelong outcomes. For example, health coverage is in the national spotlight and is recognized as a universal need, particularly for young children. Along with the Affordable Care Act (2010), the State of California began a statewide program called the California Children Services (CCS) a program for children and young adults under 21 years of age who have eligible medical conditions and whose families are unable to pay for all or part of their care. This is not a form of insurance, but only a temporary fix (Santa Cruz County Health, 2017). These initiatives are a step in the right direction for our state and country, but healthcare is only one component of the services children need in order to succeed, prosper, and give back to our nation’s economy.

These inequities have generational effects. An investment in the form of a dedicated fund for children’s services works to bridge this gap by ensuring that all children have the opportunity to services that increase their likelihood to succeed. Programs that spend in early childhood services could generate considerable cost savings for government and taxpayers. The benefits of social goods, like an investment in children, are shared by all and public policy should strive to encompass childhood funding as a priority of public interest. San Francisco was the first city to establish a dedicated children’s fund, investing in a range of children’s services that all residents could have access to, regardless of income. In 1991, the City voters passed Proposition J, a landmark measure that dedicated portions of local property tax dollars to be specifically used to benefit children, the first measure of its kind and was reauthorized in 2011. The proposition, which took years of grassroots organizing by a collective of local nonprofits, created the Children’s Fund and ultimately resulted in the creation of San Francisco’s Department of Children, Youth and Their Families (DCYF).

The Department brings together the City's government, schools, and community-based organizations to help the City's children and youth, from birth to their transition into adulthood, and their families to lead lives full of opportunity and happiness. It strives to make the City a great place to grow up through its resources, collaboration, coordination, and creativity (DCYF, 2017). In FY 2014-15 DCYF served 50,000 individuals, maximizing \$60 million of funding to service areas such as early care and education, out-of-school time, youth empowerment, youth workforce development, family support, health and wellness, and violence prevention.

Other communities have realized that in order to have sustainable child services for all, it must be reflected in their local public funding. In 1996, Oakland passed its own version of the Children's Fund, with Measure K establishing the Oakland Fund for Children and Youth. The fund was reauthorized in 2009, with Measure D setting aside 3% of the City's general fund. In FY 16-17 over \$14 million of funding supported the work of early childhood, mental health, parent support and education, after school programs, youth development and enrichment, summer, career, and academic awareness supportive programs.

FNG hopes to replicate the success in San Francisco and Oakland to other counties in California. In 2002, California voters made great strides in securing funding for the well-being of its children by enacting Proposition 49 - The After School Education and Safety Program Act. The Act was designed to ensure that programs continued to receive funding with the stated goal to "provide safe and educationally enriching alternatives for children and youth during non-school hours" (Purpose and Objectives, CDE, n.d., para. 2). Studies of the Act have found that spending in child services yields a considerable return resulting in a new, concentrated effort to solidify funding for afterschool programs—currently spearheaded by Margaret Brodtkin and the FNG campaign. These efforts consist of securing funding at both the state and local levels. It is integral to communicate how stakeholders benefit from investing in key priority areas— child care, preschool, afterschool programs, career development, mental health, health prevention, family support, and parent education.

AREAS OF PRIORITY NEED

The benefits stemming from greater investments in children are universal, leading to an increasingly productive workforce that will boost economic growth, provide government savings, and lead to reductions in future generations' involvement with the criminal justice system (Bivens, Garcia, Gould, Weiss, and Wilson, 2016). When we do not invest in services for children, we lose in the long term. Investments are worth undertaking because they would provide the economy a greater good, creating an agile and mobile economy for today and future generations.

CHILDCARE

Childcare is an important resource to most families, where it is increasingly considered vital to have both parents in the workforce. The term, used broadly, includes all types of care or education provided for young children, but is more specifically used to refer to the supplemental care of children during a parent's working hours or while they are otherwise engaged. Families are faced with calculating the true cost of working, disproportionately impacting single parents, mothers, and households living at the poverty line. According to the latest census (Laughlin, 2013) only 33% of children under 5 attend "market based" childcare, while 39% of parents do not rely on any form of supplemental care. Considering that the average cost of childcare in California is \$13,343 (Child Care Aware, 2016), these figures are not surprising.

Current levels of public funding fall short in guaranteeing access to quality childcare to all. By doing so, they shortchange children, their parents, and society at large. The United States largely targets low-income and middle-class, and professional-class families through income based programs and child tax subsidies. However, they are insufficient to meet the needs of most families considering the burdensome cost of child care (Ansel & Markezich, 2017). Investing in high-quality childhood care and education programs has been shown to be one of the best ways to improve individual outcomes for children and reduce inequality overall.

Expanding the supply and quality of affordable child care and education has societal benefits. An estimated \$8.60 return is expected for every dollar contributed to quality early childhood education. (President's Council of Economic Advisors, 2015). Childcare enables parental employment and provides a context for child development (Morrissey, 2017). By supervising children, parents are allowed, especially mothers, to return to work sooner and as parents return to work, their children experience a new environment, where interactions stimulate brain development. It is a head start on the skills necessary for a child's future success in school and life. Children in stimulating early education programs are more likely to be academically successful and less likely to need social services as adults (LIIF, 2014). Quality childcare is early education (Child Care Aware, 2016)—the strongest return on investment.

PRESCHOOL

Learning begins long before a child enters a kindergarten classroom. The earliest years of life are most critical to a child's brain development, which provides the foundation for all future learning, behavior, and health (Center on the Developing Child at Harvard University, 2007). Preschools, or pre-academic development, fosters cognitive and behavioral skills and life knowledge. Yet, just under half of America's 3-4 year olds are enrolled in some type of preschool program and patterns of enrollment are strongly associated with race and socioeconomics (NCES, 2017). Both scientists and economists believe that an investment in early childhood education, particularly for children with adverse risk factors, could have the greatest impact. Economist and Nobel Prize Winner, James Heckman asserts that for every dollar spent on early childhood education, a 13% return of investment through lifelong outcomes can be expected (Garcia, Heckman, Leaf & Prados, 2016). Ensuring access to quality education can have significant impacts spanning a child's kindergarten to 12th grade experience, including reduced involvement in the justice system and earning increased potential. These outcomes are not specific to the individual, but rather shared with society through reduced taxpayer costs. Investing in children at this critical time period saves taxpayers in the long run.

Prominent studies demonstrate the long term advantages of early childhood education within disadvantaged youth (Schweinhart, Barnes & Weikart, 1993; Schweinhart, 2004; Campbell, Ramey & Pungello, 2002; Campbell et al., 2012; Elango, Garcia, Heckman, & Hojman, 2015). Participants were studied well into adulthood, and had significant positive outcomes in comparison to their control groups. In the Perry Study, 40 year-old follow-up participants were 46% less likely to have served time in jail or prison and 26% less likely to have received government assistance (Schweinhart, 2004). In the Abecedarian Project, 30 year-old participants were four times more likely to have graduated from college and 42% more likely to have been employed for at least 1.5 years preceding the follow up (Campbell et al., 2012). At the nexus of science and economic policy, early childhood education just makes sense.



AFTERSCHOOL PROGRAMS

Afterschool programs encompass a wide variety of services for youth ages 5 to 17 and occur, generally, from 3pm to 7pm. One in five children spends time alone and unsupervised during the after school hours (America After 3PM: Afterschool Programs in Demand, 2014). Studies have shown that afterschool programs greatly improve academic performance, reduce risk of criminal justice involvement, and improve graduation rates (“Benefits for Youth,” n.d.). The positive outcomes of afterschool programs should be expanded to all children because it translates into long-term cost savings.

Brown et al. (2002), of the Rose Institute at Claremont McKenna College, conducted a cost-benefit analysis. In dollars, they found that “the greatest potential for cost savings is likely to come from crime prevention and improved educational outcomes” (p. 11). In a monetary value, for every \$1 invested in afterschool programs, there is a return of \$8.92 to \$12.90 (Brown et. al., 2002, pp. 33- 34). A more recent study by the Boys and Girls Club (2016) examines the value and efficiency of the investments their investors are making in afterschool programs. Their ROI estimated \$9-\$12 in lifetime benefits for each dollar invested, with most benefits coming from averted crime related costs (Eisenberg, 2016, p. 4).

CAREER DEVELOPMENT

Career development is a service area that targets youth ages 16 to 24. Youths in this age range who are “not actively engaged in education, training, or the workforce” have been identified as “disengaged” (Hanley et al., 2012, p. 1). The number of disengaged youth in the US is estimated to be 6.7 million, or 17% of all youth (Hanley et al., 2012, p. 1). Disengaged or “disconnected” youth can, with determination and opportunity, become “opportunity youth” instead (“Disconnected Youth in California,” n.d.). The average number of disconnected youth within California has been estimated to be approximately 6.7%, with a few counties reporting the actual rate close to 14% (“Disconnected Youth in California,” n.d.). This number translates into billions of dollars a year in costs. A 2013 study found that taxpayers lost \$27 billion related to disconnected youth. These costs are calculated in terms of direct costs—i.e. costs of public assistance and criminal justice—and indirect costs—i.e. costs of lost tax revenues and lost earnings (“Disconnected Youth in California,” n.d.). According to Hanley et al. (2012), the nationwide cost is a staggering \$4.75 trillion dollars a year (p. 1).

It is difficult to assess the return on investment, but the few bodies of research show promise that an investment in youth through career development programs and services benefits. Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. (MPRI) found that career development for youth at an initial cost of \$14,000 per participant would give a return of \$31,000 over the individual’s lifetime (Burghardt et al., 2001, p. 5). MPRI’s findings were reanalyzed by the Opportunity Youth Network to reflect the present value of a return on investment. Their findings concluded that for an initial investment of \$30,000, that over an individual’s lifetime the returns associated with reduced governmental health, crime and welfare expenditures in combination with the estimated tax revenue generated by reconnected youth would yield \$170,730, translating into a return on an investment of \$4.69 (Ferber, 2017). Youths’ potential and their contribution to their community is realized when we support their career development.

MENTAL HEALTH

Around the nation, mental health related disorders among school-aged children is a growing crisis. Mental health disorders rivals that of adults, with 17.1 million young people who have or had a diagnosable psychiatric disorder (Child Mind Institute, 2016). Adolescence is a critical period for mental development and only a minor number of children actually receive services or a form of effective intervention. Lack of sleep, anxiety, personality, sporadic eating, and depression are some of the various disorders so many children live with. Arguably the most serious problem, resulting from undiagnosed or untreated mental health, disorders is that of suicide, which is the 3rd leading cause of death in youth (NAMI, 2017).

FOR ADULTS TO BE ADVOCATES FOR CHILDREN, ONE MUST FACE THE UNDENIABLE FACTS:

- One in five children suffers from a mental health or learning disorder (Child Mind Institute, 2016).
- 75% of mental health disorders begin before the age of 24 (Child Mind Institute, 2016).
- 90% of youth those who died by suicide had an underlying mental illness (NAMI, 2017).

Treating mental illness earlier in life rather than later has strong societal benefits. Most children with serious mental illness, if appropriately diagnosed and treated, will go on to live full and productive lives. Rather than spending on prevention, as only 6% of mental health expenditures are directed at youth (O'Sullivan, 2015), society vastly spends resources on the lifetime repercussions of mental health issues. Children living in poverty are most likely to not have access to mental health resources. In order to support equal access to preventative, intervention, and educational mental health services, monetary investments are at the genesis of the overarching solution. Of the 72 million individuals living with mental illness, 15 million are children (NASMHPD, 2012). The World Health Organization (2016), estimated that for every \$1 invested in treatment for depression and anxiety, there is a return on investment of \$4. While this return is comprehensive of both adults and children, we can imagine the significance of the investment if isolated to children's treatment.



HEALTH PREVENTION

Health insurance is a form of prevention. When mothers have adequate maternal care, their baby's health outcomes are improved significantly. Access to health services throughout a child's formative years is critical. Routine checkups can detect preventable illnesses like diabetes, measles, hepatitis, flu, etc. Vaccines are one of the most cost effective tools for preventing disease. Evidence demonstrates that early intervention and prevention services improve outcomes for children and families that have lasting impacts on their lives, and the health and economic well-being of their communities and our community. These programs are far more likely to be effective and less costly because they address problems before they begin, rather than mitigating complex health, development and social problems after they have occurred (Gluck, Howard, Kyle, 2015). Every \$1 spent on early childhood health and development saves up to \$9 in future spending on health (Brousselle, Benmarhnia, Benhadj, 2016, p.135). When society invests in preventative care they save money in what would otherwise be spent on medical costs.

THE REALITIES OF PREVENTATIVE DISEASES AND HEALTH RESOURCES FACTS AVAILABLE FOR CHILDREN:

- It costs Americans \$176 billion (American, Diabetes Association, 2013) in direct medical costs to treat diabetes. It is now the number one health concern in the United States with one in three American children being overweight or obese (American Heart Association, 2016)
- Vaccinations will prevent more than 21 million hospitalizations and 732,000 deaths (CDC, 2014).
- In California, some 364,728 children are without health insurance and the number of uninsured children is rising (KFF, 2016).



FAMILY SUPPORT -- PARENT EDUCATION

Services or programs that support both children and parents, or “two-generation” strategies which simultaneously focus on workforce development for parents and provides quality early childhood education for their children. Many of these programs are taking place on university campuses across the country. In pilot programs funded by various funding streams, including the Annie E. Casey Foundation and W.K. Kellogg Foundation, women and children reside on campuses while being supported in post-secondary education and employment services, early childhood programs, affordable housing, and parenting and life skills development. The Jeremiah Program and Keys to Degrees are programs that examples of this two-generation approach.

In an annual report cited by King et al. (2016), women in the Jeremiah Program who graduated, earned 67% more than when they started and 87% of children were performing at or above age-appropriate developmental benchmarks (p. 11). Equally impressive results were observed in the Keys to Degrees program where 100% of program graduates are employed full-time, 57% earned \$40k/yr. or more and 100% did NOT receive support from federal or state Temporary Assistance for Needy Family (TANF) programs (King et al., 2016, p. 11). There is no available data specifying an actual return on investment with two-generation strategies. However, conventional wisdom, and the numerous other studies outlining ROI, dictate that someone who is not using public assistance, is not in the criminal justice system, and who is contributing to society through taxes strongly suggests a return on any investments made.

TURNING RESEARCH TO REALITY

While this research holds significance, it is our responsibility as a society to act upon it. In a world where facts and figures are everywhere, it is easy to get lost from what is important—our community’s children. Evidence-based research supports the efforts of FNG, however it is up to local change makers to make it a reality. As an aid to keep the focus on children and our taxpayers’ dollars, a one-page communication tool (Appendix A) is offered to local advocates highlighting the return on investment in areas of priority need. Sustained local funding towards children is complex but not complicated. Local tax dollars can fill state and federal gaps and provide children with services to address needs specific to their community. With the absence of existing local funding streams, funding the Next Generation initiatives are paving the way for flexible and dedicated resources proven to build human capital and return taxpayers initial investments. Policy change at the local level usually occurs in one of two ways: ballot initiatives that go before citizen voters or a policy enacted by city’s or county’s legislative body. The path to a successful campaign looks different in each community. It requires a firm grasp of the needs of children, political reality and commitment to the policy process.

ENGAGING DECISION-MAKERS AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

Local decision making bodies, such as city councils or board of supervisors, know about the issues facing their community, but no matter how positive the notion of investing in children may be received, decision makers must contend with their fiscal and political realities. An effective approach to decision-makers requires both persuasion and pressure (Pearson & Eske, n.d.). Lists of facts and stories, no matter how compelling, can only get change-agents so far; pressure is needed. Pressure prompts action. Identify who influences decision makers, develop relationships with them and employ selective pressure tactics. When a local network of stakeholders speaks, it is in the interest of the decision-makers that they listen and respond.

BALLOT MEASURES

Securing funding for children through citizen initiatives allows for the most impactful policy change and helps hold government accountable to the people. A ballot initiative or measure, is a legislative act that is proposed by citizens, printed on a petition, circulated among the jurisdiction’s voters, and submitted to a government entity to be adopted or placed on the ballot (Hertz, 2016). Passing a ballot measure at the city or county level is less complicated, easier to organize and allows for more flexibility than at the state or federal level. Initiatives at the county level, which is responsible for the delivery of human services have the advantage of having more kids than a single city. No matter at what level, local ballot initiatives should be rooted in the needs of the community, giving voters a closer connection to the proposed policy. Once priorities are established, a measure can be crafted, which identifies a funding source, a plan for implementation, and other mandated details. Ballot initiatives may be the most intensive strategy for securing a dedicated children’s fund, but they can be the most rewarding.

THE STAKEHOLDER LANDSCAPE

A fund dedicated to children is a relatively new concept. A stakeholder analysis protectively analyzes potential key actors in the policy process of achieving a children's fund. A generalized stakeholder analysis is offered as a tool to scan your community (Appendix B). Adapt it to fit the stakeholders in your area. Each stakeholder has a primary role that defines their relation to the issue. Their involvement in the issue is encapsulated by their characteristics and considers their scope of work. In the example provided, local businesses are less likely to be involved in a proposed children's fund policy than a research organization, by virtue of their work's relevance and scope within the issue. The power and potential of an influential stakeholder often defines the fate of the issue. There may be stakeholders who are very close to the issues but they do not know they can exercise the power of their voice. Each stakeholder's motives are rationalized through the perspective of a children's fund initiative.

A stakeholder's analysis identifies who would be the primary supporters—who are actively involved, have power, and stakeholder motive. Using the scale—high, medium, and low, three angles help in describing the local landscape. The first lens analyzes stakeholders by their likelihood to be supportive, be neutral, or vie for the same pool of resources. Second, is from the perspective of interest. Stakeholders level of interest vary due to their role or circumstance in relation to a proposed children's fund initiative policy. Power and potential of influence, is analyzed from an existing standpoint but envisions the use of each stakeholder's power. This is a general analysis and may not be reflective of a specific community's stakeholders. Local children's fund initiatives, are a relatively new, and stakeholders may not be aware of the possibilities an investment may bring.

Engaging stakeholders is essential to the success of any policy campaign. Advocacy efforts that neglect to enlist community stakeholders rarely succeed. Once stakeholders are identified and analyzed, advocates can strategize how to best engage each stakeholder's individual position and motives, level of involvement and potential power. The stakeholder analysis (Appendix B) offers methods of engagement. Certain stakeholders may be biased to the idea of dedicated children's fund while others may not necessarily feel it is a public priority; navigate accordingly.



CONCLUSION

Economists define externalities as “costs or benefits of market transactions not reflected in prices” (Hyman, 2010). Investing in youth is a choice. If we choose not to invest in youth through services that are proven to reduce negative outcomes, we see those externalities manifest in society. Inversely, when we allocate resources to youth, we see dividends expressed through taxpayers decreased contributions to social safety net systems and punitive institutions. The social goods result from investing in youth span generations transform our communities and our nation into a more equitable society.

Many states and local governments across the country are now realizing the power of investing in children, youth, and their families. Research supports spending in priority service needs for those who are most vulnerable. Early childhood education, afterschool programs, mental health services, health prevention, career development, and family support are all strategies that result in a return on investment. California, even with its progressive values, has yet to adopt a statewide dedicated to a funding stream specifically for children. It is up to local change makers to mobilize stakeholders, utilize research, and pressure to engage in the policy-making process. The reality is that if we do not devote resources in children today, we pay for it tomorrow. Investing in children is an investment in our collective prosperity.

REFERENCES

- 2016 Children's Mental Health Report. (2016). Retrieved from <https://childmind.org/report/2016-childrens-mental-health-report/>
- America After 3PM: Afterschool Programs in Demand. (2014). Retrieved from http://afterschoolalliance.org/documents/AA3PM-2014/AA3PM_National_Report.pdf
- Ansel, B., & Markezich, M. (2017, January 25). Falling behind the rest of the world: Childcare in the United States. Retrieved from <http://equitablegrowth.org/equitablog/falling-behind-the-rest-of-the-world-childcare-in-the-united-states/>
- Bivens, J., Garcia, E., Gould, E., Weiss, E., & Wilson, V. (2016, April 6). It's time for an ambitious national investment in America's children: Investments in early childhood care and education would have enormous benefits for children, families, society, and the economy. Retrieved from <http://www.epi.org/publication/its-time-for-an-ambitious-national-investment-in-americas-children/>
- Bondarenko, V. (2017, March 15). More than 2 million people are in jail or prison - here are 4 charts that break that down. Retrieved from <http://www.businessinsider.com/what-is-mass-incarceration-prison-jails-charts-2017-3>
- Brousselle, A. , Benmarhnia, T. , & Benhadj, L. (2016). What are the benefits and risks of using return on investment to defend public health programs?. *Preventive Medicine Reports*, 3, 135-138.
- Burghardt, J. et al. (2001). Does job corps work? Summary of the national job corps study. Retrieved from <https://wdr.doleta.gov/opr/fulltext/01-jcsummary.pdf>
- California Children Services Program (CCS). (2017). Retrieved from [http://www.santacruzhealth.org/HSAHome/HSADivisions/PublicHealth/ChildrensMedicalServices/CaliforniaChildrenServices\(CCS\).aspx#1](http://www.santacruzhealth.org/HSAHome/HSADivisions/PublicHealth/ChildrensMedicalServices/CaliforniaChildrenServices(CCS).aspx#1)
- Campbell, F. A., Pungello, E.P., Burchinal, M., Kainz, K., Pan, Y., Wasik, B. H., . . . Ramey, C. T. (2012). Adult outcomes as a function of an early childhood educational program: An abecedarian project follow-up. *Developmental Psychology*, 4, 1033-1043
- Center on the Developing Child at Harvard University (2007). A Science-Based Framework for Early Childhood Policy: Using Evidence to Improve Outcomes in Learning, Behavior, and Health for Vulnerable Children.<http://www.developingchild.harvard.edu>
- Child Care Aware of America. (2016). Parents and the high cost of child care. Retrieved from http://www.usa.childcareaware.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/CCA_High_Cost_Report_01-17-17_final.pdf
- Child population: number of children (in millions) ages 0–17 in the United States by age, 1950–2015 and projected 2016–2050. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.childstats.gov/americaschildren/tables/pop1.asp>
- Covert, B. (2014, September 30). Here's What Happened The One Time When The U.S. Had Universal Childcare. Retrieved from <https://thinkprogress.org/heres-what-happened-the-one-time-when-the-u-s-had-universal-childcare-c965a3178112>

REFERENCES

- Disconnected Youth in California. (n.d.). A Program of Lucile Packard Foundation for Children's Health. Retrieved from <http://www.kidsdata.org/export/pdf?cat=87>
- Eisenberg, Daniel (2016). Estimating the Return on Investment for Boys & Girls Clubs. Retrieved from http://www.clevelandkids.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Estimating-the-Return-on-Investment-for-Boys-Girls-Clubs_Univ-of-MI-20....pdf
- Elango, S., Garcia, J. L., Heckman, J. J., & Hojman, A. (2015). Early childhood education. St. Louis: Federal Reserve Bank of St Louis. IDEAS Working Paper Series from RePEc, .
- Employment and Training Panel. Ca.gov. Retrieved at <https://etp.ca.gov/>
- Ferber, T. (2017). Lifetime return on investment of reconnecting opportunity youth in your district. Opportunity Youth Network. Retrieved from http://forumfyi.org/files/roi_for_reconnecting_opportunity_youth_in_each_congressional_district.pdf
- Garcia, J. L. , Heckman, J. J., Leaf, D. E., & Prados, M. J. (2016). The life benefits of an influential early childhood program. Retrieved from https://heckmanequation.org/assets/2017/01/Garcia_Heckman_Leaf_etal_2016_life-cycle-benefits-ecp_r1-p.pdf
- Gluck, E., Howard, K., & Kyle, S. (2015, September 03). Early Intervention and Prevention Initiatives for Kids Cut, Despite Potential for Good. Retrieved from <https://firstfocus.org/blog/early-intervention-and-prevention-initiatives-for-kids-cut-despite-potential-for-good/>
- Governor's Budget. 2017-18. Retrieved from <http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/budget/2017-18/#/Home>
- Hanley, K.; Nabi, P.; Bean, K.; Radday, A.; and Stanzler, C. (2012). Youth Career Development. Social Issue Report. Education and Youth Development. Root Cause Social Impact Research.
- Health Insurance Coverage of Children 0-18. (2016, November 11). Retrieved from <http://kff.org/other/state-indicator/children-0-18/>
- Hertz, B. W. (2016, May 9). Ballot measure basics. Retrieved from <http://www.fundingthenextgeneration.org/nextgenwp/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Hertz-Presentation-to-Funding-the-Next-Generations-2nd-Statewide-Conference-5-9-16.pdf>
- Hyman, D. N. (2010). Externalities and government policy. Retrieved from http://www.ase.ro/upcpr/profesor/758/Scan_Hyman_Externalities.pdf
- Investing in treatment for depression and anxiety leads to fourfold return. (2016, April 13). Retrieved from <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/news/releases/2016/depression-anxiety-treatment/en/>
- Kasler, D. 2016. California economy surges to no. 6 in global rankings. The Sacramento Bee. June 16, 2016. Retrieved from <http://www.sacbee.com/news/business/article83780667.html>

REFERENCES

- King, T.C., Juniper, C.J., Coffey, R., & Smith, T.C. (2017). Promoting two-generation strategies: A getting-started guide for state and local policymakers
- Laughlin, L. (2013). Who's minding the kids? Child care arrangements: Spring 2011 P70-135
U.S. Census Bureau
- LIIF (2014) Retrieved from <http://www.liifund.org/programs/child-care/>
- Lu, C. (2015). Optimal fiscal policies in an economy with externalities from public spending. *Journal of Economics*, 116(3), 211-228.
- Millions of children not getting recommended preventive care. (2014, September 10). Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/media/releases/2014/p0910-preventive-care.html>
- Morrissey, T. (2017). Child care and parent labor force participation: A review of the research literature. *Review of Economics of the Household*, 15(1), 1-24.
- NAMI. (2017). Retrieved from <https://www.nami.org/Learn-More/Mental-Health-Conditions/Related-Conditions/Suicide>
- National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors. Fact Sheet on Behavioral Health Conditions Behavioral Health Disorders – All-Encompassing Condition. (June 2012). Retrieved from https://www.nasmhpd.org/sites/default/files/Public%20and%20Private%20Financing_Fact%20Sheets%20on%20Behavioral%20Health.pdf
- National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors. Too significant to fail: The importance of state behavioral health agencies in the daily lives of americans with mental illness, their families and their communities. (July 2012). Retrieved from <https://www.nasmhpd.org/sites/default/files/Too%20Significant%20To%20Fail%20Overview%283%29.pdf>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2017, April). Preschool and kindergarten enrollment. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cfa.asp
- National Prevention Strategy: America's Plan for Better Health and Wellness. (2014, January 17). Retrieved May 22, 2017, from <https://www.cdc.gov/features/preventionstrategy/>
- OECD. (2015). Public spending by age of children. Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/els/family/PF1_6_Public_spending_by_age_of_children.pdf
- Opportunity Youth Network. (2017, March 28). Retrieved from http://forumfyi.org/files/roi_for_reconnecting_opportunity_youth_in_each_congressional_district.pdf
- O'Sullivan, A. (2015, May 05). Now's the time to invest in child mental health. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/social-care-network/2015/may/05/invest-in-child-mental-health>

REFERENCES

- Overweight in Children. (2016, July 5). Retrieved from http://www.heart.org/HEARTORG/HealthyLiving/HealthyKids/ChildhoodObesity/Overweight-in-Children_UCM_304054_Article.jsp#.WR9aGBMrJuU
- Pearson, C., & Eske, A. (n.d) Pressure vs persuasion: The overlooked secret to winning your advocacy campaign. M+R Strategic Services. Retrieved from http://www.fundingthenextgeneration.org/nextgenwp/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/mr_pressure_vs_persuasion.pdf
- President's Council of Economic Advisors. (2015, January). The economics of early childhood investments
- Proctor, B. D., Semega, J. L., & Kollar, M. A. (2016, September). Income and poverty in the united states: 2015 P60-256(RV) U.S. Census Bureau
- Stenberg K, Sweeny K, Axelson H, et al. (2016, April 05). Returns on Investment in the Continuum of Care for Reproductive, Maternal, Newborn, and Child Health. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK361897/> doi: 10.1596/978-1-4648-0348-2_ch16
- U.S. Census Bureau Bondarenko, V. (2017, March 15). More than 2 million people are in jail or prison - here are 4 charts that break that down. Retrieved from <http://www.businessinsider.com/what-is-mass-incarceration-prison-jails-charts-2017-3>
- Youth.gov. (n.d.) Benefits for Youth, Families, & Communities. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Retrieved from <http://youth.gov/youth-topics/afterschool-programs/benefits-youth-families-and-communities>

APPENDIX A

INVESTING IN OUR CHILDREN WHY IT IS A PRIORITY NOW

Creating a local dedicated children's fund ensures that all the children in our community have access to priority needs such as preschool, after-school, health, family support, youth development, and career preparation.

Investment in children, youth and their families has been shown to pay off, preventing higher future cost that impact taxpayer's contribution into health, justice and benefits systems. Every community has different strengths and needs. Local funding streams can fill state and federal funding gaps and offer greater flexibility, creativity and targeting of priority needs, having the greatest local impact. An investment in children is an investment in our collective prosperity.

FOR EACH \$1 INVESTED THE SOCIETAL RETURNS ARE

- \$8.60 by Childhood Development
- \$4 by Mental Health Services
- \$9 - \$12 by Afterschool Funds
- \$9 by Health Prevention
- \$4.69 by Career Development

**The following facts are
illustrative of America's current state.**



1 IN 5 CHILDREN
spends time alone and
unsupervised during
after school hours



1 IN 5 CHILDREN
struggles with a mental
health or learning disorder



1 IN 3 CHILDREN
are obese or overweight



1 IN ROUGHLY 100 ADULTS
are incarcerated

**“The question is not whether we can afford to invest
in every child; it is whether we can afford not to”**

- Marian Wright Edelman

APPENDIX B

PURSUING A LOCAL CHILDREN'S FUND INITIATIVE: THE STAKEHOLDERS AND HOW TO ENGAGE THEM

LIKELY SUPPORTERS

STAKEHOLDER	PRIMARY ROLE	MOTIVES
Youth	Before a person enters adulthood, their primary role as an adolescent is to develop their human potential as future contributing members of society.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Services • Increased Academic Performance • Life Skills • Positive Outlook • Quality of Life
Parents & Guardians	A parent provides encouragement, support & is responsible for their overall development into adults.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best Interests for their children • Ability to work/pursue education • Supports family engagement
Childcare Providers	Entrusted by parents or guardians as child formal caregiver.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased business • Professional recognition & expanded development
Schools / Teachers	Responsible for the delivery of educational services & cultivates human potential in a classroom setting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students are more prepared for learning • Better health & career outcomes for their students • Stronger parent connection
Nonprofits serving children	Deliver a range of children's services. They are usually highly connected to the communities they serve.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased funding opportunities • Expansion of services • Influence in the community

<i>LEVEL OF INTEREST</i>	<i>POWER & POTENTIAL OF INFLUENCE</i>	<i>STRATEGIES FOR ENGAGEMENT</i>
Low – Youth are directly affected by a children’s fund initiative, however they need to know that they can be policy participants.	High – There is no stronger advocacy than self-advocacy. When youth speak up for services they need to succeed, people listen.	Utilize youth voice. Storytelling can have impact and puts a face to the investment. Connect with youth through schools, and nonprofits, this campaign is a platform to use their voice.
Low – Parents & guardians, particularly of low socioeconomic status, face barriers to participate in the public policy process.	High – Parents & guardians are, by definition, the most influential people in children’s live. Parents can be the best advocates for their children.	A good chunk of the taxpayer citizens are parents. They want what is best for their children. Inform parents & guardians of your children’s fund Initiative. Meet parents where they are at.
Medium – While professional organizations or networks exist, their engagement in policy process is at its genesis.	Medium – Childcare providers coordinated policy efforts are yet to be known, their alliance with parents strengthen their influence potential.	Childcare providers are a natural ally and can be a channel to garner parent engagement.
Medium – They are the recognized voice of children other than parents or guardians. Through their professional expertise they recognize the needs of children.	Medium – Unfortunately teachers expertise are undervalued & are not regarded as the champions they should be.	Go through the school districts. Naturally inclined to support children, schools and teachers be an outreach setting to reach students and their parents. Supplement the testimony of youth and their families from a professional perspective.
High – Nonprofits are active players in the policy arena & advocate for increased access & availability to services.	High – Nonprofits serving children are key policy agents. When nonprofits mobilize their collective networks they have a high power of influence.	Work through existing networks of nonprofits that serve and organize in diverse cultural communities to identify the leaders to work with. Play up the strengths nonprofits for collective and range of voices.

APPENDIX B

PURSUIING A LOCAL CHILDREN’S FUND INITIATIVE: THE STAKEHOLDERS AND HOW TO ENGAGE THEM

NEUTRAL SUPPORTERS

STAKEHOLDER	PRIMARY ROLE	MOTIVES
Taxpaying Citizens	Residents of a community who contribute a portion of their earnings to public services.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Return on investment • Better public safety • Stronger workforce & economic growth
Politicians	A representative of the local citizens in an elected office who campaigns on a set of values. They propose, support & create laws or policies that govern the land &, by extension, its people.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appeal to their voter base • Appease influential stakeholders • Career Advancement
Media	Various communication channels which news, entertainment, current events & issues, & messages are disseminated.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pursuit of profit • Public service
Research Organizations	Forecasts trends, conducts qualitative & quantitative research to expand & develop solutions for governments, businesses & the public.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates significance of their conclusions • Expanded ability to evaluate issue areas
Local Business	A company, large or small, which provides goods or services to a local population.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue • Customer Retention

<i>LEVEL OF INTEREST</i>	<i>POWER & POTENTIAL OF INFLUENCE</i>	<i>STRATEGIES FOR ENGAGEMENT</i>
Low – Generally, citizens are not active in engaging in the policy process.	High – Citizens have power when they participate in democracy. History has shown that when citizens unite around a policy issue they can have exponential influence	Inform taxpayers of the possibility & the importance of investing. Listen to community concerns. Orientate your message to your audience. Be active in your outreach. The more taxpayers you are able to reach the stronger your campaign.
Medium – Politicians rhetorically cite the importance of investing in children, but often fail engage in policy solutions.	High – Politicians are primary actors of the policy process. They have the capacity to create and prevent legislation.	Schedule a meeting with your local elected representative & city/county administrator. Present community findings & the benefits of investment in tandem with political pressure. Mobilize supports to do the same.
Medium – Media regularly covers children related content through isolated news stories.	High – Command of public attention that could communicate and persuade citizens and politicians.	Utilize media. Make them aware of the issue, the decision makers & the possibilities. Partnerships with media outlets can strengthen the attention given to a children’s fund initiative.
High – Policy is formulated from evidence, learned through the work of subject expertise.	High – Expertise is power.	Support the work of organizations by disseminating their findings. This is a key tool in persuasion & gives your initiative legitimacy.
Low – For most business, a children’s fund initiative is not related to their function.	Low – Business may or may not support a children’s initiative. Their impact on this issue is largely unknown.	Strategically invest your time. Businesses are profit centered, sponsorships that call attention to their business & your campaign is a win-win.

APPENDIX B

PURSUING A LOCAL CHILDREN'S FUND INITIATIVE: THE STAKEHOLDERS AND HOW TO ENGAGE THEM

LIKELY COMPETITORS

STAKEHOLDER	PRIMARY ROLE	MOTIVES
Public Health	A public health system includes all public, private, & voluntary entities that contribute to the delivery of essential public health services, contributing to the health & well-being of the community.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expanded resources for health interventions Healthier patients, healthier communities Access to new patient populations
Public Safety	A network of public agencies responsible for ensuring the welfare & protection of the general public. Usually composed of emergency, services, fire departments, law enforcement, courts & corrections.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prevent crime & promote safety Primarily prefers resources dedicated to their operations

It is essential to any local children's fund initiative to review the stakeholders that can shape the outcome of the policy. The scale-high-medium low is used to show the salience each stakeholder has from a level of interest and the power and potential to use their influence. This is a generalized perspective and is meant to give comprehensive assessment of primary stakeholders in a children's fund initiative. Adapt an assessment to the stakeholders your community.

<i>LEVEL OF INTEREST</i>	<i>POWER & POTENTIAL OF INFLUENCE</i>	<i>STRATEGIES FOR ENGAGEMENT</i>
<p>Medium – Generally involved the in policy process on a national level. Local initiatives for a dedicated children’s fund may not be of particular importance.</p>	<p>High – Local public health officials have considerable impact in public health policy.</p>	<p>Identify influential public health officials. Their work is important & very much needed. Remind them that this initiative supports their existing efforts, not detracts from them.</p>
<p>Low – Children services are seen outside of their primary role and outside of their scope of work.</p>	<p>High – Public Safety is highly valued. The priorities for public safety stakeholders view as important will often take precedence.</p>	<p>Keep conversations centered on how public safety benefits from investing in children. Remind them this is a long-run strategy worth pursuing.</p>

Investing in children is an investment
in our collective prosperity.
We thank you for your support.



**FUNDING THE
NEXT GENERATION**



**SAN FRANCISCO
STATE UNIVERSITY**