

Sustainable Funding for Program Strategies

How can significant amounts of long-term funding be mobilized for programs for children? What revenue streams have been created or redirected with the help of UHI campaigns? What are the components of successful efforts to access long-term funding for services and programs?

Updated March 2005

About the Urban Health Initiative

The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF) established the Urban Health Initiative (UHI) in 1995 to determine whether a concerted, collaborative effort can bring about region-wide improvements in multiple measures of child health and safety. Five cities were chosen to implement UHI. These cities and their respective UHI campaigns are:

- Baltimore's Safe and Sound Campaign
- Mayor's Time (Detroit)
- Safe Passages (Oakland)
- Philadelphia Safe and Sound
- Youth Matters (Richmond)

UHI campaigns work to implement proven programmatic strategies at such a large scale that citywide statistics will improve significantly. To do that, UHI campaigns must be change agents to secure systemic policy and fiscal changes necessary to get strategies to that scale.

The UHI was designed to be non-prescriptive, allowing communities to craft implementation plans based on local conditions without assumptions, mandates or imperatives set forward by RWJF, which made a ten-year funding commitment.

The National Program Office (NPO) based in Seattle provides guidance, technical assistance and oversight to the local UHI campaigns in a number of areas including research, management, systems change and communications. The NPO also helps campaigns attract and develop the local leaders essential to bring about and sustain change in their cities. Former Seattle Mayor Charles Royer is national program director.

About the UHI's Lessons Learned Project

The UHI has learned a great deal with regard to developing change agent organizations and securing change in large cities. The NPO is working to catalogue these lessons so they can benefit future change agent organizations and their funders. As of March 2005, these papers had been written (and more are in the works):

- Political Strategizing in a Constantly Changing Environment
- Sustainable Funding for Program Strategies
- Using Data in the Decision-Making Process
- The Experience of an Intermediary in a Complex Systems-Change Initiative: The Urban Health Initiative's National Program Office
- Reflections on the Start-Up of the Urban Health Initiative
- The Origins of the Urban Health Initiative
- Communications Planning by Change Agents

All papers can be found on the UHI's website, www.urbanhealth.org. Comments, suggestions and questions about the UHI Lessons Learned Project are welcome. Contact Jerry VanderWood, UHI Director of Communications, at 206-616-3692 or jerryvw@u.washington.edu.

Sustainable Funding for Program Strategies

By Rachel Aberbach Metz¹

Funding Goals for the Urban Health Initiative

What distinguishes the UHI from other grant programs is its emphasis on “scale”. In each of the participating cities, the goal of the initiative is to improve the health and safety of enough children to make a measurable difference in the child health statistics for the city as a whole.² In order to achieve this goal, each UHI campaign, or “site,” had to accomplish four large tasks: 1) identify the statistics local leaders believe are most important to address; 2) select programmatic strategies that according to ‘best practice’ have a good chance of impacting the statistics; 3) figure out what it would take programmatically to bring about change at a scale large enough to make a measurable difference in the city as a whole, and 4) mobilize sufficient resources for the selected program strategies to be implemented at that scale.

This paper will focus on the fourth task, how sites approached mobilizing resources and the lessons learned in the process.

The funding provided by The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF) to the sites was not intended for direct services. Instead RWJF expected that sites would need to create new funding sources and/or, since new money is difficult to secure in a recession, to reallocate existing local, state, federal and private dollars to proven interventions that would make a measurable difference. In addition to creating funding sources or reallocating existing ones, another option is to ensure that federal and state money is secured in fair measure and drawn down to the full extent possible.

The five UHI sites approached this task differently based on the experience of the staff at each of the sites. With the influence of the National Program Office (NPO), the language that the sites use is now very similar, with sites discussing securing new dollars, redirecting existing funding, and leveraging dollars to make sustainable change. Each site has had success in accessing multiple funding streams for its program strategies. The sites are moving towards scale and in the process they are looking at innovative ways to access sustainable resources.

¹ Rachel Aberbach Metz is an independent policy consultant and former Fiscal and Policy Director of Safe Passages. She holds a Masters in Public Policy from the University of California, Berkeley.

² According to Paul S. Jellinek, a former vice president of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and one of the architects of the Urban Health Initiative, as written in the UHI Lessons Learned paper, *Reflections on the Start-Up of the Urban Health Initiative*, Urban Health Initiative, 2004.

Part I: Sources of Long-Term Funding

A. New Money

Some of the several ways to secure new long-term money are to enact a tax and to secure a new set-aside of federal, state or local funding.

1. Enacting a Tax

Four of the five UHI sites have secured funding for their strategies through a tax (see Example 1). At each site the tax levied is different, but in each case, the site worked with the mayor, a member of the city council, or some combination of elected officials. None of the sites designed the tax themselves. Instead, with the help of good data and established relationships, they seized the opportunity presented by a tax that the City was already considering or designing to ensure that a portion of the tax funded children and youth services.

Sites were only able to get the funding because they had: 1) relationships in place and 2) strategies worth funding. While the sites were successful, staff in these cities say if they were to do it again, they would work harder to get the funding more closely aligned with their strategies from the beginning of the process.

2. Set-Aside of State or Federal Money

Federal and state funding is frequently allocated to programs run by cities and counties based on specific criteria or formulas. Sites can access this funding if they: are aware of the funding, know how the funding is allocated, have programs worth funding, and have relationships with those controlling the funding in place.

EXAMPLE 1: Taxes Passed at UHI Sites

Baltimore: The Mayor raised \$30 million for the general fund through an energy tax and a cell phone tax. Through relationships with city council and the Mayor, Baltimore's Safe and Sound Campaign was able to get a two million dollar set-aside, one million for summer jobs and one million for after-school. Originally they had hoped that \$16 million of the \$30 million would be used exclusively for kids, but they were successful in getting \$2 million of new funding allocated to programs that work for kids.

Detroit: While the Mayor was working on a licensing agreement with the casinos in which the City would receive a percentage of the casinos' gross revenues, the Detroit site director was busy engaging him in discussions about the dismal state of the city's after-school facilities in recreation centers. As a result of this work, starting in 2006, two percent of the casinos' gross revenues, or an estimated \$20 million per year for 20 years, will be used to renovate facilities and run after-school programs.

Oakland: The City of Oakland tried three times to pass a tax to increase funding for police and violence prevention. The measure succeeded the third time, in November 2004, and it is a parcel tax and a parking tax surcharge, funding a combination of fire, police, and violence prevention. Safe Passages worked closely with City Council, discussing the importance of violence prevention and the types of programs that work. Approximately 40% of the funding will be dedicated to violence prevention. Though the funding is not directly linked to Safe Passages, the goals are closely aligned and it is likely that a portion of the funding will go towards one or more of Safe Passages' strategies.

Philadelphia: City funds were used in the construction of two new stadiums, one for the Eagles and the other for the Phillies. Philadelphia Safe and Sound used its political capital and relationships with the City Council and Mayor, to ensure that the negotiation included an agreement that the teams would give \$1 million per year for 30 years to a "Children's Fund". A portion of the funding goes to Philadelphia Safe and Sound strategies.

In order to mobilize the resources to make a measurable difference in the health and safety of youth, sites needed to figure out where they could get long-term funding. The dollars would have to come through some combination of: 1) new money, 2) redirected money, or 3) previously untapped funds. Each is discussed in turn below with some examples of the types of funding utilized by the UHI sites.

For example, when the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant (JAIBG)³ was established, staff from Philadelphia Safe and Sound made sure that they participated on the local committee charged with determining how the money would be best spent. As a result, \$2.2 million annually was dedicated to a strategy recommended and supported by Safe and Sound.

In Baltimore, staff was aware of funding that the State of Maryland had set-aside for home visiting. Originally, the State was going to ask for applications from organizations across the state. Baltimore's Safe and Sound Campaign worked with the State so that Baltimore's portion of the money would be blended with the other funding that Safe and Sound had secured for home visiting. Instead of accepting applications from individual organizations in Baltimore, the State is working solely with the strategies supported by Safe and Sound.

B. Redirected Money

UHI sites have used three methods to redirect public funding: 1) proving that money could be spent more effectively, 2) showing that a population or area is not receiving its fair share, and 3) changing a policy so that a program can access a funding stream that currently exists. In order to redirect funding a site must do the research to know what funding is there, who controls it, what the rules are, and whether allocation patterns can be changed.

1. Program Effectiveness

All of the sites were able to move money by showing that they support effective programs based on best practices (see *Example 2*). Securing money involves not only supporting a good program but also convincing the person, people or entity in charge of the money that the change will obtain the desired results. Changes agents must be able to communicate the effectiveness of the program, explain how investing in the strategy will help accomplish the agency's goals, and possess the knowledge about what can be cut to pay for the program.

EXAMPLE 2: Redirecting Dollars to Effective Programs

Baltimore: Safe and Sound is currently working with the State of Maryland on a promising strategy called the "Compact for Sound Government." The funding has not yet been accessed, but Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) are being developed that will bind the State to redirect money towards prevention. More specifically, one example of a "Compact" states that if a Safe and Sound program to keep kids out of the foster care system is shown to reduce recidivism, and therefore saves the State money, the State will divert a portion of the money currently allocated to foster care (both Title IV-E and general fund) to maintaining Safe and Sound's intensive home intervention program.

Oakland: The Oakland Unified School District was using Local Educational Agency (LEA) Medi-Cal funding for after-school programs, but it wasn't being used as effectively as it could be. The School District wanted to use the money more strategically and leverage other money. At the same time, Safe Passages was working closely with the Oakland Unified School District, Alameda County Health Care Services, and Behavioral Health Care to design targeted interventions at Oakland middle schools. Safe Passages was able to redirect the funding by: 1) approaching the School District with a well-researched best practice program, 2) promising that the County would allocate additional Tobacco Tax Settlement dollars if the School District reallocated its LEA Medi-Cal funding, and 3) involving key personnel within the school district.

³ As of October 1, 2003 the program name was changed to the Juvenile Accountability Block Grants (JABG) program.

2. Fair Share

Another way to get funding is to increase the amount or proportion of funding directed at a target population. Doing thorough policy research and putting it in writing can be effective tools in changing the allocation of a funding stream.

For example, when Mayor's Time in Detroit prepared its systems change/investment plan, it discovered that although Detroit has 30 percent of Michigan's youth who are eligible for free and reduced price school lunches, Detroit was only receiving 10 to 12 percent of the State's 21st Century Community Learning Center funds. Knowing that 21st Century is supposed to prioritize low-income populations, Mayor's Time prepared a letter from the mayor to the state school superintendent requesting a shift in the allocation of funding. The trust that had already been established between Mayor's Time and the state superintendent, and the letter documenting the facts, resulted in Detroit now receiving its proportionate share, which represents a significant increase, of 21st Century funds.

3. Changing Policy

Funding can also be redirected by changing policy. Again, in order to succeed sites had to be knowledgeable about the current policies, have a program worth funding, and have developed a relationship with the person or people who could change the policy (see *Example 3*).

C. Untapped Funds

Finally, there may be funding available that isn't yet being drawn down from either the state or federal government. Once again, awareness about funding streams and relationships with people in city, county, and state government have been instrumental for success.

UHI sites have found drawing down federal entitlement funding to be one of their biggest challenges. Mayor's Time in Detroit is working on an innovative strategy to draw down state entitlement funding through the use of private dollars used for leverage.

In theory, if private money that is already being spent on programming is passed through the county, then the county can qualify for match funding from the state. Mayor's Time has successfully leveraged the money on a small scale using a portion of its RWJF grant. Now, the primary challenge

EXAMPLE 3: Changing Policy to Increase Funding

Detroit: Mayor's Time worked with the Detroit Public Schools on an agreement that allows community based organizations to use public school facilities to provide after-school programs rent-free.

Philadelphia: Philadelphia Safe and Sound was able to get the Police and Adult Probation Departments to adopt the principles of Safe and Sound's Youth Violence Reduction Partnership (YVRP). The agencies integrated the key principles of YVRP into their normal operations, redirecting current staff power and other resources. This required changing how people did their work, as well (e.g. working at night, rather than normal daytime work hours).

Oakland: Safe Passages worked closely with Alameda County Health Care Services to use Early Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment (EPSDT) funding to provide mental health services to youth at the middle schools. Previously, the County could not expand services because of the 18 month reimbursement lag from the State. Safe Passages found money to front the costs to start the program. Eventually, the Director of Health Care Services, who is also the Board Chair for Safe Passages, was able to change the policy so that services could be expanded without a front-end investment. This shift in policy has allowed the County to expand EPSDT eligible services throughout Alameda County.

will be convincing private funders that it is possible to create contracts with government agencies that specify how the money will be spent and that ensure accountability. Staff is currently working with the United Way and other private funders on a more permanent plan to leverage state funding.

Philadelphia Safe and Sound was able to access untapped discretionary funding from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) for after-school programming. Safe and Sound knew that the Department of Human Services was not drawing down all of the money the city was eligible for; the Department was at risk of losing the money. Safe and Sound already had a close relationship with staff within the Department of Human Services and offered to write the needs-based plan to get the funding. This increased the amount of funding for after-school programs.

Part II: Strategies for Accessing Funding

The Urban Health Initiative was very non-prescriptive in its design. The UHI design did not dictate which child health problems the cities should address, how they should be addressed, or how they should obtain the necessary resources. The previous section of this paper discussed types of funding strategies.

However, getting enough money to get to scale is not easy. Through the experiences of the UHI sites some key lessons emerge about how to access funding. In order to maximize sustainable resources sites must: 1) plan, 2) have the right people involved, 3) identify potential sources, 4) analyze legislation and regulations to identify opportunities for change, 5) engage in the long, hard work with both executive and legislative branches to secure the changes and, where possible, 6) leverage public and private resources.

Even with these components in place, obtaining large amounts of funding is challenging and there will always be unknown obstacles. The UHI sites' strategies, as well as lessons learned for future projects, are discussed below.

A. Focus on Long-Term Funding: Use Public and Private Sector Resources

In order to create sustainable systems change, sites must always consider the longevity of the funding. Much of this paper has focused on public funding because there is general agreement that the sustainable big dollars are government dollars, but there is also agreement among the sites that it is important to involve the private sector as well.

The sites have approached private funding differently. The funding portfolios at each site in the first several years of the initiative looked very different, based on the experience of the staff at each site. For example, Baltimore (where both the Executive Director and the Senior Policy Advisor came from the non profit community) started with primarily foundation funding. On the other hand, in Philadelphia the Executive Director came from within the public sector and the site focused on public money (see *Example 4*).

It is necessary to distinguish between long-term and short-term funding. The focus should be on obtaining long-term funding, but it may be necessary to use short-term funding to leverage long-term government funding. Short-term philanthropic funding should be used to prove program effectiveness or as an incentive to get others to contribute. In

some cases, sites have not kept in mind the ultimate goal of funding programs largely with sustainable funding, and have had to scale back when they realized that they did not have sustainable funding.

One important lesson stands out about seeking funding:

Focus on the long term when using public and private resources: Sites should use both public *and* private resources, but make sure that the ultimate goal is longevity. When a site pursues a short-term funding source, it should always be prepared to explain how that would help accomplish the long-term objective.

B. Planning

The goal of the initiative is to make a measurable difference in a city's child health and safety statistics. In order to do that, sites needed to: 1) identify statistics to be changed and establish the amount of change sought, 2) select best-practice strategies, 3) establish the number of children or families that those strategies would have to reach in order to make a measurable difference, 4) estimate the funding needed, 5) identify the potential resources, 6) know the mandates around the available funding, and 7) propose an economically-sound strategic/political plan for obtaining and using the funding.

When the initiative began, the sites were not prepared for the task ahead of them. Sites were asked to submit community-based plans, but their submissions were akin to grant applications, a significantly different conceptualization of what the work was to entail. Initially they did not grasp the concept of scale, nor did they have staff who understood how to develop or implement a strategic plan. They also did not have staff who had extensive knowledge of the systems they were seeking to change or contacts at the right level.

To address the first concern, the National Program Office insisted that the sites complete the "Denominator Exercise" (to establish what "scale" meant for their selected best-practice programmatic strategies) and an investment strategy (to identify the available resources and plan action steps for how to leverage those funds). Some sites actively resisted doing this work; others had great difficulty collecting or analyzing data and conceptualizing this level of work. This was due in large measure to the fact that initial staff members were primarily or exclusively experienced in service delivery or community organizing and knew little about existing systems and their funding mechanisms.⁴

EXAMPLE 4: Examples of How Sites are Using Private Funding

Baltimore: Baltimore's Safe and Sound Campaign, in partnership with the Annie E. Casey Foundation, Mayor O'Malley and others believe that it is important to start by demonstrating that programs could be effective. They assume that if they could raise private dollars and prove effectiveness, then public funding would follow. The approach is promising, with the "Compact" as described in Example 2, but it will take more time to determine its ultimate success.

Philadelphia: Philadelphia Safe and Sound has mostly focused on public dollars, but they still pursue foundation funding. They see foundation funding as a way to fund evaluation and hope to use it to do a return-on-investment study that would be used to show cost-effectiveness and advocate for public dollars.

Detroit: Mayor's Time is focused on getting private funders to rethink the length of their commitment, in essence, turning a short-term private funding source into a long-term private funding source. In addition, they are looking at innovative ways to leverage public money with private money, by redirecting the private money that already goes into the community through the county in order to leverage state dollars.

⁴ See other UHI Lessons Learned papers, particularly *Using Data in the Decision-Making Process* by Jerry VanderWood and *Reflections on the Start-Up of the UHI* by Paul Jellinek, Urban Health Initiative, 2004.

In retrospect, staff at the sites wish that they had done these tasks earlier. It forced the sites to understand what scale really meant, develop a multi-year strategy, and communicate their goals to others. While there was always an emphasis on communication, an earlier emphasis on the systems change/investment plan would have helped sites communicate their vision more clearly. In addition, having a clear plan would have forced sites to be prepared to have information available and ready for others. Sites needed to be more prepared to work with local and state governments while they were planning. They needed to be willing to provide supporting information and analysis, and to deliver briefings at a moment's notice.

Two lessons learned about planning an initiative stand out:

1. **Be more prescriptive:** While it is very important to let people identify problems and select programmatic strategies locally, the funder should be prescriptive about the need to make and implement an investment strategy.
2. **Provide specialized technical assistance:** Many of the challenges in one city or state are different from those in another. The technical assistance provided needs to address this. Sites need to spend time sitting down with the technical assistance provider and talking about the specific challenges they are facing. The technical assistance needs to be ongoing, and provided by someone with enough experience to influence and engage high level people within the city.

C. Staff and Board: Experience and Relationships

Planning allows a site to learn what resources are available and how much is needed, but it does not solve the biggest challenge: implementing the plan. In order to successfully obtain long-term resources the right people must be involved in the initiative. These people include: 1) an experienced Executive Director, 2) a staff person with broad and deep knowledge of existing systems, 3) a diverse and engaged Board with access to resources and decision makers, and 4) staff or partners who have relationships with high level staff within public agencies.

The Executive Director becomes the face of the initiative. An experienced Executive Director who has a reputation and credibility in the city is important to the success of the initiative. The Director should know at least one major public system thoroughly, have proven management skills, be creative, and have many good contacts and networking experience. The Executive Director needs to understand his/her strengths and weaknesses and be willing to hire staff with different and complementary skills.

At least one person on staff needs to be dedicated to implementing the investment plan. It is important not to confuse this role with the role of the internal finance manager or the traditional fundraiser. This staff person needs to be smart, creative, understand the local government budget office, have substantive experience working within the bureaucracies, and have expertise on programs and major funding streams, especially government funding streams. Because no one knows about all funding streams, it is important to be able to pull people together as a team, and then look around the table and see what expertise is in hand, what is missing, and how to fill in the gaps.

Consultants can also be invaluable. Mayor's Time hired Mary Lannoye to write its systems change plan. Lannoye had been the State Budget Director, and was reappointed to that post

after she finished Detroit's plan. Not only did Mayor's Time benefit from the assistance of someone who understood just what needed to be done, it also soon had a knowledgeable friend in a pivotal state government position.

A strong Board is one that represents multiple constituencies, including the public, private, business and foundation sectors. It includes civic leaders, public agency heads and foundation officials. However, the most important aspect is that among the Board should be members who have influence and access to resources, and are actively involved in the initiative with a willingness to assist in leveraging resources.

Existing relationships and the ability to build relationships are critical to generating both public and private funding for programmatic strategies. Key relationships have been imperative for all sites in accomplishing their task and overcoming the inertia of bureaucracy. Only the people working within the systems will have all of the information to know what is available and how to access it. A high level of trust with people within the system is needed to get access to the information.

The best route to that trust are staff members who came from within the systems, with existing relationships and credibility. It is helpful to have relationships with the middle managers within these departments and agencies, people who usually don't leave their positions even when elected officials and appointees change. While the support of the people controlling the resources is helpful, in order to ensure that funding is properly allocated it is necessary to have someone on staff who understands the budget minutiae of public systems.

Sites have also built trust by creating close alliances with public agencies or by directly engaging individuals from within a system. For example, the staff of Baltimore's Safe and Sound Campaign had limited experience with the public sector. Safe and Sound compensated for this by partnering with a public agency, the Family League of Baltimore, and by recruiting a Board chair with knowledge of systems and excellent contacts. As a result, the Family League adopted Safe and Sound's goals. Plus, Safe and Sound had more influence because of the relationships the Family League had in the public sector. That relationship helped bring in over \$8 million of TANF funding.

Staff in Detroit brought the Director of the Detroit City Health Department on a UHI Inter-City Leadership Visit, and this involvement helped convince him to dedicate \$2 million per year to after-school programs.

Two lessons learned about ensuring that the right people are involved in the initiative stand out:

- 1. Selection of key staff and Board members:** Many of the sites faced a challenge at the beginning of the initiative because they had little knowledge of public systems and didn't know how to get the right people involved. The funder should serve as a management consultant and take a participatory role in laying out the necessary qualifications for key staff and Board members. Sites need to hire an experienced Executive Director who has existing relationships with high-level staff within the public systems, and a staff person dedicated to the systems change effort.
- 2. Be clear from the beginning about the politics involved and provide training:** Some sites started by simply trying to advocate at City Council hearings. But in order to get substantial amounts of money allocated, it is important to work directly with the

executive and department heads during the creation of the budget. Sites were not prepared for the level of political involvement needed, and did not know how to work in a political environment. The funder needs to make sure that all sites have an extensive knowledge of local and state politics, and that site leaders can and will be involved at the local and state level.

D. Challenges

All of the Urban Health Initiative sites are moving towards scale. But, in addition to the challenges the sites had with developing an adequate plan and getting the right people involved, there have been several challenges outside the control of the sites. These include:

1. Time

The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation has made an innovative, 10-year investment in the Urban Health Initiative. This is a significant long-term investment compared to the typical foundation grant. However, when the Foundation started the initiative with an emphasis on scale, no one really knew what scale meant in terms of the number of children needed to be reached with a strategy in order to change citywide health statistics, and the cost of providing these services. It was not until three years into the initiative, after the sites had completed their denominator exercises, that scale for each programmatic strategy was quantified. Scale is enormous, with the annual funding goals for site strategies ranging from \$7.5 million to \$170 million. Ten years is not long enough to obtain that level of funding.

2. Economy

A major challenge has been the economy, which was booming when the initiative started. During the life of the initiative, the economy shifted to a recession. This had a significant impact on the ease with which sites could obtain, redirect and draw down money. Local, state and federal governments quickly went from budget surpluses to severe budget deficits, resulting in a significant impact on the willingness of government to invest in new programs. In addition, programs such as TANF, which at the beginning of the initiative seemed like a long-term public resource, were cut. One reason that entitlement funding (such as Medicaid) was so difficult for sites to access was that local or state governments did not want programs to expand and increase their match obligation in a time of budget crises.

3. Changing Administrations

In the life of the UHI there was a shift in governing political parties at the federal level. All of the states had turnover in governors, with some changes in state political party control. But more relevant to the sites were multiple changes in local administrations, including turnover in Mayors, City Council members and most frequently School Superintendents. With every major change, sites had extra work to do to regain buy-in and momentum. New key players who controlled resources needed to be introduced to the initiative and invested in its success.⁵

⁵ See other UHI Lessons Learned papers, particularly *Political Strategizing in a Constantly Changing Environment*, by Jerry VanderWood, Urban Health Initiative, 2004.

4. Federal Funding

Another challenge for the sites was accessing federal dollars. There was no common national identity for the sites, and it was difficult for any one initiative to make headway at a national level. In order to succeed with influencing federal decision-making, the sites would have to unite their efforts.

Part III: Summary Points

I. SOURCES OF LONG-TERM FUNDING. The experience of the UHI sites demonstrates that change agent organizations and their funders can generate sustainable funding for programmatic strategies via the following funding mechanisms.

1. ***New money – creating a tax:*** UHI sites have succeeded in garnering new funding for their programmatic strategies by:
 - a. Seizing opportunities as local officials consider new revenue plans,
 - b. Having existing relationships with those local officials,
 - c. Promoting programmatic strategies worth funding and effectively using data to prove it.
2. ***New money – set asides:*** UHI sites have achieved set-aside allocations by:
 - a. Being aware of the funding,
 - b. Knowing how the funding is allocated,
 - c. Having best practice and data-driven strategies to fund,
 - d. Having positive relationships with those controlling the funds.
3. ***Redirecting money by demonstrating program effectiveness:*** UHI sites convinced officials to redirect funding by:
 - a. Having sound programmatic strategies,
 - b. Effectively communicating how the strategies will help the funding entity reach its goals,
 - c. Knowing what can be cut to pay for the program.
4. ***Redirecting money via a fair allocation of funds:*** UHI sites helped their cities receive a fair (and increased) share of certain funding by:
 - a. Understanding the mechanisms and criteria for allocating funds,
 - b. Conducting the data work and making a convincing case to demonstrate how the city's share should be increased,
 - c. Having positive relationships with those controlling the funds.
5. ***Redirecting money via policy change:*** UHI sites secured local policy changes that allowed funding to flow to certain programs by:
 - a. Being knowledgeable about existing policies that obstruct the flow of funds,
 - b. Having positive relationships with those who could change the policy,
 - c. Having best practice and data-driven strategies that could be funded,
 - d. Effectively making the case for change.

6. ***Tapping untapped funds:*** UHI sites helped their cities draw down untapped funds by:
 - a. Understanding funding streams and knowing which funds may be left untapped,
 - b. Having positive relationships within appropriate levels of government,
 - c. Employing novel approaches, such as using private money as the local government's match for state or federal grants and reimbursements.

II. STRATEGIES FOR ACCESSING FUNDING. To access these sustainable funding mechanisms, the experience of the UHI suggests that change agent organizations and their funders/sponsors should keep these lessons in mind.

1. Focus on the long-term. Sustainable dollars are generally government dollars, but private dollars can play a role in sustaining programmatic strategies. Short-term funding sources should help accomplish long-term objectives.
2. Planning should conclude with a written determination of scale (via completion of a “denominator exercise” or similar calculation) and an investment strategy that identifies available resources and sets out action steps to obtain them. Technical assistance provided by funders/sponsors, tailored to local conditions and political considerations, can help sites accomplish these tasks.
3. Site staff should have knowledge of public systems that impact children, good contacts within those systems, and political networking skills.
4. Site Boards should represent multiple sectors and include government agency heads and other civic leaders, and Boards should have access to or influence over resources.
5. Among the many challenges in achieving scale are the long time it takes, fluctuations in the economy and government budgets, and political changes.

The following individuals were interviewed for this UHI lessons learned paper. The author wishes to thank all interviewees for their time and insights.

Josefina Alvarado-Mena, Executive Director, Safe Passages

Cynthia Curreri, National Program Deputy Director, Urban Health Initiative

Grenaé Dudley, Executive Director, Mayor's Time

Hathaway Ferebee, Executive Director, Baltimore's Safe and Sound Campaign

Gerry Grimm, Funding Strategist, Family League of Baltimore

Jeriel Heard, Associate Director, Mayor's Time

Linda Herzog, National Program Associate Director, Urban Health Initiative

Martha Holleman, Director of Policy and Planning, Baltimore's Safe and Sound Campaign

Jo Ann Lawer, President and CEO, Philadelphia Safe and Sound

Charles Lyons, Consultant, Philadelphia Safe and Sound

Lynn McCashin, Executive Director, Youth Matters

Naomi Post-Street, Consultant; UHI Fellow; former Executive Director, Philadelphia Safe and Sound

Charles Royer, National Program Director, Urban Health Initiative



Urban Health Initiative
National Program Office
7900 East Greenlake Drive North
Suite 302
Seattle, WA 98103

Phone:

206-616-3637

Fax:

206-616-7541

Email:

uhi@u.washington.edu

www.urbanhealth.org