

# **The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation**

**FOUNDATION INITIATIVES  
FOR CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES**

**A VIEW OF THE LANDSCAPE**

Public/Private Ventures  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
October 2002

**FOUNDATION INITIATIVES  
FOR CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES**

**A VIEW OF THE LANDSCAPE**

Public/Private Ventures  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
October 2002

## I. INTRODUCTION

In 2001, The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation asked Public/Private Ventures (P/PV) to survey philanthropic organizations across the country about their major initiatives for children, youth and families. The purpose of this survey was to help the foundation plan their future work in this area. We were asked specifically to gather information about initiatives, not just individually funded programs that are:

- Primarily aimed at improving conditions, services, opportunities or outcomes for young people in the 0 to 24 age range; and
- Multiyear and receive significant foundation support.

School reform efforts were not part of this investigation.

We gathered information primarily through telephone interviews with senior officials at 42 foundations identified by *The Chronicle of Philanthropy's* 2001 database as major givers in the children, youth and family area. We also reviewed foundation websites and publications. The organizations we surveyed are listed in Appendix A and include national, regional, local and family foundations with assets ranging from approximately \$300 million to \$11 billion. While all these foundations fund a wide variety of programs, we focused specifically on their children, youth and family initiatives.

This report summarizes foundation funding trends in the children, youth and family area. To exemplify these trends, we highlight in the body of this report specific efforts of *some* of the foundations we surveyed. It should be noted that in conducting the survey we were able to gather more information about some foundation initiatives than others.

## II. FINDINGS FROM FOUNDATION INTERVIEWS

Our interviews revealed a funding environment in which foundations are becoming increasingly concerned about how they can best leverage their giving and use their resources in ways that are most likely to improve outcomes for children and youth. For many funders, this has certainly meant investing in areas where they have a history and interest, but also in areas where there is already sufficient infrastructure, such as public and private sector leadership and capacity to effectively support major initiatives; credible research and practice that clearly outline a theory of the problem to be addressed, as well as strategies that have a reasonable chance to address the problem; and sufficient resources and interest to support policy advances and develop important knowledge in the field. Given these interests, of the 42 foundations we surveyed, 22 are investing in early childhood initiatives (ages 0 to 6), 19 have initiatives for youth in pre- to mid-adolescence (ages 7 to 15), and eight are investing in major efforts for older youth (ages 16 to 24). In some cases, these age categories are not entirely discrete and overlap to some degree.

Four foundations are implementing initiatives that target a wide age range of youth, and eight have initiatives that address issues of family and community without specifically targeting youth. Most of the foundations fund initiatives in more than one area (see Appendix B, Foundations by Initiative Type). Below, we describe philanthropic activity in each of these categories and use some foundation efforts as examples.

## EARLY CHILDHOOD

Among the foundations we interviewed, 22 are funding or planning initiatives in the early childhood area—the area where the most coherent initiatives are taking place.

Philanthropic interest in this area has increased over the past decade in direct response to a growing infrastructure—public policy, funding streams and advocacy organizations that support this age group, as well as research and evidence that provide solid underpinnings. The foundations indicated that their attraction to the early childhood “field” is based on two things: (1) they do not have to build it from scratch, and (2) there are still clear, identifiable areas where significant improvement is needed and investments could be useful.

The early childhood infrastructure has developed dramatically over the past decade, spurred in part by significant public sector investment. Generally, this area is discussed in terms of two age categories: 0 to 3 and 3 to 6.

Until relatively recently, public interest and investment has primarily focused on 3- to 6-year-olds. The focus on this group can be traced in large measure to the growth, visibility and performance of the Head Start program. Head Start, funded by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (Administration on Children, Youth and Families) and designed to foster healthy development in low-income preschoolers, began in 1965 serving approximately 560,000 children and with an annual appropriation of \$96 million. By the year 2001, enrollment was over 900,000 and the annual appropriation was more than \$6 billion.<sup>1</sup> States spent a total of \$2.1 billion on child development and family support programs for children ages 3 to 6 in fiscal year 2000—a 24 percent increase over 1988. The majority of these funds provided pre-kindergarten services by supplementing Head Start or supporting other pre-kindergarten programs and services. Currently, 43 states fund pre-kindergarten services.<sup>2</sup> Credible research, which shows that “Head Start children typically enter school ready to learn and achieve academically at national norms” has greatly contributed to public investment in pre-school education.<sup>3</sup>

Interest in the “under threes” began to grow in 1994 in response to two things: (1) the publication of the Carnegie Corporation report, *Starting Points: Meeting the Needs of Our Youngest Children*; and (2) the popularization of definitive research on brain development, which indicates that early experiences and relationships affect how the brain grows and significantly affects child development.<sup>4</sup> That same year, Congress created Early Head Start (EHS), built on the principles of Head Start, to serve pregnant women and children under the age of three in poor families. In 2001, EHS served 55,000 families and the allocation was approximately \$550 million.<sup>5</sup> Six states currently

supplement federal EHS dollars and more than half invest in other programs for infants and toddlers.<sup>6</sup>

In addition to the above programs, the number of federal and state government-initiated efforts—such as the Family and Medical Leave Act, various child care-related tax policies and subsidies, and state-funded home-visiting programs for infants and toddlers—indicate the growing concern in this country for the care and development of children ages 0 to 6. Since 1992, combined state and federal child care subsidy funding has nearly tripled.

However, there is general agreement across the child care field that there are a number of major issues, including cost, supply and quality that still need to be addressed. For example, even with the public support and consistent expansion at the federal and state levels of Head Start and Early Head Start, those programs cannot serve all children who are potentially eligible.<sup>7</sup> There is concern that with the slowing economy and resulting fiscal challenges facing most states, early childhood programs will suffer. And while poor and low-income working parents are eligible for other public child care subsidies, federal subsidies are capped, which does not allow them access to more expensive and often higher-quality programs. For non-poor parents, the Dependent Care Tax Credit offsets some child care costs; however, the lack of significant public investment in quality improvements and regulation makes child care a burden, even for these parents. These issues are of particular concern when it comes to infants and toddlers. Care is expensive for these children because it is very labor intensive. It is impossible for the child care market to sustain what most parents cannot afford—high-quality programs with few children and highly trained staff. Observers in large-scale studies have found 50 percent of the care in both home and center settings to be poor or fair, not good or excellent.<sup>8</sup>

This early childhood landscape—both its strengths and weaknesses—has been the impetus for investment by numerous foundations, large and small, national, regional and local. Responding to developments in the field, some foundations have initiated their attention to early childhood issues in the past few years, and others have increased funding to this area.

The large majority of the foundations funding early childhood initiatives are focused on the goals of school readiness and increasing the quality and quantity of child care. A smaller number are working on health initiatives or are taking a “comprehensive” approach to early childhood development and attempting to tackle the issue in a variety of ways. Close to half are funding initiatives that target the entire 0 to 6 age range; the others are concentrating specifically on either the 0 to 3 age group or 3 to 6 age group, divided almost evenly between the two.

### School Readiness and Child Care

Among the issues outlined above, increasing school readiness programs for toddlers and child care—both quality and quantity—are receiving the most attention. The funders we

surveyed generally tended to see the issues of quality child care and school readiness as integrally related. In fact, 15 of the foundations funding early childhood efforts are focused all or in part on these issues. Initiatives being funded by national foundations are attempting, primarily, to influence state and national policies on these child care issues. Regional and local funders are primarily concerned with addressing policies and program issues in the geographic areas where they provide support. A few examples, reflecting a variety of approaches, are discussed here.

The Pew Charitable Trusts, The David and Lucile Packard Foundation and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation represent the national foundation approach. The Pew Charitable Trusts is taking both a national and state-based approach to promoting access to high-quality, early education for 3- and 4-year-olds. In 2001, the Trusts launched an initiative to support both the research and advocacy necessary to advance universal pre-kindergarten. As part of this initiative, and with grants totaling over \$9 million, the Trusts created two centers: the National Institute for Early Education Research at Rutgers University, which will conduct and commission the research necessary to inform policy decisions; and the Trust for Early Education (TEE), an advocacy center aimed at bringing the Institute's research to bear on the policy debate at the national and state levels. Through TEE, the Trusts are also funding campaigns in several states to promote universal access to high-quality, early education. The initial states are Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey and Illinois. In addition to the creation of these two new centers, the Trusts are also funding other organizations, such as the Committee for Economic Development, to help bring new constituencies to the early childhood education debate.

As part of their local funding of organizations serving children, youth and families in Philadelphia, the Trusts are working to improve the quality of child care for low-income families through training, advocacy and accreditation efforts.

The David and Lucile Packard Foundation has been a leader in the early childhood area for a number of years, and funds projects both nationally and in California. Nationally, the Packard Foundation supports efforts to improve family leave benefits and strengthen public child care subsidy policies, particularly for disadvantaged children. In California, the Packard Foundation is currently focused on the ongoing implementation of the states' Children and Family First Act, or Proposition 10. Proposition 10 imposes a 50 cents per pack tax on tobacco products to fund programs that promote early childhood education, including parent education; accessible, affordable and quality child care; and pre- and post-natal health care services. The Packard Foundation supports efforts to increase civic engagement around Proposition 10 and to provide technical assistance to the Children and Families Commission, which implements the Act. In 2000, the Packard Foundation made over \$5million in grants to support Proposition 10 activity.

The W.K Kellogg Foundation is currently planning SPARK (Supporting Partnerships to Assure Ready Kids), which will work with five to seven demonstration states to support partnerships among parents, providers, communities, schools and state agencies to "increase the number of vulnerable children, ages 3 to 6, that are ready for school and the number of schools ready for the children." The Kellogg Foundation will work with the

selected sites toward increasing children's academic readiness for school, including improving the transition into the first grade. Each site could receive a multi-million dollar grant to implement SPARK over a five-year period. The Kellogg Foundation's ultimate goal is to work with other state policymakers to transfer lessons and the SPARK model to other locations.

At the regional and local level, The William Penn Foundation in Philadelphia, the Miriam and Peter Haas Fund in San Francisco, and the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation in Kansas City, Missouri, have all developed approaches to improving child care and school readiness in their localities—approaches that involve a number of actors and are aimed at affecting local policy.

After careful internal planning, The William Penn Foundation (WPF) has made promoting the well-being of children from pregnancy to age six, including the successful transition to school, an organizational priority. In early 2002, WPF recommended to its board funding (\$4 million over four years) for the first phase of a 10-year investment in the early childhood area. The investment is designed to improve school readiness for children in poor and working-poor families by increasing the availability, accessibility and use of quality child care in the region, and fostering coordination between child care and school systems to support children's successful transition to school. This initiative is based on a planning effort coordinated with the United Way of Southeastern Pennsylvania and the City of Philadelphia's Office of Children's Policy, and funded by WPF, the Carnegie Endowment and the Annenberg Foundation.

In 1992, the Miriam and Peter Haas Fund (MPHF) decided to increase its investment in children aged 2 to 5, based on compelling research being published at that time about early childhood brain and behavioral development. Over the past decade, MPHF has invested more than \$20 million in the issue of quality child care. Activity has centered around four areas: (1) funding the Model Centers Initiative, which provides multi-year support to three early childhood programs that serve low-income children in San Francisco, with a goal of implementing model centers in every San Francisco community; (2) supporting requests from licensed nonprofit centers for program materials and equipment; (3) participating in the San Francisco Child Care Facilities Fund, a public-private partnership that provides home- and center-based child care providers with flexible financing and technical assistance for their capital needs; and (4) the Quality Child Care Initiative, designed to increase public and private resources for quality child care.

The Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation has long worked to improve the quality and quantity of early childhood services in Kansas City, Missouri. In 2000, the Kauffman Foundation continued its support for Partners in Quality for Early Childhood Education, a partnership of 22 nonprofit groups, employers, educators and other community leaders that work together to improve the quality of early child care and education in Kansas City. The Kauffman Foundation is also supporting a scholarship fund that helps early childhood teachers and providers in metropolitan Kansas City to pursue two-year and

four-year degrees in early childhood education as well as efforts to establish national accreditation of local child care programs.

According to the Kauffman Foundation, one of the major challenges in creating a quality early childhood system is the lack of funding. In partnership with other funders, the Kauffman Foundation is supporting the Metropolitan Council on Child Care, which is helping to gather data on current policies and potential platforms to pursue in the Missouri General Assembly. Building on its local projects, the Kauffman Foundation is also working with the Education Commission of the States, the Council of Chief State School Officers and the Communications Consortium Media Center to disseminate information about the importance of investments in early childhood.

Recently, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, which has been so pivotal in helping to develop the early childhood field, decided to build on that work and begin a major effort to reform early elementary education. While, as previously mentioned, this report is not designed to cover education reform initiatives, the Carnegie Corporation's history in early childhood makes their ongoing work worth mentioning. Over the next few years, the Carnegie Corporation will explore issues of literacy and numeracy as children make transitions from pre-kindergarten through second grade and then to upper elementary and the intermediate grades. Emphasis will be placed on continued support for creating high-quality, early childhood systems that support school readiness and early literacy programs.

### Child Health

A much smaller number of the early childhood funders (5) are funding initiatives specifically dealing with young children's health and physical well-being. These efforts address a wide variety of issues, including community-based prevention efforts; improving health service delivery through home visiting and retraining for pediatric doctors; and improving information systems.

All but one of these foundations is a national funder, although they vary significantly in size. The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJ) is the largest funder in this group. Since it only funds health-related efforts, it dominates this area with several large-scale initiatives targeting children aged 0 to 6.

In the community-based prevention area, RWJ is joined by The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation (EMCF). RWJ funds Free to Grow, a 24-site, \$13 million initiative that helps Head Start agencies and their partners implement innovative substance abuse prevention models. The initiative is based on a growing body of research showing that drug abuse prevention efforts that start early, even at pre-school age, and target the family and community appear to hold significant promise for decreasing a child's risk of substance abuse as he or she grows. Children's Futures, another RWJ initiative, is a \$21 million program to improve the health and safety of young children in the city of Trenton, New Jersey. Children aged 0 to 4 and their young parents are targeted. As part of this effort, RWJ will fund projects in Trenton that seek to improve birth outcomes, promote effective

parenting skills, enhance the quality of child care and strengthen local leadership capacity on child health issues.

EMCF has invested more than \$30 million in the Children's Community Partnership Initiative (CCPI), an effort that supports public-private partnerships to establish community child-protection efforts. Formerly run by EMCF's program for children, CCPI is now operated by the Center for Community Partnerships in Child Welfare, created with an \$11 million grant from EMCF to the Center for the Study of Social Policy, which oversees the new Center.

RWJ, The Commonwealth Fund and The Minneapolis Foundation are all implementing efforts to improve health service delivery to low-income children. RWJ has awarded the Children's Hospital Association of Denver, Colorado, \$10 million to replicate the University of Colorado's Nurse Home Visiting Program, a well-tested model designed to improve the health and social functioning of first-time, low-income mothers and their newborns. The grant will provide assistance to establish a national center for the Nurse Home Visiting Program that will train new nurses and support for implementing a network of programs in approximately 40 communities nationwide. The Nurse Home Visiting Program has three goals: (1) help improve pregnancy outcomes among the target population; (2) help parents provide more responsible, competent care for their children; and (3) help parents develop a vision of the future, plan future pregnancies, continue their education and find jobs.

The Commonwealth Fund and The Minneapolis Foundation are involved in efforts that have pediatric training and care as central elements. The Fund's new \$15 million program on Child Development and Pediatric Care is focusing on assuring that appropriate developmental and preventive pediatric services for young children are available to all families, especially those with low incomes. The strategies being employed include promoting the adoption of new standards of pediatric care and standardized measures of quality care; supporting the acquisition of requisite professional skills; providing models and tools to restructure well-child care; and developing policy options for federal, state and local governments, private insurers, and professional societies that promote adequate reimbursement for preventive and developmental services for young children. The Minneapolis Foundation has implemented the Children's Wellness Project, which works with doctors and other staff of area hospitals to help develop training and systems for working with poor and minority parents of children aged 0 to 3. The goal is to improve health outcomes for these children and to help parents better navigate the health system.

The Pew Charitable Trusts and RWJ have implemented initiatives to improve children's health information systems. For the past three years, the Trusts have sponsored research and advocacy to develop a national system to track chronic diseases, like asthma and birth defects. This effort is part of their \$20 million Public Health Initiative. RWJ's All Kids Count is a \$20 million effort that has been operating for eight years. The initiative is designed to develop better information systems related to children's health and immunization status.

Building on that effort, RWJ recently provided The Task Force for Child Survival and Development with a three-year, \$5 million grant to create a technical assistance resource center to help develop more integrated preventive health information systems.

### Multi-Issue Initiatives

Three foundations are involved in major efforts to address early childhood concerns by dealing with a variety of issues in one initiative. One is The Ford Foundation, a major national funder. The other two—The Cleveland Foundation and the Howard Heinz Endowment Fund in Pennsylvania—are large regional funders.

The Ford Foundation is launching the Strong Foundations for Healthy Futures Initiative, a multi-pronged effort in which it will spend more than \$16 million over the next six years to “enable children in low-income working families to build assets by improving access to health care, early education and children’s savings accounts.” A major component of the effort is a \$14 million grant to 10 state-based advocacy groups that will organize parents, develop communications strategies, and improve links between research and policy organizations in order to increase states’ commitment to early childhood development. Additional components include grants to other national and state-level research, policy and advocacy groups that will support the work of the 10 initiative sites, or contribute to the overall goals of the initiative.

The Cleveland Foundation and Howard Heinz Endowment initiatives are similar, in that they are both part of ambitious, regional, public-private partnerships designed to develop community-wide systems to support early childhood development. While The Cleveland Foundation has traditionally funded early childhood efforts, their grantmaking in this area has tended to be responsive rather than strategic. Interest in a new funding approach came from its board in 1999 after increased discussion about the growing number of children in the region who were ending up in the custody of the juvenile and foster-care systems. School readiness was also a concern. The board decided it wanted to “do something earlier.” This concern coincided with growing awareness about early childhood issues by the local Mt. Sinai Health Care Foundation. The Cleveland Foundation is now a major partner in a five-year early childhood effort that includes Mt. Sinai, Cuyahoga County, the state of Ohio and 20 additional private funders. This collaborative is investing more than \$40 million in this effort. The initiative has several components, including pre-natal care, hospital assessments and at-home visits for all teen and first-time mothers in the county; supportive services as needed; connection to a health care professional for well-child visits and early identification of developmental delay; and support for expanded day-care slots. The initiative will operate through 2004.

The Howard Heinz Endowment is currently a key funder and partner in a \$59 million Early Childhood Initiative in Allegheny County. The initiative’s goal is to improve education, health and development for children aged 0 to 8 in Eastern Pennsylvania. The Howard Heinz Endowment has contributed \$12 million to this initiative; other partners include local and state governments, the United Way, public and private universities, the

private sector and other foundations. The Early Childhood Initiative has three major components: improving the quality and quantity of child care and early education, including infant, toddler and family day care; improving teacher training and professional development, and the creation of links between pre-school and the early primary grades; and expanding the scope of pediatric care to include child development and family nurturing, home visiting and parent education.

## THE 7 TO 15 AGE GROUP

There were 19 foundations with initiatives in the 7 to 15 age group—almost equal to the number that have major investments in early childhood. For the sake of categorization, we will call this group of initiatives “general youth development.” Also, like the early childhood area, the foundations with major initiatives in the 7 to 15 age group represent funders of every size—national, regional and local. However, there is a distinct difference in the way the funders with whom we spoke are giving to these two age categories—a difference that reflects the state of the field for these groups. Most of the foundations supporting major early childhood initiatives are specifically focused on child care; and even those that are taking a broader approach to early childhood (The Ford Foundation, The Cleveland Foundation and Howard Heinz Endowment Fund) have child care as the central focus of their initiatives. The early childhood initiatives also tend to have clearly identified goals and connections to public policy, either directly or through powerful collaborations and policy groups. Foundation initiatives in the 7 to 15 age group are spread over a broader number of areas and connections to public policy vary.

While foundations funding initiatives for this age group are not as tightly focused around one issue (like child care for the 0 to 6 age group), a significant subgroup (9) are investing heavily in after-school programming. Other investments generally coalesce around the following areas: leadership development (4), health (4), broadly defined community youth development initiatives (2), and infrastructure support for youth development organizations (3). Other foundations have taken on efforts that do not easily fit into these categories but are helping to build the youth development field. Finally, it should be noted that some foundations have developed juvenile justice initiatives that include youth at the upper end of this age range; however, since the large majority of youth involved in the juvenile justice system are between the ages of 16 and 18, these initiatives are included in the section of this paper that describes foundation initiatives for older youth.

Interest in youth development as a distinct approach in youth programming began in the late 1980s, as the youth field, frustrated with a “deficit-oriented” approach that was not producing improved outcomes, began to look for alternative strategies. In the seminal publication, *Turning Points*, published in 1989, the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development asked, “What qualities do we envision in a 15 year old who has been well served in the middle years of schooling? What do we want youth to know, feel or be able to do?”<sup>9</sup> During the early 1990s, researchers and practitioners began working to answer those questions—through research about the developmental needs of adolescents and by fielding programmatic approaches designed to address those needs. After-school

programming, along with mentoring and broader efforts to strengthen community-level supports and opportunities for youth, were championed approaches.

Over the past decade, significant progress has been made in establishing positive youth development as a credible approach to adolescent programming. Traditional, national “name-brand” youth organizations, like Big Brothers Big Sisters, Boys & Girls Clubs, Girls Inc. and YM/YWCAs, as well as smaller nonprofits that serve this age group in almost every community, have received more recognition and support. Many of these organizations are operating major initiatives, which are supported by foundations, the United Way and, in some cases, the federal government. For example, in 2000, Congress gave \$20 million to the Boys & Girls Clubs of America.<sup>10</sup>

However, progress in building a solid infrastructure that includes widespread public support for this age group has been slow for two major and interrelated reasons. First, there is only limited, clear and compelling evidence regarding effective interventions for this group—unlike the brain development and school-readiness evidence that is fueling the expansion of public-sector and private-sector funding for infants, toddlers and pre-kindergartners. (Research on mentoring is the exception.)<sup>11</sup> Second, advocates have had difficulty translating the general term “youth development” into a clear, understandable approach that policymakers and the general public can easily understand and therefore support. These two issues appear to be clear factors in the failure of the Youth Development Community Block Grant, which would have provided a dedicated funding stream for prevention activities, to become law.<sup>12</sup> They are also likely reasons that the 7 to 15 age group is a less orderly and easily recognizable “field” than the 0 to 6 group, and why the funders with whom we spoke are not generally organized around one or two issues in this area.

It was another Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development publication, *A Matter of Time*, published in 1992, that laid critical groundwork regarding the need to provide young adolescents with constructive activities during non-school time and helped outline initial community-based strategies for doing so.<sup>13</sup> In 1995, the U.S. Department of Education (DOE) began funding the 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLCs), a partnership between schools and community-based organizations that provide after-school, weekend and summer activities for adolescents. The original funding for the program was \$750,000. By 2001, funding for CCLCs had increased to \$850 million, and 1.2 million children in 6,800 centers were being served. In some states and localities, such as California, Kentucky, Ohio and Boston, large public investments are now being made in after-school programming.<sup>14</sup>

One reason for this support is that while there is not yet definitive evidence that after-school programs improve youth outcomes, surveys indicate that parents have an intuitive understanding of the role after-school programs can play in preventing problem behavior and promoting well-being among adolescents. A 1998 survey of the voting public conducted by the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation showed that 86 percent of respondents favored making safe, daily, after-school programming available to all children. Also, these programs are seen as opportunities for mentoring and other

constructive adult support and guidance to take place—activities that have solid evidence of effectiveness for youth development.

This developing infrastructure for after-school programming has served to expand philanthropic interest and activity. The funders we interviewed indicated that they have targeted their efforts to areas where the need for additional investment is clear. One area is the availability of programs. According to the DOE, in 2000, 40 percent of the federally funded CCLCs reported that they had long waiting lists. Two additional areas of interest are: securing an adequate and diversified funding base for local programs; and research to determine program outcomes.<sup>15</sup> Regarding the other four areas where our respondents are funding initiatives, there are various categorical funding sources at the national and state levels (Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Education, etc.) that can be used to fund activities. However, there is nothing like the dedicated dollars being made available for after-school programming.

### After-School Programming

Foundations at both the national and local levels are playing a key role in helping to develop the infrastructure for after-school programming. For example, at the national level, large foundations like the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation and the Wallace-Reader's Digest Funds, have been critical—the C.S. Mott Foundation for working to develop just about every aspect of after-school programming, but particularly for helping to establish a supportive policy environment; and Wallace-Reader's Digest Funds for supporting the development of after-school program models and funding research.

The C.S. Mott Foundation sees its investment in after-school programming as part of an overall anti-poverty strategy designed to promote community education and community schools. The centerpiece of this investment is a 1998 commitment of \$100 million over seven years in support of the DOE CCLC initiative and other after-school efforts. The C.S. Mott Foundation's role in this public-private partnership has two components. The first is to enhance the quality of local programs through spreading best practices, supporting staff training and conducting research. The C.S. Mott Foundation is co-funding with DOE an evaluation of the CCLC initiative, as well as other quality school-based and school-linked after-school programs. The C.S. Mott Foundation is particularly interested in how to link after-school program participation to specific outcomes—a weakness in this area. The Academy for Educational Development has been funded to develop a website for practitioners to share promising practices. Strategies for improving staff training and the content of program materials are also being developed.

The second component of the C.S. Mott Foundation's role is to support the sustainability of after-school programming through public awareness, communications strategies and policy work. In 2000, the C.S. Mott Foundation granted the Advertising Council \$1.2 million to launch an ad campaign, titled "What is a Hero," to increase public awareness of the need for after-school programs and to provide information about how to start and locally fund them. Work with the Advertising Council will continue over the next

several years. Over the past 18 months, the C.S. Mott Foundation has been working to focus states on the issues of after-school program quality and sustainability.

Over the past decade, the Wallace-Reader's Digest Funds have invested in many efforts to increase out-of-school learning and supported the development of after-school models that created extended-service school programs in many low-income neighborhoods. Included in these efforts has been support to public libraries and urban parks around the country so that they could improve their capacity to provide rich out-of-school learning environments for low-income youth. For example, The Funds started the MOST initiative (Making the Most of Out of School Time), which awarded grants to public and private collaborations in Boston, Chicago and Seattle to develop comprehensive approaches to after-school care for children aged 5 to 14. These grants seeded activity that resulted in sustainable after-care systems in those cities, and provided funding, training and development, and data collection strategies for programs across the country. In 1997, Wallace-Reader's Digest Funds launched the Extended-Service Schools (ESS) Initiative to create 60 extended-service schools in 17 cities across the country. Each city is adapting one of four nationally recognized models that have been successfully implemented in other communities. The ESS models have assisted the development of the DOE's CCLC effort.

Another example of the Funds' investment in after-school efforts is the Public Libraries as Partners in Youth Development (PLPYD) initiative. PLPYD was launched in 1998 and grants totaling \$9.2 million were awarded to nine leading public libraries and the Urban Libraries Council. PLPYD encourages libraries to make their institutions more responsive to youth, and create such innovative opportunities for youth during non-school hours as job training and paid positions that further the mission of the library and the development of youth.

Finally, the Funds' new Parents and Communities for Kids (PACK) initiative grows out of the Funds' experience and learning from its long-standing support of urban parks, libraries and museums, and family literacy, after-school and youth development programming. PACK has two major goals: (1) improve learning outcomes for children ages 6 to 10 through activities outside traditional school; and (2) promote learning as a core community value. Special emphasis will be placed on children with low rates of achievement. Using a combination of program research and communication activities, the Wallace-Reader's Digest Funds will work with organizations in select communities to improve the supply of quality out-of-school learning opportunities for children and families; increase the demand for and participation in such opportunities; and use participation in these activities to help children prepare for successful adulthood.

Local and regional foundations, like the Open Society Institute (OSI) in New York City, and the Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund and The James Irvine Foundation both in the San Francisco Bay area, are making contributions to after-school policy and program infrastructure development in their own localities. OSI, an organization of the Soros Foundation Network, founded The After-School Corporation (TASC) in 1998 with a \$25 million challenge grant per year for five years. In the 2000-2001 academic year, TASC

funded 148 after-school programs, providing recreational and educational activities in New York City and 57 other locations in New York State, and reaching approximately 49,000 students. Although the goal is to operate programs at all school levels, TASC-funded programs are mainly located in elementary schools; after-school programs in middle and high schools have been more difficult to develop. The policy goal of OSI and TASC is to make after-school programming available to all youth throughout New York State and to have the public sector adopt high-quality after-school programming as a primary responsibility. OSI funding has enabled TASC grantees to leverage funds from a variety of sources, including the City of New York and the New York City Board of Education, which to date have provided more than \$40 million in direct and in-kind support. The Governor of New York State announced that \$25 million in state funding would go to after-school programming in 2002. A multiyear evaluation of TASC's after-school initiative is being conducted by Policy Studies Associates (PSA), and funded by the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, The William T. Grant Foundation and Atlantic Philanthropic Services.

The Haas, Jr. Fund sees the support of "neighborhood hubs," like Beacon Schools, as a major piece of its overall youth development funding. Beacon Schools were originally implemented in New York City and are one of the after-school program models that Wallace-Reader's Digest Funds helped to replicate across the country. The Funds began supporting Beacon Schools in 1995 and are now part of a collaborative of more than a dozen funders to provide operating and technical assistance funding for eight centers in San Francisco. Of the San Francisco Beacon Initiative's \$3 million annual budget, approximately 75 percent is contributed by the San Francisco Department of Children, Youth and Their Families, through the Children's Fund, a voter-approved initiative that sets aside a portion of tax revenue for children's services. Remaining funding comes from in-kind contributions (staff, facilities, maintenance, etc.) from the San Francisco Unified School District and private funders. The Haas, Jr. Fund contributes between \$200,000 and \$300,000 annually.

The Funds have also started the Team Up for Sports Initiative, which focuses on youth development through sports. It has contributed \$5 million to the sports initiative since 1999. The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, along with other local funders, partners with the Haas, Jr. Fund in the Team Up initiative.

The James Irvine Foundation's major youth initiative is a nine-year effort called CORAL, or Communities Organizing Resources to Advance Learning. CORAL is in its third year and is being implemented in five cities across California. CORAL provides high-quality after-school programs that include homework help, tutoring, academic enrichment and recreational activities. Its community-building elements include parental engagement and community outreach. The Irvine Foundation works with a lead agency in each community to implement these activities. CORAL targets youth from K-12; however, mostly elementary and middle school youth participate. When high school youth are involved, they participate in community service, leadership opportunities, academic enrichment and mentoring programs. The Irvine Foundation will spend approximately \$87 million on the CORAL effort.

## Leadership

The youth leadership initiatives described to us by national and regional foundations are generally not stand-alone efforts, but components of larger youth development programming. For example, the Irvine Foundation's CORAL project described above includes youth leadership activities, as does the McKnight Foundation's Kids Plus initiative described in the Community-Youth Development section below.

The Ford Foundation describes the goal of its Youth Leadership for Development Initiative as "promoting civic activism as a component of youth development programming." The Ford Foundation's grants in this area, totaling \$23 million over seven years, fund a wide variety of youth development activities, and organizations that include groups and projects run by youth; advocacy organizations attempting to push a national youth policy agenda, like the American Youth Policy Forum and the National Youth Employment Coalition; expanded programming in traditional youth-serving organizations like Settlement Houses, Boys & Girls Clubs and 4-H; and groups providing research and technical support in the youth development field, like Fund for the City of New York and P/PV.

The Burnett Foundation, a family foundation that focuses on the Fort Worth, Texas, area, sees its leadership initiative as slightly more distinct but still strongly connected to its "youth asset development" agenda. Since 1994 The Burnett Foundation has worked on an effort to help communities view youth in a different way—as assets rather than liabilities. The Burnett Foundation brought the Search Institute's 40 Assets model to the city in order to help support youth leadership development. An outgrowth of this effort has been the creation of a public awareness campaign sponsored by the local United Way and the Tarrant County Youth Collaboration, a forum for discussing youth development and policy issues. More than 80 youth-serving agencies and the City of Fort Worth participate.

The Surdna Foundation's Effective Citizenry program is distinct from those described above in that its explicit goal is to "support young people to take direct action to solve serious problems in their schools, neighborhoods and the larger society, and to help build the appropriate infrastructure to support youth action." Currently, the Effective Citizenry program invests \$5 million annually to support direct youth action projects. The program is designed for a wide range of youth—those who are in the upper age range of the 7 to 15 age group, through older youth and young adults. However, the Surdna Foundation has been more successful at funding groups that work with middle and high school youth.

## Health Initiatives

Four foundations with which we spoke specifically focus on health initiatives for youth in the 7 to 15 age group. The Pew Charitable Trusts recently funded a major research and policy initiative aimed at the marketing of alcohol to youth aged 12 to 16. According to the Trusts, this effort is prompted by the lack of attention to alcohol as an illegal

substance used by this population. In 2000, the Polk Bros. Foundation, which funds in Chicago generally around school issues, launched a \$1.6 million (over five years) initiative to expand the number of school-based and school-related health clinics in the city's middle and high schools. As part of this effort, the Polk Bros. Foundation helped to identify adolescent health needs, find space for clinics, and build relationships between health providers and the Board of Education. The clinics are operated in conjunction with local health providers, provide both physical and mental health services, and may receive some Medicaid reimbursement.

The Charles and Helen Schwab Foundation, which funds human services programs in the Northern California area, also funds a national program that specifically focuses on the needs of youth aged 8 to 12 who have learning disabilities. The Schwab Foundation began operating the Learning Differences initiative in 1989 with an investment of \$100,000; in 2001, the initiative budget was \$10 million. Components include an operating program that offers comprehensive resources and guidance to teaching disabled children and their families, primarily through the Internet; and a public awareness campaign coordinated with research and advocacy groups across the country.

In another initiative related to mental health, The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation recently began planning a multidisciplinary research project to improve treatment effectiveness for adolescents. The specific goal is to provide information that increases the number of evidence-based treatments taught in professional programs and used in various care settings, including schools, mental health clinics and the juvenile justice system.

#### Community-Youth Development Initiatives

Community-youth development initiatives are generally place-based efforts that focus on strengthening local supports and developing community-wide activities for young people. They have traditionally had strong citizen and youth involvement, multi-actor collaboration components and broadly defined activities. Often, they have not been substantively defined in advance, which has made them difficult to research and thus difficult to assess as to their effectiveness.

Only three foundations with which we spoke indicated that they are funding major community-youth development initiatives. Some funders that have supported these initiatives in the past, like the Chicago Community Trust and The Annie E. Casey Foundation, have moved on to other areas. The Chicago Community Trust, which funded such an initiative in seven communities over 10 years, admits, "they did not specify up front what success in their initiative should look like or how to evaluate it." They are currently investing heavily in an early childhood effort. The Annie E. Casey Foundation has broadened the focus of its community-based initiatives to include not just youth but whole families.

Two funders supporting community-youth development initiatives are the McKnight Foundation and The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. The McKnight Foundation's

Kids Plus initiative is a good example of this youth development approach. In 1990, the McKnight Foundation created the Northland Foundation to provide regional leadership in northeastern Minnesota and help address the way rural communities view youth. The Northland Foundation created the Kids Plus initiative, which started with 10 communities and has grown to 20. The McKnight Foundation provides financial assistance and the Northland Foundation provides the communities with technical assistance. Activities across the communities include youth-run businesses, peer mediation, teen centers, job services and mentoring. Speak Out for Kids sessions bring young people and adults together to discuss community problems and strategize solutions. Every year, a Kids Plus conference brings together youth from the participating communities to listen to motivational speakers and attend training workshops and special performances.

The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation's Urban Health Initiative (UHI) is a 10-year, \$65 million research demonstration that began in 1995 in five cities: Baltimore, Detroit, Oakland, Philadelphia and Richmond. The goal is to determine whether local collaboratives of public and private agencies can improve the health and safety of young people aged 5 to 14 in the target cities.

In keeping with the kind of programmatic flexibility often seen in these initiatives, the UHI cities all take a different approach to addressing the issues facing young people, although each is implementing strategies to reduce violence, substance abuse and early sexual activity, and to increase school attendance and academic performance. Communications and advocacy campaigns that focus on increasing public awareness of youth health and safety issues are key components of each local effort; and a goal of the UHI is for each site to work with local public-sector and private-sector officials to improve systems that affect youth's health and safety. Through a national, multiyear evaluation being carried out by the Center for Health and Public Service Research, UHI collects baseline and social trends information for the five UHI cities, as well as comparison cities, and they plan to track these trends through 2005.

### Supporting Infrastructure Development

Only three foundations talked with us about initiatives specifically designed to support the capacity of youth development institutions. This hardly reflects the overall support of foundations for strong youth organizations, especially the name-brand youth institutions that, as mentioned earlier, have benefited from the attention to youth development over the past decade. However, only The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, the Wallace-Reader's Digest Funds and the Albert and Bessie Mae Kronkosky Foundation (which funds in Texas) talked of initiatives specifically dedicated to this purpose.

The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation's (EMCF) work embodies an entirely new approach to its grantmaking that it calls *institution field building*. This approach calls for the foundation to help a small number of youth-serving nonprofit organizations grow stronger so they can serve larger numbers of young people in low-income communities with high-quality programs that operate during non-school hours. The EMCF's institution and field-building work is exclusively focused on the youth development field

and, by the end of 2003, will become its sole program area. So far, EMCF has made substantial multiyear investments ranging from \$1.23 million to \$5.75 million in five local youth-serving nonprofits in Boston and one in New York City. All the organizations are implementing business plans designed to strengthen and expand their operations. In addition, EMCF has made large, multiyear investments in Big Brothers Big Sisters of America (\$4 million) and Boys & Girls Clubs of America (\$5 million) to help these two national youth-serving organizations develop and implement business plans that will greatly increase their ability to meet the needs of more youth around the country.

The Albert and Bessie Mae Kronkosky Foundation's Youth-Serving Initiative is much smaller than EMCF's, but has similar objectives. In 2000, the Kronkosky Foundation implemented a \$2.3 million initiative to help eight youth-serving institutions expand the number of youth active in their programs. This effort resulted from a roundtable discussion with several youth-serving agencies about the barriers they face in attracting and retaining new youth participants. Each agency will receive \$250,000 over three years to develop new programming and outreach strategies, and recruit adult volunteers. The agencies participating are the Boy and Girl Scouts, YM/YWCA, Boys & Girls Clubs, Big Brothers Big Sisters of America, and 4-H. As part of this initiative, a common evaluation plan is under development to enable the agencies to assess the success of each of their programs and compare the results with those of other participating agencies.

The Wallace-Reader's Digest Funds were the initial funder of the National BEST (Building Exemplary Systems of Training for Youth Workers) Initiative, which was developed to provide a delivery strategy for an exemplary youth worker training initiative developed by the Academy of Educational Development (AED). The Funds invested more than \$2 million in grants to help 15 youth organizations around the country become resources to local youth-serving sectors by offering training in youth development principles, concepts and practices; certificate and degree programs in youth development through partnerships with higher education institutions; and professional networking opportunities. AED will release an evaluation of the BEST Initiative in 2002 and is continuing to carry out youth worker training based on this effort.

### Other Efforts

It seems important to mention efforts by two other foundations that do not fall neatly into the above groupings. The first is an initiative that is part of The William T. Grant Foundation's strategy for "helping society value youth as a resource." The Grant Foundation is attempting to build the youth development field through evidence and research, something key actors in the field agree is needed. This initiative provides support for research related to three themes: (1) understanding the process of youth development; (2) understanding how social systems affect youth; and (3) understanding how the public views youth. The youth development research explores how families and other social environments affect youth, with particular emphasis on the effects of race/ethnicity, culture, class and the immigrant experience. The research and analysis of social systems, programs and policies will look at the effects on youth of the current

education, health, welfare and juvenile justice systems, as well as youth development efforts. Research on how the public views youth will focus on how particular groups of adults (policymakers, corporate leaders, etc.) view youth and how evidence-based approaches can influence adult views and actions. Specific strategies will include developing communications to influence adults' attitudes and behavior regarding youth, and developing positive indicators of youth health and well-being.

The second initiative is the Carnegie Corporation of New York's Schools for a New Society initiative. Strictly speaking, this is a school-reform effort and falls beyond the scope of this paper. Over the next five years, in cooperation with the Gates Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation will invest approximately \$60 million in the reform of urban high schools and another \$30 million to reform teacher education. This initiative is included here because the Carnegie Corporation does not view this effort as strictly "school reform," but an opportunity to apply its past youth development work in a school context. The design of the new high school will center on such youth development principles as youth voice, youth resiliency and using the whole community as a learning environment.

Interviews with foundations show that there is significant initiative activity in the 7 to 15 age group category. However, with the exception of after-school programming, where there is a great deal of public support and a developing infrastructure, activity is not as focused around common goals as it is in the early childhood area. There appears to be *some* common interest in the issues of health and youth leadership; there is little consensus about the definition of youth leadership programming.

#### THE 16 TO 24 AGE GROUP

Only eight of the 42 foundations we interviewed are investing in initiatives for the 16 to 24 age group. This lack of activity does not mean that the philanthropic community has no concern for or interest in this population. Most of the foundations with whom we spoke are aware of the difficulties faced by this age group and agree, "something must be done." In 2000, a time of unprecedented prosperity in this country, more than four million youth between the ages of 16 and 24 were neither working nor in school.<sup>16</sup> Currently, 25 percent are estimated to be parents.<sup>17</sup> Each year, more than 20,000 teens leave the foster-care system with little transitional support.<sup>18</sup> In 1997, approximately 350,000 young men between the ages of 18 and 24 were inmates in federal and state prisons and local jails. Among these inmates, young men with limited education and from minority groups were vastly over-represented.<sup>19</sup> Further, the population of 16- to 24-year-olds is expected to grow at an above-average rate over the next decade. Much of the increase will be among blacks, Latinos and young immigrants, the very groups that are presently having the most difficulty making it in our society.<sup>20</sup>

However, it was clear throughout this survey that many foundations are responding to the state of the youth *field*, rather than to youth's needs, when making decisions about where they can have the most significant impact and, therefore, where to make major investments. Federal funding for the 16 to 24 age group has significantly declined over

the past decade, especially from the U.S. Department of Labor, after weak results for out-of-school older youth from a number of demonstration initiatives during the 1980s, and from a major national impact study of the Job Training Partnership Act completed in the early 1990s. Public support for a few program areas targeting this population has not offset this overall decline. The most significant public funding for this age group rests in the \$1.3 billion Job Corps and in the Youth Conservation Service Corps, which dot the country—both have shown reasonably positive impacts. YouthBuild has also received significant federal and foundation funds; over the past five years, funding to the organization from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development increased from \$20 million to \$65 million.

The National Center for Children and Poverty reports growing interest at the state level in fatherhood initiatives that include this age group. But they also report that most of this interest is driven by the availability of federal dollars through welfare reform and child support enforcement legislation, rather than by a desire to promote a view of fathers as nurturing, economically responsible family members.<sup>21</sup>

This lack of public investment led to a significant decline in the number and capacity of programs and institutions that serve this group; and the inability to point to strategies that “work” for this population has hampered advocacy groups’ efforts to mount a campaign for public support. In fact, public opinion polls have documented that the general public’s views about the behavior of teens and young adults (with regard to crime, sexual activity and early parenting, and educational achievement) are far more negative than the reality. Reflecting on the landscape for 16- to 24-year-olds, one foundation officer said, “there is just no political will in this country to do anything for older youth right now.” Others stated that they have been convinced that age 16 is just “too late to start.”

The foundations that do have major initiatives that include older youth and young adults are mainly major national funders. Their work can be divided into the following categories: juvenile justice, education, training and employment, foster care transition, parenting and health. Some of these initiatives have significant research and policy components. Those dealing with juvenile justice focus on the younger end of this age range (16 to 18) and may include youth who are as young as 14.

### Juvenile Justice

Four funders focusing on juvenile justice are The Annie E. Casey Foundation (AECF), the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, The William Penn Foundation and the Eckerd Foundation. AECF has long had an interest in juvenile justice issues that affect poor minority youth. Their Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) began in 1994 in four states— Illinois, Oregon, New York and California—with a goal of reducing overcrowding in juvenile detention centers and improving conditions for youth who remain in confinement. Over the years, JDAI has developed an array of training and screening tools that help communities avoid placing youth who have committed less serious offenses in unsuitable detention centers, and provide community-based alternatives. Preliminary evaluation of the initiative by the National Council on Crime

and Delinquency indicates that three of the target states have achieved substantial reductions in admissions to secure detention centers and increased the availability of alternatives to detention for low- to moderate-risk youth. While formal funding for the initiative ended in 1999, three sites are being funded to develop replication strategies, and a series of reports on ways to extend the lessons of this effort have been produced.

The MacArthur Foundation is working with a multidisciplinary research network to address the issues of adolescent development and juvenile justice. Its goal is to help policymakers and practitioners gain a greater understanding of the adolescent development process, and thus to make better decisions regarding the competency of young people to participate in their own defense when sent to the adult system, and the supports youth need after release. The MacArthur Foundation is also exploring working on juvenile justice system reform in three to four states around the country. Funding for the research network and system reform efforts will be approximately \$6 million per year for the next five years. The MacArthur Foundation is seeking funding partners for both of these juvenile justice initiatives.

The William Penn Foundation has been a key partner in funding the Youth Violence Reduction Project (YVRP) in Philadelphia. The purpose of the YVRP is to develop and promote a comprehensive system that will identify and intervene with youth who are at highest risk of engaging in acts of violence. YVRP, which is a collaboration between law enforcement and youth-serving agencies, has three key elements: the intensive supervision of targeted youth by police and probation; links for youth to supportive services both inside and outside their communities; and expedited prosecution of targeted youth who are arrested for violent crimes. The initiative was piloted in the two Philadelphia police districts with the highest youth violent crime rates and has served approximately 550 youth. In July 2002, the YVRP was expanded to include an additional police district; by 2005, the city of Philadelphia intends to expand the initiative to the six police districts with the highest youth violent crime rates.

The Eckerd Foundation is working on two juvenile justice strategies. First, it is in the process of developing a grantmaking strategy for improving aftercare for youth released from the juvenile justice system. It has just completed a scan of aftercare programs across the country to determine “what works” and will base its effort on the results. Second, the Eckerd Foundation has created a separate organization called Eckerd Youth Alternatives, which operates therapeutic wilderness youth programs in seven states. Youth are sent to these programs by state juvenile justice agencies either as alternatives to confinement or for aftercare.

### Education, Training and Work

In 1995, The Annie E. Casey Foundation (AECF) established the Jobs Initiative, an eight-year, \$30 million effort designed to help disadvantaged job seekers find jobs that enable them to support families, obtain health benefits and build careers. The initiative is operated by a “development intermediary” in five communities across the county, including Milwaukee, New Orleans, Philadelphia, Seattle and St. Louis. While the target

group for the initiative is 18- to 35-year-olds, approximately 30 percent of participants have been between 18 and 25 years old. In addition to employment services, participants receive a mix of “hard” and “soft” skills training and support services. As of March 2000, the Jobs Initiative had placed close to 10,000 individuals in jobs and engaged more than 1,700 employers. AECF sees the Jobs Initiative as not just a jobs project, but also a long-term systems reform effort that will promote large-scale change in the local workforce development systems and regional labor markets where it is being implemented. Abt Associates and the New School University, along with local researchers in each community, are evaluating the effort.

The Ford Foundation and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation are both planning new initiatives that will focus on helping disadvantaged adult learners, including older youth and young adults, get the education and training they need to be productive members of society. The Ford Foundation’s four-year, \$7 million effort, called the Workforce Education and Development Initiative, is designed to improve the capacity of community colleges to work with this population. The initiative will include research on strategies to increase the enrollment and program completion of young adult and adult learners; efforts to understand and develop supports for minority and immigrant students; and efforts to influence policymakers regarding the role that community colleges can play in academic and career advancement. This year, The Ford Foundation will also complete a six-year community service initiative, whose goal is to promote the active participation of young people in community and national service. This effort is mentioned here because community service, particularly as it involves poor youth, is often used as a work-preparation strategy. Funding for this initiative covered research on service policy issues; technical assistance and other support to service-learning and AmeriCorps programs (including those in rural areas and in Native American communities); and the dissemination of information about national and community service. The Ford Foundation is currently considering how to continue its work in this area.

The Kellogg Foundation is searching for innovative options for how to work with youth aged 14 to 24. In planning its new initiative, *New Options for Youth Through Engaged Institutions*, it is looking at vulnerable youth in three categories: (1) youth who are college bound and in need of resources and support; (2) youth who do not want to go to college and need skills and connections to further education or the labor market; and (3) youth who are or have been connected to institutions, like the foster-care and justice systems, and need transitional support. The Kellogg Foundation is especially interested in involving institutions of higher education in the development and implementation of *New Options* strategies.

The C.S. Mott Foundation is doing a significant amount of work in the area of alternative education through its Educational Opportunities for Vulnerable Youth Initiative, which focuses on improving educational programming for high school youth, particularly those in second-chance systems. The strategy has three elements: (1) investments in promising practices and programs, such as *twi-lite* and community-based organization schools, and other efforts to link high-quality alternative education models with secondary education; (2) state-level policy and advocacy work to be carried out by the Youth Law Center

including development of state policies to increase educational programming for youth in the juvenile justice, child welfare and other systems; and (3) strengthening the field by building the capacity of national youth organizations ( i.e., YouthBuild and National Youth Employment Coalition) to better advocate for and serve vulnerable, older youth.

### Parenting

As mentioned at the beginning of this section, it is estimated that approximately 25 percent of youth aged 16 to 24 are parents; therefore, any initiative that targets this age group is likely to include a significant number of young people who have children. However, only three of the foundations with which we spoke were specifically targeting these youth—mothers *and* fathers—because of their parental status. Each is taking a different approach to the issue.

With the public sector attention to young, noncustodial fathers growing because of welfare reform, a few of the foundations with which we spoke are investing in fatherhood programs. The C.S. Mott Foundation, which funded fatherhood work a decade ago, came back to the area in 2000, with the \$10 million Fathers At Work initiative. This initiative is being implemented in six sites to address persistent barriers to employment for young, low-income, noncustodial fathers. The C.S. Mott Foundation's effort is unusual in its focus on employment, since most foundation-funded fatherhood programs and initiatives have tended *not* to focus on job development but rather on field-building. AECF, which has been a leading funder of fatherhood initiatives over the past decade, continues to emphasize advocacy and public education, and building support networks among organizations.

The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation's interest in young parents appears connected to its concern for the well-being of unborn and young children. The Nurse Home Visiting and Children's Futures programs (both described above under health initiatives for children aged 0 to 6) target young parents as well as children. Goals of the Nurse Home Visiting program include helping young mothers and fathers care for their children, continue their educations and find jobs. Children's Futures, designed to improve the health of young children in Trenton, New Jersey, includes parent education and a specific component for strengthening and sustaining the involvement of fathers.

### Health

A few foundations fund health initiatives that target a wide age range of youth, including older youth. Most prominent among them is The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJ). (See the next section below, Initiatives Targeting a Wide Age Range of Youth.) RWJ is the only foundation with which we spoke that has developed a major health effort specifically targeted to youth in the 16 to 24 population. RWJ is funding a 10-site, 15-year effort to develop comprehensive approaches to reducing high-risk drinking by students on college campuses and in the surrounding communities. Harvard University is conducting the evaluation.

## Foster-Care Transition

In 1999, Congress passed the Foster Care Independence Act, which provides states with greater flexibility in carrying out programs designed to help youth make the transition from foster care to self-sufficiency. Since that time, the foster-care transition issue has begun to receive more attention in foundation circles. A number of foundations told us that they consider youth transition from foster care a very significant issue in the youth field. In fact, while not funding big initiatives, some directly fund programs for youth transitioning from the foster-care system. Based on our survey, only The Annie E. Casey Foundation (AECF) and Casey Family Programs are involved in a major initiative. Casey Family Programs is a direct service operating foundation with foster care at its core. Among its services is supporting youth who are making the transition from foster care to independent adulthood. In 2001, The AECF and Casey Family Programs jointly funded the Jim Casey Youth Opportunities Initiative, designed to improve outcomes for young people who are about to leave or who have left the foster-care system. The \$18 million, three-year effort will support the development of effective policies and practices to help adolescents in foster care make successful transitions to adulthood. Gary Stangler, the former secretary of the Missouri Department of Social Services, is the initiative's director.

The initiatives being funded by the eight foundations above are certainly addressing critical issues facing the 16 to 24 age group. However, the fact that only nine of the 42 foundations we surveyed were specifically targeting this population seems to indicate less interest and engagement in this age range than in the other two age groups.

### INITIATIVES TARGETING A WIDE AGE RANGE OF YOUTH

We found four foundations—The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, the Dyson Foundation, the California Wellness Foundation and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation—that are funding initiatives targeting youth across a wide age range. All but one of these initiatives is health related.

Not surprisingly, The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJ), which specializes in health issues, dominates this area with 12 initiatives concerning insurance coverage for poor children, including those with families affected by welfare reform; pediatric injury prevention; the establishment of school-based health clinics; improving pediatric asthma care; improving substance abuse care for at-risk youth, including those in the juvenile justice system; and reducing under-age drinking. These initiatives cover youth aged 0 to 25. RWJ is investing more than \$200 million in these efforts.

In 2000, the Dyson Foundation in New York began implementing the Community Pediatrics Training Initiative. Its purpose is to encourage departments of pediatrics to create residency training programs to help pediatricians develop greater skill, interest and commitment to community-based medicine and the well-being of children and adolescents in the communities they serve. The initiative has funded 10 sites to develop new curricula, training models and methods that emphasize community-based pediatrics

and advocacy. The total budget for the effort is approximately \$31 million. Children's Hospital in Boston is coordinating the initiative.

The California Wellness Foundation (CWF) makes grants for health promotion, wellness education and disease prevention. While CWF generally focuses on the wellness, including mental health of the "whole community," two of its priority areas are youth violence and teen pregnancy prevention. The overall goal of the violence prevention area is to improve the health of Californians by reducing violence against youth across the state. Since youth are disproportionately represented as victims of violence, this effort focuses on adolescents and young adults up to the age of 24. Grants support conflict resolution programs, domestic violence prevention, peer mediation and school-based violence prevention efforts. An accompanying media campaign communicates the message that youth violence is not just a criminal justice issue but also a community health issue. Public education campaigns inform policymakers and opinion leaders about the effects of violence on public health, and the kinds of local and state policies necessary to generate resources for youth violence prevention measures.

The purpose of CWF's Teen Pregnancy Initiative is to decrease the incidence of teen pregnancies by increasing the proportion of teens who delay the initiation of sexual activity and/or use contraception. In this initiative, grants are made to organizations that provide outreach activities for reproductive health care, sexuality education, access to contraception, counseling and male involvement programs. Emphasis is placed on organizations that serve high-risk, sexually active and underserved teen populations. As with the Violence Prevention initiative, public policy and communication campaigns are key elements. A media campaign, developed to influence policymakers and public opinion leaders, disseminates information about the need for comprehensive sex education, the economic costs of teen pregnancies and effective prevention efforts. Another public relations campaign, titled "Get Real," sends the message that teenage sexuality is a reality that cannot be ignored and that teen pregnancy is as much a problem for adults as it is for teens.

The W.K. Kellogg Foundation's ENLACE (Engaging Latino Communities for Education) initiative is a multiyear effort to strengthen the educational pipeline, and increase opportunities for Latinos to enter and complete college. The planned six-year, \$28 million effort was launched in 1997 and is being implemented through 13 community-level partnerships among Latino organizations in seven states. The local collaboratives are charged with organizing and providing academic and social supports for Latino youth from day care through college. The initiative also works at the national, state and local levels to advocate for more resources for Latino youth-serving organizations.

## FAMILY AND COMMUNITY

Ten foundations, seven of which operate nationally, responded that they are funding initiatives that involve a focus on families and/or communities, but do not center *only* on children and youth. Initiatives that primarily target families include those that (1) attempt

to address family stability and child welfare supporting foster families, adoptive families and the reunification of children with natural family members; (2) connect families to a variety of community, economic and social supports; and (3) support family economic independence. Those primarily focusing on communities include broad community improvement efforts and endeavors that attempt to build the capacity and participation of local institutions, including faith-based groups, in poor communities. Often in these initiatives, the issues of family and community intersect.

It is not easy to talk about an overall infrastructure or policy context for these types of initiatives. Generally speaking, there is no well-defined field related to family and/or community efforts. Initiatives officially called “family support programs” are usually child focused and considered part of the early childhood infrastructure. Some would argue that there is a community-building field, but there are definitional problems and it is often not clear which community-based efforts should be included. At the same time, several of these initiatives are attempting to influence national and state policies with regard to families and communities. A number are described below.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation’s (AECF) and The Grable Foundation’s efforts are focused on family stability and child welfare. AECF’s Family to Family initiative was originally designed in 1992 in response to the growing number of children in this country being placed in the child welfare system. That number has continued to grow—from 260,000 in the 1980s to 550,000 in 2000.<sup>22</sup> Family to Family works with states and communities to help redesign their foster-care systems to become more neighborhood-based, culturally sensitive and located primarily in the communities where the children live. The overall goals of the initiative are to reduce reliance on institutional care for children who must be removed from their homes; increase the number and quality of foster families; reduce the overall number of children in out-of-home care and reunify children with their families as soon as safely possible; and involve foster-care families as team members in family reunification efforts. Family to Family has been field-tested in five states: Alabama, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Ohio and Maryland. Currently, several additional states, counties and cities across the country are planning to implement the initiative.

The Grable Foundation is also working to change child welfare policy and practice. However, they are focusing specifically in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, where the foundation is located. The Grable Foundation began the Allegheny County Juvenile Court Hearing Officer Initiative in 1998 in response to the passage of the national Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) in 1997. Provisions of ASFA require and provide incentives for states to change policies and practices to promote children’s adoption, their safe return to their homes, or other permanent options.

The Grable Foundation initiative was designed to promote permanent placement for dependent children residing in foster care by increasing judicial resources for juvenile dependency cases, and instituting procedures that allow for the in-depth review and close judicial monitoring of each case. The result has been a decrease in the total number of children residing in out-of-home placements and an increase in adoptions. While this

Grable Foundation-sponsored initiative officially ended in 2000, it is being continued by the Allegheny County Juvenile Court system and is recognized as a national model for the effective implementation of the Adoption and Safe Families Act.

AECF's Making Connections initiative is an excellent example of an effort that attempts to connect families to a variety of supports. Launched in 1999, Making Connections is based on AECF's significant experience with comprehensive community initiatives and represents their intention to make long-term substantial investments in communities in 22 cities around the country. The emphasis will be on "family strengthening and neighborhood transformation."

This effort will work with states, localities and neighborhoods to mediate the effects of large, public bureaucracies, and make resources and opportunities more available to vulnerable families—labor market opportunities, savings and asset accumulation, and access to social services and social networks will be key components. Casey Family Services, a direct operating unit of the AECF, whose mission is supporting needy families, is a critical partner with the Making Connections initiative in target communities.

The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation and The Rockefeller Foundation have major initiatives in the area of family economic independence, both of which are attempting to influence national policy. In 2000, the C.S. Mott Foundation provided the Council of Michigan Foundations a \$1 million grant to help form the Michigan Individual Development Account (IDA) Partnership. The Council is developing this \$10 million project in conjunction with the State of Michigan's Family Independence Agency (FIA). The effort is expected to provide 2,000 low-income Michigan families with the opportunity to establish Individual Retirement Accounts (IRAs). The resulting nest egg from these matched savings can be applied to a down payment on a house, to start a business or to pay education expenses. The C.S. Mott Foundation sees this effort as an opportunity to do "field building" in this area and to influence not only state but also national policy. The Michigan IDA Partnership will enable nonprofit community organizations to develop and manage regional IDA programs and, through its relationship with the state's FIA, also serve as a model for effective use of federal welfare funds.

The Rockefeller Foundation's Working Communities Initiative combines family economic development *and* community economic development. The goal of this initiative is to transform poor, urban communities into communities that work for poor families, by increasing the amount and quality of employment, improving the quality of schools, and increasing the influence and voice of poor residents. The Rockefeller Foundation believes that employment and the participation of poor families in developing solutions to community problems are particularly strong levers for changing communities. Approximately \$25 million annually is invested in this area. Grants are made to a number of organizations working toward policy change, developing advocacy strategies, implementing workforce development models and conducting research on a variety of related issues. For example, The Rockefeller Foundation supports the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, which monitors how federal policies and budget

allocations affect low-income families; Community Voices Heard, which does grassroots organizing and outreach among low-income families to encourage their participation in policy debates related to welfare reform and job creation; the Chicago Jobs Council, which provides capacity-building assistance to job training service providers; and the National Council of La Raza, to conduct research and outreach activities on the economic conditions of Latino families in the U.S.

With regard to initiatives that focus primarily on communities, The Wallace-Reader's Digest Funds recently created a new Communities Program to investigate how the interests of public parks, libraries, schools, youth-serving and cultural organizations in poor communities intersect. The Funds are interested in exploring a strategy of coordinated investments in these institutions in a select group of cities. Their ultimate goal is to ensure that a range of institutions within a city can support and increase high-quality learning opportunities for all family members.

The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation and The John S. and James L. Knight Foundation are involved in broad-based community initiatives that closely resemble the wide-ranging, community-youth development efforts described above. Both have very broad goals, and the individual target communities determine the issues they want to address and strategies they will use.

Although The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation (EMCF) is a national funder, its Neighborhood Partners Initiative (NPI) supports a variety of improvements in living conditions in four Central Harlem and South Bronx neighborhoods. NPI, which ends in 2003, has worked with lead agencies in each neighborhood to help them work toward community-defined goals in the areas of crime reduction, employment, housing and other quality-of-life issues. As the initiative draws to a close, EMCF is primarily focusing on assisting the lead agencies in building additional capacity and sustaining their work after the initiative ends. The Chapin Hall Center for Children is conducting the evaluation. As EMCF ends its community initiative, The Knight Foundation begins its Community Partners Program, whose goal is to "improve the quality of life in 26 communities where the Knight brothers owned newspapers." Through a local advisory committee, each community will define its own priorities around the following issues: education, housing, social services to children and families, citizen engagement, cultural life, and positive human relationships.

The area of community-level, faith-based programming has received increasing attention over the past few years, mainly as a result of federal interest. Shortly after the 2000 election, the Bush Administration opened an office of faith-based programming, and over the past two years the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) has awarded P/PV more than \$4 million to support these efforts nationwide. A number of foundations across the country are funding faith-based programs; however, only two of the funders with which we spoke—The Ford Foundation and, on the local level, the New York Community Trust—have invested in major initiatives.

Generally, faith-based programs are thought of as efforts to increase supports for families and youth—particularly high-risk youth who are not attracted to (or attractive to) other community programs. Certainly, The Ford Foundation’s Faith-Based Interventions for High-Risk Youth initiative has a youth focus. However, The Ford Foundation’s initiative has a larger community development purpose—to help strengthen the capacity of faith institutions in poor communities so they can play a more active role in strengthening the community fabric. The Ford Foundation’s more than \$7 million investment (over seven years) supports a number of intermediaries that provide direct support for faith-operated youth development programming, and help build the human and organizational resources of faith institutions. In particular, The Ford Foundation funds P/PV to provide technical assistance support in financial and administrative record keeping, and local collaboration development, to a variety of faith-based programs around the country. The Ford Foundation (along with other funders) is also supporting P/PV in its evaluation of the effectiveness of these faith-based approaches.

The New York Community Trust is a key partner, along with other public and private institutions in New York, in the Black Church Project. The three-year effort began in 2000, and is supporting the efforts of 40 churches in high-need communities to increase their stability and capacity to provide social services.

As mentioned above, the family and community area does not actually constitute a field and the initiatives represented here are only loosely related. However, the foundations doing work in this area are major funders that have the ability to influence the larger children, youth and family field. Therefore, close attention should be paid to investments in this area.

### **III. CONCLUSIONS**

The 42 foundations we surveyed certainly do not include all the funders doing work with children, youth and families. However, the survey does include foundations of various sizes, approaches to funding, and those operating at the national level or in specific areas of the country. Therefore, we believe the initiatives covered here are a fair representation of the philanthropic landscape in the children, youth and families area. This landscape not only points to a significant amount of activity, it also indicates areas of opportunity for additional philanthropic investment—opportunities to build on and strengthen important current efforts; or help develop necessary infrastructure in areas with promising programming and policy importance or significant need.

Clearly, there is a great deal of momentum in the foundation world in the early childhood area, particularly around the issues of child care and school readiness. This momentum is bolstered by sound research and focused, for the most part, on specific goals. Given the data about the significant lack of quality child care for children aged 0 to 6, particularly if they are poor, there is undoubtedly room for additional foundation investment. For funders interested in developing child care initiatives, there are a number of examples in this report, either being planned or under way. These initiatives (The Pew Charitable Trusts, The Ford Foundation, the Howard Heinz Endowment Fund, the Miriam and Peter

Haas Fund, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, and the David and Lucile Packard Foundation) point to ways in which foundation dollars can be used as incentives to promote additional public and private investment in quality, center-based and home-based care and early education. The issue of improving pediatric care, either through home visiting or improving physician training, appears to be gaining interest among a small number of the foundations we interviewed. Additional foundation investment in this area could provide more opportunities for efforts that address the needs of young children *and* young parents. Despite the current policy interest in young fathers, this survey showed few foundations funding initiatives for young parents.

There is also a great deal of initiative activity in the 7 to 15 age group. However, as stated several times in this report, this activity lacks the focus and purposefulness of the early childhood area. The exception here is after-school programming, where major, national foundations (Charles Stewart Mott Foundation and Wallace-Reader's Digest Funds) have taken the lead in helping to develop programming and policy relevance. Regional and local foundations across the country are following suit. Additional philanthropic investment in research to help identify the most effective program models would seem particularly useful and could be a catalyst for increasing public and private sector support.

In conducting this survey, we heard about other programmatic initiatives for this age group (i.e., leadership, health, community youth development programming, etc.) that do not currently have sound evidence of effectiveness or major policy interest. Foundations interested in these types of projects might consider connecting them to the after-school programming movement. The Polk Bros. Foundation's work (in Chicago) connecting school health clinics with after-school programming is an example. Wallace-Reader's Digest Funds' new effort, which ties a community-wide youth development approach *directly* to the way youth use their out-of-school time, is another strategy that funders might note.

Another promising area for additional foundation investment in this age group could be increased capacity development for youth development organizations so that they can increase their ability to serve adolescents, especially those at the upper range of this age group and particularly at risk. The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation's work, of investing in name-brand (and possibly other less-known, but well-run) youth organizations is a good example. Strengthening these groups that serve youth in neighborhoods across the country can only assist in advancing the youth development field. The public and private sectors have already shown their support for such organizations, and continued foundation investment in their capacity could help to sustain that support. The Wallace-Reader's Digest Funds' support of youth worker training also provides an excellent example for foundations aiming to invest in an area where the youth field agrees there is serious need.

The 16 to 24 age group presents the foundation world with a very tough issue, given the limited infrastructure for and positive policy interest in this area. According to our findings, few foundations, mostly large national groups with long-time interest in this

population, are conducting major work with this age group. Foundations interested in funding key initiatives for older youth will find only a few levers on which to hang new work. There are obviously a number of areas of need and some areas that appear to be good candidates for exploration and additional philanthropic investment. One general area is public relations and advocacy. Given the ambivalent view that the public seems to have of teens and publicly funded initiatives to support them, investment in public relations and communications strategies to help paint a more balanced picture could be useful to the field. The William T. Grant Foundation's work in investigating and developing strategies to change particular groups of adults' views of adolescents might provide ideas for additional efforts.

Another general area of investment in the 16 to 24 population could be supporting mainstream institutions' capacity to attract and serve this group. Selected Boys & Girls Clubs have begun to experiment with strategies for recruiting and serving older and high-risk youth and P/PV's evaluation of these efforts indicates that they are having positive results. This work is being supported by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Interested foundations could help spread this innovation throughout the Boys & Girls Clubs network or to other strong youth organizations interested in increasing their abilities to address critical community-level issues. Community-based faith institutions are another mainstream group that many believe have the potential to attract older, high-risk youth who do not participate in other programs. Currently, there is also federal interest in the ability of faith institutions to work with troubled youth and some resources available to increase their capacity to take on that role. Helping to support the development of faith institutions willing to take on this work might represent an area of opportunity for foundations seeking to invest where there is at least some indication of policy interest.

During our survey, several foundations indicated interest in the issues of juvenile justice and foster-care transition, mainly due to the number of youth involved in those systems. However, few have funded major initiatives, though there is some promising work going on around the country in these two areas. Foundation investment in identifying, strengthening and expanding such efforts would be an important contribution to the field. In the juvenile justice area, The Annie E. Casey Foundation and The William Penn Foundation's work indicates that justice officials are often willing to experiment with new approaches if they have the potential to address issues of prison overcrowding, violence prevention and recidivism. In this survey, we heard of only one major initiative—by Casey Family Programs—to address the critical issue of foster-care transition. With federal support available through the Foster Care Independence Act, some states might welcome additional investment by the philanthropic sector to improve and expand their foster-care transition programs.

With the number of youth and young adults in this age group who are neither in school nor working, the area of education and employment preparation is a critical one, and sorely lacking in new ideas and inspired leadership from either the public or foundation sectors. In spite of the magnitude of the problem, only a few foundations in our survey (The Annie E. Casey Foundation, The Ford Foundation, W.K. Kellogg Foundation and

Charles Stewart Mott Foundation) have major initiatives in this area. There are no safe bets here, but given the landscape there are a few areas that additional funders might consider. One such area is youth service. President Bush has called for the expansion of AmeriCorps, which could mean openness on the part of the federal government to partnering with foundations on key youth service efforts. It could also mean that this a good time for foundations to explore traditional youth service corps as a youth education and employment preparation strategy. Youth service corps have been around for a number of years and in a number of locations. They tend to attract, and have shown good results, with high-risk youth. These service corps could use support to strengthen their program models, especially their education components, and to increase their visibility in what could become a pro-service environment. The Ford Foundation has funded a fair amount of program and research work in the youth service area, so information about implementation strategies and effectiveness is available. The Ford Foundation has also indicated some interest in continuing this work.

Another area that needs exploration is how to better connect poor youth to career and labor market opportunities. The youth unemployment data show that this is a critical need; and the experience of schools and most youth programs indicates neither of these institutions are doing an adequate job in this area. Yet none of the foundations we interviewed are directly addressing the issue. Foundations might consider exploring strategies that have the potential of involving the business sector in career education for poor youth. Similarly, the country's high school dropout rates indicate the need for testing new ideas in the area of alternative education. The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation is doing pioneering work in this area, but there is plenty of room for other interested funders.

Initiatives that target young fathers are another area where additional foundation support could be useful. There are numerous programs already in existence around the country as well as a growing interest in this population from states due to welfare reform. One approach might be identifying and helping to strengthen the most promising programs, particularly in the area of employment or developing new fatherhood programs with an employment focus. The C.S. Mott Foundation's fatherhood initiative might prove a promising model.

In the family and community area, there is significant need for research to determine the effectiveness of community-building approaches (including the use of faith institutions for this purpose) or those that target whole families. In particular, however, the idea of IDAs for poor families seems an intriguing endeavor for foundations to consider, especially if it is developed (as is the case in The C.S. Mott Foundation's Michigan Individual Development Account Partnership) in partnership with states as an innovative way to use federal welfare funds.

## APPENDIX A: FOUNDATIONS INCLUDED IN SURVEY

### **Helen Bader Foundation, Inc.**

233 N. Water St., 4th Fl.  
Milwaukee, WI 53202  
Telephone: (414) 224-6464  
FAX: (414) 224-1441  
E-mail: [info@hbf.org](mailto:info@hbf.org)  
URL: <http://www.hbf.org>

### **The Burnett Foundation**

(Formerly The Burnett-Tandy Foundation)  
801 Cherry St., Unit 16, Ste. 1585  
Forth, TX 76102  
Telephone: (817) 877-3344  
FAX: (817) 338-0448  
E-mail: [burnettfdn@aol.com](mailto:burnettfdn@aol.com)

### **The California Wellness Foundation**

6320 Canoga Ave., Suite 1700  
Woodland Hills, CA 91367  
Telephone: (818) 593-6600  
FAX: (818) 593-6614  
E-mail: [www.tcwf.org](http://www.tcwf.org)

### **Carnegie Corp. of New York**

437 Madison Avenue  
New York, NY 10022  
Telephone: (212) 371-3200  
FAX: (212) 753-0395  
URL: <http://www.carnegie.org>

### **The Annie E. Casey Foundation**

701 St. Paul St.  
Baltimore, MD 21202  
Telephone: (410) 547-6600  
FAX: (410) 547-6624  
E-mail: [webmail@aecf.org](mailto:webmail@aecf.org)  
URL: <http://www.aecf.org>

### **The Chicago Community Trust**

111 East Wacker Drive, Suite 1400  
Chicago, IL 60601  
Telephone: (312) 616-8000  
FAX: (312) 616-7955  
E-mail: [info@cct.org](mailto:info@cct.org)

### **The Cleveland Foundation**

1422 Euclid Ave., Ste. 1400  
Cleveland, OH 44115-2001  
Telephone: (216) 861-3810  
FAX: (216) 861-1729  
E-mail: [Idunford@clevefdn.org](mailto:Idunford@clevefdn.org)  
URL: <http://www.clevelandfoundation.org>

### **The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation**

250 Park Ave., Rm. 900  
New York, NY 10177-0026  
Telephone: (212) 551-9100  
FAX: (212) 986-4558  
E-mail: <http://www.emcf.org>

### **The Commonwealth Fund**

1 E. 75<sup>th</sup> St.  
New York, NY 10021-2692  
Telephone: (212) 606-3844  
FAX: (212) 606-3500  
E-mail: [cmwf@cmwf.org](mailto:cmwf@cmwf.org)  
URL: <http://www.cmwf.org>

### **The Duke Endowment**

100 N. Tryon St., Ste. 3500  
Charlotte, NC 28202-4012  
Telephone: (704) 376-0291  
FAX: (704) 376-9336 (Charlotte)  
E-mail: [droberston@tde.org](mailto:droberston@tde.org)  
URL: <http://www.dukeendowment.org>

### **Dyson Foundation**

25 Halcyon Rd.  
Millbrook, NY 12545-9611  
Telephone: (845) 677-0644  
FAX: (845) 677-0650  
E-mail: [info@dyson.org](mailto:info@dyson.org)  
URL: <http://www.dysonfoundation.org>

### **Eckerd Foundation**

Post Office Box 5165  
Clearwater, FL 33758  
Telephone: (727) 446-2996  
FAX: (727) 442-8575  
E-mail: [JClark@eckerd.org](mailto:JClark@eckerd.org)  
URL: <http://www.pinellasgrants.org>

**The Ford Foundation**  
320 E. 43rd St.  
New York, NY 10017  
Telephone: (212) 573-5000  
FAX: (212) 351-3677  
E-mail: [office-secretary@fordfound.org](mailto:office-secretary@fordfound.org)  
URL: <http://www.fordfound.org>

**The Grable Foundation**  
650 Smithfield Street, Ste. 240  
Pittsburgh, PA 15222  
Telephone: (412) 471-4550  
FAX: (412) 471-2267  
E-mail: [grable@grablefdn.org](mailto:grable@grablefdn.org)  
URL: <http://www.grablefdn.org>

**William T. Grant Foundation**  
570 Lexington Ave., 18th Fl.  
New York, NY 10022-6837  
Telephone: (212) 752-0071  
FAX: (212) 752-0071  
E-mail: [info@wtgrantfdn.org](mailto:info@wtgrantfdn.org)  
URL: <http://www.wtgrantfoundation.org>

**Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund**  
1 Market, Landmark, Ste. 400  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Telephone: (415) 856-1400  
FAX: (415) 856-1500  
E-mail: [guidelines@haasjr.org](mailto:guidelines@haasjr.org)  
URL: <http://www.haasjr.org>

**Miriam and Peter Haas Fund**  
201 Filbert St., 5th Fl.  
San Francisco, CA 94133  
Telephone: (415) 296-9249  
FAX: (415) 296-8842  
E-mail: [mphf@mphf.org](mailto:mphf@mphf.org)

**Hall Family Foundation**  
c/o Charitable & Crown Investment-323  
P.O. Box 419580  
Kansas City, MO 64141-6580  
Telephone: (816) 274-8516  
FAX: (816) 274-8547  
E-mail: [kbart@hallmark.com](mailto:kbart@hallmark.com)

**Howard Heinz Endowment**  
30 CNG Tower  
625 Liberty Ave.  
Pittsburgh, PA 15222-3115  
Telephone: (412) 281-5788  
FAX: (412) 281-5788  
E-mail: [info@heinz.org](mailto:info@heinz.org)  
URL: <http://www.heinz.org>

**Conrad N. Hilton Foundation**  
100 W. Liberty St., Ste. 840  
Reno, NV 89501  
Telephone: (775) 323-4221  
FAX: (775) 323-4150  
E-mail: [foundation@hiltonfoundation.org](mailto:foundation@hiltonfoundation.org)  
URL: <http://www.hiltonfoundation.org>

**The James Irvine Foundation**  
1 Market St.  
Steuart Tower, Ste. 2500  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Telephone: (415) 777-2244  
FAX: (415) 777-0869  
URL: <http://www.irvine.org>  
Southern CA office: 777 S. Figueroa St., Ste.  
740, Los Angeles, CA 90017-5430  
Telephone: (213) 236-0552  
FAX: (213) 236-0537

**The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation**  
Rte. 1 and College Rd. E.  
P.O. Box 2316  
Princeton, NJ 08543-2316  
Telephone: (609) 452-8701  
FAX: (609) 452-8701  
E-mail: [mail@rwjf.org](mailto:mail@rwjf.org)  
URL: <http://www.rwjf.org>

**Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation**  
4801 Rockhill Rd.  
Kansas City, MO 64110-2046  
Telephone: (816) 932-1000  
FAX: (816) 932-1100  
E-mail: [acanfiel@emkf.org](mailto:acanfiel@emkf.org)  
URL: <http://www.emkf.org>

**W. K. Kellogg Foundation**  
1 Michigan Ave. E.  
Battle Creek, MI 49017-4058  
Telephone: (616) 968-1611  
FAX: (616) 968-0413  
URL: <http://www.wkkf.org>

**John S. and James L. Knight Foundation**  
One Biscayne Tower, Ste. 3800  
2 S. Biscayne Blvd.  
Miami, FL 33131-1803  
Telephone: (305) 908-2600  
FAX: (305) 908-2698  
E-mail: [publications@knightfdn.org](mailto:publications@knightfdn.org),  
[webmaster@knightfdn.org](mailto:webmaster@knightfdn.org)  
URL: <http://www.knightfdn.org>

**Albert & Bessie Mae Kronkosky Charitable Foundation**

112 E. Pecan, Ste. 830  
San Antonio, TX 78205  
Telephone: (210) 475-9000  
FAX: (210) 354-2204  
E-mail: [kronfndn@kronkosky.org](mailto:kronfndn@kronkosky.org)  
URL: <http://www.kronkosky.org>

**John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation**

140 S. Dearborn St., Ste. 1100  
Chicago, IL 60603-5285  
Telephone: (312) 726-8000  
FAX: (312) 920-6258 TDD: (312) 920-6285  
E-mail: [4answers@macfdn.org](mailto:4answers@macfdn.org)  
URL: <http://www.macfdn.org>

**The McKnight Foundation**

600 TCF Tower, 121 S. 8th St.  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Telephone: (612) 333-4220  
FAX: (612) 332-3833  
E-mail: [info@mcknight.org](mailto:info@mcknight.org)  
URL: <http://www.mcknight.org>

**The Minneapolis Foundation**

A200 Foshay Tower  
821 Marquette Ave., S.  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Telephone: (612) 672-3878  
FAX: (612) 672-3870  
URL: <http://www.mplsfoundation.org>

**Charles Stewart Mott Foundation**

503 S. Saginaw St., Ste. 1200  
Flint, MI 48502-1851  
Telephone: (810) 238-5651  
FAX: (810) 766-1753  
E-mail: [infocenter@mott.org](mailto:infocenter@mott.org)  
URL: <http://www.mott.org>

**The New York Community Trust**

2 Park Ave., 24th Fl.  
New York, NY 10016-9385  
Telephone: (212) 686-0010  
FAX: (212) 532-8528  
URL: <http://www.nycommunitytrust.org>

**Open Society Institute**

400 W. 59th St., 4th Fl.  
New York, NY 10019  
Telephone: (212) 548-0600  
FAX: (212) 548-4679  
URL: <http://www.soros.org>

**The David and Lucile Packard Foundation**

300 Second St., Ste. 200  
Los Alto, CA 94022  
Telephone: (650) 948-7658  
Fax: (650) 948-5793  
URL: <http://www.packfound.org>

**The William Penn Foundation**

2 Logan Sq., 11th Fl.  
100 N. 18th St.  
Philadelphia, PA 19103-2757  
Telephone: (215) 988-1830  
FAX: (215) 988-1823  
E-mail: [moreinfo@wpennfdn.org](mailto:moreinfo@wpennfdn.org)  
URL: <http://www.wpennfdn.org/>

**The Pew Charitable Trusts**

1 Commerce Sq.  
2005 Market St., Ste. 1700  
Philadelphia, PA 19103-7077  
Telephone: (215) 575-9050  
FAX: (215) 575-4939  
E-mail: [info@pewtrusts.com](mailto:info@pewtrusts.com)  
URL: <http://www.pewtrusts.com>

**Polk Bros. Foundation**

20 W. Kinzie St., Suite 1110  
Chicago, IL 60610  
Telephone: (312) 527-4684  
FAX: (312) 527-4681  
E-mail: [info@polkbrosfdn.org](mailto:info@polkbrosfdn.org)  
URL: <http://www.polkbrosfdn.org>

**Publix Super Markets Charities**

(Formerly George W. Jenkins Foundation, Inc.)  
1936 George Jenkins Blvd.  
Lakeland, FL 33815  
Telephone: (863) 688-1188  
E-mail: [www.public.com](http://www.public.com)

**The Rockefeller Foundation**

420 5th Ave.  
New York, NY 10018-2702  
Telephone: (212) 869-8500  
FAX: (212) 852-8441  
E-mail: [www.rockfound.org](http://www.rockfound.org)

**Charles and Helen Schwab Foundation**

1650 S. Amphlett Blvd., Ste. 300  
San Mateo, CA 94402-2516  
Telephone: (650) 655-2410  
FAX: (650) 655-2411  
E-mail: [info@schwabfoundation.org](mailto:info@schwabfoundation.org)  
URL: [www.schwabfoundation.org](http://www.schwabfoundation.org)

**Surdna Foundation, Inc.**  
333 Madison Ave., 30<sup>th</sup> Fl.  
New York, NY 10017-50010  
Telephone: (212) 557-0010  
FAX: (212) 557-0003  
E-mail: request@surdna.org  
URL: <http://www.surdna.org>

**Wallace-Readers Digest Funds**  
2 Park Ave., 23<sup>rd</sup> Fl.  
New York, NY 10016  
Telephone: (212) 251-9700  
FAX: (212) 679-6990  
E-mail: wrdf@wallacefunds.org  
URL: <http://www.wallacefunds.org>

**Joseph B. Whitehead Foundation/  
Robert W. Woodruff Foundation**  
50 Hurt Plz., Ste. 1200  
Atlanta, GA 30303  
Telephone: (404) 522-6755  
FAX: (404) 522-7026  
E-mail: fdns@woodruff.org  
URL: <http://www.jbwhitehead.org>

## APPENDIX B: FOUNDATIONS BY INITIATIVE TYPE

### Early Childhood (22)

- The Carnegie Corporation of New York
- The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation
- The Cleveland Foundation
- The Commonwealth Foundation
- Dyson Foundation
- The Ford Foundation
- Miriam and Peter Haas Fund
- Hall Family Foundation
- Howard Heinz Endowment
- Conrad N. Hilton Foundation
- The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
- Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation
- W. K. Kellogg Foundation
- Albert & Bessie Mae Kronkosky Charitable Foundation
  
- John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation
- The McKnight Foundation
- The Minneapolis Foundation
- The David and Lucile Packard Foundation
- The William Penn Foundation
- The Pew Charitable Trusts
- Publix Super Markets Charities
- Joseph B. Whitehead Foundation/Robert W. Woodruff Foundation, Inc.

### 7 – 15 (19)

- Helen Bader Foundation, Inc.
- The Burnett Foundation
- The Carnegie Corporation of New York
- The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation
- The Ford Foundation
- William T. Grant Foundation
- Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund
- Howard Heinz Endowment
- The James Irvine Foundation
- The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
- Albert & Bessie Mae Kronkosky Charitable Foundation
- The McKnight Foundation
- The New York Community Trust
- Open Society Institute
- Polk Bros. Foundation
- Charles & Helen Schwab Foundation
- Surdna Foundation, Inc.
- Wallace-Readers Digest Funds
- The Pew Charitable Trusts

### Initiatives Targeting a Wide Age Range of Youth (4)

- California Wellness Foundation
- The Dyson Foundation
- The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
- W. K. Kellogg Foundation

### Family and Community (10)

- The Annie E. Casey Foundation/Casey Family Programs
- The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation
- The Ford Foundation
- The Grable Foundation
- John S. and James L. Knight Foundation
- Charles Stewart Mott Foundation
- The New York Community Trust
- The Rockefeller Foundation
- Charles and Helen Schwab Family Foundation
- Wallace-Readers Digest Funds

### 16– 24 (8)

- The Annie E. Casey Foundation/Casey Family Programs
- The Eckerd Foundation
- The Ford Foundation
- The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
- W. K. Kellogg Foundation
- John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation
  
- Charles Stewart Mott Foundation
- The William Penn Foundation

## ENDNOTES

---

1. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The Administration for Children and Families. Head Start Bureau. 2001 Head Start Fact Sheet.
2. *Map and Track. State Initiatives for Young Children and Families*, 2000 Edition. p.19. National Center for Children in Poverty. Mailman School of Public Health. Columbia University.
3. *Head Start Children's Entry into Public School: A report on the National Head Start/Public School Early Childhood Transition Demonstration Study*, Executive Summary. p.5.
4. *The Future of Children: Caring for Infants and Toddlers*. Vol. 11, No. 1 Spring/Summer 2001. The David and Lucille Packard Foundation. p.7.
5. *The Future of Children*. p.90.
6. *Map and Track. State Initiatives for Young Children and Families*, 2000 Edition. p.8. National Center for Children in Poverty. Mailman School of Public Health. Columbia University.
7. *Strategic Investments in Vulnerable Children and Youth: Strengthening Normative Experiences*. A Report of a Working Meeting Convened by the National Center for Children in Poverty, November 8, 2001. p.3.
8. *The Future of Children*. Vol. 6, No. 2 Summer/Fall 1996 pp.7-9.
9. Turning Points: Preparing American Youth for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. The Report of the Task Force on Education of Young Adolescents. p.15. Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development. Carnegie Corporation of New York. June 1989.
10. "The Policy Climate for Early Adolescent Initiatives." Gary Walker. In *Youth Development Directions: Issues, Challenges and Directions*. p.73. Public/Private Ventures. July 2000.
11. See *Mentoring: A Synthesis of P/PV Research 1988-1995*. pp5-6. Cynthia L. Sipe. Public/Private Ventures. Fall 1996.
12. "Unfinished Business: Further Reflections on a Decade of Promoting Youth Development." Karen Pittman, Merita Irby and Thaddeus Ferber. p19. In *Youth Development Directions: Issues, Challenges and Directions*. (See endnote #10 above).
13. *A Matter of Time: Risk and Opportunity in the Non-School Hours*. Carnegie Corporation of New York. December 1992.
14. *Community Programs to Support Youth Development*. National Research Council, Institute of Medicine. Committee on Community-Level Programs for Youth. Jacquelynne Eccles and Jennifer Appleton Goodman (eds.). National Academy Press, Washington, D.C. 2002. pp.21, 270.
15. *Community Programs to Support Youth Development* (see endnote #14). p.271.
16. Unemployment statistic.

- 
17. *Strategic Investments in Vulnerable Children and Youth: Strengthening Normative Experiences*. A report of a Working Meeting Convened by the National Center for Children in Poverty, November 8, 2001. p.14.
  18. *Foster Care: Effectiveness of Independent Living Services Unknown*. General Accounting Office. Report to the honorable Nancy L. Johnson, United States House of Representatives. November 1999. p.1.
  19. *The 21<sup>st</sup> Century Challenge: Moving the Youth Agenda Forward*. A Policy Study of the Levitan Youth Policy Network. p.5-6. Marion Pines (ed.). Sar Levitan Center for Social Policy Studies. November 2000.
  20. See endnote #19, p.1.
  21. *Map and Track. State Initiatives to Encourage Responsible Fatherhood*. National Center for Children in Poverty. Mailman School of Public Health. Columbia University.
  22. The Annie E. Casey Foundation website. Family to Family Initiative Overview, [www.aecf.org](http://www.aecf.org).