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INTRODUCTION

With so many diverse efforts supporting the health and well-being of young people, it is often difficult to know how a community is allocating its financial resources for youth. States and municipalities are accustomed to reporting how various departments and agencies spend their funds, but tracking how these dollars are allocated to specific populations, outcomes and interventions presents a significant challenge.

Better Together Hennepin (BTH), an advisory team of state and community leaders, and a consulting team from the Forum for Youth Investment recently took on this challenge by creating a “fiscal map”: that is, by identifying and analyzing the funding sources for healthy youth development, teen pregnancy prevention and supports for teen parents in Minnesota, with a focus on Hennepin County. The fiscal map will enable Hennepin County, its partners and the community at-large to respond to funding changes and to identify opportunities and strategies that support healthy youth development and prevent teen pregnancy.

Public and private resources are often tapped to support services specific to teen pregnancy, such as subsidized child care, the Minnesota Family Investment Program, teen parent education supports, and public health care programs, as well as broader healthy youth development and prevention services. It is important for county administrators, state agency leaders and program officers to understand the policies and funding streams that support our shared goals of healthy youth development and healthy communities, and how they align and potentially compete with one another – particularly as funding constricts and shifts.

How to Use this Report
Fiscal maps provide data that can be used to inform many policy and community decisions. Below is a list of potential uses for this report.

• Identify funding streams available to support youth development
• Align funding streams and the policies that support them
• Coordinate efforts of like programs
• Focus on tying funding streams to desired outcomes
• Identify areas of flexibility
• Advocate for funding in particular areas of need
• Rethink the mechanisms in place to fund healthy youth development
A FISCAL MAP OF HENNEPIN COUNTY
YOUTH SUPPORTS

QUICK FACTS

What is the Fiscal Map? An identification and analysis of the public and private financial resources used to support healthy youth development, prevent teen pregnancy and support teen parent services for youth, ages 11 to 21, in Hennepin County, Minnesota.

Why do it? Without a clear map of where the funding comes from and where it gets deployed, it is difficult for practitioners, advocates, funders, policymakers and administrators to know whether investments are focused properly and making the difference that they could.

Why Now? A large federally funded grant to prevent teen pregnancy in Hennepin County will soon expire. To ensure continued progress in preventing teen pregnancy in Hennepin County, Better Together Hennepin and its local government and community partners are working to better understand where other resources exist to support healthy youth development and teen pregnancy prevention.

Who was involved? The mapping project was spearheaded by Better Together Hennepin, which pulled together an advisory team of 17 leaders from across Hennepin County and the state to assist with identifying the funding streams, setting the parameters of the map and making connections to survey respondents. Those respondents were primarily budget managers and administrators of public and private agencies that disburse funds.

Better Together Hennepin enlisted the support of the Forum for Youth Investment and LaCroix-Dalluhn Consulting to develop the fiscal map.

When was it completed? The survey was administered in the summer of 2014 and asked survey respondents to report on their most recent fiscal years.

Where is it focused? The main emphasis is on Hennepin County, with identification of some city, state and federal funding as well.

How was it completed? The survey process developed by the Forum for Youth Investment utilized the expertise of the advisory team in finding the best respondents, who identified 168 funding streams. The survey laid out guidelines for what funding to include and what not to include.

Some highlights of the findings:

- Respondents reported a total of about $1.2 billion in annual spending to support healthy youth development, prevent teen pregnancy and support teen parents. The funded services focus on 11- to 21-year-olds.
- Most of those resources come in the form of grants, but they also include over $100 million in local property taxes.
- Private investments provide an important vehicle for public agencies to leverage resources and/or address specific community needs. (Note: Not all private foundations serving youth in Hennepin County responded to the survey.)
- When asked to describe the outcomes targeted by their funding streams, the large majority of respondents named several high-level outcomes rather than one narrow outcome.
- The types of services most commonly supported by the funding were related to health and wellness and to education.
- While many funding streams support proactive upstream interventions like education, training and healthy youth development, the relative size of each of those funding streams is much smaller than those supporting rehabilitation, corrections and treatment.
- Approximately half of the 168 funding streams identified are available to support teen pregnancy prevention or services for teen parents.
- Public grants have the least flexibility (as a percentage of their total dollar amount) for how the money is spent.
RECOMMENDATIONS

These recommendations are detailed on page 24.

Coordinate & Align Through Partnerships
Local governments and communities rely on a variety of funding sources, both public and private, to provide services and programs to meet the needs of children and youth. Each funding source has unique eligibility requirements and guidelines for use, all of which can make it challenging to provide services and offer programs to address the changing needs within a community. Community-wide coordination and collaboration can improve outcomes and experiences within programs.

- Improve Coordination of Funding Streams
- Use Funds in More Flexible Ways
- Collaborate for Collective Impact

Reframe & Grow Funding
Hennepin County is positioned to explore new strategies in funding services and programs to support children and youth. Innovative and new funding sources are available to assist Hennepin in responding to the changing needs of children and youth while focusing on key outcomes.

- Shift to Outcomes-Focused Budgeting
- Explore Social Impact Bonds
- Pursue New Funding Sources

Sustain Data Collection & Analysis
Using the data collected to inform next steps and updating this data periodically will better position Hennepin County in its decision-making processes as it supports healthy youth development and seeks to prevent teen pregnancy.

- Give Data a Home
- Keep Mapping
Hennepin County recognizes that youth thrive when they wait until adulthood to become parents, and that healthy, self-reliant young people, in turn, build strong communities. Better Together Hennepin: Healthy Communities, Healthy Youth works to build four key supports to help young people delay parenthood:

- Healthy youth development opportunities
- Connections to caring adults
- Evidence-based sexuality education
- Accessible reproductive health services for those who choose to be sexually active

Better Together Hennepin is a county initiative that builds these supports in two mutually reinforcing ways: by changing the way systems serve young people and by funding evidence-based programming. Teen pregnancy rates in Hennepin County have declined significantly since Better Together Hennepin began its work in 2006.

Better Together Hennepin is among a handful of local funders and intermediaries working to prevent teen pregnancy. In 2015, however, Hennepin County faces significant shifts in resources to support these efforts. A five-year grant to Better Together Hennepin from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Office of Adolescent Health ($3.2 million annually) ends; local funding might be reduced as well.

As Hennepin County prepares for these changes, its leaders must understand the funding streams that support teen pregnancy prevention and that provide systemic support for healthy youth development, in order to ensure that the positive gains made in recent years are sustained.

Hennepin County selected the Forum for Youth Investment (the Forum) to serve as consultants in developing the BTH fiscal map. The Forum is a nonprofit, nonpartisan action tank dedicated to helping communities and the nation make sure all young people are ready by 21 – ready for college, work and life. As a national leader in bridging youth development principles with policy and resource alignment, the Forum works with state and local leaders and leadership groups to fundamentally change the way they do business with youth. Its strategies are built on a whole child/whole community approach, and on its experience working with dozens of communities since its founding in 1998.

The Forum partnered with LaCroix-Dalluhn Consulting in order to ensure local expertise for the BTH Fiscal Mapping Project. LaCroix-Dalluhn Consulting works with public agencies and community collaborations to identify sustainable solutions to community challenges.
THE ADVISORY TEAM

Seventeen leaders from across Hennepin County and Minnesota – from public agencies, philanthropic organizations and community organizations – came together to serve on the BTH Fiscal Mapping Advisory Team. The Team assisted Hennepin County’s staff and consultants in creating the fiscal map by helping to set the parameters of this study and to move the survey to completion.

Advisory Team members were asked to: (1) provide guidance throughout the mapping project; (2) share their knowledge and expertise on policies and funding streams aimed at supporting healthy youth development, preventing teen pregnancy and supporting teen parents; and (3) connect the fiscal mapping consultants to colleagues and staff with direct knowledge of public and/or private funding streams and policies.

Molly Snuggerud, Family Health Program Manager, City of Bloomington Public Health Division
Jennifer DeCubellis, Assistant County Administrator - Health, Hennepin County Health Department
Ann DeGroot, Executive Director, Minneapolis Youth Coordinating Board
Maggie Diebel, Director, Division of Community and Family Health, Minnesota Department of Health
Rebecca Gilgen, Executive Director, Brooklyn Bridge Alliance for Youth
Craig Wethington, Deputy Director, Division of Safety, Health and Nutrition, Minnesota Department of Education
Jamie Halpern, Area Manager for Policy Coordination, Hennepin County Human Services Department
Marcie Jefferys, Director, Governor’s Children’s Cabinet
Judith Kahn, Executive Director, Teenwise Minnesota
Zuzanne Fenner, Finance Manager, Hennepin Health Foundation and Hennepin County Medical Center
Financial Services
Morgan Grelson, Administrative Manager, Hennepin County Community Corrections and Rehabilitation
Carol Wandersee, Planning Analyst, Hennepin County Community Corrections and Rehabilitation
Coral Garner, Director, Adolescent Health and Youth Development, City of Minneapolis Health Department
Leila Farah, TANF Policy Coordinator, Minnesota Department of Human Services
Wokie Weah, President, Youthprise
Stella Whitney-West, CEO, Northpoint Health and Wellness Center
Alana Wright, Director, Empowering Healthy Lives, Greater Twin Cities United Way
Leaders who have a big-picture view of resources for young people in their communities and states can more effectively make decisions that cut across organizations and departments. Typically, however, they lack clear information about where those resources for young people are going.

Fiscal mapping helps to create the big picture with data – that is, by documenting the flow of public and private funding. The goal is to transform the way leaders make informed decisions, so that they are better positioned to effectively improve youth outcomes.

The Forum developed a Web-based data collection tool for use by public agencies and private philanthropic organizations distributing or granting funds to support healthy youth development in Minnesota. The target audience for this data collection tool was program officers or directors of foundations, as well as budget, finance or program directors of public agencies, both state and local. The survey was not distributed to nonprofit or intermediary organizations unless one of their primary functions was making grants to community partners.

In addition, individual and small group stakeholder interviews took place between Advisory Team meetings in order to mine existing data sources and funding streams and identify gaps in services and funding. These interviews provided important engagement opportunities to build support for identified goals and processes.

Among the questions that the Advisory Team sought to answer through this process are:

- What are the possible uses of this data for community-wide decision making?
- Does the data point to a need to better align and coordinate the various budget holders/decision makers in an ongoing way?
- What are the outcomes that the resources are focused on achieving? Do we have a common understanding of those goals?
- What new revenue sources can be generated to support youth development, prevent teen pregnancy and support teen parents?
ANALYSIS

METHODOLOGY AND LIMITATIONS

Fiscal mapping remains an imperfect science, but the information gleaned from this study provides a far better picture than we previously had of the public and private resources for youth programs, services and supports in Hennepin County. This study utilized snowball sampling and relied largely on the advisory team to lead us to the best sources. In some cases the survey was completed independently by individuals, and in other cases it was completed in small groups and through one-on-one interviews by the consulting team. The survey was carried out in the summer of 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Agency Respondents</th>
<th>Private Funder Respondents</th>
<th>Intermediary Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• State Agencies</td>
<td>• Greater Twin Cities United Way</td>
<td>• Youthprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Department of Human Services</td>
<td>• Private Foundations</td>
<td>• Minneapolis Youth Coordinating Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Department of Health</td>
<td>o Mortensen Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Department of Employment and Economic Development</td>
<td>o Otto Bremer Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Department of Public Safety</td>
<td>o Park Nicollet Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hennepin County Departments</td>
<td>o Pohlad Family Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Human Services and Public Health Department</td>
<td>o Sheltering Arms Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Community Corrections and Rehabilitation Department</td>
<td>o Wells Fargo Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• City Health Departments (Minneapolis and Bloomington)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• City Recreation and Parks Departments (Brooklyn Center and Brooklyn Park)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• City Workforce Departments (Minneapolis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community Education Departments (Minneapolis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey respondents identified a total of 168 funding streams for use in this report.

Due to the nature of snowball sampling, there is a high likelihood that some highly localized funding streams were not accounted for. Only a small sample of city departments within Hennepin County completed the survey, and one community education department completed the survey. Similarly, only a small number of private foundations responded to the survey.

Because the survey relied primarily on self-reports by agencies, in some cases terms were interpreted inconsistently. For instance, not everyone defines “health education” or “workforce services” the same way. There may have also been limiting points of view or perception about whether specific funding streams are actually for young people, and the allowable flexibility for how those funds are used. The actual restrictions and allowances of funding are sometimes real and sometimes perceived. Teasing out which it is becomes difficult in a traditionally risk-averse public sector. Defining the parameters of data collection is always challenging. Given the goals of this study and resources available to complete it, the Advisory Team and consultants opted to collect fiscal data related to services and programs aimed

---

1 Snowball sampling is a technique in which existing study subjects recruit additional subjects from their contacts and acquaintances, similar to a rolling snowball. As such, there are much higher likelihoods of bias within the survey.
primarily at young people ages 11 to 21 across the full spectrum of healthy youth developmental outcomes, including support for teen pregnancy prevention and teen parents. More specifically, funding for job readiness and employment services, leadership development, educational supports, home visiting and correctional and/or rehabilitative services were among those tracked in this study. This study did not collect data regarding education formula funds (e.g., K-12 education formula funding, grants to schools for basic academic education), general health care funding\(^2\), funding for housing services and subsidies for families (e.g. funding for adult or family shelters or Section 8).\(^3\)

---

**Key Definitions Throughout this Document**

- **Sources of Funding Streams**
  - Public (federal, state, county and city)
  - Private (foundations, philanthropy)
  - Other (fees, insurance reimbursements)

- **Sources of Funding Streams by Type**
  - Grants (e.g., competitive and block grants from public and private sources)
  - Property Taxes/General Fund (e.g., from county, city and school districts)
  - Fees (e.g., parent or participant fees that are leveraged by other funding sources)
  - Insurance Reimbursement (e.g., Local Collaborative Time Study (LCTS), teen sexual health reimbursement)

---

\(^2\) However, funding specific to teen pregnancy, educational outreach and Sexually Transmitted Infection testing was included in this study when it leveraged other educational and outreach resources.

\(^3\) Funding for youth homelessness prevention and foster care transition was included in this study.
**TOTAL DOLLARS REPORTED BY SOURCE & TYPE**

**What do these graphs tell us?**
The graphs show the total funding reported that is aimed toward improving outcomes for young people, categorized by funding sources and types of funding mechanisms. At the most local level, multiple resources are often patched together to support programming and services for young people and their families. Throughout the rest of the report you will see items reported by number of funding streams rather than total dollar amount. Because of the difficulty in separating out the state funds that go to Hennepin County, the data on the following pages can accurately report only the number of possible funding streams in a given area. In future studies, it would be useful to more specifically pinpoint the state investment in the county.

**Why is it important?**
This information, while incomplete, starts to paint a picture of where the bulk of spending occurs. While the amount of public dollars far outweighs the amount of private dollars, the substantial reliance on grants as a primary source of funding for programs and services raises sustainability concerns, because grants are often competitive and time-limited. Public and private resources are often braided to assure that outcomes are appropriately targeted and requirements are met. Most programs and services cannot be sustained through state, federal or private grants. Instead, they leverage these resources to provide services that are offered at reduced fees to youth and their families.

General fund resources from local property taxes are the most flexible type of resources available in Hennepin County. The use of these funds is often defined by local elected officials to respond to community priorities.

For future fiscal map studies: When looking at total investments, it is often advisable to look at how the numbers shift over time, and to examine the investment in youth as a percent of the population and in the context of broader community investments.

*Note: Throughout the remainder of the report, the information is reported by number of funding streams rather than by dollar amounts.*
PRIMARY OUTCOMES TARGETED
BY FUNDING STREAM

Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes Selected</th>
<th>Number of Funding Streams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connected &amp; Engaged</td>
<td>10 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educated</td>
<td>9 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>3 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Wellness</td>
<td>9 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>0 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reliant</td>
<td>4 41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes Selected</th>
<th>Number of Funding Streams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connected &amp; Engaged</td>
<td>3 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educated</td>
<td>2 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>0 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Wellness</td>
<td>2 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>6 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reliant</td>
<td>0 41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Colors:
- Private: Blue
- Public: Yellow
- Other: Other colors
What do these graphs tell us?
Budget holders were asked to identify the primary and secondary outcomes targeted by each of the funding streams. Respondents could select multiple primary outcomes targeted by a funding stream, and most reported that funding streams were used to address multiple outcomes.

Of the 168 funding streams identified, 70 focused on health and wellness as a primary outcome area. When asked to identify secondary outcomes (not shown here), the respondents produced a fairly even spread across the outcome areas. Notably, “equity” was identified as a primary outcome in 16 public funding streams, but rose to 24 public funding streams as a secondary outcome.

The vast majority of funding sources focused on health and wellness comes through grants. Local property taxes, which are highly flexible sources of funding, more often support outcomes focused on connected and engaged youth, safety of young people and self-reliance.

Why is it important?
Asking budget holders to report on the desired outcomes of programs is a challenge. Budgets are typically compiled according to departments and divisions, not according to the primary and secondary outcomes that are the focus of the funding. Merely posing the outcomes question with a common set of choices across departments and agencies is informative. With so much common purpose, can the agencies do more to connect their work and define the shared outcomes they are working toward?
TYPES OF SERVICES SUPPORTED
BY CATEGORY

**Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th># of Funding Streams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OST Programs</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Programming &amp; Camps</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary/Post-Secondary</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Health & Wellness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th># of Funding Streams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Education</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Emotional Supports</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Services</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Health</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parent Supports (Parents of Teens)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th># of Funding Streams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education around Discipline</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Parents How To Talk About Sex</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Support for College Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parent Supports (Teen Parents)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th># of Funding Streams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Supports</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Visiting</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Civic Connectedness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th># of Funding Streams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth Leadership</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Services</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteerism</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Delinquency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th># of Funding Streams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truancy Prevention</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Corrections</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang/Violence Prevention</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What do these graphs tell us?
Each respondent was asked to identify the services that are supported by each funding stream the respondent identified. Respondents were able to select multiple services, or choose “other” to describe their targeted services. The services options were organized by the following categories: education; health and wellness; parent supports (for parents of teens); teen parents; civic connectedness; and delinquency. In some cases where “other” was selected frequently, such as in the education category, there was mention of services like in-school programming, early learning, skill development and training, and health education and training. Within teen parent services, “other” was selected frequently. The types of services reported include employability or work readiness, family therapy, independent living and tailoring services to meet the needs of teen parents.

Why is it important?
In each of the following service areas there were more than 30 funding streams providing support: out-of-school time programs, summer programming, health education, social emotional supports, medical services, behavioral health, youth leadership and education of teen parents. The breadth of support for these service categories presents opportunities for coordination among those funding streams and the programs they support. Coordination could take the form of blending and braiding of resources, joint training, sharing physical space, planning around coverage of targeted youth and building a quality assessment system, among other strategies.

It is also important to think about how services are discussed and described. There are many different ways to describe the work that goes on, as evidenced by the many ways that services were categorized as “other.” This shows an opportunity to develop more common language to describe this work across systems.

---

4 Education services include but are not limited to out-of-school time (OST) programs, mentoring, and secondary and post-secondary education.
5 Health and wellness services include but are not limited to behavioral health, child welfare and medical care.
6 Parent supports include but are not limited to supports for parents of middle and high school aged youth, such as teaching parents how to talk about sex, parent supports for college planning and parent education.
7 Teen parent services include but are not limited to home visits, child care and parent education.
8 Civic connectedness services include but are not limited to employment, workforce services and youth leadership opportunities.
9 Delinquency services include but are not limited to juvenile corrections and gang/violence prevention. This analysis does not include data from the County Attorney’s office, which probably would have increased the number of funding streams identified as supporting truancy prevention.
TYPES OF INTERVENTION APPROACHES SUPPORTED BY FUNDING SOURCE & SIZE

**Number of Funding Streams**

- Education & Training
- Healthy Youth Development
- Prevention Services
- Other
- Treatment/Intervention & Crisis Service
- General Support
- Rehabilitation / Corrective Services
- No Answer

**Median Size of Funding Streams by Approach**

- Rehabilitation / Corrective Services: $1,600,000
- Other*: $1,519,533
- Treatment/Intervention & Crisis Service: $1,400,000
- Prevention Services: $928,873
- General Support (public benefits, health care, housing, etc.): $743,891
- Education & Training: $624,810
- Healthy Youth Development: $468,250

*This chart shows funds used or available for each type of approach. Respondents identified one or more approaches for each funding stream. As a result, some funds are counted under more than one approach in the chart.
What do these graphs tell us?
The graph on the top of page 16 illustrates the types of intervention that the funding streams support. Respondents could select multiple intervention approaches, and there may have been diverse interpretations of the terms. The most commonly reported intervention approaches across funding streams were education and training, healthy youth development, and prevention. The graph at the bottom of page 16 shows the median size of a funding stream within each type of approach.

Why is it important?
Comparing the number of funding streams to their dollar amount by intervention approach reveals an interesting contrast. The median dollar amount per funding source to support rehabilitative and corrections services is much larger than the median amounts to support prevention services, education and training services, and healthy youth development. While a greater number of funding streams focus on “upstream” supports (those more proactive prevention and early intervention services) the median amount per funding stream is smaller than for “downstream” supports (or those more reactive treatment- and corrections-type of services).

Interestingly though, the survey findings suggest the funding streams supporting rehabilitative and corrective services are more flexible, to best meet the needs of individuals. For example, the juvenile corrections agency in Hennepin County reports a much higher percentage of its budget from local property taxes than do other county departments. County departments, with support from the Hennepin County Board, determine the uses of these resources, which provides greater flexibility.

Further analysis could look at the cost per youth of some proactive “upstream” programs supported by smaller funding sources, as they might be serving more young people with fewer dollars than the downstream services. Thus their return on investment might be greater. Another area to investigate is the administrative costs associated with the management of so many small proactive “upstream” programs and funding streams.
FLEXIBILITY OF FUNDING STREAMS
BY AREA OF FLEXIBILITY & SOURCE

Areas of Flexibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Funding Streams</th>
<th>No Flexibility (0 Areas)</th>
<th>Limited Flexibility (1-2 areas)</th>
<th>Greater Flexibility (3-4 areas)</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Flexibility by Funding Sources

No Flexibility (0 areas)       Limited Flexibility (1-2 areas)       Greater Flexibility (3-4 areas)       No Answer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Funding Streams</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Green: No Flexibility (0 areas)
- Orange: Limited Flexibility (1-2 areas)
- Red: Greater Flexibility (3-4 areas)
- Black: No Answer
What do these graphs tell us?
The survey asked respondents who disburse or grant funds if there is potential for flexibility in those allocations for:

- designing the application process
- determining eligibility requirements
- allowable uses of the money
- reporting requirements
- other

While 68 public funding streams were reported to have no flexibility, 61 provide some level of flexibility.

Why is it important?
The flexibility of funding is important when providing services and programs. Too many restrictions make it difficult for community organizations and governmental agencies to respond to the needs of local communities and target eligibility for programs and services to the right young people, to stick with their own plan to achieve outcomes, and to streamline an increasingly complex set of requirements for applications and reporting. Also, it is growing more and more difficult to identify funding streams that pay for the operational costs of organizations.

Finding flexibility in funding streams available to serve youth in a localized, outcome-driven way is a critical first step toward creating a better organized system that can achieve youth outcome goals. Sometimes the lack of flexibility is “self-imposed” by program administrators, budget holders or local policymakers and sometimes it is real. To that end, there are new opportunities on the horizon at the federal level to increase the flexibility that communities have with the funding streams that serve disconnected youth. Hennepin County can now use this data as a starting place to request increased flexibility in more federal areas.

Eligibility Requirements

What does this graph tell us?
Eligibility requirements for programs and services supported by the various funding streams ranged quite a bit, but financial status was the most common.

Why is it important?
This variance in eligibility illustrates one area where flexibility can prove helpful. Some funding streams might have specific reasons from their inception for the targeting that they enforce. When the dollars reach the ground, however, factors often come into play that were not anticipated in the restrictions. Young people face myriad issues and their needs take many different forms. Funders should consider giving localities flexibility in whom they serve, as long as they reach those in need and get to outcomes.
Teen pregnancy rates are improving in Hennepin County, and that is something to celebrate. However, teen pregnancy prevention advocates know that if they are not proactive about this issue, progress will stall and they risk moving backward. They also recognize that teen pregnancy prevention can be achieved through a range of healthy youth development activities. As the rates decrease, resources available to support these prevention activities shrink. Yet as resources shrink, there is a tendency to become more prescriptive and narrow in the allowable use of funds.

Although Better Together Hennepin conducted this study with an eye toward issues related to teen pregnancy, the inclusion of funding streams covering the full range of healthy youth development provides an opportunity for stakeholders across the region and across issues. Future fiscal maps could be developed with spotlights on other issues as well.

**Funding Streams Available**

- To reduce teen pregnancy
- To implement supports for teen parents
- Neither

### # of Funding Streams

- Private
- Public
- Other
What do these graphs tell us?

Among the data findings of note:

- Although a number of funding streams cannot be used to support teen pregnancy prevention or teen parents, 83 funding streams can be so used.
- More public funding streams are used to support teen parents than to prevent teen pregnancy. Slightly more private funding sources, on the other hand, go to prevent teen pregnancy. Funds to support teen parents more often come from public grants (both block and competitive) and private grants.
- More funding streams can be used to prevent teen pregnancy and support teen parents than are currently used for those purposes.
- Public funding is, by far, the biggest source currently supporting pregnancy prevention, with private funds a distance second and other funds coming in right behind.
- Also revealed by data but not shown on the graphs: Of the funding streams now used for pregnancy prevention, more support the prevention of first pregnancies than the prevention of subsequent pregnancies.
Funding Streams Available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Streams Available</th>
<th># of Funding Streams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To reduce teen pregnancy</td>
<td>0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To implement supports for teen parents</td>
<td>0 10 20 30 40 50 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>0 10 20 30 40 50 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Streams Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Streams Used</th>
<th># of Funding Streams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Currently used to reduce teen pregnancy or to support teen parents</td>
<td>0 10 20 30 40 50 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Streams Used for Pregnancy Prevention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Streams Used for Pregnancy Prevention</th>
<th># of Funding Streams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target first pregnancies</td>
<td>0 10 20 30 40 50 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target subsequent pregnancies</td>
<td>0 10 20 30 40 50 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>0 10 20 30 40 50 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What do these graphs tell us?
Consistent with other findings in the mapping survey, these graphs show that a majority of funding comes from grants.

Why is it important?
Support for teen pregnancy prevention can be highly political, and while that has not generally been the case in Hennepin County, leaders need to be prepared for politically driven shifts at the state and federal levels. These shifts affect decisions about the types of programs and services funded and the amount of funds available. County and community leaders will continue to manage the political risks to prevent teen pregnancy in Hennepin County, which is especially important as funding for these services is reduced in 2015.

The heavy reliance on grant funding leaves the county’s teen pregnancy prevention and teen parent support efforts vulnerable to significant year-by-year shifts in funds available from grants.
Local governments and communities rely on a variety of funding sources, both public and private, to provide services and programs to meet the needs of children and youth. Each funding source has unique eligibility requirements and guidelines for use, all of which can make it challenging to provide services and offer programs to address the changing needs within a community. Community-wide coordination and collaboration can improve outcomes and experiences within programs.

**Improve Coordination of Funding Streams**

Among the opportunities revealed through the fiscal mapping project:

- 57 public funding streams focus on health and wellness outcomes for young people. Determine the objectives for each and see which ones align with each other. This can improve experiences for recipients, increase efficiency among providers and reduce gaps across systems.
- 7 funding streams support gang intervention. Align their Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for services that overlap among them. Consider developing a common grant application for those funds.
- 34 funding streams support youth leadership. Coordinate training of the staff who carry out that work.

**Use Funds in More Flexible Ways**

- Examine the limitations and flexibility of specific funding streams in order to deliver services in new and more coordinated ways. Funding regulations often provide more room than assumed for flexibility in how the funds are used and who is eligible for the services.
- Apply to join the federal government’s upcoming Performance Partnership Pilot (P3) initiative. These pilots are designed to provide unprecedented flexibility to states and localities to improve outcomes and remove unnecessary administrative burdens associated with federal funding for disconnected youth services.

**Collaborate for Collective Impact**

- Explore resources and services to implement collective impact strategies in order to increase results. Collective impact strategies call for community stakeholders to align their work by (among other things) developing a shared agenda for the community, agreeing on goals, identifying leadership groups to steer the effort and implementing common measures to track progress.
- Develop a youth master plan. The plan would outline the county’s youth development goals, and drive coordination among public and private organizations.

**REFRAME & GROW FUNDING**

Hennepin County is positioned to explore new strategies in funding services and programs to support children and youth. Innovative and new funding sources are available to assist Hennepin in responding to the changing needs of children and youth while focusing on key outcomes.

---

10 For more information, go to http://forumfyi.org/content/P3.
Shift to Outcomes-Focused Budgeting
Hennepin County relies heavily on grants to provide programs and services to young people. As a result, budgets are often built in response to grant requirements rather than based on county-wide goals and objectives. Shifting to budgets driven by outcome goals for discretionary services would enable the county to:
- Better align with other public agencies and communities.
- Better understand its most flexible funding sources and how they can be maximized to serve more young people and improve outcomes.

Explore Social Impact Bonds
A Social Impact Bond (SIB) is an innovative financial instrument being used more frequently in the United States and several other countries. SIBs complement government funding, using private capital to invest in prevention and early intervention programs. They aim to bring to scale evidence-based approaches that improve social outcomes and reduce the need for expensive, crisis-driven services.

Hennepin County is well-positioned to pursue SIBs, because it can pair measurable outcomes resulting from the use of evidence-based programs to reduce teen pregnancy with data from the fiscal mapping project about funding streams by source, type and use.

Pursue New Funding Sources
- Abstinence Education Grant Program – These federal Title V resources require a local match, but are not being drawn down by Hennepin County. While these resources support programming that is not as comprehensive as those currently provided through Better Together Hennepin, they might provide important resources that can be braided with local funds or private grants to continue the county’s efforts to reduce teen pregnancy.
- Local Time Collaborative Study

Using the data collected to inform next steps and updating this data periodically will better position Hennepin County in its decision-making processes as it supports healthy youth development and seeks to prevent teen pregnancy.

Give Data a Home
Designating one entity to maintain the data files from the fiscal mapping survey will allow the county to:
- Further explore the data for more detailed and ongoing analyses.
- Find critical data when aligning strategies and making countywide plans.

Keep Mapping
Mapping fiscal resources annually or biennially will give county and other community leaders:
- Important information about funding trends.
- An updated picture of public and private funding streams.
- More data to make and support decisions.

SUSTAIN DATA COLLECTION & ANALYSIS

Using the data collected to inform next steps and updating this data periodically will better position Hennepin County in its decision-making processes as it supports healthy youth development and seeks to prevent teen pregnancy.

Give Data a Home
Designating one entity to maintain the data files from the fiscal mapping survey will allow the county to:
- Further explore the data for more detailed and ongoing analyses.
- Find critical data when aligning strategies and making countywide plans.

Keep Mapping
Mapping fiscal resources annually or biennially will give county and other community leaders:
- Important information about funding trends.
- An updated picture of public and private funding streams.
- More data to make and support decisions.

11 Local Collaborative Time Study (LCTS) is a random moment time study administered by the Minnesota Department of Human Services (DHS). It generates federal dollars for Family Services and Children’s Mental Health Collaboratives. The LCTS accesses federal entitlement funds through administrative claiming under two sections of the Social Security Act – Medical Assistance through Title XIX and Foster Care and Adoption Assistance through Title IV-E. Only Public Health, County or Community Corrections and School Districts that are members of an approved Family Services or Children’s Mental Health Collaborative can participate and earn these reimbursements, and the federal dollars generated are given over to the local collaboratives to spend. More information is available at http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/main/groups/publications/documents/pub/dhs16_177456.pdf.
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