



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

SHOW ME THE WAY:

MAKING SENSE OF YOUTH DEVELOPMENT
FUNDING IN MILWAUKEE



PUBLIC POLICY FORUM

Most elected officials and civic leaders agree that investment in programming for Milwaukee's youth must be a critical component of citywide efforts to combat poverty, reduce violence, and appropriately prepare our future workforce. Yet, what do we know about the nature and scope of such investment, and how it is distributed among the city's largest governmental bodies?

This report seeks to answer those and related questions as a means of making sense of youth development funding in Milwaukee. Our hope is that the information herein will help policymakers, advocates, and civic leaders develop new ways to coordinate and enhance out-of-school services for young people in Milwaukee (hence our title, *Show Me the Way*).

The report was commissioned by Beyond the Bell, a citywide initiative dedicated to coordinating capacity building among youth service providers, policymakers, and funders. Leaders of the organization were seeking to track spending for out-of-school time youth development in Milwaukee, a need that was heightened by last summer's events in Sherman Park, which led many to ask searching questions about the services provided to the city's youth.

OUT-OF-SCHOOL TIME YOUTH FUNDING IN MILWAUKEE BY PROGRAM AREA

Show Me the Way explores how the Milwaukee Public Schools, the City of Milwaukee, and Milwaukee County are investing in Milwaukee's youth ages 12 to 24 during the times they are not in school. It looks at public and private sources of funding administered by the three public sector entities across three years (2014-2016) in six programmatic areas. In the body of the report, we detail expenditures administered by each respective government on a program-by-program basis for each individual year. Below, we summarize the 2016 budgeted expenditures in each programmatic area for the three entities combined.

ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT

The need to bolster prospects for academic success for Milwaukee schoolchildren is illustrated by U.S. Census figures that indicate only 22.8% of Milwaukee residents age 25 and older possess a bachelor's degree of higher, and that the poverty rate for people in that age group who have not graduated from high school is 14 percentage points higher than for those who do graduate. In 2016, MPS, the City and County were budgeted to spend about \$4.6 million on out-of-school time academic development for 12- to 24-year-olds.

2016 Funding

\$4,550,306

Programs Funded

After School and Summer Academic Programs
College Access Centers
Interscholastic Activities
Library Programs
Truancy Abatement

Key Observations

Community Learning Centers receive the largest amount of out-of-school time academic development funding, but funding is declining and may be impacted further by legislative changes.



PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT

According to the U.S. Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, regular physical activity in childhood and adolescence improves strength and endurance, helps build healthy bones and muscles, helps control weight, reduces anxiety and stress, increases self-esteem, and may improve blood pressure and cholesterol levels. It is recommended that young people ages 6 to 16 participate in 60 minutes of physical activity per day, but a 2013 Centers for Disease Control survey found that only 27% of high school students had done so on all seven days prior to the survey. The three Milwaukee public sector entities were budgeted to spend about \$10 million for out-of-school time physical development in 2016.

2016 Funding
\$9,992,550

Programs Funded

Playgrounds
Recreation Programs and Facilities
Interscholastic Athletics
Camps

Key Observation

Over 40% of all publicly administered funding for youth (as defined in this report) is directed to physical development needs; that funding has increased by 12% over the last three years.

VOCATIONAL/WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

Youth unemployment is a serious problem for the City of Milwaukee. It has consequences not only for the young people involved, but also for the city's economic and societal health. Moreover, ages 16 to 24 represent a critical time for youth during which they begin to gain employment skills that may affect them for life. Vocational and workforce development spending for youth administered by MPS, the City, and the County was expected to total about \$3.8 million in 2016.

2016 Funding
\$3,782,436

Programs Funded

Drivers education
Summer Youth Employment

Key Observation

Driver education is one of the few areas of out-of-school time youth development programming in which all three entities covered in this report (MPS, the City, and the County) have collaborated.



ARTS AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

As the Forum noted in a 2013 report – *Community-Led Arts Education Models in the U.S.* – advocates for arts education have long argued that skills taught through such education lead to improved academic skills and gains in student achievement. Those advocates also contend that the arts teach certain non-academic skills that benefit individuals once they enter the world of work, such as creativity, self-reflection, persistence, and team work.¹ A little less than \$860,000 was budgeted to be spent by MPS, the City, and the County in 2016 on out-of-school time arts and cultural development for 12- to 24-year-olds.

2016 Funding
\$859,222

Programs Funded

Art and Music Lessons
Hands-on Classes
Theater Camps
Music Festivals
Internships

Key Observation

MPS makes a substantial commitment to arts education programming during school hours and also has provided consistent support for arts and cultural development for youth outside of the school day.

SOCIAL/EMOTIONAL/PHYSICAL HEALTH PROMOTION

Robust physical and mental health is the foundation for all other development. While spending on direct medical or behavioral health care or treatment falls outside of our definition of youth development for purposes of this analysis, we do include programming that advances the well-being and development of youth by *promoting* social, emotional, and physical health. Budgeted spending on such programming among the three public sector entities considered in this report totaled \$1.3 million in 2016.

2016 Funding
\$1,341,850

Programs Funded

Teen Pregnancy Reduction
Parenting
Emotional and Behavioral Challenges
Conflict Resolution
Anger Management
AODA Prevention
Life Skills Training
Making Proud Choices
Community Leadership

Key Observations

Most funding for social/emotional/physical health promotion for youth involves treatment services provided by the County's Behavioral Health Division and is not covered by this report, though the County does provide about \$600,000 annually for general health promotion activities. The City also provides CDBG-funded support for several small programs administered by community-based organizations.

¹ Public Policy Forum (June 2013), *Community-Led Arts Education Models in the U.S.*
<http://publicpolicyforum.org/sites/default/files/CommunityLedArtsEducationModels.pdf>



VIOLENCE PREVENTION/ SAFETY PROMOTION

Physical and psychological safety are basic human needs. Research has shown that when these needs are not met, all other aspects of youth development suffer. Less than \$400,000 was spent by Milwaukee's three largest governments on violence prevention/safety promotion programming in 2016.

2016 Funding
\$388,000

Program Funded
Violence Prevention

Key Observation
Funding for youth violence prevention is relatively new in Milwaukee, almost tripling in the last three years.

OUT-OF-SCHOOL TIME YOUTH FUNDING IN MILWAUKEE BY GOVERNMENTAL BODY

In total, the Milwaukee Public Schools, Milwaukee County, and the City of Milwaukee invest about \$21 million annually in programs and services aimed at promoting youth development outside of the school day. The table below summarizes the expenditures for out-of-school time youth programming by the three governmental entities across the six programmatic categories (total spending for each category). We see that in the three years (2014 and 2015 actual and 2016 budgeted), total funding from MPS, Milwaukee County, and the City of Milwaukee grew from \$19.3 million to almost \$21 million, an increase of 9%.

Total Out-of-School Time Funding in Milwaukee

	2014	2015	2016
Academic Development			
MPS	\$3,139,435	\$2,983,931	\$2,898,413
City of Milwaukee	\$1,423,579	\$1,785,145	\$1,651,893
Total	\$4,563,014	\$4,769,076	\$4,550,306
Physical Development			
MPS	\$8,935,310	\$9,249,339	\$9,677,550
City of Milwaukee	\$30,000	\$60,000	\$315,000
Total	\$8,965,310	\$9,309,339	\$9,992,550
Vocational/Workforce Development			
MPS	\$321,645	\$542,788	\$1,214,283
City of Milwaukee	\$2,738,118	\$2,951,993	\$2,568,153
Total	\$3,059,763	\$3,494,781	\$3,782,436
Arts And Cultural Development			
MPS	\$833,069	\$989,337	\$739,222
City of Milwaukee	\$90,000	\$110,000	\$120,000
Total	\$923,069	\$1,099,337	\$859,222
Social/Emotional/Physical Health Development			
MPS	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
Milwaukee County	\$534,431	\$527,005	\$584,850
City of Milwaukee	\$827,000	\$557,000	\$507,000
Total	\$1,611,431	\$1,334,005	\$1,341,850
Violence Prevention/Safety Promotion			
City of Milwaukee	\$134,000	\$126,000	\$388,000
Total	\$134,000	\$126,000	\$388,000
Grand Total	\$19,256,587	\$20,132,538	\$20,914,364



We next slice the data a different way by showing 2016 budgeted spending totals broken down among each of the three governments. As might be expected, we see that MPS provides the greatest amount of funding (about 70% of the total), followed by the City of Milwaukee (27%). Also, MPS and the City provide funding in most of the areas studied, though funding proportions vary. The majority of MPS' budgeted out-of-school time funding was devoted to physical development and out-of-school time academic programs. For the City of Milwaukee, most funding was earmarked for vocational/workforce development and out-of-school time academic programs.

Milwaukee County devotes less spending to general youth development, which is understandable given its broader mission of providing recreational and cultural activities to the general population; and its specific state and federal mandates to provide health care, treatment, and delinquency services to youth, which were not considered youth development expenditures for purposes of our analysis.

2016 Budgeted Out-of-School Time Youth Funding by Milwaukee Governmental Bodies

	MPS		Milwaukee County		City of Milwaukee		Total	
Academic	\$2,898,413	19.6%			\$1,651,893	29.8%	\$4,550,306	21.8%
Physical	\$9,677,550	65.5%			\$315,000	5.7%	\$9,992,550	47.8%
Vocational	\$1,214,283	8.2%			\$2,568,153	46.3%	\$3,782,436	18.1%
Arts	\$739,222	5.0%			\$120,000	2.2%	\$859,222	4.1%
Health Promotion	\$250,000	1.7%	\$584,850	100%	\$507,000	9.1%	\$1,341,850	6.4%
Safety					\$388,000	7.0%	\$388,000	1.9%
Total	\$14,779,468		\$584,850		\$5,550,046		\$20,914,364	

Finally, in the table below, we summarize the sources of youth funding for MPS, Milwaukee County, and the City of Milwaukee. As shown, roughly two thirds to three quarters of the dollars being administered by the three governments are derived from the local property tax levy and/or other local revenue sources.

Out-Of-School Time Youth Funding in Milwaukee by Funding Source

Funding Source	2014	2015	2016
Local Tax	\$13,446,459	\$14,303,198	\$16,013,989
State and Federal	\$4,790,028	\$4,583,813	\$4,115,800
Philanthropic/Corporate/Foundation	\$1,020,100	\$1,245,527	\$784,575

CONCLUSIONS/POLICY INSIGHTS

Overall, our analysis of how the three governments organize and track their youth development investments generated three overriding insights that policymakers and stakeholders should consider as they seek greater impact from those investments and/or modifications in investment amounts and strategies.



- **New approaches to financial accounting would clarify youth development investment needs and results.** It is currently difficult to obtain an understanding of governmental funding that is directed specifically to youth development, as funding amounts often are buried within initiatives for the general population and/or are spread across multiple funding areas. Efforts to standardize budgeting and financial record keeping for youth programs across the three governmental entities would improve the ability of all stakeholders to plan, collaborate on, and evaluate youth programs, and could guide potential efforts to create a more specific youth-directed focus among Milwaukee's largest public sector institutions.
- **Joint planning and goal-setting could be used to strengthen current initiatives and maximize the value of investments by individual governments.** Understandably, the three governments currently allocate out-of-school time youth development funds based on the needs and requirements of individual programs and the stipulations of outside funding sources. Organizing funding to strive toward jointly developed outcomes could be an effective alternative approach, however. For example, if the three entities determined that providing safe and modern playground facilities for all youth in all parts of the city was a desirable outcome, then they could strategically determine how to prioritize and allocate individual investments in City playgrounds, County park playgrounds, and school-based playgrounds based on that goal.
- **Preserving and potentially enhancing after school programs, such as CLCs, could be the first step in a longer-term effort to collaborate on goals and to coordinate investment.** While modifying financial reporting practices and developing joint plans could take several years to implement, the need to address funding challenges for after school programs (including CLCs) and to potentially strengthen such programs offers an immediate opportunity for joint planning and collaboration. Moreover, uncertainty surrounding future federal funding for the CLC program may *require* a collective effort simply to preserve the existing framework. Planning among MPS, the City, and County regarding how after school program funding might be strategically coordinated, how/whether the County could partner with respect to recreational programming or other resources, and what it might take to further enhance the role of the CLCs and other after school programs appears to be warranted.

It is important to reiterate that our effort to "map" the funding provided by MPS, the City, and the County for youth development simply is an initial step in understanding the nature and scope of youth programming in Milwaukee, and in determining how such programming should be better coordinated and potentially enhanced. A similar endeavor that considers private resources also would be beneficial, as would a broader review from the providers' perspective that seeks to identify the complete portfolios of funding sources that support their youth development programming.

Similarly, we would emphasize that this analysis made no effort to explore precisely how public out-of-school time youth development dollars are being spent, how the programs associated with those expenditures are being implemented, and whether they are producing desired results. Ultimately, answering those questions will be the critical task in determining how to create an array of programs and services that improve educational achievement, enhance social development, and provide a brighter future for all youth in the City of Milwaukee.





PUBLIC POLICY FORUM

IMPARTIAL RESEARCH. INFORMED DEBATE.

633 W Wisconsin Ave
Suite 406
Milwaukee, WI 53203

(414) 276-8240
publicpolicyforum.org
info@publicpolicyforum.org