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• Data, framing, and building public will
• Children’s report cards
• Children’s budgets
• Return on investment studies and business cases
• Reframing public dialogue
Data, Framing, and Building Public Will

• The future of Community Action includes a strong emphasis on the collection, interpretation, and use of data
• Community action can do more to leverage the data it already collects
• The story we tell about our work doesn’t resonate with the public and policy makers
• We can’t service deliver our way to victory in the War on Poverty
What is a Children’s Report Card?

• Developed as a tool in the 1990s by foundations and public sector agencies to track outcomes
• Collects outcome data on a specific population (e.g. 0-5, 0-18) into a single report
• Typically compares local, state, and national outcomes
• Often uses smaller number of “proxy indicators” to limit information overload
• Provides concrete, visually compelling “snapshot” of community-level outcomes
Why use a Children’s Report Card?

- Agency’s already collect most of the data needed for a report through the needs assessment, IS report, and routine grant reporting requirements
- Other sources of key data are readily available through the Community Commons site, public databases, and state or national report cards
- Numerous “templates” for report cards already exist
- Report cards “translate” outcome data into a format that resonates with the general public and policy makers
- Report cards are often used as the foundation to create broader coalitions of stakeholders and policy agendas
- Annual publication of report cards focuses public attention and keeps anti-poverty issues on the “radar screen”
Community Report Cards
## County, State, and National Comparisons

**Key to table symbols.**
- Trend is improving.
- Trend is maintaining.
- Trend is moving in wrong direction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>San Diego County</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Birth to Age 3 (Infants and Toddlers)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of mothers receiving early prenatal care</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of infants born at low birthweight</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of mothers who initiate breastfeeding in hospital</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>94.5¹</td>
<td>90.8¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth rate per 1,000 teens ages 15-17 years</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ages 3-6 (Preschool)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of young children (ages 19-36 months) who completed the basic immunization series</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of children ages 3-4 enrolled in early care and education</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ages 6-12 (School Age)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of children ages 2-11 who have never visited a dentist</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of elementary school (K-5) students who did not attend school at least 95 percent of school days</td>
<td>29.2¹</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of students in grade 3 scoring proficient or advanced on the English-Language Arts achievement test</td>
<td>51.0¹</td>
<td>46.0¹</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of students not in the Healthy Fitness Zone (overweight or obese)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# CT Kids Report Card

## Stable Scorecard Published October 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Actual Value</th>
<th>Forecast Value</th>
<th>Current Trend</th>
<th>Baseline %Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Connecticut Children Grow Up in Stable Living Environments</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>10.70%</td>
<td>10.70%</td>
<td>1 -30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Chronically Absent</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>29.00%</td>
<td>29.00%</td>
<td>1 21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Insecurity</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>14.10%</td>
<td>14.10%</td>
<td>1 -12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Insecurity</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>38.00%</td>
<td>38.00%</td>
<td>2 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Insecurity</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3,551</td>
<td>3,551</td>
<td>1 -39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-Home Placements</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>33.00%</td>
<td>33.00%</td>
<td>1 14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in Single Parent Households</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>64.40%</td>
<td>64.40%</td>
<td>1 2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Meal Occurrence</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>37.70%</td>
<td>37.70%</td>
<td>10 43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free or Reduced Lunch Eligibility</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>87.30%</td>
<td>87.30%</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Students Who Feel Loved and Supported</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>87.30%</td>
<td>87.30%</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CT Kids Report Card

All Connecticut Children Grow Up in Stable Living Environments

**Students Chronically Absent**

Data Source: Connecticut State Department of Education Data on the Percentage of Students Who Missed At Least 10 Percent of Days Enrolled for Any Reason

**Story Behind the Curve**

Chronic absenteeism is defined as missing ten percent or more of the total number of days enrolled in the school year for any reason including excused and unexcused absences and days absent due to out of school suspension. Chronic absenteeism data provided by the State Department of Education since 2009 has shown a decrease of 5 percentage points to 10.70%.
Children’s Report Card Resources

California Children’s Report Card
http://www.childrennow.org/reports-research/

Connecticut Children’s RBA Report Card
https://www.cga.ct.gov/kid/rba/

Nevada Children’s Advocacy Alliance Report Card
http://caanv.org/childrens-issues/childrens-report-card/

Sacramento County Children’s Coalition
http://childrensreportcard.org/
Children’s Report Card “How to” Resources

Results Based Accountability Implementation Guide (Fiscal Policy Studies Institute)
http://raguide.org/index-of-questions/

Building the CT Kids Report Card
https://www.state.nj.us/treas/pprm/panel5-1.pdf

Report Card Development: An Analysis for the Children’s Initiative
What is a Children’s Budget?

• Addresses the need for a “big picture” of all local, state, and federal funding streams
• Typically focuses on an age range (e.g. 0-5) or type of service (e.g. afterschool programs)
• Used to identify under-investment, gaps in services, and problems with categorical requirements
• Serves to “connect the dots” between funding and outcomes
• Often coupled with report cards, return on investment studies, or development of policy agendas
Why use a Children’s Budget?

• Data is rarely available on the overall investment of public dollars in specific populations
• A lack of fiscal data makes it difficult to identify areas of under-investment
• Children’s budgets are often a critical component of systems change efforts
• Helps make the case for funding by comparing to other types of spending
Colorado’s Children’s Budget
Colorado’s Children’s Budget
# Michigan’s Great Start Strategic Financing Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>State Agency</th>
<th>Est. FY07 funding for GS population</th>
<th>Federal/State Funding sources</th>
<th>Other Funds Leveraged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Needs</td>
<td>MDHS</td>
<td>$191.5M\textsuperscript{12}</td>
<td>- TANF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Independence Program (FIP)</td>
<td>MDHS</td>
<td></td>
<td>- State general funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Restricted retained child support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Assistance</td>
<td>MDHS</td>
<td>$488.5 M\textsuperscript{13}</td>
<td>- Federal Food and Nutrition Service funds</td>
<td>- State general funds for administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Private funds for outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Choice Vouchers</td>
<td>MDHS</td>
<td>$26.6M\textsuperscript{14}</td>
<td>- Federal Housing Choice program funds</td>
<td>- Support from community partners including Habitat for Humanity and CAAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing for Homeless Families</td>
<td>MSHDA</td>
<td>$1.4 M\textsuperscript{15}</td>
<td>- Federal HOME funds</td>
<td>- 25% local match (may be capital or services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Home Energy Assistance</td>
<td>MDHS</td>
<td>$21.6 M\textsuperscript{16}</td>
<td>- MSDHA’s reserves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Assistance Program (RAP)</td>
<td>MDHS</td>
<td>$1.3 M\textsuperscript{17}</td>
<td>- Federal RAP funds</td>
<td>- Support from energy providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Support Administration</td>
<td>MDHS</td>
<td>$44.8M\textsuperscript{18}</td>
<td>- Federal/state funds for operations and enforcement</td>
<td>- County matching funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- App. $250 M in child support paid parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$775.7M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Michigan’s Great Start Strategic Financing Plan

Figure VII: Stability of Funding for Social-Emotional Health

- Federal $:
  - Stable and Growing
  - Stable/Flat
  - Some Risk of Cuts
  - High Risk of Cuts
  - Stability Unknown

- State $:
  - Stable and Growing
  - Stable/Flat
  - Some Risk of Cuts
  - High Risk of Cuts
  - Stability Unknown
Children’s Budget Resources

http://forumfyi.org/files/Adding_It_Up_Guide_0.pdf

Funding the Next Generation
http://www.fundingthenextgeneration.org/

Financing a Great Start for Michigan’s Children: Analysis of the Existing Resources of the Great Start System

Mapping Fiscal Resources in South Hampton Roads Virginia to Support School Readiness. Regional Summary
http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED509430
What is a Return on Investment Business Case?

• Developed in Polk County, Iowa in 1999
• Grew out of multi-stakeholder collaboration with a School Readiness Partnership, United Way of Central Iowa, and Early Childhood Iowa Area
• Used to make the case for investing in early childhood services to public and private sector stakeholders
• Framed the argument for funding services in terms of return on investment
Early Childhood and School Readiness Business Case

Investment Opportunities
Home Visiting and Family Support

Birth to Age 2
9,000 Families
- Currently Served: 12.89%
- Not Identified as Needing Service: 75.00%
- Investment Opportunity: 7.11%
- Would Refuse/Have Refused Service: 5.00%

Birth through Age 5
24,000 Families
- Currently Served: 8.6%
- Not Identified as Needing Service: 80.0%
- Investment Opportunity: 9.4%
- Would Refuse/Have Refused Service: 5.0%
Early Childhood and School Readiness Business Case

Per Child Capita Iowa Investments in Education and Development - 2001

- Pre-School (0-5) $621
  - State and Local $467
  - Federal $154
- School-Age (6-18) $5,302
  - State and Local $219
  - Federal $5,083
- Undergraduate (19-23) $3,347
  - State and Local $864
  - Federal $2,483
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perry Preschool</th>
<th>Abecedarian</th>
<th>Chicago Child-Parent Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location city and state</td>
<td>Ypsilanti, MI</td>
<td>Chapel Hill, NC</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program description</td>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>Educational childcare</td>
<td>Preschool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Language development</td>
<td>Language development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment age</td>
<td>3 to 4 years</td>
<td>6 to 12 weeks</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar</td>
<td>Academic year</td>
<td>50 weeks per year</td>
<td>Academic year; 6 week summer program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days per week</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of day</td>
<td>2.5 hours</td>
<td>8 hours</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child-teacher ratio</td>
<td>5:1</td>
<td>3:1 for infants to 6:1 for children age 5</td>
<td>8.5:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher qualifications</td>
<td>Master’s degree; Child development training</td>
<td>Experience working with young children; In-service training</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree; Certified in early childhood education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-home visits</td>
<td>1.5 hours per week</td>
<td>None listed</td>
<td>As part of outreach services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental involvement</td>
<td>Monthly meetings</td>
<td>None listed</td>
<td>Half-day per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services</td>
<td>None listed</td>
<td>On-site pediatric care</td>
<td>Health screening; speech therapy; nursing services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>None listed</td>
<td>Free breakfast, lunch, snack</td>
<td>Free and reduced price meals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Early Childhood ROI Studies

## Cost-Benefit Analysis

Per child, in 2005 dollars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average total costs per student</th>
<th>Average total benefits</th>
<th>Net benefits (benefits-costs)</th>
<th>Benefit-cost ratio (benefits/costs)</th>
<th>Internal rate of return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perry Preschool</td>
<td>$17,198</td>
<td>$293,579</td>
<td>$276,381</td>
<td>$17.07 to $1</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina Abecedarian project</td>
<td>$38,934</td>
<td>$147,149</td>
<td>$108,215</td>
<td>$3.78 to $1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Child-Parent Center</td>
<td>$8,018</td>
<td>$81,399</td>
<td>$73,381</td>
<td>$10.15 to $1</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perry Preschool</td>
<td>Abecedarian</td>
<td>Chicago Child-Parent Centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>$1,091</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Costs</td>
<td>-$193</td>
<td></td>
<td>-$237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Earnings</td>
<td>$60,743</td>
<td>$45,190</td>
<td>$26,098</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings of Future Generations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Earnings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$82,754</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$21,410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Benefits</td>
<td>-$2,414</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Private Benefits</td>
<td>$59,227</td>
<td>$156,243</td>
<td>$27,970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total K-12 Cost Savings</td>
<td>$10,155</td>
<td>$10,639</td>
<td>$6,197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Costs</td>
<td>-$1,362</td>
<td>-$9,787</td>
<td>-$472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Crime Savings</td>
<td>$206,467</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Administrative Costs</td>
<td>$3,333</td>
<td>$236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Abuse/Neglect Savings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Public Benefits</td>
<td>$218,593</td>
<td>$1,088</td>
<td>$23,568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Program Costs</td>
<td>$18,261</td>
<td>$43,183</td>
<td>$8,512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Early Childhood and School Readiness Business Case

Proven Investments
Benefit Costs Table for Four Early Childhood Programs: Dollars Returned for Each Dollar Invested

- Chicago Parent-Child Centers $7.10 Total
  - Government/Taxpayer: $2.91
  - Society: $0.92
  - Participant: $3.27

- Perry Preschool $8.74 Total
  - Government/Taxpayer: $2.51
  - Society: $4.66
  - Participant: $1.58

- Elmira PEIP $6.92 Total
  - Government/Taxpayer: $5.95
  - Society: $0.82
  - Participant: $0.16

- Abecedarian Project $4.01 Total
  - Government/Taxpayer: $1.57
  - Society: $2.44

Source: Early Learning Left Out, 2nd Edition
ROI Resources

The Heckman Equation
http://heckmanequation.org/

The Economics of Early Childhood Investments

The Center for High Impact Philanthropy: Invest in a Strong Start for Children

Colorado Early Childhood Investment Model
Business Case Resources

Ready Nation: The Business Case for Early Childhood Investment

Smart Beginnings: The Business Case for Early Childhood Investment
http://www.smartbeginnings.org/portals/5/pdfs/research/paes_businesscase08.3.11.pdf

LA Partnership for Early Childhood Investment
http://investinkidsla.org/home1/

Polk County Youth Development and School Success Business Case

Global Business Coalition for Education
Framing Resources

The Frameworks Institute
- Building a New Narrative of Human Services: A Communications Toolkit
- Talking Human Services: A Frameworks Multi-Media Messaging Memo
http://frameworksinstitute.org/toolkits/humanservices/

Center for Community Change
- Message Research: Lessons Learned Talking About Poverty
http://www.communitychange.org/real-power/focus/message-research/
Message Research: Lessons Learned
After nearly two years of intensive research, we walked away with five key learnings.

- **Lead with Values**
  - Americans agree that everyone ought to earn a wage that allows them to sustain a family. Messaging should embrace and lead with progressive values like family and community.

- **Emphasize the ends, not the means**
  - People are more inspired by how policies will affect their families than by details of the policies themselves. Use language that emphasizes the outcome. For example, winning a $15 minimum wage would allow your family to pay the bills.

- **Link the Problem to the Solution**
  - We won’t generate support without a roadmap for change. We must talk more about the solutions than the problems so that people have hope that change is possible.

- **Focus on lived experience**
  - Describing lived experiences is more powerful than speaking in abstractions. For example, people identify with statements like “doing my best to make ends meet” or “struggling to keep my head above water,” rather than labels like “poor” or “low-income.”

- **Name the Causes**
  - The rules of our economy are rigged to favor the wealthy few. Using language like “CEO’s who decided” and “leaders who chose” provides agency and understanding.

For more information, visit www.communitychange.org/message-research.
Tips and Strategies

• Use the data you already have and the templates that already exist
• Public CAPS can advocate within their agencies
• Connect with existing report cards, budgets, and ROI/business case efforts
• Don’t go it alone - partner with other local stakeholders (e.g. United Way, community foundations)
• Make a commitment to the long-term – the impact of these strategies accrue over time
• Use one or more of these strategies as the “signature product” of a broader outreach and engagement campaign
Questions
Contacts

Jarle Crocker
Director of Training and Technical Assistance
jcrocker@communityactionpartnership.com

Tiffney Marley
Project Director, Learning Communities
tmarley@communityactionpartnership.com

Cashin Yiu
Program and Event Coordinator
cyiu@communityactionpartnership.com

Sonji Dawson Johnson
Program Specialist
sjohnson@communityactionpartnership.com

Natalie Kramer
Program Support Specialist
nkramer@communityactionpartnership.com