



# Doing the Math

*“The youth organizations we describe run on sheer will and constant scrambling for funding . . . Their adult leaders have to spend an inordinate amount of time searching for funding and thinking of new ways to make their tried and successful work match the latest ‘flavor of the month’ requests from foundations or grantmakers.”*

—Shirley Brice Heath and Adelma Aurora Roach, researchers, Stanford University, *The Arts in the Nonschool Hours*

## This chapter covers:

- Doing the math: costs of running arts programs for at-risk youth
- Developing your budget
- Advocating for program resources
- Funding opportunities and resources

**How much does it cost to run an arts program for youth at risk?** Americans for the Arts, working with the President’s Committee for the Arts and Humanities, conducted in-depth interviews with staff from 218 after-school arts programs for youth at risk. The annual budgets for these programs varied dramatically, from \$4,355 to \$3 million; the average annual program budget was \$158,537, and the median budget was \$84,000 (one-half of the programs were above this amount and one-half below this amount). The expenses include administrative staff, artists, art supplies, team training, food, nutrition, and evaluation.

**How do the costs for running a youth arts program compare with the costs for detention?** “Young at Art,” an Idaho Commission on the Arts program, calculates that its operation cost was \$6.40 per day per youth, compared with the \$125 a day that it costs per day for a youth in juvenile detention. Americans for the Arts reports that \$7 billion is spent annually to incarcerate young offenders; the cost for incarcerating a delinquent youth for one year is at least \$20,000.

Programs for youth at risk vary widely—in the number of youth served, the frequency at which they meet, and so forth, making it very difficult to conduct cost-benefit analyses. However, based on a decade-long study of arts programs conducted at Stanford University, researchers Shirley Brice Heath and Adelma Aurora Roach estimate the cost per student per year for after-school arts programs is \$1,000. They also estimate projected savings to society, based on youth services, court costs, probation officers, imprisonment costs, and so forth, to be \$36,000 to \$100,000 annually. Although Heath and Roach conducted this analysis because they understand

that people want to know the cost benefits, they prefer to think of youth in arts programs as working “to enhance their own communities through education, entertainment, counseling and public service,” rather than looking at young people as problems to be solved within their community. Thus, the money spent on arts-based youth programs should be seen as sound investments in our nation’s future.

**Where does the money come from?** Ninety-five percent of the programs surveyed by Americans for the Arts have more than one source of funding. State and federal governments are a significant source of financial support for these programs. Federal funding opportunities include one-time-only funds and on-going program funds. An overview of federal funding opportunities for programs designed for youth at risk appears at the end of this chapter.

The YouthARTS programs operate with budgets ranging from \$100,000 to \$400,000 per year. All three YouthARTS programs have multiple sources of funding and support. Program resources combine cash contributions with in-kind contributions. In all three cities, the collaborative partners bring financial resources to the programs.

## Developing Program Budgets

Here is how the three YouthARTS programs used the planning model to develop their program budgets (expenditures and resources).

### Youth Arts Public Art

*“What seeking funding is really about is making the case to key community leaders that the arts are achieving tangible results in the community. Tenacity is a great quality for this work, along with a passionate belief in what we are doing.”*

—Bill Bulick, director, Regional Arts & Culture Council


Youth Arts Public Art is funded by the Percent for Art allocation from the construction of a new juvenile justice complex in Portland. This creative use of these funds was accomplished through a collaborative effort among the Regional Arts & Culture

Council, Multnomah County, and the Department of Adult and Juvenile Community Justice. Initial funds for the program were 1.33 percent of construction costs, which totaled \$366,000. These funds are anticipated to provide for five years of Youth Arts Public Art programming. In addition to these funds, the Multnomah County Juvenile Justice Division provides in-kind support.

The program expenses for Youth Arts Public Art's first full year of operation totaled \$74,652 in cash expenses, most of which came from the Percent for Art allocation. These funds were expended on artist fees, supplies, and equipment. Youth Arts Public Art contracted with artists or arts agencies to teach the youth; each of these contractors developed their own budgets for their individual projects, based on the activities and scope of the program developed during the planning model exercise.

A portion of the salaries of the public art manager and public art assistant—both employees of the Regional Arts & Culture Council—were taken directly from the Percent for Art allocation, and totaled \$14,030 over the first year. (The public art manager served as the Youth Arts Public Art program manager; the public art assistant provided staff support for planning and staging the public events.) This administrative cost was for the first full year of operation only and will not be as high in subsequent years for several reasons: the administrator attended all of the art classes during the pilot project to get a clear idea of how the program was working, and she provided administrative time to oversee certain aspects of the national demonstration project that were one-time-only responsibilities.

The time that probation officers spent working on the Youth Arts Public Art project was included in their ongoing work load. Probation officers were already working under a flex-time schedule and could adjust their days so that they were able to attend all of the art sessions. At first the probation officers saw the arts program as a new project. However, they eventually began to realize that the art project fit into a service category that already existed within the probation department known as a "skill group." A skill group is a structured time when youth meet to learn, among other skills, anger management, working together as a team, and so forth.



'Youth Arts Public Art is funded by the Percent for Art allocation from the construction of a new juvenile justice complex in Portland. This creative use of these funds was accomplished through a collaborative effort among the Regional Arts & Culture Council, Multnomah County, and the Department of Adult and Juvenile Community Justice.'



The probation officer time was in-kind and varied widely among the various projects, depending on the level of probation officer involvement and the art form. The most expensive project was the video project. The probation officer time was greater for this project, and the cost of supplies and equipment was higher than for other art forms. (Table 10 includes a breakdown of the budgets for each project.)

**Table 10: Youth Arts Public Art Budget 1997-98**

Category	Expenses	cash/in-kind	Resources
Art instructors and assistants	\$9,500 photo/poetry \$6,133 video \$11,700 theater	cash	Percent for Art
Probation Officer	\$1,945 photo/poetry \$6,480 video \$3,240 theater	in-kind	Multnomah County Adult & Juvenile Community Justice
Youth incentives After-school snacks Travel	\$1,850 photo/poetry \$2,000 video \$2,600 theater	cash	Multnomah County Adult & Juvenile Community Justice flex fund
Evaluation	\$1,500	cash	Percent for Art
Art supplies	\$4,969 photo/poetry \$10,365 video \$2,400 theater	cash	Percent for Art
Family activities, public event	\$795.82	cash	Percent for Art
Field trips	included in artists' fees		
Space rental	\$600 photo/poetry \$0 video \$0 theater	cash in-kind in-kind	Percent for Art Portland Art Museum Northwest Film Center Multnomah County Adult & Juvenile Community Justice
Administrative: arts council administrative overhead, project management	\$4,209 overhead \$14,030 management	cash	.33 percent administrative fee Percent for Art
Administrative: Juvenile Justice	no estimate of time was available	in-kind	Multnomah County Adult & Juvenile Community Justice
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$86,317</b>	<b>cash/in-kind</b>	

All partners felt that the benefits of the video project outweighed the additional costs because it has reached a greater audience than the 12 youth who participated. The video has been distributed to other youth on probation, attendees at juvenile justice conferences, students in public schools, and general audiences. The youth who produced the video have been present at the video showings and have answered questions about how it was made, increasing their communication skills. The video is used by the Department of Adult and Community Juvenile Justice to educate other youth on the consequences of their actions and has been translated into Spanish. Finally, the video won the regional 1998 Young People's Film and Video Festival Award.

Youth incentives, transportation, and food (except at the openings) were paid for by the "flex fund" of Multnomah County's Department of Adult and Juvenile Community Justice. The flex fund is a special fund established to pay for individualized, wrap-around services for youth and families involved in the juvenile justice system. Flex fund assistance totaled \$6,450. The probation officers in each unit went before the flex fund committee to request these supporting funds. It was up to the probation officers to decide what types of incentives, transportation, and food were appropriate for their clients.

At the beginning of the program probation officers felt that an incentive of a \$100 gift certificate for youth completing the project would be important. However, follow-up interviews with youth and probation officers did not show that the promise of a gift certificate strengthened the youths' commitment to the program. Instead, time off probation and the opportunity to participate in an art project were the most appealing incentives according to both the youth and the probation officers. Monies needed from the flex fund have dropped since the probation officers no longer provide gift certificates. (See page 55 in the Program Planning chapter for a complete discussion on incentives.)

The transportation budget varied for the three projects. For the theater project—with the Gang Resource Intervention Team—probation officers felt it was important to pick up and drop off the youth to ensure that they would come to the program and to provide them a safe access home. For the video and photography projects, youth were provided with bus passes; probation officers felt that it was important for the youth to take on the responsibility of getting to the programs on their own.

Looking at costs on a per student basis, 45 youth participated in the three programs. The overall cash expenditures totaled \$86,317 for the year. This averages out to a cost of \$1,918 per student. The evaluation conducted by Caliber Associates showed



**The cost of projects will differ based on the art form, but don't always steer away from a high-cost project. Examine the potential benefits to see if the project may be worth the extra expense.**

improvements in communication, teamwork, attitudes toward school, self-esteem, self-efficacy, positive peer associations and resistance to peer pressure. Fewer program participants had new court referrals during the program period than did comparison youth. These results provide strong evidence that the benefits of operating the Youth Arts Public Art program far outweigh the cost.

An unanticipated side effect was the interest taken in art by youth not in the arts programs. After the art from Youth Arts Public Art was displayed in the hallways of the juvenile facility, youth not in the program started asking their probation officers if they could make art and if it could be hung on the walls. This was totally unexpected.



**Use the planning model exercise as the basis from which to build your budget. This ensures that you will consider all of the expenses needed to run your program.**

## Art-at-Work

Art-at-Work is supported financially by a combination of Fulton County Arts Council and corporate funds and from proceeds from the sale of student-generated artwork. In-kind support is provided by the arts council, Fulton County Juvenile Court, Atlanta Public Schools, and local galleries and museums.

The first step in developing the Art-at-Work budget was to review the planning model and assign a cost to each activity planned. The next step was to determine where Art-at-Work would obtain the resources to pay for each of these costs.

Art-at-Work program expenses for the 1997-98 year of operation totaled \$116,500. After creating the planning model, the art council project team—the executive director, project manager, and program coordinator—determined that they would need to raise cash contributions of approximately \$67,000. The remaining \$49,500 would come from in-kind contributions.

**Table 11** shows cash and in-kind program expenses and resources for Art-at-Work for the first year of operation.

**Table 11: Art-at-Work Budget 1997-98**



Category	Expenses	cash/in-kind	Resources
Youth salary (youth are paid \$5/hour)	\$33,600	cash	Fulton County, sponsors, proceeds from sale of artwork
Artist instructors and assistants	\$20,000	cash	Same as above
Social worker	\$3,600	cash	Same as above
Curriculum Specialist	\$1,000	cash	Same as above
Program Trainer	\$2,500	cash	Same as above
Visiting Artists	\$450	cash	Same as above
Data Collector	\$1,800	cash	Same as above
Art supplies	\$3,000	cash	Same as above
After-school snacks	\$300	cash	Same as above
Family activities	\$400	cash	Same as above
Field trips	\$1,500	in-kind	local art galleries, museums, theater companies, other arts organizations
Space rental	\$5,000	in-kind	West End Performing Arts Center
Administrative: arts council project management and coordination	\$26,000	in-kind	Fulton County Arts Council
Administrative: court/liaison and probation officers	\$12,000	in-kind	Fulton County Court
School data collection	\$5,000	in-kind	Atlanta Public Schools
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$116,500</b>	<b>cash/in-kind</b>	



**Remember that in-kind services are a critical part of your program budget. At some point it may be necessary to cover in-kind services with actual cash resources.**

Of the cash expenses, more than half (\$33,600) is spent paying youth for their participation in the program. Artist instructors and assistants receive 30 percent, approximately \$20,000. The remaining 20 percent is used for program supplies and special activities.

Art-at-Work cash resources come from a variety of sources. In 1997-98 the Fulton County Arts Council contributed \$23,840; corporations provided approximately \$40,000; and proceeds from the sale of artwork totaled \$3,400.

The \$49,500 in-kind expenses are field trips, space rental, and administrative costs for project management, program coordination, and court involvement. The bulk of the expenses are for administrative work conducted by the arts council and the court: 52 percent of in-kind expenses are for administrative costs incurred by the arts council; 24 percent of in-kind expenses are administrative costs for the court. The \$1,500 expense for field trips is provided by local galleries, museums, theater companies, and other arts organizations. The in-kind contribution from the Atlanta Public Schools is for collecting data on youth who are participating in the program.

In-kind administrative resources are an important component of arts programs for youth at risk. When Art-at-Work first started, the project manager spent about 85 percent of her time setting up the program. Now that the program is up and running, the project manager estimates that she spends 30 to 40 percent of her time on Art-at-Work. The program coordinator's salary was provided by the arts council on an in-kind basis the first year; in the second year, the arts council no longer provided the staff position, and funding for this position became an added cash cost.

Fifteen students are given art instruction and taught job-readiness skills for one year. The **cost per student** is \$4,467 cash cost per student, per year; if we take into account both cash and in-kind expenses, then the cost per student per year is \$7,767. We can compare this with incarceration: Fulton County Court estimates that to incarcerate 15 youth for a year costs \$427,000, or \$28,466 per youth in 1997.



# Urban smARTS

*“The Urban smARTS program is a collaborative paradigm, and therefore the funding also needs to be broadly based.”*

— Eduardo Diaz, Executive Director,

San Antonio Department of Arts and Cultural Affairs


Urban smARTS has been in existence for more than five years. During this time the program has been funded by the City of San Antonio through its Community Initiatives and Arts and Cultural Affairs departments, the state Criminal Justice Division, and the school district. Beginning in 1998-99, Urban smARTS will be funded by the City of San Antonio through the Department of Arts and Cultural Affairs and the school district. Criminal Justice Division funds will no longer be available.

Urban smARTS operates its program at eight sites. The overall cash resources for the program are \$219,697; 43 percent comes from city of San Antonio funds, 24 percent from the school district, 22 percent from the hotel/motel tax, and 11 percent from the Criminal Justice Division grant.

The arts department funds, through an in-kind contribution, the Urban smARTS director and program manager, who spend, respectively, 35 percent and 60 percent of their time on the Urban smARTS program.

The following chart shows the expenditures for Urban smARTS. One area in which Urban smARTS differs substantially from the other two sites is in transportation expenses. Transportation home is a key element of the Urban smARTS program. It is felt that the program would be far less effective if the youth, who are 11-13 years old, were responsible for their own transportation home in the afternoon at the end of the program. The school district funds the cost and the coordination of the bus ride home.

Artist training is a critical component of the Urban smARTS program. Training costs are paid for by the art department’s arts-in-education program. **Table 12** shows a recent program budget for all eight sites.



‘Transportation home is a key element of the Urban smARTS program. It is felt that the program would be far less effective if the youth, who are 11-13 years old, were responsible for their own transportation home in the afternoon at the end of the program. The school district funds the cost and the coordination of the bus ride home.’

**Table 12: Urban smARTS Budget 1997-98**



**School districts often look to outside agencies to administer programs that address social problems and meet the needs of their students. Don't overlook the possibility of collaborating with your school district. It can be a strong ally.**

Category	Expenses	cash/in-kind	Resources
Artists/art performances	\$99,026	cash	City of San Antonio (includes state Criminal Justice Division grant), general fund, and hotel/motel tax
On-site program coordinators	\$37,613	cash	City of San Antonio
Transportation home	\$28,000	cash	school district
Teacher liaisons	\$25,151	cash	school district
Caseworkers	\$8,673	cash	City of San Antonio
Training consultants, artists stipends, and artist performances during training	\$8,500	cash	Department of Arts and Cultural Affairs
Field trips	\$9,450	cash	City of San Antonio
Nutritional snacks	\$3,964	in-kind	Park and Recreation
Supplies	\$4,000	cash	City of San Antonio
Evaluation	N/A for 1997-98	N/A	
Administration by arts department	\$7,784 administrative overhead; 35% of director; 60% of project manager; 50% of Administrative Assistant	cash in-kind	City of San Antonio Department of Arts and Cultural Affairs
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$232,161</b>	<b>cash/in-kind</b>	

The direct cost per site to operate Urban smARTS is \$20,516. This amount includes teacher liaison costs, transportation, lead and supporting artist fees, caseworkers, fees to professional artists involved in field trips, and artist supplies. This amount does not include the cost of the program manager who manages all sites; overhead costs; food; or in-kind administrative costs. Each site serves a maximum of 60 students. The annual

direct cost per student is \$341. Although the benefit to the community has not been calculated in dollars, it is clear from the evaluation results that benefits such as increased self-esteem in youth, positive peer interactions, and youths' improved attitudes toward their community far outweigh the costs of the program.

Here is how the three sites obtained financial commitment from their partners and advocated for financial support for their programs—an ongoing effort.

# Advocating for Program Resources

## Youth Arts Public Art

*"If we can succeed with programs like this, we will not need to spend so many countless millions on jail space and juvenile detention facilities and programs. We will have fewer victims and more citizens leading positive, fulfilling lives. What could be more important?"*

—Beverly Stein, Multnomah County Chair

Advocating for expending Percent for Art funds—which are typically used to commission professional artists—on a program in which court-involved youth would work with professional artists to create public art was a slow process that took vision and a great deal of commitment and time from the arts council and juvenile justice staff.

Here is how the arts council achieved approval to use Percent for Art funds to pay for an arts program with at-risk youth:

The first step was to look at the policies behind the Percent for Art program.

The purpose of the Percent for Art public art programs is "to integrate a wide range of public art into the community and reflect a diversity of populations, artistic disciplines, and points of view. (The Regional Arts & Culture Council analyzes each Percent for Art project that it undertakes to ensure that the context of the project location is considered so that there is a strong connection and resonance with the site and its users.)



**Build new programs  
that further the mission  
of your organization.  
You will have a better  
chance for success  
if you can show a  
connection between  
what you are  
proposing and the  
policies of your  
organization and your  
partner organization.**

Select goals from the Percent for Art guidelines that are relevant to funding the Youth Arts Public Art program are:

- to encourage public dialogue about and understanding of works of art and the issues public art may raise
- to develop a public collection of artwork that is of the highest aesthetic quality, represent our diverse community, and offer a wide range of artistic tastes and venues, including both established and innovative art as well as permanent and temporary works
- to provide opportunities for artists to play active roles in the revitalization of neighborhoods
- to encourage the preservation of multicultural traditions

It was this policy direction—the project having a strong connection and resonance with the site and its users—that provided the impetus for the second step in advocating for expending Percent for Art funds on an arts program designed for youth at risk. In this step, the arts council approached the juvenile justice division with the idea of a youth arts program. The director of juvenile justice was very enthusiastic. Again, policy direction played an important part in the director's decision to go forward with the project. The two juvenile justice policies that were cited as supporting this creative project were

- Multnomah County's policy of creating a "caring community"—a community in which key organizations and leaders work toward a common vision and agenda
- the juvenile justice division's goal to "serve and be an important resource to the community in helping reduce the factors that drive the need for the justice services"

Together, representatives from the arts council and juvenile justice visited each of the five Multnomah County commissioners to describe this vision for a youth program that would result in public art and to garner their support to allow the Percent for Art funds to be used in this way. Ultimately, they were successful, and the board of commissioners approved this use of Percent for Art funds.

Once juvenile justice and Multnomah County agreed to fund the Youth Arts Public Art program, the arts council was ready to proceed with the third step—the creation of a Youth Arts Plan Steering Committee. This committee was appointed by the chair of the

Multnomah County commission. (For more information about this committee, see page 32.) The committee looked at the site—the juvenile justice complex—and at policies of the county, juvenile justice, and the arts council, and proposed that public art be created in a collaborative relationship among youth, professional artists, and juvenile justice staff in a manner that would help to deter the youth from delinquent behaviors. An integral part of the program would be that the artwork produced by the youth working with the professional artists would become a part of the public art collection.

## Art-at-Work

*“I hope that you will take a moment to reflect upon the sample of art within this box. It was created by hands that could be otherwise picking up a remote control watching hours of television, shoplifting from a store, or taking an addictive substance, instead of picking up a paintbrush or a lump of clay.”*

—Harriet Sanford, director, Fulton County Arts Council,  
letter to potential funders

When the Fulton County Arts Council staff developed their budget, they also developed a fund-raising campaign targeted at corporate and individual sponsorship.

The first step in this campaign was to research corporations and individuals within the Atlanta area who might be interested in Art-at-Work. They asked themselves the following questions: Who are the corporations and individuals in this geographic area who might contribute to this type of program? How much have they given in the past to other programs in the arts or to programs focused on youth at risk? Of this list, whom should we target?

The second step was to develop a fund-raising packet. The first page of the packet is a collage of news clippings about Art-at-Work, followed by a letter from the executive director explaining the benefits of the Art-at-Work program and the amount being requested. Also included are a budget, sponsor benefits, samples of the youths’ artwork, and photos of the youth. The packet is placed in a box decorated by an artist. The box also contains a mosaic designed and created by one of the youth. (Several items from the packet are included in **Appendix 30**.)



**Appendix 30:**  
Art-at-Work fund-raising packet



**Remember you are  
selling an art program.  
Be creative! Package  
your proposal  
artistically.**



Sponsor benefits increase with the amount of money awarded. Benefits have been developed for gifts of \$5,000, \$10,000, and \$20,000. Some of the benefits offered are acknowledgement of company name in all media, print materials, and correspondence for Art-at-Work; invitations to Art-at-Work shows; installation of Art-at-Work artwork at the sponsoring company; and a photo opportunity with Fulton County commissioners.

The response to this campaign has resulted in \$47,000 for the program to date. The account for receiving these donations was set up with the Community Foundation of Greater Atlanta. This is an interest-bearing account!

## Urban smARTS

In 1992-93, when the City of San Antonio Community Initiatives and Arts and Cultural Affairs departments joined forces to create the Urban smARTS program, a program existed within the state Criminal Justice Division for cities to access monies derived from municipal court fines to fund socially based programs.

The Department of Community Initiatives was awarded, through a competitive process, five years of funding for Urban smARTS from the Criminal Justice Division. At the onset, the city knew that the program would not be funded beyond five years. The agreement signed between the city and the state provided full funding for Urban smARTS the first year; then for each of the next four years, funding was decreased by 20 percent. As a part of the funding agreement the city picked up the cost of the program in 20-percent increments. With the decrease in Criminal Justice Division funds, the city has looked to other sources to help fund the Urban smARTS program. Hotel/motel taxes have been added as a source of funding as part of an art enrichment program and are used to help fund the artists who participate in the program. By the end of the 1997-98, the city had picked up the entire cost of running Urban smARTS.

For the 1998-99 program year, the City of San Antonio will provide the funding that previously was provided by the Criminal Justice Division. Urban smARTS will be a line item within the city budget. This level of funding commitment to Urban smARTS from the city was made when the city first applied for the grant.

The financial arrangement with the school district has been stable throughout the five years of Urban smARTS (although in 1997 the district discontinued funds for meals). From 1992 to 1998 the school district budgeted a fairly constant amount of money (\$50,000 to \$65,000) a year to pay for teacher liaisons, transportation home, and field



**Be clear about what you are asking for. For example: "We are requesting \$5,000," or "We are requesting an in-kind contribution of tickets to the theater."**

trips. The school district has a contractual arrangement with the city to pay for the services. The district has been very resourceful in acquiring federal funds to meet its obligation to the Urban smARTS program.

# Funding Opportunities and Resources for Arts Programs for Youth at Risk

Numerous departments and agencies of the federal government provide funding support to communities to implement strategies and programs centered on children and youth. Federal grants are often administered by state and local entities according to standardized regulations and guidelines. Occasionally, federal entities award direct grants through national leadership demonstration projects or specialized initiatives. Youth programs that are based in the arts are often eligible to apply for direct and indirect federal support as part of community or school collaborations.

The Web sites for federal departments, agencies, and clearinghouses are important sources of **current** information about the availability of program funding, as is the **Federal Register**, available at all public libraries and on the GPO's official Web site at: <http://www.access.gpo.gov/su-docs/aces/aces140.html>. The following agencies provide particularly pertinent sources of information about federal support for arts programs for youth at risk:

The **National Endowment for the Arts** (NEA) awards hundreds of grants each year to non-profit arts organizations. The NEA Web site (<http://arts.endow.gov/>) contains valuable information about the types of grants available; grant application guidelines; descriptions of current grantees; contact information for other federal, state, and local funding sources; and other up-to-date resources. To order a hard copy of NEA's grant-application guidelines, Grants to Organizations, send your request to the following e-mail address: [Webmgr@mail.endow.gov](mailto:Webmgr@mail.endow.gov) and include your name and mailing address. You can also contact the NEA at the following address: 100 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20506.



**Prepare early for a way to replace funding sources that have a set end date. Also be sure to establish a mechanism for all partners to provide input about program priorities and how funds will be allocated to achieve these priorities. The planning model provides a good framework for these discussions.**

The **U.S. Department of Education** provides funding for after-school youth activities through several programs, most notably the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program and the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program. Current program application information can be obtained from the department's Web site: <http://www.ed.gov>.

The **U.S. Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration** (ETA) is the source of information about funding administered by state and local governments that may be of interest to youth program administrators. The ETA Web site is <http://www.doleta.gov/>.

The **U.S. Department of Health and Human Services** maintains several national clearinghouses, two of which provide current information about programs and resources that are particularly useful to arts-based youth programs: The **National Clearinghouse for Alcohol and Drug Abuse Information** provides resources on drug and alcohol education, prevention, and treatment. This clearinghouse's Web site, PREVLIN, features federal drug prevention resources and is located at <http://www.health.org/>. The **National Clearinghouse on Families and Youth** distributes information for the Family and Youth Service Bureau. Call (301)508-8098 to receive information on specific resources on youth development, family services, substance abuse, runaway and homeless youth, and community schools. The clearinghouse's Web site is located at <http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/fysb>.

The **Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention** (OJJDP) administers numerous grant programs designed to support state and local nonprofit organizations in planning, implementing, and evaluating programs for at-risk youth. In addition, OJJDP also offers a wide range of training, technical assistance, and evaluation resources. To learn more about available resources, check out OJJDP's flier "Applying for OJJDP Funding Opportunities," one of many OJJDP publications available through the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS). Information about specific publications and products is available by contacting an NCJRS reference specialist at (800)851-3420 or at [askncjrs@ncjrs.org](mailto:askncjrs@ncjrs.org). To learn more about OJJDP and its grant programs, NCJRS and its information services, and funding opportunities available through other federal agencies and private foundations, check out OJJDP's Web site at <http://www.ncjrs.org/ojjhome.htm>.



Other sources of information about funding opportunities and resources for arts programs for children and youth include:

The **National Funding Collaborative on Violence Prevention** is a public-private partnership that “links resources to local efforts to raise public awareness that violence is preventable and to empower citizens to tackle violence in their communities.” The organization pools resources from national and community foundations, corporations, the federal government, community organizations, and private donors, and is currently supporting eleven three-year pilot projects. Contact Linda K. Bowen, executive director, (202)393-4148, or by e-mail at [nfcvp@nfcvp.org](mailto:nfcvp@nfcvp.org). Also, visit the collaborative’s Web site at <http://www.lcidscampaigns.org/cac/sites/NFCUP/about.html>.

The **National Resource Center for Youth Services**, at the University of Oklahoma, offers resources and support for professionals whose focus is youth, children, and families. The center provides on-site training services and offers a wide variety of affordable publications and videos. Its mission is to “enhance the services provided to at-risk youth and their families.” Center staff can be reached at (918)585-2986. For more information, see the center's Web site at <http://www.nrcys.ou.edu>.

The **National Crime Prevention Council On-Line Resource Center** is a “national nonprofit organization whose mission is to help America prevent crime and build safer, stronger communities.” The center’s publications include an eight-page booklet entitled *Barter, Bargain, And Borrow: Lively examples of how to get the resources your program needs through a variety of local channels*. Ideas that work for finding goods, services, people, and money to get the job done and build partnerships. For more information about the center’s services, visit its Web site at <http://www.ncpc.org/>.



In addition to federal programs, there are other public and private sources that you might want to check out.

**Americans for the Arts** offers a number of publications that provide information on resources for funding arts programs. They are:

- Hotel-Motel Taxes for the Arts
- Sales Taxes for the Arts
- Amusement Taxes for the Arts
- Percent for Art Programs
- Resource Development Handbook: Untapped Public Funding For the Arts

You can visit the Americans for the Arts Web site at [www.artsusa.org](http://www.artsusa.org) for information on how to obtain copies of these publications, as well as for additional information on various youth programs.

**The Foundation Center** maintains a complete listing of foundations nationwide and information on grants awarded from each foundation. Call (202)331-1400 or visit its Web site at [www.foundcenter.org](http://www.foundcenter.org).