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Dear Colleagues in Service,

In 1960, my family came to Anaheim and made it our home. As a child growing up in this City, there were many opportunities to fill my day with healthy and wholesome activities at every park and school playground. A caring adult and a safe place to play were always just a few blocks away. Later as a teen, I found my calling in being that caring Recreation Leader on a city park, who created opportunities for children to enjoy life and to reach their highest potential. Although my job title has changed a number of times throughout my adult life, the mission has not. The legacy of caring for Anaheim’s youth continues. This year we are adding to that legacy by launching the Anaheim Youth Services Assessment, the first major community needs assessment conducted since 1989.

The 1989 study was a comprehensive effort assessing citywide services. While it focused on the general safety net, rather than any specific youth services, the process drew many community stakeholders together to create strategies for improvement that benefited youth. By 1991, these coordinated efforts had produced significant impact in the Anaheim community, including a new Boys and Girls Clubs of Anaheim, enhanced Park Ranger programs to make city parks a safer place, school-based programs such as Project S.A.Y. (Support Anaheim’s Youth), Kids in Action, and Anaheim Achieves, and many more strategic responses to the challenges preventing youth from succeeding in school and life.

Most of these programs are still engaging our community, reaching significant numbers of children, youth, and families every day. But there are still challenges to be addressed.

With feedback from community stakeholders, parents and youth, service providers, community-based organizations, and city officials, this assessment project has delved deeply into the current environment facing our at-risk youth and the state of existing programs designed to support them. The findings that follow in this substantive report can become the foundation for honest discussion about the strategies and tactics we can embrace as a community to address the systemic challenges facing our youth.

The Anaheim Community Foundation is committed to playing a leading role in this discussion and to fostering the opportunities for collaboration and responsiveness highlighted by this report.

Very simply, our youth are our future. I look forward to the ensuing conversation over these findings and to launching a new era of strategic and collaborative efforts for the families of Anaheim.

Sincerely,

Terry Lowe
Chief Executive Officer
Executive Summary

In spring of 2012, the Anaheim Community Foundation launched the first youth needs assessment in the city since 1989 with support from Disneyland Resort. The purpose of the Anaheim Youth Services Assessment was to explore the landscape of youth services in the City of Anaheim, focusing on current programs and services being offered to at-risk youth, alongside an exploration of existing priorities and challenges as identified by key stakeholders in youth services, including after-school program providers, schools, parents, youth, community-based organizations, community leaders, business, and city officials.

Much research has been dedicated to identifying what factors actually make youth “at-risk.” The term “at-risk” is used widely and regularly by educators and policymakers when referring to youth who may be at risk of lifelong disadvantage, including risk of poor economic, health, social, educational or personal outcomes. While many youth facing these risk factors grow into functional, contributing members of society, the more risk factors a youth has, the more likely he or she will suffer from an adverse outcome.

There are many models of intervention and prevention that have proven successful in addressing these risk factors in an urban context, and Anaheim itself has programs that positively impact thousands of youth each day in the city. Some programs, such as LA’s BEST, focus on after-school supports that offer safe haven, enrichments, and recreation for younger children and older youth. Other programs, such as NYC’s Harlem Children’s Zone include parent engagement, school-community linkages, and offering basic familial support to stabilize the home environment. Still others, such as the Advancement Project’s Urban Peace program, focus on addressing youth violence through community policing, youth development, and a focus on systemic issues through public health supports and community development. All of these programs offer examples of strategies and tactics that can make a difference in the lives of youth and families facing adverse circumstances in Anaheim.

With a central focus on youth services, the assessment process was anchored by demographic research to garner a current environmental scan of the city, and specifically of the city’s youth. That research was followed by a survey of providers that offer after-school and other services to youth. The providers included those that offer comprehensive youth services as a core component of their mission and others that dedicate some, but not all, of their operational energy to youth programming. For the purposes of this process, youth were defined as children and teens from age 5 to age 18.

An additional survey was developed specifically for schools, to drill down on the intersection of community programs at school sites. The survey process was then followed by a series of focus groups and interviews designed to further explore attitudes about and perceptions of the current landscape of services and the current risks faced by the city’s youth.

Findings from the assessment highlight the particular urgency for investment in Anaheim’s youth, as well as the geographic areas of highest youth needs. By combining census tracts that ranked highest in percent of youth population, with those tracts that ranked highest for housing density and lowest for median income, the research was able to pinpoint areas most in need of services, and among them, the tracts that have relatively few youth programming options.
The school survey respondents identified three key areas that could be improved to better serve the needs of Anaheim youth, including provision of more extracurricular activities, educational support in the form of counseling and tutoring, and community supports such as parent education and the creation of safe routes to and from school.

The provider survey gathered information about the organizations that offer youth services, the youth they serve, and their ideas to help youth achieve a lifetime of success. Key findings included: information about location of services (concentration of services in western and central Anaheim); information about organizational tenure (half of those surveyed have been providing services for more than 20 years); information about availability of offerings (few programs are open past 5 p.m.; far fewer programs are available for older youth); identification of primary risk factors (poverty, gang involvement, and school dropout); identification of missing services or offerings that need to be increased (prevention programs, safe space, teen pregnancy prevention, gang prevention, community engagement); barriers to program access (transportation and lack of information); and security of program funding (more than half of organizations receive program funding from a single source, and half have experienced 10% or more of decreased funding in recent years).

Participant response from the qualitative portion of the assessment unearthed perceptions and opinions on the issue of at-risk youth in Anaheim. Youth confirmed many of the findings related to key challenges they face as students and residents, including gang presence, peer pressure, lack of parental involvement and presence, and managing ethnic prejudice. Many youth agreed that after-school programs help youth stay away from gangs and stay safe. Without exception all youth agreed that they should be more involved in the creation of effective programming, but understood that they had to be at the table in order to achieve that input.

Parents identified safety as the number one concern related to their youth, and elaborated on the challenge of providing a safe environment for their children while working multiple jobs to meet basic needs and survive in a difficult economy. They also expressed a lack of awareness about available school and community programming or how to access them, and believed that parent education around this issue and others would be valuable, if such training were offered at nights or on the weekend.

Providers saw gangs and gang involvement as a top challenge facing Anaheim youth, having seen violence on the increase in recent years. More offerings, safe supervision, and parent education were identified as potential solutions to address this challenge. Providers also discussed their own limited capacity to address these needs, due to lack of funding and space. Even still, all providers agreed that their programs could only go so far, and that supporting the home environment was a critical additional investment that needed to be made, as no one program can address the magnitude and complexity of each youth’s needs.

Educators identified gangs, poverty, and lack of jobs as top challenges facing Anaheim youth and understood that the school is a trusted source of information for families. However, they also expressed concern that overreliance on schools to address all youth challenges may limit the exploration of collaborations and use of other institutions in supporting youth and families. Some expressed frustration due to the struggle to maintain a safe school environment in the face of increased dangerous activity, reduced funding and the loss of School Resource Officers. Educators repeatedly mentioned the need for a centralized collaborative effort that would help increase communication and partnership across multiple stakeholder groups.
Leaders of community-based organizations identified trust between providers and the community as a crucial factor in creating an environment of mutual respect and partnership. Leaders believe the top challenges facing youth are gangs and poverty, but also believe that the perception that all low-income youth are troublemakers, at-risk, or needy needs to be challenged, and that youth can be empowered to understand and believe in alternative opportunities for their future. Leaders also discussed the critical role of the family in the health and success of youth and suggested that a continuum of services be developed to meet the needs of youth in a variety of settings. Finally, leaders agreed that there could be more collaboration and communication between service providers themselves in order to frame a collective impact approach.

Local businesses expressed the belief that businesses should become active partners in supporting youth services, particularly in sharing their insights on what youth need to be successful in the workplace. While they thought providers could help youth prepare for the job market through mentoring, scholarships, leadership training, career/job awareness, and job search assistance, they also felt that businesses could help youth by emphasizing the importance of education and job skills, providing internships/part-time jobs, supporting skills development in business practices, and, in partnership with providers, supporting mentoring, parent programs, and volunteerism.

One-on-one interviews were conducted with 18 community leaders and city officials, and drew out the diverse opinions of this group of Anaheim stakeholders on the challenges facing the city’s youth. What most participants did agree on was that the 2008 recession had a detrimental impact on youth service offerings, and that a proactive and collaborative approach to developing strategies and solutions was needed to help address problems in a holistic fashion. Many discussed the crowded living conditions found in low-income areas of the city, that strengthening the family should be a focus of additional programming, and that the city needed to re-engage residents and recreate a sense of community in Anaheim.

In sum, the Anaheim Youth Services Assessment was able to highlight both the history of commitment to the youth and families of Anaheim, and the need for a unified vision for serving the youth of Anaheim to strengthen outcomes, families, and collaborative efforts to address the challenges identified. A sustainable, long-term strategic plan for youth services should be developed to optimize current resources and build on evidence-based practices, ensuring the best possible environment for youth to grow and develop.
The Anaheim Youth Services Assessment is the most recent expression of the Anaheim Community Foundation’s efforts to improve the quality of youth services for Anaheim residents and builds upon the City’s work in establishing programs that promote youth development. As the first assessment conducted in nearly 25 years, this timely project provides a snapshot of the challenges facing Anaheim’s youth in the midst of difficult economic times.

The 1989 community needs assessment was also a comprehensive effort to identify issues impacting youth and gaps in youth services. The process drew many community stakeholders together to create strategies for improvement, and by 1991, these coordinated efforts had produced significant impact in the Anaheim community. Highlights include:

1. New collaborative efforts among the Boys and Girls Clubs of Anaheim, the YMCA, and the YWCA to address the needs of youth in the city.

2. Targeted community safety strategies that helped decrease the incidence of community violence and gang involvement, often involving partnership between programs and law enforcement; for example, Park Ranger programs (not currently running) provided additional supervision of parks, so that people would feel safe to spend time there.

3. The City launched two new school-based youth initiatives:
   a. Project S.A.Y. (Support Anaheim’s Youth), a school-based leadership development program that encourages anti-violence, anti-substance abuse, and pro-education attitudes, still runs at the junior high and high school levels.
   b. The Anaheim Achieves after-school program, currently serving more than 4,700 elementary and junior high students a day at 44 sites, has received state and national recognition for its commitment to community collaboration and dedication to educational excellence.

While these programs have been successful in many ways, over the last two years, Anaheim has experienced a resurgence of community violence, gang activity, and other community issues that affect the future of Anaheim’s youth. With the city’s higher densities of low-income youth and a more youth-centric population than the average city in Orange County, families, service providers, community-based organizations, educators, and City officials all share the desire to ensure youth have opportunities to secure a better future. They also know that there must be collective and coordinated action to effectively support Anaheim youth in reaching their full potential.

As an initial step towards revitalizing these efforts, the Anaheim Community Foundation partnered with Disneyland Resort in the spring of 2012 to initiate an assessment process that could identify gaps in the existing service net and provide a clear picture of the challenges facing both the city’s youth and the providers that serve them. After a competitive and formal RFP process, the Anaheim Community Foundation contracted with The Olin Group to conduct the assessment. Based locally, with extensive experience conducting assessments in the nonprofit sector, The Olin Group launched the research process in the fall of 2012, reviewing current demographics, existing literature on at-risk youth, conducting stakeholder surveys and focus groups, and interviewing key leaders in the community. This report captures the results of this research and is intended to serve as an objective resource to help drive strategic action around youth development and programming in 2013 and beyond.
The City of Anaheim, incorporated in 1857, is the second largest city in Orange County, following Irvine in terms of land space, and is also, notwithstanding its long history, one of the “youngest.” Demographics show that Anaheim is more youth-centric than the average Orange County city. Of a population counting more than 336,000 people, over a quarter (27.3%) of residents are under the age of 18, a higher percentage than the countywide average of 24.1%. Measuring youth population in a different way, 44.8% of 99,238 Anaheim households have members under the age of 18, compared to an Orange County average of 37.8%. These statistics also indicate a higher percent of youth than the statewide figure (25% in 2010, 24.6% in 2011). Figure 1 shows the total number of youth living in each census tract in Anaheim, while Figure 2 represents the youth population as a percentage of the total number of residents in the census tract.

**FIGURE 1: NUMBER OF YOUTH BY CENSUS TRACT**

---

1All demographics taken from US Census Data 2010 unless otherwise noted and retrieved from http://www.census.gov/

22011 data estimates Anaheim’s population at 341,361 persons.

3Orange County data estimates from 2011. Compared to other cities of similar population size, Anaheim is second only to Santa Ana (30.7%) in percentage of residents under 18.
Anaheim is also an ethnically diverse city, harboring three major ethnic categories (see Figure 3), with a lower percentage of White (27.5%) and higher percentages of Hispanic (52.8%) and Asian (14.8%) when compared to the California averages (40.1%, 37.6%, and 13%, respectively). Anaheim also has a notably higher percentage of Hispanic residents than Orange County (34.1%), with lower percentages of White and Asian (43.5% and 18.4% in Orange County, respectively). Just over 60% of Anaheim households speak a language other than English in the home, and 38% of residents are foreign-born (see Figure 4), both categories significantly higher than the California averages of 43.2% and 27.2%, respectively. The percentage of students who are English Learners runs as high as 57.3% in the Anaheim City School District, which covers most of the city’s elementary schools, with the Magnolia School District at 53.6%.4

4Ed-Data, 2010-2011, retrieved from http://www.ed-data.k12.ca.us/Pages/Home.aspx
Anaheim’s median household income of $57,807 is slightly less than the California median of $60,883, while the average number of persons per household (3.32) is higher than the California average (2.89), indicating a density and income differential (see Figure 5 for Anaheim’s median household income by ZIP code and Figures 6 and 7 for Anaheim’s housing density and comparisons to other areas). More than one in four Anaheim households is led by a single parent (27.6%), and Anaheim children receiving financial assistance through CALWORKs account for 23% of all Orange County recipients. Twenty-one percent of Anaheim’s children and youth under 18 live below the Federal Poverty Level, a higher percentage than Orange County, California, and the nation as a whole. In Anaheim’s two main school districts, Anaheim City School District and Anaheim Union High School District, 85.5% and 62% of students qualify for Free/Reduced Price Meals, another indicator of poverty (see Table 1 for percentages across districts serving Anaheim students). Respectively, in 2010-2011, these two districts enrolled 1,870 and 2,467 pre-K through 12th grade students who were considered homeless, living in shelters, hotels/motels, cars, with other families, and in other unsuitable living conditions.
FIGURE 5: ANAHEIM MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY ZIP CODE

FIGURE 6: ANAHEIM HOUSING DENSITY BY CENSUS TRACT
In addition to these indications of poverty, Anaheim’s youth face other difficult challenges. In Orange County, Anaheim ranks in the top five cities for the number of juvenile probationers (26.4 probationers per 1,000 juveniles), and ranks third in number of violent crimes (352 violent crimes per 100,000 residents) for cities with populations over 100,000. From 2010 to 2011, the number of violent crimes known to law enforcement in Anaheim rose from 1,161 to 1,281, contrasting with an overall decrease in Orange County (6,907 to 6,508) and in nearby cities like Santa Ana (1,510 to 1,313). Officials have estimated there are approximately 1,800 gang members in 35 gangs in the city; in the 2009-2010 academic year, 9% of 7th graders, 8% of 9th graders, 7% of 11th graders, and 12% of alternative education students in the Anaheim Union High School District stated they were currently involved in a gang.

Additionally, Anaheim’s teen pregnancy rate is nearly double the Orange County average and higher than both the California and national averages. Sixty-seven percent of 11th graders, 53% of 9th graders, and 33% of 7th graders reported trying or using alcohol, marijuana, or other illegal drugs/pills, higher than Orange County’s most recent data of 63%, 45%, and 26%, respectively. Only 68% of Anaheim’s 9th grade students have a healthy body composition, ranking second lowest in the County and below both the State and County averages. Furthermore, Anaheim Union recorded a 2010-2011 adjusted grade 9-12 dropout rate of 2.9%, the second highest in Orange County.

*This table includes districts with any Anaheim school sites, as well as the overall Orange County and California percentages. Anaheim City and Anaheim Union High count the most schools in Anaheim.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anaheim City SD</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia SD</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savanna Elementary SD</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaheim Union High SD</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralia SD</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Unified SD</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified SD</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*TABLE 1: PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ELIGIBLE FOR FREE/REDUCED PRICE MEALS*

In addition to these indications of poverty, Anaheim’s youth face other difficult challenges. In Orange County, Anaheim ranks in the top five cities for the number of juvenile probationers (26.4 probationers per 1,000 juveniles), and ranks third in number of violent crimes (352 violent crimes per 100,000 residents) for cities with populations over 100,000. From 2010 to 2011, the number of violent crimes known to law enforcement in Anaheim rose from 1,161 to 1,281, contrasting with an overall decrease in Orange County (6,907 to 6,508) and in nearby cities like Santa Ana (1,510 to 1,313). Officials have estimated there are approximately 1,800 gang members in 35 gangs in the city; in the 2009-2010 academic year, 9% of 7th graders, 8% of 9th graders, 7% of 11th graders, and 12% of alternative education students in the Anaheim Union High School District stated they were currently involved in a gang.

Additionally, Anaheim’s teen pregnancy rate is nearly double the Orange County average and higher than both the California and national averages. Sixty-seven percent of 11th graders, 53% of 9th graders, and 33% of 7th graders reported trying or using alcohol, marijuana, or other illegal drugs/pills, higher than Orange County’s most recent data of 63%, 45%, and 26%, respectively. Only 68% of Anaheim’s 9th grade students have a healthy body composition, ranking second lowest in the County and below both the State and County averages. Furthermore, Anaheim Union recorded a 2010-2011 adjusted grade 9-12 dropout rate of 2.9%, the second highest in Orange County.
The demographics above highlight the challenges faced by youth in Anaheim, but similar threats impact youth who live in metropolitan areas throughout the country, demanding concerted efforts to address youth development and academic success in the face of poverty, neighborhood blight, crime and gang activity, and other obstacles to safety and success.

Much research has been dedicated to identifying what factors actually make youth “at-risk.” The term “at-risk” is used widely and regularly by educators and policymakers when referring to youth who may be at risk of lifelong disadvantage. This broad definition can encompass risk of poor economic, health, social, educational, or personal outcomes. Contributing to these issues, at-risk predictors are as wide-reaching and interconnected as the potential outcomes, from genetics to family poverty to language barriers. While these demographic “at-risk” categories do not necessarily equate with poor outcomes—many youth with these risk factors grow into functional, contributing members of society—the more risk factors a youth has, the more likely he or she will suffer from an adverse outcome.

WHAT ARE ANAHEIM YOUTH AT RISK FOR?

As with any population, Anaheim’s youth are at risk due to a number of challenges that have the potential to keep them from achieving success in their lives. The top four risk outcomes identified through this assessment process, including poverty, gang activity, school dropout, and drug use, provide specific focal points for stakeholders to address. While the specific findings of the Anaheim assessment will be detailed in subsequent sections, the discussion below provides a general understanding of these risks, including general predictors and broad strategies for addressing them.

Poverty

Poverty is both a risk factor and an outcome for which youth are at risk. As a technical designation, poverty is determined through household income compared to Federal Poverty Level standards. As a general term, it can encompass designations such as “low-income” or “low socio-economic status,” and is consistently linked to negative outcomes such as academic failure and poor health. Over the past several years, the percentage of children living in low-income families has increased, with data reflecting the recent economic downturn. A variety of risk factors have been linked to poverty, including families headed by a single mother, low parental level of education, and unemployment or part-time employment, though no factor determines economic status.

To combat poverty, current trends acknowledge that there is no single “silver bullet” to solve all problems; that systems and programs need to engage multiple sectors, including community development, education, workforce development, and health; that communities need both people- and place-based interventions; and that there must be a lead “quarterback” entity within a community to coordinate efforts. Specific strategies range from policy issues, such as raising minimum wage
or implementing tax credits, to direct service-related issues, including strengthening the safety net, helping low-income families build up savings and assets, or improving access to early childhood education.\(^\text{23}\)

### Gang Activity

Gang activity accounts for a large portion of all reported crime,\(^\text{24}\) and youth involved with gangs are more likely than those not involved to engage in delinquent activities.\(^\text{25}\) Gang activity is often associated with social disadvantage and economic inequality; however, no single factor actually determines youth involvement in gangs; rather gang involvement is based on an accumulation of factors.\(^\text{26}\) Other predictors include academic failure, a low degree of commitment to school, peer relationships, and poor family management practices, which are just as likely to lead to gang involvement and are not limited to low-income neighborhoods.\(^\text{27}\) Family structure is also influential, as single-parent households or families that undergo multiple caretaker transitions may be limited in their capacity to provide supervision and build family bonds.\(^\text{28}\) In fact, while poverty is considered a top risk factor for youth, some research has found that is it not a significant predictor for gang involvement.\(^\text{29}\)

Research findings suggest that reducing opportunities for antisocial involvement in the neighborhood and building connection to the school through elementary academic success can reduce the risk that youth will join a gang.\(^\text{30}\) Notably, while the common assumption is that jobs, school activities, athletics, religious or community activities, and other such programs can prevent or reduce gang involvement, gang prevention and reduction strategies cannot rely on these alone. In fact, one study found that among gang members, non-gang street offenders, and youth who were neither, no differences existed in each group’s range of activities; instead, differences were found in categories such as peer relationships, family and school norms, and teacher labeling.\(^\text{31}\)

### School Dropout

Dropping out of high school puts youth at risk for unemployment and lower earnings, as the income gap between dropouts and graduates has increased over recent years.\(^\text{32}\) Dropping out also contributes to increased health and welfare costs for the community,\(^\text{33}\) and dropouts are less likely to vote and participate in civic life.\(^\text{34}\) Low-income and ethnic minority students are disproportionately represented among school dropouts. Beyond demographics, poor academic performance – particularly in the 9th grade – is another significant predictor of potential drop out risk, as are difficult transitions to high school, lack of basic skills, low attendance rates, and lack of engagement with school.\(^\text{35}\) Changing schools and family dynamics, including familial stresses, and attitudes toward education, are also factors in this risk.\(^\text{36}\) While there may be a “traditional dropout group,” coming from low-income families with poor grades and attendance issues, there are obviously a variety of risk factors and types of students who may be at risk.\(^\text{37}\)

\(^{24}\)Executive summary. From poverty to prosperity: A national strategy to cut poverty in half.
\(^{33}\)Fact sheet, updated September 2010: High school dropouts in America. Alliance for Excellent Education.
\(^{35}\)High School Dropouts in America: Alliance for Excellent Education.
\(^{37}\)Ibid.
To address this outcome, the National Education Association’s dropout prevention and intervention plan encourages early intervention from pre-K to 12th grade, with a focus on transition years (such as elementary to middle school), tiered interventions, and individual attention to support students. Other strategies include family and community involvement; professional development focused on addressing the needs of diverse students for educators; and programs and partnerships that help students see the connection between school and life after graduation, such as workforce readiness components or partnerships with community colleges for career or technical fields.\textsuperscript{38}

\textbf{Drug Use}

Drug and alcohol use is interrelated with delinquency, as the two share common risk factors, and the juvenile justice system is one of the nation’s leading referral sources for adolescent substance abuse treatment.\textsuperscript{39} For teens, using alcohol and tobacco can contribute to illicit drug use later in life,\textsuperscript{40} and while youth do not necessarily progress from one drug to another, early use may correlate with more use or abuse in the future.\textsuperscript{41} Risk factors span the individual, family, school, and community, and may become more or less significant with age. For example, family-related risk factors impact younger children more than older youth, who are more influenced by peers who abuse drugs. Key risk periods come at major physical and social transitions in a youth’s life, such as transitioning to a new school.\textsuperscript{42} Risk factors can include, but are not limited to, temperamental characteristics such as aggression; poor academic performance; family history of substance abuse; and perhaps most immediately, peers who participate or look favorably on substance use.\textsuperscript{43}

A recent assessment using the Communities That Care model indicates that addressing laws and norms favorable toward drugs, low neighborhood attachment (connectedness to community and neighbors) and community disorganization, academic failure and lack of commitment to school, and negative peer influence may be key priorities for Anaheim regarding this outcome.\textsuperscript{44} In general, research has shown that prevention programs need to be long-term, as benefits from middle school programs decrease without continued engagement through high school. Community programs aimed at a general audience can be beneficial to high-risk youth if aimed at targeted transition ages. Programming for families should help families bond and increase parenting skills, in addition to drug use-specific training.\textsuperscript{45}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{38}Dianda, M.R. (2008).
\item \textsuperscript{39}Villarino-Vetter, B. (2012).
\item \textsuperscript{40}Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{41}National Institute on Drug Abuse (2003). Preventing drug use among children and adolescents: A research-based guide for parents, educators, and community leaders, 2nd ed.
\item \textsuperscript{42}Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{43}Ibid., and Villarino-Vetter, B. (2012).
\item \textsuperscript{44}Villarino-Vetter, B. (2012).
\item \textsuperscript{45}National Institute on Drug Abuse (2003).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
A Review of Best Practices

Over the years and across the nation, many programs have been enacted to protect and compensate at-risk youth for perceived disadvantages. Mentoring, recreation and physical training programs, art programs, church groups, family-based interventions and parenting classes, school improvement programs, extracurricular clubs and activities, and after-school programs have all reported successes in keeping at-risk youth out of trouble and preventing them from experiencing poor outcomes, such as those noted above.

The following highlighted programs have proven successful in other cities, and have been found through listings from governmental agencies, nonprofit best practice resource websites, and academic and field publications. This compilation is not comprehensive, nor is it an attempt to rank these best practices in any way, but is intended to inspire consideration of a broad range of strategies and tactics for addressing the primary issues facing Anaheim youth.

LA’S BEST: A NATIONAL MODEL FOR AFTER-SCHOOL SUPPORT46

Perhaps one of the most well-known after-school program models is LA’s BEST (Better Educated Students for Tomorrow) After School Enrichment Program. Its mission is to provide a safe and supervised after-school education, enrichment, and recreation program for elementary school children ages 5 to 12 in the City of Los Angeles.

Initiated by the Mayor’s Education Council in 1988 at ten inner city elementary schools, LA’s BEST has become a national model for youth development and has been replicated in other California cities, including San Jose, Sacramento, and San Diego. LA’s BEST now serves 28,000 students at 189 elementary schools in Los Angeles. Targeted neighborhoods face similar challenges to Anaheim, in that they are vulnerable to gangs, drugs, crime, family poverty, and low academic achievement.

Each school site maintains a great deal of flexibility to tailor core program components to fit the needs of the neighborhood and leverage the expertise of site staff. The “three and a half beats” that each site offers include help with homework, a learning activity in reading or math, a fun activity, and a nutritious snack. Specific activities could include computer skills instruction, music activities, sports, board games, workshops, and service activities. These daily activities are supplemented by monthly field trips and city-wide activities, which include parents and the community as well.

Beyond the program structure itself, in its replication manual, LA’s BEST noted key learnings regarding other stakeholders. The program counts significant volunteer involvement and intentionally hires staff local to the program site area, which reconnects neighborhoods and schools and decreases staff turnover. Partnerships with the School District and the City have provided in-kind support, such as insurance, equipment, and space. Finally, LA’s BEST also observed that for the parents they serve, traditional meetings/conferences and workshops have not been as effective as one-on-one, informal interactions had while parents attend community activities and field trips.

A number of program evaluations of LA’s BEST have demonstrated significant positive outcomes:

- A 1995 UCLA study showed that children attending LA’s BEST at the ten longest running schools for at least two years improved their grades at a faster rate than the control group. Also, 77% liked school more and were more likely to include college in their plans for the future. Participants were more likely to have adults to help them with problem solving, and while many still perceived problems in their neighborhoods, they felt safer during the after-school hours.
- The Los Angeles Unified School District School Police Department observed that reports of school-based crime were reduced by 64% at the longest running sites; in one exemplary case, a school saw a reduction in criminal acts from 70 the year before the program started to nine by 1997.
- More recent studies from 2005 on have shown that LA’s BEST participants are 20% less likely to drop out of school and 30% less likely to commit juvenile crime. They show improved middle school attendance and GPAs, as well as higher scores on California Standardized Tests in general math and algebra.
- Former participants are eager to volunteer their time or even join the staff, indicating continued engagement.

**URBAN PEACE: APPROACHING YOUTH VIOLENCE THROUGH COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND COLLABORATION**

The Urban Peace program aims to reduce and prevent community violence, making poor neighborhoods safer so that children can learn, families can thrive, and communities can prosper. Run by the Advancement Project, Urban Peace is a new approach to preventing community violence, making use of public health methods in innovative and holistic ways, and aligning with the national Centers for Disease Control & Prevention’s STRYVE (Striving To Reduce Youth Violence Everywhere) campaign.

Urban Peace developed out of recommendations made in the Advancement Project’s 2007 report on comprehensive strategies for reducing gang activity in Los Angeles. Since 2007, Urban Peace has engaged with the City and other partners in support of new strategies for gang violence reduction (such as establishing the office of Gang Reduction & Youth Development) and has provided technical assistance for place-based initiatives throughout the state.

Urban Peace has also developed a Community Safety Scorecard, a zip code-level analysis of L.A.’s communities that grades areas on violence levels, state of schools, risk factors, and protective factors. One community that scored poorly with these criteria was Belmont, in the Pico-Union/Westlake area of L.A. With more than a third of families below the poverty line and 27 active gangs in the area, it received an F for community safety. In addition, it had high dropout rates and low enrollment in after-school and parent support programs.

Implementing strategies from the 2007 report, Urban Peace worked with community-based organizations and public agencies to create the Belmont Schools Zone of Choice, providing middle school students with more choices for their education in high school. As a part of this place-based strategy, Urban Peace leads the Belmont School Safety Collaborative, comprised of 21 community-based organizations, six government agencies, residents, and youth.

---

In 2011, Urban Peace piloted the Belmont School Safe Passages Initiative at a middle school and a high school in the area. The initiative aims to ensure safe passage to and from school for students and families through the support of parents, teachers, police, and local business owners who supervise the route home. The 2011 pilot involved 15-30 volunteers, 3-6 law enforcement personnel, 15 school personnel, and thousands of students. The L.A. Unified School District is also delivering a safety and violence prevention curriculum in the classroom, helping students become aware of the issues. The L.A. Department of Transportation may also be supporting by upgrading local streets. Overall, the program aims to increase student attendance, perception of safety, academic performance, and participation in after-school activities, while decreasing dropout, truancy, and crime and violence around the schools.

In addition to these intensive place-based strategies, Urban Peace also runs its Urban Peace Academy, a professional training and certification program for gang intervention workers and a collaborative effort among Urban Peace, the University of Southern California, law enforcement, and street-level practitioners. Since 2009, Urban Peace has trained nearly 1,200 individuals, including 400 police officers trained to work with interventionists and implement effective community policing.

Together, these strategies represent a collaborative, needs assessment-based approach to tackling gang violence and opening opportunities for youth in these areas to thrive in school.

**ACROSS AGES: ENGAGING OLDER ADULTS IN MENTORING AT-RISK YOUTH**

Across Ages is a school- and community-based substance abuse prevention program for youth ages 9 to 13. Its goal is to increase protective factors for high-risk students, ultimately preventing, reducing, or delaying use of alcohol, tobacco, or other drugs. Youth participants come from communities lacking adult role models and positive alternatives for spending free time; many have poor school performance or attendance, as well as problem behavior, low commitment to school, and no extracurricular participation.

Originally funded in 1991 by the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention as a five-year research and demonstration project in Philadelphia, Across Ages has since been replicated at 85 urban, suburban, and semirural sites across the country. In the 2006-2007 year, there were over 50 sites, with 30-40 children served at each site. Approximately one-third of sites have sustained the program through a variety of funding sources, and more than 8,000 youth have participated.

There are four main components to the Across Ages program, including:

- **Mentoring:** Older adults over the age of 55 are recruited from the community and trained to serve as mentors for one or two students. Providing at least 2 hours of mentoring per week outside of school hours, these mentors help at-risk youth develop awareness, self-confidence, and skills that will help them both resist drugs and achieve success in other areas of life. Mentors may help with classwork or go to sporting or cultural events with youth.

- **Classroom Learning:** Youth participate in 26 weekly 45-minute social competence training lessons in the classroom. The program uses the Social Problem-Solving Module of the Social Competence Promotion Program for Young Adolescents, incorporating lessons on life skills, problem solving, substance abuse education, and health information. The Substance Abuse

---

Prevention curriculum provides the opportunity for youth to apply the problem solving model to substance use decisions.

- **Community Service:** Youth participate in weekly community service activities, including visiting elderly residents of nursing homes, often with mentors. Youth keep a journal of their reflections.
- **Family Activities:** Youth, families, and mentors participate in monthly weekend social, cultural, and recreational activities, including meals and entertainment. Mentors contact parents through mail and phone, as well as through flyers sent home with youth.

Studies have shown that Across Ages has a positive effect on attitudes toward school, the future, and elders, as well as school attendance. Students benefiting from the full program also showed decreased alcohol and tobacco use, and they showed more awareness of response options to situations involving drug use. For example, they knew they could walk away from a situation or watch others drink without drinking themselves. Finally, a study of 6th grade classes in Massachusetts showed that students who took part in the whole program showed more positive attitudes toward helping other youth than those in a group that did not receive mentoring and those who did not participate in any component of the program.

**HARLEM CHILDREN’S ZONE AND BEACON CENTERS: COMPREHENSIVE SERVICES FOR NEIGHBORHOODS**

New York’s Harlem Children’s Zone (HCZ) is a comprehensive place-based continuum of services to develop healthy children and a healthy community at the same time. All programs are geared toward a 24-block area within Harlem and include preschool, parenting education, youth development, after-school programs, health services, child welfare services, employment services, and physical revitalization of the area. By 2009, ten years into the program, HCZ is projected to have served 24,000 adults and children.

HCZ also operates two of 80 Beacon Centers in New York. Beacon Centers are funded by a New York City initiative created to re-build communities of support for children and youth in urban neighborhoods. These Beacons are school-based community centers offering a wide range of services and activities during after-school, evening, and weekend hours, and during the summer and other school vacations for an average of 10-12 hours per day. Beacons focus on the following core areas of programming:

- Youth development, including educational enrichment, cultural arts, sports, and recreation;
- Youth leadership, community service, and career education;
- Parent involvement and family support;
- School-community linkages to increase academic achievement;
- Building of safe and supportive neighborhoods for child and youth development; and
- Employment.

Beacons also serve as sites for community meetings and social activities. The particular combination of services varies from community to community, each approved by a community advisory board.

The geographically compact nature of New York makes a school-based community center such

---

as a Beacon, or a place-based strategy such as HCZ, particularly attractive, as community access is relatively assured. For a city such as Anaheim, where communities can be defined by miles, thought must be given to transportation needs to ensure community access. Also, one caveat on HCZ is that program leaders did not have the capacity or community development plans needed to capitalize on the avalanche of resources that its tremendous success triggered.

Despite these challenges, HCZ and Beacons represent a “coherent youth and community development initiative” that sees community rebuilding as key not only to reducing violence but also to developing healthy children with a broad range of positive options before them. Likewise, they may be helpful urban transformation success stories that offer rich lessons for Anaheim.

**YOUTH OPPORTUNITY MOVEMENT WATTS: STUDENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION PROGRAM**

For many years, Los Angeles’ implementation of the national Youth Opportunity (YO!) Movement has been a bright spot in the City’s youth employment effort. With a grant from the Department of Labor, the City built a network of Youth Opportunity centers to provide career, education, and supportive services to youth. There are currently three YO! centers in Watts, Boyle Heights, and the San Fernando Valley. Of these, YO! Watts, in collaboration with the County Probation Department, County Office of Education, and Los Angeles Trade Technical College, is piloting the Students for Higher Education Program and stands out as a stellar effort at collaboration, meaningful intervention, and mission-driven dedication.

Granted, the collaboration among City, County, and higher education institutions is itself a step to be applauded. Beyond that step, however, the program also targets a troubled population of highest-risk youth that others avoid. Many of them are already in gangs, and all of them are in a probation camp.

As a pilot, the program currently operates at Camp Gonzalez with 50 youth who receive a mix of case management, mentoring, leadership development, access to college credit courses, vocational training, and intensive transition services.

The stated goal is to reduce recidivism rates among these youth, but the program does much more. For many of these youth, the very idea of attending college, let alone the potential for securing up to seven college credits while at camp, is unimaginable. Others expand their employment prospects—for example, some youth participate in the culinary training program, learning real-life vocational skills that can help them to secure jobs when they exit from the camp.

The most important component of this program, however, is its intensive transition support for youth provided by YO! case managers, who regularly visit them at the camp and follow up with them immediately after their release. After youth are released, YO! case managers take them to Los Angeles Trade Technical College to enroll them and provide financial support for basic necessities and school supplies. They continue to track the youth for the next 12 months by mentoring, giving support, and helping them solve problems.

This successful strategy, which incorporates targeted services to high-risk youth, the integration of opportunities with support services, intensive transition support from probation camp, and case management follow-up over a significant period of time can all be replicated elsewhere. The program
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YO! Movement Watts helps high-risk youth on probation see a variety of opportunities for future education and employment, proving that while prevention is necessary, intervention programs can also be successful.

---

also demonstrates that while prevention is the best strategy for most youth, intervention strategies, even with those youth who are gang-involved, are not only possible, but are also already being implemented successfully.

ROCA, THE VIA PROJECT, AND ENGAGED INSTITUTIONS: VALUE-DRIVEN COLLABORATION

Based in Chelsea, Massachusetts, Roca is a values-led, community-based youth and young adult development organization serving the most high-risk young people in Chelsea, Revere, Lynn, and East Boston, Massachusetts. Founded in 1988, Roca envisions young people thriving and leading change. To this end, Roca’s mission is to promote justice by fostering opportunities to lead happy and healthy lives.

Building on success serving younger youth, Roca committed to responding to the needs of young adults aged 16-26 around 2002. Roca targets the most vulnerable youth, including street, gang, and/or court-involved youth; dropouts; those who lack interest in life; young parents; and refugees/immigrants. These youth struggled to access and participate in traditional school, adult education, job training, and young parent programming.

Originally, Roca’s strategies of advocating for these youth involved “power organizing,” or pushing against policies and opinions that presented barriers for their clients, sometimes creating antagonistic feelings. Roca realized that while it encouraged youth to live out core values of belonging, generosity, competence, and independence, Roca itself was not following this in its relationships with other public and private agencies.

In response to this realization, Roca shaped its Via project for youth to incorporate not only intensive programmatic services but also systemic change and capacity components. Strategies included:

- Street work and outreach;
- Transformational relationships;
- Peacemaking circles (an innovative setting, originally programmatic, that has become an internal development tool for Roca and an opportunity for other institutions to engage in the process of hearing the voice of youth and families);
- Creation of opportunities for education, employment, and civic participation; and
- Engaging institutions to build the capacity of Roca and other partners to achieve positive outcomes.

The project’s goals included not only programmatic outcomes for young adults, but also capacity and relationship building outcomes among institutions, such as understanding and being more responsive to youth needs, being accountable for services provided, and understanding the impact they have on youth’s lives. By addressing both avenues, Roca has more capacity and is more accountable and transparent to stakeholders. Young people have better access to services, and they also experience better outcomes through engagement in partner systems.

While more work can be done in analyzing this promising model, Roca’s experience emphasizes open, honest, clear communication to build trust across agencies, particularly clear communication of intentions to partners and clear institutional focus and programmatic intent.

---

To provide a comprehensive assessment of youth services in Anaheim, it was necessary to develop a methodology that would engage as broad a spectrum of decision-makers and participants as possible. While providers of youth services are supremely knowledgeable about their programs, we also needed to learn the perspectives of the youth who participate in the programs, their parents, educators, business leaders, policymakers, and other community-based organizations that serve Anaheim neighborhoods. Each group provided its own challenges for engagement in the assessment process; therefore, a methodology was designed for each group to optimize access to the group and information learned from its members. Throughout the assessment process, flexibility was critical in adapting plans to engage with the desired stakeholders.

SURVEYS

Schools

A short, 3-question survey was emailed or mailed to 56 public schools that serve Anaheim students. Twenty responses were received for a response rate of 36%. Responses were received from elementary, middle, and high schools. For the school survey questions, please see Exhibit 1.

Providers

Given the higher numbers of youth, higher housing densities, and lower median incomes in the West and Central Anaheim areas, during the summer of 2012, The Olin Group conducted an internet search of youth service providers serving primarily West and Central Anaheim. The parameters were limited to organizations and agencies that provide services to Anaheim youth as their core operating mission, creating an initial list of service providers. Additional providers of youth programming, including cultural centers, intermittent summer programs, classroom-time educational programs, and faith-based organizations were later included (see Exhibit 2 for a complete list of providers contacted).

For these organizations and agencies, The Olin Group designed a survey to provide a “snapshot” of current services available to Anaheim youth. The survey was sent electronically for those organizations with an email address and was also mailed to organizations. For this survey, youth were defined as children and teens from age 5 to age 18. The survey consisted of 52 questions that incorporated multiple choice, forced response, Likert-type scale, and open-ended questions to measure program capacity, usage, facilities, budgets, and youth user profile information and to gather providers’ opinions (see Exhibit 3 for the full provider survey instrument).

A total of 54 organizations were invited to participate, and 34 responded, including the major providers of youth services, yielding a 63% response rate. These 34 organizations reported that they serve anywhere from 16 to 5,300 Anaheim youth (unduplicated counts provided by respondents). Because youth may participate in more than one program, it is impossible to know how many total youth are served by these programs. However, by adding up the totals provided by the programs that are least likely to overlap, it is estimated that these providers serve 15,000 to 20,000 Anaheim youth.
FOCUS GROUPS

Survey data can often be insufficient in assessing attitudes and opinions about services, so six focus groups of key community stakeholders and an additional open-ended survey were conducted to more comprehensively and qualitatively capture perceptions of youth needs and existing programming. These groups involved parents, youth, providers, educators, community-based organizations, and businesses, and were held at different locations and times over a 1.5-month period from early November to mid-December. Focus group sessions generally lasted 60-90 minutes. For a sample focus group email invitation (adapted versions sent to providers, educators, and community-based organizations) and a full listing of questions asked per stakeholder group, please see Exhibits 4 and 5.

In total, 93 people were invited to participate, and 66 took part in in-person focus groups. (Group specifics are detailed below.) Some groups, such as youth and parents, proved harder to organize due to access and scheduling issues. Every attempt was made to ensure a diverse population for focus group participation. Approximately 38% of participants were male, and 62% female; ethnically, approximately 77% of participants were Latino, 20% were White, and 3% were Asian.

Youth

While the youth focus group proved most difficult to convene, it was perhaps the most significant in that it engaged Anaheim youth in discussing their own needs. Youth were recruited via local community organizations. 15 youth, ranging from 13 to 17 years old, attended the group. Topics discussed included what youth do after school and what type of programs they themselves would create to address their needs.

Parents

Parents play a major role in their children’s lives and chances for success, representing another key stakeholder group in addressing challenges youth face. Two parent focus groups were held, with parents also recruited via local community organizations. A total of 27 parents participated in the focus groups (10 at the first, 17 at the second). Of these 27 parents, most have children participating in after-school or other youth service programs. Topics discussed included what factors parents consider when choosing an after-school program and what needs are not currently being met.

Youth Service Providers

As those serving youth “on the ground,” providers do their best to craft programs and opportunities that meet the needs of youth. Providers were recruited via self-selection through the provider survey, as they could indicate interest in participating in a focus group at the end of the survey. All survey respondents who expressed interest were invited, and 9 attended the group. Topics discussed included program capacity needs, critical operational challenges, and barriers to accessing current services provided.

Educators

Educators have a unique perspective on the needs of youth and are trained to notice developmental and social pressures that school-age children experience. To gain their perspective, we invited principals or assistant principals from 3 high schools, 4 junior high schools, and 2 elementary schools to attend the focus group along with a teacher from their schools, in addition to inviting 7 district-level and other educational programming staff. Of the 16 invited, 9 individuals participated, including a principal and teacher from a high school, an assistant principal and teacher from a junior high school, 3 district staff, and 2 educational programming staff. Topics discussed included how after-school programs can serve high school students’ needs and what the appropriate role of schools in addressing youth issues.
Community-based Organizations

While they may not solely serve youth, community-based organizations are “tapped into” the needs of the local communities they represent. To gather these organizations’ opinions, 13 community-based organizations’ leaders were invited to participate. While only 6 actually attended, an additional 4 were interviewed (see description below). Topics discussed included top threats for youth and what community-based organizations can do to help address the issues.

Businesses

In relation to youth services, businesses represent both a resource for programming and a beneficiary of after-school programs that help youth develop job skills. Although the original plan was to conduct an in-person focus group of business leaders, this proved challenging due to schedules and the diversity of businesses in Anaheim. Instead, The Olin Group developed a set of 10 questions that business leaders could answer online. With 6 open-ended questions asking about ways to prepare Anaheim youth for the job market, barriers to effective engagement, and how businesses and providers can partner to engage youth, respondents could share their thoughts without being influenced by suggested response options (see Exhibit 6 for the full list of questions). A link to the online questions was emailed to about 200 businesses by the Anaheim Chamber of Commerce, and eight provided input. Five of the businesses are involved with organizations that provide after-school or other services to youth in Anaheim. Five said they hire young people ages 17-25, and three said they have hired youth from disadvantaged neighborhoods.

INTERVIEWS

Key informant interviews were conducted to gather the perceptions of individuals who are involved with youth, and individuals who are responsible for policy change in Anaheim. A list of 25 potential interviewees was compiled, including Anaheim City Council Members, City employees, school personnel, and community leaders. Prospective interviewees were contacted either through a letter from the Anaheim Community Foundation (see Exhibit 7) or through a similarly worded email from The Olin Group. A total of 18 interviews were conducted, with broadly structured questions focused on top threats facing youth, barriers to youth engagement, and input on addressing these issues (see Exhibit 8 for questions).
DEMGRAPHICS & GEOGRAPHY FINDINGS

While policy should not be based on any single factor, Anaheim’s demographics highlight the particular urgency for investment in Anaheim’s youth, as well as geographic areas of highest youth needs. By combining those census tracts that ranked highest in number or percent of youth (Figures 1 & 2), with those census tracts that ranked highest for housing density (Figure 6) and lowest for median income (Figure 5), we can pinpoint the geographic areas where youth may be most in need of services. Seven tracts ranked at the top of the list and are recorded in Table 2 and mapped in Figure 8, along with locations of known service providers (those listed in Exhibit 2). These seven tracts account for almost 20,000 youth under the age of 18, 1 in 5 (21%) of the youth in Anaheim, but they contain few services for youth over the age of 12, as summarized in Table 3.

TABLE 2. TARGETED CENSUS TRACTS FOR YOUTH SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract</th>
<th>Number Youth</th>
<th>Percent Youth</th>
<th>Persons per Household</th>
<th>Median Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>863.05</td>
<td>2438</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>&lt;$50,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>864.05</td>
<td>2135</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>&lt;$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>865.02</td>
<td>2339</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>&lt;$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>866.01</td>
<td>3429</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>&lt;$39,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>873</td>
<td>3269</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>&lt;$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>874.05</td>
<td>2601</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>&lt;$41,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>875.04</td>
<td>2918</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>&lt;$41,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 8: TARGETED HIGH-NEEDS CENSUS TRACTS AND KNOWN PROVIDERS
### TABLE 3: SUMMARY OF SERVICES AVAILABLE IN EACH TARGETED CENSUS TRACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Total Population of Youth under 18</th>
<th>Number of Providers Serving in Tract*</th>
<th>Number of Providers Serving Ages 5-12 (Elementary)</th>
<th>Number of Providers Serving Ages 12-14 (Junior High)</th>
<th>Number of Providers Serving Ages 14-18 (High School)</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>863.05</td>
<td>4006</td>
<td>2438</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>While two schools offer Anaheim Achieves and one offers Project S.A.Y, only a church youth group serves high school youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>864.05</td>
<td>6578</td>
<td>2135</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Only two providers offer after-school care, and more services are available for youth under 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>865.02</td>
<td>6551</td>
<td>2339</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>There are no known youth service providers within the tract, although there are several east and south. The nearest elementary schools offering after-school programming are several blocks outside the tract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>866.01</td>
<td>9584</td>
<td>3428</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>These providers include two elementary schools offering Anaheim Achieves up to age 12 and a church serving 75 youth twice a week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>873</td>
<td>10413</td>
<td>3269</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>There are several providers in and near this tract; within the tract, there are two drop-in spots, as well as Boys and Girls Club and Anaheim Ballet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>874.05</td>
<td>6678</td>
<td>2601</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>One elementary school offers Anaheim Achieves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>875.04</td>
<td>7997</td>
<td>2918</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>There are no known youth service providers within the tract, and even the closest schools are several blocks away.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Provider count only includes known providers within or on the border of each census tract.
These potential geographic gaps in services are critical. In a 2009 study, California parents reported that convenience was their number one factor in choosing an after-school program, thus, services that are not conveniently located may be under-utilized by the community. Overlaying the map of providers with the geographic map of Anaheim in Figure 8 demonstrates that services may not be available in each census tract. While there are services that may be convenient by car or bus, consideration must be given to youth who would need to walk through potentially dangerous areas to receive services. In addition, many of the providers mapped offer services only one or two days a week and/or may not provide in-depth engagement.

A common theme across assessment components was the need to “take services to where the kids are,” and to engage the community at the “neighborhood level.” To pursue these strategies, this demographic data and accompanying map of providers may help target areas in need of services. The following maps and descriptions detail each of the identified target census tracts and the service providers located in the area.

FIGURE 9: CENSUS TRACT 863.05

Census tract 863.05 is bordered by East South Street to the north, State College Boulevard to the west, East Wagner Avenue on the south, and Anaheim Coves trail on the east. There are approximately 4,000 residents in this tract, and more than half of them are youth (2,400).

- Two schools offer Anaheim Achieves after-school programming in this tract: Benito Juarez Elementary School (for ages 5-12) and South Junior High School (for ages 12-14).
- South Junior High School also offers Project S.A.Y. services, as does Katella High School (for ages 14-18), which sits on the south border.

---

52The City of Anaheim has also identified priority neighborhoods, three of which fall into these census tracts.
• James Guinn Elementary School, a few blocks further south, and Theodore Roosevelt Elementary School, a block away to the west, both offer after-school programming for youth under the age of 12.

• Two faith-based youth service providers are on the north border: Lamb of God Day Camp, which provides after-school programming and transportation for 30 Anaheim youth under the age of 12, and the Sunkist Community Church, which has a youth group.

• This tract also has access to two fee-based after-school/daycare programs for youth up to age 12: Childtime Children’s Center and KinderCare Learning Center.

Census tract 865.02 touches the 91 Freeway, crosses La Palma Avenue, and borders at East Sycamore Street. This tract has a total population of around 6,500 residents, more than 2,300 of whom are under the age of 18.

• There is not a single youth service provider within the census tract.

• The two closest elementary schools that offer after-school programming to youth up to age 12 are both several blocks outside the tract area.

• The GOALS (Growth Opportunities Athletics Learning Service) program is located a few blocks outside the tract area and serves over 1,000 youth ages 5-18 from 865.02, as well as 864.05 and 873. More than 60% of those served at GOALS are under the age of 12, and only 4% are in high school.

Census tract 864.05 sits adjacent to tract 865.02 and is bordered by La Palma Avenue on the north, North State College Boulevard on the east, and Lincoln Avenue on the south, with a population similar to 865.02. Unlike 865.02, there are several providers of youth services on the border of this tract.

• Four of these are faith-based churches and facilities, two of which offer after-school care. The First Congregational School of Anaheim offers after-school care, including transportation, to families in Anaheim for a fee. The Zion Lutheran Church and School offers after-school care for their 200 enrolled students in kindergarten through 8th grade. The St. Anthony Claret Catholic Church offers a youth group that meets one evening a week to all high school students.
• Sycamore Junior High School offers after-school programming through both Project S.A.Y. and Anaheim Achieves for Youth ages 12-14.
• The Cops 4 Kids program is located on the border of tract 864.05 and serves 1,000 kids from all over Anaheim in a variety of programs. Their after-school program serves youth ages 6-17.
• The Islamic Institute of Orange County, a faith-based provider, lies a few blocks outside this tract and offers a weekly youth group that serves approximately 40 Anaheim youth.
• Miss Muffett’s Playhouse is also a few blocks outside this tract and offers fee-based after-school programming, including transportation, for youth up to age 12.
• Abraham Lincoln Elementary School is right outside the tract and offers after-school programming though Anaheim Achieves for youth up to age 12.

Census tract 873 shares proximity to Abraham Elementary School and is adjacent to tracts 865.02 and 864.05. It is bordered by East Santa Ana Boulevard and Harbor Boulevard.
• There are several providers in this tract, including Boys and Girls Clubs of Anaheim and Project S.A.Y. at Anaheim High School.
• “Drop-in” spots open after school include the Anaheim Library and the Downtown Anaheim Youth Center.
• Three faith-based providers are available to this tract: St. Boniface Catholic Church, Anaheim First Presbyterian, and Portico Church of Anaheim, which provide youth services generally aimed at youth members of their churches. Portico is open two days a week after school and one evening, serving approximately 70 youth.
• Anaheim Ballet is located in the heart of this census tract and offers after-school programming for approximately 120 kids attending an average of four days per week.

FIGURE 11: CENSUS TRACT 866.01

Census tract 866.01 has a total population of nearly 10,000 and a youth population of over 3,400. This tract is bordered by the 91 Freeway on the north, La Palma Avenue on the south, Euclid Street on the west, and Harbor Boulevard on the east.
• One elementary school, Patrick Henry, is centered in this tract, and Horace Mann Elementary is on the border, both offering after-school programming through Anaheim Achieves for youth up to the age of 12.
• Three neighboring elementary schools also offer after-school programming: John Marshall, Adelaide Price, and Westmont.
• The only other provider in this tract is the faith-based St Mary & St Verena Coptic Orthodox Church, which offers twice-weekly services to approximately 75 Anaheim youth.
• The GOALS program is located a block outside of this tract and the Salvation Army, located several blocks south, serves approximately 150 residents ages 5-12.

FIGURE 12: CENSUS TRACT 874.05

Census tract 874.05 has a total population of over 6,500, of whom 2,600 are under the age of 18. This tract is bordered by the 5 Freeway, Ball Road, South Olive Street, and West Vermont Avenue.
• An Anaheim Achieves site at Orange Grove Elementary School is the only youth service provider in this tract and limits services to youth up to age 12.
• Olive Street Elementary School sits on the West Vermont border and also offers Anaheim Achieves.
• Five other elementary schools offer after-school programming in the surrounding area, all several blocks outside the tract.
• The Prince of Peace Lutheran Church is also outside this tract and offers after-school programming for approximately 25 Anaheim youth between the ages of 5 and 18.
• The Downtown Anaheim Youth Center located north of this tract offers drop-in services and programming.
Figure 13: Census Tract 875.04

Census tract 875.04 lies adjacent to Anaheim’s resort area and is bordered by the 5 Freeway to the east, East Katella Avenue on the north, Haster Boulevard to the west, and East Simmons Avenue on the south. This tract has a population of nearly 8,000 residents and almost 3,000 youth.
- There are no youth service providers in this census tract.
- The closest after-school programs are located at Alexander J. Stoddard Elementary and Paul Revere Elementary Schools several blocks away.
- The Anaheim Equestrian Center is located 3 miles away across the freeway.

Survey Findings

School Survey

All of the schools that responded to the school survey offer the Anaheim Achieves (previously known as ASES) after-school program. Two of the schools also offer Project S.A.Y. Other after-school programming mentioned were mentoring through the Orange County Asian and Pacific Islander Community Alliance, Out of School Time (through GRIP and the City of Stanton), and various enrichment activities, including English language arts taught through drama, music, arts; Ballet Folklorico; a running club; and chess.

What Is Needed to Help Anaheim Youth Achieve a Lifetime of Success

An open-ended question asked “what ONE or TWO things do you think would be most helpful in order for Anaheim youth to achieve a lifetime of success that is not being done today?”

Survey respondents identified three key areas that could potentially be developed and/or improved to better serve the needs of Anaheim’s youth.

Extracurricular Activities: Several respondents suggested providing more resources for the Anaheim Achieves program, perhaps finding ways to increase staffing and expand programs, as well
as offering affordable, easily accessible, and engaging activities for children during the summer. Others suggested providing opportunities for school children to develop community leadership skills, participate in community projects, and interact with successful people, businesses, and agencies. Towards that end, another recommendation focused on promoting mentoring and volunteerism among better situated adults with the idea that they could help guide and support children whose parents were of low socio-economic status or had other parenting challenges that prevented them from being fully engaged in raising their children.

**Education:** Numerous respondents proposed comprehensive educational support in the form of academic counseling and tutoring for multiple subjects, along with providing students “hands-on” learning tools such as iPods, smart phones, and video games. One respondent felt many children would benefit from having a 6-year plan outlining the years between entering junior high school and high school graduation, and another stressed the notion that children should be told that vocational schools are a viable alternative for those who may not be university-bound.

**Community-wide Solutions:** One person suggested that the parents of teenage children need to be given more information on how to keep their children goal-oriented, focused, and on track during their high school years, a time when some young adults get lost and are prone to making poor decisions. Two others recommended providing young children with safe routes to and from school as well as safe places to play under the supervision of adults.

**Provider Survey**

The provider survey gathered information about the organizations that provide youth services, the youth they serve, and their ideas to help youth achieve a lifetime of success. The results are summarized in this section, starting with key findings and followed by more detailed information. For the full report of survey findings, which includes analysis of questions not included here, see Exhibit 9.

**Key Findings from the Provider Survey**

- The responding organizations serve youth from throughout Anaheim, with services concentrated in western and central Anaheim.
- Half of the organizations have been providing youth services for more than 20 years.
- Most programs end by 5 pm; fewer than half are open later in the evening.
- 18% of providers said the typical child participates 5 days a week; 27% said the typical child participates 1 day a week.
- There are more youth ages 8-12 participating in these services than older youth ages 16-18.
- Most of the youth in these programs are considered disadvantaged or “at-risk.”
- Most of the programs serve a high percentage of youth whose home language is not English, live in low-income households, and have no good place to do homework.
- Respondents believe youth are most at risk for poverty, followed by gang involvement and school dropout.
- 90% say Anaheim needs more safe places for youth to hang out; yet only 41% provide a place for youth to hang out.
- 81% say Anaheim needs more teen pregnancy prevention services; only 12% offer it.
- 78% say Anaheim needs more gang prevention activities; only 24% offer it.
- The top goals among providers are to “keep kids out of trouble” and increase community engagement.
- 39% of the providers said the number one reason parents select their program is because it makes a difference for their children; 15% say they are chosen because children enjoy it.
- Most providers said parents learn about their program by word of mouth, from their website, through the school, or from flyers or brochures.
- The providers believe the top barriers to participation in their programs are transportation and that too little information is known about their programs.
- More than half of the respondents receive half or more of their funding from a single source.
• Half of the respondents said their funding went down 10% or more over the past three years.
• Nearly a third of the respondents do not apply for grant funding; organizations that never or rarely apply are government-operated or church-affiliated/faith-based; all of those that apply more frequently are nonprofit entities.
• Only 26% described their program’s future funding as secure or very secure.
• Most of the respondents partner with other organizations to provide additional services to the children and families; half said they collaborate on a project that involves shared funding, staffing, training, or facilities.

About the Organizations that Provide Youth Services – Who?  Where?  How Long?  When?

About two-thirds of the survey respondents represented nonprofit organizations; about one third were church-affiliated and/or faith-based (these could also have been nonprofit organizations). Six respondents (18%) were a city or other government-sponsored program.

Services of the survey respondents are concentrated in western and central Anaheim. While 41% of the respondents said they serve youth from all zip code areas of Anaheim, organizations that serve only a subset of the zip codes areas do not serve 92807 or 92808 (Anaheim Hills), which means there are more services concentrated in the remaining areas. Seventy-three percent of the organizations serve youth in the Central Anaheim zip code area of 92805, and 71% serve youth in 92801.

The programs have a long history of serving Anaheim youth, with half of the organizations being in operation for more than 20 years. Only one respondent had been in operation for just 1-2 years.

Eighty-two percent of the organizations described their programs as being “year-round,” and 74% said they offered after-school services. Only 18% of respondents said their program was open before school and even fewer (15%) described their program as “child care.”

**FIGURE 14: PERCENT OF PROGRAMS OPEN AT THE SPECIFIED TIME (N=33)**

Most respondents said their program was open Monday through Friday before 5 pm. By 5 in the afternoon, only about a third of the programs said they were open; more were open at 6 pm, although still less than half except on Wednesday. After 6 pm, the number of open programs drops steadily through-out the evening. Only one organization said they have services available after 9 pm on most days of the week, and this organization was rather specialized.

On the weekends, the time period with the greatest number of programs open is Saturday afternoon, when 45% of the responding programs are open. Fewer programs are open on Sunday than Saturday and few programs are open either day in the evenings.

Most of the programs (82%) are open in the summer or between school sessions of year-round schools, including most of the after-school programs. Only three programs were described as after-school and not open during summer or between school sessions.
How Many Days per Week Youth Participate

Only 18% of the respondents said that the typical child participates five days a week in their program – all but one of these is an after-school program. More than a quarter of the programs said the typical child participates just one day per week, and nearly half of these described their program as “after-school.” All of the programs that said youth typically participate 3 or 4 days per week are after-school programs.

FIGURE 15: PERCENT OF ORGANIZATIONS REPORTING THAT THE TYPICAL CHILD PARTICIPATES IN THEIR PROGRAM THE SPECIFIED NUMBER OF DAYS (N=33)

Who They Serve – Ages, Race/Ethnicity

Collectively, the respondents serve youth of all ages from 5 to 18 years. Some of the providers have very small programs and others are quite large. The age group with the most youth enrolled is 8-12 years, with the largest number of programs and highest average number of children served. The least-served age group is 16-18 years, with the fewest number of programs and smallest average number of youth served.

TABLE 4: NUMBER OF CHILDREN SERVED BY AGE GROUP (N=34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number of organizations serving any children in age group</th>
<th>Fewest number of children served</th>
<th>Highest number of children served*</th>
<th>Average number of children served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-8 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-12 years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*two organizations that serve large numbers of youth on an informal basis or large numbers of youth outside Anaheim were not included in this table.

Most of the youth served by these programs are Hispanic (65% across the 30 programs that provided information). Half of the organizations said that at least 75% of the youth in their programs are Hispanic; one program each said at least 75% of their youth are White, Asian, More Than One Race, or Other.

Most Youth are “At-Risk”

More than half of the respondents said that 75% or more of the youth they serve are disadvantaged or “at risk” for poor life outcomes. Five respondents said this applies to all the children they serve. Only four respondents said this applies to 25% or fewer of the children in their program.
Most respondents (86%) consider a youth at risk if they live in a low-income home. Other factors most respondents said they believe put youth at risk include limited parent supervision, exposure to drugs, living in a family with domestic violence/child abuse or neglect issues, being homeless or living in a motel, living in crowded housing with multiple families, and family criminal activity. Very few respondents thought family size or ethnicity put youth at risk.

**FIGURE 16: PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS THAT CONSIDER YOUTH TO BE AT-RISK IF THEY FIT ONE OF THE LISTED CRITERIA (N=29)**

In looking at the youth in their programs, the respondents estimated how many of the youth fit into a set of characteristics that could put them at higher risk of poor life outcomes. Half or more of the respondents said that 60% or more of the youth they serve could be described as living in a home where the primary language is not English, the family is low income, there is no good place to do homework, and their neighborhood has gang activity. Relatively few programs serve a majority of youth who have only one parent, whose parents are college graduates, or who are violent or homeless. Only a third of the respondents said a majority of their youth have good role models.

**FIGURE 17: PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS WHO ESTIMATED THAT 60% OR MORE OF THE YOUTH IN THEIR PROGRAM COULD BE DESCRIBED BY THE SPECIFIED CHARACTERISTIC (N=23-30)**

The one consequence most respondents thought the youth in their program were MOST at risk for was poverty (40% of respondents), followed by gang involvement (20%) and school dropout (17%). Only 13% of respondents think their youth are MOST at risk for drug use and 10% said unemployment. None of the respondents selected crime victim, crime offender, or homelessness as the top consequence for their youth.
Program Goals, Services Provided, and Perception of Services Needed

Nearly 70% of respondents said one of the top three goals of their program is to keep kids out of trouble, and 56% said it is a top program goal to increase community engagement. Less than half said one of their top three goals is to improve behavior in school (31%), improve grades (25%), or improve graduation rates, prevent gang involvement, develop job and workforce skills, or build self-esteem (16% each). Only 3% said it was a top goal to reduce truancy, prevent teenage pregnancy, or prevent drug use.

The next table shows the percent of programs that provide specific services on the left side, and the percent of respondents who said they believe there are not enough of a particular type of service on the right. Although nearly all respondents believe there are not enough safe places for kids to hang out, only 41% said they provide such a place. Even though 68% provide self-esteem-building activities, 79% believe there are not enough of such programs. Over 81% believe there are too few teen pregnancy prevention programs, yet only 12% include it among the services they provide and only 3% said it was a top goal of their program. Similar findings are true for gang prevention, improving school performance (tutoring and homework assistance), and college preparation.

### TABLE 5: SERVICES PROVIDED COMPARED TO PROVIDER’S OPINIONS OF SERVICES NEEDED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of respondents who said THEIR PROGRAM PROVIDES the following services</th>
<th>Percent of respondents who said there are NOT ENOUGH of the following services in Anaheim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 71% volunteer opportunities</td>
<td>• 90% safe places to hang out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 71% recreation</td>
<td>• 85% jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 68% self-esteem building</td>
<td>• 81% teen pregnancy prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 65% field trips</td>
<td>• 79% programs that build self-esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 59% sports and exercise</td>
<td>• 78% workforce development programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 56% life skills</td>
<td>• 78% gang prevention activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 53% mentoring</td>
<td>• 71% college preparatory help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 50% access to computers/internet</td>
<td>• 71% community engagement activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 47% homework assistance</td>
<td>• 70% music/arts/dance/theater programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 47% art/music/dance</td>
<td>• 69% tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 41% a place to hang out</td>
<td>• 67% after-school programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 38% community improvement projects</td>
<td>• 64% homework assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 35% bullying information and prevention</td>
<td>• 60% drug use prevention programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 29% tutoring</td>
<td>• 45% sports programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 29% job training</td>
<td>• 15% case management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 29% nutrition/wellness information</td>
<td>• 15% health services referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 27% job application assistance</td>
<td>• 15% SAT preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 27% civic engagement</td>
<td>• 12% teen pregnancy prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 24% gang prevention education and intervention</td>
<td>• 12% high school exit exam preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 21% counseling/therapy</td>
<td>• 6% community garden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twelve of twenty-six respondents said what they think would be most helpful for Anaheim youth to achieve a lifetime of success that is not being done today is to provide guidance, encouragement, opportunity, and tutoring. Another four respondents focused their comments on strengthening families.

In comments, 11 of 28 respondents said that when they tell others about their program’s accomplishments, they talk about developing character and leadership skills, building self-esteem, or teaching life principles. Seven noted the educational focus of their program and five wrote about how they improve civic engagement and/or citizenship. Four said they provide a safe environment for youth, and two help youth see a better future for themselves.

**How Parents Hear About Their Program**

Nearly all of the respondents (91%) believe that most parents find out about their program through word-of-mouth. Respondents also said parents can learn about their programs from their website (85%), through the child’s school (82%), or from flyers or brochures (76%). Just over half said parents find out about their program through social media. Very few said parents find out about their program from mailers or newspaper advertisements.

**Why Parents Choose Their Program**

The most commonly selected reason that respondents think parents choose their program is because it makes a difference for their child. (39% selected this). Only 15% of respondents think the primary reason parents choose their program is because their kids enjoy it and even fewer said their program is chosen because it is inexpensive and offers enrichment.

**FIGURE 18: PERCENT OF ORGANIZATIONS THAT SELECTED ONE OF THESE REASONS AS THE PRIMARY REASON PARENTS CHOOSE THEIR PROGRAM (N=33)**

**Barriers to Youth Participation**

Providers thought the biggest barriers to youth participating in their programs were transportation and not enough knowledge about their program. In addition, the fee/cost was perceived as a significant barrier by 37% and not a barrier by 53%. Although perceived as a significant barrier by some (17%), most respondents (73%) thought a lack of available slots was not a barrier.
Organizational Funding and Capacity

The responding organizations had a wide range of budget sizes, with nine respondents reporting an annual budget of less than $50,000 and nine reporting annual budgets of $500,000 or more, including three with budgets over $1 million.

Over half of the organizations receive at least some funding from private donations, fees, and/or fundraising events. Only 15% receive any funding from the federal government, and 7% raise money through a social enterprise. Three-quarters of the responding organizations (74%) rely on just one source for more than 50% of their funding; the most common funding sources for those organizations are private donations and state government followed by fundraising events and local government.

Just over half of the respondents said their funding had declined by 10% or more over the past three years; 10% said it was down by more than half. Another 10% said their funding had gone up some (10-50%) over the past three years; none said it had gone up over 50%. Only 26% of the respondents described their future funding as secure or very secure. Just under 50% said it was somewhat secure and 23% said it was not secure at all.
While 67% of the organizations reported that they submit grant proposals, only 10% submit grant proposals 12 or more times per year. Thirty-two percent said they apply for grants only 1 or 2 times per year, and 29% that said they never apply for grants. The organizations that never apply or apply infrequently tended to be government-supported programs or church-affiliated/faith-based programs. All seven of the organizations that apply more frequently (six times per year or more) are nonprofit organizations (n=31).

Partnerships with Other Organizations

Twenty-seven of the respondents said they collaborate or partner with other organizations to provide goods or services to their clients. Seven respondents either do not partner with other organizations or skipped the question. The most common things the organizations do through these collaborations or partnerships are to provide activities for the youth (63%); clothing, backpacks, or gifts for the youth or their families (52%); food for the families (44%); referrals for service (44%); field trips for the youth (41%); other needs of the family (33%); and food service for the program (30%). Just over half of the respondents said they collaborate with another organization on a project that involves shared funding, staffing, training or facilities (n=31).

Suggestions for Increasing Capacity

When asked what one thing their program could do to increase capacity and serve more Anaheim youth, 28 respondents wrote in a suggestion. Nine wrote that they could or would need to increase the number of paid staff and/or volunteers in order to provide more services. Seven indicated they
could raise more money, but none provided insights as to how they would do this. Seven wrote about changes they would need to make to their facility, such as move to a larger facility or utilize more of their existing facility. One suggested they could improve their parking lot so it could be used for basketball or volleyball. Four indicated they could improve their advertising so more people know about their program.

**Focus Group Findings**

**Voice of the Youth**

Youth participants (ages 13 to 17) identified several challenges of growing up in Anaheim, including gang presence, peer pressure, lack of parental involvement, pressures to excel, and managing ethnic prejudices. Of those, lack of parental presence seems to have the biggest ripple effect. When parents are not present, participants tend to rely on other relatives, school counselors, teachers, and peers as their support network.

Most of the youth agreed that participating in after-school programs gives youth an alternative to stay away from gangs and choose healthy environments with like-minded peers. Those who are not able to participate often stay inside their homes for fear of their safety. All participants agreed on the significant benefits of after-school programs. However, they also identified affordability and availability as the key barriers to getting into programs. Ninety percent of participating youth said that they are the primary decision-makers when choosing a program, as adults may not know their needs or desires. The entire group agreed that involving youth in crafting solutions is the best strategy for creating effective programs, but to accomplish this, adults must recognize the assets that youth bring to the table.

**Voice of the Parents**

Parents identified several challenges in their attempts to support youth in their growth and development. Among the groups, safety was reflected as the primary concern parents had when choosing programs for youth, and many look to the schools as the only safe space outside the home. Several stated that the preferred location for youth programming was the school, and many shied away from neighborhood locales other than schools when deciding on programming and services for their children.

Parents also discussed the challenging economic reality for working poor families. Many families find they have to work multiple jobs to meet their basic needs, which in turn leads to limited parental involvement and lack of youth supervision during after-school and evening hours. This lack of parental supervision leaves youth vulnerable to gang recruitment, drugs, violence, and unsafe environments. Some parents stated they have been able to create support networks in collaboration with neighbors and relatives to help supervise and look after youth during these key hours. However, many do not have access to such a trusted network.

Parents stated that their primary source of information about youth programs and services is their child’s school or church. This may lead to a lack of awareness of city and community programs available, and reliance on youth to be the conduit of school flyers and newsletters is likely an inaccurate delivery method. Parents shared that they were often unaware of available programs and resources and how to access them. This lack of awareness and passive reliance on the schools may limit parents’ ability to be active participants in securing space in programs and services offered to youth. Additionally, the cost of many programs can often be prohibitive for families that are “just getting by.” Parents also expressed that lack of competence in navigating the “systems” and the cultural habit of entrusting children to the teacher as the expert authority hinders parental involvement. They felt
that parent education classes would be a path to improved parental engagement. There was also a request for the City to plan programming with more evening and weekend offerings that fit parents’ schedules. Finally, parents expressed concern that current programs focused on intervention with kids already in trouble, but few were offered as prevention to keep kids from getting in trouble in the first place.

**Voice of the Providers**

When asked about top challenges facing Anaheim’s youth, providers discussed gangs and gang involvement. They believe youth face increasing pressure to join gangs and are at greater risk of gun violence and gang activity than in previous years. The group expressed a concern that gang violence, once on the wane, has started to increase again with a new generation. Providers feel youth need more supervision; the challenge is finding the right program fit that will keep youth engaged and out of trouble. Providers also recommended parent education classes to increase parental awareness and skills, cultural differences, and lack of life skills.

Providers also discussed their own ability to meet the needs of Anaheim’s youth; they perceive that their organizational and program capacity is too limited to serve the variety of needs and all age groups effectively. Providers felt that being in organizational “survival mode” often requires them to create insular and reactive approaches to serving youth needs supported by funding available, rather than being proactive and strategic about serving needs that are critical. Funding priorities can force tough decisions that jeopardize the ability to sustain services to the most needy youth groups or areas. In addition, the lack of continuum of programs and services often limits the ability to effectively address youth needs systemically. Provider participants appeared eager to form a collaborative effort around youth needs and common issues and suggested the Anaheim Community Foundation could serve as a facilitator of this effort.

Providers believed that every child needs some engagement outside of home and school, but all agreed no one provider can supply this engagement. The complexity and magnitude of the needs of youth are larger than any one provider’s ability to address them. Providers expressed the belief that it takes a coordinated, participatory, and accountable effort, where everyone around the table is committed to sustainable impact guided by a broad systemic vision and a strategic outlook on how to attain it. Providers also expressed the belief that parents and youth are key partners to finding a solution as parental involvement and commitment are instrumental in youth participation. Understanding family dynamics helps craft more effective strategies to sustain impact in all contexts – home, school, and after-school sites.

**Voice of the Educators**

Educators identified gangs, poverty, and lack of jobs as top challenges youth face. Additionally, some stated that lack of awareness of opportunities, rather than a lack of opportunities themselves, may be the issue. As parents indicated, educators did agree that schools provide the trusted infrastructure for youth engagement.

Educators also identified challenges they face in trying to ensure this trusted environment for youth. They feel schools spend a great deal of time grappling with significant safety issues—drug offenses, violence, and campus incidents—which present law enforcement challenges falling outside of the school’s domain and hinder their ability to maintain a safe, healthy environment. The reduction and current lack of School Resource Officers creates urgent conditions impacting the safety of youth, not only on campus, but also on the streets. There was also concern over perceived lack of equity across schools, and educators shared that family mobility makes it difficult for schools to connect with families about changing services and program needs.
Educators expressed concern that overreliance on schools to address all youth challenges may limit the potential impact of collaboration with other critical institutions, including faith-based organizations, city partnerships, and the police. Additionally, educators said that the absence of clear, consistent, and concrete communication across stakeholders also limits schools’ abilities to effectively connect youth and families to services. All stakeholders have faced funding challenges—the schools are no exception—but there is a history of successful programming when resources are combined. Educators repeatedly mentioned the need for a centralized collaborative effort that would ensure increased communication and partnership across multiple stakeholder groups.

**Voice of Community-based Organizations**

Leaders of community-based organizations (CBOs) expressed the belief that the trust between providers and the community is crucial to creating an environment of mutual respect, understanding, and commitment. To nurture this environment, CBO leaders feel that combating low expectations of youth, including the perception that youth are trouble-makers, needy, or at-risk, is the first critical step to empowering youth to understand and believe in alternative opportunities for their futures. They agreed that top challenges facing Anaheim youth are gangs and poverty and believe these contribute to high school dropout rates.

CBO leaders also stated that youth cannot be involved without the commitment of the whole family. They discussed the need to identify key players who influence youth, such as family, teachers, and peers, followed by designing a continuum of programs that develops a comprehensive circle of influence to meet youth where they are at.

CBOs shared the concern that inconsistent resources create unsustainable programs, which also disrupt the continuity of any community development impact. In addition, they believe this inconsistency creates a silo effect among providers and stakeholders trying to sustain their own models in an unpredictable funding environment. They recommended funding cross-sector collaboratives, encouraging communication and collaboration among stakeholders in order to frame a collective impact approach.

**Voice of Businesses**

Business involvement with organizations that provide youth services takes many forms, but most common among participants are serving on the Board of Directors and donating money. Other ways businesses support youth programming include participating in career exploration presentations, encouraging staff to participate in volunteer days, sponsoring events, mentoring youth, providing goods and services, and providing internships or apprenticeships.

While participating businesses said they are more than willing to hire youth who are qualified, they felt youth would benefit from job application assistance, one-on-one mentoring, internships, more support for families raising youth in troubled neighborhoods, and learning to be more responsible. To address the difficulty of engaging older youth in after-school and other youth services, businesses said the programs need to be relevant to the interests of older youth. Another suggestion was to have older youth serve as mentors and plan activities and events for younger youth, thereby helping them develop leadership skills and feel valued.

Businesses think youth service providers could help youth be more prepared for the job market and adulthood with more mentoring, scholarships, leadership training, career/job awareness (either informally or through workshops), and helping youth search for jobs, write resumes, and complete job applications. Businesses can help youth by stressing the importance of education and job skill development, providing internships, and supporting a structural and philosophical change in business practices to promote skills development. Furthermore, businesses suggested that, in partnership with youth service providers, businesses should fund or support mentoring, job skills development,
and parent support programs. Businesses should become active partners and share their insights on the skills youth need to be successful in the real work place.

Participating business leaders feel priorities for youth services should include skills training, gang prevention starting with young children, engaging the business community to offer internships or hire youth on a part-time basis, and providing activities for teens and adults to interact through volunteerism. One suggested that the Anaheim Community Foundation should be the central point to align and direct collaborative efforts to meet the needs of youth.

**Interview Findings**

The policymakers and community leaders approached to participate in the assessment were accommodating and made time in their busy schedules for this project. As noted in the methodology, a list of questions (Exhibit 8) was developed beforehand to ensure consistency across interviews, but many interviewees had other topics they wanted to make sure were covered. These included issues such as Anaheim’s current housing issues, the need for targeted programs, and philosophical conversations about culture change. Even amidst this diversity, however, there were several common themes that were repeatedly heard.

Most feel something needs to change in serving Anaheim youth, but opinions on what and how change should happen often diverged. What everyone did agree upon was that the 2008 recession had a detrimental impact on service offerings and available funding, and that basic services have been prioritized. Several interviewees used the word “reactive” to describe current approaches to Anaheim youth issues, and there was a universal desire to become more proactive and collaborative in developing strategies and solutions. Many mentioned the need to approach problems holistically and at the neighborhood level, offering a variety of ideas about how this could be done. Interviewees also mentioned the need to re-engage residents and re-create a sense of community in Anaheim. Notably, while many emphasized the general need for meeting youth where they are at, geographically and personally, fewer directly suggested asking youth what programming would appeal to them.

Several of those interviewed talked about Anaheim’s crowded living conditions as a contributing factor to youth crime and gang activity. Unable to stay inside, youth congregate in the streets, spending large amounts of time without adult supervision. In addition, they may not study and thus fall behind in schoolwork. Most felt that youth need safe places to hang out when home is not an option, and community centers, libraries, parks, and school sites were posed as potential places for development of “hang-out” spots that would provide safe and supervised outlets.

All interviewees agreed that gangs are a threatening reality in Anaheim, with many commenting that Anaheim is well into second- and third-generation gang activity. Some mentioned that gang activity has escalated in the past few years. When asked how to deal with gang activity, many answered that Anaheim needs more early intervention and education programs or an increase in available jobs for gang-aged youth. Several emphasized that many Anaheim residents and neighborhoods distrust the police, complicating efforts to shift neighborhood cultures away from gangs. A few saw a need for community policing to help address these issues.

Many expressed the belief that change needs to start within the family structure itself, and that programming should be focused on strengthening the family. Others broached the role of Anaheim-based businesses in providing youth services: some think businesses could do more by getting involved in neighborhoods and providing outreach to at-risk youth, while others think businesses should limit their role to providing jobs for youth and potentially funding youth programs. Many spoke favorably of Anaheim’s larger business entities and their willingness to address community issues. Still others thought the City should do more. Finally, while some feel the Anaheim Community Foundation should be more involved in engaging and coordinating efforts, there were also some who believe the role of the Community Foundation should be more limited.
There is no one vision for how best to serve the youth in Anaheim. Anaheim’s economic, cultural, and geographic challenges make providing supportive services to youth necessary, yet simultaneously difficult. The needs of youth and families are as diverse as the residents of the city, and myriad methods have been found to be successful in providing support and resources. But the assessment process did unearth some significant themes that may help hone strategic responses to these identified needs of youth by community leaders, providers, and city officials.

1. **A holistic approach to interconnected issues.** The challenges facing youth are interconnected across multiple domains. There are systemic problems facing Anaheim youth that cannot be solved with a single solution or program, but rather require interconnected strategies delivered via a collective and collaborative approach. A balanced response to the needs of youth might include sustaining successful strategies already in place; targeting the most critical geographic, demographic, and programmatic gaps; and addressing core and peripheral conditions, including the basic needs of low-income families, which jeopardize the effectiveness and efficiency of current program impact. As a general principle, programs should be consistent, long-term, adaptable, and sustainable, and linked together to form a continuum of services for youth and families guided by a collective impact approach to youth development.

2. **Developing programs that make a difference.** While national research identifies convenience as the primary reason for selection of supportive programs, surveyed providers say parents choose their program because it makes a difference or kids enjoy it. Conversely, parents identified safety, availability, and accessibility as their top reasons for choosing a program, while youth consider if a program is fun, whether it benefits them, and if their peers are participating. Discrepancies in perceived program value can affect both the development of program offerings and the consistency of selection processes that ultimately determine youth engagement and program impact. Best practices in youth development models strike a critical balance between effective strategies and flexible offerings that allow organizations to tailor their programs to the diverse needs of youth and families.

3. **Creatively addressing the most critical gaps.** There is widespread awareness among parents, educators, and providers that safety is a critical need. Parents and youth want an alternative to neighborhood violence, and after-school programs are often a trusted, though limited, environment that acts as a continuation of home and school safe havens. However, while 90% of providers identified safety during after-school hours as a priority, only 41% of those surveyed said they were able to provide a safe place for kids to hang out. Seventy-eight percent of providers stated that Anaheim needs more gang prevention activities, yet only 24% provide them. Also, availability and access were other identified priorities for programs, but the demographic mapping conducted in this process shows that there are critical pockets of service gaps in seven high-risk census tracts. Furthermore, among programs provided by those surveyed, most programs end by 5:00pm; fewer than half are open later, and a large number of Anaheim youth service providers only offer programming one or two days per week. These findings highlight a disconnect between identified critical needs and existing solutions, or lack thereof, which calls for the collective wisdom of stakeholders to draft creative approaches to address them.
4. **Serving the needs of older youth.** There are significantly fewer services available for teens than there are for youth under 12. Regular non-school sponsored or extra-curricular programming, especially for youth over the age of 13, is limited in Anaheim. This is especially applicable to career development, community service, and arts-related programs. There was also a pervasive theme that emerged from discussion that services need to meet youth where they are, start at young ages, focus on developmental transition periods, and involve the family. In addition, high school-aged youth tend to look for more experiential learning opportunities rather than classroom-based approaches. Therefore, strategies to improve youth services in Anaheim for older youth need to embrace these factors as part of the equation for effective youth engagement.

5. **Funding shifts impact program sustainability.** Organizational survival often forces providers and schools to use restricted funding to create insular and reactive solutions to address the needs of youth, rather than being proactive and strategic about serving needs that are most pressing. As a result, providers have limited capacity to effectively serve the variety of needs in Anaheim across census tracts and age groups. Tough decisions often have to be made that jeopardize the ability to sustain services to the most needy youth groups or areas, which in turn disrupts the continuity of any community development impact. Consistent community investments in impactful strategies and programs will help create a foundation that can foster long-term solutions. Additionally, enhancing or fostering interaction between service providers can potentially unearth opportunities for collaboration, leveraging and cost-savings, which can ultimately promote the sustainability of impactful strategies.

6. **Improving communication for effective collaboration.** Effective communication is key to creating coordinated strategies to address the vast and varied needs of youth in Anaheim. There appears to be a lack of awareness, coordination, and synergy among key stakeholders who have a vested interest in youth outcomes, and improved, inclusive communication should be sought. In addition, the absence of clear, consistent, and concrete communication across the schools challenges their ability to effectively broker and connect services that are available to youth. Schools are considered a trusted infrastructure to engage youth, and several services are offered on campus every year. However, the lack of awareness by campus staff, the annual changes of information and resources, and the disconnect in communication among internal stakeholders limits a school’s ability to effectively connect families in need to the resources that can help them. Furthermore, parents reported a lack of knowledge of or access to programs and noted that they rely on their youth to convey information from the school. Supporting this, 90% of focus group youth self-identified as the primary decision-makers in the family to access programs. Providers are also unaware of other providers’ services and programs that could help support the youth they serve. All stakeholders who participated in this project called out the siloing that occurs among various providers, parents and families, and schools, and even at an intergovernmental level among City, County, and State agencies.

7. **Developing a unified vision for collective action.** Several participants identified the need for a centralized entity to champion strategic, collaborative efforts and to help create a unified vision for serving the youth of the city. A solidified vision for collective action will help define the roles of various stakeholders. It will also help leverage and coordinate resources and can help guide a roadmap to attain youth and community development aspirations. Furthermore, many participants articulated the need to create a process that is transparent, accountable, and participatory, involving a broader range of
stakeholders, from youth and parents to different kinds of organizations (faith-based, Chamber, etc.). If the creation of a continuum of integrated services becomes a goal, then there is a definite need for a lead entity to coordinate efforts, leverage resources, maintain communication across stakeholder groups, and create an integrated network of providers.

8. **Involving youth and parents as part of the solution.** Youth cannot be looked at independent of their family dynamics. Parent involvement and buy-in are both key to fostering successful youth development. The one common recommendation across all participant groups was the need for increased parental engagement and improved parental education. All shared a fundamental understanding that decisions for youth begin in the home; therefore, the most effective way to engage youth is to build trust and familiarity with those who are closest to them. Youth cannot be involved in programming without the commitment of the whole family. In order to influence youth, programs have to identify key influencers – family, teachers, and peers – and design a continuum of services that address the needs of youth where they are at. While designing systematic solutions to foster youth development, it is also critical to remember the importance of building relationships to ensure a successful process. *Trust between the providers and the community is necessary to foster an environment of reciprocity, understanding, and commitment.* Combating low expectations of youth, the perception that youth are trouble-makers, or needy and at-risk is the first battle to overcome as a critical step to empower youth and their families to understand and believe in alternative opportunities for their future.

9. **Focusing on prevention as much as intervention.** The old adage, “An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure,” was raised several times. A large majority of the programs currently offered focus on intervention methods for youth in trouble. However, the two ends of the targeted youth population spectrum seem to be neglected. There are few prevention programs for those who are not “in trouble,” and there are few restorative programs for those who are already in the “correctional” system. Everyone else must be at-risk to qualify for limited program offerings. Therefore, if resources can be devoted to sustaining healthy environments and preventative programs, that investment may reduce the need for long-term intervention programs and bolster youths’ own ability to avoid risky or negative behaviors. There is a general feeling that both intervention and prevention strategies need to happen concurrently. A large number of Anaheim youth do well in school and stay out of trouble. In support of the findings described above, participants articulated some frustration that these kids who are not “in trouble” receive far less attention and programming, which could help to expand their experiences and opportunities.

10. **Improving school and community policing to enhance safety.** Schools are grappling with significant safety challenges that hinder their ability to ensure a trusted environment for youth development. Drug offenses, violence, and campus incidents create law enforcement challenges that fall outside of the school’s domain to address. Lack of resource officers creates urgent conditions that have ripple effects in safety for youth not only on campus but also on the streets. Every stakeholder has a role to combat safety issues at school and in the community. Overreliance on the school infrastructure to address all youth challenges limits the scope of impact that could be created with the collaboration of other critical institutions, such as faith-based organizations, city partnerships, police, and others. There are some historical stories of success of collaborative efforts among all key stakeholders to transform Anaheim. There is a need to re-engage all key stakeholders in the same spirit and recognize that there is a role for everyone in a responsive community policing system.
While this assessment focused specifically on youth needs, challenges, and gaps in service provision, it is important to note the critical and impactful work that goes on every day in the City of Anaheim to support at-risk youth. Sustaining and expanding successful programs that already exist, rather than inventing new ones, could be one of the first steps to effectively addressing some of the issues identified. What the findings of this report provide is an opportunity for engaged community leaders to take a closer look at the gaps in service and the structural and logistic challenges to addressing them. A continuum of care that incorporates prevention and intervention, focuses on transitional ages, and accounts for the different needs of different ages may go a significant way in breaking down silos between service providers, and between the community and available programs. Incorporating youth in the development of programs and engaging parents in ways that help maintain safer and healthier environments for youth are also critical strategies to embrace.

In addition, focusing on systemic approaches to bolstering local capacity to serve youth may also provide an opportunity to engage individual donors and regional investors in funding collaborative solutions and may be a critical factor in the development of opportunities for public-private partnership.

A sustainable, long-term strategic plan for youth services should be developed that optimizes current resources and builds on evidence-based practices to ensure the best possible environment for youth to grow and develop. With the large population of youth in the city, this process will be an investment in a stronger, more dynamic future for the residents of Anaheim.


Division of School and Community Services, Orange County Department of Education. 2010-2011 Orange County Homeless Children and Youth.
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Exhibits
Exhibit 1: School Survey Questions

Dear Principal,

The Anaheim Community Foundation is committed to finding ways to foster the development of the City’s youth to help them reach their full potential. To support this goal, we are launching the Anaheim Youth Services Assessment to help us understand how our community is serving the needs of Anaheim youth. As part of this assessment, we have invited the programs that provide after-school services to complete a comprehensive survey about the services they provide to Anaheim youth. We also are contacting each school in Anaheim to identify which after-school programs they have and to learn just a little about what you perceive as the needs of at-risk youth in your school.

We invite you to complete the survey below by clicking on the link provided. It is just three questions and can be completed in five minutes.

1. Name of your school: ______________________________________________________

2. Which after-school programs are offered at your school:
   □ Anaheim Achieves
   □ Project Support Anaheim’s Youth (S.A.Y.)
   □ After School Education and Safety (ASES)
   □ 21st Century Community Learning Center
   □ Other – please provide the name of the program(s)___________________________

   ________________________________________________________________________

3. What ONE or TWO THINGS do you think would be most helpful in order for Anaheim youth to achieve a lifetime of success that is not being done today?

If you have any questions about this survey or the Anaheim Youth Services Assessment, please contact Terry Lowe, Director of Community Services at tlowe@anaheim.net. Thank you for your participation!
Exhibit 2: List of Providers Contacted

The following list compiled from websites and online information represents core and casual providers of youth services for the target area in Anaheim. While not exhaustive, this list includes major providers serving youth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 Mile Club!</td>
<td>815 W. 6th St., Suite 105, Corona, 92882</td>
<td>(951) 340-2290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability First After-School Enrichment Programs</td>
<td>2660 W. Broadway, Anaheim, 92804</td>
<td>(714) 821-7448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCESS California Services</td>
<td>2180 W. Crescent Ave., #C, Anaheim, 92801</td>
<td>(714) 917-0440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Stars Preschool</td>
<td>1340 W. La Palma Avenue, Anaheim, 92801</td>
<td>(714) 517-8277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaheim Achieves / YMCA</td>
<td>240 S. Euclid St., Anaheim, 92802</td>
<td>(714) 635-9622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaheim Ballet</td>
<td>280 E. Lincoln Ave., Anaheim, 92805</td>
<td>(714) 520-0904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaheim Equestrian Center</td>
<td>1370 S. Sanderson Ave., Anaheim, 92806</td>
<td>(714) 535-3510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaheim Family YMCA</td>
<td>240 S. Euclid St., Anaheim, 92804</td>
<td>(714) 635-9622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaheim Independencia Family Resource Center</td>
<td>10841 Garza Ave., Anaheim, 92804</td>
<td>(714) 826-9070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaheim Magnolia Daycare</td>
<td>720 South Magnolia Ave., Anaheim, 92804</td>
<td>(714) 827-0554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaheim Police Activities League (APAL), dba Cops4Kids (C4K) at After School Center in Anaheim/Junior Cadet Program</td>
<td>1290 E. Lincoln Ave., Anaheim, 92805</td>
<td>(714) 533-8255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaheim Police Explorers</td>
<td>425 S. Harbor Blvd., Anaheim, 92805</td>
<td>(714) 765-1597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaheim Public Libraries</td>
<td>500 W. Broadway, Anaheim, 92805</td>
<td>(714) 765-1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaheim United Methodist Church</td>
<td>1000 S. State College Blvd., Anaheim, 92806</td>
<td>(562) 822-2647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Brothers Big Sisters of Orange County</td>
<td>14131 Yorba St., Ste. 200, Tustin 92780</td>
<td>(714) 544-7773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys and Girls Clubs of Anaheim</td>
<td>311 E. Broadway, Anaheim, 92805</td>
<td>(714) 491-3617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy Scouts of Orange County</td>
<td>1211 E. Dyer Road, Santa Ana, 92705</td>
<td>(714) 546-4990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childtime Children’s Center</td>
<td>1000 S. State College, Anaheim 92806</td>
<td>(714) 772-7225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service Programs (CSP), Inc.</td>
<td>1821 E. Dyer Rd., #200, Santa Ana, 92705</td>
<td>(949) 250-0488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Youth Center</td>
<td>225 S. Philadelphia, Anaheim, 92805</td>
<td>(714) 765-4501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith Lutheran Church-Youth Ministries</td>
<td>2219 W. Orange Ave., Anaheim, 92804</td>
<td>(714) 535-9654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCCA’s First Congregational School of Anaheim</td>
<td>515 N. State College Blvd., Anaheim, 92806</td>
<td>(714) 776-0605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Southern Baptist Church of Anaheim</td>
<td>1275 E. Broadway Ave., Anaheim, 92805</td>
<td>(714) 774-2966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl Scouts of Orange County</td>
<td>9500 Toledo Way, Irvine, 92618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Inc.</td>
<td>1815 Anaheim Ave., Costa Mesa, 92627</td>
<td>(949) 646-7181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Opportunities Athletics Learning Service (GOALS)</td>
<td>1170 La Palma Park Way, Anaheim, 92801</td>
<td>(714) 956-4625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen Child Development Center</td>
<td>1300 S. Knott, Anaheim, 92804</td>
<td>(714) 484-4607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic Institute of Orange County</td>
<td>1220 N. State College Blvd., Anaheim, 92806</td>
<td>(714) 533-6271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIDS CLUB!</td>
<td>200 S. Anaheim Blvd., Ste. 422, Anaheim, 92805</td>
<td>(714) 765-5219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KinderCare Learning Center</td>
<td>2515 E. South St., Anaheim, 92806</td>
<td>(714) 774-5141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knott Avenue Christian Church</td>
<td>315 S. Knott Ave., Anaheim, 92804</td>
<td>(714) 527-5195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamb of God Day Camp</td>
<td>2443 E. South St., Anaheim, 92806</td>
<td>(714) 772-0300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia Baptist Church</td>
<td>720 S. Magnolia Ave., Anaheim, 92804</td>
<td>(714) 827-0553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Muffet's Playhouse</td>
<td>2229 E. Lincoln Ave., Anaheim, 92806</td>
<td>(714) 774-0883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County United Way / Destination Graduation</td>
<td>18012 Mitchell Ave. S., Irvine, 92614</td>
<td>(949) 660-7600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portico Anaheim (formerly First Baptist Church of Anaheim)</td>
<td>701 W. Broadway, Anaheim, 92805</td>
<td>(714) 774-4444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince of Peace Lutheran Church</td>
<td>1421 W. Ball Rd., Anaheim, 92802</td>
<td>(714) 774-0993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project S.A.Y. (Support Anaheim's Youth)</td>
<td>200 S. Anaheim Blvd., Anaheim, 92805</td>
<td>(714) 765-5246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Shield Program Community Center of Anaheim (Salvation Army)</td>
<td>1515 North St., Anaheim, 92801</td>
<td>(714) 687-9836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army Church</td>
<td>1515 W. North St., Anaheim, 92801</td>
<td>(714) 491-1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Anthony Claret Catholic Church Youth Group</td>
<td>1450 E. La Palma Ave., Anaheim, 92805</td>
<td>(714) 776-0270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Boniface Catholic Church</td>
<td>120 N. Janss St., Anaheim, 92805</td>
<td>(714) 956-3110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Justin Martyr Catholic School</td>
<td>2050 W. Ball Rd., Anaheim, 92804</td>
<td>(714) 774-2595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary &amp; St. Verena Church</td>
<td>1617 W. La Palma Ave., Anaheim, 92801</td>
<td>(714) 777-9964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State College Church of Christ</td>
<td>311 N. State College Blvd., Anaheim, 92806</td>
<td>(714) 287-9075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunkist Community Church Youth Group</td>
<td>701 S. Sunkist St., Anaheim, 92806</td>
<td>(714) 360-5314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Church in Anaheim</td>
<td>1853 W. Ball Rd., Anaheim, 92804</td>
<td>(714) 350-7471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiger Woods Learning Center</td>
<td>1 Tiger Woods Way, Anaheim, 92801</td>
<td>(714) 765-8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vital Link</td>
<td>P.O. Box 12064, Costa Mesa, 92627</td>
<td>(949) 646-2520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Anaheim Youth Center</td>
<td>320 S. Beach Blvd., Anaheim, 92804</td>
<td>(714) 765-6400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Leadership America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YWCA of North Orange County</td>
<td>215 E. Commonwealth Ave., Ste. F, Fullerton, 92832</td>
<td>(714) 871-4488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zion Lutheran Church &amp; School</td>
<td>222 N. East St., Anaheim 92805</td>
<td>(714) 535-3600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 3: Provider Survey Questions

The goal of this survey is to learn about the afterschool programs and other youth services available to Anaheim youth ages 5-18 and what the program providers believe would be necessary to expand capacity and/or improve effectiveness.

Your organization was selected to participate in this survey because it provides afterschool or other services to children in the 5-18 age range. If this is not the case, you do not need to complete the survey.

This survey should be answered by someone who is knowledgeable about the afterschool programs and other youth services provided by your organization. There should be just one completed survey per organization, and you should anticipate the process will take approximately 20 minutes. The survey window opens September 24th and closes October 10th. Thank you for your participation.

ABOUT YOUR ORGANIZATION and SERVICES

1. Name of your organization______________________________

2. Which of the following could be used to describe your organization? (Select all that apply)
   - Nonprofit organization (501c3)
   - Government/City entity
   - For-Profit Center
   - Church (or affiliated with a church)
   - Faith-based
   - Public school
   - Private school
   - Other

3. Where are your organization’s headquarters?
   - Located in Anaheim
   - Located outside Anaheim

4. In which of the following Anaheim zip codes do you provide services for youth ages 5-18? (check all that apply)
   - 92801
   - 92802
   - 92804
   - 92805
   - 92806
   - 92807
   - 92808
   - Other

5. How broad of a geographic area do you generally serve?
   - We serve primarily Youth in the same zip code as our facility/facilities
   - We serve Youth in one or two Anaheim zip codes neighboring our facility/facilities
   - We serve Youth from all over Anaheim
   - We Serve Youth from multiple cities at our Anaheim facility/facilities

6. How many years has your organization been providing services to Anaheim Youth ages 5-18?
   - Less than 1 year
   - 1-2 years
   - 3-4 years
   - 5-9 years
   - 10-19 years
   - 20 or more years

7. How many unduplicated children in each age group does your organization serve?
   - 5-8 yrs
   - 8-12 yrs
   - 13-15 yrs
   - 16-18 yrs

8. Approximately how many of these are Anaheim residents? (enter numerical value)

9. Based on your current resources and space, what is the maximum number of Youth ages 5-18 that your organization can serve? (enter numerical value)
10. Does your organization have a waiting list for its youth services programs? ________

☐ Yes
☐ No

11. How would you describe your program(s)? (Select all that apply)

☐ After-school
☐ Before-school
☐ In-school services
☐ Child care
☐ Summer
☐ Year-round
☐ Drop-in
☐ Enrichment

12. How many distinct programs do you offer to youth 5-18? (A program may offer multiple services, please provide a count of the programs, not the individual services within a program. For example, a program may include homework assistance, field trips, and sports activities; it would be counted as one program, not three) ____________ (enter numerical value)

13. What are the hours your program(s) is/are open during the week to Youth ages 5-18?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open until:</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 5pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later than 9pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. What are the hours your program(s) is/are open on the weekend to Youth ages 5-18?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 8pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Is/are your program(s) open: (Check all that apply)

☐ Holidays
☐ Summer/between school sessions for year-round schools
☐ Before School
☐ Off-track hours on school days
☐ None of the above
16. Which of the following services do you offer to Youth age 5 -18? (Select all that apply)

- Tutoring
- Homework assistance
- Access to computers and the internet
- High School Exit Exam preparation
- SAT preparation
- Mentoring
- Field trips
- Community improvement projects
- Community garden
- Volunteer opportunities
- Civic engagement
- Art/music/dance
- Sports activities/Exercise
- Recreation
- Life skills
- Gang prevention education/intervention
- Job training
- Job application assistance (resume building, job search and interview skills)
- Teen pregnancy prevention
- Self-esteem building
- A place to hang out
- Snacks and/or meals
- Bullying information/prevention
- Health services referrals
- Nutrition/wellness information
- Counseling/therapy on-site or referrals
- Case Management
- Other

17. What is the typical distance to your program(s) from the nearest Anaheim school your participants attend?

- It is/they are at the schools
- Less than half a mile
- Half to under a mile
- About a mile
- 1.5 to 3 miles
- More than 3 miles

18. How do youth get to your program(s)? (Select all that apply)

- They walk or ride bikes
- They take public transportation
- Our program picks them up from school
- Parents drop them off
- Other ____________________________

19. Which of the following describes the facility or facilities at which your organization provides services to Anaheim youth ages 5-18? (Select all that apply)

- Our organization owns the facility
- Our organization rents the facility
- We operate in a city owned facility
- It is in a school
- It is at a church
- It is in a house
- It is in a shopping center
- It is a single facility in Anaheim
- It is a single facility outside Anaheim
- We provide services at multiple locations in Anaheim
- We provide services at multiple locations that are in and/or outside Anaheim
20. Which of the following describes the amenities of your facility/facilities? (Select all that apply)
   ☐ It is spacious
   ☐ It is cramped
   ☐ It has an outside area where youth can play outdoors
   ☐ It has a community garden
   ☐ It has a gym
   ☐ It has a computer lab
   ☐ It has a pool
   ☐ It has a game room
   ☐ None of these apply
   ☐ Other ________________________________________________________

21. Our facility/facilities: (Select all that apply)
   ☐ Appear(s) freshly painted and clean
   ☐ is/are in need of some maintenance
   ☐ is/are less than 5 years old
   ☐ is/are more than 25 years old
   ☐ None of these apply

22. How many people do you employ to provide services to youth ages 5-18?
   _____ Full-time staff
   _____ Part-time staff
   _____ Volunteers

23. How many of them are bilingual? ________

24. How many days per week does the typical child participate in your program(s)?
   ☐ 1
   ☐ 2
   ☐ 3
   ☐ 4
   ☐ 5
   ☐ 6
   ☐ 7

25. What do you think is the PRIMARY reason parents choose your program? (select ONLY one)
   ☐ Convenient
   ☐ Inexpensive
   ☐ Kids enjoy it/kid’s choice
   ☐ Hours of operation
   ☐ Safety
   ☐ Enrichment
   ☐ Recommended by school or trusted friend
   ☐ Prefer faith-based program
   ☐ We make a difference for their kids
   ☐ Mandatory referrals

26. Do you accept mandatory referrals (e.g., from probation, police, courts)?  YES   NO  (circle one)

27. Which of the following are eligibility requirements for your program? (select all that apply)
   ☐ Income
   ☐ Live in particular neighborhood
   ☐ School attended
   ☐ Age
   ☐ Referral only
   ☐ Church attended
   ☐ Gender
   ☐ Meet certain academic achievement levels
   ☐ We do not have any eligibility requirements
   ☐ Other ________________________________________________________

28. What is the standard fee to the family for one child to participate in your program? $_________
29. Is this Per:
☐ Day
☐ Week
☐ Month
☐ Semester
☐ Annual

30. Do you offer any of the following? (select all that apply)
☐ Sliding scale based on family income  
☐ Discount for low income families  
☐ Sibling or family discount  
☐ Scholarships  
☐ We don’t charge for our program  
☐ Other

31. How do families find out about your program(s)?
☐ Website  
☐ School  
☐ Mailers  
☐ Flyers or brochures  
☐ Newspaper/local ads  
☐ Social media (i.e., Facebook)  
☐ Word-of-Mouth  
☐ Other

ABOUT THE KIDS YOU SERVE

32. What is the ethnic breakdown of the kids in your program?

_____% White  
_____% Hispanic  
_____% Asian  
_____% Black  
_____% More than one race/ethnicity  
_____% Other

33. What percent of the youth in your program would you classify as disadvantaged or “at risk” for poor life outcomes? ______%  

34. What criteria do you use to classify youth as “at risk”? (Select all that apply)
☐ Low income  
☐ No/limited parental supervision  
☐ Single-parent household  
☐ English language learner  
☐ Known gang affiliation in the family  
☐ Homeless/Motel family  
☐ Family criminal activity  
☐ Family with domestic violence/child abuse or neglect issues  
☐ Living in crowded housing with multiple families  
☐ Parents do not have a high school education  
☐ Family size  
☐ Ethnicity  
☐ Parental unemployment  
☐ Poverty

35. What do you think the youth in your program are MOST “at risk” for? (select one)
☐ Gang involvement  
☐ Drug use  
☐ School drop-out  
☐ Poverty  
☐ Unemployment  
☐ Crime victim  
☐ Criminal offender  
☐ Homelessness
35. What do you think the youth in your program are MOST “at risk” for? (select one)
   - gang involvement
   - drug use
   - school drop-out
   - poverty
   - unemployment
   - crime victim
   - criminal offender
   - homelessness

36. Please use your best guesses to estimate the percentage of youth 5-18 in your program to which each statement applies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Very few (0-20%)</th>
<th>Some (20-40%)</th>
<th>About half (40-60%)</th>
<th>Many (60-80%)</th>
<th>Most or all (80-100%)</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The family has a low income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The primary language spoken at home is not English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The youth lives in a crowded home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The youth does not have a good place at home to do homework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The youth lives with only one parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The youth is doing well in school (i.e., good grades)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. The youth is homeless and/or lives in a motel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. The youth lives in a neighborhood with gang activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. The youth is at risk of being recruited to join a gang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. The youth is exposed to illicit drug use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. The youth has good role models and/or mentors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. The youth is sometimes violent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. The mother and/or father are high school graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. The mother and/or father are college graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. In looking at the following list of services or activities for Anaheim youth ages 5-18, do you think there are not enough, about enough, or too many?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Not enough</th>
<th>About enough</th>
<th>Too many</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Afterschool programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Workforce development programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Sports programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Music/arts/dance/theater programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Programs that build self-esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Safe places to hang out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Homework assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Tutoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. College preparatory help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Gang prevention activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Teenage pregnancy prevention programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Community engagement activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Drug use prevention programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
38. What ONE THING do you think would be most helpful in order for Anaheim youth ages 5-18 to achieve a lifetime of success that is not being done today (Please limit response to 250 characters).
__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________

ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY QUESTIONS

Thinking about your program that provides after-school and other services for youth ages 5-18:

39. What would you say are the top 3 goals of your program(s)? (select up to three)

- Reduce truancy
- Improve school attendance
- Improve grades
- Improve graduation rates
- Improve behavior in school
- Help kids keep out of trouble
- Prevent gang involvement
- Teenage pregnancy prevention
- Job skills/workforce development
- Prevent drug use
- Increase community engagement
- Our program does not have specific goals
- Other __________________________________________________________

40. What do you tell others about the greatest impacts your organization/program is having on the youth and families it serves?
__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________

41. What are the biggest challenges your organization/program faces in achieving your desired goals?
__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________

42. What was the annual budget for your youth services programs in 2011? (limit selection to one)

- Less than $50,000
- $50,000 - $99,999
- $100,000 - $199,999
- $200,000 - $299,999
- $300,000 - $499,999
- $500,000 - $749,999
- $750,000 - $1,000,000
- More than $1 million

43. Which of the following does your organization employ to raise funds for youth services? (Check all that apply)

- Public sector contracts (city, state, federal)
- Submit grant proposals
- Hold fundraising events
- Court major donors
- Seek corporate sponsorship
- Sell a product (social enterprise)
- Charge fees
- None of these
- Other
44. Approximately what percentage of your organization’s youth services annual income comes from each of the following sources?

- _____% Federal government
- _____% State government
- _____% Local government
- _____% Private sector grants
- _____% Private donations
- _____% Fees
- _____% Fundraising events
- _____% Corporate sponsors
- _____% Social enterprise
- _____% Other

45. How has your funding changed in the last 3 years?

- Funding is down quite a lot (more than 50%)
- Funding is down some (10-50%)
- Funding is about the same (up or down within 10%)
- Funding is up some (10-50%)
- Funding is up a lot (more than 50%)
- Not applicable (i.e., new program)

46. How secure is your funding for the next 1-3 years?

- Not secure
- Somewhat secure
- Secure
- Very secure
- I don’t know

47. How often are grant proposals submitted to fund your program(s)?

- We do not seek grant funds
- Once or twice a year
- 3-5 times a year
- 6-12 times a year
- More than 12 times a year (more than once a month)

48. Do you collaborate or partner with other organizations to provide any of the following? (select all that apply)

- Field trips for the youth
- Activities for the youth
- Food to the families
- Food service for your program(s)
- Shelter to the families
- Clothing, backpacks, gifts for the youth and families
- Referrals for services
- Meet other needs of the families
- Other

49. Do you currently collaborate with another organization on a project that involves shared funding, staffing, training or facilities?

- Yes
- No

50. To what extent do you consider the following items to be barriers to Youth being able to participate in your program(s) or others like it in Anaheim?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Significant Barrier</th>
<th>Slight Barrier</th>
<th>Not a Barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Parent/Fee cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Older youth need to work/care for younger siblings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Lack of available slots in program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Lack of interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Negative perception of program or afterschool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Not all youth in one family can attend due to age differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Not enough knowledge about program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
51. What ONE THING could your program do to increase capacity and serve more Anaheim Youth? (Please limit response to 250 characters).

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

52. Are there specific regions of Anaheim that you think need youth services but don’t have them? If yes, where?

_____________________________________________________________________________________

53. What is your position with the program?

☐ Executive Director
☐ Financial Officer
☐ Member of Board of Directors or Advisory Committee
☐ Full-time staff person
☐ Part-time staff person
☐ Volunteer
☐ Other

The responses you provide are confidential and will not be shared with any identifying information. We will be conducting focus groups in the near future. We also would like the option of contacting you in the unlikely event that we need clarification or further explanation of your responses.

If you are interested in participating in a focus group or willing to be contacted, please provide your name, email address and phone number.

   Name:

   Email:

   Phone:

☐ Interested in focus group

☐ You may contact me if you have questions about these responses
Exhibit 4: Sample Focus Group Invitation

(For distribution by email)

Dear Provider:

On behalf of the Anaheim Community Foundation, I am writing to ask for your participation in a focus group to talk about current services available to Anaheim youth and the challenges they are facing. We have been tasked with implementing an assessment of youth services in Anaheim to help identify gaps in service and opportunities to help support the children and families of the city. This focus group will be a critical component of that effort.

As a provider of afterschool services in Anaheim we value and need your opinion. Your insights and feedback on this issue will help us garner a fuller understanding of the city’s needs. The focus group will be held at The Village in Santa Ana (1505. E. 17th Street, Santa Ana, CA 92705) on November 5 at 8 AM. Parking is free, and breakfast will be served.

Please let me know at your earliest convenience if you will be able to join us. If we do not hear from you in the next few days, a representative of The Olin Group will call you to follow up on this invitation. The focus group will take about 90 minutes. If you have any questions about the project or process in the meantime, please feel free to contact the Special Projects Manager, Ariel Okamoto, at 714-647-0900 or by email, ariel.okamoto@theolingroup.com.

Best regards,

Anne Olin
Exhibit 5: Focus Group Questions

(General information for each session)

**Purpose:** To get participants’ opinions about after-school youth services offered in Anaheim.

**Ground Rules:**
1. Respect and integrity in our interaction
2. Excellence in our exchange of ideas
3. Environment of confidentiality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Suggested Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. What do your children do after school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. What are concerns for kids’ after-school time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. How many use current after-school programming?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. When choosing an after-school program, what factors do you consider?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. What barriers are there to accessing current services?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. What are needs that youth have that are not being met by the current program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. What other programs would you like to see offered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. What do you think are the top threats that youth in Anaheim face?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. What is your sense about gangs in Anaheim and their impact to youth?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. What do you do after school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. How many use current after-school programming?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. What do you like about the program in which you participate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. What part of the program is not relevant to your needs/aspirations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. If you were to create a program that addresses the most important needs for youth in Anaheim, what would it look like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Would you include a college prep or job skills programs? If no, why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. What other critical factors may prepare youth for life after high school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. What are some of the challenge for youth growing up in Anaheim?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. What do you think most youth in Anaheim get encouraged by their families to do - get a job or go to college?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. What is your sense about gangs in Anaheim and their impact to youth?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. What are the most critical capacity needs/challenges that providers serving youth in Anaheim face?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. How do you respond to those needs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. If you were to describe the ideal collaborative partnership with another provider, what would this look like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. When choosing an after-school program, what do you think are the key factors parents/youth consider?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. What barriers are there to accessing current services?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. How do people find out about services?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. What do you think are the top needs/challenges for youth in Anaheim?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. What is your sense about gangs in Anaheim and their impact to youth?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. What do you think are the top threats that youth in Anaheim face?
   a. What is your sense about gangs in Anaheim and their impact to youth?
   b. What is your sense about school drop-outs in Anaheim and their impact to youth?
   c. What can be done to alleviate these issues?

2. Thinking of high school-aged youth, how are after-school programs serving their needs?
   a. If not, what needs to be adjusted/added to serve the youth needs?
   b. What are some of the inherent challenges of providing after-school support to older youth?

3. Schools are often considered an effective exiting infrastructure to reach youth and engage them in a number of programs. In that scenario:
   a. What are schools grappling with that they shouldn’t be?
   b. What is the appropriate role of the schools? Should they do less/more?

4. Could you describe what the ideal school-provider partnership looks like?

---

**Final Question (choose the most appropriate):**

- If you could advise the Anaheim Community Foundation on one priority, what would you say?
- Of all the things we discussed, which do you think is the most important?
- Have we missed anything?
Exhibit 6: Business Survey Questions

The Anaheim Community Foundation has launched the **Anaheim Youth Services Assessment**, which is designed to describe the environment of current services available to Anaheim youth and identify potential gaps in services or new opportunities for investment. It also will help us identify potential opportunities to enhance, strengthen, and grow the collaborative capacity of our community to address the needs of our youth.

The Olin Group was retained to conduct this city-wide assessment. They are gathering input from key stakeholder groups, including providers of youth services, businesses, educators, youth, parents, and community leaders. The survey that follows was designed to provide an easy way for business leaders to provide input to this assessment. It has only 10 questions and can be completed in 10-15 minutes. All responses are anonymous; no names of respondents will be included in the report.

Please take a few minutes to provide your responses to the questions that follow. Thank you.

1. Are you and/or your business involved with any organizations that provide afterschool or other services to youth in Anaheim?
   - □ Yes
   - □ No

2. If yes, in what capacity?
   - □ Serve on the Board
   - □ Mentor youth
   - □ Tutor youth
   - □ Coach sports activities
   - □ Participate in career exploration presentations
   - □ Provide goods or services
   - □ Sponsor events
   - □ Donate money
   - □ Provide internships or apprenticeships
   - □ Encourage staff to participate in a volunteer day with an organization
   - □ Other – please specify ______________________________________________

3. Do you hire young people (ages 17-25) in your business?
   - □ Yes
   - □ No

4. Do you ever hire youth from disadvantaged neighborhoods?
   - □ Yes
   - □ No

   Why or why not?

5. What do you think Anaheim youth need in order to be better prepared for adulthood and the job market?

6. What do you think youth service providers can or should do to help Anaheim youth be better prepared for adulthood and the job market?
Exhibit 7: Sample Interview Invitation

(For distribution through mail and email)

DATE

Dear __________,

I am writing to ask for your participation in and support of a newly launched assessment process designed to describe the environment of current services available to Anaheim youth: the Anaheim Youth Services Assessment.

You know that one of the critical community challenges in Anaheim is the need for services and resources for our youth. The Anaheim Community Foundation is committed to finding ways to foster the development of the City’s youth to their full potential, and has embarked on this assessment after many months of planning.

The primary purpose of this project is to help us understand how our community is serving the needs of youth in Anaheim. The assessment also will delve into successful models of service in similar settings; help us identify potential gaps in service or new opportunities for investment; and help us identify potential opportunities to enhance, strengthen, and grow the collaborative capacity of our community to address the needs of our youth.

After a competitive and formal RFP process, The Olin Group was retained to conduct this city-wide assessment. Based locally, and with extensive experience conducting assessments in the nonprofit sector, The Olin Group has designed a comprehensive process that includes a survey of organizations that provide services to Anaheim youth, focus groups of key stakeholders, including parents and youth, and interviews with decision makers and other individuals who are knowledgeable about the city and the environment in which youth services are provided.

I am writing to invite you to participate in a one-on-one interview for the Anaheim Youth Services Assessment. Your insights and feedback on this issue will be a critical component of garnering a full understanding of our city’s needs. A representative of The Olin Group will call your office in the next week to schedule an appointment. The interview can take place in person or by phone, whichever you prefer. Each interview is expected to take about half an hour. If you have any questions about the project or process in the meantime, please feel free to contact the CEO of The Olin Group, Anne Olin, at 714-647-0900 or by email, anne.olin@theolingroup.com.

Sincerely,

Terry D. Lowe
Chief Executive Officer
Anaheim Community Foundation
Exhibit 8: Interview Questions

1. What do you think are the top threats that youth in Anaheim face?
   a. What is your sense about gangs in Anaheim and their impact to youth?
   b. What is your sense about school drop-out in Anaheim and its impact to youth?
   c. What can be done to alleviate these issues?
   d. What services would you like to see offered to solve these problems?

2. What is the most effective role the Anaheim Community Foundation can play to help address the issues facing youth in Anaheim?
   a. How can youth be given a voice to communicate their needs?
   b. What are the best avenues for residents to advocate for youth?

3. What do you perceive as obstacles/barriers to effective youth engagement in Anaheim?

4. If you could advise the Anaheim Community Foundation on one priority, what would you say?
Exhibit 9: Complete Provider Survey Report

Methodology

A survey was provided to 60 organizations that are known to provide services to youth ages 5-18 in Anaheim outside of regular school hours. If an email address was known, the organization was sent a link to the online survey. There were three reminder emails after the initial invitation to participate. Each email included the link to the survey. The survey also was mailed to the organizations.

Thirty-four of the organizations took at least part of the survey and 30 completed it – a response rate of 57% and completed rate of 50%.

About the Organizations that Provide Youth Services – Who? Where? How Long? When?

Most respondents (67.6%) were non-profit organizations. Respondents could have selected more than one type, so the percentages do not add up to 100.

Figure 1: Percent of organizations that identified themselves using the specified categories (n=34)

Most of the organizations are based in Anaheim, with 82.4% indicating their organization’s headquarters are in the city (n=34).

Fourteen of the 34 respondents (41%) said their program serves youth in all seven Anaheim zip code areas. The zip code area served by the most respondents was 92805 (Central Anaheim, with 72.7% of the responding organizations) (see Figure 2). Zip code areas 92807 and 92808 (Anaheim Hills) were served by the fewest organizations (41%) among the respondents. Thirteen respondents indicated they serve youth from multiple cities in their Anaheim facilities.
Of the 19 respondents who answered an open-ended question asking if there are specific regions of Anaheim that they think need youth services but don’t have them, five said they didn’t think there are regions without services and two were unsure. Of the twelve respondents who said there are regions without services, there was no consensus about where the gaps are. The three most commonly mentioned areas were West Anaheim, Central Anaheim, and East Anaheim. One respondent summed it up the best:

“There are gaps all over the city. You could put any youth services program on the block with another youth service program anywhere in this city and there still would be a need for more on that same block. There just are not enough services.”

Over half of the organizations provide services at a school or within a half mile of the closest Anaheim school attended by their participants. Only four organizations said the nearest Anaheim school is more than three miles from where they provide services (n=34).

About 65% of the respondents said the children walk or ride bikes or their parents drive them to the program. About 30% of respondents said some children take public transportation, and 20% said their program picks the children up from school. (Respondents could select more than one mode of transportation to describe how children get to their program.) Two respondents noted that some of the youth drive themselves to their program (n=34).

Half of the organizations have been providing services to Anaheim youth for 20 years or more. Another 27% have been serving Anaheim youth for 10-19 years. Only one respondent had been serving Anaheim youth for only 1-2 years (n=34).

Providers were asked how many distinct programs they offer to youth. A program may offer multiple services, such as homework assistance, field trips and sports activities; respondents were asked to count
programs and not the individual services within a program. Twelve of the respondents (35.3%) reported having only one distinct program. Four each said they have two or three distinct programs (12% each). Of the remaining organizations, 12 (35%) said they offer 4-8 programs, one offers 10 distinct programs, and one has 15 programs (n=34).

When asked to choose from a list to describe their program, most respondents indicated their programs were year-round and/or after school (see Figure 3). Very few respondents described their programs as “before school” or “child care.” Respondents could select all that apply, so the percents do not add up to 100.

**Figure 3: Percent of organizations that selected the specified descriptors of their program(s) (n=34)**

![Figure 3: Percent of organizations that selected the specified descriptors of their program(s) (n=34)](image)

**Figure 4: Percent of programs that are open during the specified times Monday-Friday (n=33)**

![Figure 4: Percent of programs that are open during the specified times Monday-Friday (n=33)](image)
More than half of the programs are open after school, before 5 pm, with 67% open on Wednesdays and 54% open on Fridays during this time period. The percent open at 5 pm dropped to 36-42%, depending on the day of the week. More programs were open at 6 pm (36-52%) than at 5 pm; after 6 pm, the number open dropped throughout the evening hours, with only one fairly specialized program offering any services after 9 pm (see Figure 4).

On the weekends, fewer than half of the programs are open. Eleven of 29 respondents said they are open Saturday morning; 13 are open Saturday afternoon; 4 on Saturday evening; and only one is open Saturday after 8 pm. Even fewer are open on Sunday, with 10 open Sunday morning; 5 open in the afternoon; 2 in the evening; and 1 after 8 pm (see Figure 5).

Figure 5: Percent of programs that are open during the specified weekend times (n=29)
Most of the organizations offer services during the summer or between school sessions of year-round schools. Nearly half are open during off-track hours on school days. Only 21% are open on holidays (see Figure 6).

Nearly half of the organizations said the typical child participates in their program only one or two days per week. Only 18% of respondents said the typical child participates in their program five days per week (see Figure 7).

Figure 6: Percent of organizations that are open during the specified times (n=33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Open Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer / between</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>off track hours</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on school days</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holidays</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before School</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: Percent of organizations reporting that the typical child participates in their program the specified number of days (n=33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days of Participation</th>
<th>Open Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Day</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Days</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Days</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Days</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Days</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Days</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
About the Facilities

Fourteen organizations (41.2%) said they own the facility where they provide services to Anaheim youth; four (11.8%) said they rent the facility. Eleven (32.4%) said they operate in a city-owned facility; eight (23.5%) said their services are in a school; another eight said they provide services at a church (n=34; respondents could select all that apply so the percentages do not add up to 100).

Eight (23.5%) said they operate out of a single facility in Anaheim and ten (29.4%) said they have multiple locations in Anaheim. Seven respondents (20.6%) said they provide services at multiple locations both in and outside Anaheim (n=34).

When asked to select from a list to describe their facility amenities, over half said it has an outside area where youth can play and half described it as spacious. Only two respondents said they have a pool, and only one said they have a community garden (see Figure 8).

Figure 8: Percent of organizations that have the specified facility amenities (n=34)
Sixteen organizations said their facility appeared freshly painted and clean and 16 said their facility was more than 25 years old; only four said their facility was both over 25 years old and freshly painted and clean. Eleven said their facility was over 25 years old and needs some maintenance (see Figure 9).

**About The Staff**

Thirty-three respondents provided information about the numbers of full-time and part-time staff and volunteers they use to operate their programs. Nearly half of the survey respondents indicated they have none or only one full-time staff member. Twelve said they have none or only one part-time staff member. Five respondents said they operate with only volunteers and have no paid staff; only three organizations said they have no volunteers. Only one organization had no bilingual staff or volunteers. Two reported that more than 95% of their staff and volunteers are bilingual.

**Table 1: Numbers of paid and volunteer staff and bilingual status (n=33)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-Time Staff</th>
<th>Part-time Staff</th>
<th>Volunteers</th>
<th>Total – all types of paid and volunteer workers</th>
<th>Bilingual – all types of paid and volunteer workers</th>
<th>% Bilingual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Least</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of respondents with zero</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of respondents with one</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
About the Youth Served by These Programs

The number of unduplicated children served by each organization was reported by age group (see Table 2). The table below shows the number of organizations that reported serving children in each age group, and then the low, high, and average number of children served by the organizations that reported serving any children in that age group. These numbers include children who do not live in Anaheim, so it is a reflection of the total capacity of the programs throughout Orange County, not just in Anaheim.

Table 2: Number of children served by age group (n=34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number of organizations serving any children in the age group</th>
<th>Fewest number of children served</th>
<th>Highest number of children served*</th>
<th>Average number of children served per program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-8 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-12 years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Two organizations that serve large numbers of youth on an informal basis or large numbers of youth outside Anaheim were not included in this table.

Collectively, the respondents serve youth of all ages from 5-18 years. The age group with the most youth enrolled is 8-12 years, with both the largest number of programs and highest average number of children per program. The least-served age group is 16-18 years with the fewest number of programs and lowest average number of youth per program.

The respondents also reported the total number of children they serve who live in Anaheim (all age groups) and their program capacity. Only 29% or the organizations reported they have a waiting list for their youth services programs.

Table 3: Number of Anaheim youth served and program capacity (n=34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of organizations reporting</th>
<th>Fewest number of youth</th>
<th>Highest number of youth</th>
<th>Average number of youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anaheim youth served</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5300*</td>
<td>1249*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program capacity</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5600*</td>
<td>1366*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Two organizations that serve large numbers of children on an informal basis or large numbers of youth outside Anaheim were not included in this table.

Most of the youth served by these programs are Hispanic (65% across the 30 programs that provided information). Half of the organizations said that at least 75% of the children in their programs are Hispanic. One program each said at least 75% of the children they serve are White, Asian, More than One race, or Other. Only three organizations (10%) said fewer than a quarter of the children they serve are Hispanic (n=30).

Most organizations report no or few eligibility requirements for their program. Age was the most commonly selected eligibility requirement (see Figure 10).
Most Youth Served Are Disadvantaged or “At Risk”

Over half of the respondents (53.8%) said they consider at least 75% of the children they serve to be disadvantaged or “at risk” for poor life outcomes. Five respondents said this applies to all the children they serve. Only four respondents said this applies to a quarter or less of the children they serve (n=27).

When asked what criteria they use to classify youth as at-risk, the most common response given was low income, selected by 86% of respondents (see Figure 11). The least often selected criteria were family size and ethnicity (10.3% of respondents).
Respondents were asked to estimate the percentage of the youth in their programs who fit in a number of risk categories. A Don’t Know option was provided, but don’t know responses were not included in the calculation of percents. To help respondents develop estimates, each response option was defined with a percentage, so, for example, respondents were to select “Most or All” if they thought 80% or more of the youth in their program was at risk for living in a home where English is not the primary language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Most or All</th>
<th>Many</th>
<th>About half</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Very Few</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>80-100%</td>
<td>60-80%</td>
<td>40-60%</td>
<td>20-40%</td>
<td>0-20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the characteristics in the chart, there were 23 to 30 organizations providing responses. The largest number of responses was to the item about family income, with 43% of the 30 responding organizations estimating that most or all of the children they serve live in families with low income. An additional 20% said that many were low-income. Only 7% of the responding organizations thought that very few of the children in their program were low-income.

Respondents were least willing to estimate the number of children who are homeless or live in motels, with only 23 organizations responding to this item. Of those who responded, 74% thought very few of the children in their programs were homeless or living in a motel.

In Figure 12, the items are presented in order, starting with the items most organizations identified as describing the majority of the children they serve on the left (the item describes 60% or more of the youth), to the items they felt described very few of their children on the right. In other words, 69% of the respondents estimated that many of the children they serve live in a home where English is not the primary language, and 63% believe that many of the children they serve live in households with low income. On the other hand, only 4% (one respondent) thought that many of the children they serve are homeless or sometimes violent.
When asked what consequence they felt the youth in their programs were most at risk for, 40% said poverty. None of the respondents selected crime victim, crime offender, or homelessness (see Figure 13).

Figure 13: Percent of respondents that identified these consequences as the ONE THING youth in their program were MOST at risk for (n=30)

When asked what consequence they felt the youth in their programs were most at risk for, 40% said poverty. None of the respondents selected crime victim, crime offender, or homelessness (see Figure 13).

Program Goals, Services Provided, and the Perception of Services Needed

The organizations that serve youth have a variety of goals they are trying to achieve. When asked to select their program’s top three goals from a list, the most commonly selected goal was to “help keep kids out of trouble” (see Figure 14). The second most common goal was to “increase community engagement.” For those who did not find their goals on the list, they could write in their goals. Three
goals came up more than once in written comments, and these are denoted with an asterisk in the chart below. Goals that applied to only one organization and were not on the list were to raise awareness of science and conservation; help youth navigate career training and life opportunities; and building lifelong literacy.

**Figure 14: Percent of organizations that selected each goal as one of the top three goals of their program (n=32)**

* These items were not on the original drop-down list but were written in by more than one respondent.

The next set of graphs (Figures 15-17) show the percent of organizations that provide each type of service listed. From a list of 27 possible services that programs could provide, the most commonly offered services were volunteer opportunities and recreation. The least commonly offered services were teen pregnancy prevention, high school exit exam preparation, and a community garden.
Services selected by half or more of the respondents:

Figure 15: Percent of organizations that provide each of the listed services (n=34)

![Bar chart showing services selected by half or more respondents]

Services offered by 25 to 49 percent of the respondents:

Figure 16: Percent of organizations that provide each of the listed services (n=34)

![Bar chart showing services offered by 25 to 49 percent respondents]

Goals came up more than once in written comments, and these are denoted with an asterisk in the chart below. Goals that applied to only one organization and were not on the list were to raise awareness of science and conservation; help youth navigate career training and life opportunities; and building lifelong literacy.

Figure 14: Percent of organizations that selected each goal as one of the top three goals of their program (n=32)

* These items were not on the original drop-down list but were written in by more than one respondent.

The next set of graphs (Figures 15-17) show the percent of organizations that provide each type of service listed. From a list of 27 possible services that programs could provide, the most commonly offered services were volunteer opportunities and recreation. The least commonly offered services were teen pregnancy prevention, high school exit exam preparation, and a community garden.
Additional services provided by organizations include hands-on science learning, social development, development of character and moral values, leadership development, spiritual growth, and interscholastic athletics.

Twenty-five to thirty of the organizations responded to a question asking their opinion about whether Anaheim has too few, enough, or too many of a variety of services or activities for Anaheim youth. The item the respondents feel is in shortest supply in Anaheim is safe places to hang out, with 90% of the respondents saying there are not enough safe places for youth to hang out. Less than half of the respondents felt there are not enough sports activities, and 7% felt there are too many. In Figure 18,
the services or activities are ranked with the ones that respondents felt were most lacking on the left to those they felt are sufficiently available on the right.

Twenty-six respondents wrote in their ideas of the one thing they think would be most helpful for Anaheim youth to achieve a lifetime of success that is not being done today. Twelve respondents wrote about youth needing more guidance, encouragement, opportunity, and tutoring.

As one person wrote, “Identify their skills and talents and identify how they can use those skills/talents to move toward a career that will allow them reach their potential and become economically self-sustaining.”

Another suggested a community-wide effort to support youth, “Develop a community wide initiative for businesses, government agencies, schools, families to participate in to support healthy, positive youth development.”

Four respondents focused their comment on strengthening families, writing about the need for parenting classes and especially recognizing the needs of grandparents and other relatives who may not have planned to be raising a child at that point in their life.

How Parents Find Out About Their Program

Organizations use a variety of strategies to publicize their programs. In response to a question asking how families find out about their program, nearly all said by word of mouth (see Figure 19). Other common mechanisms were the program’s website, the school, and flyers or brochures. Less commonly mentioned was social media. Mailers and newspaper ads were the least likely ways parents found out about the programs. Other methods mentioned by the respondents included health fairs and church/mosque announcements.

Figure 19: Percent of organizations that said parents find out about their programs through the specified methods (n=33)
Why Parents Choose Their Program

When asked to select from a list what they believe is the primary reason parents choose their program, the most commonly selected reason is that the program makes a difference for the children (see Figure 20). None of the respondents selected Hours of Operation as the primary reason parents choose their program.

Figure 20: Percent of organizations that selected one of these reasons as the primary reason parents choose their program (n=33)

Barriers to Youth Participation

Respondents thought transportation and too little information known about their programs were the biggest barriers to youth being able to participate in their programs (see Figure 21). Program cost was perceived by some to be a significant barrier and by others as not a barrier at all. Similarly, while most respondents said the number of available slots was not a barrier, a few said it was a significant barrier. None of the respondents thought that a negative view of their program was a significant barrier to youth participation.
When asked to select from a list what they believe is the primary reason parents choose their program, the most commonly selected reason is that the program makes a difference for the children (see Figure 20). None of the respondents selected Hours of Operation as the primary reason parents choose their program.

Program Impacts

Analysis of an open-ended question about what the organizations tell others about the greatest impacts their program is having on youth and families found similar outcomes, with eleven organizations citing character and leadership development, building self-esteem, or teaching life principles (n=28). Seven respondents noted the educational content of their program. Five mentioned improving civic engagement and/or citizenship. Four wrote about the safe environment they provide, and two said they help youth see a better future for themselves. Mentioned by only one respondent each were social skills development, improved health, provide job skills training, and a place for recreation. Two quotes exemplify the responses provided:

“We recognize that we have made a great impact when a youth does the right thing when no one is looking.”

“98% feel more positive about their future. 92% report improved grades, 90% are better aware of college/career options.”

Program Challenges

The biggest challenge the respondents identified as keeping them from achieving their goals was insufficient and declining funding, mentioned as a problem by 18 respondents (n=30). Six noted challenges with having enough staff and especially volunteers. Five commented on their inability to meet demand and that there was insufficient capacity to serve all the needs. Four respondents wrote about their challenges with engaging parents, and three noted difficulties with overcoming peer pressure when recruiting youth. Among the challenges noted by only one respondent is the difficulty in collecting long-term outcomes data, especially when the long-term outcome is to avoid bad behaviors.
Another respondent commented on the competition for limited local funds: “...in central Anaheim there apparently appears to be limited financial resources from local public and private sector sources. This is compounded by the fact that there is a "monopoly" on major state (ASES) local after-school funding through a contract held by 1 not for profit, coupled by a lack of local school district collaboration, a tightly ‘crowded’/competitive local market with other youth-serving organizations, and an extended national recession. Regional foundations do not fund on a multi-year basis. Local fundraising is saturated.”

What Is Needed to Increase Capacity

Twenty-eight respondents wrote in a response to an open-ended question asking what one thing their program could do to increase capacity and serve more Anaheim youth. Nine wrote that they could or would need to increase the number of paid staff and/or volunteers in order to provide more services. Seven indicated they could raise more money, but none provided insights as to how they would do this. Seven wrote about changes they would need to make to their facility, such as move to a larger facility or utilize more of their existing facility. One suggested they could improve their parking lot so it could be used for basketball or volleyball. Four indicated they could add services, although two said they would first need to raise more funding. Three wrote about partnering with the schools and perhaps using school facilities. Two said they could improve their advertising so more people know about their program.

Program Costs and Funding

Most programs charge low fees for their services, and 14 organizations said there is no charge for their youth programs. Several organizations reported they charge $5 to $20 per year. The most expensive organization charges $175 per week (n=30).

Most of the programs that charge for their program also offer financial assistance to the parents. The most common type of assistance is scholarships, offered by 15 of the organizations (83% of the 18 organizations that charge); 8 provide a discount for low-income families (44%); 6 offer discounts for siblings/families (33%); and 5 use a sliding scale based on income (28%). One program offers discounts based on residency.

Of the thirty respondents that provided information about the size of their budget for youth services, half have budgets below $100,000 per year. Three programs have budgets over $1 million (see Figure 22).
Most of the organizations employ multiple methods for raising funds (see Figure 23). The most common methods are grant proposals and fundraising events. The least common method was to sell a product, used by only two organizations. Three organizations (9.7%) said they do not use any of the methods listed in Figure 23, nor did they write any other methods in.

Figure 23: Percent of organizations that use each method for fundraising (n=31)

Most of the organizations employ multiple methods for raising funds (see Figure 23). The most common methods are grant proposals and fundraising events. The least common method was to sell a product, used by only two organizations. Three organizations (9.7%) said they do not use any of the methods listed in Figure 23, nor did they write any other methods in.

Figure 23: Percent of organizations that use each method for fundraising (n=31)

*From responses written in after selecting “other.”

Over half of the organizations receive at least some funding from private donations and fees and fundraising events (see Figure 24). Only 15% receive funding from the federal government and 7% have some form of social enterprise. Three quarters of the organizations (74%) rely on just one source for
more than 50% of their funding; the most common funding sources for those organizations are private donations and state government.

**Figure 24: Percent of organizations that receive any funding from the sources listed (blue bars) and the percent that receive over half of their funding from a single source (red bars) (n=27)**

Just over half of the organizations reported that their funding had declined 10% or more over the past three years (see Figure 25). Almost 10% had seen declines greater than 50%. None of the organizations had seen an increase greater than 50%, although nearly 10% said their funding had increased 10-50%.

**Figure 25: Percent of organizations that indicated how their revenue had changed over the past three years (n=31)**
Less than 20% of the respondents said their funding is secure over the next 1-3 years, and about half called their funding “somewhat secure” (see Figure 26). Only two respondents (6.5%) said their funding was “very secure,” while nearly a quarter said it was not secure at all.

Figure 26: Percent of respondents that indicated how secure they think their future funding is (n=31)

About 60% of the organizations do not seek grant funds or do so rarely (see Figure 27). Just over 20% apply for grants 6 or more times in a year. The organizations that do not apply or apply infrequently tended to be government-operated or church-affiliated/faith-based. All of the organizations that apply 6 or more times per year were nonprofit organizations.

Figure 27: Percent of organizations that indicated how frequently they apply for grants (n=31)
Partnerships with Other Organizations

Twenty-seven of the respondents said they collaborate or partner with other organizations to provide goods or services to their clients (n=27). The most common things the organizations do through collaboration or partnership are to provide activities for the youth or clothing, backpacks, or gifts for the youth or their families (see Figure 28). Just over half of the respondents said they collaborate with another organization on a project that involves shared funding, staffing, training, or facilities (n=31).

Figure 28: Percent of organizations that partner with other organizations for the specified goods or services (n=27)
Exhibit 10: List of Participants' Suggested Ideas

The following list of ideas has been compiled from surveys, focus groups, and interviews and has not been vetted. Its inclusion in the exhibits is intended to foster discussion about ways to best implement the recommendations included in the body of the report.

- Hold organization accountable for whole family engagement.
- Create transportation programs to bring children from school to after-school sites and from sites to home.
- Offer affordable child care programs for working families.
- Build program for parents who are not working to do things with youth after school.
- Diversify existing programs to include music, arts, empowerment, leadership and character development, personal development, and sports.
- Create prevention programs for children who show early signs of violence and involve the whole family in strategies to address the signs.
- City needs to engage more with youth leaders, like student ambassadors, ASB, or site councils at high schools.
- Engage high school students through experiential learning, including sports, internships, community service, workforce development initiatives, and other activities.
- Create proactive programs to give youth jobs.
- Lobby high schools to provide more job skills classes.
- Strengthen volunteerism to supplement nonprofit’s organizational capacity to serve youth.
- Incorporate a strong community service program for youth at schools.
- Have star graduates and alumni speak at school-based and community events so they can be role models for current youth.
- Create a skating park for youth.
- Create an Anaheim-based soccer league.
- Develop mobile programs to reach out to neighborhoods where programs do not exist.
- Establish a living wage ordinance in the City.
- Out of 3,000 kids in gangs, there are 300 who are the core leadership (who are back) – target your policing to the 300.
- Review lessons from the resort district transformation, and target a community development strategy for the other 12 neighborhoods as we did the resort district.
- Create safe havens (parks, community centers, etc.) for kids to be kids.
- Create programs that celebrate the city's cultural pluralism to mitigate fears of the demographical evolution of Anaheim.
- Integrate character development curriculum into schools (i.e., 40 developmental assets) and other non-cognitive skill subjects that are crucial for personal development (performing and creative arts).
- Support what already works. (For example, Anaheim Achieves has a waiting list of over 100 children annually at every school; expand its availability.)
- Reinstate programs that support parent education – used to have great ones, but stopped due to lack of funding.
- Spanish translation at meetings would help get a broader range of residents involved.
- Determine why the most needy communities are lacking programs and organizational support, then establish a pool of funds for nonprofits to work in those neighborhoods.
- Focus CDBG funding on key strategic focus areas.
- Fund collaborative projects, including cross-sector partnerships, to create systemic solutions.
- Seek ways to spread the resource networks (funders) wider and deeper – make a bigger case for funding for Anaheim.
- Make long-term community development investments. Reactively sprinkling resources to a few does not create sustainable impact in the community.
- Subsidize program for working families who are trying to stretch their dollars – but do not give it for free.
- Develop creative tax strategies to source a city-wide community development fund to support: micro-enterprise development in the city, subsidize programs for kids, and support youth development programs.
- Support smaller projects, which are also creating significant impact, but in smaller scale.
- Work out ways to address liability and maintenance issues so as to utilize City and school facilities to the fullest for after-school activities.
- Create and communicate a strategic vision and plan to help define roles, coordinate resources, and communicate aspirations for the future of Anaheim’s youth.
- Mayor needs to be the champion of this campaign with a task force to oversee the strategic plan development and implementation.
- Create an online referral system for Anaheim youth programs, so that providers can reduce the number of calls they make to find the right organization to refer to/partner with. Database could include services, primary languages available, target population, etc.
- Initiate provider convenings to break down siloes.
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Thank you to all the Anaheim residents, community leaders, school staff, and City leadership who participated in this project.