



St. Louis Metropolitan Children's Summit

Visioning Report

December 9, 2009

Overview

At its December 9, 2009 St. Louis Metropolitan Children's Summit, Vision for Children at Risk held a special visioning session. The aim was to involve participants – who represented a broad cross-section of non-profits, government agencies, business organizations and others who are concerned about children's issues – in considering a new initiative and offering their advice. "Invest in Kids," will be a child-focused human capital development initiative that enlists the St. Louis region's business community in promoting child well-being as a strategy for community and economic development.

The visioning session came in the afternoon, after speakers at the day-long Summit had outlined the initiative and offered some ideas about how it might work. The principal questions for the afternoon were whether "Invest in Kids" was worth the investment of time and attention it would require, how initiative organizers should answer possible objections from the business community, and what the roles of business, non-profits and governments might be if the initiative were successful. About 200 of the 275 who attended the Summit participated in the afternoon visioning session.

Working in 16 small groups, participants offered more than 500 ideas and suggestions, all of which are included in this report. The consensus was that "Invest in Kids" was an important initiative and worth the time and effort it would require. But participants also recognized that creating partnerships with businesses would require change on the part of non-profits and children's advocates. Said one group, such an undertaking would demand "lots of work to build these relationships," but added, "(this is a) real obstacle, but critical to do." Another group offered this thought: "Social services (organizations) may have a negative view of business," but added that these organizations would "have to overcome this resistance/discomfort."

Indeed, it was clear that participants knew that working closely with businesses would require as much change from non-profits as from businesses. Some fretted that involving the business community might cause non-profits to "lose (their) mission by chasing money." But many more thought it would be a good thing for children's organizations. It might, one group said, "help non-profits think 'outside the box' – think differently – (and) open (themselves) to change." Another group said it "forces us to sharpen our focus, business plan, communications."

VISION FOR CHILDREN AT RISK:
CHILDREN'S SUMMIT VISIONING REPORT

This openness to change was also apparent in the answers to the other questions – about answering objections from businesses and describing the roles of business, non-profits and government. In the latter area, participants spent far more time describing how businesses could help in non-monetary ways than in monetary ways (that is, by making donations). Businesses and business organizations could be effective advocates, sources of volunteers and employment for young people, and advisors for non-profits, various groups said. One group even suggested that the business community might “adapt M&A (mergers and acquisitions) theories and practices to (the) non-profit sector” so there would be “fewer but more effective non-profits.” Translation: If they got involved in children’s issues, businesses might insist that some non-profits be merged – and that would be a good thing.

Visioning Process

The Summit began with a report on the 2009 “Children of Metropolitan St. Louis” report and a preview of the new Children’s Information Clearinghouse web site. Then participants heard a keynote address by Robert Dugger, chair of the Partnership for America’s Economic Success. Dugger is managing partner of a Washington, D.C.-based investment firm. His speech was about the economic and business logic of investing in children. He was followed by a panel of St. Louis area business leaders, who added their own ideas to Dugger’s remarks.

In the late morning, there were breakout sessions that offered updates about six “childhood fundamental needs” that Vision for Children at Risk monitors and advocates on behalf of. (They are: family support, early childhood development, maternal and child health, quality education, youth development and safe neighborhoods.) At lunch, an award for investing in children was presented to Sen. Christopher Bond. The visioning session followed immediately after the lunch and lasted two and a half hours.

In the visioning session, participants were seated in 16 circles of five to 10 participants, with flip charts and markers. Facilitator Otis White from Civic Strategies, Inc., in Atlanta explained the process and the objective: to “tap the wisdom of the room” to learn how VCR, St. Louis Children’s Agenda Partners, and other child advocates can successfully create an initiative to “place children’s issues on the region’s economic and community agenda.” After participants introduced themselves in their circles and selected a spokesperson and scribe, White asked the groups to answer a question. Here is the question:

Is positioning children’s issues as economic and community development issues for the St. Louis region worth the investment in time and attention? If so, why? If not, why not?

The groups worked on this question for 30 minutes, recording their ideas and suggestions on flip chart pages. Then they reported some of their discussion to the larger group.

Then White asked them to consider two additional questions in their small groups. Here are the questions:

There are some natural objections that business people will make to being involved in children’s issues: “It’s all about raising my taxes.” “What in it for me?” How should we overcome these objections?

It’s December 2014, five years from now, and we now have stakeholders from public, private and non-profit sectors working together on children’s issues. Describe what each of these stakeholder

groups – government, business and non-profits – is doing. In other words, what is the most appropriate and effective role for each of these stakeholder groups?

The groups had 45 minutes to discuss and record their ideas and comments about these questions, followed by a report out to the larger group. The visioning session ended with a summation of some of the key ideas by Otis White.

Key Themes

As we reported above, there was a clear consensus among the 200 or so participants that “Invest in Kids” was a worthwhile initiative. But there was a surprising recognition that, in forming partnerships with businesses and business organizations, non-profits would themselves be changed. And there was a recognition that this would be difficult but necessary. Here are some of the comments about this change:

- This initiative would force non-profits to “connect the dots between the work (we do) and the results.”
- It would require non-profits to “come to businesses with (a) coherent agenda.”
- It would “create partnerships vs. just asking for money.”

It might also change businesses, some groups suggested. One said it had the potential to keep “business connected to (the) community.”

Many saw reasons businesses might be interested in helping children’s organizations. It would, they said, help “draw talent into our region” – including the parents of small children. In general, one group said, it “strengthens our community and makes us more competitive.” It also, another group said, connects childhood development to workforce development, which is a key concern of the business community. It’s also cheaper than the alternative, one group said, posing it as “crisis management vs. prevention focus.” Preventing children from falling into poverty and despair, the group said, was “cost effective.”

There were some reasons certain businesses might want to participate, some said. One group gave this example: “When businesses moves into (an) economically disadvantaged community, giving back can help (ease the) adversarial relationship with (the) community.” But another group saw a universal reason for businesses to help children’s organizations: It connects them to the place, and, the group said, “isolated people (are) hungry for connection.”

But there were also cautions from some of the groups. One group thought that if non-profits tried too hard to explain their work in language business people could understand, their work might be diminished. “(The) real motivation of (our) work (is) lost when translated to business language – i.e., return on investment.” Another worried that being too concerned about what business people think “dulls the moral sense.” Yet another group thought it might be a hard thing to bring businesses into children’s issues – that business people were “too busy to volunteer” and wouldn’t see the value of closer connections with the community.

But these concerns were outweighed by the number who thought that, if it could be done, forging tighter bonds with the business community would benefit non-profits working on behalf of children’s issues. In dealing with possible objections from the business community, many cited the high cost of “social clean-up,” as one group put it, compared to the more affordable cost of providing a safe and nurturing environment for children. Another group urged that businesses compare the “cost of educating a child vs. the cost of incarceration.” There were other appeals to business logic, including considering this as part of

VISION FOR CHILDREN AT RISK:
CHILDREN'S SUMMIT VISIONING REPORT

workforce development – and a reassurance for their own workers that their children would be taken care of.

There were also suggestions that businesses that participated in such programs were more highly regarded by potential customers. As one group put it, “Research shows that businesses involved in (the) community are favored by consumers.”

There was also advice from some of the groups about how children's groups should conduct themselves in speaking to business people. “Start (a) conversation with ‘what do businesses need/want,’ one group suggested. Another said non-profits should “speak to (the) head and heart (with) stats and stories.”

When they looked ahead at the parts that the three major stakeholder groups (government, non-profits and business) might play in a successful collaboration, they saw a number of important roles for each sector. For government, they saw visionary public policies, such as a “regional trust fund for education and childcare” funded by sales taxes and business development funds and a college-funding program similar to the “Michigan Promise” one. They also saw government providing “safety net” programs, like education and health care (“fill the gaps,” one group said). They saw government's role as convening people to work on issues. Finally, they imagined that social services provided by government could be more closely linked to the services of non-profits. An example from one group: “Feedback mechanism to communicate pros/cons, what's working (and) what's not.”

In looking at business' role in the future, they saw donations and other forms of funding, but they had numerous suggestions of non-monetary contributions that business could make, from volunteers and expertise (in areas like technology, finance and marketing) to lobbying on behalf of children with legislators and council members (“advocating with politicians”). As noted earlier, there was also interest in having businesses assist non-profits by pushing them to focus their services – or simply merge. As one group said, “Businesses have less biased perspective on non-profit sector/market.” They saw businesses doing more for their own employees, by assisting with childcare and other family-friendly programs. Finally, they saw businesses providing jobs for young people.

Participants saw non-profits being better crafters of a vision for children's services in the St. Louis region and more focused and efficient in their work. As one group put it: “More mergers, collaboration; less duplication.” They envisioned non-profits sharing back-office services. They saw them as providing reliable information and creating “innovative program development based on models.”

Finally, several groups saw benefit simply in working across these stakeholder groups. “By putting strange bedfellows together, you create synergy and opportunities you can't even envision until it occurs,” one group said. Another group seconded that idea: “More partnerships across the board!”

Small Group Notes

Worth the Investment?

Is positioning children's issues as economic and community development issues for the St. Louis region worth the investment in time and attention? If so, why? If not, why not?

Group 1

Why

- Save money
- Enriches our community
- Strengthens our community and makes us more competitive
- Effective workforce
- Makes us feel good, e.g. youth success
- Makes us more attractive
- Build tax base
- Break destructive cycle
- United community
- Be a model for other communities

Why not

- Businesses have too much on their plate- too busy
- Other more pressing issues, e.g. jobs, economy, etc.

Group 2

Why

- Definitely worth the time and investment
- Reaching out to business community brings different points of views as well as money

VISION FOR CHILDREN AT RISK:
CHILDREN'S SUMMIT VISIONING REPORT

- Community development should be a task of business/economic community to bolster dilapidated neighborhoods not just give money
 - Longer lasting impact
- Workforce development future pipeline of St. Louis children
- Renewed leadership of St. Louis region by business community but updated for/by current context of the times
- We represent a large part of the St. Louis region (equal tax paying constituents)

Why Not

- Lack of clarity around needs
- Exhaustive need for planning
- Real motivation of work lost when translated to business language (i.e. return on investments)

How

- Need the stories to back up the bar charts and data
- Strengthen the cases of our business' needs (although non-profit organizations still running organizations)

Group 3

Why

- It is self-evident that if we don't focus on developing our children, there will be neither economic nor community development
- It's an economic issue
- ES need assistance
- Values, faith
- Right thing to do
- Self interest of the community
- High cost if we do later (remedial education, jails, cost of fragmented families, lost taxes, cost to recruit ES from outside the region)
- Framing the issue properly is important, coupling neuro science with budgets is important
- Tying to business development could be successful
- We must connect the dots between the work and the results, it's our city so it's our city's children, we are in this together no matter where you live in the region. Community and economic development are linked

Why not

- Dulls the moral sense
- Not worth it for agencies- won't jive with mission
- Too much planning with no action
- We don't want to get caught up in rhetoric about jobs unless good jobs for better family life

Group 4

- Yes
- Accountability of “all” sectors
 - Housing, DOH, media influence
- Drawing talent into our region
- Communication- lacking open lines of communication
- Needing to connect the dots of all sectors
- NOT adopting the concept of “all kids are our kids”
 - Folks are staying to their own community
 - Needing all of us to recognize the common good for all
 - Crisis management vs. prevention focus
- Still very segregated and silo (history and present concern)
- Increase level of restrictions but decrease number of resources to follow up on (eg: home schooling)

Group 5

- Yes!
- The issue and outcomes impact all of us
- Impacts economic and community development
- Workforce
 - Parents and children
 - Short- and long-term, can't attract people
- Cost effective: too expensive not to
- If we don't lead this effort who will?
- Supporting children = families = community development
- Addressing city-county municipality faction
 - Inequality
 - Disparity
- Community reflects how we treat our children
- Can't attract business

Group 6

Why

- Increase awareness
- Increases likelihood that businesses will be engaged
 - Helps businesses get their name out
- Louder (more influential) voice
 - The workforce is here. Solutions are here.

VISION FOR CHILDREN AT RISK:
CHILDREN'S SUMMIT VISIONING REPORT

- Access to individuals with the organizations credibility
- Create partnerships vs. just asking for money
- Forces us to sharpen our focus, business plans, communication
- Generates media attention
- Right thing to do, civic responsibility, feels good
- Creates a “community”—inclusive, keeps business connected to community, pay it forward

Why not

- Becomes political, lose sight of mission
- If they don't see returns on investments will lose interest
- Lose mission by chasing money
- Conflict of interest (corporate mission vs. our mission)
- Lots of work to build those relationships (real obstacle but critical to do)
- Hard to get in the door
- Overwhelming to small businesses
- Fragmentation = confusion

Group 7

Why

- Education reform is a global issue requiring collaborative efforts
- Important to “speak the language”
 - Money talks
 - Employees have child care concerns
 - Builds workforce
 - Need the money
 - Professional expertise (volunteer?)
 - Lifetime engagement!
 - Can advocate
 - Long-term view is hard
- Non-profits are an economic engine in itself
- Have to think about it this way
 - We are employers
- Region-wide focus
 - People live in these communities
 - Impacts business here
- Social services may have a negative view of “business”
 - Have to overcome this resistance/discomfort
 - Have to present ourselves in a clear, outcome driven manner
 - Help them understand that they are funding outcomes, not services
 - Metrics
- Where are the “business people” here today? We need to engage them. More than writing a check

Group 8

Why

- Bring issue to a powerful audience
- We are squeaky wheel
- Need to focus on system reforms
- Develop money- frame as issue along with other aspects that are not exclusive
- More people may pay attention with money develop frame
- Figure out how to get people caring about kids etc, money can be one way, different strategies for different perspectives
- Present as way to save tax money
- Money development safe way to connect
- Isolated people hungry for connection

Why Not

- Emotional component as barrier
- X + energy - busy lives
- Issues overwhelming, people feel powerless
- What is the connection to the people in
- Too busy to volunteer-no personal experience with these issues, also not a priority
- Affluent lives, don't see bigger issues

Group 9

- Yes
- Need community support
- Greater political will (through linkages)
- Can't have economic/community development without kids
- Additional stronger (not only) argument/position
- Essential to future of community
- Language that bridges community areas
- Help us achieve goals (need extra resources and connections)
- Need economic and community development language (comparison to enable prioritization of scarce resources or reach collective goals)
- Make case appeal to larger group

Group 10

- Yes! Don't let positioning/discussion of question get in way of goal
- Access to healthcare crucial
- Economic viability
- Cost more in the long run
- Ready to move? More summits?

VISION FOR CHILDREN AT RISK:
CHILDREN'S SUMMIT VISIONING REPORT

- Overlap of services
- Will investments yield intended results
- Simple talking points/next steps
 - Less time “studying”
 - Benefits known
 - How do businesses move forward now?
- What is formula for businesses that make decision to change/adopt this midset
 - See it as “win-win”
- We’ve tried this before—Vashon Compact—what did we learn?
- Businesses must have active desire to work with providers, take the initiative
- What’s the ask?
 - Come to businesses with cohesive agenda
- Are we taking on too much?
 - Adopt a more narrow focus? Geographic? Harlem Children’s Zone model?
 - But still have to focus on whole system of care
- Can’t focus locally until local operations are restructured

Group 11

- Because children are our future
- Nature of society
- It is about numbers and money
- Need resolutions to address problems
- Need for coordination of efforts
- Consensus needed
- Bridge that fills the gap
- Cultivating the society
- All interconnected
- Work toward a common vision and clarify the vision
- Put money and vision together with expertise
- Build a common future
- Broaden scope of resources
- Make needs and issues tangible

Group 12

Why:

- Expertise, resources e.g. lawyer, accountant
- Business desire to contribute
- Money on the table
- Opportunity to partner, to educate business
- Getting focused on economic and community development can help put children front and center
- Might help non-profits think “out of the box”—think differently—open to change

VISION FOR CHILDREN AT RISK:
CHILDREN'S SUMMIT VISIONING REPORT

- Win-win –can create opportunity to open up and expand business
- When business moves into economically disadvantaged community—giving back can help adversarial relationship with community
- Companies can do Junior Achievement type programs in schools

Why Not:

- Don't want some businesses directing the policies/programs
 - They might push their products/services
- Does their branding fit with your mission?

Group 13

- Kids have limited skills, poor healthcare increases gap
- Adds to our audience
 - Economic good way to include others concerned
 - Diverse population of those included in gap
- Broadens what we do with kids with greater audience
- Bringing business community to table to buy into their return on investments
- Will impact the business owners in diverse ways
 - Example: Will impact their children who may inherit business
- Thinking about ways to communicate with board about today's message in ways that can generate increased support/action
- Process of education to build awareness with own board
- Changing the conversation from “giving to charities” to investing in society and other contributions
- What are other ways business community can give/help beyond monolithic support
- Let's go beyond the emotional stories to create broader conversation and system for reasons to give
- Tapping into individual or corporate “self” interest, “goes beyond logic or it's the right thing to do”
- Encouraging business community to advocate/mobilize political support for additional funding
- Invite state representatives into your community/agencies to see/experience your needs

Group 14

Why

- Invest now
- Attractive to businesses to locate in St. Louis
- Attract employees
- Benefits your child and others vs. “after school window” crime, etc. in St. Louis
- Will build property value
- Programs economically available to all kids

VISION FOR CHILDREN AT RISK:
CHILDREN'S SUMMIT VISIONING REPORT

- Increase social interaction skills
- Action:
 - Recruit “retiring” grandparents familiar with business who care about kids, sell and argue change to other businesses
 - Help us build our case first
- Windows of opportunity:
 - Health care reform
 - Political: Democrat in White House
- If not now, when?
- Help RCGA build St. Louis image to attract business, not just pay to stay here

Why not

- Will create more “white noise” if we continue same way on the need
- Do we have our case (numbers, best practices, etc.) built first?
- We have not provided a network of ourselves first
- Are we ready to be fiscally responsible?
- Would this point out duplication of services?

Group 15

Why

- We can't afford not to
- The numbers/statistics mentioned earlier in the day are SCARY
- St. Louis is a microcosm of the bigger, national problems
- All kids are “us”...when they mature they leave St. Louis because of lack of work, therefore the economy suffers
- We need to tie youth decision making to family functioning...get back to basic parenting skills
- Preventative/intervention, process/strategy need to be in place now to address issues that will come 20 years from now. (We are dealing with issues we did not address 15 years ago.)
- Look at cycles that need to be broken
- We need to sustain the economic security of the community, not just economic development for the sake of economic development. We will lose resources when families have to leave community to access services, goods, and programs.

Group 16

Why

- If we want to continue to be leaders in the world, we need citizens positioned to step into leadership roles in the areas of science, math, technology, without this basic knowledge there will not be innovation and Missouri will not be able to go forward economically
- Imagination is not being stirred in a way that promotes holistic development in young people
- Imagination must be mined

VISION FOR CHILDREN AT RISK:
CHILDREN'S SUMMIT VISIONING REPORT

- We need to help young people dream **BIG**
- Youth need opportunities to experience **WOW** factor with the support of business, challenge for business: show youth **WOW** of the industry
- Non-profits need to speak business language to get support financially—with volunteers—with technical assistance

Dealing with Objections

There are some natural objections that business people will make to being involved in children's issues: "It's all about raising my taxes." "What in it for me?" How should we overcome these objections?

Group 1

- Take a more proactive role because if not we will pay later
- Cost of educating a child vs. cost of incarceration
- True cost to the community
- This is an investment
- U.S. no longer leading the world, St. Louis no longer leading the nation
- Future consumers
- Investing in children is investing in jobs

Group 2

- Workforce development
- Cost of not investing
- Contain the "sprawl" of issues
- Avoid embarrassing regional issues (i.e loss of St. Louis Public Schools accreditation)
- Retain educated workforce in the region through sector investment (which in turn will invest in community)
- Opportunity cost of tax money spent on "social clean-up" vs. advancement/infrastructure etc. projects

Group 3

- Doesn't have to mean higher taxes
- The investments would lower costs of jails, social services
- Make it easier to attract good ES
- Create more consumers
- Make St. Louis go up in stature
- More capital investment

VISION FOR CHILDREN AT RISK:
CHILDREN'S SUMMIT VISIONING REPORT

- Can be done without raising taxes (the rate)
- Would lower taxes in the long run
- Needs to be done efficiently
- The resources will not necessarily only go into the public sector
- High taxes often equal high business activity
- We need to change the language, not “socialized” but “civilized”
- Businesses would have a better E base, lower costs, competitive edge
- Research shows businesses involved in community are favored by consumers (ex. Anheuser Busch)

Group 4

- Must use statistics to show the trends of lack of investment is showing “no” return on investments.
- Matching the dollars of crisis mode to spend now to prevent. (Residential facility, teen birth)
- Focus on the “today”

Group 5

- Another form of social security, next generation provides for community
- Increased productivity of employees
- Better workforce, better prepared
- More costs later if no initiative now
- Companies choose to locate places based on taxes, quality of life, etc.
- Is there a commitment to the local workforce?
- Small businesses vs. large corporations

Regional

- Business Council- mid sized
- RCGA
- Small Business Association
- Socially conscious businesses- assist with marketing, IT, etc.
- Look up family friendly corporations
- Everyone in the room is also an employee...what are our policies for family/child issues separate from our organization's mission

Group 6

- Working for common good; same page
- Consistent messaging in understandable language
- Goal is bigger than its parts
- Save tax money by prevention

VISION FOR CHILDREN AT RISK:
CHILDREN'S SUMMIT VISIONING REPORT

- How do we now help one another? Not bar raising but social services/supports
- Understand the opposition and answer in ways they understand
- Good that's going on in the social sector
- Facts don't refute emotion
- Know when to give up
- Speak to head and heart, stats and stories
- Make the business case, cost benefit analysis
- How does it impact me now vs. 20 years from now?
- Cross section- in best interest to support, need educated workforce, schools, etc.

Group 7

- Economic story- don't think you are not paying for it
- Social security- need workforce paying in
- Show them overall social value/return/outcome
- Region impact (better for business, airport, etc.)
- Focus on showing shorter term successes first
- Not dependence on! Expertise, support, partnership
- Goodwill- measure- prove it- expand money

Group 8

- Business adopt a school (or a classroom)
- Who will take care of you if we don't invest/preparation for people caring for you
- Pay now vs. pay more later
- Reduced world power vs. mindset change is possible mentality
- Tomorrows customers, won't have money and housing to purchase
- Is expectation level reduced?!
- Insular society- no need/fear is motivator

Group 9

- Find business person that supports issues already
- Tax issue: gives you more control (i.e. tax credits)
- Productivity increases for employees
- Human capital (education, good community, property value)
- Quality education vs. sports team...use example
- Know your audience, what appeals to them, what's their background and need (past commitments, high skill vs. low skill labor)

Group 10

- Show where tax dollars currently go
 - Highlight inefficiencies to be fixed
- Distraction: executives think they could spend time elsewhere
 - Highlight where that logic has gotten us so far
- Use similar strategies that work on voter issues
 - Start conversation with “what do businesses need/want”
 - Trace back what businesses report they want out of education
- Start by focusing assistance directly on workforce/employees
- Document effectiveness of how their dollars worked
 - If it's really working, businesses will notice themselves by seeing how workforce performance improves
- Identify right person in the company to carry the message
- Increasingly, many corporate leaders don't see St. Louis as home
 - Stress the short-term outcomes

Group 11

- Ask what kind of employment pool do you want for your business
- Note that investment in children will provide a stable and productive workforce

Group 12

- More business for me (kids spending money)
- Future workforce
 - Kids will know about your business
 - Especially high level expertise
 - Kids develop social skills
- You will feel better that you made a difference in the life of a child
- Free advertisement
- Tax write-off/charitable contribution
- Region: healthy economically- investment
- You have employees that have children, when children are cared for you have more highly productive employees (others have to do more work for those whose kids are not cared for)
- Crime will go down when youth and adults are fully employed

Group 13

- Make your pitch persuasive
 - Story along with logic and data
 - Information and awareness
- Having a relationship/engagement is key! (TRUST)

VISION FOR CHILDREN AT RISK:
CHILDREN'S SUMMIT VISIONING REPORT

- Having persuasive enough data to make the case for investing
- Persistency of message
- Building a culture of value and importance for investing in kids
 - Example: Kansas City effort "\$ is Good 4 the Kids"
 - Build state campaign "Its all about the Kids"
- Coordinating coalitions/kids issues and efforts locally, regionally, across the state
- Overcoming the St. Louis mindset of going beyond the borders of the county/region to learn and grow
- Making the case for a greater workplace that can address tough social issues
- What are your needs? What are my needs? COMPROMISE
- Back door approach "companies with seal of approval"
 - Shaming, no blaming companies into wanting to be on the "A" list
- Being a part of or being included in the culture ex. Big Brothers, Big Sisters
- Linking a connection with outcomes of organization or initiative

Group 14

- Businesses can choose to pay for successes or failures
- Productivity of current workforce, and future workforce
- Get write-offs for community support
- Makes great community relations, promotional
- It's the right thing to do, socially responsible
- Lower business costs of security operations

Group 15

This group joined Group 16 for the final two questions

Group 16

- Stronger communities required for a better region
- Everybody know somebody who can help
- It's not only about money, it's about connections

Roles of Stakeholder Groups

It's December 2014, five years from now, and we now have stakeholders from public, private and non-profit sectors working together on children's issues. Describe what each of these stakeholder groups – government, business and non-profits – is doing. In other words, what is the most appropriate and effective role for each of these stakeholder groups?

Group 1

Government:

- Children Opportunity Program (tax credit COP)
- Report card demanded by regional leaders (ENGCC) set goals and measures
- Champions of children in the legislature
- One laptop per child
- Coalition of government and non-profit leaders

Business:

- Celebrating and rating the businesses that contribute to child development (using incentives)
- Loan execs for kids loaned to non-profits

Non-profits:

- Shared resources/mergers
- Common goals/common pot of money
- Co-op/share back office services
- Coalition of government and non-profit leaders

Group 2

Government:

- Provide tax credits as incentive to participation
- Help identify and set priorities

VISION FOR CHILDREN AT RISK:
CHILDREN'S SUMMIT VISIONING REPORT

Non-profits:

- Long-term sustainability planning
- Mission focus

Community:

- Trust leadership
 - Act as own safety net

Business:

- Adapt M & A theories and practices to non-profit sector
 - Fewer but more effective non-profits
- Understand role in larger community
- Provide funding, skills, access, volunteers

All:

- Work as equal partners with transparency, clear goals and roles

Group 3

Government:

- Reduced duplication in paperwork, better organization
- To be engaged and informed
- A regional trust fund for education and childcare growing out of the current city and county sales taxes and state business development funds
- Our region have cutting edge programs like funding college for all qualified students (ex. Michigan Promise)
- Ensure that resources are distributed equitably to quality programs
 - If programs were funded equitably, we would look at “potential” instead of “at risk”
- Make the whole region the St. Louis Children's Zone
- Excess school space made available for parent education, healthcare, nutrition, housing, income support, take stress off kids and families
- Create a wellness quotient, regional and community specific, identify the indicators
- Set goals now and be serious about them
- Reconcile school governance dysfunction within the city schools, State Appointed Board and Elected School Board agree on a plan for improvement and transition back to Elected Board by putting children first

VISION FOR CHILDREN AT RISK:
CHILDREN'S SUMMIT VISIONING REPORT

Business:

- Bring corporate conversation back to on-site childcare, investment in community, with change from local ownership, we lost some of this- loss of locally owned/controlled fortune 500 companies
- Develop a Regional Pact; child-centered plan, services go with child regardless of city or county residency, with corporate funding of transitions, regional basis- expand Special School District to include St. Louis City

Non-profits:

- Transparent about financial stewardship, good management, program successes, elimination of duplications, competition
- Funders to work to address

Group 4

Government:

- Create the legislative framework
- Enforcement
- Reclaim our morals and values

Business:

- Provide expertise in development and financial strategy
- Benefit programs for employees to accommodate the need of the family
- Long term commitment
- Help each sector to understand “what to care for, what to invest in, how to sustain...”

Group 5

Business:

- Source of volunteers
- Technical assistance:
 - IT assessment
 - Strategic planning
 - Goals, outcomes
 - Cost analysis
 - Research
 - Marketing
- Mentors- in corporations and out in community
- Integrate best business practices to generate income
- Advocacy champions

VISION FOR CHILDREN AT RISK:
CHILDREN'S SUMMIT VISIONING REPORT

Non-profits:

- Needs assessment
- Community/wholistic
- Resource mapping
- Information on outcomes, data, statistics, etc.
- Services:
 - Volunteer opportunities/experiences
 - Awareness of employees/customers needs, human resources

Public:

- Incentives to businesses
- Infrastructure-investment
- Convening power
- Leveraging multiple funders
 - Stimulus money, national and local funders

Universities:

- Staff, research, interns
- Relationship with government and corporations, money often flows through them

All:

- By putting strange bedfellows together you create synergy and opportunities you can't even envision until it occurs

Group 6

Government:

- Invest, not deliver service
- Monitoring and regulatory role
- Accountability, transparency
- Deliver appropriate services: military, prisons, safety
- No unfunded mandates
- Policies and laws reflect best practices
- Evaluate impact, not outputs

Business:

- Provide jobs
- Technology advances

VISION FOR CHILDREN AT RISK:
CHILDREN'S SUMMIT VISIONING REPORT

- Partner to meet future trends/workforce issues
- Learn human service language
- Valuing our knowledge
- Engaged; have CSR ingrained in business, part of strategy not just an add-on
- Investment in social sector

Non-profits:

- Given the respect, esteem, credit we deserve
- Not non-profits: call us social sector, community profit, etc.
- We see ourselves as an important industry sector, as experts
- Recognize what we do better than anyone else
- More mergers, collaboration; less duplication
- Social entrepreneurship

More partnerships across the board!

Group 7

Government:

- Make sure HS above board
- Take role in measure/accountability
- Fill the gaps

Business:

- Personal role beyond money
 - Active partner
 - Collaboration
 - Name on it
- Share expertise

Non-profits:

- Tell the economic story
- Help see long term view
- Measure!
- Take expertise

All:

- Cross-pollination!

Group 8

Government:

- Safety net
- Policy directing agency
- Directing change through policy
- Good data to make the case
- Train, prepare workers

Business:

- Supporting our work interest in community

Non-profits:

- Direct service
- Community conscience
- Advocacy/change agents

Higher education:

- Research/help support change

Group 9

Non-profits:

- Tell the story: human face
- Data research
- Innovative program development based on models
- Being the expert/specialist advocate
- Leverage funding in addition to government money
- Bring in money from foundations

Government:

- Policy and funding create priorities (bully pulpit)
- Regulatory guidance: basic standards and accountability
- Cover issues/priorities that others don't want to (safety net)

VISION FOR CHILDREN AT RISK:
CHILDREN'S SUMMIT VISIONING REPORT

Business

- Assistance:
 - Money
 - Models
 - Structure
 - Managerial
- Spokespeople...give weight to issue
- Broker relationships with elected officials
- Pool of people for information, etc.

Group 10

Government:

- Legal framework
- Funding
- Some implementation

Business:

- Feel invested
- Participate
- Management skills
- Some funding/human resources
- Oversight
- Businesses have less biased perspective on non-profit sector/market
- Analysis, identify overlap of services

Non-profits:

- Craft vision
- Implementation
- Increase interaction of non-profit staff with private sector staff, Board engagement

All:

- Alignment of mission statements
- Structure for feedback
- Adaptability
 - Policy and program
- Enhance current structure rather than ongoing impulse to create new stuff

Group 11

- Changed mindset
- Break-down of narrow interests
- Interchange of resources
- Dialogue is on going
- Everyone benefits
- Ongoing assessment to get to win-win
- Collective problem solving
- Fading of “haves” and have-nots”
- Touch majority
- Sealing of models that were successful
- Dialogue leads to action
- Use history to build better programs
- Set up systems that will survive political change – is it possible?

Group 12

Government:

- Funding
- Support services
- Regulation/assurance
- Direct services (e.g. education, health care)
- Infrastructures
- Expertise in specific topics
- Fulfill the policy agenda the community/electorate dictates

Business:

- Be active in community
- 1% of costs of building donated to early child care and education
- Early care facility in business so every worker has accredited early child care
- Advocate for children's issues
- Coordinate more with schools, invest in future workforce
- See value of employment for teens

Non-profits:

- Better versed in speaking business language
- Better funded (core operations, salaries!!)
- Better facilities

VISION FOR CHILDREN AT RISK:
CHILDREN'S SUMMIT VISIONING REPORT

Schools:

- Spending money better
- Teachers/parents more accountable
- Prepared/positioned to work with business capacity

Group 13

Government:

- Process that's easily accessible, fair and equitable
- Government run social service closely linked/connected to non-profit service support
 - Examples: feedback mechanism to communicate pros/cons, what's working, what's not

Business:

- Advocating with politicians
- Cross section of sharing talents
 - Examples: IT, management expertise
- What about a tax incentive for contributions

Non-profits:

- Using EBP models
- Open feedback from others (success/failures)
- Decrease duplication
- Ongoing conversation with stakeholders

Group 14

Government:

- Legislation supporting early childcare education (policy)
- Funding

Business:

- Provide expertise and partnerships
- Consider recruitment strategy at pre-school

Non-profits:

- Staff to carry out work

VISION FOR CHILDREN AT RISK:
CHILDREN'S SUMMIT VISIONING REPORT

Family:

- Parent involvement, participate and commitment on their part and do advocacy
- Mothers make “noise” and grassroots efforts
- Parents Policy Council goes to Jefferson City
- Grandmas- connections, sense of history, stability in neighborhoods all day

Group 15

This group joined Group 16 for the final two questions

Group 16

Government:

- Must be proactive

Business:

- Must grow locally to compete globally
- Must see marketing potential of youth

Non-profits:

Must communicate better what each new initiative will do in outcomes and track it