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Introduction

The Al Wooten Jr. Youth Center, located at 9106 S. Western Avenue had operated for almost 30 years in Los Angeles, California. Its permanent location, under renovation, was across the street from its original site in six storefront buildings that the Center owned.\(^1\) The six buildings housed classrooms, a kitchen, and other facilities.\(^2\) The Center served more than 350 students per year while remaining dedicated to its purpose to develop young people who strove for academic excellence and good citizenship under the umbrella of a safe and nurturing environment.

Naomi McSwain, Executive Director of the Al Wooten Jr. Youth Center (“Center”), had run the Center first from 1990 to 1994, then as Acting Executive Director from November 2010 to February 2011, and finally, as Executive Director again from February 2011 to the present. As the niece of Myrtle Faye Rumph, the Center’s founder, and the cousin of Al Wooten Jr., the young man whose untimely death due to alleged gang violence had inspired the creation of the Center, she was a dedicated and highly competent leader and administrator.

The Center facilitated after-school, summer-school, and college-preparatory programs for school-age youth in grades 3-12. Through talks with officials from the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health, the Center also had an opportunity to serve as a model for other after-school programs. Still, the Center had numerous challenges, including necessary upgrades to its buildings to obtain a certificate of occupancy as an educational facility. Moreover, violence, including stray bullets that hit the Center’s buildings in three separate incidences in the past two years, elevated safety concerns. In contrast, an increase in support from its Board of Directors (“Board”), corporate and individual donations, and private foundations allowed the Center greater financial flexibility. An increase in the number of partnerships from other organizations, such as NASA and The Walt Disney Company, and universities, such as Loyola Marymount University (LMU), the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), Mount Saint Mary’s University, Pepperdine University, and the University of Southern California (USC) helped the Center to provide quality STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math) activities and other school programs and services.

The Center had made several additions and adjustments to its programs and assessments, including tutoring, police and urban-youth relations, project-based learning, and psychological services. It had also added college scholarships for a number of deserving high school graduates who were entering or transferring to four-year colleges.

The 2018 Board Retreat led to several strategic initiatives described in this strategic plan. The Board adopted much of the strategic plan from Board documents used in the 2018 Strategic Planning Retreat, including a case on the Al Wooten, Jr. Youth Center case (adapted herein) and a situation "SWOT" analysis, as well as from subsequent Board discussions and conclusions. Board members, Pepperdine University Professor Connie James and Executive Director Naomi McSwain, in addition to Pepperdine University graduate Kristine Forster wrote the case used in the Board Retreat. Much of the research that went into the case was included in this strategic plan and in the materials given to the Board, including studies performed by student-led teams in Pepperdine University's Service Leadership classes under the teaching of Amy Johnson,
Pepperdine University Executive in Residence and CEO of Go Make a Difference. Amy, a co-facilitator at the Board’s Strategic Planning Retreat, had subsequently joined the Board in December 2018.

The Center’s Strategic Plan (described herein) begins with sections that describe its “Mission” and “Organizational History” in order to establish the key foundation and values for the Center. Summaries of its external and internal “Environment” follow these sections to provide the context for the community and culture in which the Center operates. Following the “Environment” section are detailed descriptions of operating entities that provide key support and staffing, including descriptions of the “Board of Directors,” “Board Support and Fundraising,” and “Staffing.” Given that the Center leveraged partners and outside support, the next section is a summary of key external organizations, partnerships, and people who or agencies which support the Center: “Program Partnerships” and “Foundations, Corporations, and Individual Grants and Awards.” Next are descriptions of “Programs” that the Center operates followed by a section entitled “Other After-School Programs in Los Angeles.” The next section is a “Summary of the Financial Statements.” These sections form the basis for the final sections on “Strategic Initiatives” and “Conclusions.”

The Center’s Board of Directors developed strategic initiatives at its March 2018 Board Retreat. It then reviewed and discussed these strategic initiatives at its Board Retreat in March 2019 in addition to exploring a capital campaign. The initiatives covered the following seven areas:

1. Building and safety
2. Risk management and personal safety
3. California After-School licensing
4. Program effectiveness
5. Program enrollments
6. Staffing levels and staff development
7. Fund-raising and financial sustainability.

Based on issues that arose from the strategic planning process at the March 2018 Board Retreat, the Board helped the Center relocate into temporary quarters at the UCLA Mann Center in Los Angeles to facilitate needed repairs and upgrades to its Western Avenue location. The Center made a number of other changes to its staff, staff development, program assessments, and roles of the Executive and Assistant Director to facilitate more oversight and grant writing and to become licensed as a California Child Care facility. These updates follow the strategic initiatives outlined in this plan.

Mission

The Center’s mission, as noted on its website, is as accurate today as it was when the 501(c)(3) organization first opened in 1990 with a team of volunteers, which included Naomi McSwain, Al Wooten’s cousin and current Executive Director. Naomi and her Aunt Faye developed the mission statement a year after its opening with help from Loretta Randle, a former United Way consultant and good friend of the Center. Only one word in the mission statement has changed in almost 30
years (from "caring" to "nurturing"). The statement as of March 2019 is that the Al Wooten Jr. Youth Center is as follows:

“A neighborhood approach to the revitalization and empowerment of a community in crisis. We provide a safe and nurturing environment, committed to good citizenship and academic excellence.”

A vision that Myrtle Fay Rumph had for the Center was to be a beacon of light on a hill, as an exemplary youth center.³ It was Myrtle Faye Rumph's vision that the Center be nationally recognized and a blueprint that others might follow. Becoming licensed in a safe facility was a key step in achieving the vision of being an exemplary youth center and a beacon of light that other centers might follow.

Organizational History⁴

In January 1989, Alton "Dunnie" Wooten, Jr., was killed in a drive-by shooting near Adams and Crenshaw in South-Central Los Angeles. Neighbors thought that the murder of the 35-year-old black man was the result of a gang initiation. Drive-by shootings were at a new high when an alleged gang member killed Dunnie. Community members started programs such as "Taking Back Our Community" and "Mothers Against Gangs in Communities" out of a desperate attempt to stop the violence. Law enforcement increased "gang sweeps" and harsher penalties for youth offenders. However, Dunnie's mother, Myrtle Faye Rumph, felt that the solutions only angered already rebellious youth.

“What they need is love and attention,” said Myrtle Faye Rumph, Al Wooten’s mother. “They need to stay busy. They need to have more confidence. They need to have their attitudes changed. If somebody had taken more time with the person who killed my son, maybe my son would still be alive.”

Within weeks of his death, Faye began holding meetings in her home with family and friends, wanting to find solutions to the gang crisis in their community. They developed a plan to open a youth center to provide alternatives to gang activity in South Los Angeles.

Faye and Naomi scouted out after-school programs for teens in Los Angeles. They realized that the government had closed most of the programs in the 1980s and that the community needed more youth centers. Finding only five youth centers in the city, including People Who Care and four Teen Post after-school programs, down from about 100 Teen Post programs that were previously in Los Angeles, Faye rented a two-room storefront in 1990 at a rent of $400 per month.⁵ Each Board member provided $50 per month for operating expenses, such as utilities. This two-room storefront was located at 9115 S. Western Avenue, next to the moving and storage business she owned with her husband, Harris Rumph. She called the family and friends who had met in her living room to return and open the youth center they had discussed and envisioned. The group and Naomi’s family helped to clean, paint, and furnish the building, and this same group later formed an administrative board that would serve as directors and volunteer staff. This board contributed
more than just $50 per month, it also engaged in fundraising through candy and pizza sales, covering the $400 monthly rental fee and other operating costs.

The Center’s original name was lengthy because the group wanted it to have a variety of focuses, from adults to children. Faye, who was an active listener and believed in compromise, said, “We’ll do it all,” and she passed Naomi a piece of paper with the name, “Al Wooten Jr. Youth and Adult Cultural and Educational Center.” Naomi suggested shortening the name to the “Al Wooten Jr. Heritage Center.” Years later, at a Board of Director’s meeting in 2016, the Board voted, at Naomi’s request, to change the name to the “Al Wooten Jr. Youth Center.” This name was officially adopted in 2019 after Brian Condon, a Board Member successfully led the filing of a change in the DBA (“Doing Business As”), articles of incorporation, and bylaws with the State of California to reflect the new name and needed changes in the governance of the Center, including expanding the number of Board members.

The Center’s first participants in 1990 were four pre-teen boys who hung out on the street corner in front of the Rumph’s business. After two years of helping youth with reading and homework, taking children to the local bowling alley, playing board games, celebrating holidays with families, and holding discussions about tagging, drugs, and gang violence, the Center expanded into a second adjacent building, as enrollments increased.6

The civil unrest in Los Angeles in 1992 drew many more caring people who became long-time supporters, including several of the Center’s 2018 Board members and volunteers, including Actor Ron Glass former Board Chairman.

Some 28 years later, the Center, still operating on Western Avenue, was across the street from its original site in six storefront buildings that the Center now owns.7 The six buildings housed classrooms, a kitchen, a library, offices, a teen room, a basketball court, and a parent and family room.8 The Center served more than 350 students per year, helping them to achieve academic excellence and good citizenship within a safe and nurturing environment. (For more information, please see a video on the Center at the following site:9 https://youtu.be/GxVVtnCnyAk.)

Prominent figures and major publications recognized Faye and the Center’s efforts. In 2010, President Barack Obama named Faye one of 13 recipients of the annual Presidential Citizens Medal, the nation's second-highest civilian award, for her grassroots work and founding of the Center.10 (For a video of Faye accepting the award, see https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JcRThnvPMxw.) In 2015, Faye passed away from heart failure. Presented as an example of "something positive" in the aftermath of the 1992 L.A. Riots, the Al Wooten Jr. Youth Center had been featured nationwide in print and broadcast media, including in The Wall Street Journal, The Los Angeles Times, People Magazine, The Today Show, and on CBS, ABC, PBS, and Fox News.

Environment

The Center operated in a sector of the economy entitled the “After-school Care Providers.”
sector was made up of mostly small non-profit organizations that operated independently or in cooperation with other similar organizations.

**U.S. After-School Provider Industry**

In 2017, California was the leading state in after-school programs in the United States, representing 17.5% of all after-school providers in the country.\(^{11}\) Children spent an average of eight hours per week at after-school facilities.\(^{12}\) Low-income families represented 47% of children participating in after-school programs, and this high participation rate was most likely because the state government funded the expansion and availability of after-school facilities throughout California.\(^{13}\) Many families also received funding from the government; the California Budget and Policy Center noted that in 2015, approximately 1,500,000 families were eligible for subsidized childcare.\(^{14}\)

Most U.S. after-school providers were small, with only the YMCA and the Boys and Girls Club of America being large providers, each attaining close to 1% of the sector.\(^{15}\) The After-school Program Sector had struggled because of the 2013 federal government sequester, which dramatically reduced the largest source of funding and revenues for many after-school programs across the nation.\(^{16}\) “Over the next five years, however, …. [IBISWorld projected that] … federal funding for social services … [would] … increase at an annualized 4.3%, largely due to the estimated funding spike of 24.4% in 2017 alone.”\(^{17}\) Also, in times of high unemployment, parents were more likely to take care of their children, rather than sending them to an after-school facility.\(^{18}\) With the rise in employment rates, the demand for after-school programs was likely to increase.

According to IBISWorld, key success indicators for the After-school Program Sector revolved around the ability to vary services around needs, to operate at optimum capacity utilization, to receive recommendation (including parents and potential employees), to be accredited by authoritative agencies, and to have the ability to alter employment levels, such as flexible staffing arrangements.\(^{19}\) While key success factors varied from one organization to another, industry factors supported the Center’s plan to meet licensing and zoning requirements and to improve staffing levels and staff development.

**Center’s Environment**

With assistance from bankers and attorneys who offered to help after civil unrest in 1992, the Center moved across the street to its site at 9106 S. Western Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90047 in a neighborhood known as Gramercy Park.

In 2018, the neighborhood in South Los Angeles was home to more than 10,000 residents, of which 86.4% were African Americans.\(^{20}\) The percentage of African Americans was one of the highest in Los Angeles County. The neighborhood had a median household income of $57,983 (in 2008 dollars), which was above average for the city and county of Los Angeles.\(^{21}\)

According to a Pepperdine University study of the area code 90047, which included Gramercy Park, there were significant differences in the demographics of the zip code versus national averages.\(^{22}\) For example, education levels differed. Although all education levels were approximately 5% less than the national average, women in the 90047 zip code were twice as
likely as men to complete an associate’s degree or higher. Additionally, 40% of households in the area included a married couple or family, as opposed to 60%, which was the national average. Single-family households were also significantly more prevalent in the 90047 zip code, with male-led households representing 12% (versus the national average of 6%) and female-led households at 36% (versus the national average of 17%).

In the same study with a limited sample size, Pepperdine University students also surveyed community respondents about the Center to determine its community exposure. Of the people who responded to the study, 60% noted that they had not heard of the Center, and 75% responded that they were not aware of the services provided by the Center. Students also collected data on the method for new client referrals. Facebook referrals were approximately 31%. Parents or students referred another 21%, and someone other than parents and students referred an additional 21%. Internet searches resulted in 9% of referrals, and the Center’s staff or volunteers referred an additional 9%. “Other” represented the remaining 9% of referrals.

Under the surface of the demographic statistics and blocks of Spanish-style homes, violent crime was prevalent in Gramercy Park. According to the LA Times Mapping L.A. Project, there were 129 violent crimes and 176 property crimes in the six months from July 2016 to January 2017, which yielded a rate of 273 crimes per 10,000 people. This rate was the sixth highest among the 209 neighborhoods reported in Los Angeles.

Although the crime rate for Los Angeles had drastically decreased since 1992, this neighborhood and South Los Angeles, in general, still suffered from gang violence. For example, there was a shooting across the street from the Center’s facilities in August of 2015, in which six or seven people were shot, according to the police. Fortunately, the shooting happened right after the Center’s students went home from their monthly SAT study group, so none of the incidents involved the Center's children. Two staff members were inside the Center’s building at the time of the shooting and heard arguing, followed by gunshots. Gunshots had shattered a front window of the Center’s facility. A couple years later, stray bullets hit the Associate Director’s car.

The Center had experienced violence on its street on other occasions, including the “100 days and nights” crisis. During this crisis in 2015, bullets hit the corner building twice. Once again, no one at the Center’s facility was hurt. In December of 2017, when the Executive Director arrived at work, she found several small bullet holes from shrapnel in the window of her office building.

The government, including school districts that were more amenable to the value of after-school programs, and a growing number of faith-based organizations were striving to change the situation and reduce gang violence. The subsequent shootings and bullet holes in the Center's windows exacerbated the urgency for increased safety and security for the children and staff. For example, a representative from L.A. County Public Health came to discuss ways to reduce violence in the Athens/Westmont area, which lies adjacent to Gramercy Park.

Given the violence in the surrounding area, the Board became increasingly concerned about the safety of the children and staff. Additionally, the buildings were 40 years old. As Naomi investigated improving the safety of the buildings, some facility concerns arose. One issue was that the building was zoned for commercial use and needed to meet fire and safety standards to
receive an Education (E) Certificate of Occupancy. Early estimates of renovations started at approximately $100,000. The question arose: Should the Center stay in its current location, or should it find a new building in which it could operate?

Another concern revolved around the Center’s need for a California Child Care Center License. This would allow the Center to operate as a licensed child care center. The Center would be limited to approximately 60 children based on the size and configuration of the Center’s buildings and the standards of the license, if it could be obtained. These standards restricted the number of children based on several factors, including the number of toilets and sinks. Both the educational zoning certificate and the license to become certified as a child care center made the need for significant renovations or relocating more critical.

**Board of Directors**

The Board of Directors “Board” of the Al Wooten Jr. Youth Center had already begun to face a number of these challenges. With 17 active members — more than half of whom were financial or corporate executives — the Board provided fiscal oversight, financial support, operational reviews, and volunteer services. In 2017, the Board donated more than $160,000 in addition to volunteering at the Center. For example, Robert Clark, a retired FBI agent, conducted a weekly teen discussion group, and Dr. Scott Miller, a finance professor at the University of Tampa, conducted an annual summer basketball camp.

The Center’s Chairman of the Board in 2018 was Paul Wetmore, Managing Director and Wealth Management Advisor at Merrill Lynch. Paul had a BA in Psychology from Dartmouth and a Certified Investment Management Analyst (CIMA) Certification from the Wharton Business School. He had more than 30 years of experience as a financial advisor. He, like the past Chairman and Board member John Lapham, Managing Director and Co-head of Leveraged Finance at PineBridge Investments, had been on the Board for more than 15 years.

Several Board members had served as guest mentors at the Center’s monthly College and Career Day. Board members, including Camille Richardson, the Chairperson of the Board’s Programs Committee and First Vice President at Kinecta Federal Credit Union, had provided a variety of services, engaging their companies to match gifts or to join them as volunteers on service days or at events.

Other active Board committees included Governance, Finance, Development, and Legal Affairs. Paul Wetmore led the Governance Committee. Paul also directed the Center's efforts to refinance its mortgage with Bank of America. The Ad Hoc Legal Affairs Committee, chaired by Brian Condon, a partner with Arnold and Porter, LLP, worked with a firm to revise the Center’s bylaws and changing its corporate name. The Board's Finance Committee, chaired by Gary Wagner, retired Chief Financial Officer (CFO) and Chief Operating Officer (COO) of Ameron International, monitored budgets and worked with auditors to complete the fiscal year audit and tax filings. Kathy Talley-Jones led the Development Committee. She was an independent writer and planner, who completed the 2017 strategic Annual Report and supported the Center's fundraising and fund development activities.
Several directors were involved in education. Keith Parker had retired from his position as Assistant Vice Chancellor of Government and Community Relations at UCLA. Other Board members were UCLA alumni, including John Lapham, Christopher Jennings, and Gary Wagner, who all had MBAs from UCLA, along with Dr. Connie James, a Pepperdine University professor, whose Ph.D. in corporate strategy was also from UCLA. They helped introduce friends and colleagues to the Center to provide resources including volunteer services, financial support, and in-kind gifts.

The Board included Dr. Laurie Inman, a USC graduate and former South Los Angeles charter school President, who was also teaching education students at California State University (CSU), Dominguez Hills as the director its Liberal Studies Program. The Board also included Leighton Carter, head trader at Lombardia Capital Partners, and Frank Denkins, retired from owning an office furniture company in Los Angeles. Kit Jennings was a Principal at Liquid Venture Partners while Kenneth McRay was a Senior Vice President at Crescent Capital. Dashan Nettles, a Center alumnus, was a PACS administrator at the US Department of Veterans Affairs. Mary Spellerberg was the Corporate Account Director at London West Hollywood at Beverly Hills. The most recent additions to the Board were Brett Roberts, the 2nd Traffic and Parking Commissioner for the City of Inglewood and Sr. Community Relations Officer for Metro’s Willowbrook project, Amy Johnson, the Executive-in-Residence faculty member at Pepperdine and CEO of Go Make a Difference, and Michael Jones, CEO of Success Management.

While the Board was diverse in terms of experience, backgrounds, gender, and ethnicities, it sought to expand, as noted in its revised bylaws. It particularly sought expertise in personnel and human resource management as well as additional assistance in legal services. The Board of Directors typically met bimonthly, at least six times a year, alternating between on site meetings at the Center’s facilities and teleconferences. The Board established the foundation for the Center’s strategic plan as noted in this document at its Annual Retreat in 2018 and spent time reviewing the strategic initiatives at its 2019 Annual Retreat.

**Board Support and Fundraising**  

The Board was supportive operationally, and it was also active in fundraising. Each year, the Center hosted two events that contributed significantly to its funding: the Catch the Vision Awards Dinner and the Wooten Golf Classic. The annual dinner brought the Board and staff, as well as friends and associates, together to raise awareness and donations for the Center; and it often built upon contacts developed at the fund raiser. Similarly, the Golf Classic was another opportunity for the Board to unite and raise money for the Center. Together, these events raised anywhere from $100,000 to over $200,000 per year. Some Board members also contributed to the annual Christmas Card appeal, which brought in over $18,000 in 2017.

In addition to the fundraising capabilities of the Board, each member was actively committed to the Center with his or her time. For example, Keith Parker facilitated a discussion between the LA City Council and the Center as well as assisted with building and safety. He also invited Naomi to his retirement party, which was at a live Los Angeles City Council meeting, where he announced
that during his retirement, he could be found at the Center. Also, John Lapham's company and staff at PineBridge Investments sent playground equipment and jump ropes to the Center. They later gave food at Thanksgiving to the parents of the Center’s students. Connie James received Pepperdine Community Grants that provided robotics, computers and support for strategic planning and case writing. Many other Board members were supportive by spending time outside of meetings to volunteer, building relationships or giving generous gifts to the Center. The Board was a significant strength for the Center. (Refer to the Situation “SWOT” Analysis in Exhibit 1.)

Staffing

Of a total staff of nine, there were only two full-time employees at the Center, Naomi McSwain, Executive Director, and Christelle Telesford, Associate Director. Naomi was in charge of the entire organization and managed finance, fundraising and development, strategic planning, legal compliance, program and policy development, and hiring of personnel. Naomi had a BA in Journalism and Marketing from CSU, Northridge, which was foundational to her grant-proposal writing skills. She had an MA in Intercultural Studies, specializing in students and children-at-risk from Fuller Theological Seminary, where she wrote her thesis paper on gang prevention in Los Angeles. Christelle had a BA in Education Administration from CSU, Long Beach. Christelle oversaw daily operations, including maintaining programs and resources as well as supervising staff and volunteers.

Seven of the nine staff members were part-time, averaging 10-20 hours per week. Based on the strategic plan, the Center planned to upgrade its Program Specialist, who oversaw the Center's recreation activities and field trips, to Program Director. Jesse Morales, a current Program Director, was second to Christelle in overseeing daily operations. Jesse was a former school-based, after-school program, site coordinator and a parent who had enrolled her son in the Center's Summer Fun Camp. All of the Center's staff were either college graduates or former students. Jesse and Victor Casey, a math teacher at the Center, studied child development or math. The Center hired Rebecca Arce, a Communications Assistant who started as a student Teen Helper, in 2016 at the close of her summer internship. Juana Alvarado, a Program Coordinator, was studying criminal justice at CSU, Long Beach, while a former Program Specialist, Christford Telesford, helped with recreation and transportation, driving a 2016 Nissan NV 12-passenger van purchased with $42,000 from the Ahmanson Foundation. Suzanne Vaughn worked part-time on bookkeeping, and April Silva was a part-time Administrative Secretary.

All of the Center’s staff worked in concert with volunteers and partners (described further in the section of this plan on “Program Partnerships”) providing key services including homework assistance, assessments, tutoring, and recreation. Paid contractors supplemented the staff's work, teaching classes such as piano, percussion, and music and video production. Young men from LMU's Crimson Circle service group, among the many volunteer interns, helped weekly with homework and other services.

Program Partnerships
The Center worked with external partners since its inception. As part of Faye's vision to revitalize the community, the Center aligned with many partners to support the needs of the youth, their parents, and the surrounding community. Partnerships also allowed the Center to leverage its limited resources.

Partners provided much needed staff support and expertise in areas, such as STEM. With so many part-time staff members, sometimes it was difficult to find the right personnel or even sufficient personnel to run the programs. The Center was heavily dependent on volunteer commitments. Many agencies provided resources to fill the gaps in skills that the Center was lacking. Partners were generally not paid, but were volunteers.

Partners helped the Center in various ways. For example, the Center’s students in partnership with the Los Angeles Metropolitan Churches, an organizing association of majority African American churches, co-hosted the Teen Talk Radio Show. The Center also partnered with the Holman United Methodist Church (part of the Holman Community Development Corporation) that worked with Hire LA’s Youth, to provide summer jobs for teens. This partnership enhanced one of the Center's main programs for teenagers, MyCollegeTrek (noted in greater detail in the “Programs” section.)

The Center also had partnerships with NASA, MIT, and The Walt Disney Company, which allowed the Center to provide STEM activities. NASA provided the Center with a summer of innovation, introducing the children to aerospace engineering. MIT had a Scratch coding initiative that the Center used to teach the children how to write programs. (See scratch.mit.edu for further information.) While some partners provided online resources, such as MIT, others were more direct in providing time or facilities to support the Center. For example, Disneyland provided a behind-the-scenes tour that included an animation workshop. The Society of Black Professional Engineers served as mentors, conducting a tour of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL) and provided a college and career event table on “Space Day” at the Center.

Partners presented opportunities for advanced study and specialized education that could vary each year. STEM activities ranged from computer science to zoology. For example, in the summer of 2016, a student, at the Art Center College of Design in Pasadena, taught the children mobile game design. The children created their own apps on their cell phones. The children loved the summer program so much that the Center extended the program into the fall.

During the summer of 2017, the National Organization of Minority Architects (NOMA) provided an architecture curriculum. Partners included Rick Shlemmer, architect and owner of SAAIA, and NOMA. He supported the elementary school program, and NOMA supported the middle school program. They taught the children SketchUp, a free design tool (which is used by HGTV) to create potential designs of the Center’s buildings. Students created multiple models of the buildings in addition to touring architectural sights in Los Angeles. Rick also assisted the Center with architectural plans and permitting to remodel the Center’s facilities in order to obtain an E Certificate of Occupancy and to meet California Child Care Center License requirements.

The Center had ongoing support from local universities. Colleges, including UCLA, Mount Saint Mary's University, CSU, Northridge, LMU, USC, and Pepperdine University, provided regular
support, mainly through student service teams that helped with numerous manuals and activities. Some examples of service projects included marketing materials, accounting manuals, volunteer recognition plans, demographic analyses of the local community and parents, websites, signage, and upgrading documentation. College student interns tutored, played games, and discussed college preparation with the Center's youth. For example, LMU sent 18 interns who helped to provide tutoring and other services.

In addition to universities, several organizations partnered with the Center. In response to a growing need for psychological services for its students and their families, the Center had partnered with the Jenesse Center to provide marriage, family, and therapy interns supervised by a licensed psychologist and referrals to support services. They also provided services on site. Other partners, such as Kinecta Federal Credit Union and Paramount Studios, supported the Center on an ongoing basis. Additionally, the Center’s partnership with Junior Achievement (JA) was in its second year in 2017. JA worked with the Center to empower its students to learn about the business world while improving their academic skills. This was of interest to both junior high school and high school students because several youth were interested in starting their own businesses.

While some programs addressed the needs of the Center’s youth, others were aimed at its mission regarding community revitalization. With Board member Keith Parker’s assistance and Board approval, the Center had begun working out the details of a partnership with the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health Office of Injury and Violence Prevention. The Kaiser Foundation invited the Center to submit a proposal and awarded $5,000 toward the Center’s work with the Public Health Office of Violence Prevention conference. The Center would become a major sponsor, attending meetings, facilitating accounts payable for the conference, and participating in the conference.

While adding too many programs outside of its primary mission was a concern of the Board, it remained supportive of the Center's ability to achieve its mission and leverage its resources through partnerships while also providing quality instruction and materials from experts. Still, the Board encouraged the Center's Executive Director to focus on the youth and thoroughly to vet the partners in her efforts to achieve the Center's mission and vision.

**Foundation, Corporate and Individual Grants and Awards**

In addition to the fundraising and donations from the Board and the support of program partners, foundations and other donations (corporate and individual) provided the Center with a significant amount of its funding. Thus, raising funds from foundations, corporations, and individuals other than Board members, referred to as “fund development,” was a central function of the Center. The Center also focused on having a balanced funding mix, meaning that it received donations from a variety of sources.

Given that the Center had always relied heavily on donations, the Great Recession of 2008 and 2009 caused financial troubles for the Center as it did for most nonprofits. Many partners and donors stopped giving as much as they had previously given, and others stopped donating
altogether. The Center's budget in 2009 when Faye retired was nearing $800,000. A year later, as the recession had negatively impacted many nonprofit agencies, the Center saw its income practically cut in half. It had been growing since then, and in 2017, it closed the year with more than $200,000 in surplus funds. The surplus included a $150,000 gift received after Board member Ron Glass passed away. Ron had noted that the Center was his “favorite charity.” The Center held these funds in reserve as of February 2018.

KROQ had given proceeds to the Center for the past ten years from its annual acoustic Christmas concert, including $90,000 per year after moving to the Forum. In 2016 and 2017, it had also given $20,000 for Apple computers and bulletproof windows. With changes in ownership, the funding was at risk.

In 2016, several donors started to give to the Center once again. Donors included foundations such as The Ahmanson Foundation, Weingart Foundation, California Community Foundation, Bank of America, Kaiser Foundation, Crail-Johnson Foundation, The California Endowment, and Dwight Stuart Youth Fund.

The Ahmanson Foundation had helped significantly. It gave money to buy the van used to pick up students from schools and to take them on field trips. Its generous grant in 2016 of $100,000 for a van and operations provided more than requested, as it wanted to invest in the Center, believing in its impact on South Los Angeles. In 2017, The Ahmanson Foundation provided an additional $100,000 to be used for the necessary upgrades to the Center’s facilities. These grants had a significant impact on securing grants from other foundations.

The Weingart Foundation had long been a supporter of the Center, returning after the recession. It provided the Center with a $25,000 grant for operations in 2017.

The California Community Foundation had provided the Center with a $25,000 grant for general operating expenses in 2017. The grant gave an additional stipend for Naomi to attend a capital campaign workshop. It gave her a referral to apply for a $5,000 grant for general operations from UCLA/Kaiser. In addition, the Kaiser Family Foundation had given $10,000 for MyCollegeTrek.

The Bank of America Charitable Foundation gave $10,000 for general operating support in both 2016 and 2017. Bank of America staff were in the process of creating a JA class for the future.

The Center’s programs relied on support for operations from Crail-Johnson Foundation, which donated $12,500, and the Dwight Stuart Youth Fund, which donated $10,000. The generous support of these donors and other donations had allowed the Center to expand its programs and staff, including adding a second full-time employee in 2017.

**Programs**38
The Center provided free after-school and low-cost summer programs for some 350 unduplicated students in 2016-17 at its youth center and other sites in South Los Angeles. The three programs were CollegeTrek Afterschool Program, MyCollegeTrek Program for teenagers, and Summer Fun Camp as described below. (See Exhibit 3 for 2017 data on programs.)

**CollegeTrek Afterschool Program**

CollegeTrek was a free college readiness after-school program for students in grades 3-12. The primary goals were to help students attain grade-level promotion and proficiency, high school graduation, and college access and success.

- Grades: 3-12
- Enrollment/Average Daily Attendance (2016-17): 90/36
- 2016-17 Enrollment/Average Daily Attendance: 60/32
- Schedule: August-June, Monday-Friday, 2-6pm
- Location: Center’s facilities
- Fees: Free tuition; $30/year per household registration; $30/month per household

Academic enrichment was the primary goal of the Center. LMU interns, along with the Center’s teachers and interns from other schools and universities, provided homework assistance and tutoring daily from 2:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. Free time with sports and recreation occurred from 5:00 to 6:00 p.m. daily. The Center used i-Ready.com for online assessments and tutoring in reading and math. i-Ready was an adaptive learning resource, providing study plans based on student strengths and challenges. It offered blended learning through a combination of online tutoring and small study groups assigned according to student abilities.

Homework and tutoring were central to the Center's mission for academic excellence and good citizenship, but they were not enough to help students compete in a 21st-century world or to be college ready. The Center's after-school program offered a mix of activities for a holistic approach. For example, in addition to computerized math and English computerized educational programs, students engaged in a variety of activities. For example, GameSalad was an activity that helped students learn game design. (See YouTube video at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LwlsxdHpM.)

Also, activities are listed below for grades 3-12:

- **Academic Enrichment:** Assessments, homework and tutoring, computer training
- **College and Career Readiness:** Teen Helper internships, Teen Job Shop job readiness, College and Career Day with guest mentors, SAT-prep workshops, and college advisement, tours and scholarships
- **Civic Engagement and Leadership Development:** Juvenile Justice Jeopardy, Youth and Junior Council
- **Social/Emotional Learning:** Bridge Builders group, world languages and culture, youth and family counselling
- **Performing and Visual Arts:** Piano, percussions, music and video production, Teen Talk YouTube show, arts and sciences (visual arts, cooking, gardening and project-based STEM)
- **Sports and Recreation:** Basketball, soccer, golf, double Dutch, games, and field trips.

Also, in the 2017-2018 school year, the Center provided transportation for several students from multiple schools using a 12-passenger van, purchased in 2016 with a grant from The Ahmanson Foundation. A new offering was youth and family counseling, provided by the Jenesse Center, the oldest women's and children's domestic violence shelter in South Los Angeles. Three Pacific Oaks College students, majoring in marriage and family therapy, helped with homework, basketball, and other activities. Supervised by a licensed psychologist at South Central Training Consortium, the interns monitored and corrected student behavior, trained staff and interns, and referred youth and parents to Jenesse Center counselors. The Center was in the process of developing an art therapy component in partnership with the Jenesse Center and LMU.

All lesson planning in the after-school and summer programs used the Center's STEP Tutorial Model for activities that were Self-Directed, Team-Oriented, Experiential, and Project-Based. Project-based activities, such as parachutes in arts and sciences, engaged students in four college readiness skills: critical thinking, collaboration, communications, and creative expression.

The Center started at grade 3 to prepare students to adopt skills needed to complete their journey to higher education. Its CollegeTrek Afterschool Program provided the following activities:
- Quarterly assessments and monthly monitoring in language arts and math
- Homework assistance, individualized tutoring, small study groups
- Monthly College and Career Day with guest mentors and college plans
- College-prep electives (world languages and culture, STEM classes, and computer lab)
- Visual and performing arts (percussions, arts and crafts, theater, Teen Talk Radio)
- Life Skills and Leadership Development (Juvenile Justice Jeopardy, Teen Job Shop, Teen Helpers, Youth and Junior Councils)
- ESL English (teens and adults)
- SAT-prep and college advisement
- Sports and recreation (basketball, ping pong, golf, soccer, health and fitness, and chess)
- Field trips
- Hot and nutritious snacks

The Center worked in partnership with parents, schools, and community partners to help its students achieve good citizenship and academic excellence. By promoting critical thinking, collaboration, communication, and creative expression, the Center’s students were better prepared for college success and academic excellence.

**MyCollegeTrek**

MyCollegeTrek was an addition to the Center’s CollegeTrek Afterschool Program. MyCollegeTrek focused on activities for teens only, with an emphasis on preparing middle and
high school youth for college, careers, and life. Most students attended the Center’s quarterly SAT-prep workshops held in the dining halls at Holman United Methodist Church, LMU, and Bethel AME Church. The workshops featured instruction by the Center’s partner and vendor Study Smart Tutors and college advisement and materials from UCLA, Educate California, Kinecta Federal Credit Union, and other partners. The Center paid Study Smart $1,000 for up to 60 students and offered free SAT preparatory classes for youth. The Center had 80 students enrolled as of November 2017.

- Grades: Middle through High School
- Enrollment/Attendance at SAT workshops (2016-17): 226/155
- Projections for SAT Enrollment/Attendance (2017-18): 225/150
- Schedule: daily teen helpers, weekly Bridge Builders/Teen Talk, quarterly SAT workshop, annual Job Shop
- Location: Center’s facilities and offsite
- Fees: See CollegeTrek Afterschool Program; free SAT-prep

Teens enrolled in the MyCollegeTrek after-school program attended a weekly Bridge Builders discussion group facilitated by the Center’s Board member Robert Clark. As a retired FBI agent and cast member on CBS’s 2017 TV show Hunted, Robert worked with teens on a number of programs. The Teen Talk YouTube channel featured Wooten high school students as hosts and technicians. Facilitated by Los Angeles Metropolitan Churches, Teen Talk involved students in scheduling and interviewing guests and researching topics, such as domestic violence and human trafficking.

Robert Clark also ran Juvenile Justice Jeopardy, a program designed to address improving police/community relations. The program’s aim was to teach the Center’s youth about being aware of their rights and how to exercise them properly. Developed by Strategies for Youth and sponsored by The California Endowment in partnership with The Advancement Project, Juvenile Justice Jeopardy was a digital game with questions and answers on juvenile law. The Center invited police officers to interact with children for a mutually beneficial learning experience. (For more information, go to [www.strategiesforyouth.org](http://www.strategiesforyouth.org).)

Teen helpers were a daily fixture at the Center, serving as volunteers or paid interns year-round. Employment partners Holman CDC, Hire LA's Youth, YO! Watts, and the Archdiocesan Youth Employment Services paid salaries for qualified teens and provided training in customer service and other workforce readiness skills. The Center’s Teen Job Shop brought a business professional to the Center in the spring to guide students in preparing resumes and applying for summer jobs. The program did more than refer teens to jobs; it also ensured that they knew how and when to apply for jobs by helping students learn how to create resumes of their own and by helping them prepare for job interviews.

A new MyCollegeTrek offering was made possible by the Ron Glass Memorial Scholarship, named in honor of the Board’s long-time member who passed away in 2016. (Ron Glass was an actor on the hit TV show Barney Miller and the TV series Firefly and its sequel, Serenity.) The Center awarded $24,000 in scholarships in 2017 to help five students attend UCLA, UC Merced, CSU, Northridge, and Cal Poly Pomona. The Board’s Ad hoc Scholarship Committee was
exploring ways to provide academic, mentoring, and other support for recipients until college graduation.

All SAT workshops closed with an advisement session on college preparations, admissions, and financial aid. The sessions were open to students and parents. Additional advisement for teen girls in grades 9-12 was available through monthly mentor sessions with the Women's Center of Los Angeles. All of the Center’s staff were either college graduates or students and were available to consult with students and parents on college preparation.

**Summer Fun Camp**

Summer Fun Camp was open to students in grades 3-9. Teen helpers in grades 9-12 served as volunteers or paid interns. Summer Fun Camp provided the same activities offered in the CollegeTrek Program, including homework assistance for summer school students. Additional activities included a week-long basketball camp, weekly field trips, and swim lessons at Ketchum YMCA in downtown Los Angeles. Assessments of student performance and tutorials in language arts and math identified strengths and challenges and provided instruction to help students perform on or above grade level. The tutorials helped to avoid the "summer slide," in which many students lost much of their learning from the previous school year. The Center offered project-based STEM classes, such as aerospace engineering, computer animation, and coding, with quality curricula and materials from partners including NASA, Disney, and MIT. The summer of 2017 featured architecture classes taught by professional architects engaging students in creating 3-D SketchUp models of their dream youth center.

Program highlights follow:
- Grades: 3-9, Teen Helpers 9-12
- Enrollment/Average Daily Attendance (2016-17): 104/48
- Projections for Summer 2018: 100/60
- Schedule: July-August, Monday-Friday, 8:00 am – 6:00 pm
- Location: Center’s facilities
- Fees: $30/yr. registration per household; $60/wk. per student tuition; $55/wk. per student with three or more

The Summer Programs also paid dividends to the Center. For example, the two architecture classes for teens and elementary youth helped the Center obtain feedback from students for a proposed capital campaign to renovate or rebuild the Center’s facilities.

**Other After-School Programs in Los Angeles**

Many youth organizations and different types of nonprofit organizations had planted their roots in the same community that the Center served. Some of them took the same approach as the Center while others were part of school-based, after-school programs. Examples of other types of after-school youth programs in the area follow.
Youth United\textsuperscript{39}

Similar to the Center, Youth United was not located at a school and was not a government-run program. It was also only about a mile away from the Center’s facilities, on the corner of Manchester and Van Ness. Youth United had been serving the community for over 17 years and strove to provide comprehensive educational, recreational, and social programs to youth, focusing on academic achievement, personal responsibility, leadership, and cultural awareness.

The organization operated in three programs areas: 1) academics and arts; 2) vocational, technical, and life skills, mentoring, and training; and 3) social and recreational activities. During the weekdays, the organization mainly provided after-school enrichment, mentoring activities, and free tutoring. On the weekends, Youth United provided classes on how to practice for the SAT, as well as assistance with college applications. It also offered other activities, such as computers and games, photography class, and field trips.

Unlike other after-school programs, Youth United provided parenting classes to the adults with children in the program and to teens who already had their own children. Its basic class was a 10-week comprehensive skill-building program designed to teach advanced parenting techniques and increase parenting skills and knowledge. For teen parents, there was a 16-week course that included child development skills and activities.

LA’s BEST

There were approximately 100 LA’s BEST programs spread throughout Los Angeles. Hosted on school grounds, the nearest LA’s BEST program was at Manhattan Place Elementary School, approximately half a mile away from the Center’s facilities. The plan was an after-school activity program that strove to provide a safe and supervised after-school education, enrichment, and recreation program for children age five to 12, covering schools mainly in the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). The program partnered with 193 elementary schools across LAUSD to provide after-school programs. At the program, students ate a nutritious snack, received help with their homework, and participated in many exciting activities.\textsuperscript{40}

The program sought to host both a learning activity that boosted core academic skills, such as reading or math, and a learning activity that was something new and fun. Although all LA’s BEST programs were similar to each other, each one varied based on the school’s equipment and staff’s interest and experience. Other than the core activities, LA’s BEST offered enhanced programs focused on specific areas such as arts, business (in partnership with JA), and the STEM area. Each year, LA’s BEST also hosted city-wide events including a science fair, a talent showcase, and a family health festival.\textsuperscript{41}

With so many locations, quality varied from place-to-place. Even though 79\% of LA’s BEST employees would recommend working there to a friend, the organization had a 3.5 out of 5.0 Glassdoor rating\textsuperscript{42}. Some employee criticisms included a lack of training and being babysitters to the children, rather than being teachers to them\textsuperscript{43}. Still, the program was one of the largest, serving hundreds of school children in Los Angeles.
YMCA Weingart Wellness and Aquatic Center\textsuperscript{44}

The YMCA Weingart Wellness and Aquatic Center was a typical YMCA wellness center that offered swimming pools, a gym, and camps. It strove to provide a "safe, positive environment for children to learn good values, social skills, and behaviors. Children and teens played, learned who they were and what they could achieve, and were accepted." Unlike many programs mentioned above, this program focused more on the physical wellness of the children. The YMCA provided classes about swimming, jogging, and weight training. With a $15 monthly membership fee, children and teens alike could utilize the equipment that the YMCA offered. Similar to many other YMCA centers, the Weingart Wellness Center offered various weekly youth camps and summer camps.

Urban Scholar Academy\textsuperscript{45}

Based in part on the Center model, Urban Scholar Academy (which was five years old in 2018) was located approximately 2.5 miles from the Center’s facility and strove to “prepare urban youth to become transformative leaders in the community through academic enrichment and community service opportunities.” The Urban Scholar Academy offered a homework club, a one-on-one after-school tutoring session, and a Saturday option. Teaching the students organizational and time management skills, along with providing access to technology and research materials allowed students the opportunity to become successful in their academic pursuits. In December of 2017, the Winter Academy, available for children between kindergarten and 8\textsuperscript{th} grade, offered STEM activities, technology integration, arts and crafts, and snacks.

Challengers Boys & Girls Club on Vermont\textsuperscript{46}

The Challenger Boys & Girls Club on the corner of Vermont and 51\textsuperscript{st} Street aimed to “motivate, educate, and elevate the children and teens of South Los Angeles to become responsible, caring, productive adults.” Lou Dantzier founded the Challenger Boys & Girls Club after he discovered that his neighbor's 11-year-old son had broken into his home. With no one to take an interest in being the child’s father figure, Dantzier decided to teach the boy about the differences between right and wrong, inviting other neighborhood children along to learn more about becoming productive citizens. He established the Challenger Boys & Girls Club, and it now has impacted over 35,000 children in the South Los Angeles area.

The Challenger Boys & Girls Club offered a variety of activities, ranging from arts and crafts to a career development courses. Focusing on three different areas—academic success, healthy lifestyles, and good character and citizenship—this program aimed to provide a well-rounded set of activities that occurred either after school or during the summer. The programs at the Challenger Boys & Girls Club were available for children in elementary school to teens in high school.

A Place Called Home\textsuperscript{47}
Lastly, A Place Called Home was a youth center that provided a safe space for children and teens in South Central Los Angeles. It offered educational programs such as tutoring and homework help, counselling, and mentorship. The program also offered activities for high school dropouts and year-round SAT preparation classes. A Place Called Home focused on the nutrition of its students and even had a fruit and vegetable garden on its property. It highlighted the importance of being creative by offering dance, theater, and writing activities. A Place Called Home was also committed to the family feel of its activities and programs, and it provided classes for its parents to encourage health and leadership.

Summary of Financial Statements

The Center's operating budget was beginning to return to pre-recession levels in 2017. The Center reported its financials on a calendar-year basis. Audited revenues in 2017 climbed to over $828,000 from the previous year's $452,000 due to increases in all major categories of giving, including donations from its Board and foundations as well as an increase in in-kind gifts from volunteers. The net income of the Catch the Vision Awards Dinner and the Wooten Golf Classic increased more than $37,000. Individual contributions not included in these two fundraising events rose $229,000, and foundation support increased $57,000. There was also an increase in corporate gifts of $11,000. The most significant components of the increase in individual contributions came from a one-time gift from Ron Glass' estate of $150,000 and donations to the scholarship fund of $53,000.

Rental income decreased by almost $6,000 as the Center closed a beauty salon that was renting space on its property. The Center closed the salon as part of the process of obtaining the E Certificate of Occupancy.

The Center received support from recurring and new individual donors, foundations and corporate donors. The most significant 2017 donations came from individual donors, which totaled $275,000, or 33.1% of total revenues. Foundation grants totaled $195,000, or 23.5%; and fundraising, net of expenses of $55,000 for the Catch the Vision Awards Dinner and the Wooten Golf Classic, generated $132,000, or 15.9% of the Center's revenues. This was closely followed by donations from corporate donors of $101,000, or 12.2%. In addition to the one-time gift of $150,000 from Ron Glass' estate, the next largest donations came from The Ahmanson Foundation, $100,000, and KROQ, $100,000. Included in the amount received from individual donors were stock donations, which were immediately sold by the Center for cash. The Center opened a brokerage account in 2017 to begin accepting stock donations.

Actor Ron Glass had been a devoted fundraiser and Chairman of the Center’s Board. Ron had stated that the Center was his favorite charity, as demonstrated by his generous donation in his will. While the estate funds could be used for general operations, the Board decided to put the majority of the funds into a reserve for a future endowment for the Center.

The Center's audited expenses increased from $449,000 in 2016 to $542,000 in 2017. While program, operating and other expenses decreased from 2016 to 2017, personnel costs increased almost $28,000. Personnel costs rose almost $9,000 for Program Specialists, $9,000 for Program
Assistants, and $8,000 for a new Program Director of Education. Program and operating expenses declined by almost $18,000 in 2017, even though initial awards of $24,000 were made under the new Ron Glass Scholarship program. Offsetting the scholarship awards were reductions in contractors, miscellaneous program expenses, and in-kind contributions, which are expensed when contributed. Expenses for facilities and equipment remained constant. Professional fees increased over $82,000 in 2017, due primarily to the expensing of contributed architectural services related to the planned upgrade of the Center’s facilities.

As is the case in many nonprofit budgets, the most significant 2017 expense was for payroll. Payroll and related expenses totaled almost $228,000, or 27.5% of revenues in 2017. Program and other operating expenses totaled $145,000, or 17.5% of revenues; and expenditures for facilities and equipment totaled $74,000, or 9.0% of revenues. Professional fees totaled $95,000 in 2017. These fees covered accounting and grant-writing support, architectural services related the upgrade of the Center’s facilities and other services provided by outside contractors. Direct expenses of $55,000 related to the two fundraising events were netted against the revenues from the events and were not included in total expenses. The expenses and revenues included in-kind gifts and volunteer services valued at over $99,000 in 2017. Almost $74,000 of contributed architectural services were expensed as professional fees, and almost $25,000 of other in-kind contributions were included in program expenses.

The Center’s balance sheet had improved significantly in the years leading up to 2017 with the refinancing of its mortgage and the increase in donations. As of December 31, 2017, the Center had over $817,000 in total assets, including approximately $364,000 of current assets and $454,000 of fixed assets. The most substantial single assets were the land and buildings that housed the Center. Current liabilities were slightly over $29,000. Long-term liabilities totaled $278,000. Equity was $501,000. The most significant liabilities were for the Bank of America mortgage on the Center's property and an automobile loan.

Thanks to the refinancing of a previous mortgage and increases in donations, such as The Ahmanson Foundation's funding and the gift from Ron Glass’ estate, the Center was once again on relatively stable financial footing. Though unforeseen events, such as a recession or market correction as well as changes in US tax laws regarding charitable giving, might adversely affect donation and grants, in general, the Center had a strong balance sheet.
Strategic Initiatives

With a vision to provide exemplary after-school and summer programs to the youth in Los Angeles, the Board and the administrative staff assessed the risks and opportunities for the Center. The Board also evaluated the Center's strengths and weaknesses, juxtaposing them against the risks and opportunities facing the Center. Immediate threats to the efficacy of the Center emerged in licensing requirements, building safety and certification, risk management and personal safety. Addressing these risks factors had significant implications for staffing levels and staff development, program effectiveness, program enrollment, and funding and financial sustainability. These risks and implications became the seven strategic initiatives described in the aforementioned sections. While the strategic initiatives are interdependent for the most part, some aspects of each initiative are independent of others. (See Figure 1.)

Figure 1. Strategic Initiatives

The sections that follow include descriptions of these seven strategic initiatives as well as an overarching objective related to the vision of the Center. The descriptions of each initiative include more specific goals, background summary, SWOT components addressed, target audiences, funding implications, and key steps. Key steps are included as a recommendation to the Center and for further consideration by the Board and the Center's administration and staff. The order of the initiatives reflects the most pressing concerns at the time of the creation of the plan, but is not intended to indicate any one item being more important than another. Furthermore, the strategic initiatives have considerable overlap.
Strategic Initiative 1 – Building Safety and Certification

A. Strategic Objective:
To make the Center’s facility a physically safe space that meets building codes and the long-term program needs of the Center

B. Strategic Goals:
Short-term
1. To bring the Center’s facilities up to current building and safety codes as quickly as possible.
2. To obtain a Los Angeles County E Certificate of Occupancy by the fiscal year end of 2019.

Long term
1. To build a new or significantly renovated building to meet the safety needs of the Center, its programs, and its students in the next few years.
2. To create a larger facility, potentially doubling the number of enrolled students from 60 to 120.

C. Background Summary:
The Building and Safety Strategic Initiative addresses two primary concerns facing the Center. The first concern is that the current building is licensed for commercial use and not for educational purposes. The Los Angeles County Building and Safety Division review of the Center’s facilities noted that while some existing features of the facility might be grandfathered in to meet certification requirements, the facility still needed significant renovation to bring the buildings up to fire and safety codes. Furthermore, the six building, built in the 1940s, did not meet the current needs of the three major after-school and summer programs. The buildings were not well suited for educational purposes as they were originally constructed as storefronts, including a beauty shop that the Center closed to meet E occupancy certification requirements.

D. SWOT Components Addressed:
This initiative confronts the threat of shutting down the Center’s facility due to a lack of proper certification and zoning for educational purposes. By utilizing the strengths of owning the buildings, location, and Board members to increase knowledge and ability to navigate through building and safety requirements for E occupancy certification, the Center is expected to be able to address this threat. The Center could also leverage partnerships, such as the one with Rick Shlemmer, architect, and his firm in developing plans and negotiating with the city.

E. Target Audience:
Center staff and students are the primary audiences, but the facility affects all major constituents including volunteers, partners, Board members, and the surrounding community.

F. Funding:
Short-term Estimate - $175,000
Potential funding sources – The Ahmanson Foundation and financial reserves

Long-term Estimate - $3,500,000 new building, $1,500,000 renovated building
Potential funding sources – The Ahmanson Foundation, other foundations, fundraisers, capital
campaign

G. Key Steps and Considerations:

2018-2019
1. Naomi McSwain and Keith Parker will work together to determine the correct people to work within the LA County offices to secure the E Certificate of Occupancy. Relevant departments include the LA County building and safety office and the LA County Supervisor’s office. Naomi McSwain is also to work with the architects to secure a plan that meets LA County’s requirements and is approved by the Board.
2. The Center will move into a temporary facility while renovations take place. Keith Parker secured the UCLA Mann Center for the time being.
3. Naomi McSwain will work with the architect, builders, and California Child Care and Licensing requirements county staff to secure the necessary building plans for E occupancy certification.
4. Naomi will report updates to the Board, both in terms of the building requirements and its associated costs.
5. Pending Board approval, once the Center meets fire and safety requirements and receives the E Certificate of Occupancy, the staff and programs will move back to the Center’s facilities.

2019 to 2023
1. The Center will also develop a second plan for major renovation and expansion. This plan requires both a capital campaign and Board approval (see Strategic Initiative 7).
2. Naomi will work with an architect and builder to ensure that the plans comply with the building and safety codes to maintain the E Certificate of Occupancy and California Child Care Licensing requirements (see Strategic Initiative 3).
3. Naomi will work with the Board and seek its approval of plans and budgets to expand the Center’s facilities and to make the facilities more useable to meet the program needs of the Center. The plan is to double the number of children served from approximately 60 to 120, pending budgetary and logistical considerations.
4. Once the Board approves the plans and associated cost estimates, then the Board will engage in a capital campaign to fund the plan.
5. Pending a successful campaign, the Center will relocate during the renovation. Upon completion and securing the necessary certifications, including E occupancy, the staff will move back to the Center’s facilities.

Strategic Initiative 2 – Risk Management and Personal Safety
A. Strategic Objective:
To keep students and staff safe and minimize risk at the Center’s facilities and its off-site activities.

B. Strategic Goal:
   1. To develop and implement a staffing plan for personal safety within the next year.
   2. To enhance and implement a risk-management program for the Center within the next year.

C. Background:
The Center was founded based on the need to provide a safe alternative to gang membership. Its location, while close to gang activity, was closely tied to its mission and founder's profound loss of her son due to gang violence. Located in one of the most active gang areas of Los Angeles, creates challenges while positioning the Center as an important alternative to gang membership.

Moreover, Los Angeles was the gang capital of the nation, with almost 500 gangs and 50,000 members, according to the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD). With an increase in narcotics, Los Angeles gang membership had also increased. Evidence of this at the Center’s facilities was shown in bullet holes in the door jambs near the director’s office, in the shattered staff member’s car windows, and additionally in the student who ran to the building for protection after being attacked by nearby gangs.

While bringing the Center’s buildings up to fire and safety codes was a step in the right direction, it would not address broader safety concerns. The Board discussed concerns regarding the rise in gang violence near the Center’s facilities, vandalism of the Center’s buildings, and the physical safety of the students and staff. In addition to the potential for gang violence, the location of the Center’s facilities in Southern California was prone to natural disasters. Increased temperatures had resulted in more frequent natural disasters, such as fires, floods, mudslides, earthquakes, and droughts. These threats and changes to the neighborhood had increased the Center's need for a greater focus on risk management and personal safety.

D. SWOT Components Addressed:
This initiative focuses on the non-major capital resources that the Center could utilize to develop personal safety plans and programs. It utilizes the strengths of the staff and the Board along with the weaknesses of personal safety and lack of education and awareness as well as the threats of rising crime, gang activity, and natural disasters to create stronger risk-management training of staff and to increase the Center’s preparedness.

E. Target Audience:
Center staff, students, parents, volunteers, partners, the Board, and community/neighbors are all considered the target audience.

F. Funding
No significant funding is required or identified to begin, but establishing a budget is included in the following steps.

E. Key Steps and Considerations:
Although the Center had already begun taking more concerted steps in February 2018, the next steps are as follows:

1. Naomi McSwain is to work with relevant Board members, possibly including Robert Clark and Laurie Inman, on designing a personal-safety program for the staff.
2. Naomi and Robert Clark plan to enhance current programs with students on how to address gang violence and police interaction.
3. Christelle Telesford and Naomi McSwain are to investigate LA County Care licensing requirements regarding school safety and to add any potential requirements to the staff development plans in Strategic Objective 4.
4. The Center will develop or enhance the following:
   a. Increase staff and volunteer training, education, and awareness
   b. Develop or revise a disaster plan, emergency preparedness plan, and a business continuity plan.
5. The Center will also develop a “Personal-Safety Strategy and Risk-Management Program” including the following:
   a. Build alliances and partnerships with organizations including the LA City Council, Western Community Watch, and the South LA Chamber.
   b. Engage in a PRN-First Aid Training.
   c. Develop a Block Club “Creation”.
   d. Develop and implement Professional Development for safety and risk management.
   e. Develop and implement a Physical Security Plan (security cameras, for example.).
   f. Create a budget, change staff intake forms, and keep records.
   g. Leverage the Board to execute programs and action plans.

**Strategic Initiative 3 – Licensing**

A. Strategic Objective:
To become a licensed, exemplary after-school and summer-school youth program.

B. Strategic Goal:
1. To obtain the State of California Child Care License in 2019.

C. Background:
The application to obtain the State of California Child Care License included many specifications regarding facilities, staffing, and operations. The facilities requirement included having an E Certificate of Occupancy, which as noted in Strategic Initiative 1 – Building Safety, was subject to renovating the buildings to comply with safety and fire code regulations. Also, the staff had to meet certification standards (Staffing issues were addressed in Strategic Initiative 4 – Staff Levels and Staff Development).

There were many benefits to being a licensed facility, including fundraising and development. More importantly, the Center could be forced to close if it did not obtain the license. Becoming licensed would also help to achieve the vision of being an exemplary youth center and signal to parents and stakeholders that the Center was legally compliant. The license would give the Center more legitimacy and potentially give it an increased ability to meet the needs of the youth in its programs. It would also differentiate the Center from non-licensed youth programs.

D. SWOT Components Addressed:
The lack of a State of California Child Care license was a significant threat and indicator of weaknesses in staffing and facilities to meet licensing standards. Strengths included the Executive and Associate Director who had already begun to move towards licensing standards, staff who were already meeting the requirements, and Board support.
E. Target Audiences:
The State of California with benefits to the Center and its stakeholders and the Health and Human Services Agency, the Center’s staff, and its Board.

F. Funding:
The building costs are noted in Strategic Initiative 1 – Building Safety and staffing issues are covered in Strategic Initiative 4 – Staffing Levels and Staff Development. The increment costs of the license filing fees were minimal and the Executive Director’s costs for training and time were not incremental to the current budget because previous donations covered them.

G. Key Steps and Considerations:
1. Naomi McSwain had already familiarized herself with the details of the State of California’s Child Care Licensing requirements.
2. Christelle Telesford had also begun to review the requirements for staff.
3. The Center would need to complete the Building Safety initiative in order to safely occupy its buildings. The E Certificate of Occupancy is also needed to obtain the Child Care License.
4. Naomi McSwain would continue to meet with staff in the State of California Health and Human Services Agency and attend classes to facilitate the filing of the application.
5. Staffing levels and staff development to meet licensing requirements are addressed in Strategic I initiative 4.

Strategic Initiative 4 – Staffing Levels and Staff Development

A. Strategic Objective:
To improve the quality of the staff and to match the staffing levels with program needs and licensing requirements.

B. Strategic Goal:
1. To bring all staff up to the State of California Child Care License requirements in 2019.
2. To enhance the quality of volunteers and staff engaged in tutoring and homework oversight in 2018.
3. To increase staff development and enhance the quality of staff.

C. Background:
The Center operated with two full-time staff, the Executive Director and Associate Director, and seven part-time staff members. It recently hired a part-time Administrative Secretary. The Center was also upgrading its Program Specialist, who oversaw the Center’s recreation activities and field trips, to a Program Director. All of the Center’s staff were either college graduates or college students. Staff studied child development, psychology, and math. Positions included Program Directors, Program Coordinators, Program Specialists, and a Communications Assistant. The staff worked in concert with each other, volunteers, and paid consultants, providing critical services including homework assistance, assessments, tutoring, and recreation. Paid contractors supplemented the staff’s work, teaching classes such as piano, percussion, and music and video production. Volunteer interns, such as young men from LMU’s Crimson Circle service group, helped weekly with homework and other services.
The Center operated with highly dedicated staff, but also used partnerships and volunteers to leverage limited resources. Volunteers also varied in terms of quality and consistency. The Center received more than $99,000 of in-kind gifts and volunteer services in 2017.

Volunteers included teen helpers and interns who were both paid and unpaid. Moreover, staff turnover had made it difficult to maintain the quality of the programs. While the Center screened the staff for criminal records, they did not all meet the requirements of the State of California Child Care License. Future plans required that all staff meet the licensing requirements.

In addition to the broad issues that affected all staff, there were specific issues that the Center also planned to address. The Center lacked a grant writer, a human resource expert, and enough administrative support. Without a grant writer, Naomi McSwain took on additional grant writing duties. The recent hire of a part-time Administrative Secretary was expected to help address some of the unfulfilled administrative duties.

D. SWOT Components Addressed:
This initiative covers both the strengths and weaknesses of the staff and staffing levels along with the threat of not having a Child Care License.

E. Target Audience:
Staff, volunteers, partners, and the State of California’s Health and Human Services Agency. The Board would also be involved with training and development as well as approval of personnel changes.

F. Funding:
To be assessed.

G. Key Steps and Considerations:
1. Christelle Telesford would assess the staff’s ability to meet licensing requirements; if a staff member did not meet the requirements, then he or she will be let go.
2. The Center would create a staff development plan. Board Member Laurie Inman agreed to work with the Center on staff training and development, including a retreat.
3. Naomi would work on any further staffing levels and make staffing recommendations to the Board.
4. Staff, volunteers and partners would engage in additional training. (See Strategic Initiative 5 – Program Effectiveness for additional details.)
5. Staff development plans would incorporate the personal safety plans outline in Strategic Initiative 2 – Risk Management and Personal Safety.
6. The Center will utilize external partnerships and alliances to enhance staff development and implement staff reviews to ensure compliance with licensing requirements.

**Strategic Initiative 5 – Program Effectiveness**

A. Strategic Objective:
To enhance student achievement by improving programs in academic excellence, citizenship, and life skills.
B. Strategic Goal:
1. To improve the program effectiveness of the CollegeTrek, MyCollege Trek, and Summer School programs.
2. To better serve the evolving community and create a program that is more representative of the multicultural population surrounding the Center’s coverage area.

B. Strategic Objectives:
1. To increase the grade level assessments of reading, math and college preparatory subjects, thus increasing the number of students who graduate high school and pursue a college education.
2. To upgrade the technology and program support for a broader demographic of students.
3. To increase the number of graduates accepted into college.
4. To improve the student's engagement on citizenship activities and life skills.

C. Background:
The Center has a growing need to improve the effectiveness of its programs. The effectiveness is multifaceted, including student achievement, staffing levels, consistency of staff, assessment tools, and attendance. Students are testing below grade level, and many are not improving at a pace that would make them college ready. This objective is at the core of the Center’s motivation to enhance student achievement. For the Center to achieve its mission, it places a heavy emphasis on improving the academic achievements of the students.

The Center recognizes that improving the academic portion of the after-school program is critical. Students are performing significantly under grade level. Center reports show that the students are only achieving 15% of grade level in math and 7% of grade level in reading. These low scores are unacceptable. To improve this area, the Center will increase the staff's capabilities to teach math, reading, and other subjects.

Moreover, the aspirations of the Center go beyond growing educated, college-ready youth. The founders and the Board have aspired to transform the Center into a place that inspires good citizenship. Citizenship and becoming a productive member of society are values that the Board wants to put at the core of the Center.

Furthermore, partnerships may facilitate outreach and alliances may help leverage the Center's limited resources. Partnerships with other schools might focus on joint programs, such as the current SAT prep classes. Partnerships with parents and churches might enhance program support. For example, working with parents to encourage students to bring in their report cards would help to establish baselines and progress levels at school. The Center might also form partnerships with Foster Care agencies.

D. SWOT components addressed:
Minimize the weakness of low student achievement through enhancing the effectiveness of existing programs. In addition, better training the staff will make personnel more equipped to enhance the grade level of students. Leverage partnerships, including existing partnerships with parents, schools and churches as well as review the potential for new partnerships with Foster Care agencies, etc. Build on the Center's mission and holistic approach that emphasize both academic
excellence and good citizenship, which are manifested in the Center’s academic readiness, college prep, and life-skills programs.

E. Target Audiences:
Students (both teens and pre-teens), staff, parents and SAT alliance partners.

F. Funding:
Funding needs are not currently assessed, but there is an expected cost for increasing the quality of staff in Strategic Initiative 3

G. Key Steps and Considerations:
1. Support Christelle’s leadership improving program effectiveness.
2. Assess program effectiveness in terms of technological tools, tutoring and homework preparation,
3. Review potential partnerships with Foster Care agencies
4. Leverage existing partnerships with churches and local schools.
5. Develop a program with parents to ensure that students provide the necessary documentation.
6. Review volunteer staff qualifications and staffing levels needed to monitor and administer programs. Enhance training and screening of qualified personnel for tutoring, homework, and administration of educational software.
7. Survey student and parent needs, including differences that might highlight the changing demographics, regarding potential life skills, citizenship and academic needs.

**Strategic Initiative 6 – Program Enrollment**

A. Strategic Objective:
Increase awareness of and student enrollments of the Center.

B. Strategic Goal:

1. To double the enrollment of students in the Center.
2. To use social media as a means of reaching other demographics as well.

C. Background:
While enrollments had been strong, the move to the UCLA Mann Center, on a temporary basis, produced a marked drop in enrollments to less than 30 students. Nineteen former students could not make the commute, and the Center could not pick them up due to a lack of vans. The one van, owned by the Center (purchased with The Ahmanson Foundation grant) was already used to pick up other students.

Moreover, the community surrounding the Center’s facilities was changing. While the Center’s staff and students were predominantly African-American and Latino-American, the surrounding community had increasingly become more multicultural, including first-generation immigrant families from Africa and Latin America. The community was also undergoing significant change
in terms of rising home values, which were driving out lower income households.

Changing demographics could be seen as an opportunity for the Center, allowing the Center to aid students of other ethnicities and backgrounds. However, reaching these new students and their families would require a change in the Center’s approach to marketing to them. Currently, the Center relied mostly on word-of-mouth, flyers, and a limited amount of social media, including a Facebook page.

Pepperdine University students also surveyed community respondents about the Center to determine community exposure\(^5\). With a limited sample size, 60% of respondents stated that they had not heard of the Center; and 75% were not aware of the services provided by the Center. Students also collected data on the method for new client referrals. Facebook referrals were approximately 31%. Parents or students referred another 21%, and someone other than parents and students referred an additional 21%. Internet searches resulted in 9% of referrals, and the Center staff or volunteers referred an additional 9%.

D. SWOT Components Addressed:
While the community lacked awareness of the Center, according to a study by Pepperdine University students, there was an opportunity to increase the recognition of the Center through using social media and upgrading the Center’s website. As demographics around the Center’s facilities became more diverse and the number of families living near the Center’s facilities increased, the number of students needing a program like those offered by the Center expanded as well.

E. Target Audiences:
External – potential student enrollees and their parents.

F. Funding:
Not assessed at this time.

G. Key Steps and Considerations:
1. Develop a stronger social media presence to increase awareness of the Center.
2. Upgrade the website, including additional marketing tools.
3. Use the established SAT prep program partners to increase visibility.
4. Explore other avenues to promote the Center (e.g., visiting local schools).
5. Have discussions with the parents of existing and potential students regarding ways to improve visibility.
6. Develop a public relations/marketing and social media plan.

**Strategic Initiative 7 – Funding and Financial Sustainability**

A. Strategic Objective:
To implement a sustainable financial plan for the Center.

B. Strategic Goal:
1. To increase long-term financial resources for the Center.
2. To increase revenue and funding, specifically through a capital campaign.

C. Background:
The Center had at one point increased its revenues to nearly $1 million per year, before the Great Recession. As funding dried up to almost half of this amount during the Great Recession, the Center had to cut positions and eliminate programs while adding partnerships, leveraging alliances, and relying on volunteers. While Naomi had managed well through this transition, it was not without its drawbacks. Students still performed significantly below grade level and were not progressing fast enough to make most of them college ready, for example.

The Board had made significant progress in improving the financial stability of the Center. From refinancing the mortgage to contributing cash, over $160,000 in 2017, and in-kind gifts and volunteer services, it provided significant support. Moreover, the Center had accumulated over $200,000 of excess cash at the end of 2017. Naomi McSwain had also done an excellent job of writing grants and nurturing key fund development partners and foundations that were very supportive of the Center.

Many sources contributed to approximately $828,000 of revenues in 2017. The most significant 2017 donations came from individual donors, which totaled $275,000. Foundation grants totaled $195,000, and event fundraising generated $132,000, net of direct expenses. This was closely followed by donations from corporate donors of $101,000. In addition to the one-time gift of $150,000 from Ron Glass' estate, the next largest donations came from The Ahmanson Foundation, $100,000, and KROQ, $100,000. (See Exhibit 4.) Due to the lack of having a California Child Care License, the Center was not eligible for government funding. While funding varied from year-to-year, in 2017 the Center had been able to raise funding in excess of operating expenses, allowing it to increase reserves or use funds for capital expenses. Expenses totaled approximately $542,000 in 2017.

D. SWOT Components Addressed:
The Board played a significant role in addressing the weaknesses of establishing more long-term financing. The Executive Director and her fund development abilities have improved the finances of the Center. The Center did this by leveraging fund development with foundations, corporate partnerships, and exploring the opportunity of receiving government funding.

E. Target Audiences:
 Mostly external – foundations, fund development agencies, corporations, universities, individual donors, and government
 Internal audiences – the Board and the Executive Director

F. Funding:
Not assessed at this time.

G. Key Steps and Considerations:
1. The Board will assess the long-term funding needs and a capital campaign for the Center as well as its fund raising activities.
2. The Executive Director will continue to secure grants, awards, donations, gifts, and foundation support.
3. The Center will consider seeking long-term funding for an endowment.
4. The Center will start a capital campaign to cover the cost of a new building or a largely renovated facility. The campaign may also include more long-term financing items, including endowments, on-going maintenance and other operating costs.
5. The Center will consider government funding once it has secured a State of California Child Care License.

Conclusions

The Center’s implementation of the seven strategic initiatives would help it achieve an overarching goal, to make the Center a model of a safe and nurturing after-school provider that other programs could replicate in South Los Angeles and beyond. The implementation of the strategic plan would also make the Center’s facilities safer and better equipped to achieve its mission to develop academic excellence and good citizenship for youth in South Los Angeles.

There was much to be done, both short-term and long-term. The Center would address the strategic plan in phases:

Short-term

The Center’s highest priority was to improve building and safety. So that the building could be renovated to improve safety, the Center moved its operations to the Mann Center in Los Angeles, within a school owned by UCLA. The renovations would allow the Center to obtain its E Certificate of Occupancy in 2019 and to meet the safety and fire code standards necessary to obtain a California Child Care License. The Board expected the Center to meet licensing requirements and to apply for the California Care License as soon as possible.

The Center was also working on improving staffing to meet licensing requirements as well as to enhance program effectiveness. Christelle oversaw staff development and program effectiveness while Naomi increased her focus on grant writing, fund development, and external relations. The Center had already replaced iReady with iExcel, to improve the accuracy and usefulness of student tests. It was also reviewing ways to improve the effectiveness of its programs, including a student survey of potential life skills programs to address current issues, such as bullying. Additionally, the Center increased its efforts to meet licensing requirements, including training and upgrading staff. It also hired a part-time Administrative Secretary. Moreover, the Center was working to expand staff where needed and to bring all staff up to the level required to obtain the State of California Child Care License.

In March 2019, the Board met at a retreat to discuss the implementation of a capital campaign and the development of a financial strategy to address the operating expenses of a new building and the seven strategic initiatives and goals described in this plan. Naomi had also entered into a partnership with Kaiser and LA County Public Health to prevent violence in Los Angeles. This
partnership would give the Center greater visibility, funding, and a seat at the table in LA County discussions of community issues and violence prevention.

The Board had completed the name change to the Al Wooten Jr. YouthCenter in February 2019 and had previously updated its bylaws. One of the improvements included adding more seats on the Board and seeking new Board members who could help the Center in specific roles, including community development and human resource management. The Board added new members Amy Johnson (Pepperdine University Executive in Residence and CEO of Go Make a Difference) and Michael Jones (CEO of Success Management and former Executive Director of the Crenshaw YMCA).

**Long-term**

Naomi’s recent focus on grant writing, the new brokerage account, growing the Board, and being able to secure government grants as a licensed child care facility would improve the Center’s financial position and aid in building expansion and renovations. The Board was also considering how to improve the Center’s long-term financial stability.

Additionally, achieving building safety standards was a top priority for the Center in the long-term as well as the short-term. The new or updated building would be safer, but a risk management plan in addition to personal safety plans needed to be developed for the staff, volunteers, and the students.

Once the building was renovated, fund raising for the second phase of building expansion could begin. This phase would allow for an increase in the capacity of the Center’s facilities from 60 students to approximately 120 students. It would also allow for space more suited to the program needs of the Center. Designing programs and the infrastructure to support and monitor these programs would take time.

Increased enrollments would put greater pressure on staffing levels and in ensuring that staff adhered to licensing requirements. In addition to increased staffing levels, Naomi and Christelle were increasing the quality of the staff. Along with higher quality staff and increased enrollments, came the need for more staff training, staff assessments, and risk management.

A more appropriate staff and staff development program will aid the improvement of program effectiveness, including additional support for tutoring and homework to help bring students up to grade level. As time goes on, the Center will reassess staffing levels, training, hiring, and development. Better staffing and programming were closely correlated with improvements in student achievement and their academic success, increased levels of citizenship, and improved life skills as well; all of which would help the Center to achieve its mission.

The successful implementation of the plan would provide today’s youth with a safe and nurturing environment, a place to learn how to succeed in secondary school and college, improved life skills to meet the challenges of daily living, and the skills to contribute to the community and larger society in which they live. With the assistance of the Board, many foundations, and partners that
supported the Center, the Center would be able to achieve its strategic plan and stay true to both Faye Rumph’s legacy, Naomi’s embodiment of her aunt’s spirit, and the vision to be a beacon on the hill, continuing to honor the memory of Alton “Dunnie” Wooten, Jr.
Exhibit 1 - Situation Analysis
(Key SWOT – strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Strengths</th>
<th>Internal Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Legacy and Reputation</td>
<td>1. Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Executive Director</td>
<td>2. Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Staff</td>
<td>3. Staffing - grant writer, administrative (HR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Board – diversity of skills and backgrounds</td>
<td>4. Finances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Programs</td>
<td>5. Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Partnerships</td>
<td>6. Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fund Development/Fundraising</td>
<td>7. Turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Volunteers</td>
<td>8. Size of Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Location</td>
<td>9. Licensing requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Opportunities</th>
<th>External Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fundraising</td>
<td>1. Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fund Development</td>
<td>2. Building and Safety Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Construction</td>
<td>3. Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Relocation</td>
<td>4. Government regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Alliances – schools and churches</td>
<td>5. Inflation and cost of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Neighborhood revitalization programs</td>
<td>7. Tax bill implications on charitable giving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. After-school collaborations</td>
<td>8. Increase in Los Angeles property values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 2 - Gangs

According to the LAPD, murder rates have decreased while violent crime rates have increased in Los Angeles, largely due to the increase in gang activity.

“The County and City of Los Angeles are the “gang capital” of the nation. There are more than 450 active gangs in the City of Los Angeles. Many of these gangs have been in existence for over 50 years. These gangs have a combined membership of over 45,000 individuals.

Gang membership in Los Angeles has continued to increase over the past five years even though there have been periodic crime decreases. One of the major factors contributing to increased gangs, gang membership and violence has been the lucrative narcotics trade, with rival gangs vying for the greatest market share.

Gangs are not a new phenomenon. During the last three years, there were over 16,398 verified violent gang crimes in the City of Los Angeles. These include 491 homicides, nearly 7,047 felony assaults, approximately 5,518 robberies and just under 98 rapes.”

Graffiti

“Of greater concern is the inherent violence associated with gang graffiti. When a neighborhood is marked with graffiti indicating territorial dominance, the entire area and its inhabitants become targets for violence. Anyone in the street or in their home is fair game for drive-by attacks by rival gang members. A rival gang identifies everyone in a neighborhood as a potential threat. Consequently, innocent residents are often subjected to gang violence by the mere presence of graffiti in their neighborhood.”
Exhibit 3 – Center’s Programs

**CollegeTrek Afterschool Program**

- Grades: 3-12
- Enrollment/Average Daily Attendance (2016-17): 90/36
- 2016-17 Enrollment/Average Daily Attendance: 60/32
- Schedule: August-June, Monday-Friday, 2-6pm
- Location: Center’s facilities
- Fees: Free tuition; $30/year per household registration; $30/month per household transportation

**MyCollegeTrek**

- Grades: Middle through High School
- Enrollment/Attendance at SAT workshops (2016-17): 226/155
- Projections for SAT Enrollment/Attendance (2017-18): 225/150
- Schedule: daily teen helpers, weekly Bridge Builders/Teen Talk, quarterly SAT workshop, annual Job Shop
- Location: Center’s facilities and offsite
- Fees: See CollegeTrek Afterschool Program; free SAT-prep

**Summer Fun Camp**

- Grades: 3-9, Teen Helpers 9-12
- Enrollment/Average Daily Attendance (2016-17): 104/48
- Projections for Summer 2018: 100/60
- Schedule: July-August, Monday-Friday, 8am-6pm
- Location: Center’s facilities
- Fees: $30/yr. registration per household; $60/wk. per student tuition; $55/wk. per student with three or more
Exhibit 4 - Summary of Revenues and Expenses (year ended December 31, dollars in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate and Business Contributions</td>
<td>$101.4</td>
<td>$90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations and Trust Grants</td>
<td>195.0</td>
<td>137.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Contributions</td>
<td>274.5</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Income</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Income</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising Income</td>
<td>131.7</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-kind Contributions</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$828.8</td>
<td>$451.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/ Consultants</td>
<td>$95.3</td>
<td>$12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Equipment</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Expenses</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>112.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Expenses</td>
<td>227.6</td>
<td>199.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$541.9</td>
<td>$449.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Income</strong></td>
<td>$286.9</td>
<td>$2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2017 Summary of Revenues and Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of Revenues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate and Business Contributions</td>
<td>$101.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations and Trust Grants</td>
<td>195.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Contributions</td>
<td>274.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Income</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Income</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising Income</td>
<td>131.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-kind Contributions</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$828.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/ Consultants</td>
<td>$95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Equipment</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Expenses</td>
<td>97.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Expenses</td>
<td>227.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$ 541.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income</td>
<td>$ 286.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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