AMERICANS ALL 2.0

People • Storytelling • Schools • Businesses • Community

Research and Opportunity Assessment

Exploring a Potential Strategic Partnership with the Major League Baseball Players Association

November 2026



The question: Can Americans All 2.0 complement baseball's existing community-impact efforts by connecting families, schools, businesses, and professional service providers through a shared storytelling platform that generates recurring community funding?

To view or download these documents, visit www.americansall.org/node/566904

Americans All 2.0 • Bethesda, MD 20817 • 301-520-8242 • allan@aa-pilot.org • aa-pilot.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I. UNDERSTANDING THE EXISTING BASEBALL COMMUNITY-IMPACT LANDSCAPE

1. Purpose of This Research **3**
2. The Central Question **3**
3. An Established Foundation of Community Engagement **3**
3.1 Major League Baseball: MLB Together **3**
3.2 The MLBPA Players Trust **4**
3.3 Minor League Baseball and Local Club Initiatives **4**
4. Preliminary Findings **4**
5. Next Research Objective **5**

PART II. A SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON OF EXISTING BASEBALL PROGRAMS AND AMERICANS ALL 2.0

6. Purpose of the Comparison **5**
7. Comparison of Major Programs **6**
7.1–7.6 MLB and MLBPA Players Trust Programs **6**
7.7 Summary of the Comparison **8**
8. Initial Comparison Matrix **9**
9. What the Comparison Establishes—and What It Does Not **10**
10. Implications for the Partnership Opportunity **10**

PART III. WHAT FANS AND COMMUNITIES MAY WANT FROM BASEBALL BEYOND THE GAME

11. Purpose of This Research **11**
12. Fan Sentiment and the Risk of Labor Disruption **11**
12.1–12.3 Fan Surveys and Lessons from the 2021–2022 Lockout **11**
13. What Research Says About Sports and Community Belonging **12**
13.1–13.2 Sports Fandom, Community Belonging, and Storytelling **12**
14. What the Research Suggests for AA 2.0 **13**
15. Preliminary Conclusion **14**

PART IV. EVALUATING THE AMERICANS ALL 2.0 BUSINESS MODEL, FIRST-YEAR FUNDING, AND STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP

16. Purpose of the Financial Assessment **15**
17. Understanding the Proposed Business Model **15**
17.1–17.2 The Platform's Intended Roles; Current Pricing and Participation Structure **15**
18. First-Year Funding and the Expansion Decision **16**
19. The First 120 Days **16**
20. Evaluating the Revenue Model **17**
20.1–20.4 Family and Business Revenue; Distribution; Retention and Operating Requirements **17**
21. Required Financial Scenarios **22**
22. Funding, Ownership Transfer, and the Strategic Partnership **19**
22.1–22.4 Funding Approach; Repayment; Ownership; Governance and Documentation **19**
23. What the Pilot Must Demonstrate **19**
23.1–23.7 Participation, Storytelling, Funding, Efficiency, and Sustainability Measures **19**
24. Preliminary Financial Conclusion **21**

PART I. UNDERSTANDING THE EXISTING BASEBALL COMMUNITY-IMPACT LANDSCAPE

1. Purpose of This Research

Before evaluating whether Americans All 2.0 (AA 2.0) presents a worthwhile opportunity for the Major League Baseball Players Association (MLBPA), we must first understand the community-impact work already undertaken by Major League Baseball (MLB), its clubs, the MLBPA, the Players Trust, and their charitable partners.

Baseball has a long history of supporting communities through charitable contributions, educational initiatives, youth programs, volunteer activities, and partnerships with nonprofit organizations. Any proposal for AA 2.0 must acknowledge these accomplishments and demonstrate how the platform might complement—not unnecessarily duplicate—existing efforts.

- This research aims to determine:
- What community-impact programs and resources already exist.
- Which audiences and needs those programs serve.
- How those programs operate and obtain support.
- Where AA 2.0's proposed approach overlaps with existing initiatives.
- Whether there are credible opportunities for AA 2.0 to provide complementary value.
- What evidence, resources, and conditions would be necessary to test such an opportunity responsibly.

This assessment is intended to support an informed decision, not predetermine the outcome.

2. The Central Question

Can AA 2.0 complement baseball's existing community-impact efforts by connecting families, schools, businesses, and professional service providers through a shared storytelling platform that generates recurring community funding?

This question has two parts.

- First, does AA 2.0 offer a sufficiently distinct and useful approach to justify further exploration?
- Second, if a worthwhile opportunity exists, can the platform be implemented, funded, and sustained in a way that benefits participating communities while preserving the possibility of eventual MLBPA ownership?

Neither question can be answered by the concept alone. Both require evidence, financial analysis, risk assessment, and a practical implementation plan.

3. An Established Foundation of Community Engagement

3.1 Major League Baseball: MLB Together

MLB Together is Major League Baseball's national social-responsibility and community-engagement platform. It brings together MLB, its 30 clubs, affiliated Minor League Baseball clubs, partners, players, and fans.

Its seven principal areas of activity are:

- Youth empowerment.
- Inclusion.
- Domestic and physical safety.
- Health research and resources.
- Military family and veteran resources.
- Disaster relief.
- Environmental sustainability through MLB Green.

The platform connects a broad range of initiatives and nonprofit partnerships under a common community-impact identity. In 2026, MLB Together also established a goal of reaching 250,000 volunteer hours in celebration of America's 250th anniversary.

Implication for AA 2.0: The proposal should not suggest that baseball lacks a national community-engagement platform. Instead, research must establish whether AA 2.0 could complement existing efforts through a different combination of participation, storytelling, local-business involvement, and recurring financial support.

3.2 The MLBPA Players Trust

Established in 1996, the MLBPA Players Trust provides a vehicle for Major and Minor League players to support causes and communities that matter to them.

Its existing initiatives include:

- **MLB Players STEM League:** A baseball-inspired educational program for middle-school students, developed in partnership with Learn Fresh. The program uses a board game and curriculum to develop mathematics, leadership, and teamwork skills. It is offered free to participating schools and youth organizations.
- **Players Exchange:** A cross-cultural educational initiative developed with Level Up Village. It connects students internationally through virtual collaboration and shared learning activities.
- **Double Play Matching Gift:** A program that matches eligible charitable donations players make to qualifying nonprofit organizations and causes they support.
- **Most Valuable Philanthropist:** An initiative that recognizes players' charitable contributions and directs grants to their chosen causes.

The Players Trust's 2025 annual report, published in June 2026, reported more than 30,000 young people engaged through baseball-inspired programming, more than $483,000 distributed to over 200 player-selected organizations through Double Play, and more than $1 million in monetary and in-kind community support.

These reported results demonstrate an established community-impact operation with programs, partners, and measurable activity.

Implication for AA 2.0: The platform must be evaluated in relation to this existing infrastructure. Its strongest potential distinction may not be storytelling or charitable support considered separately, but the proposed integration of storytelling, broad community participation, business involvement, and recurring funding for schools and nonprofits.

That possibility remains a hypothesis to investigate, not a proven gap in the Players Trust's current work.

3.3 Minor League Baseball and Local Club Initiatives

Minor League Baseball also maintains a substantial community-engagement presence through MiLB Together and local club programs.

MLB's published information indicates that affiliated Minor League clubs contributed more than $16 million in monetary and in-kind donations to community partners during 2024. The MLB Together platform organizes national and local activities around areas that broadly align with MLB's community-impact priorities.

Individual clubs and their foundations support local communities through charitable contributions, youth development, education, and other programs.

Implication for AA 2.0: Any future proposal should distinguish between an opportunity to supplement existing efforts and a proposal that would compete with or duplicate them. It should also assess whether a shared platform could add value across markets without interfering with clubs' existing community relationships.

4. Preliminary Findings

Initial research supports three conclusions.

Finding 1 — Baseball already has a substantial community-impact infrastructure. MLB Together, the MLBPA Players Trust, Minor League Baseball, individual clubs, and their partners support a wide range of initiatives.

Finding 2 — AA 2.0 must demonstrate complementary value. Storytelling, education, charitable giving, and community involvement alone are not sufficient distinguishing features. Existing baseball programs already address many of these areas.

Finding 3 — The proposed funding mechanism deserves specific examination. AA 2.0 proposes combining community participation with recurring revenue intended to support participating schools and other nonprofit organizations. We must examine how this model differs from existing grants, matching gifts, donations, and educational programs—and whether it can generate sufficient participation and revenue to operate sustainably.

At this stage, the research supports further investigation. It does not yet establish that the MLBPA has an unmet need for AA 2.0, that the platform would improve fan sentiment, or that its financial model would succeed.

5. Next Research Objective

The next stage will compare the Players Trust's principal programs and MLB's broader community initiatives with AA 2.0's proposed features.

The comparison will identify:

- Existing capabilities and demonstrated results.
- Areas of direct overlap.
- Potentially complementary functions.
- Evidence still needed.
- Risks of duplication or unnecessary complexity.

The resulting comparison chart will summarize the findings, while the supporting report will document sources, reasoning, limitations, and unresolved questions.

Research Sources for This Section

These are the principal sources supporting the draft. We will maintain a source list as the report develops.

MLB Together — official platform and community-impact priorities: MLB Together

MLB Together — seven pillars: MLB Together Pillars

MLBPA Players Trust — official programs and reported impact: Players Trust official website

Players Trust 2025 Annual Report announcement, published June 11, 2026: MLBPA Players Trust annual report announcement

MiLB Together — official overview and reported community contributions: MiLB Together overview

Important note for the next stage: The figures above are reported by baseball's own organizations. They establish the scale of existing activity but are not independent evaluations of program effectiveness.

PART II. A SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON OF EXISTING BASEBALL PROGRAMS AND AA 2.0

6. Purpose of the Comparison

The central question is not whether baseball already supports its communities. The evidence establishes that it does.

The question is whether Americans All 2.0 (AA 2.0) could offer a complementary approach that connects existing community-impact efforts with a broader network of families, schools, businesses, professional service providers, and nonprofits.

To investigate that possibility, this section compares established Major League Baseball (MLB) and MLB Players Association (MLBPA) initiatives with the proposed AA 2.0 model.

The comparison distinguishes three categories:

- **Established capability:** What an existing program demonstrably provides.
- **Proposed AA 2.0 capability:** What the platform is designed to provide but has not yet demonstrated at scale.
- **Potential complementary opportunity:** A possible point of distinction that requires further investigation.

A difference between two programs does not automatically mean that one fills a need the other leaves unmet. That conclusion requires additional evidence.

7. Comparison of Major Programs

7.1 MLB Together

Established program. MLB Together serves as Major League Baseball's national community-engagement platform. It brings together MLB, its 30 clubs, 120 affiliated Minor League clubs, and partners around seven principal areas: youth empowerment, inclusion, domestic and physical safety, health research and resources, military family and veteran resources, disaster relief, and environmental sustainability.

The platform encourages participation from players, clubs, partners, and fans. Its initiatives include education, community service, charitable activities, and other forms of public engagement.

AA 2.0's proposed approach. AA 2.0 would provide a shared platform for families, schools, businesses, professional service providers, and community organizations to participate in storytelling and a recurring funding model.

Its intended contribution is not to replace MLB Together or create another general-purpose charitable umbrella. It aims to investigate whether an additional participation and funding mechanism could complement the work already underway.

Potential complementary opportunity. AA 2.0 could potentially help participating communities connect their own stories and local business relationships to ongoing support for schools and nonprofit organizations.

However, MLB Together already has a broad national reach and encourages community participation. Further research is needed to determine whether AA 2.0 would provide a meaningful additional benefit, integrate with existing initiatives, and offer a funding model attractive to the MLBPA.

7.2 MLBPA Players Trust — Players Exchange

Established program. Players Exchange, developed by the Players Trust in collaboration with Level Up Village, connects classrooms internationally through video-based interactions and project-based challenges.

Students develop critical-thinking skills, explore different perspectives, and build cross-cultural understanding. Recorded contributions from Major League players help students learn from their experiences, challenges, and lessons.

The program is free for participating educators. The Players Trust reported that more than 1,000 students worldwide participated in collaborative activities during 2025.

AA 2.0's proposed approach. AA 2.0 includes a storytelling tool intended to help families and individuals share their personal and cultural experiences. Its proposed audience extends beyond students and educators to families, schools, businesses, professional service providers, and community organizations.

Potential complementary opportunity. Players Exchange demonstrates that the Players Trust already recognizes the value of personal experience, baseball, and cross-cultural connections as educational tools.

Consequently, AA 2.0 cannot credibly claim to introduce these concepts to baseball.

The distinction may lie in the broader mix of participants and the proposed link between storytelling and recurring community funding.

Further research must determine whether that combination would complement Players Exchange or overlap with other Players Trust initiatives.

7.3 MLBPA Players Trust — MLB Players STEM League

Established program. The MLB Players STEM League is a baseball-inspired educational program developed with Learn Fresh. It uses a board game and curriculum to help middle-school students develop mathematics, leadership, and teamwork skills.

The program is free to participating schools and organizations. The Players Trust reported that more than 30,000 young people participated in baseball-inspired programming in 2025, including STEM League activities.

AA 2.0's proposed approach. AA 2.0 includes educational and storytelling resources, but its principal proposed function is broader than delivering a specific educational curriculum. It seeks to connect community participation with a sustainable funding mechanism for schools and nonprofits.

Potential complementary opportunity. The STEM League demonstrates that the Players Trust already has an established educational program with measurable participation.

AA 2.0 should not be positioned as an alternative STEM program. Instead, research should investigate whether its proposed platform could help schools connect educational engagement, community relationships, and recurring support in ways that complement existing programs.

No such benefit has yet been demonstrated.

7.4 MLBPA Players Trust — Double Play Matching Gift

Established program. Double Play enables eligible current and former players to support qualifying charitable organizations through a matching-gift program administered by the Players Trust.

The program amplifies eligible donations made from players' personal funds. In 2025, the Players Trust distributed more than $483,000 to over 200 player-selected organizations through the program.

This established mechanism directs financial support to charitable causes players care about.

AA 2.0's proposed approach. AA 2.0 would seek to generate recurring revenue through optional family subscriptions and annual participation fees for businesses and professional service providers. Under the program's financial model, a portion of membership revenue would go to participating schools and other nonprofits.

Potential complementary opportunity. The two models use different proposed mechanisms:

Double Play matches eligible charitable donations made by players.

AA 2.0 seeks to generate recurring support through participation by families and local businesses.

This difference is potentially significant because it could create a funding stream not solely dependent on individual charitable gifts.

However, AA 2.0's revenue model must be validated. The likely costs of acquiring participants, maintaining the platform, processing payments, distributing funds, and the participation level needed for sustainability must be established.

The existence of different mechanisms does not by itself establish that AA 2.0 would generate additional funding or that schools would prefer its model.

7.5 MLBPA Players Trust — Most Valuable Philanthropist

Established program. The Most Valuable Philanthropist initiative recognizes Major League players who make meaningful charitable contributions.

During the 2026 season, the program selects six monthly honorees, each with their chosen charity receiving a $10,000 grant. The Philanthropist of the Year receives an additional $25,000 donation to their chosen cause.

The initiative recognizes player philanthropy and provides direct financial support to selected organizations.

AA 2.0's proposed approach. AA 2.0 is not designed primarily as an award or recognition program. It proposes a shared platform intended to connect community participants and create recurring financial support for schools and nonprofit organizations

AA 2.0's proposed approach. AA 2.0 is not designed primarily as an award or recognition program. It proposes a shared platform intended to connect community participants and create recurring financial support for schools and nonprofit organizations.

Potential complementary opportunity. The existing award program recognizes and supports individual players' charitable work. AA 2.0's proposed model would focus on broader community participation.

These approaches differ in purpose and structure, but that difference does not establish a need for AA 2.0. The key question is whether the proposed platform could expand community participation and build incremental support without duplicating the Players Trust's existing activities.

7.6 MLBPA Players Trust — Players' Purpose

Established program. The Players Trust has also developed Players' Purpose, an initiative that empowers active Minor League players to design and carry out charitable projects in their communities.

In September 2026, the MLBPA announced $5,000 grants for four Minor League players to support their charitable projects.

This initiative is particularly relevant because it demonstrates that the Players Trust is already extending community-impact opportunities to players outside the Major Leagues.

AA 2.0's proposed approach. AA 2.0 seeks to provide a shared platform for participation by families, schools, businesses, professional service providers, and nonprofit organizations. Its potential role would not depend exclusively on a player initiating or personally funding a charitable project.

Potential complementary opportunity. Players' Purpose provides a structured way for Minor League players to lead charitable projects. AA 2.0 could potentially offer a different form of community participation by connecting local organizations and businesses with ongoing support.

Further research would need to determine whether Minor League players, their communities, or the Players Trust would find such a connection useful—and whether it would be practical to implement across different baseball markets.

7.7 Summary of the Comparison

The programs reviewed so far demonstrate that baseball already supports the following:

- National community engagement and charitable partnerships.
- Youth education and skills development.
- Cross-cultural educational collaboration.
- Player-directed charitable giving and matching gifts.
- Recognition of player philanthropy.
- Charitable projects led by Minor League players.

AA 2.0's proposed distinction is not any one of these activities in isolation. It is intended to integrate personal storytelling, broad community participation, local business involvement, and recurring financial support for schools and nonprofits.

That combination may offer a complementary opportunity. Whether it would be distinctive, useful, and financially sustainable remains to be established.

8. INITIAL COMPARISON MATRIX

Dimension	Existing MLB/MLBPA initiatives	AA 2.0's proposed model	Preliminary assessment
National community engagement	Established through MLB Together and related initiatives	Shared platform intended to connect participating communities	Significant overlap in broad purpose
Youth education	Established educational programs, including STEM League	Storytelling and educational resources	Some overlap; distinct value requires clarification
Cross-cultural learning	Players Exchange connects students internationally	Multicultural storytelling involving families and communities	Related objectives; broader proposed audience
Player charitable giving	Grants, matching gifts, awards, and player-led projects	Not primarily a player-donation program	Different primary mechanisms
Family participation	Families may benefit from or participate in existing initiatives	Families are intended to be direct platform participants	Potential distinction; adoption unproven
Local business participation	MLB and clubs have existing business and community partnerships	Businesses and professional service providers are intended to participate directly in the platform	Potential distinction; must compare with existing arrangements
Recurring community funding	Existing charitable grants, donations, and matching-gift programs	Proposed recurring revenue generated through subscriptions and participation fees	Potentially distinct mechanism; financial viability unproven
Support for schools and nonprofits	Established through multiple programs and charitable contributions	Intended to be supported through an ongoing revenue-sharing model	Different proposed funding structure; incremental benefit unproven
Reach across baseball markets	Existing national and local networks	Intended to connect participating communities through a shared platform	Potentially complementary; reach and implementation remain untested

9. What the Comparison Establishes—and What It Does Not

What the evidence establishes

The Players Trust and MLB have active, established community-impact initiatives. Their published reports document substantial participation, charitable contributions, educational activity, and partnerships.

AA 2.0 must therefore be presented as a possible addition to an existing ecosystem—not as a solution to baseball's lack of community engagement.

What remains a hypothesis

The research has identified a possible distinction in AA 2.0's combination of storytelling, participation by families and local businesses, and recurring support for schools and nonprofit organizations.

We have not yet established:

- Whether the combination addresses a demonstrated unmet need.
- Whether MLBPA or the Players Trust would consider it strategically useful.
- Whether schools, families, and businesses would participate at the levels required.
- Whether the platform could generate sufficient revenue to cover its costs and deliver meaningful support.
- Whether it would complement existing programs without creating unnecessary duplication or administrative burdens.

These questions must be addressed before recommending a significant financial commitment.

10. Implications for the Partnership Opportunity

The preliminary comparison suggests that AA 2.0 should not ask MLBPA to support another general charitable initiative merely because community engagement is important. Instead, the proposal should invite MLBPA to examine a specific possibility: whether a shared community platform could connect storytelling and local participation with recurring financial support in a way that complements the Players Trust's existing work.

The potential value must be demonstrated in practical terms. That includes the benefits to participating schools and communities, the value to MLBPA and its players, the resources needed to implement the model, and the risks associated with participation and financial sustainability.

The long-term possibility of MLBPA ownership should also remain an explicit consideration in the funding strategy. If MLBPA expresses interest, it should have an appropriate role in reviewing proposed funding sources and terms before AA 2.0 accepts commitments that could restrict future ownership options.

Preliminary conclusion: The comparison provides a reasonable basis for further investigation, but not yet a recommendation to invest. The next stage must test the potential community need, the proposed model's distinctiveness, and the practical case for funding a pilot.

Before a final assessment, further research should also examine team foundations, local-business partnerships, and programs that generate continuing community support. These areas could reveal additional overlap that the initial comparison has not yet captured.

Sources Supporting Part II

The following are the principal sources for this section. They should remain in the working source list so that details can be verified as the document develops.

- MLB Together — official platform and pillars: MLB Together; MLB Together Pillars
- Players Trust — official program descriptions and impact figures: Players Trust official website
- Players Exchange — program format and cross-cultural objectives: Players Exchange program description
- Double Play — official eligibility and matching-gift details: Double Play Matching Gift program
- Most Valuable Philanthropist — 2026 program: 2026 MVP program
- Players Trust 2025 Annual Report announcement: 2025 Annual Report announcement
- Players' Purpose and other current MLBPA initiatives: MLBPA press releases

PART III. WHAT FANS AND COMMUNITIES MAY WANT FROM BASEBALL BEYOND THE GAME

11. Purpose of This Research

The existence of established baseball community programs does not, by itself, establish a need for Americans All 2.0 (AA 2.0). We must examine whether a broader rationale exists for connecting baseball, its fans, and surrounding communities in additional ways.

This section addresses three questions:

1. What do public-opinion surveys reveal about fan sentiment toward baseball and labor disputes?
2. What does research suggest about the relationship between sports, community belonging, and public engagement?
3. Is there evidence that a platform combining storytelling, community participation, and recurring funding could offer a useful additional approach?

The evidence comes from different types of research. Some studies examine MLB fans and labor disputes; others examine sports fandom more broadly. These findings must not be treated as interchangeable.

12. Fan Sentiment and the Risk of Labor Disruption

12.1 The March 2026 Seton Hall Sports Poll

A Seton Hall Sports Poll conducted March 5–9, 2026, surveyed 1,536 U.S. adults and examined attitudes toward the upcoming MLB season, a potential salary cap, and a possible players' strike.

Among self-identified MLB fans:

- 44% said players would not be justified in striking over opposition to a salary cap.
- 32% said players would be justified.
- 34% said a labor dispute would reduce their interest in MLB.

The results show that the prospect of a labor dispute raises concerns about fan interest, while opinions about the players' position remain divided.

An important qualification is that the question about whether players would be justified in striking specifically concerned opposition to a potential salary cap. It did not measure fan attitudes toward every possible labor dispute or establish how fans would react to an owner-imposed lockout.

Implication for AA 2.0: MLBPA has a legitimate interest in maintaining strong relationships with fans and communities. However, this poll does not show that a community program would change opinions about a salary cap, improve the union's standing, or reduce the risk of declining fan interest.

Source 1.

12.2 The October 2026 Reporting on The Athletic’s Fan Survey

An October 2, 2026, article in The Ringer reported results from a survey of about 8,500 fans that The Athletic conducted in June 2026. According to that report:

- 75% of respondents said the payroll gap had created an unfair competitive environment in MLB.
- Three-quarters identified team owners as responsible for payroll disparities.
- Nearly 60% specifically blamed low-spending owners.

If games were canceled in the following year, respondents were approximately twice as likely to blame ownership as players.

These results suggest that concerns about competitive balance and responsibility for payroll disparities are important elements of current fan sentiment.

The survey findings are especially relevant to upcoming labor negotiations. They also illustrate why public opinion should not be reduced to a single claim that fans support or oppose players.

Implication for AA 2.0: A community-engagement initiative should not be presented as a substitute for MLBPA's labor strategy or to persuade fans to accept a particular bargaining position. Assess its potential value independently—specifically, whether it can provide a credible, ongoing way to connect players and communities outside the negotiations themselves.

The survey was conducted among The Athletic respondents, and the figures are reported here from The Ringer. They should not be treated as a universal measure of all MLB fans' views.

Source 2.

12.3 Lessons from the 2021–2022 Lockout

Research conducted by the Associated Press-NORC Center for Public Affairs Research provides useful historical context.

Following the 99-day MLB lockout that delayed the start of the 2022 season, the April 2022 survey found:

- 47% of baseball fans said the lockout had at least some impact on their views of MLB.
- 8% said it had a major impact.
- 39% said it had a minor impact.

Despite those effects, 75% were at least somewhat excited about the upcoming season, and 86% were at least somewhat interested. These findings offer a balanced picture. A labor dispute can affect how some fans view baseball, yet substantial interest in the sport can remain.

A separate Los Angeles Times/SurveyMonkey poll in March 2022 found that six in ten surveyed MLB fans said the lockout had reduced their interest in baseball that season. These different findings show that results can vary with a survey's timing, wording, and methodology.

Implication for AA 2.0: Labor disputes can create reputational risks, but the evidence does not establish that every dispute produces lasting damage or that a community initiative would reverse it. AA 2.0 should therefore be evaluated as a potential long-term community resource, not as a temporary public relations response to negotiations.

Sources 3 and 4.

13. What Research Says About Sports and Community Belonging

13.1 More in Common and FOX Sports: Sports Fandom and Community Belonging

A report published September 8, 2026, by More in Common in partnership with FOX Sports examined the relationship between sports fandom and community belonging.

The research surveyed 5,572 U.S. adults between May 28 and June 11, 2026. It also included qualitative responses from a panel of 210 Americans.

Among highly engaged sports fans, the report found:

- 79% said sports give them an opportunity to enjoy something alongside people whose political views differ from their own.
- 87% said they feel a sense of belonging in their local community.
- 71% said they use sports to start conversations with someone new.
- 58% reported having worked with others to improve their community.
- 49% reported volunteering for an organization.

The report also found that highly engaged sports fans were more likely than non-fans to report a sense of local belonging and community involvement. These results matter because they suggest that sports fandom can coexist with social connection, belonging, and community participation.

However, the study examined relationships between fandom and these outcomes. It did not establish that sports fandom causes greater community involvement, nor did it test AA 2.0 or a comparable funding platform.

The results also cover sports generally, rather than MLB fans specifically.

However, the study examined relationships between fandom and these outcomes. It did not establish that sports fandom causes greater community involvement, nor did it test AA 2.0 or a comparable funding platform.

The results also cover sports generally, rather than MLB fans specifically.

Implication for AA 2.0: There is a credible basis for investigating whether baseball's connection with its fans could be extended into meaningful community participation. A platform that connects people through shared stories and local activities could be consistent with that broader trend.

But this remains a proposition to test. We still need evidence that families, schools, and businesses would participate in AA 2.0 and that such participation would generate measurable community benefits.

Source 5.

13.2 Robert Wood Johnson Foundation: Athletes and Public Awareness

Research highlighted by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation reported that:

- 84% of adults believed athletes could help raise awareness of important issues in American society.
- 70% supported athletes sharing their opinions on important issues, even when others might disagree.

These findings suggest that many Americans recognize athletes as influential public figures.

For AA 2.0, the relevant opportunity is not necessarily for players to make public statements about controversial subjects. Rather, players may contribute to community engagement through their experiences, personal stories, and participation in constructive activities.

This could be especially relevant to a nonpartisan program designed to connect people across cultural and community differences.

The limitations are important: the findings measure public attitudes toward athletes' ability to raise awareness and express opinions. They do not establish public demand for AA 2.0, nor do they demonstrate that a storytelling platform would improve the MLBPA's reputation.

Source 6.

14. What These Findings Mean for AA 2.0

Taken together, the research supports several key observations.

Observation 1: Baseball’s relationship with fans is valuable but not immune to disruption. Polling shows that labor disputes can affect some fans’ attitudes and interest. However, the size and nature of these effects vary, and considerable enthusiasm for baseball can remain. AA 2.0 should not promise to protect fan interest during a labor dispute. Any claim of that kind would exceed the evidence.

Observation 2: Sports can provide a setting for social connection. More in Common research suggests that highly engaged sports fans often report strong community belonging and participation. Findings from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation also indicate that many adults see athletes as influential voices. These findings support examining the potential for sports-related community engagement, but they do not establish that AA 2.0 would produce the same results.

Observation 3: Evaluate a community initiative on its own merits. A program designed to build lasting community relationships should have a clear purpose, independent of immediate public relations concerns. The labor environment may make it timely to explore additional forms of community engagement. However, it should not determine the program’s purpose, and the program should not be portrayed as a way to influence collective bargaining.

Observation 4: The case for AA 2.0 still requires direct evidence. The research reviewed here supports a general rationale for investigating sports-related community engagement. It does not establish that AA 2.0 addresses a specific unmet need, that the MLBPA would benefit from it, or that its financial model would be sustainable. Those questions require further investigation, including direct feedback from schools, families, businesses, and prospective partners, as well as financial and operational analysis.

15. Preliminary Conclusion

The evidence provides a reasonable basis for further exploration of the relationship between baseball, community engagement, and the public's connection to the sport.

It suggests that sports can provide opportunities for social connection and that some fans' attitudes toward MLB may be affected by labor disputes. It also indicates that athletes can help raise awareness of issues important to the public.

However, none of the research reviewed to date proves that AA 2.0 would strengthen the MLBPA's relationship with fans, improve public opinion, or produce sustainable funding for schools and nonprofits.

The appropriate conclusion is therefore limited but meaningful: There is a credible rationale to investigate whether AA 2.0 could provide a useful, ongoing form of community engagement. Whether it can do so effectively and sustainably remains unanswered.

The next stage must examine the platform's proposed operating model, the costs and risks of reaching pilot readiness, the funding required, and the evidence needed to justify a pilot and, eventually, expansion.

Sources for Part III

The following sources correspond to the research discussed in Sections 12 and 13. The numbering below continues the report's numbered source list.

1. Seton Hall Sports Poll, "Strong Support for World Baseball Classic and 2026 MLB Season," March 11, 2026. Read the poll results.

2. The Ringer, "What Would a Dodgers Three-peat Mean for MLB's Labor Battle?" October 2, 2026. Reports findings from The Athletic's survey of approximately 8,500 fans. Read the article.

3. Associated Press-NORC Center for Public Affairs Research, "Feelings Toward Major League Baseball Ahead of Season Opener," April 6, 2022. Read the survey findings.

4. Los Angeles Times, "Most fans losing interest in baseball because of lockout, Times poll suggests," March 8, 2022. Read the article.

5. More in Common and FOX Sports, Sports Fandom: Pathway to Community Belonging, September 8, 2026.

6. Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, "Stories open hearts. Data opens eyes," October 2025. Read the research summary.

PART IV. EVALUATING THE AMERICANS ALL 2.0 BUSINESS MODEL, FIRST-YEAR FUNDING, AND STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP

16. Purpose of the Financial Assessment

A compelling mission and a potentially useful platform are not enough to justify a financial commitment. Americans All 2.0 must show it can be prepared, launched, and operated; attract meaningful participation; generate reliable revenue; and support participating schools and nonprofits.

The financial assessment must answer five questions:

1. What resources are required to prepare, launch, and operate the program during its first year?
2. How will the first-year budget support participant recruitment, implementation, ongoing operations, and evaluation?
3. What level of participation would be necessary for the business model to become sustainable?
4. What funding and ownership arrangement would support implementation while protecting the interests of the parties involved?
5. What evidence would justify continuing, modifying, or expanding the program after the first year?

This analysis distinguishes existing facts from assumptions and projections. A projected revenue figure is not evidence that the revenue will be achieved. Treat the first year as an operating and learning period in which actual participation, revenue, expenses, and outcomes are compared with the planning assumptions.

17. Understanding the Proposed Business Model

17.1 The Platform's Intended Roles

Americans All 2.0 connects individuals and families, schools, local businesses, professional service providers (PSPs), and other nonprofit organizations through a shared community platform.

Individuals and families can obtain free basic membership, access storytelling resources, and participate in the community. An optional paid subscription provides additional value through discounts and benefits offered by participating businesses and PSPs.

Businesses and PSPs can offer discounts, benefits, or promotions to members while developing relationships with local families and supporting community participation. Schools and other participating nonprofit organizations can benefit from the program's revenue-sharing model.

The platform provides the technology, storytelling resources, directory, membership structure, and administrative processes intended to connect these groups. Unlike a one-time fundraising campaign, the model seeks ongoing participation and recurring revenue. Recurring revenue, however, remains a design objective—not a demonstrated result. Achieving this depends on participation, perceived value, retention, operating costs, and the ability to deliver promised benefits.

The storytelling component is an important part of the platform's identity. It gives families and individuals a chance to share personal, cultural, and community experiences while creating a common point of participation for schools, businesses, and other organizations. The financial model and storytelling component are intended to work together, rather than operate as unrelated features.

17.2 Current Pricing and Participation Structure

Basic family and individual membership is free and is intended to provide lifetime access to the storytelling resources and designated platform content. The optional discount subscription is planned to begin after the pilot period:

- $4 per month under a one-year subscription ($48 for the year). A subscriber may cancel their commitment at any time without penalty; cancellation stops future monthly payments, and amounts already paid are not refunded.
- $6.50 per month for month-to-month enrollment.
- Businesses and professional service providers pay $96 per year, in two semiannual installments of $48, to participate and offer members discounts, benefits, or promotions.

The proposed revenue model designates 90% of gross membership revenue for schools, participating nonprofits, and designated community and administrative recipients. The remaining 10% is allocated to payment processing and the developer/equity-partner arrangement. Section 20 sets out the detailed allocation. The 90% is a combined distribution pool; it is not an allocation exclusively to local schools.

These prices and allocations must remain consistent across the website, membership terms, financial projections, and any proposal to a prospective partner. Actual revenue will depend on enrollment, paid conversion, business participation, renewals, and the value delivered to participants.

18. First-Year Funding and the Expansion Decision

The proposed $190,000 will fund the program's entire first year of operations. It is not merely a pilot-readiness budget, nor does it represent a separate readiness investment followed by an unfunded pilot. The one-year funding plan includes preparation, implementation, the initial pilot, evaluation, and ongoing first-year operations.

The first-year budget supports the work needed to put the platform in operating condition, establish financial and membership systems, recruit and assist participants, conduct the initial pilot, evaluate results, and address the practical requirements of operating the program.

The first year consists of three connected stages:

- **Stage 1: Preparation and Operating Readiness**
- This stage includes platform rebuild and customization, data migration and quality checks, financial and membership systems, branding and partnership materials, instructional videos, training resources, and establishing operating procedures. It also includes addressing prior obligations identified in the budget.
- **Stage 2: Implementation and Initial Pilot**
- The pilot takes place within the first-year operating period. It involves recruiting schools, businesses, and PSPs, and families; onboarding participants; providing support; testing the membership and benefit experience; tracking revenue and distributions; and gathering feedback. The pilot is an initial operating phase—not a separate project with operating costs outside the $190,000 budget.
- **Stage 3: Evaluation and Expansion Decision**
- During the first year, compare actual results with the assumptions in the financial model. A decision about expansion should consider participation, retention, participant value, operating costs, net support delivered to schools and nonprofits, technical capacity, and the availability of continuing resources. Expansion would require a separate decision and plan; first-year funding does not guarantee it.

The $190,000 provides for the entire first year of operations. It does not guarantee that the program will achieve its revenue projections or become self-sustaining during that period.

19. The First 120 Days

The first 120 days provide a practical framework for moving from agreement and preparation to implementation and early evaluation. These activities take place within the first-year operating budget and are not intended to represent the entire funded program.

The phases and timelines below are a working framework, not a rigid sequence. Depending on progress, priorities, and lessons learned, some tasks may begin earlier than anticipated, carry forward into subsequent phases, or require revisiting earlier steps. The schedule will be adjusted as needed by mutual agreement to support effective implementation.

Days 1–30: Establish Partnership and Priorities

- Confirm the strategic objectives, roles, decision-making process, and communication arrangements.
- Agree on the initial communities, schools, and participant groups to be approached.
- Review the platform, technical requirements, existing obligations, first-year budget, and implementation dependencies.
- Establish initial measures of progress and a process for reporting issues and decisions.

Days 31–60: Platform and Participant Readiness

- Advance platform development, testing, data migration, and membership/payment-system preparation.
- Prepare participant materials, training resources, and support procedures.
- Begin school, business, and PSP outreach and confirm initial participation commitments.
- Prepare family recruitment and communications for the initial launch.

Days 61–90: Launch the Initial Pilot

- Onboard participating schools, businesses, PSPs, and families.
- Activate the relevant membership, storytelling, directory, and benefit features.
- Monitor registration, active use, benefit availability, support requests, and technical performance.
- Track revenue received, expenses incurred, and the operation of the distribution process.
- **Days 91–120: Evaluate Early Results and Next Steps**
- Review participation and early retention indicators across each participant group.
- Collect feedback from schools, families, businesses, and PSPs.
- Identify technical, administrative, financial, and communications issues requiring adjustment.

Compare early results with initial targets and assumptions; agree on priorities for the remainder of the first year.

The 120-day review is an early checkpoint. It should inform adjustments to the remaining implementation and operating period, not serve as a final determination of long-term sustainability.

20. Evaluating the Revenue Model

The proposed model depends on two principal sources of membership revenue: optional paid family subscriptions and annual business/PSP participation fees. Apply the following structure consistently in the financial model and supporting materials.

20.1 Family and Individual Membership Revenue

Basic membership is free. After the pilot period, the proposed optional discount subscription is $4 per month under a one-year subscription plan ($48 annually). A subscriber may cancel their commitment at any time without penalty; cancellation stops future monthly payments, and amounts already paid are not refunded. The alternative is $6.50 per month for month-to-month enrollment. Projections based on $48 per year assume annual subscription pricing and must not be indiscriminately applied to monthly subscribers.

20.2 Business and Professional Service Provider Revenue

The proposed business/PSP participation fee is $96 per year, paid in two semiannual installments of $48. Revenue projections must distinguish new participants from renewals and account for timing, nonpayment, cancellations, and any agreed pilot-year arrangements.

20.3 Proposed Distribution of Gross Revenue

The proposed allocation of gross membership revenue is:

- 75% — local participating schools and other participating nonprofits
- 2% — board
- 3% — state offices
- 5% — county offices
- 2% — program overhead
- 3% — People of America Foundation (POAF)
- 3% — payment processing
- 7% — developer/equity-partner allocation

The first six categories total 90% of gross revenue and form the designated school, nonprofit, community, and administrative distribution pool. The remaining 10% consists of 3% for payment processing and 7% for the developer/equity-partner allocation. The 75% school/nonprofit allocation is one component of the 90% pool, not an additional amount. POAF's share is subject to its applicable nonprofit purposes and requirements.

The allocation process is intended to be automated so that calculations and records can be generated consistently without manual handling. Automation does not eliminate the need for oversight, reconciliation, financial controls, and clear reporting.

Financial reporting should distinguish gross revenue collected, distributions calculated, amounts actually transferred, payment processing costs, operating expenses, and funds retained or required for future obligations. The allocation formula must be consistent across the website, membership terms, projections, and partner materials.

20.4 Retention, Renewal, and Operating Requirements

Long-term sustainability depends on participants continuing to receive sufficient value to justify renewal. New participants must be shown separately from renewals, and renewal assumptions must be explicit. Use actual results to revise projections, rather than treating initial assumptions as established facts.

Growth may also increase technical capacity, recruitment, customer support, administration, and financial oversight requirements. These costs must be reflected in the model, rather than assuming that additional revenue can be generated without additional operating resources.

21. Required Financial Scenarios

Before a strategic partner or prospective funder commits, Americans All 2.0 should prepare three distinct scenarios: conservative, base-case, and upside. These are planning cases, not forecasts or performance guarantees.

Each scenario should use clearly stated assumptions for new family subscriptions, family renewals, new business/PSP memberships, business renewals, pricing, timing of receipts, and retention. Scenarios should not simply vary revenue while holding all costs constant. Higher participation may require additional technical capacity, recruitment, support, and administration.

- Each scenario should show:
- Monthly cash requirements during preparation, implementation, and first-year operations.
- The timing of expected cash receipts and payments.
- Revenue by participant category, distinguishing new participants from renewals.
- Amounts allocated to schools, nonprofits, and other designated recipients.
- One-time development costs and recurring operating costs.
- Cash remaining at the end of each period.
- Additional funding required if receipts are delayed or below assumptions.
- Conditions under which the program should pause, change course, or stop.

The purpose is to identify what must be true for the program to operate responsibly and become financially viable—not to make the numbers appear attractive. Revise assumptions as evidence becomes available.

22. Funding, Ownership Transfer, and the Strategic Partnership

Consider the funding arrangement alongside the intended ownership transition. The objective under discussion is for the strategic partner to acquire all Americans All 2.0 properties and determine the entity through which the program will be owned and operated. This is a proposed direction for negotiation—not an agreement already reached with MLBPA or any other organization.

22.1 Preferred Funding Approach

The preferred approach is for the strategic partner to help arrange the $190,000 in first-year funding through its relationships and outreach. This would place the financing discussion within the broader strategic transaction and avoid creating a separate ownership interest in a funder whose role may be limited to providing capital.

The proposed $190,000 is intended to cover the complete first year of operations, including preparation, implementation, the initial pilot, evaluation, and ongoing operating requirements. The budget should be supported by the detailed cost schedule and updated documentation before any commitment is made.

.

22.2 Repayment and Additional Lender Compensation

The financing is not intended to be treated as an ordinary loan detached from the ownership transaction. Repayment would begin after the first year and be made automatically from available program cash flow. If cash flow is insufficient, repayment would be delayed rather than requiring payments the program cannot support.

The developer/equity-partner allocation would not be distributed to the developer while the original $190,000 remains unpaid; that 7% allocation would instead be applied toward repayment during that period. The developer would provide the lender with distribution summaries as requested.

After repayment of the original $190,000, the parties would select and document one additional compensation arrangement. One option is an additional payment of $190,000 to provide the lender with additional compensation. The alternative is compensation equal to 1% of the program's annual gross revenue, together with a board seat. These are options for negotiation; no selection or commitment has been made.

22.3 Ownership and Operating Entity

Ownership: Transfer all Americans All 2.0 properties to the strategic partner and the entity through which the program will operate.

The strategic partner would determine which entity should hold and operate the program. The transfer should address all relevant intellectual property, websites, domains, content, technology, trademarks, records, and other program assets, subject to verification of ownership, third-party rights, and existing obligations.

Americans All Business Corporation (AABC) is available as an existing entity if its use is convenient and appropriate. If the strategic partner prefers another operating structure, AABC could be wound down after the ownership transfer, subject to legal requirements and the resolution of outstanding obligations. The parties should decide this as part of the transaction, not assume it in advance.

22.4 Governance, Reporting, and Documentation

The final agreement should define the funding source and timing, ownership transfer, repayment priority, additional lender compensation, board or governance rights, reporting, operating responsibilities, and the roles of the strategic partner and Americans All 2.0 during transition. It should also address what happens if funding, implementation, or revenue does not proceed as planned.

The proposed structure is intended to align financing with the strategic partner's long-term role and the program transfer. All terms remain subject to due diligence, negotiation, and legal and financial review. Do not represent any funding, partnership, repayment, or ownership transfer as agreed until the parties execute definitive documents.

23. What the Pilot Must Demonstrate

The pilot should be designed to produce evidence to inform a decision, not merely to report the number of people registered. Establish targets, definitions, and calculation methods before launch, and apply them consistently.

23.1 School and Nonprofit Participation

Track organizations approached, interested, enrolled, and actively participating. Record staff involvement, required support, and whether the entity understands how its potential benefit is calculated and delivered.

23.2 Business and Professional Service Provider Participation

Track businesses and PSPs approached, enrolled, paid, and actively offering usable member benefits. Assess whether the benefits are accessible, whether members use them, and whether participating businesses intend to renew.

23.3 Family Participation and Retention

Measure registrations, active use, engagement with available features, paid-subscription conversion when applicable, cancellations, and renewals. Distinguish free basic members from paid subscribers and avoid treating registrations alone as evidence of sustained participation.

23.3 Family Participation and Retention

Measure registrations, active use, engagement with available features, paid-subscription conversion when applicable, cancellations, and renewals. Distinguish free basic members from paid subscribers and avoid treating registrations alone as evidence of sustained participation.

23.4 Storytelling Participation and Safeguards

Track stories started, submitted, completed, and shared or used through the platform. Document the purpose and level of participation while maintaining appropriate privacy, consent, moderation, and data protection safeguards. The number of stories submitted does not by itself demonstrate improved understanding, belonging, or community relations.

23.5 School and Community Funding

Measure revenue collected, amounts allocated under the approved formula, amounts distributed, transfer timing, and any discrepancies or adjustments. Report school and nonprofit distributions separately from amounts retained for processing, operations, or other designated purposes.

23.6 Operating Efficiency and Participant Experience

Track operating expenses, cost per participant, transaction costs, technical issues, support requests, and staff or contractor time. Gather feedback from families, schools, businesses, and PSPs regarding ease of use, value received, and areas requiring improvement.

23.7 Financial Sustainability and Decision Criteria

Compare actual revenue, costs, cash requirements, renewals, and distributions with the conservative, base-case, and upside assumptions. Establish in advance the evidence and thresholds that would support continuing, modifying, expanding, or discontinuing the program.

The pilot is part of the $190,000 first-year operating program. The first 120 days provide an early implementation and evaluation checkpoint; they are not the entire test of long-term viability. The evaluation should distinguish activity from outcomes and remain proportionate to the available budget while providing sufficient evidence for a defensible decision.

24. Preliminary Financial Conclusion

Americans All 2.0 presents a defined concept for connecting families, schools, local businesses, professional service providers, and nonprofit organizations through community participation, multicultural storytelling, and recurring financial support. The storytelling and financial components are intended to reinforce one another within a shared platform.

The proposed pricing and revenue-distribution structure provides a basis for financial analysis. It does not, by itself, demonstrate that the model is sustainable. That determination will depend on actual participation, paid conversion, retention, business engagement, delivery of participant benefits, reliable revenue allocation, and the cost of operating the program.

The proposed $190,000 is a first-year operating budget intended to cover preparation, implementation, the initial pilot, evaluation, and ongoing operations. It is not simply a pilot-readiness amount, and it does not guarantee that revenue projections will be achieved or that the program will become self-sustaining during the first year.

The preferred financing direction is for a prospective strategic partner to help arrange the first-year funding as part of a coordinated transaction involving the transfer of all Americans All 2.0 properties and selection of the entity through which the program will operate. AABC may be used if convenient and appropriate; otherwise, it may be wound down after the transfer, subject to legal requirements and outstanding obligations.

The proposed repayment and additional lender-compensation arrangements, ownership transfer, governance, reporting, and operating roles remain matters for due diligence and negotiation. No partnership, financing, or transfer should be described as agreed unless and until definitive agreements are approved and executed.

The first year should generate evidence by comparing actual participation, revenue, expenses, retention, participant experience, and distributions with the assumptions used in the financial scenarios. That evidence should guide decisions about continuing, modifying, or expanding the program.

Preliminary conclusion: Americans All 2.0 merits continued consideration as a potential strategic partnership. Its projections remain assumptions to be tested, and its financial sustainability has not yet been demonstrated. The appropriate funding structure, ownership transition, and operating arrangement should be determined through a coordinated process with the prospective strategic partner.

18. FIRST-YEAR FUNDING: COST AREAS

Cost category	What must be established
Existing obligations	Which obligations remain outstanding, to whom they are owed, and the amount required to settle them
Website and technology	Which components are complete, which require correction, and which require new development
Data and membership systems	Whether registration, participant records, reporting, and financial tracking function reliably
Educational and instructional materials	What materials are complete and what additional videos, tutorials, or guides are necessary
School recruitment	The cost of identifying, approaching, onboarding, and supporting participating schools
Business recruitment	The cost of identifying, approaching, onboarding, and supporting local businesses and professional service providers
Family participation	The cost of outreach, communications, registration support, and engagement
Administration and operations	Hosting, software, payment processing, insurance, legal support, accounting, and other necessary expenses
Pilot evaluation	The cost of gathering data, analyzing results, documenting limitations, and preparing recommendations
Contingency	A reasonable allowance for identifiable uncertainties and unexpected costs

21. REQUIRED FINANCIAL SCENARIOS

Scenario	Purpose	Principal question
Conservative	**Tests lower-than-expected recruitment, subscriptions, and renewals**	**Can the program limit losses and continue operating if participation is slow?**
Base case	**Uses the most defensible assumptions supported by current evidence**	**What funding is needed if results are consistent with reasonable expectations?**
Upside	**Examines stronger participation and renewal rates**	**How would additional participation affect school support, operating capacity, and growth?**

Sources and References for Part IV

1. Americans All 2.0 — Registration and membership information. Website information describing free basic membership and the proposed optional discount subscription. Verify the live registration page and current terms before relying on pricing details.

2. Americans All 2.0 — Homepage. Overview of the proposed platform and its intended benefits for families, businesses, schools, and communities. Homepage.

3. Americans All 2.0 — Frequently Asked Questions. Describes the intended participation model, school support, business participation, storytelling, and funding mechanism. FAQ.

4. National Council of Nonprofits — Business Planning for Nonprofits. Guidance on business planning, financial health, revenue sources, implementation, and contingencies. Read the guidance.

5. Nonprofit Finance Fund — Cash-flow planning. Explains the importance of timing assumptions for cash receipts and expenses. Ask NFF.

6. Nonprofit Association of the Midlands — Evaluation guidelines. Guidance on defining measurable outcomes and distinguishing activity measures from evidence of impact. Evaluation guidelines.

24. PILOT MEASURES AND EVIDENCE

Area	Evidence to collect	Why it matters
School participation	Schools approached, interested, enrolled, and actively participating	Establishes the level of institutional interest
Business participation	Businesses approached, enrolled, paying, and offering usable benefits	Tests the supply side of the model
Family participation	Registrations, active use, subscription conversion when applicable, and retention	Tests whether families find sufficient value
Storytelling	Stories submitted, completed, shared, and used, with appropriate privacy protections	Measures engagement with the educational and cultural component
School funding	Revenue collected, amount allocated, and amount actually distributed	Tests whether the financial promise is being fulfilled
Operating efficiency	Cost per recruited participant, transaction costs, support requirements, and other operating expenses	Helps establish the true cost of delivery
Participant experience	Feedback from schools, families, and businesses	Identifies practical benefits, barriers, and improvements
Financial sustainability	Revenue, costs, cash requirements, and renewal behavior	Helps determine whether the model can operate over time