COMMITTEE AGENDA TOPICS

I. Subject: Out of School Time RFP

Action: At the June 19th ED Committee meeting, staff presented an overview of the 2012 RFP process for award of Out of School Time contracts, and sought direction from the Committee regarding the new RFP release, including schedule, eligibility, scoring and award methodology. Staff was directed to meet with existing contractors and contract respondents to solicit their feedback regarding the 2012 OST RFP process. Meetings with contractors and respondents occurred on September 17, 2012. Staff will present their findings and recommendations.

II. Subject: Youth Council

Action: At the June 19th ED Committee meeting, staff presented information requested by Council on the history of Youth Councils in Charlotte and sought direction on a path forward for the creation of a new Charlotte Youth Council. Staff was directed to continue research on best practices, on opportunities for local youth council partners, and on alignment with NC Office of Youth Advocacy and Involvement and bring back options for Council consideration to advance a Charlotte Youth Council. Staff will present their research and next steps.

III. Next Meeting Date: October 18, 2012 at Noon, Room CH-14

COMMITTEE INFORMATION

Present: James Mitchell, Patrick Cannon, David Howard, LaWana Mayfield and Warren Cooksey
Time: 12:00 Noon–2:30 p.m.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Out of School Time Presentation
2. Budget Committee out of School Time Partner Funding Recommendations
3. Youth Council Update

DISCUSSION HIGHLIGHTS

Chairman Mitchell: Opened the meeting and asked everyone to introduce themselves. We had a special celebration in our community today, thanks to some of the members of the Economic Development Committee. We had the Mosaic Village groundbreaking and I want to thank staff and the Committee Members for being there. We have two items on our agenda today and I will turn it over to Mr. Kimble and let him recognize the staff.

Kimble: Thank you. You met last week and you are meeting this week and you are meeting in two more weeks. There are different points every time as many issues have been referred to the Committee and you are knocking them out of the park each time. We have two more to bring to you today, the Out of School Time and the work that you've done. I will let staff carry the message and

the recommendation here, but also as you know the Budget Committee has been working on a parallel path on a related part of this so at the end of the day, what the Budget Committee is doing and what you are doing will kind of meet up with each other at Council. We will walk you through that and where things are. Then the Youth Council is also another step in a very positive direction about how we can step up our efforts in the area of youth. I will turn it over to Aisha Alexander about Out of School Time.

I. Out of School Time

Alexander: I'm happy to be back with you again to talk about the Out of School Time (OST) RFP process. We will do a little bit of follow-up from our last Committee meeting. Since then, we've had the meeting with the Budget Committee and they had some recommendations so we will go over that briefly and then talk about your recommendations to meet with Out of School Time providers and how that worked out. That is an ongoing process that we are excited to share with you as well. We will have some discussion about your priorities, the eligibility requirements, the evaluation procedure and the award methodology.

Since the last time, we met with the Budget Committee to discuss the Out of School Time funding level, sources and agency caps. The discussion resulted in the recommendation that summarized in the memo from Councilmember Barnes. Ms. Mayfield is also on that Committee. It resulted in a three-part recommendation that was voted on unanimously so we can go through that briefly.

Finding#1: The City's allocation for OST has remained at $1.24 million for the past 12 years and the Federal CDBG decrease has been offset by the Pay-As-You-Go Funding. Their recommendation in relation to that is to cap the City's Innovative housing funding at the current FY13 level of $590,000 and that's the City's historical high and it comes from the PAYGO budget. That also means that the OST funding allocation could fluctuate depending on Federal funds so if Federal funds go down that means there would be more money available, but if they go up, there would be more funds available. Again, that was unanimous.

Howard: Tell me what that last one means? It means it could be $1.24 million or it may be less? What is that based on?

Alexander: The amount of CDBG funds so it will hold PAYGO, the City's investment of our local dollars constant, but the other piece would be from the public service funds from CDBG so depending on how much those CDBG funds we have available, it would go up again.

Howard: I was just trying to figure out what the recommendation was. The recommendation was not to do more than the amount of the local funds ever.

Alexander: Exactly.

Kimble: Again, that is a Committee recommendation so when it gets to the Council, the Council gets to debate that topic.

Howard: I'm not sure what it means in the scheme of things, but I don't need to know now.

Alexander: Finding#2 has to do with the portion of the agency program budgets comprised of City funding. Currently it is between 2% and 100% for the currently funded programs. City funding makes up between 2% and 100% of their budget. We have four of the seven City funds that are making up over 50% of their budget. Their recommendation in regards to that finding was to cap the percentage of an OST program budget that can be funded from the City. They decided that should be at 66% or 1/3 for new programs that would start immediately, but for existing programs, they would transition them down, starting at 66% and going down to the 33% or 1/3.

Howard: All in one year?

Alexander: No, for the existing programs. The ones that we are working with already, the legacy programs, it would start at 66% next year and then would go down the next year to that 1/3 number.

Mayfield: What we decided is that in order for us to be able to maximize the dollars that we have, most of the organization is doing great work if we come up with a level would give the legacy organization two years to work toward identifying community partners because we have some organizations that receive less than 2% of their funding from the City and others that were receiving over 80%, so we need to try to balance that out a little bit and help the legacy organizations to reach out to other partners and identify other grants.

Alexander: We wanted to be able to let them know this as soon as possible if you all make this decision permanent.

Alexander: Our third part was that currently OST partners that receive City funding are not allowed to charge a nominal fee for their services. The recommendation was to allow OST providers to charge a nominal fee and we will set a cap for that fee, but a nominal fee to be able to offset some of those funding changes.

Mayfield: If you don't mind, would you please give a better background as far as what some organizations formerly charged and then under our program they were no longer able to?

Alexander: We had at least three programs that formerly charged and once we put that cap on them, they couldn't charge they took that away. It isn't something that would be new to the families or new to the programs. It is really a nominal fee, no more than $20 per week usually and it is something that can help have buy-in from the parents, but also help the program offset a little bit for their activity. Also some of the studies that have run around national and looked at what cities funded OST program, a large six-city study was conducted and Charlotte was included in that study. We were the only city that would not allow for programs to charge a nominal fee.

Mitchell: Right now out of the six entities, I think Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools (CMS) is the only one that charges, correct?

Alexander: CMS used to charge but they don't charge anymore. The Police Athletic League (PAL) also used to charge.

Howard: That is interesting to me. How long has it been or has it always been if you got money from the City, you couldn't charge for those kids? It's almost like a scholarship?

Alexander: Yes, it has not always been that way. We made it that way with the RFP process so everybody would be on the same plan. In order to be able to apply for the RFP process, you had to agree not to charge. That was something that was new.

Warshauer: The thinking behind that was when we were going through the RFP process; we needed to have everyone on the same playing field so we went to a no charge format because some of them were not charging. What we are learning from this is that we need to allow people to charge, so we are going back to charge.

Alexander: The next thing we are going to take a look at is your recommendation from our last meeting. We talked to the OST providers, have a few meetings with them which has been a great process so far. We had our first meeting on September 17, 2012. It happened in two parts, and the first part was existing contractors and we talked about changing the RFP contract cycle as we discussed before going to an August to September cycle. Part B was with all of the RFP respondents from the FY12 RFP. We will have a second meeting in October to review the actual RFP and then we will have a third meeting that will be scheduled after the release of the RFP to answer questions. One other thing that has happened is we've engaged Council for Children's Rights in the Larry King Center to help us have some of these conversations with OST providers. They have been doing a lot of work around OST and they are also a neutral party that can come in and get some real honesty back from the providers. At this time, I will invite Laura Clark to talk about some of the feedback they got from the first meeting, but first I will talk about Part A of that meeting with existing contractors. We had all six of the currently funding providers represented and we talked about adjusting the contract cycle to August – September and then the impact of extending the current contracts at no cost to the providers, so no additional funding for this year. When we talked about that everyone agreed that in the long-term adjusting, the funding schedule was definitely beneficial for not just the programs, but for the parents and the families to be able to predict and plan for the future. That was a great outcome of that meeting. They agreed to mitigate the impacts through July and August of this year and we will help them with that, but there was some feeling that some were disproportionately affected. I'll let Laura speak to that a little bit as well. Those contract extensions will be signed in mid-October. We are working with each provider to amend their contract and figure out the best way to mitigate that loss. For some of them, they won't have any impact at all because they did not have a summer program because they were waiting on hearing about funding for this year so they didn't have their summer program and they will be able to carry over that funding. The impact is different per program.

Laura Clark, Director, Larry King Center at the Council for Children's Rights.
Thank you for having us here today to talk about our findings from the focus groups that we conducted with the providers. It has been a real pleasure to work with the City Council and Aisha and Tom on this process. I've really enjoyed it so far and I'm looking forward to the rest of it. We had 21 representatives from 17 organizations that submitted proposals for last fiscal year so this included those who were funded as well as some who applied and were not funded. We divided into two groups, there were two focus groups that were run simultaneously and participants were asked a series of questions related to what worked well about the process, what was challenging about the

process, what could be improved about it, how well they understood the process and the actual RFP document, including those eligibility requirements and the program criteria. Finally, we got their input related to what changes they would recommend to improve to the process going forward. Generally participants agreed that the new funding process was a positive. There was no real objection to the RFP in principle. I think most non-profits; most organizations are used to RFP processes or grant type proposals so that part was okay. The agencies that are providers were really appreciative of the opportunity to give this feedback. I think it was a really good thing that the focus group opportunity was given. We had robust conversations in both groups. A lot of participation and a lot of good feedback were given. We went back and we themed that feedback and really there were about four themes that emerged. I will talk specifically about each one of these, but they were related to communication, clarity, fairness and the funding priorities themselves. Providers offered specific suggestions to improve the application process and that is what I'm going to go through with you today. It is important to keep in mind the recommendations, their suggestions. Some of these things you might not find feasible or realistic or you may find there are things you might want to implement but you are going to have to do it in a phased in approach of over time. So keep that in mind as we go through these things.

The first recommendation was to provide clear and consistent communication and ensure a shared understanding of the funding process and the RFP document. Interestingly we had some people say in the groups they understood it completely. They felt like they knew everything they needed to know, all the information was there, and in fact, we had some respondents say information was in there repeatedly. We had folks in the same group say I don't feel like any of that information was in there. I didn't see it, I didn't understand it so I think that in and of itself is emblematic that it probably wasn't as clear as it could have been if some people felt that strongly that the information was there and others felt like it wasn't.

Howard: How many of the people in the group were professionally grant writers and how many were not?

Clark: That is a great question. There was quite a bit of discussion in the groups about that very issue and really where it came up was related to who had the advantage in the funding process. Clearly larger agencies that have funding infrastructure have fund development staff grant writers seem to have more comfort with the document in and of itself. I can tell you from my own experience from writing grants, the more you do it, you can read between the lines I think in RFP's a little bit better than when you don't have as much of that experience. That seems to be kind of how the feeling in the room was. One of the suggestions was to reach more programs with direct communication. There was some sense in the room that things were communicated by word of mouth and there wasn't as much over direct standardized communication, attempts to get to lots of the agencies with the same information. People were hearing things through the grapevine and so with that comes the opportunity for misinformation I think. Providing additional opportunities for providers to get their questions answered as well as to answer questions about their proposal. There was some feedback that some agencies were brought in to give more information about their proposals, others weren't and it wasn't clear how that decision was made. Who got to give more information about their proposals?

Howard: Was that factual or just hearsay?

Clark: My understanding is that some agencies were brought in or were asked for additional information on their RFP's.

Alexander: The agencies that we deemed eligible, they all got to come in and do an in person presentation about their program and services, as well as provide clarifications to questions regarding their proposal.

Howard: That was part of the misinformation about how that qualification was actually extended to people?

Clark: Right, people just didn't know. They didn't know how the decision was made, that some gave more information and maybe they could have given more information. Also, but nobody asked me so it wasn't clear that there wasn't a certain point at which that decision was made, based on these criteria and these providers who were invited in.

Clark: Finally, ensuring a shared understanding of the program criteria and the questions in the RFP narrative. Again, some of that gets back I think to serious grant writing familiarity with RFP's and some of us just making sure that the words on the paper made sense.

Recommendation #2 – Streamline the submission process and review eligibility requirements to promote access from a broad range of providers, specifically under the simplified submission process. There was quite a bit of conversation about the submission process itself, electronic versus paper and how many copies and the binding requirements and some of those things. Again, I think you saw a little bit of a division between smaller agencies and agencies with more infrastructure to do those types of things. Review and clarify eligibility requirements and connect those eligibility requirements to the funding goals. One of the things we heard throughout was a little bit of a disconnect between what the City is trying to accomplish with these funds and how that is reflected in the RFP. That is some ongoing work that Aisha is going to talk about later that we are helping with as well around developing that logic model so you can see that connection between goals and outcome and your funding model can be reflective of that as well. Determining a balanced approach to eligibility factors to promote inclusion of smaller programs as well as large multi-site agencies. Again, that conversation about the balance between smaller agencies versus larger more established programs in the community.

Mitchell: I think this past year there was some question about evaluation. Betty does an evaluation of a program and how the evaluation does not include an RFP. Were they clear this year that it was a separate issue? An audit is an audit and is not part of the RFP process?

Alexander: We have made that clear, but in addition to that, we do think that an evaluation is a very important part in helping them develop an agency and something that we are underscoring. We have developed some evaluation goals this year that will speak specifically to the program, some survey tools. Those will factor into the actual RFP form this year.

Howard: That is a good point because it is not just evaluation this first time around of legacy, it is also going forward. If we just don't evaluate and if that is not part of it, then why are we doing it? It seems to be a little disjointed.

Clark: *Recommendation #3* – Create a fair and transparent review and decision process that is consistently applied. There was a lot of discussion in both the focus groups about the sense that the review process was unclear, the sense that it felt like a political process. One responder referred to it as the pink elephant in the room that it was a very politicized process and it had to do with how you lobby City Council, who was on your board, those kinds of things. Other folks they didn't even understand what the decision making process was, it wasn't entirely transparent so from that, some specific recommendations came up such as, clarify the review process and make sure everybody understands how these decisions are going to be made and ensure an impartial review committee is in place. Is it just staff making decisions or are there a group of volunteers making those decisions? How do you put something in place that folks were brought into and they feel they understand and they will actively engage in that process?

Mitchell: Staff, how was the scoring? You all look at the applications and you all make recommendations yourself?

Alexander: Five internal staff.

Clark: We talked with staff about how other funders do the funding decision process, how they may be engaged with volunteer committees and things like that so we brought some recommendations about how some of that might be utilized as well. Related to clarify and communicate the funding decision process again, to just make sure that applicants understand how decisions are going to be make, the timeline for decision making, is there is going to be an appeal process, what does that look like and those kinds of things. Create an atmosphere of trust and ensure that policies are consistently applied. I think you are headed down that path by having an opportunity for folks to give feedback and input into the process going forward. Finally, provide additional opportunities for applicants to demonstrate program quality. Specifically, in this area things like program site visits, having presentations made about their program, those kinds of things so just instead of being words on paper; there is another qualitative aspect to understanding the program.

Mitchell: Who performs the site visit?

Alexander: Betty has traditionally done the site visit, again this year with those more robust evaluation tools. Betty and I will be going out and doing some site visits, some surprise site visits and some planned scheduled type visits from the interview and surveys. It will be a much more intense site visit process this year and going forward.

Clark: I think specifically they were referencing doing site visits of applicants so once you got to a certain point in the process, maybe it is weeded out some but you got it down to a short list and you make site visits or have presentations made.

Cannon: What are you looking for when you make these site visits?

Clark: That is a great question and I think that has to be determined by this body and staff, what are the things you would be looking for. Are there certain elements of quality you want to be able to see? Do you want to see the staffs are knowledgeable as you question them about certain things? My recommendation would be if you were going to do something like that, you go with a set list of questions that you are going to ask every agency as you go in there. Ideally, I think you could have a situation where maybe you have a staff person plus a volunteer from the community so it is very transparent, very objective process. You may require that certain staff is there for the site visits and you may want to meet with the ED and the program director or whatever, but you have a set criteria and list of questions that are complimentary to the RFP.

Alexander: We began developing those materials already that actually corresponds very well with the priorities and goals as we've outlined them here.

Cannon: So this is from an operational standpoint in terms of what your visit would be about?

Alexander: Operational program, child outcomes.

Cannon: That is where I was going because obviously I know we aren't the Board of Education per se, but I'm sure it is important to many of us about the level of development that may be occurring with those children. Then what would be the benchmarks that would equal success as far as we are able to tell so that we can justify our spend for what it is that we are supporting. Does that make sense?

Clark: It does and I think it very nicely goes into recommendation #4.

Howard: I know there is a process that you have in place already for your financial partners and I assume that is a part of what Betty is a part of where you go through the structure, the board, just sort of everything. I think that continues no matter what right?

Alexander: That continues and then we've added five other additional tools.

Howard: That is standard for every financial partner and we can see those copies every two years and we can put them in our package, but it may be nice to see that so we see just how thorough that process already is, along with whatever else you would add on top of it.

Alexander: That process is more to set the compliance of the contract and the structure and new evaluation tools that we put in place will look at partners. We will be doing pre-imposed surveys with the students and we will be doing feedback surveys with the parents, we will actually come out and do some observations that get more specifically into the child outcomes. Those are two different things I'm very excited about.

Mayfield: Earlier this year, I had the opportunity to attend the Bell after School Program. They did not qualify in last year's process because they were new and they were encouraged to apply again. In this process, is there opportunity or not for the Council to also participate in the site visits? That was just an invitation that they sent out. So I and the Chair of the School Board and a number of other people were there to spend some time with the youth and go through the program. I was just wondering if in your discovery right now you have considered a role that we can play in that process.

Alexander: We haven't, but I think we would love to have you.

Mayfield: If you haven't, I don't want to add any additional work; I just wanted to throw that out.

Alexander: Additional work for you.

Mitchell: I think Ms. Mayfield brought up an excellent suggestion because in going forward, I want this to be kind of a way strictly collaboration and partnership for success of the child. I think the more they can see the policy makers having invested interested, they always get excited. When you make the schedule, I think I have two in my area, PAL and Greater Enrichment. You have Bethlehem Center and all of us have CMS and St. Paul is Patsy, so we will give that to Mr. Cooksey. If you can incorporate that with our schedule, I think it won't be perceived that they are watching us, but they are our partner and making sure the child is successful.

Alexander: Just to be clear, would you all like to come to the planned visit or the surprise visit?

Howard: My goal with this process would be to continue to find ways to make it fair so we don't insert ourselves unnecessarily. That is what my goal is so whatever we would do; I would hope that we try real hard not to politicize it doing forward. On the Planning Commission, we were always told when we had community meetings not to go and talk because a lot of times when you go and start sharing your opinions, it could come to what is the point in going through the process. They have already made up their minds. We have to be really careful when we go out not to – well you came out and made me feel like I was doing great, but you voted against it. You've got to be real careful about that. It is important when we insert ourselves into the process. Site visits after the decision has been made feels better to me than why you are doing the evaluation trying to get ready.

Kimble: You are sitting on a very important crucial issue too. The difference between setting policy and administration and implementation. I would be real careful for us to structure something together, Council and staff that works without what Mr. Howard is referring to and the implementation and the evaluation needs to be, in my mind, kind of a staff function such that we can report back to you on the implementation and administration of the policy position that you have put forth. It would seem to me, I understand what you are asking for, but there might be a different better way to accomplish what you want to achieve, which is we do the site visit on the evaluation and the gathering of data and information on how well they are performing and that a different time there is a week set aside where any and all Councilmembers can visit the organizations who have been successful in achieving money from the City for this program and that we do that a separate time than the actual evaluation and implementation. I hear what you want and I believe you should get that, but how we do it is equally important.

Mayfield: What I was thinking about is that all of us receive requests from middle schools and elementary schools to come speak to the children or read to the children. I know personally within the last three to four months, I have participated in four different school events so I was thinking if there is a way, even if that connection from where we're already going to the schools to speak if we could at least let the partners know that we are available to participate. As I go out and speak to different students and meet with the principals and the teachers I hear we put the call out and a lot of

times they are surprised, so I think a lot of them would appreciate knowing that we are assessable if that is something they would like. I don't want to create anything that is going to be more work, and I'm only speaking for me. If there is a request, I want the partners to know that I'm available if you would like for me to come out to take a tour, read to the students, visit or whatever it is.

Mitchell: I think Ms. Mayfield and Ron you said it best, we could take a prime example of, "National Lights Out" for afterschool and to me that is when Council plans visits. We are going to see what programs they are going to do to recognize success for the kids and saying we are supportive, we just want to come and visit. I totally agree to keep it separate; we don't need to be in the process so I think there is a balance we can strike that everyone can work toward a goal to make sure that we are working together.

Cannon: Would you all be looking at how they are identifying their program in terms of its quality? Would you be looking at the complainant process of maybe a parent that may not be pleased about something it could be one of our partners that has a concern about a parent. I'm asking that question largely in part because I've gotten some calls in regard to that and raised that issue a long time ago. I want to make sure that if we are not looking at that that we find a way to determine how they are doing in that process and handling that.

Warshauer: In the new process, we are talking with parents and talking with our partners so we will have direct conversations with people. We will be able to get more of a 360 of how they are doing through the site visits as well as talking to people that they are serving. We think one of the things we have been learning is that parents are partners we are serving and we want to talk with them to make sure they are comfortable.

Cannon: I want to go back if I can to page three. There is a nominal fee to charge participants and it looked like this recommendation had come by way of the Budget Committee. I'm wondering if we know what went into their level of determining how they would charge and who they would charge to figure out if one could readily afford that amount or even a higher amount or no amount at all.

Alexander: It would be a nominal fee and we would definitely set a cap. Two of our providers that used to charge a fee and were new in the RFP process where we said they could not charge a fee, looking at non-profit OST providers, 112 of them across the country, the City of Charlotte is the only one in that study who has that provision that you couldn't charge a fee. It also did not mean that all of the programs that we talked to them about charging a nominal fee, that did not mean they would turn away a child if they couldn't pay the fee. They would still take them, but it is just something to have a little bit of buy in from the parents and it could also help the program offset a little bit of their costs. Very nominal, most PAL charged $20 per week and that was the highest.

Cannon: What might be nominal in my household may not be nominal in your household.

Alexander: Right and they would not turn a child away because of the parent's inability to pay.

Cannon: I read where it is at their discretion I guess. I just hope we don't find a case where a family has been turned away because a child couldn't get in. I've got some real concerns about that. I would even vote for it to be honest with you. I think Ms. Mayfield, who is on this committee, did vote

for it and in fact it was unanimous. That is just somebody being there in my growing up and knowing how hard it was for my mother and other moms like her even today are struggling with that so I'm sensitive to it.

Howard: They also mentioned the fact that part of the recommendation was coming from the Budget Committee was to take our funding down to 33%. I think that was some fairness to them, it is our requirement right now that they can't charge and I didn't know that. That was just changed last year from what I understand so if you are going to say we want to give you 33% of your funding, I think what they were trying to do was get some flexibility and kind of how they could raise that difference. It could be the difference in some funding and no funding if they can't get a gap some kind of way.

Cannon: I got your point. A lot of non-profits have to be very creative today in how they raise capital. I happen to be over at A Child's Place last week and understand their budgets and trying to help them with some things, but I will tell you we have to be conscious of what it is we may be putting on the backs of families. That may or may not be a big issue and I follow you, but I don't know that I agree with the logic of it because we depreciated the amount of giving on our end that somehow it is going to help them to make up that gap. I just don't think that flies too far, but I appreciate you putting that out.

Jackson: I just wanted to mention with regard to what Mayor Pro Tem was talking about, the agencies that are funded have always done a parent survey so at the end of the year, that is attached to their final report. All of the organizations as well have a process and a handbook that they give to parents, if they have a complaint and what is the process. If there are any complaints, I have made it clear to the program directors that I want to hear about it. I want to know about it and I certainly don't want to see them on the front of the Observer so we want to handle things as they come in so that is sort of where the process has been regarding that.

Cannon: There has been a history, I'm a product of Bethlehem Center and so are Councilmembers Howard and Mitchell. Even then they had a process so their credit even then they have been working a process.

Jackson: I was going to mention also with regards to the funding, it is good that we could charge a fee if parents feel they have more buy in and it is not just a free program and it doesn't matter if the children show up, but also if the parent is not able to pay then they say they have a scholarship that will allow their child to attend because we also don't want to say one mother tells another mother, well I haven't been paying. Then the other mother will start thinking, well, I can't afford it either.

Alexander: Some programs also allow parents to volunteer and it can create a better cohesion with the parents and the families and a stronger sense of parental buy in.

Mayfield: When the Budget Committee was having conversation, a lot of that along with the study that we were the only one that was still not charging. There was also consideration that some organizations were receiving around 2% of their funding from the City of Charlotte while others were

receiving over 80% so the question for the earlier regarding the deduction was to try to level the playing field, but doing a step down process so for new applicants that come in, they are coming in at the 1/3 before our legacy, those that are already in the system. They are going to have basically two years to transition to help them identify other funding sources and other partners, whether that is through grants so that it is a level playing field and we are able to maximize the dollars. What we identified was the maximum cap that we have seen as far as funding that I believe $590,000, that has been the maximum for a while so we wanted to cap it there because the CDBG funds fluctuate, but there is a possibility they can go up so if you haven't hit that, that still gives us money out there that we can apply to organizations, but it also tries to level that playing field a little bit. Those are the conversations we had on the Budget Committee to try to help support staff to have a clear process so everyone that comes to the table has a real opportunity and we are going through the process now of hearing when they have breakout sessions. Some folks didn't feel they had a real chance and some organizations by lobbying Council or going through other doors that they were able to supersede the process. This was all in consideration of how do we create a program and a process that is going to be consistent and equitable.

Cannon: I can appreciate that. Have you all gone back and even talked to some of the partners to determine any assumptions by way of what I got for $20? How many parents would be able to afford such? What do those numbers look like?

Alexander: We talked to some of them about being able to charge a nominal fee and that there were a couple that charged that already. All of the programs were excited about that possibility to be able to charge to make up a small percentage of their funds. They also mentioned they had scholarships students and the ones that had had a fee previously; they did not turn students away if they were not able to charge the fee.

Cannon: Do we have a handle on how much that generates for them, the ones that already do?

Alexander: I don't.

Cannon: Can you research that please? In terms of transitioning and capacity and being able to take on these children and to allow other new children to be able to take advantage of these programs, how long are they staying in these programs to transition out?

Alexander: You have to understand you are dealing with the transient population so they may be there half of the school year or a year to two years.

Cannon: I'm trying to figure out that nominal fee. They are charged that each year that they participate in the program or would it be a onetime nominal feel charge?

Jackson: It is a weekly fee. For instance, CMS when they were charging, they charge $5 for the first child and then $80 for the second child.

Cannon: Eighty bucks a month?

Mayfield: The other piece is when you think of Park and Recreation, that $55 that you pay for that program plus the fact that you are paying for your uniform, your shoes, everything you need for it, and then this is opening the door to give them the ability so when you are looking at the size of the population that we are reaching out to and the work that these organizations are doing, for me that is getting into how it breaks down. I'm comfortable with how staff is going to work with OST partners and with our new partners from the Council for Children to make sure that we come up with a way, and the scholarships are going to be there, but it is also been proven in multiple arenas that when you have even a nominal fee attached to something the parent has move value for it. There is plenty of times when we've seen events in the community that have been free events and you don't have a lot of participation, but even something as minimal as $2 or $5 because there is buy in and they are taking ownership of that, that fee changes the dynamics some for people to see the greater value in something that was already valuable. This is just opening the door to give them that opportunity to be able to identify what that fee is. This isn't a money maker for them. This isn't something that is going to make them a lot of money but it is a way to offset some of the little costs that they may have, but if it is a family where they aren't able to participate that $20 per week or $15 a week, whatever amount is decided, then the scholarships will kick in.

Alexander: You also have to remember that programs want to do the right thing for the population they serve. Even though the programs appreciate the flexibility to be able to charge a minimal fee, all of them are not planning to do so.

Cannon: We have a program called Neighborhood Matching Grants still on the books. Typically what we do with that program, as you all know is that if a neighborhood can't put up any monetary support toward the project, we have something we call sweat equity that they engage in. That is how a tradeoff for being able to get that level of buy in and participation and/or ownership such that they now are involved more so. I would love to have seen maybe that be something out there because how many parents do we know that are not participating in their child's education right now in CMS and people expect for the school or the system to do all the work when the parents needs to be sitting down and engaging with them as a parent. We have to find a way I think to offset that and I think if you are trying to get buy in for their level of participation, we should be looking at some level of sweat equity. I'm really concerned about the $20 per week on the backs of some people.

Alexander: We can look at the language around that, but as I said, a lot of the programs do allow for the parents to participate and volunteer if they are not able to pay that fee. I know that PAL has done some of those things as well. If a photographer has a trade if they can't pay that fee, they will let them come in and take pictures of the event and that can be what they do for their fee and that gets them in the program and they are participating. We can look at the language around that nominal fee and tie in the sweat equity as well.

Warshauer: We can bring you back some information regarding that particular issue.

Mitchell: I thank you for bringing the budget conversation to us so we all understand. We are hearing the discussion on both sides and I'm very sympathetic and just a personal experience, I don't know if my mother could afford to send me to Bethlehem Center as a young boy on the south side, but I remember paying by the school for my oldest at David Cox, and you are right there were some parents who said we can't afford it and I had to write that check out every week for $60. I was

blessed to be in a position to do it and I can remember some mothers saying wow, I can't do it. You heard the discussion and it is coming from real experience that some of us have gone through in our lives. If you are saying we are going to get the flexibility of not to go for the $20, just make sure that is clear because one argument could be made, what is the $20 going offset, what are we using that funding for as well as taking the City funding. We just want to be clear we are trying to encourage as many kids as possible to be in after school environment.

Howard: We need to bring this up. We are adding another criteria, don't charge a lot but we don't want to give you more than 33% of your funding. At some point, we've got to find a balance on what we are willing to do for somebody not to have to pay more than a nominal fee.

Mitchell: It would be interesting for us, what is the average cost program per child? I think that gets lost.

Howard: After school at my child's school is $60 per week.

Mitchell: Just having that data makes us kind of aware and I don't know what the other six providers average cost is per child.

Clark: There was a final recommendation from the focus group and we are already working to put some of this in place. It is to establish and communicate clear priorities, goals, and evaluation requirements for the City's OST funding. A lot of this gets back to communication as well, but specifically around what are the goals, what are the priorities and how will it be evaluated. Create guidelines related to funding amounts and consider policies to promote financial sustainability of agencies. We know we've got some funded agencies that are very heavily reliant on City funding, there is not a lot of diversified funding there and so you want to be able to give some guideline so that providers can tailor their proposals appropriately and they are not asking for something that is way outside the realm of possibility or they are not under asking what they could be for if they don't really know what is out there and what is available. Clarify the priorities and goals for funding, so what are you trying to achieve with your monies. Establish criteria or define preferences related to a target population. This came up from some providers that there are so many children in Charlotte-Mecklenburg, is there a certain population you are targeting, is there a certain geography you are targeting or do you just want children from all over the City from diverse backgrounds and populations, but it is just not clear and the providers weren't really saying one way or the other. They were saying we just want to know if there are those guidelines, if there are those criteria, what they are. Finally clarify the evaluation requirements for funded programs and require reporting on outcomes. You've already had some conversation about that today and I know staff is hard at work on putting some of those pieces into place. I could not agree more that the evaluation component is really essential and I think that on a whole the providers understand that and expect it as well. I wasn't surprised to hear that come up. Those are the four primary recommendations. We are continuing to work with the City on building out this logic model, what are the goals, what are the strategies and what is the expected outcome. We will be meeting with the providers again to help facilitate that conversation as the RFP is developed.

Mitchell: Thank you so much staff and thank you for identifying someone who has a passion for working with our kids and making sure we have a good program.

Cannon: I just want to make sure you do have information to get back from them, how many are making a contribution, how many are not making a contribution. I should say the number of parents that are making or not making a contribution and what is the total amount that is being generated overall from the partners that are collecting that.

Alexander: Remember, no one is collecting that this year.

Cannon: Did I understand you to say earlier that some are already collecting a fee?

Alexander: No, some have in the past. The FY12 RFP process was the first time we did not allow them to.

Howard: Just to clarify a question on that. Is that to cover the kids that we would pay for in an already established program or did they separate a program just for this not to charge?

Alexander: It would be for the kids that we were paying for.

Howard: If they had a program of 200 kids, we pay for 50 of them and 50 of them are scholarships or did they set up a new program just for this money?

Alexander: No, they put in a request for us that can run the gamete on operations, and the fee is something they charge for that.

Howard: After school, CMS after school, that is a good point, so they have a huge program. Actually I'm asking two questions. We have kid's scholarship in their program or did they set up a special one at a school where everybody went free?

Clark: They are mainstreamed into the regular CMS program.

Howard: So we have some scholarship kids in the CMS so when you take their budget and I'm assuming they are a 2%, we're taking their full budget and they are using us for scholarship. I'm trying not to say it like it is a bad thing because it is not a bad thing but that is kind of their setup in this.

Alexander: Realizing that CMS works a little bit differently because they are such a huge system with a lot of kids that can't afford to go to CMS, or other programs are released that aren't serving children of low income families.

Clark: Actually the CMS after school program is a non-profit that has to apply for their own grants.

Alexander: Now we are going to get back to what your charge is specifically. You are tasked with reviewing the RFP components and we are looking for some confirmation on these themes. Confirm Council priorities; confirm eligibility requirements, the evaluation procedure and the reward methodology. Staff will examine those provider recommendations to develop draft RFP

recommendations. We have been working on that and will be excited to share that with you. It will be a much easier read document and easier to outline it along with the priority component.

This is the logic model that Laura referenced that we've been working on and keep in mind that this is a living, breathing model and is really based on our conversations over the last couple of years and what I really interpreted as your priorities. If I didn't capture them correctly, let me know. There was a real need from the providers that we really need to clearly outline our priorities and our goals and what we are looking for. I'm looking for this logic model to be something we share with the providers so they know clearly and specifically what our funding priorities are. As a larger goal around our youth programs and our quality of life, we are looking at improving neighborhood quality of life through a community engagement strategy that ensures that children are safe, succeeding in school and supportive in their community. We are all about improving quality of life and that is really our role and where we see our funding priorities when it comes to OST time and the City's role in these in general. We start with our goals and the overall goals would be to make sure that children are safe, children are succeeding in school and that children are supported by their community. That is not just with OST, but Mayor's Youth Employment Program, with the neighborhood school partnership initiative and the Mayor's Mentoring Alliance. We really want to make sure that children are safe, succeeding in school and especially feels supported by their community and there is a reciprocal relationship there.

Howard: To me, this has always been a public safety program. I would love to see that keep children safe, but it also kind of keeps them out of trouble.

Alexander: That is exactly what we mean and we thought about you saying that when we put that in there.

Howard: I want to make it clear we are tying this to public safety and we are trying to keep kids out of trouble too.

Alexander: That is a goal for the outcomes that we are looking from out of those goals. In keeping children safe, we are really talking about we want healthy behavior, we want children to make healthy decisions for themselves so that includes keeping them out of trouble when they are making those big decisions. We also want to make sure that they are receiving some academic and social skills that support learning. We don't want to hold OST after school responsible for all their grades for they are there a couple hours a day where you are in school eight hours a day, but we want to make sure there are learning skills that when they go back to school, they are able to use those skills to learn better.

Mitchell: Do we somehow tie this to the youth index on the quality of life for the neighborhood? If I'm from Garden Park and I attend the after school, on the youth index for Garden Park, there is a thumbs up that James Mitchell is involved in the youth activity or there is no coalition between after school and the youth index on the quality of life side.

Warshauer: Access to after school activities is a part of the quality of life study so we have something to take a look at school academic performance of kids in the neighborhood. We've been trying to breakdown some of those so we can take a look at the performance of the school.

Alexander: Lastly, we want to look at Youth Community Connections so we are all about improving quality of life as a City and we can't look at youth as a separate set of goals and the community as a separate as those things need to work together. We want to look at how the youth contribute to the community and how the community contributes to the youth.

Mayfield: Tell me if we had any connection or if we are having any conversations with Queens University. A few weeks ago, I attended Queens University and they partner with Sedgefield Elementary for their volunteer challenge. They had a challenge to do 75,000 volunteer hours and they actually did 80,300 volunteer hours and I thought that was a really great opportunity of having one of our universities working directly with the schools. Where we are looking at these priorities and looking at healthy behavior and the art of volunteering. Are we identifying any of those components or are we talking with them?

Warshauer: We are and that is a really important component of how we structured the partnership. We think the partnerships not only enrich the child's life, but when people begin to know the kids, know the schools the kids go to the story that people tell about those kids in the community and the story they tell about the neighborhoods those kids live in begins to change. We can build a two-way street that really happens there and that is why we're improving the quality of life in those neighborhoods. We feel it is important that people have partnerships because they enrich the child's life and they also begin to change the understanding the community has about the needs the children have and the successes the children are having in the programs they are working in.

Alexander: Councilmember Cannon mentioned the Neighborhood Matching Grant Program and we've added a new program area to Neighborhood Matching Grants that specifically looks at neighborhood school partnerships and allows the neighborhood or community to apply to do something within their school or the school to do something within the community.

Howard: One of them I think is Winterfield. Winterfield brought their kids down for something and the Mayor couldn't do it and I wound up giving them a tour and those kids are bright. I got excited about that because I'm wondering from a big picture standpoint how do we get neighborhoods to understand that there are multiple ways that can support them. Now we are saying to talk to your school so you can come through the Matching Grants Program or go to talk to a provider so maybe you can come to afterschool. We are starting to get these layers now so that neighborhoods have tools they can use beyond the Matching Grants Program.

Warshauer: Actually, we are working with neighborhoods and we've really expanded the way that neighborhoods can be engaged in activities. We are working with the Mentoring Alliance Program for Youth, bringing people who have businesses into the school. We are doing a Mayor's Youth Employment Program and the Career Day. We are working to network schools and communities together.

Howard: It is a neighborhood toolbox is what I'm saying so they can actually have access to all of these things so they know they can get involved. It can be cumbersome when you say here is a website for this and here is another website, without understanding how they all connect.

Alexander: I'm glad you mentioned that because we are working on the online tool kit that would have all of that information in one place. It is going to be connected to the new online quality of line task force so if you are looking at this metric, it will take you directly to the tool kit and it will have things categorized and will list out best practices to do a neighborhood school partnership initiative. It will tell you what they did in Winterfield and how they did it. We found that neighborhoods really want to learn from each other.

Howard: To me, it feels like when you guys presented the youth Infrastructure a couple months ago, I got excited because now we've got multiple ways for youth to get involved. That is the way I feel about this with neighborhoods, we've actually got this tool box thing that we can actually take to Clanton Park and say here is a host of things you can do to improve your neighborhood.

Warshauer: That is exactly how we feel about community engagement. We want to connect to whatever your passion is. If your passion is bicycling, mentoring, recycling, there are ways to really engage your community and make the City better around that issue and that is what we think our role is.

Mitchell: What is missing from my perspective are success stories. How well they did and I don't know how you capture that but it would be good on the outcome if we have a box where they tell a success story. At the end of the day, we've got to measure our dollars and make sure our dollars are spent in a very fruitful way, but I do think it is a tremendous success story.

Alexander: Specifically look at those goals, we are looking at programs that have those characteristics and use these strategies to achieve those outcomes. You all can read those at your leisure so I will skip those. Looking at the eligibility requirements and this is where I need some confirmation from you all. Looking at FY12, we looked at local education agencies nonprofit organizations or faith-based organizations that are current after school time providers. They have to provide the OST services in Charlotte for a minimum of three years and have to be licensed to do business in North Carolina and serve at least 50 students. We want to keep the same with all those requirements, with the exception; we would like to change to say that you have to provide OST service for a minimum of three years, not in Charlotte. That means you could have provided a great OST service like a program like Bell who has been doing an excellent program in other cities for 25 years. That opens the opportunity to have an exceptional program that have had some great achievement come in the City and do some business. This is our recommendation, but it is up to you all.

Howard: The only thing I would add is provides and not somebody who did it 15 years ago and want to start up again.

Alexander: No, we had someone like that in the previous RFP schedule. They have to currently provide the service.

Cannon: Do we have a handle on what the waiting list is like for children trying to get into some of these programs?

Alexander: I do not have that with me, but I do have it.

Cannon: I'm only asking for the purpose of being able to justify your ask because obviously if there is a waiting list, which I believe there is across the board we ought to be doing everything we can to create more opportunity, not less opportunity for these children to engage in something positive.

Alexander: It also speaks to geography diversity. There are not a lot of programs on the east side to be able to bring in some programs that would serve other geographies.

Mayfield: I would like to suggest in the recommendation that they at least have a minimum of one year of service in Charlotte because personally I like the idea of us supporting local because there is a different dynamic here in Charlotte, especially the way our school system is set up and our after school programs opposed to an organization that just may have been in business. We have a lot of organizations that wanted to just have the opportunity to get into the Charlotte market. I don't necessarily feel comfortable with us opening the door for them to come to the table to seek funding just in case it is not a successful program, opposed to organizations that have been here and may be doing great work. I want at least to see you have some buy-in in the local area before having access to the services and funds that the City has available. For me, I don't know how my colleagues feel about that, but I would like to see that you have a minimum, like Bell which is doing great work but still they've figured out a way to make it happen without receiving our funding so in a way they have proven themselves through their work and now they are going to come back and apply.

Kimble: I think you are going to want a motion. Would it say must have provided out of school services for the most recent three years and the most recent year in Charlotte? Is that what you are saying?

Mitchell: Is that what you are saying, three years with a minimum of one year in Charlotte?

Mayfield: Yes.

Alexander: Currently serve.

VOTE: Cannon made a motion to "move FY12 eligibility requirement, local educational agencies non-profit, 501©(3) organizations, or faith-based organizations who are current after school care providers, must have provided OST service in Charlotte for a minimum of three years, must be licensed and registered to do business in North Carolina and must serve at least 50 students." Mayfield seconded and the vote was unanimous.

Alexander: Looking at the evaluation procedure, as we said, the FY12 RFP's were reviewed by internal staff. We used a scoring rubric that had 15 points for each one of those components and then in-person interviews were conducted for the eligible applicants. We would like to conduct site visits for the respondents this year, revise the point values to reflect Council priorities so in hindsight should the program schedule an enrollment; we would like to look at the scoring and make sure the scoring reflects the priorities and the goals. Also publish the scoring rubric in the RFP and that just goes back to the communication clarity for the providers so they know where things are going to be weighed. Considering convening a group of external volunteers to participate in the review process. We are not

sure how that would work and we don't want to turn it all over to external volunteers, but we would like to involve some volunteers in our process.

Howard: Do you have a body already in place? I was wondering if we could change to mention mentoring.

Alexander: No.

Mitchell: I think part of the Marion Diehl Center report talks about getting more eyes on the RFP process so I allowed you all to give us feedback because usually the Councilmembers can make a recommendation.

Alexander: We want to work with them because we don't know what that looks like yet, but we can certainly update you all when we have some context around it.

VOTE: Mayfield made a motion to accept the evaluation procedure recommendation. Howard seconded and the vote was recorded as unanimous.

Howard: Part of the evaluation we were talking about earlier had to do with how they got points for previous evaluations so you are going to come back with what that system is?

Alexander: Right. It will include a point designation for currently funded programs.

Alexander: Lastly, looking at the award methodology. We used the Housing Trust Fund model last year. That model funds the top scoring programs at 100% of their request until the funds are exhausted. We really believe that the Housing Trust Fund Model is the most fair and adequate way to disburse the funds so we would like to stick with that model. One thing that came up in the feedback sessions about that model, if that is the model, the City is going to use them. We are just going to up our ask to $800,000 and if we are at the top, then we will get 100% of our ask.

Cooksey: They would have to get $2 for every $1 they are asking for?

Alexander: Exactly. Because of that we did want to consider adding a dollar amount cap of $300.000 to ensure agency diversity. That would mean if someone scored high, they wouldn't take up the majority of the funds with their request.

Howard: Has that been a problem?

Alexander: It could be a problem. It hasn't been, but it could be.

Howard: What was the biggest one?

Alexander: The biggest request was $625 from GEP so let's just say that GEP came out on the top, they would have taken out half of the funds. You would have been only able to fund one or two other programs so you would have lost a lot of the programs and a lot of the diversity.

Howard: I don't mind moving forward with this, but I would love for this to be part of the conversation when you go back to the providers to just kind of talk through this one and let us know what they said about it. I have a feeling that one or two may say something about it.

Cooksey: I appreciate the cap idea. Any discussion or am I just pulling out a hypothetical situation about an approach not necessarily about a dollar cap of the award but a maximum total budget amount from a requester. If there is a very well-funded organization, we could say you shouldn't be coming to us, you've got a good amount of money. If you do a dollar count of $300,000, that is in effect saying if your budget is over $900,000, you are not going to get up to the third we say, you are going to get something less than that. If there is an organization that has a larger budget, maybe part of this could be a way to help move some organization to where they wouldn't need City funding. If we have this diversity of organizations and many agencies out there, some may need it and some may not. I didn't know if there was any discussion about it or just a cap saying once an agency has a total budget above a certain amount then they are doing well. If there is an agency budget size higher than which we would say you don't really need us.

Warshauer: There are some agencies that provide where we are really using scholarships for people who do great jobs, so if you want to have certain programs available to low income individuals then there may be a program and what we are really doing is providing scholarships for kids to attend that really need our program criteria. I'm not sure how that would impact those larger programs that might be providing excellent work in that area.

Cooksey: Another layer to that arguing against the cap concept is our goal of making sure that kids are helped or is our goal making sure that quite a number of agencies get dollars from us?

Warshauer: There is a balance in there but we wanted to make sure that there were programs available throughout our community and we weren't putting all of our eggs in one basket so that we really were providing some diversity in terms of approach. We might not be able to do if we were funding one or two agencies so we are partnering with a variety of agencies and we are encouraging people to reach out in the community to fund their budgets and developing that kind of partnerships and networks.

Cannon: This is supposed to be up $300,000. People aren't doing business the same across the board; somebody may have more capacity than others through other resources. If I were a provider, I would be looking to go for the gusto. I would be looking to get that $300,000 so I want to know all the particulars we would be looking at to ensure that they get a certain amount, but then there would also be people who would be asking for $600,000. Could one argue you are shorting us an opportunity to help as many kids as possible? The short answer would be no, it all depends upon the criteria. I just want to make sure our criteria are going to be tight enough and how they qualify for these funds. Is $300 the right amount? I don't know that it is, I just don't know and I'm trying to understand the logic behind it all.

Alexander: I think the dollar amount is up for debate for you all to decide.

Cannon: I'm only asking and we can debate it but we need to understand the rational in terms of why you came to that number of $300,000 versus $250,000, so you need to help us with that.

Warshauer: We have about $1.2 million is where we are in our budget. We wanted to make sure that we had some diversity that we are providing a large enough amount of funds that it was worth it for people to be asking. We didn't want to be out there with a $100,000 cap and this looked it was pretty much where we were with most of our programs. What we are hearing from our providers if this is our funding rubric, they would increase their ask and that might make some of our smaller programs really fall off very quickly at the bottom, that we only be able to entertain if we don't put something around a cap, we won't be able to entertain the partnerships that we might want in our community. That would make it really hard to implement some of the work that we are all doing in our community from your perspective politically, but also in terms of the partnership that we want to build. We want more people to be engaged and we want agencies to be working with more partners. We were trying to create a balance and we thought somewhere between $250,000 - $400,000 would probably be about right. It may be that it solves itself. On the other hand, what we were hearing is we may have a different set of apps next year so we just wanted to make sure that you are aware that could happen. Under this funding rubric if the top scoring agencies come forward, it may push a lot of others off the bottom. That is what we were being cautious about as we looked at this.

Cannon: One size I don't think fits all in this case. When you put forth the ask for the future, I need to know for the present if you all have had a conversation with the providers. You already know on paper what it looks like and what their capacity is so from that perspective you should have some ability to be able to forecast what that need could be, but you still would have something to go off of which takes me back to the point, one size doesn't fit all. If we know that ABC entity can do this and another can do that then I think we ought to be benchmarking off of that.

Warshauer: We had 17 providers to apply last year; several of them were not eligible just because they had not been in business enough years so we know that this year will be much more competitive. It just depends on where we want to be in terms of funding. It may be much more challenging to develop the type of partnership that we want.

Mayfield: Help me to remember, I believe in Budget we talked about a possible percentage and the reason we came up with that third is a third of their budget, not a third of our budget. One, they have to justify that $1 million budget, but we are saying the maximum you can ask for from the City is a third or below your total budget. I thought we had a conversation about a percentage as well as coming up with a possible dollar amount and that we were going to look at both so that even before hitting the dollar amount, it can't go past this percentage if we are saying this can only be a third of your budget that you can request our funding from. I thought that was helping to create that wiggle room as far as how much.

Warshauer: We have a meeting coming up with our providers again on October 17th. Why don't we take this back and get more input from them and bring back something else to you all and get some input before you make a determination on this.

Cooksey: When you go back and talk about this, I would encourage you to think about other ways to achieve the goal that this puts forth about funding programs. I'm hearing geographic diversity is a kind of diversity you are looking for. Taking into account that not everyone who applies will qualify under the filters we've got. While I realize it is more common that we run out of money before we run

out of requests conceivably if we have really good standards in place, there may be an occasion where the flat dollar cap we run out of request before we run out of money. Perhaps if a cap is being considered to ensure some geographic diversity in the program then perhaps that cap should be formulated in terms of a ratio or fraction or percentage that no more than X percent of the money available, which is going to be a variable amount year to year perhaps given our contribution versus what is available from Community Development Block Grants. Maybe it should be expressed as a percentage or ratio that no more than X percent can go to a particular geographic area and that way it balances your number of agencies, amount of money available, disbursal throughout the community, something which I realize adds a layer of complexity that nobody wanted when they can into this.

Howard: Using the trust fund model, what happens if you just don't have enough people and because you've got money to spend? At some point, it needs to be only the ones recommended and not just in the flow of scoring. If you only have enough people to do 1.1 that is what you spend. You don't go down to the next one just because you have the money and they were not considered one of your top picks.

Mitchell: Thanks for the discussion. If we can defer this item and then bring it back to us on a future schedule.

Alexander: Next steps, the remainder of this month we will revise the RFP, working with the Larry King Center. We will meet again with the respondents on October 17th. You will consider the recommendations at the November 12th Council Meeting and in November we plan to release the RFP so we will waiting with bated breath as to what your decision will be so we can release it the next week. In December, we will have pre-submission conferences to answer all those questions. In April, evaluation will be complete and a recommendation to Council. We want to put people on notice as soon as possible so they can begin to plan.

Kimble: We meet again on October 18th and I think we need to bring it back to you then because that means the Budget Committee recommendation and the recommendations this Committee makes on October 18th they both go to Council on November 12th.

II. Youth Council Update

Warshauer: This will be a much shorter presentation. We have not made as much progress on this, but what we have done is started what you all asked us to do. To learn more about what was happening with other Youth Councils in regions other than Charlotte and to learn from the North Carolina Office of Youth Advocacy and Involvement (NCYAI) about what they were doing. What we have really discovered and you also asked us at the last meeting to think more robustly about a larger scope within a Youth Council. NCYAI suggested that we look more broadly at what we were doing to really consider more of a committee structure and that is where we are going to be going.

What we have been learning was to really structure a Youth Council that was broader and to take a look at dividing them up into more of a committee structure so you could have more youth that would be engaged. Not to hold a small number, but to bring a lot of youth in and really engage them in the work of the government, engage them in the work of the community and to use them as a sounding

board on policies that really affect youth in our community. That is a more robust goal, but it is also a goal that requires a more robust staffing of that effort. You have in front of you a sheet about some of the work we've been taking a look at and what has been going on in our community and also what is going on regionally and how those programs are developed and run. We are looking at doing some additional work with some of our local Charlotte youth councils to see if we can develop a partnership with any of those that we would want to bring back to you on how we could expand on their work to engage a larger number of youth around the work of government and creating advice. We are looking at youth councils that are more around youth advocacy than youth service projects. A number of agencies have youth that really do projects and are asking the youth to work on a specific target. That is not what the youth council that we are considering is; we are really looking at them to advise us. Some components of them and some of their committee structure may have specific goals in a way of Neighborhood Matching Grants. They are interested in recycling or environment, they may be interested in planning or more interested in employment, so we may have the youth council that has different committees who are interested in doing different projects, but the overall structure would be one that was much broader. We are taking a look at Generation Nation and some of the other agencies, Foundation of the Carolinas, Mecklenburg Ministries, other organizations of structure and we will be working with them to set up a youth council for Charlotte to bring back to you.

Alexander: Generation Nation used to be Kid's Voting and they are restructuring some of their program goals to look at the advocacy as a platform so they may be a natural partner since they are already working in some of the schools. We have had some initial discussions with all of these different groups but before we come back with a formal recommendation for you, we want to spend some additional time with each one of them to figure out exactly how things work and go and come back with a recommendation to you.

Mitchell: You know I take pride in some of the Committee Members are always passionate about, we have Cooksey who has been passionate about entrepreneurship and Ms. Mayfield has been passionate about incentives to include more jobs created. The youth council is very fortunate that we had both Mayor Pro Tem Cannon and Councilmember Howard collaborating on this. I'm going to yield to them to talk about their vision for the youth council.

Howard: When I was doing the research for this, I talked to Tracy in the Mayor's Office and that was around the same time that Kid's Voting was doing its transition to Generation Nation and there was a lot of enthusiasm on their part to be included in what I was talking about at the time. Their intent from the beginning was to be part of this conversation. I just couldn't get this conversation going fast enough with everything else that we had going on.

Warshauer: We had a great meeting with Generation Nation and they were real excited and it involved about 120 kids in 12 different high schools. We really liked the platform they had because it was really broad and it was much more robust and engaged and they allowed any kid to serve.

Howard: I'd love to know how they are doing it with 100 kids. That would really be interesting to me, maybe not today, but if you come back with that as a recommendation. I always thought it would be 21 kids or less that would be involved. The other group that was real instrumental in getting me to think about it was Union County. They have one and every year they take kids to Washington for our lobbying meeting with the National League of Cities (NLC) and they bring a group every year and I

think part of that research I gave you should be some write-up about what they are doing in Union County. The Chair also included youth in national leadership training this past year, which is another one of those things that if NLC continues to develop that proponent, that is something else we add as a possible activity for the kids. He entitled it "Passing the Gavel" and I think if he has his way, NLC will keep adding layers. Union County has already taken it from just local to exposing them to national.

Alexander: One of the things that the State Youth Council Organization looks at was that committee structure so they encourage you to be broad and involve as many kids as possible. They suggest letting the 120 kids elect their own governing body of 12 to 15 and how to be more interactive with you all and would take that information back to the larger body.

Howard: Is that like the Model UN program in the schools and local colleges where they come together around issues?

Alexander: The Model UN does not look at not real issues so we would let them look at real policy issues that you are actually working on and come back with actual recommendations. In theory, that is what we are talking about.

Cannon: Let me thank staff for hearing us prior and going off and pulling together some really good information that I think you can build upon. I think the direction you are going in is perfect in terms of next steps, which are to go out and develop a clear purpose for the youth council and how it relates to the current Charlotte youth programs. I noticed that you are going to be inducting site visits to Charlotte Youth Council and surrounding cities and counties with youth councils. Would you also be engaging with other youth type organizations like some of the mentoring organizations we have between Big Brothers and Big Sisters where you target certain demographic to go after and from there gain some level of insight and input? The only thing I don't see in here that I would propose is that it gets them engaged with City Council, that was really good and Councilmember Mitchell didn't really say it, but he has been a big part of this quietly in his own humble way about wanting to bring the Youth Involvement Council back. That is what we used to call it back in the day. The one thing I would like to see if it could happen, we are trying to build future leaders in this community and if that is the case, a part of that is trying to make sure they have some kind of economic grounds or foundation so where they could be engaged with some other companies already tied into us for apprenticeship opportunities. I think that might help along the way as we try to, not just have them be a part of a program or organization, but now it is really worthwhile and now here is a bigger demand. I'm sure Charlotte can surpass those big numbers, the question becomes are we able to manage 100 plus kids. I'd like to see a greater capacity or level of involvement for those youth that is not so costly to us that maybe some of the private sector can wrap their arms around and get behind the Mayor's push of what it is we are trying to do to expose our youth.

Mitchell: Councilmember Howard and I both received an e-mail from Men Who Care Global because they've been working with youth and they have a unique program where they have been able to develop some partnership where the youth work with the private sector. I know we have Executive Director Earl and then we have who we call mentor because he helped three of us get elected, Ron Leeper. Can you talk about the initiative you are doing because you talk about employing our youth and some opportunities with the private sector?

Leeper: Let me be respectful of your time and I appreciate you sharing with me. I just saw a little bit about talking about youth, and every time I hear discussion in the community about our youth, it picks my interest so I wanted to come and hear what you were talking about. I will share some information with you, but what I would like to do is challenge you as our City leaders to think about all of our kids. There are a lot of programs out there that are dealing with kids who are tracking pretty well and they are going for the most part to succeed because they have the support systems in place. There are a lot of mentoring opportunities with a lot of good programs that are really working well. There is another group of kids in our community that you all have experienced with me with our major events in the City where we've been out trying to provide some guidance and direction for some of the kids who are not tracking very well at all. In fact, in most cases, have given up and some of the kids have dropped out of school and some of them have graduated from school and don't have very much direction about what they are going to do next. We've hit a spike in the economic times that we are in, obviously jobs are scarce as they are and for many of these young people who haven't really prepared themselves either through school or by dropping out, they are just a drain on our community and they are going to adversely affect all of us in some way or another. While you are thinking about youth and how we can deal with youth, I challenge you to consider looking at this group of youth as well. One of the things I shared with Councilmember Mitchell which resulted in him inviting me to come down was sort of out of frustration. Men Who Care Globally are committed to dealing with African-American males from 13 to 22 years old, and as a result of our engaging some of the kids on the street, we have found out multiple things about them, where they are in life and what kind of barriers they are confronted with. As a result of that, we set up a summer program this summer with a small group of kids on a trial basis, just trying to figure out how to get them engaged. Many of these kids have already been involved with the judicial system, many of them are on the way of dropping out or have dropped out of school and most of these kids are 16 to 21 maybe. We developed a summer program with the Urban League to try to keep them off the street during the summer because that is when many kids who are not employed, who are not motivated to do other things, they generally are getting in trouble. They are either breaking into your homes or my home or doing something else that they ought to not be able to do. We started this program and took a number of kids through it only to find out through our frustration that we thought there were going to be some employment opportunities for them at the end of the training and it wasn't. As a result of it, more out of frustration than anything else, I developed an intern apprenticeship program with my company and we are going to take two of the kids, we've already hired one of them. We took them through some soft skills training, got them ready and I've actually employed them. The intern is sort of based on a 90-day intern, let's see if we like you and you like us and you are willing to do the things that you need to do. If that works in the 90 days, then it goes to an apprenticeship program and through that program every sub-contractor that comes on my job, I've asked them to allow this youth to work with them for a period of time on that job to get exposed to, whether it is pouring concrete or painting or framing or hanging dry wall or whatever, electrical and at some point in time, we will evaluate him to see if he finds something that he likes. If he does then we are going to pay for him to go to Central Piedmont while he works. After he gets off work, he goes and takes up this additional training that we will pay for. We've been fortunate to get CATS to provide us some bus passes so we are trying to take down every barrier we can find. We are pretty excited about this young man right now that has been on the job and we hope that in some point in time he is going to select one of these trades and we're going to be talking to our sub-contractors to get them to hire him, then we are going to bring on another one. There is no reason with the amount of money that

the City spends on infrastructure whether it is doing curb and gutter or vertical construction that you ought not have a component to your program that says you get the City money, here is what you need to do. You need to have an intern, an apprentice, and we've got a program that is developed that you can follow. I'm paying for this young man and we started off with $9 per hour, when he moves to the apprentice stage he will get $10 per hour.

The developer who is part of this project we are working on has also agreed to contribute to pay whatever they need to pay, but just think if we got a number of businesses in this community to say we are willing to try this and there may be some opportunities where you have some resources where you can defray some of the costs. If you said to an employer and they were going to hire somebody for $8 an hour and you said we will pay $4 for six months for you to take them and try them out. That is an incentive for employers to say, well, you know we need somebody and I don't have to pay all the freight. I'm not asking you to do that for me, I'm just saying that could be an incentive particularly resources you have in these corridors where there is activity going on that you were influencing by using your public leverage and dollars. I said all that to say we've got to do a better job. Everybody is talking about jobs and everybody is training these kids to death. You can find some who have been to ten training programs; they've got ten certificates and no job. It is a waste of money. There needs to be something at the end of the line, otherwise, you just further frustrate these kids. That is a group of kids that nobody is dealing with and I'm challenging you and encouraging you to consider as you talk about youth in the community, don't just talk about the youth that look like they are going to make it anyway. I don't mean you shouldn't be doing something in that area, but I'm saying there is another group of kids that everybody has written off and in many cases they have written themselves off.

Mayfield: I want to mention that Mr. Ratchford and I had a conversation earlier this week because I reached out to him because unfortunately there was another killing last week off of Garibaldi. We started a conversation about what we really can do on the ground in the community and I said clearly I don't know what to do in that instance, but during that conversation he shared the work that you have taken on and the fact that as you mentioned, the program you all thought it would be one thing and the young men went through the program, but the jobs weren't there. My question for you is do you foresee there being any legal push back for us to try to move toward a model where we have a component that actually connects our youth to these apprenticeships or creating an apprenticeship and actually getting that commitment on the front end?

Kimble: My answer would be the preferred method would through strong encouragement and community pull together of the private, public and non-profit sector. I think it is a more difficult challenge legally if you want to mandate it so we need to look through that to determine what the best method to achieve success is.

Mayfield: Looking at putting that as part of our requirement because there is push back to anything. There is push back to change and I'm not necessarily a fan of we might go to court, that is what we have a whole set of attorneys for as far as I'm concerned and it is job security for them. But if there is a way for us to put it in our contract in order to open that door so we are having a real impact? I would like for us to have a conversation about what that could look like.

Kimble: There would be legal issue hurtles to clear if your goal is to put that as a requirement or a mandated program as a condition of getting contract awards.

Howard: I think it is clear to everybody in this room why we call him "Mitchell" because he is always thinking what we should be doing next as a community. I'm not sure how it fits into the Youth Council, but I can tell you personally Mr. Leeper for me, I think there is probably a level between the ones that are going to be okay and the ones you are talking about and I call them "David" because I could have gone either way at one point. There were some people who reached out to me to make sure that I pushed the other way for the most part. I'm concerned about that middle ground as going down and that was what I was thinking about when we started talking about the Youth Council, not necessarily just the ones that are already in student government, but the ones that could use a push here or there just to keep them going in the right direction. I'm not sure where this falls, if this is a different subject or what we should do with it, but it is not one that we should just let go, that's for sure. Ms. Mayfield has been talking about jobs and how we create jobs and part of that is definitely making sure that the young people have jobs because they become our problems in the future if we don't.

Leeper: When you see five kids kill one kid because they are saying something about respect and I feel like that is something lacking in what all of us collectively are doing when kids form the opinion about where respect comes from and how important that is versus somebody's life. This kid that I hired recently is going to set an example for some other kids who have given up, who said nobody cares about us, nobody is going to give us a chance. I've been to court and I messed up, I broke into somebody's car and I'm never ever going to have a chance. There are a lot of kids out there who sort of form that opinion, and unless we are willing to say that is not the end of the world, you made a mistake and this community is not giving up on kids because they make mistakes. Otherwise, there are many of us who wouldn't be here today. I'm challenging you and I hear what Mr. Kimble is saying and you now I've sat in your seat and I've heard all the conversation about when you set up an MWBE Program or when you set up an SBE Program you know you are going to be challenged and you know you are going to court and people are going to object to it. I'm not saying it is easy, but we ought to be able to create some examples where people want to do this, where people feel like there is a buy-in for me to do this. More than forcing people to do it, we ought to create the environment where people say we can point to some examples and say that is the reason we want to do business with R. J. Leeper Company because they care more about just making profits here, they care about the well-being of the community. That is the kind of competition we ought to be trying to create where people say, oh that is a part of the City's program, we'll take a kid.

Howard: I think with some of the things we've talked about with the youth employment, the Mayor's Youth Employment Program, even having the Chamber here, but having all the folks that are involved in economic development. It would be nice to have a conversation around how we integrate what he is talking about, not just in this, but everything we do. You told me about the program you guys are doing at the Chamber where you are doing apprenticeships with different companies. It is kind of the same thing. What you are doing is going back to that infrastructure that is put in place and say how we take it down to another level so that we bring in another City component that is important to us and how do we do it together.

Leeper: It is small minority businesses with a larger firm. Chief Monroe has given us a lot of acqulays about being out there when many of the men would probably rather be home with their families. They are out there on the street trying to encourage kids to conduct themselves in a proper manner and what I'm suggesting to you is we need to have some carrot for these kids when we engage them and say you need to behave this way, we need to be able to have another carrot to say, and if you do, these things that we are suggesting you do, we are not going to leave you hanging. We are going to help you develop the necessary skills you need to have and we are going to be able to point you to some employers who will hire you. We are asking you to help us with some tools that we can help these kids with other than just say keep the neighbors quiet during these major events in our town and we appreciate it.

Cannon: Staff, I think in terms of directives, I think all you've heard gets us down to the second bullet in next steps and a combination of the first step, but to talk about developing a platform of engagement from City Council. It may be if you look around some of our focus areas that the Council is engaged in between Public Safety, Transportation, Economic Development, etc., that is where we try to streamline some of the youth in terms of what can be considered within the things they go through or experience with Youth Council. The piece relative to, we have these Business Investment Grants and we have set where we will say a certain number of jobs have to be committed to the Charlotte area in the way or whether or not we want to move forward. If there are not enough jobs there, I don't know if there is anybody on this Committee or anybody on Council would move approval on something like that where there is zero jobs in Charlotte, but yet other jobs outside the parameter. I don't see anything too much different about what is being suggested because that is where you are going. There is a level of standards and expectation, but if we don't begin to change the culture in this community, Charlotte will never ever get to a degree of where it should be. You go to other cities and they have culture of doing certain things. I had a guy come to me and say who do I meet with to bring about some minority participation because he was told by some other leadership that you don't have to meet with anybody to do that kind of thing. But in a city like Atlanta, where he was from, it was just within him to come to me to ask who he should get with because a culture was already created. We have to do the same thing as it relates to our youth. If it means being more progressive and aggressive, which is what I'm hearing, I think that is exactly where we ought to be going. As we talk about trying to cultivate developing that clear purpose because you are getting some other information prior to the meeting on June 21st. Let's see if it is alright Mr. Chair, if we can go and start trying to develop what something might look like around our focus area, but more so and particularly around the economic development side as we talk about apprenticeships that could lead to employment opportunities. Mr. Leeper, were those apprenticeships with your company paid or non-paid?

Leeper: They are paid. We start them at $9 per hour and after a 90-day period if he has shown that he is committed to it, he is coming to work on time and doing those things we've asked him to do, then he moves to $10 per hour. That comes out of my profit and I'm not asking anybody else to do that but the interesting thing is the developer and others who have been a part of this have bought into it and said, great idea, how can we help. This is the first time we've tried this, but I believe it is something that will catch on to others and really begin to make a difference in our community. We can say all we want to say, but these kids who get a chance to change their lives, they can tell the story much better than we can tell it. We spend a lot of money on keeping kids out of gangs, and I'm

not sure what that means. You can't just talk to people and tell them to stay out of gangs, but I don't have anything else for you.

Cannon: It is hard for me to believe that Chiquita or some of the other companies that have come here on our dime, or the Chamber's level of involvement, would not want to embrace. I really believe if we had approached Chiquita or any of these companies that they would have been more than happy, but I don't believe from where we sit have taken the first step to ask them would you engage our youth in some level or aspect. I think we have to start taking some additional steps and use some other lines of thinking.

Warshauer: We have a Mayor's Youth Employment Program and we talk a lot to employers about their participation. One of the great things that your story really resonates with us in the Mayor's Youth Employment Program is we have people that say I can't take on an intern. We intentionally do our career day and what we find is when people meet the kids, they find these are really great kids and I really want to do something. We frequently have situations where we are doing this exposure to help kids but another reason for those exposures is that we find that businesses want to become more and more engaged in the kids. The more they realize those kids are not that different from their own kids, those kids have good days and bad days and most parent experiences good days and bad days with their kids. What we are finding is the more engagement we offer to employers, the deeper our relationship gets with those employers and the easier it is for us to take those two paid positions. We are very excited about how some of that works.

Leeper: We are not saying we know all there is to know about this, but I'm saying we've got to drive the stake in the ground at some point in time and say we are committed to try to figure out how to make this work. We stand ready to work with you.

Cannon: Tom, do you know how many of our youth Chiquita has over there with them?

Warshauer: I don't know we have anything with Chiquita.

Cannon: What about Husqvarna?

Alexander: They have some and I don't know how many but Chiquita does not.

Cannon: There are a few that aren't engaged like that and MYEP is doing an excellent job. I was just trying to find a way to marry them such that we are away from the liability aspects that have to be brought up that I think we can get around. We've been doing it successfully with other things; I think we can find a way to get there with this too.

Mitchell: Mr. Leeper, you shared with me, but can you send that e-mail about your program to City staff and other Committee members?

Leeper: I wonder if I could just give it to them now.

Mitchell: David and LaWana joined me for the Youth Summit and there was a Councilmember from Maryland who showed us a champion for youth. They give out to the business community who

champion, hire a youth and they have a sticker in the window … champion a youth. It is a small city, no more than 17,000, but this is a great idea we can learn from them and the City has a ceremony and they bring up the company and they all get a pin that says champion of youth. I think that is a program we could put in place that would give those companies that recognition and it makes the kids feel good and makes the City feel good and it is a win/win for all of us. I've got to apologize for going over but this was our youth day. Everything we did today was around the youth.

Kimble: You are scheduled for a longer conversation about MWSBE and we will bring back the issues on OST to resolve those so you can make a recommendation for the November 12th Council Meeting.

Mitchell: Committee, we need to have a brief discussion about the tour and the Carolina Theatre.

Adjourned: 2:30p.m.

Economic Development Council Committee
October 4, 2012 at Noon
Room CH-14

Committee Members: James Mitchell, Chair
Patrick Cannon, Vice Chair
Warren Cooksey
David Howard
LaWana Mayfield

Staff Resource: Ron Kimble, Deputy City Manager

AGENDA

I. OUT OF SCHOOL TIME RFP – 60 minutes

Staff: Tom Warshauer & Aisha Alexander, Neighborhood & Business Services

Action: At the June 19th ED Committee meeting, staff presented an overview of the 2012 RFP process for award of Out of School Time contracts, and sought direction from the Committee regarding the new RFP release, including schedule, eligibility, scoring and award methodology. Staff was directed to meet with existing contractors and contract respondents to solicit their feedback regarding the 2012 OST RFP process. Meetings with contractors and respondents occurred on September 17, 2012. Staff will present their findings and recommendations. **Attachment**

II. YOUTH COUNCIL - 30 minutes

Staff: Tom Warshauer & Aisha Alexander, Neighborhood & Business Services

Action: At the June 19th ED Committee meeting, staff presented information requested by Council on the history of Youth Councils in Charlotte and sought direction on a path forward for the creation of a new Charlotte Youth Council. Staff was directed to continue research on best practices, on opportunities for local youth council partners, and on alignment with NC Office of Youth Advocacy and Involvement and bring back options for Council consideration to advance a Charlotte Youth Council. Staff will present their research and next steps.

III. NEXT MEETING DATE: October 18, 2012 at Noon, Room CH-14

Tentative Schedule:

- Disparity Study/MWSBE Program Update

Distribution: Mayor/City Council Curt Walton, City Manager Leadership Team Executive Team

CHARLOTTE.

OFFICE OF CITY COUNCIL
M E M O R A N D U M

September 18, 2012

TO: Council member James Mitchell Jr., Economic Development Committee Chair

FROM: Council member Michael D. Barnes, Budget Committee Chair

SUBJECT: Budget Committee Out-of-School Time (OST) Partner Funding Recommendations

---

At the May 16th Budget Adjustments Meeting, City Council referred two OST items for Council committee review. This included review of OST funding level caps and funding sources to the Budget Committee and review of the OST RFP process to the Economic Development Committee. The purpose of this memorandum is to share the Budget Committee's recommendations.

Finding #1: The City's total allocation for OST has remained at $1.24 million for the past 12 years, despite annual decreases in Federal CDBG funding available for OST. The Federal CDBG decrease has been offset by increases in funding from the City's Innovative Housing account within the Pay-As-You-Go (PAYGO) capital budget.

> Excluding a General Fund contribution to Partners In Out of School Time funding from FY08 through FY10 and a one-time contribution from Capital Reserves in FY2013 to the Greater Enrichment Program, the Budget Committee's findings showed that the total CDBG and Innovative Housing funding (the City's two traditional OST funding sources) has remained flat at $1.24 million over the past 12 years. However, during this time the funding source mix has shifted as follows:

Fiscal Year	Federal CDBG Funding %	City Innovative Housing Funding %
FY2002	75%	25%
FY2013	53%	47%

> The annual reduction in federal funding has been offset with increased City funding to maintain a $1.24 million total OST funding level. The Budget Committee's sentiment was that this funding trend is unsustainable. The current funding trend results in less available PAYGO funding for other city priorities such as housing programs or capital maintenance programs.

Committee Recommendation #1: Cap the City's Innovative Housing funding at the current FY2013 level of $590,000 (the City's highest historical level). The City's total OST funding

allocation could fluctuate depending on federal CDBG funding levels. (Unanimous vote: Barnes, Dulin, Fallon, Kinsey, and Mayfield)

Finding #2: The portion of OST agency program budgets comprised of City funding varies from 2% to 100% with four of the seven City-funded OST programs receiving over 50% of their program budget from the City.

> Committee consensus was that greater diversification of sources funding an OST agency program would strengthen an agency's long-term financial stability. National best practices indicate that caps:
>
> - Reinforce that funding is limited and may not continue,
> - Help wean programs off of City dependency and encourage funding diversification, and
> - Reinforce competiveness of the funding process.
>
> Furthermore, a study on the *Cost of Quality Out of School Time Programs* from the Wallace Foundation and Public/Private Ventures reported that the average OST program budget was comprised of approximately 33% from governmental sources. The City of Charlotte's FY2013 average percentage is 47%.

Recommendation #2: Cap the percentage of an OST agency program budget that can be funded from the City. Transition existing City legacy OST partners to no greater than 66% in first year, then to no greater than 33% in second year and thereafter. New OST partners would be capped at no greater than 33% from the start of funding. (Unanimous vote: Barnes, Dulin, Fallon, Kinsey, and Mayfield)

Finding #3: OST partners that receive City funding are not allowed to charge a nominal fee for participants.

> The Budget Committee felt that if OST City funding caps were enacted, agencies should be allowed the flexibility to charge a nominal fee for participants, if they so choose. This additional funding stream option supports the desire for agencies to diversify their revenues, which supports long-term financial stability.

Recommendation #3: Allow City-funded OST programs the flexibility to charge a nominal fee for participants, if they so choose**.** (Unanimous vote: Barnes, Dulin, Fallon, Kinsey, and Mayfield)

Next steps

> I am happy to discuss the Budget Committee's OST discussions and other considerations the Budget Committee contemplated. I look forward to hearing about the Economic Development Committee's recommendations. My understanding at this point is that our two committee recommendations will be provided to the full Council at our October 8th business meeting.

CHARLOTTE.
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Out of School Time RFP Process

Economic Development Committee
October 4, 2012

Aisha Alexander, Neighborhood & Business Services

CHARMECK.ORG

CITY OF CHARLOTTE

Outline

- Follow-up from August 16 ED Committee Meeting:
  - Budget Committee recommendations
  - Meetings with Out of School Time (OST) providers
- Discussion:
  - Council priorities
  - Eligibility requirements
  - Evaluation procedure
  - Award methodology

CHARMECK.ORG

CITY OF CHARLOTTE

Budget Committee Recommendations

- August 30, 2012 - Budget Committee met to discuss OST funding level, sources, and agency caps
- The discussion resulted in three findings and three corresponding recommendations, summarized in the memo from CM Barnes

CHARMECK.ORG

CITY OF CHARLOTTE

Budget Committee Recommendations

FINDING 1:

- The City's total allocation for OST has remained at $1.24 million for the past 12 years, despite annual decreases in Federal CDBG funding available for OST.
- The Federal CDBG decrease has been offset by increases in funding from the City's Innovative Housing account within the Pay-As-You-Go (PAYGO) capital budget.

RECOMMENDATION 1:

- Cap the City's Innovative Housing funding at the current FY13 level of $590,000 (the City's highest historical level).
- The City's total OST funding allocation could fluctuate depending on federal CDBG funding levels.
- Unanimous vote: Barnes, Dulin, Fallon, Kinsey, and Mayfield

CHARMECK.ORG

CITY OF CHARLOTTE

Budget Committee Recommendations

FINDING 2:

- The portion of OST agency program budgets comprised of City funding varies from 2% to 100% with four of the seven City-funded OST programs receiving over 50% of their program budget from the City.

RECOMMENDATION 2:

- Cap the percentage of an OST agency program budget that can be funded from the City.
- Transition existing City legacy OST partners to no greater than 66% in first year, then to no greater than 33% in second year and thereafter.
- New OST partners would be capped at no greater than 33% from the start of funding.
- Unanimous vote: Barnes, Dulin, Fallon, Kinsey, and Mayfield

CHARMECK.ORG

CITY OF CHARLOTTE

Budget Committee Recommendations

FINDING 3:

- OST partners that receive City funding are not allowed to charge a nominal fee for participants.

RECOMMENDATION 3:

- Allow City-funded OST programs the flexibility to charge a nominal fee for participants, if they so choose.
- Unanimous vote: Barnes, Dulin, Fallon, Kinsey, and Mayfield

CHARMECK.ORG

CITY OF CHARLOTTE

OST Provider Meetings

- Meeting 1: September 17, 2012
  - Part A: Existing contractors discussed the implications of change to the RFP contract cycle
  - Part B: FY12 RPF respondents met to provide feedback on the FY12 RFP process
- Meeting 2: being scheduled for October to review RFP
- Meeting 3: to be scheduled to answer questions of the released RFP
- Engaged Council For Children's Rights/Larry King Center
  - Facilitate process to increase understanding of the RFP and process
  - Assist staff in revising RFP to reflect goals and outcomes, including revision of evaluation design for funded programs

CHARMECK.ORG

CITY OF CHARLOTTE

OST Provider Meeting 1

- Part A: Existing Contractors Meeting:
  - All six of the currently funded providers represented
  - Discussion:
    - Adjusting the OST contract cycle to August-September
    - The impact of extending the current contracts through August with no additional funding
  - Agreement that, in the long term, adjusting the funding schedule beneficial to program management and planning, as well as provides more predictability for students and families
  - Though providers agreed to work to mitigate the impact in July-August of 2013, some felt disproportionately affected
- Contract extensions will be signed in mid-October

CHARMECK.ORG

CITY OF CHARLOTTE

OST Provider Meeting 1

- Part B: RFP Respondents meeting:
  - 21 representatives from 17 organizations that submitted proposals in FY12
  - Participants were asked:
    - What worked well and what was challenging about the process?
    - How well they understood the process and RFP document, including eligibility requirements and program criteria?
    - What changes they would recommend to improve the funding process?

CHARMECK.ORG

CITY OF CHARLOTTE

OST Provider Meeting 1

- Participants generally agreed that the new funding process is a positive change and appreciated the opportunity to provide feedback
- Consistent themes in the feedback were related to:
  - Communication
  - Clarity
  - Fairness
  - Funding priorities
- Providers offered a specific suggestions to improve the application process

CHARMECK.ORG

CITY OF CHARLOTTE

Provider Recommendations

RECOMMENDATION 1:

Provide clear and consistent communication and ensure a shared understanding of the funding process and RFP document.

- Reach more programs with direct communication.
- Provide additional opportunities for providers to get questions answered and to answer questions about their proposals.
- Ensure a shared understanding of the program criteria and the questions in the RFP narrative.

CHARMECK.ORG

CITY OF CHARLOTTE

Provider Recommendations

RECOMMENDATION 2:

Streamline the submission process and review eligibility requirements to promote access from a broad range of providers.

- Simplify the submission process.
- Review and clarify eligibility requirements and connect eligibility requirements to funding goals.
- Determine a balanced approach to eligibility factors to promote inclusion of smaller programs as well as large, multi-site organizations.

CHARMECK.ORG

CITY OF CHARLOTTE

Provider Recommendations

RECOMMENDATION 3:

Create a fair and transparent review and decision process that is consistently applied.

- Clarify the review process and ensure an impartial review committee.
- Clarify and communicate the funding decision process.
- Create an atmosphere of trust and ensure that policies are consistently applied.
- Provide additional opportunities for applicants to demonstrate program quality.

CHARMECK.ORG

CITY OF CHARLOTTE

Provider Recommendations

RECOMMENDATION 4:

Establish and communicate clear priorities, goals, and evaluation requirements for the City's out-of-school time funding.

- Create guidelines related to funding amounts and consider policies to promote sustainability.
- Clarify priorities and goals.
- Establish criteria or define preferences related to target population.
- Clarify evaluation requirements for funded programs and require reporting on outcomes in addition to listed reporting requirements.

CHARMECK.ORG

CITY OF CHARLOTTE

ED Committee Charge

- ED Committee is tasked with reviewing RFP components:
  - Confirm Council priorities
  - Confirm eligibility requirements
  - Review evaluation procedure
  - Review award methodology
- Staff examined initial OST Provider Recommendations to develop draft RFP recommendations

CHARMECK.ORG

CITY OF CHARLOTTE

OST Funding Priorities

CHARMECK.ORG

CITY OF CHARLOTTE

OST Funding Priorities

Program Characteristics

Effective partnerships
- Fosters productive relationships with students and schools
- Develops partnerships with the community, business, non-profits and other groups to enhance services to students

Family engagement and support
- Evidence of parent/caregiver participation
- Provides additional assistance to support the holistic needs of the family unit

Quality staff and programming
- Appropriate education and training
- Continually builds staff capacity
- Evidence of increased educational and social development

Financial sustainability
- Evidence of long rage financial planning
- Diversified funding sources
- Maintained partner interest

CHARMECK.ORG

CITY OF CHARLOTTE

OST Funding Priorities

Provider Strategies

Varied academic and non-academic activities
- Sequential activities that promote mastery
- Opportunities to explore and develop interests
- Individualized academic support and intervention

Exposure to new and engaging experiences
- Access to cultural experiences
- Access to the "world of work"
- Innovative activities that develop life skills

Opportunities for positive social interaction
- Activities that promote pro-social behavior
- Activities that promote respect for diversity

Civic engagement opportunities
- Leadership development opportunities
- Service learning and community building opportunities

CHARMECK.ORG

CITY OF CHARLOTTE

Eligibility Requirements

FY12 Eligibility

- Local Education Agencies (LEA), non-profit 501(c)(3) organizations, or faith based organizations who are current after school care providers
- Must have provided OST services in Charlotte for a minimum of three years
- Must be licensed and registered to do business in North Carolina
- Must serve at least 50 students

Recommendation for FY13

- Maintain current eligibility requirements, with the exception of:
- Must have provided OST services for a minimum of three years

CHARMECK.ORG

CITY OF CHARLOTTE

Evaluation Procedure

FY12 Evaluation

- FY12 RFPs were reviewed by a team of five internal staff
- Reviewers scored proposals individually, based on a 130 point rubric:

10 pts

- Executive Summary

15 pts (each)

- Staffing & Professional Development
- Youth Recruitment and Retention Plan
- Program Schedule and Enrollment
- Program Goals
- Program Activities
- Self-Assessment
- Parent/Caregiver Engagement
- Program Budget

- In person interviews were conducted with eligible applicants

Recommendation for FY13

- Conduct site visits for respondents
- Revise point values to reflect Council priorities
- Publish the scoring rubric in the RFP
- Consider convening a group of external volunteers to participate in the review process

CITY OF CHARLOTTE

Award Methodology

FY12 Award Methodology

- FY12 OST funding recommendation based on the Housing Trust Fund Model
- This model funds the top scoring programs at 100% of their request until funds are exhausted

Recommendation for FY13

- Continue to utilize the Housing Trust Fund model
- Consider adding a dollar amount cap of $300,000 per agency to ensure diversity

CHARMECK.ORG

CITY OF CHARLOTTE

Next Steps

- October
  - Use feedback to revise RFP with assistance from the Council for Children's Rights/Larry King Center
  - Meet with potential OST Respondents for review and input to RFP
- November
  - Council to consider Budget Committee recommendations at November 12 Council Meeting
  - RFP released
- December
  - Host pre-submission conferences
- April
  - Evaluation complete
  - Recommendation to Council

CHARMECK.ORG

- ကုမ္ပဏီအမည်အပြည့်အစုံ
- ကုမ္ပဏီ၏ရုံးချုပ်လိပ်စာ
- ဖုန်းနံပါတ်နှင့်အီးမေးလ်
- ကုမ္ပဏီ၏ဝက်ဘ်ဆိုက်
- ကုမ္ပဏီ၏ဥပဒေရေးရာကိုယ်စားပြု
- ကုမ္ပဏီ၏ဥပဒေရေးရာကိုယ်စားပြုလိပ်စာ
- ကုမ္ပဏီ၏ဖိုင်ပြားနံပါတ်
- ကုမ္ပဏီ၏ဥပဒေရေးရာကိုယ်စားပြု
- ကုမ္ပဏီ၏ဥပဒေရေးရာကိုယ်စားပြုဖုန်းနံပါတ်
- ကုမ္ပဏီ၏ဥပဒေရေးရာကိုယ်စားပြုအီးမေးလ်

ဆက်သွယ်ရေးအတွက်ကိုယ်စားပြုပုဂ္ဂိုလ်ကိုရွေးချယ်ပေးပါ။ ကျွန်တော်တို့ကပြန်ကြားပေးနိုင်ရန်ဖြစ်ပါသည်။

- ပုဒ်မ(၁)တွင်ဖော်ပြထားသော ကုမ္ပဏီ၏ဥပဒေရေးရာကိုယ်စားပြုပုဂ္ဂိုလ်ကိုပြောင်းလဲခြင်းများ ရှိပါက ကျွန်တော်တို့ကိုအကြောင်းကြားပေးပါရန်
- ဆက်ဆံရေးအတွက်ကုမ္ပဏီ၏ဥပဒေရေးရာကိုယ်စားပြုပုဂ္ဂိုလ်ကို အကြောင်းကြားပြီးပါက ကုမ္ပဏီ၏ဥပဒေရေးရာကိုယ်စားပြုပုဂ္ဂိုလ်ကိုသာ ဆက်ဆံရေးပြုလုပ်ပေးပါမည်
- ရုံးချုပ်ကနေပြီး ကုမ္ပဏီ၏ဥပဒေရေးရာကိုယ်စားပြုပုဂ္ဂိုလ်ကနေ ကျွန်တော်တို့ဆီကို ပြန်ကြားပေးပို့ပေးပါမည်
- ဒီကိစ္စအတွက် ကုမ္ပဏီ၏ဥပဒေရေးရာကိုယ်စားပြုပုဂ္ဂိုလ်ကနေ ကျွန်တော်တို့ဆီကို ပြန်ကြားပေးပို့ပေးပါရန်

ကျွန်တော်တို့ရဲ့ အကြောင်းကြားချက်ကို ဘယ်လိုနည်းနဲ့ ရယူနိုင်ပါသလဲ။

ကျွန်တော်တို့ရဲ့ အကြောင်းကြားချက်ကို ကုမ္ပဏီ၏ဥပဒေရေးရာကိုယ်စားပြုပုဂ္ဂိုလ်ထံ ကျွန်တော်တို့ရဲ့ဖုန်းခေါ်ဆိုမှုတွေ၊ အီးမေးလ်တွေ၊ ရုံးတော်ကနေ ပေးပို့ထားတဲ့ စာတွေ ဒါမမဟုတ် ကုမ္ပဏီ၏ ဝက်ဘ်ဆိုက်ပေါ်ကနေ ရယူနိုင်ပါတယ်။ ကျွန်တော်တို့ကနေ ကုမ္ပဏီ၏ ဥပဒေရေးရာ ကိုယ်စားပြုပုဂ္ဂိုလ်ကို ဆက်သွယ်ပြီးတဲ့အခါ ကုမ္ပဏီ၏ ဥပဒေရေးရာ ကိုယ်စားပြုပုဂ္ဂိုလ်ကနေ ကျွန်တော်တို့ဆီကို ပြန်ကြားပေးပို့ပေးပါမယ်။

ကျွန်တော်တို့ကနေ ကုမ္ပဏီ၏ ဥပဒေရေးရာ ကိုယ်စားပြုပုဂ္ဂိုလ်ကို ဘယ်လိုကူညီပေးနိုင်မလဲ။

- ကုမ္ပဏီ၏ ဥပဒေရေးရာ ကိုယ်စားပြုပုဂ္ဂိုလ်ကို ကျွန်တော်တို့ဆီကနေ ရရှိတဲ့ ကိုယ်ရေးကိုယ်တာ အကြောင်းအရာတွေ ကို ကျွန်တော်တို့ ဘယ်လိုမျှဝေပေးနိုင်ပါသလဲ
- ကုမ္ပဏီ၏ ဥပဒေရေးရာ ကိုယ်စားပြုပုဂ္ဂိုလ်ကို ကျွန်တော်တို့ ဘယ်လောက်ထိ ကြာကြာ ကူညီပေးနေမှာလဲ
- ကုမ္ပဏီ၏ ဥပဒေရေးရာ ကိုယ်စားပြုပုဂ္ဂိုလ်ကနေ ကျွန်တော်တို့ကို ပြန်ကြားပေးပို့ဖို့ ကျွန်တော်တို့ ဘယ်လိုလုပ်ပေးနိုင်ပါသလဲ
- ကုမ္ပဏီ၏ ဥပဒေရေးရာ ကိုယ်စားပြုပုဂ္ဂိုလ်ကနေ ကျွန်တော်တို့ဆီကို ပြန်ကြားပေးပို့ဖို့ ကျွန်တော်တို့ ဘယ်လိုလုပ်ပေးနိုင်ပါသလဲ

ကျွန်တော်တို့ကနေ ကုမ္ပဏီ၏ ဥပဒေရေးရာ ကိုယ်စားပြုပုဂ္ဂိုလ်ကို ကျွန်တော်တို့ ဘယ်လောက်ကြာကြာ ကူညီပေးနေမှာလဲ

ကျွန်တော်တို့ ကုမ္ပဏီ ဥပဒေရေးရာ ကိုယ်စားပြုပုဂ္ဂိုလ်ကို ကျွန်တော်တို့ ဘယ်လိုကူညီပေးနိုင်ပါသလဲ ဆိုတာ ကျွန်တော်တို့ ကုမ္ပဏီ ဥပဒေရေးရာ ကိုယ်စားပြုပုဂ္ဂိုလ်ကနေ ကျွန်တော်တို့ဆီ ပြန်ကြားပေးပို့ဖို့ ကျွန်တော်တို့ ဘယ်လိုလုပ်

CHARLOTTE.
NEIGHBORHOOD & BUSINESS SERVICES

Recommendations from Surrounding Youth Councils

Information has been gathered from local youth councils, including those in Charlotte [see Attachment 1]. During the process of gathering this information, youth council coordinators offered recommendations for developing a youth council:

- Encourage youth involvement during the process of creating a youth council.
- Offer opportunities for members of a youth council to work alongside Council members.
- Have a clear purpose regarding how the youth council will focus efforts (e.g. service-oriented vs. advocacy).
- Attend state or local youth council conferences and network with leaders of other youth councils for guidance.
- Meet with local guidance counselors, school superintendent, or principals for support and feedback.
- Consider a full-time staff member to coordinate the council's activities. Most local councils have full time staff whose average salary is between $33,387-$41,734.

Next Steps

- Develop a clear purpose for the youth council and how it will relate to current Charlotte youth programs
- Develop a platform of engagement with City Council
- Conduct site visits to Charlotte youth councils and surrounding cities/counties with youth councils
- Examine whether it will be more appropriate to partner with an existing youth council in Charlotte or create a new platform

Attachment 1: Surrounding Youth Councils and Charlotte-based Youth Councils

Surrounding Youth Councils						
Name	Sponsor	# of youth	Grade	Staff	Meeting Schedule	Activities
City of Concord Youth Council	Park & Rec	73	9-12	2 full-time Park & Rec staff 1 volunteer from Police Dept.	Twice per month	5 Alarm 5k; 2-3 conferences a year
Mayor's Youth Leadership Council in Gastonia	Park & Rec	20	9-12	2 full-time staff City Council Advisor	Once per month	Habit for Humanity, hospital visits
Lake Norman Teen Council	Park & Rec	45-50	9-12	2 full-time staff with other duties	Twice per month	Local festivals and forums
Mooresville Youth Advisory Council (regrouping)	Park & Rec	8	9-12	2 full-time staff	Regrouping	Makes recommendations to the Town Board
Charlotte-based Youth Councils						
Generation Nation	Non-profit	100	9-12	1 full-time staff	Twice per month	Round table events about current issues; Kids Voting and Candidate Days
Youth Empowered Solutions (YES!)	Non-profit	40; 5 paid youth staff	Ages: 14-21	5 full-time staff	1-3 times per month	Advocate for CMS healthy vending policy; piloting a lunchroom redesign
Mecklenburg Ministries	Non-profit/ faith-based	20	Grades 9-12	1 part time staff	Once per month	Homeless awareness, teen dialogue on race, interfaith Thanksgivings, community service
Foundation For The Carolinas	Non-profit	25	Ages: 14-18	1 full-time staff – half time on this program	Once per month for 10 months	Provides Mecklenburg County students leadership skills in philanthropy; participants award grants to youth serving programs.