

Council Meeting – June 6, 2005

Straw Votes

Council Chamber

5:00 p.m.

Straw Votes on the FY2006 & FY2007 Budget

City Council Straw Votes information was distributed in the Friday, May 27th Council-Manager Memorandum. Additional questions received from Council members are attached.

June 6th is the date set for Council's straw vote on the FY2006 & FY2007 Strategic Operating Plan and the FY2006-FY2010 Capital Investment Plan.

Council's practice is to vote on items at the June 6th meeting. Each of these items receiving six or more votes will be incorporated into the budget ordinance that will be part of the June 13th budget adoption agenda item.

By the end of the June 6th budget retreat, changes to revenues and expenditures must balance in preparation for the scheduled June 13th budget adoption. By State law, the adopted budget must balance revenues to expenditures.

Questions and Answers

Additional Questions from Council Members

Question 1: What are the estimated budget savings from moving police officers in the DARE program “to the street”?

Non-donated operating expenses for the DARE program total approximately \$20,000. If police officers were moved from the DARE program this amount would be offset by the operating expenses associated with on-street patrol officers. In addition, DARE officers do not have assigned vehicles. DARE officers report to their respective division station and check out an older pool vehicle to use to travel to their assigned school. Therefore, there is no budget savings to be gained from moving police officers from the DARE program to the street.

Question 2: What are the estimated budget savings if the City does not provide service to ABC stores? Are there any other outstanding costs related to ABC?

According to Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police, there are no police officers “assigned” to ABC stores, neither on-duty nor off-duty, however, all police officers have permission from the State to enforce ABC laws. There are no budget savings related to ABC stores since there are no funds currently allocated to this area. In addition, there are no other outstanding costs related to ABC. Police does not rent space from ABC and therefore, pays no rent to ABC.

Question 3: What is the current number of sergeants in CMPD? How many of those sergeants are assigned “to the street”? What is the ratio of sergeants to police officers?

The total number of sergeants in CMPD is 164. The majority of the sergeants supervise patrol officers and spend a portion of their time in the field. In patrol, the ratio of sergeants to police officers is approximately 1 to 10. A small number of sergeants are assigned within the department to areas where the job duties and responsibilities require this ranking. For example, seven sergeants are assigned to Internal Affairs to complete investigations. Sergeants are also assigned to manage areas including robbery, SWAT team, crime prevention, and to coordinate the court case scheduling for patrol officers. Due to the level and nature of responsibility required in these areas, civilian employees nor officers below the rank of sergeant are viable options to fill these roles.

Area of Deployment	Number of Sergeants
Field Operations	110
Field Operations Support	6
CATS Liaison	1
Internal Affairs	7
International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP)	1
Investigations	23
Special Services (K9, Traffic Safety, Crime Scene, etc.)	11
Training Academy	5
Total	164

Question 4: Are there any General Fund savings related to the Work Force Development Board?

There are no budget savings available to help the General Fund from the Workforce Development Board. Work Force Development is funded through a combination of a federal grant and the General Fund.

In FY2002, the federal Workforce Investment Act mandated that a Workforce Development Board be established to administer Workforce Investment funds. These funds provide training and employment search assistance for adults, youth, and dislocated workers. The City's contract with the Workforce Development Board requires that the General Fund pay for a portion of two administrative positions. No other General Fund funds are used to support any part of this program.

Occasionally, the amount of grant funds appropriated in a given year is less than the actual grant award. When this happens, the additional grant funds are appropriated the following year.

These additional grant funds must be used on Work Force Development activities. It is anticipated that this program will recognize a 30% reduction in federal funds in FY06, going from \$5.3 million in FY05 to \$3.7 million in FY06.

Question 5: Please provide a copy of the recent After-School evaluation materials.

The Privatization Competition Advisory Committee (PCAC) recently completed a review of the After-School programs. The complete report from the PCAC is provided as attachment 1.

**Privatization and Competition Advisory Committee
City After School Enrichment Programs
Vender Selection Process
March 10, 2005**

Requested Action: Approved PCAC Neighborhood Development Subcommittee recommendation to:

- A. Initiate an RFP process to select a third-party intermediary to administer the After School Enrichment Program (ASEP) on behalf of the City. The intermediary will be responsible for ASEP vendor selection; allocating City funds; monitoring program performance; raising funds to leverage City resources; and preparing a cost/benefit analysis of intermediary work with ASEP.
- B. Adopt the City's intermediary selection criteria and process.

The PCAC Neighborhood Development Sub Committee met on March 3, 2005 to review staff recommendations. Five PCAC members – David Morgan, Frank Gentry, Bonita Hairston, Christopher Squier and Raphael Basisa – met to discuss program quality standards, vendor selection criteria and the introduction of a third-party intermediary to administer the ASEP. Toni Tupponce and Stanley Watkins of Neighborhood Development provided the City's presentation. Claire Tate of Partners in Out-of-School Time (POST) provided additional presentation support and David Elmore assisted the PCAC.

PCAC – Neighborhood Development Sub Committee Report

- The City of Charlotte has provided financial support for six inner city After School Enrichment (ASEP) Programs, some for almost 30 years.
- National research supports the positive impact of after school and out of school time programs on children and families – particularly low wealth families – keeping children safe, improving academic performance and providing opportunities for mentoring and cultural enrichment.
- Updated program numbers show the City sponsored After School Enrichment Programs serve approximately 755 elementary school students (K – 5) and 60 middle school students. (Approximately 4,000 students are on the waiting list for similar programs.)
- The City's current budget for the programs is \$1.2 million with 71% of the funding coming from federal Community Development Block Grant and 29% from local Innovative Housing Funds.

City Council Requests

- On June 28, 2004 City Council directed staff to work with Partners in Out- of- School Time (POST) to develop quality standards for program improvement based on national best practices; and with the Privatization and Competition Advisory Committee (PCAC) to develop a process for vendor selection.

Process to Date

- City Staff has worked with POST to develop program quality standards. The current After School Enrichment Program vendors were apprised of the City process and reviewed draft standards.
- On January 13, 2005 staff made a presentation to Privatization and Competition Advisory Committee – referred to Neighborhood Development Sub-Committee
- On January 27, 2005 the PCAC Neighborhood Development Sub-Committee met with staff and a POST representative for clarification of program purpose, eligibility and outcomes as well as discussed vendor selection options. The options were:
 1. Continue City program administration using quality standards as funding criteria;
 2. Initiate a Request for Proposals for FY 2007 for vendors;
 3. Initiate and administer after school care voucher program for geographic and income eligible families and program eligible vendors; or
 4. Contract with a third party intermediary to select vendors, allocate city funds, monitor vendors and administer the overall program.

An over riding theme was for City programs to shift from an operating orientation (pay for staff) to a capital orientation (pay for facilities), which may provide incentive for vendors to become more aggressive in raising operating funds.

- On February 10, 2005 the full PCAC reviewed program quality standards and discussed vendor selection options. Staff expressed a preference for a third party intermediary which could 1) leverage City resources with those of other public, non-profit and private entities to serve more children; 2) undertake research and development of best practices for local ASEP vendors; and 3) provide oversight and management of the program on behalf of the City. An intermediary may add \$85,000 to \$100,000 to the City's cost for the program. The PCAC referred the issue back to Neighborhood Development Sub-Committee to review intermediary selection criteria.

Proposed ASEP Intermediary Selection Criteria

The City staff proposed entering into a three-year agreement with an intermediary to administer the ASEP. The following are recommended intermediary selection criteria:

- **Organizational Expertise** – Organization knowledge and experience in after school

and out of school policy and program development, early childhood and youth development and working with families in low wealth neighborhoods;

- **Management Plan** – Quality of proposed vendor selection process, program management approach and compliance assurance based on the City’s ASEP Quality Standards, Vendor Selection Criteria;
- **Compliance System** - Organizational infrastructure in place to effectively manage, monitor and evaluate the City’s ASEP vendors, i.e., tracking of vendor licensing and/or certification progress, documenting students’ geographic location, determining household income eligibility, documenting vendor site visits, and providing timely and accurate expense reports, etc.;
- **Fund Raising Expertise** – Ability to secure other public, non-profit and private resources to leverage the City ASEP funding and provide technical assistance to ASEP vendors seeking other funding;
- **Cost/Benefit Analysis** – Intermediary will project benefit of third-party contract to the efficiency and effectiveness of the ASEP and will present documented cost/benefit analysis to City at end of year one;
- **Cost to City** – Cost to the City for the intermediary to administer the program; and
- **Staff Quality** - The education and experience of the intermediary’s staff and administrative team.

City After School Enrichment Program Vendor Selection Criteria

Proposed Standards	Comment
1. Household must be located within the City Within A City (CWAC) geography (within four miles of uptown). Priority consideration should be given to households located with the City’s targeted revitalization neighborhoods.	Amended Standard
2. Participant eligibility for families earning incomes $\leq 60\%$ of AMI ($\leq \$38,500$ for a family of four)	Current Standard
3. North Carolina Day Care Certification or ability to obtain certification within two years (Quality Standard)	New Standard
4. Participating students must meet $\geq 80\%$ program daily attendance rates	Current Standard
5. Provides lowest reasonable cost per student	City current cost is \$1,456 per student annually
6. Provide a diverse curriculum for academic improvement and cultural enrichment (Quality Standard)	Current Standard

7. Fifty percent (50%) of participants improve in areas that support academic improvement such as class participation, homework completion, etc. or perform at grade level. (Quality Standard)	Amended Standard
8. Demonstrated involvement of parent/guardian or other responsible family member in the program (Quality Standard)	Current Standard
9. Collaboration with participants' schools and/or teachers for curriculum or student goal alignment (Quality Standard)	New Standard
10. Annual staff development plan (Quality Standard)	Current Standard
11. Development of fiscal sustainability plans	Current Standard
13. Provide transportation to students, if needed	New Standard

Proposed Timetable for Intermediary and Vendor Selection

- April 2005 – Solicit Request for Proposals for Intermediary
- June 2005 – Award ASEP Administrative Contract (*Intermediary will provide contract management and technical assistance needed to help current vendors meet the quality standards necessary to be competitive in the RFP process.*)
- August – November 2005 – Contractor provides technical assistance to ASEP vendors in preparation for FY 2007 contract preparation (Current ASEP vendors should be maintained during FY 2006 to minimize student disruption)
- December 2005 – Initiate vendor selection process
- July 2006 – New Vendor program

Potential list of qualified ASEP Administration Contractors

- Child Care Resources, Inc.
Janet Singerman, President
4601 Park Road – Suite 500
Charlotte, NC 28209
- Partners in Out – of – School Time
Claire K. Tate, Director
Partners in Out-of –School Time
217 South Tryon Street – Suite 312
Charlotte, NC 28202